IJAAR PUBLISHING®

Scholarly Journal of Social Sciences Research | ISSN: 2955-0785
Vol. 4, Issue 2 (2025) | www.ijaar.org/sjssr

THE WEAPONIZATION OF POVERTY BY THE POLITICAL CLASS IN NIGERIA

Umar, Garpiya

Department of Political Science
Federal University of Education, Zaria
Kaduna State, Nigeria
umargarpiyapeace@yahoo.com
https://orchid.org/0009-0003-9836-7731
Phone: +234 7036287777

Abstract

This study examines the multifaceted nature of poverty in Nigeria and its strategic manipulation by political and economic elites as a tool for maintaining power and control. Employing the theoretical framework of Geographical Disparities, the research explores how poverty extends beyond mere economic deprivation to encompass social exclusion, capability deprivation, and systematic disenfranchisement. The study reveals that poverty in Nigeria manifests through various dimensions, including economic poverty, multidimensional poverty, and structural poverty, with significant disparities between rural and urban contexts. The research identifies several mechanisms through which poverty is weaponized, including the strategic use of hunger and food insecurity, manipulation of welfare policies, implementation of economic policies favoring the wealthy, and strategic media narratives. The analysis demonstrates how geographical disparities are deliberately created and maintained through unequal resource distribution, biased infrastructure development, and discriminatory government policies that favor certain regions while marginalizing others. International institutions, particularly the International Monetary Fund and World Bank, have inadvertently contributed to poverty weaponization through Structural Adjustment Programs, conditional aid, and trade policies that often exacerbate inequality rather than alleviate it. The study highlights how these interventions, despite their stated intentions, frequently result in currency devaluation, reduced social spending, and increased dependency on foreign assistance. The consequences of poverty weaponization are far-reaching, encompassing political manipulation through electoral corruption and governance failures, security challenges including insurgency and communal conflicts, social impacts such as human rights violations and restricted access to education and healthcare, and economic ramifications including stunted growth and increased inequality. To address poverty weaponization in Nigeria, the inclusion of impoverished individuals in the political process through education, advocacy, and support for grassroots initiatives is recommended.

Keyword: Weaponization, Poverty, Political Class

Umar, G. (2025). The Weaponization of Poverty by the Political Class in Nigeria. *Scholarly Journal of Social Sciences Research. 4*(2), 88-99. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17052677

Introduction

Poverty has consistently been a significant issue in human history, with its causes and potential solutions subject to extensive debate. Nevertheless, a frequently neglected consideration is the potential for those in authority to exploit poverty as a tool. The political class often utilizes poverty to strengthen the social and economic supremacy of the elite. This exploitation encompasses multiple dimensions, including the manipulation of economic policies, social welfare systems, and media narratives.

Historically, different political regimes have employed poverty as a mechanism to exert control and secure the welfare of the elite. During the feudal era, serfs were maintained in poverty to guarantee a consistent labor supply for the nobility (Bloch, 1961). The origins of the weaponization of poverty by Nigeria's political class can be traced to the post-independence period, marked by political instability, corruption, and economic mismanagement. The colonial legacy established a socio-economic framework that benefited a limited elite while disenfranchising the majority. Subsequent administrations, whether military or civilian, failed to address these disparities, choosing instead to exploit them for political gain (Ake, 1996). In colonial times, colonisers set up economic systems that kept the colonised populations in poverty to facilitate resource and labour extraction (Rodney, 1972).

In contemporary Nigeria, poverty weaponization has evolved into a sophisticated system of control that transcends traditional economic indicators. The country's vast natural resources, including oil reserves, solid minerals, and agricultural potential, present a paradox where abundance coexists with widespread deprivation. This paradox is not accidental but rather the result of deliberate policies and practices that concentrate wealth among a small elite while maintaining the masses in various forms of poverty (Okonjo-Iweala, 2018). The multidimensional nature of poverty in Nigeria encompasses not only income deficiency but also limited access to quality education, healthcare, clean water, and basic infrastructure, creating a complex web of deprivations that reinforce each other.

