International Journal of Multidisciplinary and Innovative Research

ISSN(print): 3050-6883, ISSN(online): 3050-6891

Volume 02 Issue 10 October 2025

DOI: 10.58806/ijmir.2025.v2i10n03

Page No: 300-309

The Politics and Economics of Igbo Marginalization in Post-War Nigeria

Njoku, Chinwendu, Shedrack[1], Nwogu Boniface Kelechi Phd[2]

[1]Department of Political Science, K.O. Mbadiwe University, Ideato, Imo State

[2]Department of Pubilc Administration, IMO state Polytechnic, Omuma

ABSTRACT

The Nigerian Civil War (1967–1970) left deep political, economic, and psychological scars on the Igbo people of southeastern Nigeria. The phrase "In Biafra, Africa Died" captures the magnitude of human and moral tragedy that accompanied the conflict, as well as the enduring marginalization that followed. This study examines the politics and economics of Igbo exclusion in post-war Nigeria, focusing on how state policies, resource allocation, and federal structures perpetuated socio-economic inequality and political disempowerment. It explores the impact of post-war reconstruction measures such as the "Twenty Pounds Policy," abandoned property decrees, and deliberate industrial neglect on the Igbo economy. Politically, it interrogates the systematic underrepresentation of the Igbo in national decision-making processes and federal appointments. Using a political economy framework, the study argues that the post-war Nigerian state institutionalized structures of exclusion that constrained Igbo reintegration and development. It concludes that overcoming these historical injustices requires genuine federal reforms, equitable economic policies, and national reconciliation that recognizes the Igbo struggle as integral to Nigeria's democratic and developmental aspirations.

KEYWORDS: Biafra, Igbo marginalization, political economy, post-war Nigeria, reconstruction.

ARTICLE DETAILS

Published On:
18 October 2025

Available on:
https://ijmir.com

INTRODUCTION

The Nigerian Civil War (1967–1970), commonly referred to as the Biafran War, remains one of the most defining and tragic events in modern African history. Sparked by ethnic tensions, political instability, and economic disparities in post-independence Nigeria, the war led to the secession of the Eastern Region under the name "Republic of Biafra" and culminated in a humanitarian catastrophe that claimed over a million lives (Madiebo, 1980; Nwankwo, 2020). The famous phrase *"In Biafra, Africa Died"* encapsulates both the collapse of African solidarity and the moral failure of the continent to prevent or mitigate the devastation (Achebe, 2012). Beyond its human cost, the aftermath of the war redefined the political and economic landscape of the Igbo people, the principal group behind the Biafran cause.

Following the war's end and the declaration of "No Victor, No Vanquished," the Nigerian state adopted policies that ostensibly sought reintegration but in practice deepened the marginalization of the Igbo (Nzimiro, 1982). Economically, measures such as the "Twenty Pounds Policy"—which limited bank withdrawals for returning Biafrans regardless of pre-war savings—crippled Igbo capital accumulation and stifled entrepreneurship (Uche, 2008). Politically, the Igbo were systematically excluded from key national institutions, federal appointments, and resource allocation, reinforcing structural inequality within the federation (Osaghae, 1998). These developments entrenched a pattern of socio-political alienation that continues to shape Igbo identity and Nigeria's fragile national cohesion.

This study critically examines the politics and economics of Igbo marginalization in post-war Nigeria through a political economy lens. It interrogates how post-conflict state policies and federal structures institutionalized exclusion, inhibited reconstruction, and perpetuated regional imbalance. By revisiting these dynamics, the study contributes to understanding Nigeria's ongoing struggle with federal equity, justice, and national integration.

Historical Context of the Biafran Conflict

The roots of the Biafran conflict can be traced to the colonial political economy that entrenched ethnic inequality and regional rivalry in Nigeria. British colonial rule, through the policy of indirect rule, reinforced existing ethnic divisions and created unequal systems of governance between the Northern and Southern regions (Falola & Heaton, 2008). The North, governed through traditional emirs, was politically conservative, while the South, especially the East, experienced greater Western education and Christian missionary influence, producing a more politically assertive and economically competitive population (Afigbo, 1981). This uneven modernization laid the groundwork for post-independence competition over access to state resources and political power (Nnoli, 2008).

