International Journal of Financial Economics and Accounting (IJFEA)
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.14773885

Research Article

The Politics of Borrowing in Nigeria: Balancing Short-Term Gains and Long-Term Risks

Prof. Egiyi Modesta Amaka

Department of Accounting, Godfey Okoye University, Enugu, Nigeria

Cite as:
Egiyi, M. A. (2024). The Politics of Borrowing in Nigeria: Balancing Short-Term Gains and Long-Term Risks. *International Journal of Financial Economics and Accounting, 4(1), 1-10. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14773885*

Abstract

This study delves into the political drivers and implications of borrowing in Nigeria, emphasizing the balance between short-term gains and long-term risks. It explores the complexities of Nigeria's borrowing history, current debt levels, and the implications of both domestic and external debt. Key political factors such as the electoral cycle, populist pressures, rent-seeking, corruption, and federalism play significant roles in shaping borrowing practices. The research highlights the challenges of responsible debt management, including the political unpopularity of austerity measures and the tension between short-term political incentives and long-term fiscal sustainability. The study also examines historical examples, such as France in the 18th century and developing countries in the late 20th century, to illustrate the consequences of excessive borrowing. To mitigate these risks, the study recommends strengthening fiscal management institutions, enhancing transparency and accountability, promoting public awareness, and diversifying the economy. By adopting these strategies, Nigeria can develop a more sustainable borrowing framework that supports economic development and ensures long-term fiscal stability. Ultimately, the study underscores the need for good governance and fiscal responsibility and calls for a national dialogue on sustainable borrowing to safeguard Nigeria's economic future.

Keywords: Political Drivers of Borrowing; Fiscal Responsibility; Debt Management; Nigeria's Economic Policy; Sustainable Borrowing Practices

1. Introduction

The politics of borrowing in Nigeria presents a complex interplay between achieving short-term economic gains and managing long-term fiscal risks. As Africa's largest economy, Nigeria has faced numerous challenges that have necessitated borrowing, including fluctuating oil prices, infrastructure deficits, and socio-economic development needs. While borrowing can provide immediate financial relief and support for critical projects, it also poses substantial risks, such as high debt servicing costs and potential future economic instability.

Historically, Nigeria's economy has been heavily reliant on oil exports, which account for a significant portion of government revenue. This dependency on a single commodity makes the country vulnerable to global oil price fluctuations, leading to periods of economic instability. During times of low oil prices, the government has often turned to borrowing to finance budget deficits and maintain public spending (Kale, 2019). This reliance on external factors adds complexity to Nigeria's borrowing decisions, as the country must balance the need for immediate financial support with the long-term implications of accumulating debt.

Borrowing has enabled Nigeria to undertake essential infrastructure projects, such as roads, railways, and power plants, which are crucial for economic development. These projects have the potential to stimulate economic growth, create jobs, and improve the overall quality of life for Nigerians. For example, the construction of the Lagos-Ibadan railway, funded by loans from China, aims to enhance transportation efficiency and boost economic activities along the corridor (Ekpo, 2021). However, the benefits of borrowing come with significant long-term risks. High debt levels lead to increased debt servicing costs, which divert funds away from essential public services such as education, healthcare, and social welfare.

The International Monetary Fund (IMF) has projected that Nigeria may spend nearly 100% of its revenue on debt servicing by 2026, highlighting the urgency of addressing these complexities (IMF, 2024). This situation underscores the need for a strategic approach to borrowing that balances immediate economic needs with long-term fiscal sustainability. Additionally, the World Bank has warned that while Nigeria's debt is currently deemed sustainable, it remains vulnerable and costly. The cost of servicing debt in foreign currencies can escalate due to exchange rate volatility, further straining the economy. For instance, the depreciation of the Nigerian naira against major currencies increases the burden of external debt repayment, exacerbating fiscal pressures (World Bank, 2023).

Nigeria's borrowing strategy must carefully navigate the trade-offs between leveraging loans for immediate development gains and managing the long-term implications of debt accumulation. The complexities involved in this balancing act highlight the importance of prudent fiscal management, economic diversification, and transparent governance to ensure sustainable development and economic stability.

