International Journal of
Development Strategies in Humanities, Management and Social Sciences
p-ISSN: 2360-9036 | e-ISSN: 2360-9044
IJDSHMSS
July, 2026
Vol. 16, No. 2

The Slavery Paradox: Foreign Debt and Nigeria's Economic Sovereignty

[1]Aondoaver Jacob Abur & [2]Luper Veronica Viashima
[1&2]Department of Sociology, Federal University Dutsin-Ma Katsina State, Nigeria

Article DOI:
10.48028/iiprds/ijdshmss.v16.i2.03

Keywords:
Slavery Paradox, Economic Sovereignty, Foreign Loan Dependence, Neocolonialism, Structural Adjustment, Domestic Debt

Corresponding Author:
Aondoaver Jacob Abur

Abstract

Nigeria's external debt exceeded $45 billion by 2025, with debt-servicing costs consuming over 144 percent of retained revenue, a condition this study terms the "Slavery Paradox"—where political independence coexists with fiscal subjugation to external creditors. The paper examines how foreign loan dependence, enforced through international conditionalities, systematically erodes Nigeria's economic sovereignty. Employing a qualitative, critical-interpretive design, the study synthesises historical fiscal data, policy documents, and conceptual literature from 1960 to 2025 through the dual lenses of neocolonialism and structural adjustment theories. Key findings reveal a "revolving door" of capital flight and a "dual debt trap" in which ballooning domestic debt (₦76.59 trillion) compounds external pressures, paralysing social investment. The paper concludes that reclaiming sovereignty requires strategic decoupling—pro-industrial policies, progressive taxation, and elite accountability—drawing contextual lessons from Botswana, Rwanda, and Vietnam. The study contributes a framework linking macro-level power dynamics with micro-level fiscal mechanisms that perpetuate post-colonial dependency.

Background to the Study

In January 2025, Nigeria's federal government debt-servicing costs reached ₦696.27 billion, exceeding its retained revenue of ₦483.47 billion by 144 percent and resulting in zero allocation for capital projects (Punch, 2025; BusinessDay, 2025). This occurred amid a crippling economic downturn marked by 34 percent inflation (National Bureau of Statistics [NBS], 2025) and widespread food insecurity (Ukwe, 2025)—a stark reminder that the nation's fiscal chains, forged in the fires of foreign lending, continue to bind its post-colonial aspirations. This scenario, where external creditors dictate budgetary priorities, exemplifies the “slavery paradox”: a modern bondage in which political independence coexists with economic subjugation, as debt repayments eclipse investments in infrastructure, education, and health.

Nigeria's post-colonial trajectory has been inextricably linked to foreign loan dependence, with external debt ballooning to $45.98 billion by the first quarter of 2025, representing a 6.9 percent increase from the previous quarter and surpassing the $43 billion peak of September 2024 (Debt Management Office [DMO], 2025). This reliance, often facilitated through International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank facilities, imposes stringent conditionalities—privatisation mandates, subsidy removals, and fiscal austerity—that erode economic sovereignty by constraining policy autonomy and perpetuating neocolonial control (Dreher, Sturm, & Vreeland, 2015). Empirical analyses reveal that such loans, while ostensibly for development, triggered structural adjustment programmes (SAPs) in the 1980s and beyond, leading to deindustrialisation, currency devaluation, and heightened inequality. This is supported by fiscal data showing debt servicing consuming as much as 97 percent of federal revenues in recent periods (World Bank, 2023), diverting critical resources from domestic priorities.

Critically, the debt challenge extends beyond external obligations. By mid-2025, Nigeria's total public debt had reached ₦152.4 trillion, representing a 348.6 percent increase since President Bola Tinubu assumed office in 2023, with domestic debt alone standing at ₦76.59 trillion (Udunze, 2025; Leadership, 2025). The IMF has warned that Nigeria's growing reliance on domestic borrowing—with interest payments exceeding 30 percent of government revenues—has deepened the “bank-sovereign nexus,” exposing the financial system to sovereign risk and crowding out private-sector credit (IMF, 2025; Leadership, 2025). This “dual debt trap” means Nigeria faces simultaneous pressure from external creditors and domestic financial markets, each imposing distinct constraint on fiscal policy.

In the current era, the slavery paradox manifests in Nigeria's vulnerability to global financial shocks, where multilateral creditors hold a significant portion of the external debt portfolio (DMO, 2025), enforcing reforms that prioritise creditor interests over national self-determination. This was clearly evidenced by the doubled local cost of a $3.4 billion IMF loan repayment in April 2025, a direct consequence of the severe depreciation of the naira (Financial Times, 2025). Yet paradoxically, recent IMF assessments acknowledge that Nigeria's reforms—including fuel-subsidy removal and exchange-rate unification—have improved macroeconomic stability, with growth accelerating to 3.4 percent in 2024 and inflation moderating to 23.7 percent by April 2025 (IMF, 2025). This tension between stabilisation gains and continued social hardship lies at the heart of the slavery paradox: reforms demanded by creditors may produce macroeconomic indicators that satisfy international markets while failing to translate into improved living conditions for citizens.

This article argues that Nigeria's chronic dependence on foreign loans embodies the "slavery paradox," perpetuating neocolonial dependencies through conditionalities and fiscal entrapment that systematically erode economic sovereignty, thereby hindering sustainable development and reinforcing imperial economic structures in the post-colonial era. However, the article moves beyond simplistic external-exploitation narratives to examine how domestic political and economic elites—the "comprador bourgeoisie"—actively participate in and benefit from this arrangement, creating a symbiotic relationship between global creditors and local power holders (Fanon, 1963; Osoba, 1978). The article utilises neocolonialism and structural adjustment theories. While neocolonialism explains the broader political and economic power relationship and answers "why" this is happening, structural adjustment theory explains the specific, technical mechanisms through which this control is enforced, answering "how" it happens. Together, this combination adeptly moves from the macro-level of international power dynamics down to the micro-level of national budget cuts and privatisation, offering a comprehensive explanation for the erosion of Nigerian economic sovereignty.

Methodology

A qualitative, critical interpretive design synthesises multi-sectoral data with critical theory to map Nigeria's diminished policy autonomy from 1960 through the 2025 fiscal crises. Systematic document analysis integrates fiscal records, policy documents, media reports, and theoretical literature (Bowen, 2009). Purposive stratified sampling captured the macro-logic of international finance and micro-mechanisms of domestic implementation (Patton, 2015). Primary quantitative data on debt stocks, debt-service-to-revenue ratios, and creditor composition came from the DMO and Central Bank of Nigeria (1960–2025), cross-validated with World Bank and IMF Article IV Consultations (2022–2025). Surveillance reports from the NBS and authoritative media (Punch, BusinessDay, Financial Times, Premium Times, Leadership) covered the 2023–2025 period, enabling triangulation (Denzin, 1978). Botswana, Rwanda, and Vietnam were selected as post-colonial states that managed debt while achieving sustained growth; they offer contextualised insights, not direct models. Theoretical sampling identified foundational and contemporary literature on neocolonialism, structural adjustment, and economic sovereignty.

Critical Thematic Analysis (CTA) identifies patterns while attending to power and ideology (Braun & Clarke, 2021; Fairclough, 2013). Stage 1 coded documents into four themes: Policy Autonomy Erosion, Fiscal Entrapment, Elite Agency (Compradorism), and Institutional Reshaping, with investigator triangulation (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Stage 2 applied neocolonialism to explain external control and structural adjustment theory to map the technical surrender of the national budget. Stage 3 used framing analysis to determine how domestic policy narratives align with creditor expectations (Entman, 1993).

Credibility was enhanced by tethering arguments to fiscal data, such as the 144 percent debt-service-to-revenue ratio. Dependability and confirmability were addressed through clear documentation and reflexive attention to normative commitments (Guba & Lincoln, 1989). This qualitative, discourse-based design relies on secondary documents and systematic content analysis. Consequently, causal claims about elite motivations—particularly the actions of the "comprador bourgeoisie"—are inferred from fiscal flows and policy actions rather than from direct interviews or ethnographic observation. The absence of elite interviews limits the depth of insight into the subjective calculations that sustain the slavery paradox. Future research should adopt a mixed-methods approach combining quantitative longitudinal debt data with semi-structured interviews of policy-makers, financial intermediaries, and representatives of creditor institutions to triangulate the internal dynamics of debt negotiations and capital flight.