The 1946 Richards Constitution and the subsequent 1954 Lyttleton Constitution deepened regionalism by institutionalizing Nigeria's tripartite federal structure along ethnic lines—North, West, and East (Suberu, 2001). The Igbos, concentrated in the Eastern Region, were often portrayed as economically aggressive and politically ambitious, which generated resentment from other groups, especially in the North (Achebe, 2012). Thus, colonial administrative practices not only produced economic imbalance but also sowed seeds of inter-ethnic mistrust that would later explode into violent conflict. The colonial legacy of unequal development and ethnic competition ultimately set the stage for the Nigerian Civil War.

Furthermore, post-independence Nigeria was immediately beset by political instability rooted in regional rivalry, corruption, and mistrust. The First Republic (1960–1966) operated under a fragile federal system that reflected the divisions institutionalized during colonial rule. Electoral malpractices in the 1964 federal elections and the 1965 Western Regional crisis intensified ethnic tensions, with the Northern People's Congress (NPC), Action Group (AG), and National Council of Nigerian Citizens (NCNC) each pursuing sectional interests (Osaghae, 1998).

These crises culminated in the January 1966 coup led predominantly by Igbo officers, which overthrew the federal government and assassinated key Northern and Western leaders, including Prime Minister Abubakar Tafawa Balewa and Northern Premier Ahmadu Bello (Siollun, 2009). Although the coup's leaders claimed nationalist motives, it was perceived in the North as an Igbo conspiracy to dominate Nigeria. The retaliatory counter-coup of July 1966 brought Lt. Col. Yakubu Gowon, a Northerner, to power and unleashed pogroms against Igbos in Northern cities, killing thousands (Madiebo, 1980). The mass exodus of Igbos from the North and the failure of peace talks at Aburi in 1967 led to the secession of the Eastern Region as the Republic of Biafra under Lt. Col. Odumegwu Ojukwu (Nwankwo, 2020). Thus, the military coups and subsequent massacres crystallized political distrust and directly triggered the Nigerian Civil War.

The secession of Biafra in May 1967 and the ensuing thirty-month war had devastating economic and humanitarian consequences. The blockade imposed by the Nigerian federal government cut off food, medicine, and essential supplies to Biafran territories, resulting in widespread famine and the deaths of an estimated one to two million people, mostly children (De St. Jorre, 1972). The once-thriving Eastern economy collapsed under the strain of war, with industries destroyed, infrastructure devastated, and trade routes severed (Uche, 2008).

Beyond the economic ruin, the war produced one of Africa's worst humanitarian crises, galvanizing global sympathy through harrowing media images of starving children (Heerten & Moses, 2014). International humanitarian organizations such as the Red Cross and Caritas mounted relief operations, though access was frequently obstructed by military hostilities. Post-war, the Igbo people faced further economic marginalization through punitive policies like the "Twenty Pounds Policy," which limited compensation for pre-war bank savings, and the Abandoned Property Edicts that dispossessed many returnees in Port Harcourt (Achebe, 2012). The war's legacy thus extended beyond the battlefield, embedding long-term economic disenfranchisement and social trauma that shaped Igbo relations with the Nigerian state.

The Nigerian Civil War drew significant regional and global attention, exposing the limits of African solidarity and the politics of Cold War alliances. Within Africa, most states—led by the Organization of African Unity (OAU)—supported Nigeria's territorial integrity, emphasizing the principle of non-interference and the sanctity of colonial borders (Akinyemi, 1972). Only a few African countries, notably Côte d'Ivoire, Tanzania, Gabon, and Zambia, recognized Biafra's independence, citing humanitarian concerns and the right to self-determination (Stremlau, 1977).

Internationally, the conflict became a proxy for competing geopolitical interests. Britain, the former colonial power, supported the Nigerian federal government militarily and diplomatically, driven by its oil and economic interests (Uche, 2008). In contrast, France covertly supplied arms to Biafra to weaken British influence in West Africa. The Soviet Union also backed Nigeria, marking a rare convergence of British and Soviet foreign policy during the Cold War (Heerten & Moses, 2014). Humanitarian organizations and churches in Europe and North America mobilized massive relief campaigns, yet their efforts were often politicized and restricted by both warring sides. Ultimately, Africa's failure to mediate effectively in the conflict reinforced the sentiment captured in the phrase "In Biafra, Africa Died," symbolizing the collapse of Pan-African empathy and collective moral responsibility (Achebe, 2012).