The theoretical framework of geographical disparities provides crucial insight into understanding how poverty is systematically deployed as a weapon of control. Regional inequalities in Nigeria are not merely the result of natural endowments or historical accidents but are often the product of calculated political decisions. The concentration of development projects, infrastructure investments, and federal appointments in certain regions while neglecting others creates artificial scarcities that can be exploited for political advantage (Krugman, 1991). These disparities are further entrenched through ethnic and religious divisions, where political elites mobilize identity-based loyalties to justify unequal resource distribution and maintain their grip on power.

The role of international institutions in this dynamic cannot be overlooked. Organizations such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank, through their structural adjustment programs and conditional aid packages, have inadvertently provided tools that local elites use to further entrench poverty. The neoliberal economic policies promoted by these institutions often prioritize market liberalization and austerity measures over social protection, creating vulnerabilities that can be exploited by domestic political actors (Stiglitz, 2002). The result is a system where international development assistance, intended to alleviate poverty, sometimes becomes complicit in its weaponization.

The mechanisms through which poverty is weaponized in Nigeria are diverse and sophisticated. Food insecurity is deliberately maintained through inadequate agricultural policies and poor storage facilities, creating opportunities for political manipulation during

election periods. Welfare programs are designed not to lift people out of poverty but to create dependency relationships that can be politically exploited. Cash transfer programs, for instance, are often implemented without sustainable exit strategies, ensuring that beneficiaries remain politically beholden to their patrons (Piven & Cloward, 1971). Similarly, educational policies that fail to provide quality education to the masses ensure a perpetually uninformed electorate that can be easily manipulated through primordial appeals and temporary material benefits.

The consequences of poverty weaponization extend far beyond economic indicators to encompass security, social cohesion, and democratic governance. Poverty-driven desperation has created fertile ground for insurgency movements such as Boko Haram, which exploits economic marginalization to recruit followers and justify violent activities (Adegbulu, 2013). Communal conflicts over resources are exacerbated by artificial scarcities created through unequal development policies. The democratic process itself is undermined as electoral competition becomes a contest of who can better exploit the desperation of the poor rather than who can provide better governance and sustainable development.

Weaponization of poverty in Nigeria operates through both formal institutions and informal networks. While official policies may ostensibly aim at poverty reduction, their implementation is often subverted to serve elite interests. The proliferation of poverty alleviation programmes that fail to meet their objectives is not simply a result of incompetence but often reflects the deliberate design to sustain control rather than genuinely tackle poverty (Easterly, 2006). This systematic approach to preserving poverty ensures that the political elite maintains its relevance and power while the populace remains reliant on their largesse.

Clarifications of Concept on Poverty in Nigeria

Poverty in Nigeria is a complex issue encompassing economic deprivation as well as social and political disenfranchisement. Comprehending poverty in this context necessitates the clarification of several interconnected concepts:

Economic Poverty: Economic poverty in Nigeria refers to the inadequate income and resources required for a sustainable livelihood. Poverty is frequently assessed through income levels, with a considerable segment of the population existing below the poverty threshold, commonly defined as earning less than $1.90 per day (World Bank, 2020).

Multidimensional Poverty: The Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI) assesses the multiple deprivations individuals face in their daily lives, extending beyond income alone. In Nigeria, poor health, lack of education, inadequate living standards, and exposure to violence are significant factors (UNDP, 2022).

Rural and Urban Poverty: Rural poverty in Nigeria is characterized by heightened severity, primarily attributed to restricted access to essential services such as healthcare, education, and clean water. Urban poverty presents distinct challenges, including overcrowding, inadequate housing, and employment instability (National Bureau of Statistics, 2021).

Structural Poverty: Structural poverty denotes systemic factors that sustain poverty, including corruption, inadequate governance, and ineffective policies. In Nigeria, these issues intensify the poverty cycle, hindering individuals' ability to escape poverty (Okonjo-Iweala, 2018).

Absolute and Relative Poverty: Absolute poverty is characterized by a fixed standard of living, wherein individuals are deprived of necessities for survival, including food, shelter, and clothing.

Relative Poverty: A comparative metric defines individuals as poor if their income is substantially below the societal average income. This concept underscores the presence of inequality in Nigeria (NBS, 2019).

Poverty Traps: Poverty traps are mechanisms that reinforce themselves, leading to the continued existence of poverty. In Nigeria, low human capital, inadequate infrastructure, and limited access to financial services contribute to a persistent cycle of poverty (Collier, 2007).