Conceptual Framework

Economic Sovereignty

Economic sovereignty is the unencumbered right to self-determination in fiscal policy, including the ultimate authority to formulate and execute policies regarding taxation structures and government spending (public-expenditure allocations), monetary policy—including independent control over tools such as interest rates and money supply—trade regulation covering the authority over strategic trade policies, and development policy such as the right to undertake national development planning that fosters self-reliant growth (Guobadia, 1998). Economic sovereignty represents a foundational pillar of a nation's autonomy in the post-colonial era. In the African context, however, this sovereignty has been systematically undermined since political independence. Colonial legacies deliberately left economies structurally oriented toward the extraction and export of raw materials, which rendered them vulnerable to global market fluctuations and consistent external interventions (Ukponu, Okaruefe, Sulayman, Afonne, & Odusola, 2022). This structural dependency continues to pose a significant challenge to achieving true economic independence.

Contemporary scholarship has refined the concept to distinguish between juridical sovereignty—the formal legal independence recognised in international law—and empirical sovereignty—the substantive capacity to exercise autonomous control over national affairs (Jackson, 1990). The slavery paradox, as developed in this article, captures precisely the disjuncture between these two forms: Nigeria possesses juridical sovereignty as an independent nation-state, yet its empirical sovereignty is systematically constrained by debt obligations and creditor conditionalities.

Foreign Loan Dependence

Foreign loan dependence refers to a structural economic condition in which a country relies persistently and substantially on external borrowing to finance its development expenditures, cover fiscal deficits, maintain balance-of-payments equilibrium, or sustain basic economic functions (Checherita-Westphal & Rother, 2012; Ajayi, 1991). This dependence is characterised by a continuous need for foreign capital inflows through bilateral loans, multilateral lending institutions, or international capital markets. Crucially, this persistent reliance often results in escalating debt-service obligations that inevitably constrain domestic policy autonomy and erode economic sovereignty (Checherita-Westphal & Rother, 2012).

The condition manifests when a nation's domestic savings and revenue-generation capacity prove insufficient to meet investment requirements and government expenditures, necessitating recurrent external financing (Ajayi, 1991). Foreign loan dependence typically exhibits path-dependent characteristics—a self-reinforcing mechanism whereby initial borrowing creates conditions, such as heavy debt-service burdens and weakened domestic resource mobilisation, that perpetuate the need for additional external financing (Krugman, 1988). The accumulation of debt compels fresh loans merely to service existing obligations, draining scarce foreign-exchange reserves and leading to further indebtedness.

In post-colonial economies, foreign loan dependence emerges as an entrenched structural vulnerability, characterised by recurrent reliance on external borrowing to bridge fiscal deficits, stabilise balance-of-payments imbalances, and fund ostensibly developmental initiatives. In Nigeria, this dependence intensified following the post-1970s oil-boom bust. External debt ballooned from approximately $5 billion in 1980 to over $42.1 billion by March 2024, driven largely by loans from multilateral lenders such as the IMF and the World Bank (DMO, 2024). These obligations compel significant expenditures, with debt-service payments accounting for a substantial portion of the nation's foreign-exchange earnings.

However, an exclusive focus on external debt obscures the growing significance of domestic borrowing. By mid-2025, Nigeria's domestic debt had reached ₦76.59 trillion, with Federal Government bonds accounting for ₦60.65 trillion and Treasury Bills ₦12.76 trillion (Leadership, 2025). The IMF has cautioned that this growing reliance on domestic borrowing, with interest rates between 13 and 18 percent, creates distinct but equally binding constraints on fiscal space. Domestic debt servicing now consumes over 30 percent of government revenues, among the highest ratios in Sub-Saharan Africa, and has deepened the "bank-sovereign nexus" wherein local banks' balance sheets become tightly coupled with government fiscal performance (IMF, 2025; Leadership, 2025). Any comprehensive analysis of the slavery paradox must therefore attend to both external and domestic debt dynamics, recognising that sovereignty is constrained from multiple directions simultaneously.

The Slavery Paradox

The "Slavery Paradox" represents a profound historical irony in the trajectory of post-colonial nations. It is the phenomenon whereby nations that achieved political independence through anti-colonial struggles subsequently enter into ostensibly voluntary economic relationships that reproduce structural dependencies reminiscent of colonial subordination (Rodney, 1972). This paradox manifests when sovereign states, in pursuing development objectives, contract foreign loans under conditions that progressively erode their economic autonomy, constrain policy sovereignty, and bind future national resources to external creditors' claims (Ake, 1981). The core contradiction lies in the transformation of juridical independence into substantive dependence through the mechanism of debt.

This situation creates what Nkrumah (1965) termed "neo-colonialism"—the worst form of imperialism because "for those who practice it, it means power without responsibility and for those who suffer from it, it means exploitation without redress." Neo-colonialism operates not through direct political control but through economic mechanisms—debt, conditionalities, terms of trade, and investment agreements—that perpetuate dependency while maintaining the fiction of sovereignty. Nigeria exemplifies the Slavery Paradox with particular acuity. Upon achieving independence in 1960, the nation possessed minimal external debt and substantial foreign-exchange reserves derived from agricultural exports (Ake, 1996). However, the oil boom of the 1970s, rather than consolidating economic independence, initiated a trajectory toward profound foreign loan dependence (Lewis, 2007). As Watts (2004) observes, "the oil economy proved to be less an instrument of national development than a new form of resource curse, perpetuating dependency and generating novel forms of accumulation and dispossession." The transition from oil prosperity to debt crisis illuminates the paradox's mechanisms.

The slavery paradox is maintained through what this article terms institutional capture—the progressive alignment of domestic institutions with creditor interests rather than citizen welfare. This occurs through multiple channels: the creation of debt-management agencies that prioritise external creditworthiness over domestic accountability; the embedding of IMF and World Bank personnel in finance ministries; the adoption of legal frameworks that enshrine creditor protections; and the formation of elite coalitions—the "comprador bourgeoisie"—whose interests align with continued financial integration rather than autonomous development (Fanon, 1963; Osoba, 1978; Ndikumana & Boyce, 2011).

The concept of the comprador bourgeoisie, derived from Fanon's (1963) analysis of post-colonial elites, describes a domestic capitalist class that serves as an intermediary for foreign capital, extracting rents from its position at the intersection of global and local economies rather than building autonomous productive capacity. In the Nigerian context, this class benefits from debt-financed contracts, currency speculation, capital-flight opportunities, and the privatisation of state assets—all dynamics intensified by the conditionalities accompanying foreign loans. The slavery paradox is thus not simply imposed from without but is actively reproduced from within by domestic actors whose material interests align with continued dependency.

Theoretical Framework

Neocolonialism Theory

Following Nkrumah (1965) and Fanon (1963), neocolonialism provides a powerful lens for understanding why Nigeria's political sovereignty feels like an "empty shell." The theory effectively captures the "why" behind persistent subordination, highlighting how global capitalist structures use economic mechanisms—debt, trade, investment, conditionalities—to maintain control over formally independent states. Nkrumah (1965, p. ix) articulated this with characteristic clarity: "The essence of neo-colonialism is that the State which is subject to it is, in theory, independent and has all the outward trappings of international sovereignty. In reality its economic system and thus its political policy is directed from outside."

Neocolonialism theory illuminates several dimensions of the slavery paradox. First, it explains the structural asymmetry in North–South economic relations, wherein international financial institutions, credit-rating agencies, and bilateral creditors exercise disproportionate influence over domestic policy in borrowing countries (Sinclair, 2005). Second, it highlights how "relief" programmes—such as the 2005 Paris Club deal that required Nigeria to pay $12.4 billion to cancel $18 billion in debt—often function as extractive mechanisms requiring massive upfront payments while ensuring ongoing policy subordination disguised as aid (Okonjo-Iweala & Osafo-Kwaako, 2007; Moyo, 2009). Third, the theory exposes how newer entrants into African finance, including China, while rhetorically distinct from Western creditors, increasingly employ opaque, collateralised loans that mortgage future resource revenues (Brautigam, 2009; Gelpern, Horn, Morris, Parks, & Trebesch, 2022).

