NEOLIBERALISM AND ENVIRONMENTAL DECLINE IN AFRICA: WHY GLOBAL CLIMATE AGENDAS UNDERMINE NIGERIA'S DEVELOPMENT PRIORITIES

Mbalisi, Chinedu N. PhD, cn.mbalisi@unizik.edu.ng,
Nwaiwu, Nnaedoziem S. samfrancesco4u@gmail.com,
Chiemela A. Mbalisi, chiemelambalisi@gmail.com,
Department of History and International Studies, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka
[3] **Alokwu, Cyprian Obiora. PhD**, co.alokwu@inizik.edu.ng,
Department of Religion and Human Relations, Nnamdi Azikiwe University

Abstract
This paper interrogates the intersection of neoliberal economic policies, environmental degradation, and global climate governance in Africa, with a particular focus on Nigeria. It posits that the implementation of neoliberal reforms, which are characterized by privatization, deregulation, and influx of foreign investment has systematically, diminished the state's regulatory capacity. This reduction in capacity has been linked to an exacerbated environmental degradation, and the entrenchment of resource extraction as the primary mechanism for economic growth. Simultaneously, global climate agendas, shaped predominantly by industrialized nations, impose stringent de-carbonization frameworks that frequently conflict with the economic realities faced by resource-dependent economies such as Nigeria. The paper explores the inherent contradictions that exist among environmental sustainability, economic growth, and energy security, highlighting how international climate commitments, climate finance mechanisms, and policy prescripts often undermine Nigeria's developmental priorities. Through the examination of relevant case studies and historical contexts, this analysis demonstrates how these structural imbalances contribute to a cycle of economic dependency and environmental vulnerability. The study contends that Nigeria must adopt a strategic approach that prioritizes national interests within global climate negotiations, strengthens environmental governance, and fosters regional cooperation to navigate the competing pressures of sustainable development and economic resilience. Ultimately, the paper calls for a rethinking of Africa's engagement with both neoliberalism and global climate frameworks to ensure a more equitable and self-determined path toward environmental and economic sustainability.
Keywords: Neoliberalism, Environmental Failure, Africa, Global Climate Agendas, Nigeria's Development

Introduction
The intersection of neoliberal economic policies with global climate governance introduces a notable paradox for African nations, with Nigeria serving as a stark example, where the interdependency between economic development and environmental sustainability is particularly pronounced. The Neoliberal framework which is predominantly characterized by an emphasis on market liberalization, privatization, and diminished state intervention, has been instrumental in shaping the economic landscape of Nigeria over recent decades. Initially, these policies were designed to facilitate economic growth by attracting foreign direct investment and promoting industrial expansion, as indicated by Ekanade (2014). Nevertheless, the negative repercussions of these neoliberal strategies have become increasingly evident as they have been associated with significant environmental degradation, the deterioration of institutional governance structures, and the intensification of socio-economic inequalities, as noted by Bakare (2018). Simultaneously, the global climate agenda, predominantly orchestrated by developed nations, has introduced rigorous environmental regulations aimed at achieving carbon neutrality and fostering conservation efforts. These regulations frequently impose significant constraints on the economic growth of resource-dependent economies such as Nigeria (Olajide & Lawanson, 2021). Consequently, a disjunction arises-a conflicting reality-wherein Nigeria is compelled to comply with international climate obligations, while simultaneously grappling with economic frameworks that hinder its ability to pursue sustainable development. This paper examines how these contradictions manifest and it contends that international climate policies disproportionately favour Northern economic interests while exacerbating energy poverty and stifling industrial growth in Nigeria.

Neoliberal economic reforms introduced under Structural Adjustment Programs (SAP) and championed by international financial institutions such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank, were aimed at improving the economic efficiency of Nigeria. These reforms encompassed policies that promoted privatization, trade liberalization, and deregulation, with a significant focus on sectors including cement production and energy (Bakare, 2018). Despite the initial symptoms of economic growth attributed to these measures, governance failures became pronounced, particularly within the environmental sector. The weakening of regulatory oversight permitted corporate interests to overshadow or take precedence over ecological sustainability, leading to adverse outcomes (Mbah et al., 2019). Furthermore, the commodification of natural resources fostered by this neoliberal paradigm has intensified socio-environmental inequalities, especially in urban environments like Lagos, where projects such as the Lekki Free Trade Zone have been identified as catalysts for land dispossession, ecological disruption, and urban fragmentation (Olajide & Lawanson, 2021). Additionally, the incorporation of informal economies into neoliberal municipal waste management strategies has been observed; however, market-driven priorities persistently restrict the implementation of comprehensive environmental solutions (Mbah et al., 2019). These observations elucidate how the market-centric ideology characteristic of neoliberalism has exacerbated environmental failures in Nigeria, while seemingly undermining the prospect for sustainable economic development.

The design of global climate policies, including mechanisms such as carbon markets, emissions reduction targets, and commitments to combat deforestation, often perpetuates economic disparities between the Global North and South. In the context of Nigeria, as representative of numerous African nations, the obligation to adhere to international climate accords, which prioritize carbon reduction over industrial advancement, results in a significant compromise of economic sovereignty (Ogbuabor & Egwuchukwu, 2017; Ucheje et al., 2024). Studies conducted by these scholars demonstrate that carbon emissions have a detrimental impact on the economic growth of Nigeria, affecting the nation in both short-term and long-term contexts. Nevertheless, the implementation of these climate policies aimed at curtailing fossil fuel usage and enforcing rigid emissions regulations intensifies economic stagnation (Ogbuabor & Egwuchukwu, 2017). The agricultural sector, a critical component of Nigeria’s economy, finds itself particularly susceptible to the ramifications of climate change. Factors such as increasing temperatures, altered precipitation patterns, and the prevalence of extreme weather events pose significant threats to food security, thereby necessitating the formulation of policies designed to bolster climate resilience (Adeosun et al., 2021). Despite the pressing need for effective climate strategies, many international climate initiatives inadequately reflect Nigeria's developmental context. Instead of offering tailored support, these initiatives tend to adopt uniform approaches that often do not align with the country’s economic objectives. The proposal for the establishment of a National Climate Change Commission highlights the critical need for a localized framework that effectively integrates climate adaptation strategies into the overarching economic planning processes (Ogbuabor & Egwuchukwu, 2017).

The contradictions between environmental sustainability, economic growth, and energy security in Nigeria highlight the complexities of navigating both neoliberalism and global climate governance. In Nigeria, economic expansion is often correlated with heightened carbon emissions and environmental degradation, primarily driven by pollution-intensive sectors, including petroleum and agriculture, which are instrumental in promoting GDP growth (Tijani et al., 2023). This situation presents a profound dilemma: while economic growth remains a national priority, such development frequently occurs at the expense of environmental sustainability. Similarly, Nigeria's energy sector epitomizes a paradoxical state. Although energy consumption constitutes a critical component for both industrialization and economic advancement, it simultaneously leads to ecological deterioration (Jack & Jack, 2022). The prevalence of energy insecurity in Nigeria, characterized by persistent electricity shortages and a heavy reliance on fossil fuels, exacerbates environmental issues, particularly through the extensive practice of gas flaring in the Niger Delta (Birnintsaba et al., 2021). Moreover, despite the recognized capacity of renewable energy sources to address these pressing challenges, investment in alternatives such as solar and wind power has remained grossly inadequate. This underinvestment can be attributed to various structural and economic constraints that hinder progress in transitioning to sustainable energy (Birnintsaba et al., 2021). These contradictions bring to fore, the disconnect between global climate policies designed ostensibly to promote sustainability and the real industrial and energy requirements of Nigeria. Such discrepancies serve to further entrench existing economic disparities in the country.
Beyond these environmental and economic tensions, Nigeria grapples with significant policy and governance obstacles that impede the effective amalgamation of climate and development frameworks. The implementation of various neoliberal economic strategies, guided by international financial institutions, has often resulted in socio-economic instability rather than fostering sustainable advancement, as highlighted by Shafiu and Salleh (2021). Similarly, the politicization of social policies, especially in the realm of climate governance, has generated considerable implementation gaps, thereby diminishing Nigeria's capacity to effectively tackle climate-related issues in a holistic manner, as noted by Shadare (2022).Despite Nigeria's substantial contribution to greenhouse gas emissions within the African context, its influence in international climate negotiations is significantly restricted by financial constraints and political dynamics, as observed by Akindele and Chabinga (2024). In light of these challenges,

policy recommendations advocate for an integrated strategy that goes beyond climate-smart agricultural practices, to include also reforms in waste management, and the establishment of a more robust environmental foreign policy, as discussed by Mbah et al. (2019) and Nwokolo et al. (2023).Nevertheless, unless a fundamental reorganization of domestic governance structures and international climate collaboration occurs, Nigeria is likely to remain entrenched in an ongoing conflict between development goals and externally imposed environmental requirements. This structural inadequacy poses a significant threat to the nation's aspirations for sustainable development, thereby necessitating urgent and comprehensive reforms in both domestic and international arenas.

Ultimately, the positioning of Nigeria within the global climate framework serves as a reflection of the broader challenges encountered by numerous African nations striving to pursue development amidst restrictive international regulations. Nigeria faces significant hurdles, including deforestation, land degradation, scarcity of water resources, and the impacts of extreme weather events, which collectively challenge its resilience. Concurrently, urbanization and population growth exert additional pressure on environmental resources. However, the prevailing global climate policies frequently neglect to address these specific local circumstances (Ayodele, 2015).Although Nigeria has demonstrated commitment to international frameworks such as the Paris Agreement, the effectiveness of policy implementation is often hampered by political inertia and economic limitations (Akindele & Chabinga, 2024). To establish sustainable solutions, it is essential to foster not only increased investments in renewable energy and reforestation initiatives but also to advocate for a transformation in global climate governance systems. Such a transformation should be aimed at accommodating the unique requirements of developing economies.