Social Exclusion: Social exclusion refers to the marginalization of specific groups within society, restricting their access to resources, opportunities, and services. Social exclusion in Nigeria disproportionately impacts women, children, and ethnic minorities, exacerbating the poverty divide (Oxfam, 2021).

Capability Deprivation: Amartya Sen's concept of capability deprivation emphasizes the actual abilities and opportunities available to individuals, rather than solely their income levels. In Nigeria, inadequate access to quality education, healthcare, and employment opportunities substantially restricts individuals' capabilities (Sen, 1999).

Chronic and Transient Poverty: Chronic Poverty: Long-term and persistent, affecting individuals who remain poor for extended periods.

Transient Poverty: Short-term poverty experienced due to temporary shocks such as illness, loss of employment, or natural disasters. Both forms are common in Nigeria, with chronic poverty being more extensive due to structural issues (Hulme & Shepherd, 2003)

Theoretical Framework

This paper employs the theory of Geographical Disparities to examine the utilization of poverty by elites in Nigeria as a means to maintain the financial subjugation of the impoverished population. This theory posits that specific regions are deficient in the necessary resources to produce wealth and income, while also lacking the power to advocate for redistribution. Factors contributing to poverty in these contexts encompass disinvestment, proximity to natural resources, and the density and diffusion of innovation (Addae-Korankye, 2019).

The theory of geographical disparities is a framework established by scholars, including Krugman (1991), Harvey (1973), Storper (1997), Massey (1984), and Florida (2002), aimed at elucidating the reasons behind the variation of economic and social conditions across regions. Political organizations can contribute to the creation of poverty by neglecting certain regions of the country. The one-sided appointments during President Buhari's eight-year administration exemplify this issue, as he stereotyped certain regions as insignificant in terms of their electoral contributions during interviews. Unequal investment in certain regions may perpetuate poverty through biased policies. The administration focused cash transfers primarily in North-Western states under the guise of poverty alleviation. This approach ultimately exacerbated poverty levels in the North due to increased reliance on government support. Meanwhile, regions previously labelled as "dot" capitalized on this situation to exert control over the state's economy by utilizing their own financial resources through trade. This phenomenon is prevalent due to the strong influence of tribal and religious affiliations. When the ruling party represents a different tribe, region, or religion, the state encounters significant challenges.

Factors Contributing to Geographical Disparities:

i. Economic Structure: Regions characterized by a diverse economic base generally experience elevated income levels and improved living standards. Conversely, regions reliant on a singular industry exhibit increased susceptibility to economic volatility (Martin, 2001). Similar to North-Western Nigeria, the mining of gold in states such as Zamfara has been monopolized by a select group of elites, resulting in the impoverishment of the local population. The government of Zamfara asserts ownership of the gold resources, receiving support from its citizens despite their prevailing poverty amidst abundance. Additionally, they accuse the Niger-Deltans of receiving greater federal allocations, despite having a larger population than that of the Niger Delta region. If their gold had been allocated to the federation for utilization, they would have received an equivalent or greater allocation than the Niger-Deltans.
ii. Infrastructure: The quality and availability of infrastructure are essential factors influencing a region's economic activities and access to services. Robust infrastructure enhances business attraction and investment opportunities (Aschauer, 1989). The recently completed Dangote refinery in Lagos, Nigeria, is expected to attract a significant level and caliber of businesses and individuals to the industry.
iii. Government Policies: Policies implemented at different levels can either mitigate or intensify geographical disparities. Investments in infrastructure, education, and healthcare contribute to the reduction of these disparities (Storper, 2013).
iv. Historical and Cultural Factors**:** Regional development is shaped by historical events, cultural practices, and social norms (Acemoglu & Robinson, 2012).
v. Natural Resources**:** The availability of natural resources influences regional development. Regions abundant in resources may experience economic advantages, whereas those deficient in resources frequently encounter difficulties (Sachs & Warner, 1995). This is evident in the oil-rich Niger Delta, where the population is relatively small compared to North-Western Nigeria, where the population of a single state can equal that of three to four states in South-Eastern Nigeria. In the context of revenue sharing, Bayelsa State receives a larger allocation than Kano and other Northern States due to its natural resources, particularly crude oil.
vi. Education and Skills: Variations in education and training lead to differences in skill levels within the workforce (Florida, 2002).
vii. Urbanization and Migration: Urban areas typically provide greater economic opportunities and services, drawing individuals from rural regions (Tacoli, 1998). This occurs due to industrial advancement, where the placement of infrastructure is primarily prioritized in urban areas over rural areas, thereby encouraging individuals to migrate to urban centers for livelihood opportunities.
viii. Globalization**:** The integration into the global economy yields uneven benefits across regions, resulting in disparities (Krugman, 1991). Certain regions benefit from globalization due to their proximity to borders, as evidenced in Cross-River, Rivers, Akwa-Ibom, Lagos, Adamawa, Taraba, Katsina, and Sokoto States. Early interactions with external entities are evident in the cases of the South-East, South-South, and North, particularly with the onset of colonial incursions. iii. The presence of raw materials in specific regions, such as Jos (Plateau) for columbites and tin, and the Niger-Delta region due to the discovery of crude oil.