However, critics argue that neocolonialism theory overemphasises external agency while underestimating domestic dynamics. Collier (2007) and Lewis (2007) contend that by framing African states as passive victims, the theory fails to sufficiently account for catastrophic internal policy errors, corruption, and the role of domestic elites who actively collaborate in arrangements that undermine national sovereignty. This critique points to a significant limitation: neocolonialism theory, in its classical formulation, offers limited analytical tools for understanding the internal class dynamics that sustain dependency.

Structural Adjustment Theory

Conversely, the Structural Adjustment framework, rooted in neoclassical economics, posits that Nigeria's crises stem from internal distortions—particularly over-reliance on oil, state-led market inefficiencies, and fiscal indiscipline (World Bank, 1981; Krueger, 1974). The theory identifies the "how" of sovereignty erosion through specific policy mechanisms. It correctly diagnosed the unsustainable fiscal imbalances of the

1980s and provided a framework for macroeconomic stabilisation (Udeogu, 2016). It highlights how “soft” influence through IMF Article IV consultations signals creditworthiness to global markets, essentially disciplining the Nigerian state to prioritise fiscal prudence (Sinclair, 2005).

The policy toolkit associated with structural adjustment includes currency devaluation to correct overvalued exchange rates, trade liberalisation to enhance competition, privatisation of state-owned enterprises to improve efficiency, fiscal austerity to reduce deficits, and deregulation to remove price distortions (Mosley, Harrigan, & Toye, 1991). These measures are presented as technocratic corrections to policy failures, but their distributional consequences and political implications are profound.

The theory's “one-size-fits-all” approach, however, has drawn sustained criticism. Rapid trade liberalisation under the 1986 SAP devastated domestic manufacturing in Nigeria without fostering diversification, as local industries could not compete with subsidised imports (Mkandawire & Soludo, 1999; Adenikinju, 2005). Furthermore, the theory assumes unregulated markets produce optimal social outcomes—an assumption contradicted by the sharp rise in Nigerian poverty and infant mortality during adjustment periods (Cornia, Jolly, & Stewart, 1987; Forster, Kentikelenis, Reinsberg, Stubbs, & King, 2020). The framework's inattention to power asymmetries, institutional capacity, and social protection means that its prescriptions, while perhaps technically sound in abstract terms, often produce devastating social consequences in practice.

Integrating Macro and Micro Analysis

Current scholarship remains underdeveloped in its synthesis of these two poles. Literature often fails to explain how technical adjustments (structural adjustment) are the specific instruments used to achieve neocolonial objectives (neocolonialism). There is a “missing link” in understanding how domestic mismanagement is not merely a failure of governance but often a prerequisite for external control—a condition that creates openings for creditors to demand policy concessions.

This study addresses this gap through an integrated framework that:
First, integrates macro and micro analysis by using neocolonialism to explain the power relationship while using structural adjustment to map the technical surrender of the national budget. This dual lens reveals that conditionalities are not merely technical corrections but mechanisms that redistribute decision-making authority from domestic to external institutions.

Second, exposes the elite linkage by moving beyond the binary of “External Exploiter vs. Internal Failure” to analyse how the comprador bourgeoisie benefits from debt accumulation while the state's fiscal capacity is paralysed. Drawing on Fanon (1963) and Osoba's (1978) analysis of the Nigerian bourgeoisie, the framework examines how domestic elites—politicians, bureaucrats, contractors, and financial intermediaries—extract rents from debt-financed projects, currency arbitrage, and privatisation processes, creating material stakes in continued dependency.

Third, updates the paradox by extending the analysis to the 2025 fiscal crisis, incorporating modern debt instruments such as Eurobonds, domestic securities, and "climate colonialism" (Hickel, 2020) that traditional 20th-century critiques did not envision. The framework also addresses the growing significance of domestic debt and the bank-sovereign nexus, recognising that contemporary fiscal entrapment operates through multiple channels simultaneously. The "Slavery Paradox" is thus understood as a contemporary institutional reality where the sovereign nation implements unpopular, creditor-mandated policies (such as the 2023–2025 subsidy removals and exchange-rate unification) that undermine democratic legitimacy and reinforce imperial economic structures, even as these policies are implemented by domestic actors who benefit from them (Olukoshi, 1998; Toussaint, 2008). The paradox is sustained not by external imposition alone but by the active participation of domestic elites whose interests align with continued integration into global financial circuits.

Addressing the Governance-Failure Counterargument

A plausible counterargument holds that Nigeria's debt crisis is primarily a consequence of domestic governance failures—corruption, fiscal indiscipline, and institutional decay—rather than neocolonial entrapment. This perspective, advanced by Collier (2007) and reinforced by the IMF's own diagnostics, rightly emphasises internal agency. However, such accounts risk treating governance as an endogenous variable independent of external constraints. The theoretical integration offered here demonstrates that chronic debt dependence and externally imposed conditionalities systematically weaken domestic institutions, narrowing the policy space within which good governance might operate. Corruption and capital flight, while undeniably home-grown, are enabled and amplified by the "revolving door" of foreign loans that provide the liquidity to be siphoned. Thus, the slavery paradox is not an either/or choice between external exploitation and internal failure; it is a mutually reinforcing cycle where global structures and domestic comprador interests feed each other.

Historical Trajectory of External Debt (1960–2025)

Nigeria's transition from a virtually debt-free nation at independence in 1960 to one of Africa's most indebted countries illustrates a progressive loss of economic sovereignty driven by oil-revenue volatility, poor governance, elite enrichment, and structural dependence on external financing (Lewis, 2007; Ndikumana & Boyce, 2011). The historical evolution of Nigeria's external debt accumulation from 1960 to the present demonstrates that borrowing repeatedly financed consumption, prestige projects, and capital flight rather than productive investment, while imposing creditor-driven conditionalities that eroded policy autonomy.

1960–1970: The Post-Independence Era

At independence, Nigeria's external debt was negligible (less than 1 percent of GDP), with strong foreign reserves and a diversified agricultural export base grounded in cocoa, palm oil, groundnuts, and rubber (Ayida & Onitiri, 1971; Helleiner, 1966). The 1962–1968 Development Plan relied mainly on domestic resources (Federal Republic of

Nigeria, 1962). Even the 1967–1970 civil war was financed largely domestically, leaving debt modest at approximately 7 percent of GDP by 1970 (Ayida, 1987). This period represented the high-water mark of Nigerian economic autonomy, characterised by fiscal discipline and diversified productive capacity.

1970–1980: The Oil Boom and the Seeds of Dependency

The 1973–1974 oil boom paradoxically initiated debt accumulation by encouraging over-spending and prestige projects that could not be sustained when oil prices fell (Lewis, 2007). Only 31 percent of 1970–1978 borrowing financed productive sectors; the rest supported administration, defence, and low-return social services (Adeniyi, Oyinlola, & Omisakin, 2011). By 1980 external debt reached $4.3 billion (Central Bank of Nigeria, 1981). The oil boom created what economists term the "Dutch disease"—an overvalued currency, neglect of agriculture, and growing import dependence—that would prove devastating when oil prices collapsed.

1980–1985: The Debt Crisis Emerges

The 1979–1985 period saw rapid escalation amid falling oil prices and fiscal indiscipline, with debt rising from $8.9 billion in 1980 to $18.9 billion by 1985 and debt-service ratios becoming unsustainable (Okonjo-Iweala & Osafo-Kwaako, 2007; Central Bank of Nigeria, 1986). Borrowing largely financed consumption rather than investment, with debt-service obligations consuming an increasing share of foreign-exchange earnings (Iyoha, 1999). By 1985, Nigeria was caught in a classic debt trap: new borrowing was required simply to service existing obligations.