This paper seeks to critically interrogate the intersections between neoliberal economic policies, global climate agendas, and Nigeria's development priorities, with the aim of exposing the contradictions that hinder sustainable progress. By analyzing the impacts of neoliberalism on governance, environmental management, and economic growth, the study seeks to highlight how market-driven reforms have often exacerbated socio-environmental vulnerabilities. Additionally, it examines the ways in which global climate policies, though well-intentioned, may impose constraints on Nigeria's economic trajectory, limiting its ability to pursue development models that are tailored to its unique socio-economic and environmental conditions. By drawing on historical trends, contemporary policy frameworks, and case studies from key sectors, this research offers a comprehensive assessment of the challenges and opportunities in aligning Nigeria's economic ambitions with environmental sustainability. Ultimately, the paper advocates for a paradigm shift that moves beyond the constraints of neoliberal orthodoxy and towards a more equitable, sustainable, and context-specific development strategy.

Conceptual Clarifications

Neoliberalism

Neoliberalism constitutes a complex and contested framework that has significantly influenced global economic, political, and social structures. This phenomenon can primarily be characterized as the extension of market mechanisms into diverse areas of human life, a process often facilitated by governmental interventions aimed at fostering efficiency and discipline (Pinson & Journel, 2016). Scholarly interpretations of neoliberalism diverge, with some researchers positing it as a coherent ideology, while others contend that its essence resides in its role as a developmental phase of capitalism characterized by financialization and a transformation of state functions to align with capital interests (Fine & Saad-Filho, 2017). The inherent theoretical flexibility of neoliberalism invites a variety of sometimes contradictory interpretations, which raises critical questions about its analytical utility (Venugopal, 2015). Central to neoliberalism is the advocacy for deregulation, privatization, and market liberalization, frequently at the detriment of social welfare systems. The implementation and effects of these policies, however, display considerable variation across different regions and historical contexts, rendering neoliberalism both an economic paradigm and a political initiative that evolves in response to a myriad of social realities (Garrett, 2018). This adaptability has been integral to its durability, allowing neoliberalism to endure through economic crises and recalibrate itself when faced with challenges (Dean, 2014).

The intellectual lineage of neoliberalism is rooted in various schools of thought, including the Vienna, Freiburg, London, and Chicago schools, all of which aimed to refine classical liberalism in light of perceived economic inefficiencies and the ascendance of collectivist ideologies (Urazova, 2019). A significant milestone in the conceptual development of neoliberalism was the 1938 Walter Lippmann Colloquium, where an assembly of intellectuals deliberated on the capacity of market mechanisms to address the inefficiencies and fragmentation inherent in state systems (Brennetot, 2015). This colloquium provided a foundational framework for the establishment of the Mont Pèlerin Society in 1947, a vital institution for the propagation of neoliberal tenets, founded by Friedrich Hayek (Jackson, 2021). The post-World War II reconstruction phase further catalyzed the spread of neoliberal ideology, as evidenced by the integration of neoliberal concepts into governance structures in countries such as the Netherlands, where they were synthesized with ordoliberal principles to form pro-market coalitions (Mellink, 2021). By the conclusion of the twentieth century, neoliberalism had solidified its global presence, particularly through the advocacy of leaders such as Margaret Thatcher and Ronald Reagan, who prioritized privatization, deregulation, and a diminishment of state intervention (Harvey, 2020). This period marked a transition for neoliberalism from an academic dialogue to a prevailing global economic and political paradigm, influencing pivotal institutions such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank.

The defining attributes of neoliberalism encompass a variety of economic policies, governance frameworks, and societal impacts. Market-oriented approaches are championed, with an emphasis on competition, entrepreneurship, and economic efficiency, often necessitating a restructuring of the state to better align with capitalist interests (Eagleton-Pierce, 2016). Accompanying this shift has been a noticeable increase in income inequality and the proliferation of precarious labor conditions, as policies that promote deregulation and privatization frequently undermine social safety nets (Garrett, 2018). Neoliberal governance tends to favor technocratic decision-making processes, prioritizing economic expertise over democratic engagement (Hilgers, 2012). This paradigm shift is manifested in the financialization of public services, whereby critical sectors such as education, healthcare, and infrastructure have increasingly become profit-driven entities, thereby limiting accessibility and exacerbating social inequalities (Kiely, 2017). The global outreach of neoliberalism has resulted in varied implementations across regions, each shaped by distinctive historical, economic, and political contexts (Steger & Roy, 2021). In the Global South, neoliberalism has often been articulated as a strategy for development, displacing earlier economic models and restructuring local economies to conform to global capitalist frameworks (Connell & Dados, 2014). Nevertheless, these adaptations do not obliterate the inherent tensions within neoliberalism, particularly its handling of economic crises. The financial crisis of 2007-2008 exposed fundamental contradictions within neoliberal ideology; nevertheless, policymakers opted to reinforce existing structures through bailouts and austerity measures, indicative of neoliberalism's capacity for self-preservation through evolution rather than demise (Garrett, 2018).

In the African context, the path of neoliberalism has been influenced by historical legacies, global economic dynamics, and local political frameworks. The transition from dependency theories to neoliberalism during the late twentieth century was characterized by structural adjustment programs (SAPs) mandated by the IMF and the World Bank, emphasizing economic liberalization, privatization, and fiscal discipline (Owusu, 2003). These initiatives were framed as mechanisms for modernization and integration into the global economy but frequently intensified socio-economic disparities and diminished state capacity (Adevor, 2021). The historical context of colonial exploitation significantly shaped the adoption of neoliberal paradigms, as African economies were historically oriented towards serving external interests rather than fostering independent, self-sustaining industrial development (Harrison, 2018). Neoliberal practices in Africa have often coincided with authoritarian governance, wherein economic liberalization coexists with political repression, thereby undermining democratic institutions (Harrison, 2005). This disjunction manifests in fragile economic growth that disproportionately benefits elite groups while marginalizing substantial portions of the populace, resulting in persistent instability. Furthermore, neoliberal globalization has exacerbated Africa's multi-faceted crises related to primitive accumulation, nation-state formation, and democratization, complicating efforts by African nations to assert economic sovereignty (Moore, 2001). The labor market has been adversely affected by neoliberal reforms, leading to an increase in informal and unregulated labor conditions reminiscent of exploitative colonial practices (LeBaron & Ayers, 2013). These challenges illuminate the inadequacies of neoliberal development strategies in Africa, where policies designed for Western capitalist contexts fail to accommodate local socio-political complexities.

Beyond the economic and governance landscapes, neoliberalism has also redefined environmental policies, advocating for market-oriented solutions to ecological issues. Neoliberal environmentalism places a premium on economic growth and individual accountability rather than collective governmental action, contributing to the commodification of nature and the adoption of market-based instruments (MBIs) such as carbon trading (Dent, 2022). This paradigm shifts environmental responsibility from governmental bodies to private entities and individuals, promoting the notion that consumer behavior and corporate actions can effectively facilitate sustainability, despite evidence that contradicts this belief (Dimick, 2015). Criticism has emerged regarding the neoliberal approach to environmental governance, particularly concerning the erosion of regulatory frameworks, as environmental protections are frequently reprioritized during economic downturns in favor of recovery efforts (McCarthy, 2012). Conservation initiatives under neoliberalism tend to involve public-private partnerships that prioritize profit over ecological viability, often displacing local communities and exacerbating socio-economic disparities (Fletcher, 2010). This model of environmental governance has resulted in what some scholars refer to as a "glass ceiling," hindering substantial ecological transformations, as neoliberal frameworks inherently resist systemic change (Hatzisavvidou, 2019). Rather than addressing environmental degradation through transformative shifts in production and consumption practices, neoliberal environmental policies maintain the existing status quo, ensuring that market mechanisms remain the predominant approach to ecological management.

Notwithstanding, neoliberalism should not be perceived as a monolithic or static ideology; rather, it represents a dynamic political and economic project that has fundamentally altered governance, economic policy, labor markets, and environmental management on a global scale. It emerged as a response to the limitations of classical liberalism and collectivist theories, gaining prominence through intellectual movements and institutional frameworks aimed at extending market rationality across all dimensions of life. Proponents of neoliberalism argue that its policies foster efficiency, competition, and innovation; however, critics assert that it exacerbates inequalities, diminishes democratic institutions, and fails to adequately address systemic socio-economic and ecological crises. The adaptability of neoliberalism permits its continued existence despite recurrent challenges, facilitating the recalibration of strategies while maintaining core principles of privatization, deregulation, and market dominance. Its ramifications are deeply integrated into the global political economy, thus rendering it a subject of persistent academic inquiry and debate, as scholars ponder whether it signifies an inevitable trajectory of capitalism or a historically contingent phase that may ultimately be supplanted by alternative economic paradigms.