Mechanisms used in weaponizing poverty

Weaponization of poverty in contemporary times involves several mechanisms:

i. Hunger and Food Insecurity: Hunger denotes the physiological need for food, whereas food insecurity involves more comprehensive concerns regarding the availability, access, and utilization of adequate, safe, and nutritious food (Food and Agriculture Organization, 2020). The Elites focus on this to deprive citizens of resources, utilizing foodstuffs as leverage for gaining power during election periods.
ii. Manipulation of Welfare Policies: Welfare policies frequently offer limited assistance to impoverished individuals, perpetuating their reliance on such support. Welfare programs introduced by politicians may ostensibly assist the impoverished, yet they are often designed to foster dependency (Piven & Cloward, 1971). The Social Cash Transfer program under the Buhari administration illustrates that, in the 21st century, the Minister of Humanitarian Affairs reported that citizens received money in cash rather than through bank accounts, citing widespread illiteracy as a primary reason.
iii. Economic Policies Favoring the Rich: Economic policies, including tax reductions for the affluent, deregulation, and austerity measures, tend to favor the elite and intensify poverty among lower socioeconomic groups (Stiglitz, 2012).
iv. Strategic Use of Media: Media Narratives are strategically managed to influence public perception of poverty, frequently attributing responsibility for their circumstances to the impoverished while idealizing the affluence and achievements of the elite (Herman & Chomsky, 1988).

The Role of International Institutions

The involvement of international organizations in exacerbating poverty in Nigeria presents a complex and multifaceted challenge. Understanding this requires an examination of how these organizations, through their policies, actions, and occasional inactions, have shaped the economic and social landscape of Nigeria. International institutions such as the International Monetary Fund and World Bank have significantly contributed to the weaponization of poverty. Their policies frequently support neoliberal economic models, resulting in heightened inequality and poverty in numerous developing nations. Austerity measures implemented by these institutions decrease social spending, favoring the elite (Stiglitz, 2002).

i. Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs)

International organizations have significantly influenced poverty in Nigeria through the Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs) implemented by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank. During the 1980s, Nigeria, similar to numerous other African nations, encountered significant economic difficulties and sought financial support from these institutions. The SAPs mandated Nigeria to adopt austerity measures, devalue its currency, and liberalize its economy. These policies, which were intended to stabilize the economy, resulted in significant repercussions. There was Naira devaluation that resulted to significant increases in the prices of goods and services, diminishing the purchasing power of average Nigerians and contributing to a rise in poverty levels (Okonjo-Iweala, 2012).