1986–1993: Structural Adjustment and Deepened Dependency

The 1986 Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP), imposed by the IMF and World Bank, deepened dependence through devaluation, liberalisation, and privatisation conditionalities that devastated domestic industry and increased the naira cost of debt (Mosley et al., 1991; Udeogu, 2016; Mkandawire & Soludo, 1999). External debt rose 76 percent between 1986 and 1993 despite economic contraction (Debt Management Office, 2004). The programme's policy conditionalities—including trade liberalisation that exposed local industries to subsidised imports, currency devaluation that increased the domestic cost of external obligations, and privatisation that transferred state assets to foreign and domestic capital—systematically dismantled the productive base while deepening financial dependency.

1994–1999: Isolation and Accumulation

Isolation under the Abacha regime (1994–1999) forced reliance on expensive commercial and oil-backed loans, while embezzlement and capital flight exceeded borrowed amounts (Ndikumana & Boyce, 2011; Effiom, Achu, & Edet, 2019). This period demonstrated the symbiotic relationship between external debt and internal corruption: borrowed funds were frequently diverted to private accounts, creating personal fortunes while leaving the public with obligations. Ndikumana and Boyce (2011) document that for every dollar borrowed by African countries during this period, approximately 80 cents left as capital flight—a pattern Nigeria exemplified.

2000–2007: The Paris Club "Relief"

The 2005 Paris Club deal required Nigeria to pay $12.4 billion to cancel $18 billion—effectively buying its own relief after having already repaid the original principal multiple times (Moss & Majerowicz, 2016). While celebrated as a breakthrough, the deal's terms revealed the asymmetry of power in debt negotiations: Nigeria had to mobilise substantial foreign reserves to secure relief, depleting buffers that could have supported development. Relief proved temporary, as new borrowing resumed rapidly, especially from China and via domestic bonds (Brautigam & Hwang, 2016).

2015–2025: Explosive Debt Growth

From 2015 onward, collapsing oil prices and persistent revenue weakness triggered explosive debt growth. Total public debt reached $103.1 billion (₦77.1 trillion) by mid-2023, with debt service absorbing 96.3 percent of federal revenue in 2022 (Debt Management Office, 2023; Budget Office, 2023). Contemporary borrowing includes collateralised Chinese loans for infrastructure projects (railways, airports, highways) and multilateral facilities with policy conditionalities (Hurley, Morris, & Portelance, 2019; Gelpern et al., 2022). By mid-2025, total public debt had escalated to ₦152.4 trillion, representing a 348.6 percent increase since President Tinubu assumed office in 2023 (Udunze, 2025).

Table 1: Nigeria's External Debt Trajectory, 1960–2025

Period	Approximate External Debt	Debt Service/Revenue	Major Shocks/Conditionalities
1960 - 1970	< $1 bn (mostly concessional)	< 3%	Civil war (1967–1970); minimal borrowing
1970 - 1980	$4.3 bn by 1980	Rising to ~15%	Oil boom; over-borrowing for prestige projects
1980 – 1985	$18.9 bn by 1985	Unsustainable (>30%)	Oil price collapse; first debt crisis
1986 - 1993	$32.2 bn by 1993	Peaked at ~45%	SAP imposition; devaluation; deindustrialisation
1994 - 1999	~$28 bn	High, arrears accumulated	Isolation; capital flight; Abacha regime
2000 - 2007	Post-relief ~$3.5 bn (2006)	Declined temporarily	Paris Club deal; new borrowing resumes
2015 - 2025	$45.98 bn (Q1 2025); domestic ₦76.59 tn	96.3% (2022); still >60% by 2025	Oil crash; dual-trap; IMF/WB reform programmes

The Dual Debt Trap: External and Domestic Dimensions

While the preceding analysis focuses on external debt, a comprehensive understanding of Nigeria's fiscal entrapment requires attention to the domestic debt dimension. As of June 2025, Nigeria's domestic debt stood at ₦76.59 trillion, accounting for the largest share of total public debt (Leadership, 2025). Federal Government bonds valued at

₦60.65 trillion constitute the bulk of domestic obligations, with Treasury Bills adding ₦12.76 trillion.

The IMF's October 2025 Regional Economic Outlook for Sub-Saharan Africa issued a stark warning about Nigeria's growing reliance on domestic borrowing (Leadership, 2025). Key findings include:

1. Deepening Bank-Sovereign Nexus: Nigerian banks hold substantial quantities of government securities, creating a vicious cycle where sovereign credit weakness directly threatens banking-sector stability, which in turn constrains private-sector credit and economic growth.
2. Crowding Out: With domestic interest rates between 13 and 18 percent, government borrowing absorbs available credit that might otherwise finance private investment. This “crowding out” effect undermines the productive capacity necessary for sustainable growth and debt repayment.
3. Interest Burden: Interest payments now exceed 30 percent of government revenues, among the highest ratios in Sub-Saharan Africa, leaving minimal fiscal space for development spending.
4. Cost Inversion: The cost of new domestic borrowing now exceeds external borrowing costs, a significant reversal from historical patterns. Yet external borrowing introduces currency risk, as demonstrated by the doubling of naira costs for foreign-currency obligations following exchange-rate adjustments.

The interaction between external and domestic debt creates a “dual debt trap” with compounding effects. External debt obligations require foreign exchange, pressuring the naira and increasing the domestic-currency cost of servicing. Domestic debt obligations require high interest rates to attract buyers, increasing fiscal pressure and crowding out investment. Together, they create a fiscal environment where debt service consumes the overwhelming majority of revenue, leaving minimal resources for the developmental functions that might generate future capacity to repay

Debt Composition and Creditor Dynamics

Understanding contemporary debt dynamics requires disaggregating Nigeria's external portfolio by creditor type, as each category imposes distinct constraints on sovereignty.

Multilateral Creditors

Multilateral institutions (World Bank, African Development Bank, Islamic Development Bank) hold a significant portion of Nigeria's external debt. While these loans offer relatively concessional rates (1.5–3.5 percent), they come with extensive policy conditionalities. Reinsberg, Stubbs, Kentikelenis, and King (2020) demonstrate that IMF and World Bank conditions significantly reduce independent policy adjustment. The 2023 removal of fuel subsidies, linked to a $1.5 billion World Bank financing programme, exemplifies this dynamic (World Bank, 2023c). Multilateral debt also enjoys “preferred creditor status,” meaning it cannot be restructured, forcing Nigeria to prioritise these payments even during fiscal crises (Schlegl, Trebesch, & Wright, 2019).

Bilateral Creditors

Bilateral debt, with China accounting for over 80 percent of this category, involves unique structural risks. Chinese loans are typically tied to procurement requirements mandating the use of Chinese firms, which can inflate project costs by 30–50 percent (Morris, Parks, & Gardner, 2020). Many agreements, such as railway loans, stipulate that debt service is deducted directly from crude-oil proceeds, effectively "mortgaging" national resources (Gelpern et al., 2022). This resource-collateralised lending creates a direct pipeline from Nigerian oil extraction to Chinese creditors, bypassing the national budget entirely.

Commercial Creditors

Commercial borrowing through Eurobonds represents Nigeria's most expensive debt category, with yields historically reaching 9.25 percent or higher. Nigeria suffers from "original sin"—the inability to borrow internationally in its own currency (Eichengreen & Hausmann, 1999). Consequently, naira depreciation has dramatically increased the domestic cost of servicing Eurobonds. The return to Eurobond markets in late 2024, while signalling improved investor confidence, also exposes Nigeria to global financial volatility (IMF, 2025; NAN, 2025).

International Financial Institutions and Policy Conditionalities

International financial institutions (IFIs) such as the IMF and the World Bank have played a significant role in influencing economic policies in Nigeria, primarily through lending programmes, policy advice, and conditionality. Nigeria's engagement with these institutions spans decades, marked by periods of direct borrowing with attached conditions and more recent non-borrowing surveillance via Article IV consultations. Nigeria's most direct exposure to IFI conditionality occurred in 1986 with the adoption of the Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP), influenced heavily by the IMF and World Bank amid a debt crisis and falling oil prices. SAP required market liberalisation, currency devaluation, privatisation, trade deregulation, and reduction of public spending in exchange for loans and debt-restructuring support. These policies aligned with the "Washington Consensus" promoted by both institutions.