Environmental Failure

The concept of environmental failure encompasses a multifaceted phenomenon characterized by the degradation or collapse of ecological systems resulting from a complex interplay of natural and anthropogenic influences. This failure is evident in various contexts, encompassing ecological damage, infrastructural deterioration, corporate negligence, and systemic economic inadequacies. Environmental failure fundamentally denotes the incapacity of ecosystems, infrastructure, or socio-political institutions to uphold environmental integrity, thereby producing detrimental effects on human populations, economic systems, and ecological health. Such failures are not isolated incidents; rather, they emerge from intertwined processes fueled by industrial activities, unsustainable economic practices, ineffective waste management, and inherent vulnerabilities in materials and governance structures. This phenomenon elucidates the fragility of both natural and anthropogenic systems under environmental stressors, which may arise from neglect exploitation, or systemic deficiencies (Hochstetler, 2013).

A striking illustration of environmental failure can be observed through the degradation of industrial and engineering materials. Environmental variables, including temperature variations, humidity fluctuations, and chemical exposures, contribute significantly to the deterioration of materials, resulting in severe vulnerabilities within infrastructure. The failure of adhesive joints and high-strength aluminum alloys, attributed to environmental cracking and fatigue, exemplifies the susceptibility of vital infrastructure to adverse environmental conditions (Yang et al., 2022). Such material failures carry substantial consequences, particularly in sectors where structural integrity is critical, such as aviation, construction, and transportation. The compromise of material integrity by environmental conditions not only results in economic repercussions but also poses direct threats to human safety and ecological balance. The complex interrelationship between environmental factors and material resilience highlights the urgent necessity for sustainable engineering practices, integrating resilience into structural design to avert prospective failures.

In addition to the physical implications, environmental failure extends into economic and corporate domains, where the reliance on unsustainable industrial practices coupled with inadequate regulatory frameworks precipitates crises with long-lasting financial and ecological ramifications. Within corporate contexts, the notion of environmental failure is closely associated with risk perception; companies that neglect to incorporate sustainable practices encounter severe economic and reputational repercussions (Vasi & King, 2012). Corporations engaging in environmentally harmful activities such as pollution, deforestation, or irresponsible resource extraction, frequently face public backlash, intensified regulatory scrutiny, and financial instability. This phenomenon is particularly evident in circumstances where corporations ignore sustainable value chains, resulting in operational inefficiencies and financial losses precipitated by regulatory penalties, legal disputes, and boycotts instigated by activists (Alzlzly & Sorour, 2023). The transition towards green economic models reflects an escalating awareness of environmental risks within corporate governance, compelling organizations to adopt sustainable practices as a means of mitigating potential environmental failures that could undermine their financial stability and public credibility.

The historical progression of environmental failure is replete with impactful case studies, one significant example being the Love Canal disaster, which arose from hazardous waste mismanagement leading to extensive environmental contamination and severe public health crises (Phillips et al., 2007). This incident illustrates how lapses in regulatory oversight and corporate irresponsibility can culminate in environmental disasters that devastate ecosystems and imperil human settlements. The Love Canal case serves as a cautionary example, underscoring the critical importance of rigorous waste management policies, thorough environmental assessments, and proactive governmental interventions. Historical precedents such as this accentuate the essential role that policy frameworks play in averting environmental failure, emphasizing the necessity for stringent environmental regulation and enforcement to mitigate the enduring consequences of industrial misconduct.

Furthermore, environmental failure is intrinsically linked with systemic economic and political dynamics, particularly in the wider context of globalization and capitalism. The relentless pursuit of economic expansion frequently leads to the overexploitation of natural resources, thereby exacerbating environmental degradation. Hochstetler (2013) posits that the expansionist logic inherent in capitalism fundamentally conflicts with ecological sustainability, prioritizing immediate economic benefits at the expense of long-term environmental stability. This unsustainable trajectory is manifested in widespread deforestation, biodiversity loss, climate change, and heightened environmental vulnerability within marginalized communities. Globalization exacerbates these challenges by enabling transnational corporations to transfer environmental burdens across borders, often taking advantage of lenient environmental regulations in developing nations while externalizing the ecological costs associated with their operations. The intrinsic contradictions between economic growth and ecological preservation underscore the pressing necessity for a paradigm shift towards sustainability-centered economic models that incorporate environmental accountability into economic decision-making frameworks.

In addition to the economic and material dimensions, environmental failure carries significant psychological and social implications. The degradation of environmental conditions has been correlated with various forms of social distress, including mental health crises and the deterioration of communal well-being. Jacobs (1994) illustrates how environmental oppression fosters psychopathological conditions; individuals residing in polluted or degraded environments often experience heightened levels of stress, anxiety, and diminished quality of life. This perspective broadens the understanding of environmental failure, positing it not solely as an ecological or industrial issue, but also as a critical determinant of social and psychological health. The interconnection between environmental conditions and mental health accentuates the urgency of implementing holistic environmental policies that prioritize both ecological sustainability and human welfare. Addressing environmental failure necessitates an integrated approach that acknowledges the interdependence of environmental health, social stability, and psychological resilience.

Moreover, a more refined understanding of environmental failure necessitates an exploration of land use alterations and their contribution to ecological instability. The transformation of forests into agricultural or industrial zones often triggers a sequence of environmental disturbances, including habitat destruction, loss of biodiversity, and increased susceptibility to natural disasters. Kiš and Geršak (2024) argue that unsustainable land use practices act as a significant driver of environmental failure, particularly in regions where regulatory oversight is inadequate. The conversion of landscapes for economic purposes, while frequently justified in the name of development, often yields long-term environmental consequences that eclipse immediate economic gains. Therefore, the formulation of sustainable land management policies that harmonize economic advancement with ecological preservation is imperative for addressing the root causes of environmental failure and cultivating resilience against future environmental challenges.

On this note, environmental failure represents a complex phenomenon arising from the confluence of material, economic, political, social, and ecological factors. Whether it is evident in material degradation, corporate irresponsibility, hazardous waste mismanagement, or systemic economic pressures, environmental failure exposes the vulnerabilities inherent in human-environment interactions. The historical and contemporary dimensions of this issue reveal an urgent need for comprehensive policies, sustainable corporate practices, and proactive environmental governance to mitigate its impacts. Recognizing the interconnected nature of environmental, social, and economic systems is essential in formulating holistic strategies aimed at addressing the underlying causes of environmental failure while fostering resilience against prospective ecological crises. As global challenges related to environmental degradation intensify, the imperative to reconceptualize economic frameworks, industrial practices, and policy structures in alignment with sustainability becomes increasingly critical.

Global Climate Agendas

The global climate agenda encompasses a framework designed to unify international endeavors aimed at counteracting climate change. This agenda emerges from a multifaceted interaction among various elements, including mitigation strategies, adaptation techniques, and both economic and political considerations, all facilitated by both legally binding agreements and voluntary commitments. Central to this framework are international accords such as the Paris Climate Agreement and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), which endeavor to create mechanisms for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, promote sustainability transitions, and foster climate resilience (Rovinskaya, 2023). Nevertheless, the predominant focus on mitigation often eclipses the critical need for adaptation, engendering a demand for a more equitable approach that addresses the pressing requirements of vulnerable populations, particularly in the Global South (Chan &Amling, 2019). Furthermore, the ongoing discourse surrounding global climate policies necessitates the integration of broader global challenges, including biodiversity conservation and sustainable economic development, to cultivate a comprehensive and just climate response (Pettorelli et al., 2021).

At the foundation of global climate governance lies a juxtaposition of legally binding frameworks and voluntary initiatives, which collectively establish international emissions reduction targets and promote sustainable development efforts. The Paris Climate Agreement, enacted in 2015, constitutes a significant commitment to restraining global temperature increases to well below 2°C, with aspirational objectives aimed at limiting warming to 1.5°C (United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, 2015). Signatory states are mandated to formulate and submit Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs), transparently report their progress, and periodically enhance their climate ambitions. However, the disparities observed in implementation have raised pertinent concerns regarding accountability and the sufficiency of global efforts to achieve established climate targets (Rovinskaya, 2023). Additionally, initiatives such as the Loss and Damage Agenda strive to mitigate the irreversible impacts of climate change by proposing financial mechanisms to assist nations suffering from climate-induced disasters (Roberts & Pelling, 2018). The incorporation of climate risk management into critical sectors such as agriculture, exemplified by initiatives like the Climate Services Partnership (CSP) and the CGIAR research program on Climate Change, Agriculture, and Food Security (CCAFS), further illustrates the expanding landscape of global climate policies (Hansen et al., 2014).

The relationship between economic and political dimensions within global climate agendas significantly affects international trade, energy transitions, and industrial policies. Effective climate action necessitates extensive structural transformations, particularly within high-emission sectors, which can induce economic disruptions and provoke political resistance. The European Green Deal serves as an illustrative example of the European Union’s (EU) ambitious initiative to transform itself into the first climate-neutral continent by 2050, establishing stringent decarbonization targets and leading the global shift towards clean energy (Allwood, 2020; Čavoški, 2020). However, such transformative initiatives may also incite economic anxieties, particularly in economies reliant on fossil fuels, where industrial growth and employment are inextricably linked to carbon-intensive industries (Turaeva, 2024). Moreover, climate governance remains intricately connected to geopolitical tensions, exemplified by the strategic positions adopted by major emitters, including the United States, China, and Russia, in climate negotiations. The influence of varied political ideologies, ranging from nationalist opposition to international climate norms to the rejection of multilateral collaboration by populist leaders, further complicates the development of a unified global consensus on climate action (Ettinger & Collins, 2023).