2. Political Drivers of Excessive Borrowing

2.1 Electoral Cycle

Political Unpopularity of Austerity Measures

One of the significant challenges in responsible debt management is the political unpopularity of austerity measures. Austerity, which often involves cutting public spending and increasing taxes, can lead to immediate socio-economic hardships, such as reduced public services, higher unemployment, and increased cost of living. These measures are rarely welcomed by the electorate, making them politically risky for governments to implement (Streeck & Mertens, 2010). Politicians, sensitive to public opinion and the potential loss of voter support, may avoid or delay implementing necessary austerity measures, even when they are crucial for long-term fiscal stability.

For example, during Greece's debt crisis, the government's implementation of severe austerity measures, as required by international creditors, led to widespread protests and social unrest (Featherstone, 2011). The cuts in public spending, pension reforms, and tax increases were deeply unpopular, contributing to political instability and changes in government. This case highlights the tension between the necessity of austerity measures for debt reduction and the political cost of such measures.

Tension between Short-Term and Long-Term Interests

Another critical aspect of the difficulty in responsible debt management is the inherent tension between short-term and long-term interests. Political leaders often operate within short electoral cycles, typically four to five years, during which they need to demonstrate tangible achievements to secure re-election (Keefer, 2007). This focus on short-term gains can lead to decisions that prioritize immediate economic benefits over long-term fiscal sustainability.

For instance, investing borrowed funds in visible infrastructure projects or social programs can boost a government's popularity in the short term. However, if these investments are not carefully planned and do not generate sufficient economic returns, they can lead to increased debt burdens in the long run (Alesina & Tabellini, 1990). The challenge lies in balancing these short-term political incentives with the need for responsible long-term debt management, which often requires making unpopular decisions that may not yield immediate benefits.

2.2 Lack of Political Will

Prioritizing Short-Term Electoral Gains over Fiscal Responsibility

The lack of political will to prioritize fiscal responsibility is a common driver of excessive borrowing. Political leaders may prioritize short-term electoral gains over long-term economic health, leading to unsustainable borrowing practices. This behavior is driven by the desire to deliver immediate benefits to the electorate, such as increased public spending or tax cuts, to enhance their chances of re-election (Acemoglu, Johnson, & Robinson, 2001).

In Nigeria, political leaders have often resorted to borrowing to finance large-scale infrastructure projects and social programs, particularly in the lead-up to elections. While these projects can provide short-term economic stimulus and political capital, they may not always be financially viable in the long term. The focus on immediate gains can overshadow the need for prudent debt management, resulting in accumulating unsustainable debt levels (Collier & Gunning, 1999).

Consequences of Accumulating Unsustainable Debt

The consequences of accumulating unsustainable debt are far-reaching and can have severe implications for a country's economic stability and development. High debt levels lead to increased debt servicing costs, which can consume a significant portion of government revenue. This situation reduces the funds available for essential public services, such as education, healthcare, and infrastructure, adversely affecting the population's well-being (Reinhart & Rogoff, 2010).

Additionally, unsustainable debt levels can undermine investor confidence, leading to higher borrowing costs and reduced access to international capital markets. This can create a vicious cycle where countries must borrow more to service existing debt, further exacerbating the debt burden (Krugman, 1988). For example, Argentina's repeated debt crises have been characterized by a cycle of borrowing, default, and restructuring, which has hindered the country's economic development and led to prolonged periods of economic instability (Damill, Frenkel, & Rapetti, 2015).

2.3 Rent-seeking & Corruption

Impact on Fiscal Management

Rent-seeking and corruption are significant political drivers of excessive borrowing. Rent-seeking behavior involves individuals or groups attempting to gain financial benefits through manipulation or exploitation of the political environment, rather than through productive economic activities. Corruption, on the other hand, involves the misuse of public office for private gain. Both practices can severely undermine fiscal management and lead to inefficient allocation of resources (Mauro, 1995).