Empirical assessments remain contested. An IMF occasional paper concluded that vigorous market reforms and tight financial policies under SAP led to initial economic growth and employment expansion, but benefits were not sustained due to premature abandonment and inconsistent implementation (International Monetary Fund, 1997). Conversely, academic critiques argue that SAP exacerbated poverty, deindustrialisation, and inequality. Currency devaluation and subsidy cuts increased import costs and inflation, leading to factory closures and unemployment, while privatisation favoured foreign interests over local development (Mkandawire & Soludo, 1999). One study described IMF loan conditionality as a "crux impediment" to Nigeria's progress, perpetuating economic backwardness through dependency (Olukoshi, 1993).

After repaying major debts in the 2000s, Nigeria avoided new IMF borrowing programmes, relying instead on Policy Support Instruments (2005–2007) and annual Article IV consultations. The World Bank continued project-based lending focused on infrastructure, poverty reduction, and governance. Without formal conditionality from borrowing, influence shifted to advisory and signalling roles. IMF Article IV reports routinely recommended fiscal consolidation, subsidy reforms, exchange-rate flexibility, and revenue mobilisation (IMF, 2022, 2025). World Bank Development Policy Financing supported similar priorities, such as tax reforms and social safety nets (World Bank, 2024a, 2025a). This "soft" influence preserves formal autonomy while creating indirect pressure. Aligning with IFI advice signals credibility to investors and donors, while divergence risks market penalties or withheld support. The IMF's July 2025 Article IV mission concluded that Nigerian authorities "have implemented major reforms over the past two years which have improved macroeconomic stability and enhanced resilience," while noting that "poverty and food insecurity have risen" (IMF, 2025).

Under President Bola Tinubu, Nigeria implemented major reforms in 2023 including full removal of fuel subsidies and unification/floating of the naira exchange rate. These mirrored long-standing IMF and World Bank recommendations to eliminate distortions, fiscal drains, and arbitrage opportunities (IMF, 2024, 2025; World Bank, 2024b). The outcomes have been mixed. Macroeconomic indicators show improvement: reserves rose, inflation began moderating from peaks (declining to 23.7 percent by April 2025), and Nigeria successfully accessed Eurobond markets with improved credit ratings (IMF, 2025; World Bank, 2025b; NAN, 2025). The IMF praised these as "bold" steps enhancing resilience and investor confidence (IMF, 2025). World Bank financing ($2.25 billion in 2024) supported revenue mobilisation and social protection tied to these reforms (World Bank, 2024c).

However, short-term costs have been severe: fuel prices tripled, the naira depreciated sharply, inflation surged (peaking near 35 percent before moderating), and poverty and food insecurity worsened (World Bank, 2025c; IMF, 2025). Critics argue these measures echo SAP failures, disproportionately harming the poor without adequate safety nets (Borgen Magazine, 2025; ROAPE, 2025). The critical question for the slavery-paradox framework is whether these reforms represent autonomous policy choice or "anticipatory alignment"—domestic actors implementing externally-preferred policies in hopes of attracting investment and avoiding market punishment (Foreign Policy, 2023; Parthian Partners, 2025).

Fiscal Entrapment and Social Consequences

The empirical evidence regarding Nigeria's fiscal trajectory suggests that the pursuit of development finance has resulted in substantive erosion of economic sovereignty. As established by Ajayi and Ndikumana (2015), economic sovereignty is fundamentally defined by a nation's capacity to autonomously implement policies for national development; yet, the Nigerian experience reveals systematic erosion of this capacity.

This erosion originated with the adoption of the 1986 Structural Adjustment Programme, a foundational surrender where Nigeria accepted over 100 policy conditions to address a $3.2 billion crisis, effectively transferring policy control to the IMF and World Bank (Udeogu, 2016; Mosley, Subasat, & Weeks, 1995). The quantitative reality of this decline is stark, with Nigeria's policy-autonomy index score dropping substantially during the SAP era, a trend that culminated by 2022 in a catastrophic debt-service-to-revenue ratio of 96.3 percent, effectively paralysing discretionary fiscal capacity (Dreher et al., 2015; Budget Office, 2023). By 2025, despite improvements in some macroeconomic indicators, the fundamental constraint remains: debt servicing consumes revenue that might otherwise fund development.

This fiscal entrapment has precipitated a "crowding out" of critical social investments. Although the UNESCO Education 2030 Framework recommends allocating up to 20 percent of public expenditure to education, Nigeria's funding averaged a mere 5 to 8 percent between 2023 and 2025, while debt obligations consumed over 32 percent of the total budget (UNESCO, 2015; Brookings Institution, 2023; Guardian Nigeria, 2025). This pattern of underfunding extends to the healthcare sector, where annual allocations hover around 5.7 percent, failing to meet the 15 percent threshold pledged in the Abuja Declaration (Archibong, Ogana, Edet, & Enamhe, 2023). The resulting "debt overhang" transcends balance sheets to impact human outcomes directly; as Traoré (2021) suggests, the diversion of productive funds away from health infrastructure correlates with Nigeria's alarmingly high maternal-mortality ratio of 512 per 100,000 live births, far exceeding the Sustainable Development Goal target of 70 (Ajegbile, 2023; Oweibia, Elemuwa, Egberipou, Timighe, Sylvanus, & Wilson, 2025).

The 2026 Appropriation Bill, presented at ₦58.18 trillion, epitomises the fiscal contradictions identified throughout this analysis. As Udunze (2025) observes, the budget promises "consolidation, renewed resilience, and shared prosperity" while being built on a deficit of ₦23.85 trillion (4.28 percent of GDP) financed largely through borrowing. Debt servicing alone will consume ₦15.52 trillion—nearly half of projected revenue. The fundamental question posed by the slavery paradox is starkly illustrated: "How sustainable is a fiscal model where debt service crowds out development spending year after year?" (Udunze, 2025). Furthermore, the "Slavery Paradox" is institutionalised through a profound asymmetry in resource flows and the reshaping of domestic governance. Institutional sovereignty has been reconfigured by creditor mandates, exemplified by the creation of the Debt Management Office, which often prioritises external creditworthiness over domestic accountability (Ndikumana & Boyce, 2011). This institutional framework facilitates a "revolving door" of capital, where every dollar of external borrowing is empirically associated with $0.83 of capital flight (Ndikumana & Boyce, 2011). Between 1970 and 2018, capital flight totalled $182.6 billion, a figure that surpasses the nation's total external debt of $154.8 billion, suggesting that the modern Nigerian state functions more as a debt-collection and capital-evacuation agency than as a sovereign provider of public goods (Ndikumana, Boyce, & Dunaway, 2020).

The concept of the comprador bourgeoisie, developed by Fanon (1963) and applied to Nigeria by Osoba (1978), illuminates this dynamic. The comprador class does not simply mismanage the economy through incompetence or corruption; rather, its members actively benefit from arrangements that facilitate capital outflow. Debt-financed infrastructure contracts generate kickbacks; currency volatility creates arbitrage opportunities; privatisation enables asset acquisition at below-market values. The interests of this class align not with autonomous national development but with continued integration into global financial circuits that enable private accumulation at public expense.

These findings complicate the classic neocolonial arguments of Rodney (1972) by highlighting the role of domestic agency in the surrender of sovereignty. The fact that debt servicing creates a "first-line charge" on national resources implies that the paradox is maintained by a symbiotic relationship between global creditors and a local comprador bourgeoisie (Adedeji, 1969; Okonjo-Iweala, 2018). This study therefore extends existing scholarship by moving beyond the binary of "external exploitation vs. Internal failure" to show that Nigeria's economic sovereignty is eroded through a symbiotic relationship between global creditors and local compradors. This supports the thesis that the "Slavery Paradox" is maintained by a domestic institutional framework designed to facilitate the outflow of capital under the guise of developmental borrowing.

Comparative Perspectives: Botswana, Rwanda, and Vietnam

The selection of Botswana, Rwanda, and Vietnam for comparative analysis follows explicit theoretical sampling criteria: each represents a post-colonial state that has achieved sustained economic growth while managing debt constraints, yet each follows a distinct development trajectory offering different lessons for Nigeria.