In addition to state actors, cities, regional governments, and non-state entities have emerged as influential advocates for global climate action. Urban locales, particularly through networks such as the C40 Cities Climate Leadership Group, are spearheading localized climate solutions, enhancing urban resilience, and promoting grassroots climate governance (Lago et al., 2023). The increasing prominence of youth and grassroots movements in shaping the climate discourse is evident, with figures such as Greta Thunberg and the Fridays for Future movement galvanizing public demand for accelerated climate action from policymakers (Routledge et al., 2018). Furthermore, developing countries, despite facing significant climate vulnerabilities, have achieved greater visibility in international climate negotiations, utilizing financial and technical assistance mechanisms to further their sustainable development objectives (Panova, 2024). However, the imbalanced distribution of financial resources and technological capabilities continues to impede the full engagement of developing nations in global climate governance.

Despite advancements in international climate policy, the global climate agendas face substantial criticism. Right-wing populist movements often characterize climate policies as elitist and detached from the immediate concerns of ordinary citizens, thus reinforcing a narrative that portrays climate action as serving a cosmopolitan elite rather than the general populace (Lockwood, 2018). Similarly, nationalist perspectives frequently resist external pressures regarding climate, as evidenced by reactions to foreign climate critiques, wherein nations assert their sovereignty over environmental policy choices instead of aligning with global climate standards (Spektor et al., 2021). Conservative movements, particularly in the United States, historically align with fossil fuel interests, challenging the tenets of mainstream climate science and obstructing regulatory measures, as demonstrated by opposition to the Kyoto Protocol (McCright& Dunlap, 2003). Moreover, the economic critique of global climate agendas remains relevant, with assertions that such policies disproportionately favor developed economies while constricting industrial growth in developing regions (Turaeva, 2024).

Communication and governance challenges further complicate the efficacy of global climate policies. Diplomatic friction often permeates climate negotiations, wherein states engage in mutual accusations of hypocrisy and insufficient commitments, thereby undermining cohesive action (Krämer& Winkler, 2023). The climate governance landscape post-Paris Agreement has seen an increased reliance on non-state actors, raising concerns about the extent to which corporate and non-governmental initiatives either supplement or supplant state-led climate actions (Marquardt et al., 2022). Although non-state actors can catalyze innovation and enhance public engagement, their participation sometimes lacks robust accountability mechanisms, resulting in superficial involvement rather than genuine climate commitments. The role of transnational actors in bridging governance gaps remains vital; however, their effectiveness is contingent upon fostering authentic collaboration, as opposed to reinforcing existing power imbalances.

Therefore, global climate agendas embody a dynamic and adaptive framework for addressing one of the most pressing existential challenges of the 21st century. They encapsulate a delicate equilibrium of mitigation, adaptation, economic restructuring, and international collaboration; nevertheless, their implementation is replete with political, economic, and ideological hurdles. The intensification of climate impacts accentuates the need for more inclusive, equitable, and enforceable global climate policies. Thus, the advancement of effective global climate governance will hinge on the collective commitment of both state and non-state actors to transcend political divisions, engaging in transformative, science-based, and socially just climate policies that ensure the planet's sustainability for future generations.

Neoliberalism and Environmental Failure in Africa

The relationship between neoliberal economic policies and environmental governance in Africa is characterized by significant challenges, often exacerbating socio-environmental issues instead of mitigating them. The introduction of neoliberal reforms, prominently through Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs) implemented by international financial institutions such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank, has emphasized the importance of market mechanisms, privatization, and a reduction in government expenditure. These measures were ostensibly designed to stimulate economic growth and enhance efficiency (Elias et al., 2024). Nevertheless, this market-centric strategy has contributed to the commodification of nature, creating a dichotomy between conservation efforts and developmental needs. Consequently, this has polarized various stakeholders and complicated the establishment of effective environmental governance (Büscher& Dressler, 2007). Furthermore, the overarching focus on economic liberalization exhibited in these policies frequently marginalizes social and environmental concerns, thus fostering a technocratic governance model that is disconnected from local realities. This phenomenon is exemplified by South Africa’s transition towards market mechanisms for environmental management, which has led to the compromise of socio-economic and ecological considerations in favor of economic growth (Hector &Lambrechts, 2024). Such a trend is indicative of a larger pattern across the African continent, wherein the narrow emphasis on economic indicators by neoliberalism inadequately addresses the environmental and social disarray it leaves in its wake.

In Nigeria, the ramifications of neoliberal policies are particularly pronounced in the context of privatization and deregulation, especially within the extractive and industrial sectors. The privatization of industries, exemplified by the cement sector, has significantly transformed the interactions between state and non-state actors. This transformation has often resulted in dysfunctional governance structures that obstruct sustainable development (Bakare, 2018). Additionally, the shift towards privatization has not only diminished regulatory oversight but has also solidified a governance framework characterized by insufficient institutional capacity and a pronounced lack of political will for effective decentralization. Moreover, the neoliberal focus on attracting foreign direct investment (FDI) has produced adverse environmental impacts. The influx of FDI, which is closely associated with heightened carbon dioxide emissions and resource depletion, particularly in the oil and gas sectors, aligns with the pollution haven hypothesis. This hypothesis suggests that lax environmental regulations effectively attract pollution-intensive industries (Odugbesan & Adebayo, 2020). Consequently, this paradigm, which prioritizes capital mobility over environmental integrity, renders Nigeria increasingly susceptible to ecological deterioration while simultaneously failing to secure enduring economic advantages for its populace.

The ecological implications of the policies in question extend beyond mere greenhouse gas emissions, encompassing a wider array of environmental degradation. The unsustainable nature of foreign direct investment (FDI)-oriented growth is evidenced by the depletion of essential natural resources, including crude oil, forestry, and fisheries (Adediyan et al., 2021). This depletion, coupled with insufficient regulatory frameworks, reveals a governance structure that is inadequately equipped to handle the environmental externalities associated with neoliberal economic expansion. The neoliberal emphasis on market-driven solutions, such as emissions trading schemes and initiatives led by the private sector for conservation, frequently neglects the socio-economic intricacies involved in environmental management within developing nations. For example, in Kenya, the intersection of democratization and neoliberal reforms has introduced complexities into the protection of environmental resources, exemplified by the Karura Forest. Economic adjustments undertaken during political transitions have undermined conservation initiatives (Njeru, 2010). This phenomenon can be paralleled with the situation in Nigeria, where market mechanisms fail to remedy the fundamental socio-economic inequalities that fuel environmental exploitation.

Furthermore, the impact of neoliberalism on state capacity bears significant consequences for Nigeria’s strategies pertaining to climate adaptation. The prevailing trend towards deregulation and diminished state intervention has systematically weakened governmental abilities to implement effective environmental policies and foster socially inclusive adaptation measures (Andrew & Cortese, 2013). Consequently, the shaping of environmental governance has increasingly fallen under the influence of multinational corporations, whose interests are frequently aligned with neoliberal principles, thereby further limiting state-led initiatives that are critical for successful climate adaptation (Bailey & Maresh, 2009). This dynamic is notably evident in Nigeria's agricultural sector, an area crucial for enhancing climate resilience, where neoliberal policies have failed to facilitate the essential structural and institutional changes required to develop adaptive capacity (Okafor et al., 2024). Although market-based instruments (MBIs) present a theoretically appealing approach to climate action, they often prove inadequate in addressing the immediate and localized challenges posed by climate vulnerabilities. Thus, there exists a pressing need for a reevaluation of policy frameworks that can more integratively merge socio-economic and environmental objectives.

The interrelationship between neoliberal policies and environmental degradation is further illustrated through specific case studies, such as Nigeria's involvement in the REDD+ initiative. This program, which aims to diminish emissions from deforestation, has faced opposition from local communities, including the Ekuri forest community, which has contested state-led land appropriations and unmet commitments (Asiyanbi et al., 2019). This resistance underscores broader issues surrounding land rights and resource sovereignty, which neoliberal frameworks often neglect. Similarly, attempts to achieve Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) in Nigeria have encountered obstacles stemming from fragmented policies and insufficient data, thereby demonstrating how neoliberal governance structures struggle to reconcile international environmental commitments with national realities (Speranza et al., 2019). These examples highlight the disconnection between top-down, market-oriented environmental strategies and the actual experiences of communities that are directly impacted by such policies.

Again, the shaping of Nigeria's environmental and economic policies has been significantly influenced by international financial institutions (IFIs) through their Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs) and associated loan conditions. Although these programs are ostensibly intended to stabilize economies and alleviate poverty, the strict conditions imposed, such as deregulation and the removal of subsidies, have frequently resulted in economic instability and an increase in poverty levels. This outcome in turn exacerbates social discontent and undermines effective environmental governance, as noted by Shafiu and Salleh (2021). Such dynamics are not isolated to Nigeria; they resonate across the African continent, where the persistent influence of IFIs has fostered a cycle of debt dependency that many critics assert compromises Africa's economic sovereignty and its capacity to pursue sustainable environmental development (Leshoele, 2022). Furthermore, while reliance on external financial resources may provide temporary uplift to economic indicators, it is often inadequate in building the requisite local institutional capacity necessary to sustainably address complex environmental challenges.

The examination of Nigeria's experiences within the context of Africa reveals a significant misalignment between economic strategies and environmental requirements, particularly underpinned by a neoliberal approach to environmental governance. The emphasis placed on economic growth driven by privatization, foreign direct investment (FDI), and market liberalization systematically undermines the environmental resilience of nations across the continent. As global environmental policies increasingly lean towards market-oriented solutions, a critical assessment of these frameworks is imperative. It must be determined whether such approaches can genuinely promote sustainable development or if they merely perpetuate the inequalities and environmental degradation characteristic of neoliberal capitalism. Addressing these systemic inadequacies mandates a comprehensive re-evaluation of both national and international strategies, ensuring that environmental policies serve not solely as instruments for economic advancement but also as catalysts for authentic ecological and social transformation.