In Nigeria, corruption has been a pervasive issue, affecting various sectors of the economy. Public funds intended for development projects are often siphoned off by corrupt officials, leading to incomplete or substandard projects that do not generate the expected economic returns. This mismanagement of resources necessitates further borrowing to cover budget deficits, perpetuating a cycle of debt accumulation (Smith, 2007).

Erosion of Public Trust

Corruption and rent-seeking also erode public trust in government institutions. When citizens perceive that their leaders are misusing public funds, it undermines confidence in the government's ability to manage the economy effectively. This lack of trust can lead to social unrest and reduced compliance with tax policies, further straining public finances and increasing the reliance on borrowing (Tanzi & Davoodi, 1997).

2.4 Federalism & State-level Borrowing Dynamics

Decentralized Borrowing Practices

Federalism, characterized by the division of powers between central and state governments, can complicate borrowing dynamics. In a federal system, state governments often have the authority to borrow independently of the central government. This decentralized borrowing can lead to a lack of coordination and oversight, resulting in excessive borrowing at the state level (Rodden, 2006).

In Nigeria, state governments frequently engage in borrowing to finance their development projects and meet budgetary needs. However, the lack of stringent oversight and accountability mechanisms can lead to irresponsible borrowing practices. States may accumulate significant debt without adequate consideration of their repayment capacity, contributing to the overall debt burden of the country (Ezeabasili, 2011).

Moral Hazard and Bailouts

The federal structure can also create moral hazard issues, where state governments engage in risky borrowing behavior, expecting that the central government will bail them out in case of financial distress. This expectation can lead to a lack of fiscal discipline at the state level, as states may not fully bear the consequences of their borrowing decisions (Inman, 2003).

For example, in Nigeria, the central government has occasionally provided financial assistance to states facing fiscal crises, reinforcing the perception that states can rely on federal bailouts. This dynamic can undermine efforts to promote responsible borrowing practices and fiscal discipline at the state level.

3. The Role of Political Will

3.1 Difficulty of Responsible Debt Management

Political unpopularity of austerity measures

One of the significant challenges in responsible debt management is the political unpopularity of austerity measures. Austerity, which often involves cutting public spending and increasing taxes, can lead to immediate socio-economic hardships, such as reduced public services, higher unemployment, and increased cost of living. These measures are rarely welcomed by the electorate, making them politically risky for governments to implement (Streeck & Mertens, 2010). Politicians, sensitive to public opinion and the potential loss of voter support, may avoid or delay implementing necessary austerity measures, even when they are crucial for long-term fiscal stability.

For example, during Greece's debt crisis, the government's implementation of severe austerity measures, as required by international creditors, led to widespread protests and social unrest (Featherstone, 2011). The cuts in public spending, pension reforms, and tax increases were deeply unpopular, contributing to political instability and changes in government. This case highlights the tension between the necessity of austerity measures for debt reduction and the political cost of such measures.

Tension between short-term and long-term interests

Another critical aspect of the difficulty in responsible debt management is the inherent tension between short-term and long-term interests. Political leaders often operate within short electoral cycles, typically four to five years, during which they need to demonstrate tangible achievements to secure re-election (Keefer, 2007). This focus on short-term gains can lead to decisions that prioritize immediate economic benefits over long-term fiscal sustainability.

For instance, investing borrowed funds in visible infrastructure projects or social programs can boost a government's popularity in the short term. However, if these investments are not carefully planned and do not generate sufficient economic returns, they can lead to increased debt burdens in the long run (Alesina & Tabellini, 1990). The challenge lies in balancing these short-term political incentives with the need for responsible long-term debt management, which often requires making unpopular decisions that may not yield immediate benefits.

3.2 Lack of Political Will

Prioritizing Short-term Electoral Gains over Fiscal Responsibility

The lack of political will to prioritize fiscal responsibility is a common driver of excessive borrowing. Political leaders may prioritize short-term electoral gains over long-term economic health, leading to unsustainable borrowing practices. This behavior is driven by the desire to deliver immediate benefits to the electorate, such as increased public spending or tax cuts, to enhance their chances of re-election (Acemoglu, Johnson, & Robinson, 2001).