Botswana: Resource Management and Institutional Capacity

Botswana's trajectory from one of the world's poorest countries at independence in 1966 to an upper-middle-income country offers important lessons in sovereign resource management. Diamond revenues, rather than becoming a "resource curse" as in Nigeria, were channelled into development through several institutional mechanisms. First, Botswana established the Pula Fund in 1994, a sovereign wealth fund that buffers against commodity-price volatility and provides fiscal space during downturns. The fund's disciplined management ensures that resource extraction benefits future generations rather than financing immediate consumption (World Bank, 2024). Second, Botswana maintained fiscal discipline through consensus-based policy-making involving traditional authorities, elected officials, and civil servants. Third, the country preserved policy autonomy by avoiding IMF programmes and associated conditionalities, instead financing development through domestic revenue and carefully negotiated mineral agreements. However, Botswana's model rests on specific conditions not replicable in Nigeria: a small, relatively homogeneous population; diamonds as a high-value, easily taxable resource; and institutional continuity unusual in post-colonial Africa. The lesson for Nigeria is not direct emulation but the demonstration that resource wealth need not produce dependency when accompanied by strong institutions and elite commitment to national development.

Rwanda: Post-Conflict Reconstruction and Strategic Vision

Rwanda's post-1994 reconstruction demonstrates the possibility of rapid development under visionary leadership, even from a devastated base. The Rwandan model includes several elements relevant to Nigeria.

First, Rwanda has pursued strategic integration into global markets while maintaining policy space—attracting investment on terms that build domestic capacity rather than simply extracting resources. Second, the country invested heavily in institutional capacity, creating efficient public administration that implements policy effectively. Third, Rwanda prioritised social development—health, education, gender equality—as foundations for productive transformation. Fourth, the government-maintained policy coherence across sectors, ensuring that trade, investment, fiscal, and social policies reinforced rather than contradicted each other.

Critics note that Rwanda's model depends on strong state capacity and political centralisation that may not be transferable to Nigeria's federal, pluralistic context. Moreover, Rwanda's debt levels have risen significantly, raising questions about long-term sustainability (IMF, 2025). The lesson is not institutional replication but the demonstration that strategic vision and implementation capacity can transform development trajectories.

Vietnam: Developmental State and Strategic Decoupling

Vietnam's transformation from war-torn poverty to lower-middle-income status offers perhaps the most relevant lessons for Nigeria. Vietnam has achieved what Nigeria has not: sustained, diversified growth that has dramatically reduced poverty while building productive capacity.

Key elements of the Vietnamese model include:

1. Strategic state capitalism: State-owned enterprises operate in strategic sectors, building domestic capacity before gradual liberalisation
2. Local content requirements: Foreign direct investment is channelled into joint ventures and subject to local-content rules that build domestic supply chains
3. Managed integration: Vietnam integrated into global markets on terms that protected domestic industries during their development phase
4. Agricultural transformation: Land reform and investment raised agricultural productivity, releasing labour for industrialisation
5. Export diversification: From rice to electronics, Vietnam steadily moved up the value chain

Vietnam's approach to foreign capital has been particularly strategic. The country welcomes foreign investment but on terms that ensure technology transfer, local employment, and domestic-linkage development. This contrasts sharply with Nigeria's extractive model, where foreign capital operates in enclaves with minimal domestic integration (IMF, 2025).

Vietnam has also managed debt strategically, borrowing for productive investment rather than consumption, and maintaining policy autonomy through diversified partnerships that prevent excessive dependence on any single creditor or donor.

These cases yield several lessons for Nigeria, none suggesting simple replication but each illuminating principle that might inform Nigerian policy:

1. Institutional capacity matters more than resource endowment: Botswana's success rests on institutions that manage resources for development; Nigeria's oil wealth has produced dependency because institutions channel it toward private accumulation rather than public investment.
2. Strategic integration, not isolation or passive opening: Vietnam's managed integration into global markets contrasts with Nigeria's liberalisation without industrial preparation. Strategic decoupling—temporarily shielding strategic sectors while building capacity—may be necessary before competitive integration is possible.
3. Domestic elite commitment to national development: In all three cases, domestic elites prioritised national development over personal enrichment. This “developmentalist” orientation, absent in Nigeria's comprador dynamics, is essential for sovereignty.
4. Policy coherence and continuity: Each case demonstrates consistent policy orientation over decades, enabling private-sector confidence and cumulative capacity-building. Nigeria's policy volatility undermines long-term investment.
5. Diversification as sovereignty strategy: All three cases diversified economies and export structures, reducing vulnerability to commodity-price shocks and creditor pressure.

Policy Recommendations and Implementation Strategy

To reclaim its economic sovereignty, Nigeria must move beyond broad developmental platitudes and implement a strategy of targeted institutional and structural defiance. The path forward begins with a fundamental overhaul of the nation's fiscal integrity, specifically by addressing the “bleeding” of national wealth through capital flight, which historically outpaces the country's total external debt. This requires a shift in revenue mobilisation; instead of viewing taxation as a desperate “revenue drive” to satisfy foreign creditors, the state must anchor its fiscal policy in the domestic social contract. By implementing progressive taxation and scrutinising tax expenditures, the government can ensure that the fiscal burden shifts away from the poor and toward the “comprador” class that has long benefited from the status quo.

Crucially, this quest for integrity requires a sceptical approach to international technical partnerships. Recent collaborations with foreign entities, such as the 2025 tax partnerships with France, must be handled with extreme caution to ensure they do not become modern conduits for external surveillance or the further erosion of domestic policy control (Premium Times, 2025). Reclaiming sovereignty also demands that the Debt Management Office be stripped of its role as a mere creditor liaison and restructured as an institution of domestic accountability, subject to rigorous parliamentary oversight and public audits. Furthermore, the study argues that Nigeria must embrace a process of "strategic decoupling" to foster genuine industrial diversification. This does not imply economic isolation, but rather a Vietnam-inspired "selective integration" where the state protects infant industries through tariff structures and mandatory local-content requirements. By utilising tools such as sovereign wealth funds to buffer against commodity volatility and leveraging the AfCFTA to build regional value chains (AfCFTA Secretariat, 2023), Nigeria can create a South–South shield against the austerity-driven mandates of Western-led institutions. This regionalism serves as a critical pillar for reducing exposure to global shocks and "weaponised" currency fluctuations.

Ultimately, however, no technical reform will suffice without a frontal assault on the "comprador dynamic" that sustains the slavery paradox. Reclaiming sovereignty is as much a political project as an economic one; it requires transforming the incentives of the domestic elite, shifting them away from rent-seeking and toward productive national investment. This transformation must be underpinned by democratic mobilisation, where a vigilant civil society demands that the state's primary allegiance be to its citizens rather than its creditors. Only through this combination of fiscal discipline, industrial protectionism, and elite accountability can Nigeria reconcile its political independence with substantive economic self-determination.

The political feasibility of these measures faces formidable obstacles. The comprador bourgeoisie—including politically connected contractors, currency speculators, and financial intermediaries—derives substantial rents from the current debt-driven system and will mobilise to block reforms that threaten their interests. International creditors and rating agencies, too, may penalise any attempt at "strategic decoupling" by downgrading Nigeria's sovereign credit, temporarily raising borrowing costs and constricting access to global capital. Overcoming this resistance demands a sequential strategy: immediate transparency measures (public audits of debt contracts, asset-declaration enforcement) that build a domestic constituency for reform, followed by targeted industrial policies that create an alternative base of productive entrepreneurs with a stake in national development. External pressure can be mitigated by securing contingent support from South–South financial mechanisms (e.g., the AfCFTA-linked infrastructure fund) and by diversifying the creditor base before initiating restructuring negotiations.

By prioritising these pro-industrial policies over creditor-friendly "stabilisation" measures, Nigeria can finally reconcile its juridical independence with substantive economic sovereignty. This transition from debt-induced subservience toward a self-reliant developmental trajectory requires a phased approach: immediate debt-service suspension and restructuring to create fiscal oxygen; short-term curbs on capital flight through progressive taxation; medium-term industrial diversification; and a long-term democratic deepening that aligns policy with citizen welfare. The path is difficult, requiring both technical competence and political courage. But the alternative—continued entrapment in the slavery paradox—offers only deepening dependency and the hollowing out of sovereignty. The choice facing Nigeria is not between reform and stasis, but between reform that serves citizens and reform that serves creditors. This study has documented the mechanisms through which the latter has dominated; it now points toward the urgent possibility of the former.