The country also witnessed reductions in government expenditure on social services, such as health and education. This negatively impacted the impoverished and intensified inequalities (Jega, 2000).The push for privatization in Nigeria through the policies led to job losses as state-owned enterprises were sold, often without adequate social safety nets for the displaced workers (Bangura, 1994).

ii. **Aid and Development Programs**

International organizations, such as the United Nations (UN), numerous non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and bilateral aid agencies, have contributed through their aid and development initiatives. Although these programs seek to alleviate poverty, their execution and the associated conditions frequently result in unintended outcomes. Assistance frequently entails stipulations that may restrict the autonomy of beneficiary nations. Such conditions may encompass alterations in economic policy that do not consistently correspond with the local context or serve the interests of the impoverished (Easterly, 2006). The ongoing dependence on foreign aid may foster a dependency syndrome, undermining local initiatives and obstructing sustainable development (Moyo, 2009).

iii. **Trade Policies**

The World Trade Organization (WTO) and other international trade bodies have impacted Nigeria's poverty levels via trade policies. Advocating for Nigeria to liberalize its markets for international trade has occasionally resulted in the influx of inexpensive foreign products, which may surpass local industries in competitiveness and contribute to job losses (Adenikinju, 2005). International Agricultural Policies and Subsidies in developed nations have also hindered the ability of Nigerian farmers to compete globally, thereby impacting their incomes and livelihoods (Akande, 2003).

iv. **Debt Relief Initiatives**

Debt relief initiatives, such as the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) initiative, aim to alleviate poverty by reducing debt burdens; however, the process and implementation have not consistently produced the desired outcomes. Debt relief frequently entails strict conditions necessitating economic restructuring, potentially harming impoverished populations (Easterly, 2002). In certain instances, the allocation of relief funds has been hindered by corruption and mismanagement within the nation (Lewis, 2007).

v. **Humanitarian Interventions**: International humanitarian interventions, especially in conflict zones, have also had mixed impacts, which include:

Displacement: Assistance initiatives in conflict zones can result in community displacement and local economic disruption (IRIN, 2005).

Militarization of Aid: In certain cases, aid has functioned as an instrument of foreign policy, potentially intensifying tensions and fostering instability (Duffield, 2001).
The involvement of international organizations in exacerbating poverty in Nigeria is complex. Although their interventions are frequently well-intentioned, the results can occasionally be counterproductive. Structural adjustment programs, conditional aid, trade policies, debt relief conditions, and humanitarian interventions have significantly influenced Nigeria's economic and social landscape, frequently intensifying poverty instead of mitigating it.

Consequences of the Weaponization of Poverty

In Nigeria, poverty is intentionally used by different parties for their own political, economic, and social ends. This is known as "weaponization of poverty." This strategy has significant implications for governance, security, social cohesion, and economic development.

i. **Political Consequences**

Manipulation of the Electorate: Politicians frequently leverage poverty to influence the electorate. Disadvantaged populations exhibit greater vulnerability to vote-buying, intimidation, and various forms of electoral manipulation. This compromises democratic processes and results in the election of leaders who may not prioritize the public's best interests (Smith, 2020).

Corruption and Governance: The exploitation of poverty sustains a cycle of corruption. Political elites exploit state resources to sustain their authority, reallocating funds intended for poverty alleviation to benefit themselves and their associates. This undermines governance frameworks and diminishes public confidence in institutions (Akinyemi, 2019).

The political class's weaponization of poverty has significant implications for Nigerian society. This sustains a cycle of poverty, as individuals and communities maintain economic dependence on political figures. This dependency compromises democratic processes, as votes are acquired through financial means rather than through authentic political engagement and substantive policy proposals. Moreover, it promotes corruption and mismanagement of public resources, as funds are redirected for political objectives instead of tackling the fundamental causes of poverty (Ake, 1996).

ii. **Security Consequences**

The emergence of insurgency and terrorism is significantly influenced by poverty and unemployment, which increase the susceptibility of individuals, particularly youth, to recruitment by groups such as Boko Haram. These groups leverage economic desperation to garner support and extend their influence, resulting in heightened violence and instability (Adegbulu, 2013). Poverty intensifies ethnic and religious tensions, resulting in recurrent communal conflicts. Competition for limited resources, including land and water, can trigger conflicts, especially in areas such as the Middle Belt of Nigeria (Ikelegbe, 2017).

iii. **Social Consequences**

Human Rights Violations: The exploitation of poverty frequently leads to violations of human rights. Individuals in poverty may experience coercion, forced labor, and various forms of exploitation by those in positions of power. This is especially apparent in rural regions where governmental supervision is limited (Human Rights Watch, 2019).