In Nigeria, political leaders have often resorted to borrowing to finance large-scale infrastructure projects and social programs, particularly in the lead-up to elections. While these projects can provide short-term economic stimulus and political capital, they may not always be financially viable in the long term. The focus on immediate gains can overshadow the need for prudent debt management, resulting in accumulating unsustainable debt levels (Collier & Gunning, 1999).

Consequences of Accumulating Unsustainable Debt

The consequences of accumulating unsustainable debt are far-reaching and can have severe implications for a country's economic stability and development. High debt levels lead to increased debt servicing costs, which can consume a significant portion of government revenue. This situation reduces the funds available for essential public services, such as education, healthcare, and infrastructure, adversely affecting the population's well-being (Reinhart & Rogoff, 2010).

Additionally, unsustainable debt levels can undermine investor confidence, leading to higher borrowing costs and reduced access to international capital markets. This can create a vicious cycle where countries must borrow more to service existing debt, further exacerbating the debt burden (Krugman, 1988). For example, Argentina's repeated debt crises have been characterized by a cycle of borrowing, default, and restructuring, which has hindered the country's economic development and led to prolonged periods of economic instability (Damill, Frenkel, & Rapetti, 2015).

4. Historical Examples

4.1 France (18th Century)

Excessive borrowing Leading to Debt Crisis and Revolution

The financial situation in France during the 18th century provides a compelling example of how excessive borrowing can lead to a severe debt crisis and political upheaval. Leading up to the French Revolution, France's economy was in a precarious state, burdened by substantial debt from years of excessive borrowing. The French monarchy, particularly under Louis XVI, incurred significant debts to finance participation in various wars, including the costly American War of Independence (1775-1783) (Schama, 1989).

This borrowing was largely driven by the need to maintain France's military and political influence in Europe. However, the lack of effective fiscal reforms and the continued lavish spending by the monarchy exacerbated the financial crisis. By the late 1780s, France's debt had ballooned, and the government's expenditures far outstripped its revenues, leading to severe budget deficits (Doyle, 1980).

Efforts to address the fiscal crisis, such as calling the Estates-General and proposing new taxes, were met with resistance from the privileged classes, who were largely exempt from taxation. The inability to enact meaningful fiscal reforms led to widespread discontent among the populace. The financial crisis, coupled with social and economic inequalities, set the stage for the French Revolution in 1789. The revolution ultimately led to the downfall of the monarchy and significant political and social changes in France (Lefebvre, 2005).

4.2 Developing Countries (Late 20th Century)

Borrowing for Development, often Mismanaged, Leading to Debt Crises

In the late 20th century, many developing countries turned to international borrowing to finance their development ambitions. The intent was to invest in infrastructure, education, and other essential sectors to spur economic growth. However, the mismanagement of these borrowed funds often led to debt crises, undermining the very development goals they sought to achieve.

One notable example is the Latin American debt crisis of the 1980s. Countries such as Brazil, Mexico, and Argentina borrowed heavily from international lenders during the 1970s, driven by the need to modernize their economies and achieve rapid growth. However, the global economic environment changed dramatically with the oil shocks of the 1970s and the subsequent rise in interest rates in the early 1980s (Sachs, 1989).

These external shocks increased the cost of borrowing and servicing existing debts. Additionally, many of these countries had weak fiscal policies and governance structures that led to inefficient use of borrowed funds. Corruption, misallocation of resources, and overambitious projects that did not generate expected returns further exacerbated the financial problems (Edwards, 1995).

By the early 1980s, several Latin American countries found themselves in a debt trap, unable to meet their debt obligations. Mexico's announcement in 1982 that it could no longer service its debt marked the beginning of a regional debt crisis that would have widespread economic and social implications. The crisis led to a "lost decade" for Latin America, characterized by economic stagnation, high inflation, and increased poverty (Stallings & Peres, 2000).

Another example is Sub-Saharan Africa, where many countries faced debt crises in the 1980s and 1990s. Governments borrowed extensively to fund development projects, but poor governance, corruption, and unfavorable economic conditions led to unsustainable debt levels. Countries like Zambia and Zimbabwe experienced severe economic distress as they struggled to repay their debts, leading to cuts in public spending and worsening socio-economic conditions (Moss, 2003).