Global Climate Agendas and Nigeria’s Development Priorities

Global climate policies, as structured by international agreements such as the Paris Agreement, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), and the Kyoto Protocol, exert a profound influence on the formulation of Nigeria's economic and industrial strategies. These frameworks advocate for sustainable development through climate change mitigation and adaptation initiatives; however, they simultaneously introduce challenges that require a delicate equilibrium between environmental obligations and national developmental aspirations. Given its status as a resource-dependent developing nation, Nigeria encounters a significant paradox: the necessity to align with global climate objectives while securing economic stability, energy security, and industrial advancement. This interaction between international climate mandates and Nigeria's national interests highlights both avenues for transformative change and structural limitations that hinder the nation's capacity to fully engage with the benefits associated with global environmental governance.

The multifaceted impact of international climate agreements on Nigeria's economic policies is particularly evident in critical sectors, including agriculture and carbon emissions management. Agricultural production, which constitutes a vital segment of Nigeria's gross domestic product (GDP) and employment landscape, remains vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change, encompassing increasing temperatures, unpredictable rainfall patterns, and extreme weather phenomena. International agreements advocate for adaptive measures, such as climate-smart agricultural practices, conservation farming techniques, and reforestation initiatives (Ucheje et al., 2024). Nevertheless, the financial and technological resources necessary for the implementation of these adaptive strategies are markedly inadequate, leaving smallholder farmers exposed to climatic disruptions. Furthermore, Nigeria's commitment to international protocols aimed at carbon emission reduction has prompted policy reforms that favor cleaner energy usage and mechanisms for carbon mitigation (Ogbuabor&Egwuchukwu, 2017). However, the transition towards low-carbon economic frameworks demands substantial infrastructural investments and regulatory adjustments, both of which are constrained by governance challenges, economic volatility, and dependence on external financial resources. Industrial policy adaptations in Nigeria, influenced by global climate obligations, have led to the incorporation of more sustainable practices across manufacturing, construction, and energy sectors. International agreements compel adherence to environmental accountability through the implementation of pollution control protocols, waste management regulations, and participation in carbon offset programs (Uche&Azoro-Amadi, 2024). The Paris Agreement, specifically, has stimulated initiatives to integrate renewable energy solutions within Nigeria's energy framework, facilitating investments in solar, wind, and hydroelectric power infrastructure (Akindele&Chabinga, 2024). Nonetheless, these advancements are obstructed by insufficient institutional frameworks, inconsistent policy enforcement, and limited access to clean energy technologies. Moreover, the slow pace of industrial diversification away from fossil fuels can be largely attributed to Nigeria's entrenched dependence on petroleum exports as a primary source of governmental revenue. While the implementation of sustainable industrial practices presents long-term economic possibilities, including the generation of employment opportunities within the renewable energy sector, such initiatives require coherent policy alignment and substantial financial commitments, which remain inadequately addressed.

The global impetus towards decarbonization poses a considerable conflict for Nigeria, primarily due to its economic reliance on fossil fuels. As the largest oil producer in Africa, Nigeria's economy is intrinsically linked to petroleum exports, which account for over 90% of the nation's foreign exchange earnings and a significant portion of government revenue (Daggash& Mac Dowell, 2021). The push from international climate policies for rapid divestment from fossil fuels challenges this economic structure, placing Nigeria in a precarious position between adhering to climate commitments and sustaining economic viability. Complications related to the transition towards renewable energy sources further arise from concerns regarding energy reliability, given that fossil fuels currently provide a more stable energy supply compared to the intermittent nature of renewable sources (Roche et al., 2019). This scenario accentuates the tension between global climate objectives and national developmental priorities, emphasizing the conflicts inherent in Nigeria's dual obligations. Additionally, regulatory and financial obstacles hinder Nigeria's effective transition towards a greener economic model. Barriers such as high capital expenditure, insufficient investment in green technologies, and inconsistencies in policy implementation exacerbate the challenges faced in aligning national interests with global decarbonization agendas (Egeruoh-Adindu, 2022).

Climate finance mechanisms, including carbon credits, green funds, and international aid, have been recognized as instrumental in supporting Nigeria's climate initiatives. These financial resources hold the promise of enhancing Nigeria's resilience against climate adversities, fostering renewable energy adoption, and advocating for economic diversification (Ignatius et al., 2023). When harnessed effectively, international climate finance mechanisms could address vital funding deficiencies within energy infrastructure and climate adaptation projects (Munyuzangabo, 2021). Nonetheless, inefficiencies in governance, lack of transparency, and limited financial accessibility impede the efficient allocation and utilization of these funds. Corruption, bureaucratic delays, and ineffective financial coordination diminish the impact of climate finance interventions, leading to suboptimal project outcomes (Edeminam & Akpasoh, 2023). The reliance on external funding sources introduces vulnerabilities, as conditions tied to climate financing may not always resonate with Nigeria's broader developmental objectives. Moreover, the underdevelopment of green bonds and local fiscal measures aimed at mobilizing domestic climate financing further complicates the effective mobilization of financial resources for sustainable development (Toyin & Onanuga, 2019).

Structural imbalances within global climate governance emerge as a critical challenge for Nigeria, often positioning developing nations at a disadvantage during international climate negotiations. Although frameworks such as the Paris Agreement seek to promote inclusive climate action, the preeminence of developed nations in shaping global climate policies is evident (Di Gregorio et al., 2019). Nigeria, along with other developing countries, experiences difficulties in asserting its developmental priorities during such negotiations, particularly concerning the procurement of equitable climate financing and technology transfer mechanisms. Frequently, global climate policies emphasize emissions reductions while neglecting the historical responsibilities of industrialized nations and the distinct socio-economic circumstances of developing countries (Lovera-Bilderbeek & Lahiri, 2021). As a consequence, Nigeria's climate policy landscape is frequently influenced by external pressures rather than domestic priorities, constraining its ability to negotiate favorable agreements that correspond with its economic and infrastructural realities. Furthermore, while differentiation within climate institutions aims to acknowledge the varying capabilities among nations, countries such as Nigeria continue to encounter barriers to accessing equitable financial and technological support for effective climate action (Thompson, 2020).

The compounded effects of economic and political dependencies further exacerbate Nigeria's constrained agency in global climate governance. Climate interventions are often contingent upon foreign loans, which contribute to the nation's debt liabilities and restrict fiscal flexibility for broader developmental pursuits (Ogbuene & Mbaeze, 2024). Additionally, the regulatory frameworks established by international climate agreements may diverge from Nigeria's pressing economic necessities, engendering a discord between external sustainability mandates and domestic industrial priorities (Akhakpe, 2022). The political economy surrounding global climate policy tends to favor developed countries, which possess superior economic leverage and advanced technological capabilities, leaving nations like Nigeria to manage the restrictive conditions associated with climate funding and trade agreements (Brigid et al., 2022). This dynamic not only challenges Nigeria's autonomy in determining its developmental course but also reinforces systemic inequalities within international climate governance, thereby allowing the policies and priorities of the Global North to disproportionately influence the sustainability trajectories available to developing nations.

Ultimately, Nigeria's interaction with global climate policies embodies a complex balancing act, striving to fulfill international commitments while concurrently safeguarding national economic and developmental interests. While climate action offers pathways for economic diversification, technological progression, and international collaboration, the constraints posed by financial dependencies, governance deficiencies, and structural power imbalances significantly complicate Nigeria's ability to capitalize on these opportunities. A refined and context-specific approach to climate governance is essential, one that reconciles Nigeria's developmental ambitions with its climate commitments without jeopardizing economic stability or national sovereignty. Addressing the myriad challenges associated with this task necessitates the establishment of robust institutional frameworks, improved negotiation tactics within global climate dialogues, and the development of an active domestic climate finance strategy that diminishes reliance on external sources. Through such initiatives, Nigeria may navigate the complexities of global climate governance, thereby fostering sustainable and inclusive developmental outcomes.

Reconciling Environmental Sustainability and Development in Nigeria

The pursuit of economic growth in Nigeria has historically been accompanied by considerable environmental deterioration, thereby necessitating an approach that reconciles the objectives of sustainability with developmental aspirations. The nation's economic framework, which exhibits a pronounced dependence on fossil fuels and agricultural practices, has precipitated significant carbon emissions, widespread deforestation, and environmental pollution. These factors have exacerbated vulnerabilities related to climate change and resource depletion, as evidenced in the literature (Saliminezhad et al., 2021). To achieve a sustainable equilibrium, it is imperative to establish a robust policy framework that incorporates the adoption of renewable energy, enhancement of industrial efficiency, enforcement of regulations, and engagement of stakeholders. Although economic development is vital for alleviating poverty and advancing social well-being, unchecked industrial activities pose a threat to ecological resilience, thereby necessitating a shift toward more environmentally sustainable economic pathways (Sobajo, 2024). Central to this reconciliation is the diversification of Nigeria's energy sector, which would diminish reliance on fossil fuels while simultaneously increasing the share of renewable energy sources, such as solar, biomass, and wind. The abundant solar resources available in Nigeria offer a promising opportunity to generate clean energy at competitive costs, thus contributing to reductions in emissions and enhancements in energy security (Eweka et al., 2022). Furthermore, the integration of sustainable energy solutions within industrial production systems has the potential to foster economic growth while concurrently mitigating environmental impacts (Dioha & Kumar, 2020). However, this transition is impeded by inadequate policy implementation, financial limitations, and infrastructural deficits, which necessitate substantial governmental intervention, strategic investment, and regulatory reforms (Adeshina et al., 2024). In addition, effective urban planning emerges as a vital aspect of aligning development objectives with environmental considerations. The rapid urbanization experienced in Nigeria has led to increased deforestation, ineffective waste management practices, and inadequate urban infrastructure, thereby exacerbating environmental challenges in key metropolitan areas (Unegbu et al., 2024). By incorporating environmental considerations into urban development efforts such as promoting green building initiatives, improving waste disposal methods, and developing smart transportation systems. These adverse impacts can be mitigated, leading to cities that are both livable and economically vibrant. Nonetheless, successful urban planning demands sufficient financial resources, enhanced institutional capabilities, and a strong political commitment to sustain the enforcement of sustainable development policies (Unegbu et al., 2024). Failure to address these deficiencies will result in continued urban expansion that poses significant environmental and socio-economic risks.