Conclusion

In exploring the "Slavery Paradox," this study finds that Nigeria's economic sovereignty has become more of a legal fiction than a functional reality. By 2025, the nation's fiscal landscape reached a breaking point where debt-servicing costs fundamentally decoupled from national revenue, creating a scenario where the state exists primarily to satisfy external creditors. This is not merely a failure of accounting; it is a structural entrapment. The research illustrates that while the outward symbols of independence remain, the inward levers of power—specifically the ability to prioritise education, health, and infrastructure—have been surrendered to the conditionalities of international finance. The persistence of this paradox suggests that Nigeria is caught in a "dual-trap" where neocolonial pressures and internal elite interests converge. The findings argue that "home-grown" reforms are often less about domestic innovation and more about "anticipatory alignment" with global markets to maintain creditworthiness. This creates a cycle where borrowing for development paradoxically leads to the de-development of the social sector. However, the comparative analysis of states such as Vietnam and Botswana offer a glimmer of hope, suggesting that when a nation strategically decouples its industrial policy from creditor mandates and strengthens its domestic institutions, it can reclaim its policy space. Ultimately, the study concludes that for Nigeria to break these "fiscal chains," it must move beyond the role of a passive borrower. Reclaiming sovereignty demands a transition toward strategic autonomy—a shift where the domestic social contract is given precedence over international credit ratings. Escaping the slavery paradox will require more than just debt restructuring; it will require the political courage to prioritise self-reliant industrialisation and regional integration over the extractive logic of foreign loan dependence.

References

Adedeji, A. (1969). *Nigerian federal finance: Its development, problems, and prospects,* Hutchinson Educational.

Adenikinju, A. F. (2005). African imperatives in the new world trade order: Country case study of the manufacturing sector in Nigeria. In T. A. Oyejide & D. Njinkeu (Eds.), *African imperatives in the new world trade order* (pp. 103–140), Africa World Press.

Adeniyi, O., Oyinlola, A., & Omisakin, O. (2011). Oil price shocks and economic growth in Nigeria: Are thresholds important? *OPEC Energy Review, 35*(4), 308–333.

AfCFTA Secretariat. (2023). *AfCFTA annual report 2023: Accelerating the implementation of the African Continental Free Trade Area,* African Union.

Ajayi, S. I. (1991). *Macroeconomic approach to external debt: The case of Nigeria* (AERC Research Paper No. 8). African Economic Research Consortium.

Ajayi, S. I., & Ndikumana, L. (Eds.). (2015). *Capital flight from Africa: Causes, effects, and policy issues,* Oxford University Press.

Ake, C. (1981). *A political economy of Africa, Longman.*

Ake, C. (1996). *Democracy and development in Africa,* Brookings Institution Press.

Archibong, E. P., Ogana, J. F., Edet, A. F., & Enamhe, D. C. (2023). Healthcare financing and services utilisation in Cross River State, Nigeria, *Global Journal of Social Sciences, 22,* 141–152.

Ayida, A. A. (1987). *The Nigerian revolution 1966–1976,* Ibadan University Press.

Ayida, A. A., & Onitiri, H. M. A. (Eds.). (1971). *Reconstruction and development in Nigeria,* Oxford University Press.

Borgen Magazine. (2025). *The impact of austerity measures on Nigerian poverty levels.* https://www.borgenmagazine.com

Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal, 9*(2), 27–40.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021). *Thematic analysis: A practical guide,* SAGE Publications.

Brautigam, D. (2009). *The dragon's gift: The real story of China in Africa,* Oxford University Press.

Brautigam, D., & Hwang, J. (2016). *Eastern promises: New data on Chinese loans in Africa, 2000–2014* (China–Africa Research Initiative Working Paper No. 4). Johns Hopkins University.

Brookings Institution. (2023). *Foresight Africa: Top priorities for the continent in 2023,* Brookings Institution Press.

Budget Office of the Federation. (2023). *2022 fourth quarter budget implementation report,* Ministry of Finance, Budget and National Planning.

BusinessDay. (2025, May 16). The slavery paradox and Nigeria's foreign loan dependence: Breaking the cycle, *BusinessDay*.

Central Bank of Nigeria. (1981). *Annual report and statement of accounts for the year ended 31st December 1980,* Central Bank of Nigeria.

Central Bank of Nigeria. (1986). *Annual report and statement of accounts for the year ended 31st December 1985,* Central Bank of Nigeria.

Checherita-Westphal, C., & Rother, P. (2012). The impact of high government debt on economic growth and its channels: An empirical investigation for the euro area, *European Economic Review, 56*(7), 1392–1405.

Collier, P. (2007). *The bottom billion: Why the poorest countries are failing and what can be done about it,* Oxford University Press.

Cornia, G. A., Jolly, R., & Stewart, F. (Eds.). (1987). *Adjustment with a human face: Protecting the vulnerable and promoting growth,* Oxford University Press.

Debt Management Office. (2004). *Nigeria's external debt: A historical overview.* Debt Management Office.

Debt Management Office. (2023). *Nigeria's public debt stock as at June 30, 2023.* https://www.dmo.gov.ng

Debt Management Office. (2024). *Nigeria's external debt stock as at March 31, 2024.* https://www.dmo.gov.ng

Debt Management Office. (2025, June 27). *Nigeria's total public debt stock as at March 31, 2025.* https://www.dmo.gov.ng

Denzin, N. K. (1978). *The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods* (2nd ed.). McGraw-Hill.

Dreher, A., Sturm, J. E., & Vreeland, J. R. (2015). Politics and IMF conditionality. *Journal of Conflict Resolution, 59*(1), 120–148.

Effiom, L., Achu, A. C., & Edet, S. E. (2019). Capital flight and domestic investment in Nigeria: Evidence from ARDL methodology, *International Journal of Financial Research, 11*(1), 348–360.

Eichengreen, B., & Hausmann, R. (1999). *Exchange rates and financial fragility* (NBER Working Paper No. 7418). National Bureau of Economic Research.

Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm, *Journal of Communication, 43*(4), 51–58.

Fairclough, N. (2013). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language* (2nd ed.), Routledge.

Fanon, F. (1963). *The wretched of the earth* (*C. Farrington, Trans.),* Grove Press. (Original work published 1961)

Federal Republic of Nigeria. (1962). *National development plan 1962–68.* Federal Ministry of Economic Development.

Financial Times. (2025). Nigeria's factories go local to survive currency turmoil, *Financial Times.*

Foreign Policy. (2023). *Tinubu's shock therapy: Nigeria's high-stakes economic gamble,* https://foreignpolicy.com

Forster, T., Kentikelenis, A. E., Reinsberg, B., Stubbs, T. H., & King, L. P. (2020). Globalization and health equity: The impact of structural adjustment programs on developing countries, *Social Science & Medicine, 267*, 112496. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2019.112496

Gelpern, A., Horn, S., Morris, S., Parks, B., & Trebesch, C. (2022). *How China lends: A rare look into 100 debt contracts with foreign governments* (PIIE Working Paper 22-4). Peterson Institute for International Economics.

Guardian Nigeria. (2025). Nigeria's education budget falls short of UNESCO recommendation, *The Guardian*.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1989). *Fourth generation evaluation,* SAGE Publications.

Guobadia, D. A. (1998). Issues in facilitating foreign investment for national development in Nigeria, *Modern Practice Journal of Finance and Investment Law, 2*, 39–62.

Helleiner, G. K. (1966). *Peasant agriculture, government, and economic growth in Nigeria.* R. D. Irwin.

Hickel, J. (2020). Quantifying national responsibility for climate breakdown: An equality-based attribution approach for carbon dioxide emissions in excess of the planetary boundary, *The Lancet Planetary Health, 4*(9), e399–e404.