5. Nigeria's Borrowing Context

5.1 Historical Borrowing Patterns & Impact

Nigeria's borrowing history is rooted in its economic development strategies and the need to finance budget deficits. During the oil boom of the 1970s, Nigeria experienced significant revenue inflows, which prompted large-scale investments in infrastructure and social services. However, the subsequent oil price collapse in the early 1980s led to revenue shortfalls, prompting the government to borrow extensively both domestically and externally to maintain public spending (Iyoha, 1999).

The 1980s and 1990s were marked by periods of economic instability, characterized by high inflation, fiscal deficits, and mounting debt. The Structural Adjustment Program (SAP) implemented by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank in the mid-1980s aimed to stabilize the economy through fiscal austerity, trade liberalization, and privatization of state-owned enterprises. Despite these efforts, Nigeria's debt burden continued to grow, peaking at $36 billion by 2004 (Easterly, 2002).

The debt relief granted to Nigeria under the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) initiative and the Multilateral Debt Relief Initiative (MDRI) in 2005 significantly reduced the country's external debt, providing a temporary reprieve. However, the underlying structural issues, such as reliance on oil revenues and poor fiscal management, remained unaddressed, leading to a resurgence in borrowing in subsequent years (Onyekwena & Ekeruche, 2019).

5.2 Current Debt Levels & Sustainability

As of the first quarter of 2024, Nigeria's public debt stock stood at approximately N121.67 trillion (US$91.46 billion), with external debt accounting for N56.02 trillion (US$42.12 billion) and domestic debt at N65.65 trillion. The country's debt-to-GDP ratio, a critical indicator of debt sustainability, has been a subject of concern among policymakers and international financial institutions. While Nigeria's debt-to-GDP ratio remains below the IMF's threshold for debt sustainability, the rising debt servicing costs pose significant challenges to fiscal stability (IMF, 2024).

The debt servicing obligations have consumed a substantial portion of Nigeria's revenue, limiting the government's capacity to invest in critical sectors such as education, healthcare, and infrastructure. The IMF has projected that Nigeria may spend nearly 100% of its revenue on debt servicing by 2026, underscoring the urgency of addressing the debt sustainability issue (IMF, 2024). The World Bank has also warned that while Nigeria's debt is currently deemed sustainable, it remains vulnerable to external shocks and exchange rate volatility (World Bank, 2023).

5.3 Domestic vs. External Debt Implications

Nigeria's debt portfolio is comprised of both domestic and external debt, each with distinct implications for the economy. Domestic debt, which includes government bonds, treasury bills, and other debt instruments issued within the country, has a relatively stable impact on the economy. The interest rates on domestic debt are typically lower than those on external debt, and the repayment obligations are in local currency, mitigating exchange rate risks (Ezeabasili, Mojekwu, & Herbert, 2011).

However, high levels of domestic borrowing can crowd out private sector investment by increasing interest rates and limiting access to credit. This crowding-out effect can hinder economic growth and reduce the capacity of the private sector to contribute to development (Were, 2001).

External debt, on the other hand, is sourced from international financial institutions, foreign governments, and private lenders. While external borrowing can provide access to larger amounts of capital and lower interest rates compared to domestic borrowing, it carries significant risks. The repayment obligations are in foreign currencies, exposing the country to exchange rate fluctuations and the risk of currency depreciation. Additionally, external debt often comes with stringent conditions imposed by lenders, which can constrain fiscal policy and limit the government's ability to implement development programs (Ajayi, 1991).

The implications of external debt were evident during the 1980s and 1990s, when Nigeria faced debt servicing difficulties due to declining oil revenues and currency depreciation. The subsequent debt relief initiatives provided temporary relief but highlighted the need for prudent debt management practices to ensure long-term sustainability (Okonjo-Iweala, 2012).