Furthermore, the establishment and enforcement of regulatory frameworks prioritizing environmental protection while facilitating economic growth are essential. Despite the existence of environmental legislation, inadequate enforcement has resulted in rampant deforestation, unregulated industrial discharges, and land degradation (Adejumo, 2019). The fortification of policy frameworks to align with global sustainability standards such as those stipulated in the Paris Agreement can provide a directional guide for Nigeria's development trajectory toward a low-carbon economy (Ogbowuokara et al., 2023). Measures to enhance eco-efficiency, which may include pollution control strategies, afforestation initiatives, and environmental impact evaluations, can further support sustainable development, ensuring that economic advancement does not entail environmental degradation (Nwokolo et al., 2023).

Public-private partnerships (PPPs) represent a feasible mechanism for bridging investment gaps in environmental sustainability endeavors. By promoting PPPs in areas such as renewable energy, infrastructure development, and waste management, innovation, operational efficiency, and financing for sustainable initiatives can be stimulated (Asemota & Olokoyo, 2022). Additionally, the cultivation of cooperative relationships among research institutions, businesses, and governmental agencies can expedite the integration of cleaner technologies and sustainable business practices (Adeshina et al., 2024). The involvement of the private sector in sustainable development is fundamental, as enterprises can utilize Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) initiatives to mitigate environmental impacts while generating economic returns.

Moreover, regional and international collaborations are pivotal in reconciling Nigeria's developmental objectives with environmental sustainability. As a prominent member of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) and the African Union (AU), Nigeria possesses the capacity to harness regional partnerships to advocate for favorable climate policies, secure international financing, and exchange best practices concerning sustainable governance (Nelson, 2016). Engaging with global climate finance mechanisms, such as the Green Climate Fund, could provide Nigeria with essential resources to implement extensive renewable energy projects, reforestation efforts, and climate adaptation strategies (Nelson, 2016). However, the translation of international commitments into localized policies necessitates a coordinated governance strategy that reconciles national priorities with global sustainability objectives (Akindele & Chabinga, 2024).

Strengthening institutional capabilities is an additional imperative for achieving balance between development and environmental preservation. Agencies such as the National Environmental Standards and Regulations Enforcement Agency (NESREA) and the National Council for Climate Change must be adequately empowered with the requisite technical expertise, funding, and autonomy essential for the effective enforcement of environmental regulations (Olujobi et al., 2024). Moreover, enhancing public engagement in environmental governance through community involvement, advocacy initiatives, and transparent policymaking processes can promote accountability and ensure that sustainability efforts are inclusive and impactful (Awhefeada et al., 2023).

Technological advancements and innovations also offer transformative prospects for sustainable development in Nigeria. The application of the Internet of Things (IoT) for environmental monitoring, smart agriculture, and resource management can improve operational efficiency and diminish ecological degradation (Victor et al., 2024). Furthermore, developments in green technology, including carbon capture and storage (CCS), precision agriculture, and smart grid systems, can further optimize resource utilization and lessen environmental damage (Umeh et al., 2024). By cultivating a knowledge-driven economy that prioritizes sustainable innovations, Nigeria can position itself as a leader in environmentally responsible development.

Therefore, the attainment of a harmonious relationship between development and environmental sustainability in Nigeria necessitates a multidimensional approach that synthesizes energy transition, urban planning, regulatory enforcement, stakeholder engagement, regional cooperation, institutional capacity building, and technological advancements. While the objective of economic expansion remains a primary focus, it is essential to ensure that such growth does not compromise ecological stability, thus safeguarding long-term prosperity. An unwavering commitment to sustainability will not only conserve Nigeria's natural resources but also bolster resilience against climate change, advance social equity, and secure a sustainable future for forthcoming generations.

Conclusion

The relationship between neoliberal economic policies, environmental degradation, and developmental processes in Nigeria, as well as across the African continent, illustrates a significant paradox. Neoliberal agendas, which have been established through structural adjustment programs (SAPs), privatization, and deregulation, have systematically diminished the capacity of the state to govern environmental issues. This weakening of state authority has perpetuated extractivist economic models that prioritize immediate economic gains at the expense of long-term sustainability. In contrast, global climate initiatives—primarily dictated by industrialized nations—impose rigorous decarbonization obligations that often overlook the developmental realities faced by resource-dependent economies in Africa.

Consequently, this scenario engenders a structural dilemma in which Nigeria and other African states are compelled to pursue sustainability while simultaneously contending with challenges such as poverty, unemployment, and energy insecurity.

Nevertheless, this predicament also offers an opportunity for African nations to redefine their developmental trajectories by advocating for an alternative paradigm that harmonizes environmental sustainability with economic resilience. By transcending the limitations imposed by neoliberal orthodoxy, African countries are encouraged to investigate transformative policy frameworks that are more aligned with their specific interests and needs. Such approaches may facilitate economic diversification while ensuring that environmental sustainability is maintained, rather than compromised, in light of global climate commitments that inadequately consider Africa's particular socio-economic contexts. Furthermore, the utilization of regional alliances, such as the African Union (AU) and the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), has the potential to strengthen Africa's negotiating capacity in global climate discussions, thereby promoting a more equitable distribution of climate finance and technology transfer mechanisms.

Ultimately, the continent's capacity to navigate the conflicting demands posed by neoliberal economic imperatives, global climate agendas, and national developmental priorities will be central to its long-term sustainability. A comprehensive rejection of externally imposed, generic climate solutions is deemed necessary in favor of locally driven, context-specific strategies that harmonize ecological responsibility with economic development. By reclaiming authority over its environmental and developmental policies, Africa can establish a new pathway that is not only environmentally viable but also socially equitable and economically transformative.

References

Adediyan, A., Chigozie, U., & Obadoni, V. (2021). Foreign Direct Investment and External Debt Impacts Assessment on Environmental Resources Depletion in Nigeria. Ekonomickérozhľady –Economic Review. https://doi.org/10.53465/er.2644-7185.2021.4.361-380

Adejumo, O. (2019). Environmental quality vs economic growth in a developing economy: complements or conflicts. Environmental Science and Pollution Research, 27, 6163-6179. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-019-07101-x

Adeosun, O., Asare-Nuamah, P., & Mabe, F. (2021). Vulnerability analysis of Nigeria's agricultural output growth and climate change. Management of Environmental Quality: An International Journal. https://doi.org/10.1108/MEQ-04-2021-0075

Adeshina, M., Ogunleye, A., Suleiman, H., Yakub, A., Same, N., Suleiman, Z., & Huh, J. (2024). From Potential to Power: Advancing Nigeria's Energy Sector through Renewable Integration and Policy Reform. Sustainability. https://doi.org/10.3390/su16208803

Adevor, J. (2021). How Is Africa a Neoliberal Utopia ? An analysis of God complexes , Eden , and development. Revue YOUR Review (York Online Undergraduate Research), 8.

Akhakpe, I. (2022). Climate Change and Sustainable Development in Nigeria. Research Anthology on Environmental and Societal Impacts of Climate Change. https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-5225-3194-4.CH011

Akindele, A., &Chabinga, R. (2024). Navigating Climate Change and Sustainability Solutions: Nigeria's Role in International Environmental Law. African Journal of Climate Change and Resource Sustainability. https://doi.org/10.37284/ajccrs.3.1.2188

Allwood, G. (2020). Mainstreaming Gender and Climate Change to Achieve a Just Transition to a Climate-Neutral Europe. JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcms.13082

Alzlzly, R., &Sorour, M. (2023). The Costs of Environmental Failure and The Impact of The Green Value Chain in Reducing Them. Journal of Namibian Studies : History Politics Culture. https://doi.org/10.59670/jns.v33i.600

Andrew, J., &Cortese, C. (2013). Free market environmentalism and the neoliberal project: the case of the Climate Disclosure Standards Board. Critical Perspectives on Accounting, 24, 397-409. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.CPA.2013.05.010

Asemota, F., &Olokoyo, F. (2022). Renewable Energy Financing and Sustainable Industrial Development in Nigeria. International Journal of Energy Economics and Policy. https://doi.org/10.32479/ijeep.13077

Asiyanbi, A., Ogar, E., &Akintoye, O. (2019). Complexities and surprises in local resistance to neoliberal conservation: Multiple environmentalities, technologies of the self and the poststructural geography of local engagement with REDD+. Political Geography. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.POLGEO.2018.12.008

Awhefeada, U., Aloamaka, P., & Kore-Okiti, E. (2023). A Realistic Approach Towards Attaining Sustainable Environment Through Improved Public Participation in Nigeria. International Journal of Professional Business Review. https://doi.org/10.26668/businessreview/2023.v8i4.844

Ayodele, D. (2015). Climate Change and Challenges of Environmental Sustanability in Lagos State, Nigeria. Journal of environment and earth science, 5, 45-50.