Post-War Nigeria: The Politics of Reintegration and Exclusion

At the end of the Nigerian Civil War in January 1970, General Yakubu Gowon declared a policy of *"No Victor, No Vanquished"* and announced a "Reconstruction, Rehabilitation, and Reintegration" (3Rs) program intended to heal the wounds of war and promote national unity (Gowon, 1970). In principle, this declaration symbolized reconciliation and the restoration of the Igbo people into Nigeria's political and economic framework. However, in practice, the policy was riddled with contradictions that deepened post-war marginalization. While the federal government proclaimed national unity, it simultaneously implemented economic and political measures that punished the former secessionists (Achebe, 2012).

The infamous "Twenty Pounds Policy," which limited Biafran returnees to a mere twenty pounds regardless of their pre-war savings, crippled Igbo economic recovery and denied them access to their financial assets (Uche, 2008). Similarly, the Abandoned Property Decree dispossessed many Igbo returnees of their homes and businesses, particularly in Port Harcourt (Madiebo, 1980). These measures contradicted the stated ideals of reconciliation and equality. In effect, the *"No Victor, No Vanquished"* slogan became a political façade that masked structural exclusion and economic retribution. The aftermath of the war thus reflected a paradoxical reality: while the guns were silent, the politics of punishment persisted, leaving the Igbo economically disempowered and politically sidelined.

Federal Restructuring and Political Representation of the Igbo

Federal restructuring in post-war Nigeria significantly reshaped the political landscape, often to the detriment of the Igbo. Before the war, the Eastern Region enjoyed relative autonomy within Nigeria's tripartite federal structure, but the 1967 creation of twelve states by Gowon fragmented the region, diluting Igbo political cohesion and influence (Suberu, 2001). Ostensibly designed to promote unity and administrative efficiency, the restructuring served strategic purposes during the war—isolating the Igbos from minority ethnic groups within the old Eastern Region who were less supportive of Biafra (Osaghae, 1998).

In the post-war period, successive regimes continued the state-creation exercise, expanding Nigeria to thirty-six states. While this development was celebrated as a federal balancing act, it further reduced the Igbo political bloc to only five states in the Southeast, compared to six in the Southwest and seven in the Northwest (Suberu, 2001). This numerical disadvantage limited Igbo representation in national decision-making institutions, including the National Assembly, the Council of States, and the revenue allocation process (Nwankwo, 2020). The result was a systemic underrepresentation of the Southeast in national politics. Federal restructuring, therefore, while presented as a nation-building strategy, became an instrument for containing Igbo political resurgence and maintaining central control over the post-war order.

The Marginalization of the Igbo in National Politics, Military, and Bureaucracy

In the decades following the civil war, the Igbo experienced sustained marginalization within Nigeria's political, military, and bureaucratic institutions. Despite Gowon's reintegration rhetoric, post-war appointments and promotions in the military systematically excluded the Igbo from senior command positions (Siollun, 2009). The Nigerian army, which before the war had a considerable number of Igbo officers, was restructured to ensure Northern dominance and prevent another secessionist threat (Madiebo, 1980).

Politically, since the end of the war, no Igbo has occupied the presidency or vice presidency until 1999, when an Igbo, Alex Ekwueme, served briefly as vice president under the Second Republic (Osaghae, 1998). The marginal presence of Igbos in key federal ministries, parastatals, and security agencies further underscores the persistence of exclusionary politics (Nnoli, 2008). Bureaucratic marginalization was also evident in federal employment and infrastructural distribution, where Southeast states received disproportionately fewer appointments and development projects (Suberu, 2001).

This structural underrepresentation has reinforced feelings of alienation and fostered renewed Igbo nationalism. Movements such as the Movement for the Actualization of the Sovereign State of Biafra (MASSOB) and the Indigenous People of Biafra (IPOB) draw their legitimacy from this persistent sense of political and institutional exclusion (Nwankwo, 2020). Thus, Igbo marginalization after the war was not merely economic but institutionalized through deliberate political engineering within the Nigerian state.

Federal Character Principle and Its Uneven Implementation

The introduction of the *federal character* principle in the 1979 Constitution was intended to address the imbalance in Nigeria's federal system by ensuring equitable representation of all groups in public institutions. It aimed to prevent domination by any region and promote national integration (Suberu, 2001). However, while the principle appeared to provide a framework for inclusivity, its implementation has often been uneven and politically manipulated. In practice, it entrenched Northern political dominance and perpetuated Igbo marginalization under the guise of national balance (Osaghae, 1998).