6. Mitigating Risks

6.1 Strengthening Fiscal Management Institutions

A robust and effective fiscal management system is crucial for mitigating the risks associated with excessive borrowing. Strengthening fiscal management institutions involves enhancing the capacity of government agencies responsible for public finance management, including budgeting, expenditure control, and debt management. By improving these institutions, governments can ensure that borrowed funds are allocated efficiently and used for productive investments that generate sustainable economic returns.

In Nigeria, efforts to strengthen fiscal management institutions have included implementing the Treasury Single Account (TSA) to consolidate government revenues and improve financial transparency (Okwoli, 2014). The TSA has helped reduce leakages and inefficiencies in the management of public funds, contributing to more effective fiscal discipline. Additionally, the adoption of the Integrated Personnel and Payroll Information System (IPPIS) has helped streamline payroll management and reduce ghost workers, further enhancing fiscal accountability.

To build on these initiatives, Nigeria must continue to invest in capacity-building programs for public finance managers, enhance financial management information systems, and strengthen oversight mechanisms. These measures will help ensure that public funds are managed effectively, reducing the need for excessive borrowing and promoting long-term fiscal sustainability (Levin, 2007).

6.2 Enhancing Transparency & Accountability

Transparency and accountability are critical components of effective debt management. Enhancing transparency involves ensuring that information about government borrowing, debt levels, and fiscal policies is readily available to the public and stakeholders. This openness allows for informed public discourse and helps build trust in government institutions.

In Nigeria, the implementation of the Fiscal Responsibility Act (FRA) in 2007 aimed to promote transparency and accountability in public finance management (Dabwor & Okoh, 2012). The FRA requires the government to publish regular reports on fiscal performance, including debt levels and borrowing activities. Additionally, the establishment of the Debt Management Office (DMO) has provided a centralized platform for managing Nigeria's debt portfolio and enhancing transparency in debt transactions.

To further enhance transparency and accountability, Nigeria should strengthen the role of independent oversight bodies, such as the Office of the Auditor-General and civil society organizations, in monitoring fiscal activities. Implementing open data initiatives and leveraging digital platforms can also improve access to information and facilitate citizen engagement in public finance management (Fjeldstad, 2004).

6.3 Promoting Public Awareness

Promoting public awareness about the implications of borrowing and the importance of fiscal responsibility is essential for fostering a culture of accountability and prudent financial management. Educating citizens about the impact of excessive borrowing on public services, economic stability, and future generations can empower them to hold government officials accountable for their fiscal decisions.

Public awareness campaigns can be conducted through various channels, including media, social networks, community forums, and educational institutions. By engaging with the public and providing clear, accessible information about fiscal policies and debt management, governments can build a more informed and active citizenry (Brinkerhoff & Wetterberg, 2016).

In Nigeria, initiatives such as the "Budget Transparency" campaign by the International Budget Partnership have aimed to improve public understanding of the budget process and promote citizen participation in fiscal matters. Expanding such initiatives and incorporating them into school curricula can help cultivate a culture of fiscal responsibility from a young age (International Budget Partnership, 2020).

6.4 Diversifying the Economy

Economic diversification is a crucial strategy for reducing dependence on borrowing and mitigating the risks associated with debt. Diversifying the economy involves developing multiple sectors, investing in human capital, and fostering innovation. A diversified economy is more resilient to external shocks and can generate stable revenue streams, reducing the need for external borrowing.

Nigeria's economy has historically been heavily reliant on oil exports, making it vulnerable to fluctuations in global oil prices. To address this, the government has prioritized diversification efforts through initiatives such as the Economic Recovery and Growth Plan (ERGP) and the National Economic Diversification Strategy (NEDS) (Ajakaiye & Ncube, 2010). These initiatives focus on developing key sectors such as agriculture, manufacturing, and services, which have the potential to generate employment, boost exports, and drive economic growth.

Investing in education and skills development is also critical for economic diversification. A well-educated and skilled workforce can drive innovation and entrepreneurship, leading to the growth of new industries and sectors. By fostering an enabling environment for private sector development and supporting small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), Nigeria can build a more resilient and dynamic economy that is less reliant on borrowing (UNDP, 2014).