Bailey, I., &Maresh, S. (2009). Scales and networks of neoliberal climate governance: the regulatory and territorial logics of European Union emissions trading. Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, 34, 445-461. https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1475-5661.2009.00355.X

Bakare, H. (2018). Making sense of neoliberal governance through nature: A study of privatisation and environmental governance in the Nigerian cement industry in Ogun State, southwest Nigeria (Doctoral dissertation, University of Birmingham).

Birnintsaba, D., Ozdeser, H., &Saliminezhad, A. (2021). Impact Analysis on the Effective Synergy Between Climate Change, Ecological Degradation and Energy Consumption on Economic Growth in Nigeria. SAGE Open, 11. https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211061361

Brennetot, A. (2015). The geographical and ethical origins of neoliberalism: The Walter Lippmann Colloquium and the foundations of a new geopolitical order. Political Geography, 49, 30-39. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.POLGEO.2015.06.007

Brigid, O., Okwuchukwu, E., & Marcel, J. (2022). The Political Economy of Climate Change in Nigeria. Scholars Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences. https://doi.org/10.36347/sjahss.2022.v10i07.003

Büscher, B., & Dressler, W. (2007). Linking Neoprotectionism and Environmental Governance: On the Rapidly Increasing Tensions between Actors in the Environment-Development Nexus. Conservation and Society, 5, 586-611.

Čavoški, A. (2020). An ambitious and climate-focused Commission agenda for post COVID-19 EU. Environmental Politics, 29, 1112 - 1117. https://doi.org/10.1080/09644016.2020.1784010

Chan, S., &Amling, W. (2019). Does orchestration in the Global Climate Action Agenda effectively prioritize and mobilize transnational climate adaptation action?. International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law and Economics, 1-18. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10784-019-09444-9

Connell, R., & Dados, N. (2014). Where in the world does neoliberalism come from?. Theory and Society, 43, 117-138. https://doi.org/10.1007/S11186-014-9212-9

Daggash, H., & Mac Dowell, N. (2021). Delivering low-carbon electricity systems in sub-Saharan Africa: insights from Nigeria. Energy and Environmental Science, 20. https://doi.org/10.1039/d1ee00746g

Dean, M. (2014). Rethinking neoliberalism. Journal of Sociology, 50, 150 - 163. https://doi.org/10.1177/1440783312442256

Dent, C. (2022). Neoliberal Environmentalism, Climate Interventionism and the Trade-Climate Nexus. Sustainability. https://doi.org/10.3390/su142315804

Di Gregorio, M., Fatorelli, L., Paavola, J., Locatelli, B., Pramova, E., Nurrochmat, D., May, P., Brockhaus, M., Sari, I., &Kusumadewi, S. (2019). Multi-level governance and power in climate change policy networks. Global Environmental Change. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.GLOENVCHA.2018.10.003

Dimick, A. (2015). Supporting youth to develop environmental citizenship within/against a neoliberal context. Environmental Education Research, 21, 390-402. https://doi.org/10.1080/13504622.2014.994164

Dioha, M., & Kumar, A. (2020). Exploring the energy system impacts of Nigeria's Nationally Determined Contributions and low-carbon transition to mid-century. Energy Policy, 144, 111703. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2020.111703

Eagleton-Pierce, M. (2016). Neoliberalism: The key concepts. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203798188

Edeminam, V., &Akpasoh, A. (2023). Climate finance landscape in Nigeria. Resourceedings. https://doi.org/10.21625/resourceedings.v3i1.945

Egeruoh-Adindu, I. (2022). Transition to Sustainable Energy as a Tool for Decarbonisation in Nigeria: Regulatory Challenges. Journal of Environmental Law & Policy. https://doi.org/10.33002/jelp02.01.01

Ekanade, O. (2014). The Dynamics of Forced Neoliberalism in Nigeria Since the 1980s. 1, 1-24.

Elias, O., Abdullahi, M., & Joe-Akunne, I. (2024). The role of international financial institutions in shaping African development: a case study of Nigeria's engagement with the IMF and world bank. World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews. https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2024.23.3.2981

Ettinger, A., & Collins, A. (2023). Trumpism and the rejection of global climate governance. International Relations. https://doi.org/10.1177/00471178231153555

Eweka, E., Lopez-Arroyo, E., Medupin, C., Oladipo, A., & Campos, L. (2022). Energy Landscape and Renewable Energy Resources in Nigeria: A Review. Energies. https://doi.org/10.3390/en15155514

Fine, B., &Saad-Filho, A. (2017). Thirteen Things You Need to Know About Neoliberalism. Critical Sociology, 43, 685 - 706. https://doi.org/10.1177/0896920516655387

Fletcher, R. (2010). Neoliberal environmentality: Towards a poststructuralist political ecology of the conservation debate. Conservation and Society, 8, 171. https://doi.org/10.4103/0972-4923.73806

Garrett, P. (2018). What are we talking about when we talk about 'Neoliberalism'?. European Journal of Social Work, 22, 188 - 200. https://doi.org/10.1080/13691457.2018.1530643

Hansen, J., Zebiak, S., & Coffey, K. (2014). Shaping global agendas on climate risk management and climate services: an IRI perspective. Earth Perspectives, 1, 1-12. https://doi.org/10.1186/2194-6434-1-13

Harrison, G. (2005). Economic faith, Social project and a misreading of African society: the travails of neoliberalism in Africa. Third World Quarterly, 26, 1303 - 1320. https://doi.org/10.1080/01436590500336922

Harrison, G. (2018). Authoritarian neoliberalism and capitalist transformation in Africa: all pain, no gain. Globalizations, 16, 274 - 288. https://doi.org/10.1080/14747731.2018.1502491

Harvey, D. (2020). A Brief History of Neoliberalism. The Anti-Capitalist Chronicles. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv17ppcd0.8

Hatzisavvidou, S. (2019). Inventing the environmental state: neoliberal common sense and the limits to transformation. Environmental Politics, 29, 96 - 114. https://doi.org/10.1080/09644016.2019.1684732

Hector, M., &Lambrechts, D. (2024). Exploring the conflicting ideals of ecological modernisation and environmental justice in South Africa: Evidence from the 2020 National Waste Management Strategy. South African Journal of International Affairs, 31, 87 - 107. https://doi.org/10.1080/10220461.2024.2350726

Hilgers, M. (2012). The Historicity of the Neoliberal State. Social Anthropology, 20, 80-94. https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1469-8676.2011.00192.X

Hochstetler, K. (2013). Who Governs the Global Environment. International Studies Review, 15, 628-630. https://doi.org/10.1111/MISR.12064

Ignatius, O., Obeta, P., Anosike, O., & Ali, O. (2023). The efficacy of climate change financing on sustainable economic development in Nigeria. International Journal of Advanced Research in Accounting, Economics and Business Perspectives. https://doi.org/10.48028/iiprds/ijaraebp.v7.i2.01

Jack, J., & Jack, B. (2022). Nigeria's Energy Crisis and the Sustainability Question. Social and Health Sciences. https://doi.org/10.25159/2957-3645/11449

Jackson, B. (2021). Putting Neoliberalism in Its Place. Modern Intellectual History, 19, 982 - 995. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1479244321000032

Jacobs, D. (1994). Environmental failure-oppression is the only cause of psychopathology. Journal of Mind and Behavior, 15, 1-18.

Kiely, R. (2017). From Authoritarian Liberalism to Economic Technocracy: Neoliberalism, Politics and 'De-democratization'. Critical Sociology, 43, 725 - 745. https://doi.org/10.1177/0896920516668386

Kiš, K., &Geršak, N. (2024). Easement of forests and forest land for the growing of perennial crops - the analysis of (non)functionality regarding the ecological network and ecosystem functions. Environmental engineering. https://doi.org/10.37023/ee.10.1-2.5

Krämer, A., & Winkler, P. (2023). Overcoming the "blame game" in strategic climate communication: from decoupling accusations toward an arena-spanning agenda. Journal of Communication Management. https://doi.org/10.1108/jcom-12-2022-0132

Lago, A., Chaparro, S., &Lumbreras, J. (2023). A Decade of Climate Action and the Mission towards Climate Neutrality and Adaptation in European Cities: Delivering Urban Transformations?. Sustainability. https://doi.org/10.3390/su152416665

LeBaron, G., & Ayers, A. (2013). The Rise of a 'New Slavery'? Understanding African unfree labour through neoliberalism. Third World Quarterly, 34, 873 - 892. https://doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2013.800738

Leshoele, M. (2022). A Sankarian Perspective on the IMF Loans to South Africa – 'Debt as a Cleverly OrganisedReconquest of Africa'. The African Review. https://doi.org/10.1163/1821889x-bja10044

Lockwood, M. (2018). Right-wing populism and the climate change agenda: exploring the linkages. Environmental Politics, 27, 712 - 732. https://doi.org/10.1080/09644016.2018.1458411

Lovera-Bilderbeek, S., &Lahiri, S. (2021). Addressing power imbalances in biosequestration governance. Global Policy. https://doi.org/10.1111/1758-5899.12882

Marquardt, J., Fast, C., & Grimm, J. (2022). Non- and sub-state climate action after Paris: From a facilitative regime to a contested governance landscape. Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change, 13. https://doi.org/10.1002/wcc.791