Education and Health: Poverty affects access to critical services such as education and healthcare. Weaponizing poverty involves the intentional underfunding of essential sectors, resulting in an uneducated and unhealthy population, thereby facilitating control over these individuals. This sustains the cycle of poverty and underdevelopment (Okechukwu, 2018).

iv. **Economic Consequences**

Stunted Economic Growth: The intentional maintenance of poverty hinders economic development. It constrains the development of human capital and diminishes productivity. A significant portion of the population's inability to contribute effectively to the economy hinders national growth (Nwafor, 2021).

Inequality: The use of poverty as a tool intensifies economic inequality. The disparity in wealth between the elite and the impoverished increases as resources become concentrated

among a limited number of individuals. This results in a polarized society characterized by substantial social and economic disparities (Obi, 2020).

The weaponization of poverty results in heightened social stratification, diminished social mobility, and sustains a challenging cycle of poverty. This impacts individuals' economic welfare and carries significant social and political consequences, resulting in instability and conflict (Sen, 1999).

Conclusion

The weaponization of poverty in Nigeria represents a systematic strategy employed by political and economic elites to maintain power and control. This paper demonstrates that poverty extends beyond economic deprivation to encompass deliberate mechanisms of social, political, and economic manipulation through geographical disparities, food insecurity, welfare dependency, and biased policies. The consequences are far-reaching: undermining democratic processes, fueling insurgency and conflicts, perpetuating human rights violations, and stunting economic growth. International institutions have also contributed through structural adjustment programs and conditional aid that often exacerbate inequalities.

Recommendation

Addressing the weaponization of poverty necessitates a multifaceted approach as follows:

i. Policy Reform: The implementation of policies designed to effectively reduce poverty and inequality, including progressive taxation, enhanced social spending, and equitable labour practices.
ii. Empowerment of the Poor: Facilitating the inclusion of impoverished individuals in the political process through education, advocacy, and support for grassroots initiatives.
iii. Media Accountability: Fostering independent media that delivers impartial reporting on poverty, inequality, and other infringements that could further aggravate poverty.
iv. International Cooperation: Reforming international institutions to align their policies with sustainable development objectives of the state and mitigate inequality.
v. Institutional Strengthening: Enhancing electoral and anti-corruption institutions to prevent the exploitation of food aid for political ends (Transparency International, 2019).
vi. Sustainable Food Programmes: Establishing enduring, sustainable food initiatives that are protected from political influence to reduce susceptibility to political manipulation (World Food Programme, 2020).
vii. Civic Education: Civic education is essential for informing the electorate about their rights and the importance of free and fair elections, thereby empowering them to resist manipulation (Uslaner, 2004).
viii. Monitoring and Accountability: Setting up effective monitoring and accountability systems is vital to ensure that food aid reaches those in need and is not exploited for political purposes (Olken, 2007).

References

Addae-Korankye, A. (2019). Causes of poverty in Africa: A review of literature. *American International Journal of Social Science Research*, 5(1), 1-8.

Adegbulu, F. (2013). Boko Haram: The emergence of a terrorist sect in Nigeria 2009-2013. African Identities, 11(3), 260-273.

Adenikinju, A. (2005). Productivity performance in developing countries: Country case studies. United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO).

Akande, T. (2003). The global food crisis and Nigerian agriculture. Nigerian Institute of Social and Economic Research (NISER).

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

Akinyemi, O. (2019). Corruption and democratic governance in Nigeria: Implications for development. *Journal of Political Science and International Relations*, 6(2), 31-39.

Aschauer, D. A. (1989). Is public expenditure productive? Journal of Monetary Economics, 23(2), 177- 200.

Bangura, Y. (1994). The search for identity: Ethnicity, religion and political violence. Oxford University Press.

Bloch, M. (1961). *Feudal Society*. University of Chicago Press.

Collier, P. (2007). The Bottom Billion: Why the Poorest Countries are Failing and What Can Be Done About It. Oxford University Press.

Duffield, M. (2001). Global governance and the new wars: The merging of development and security. Zed Books.

Easterly, W. (2002). The elusive quest for growth: Economists' adventures and misadventures in the tropics. MIT Press.

Easterly, W. (2006). The white man's burden: Why the West's efforts to aid the rest have done so much ill and so little good. Penguin Press.