7. Conclusion

Nigeria's borrowing history and current debt dynamics underscore the critical need for a balanced approach to fiscal policy. The intricate interplay of political, economic, and social factors necessitates good governance and fiscal responsibility to mitigate the risks associated with excessive borrowing. Sustainable borrowing practices are essential to ensure that the country can meet its development goals without compromising long-term economic stability and burdening future generations with unsustainable debt.

Good governance and fiscal responsibility are paramount in managing public debt effectively. Strengthening fiscal management institutions, enhancing transparency, and promoting accountability are crucial steps towards achieving this goal. By implementing robust fiscal policies and ensuring that borrowed funds are allocated efficiently to productive investments, Nigeria can foster economic growth and stability. The role of independent oversight bodies and civil society in monitoring fiscal activities is also vital in maintaining fiscal discipline and preventing corruption.

Furthermore, there is an urgent need for a **national dialogue on sustainable borrowing**. Engaging various stakeholders, including government officials, policymakers, civil society, and the public, in discussions about borrowing practices and debt management can foster a shared understanding of the challenges and opportunities. This dialogue should focus on developing comprehensive strategies for debt sustainability, emphasizing the importance of economic diversification, prudent fiscal management, and the responsible use of borrowed funds. Public awareness campaigns can also play a significant role in educating citizens about the implications of borrowing and the importance of fiscal responsibility.

In conclusion, achieving a balance between leveraging loans for development and maintaining long-term fiscal stability is crucial for Nigeria's economic future. Good governance, fiscal responsibility, and a national dialogue on sustainable borrowing are essential components of this endeavor. By adopting these principles, Nigeria can build a more resilient and dynamic economy, reduce its reliance on borrowing, and ensure a prosperous future for its citizens.

References

Acemoglu, D., Johnson, S., & Robinson, J. A. (2001). The Colonial Origins of Comparative Development: An Empirical Investigation. *American Economic Review*, 91(5), 1369-1401.

Ajakaiye, O., & Ncube, M. (2010). Infrastructure and Economic Development in Africa: An Overview. *Journal of African Economies*, 19(Supplement 1), i3-i12.

Ajayi, S. I. (1991). Macroeconomic Approach to External Debt: The Case of Nigeria. *African Economic Research Consortium*, Research Paper 8.

Alesina, A., & Tabellini, G. (1990). A Positive Theory of Fiscal Deficits and Government Debt. *Review of Economic Studies*, 57(3), 403-414.

Brinkerhoff, D. W., & Wetterberg, A. (2016). Gauging the Effects of Social Accountability on Services, Governance, and Citizen Empowerment. *Public Administration Review*, 76(2), 274-286.

Collier, P., & Gunning, J. W. (1999). Explaining African Economic Performance. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 37(1), 64-111.

Dabwor, D. T., & Okoh, J. U. (2012). The Fiscal Responsibility Act (2007) and Fiscal Discipline in Nigeria. *Journal of Economics and Sustainable Development*, 3(8), 90-102.

Damill, M., Frenkel, R., & Rapetti, M. (2015). Argentina: Macroeconomic Performance and Crises. In *The Oxford Handbook of Latin American Economics* (pp. 703-735). Oxford University Press.

Doyle, W. (1980). *Origins of the French Revolution*. Oxford University Press.

Easterly, W. (2002). *The Elusive Quest for Growth: Economists' Adventures and Misadventures in the Tropics*. MIT Press.

Edwards, S. (1995). *Crisis and Reform in Latin America: From Despair to Hope*. Oxford University Press.

Ekpo, A. H. (2021). Infrastructure Development and Economic Growth in Nigeria: The Role of External Borrowing. *African Development Review*, 33(2), 145-156.

Ezeabasili, V. N. (2011). Nigeria's Debt Management and the Impact on Economic Growth. *Journal of Economics and International Finance*, 3(4), 236-241.

Ezeabasili, V. N., Mojekwu, J. N., & Herbert, W. E. (2011). An Empirical Analysis of Fiscal Deficits and Inflation in Nigeria. *International Business and Management*, 3(1), 156-162.