Mbah, P., Ezeibe, C., Ezirim, G., Onyishi, C., &Nzeadibe, T. (2019). Value reclamation from informal municipal solid waste management: green neoliberalism and inclusive development in Lagos, Nigeria. Local Environment, 24, 949 - 967. https://doi.org/10.1080/13549839.2019.1663801

Mccarthy, J. (2012). The Financial Crisis and Environmental Governance 'After' Neoliberalism. Tijdschriftvooreconomischeensocialegeografie, 103, 180-195. https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1467-9663.2012.00711.X

McCright, A., & Dunlap, R. (2003). Defeating Kyoto: The conservative movement's impact on U.S. climate change policy. Social Problems, 50, 348-373. https://doi.org/10.1525/SP.2003.50.3.348

Mellink, B. (2021). Neoliberalism Incorporated: Early Neoliberal Involvement in the Postwar Reconstruction: The Case Study of the Netherlands (1945–1958). European History Quarterly, 51, 98 - 121. https://doi.org/10.1177/0265691420981832

Moore, D. (2001). Neoliberal globalisation and the triple crisis of 'modernisation' in Africa: Zimbabwe, the Democratic Republic of the Congo and South Africa. Third World Quarterly, 22, 909 - 929. https://doi.org/10.1080/01436590120099713

Munyuzangabo, C. (2021). Catalyzing International Climate Finance: Tackling Energy Poverty in Nigeria. Potentia: Journal of International Affairs. https://doi.org/10.18192/potentia.v12i0.5947

Nelson, M. (2016). Africa's Regional Powers and Climate Change Negotiations. Global Environmental Politics, 16, 110-129. https://doi.org/10.1162/GLEP_a_00348

Njeru, J. (2010). 'Defying' democratization and environmental protection in Kenya: The case of Karura Forest reserve in Nairobi. Political Geography, 29, 333-342. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.POLGEO.2010.07.003

Nwokolo, S., Meyer, E., &Ahia, C. (2023). Credible Pathways to Catching Up with Climate Goals in Nigeria. Climate. https://doi.org/10.3390/cli11090196

Odugbesan, J., & Adebayo, T. (2020). The symmetrical and asymmetrical effects of foreign direct investment and financial development on carbon emission: evidence from Nigeria. SN Applied Sciences, 2. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42452-020-03817-5

Ogbowuokara, O., Leton, T., Ugbebor, J., &Orikpete, O. (2023). Developing climate governance strategies in Nigeria: An emphasis on methane emissions mitigation. The Journal of Engineering and Exact Sciences. https://doi.org/10.18540/jcecvl9iss9pp17383-01e

Ogbuabor, J., &Egwuchukwu, E. (2017). The Impact of Climate Change on the Nigerian Economy. International Journal of Energy Economics and Policy, 7, 217-223.

Ogbuene, A., &Mbaeze, C. (2024). Climate Change Interventions and Sustainable Economic Development in Nigeria, A Case for Ingenious Approach. International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science. https://doi.org/10.47772/ijriss.2024.8090232

Okafor, C., Ajaero, C., Madu, C., Nzekwe, C., Otunomo, F., & Nixon, N. (2024). Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation in Nigeria: A Review. Sustainability. https://doi.org/10.3390/su16167048

Olajide, O., &Lawanson, T. (2021). Urban paradox and the rise of the neoliberal city: Case study of Lagos, Nigeria. Urban Studies, 59, 1763 - 1781. https://doi.org/10.1177/00420980211014461

Olujobi, O., Irumekhai, O., &Aina-Pelemo, A. (2024). Sustainable Development and National Integration: A Catalyst for Enhancing Environmental Law Compliance in Nigeria. Environmental Policy and Law. https://doi.org/10.3233/epl-230050

Owusu, F. (2003). Pragmatism and the Gradual Shift from Dependency to Neoliberalism: The World Bank, African Leaders and Development Policy in Africa. World Development, 31, 1655-1672. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0305-750X(03)00136-0

Panova, E. (2024). The place of the climate agenda in modern global communications. Litera. https://doi.org/10.25136/2409-8698.2024.6.70898

Pettorelli, N., Graham, N., Seddon, N., Da Cunha Bustamante, M., Lowton, M., Sutherland, W., Koldewey, H., Prentice, H., & Barlow, J. (2021). Time to integrate global climate change and biodiversity science-policy agendas. Journal of Applied Ecology. https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.13985

Phillips, A., Hung, Y., &Bosela, P. (2007). Love Canal Tragedy. Journal of Performance of Constructed Facilities, 21, 313-319. https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)0887-3828(2007)21:4(313)

Pinson, G., &Journel, C. (2016). The Neoliberal City – Theory, Evidence, Debates. Territory, Politics, Governance, 4, 137 - 153. https://doi.org/10.1080/21622671.2016.1166982

Roberts, E., &Pelling, M. (2018). Climate change-related loss and damage: translating the global policy agenda for national policy processes. Climate and Development, 10, 17 - 4. https://doi.org/10.1080/17565529.2016.1184608

Roche, M., Verolme, H., Agbaegbu, C., Binnington, T., Fischedick, M., &Oladipo, E. (2019). Achieving Sustainable Development Goals in Nigeria’s power sector: assessment of transition pathways. Climate Policy, 20, 846 - 865. https://doi.org/10.1080/14693062.2019.1661818

Routledge, P., Cumbers, A., &Derickson, K. (2018). States of just transition: Realising climate justice through and against the state. Geoforum, 88, 7886. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.GEOFORUM.2017.11.015

Rovinskaya, T. (2023). Global Climate Agenda: Big Gamble. World Economy and International Relations. https://doi.org/10.20542/0131-2227-2023-67-9-15-30

Saliminezhad, A., Ozdeser, H., &Birnintsaba, D. (2021). Environmental degradation and economic growth: time-varying and nonlinear evidence from Nigeria. Environment, Development and Sustainability. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10668-021-01702-8

Shadare, G. (2022). The Governance of Nigeria’s Social Protection: The Burdens of Developmental Welfarism?. Societies. https://doi.org/10.3390/soc12010020

Shafiu, R., &Salleh, M. (2021). Role of IMF Lending Preconditions In Nigeria. Proceedings of the International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Operations Management. https://doi.org/10.46254/an11.20211205

Sobajo, M. (2024). Advancing Nigeria's Energy and Environmental Policy: The Urgency For Sustainable and Renewable Energy Solutions. Path of Science. https://doi.org/10.22178/pos.107-41

Spektor, M., Mignozzetti, U., &Fasolin, G. (2021). Nationalist Backlash Against Foreign Climate Shaming. Global Environmental Politics, 22, 139-158. https://doi.org/10.1162/glep_a_00644

Speranza, C., Adenle, A., &Boillat, S. (2019). Land Degradation Neutrality - Potentials for its operationalisation at multi-levels in Nigeria. Environmental Science & Policy. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ENVSCI.2018.12.018

Steger, M., & Roy, R. (2021). Neoliberalism: A Very Short Introduction. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/actrade/9780199560516.001.0001

Tijani, D., Adeyinka, O., & Michael, D. (2023). Nexus of energy efficiency, carbon emission and economic growth in Nigeria. JurnalPerspektifPembiayaandan Pembangunan Daerah. https://doi.org/10.22437/ppd.v10i6.21571

Toyin, O., &Onanuga, A. (2019). Carbon Fiscal Instruments and Green Finance: An Aid to the Success of SDGs in Nigeria?. 3, 49-62. https://doi.org/10.22219/jibe.v3i02.7895

Turaeva, M. (2024). History of the Global Climate Agenda and Its Future in the Eurasian Economic Union. ISTORIYA. https://doi.org/10.18254/s207987840031942-5

Uche, L., &Azoro-Amadi, O. (2024). Aligning Nigeria’s International Obligations: A Comprehensive Analysis of Environmental Protection within the Industrial Law and Policy Framework. South African Yearbook of International Law. https://doi.org/10.25159/2521-2583/15159

Ucheje, O., Okolo, O., &Chukwueloka, O. (2024). Effect of Climate Change on Nigerian Economic Sustainability. International Journal of Environment and Climate Change. https://doi.org/10.9734/ijecc/2024/v14i54171

Umeh, C., Nwankwo, A., Oluka, P., Umeh, C., &Ogbonnaya, A. (2024). The Role of Renewable Energies for Sustainable Energy Governance and Environmental Policies for the Mitigation of Climate Change in Nigeria. European Journal of Applied Science, Engineering and Technology. https://doi.org/10.59324/ejaset.2024.2(2).08

Unegbu, H., Yawas, D., Dan-Asabe, B., &Alabi, A. (2024). Sustainable Urban Planning and Development: A Systematic Review of Policies and Practices in Nigeria. Journal of Sustainable Development Innovations. https://doi.org/10.61552/jsi.2024.01.005

United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. (2015). Paris Agreement. https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/english_paris_agreement.pdf

Urazova, D. (2019). Globalists: the end of empire and the birth of neoliberalism. International Affairs. https://doi.org/10.1093/IA/IIZ107

Vasi, I., & King, B. (2012). Social Movements, Risk Perceptions, and Economic Outcomes. American Sociological Review, 77, 573 - 596. https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122412448796

Venugopal, R. (2015). Neoliberalism as concept. Economy and Society, 44, 165 - 187. https://doi.org/10.1080/03085147.2015.1013356

Yang, X., Zhang, X., Liu, Y., Li, X., Chen, J., Zhang, X., & Gao, L. (2022). Environmental Failure Behavior Analysis of 7085 High Strength Aluminum Alloy under High Temperature and High Humidity. Metals. https://doi.org/10.3390/met12060968