Hurley, G., Morris, S., & Portelance, G. (2019). *Examining the debt implications of the Belt and Road Initiative from a policy perspective,* Center for Global Development.

International Monetary Fund. (1997). *Nigeria: Experience with structural adjustment* (IMF Occasional Paper No. 148).

International Monetary Fund. (2022). *Nigeria: 2022 Article IV consultation* (IMF Country Report No. 22/142).

International Monetary Fund. (2024). *Nigeria: 2024 Article IV consultation,* (IMF Country Report No. 24/111).

International Monetary Fund. (2025). *IMF staff completes 2025 Article IV mission with Nigeria* (Press Release No. 25/231). https://www.imf.org/en/News/Articles/2025/07/01/pr-25231-nigeria-imf-staff-completes-2025-article-iv-mission

International Monetary Fund. (2025). *Rwanda: 2025 Article IV consultation* (IMF Country Report). IMF.

International Monetary Fund. (2025b). *Vietnam: 2025 Article IV consultation* (IMF Country Report No. 25/001). IMF.

Iyoha, M. A. (1999). *External debt and economic growth in Sub-Saharan African countries: An econometric study* (AERC Research Paper No. 90). African Economic Research Consortium.

Jackson, R. H. (1990). *Quasi-states: Sovereignty, international relations and the Third World,* Cambridge University Press.

Krueger, A. O. (1974). The political economy of the rent-seeking society. *American Economic Review, 64*(3), 291–303.

Krugman, P. (1988). Financing vs. Forgiving a debt overhang, *Journal of Development Economics, 29*(3), 253–268.

Leadership. (2025). IMF warns Nigeria against growing reliance on domestic borrowing. *Leadership Newspapers.* https://leadership.ng/imf-warns-nigeria-against-growing-reliance-on-domestic-borrowing/

Lewis, P. M. (2007). *Growing apart: Oil, politics, and economic change in Indonesia and Nigeria,* University of Michigan Press.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry.* SAGE Publications.

Mkandawire, T., & Soludo, C. C. (1999). *Our continent, our future: African perspectives on structural adjustment,* Africa World Press.

Morris, S., Parks, B., & Gardner, A. (2020). *Chinese and World Bank lending terms: A systematic comparison across 157 projects and 15 countries.* Center for Global Development.

Mosley, P., Harrigan, J., & Toye, J. (1991). *Aid and power: The World Bank and policy-based lending (Vol. 1).* Routledge.

Mosley, P., Subasat, T., & Weeks, J. (1995). Assessing adjustment in Africa, *World Development, 23*(9), 1459–1473.

Moss, T., & Majerowicz, S. (2016). *Nigeria's Paris Club debt problem,* Brookings Institution. https://www.brookings.edu/articles/nigerias-paris-club-debt-problem/

Moyo, D. (2009). *Dead aid: Why aid is not working and how there is a better way for Africa.* Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

National Bureau of Statistics. (2025). *CPI & inflation report: January 2025,* National Bureau of Statistics.

Ndikumana, L., & Boyce, J. K. (2011). *Africa's odious debts: How foreign loans and capital flight bled a continent,* Zed Books.

Ndikumana, L., Boyce, J. K., & Dunaway, M. (2020). *Capital flight from Africa: Updated estimates and analysis,* Political Economy Research Institute (PERI).

News Agency of Nigeria. (2025). *FG reforms have improved Nigeria's macroeconomic outlook – Repor*t. *News Agency of Nigeria.* https://nannews.ng/2025/04/23/fg-reforms-have-improved-nigerias-macroeconomic-outlook-report/

Nkrumah, K. (1965). *Neo-colonialism: The last stage of imperialism*, Thomas Nelson & Sons.

Okonjo-Iweala, N. (2018). *Fighting corruption is dangerous: The story behind the headlines,* MIT Press.

Okonjo-Iweala, N., & Osafo-Kwaako, P. (2007). *Nigeria's economic reforms: Progress and challenges* (Brookings Global Economy and Development Working Paper No. 6).

Olukoshi, A. O. (Ed.). (1993). *The politics of structural adjustment in Nigeria,* James Currey.

Olukoshi, A. O. (1998). *The elusive prince of Denmark: Structural adjustment and the crisis of governance in Africa,* Nordic Africa Institute.

Osoba, S. (1978). The deepening crisis of the Nigerian national bourgeoisie, *Review of African Political Economy, 5*(13), 63–77. https://doi.org/10.1080/03056247808703374

Oweibia, M., Elemuwa, C. O., Egberipou, T., Timighe, G. C., Sylvanus, P., & Wilson, T. R. (2025). *Maternal and child health trends in Nigeria: A scoping review of NDHS 2018 vs. NDHS 2023,* medRxiv. https://doi.org/10.1101/2025.05.18.25327864

Parthian Partners. (2025). *Economic outlook: Navigating Nigeria's fiscal reforms,* Parthian Partners.

Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods (4th ed.),* SAGE Publications.

Premium Times. (2025). ADC demands transparency in Nigeria–France digital tax deal, *Premium Times*, https://www.premiumtimesng.com/news/more-news/843060-adc-demands-transparency-in-nigeria-france-digital-tax-deal.html

Punch. (2025). Debt servicing gulped N696bn in January – CBN. *Punch Newspaper.*

Reinsberg, B., Stubbs, T., Kentikelenis, A., & King, L. (2020). Bad governance: How privatization increases corruption in the developing world, *Regulation & Governance, 14*(4), 698–717. https://doi.org/10.1111/rego.12265

ROAPE. (2025, April 29). The enduring colonialism and neoliberalism in Africa: A close look at Nigeria's political-economic entanglements, *Review of African Political Economy*.

Rodney, W. (1972). *How Europe underdeveloped Africa,* Howard University Press.

Schlegl, M., Trebesch, C., & Wright, M. L. (2019). *The senior debt term structure,* Kiel Institute for the World Economy.

Sinclair, T. J. (2005). *The new masters of capital: American bond rating agencies and the politics of creditworthiness,* Cornell University Press.

Toussaint, E. (2008). *The World Bank: A critical primer,* Monthly Review Press.

Traoré, O. (2021). Convergence in public health expenditure across Sub-Saharan African countries, *Health Economics Review, 11*, Article 22.

Udeogu, E. (2016). Financialisation and economic growth in Nigeria, *Review of African Political Economy, 43*(149), 489–503.

Udunze, B. (2025). *Nigeria's N58.18t budget and rising cost of deficit governance,* The Eagle Online. https://theeagleonline.com.ng/nigerias-n58-18t-budget-and-rising-cost-of-deficit-governance-by-blaise-udunze/

Ukponu, M. U., Okaruefe, S. U., Sulayman, Y., Afonne, J. E., & Odusola, N. S. (2022). Globalization and the sovereignty of African states in the post-colonial era: A contemporary Afrocentric legal perspective, *Journal of Law, Policy and Globalization, 119*, 50–64.

Ukwe, C. (2025). *Nigeria and food security challenges,* Intech Open Journals.

UNESCO. (2015). *Education 2030: Incheon Declaration and Framework for Action,* UNESCO.

Watts, M. (2004). Resource curse? Governmentality, oil and power in the Niger Delta, *Nigeria. Geopolitics, 9*(1), 50–80.

World Bank. (1981). *Accelerated development in Sub-Saharan Africa: An agenda for action* (The Berg Report), The World Bank.

World Bank. (2023). *Nigeria development update (NDU): Seizing the opportunity,* World Bank Group.

World Bank. (2023c). *Nigeria: Fuel subsidy removal program* (Program Document), World Bank Group.

World Bank. (2024a). *Nigeria: Development policy financing* (Program Document), World Bank Group.

World Bank. (2024b). *Nigeria public finance review: Fiscal adjustment for better development outcomes,* World Bank Group.

World Bank. (2024c). *Nigeria: $2.25 billion development policy financing* (Press Release), World Bank Group.

World Bank. (2025a). *Nigeria: Country partnership framework,* World Bank Group.

World Bank. (2025b). *Nigeria economic update: Charting a new course,* World Bank Group.

World Bank. (2025c). *Nigeria poverty assessment,* World Bank Group.