Featherstone, K. (2011). The Greek Sovereign Debt Crisis and EMU: A Failing State in a Skewed Regime. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 49(2), 193-217.

Fjeldstad, O. H. (2004). What’s Trust Got to Do with It? Non-Payment of Service Charges in Local Authorities in South Africa. *Journal of Modern African Studies*, 42(4), 539-562.

IMF. (2024). Nigeria still borrowing amid high debt costs – IMF. Retrieved from Punch Newspapers

Inman, R. P. (2003). Transfers and Bailouts: Enforcing Local Fiscal Discipline with Lessons from U.S. Federalism. In J. Rodden, G. S. Eskeland, & J. Litvack (Eds.), *Fiscal Decentralization and the Challenge of Hard Budget Constraints* (pp. 35-83). MIT Press.

International Budget Partnership. (2020). *Nigeria: Open Budget Survey 2019*. Retrieved from International Budget Partnership Website

Iyoha, M. A. (1999). External Debt and Economic Growth in Sub-Saharan African Countries: An Econometric Study. *African Economic Research Consortium*, Research Paper 90.

Kale, Y. (2019). The Impact of Oil Price Fluctuations on Nigeria’s Economy. *Journal of African Economies*, 28(3), 343-362.

Keefer, P. (2007). Clientelism, Credibility, and the Policy Choices of Young Democracies. *American Journal of Political Science*, 51(4), 804-821.

Krugman, P. (1988). Financing vs. Forgiving a Debt Overhang. *Journal of Development Economics*, 29(3), 253-268.

Lefebvre, G. (2005). *The Coming of the French Revolution*. Princeton University Press.

Levin, J. (2007). *Taxation and State Building in Developing Countries: Capacity and Consent*. Cambridge University Press.

Mauro, P. (1995). Corruption and Growth. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 110(3), 681-712.

Moss, T. J. (2003). *Adventure Capitalism: Globalization and the Political Economy of Stock Markets in Africa*. Palgrave Macmillan.

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

Okwoli, P. A. (2014). Treasury Single Account (TSA) and Budget Implementation in Nigeria. *International Journal of Public Administration and Management Research*, 2(2), 31-40.

Onyekwena, C., & Ekeruche, M. A. (2019). Nigeria's Debt Sustainability Analysis. *Brookings Institution*. Retrieved from Brookings Institution Website

Reinhart, C. M., & Rogoff, K. S. (2010). Growth in a Time of Debt. *American Economic Review*, 100(2), 573-578.

Rodden, J. (2006). *Hamilton's Paradox: The Promise and Peril of Fiscal Federalism*. Cambridge University Press.

Sachs, J. D. (1989). *The Debt Crisis in Latin America: The Case of Argentina*. In Barry Eichengreen & Richard Baldwin (Eds.), *The Economic Impact of Bank Failures*. Springer.

Schama, S. (1989). *Citizens: A Chronicle of the French Revolution*. Vintage.

Smith, D. J. (2007). A Culture of Corruption: Everyday Deception and Popular Discontent in Nigeria. Princeton University Press.

Stallings, B., & Peres, W. (2000). *Growth, Employment, and Equity: The Impact of the Economic Reforms in Latin America and the Caribbean*. Brookings Institution Press.

Streeck, W., & Mertens, D. (2010). Fiscal Austerity and Public Investment: Is the Possible the Enemy of the Necessary? *Socio-Economic Review*, 8(4), 577-617.

Tanzi, V., & Davoodi, H. R. (1997). Corruption, Public Investment, and Growth. *IMF Working Paper*, WP/97/139.

UNDP. (2014). *Human Development Report 2014: Sustaining Human Progress: Reducing Vulnerabilities and Building Resilience*. United Nations Development Programme.

Were, M. (2001). The Impact of External Debt on Economic Growth in Kenya: An Empirical Assessment. *African Economic Research Consortium*, Research Paper 116.

World Bank. (2023). Nigeria Economic Update: Managing Debt and Ensuring Economic Stability. Retrieved from World Bank Website