Edelman, P. (2012). *So Rich, So Poor: Why It's So Hard to End Poverty in America*. New Press.

Florida, R. (2002). The rise of the creative class. *Washington Monthly*, 34(5), 15-25.

Food and Agriculture Organization. (2020). *The State of Food Security and Nutrition in the World*.

Herman, E. S., & Chomsky, N. (1988). *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media*. Pantheon Books.

Hulme, D., & Shepherd, A. (2003). Conceptualizing Chronic Poverty. World Development, 31(3), 403-423.

Human Rights Watch. (2019). Nigeria: Events of 2018. Retrieved from https://www.hrw.org/world- report/2019/country-chapters/nigeria

Ikelegbe, A. (2017). Ethnic militias and conflict in Nigeria. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 15(3), 1-11.

IRIN. (2005). Nigeria: Internal displacement - A hidden crisis. Integrated Regional Information Networks.

Jega, A. M. (2000). Identity transformation and identity politics under structural adjustment in Nigeria. Nordic Africa Institute.

Krugman, P. (1991). Geography and Trade. MIT Press.

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

Mkandawire, T., & Soludo, C. C. (1999). *Our Continent, Our Future: African Perspectives on Structural Adjustment*. CODESRIA.

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 (NBS). (2019). Poverty and Inequality in Nigeria: 2019.

National Bureau of Statistics (NBS). (2021). Poverty and Inequality in Nigeria: 2021.

Nwafor, M. (2021). Poverty and economic growth in Nigeria: An empirical analysis. *International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues*, 11(1), 45-53.

Obi, C. (2020). Inequality and economic development in Nigeria. *Development in Practice*, 30(7), 870-883.

Okechukwu, S. (2018). Impact of poverty on access to education and health in Nigeria. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention*, 7(5), 22-29.

Okonjo-Iweala, N. (2012). Reforming the unreformable: Lessons from Nigeria. MIT Press.

Okonjo-Iweala, N. (2018). Fighting Corruption is Dangerous: The Story Behind the Headlines. MIT Press.

Olken, B. A. (2007). Monitoring Corruption: Evidence from a Field Experiment in Indonesia. *Journal of Political Economy*, 115(2), 200-249.

Oxfam. (2021). Inequality in Nigeria: Exploring the Drivers.

Patnaik, U. (2003). Global capitalism, deflation, and agrarian crisis in developing countries. *Journal of Agrarian Change*, 3(1-2), 33-66.

Piven, F. F., & Cloward, R. A. (1971). *Regulating the Poor: The Functions of Public Welfare*. Pantheon Books.

Rodney, W. (1972). *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*. Bogle-L'Ouverture Publications.

Sachs, J. D., & Warner, A. M. (1995). Natural resource abundance and economic growth. *NationalBureau of Economic Research Working Paper Series*, No. 5398.

Saez, E., & Zucman, G. (2019). *The Triumph of Injustice: How the Rich Dodge Taxes and How to Make Them Pay*. W. W. Norton & Company.

Sen, A. (1999). *Development as Freedom*. Oxford University Press.

Sen, A. (1999). Development as Freedom. Oxford University Press.

Smith, D. (2020). Electoral manipulation and poverty in Nigeria: A political economy perspective. *Journal of African Elections*, 19(1), 45-60.

Stiglitz, J. E. (2002). *Globalization and Its Discontents*. W. W. Norton & Company.

Stiglitz, J. E. (2012). *The Price of Inequality: How Today's Divided Society Endangers Our Future*. W. W. Norton & Company.

Storper, M. (1997). *The Regional World: Territorial Development in a Global Economy*. Guilford Press.

Tacoli, C. (1998). Rural-urban interactions: a guide to the literature. *Environment and Urbanization*, 10(1), 147-166.

Transparency International. (2019). *Corruption Perceptions Index 2019*. Transparency International.

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). (2022). Nigeria Human Development Report 2022.

Uslaner, E. M. (2004). Trust and corruption. In J. G. Lambsdorff, M. Taube, & M. Schramm (Eds.), *The New Institutional Economics of Corruption* (pp. 76-92). Routledge.

World Bank. (2020). World Bank Data on Nigeria.

World Food Programme. (2020). *Global Report on Food Crises 2020*. World Food Programme