Appointments into federal ministries, security agencies, and parastatals have frequently violated the equity spirit of the federal character clause, with the Southeast often receiving the fewest appointments relative to its population (Nnoli, 2008). In many cases, competence has been subordinated to regional favoritism, reinforcing inefficiency and public resentment (Suberu, 2001). The political deployment of federal character has thus become a tool for maintaining elite patronage networks rather than ensuring genuine representation. Consequently, rather than mitigating post-war inequalities, the principle has legitimized them by providing a constitutional cover for systemic exclusion. The uneven application of federal character reflects the broader contradiction of Nigerian federalism—where unity and diversity coexist in perpetual tension, and the Igbo remain marginalized in the distribution of state power and resources (Achebe, 2012).

THE ECONOMICS OF IGBO MARGINALIZATION

i. The "Twenty Pounds Policy" and its impact on Igbo capital recovery

The so-called "£20 policy" refers to post–Civil War practices and narratives about how many Igbo returnees and eastern businesses fared financially after 1967–1970. Many Igbo who fled or whose assets were rendered inaccessible during the war encountered banking and administrative obstacles when attempting to reclaim savings or access capital: account records were incomplete, access to safe banking infrastructure had been disrupted, and some claimants encountered arbitrary limits or reductions in the amounts they could immediately withdraw or have recognized by state organs. The combined effect was that a portion of pre-war liquid capital (cash, bank balances, short-term credit) held by Igbo traders and savers was difficult to recover quickly, constraining immediate reinvestment in businesses and delaying the region's post-war economic regeneration. These capital recovery problems compounded other post-war disadvantages such as damaged property, loss of networks, and limited access to federal rehabilitation funds, and they helped lock many Igbo entrepreneurs into informal, small-scale credit arrangements (rotating credit, trade credit) rather than rapid capital expansion. Scholars who study post-war property and finance argue that these banking and administrative frictions functionally reduced the speed of Igbo capital recovery and increased the transaction costs of restarting larger-scale industrial or wholesale operations.

ii. Abandoned property decrees in Rivers and other states

Following the civil war the federal government and some state authorities promulgated "Abandoned Property" laws and decrees to manage properties left behind by displaced persons. In practice, these instruments were used to take custody, reallocate, or reassign houses, businesses, land, and other assets deemed "abandoned" during the war. In Rivers State and at the national level, implementation produced enduring controversies: claimants often faced slow bureaucratic processes, weak restitution mechanisms, lengthy litigation, and perceptions (and in many cases evidence) of selective application that disadvantaged eastern owners. Reviews of the Abandoned Property saga show that while the stated policy objective was resettlement and orderly management of displaced assets, the legal framework and implementation sometimes resulted in permanent dispossession or protracted disputes over title — outcomes that reduced the stock of recoverable capital for many displaced Igbo and discouraged large-scale return investments. The unequal application of these decrees also fed narratives of institutional marginalization and complicated later efforts to recover or monetize property through formal channels.

iii. Industrial neglect and uneven infrastructural development

Infrastructure and industrial policy in post-war Nigeria exhibited geographical imbalances that disadvantaged the southeast. Government and private industrial investment tended to concentrate in certain regions and urban centers due to political networks, security perceptions, and historical investment patterns; meanwhile, many areas in the Igbo homeland experienced slower rebuilding of power, transportation links, public utilities, and formal industrial projects. Studies of regional development find patterns of "urban bias" and uneven public investment that translated into fewer large-scale factories, weaker supply chains, and less state-supported industrialization in the southeast compared with other parts of the country. This structural under-investment raised operating costs for local producers (unreliable electricity, poor roads), limited economies of scale, and discouraged external investors who rely on predictable infrastructure. The result was a pronounced tilt toward small- and medium-scale workshops and trading clusters rather than integrated industrial parks, constraining the region's ability to capture higher value-added manufacturing opportunities.

iv. Restrictions on trade, employment, and regional investment

Beyond physical infrastructure, administrative and informal barriers affected Igbo participation in some formal employment and trade channels. Several states have historically favored "indigeneship" in hiring and contracting — practices documented by human rights and labour studies — which meant non-indigenes (including many Igbo in parts of the country) faced restricted access to permanent civil service jobs, state contracts, and sometimes bank credit tied to political patronage. Trade restrictions — whether via licensing, informal harassment, or discriminatory enforcement — raised transaction costs for Igbo traders operating outside their home region. At the macro level, national investment patterns and protection for certain regional elites also shaped where capital flowed; these institutional dynamics, both formal and informal, can cumulatively impede regional investment inflows into Igbo areas and reduce market access for Igbo entrepreneurs in some states. These constraints help explain why many Igbo shifted toward mobile, trade-based, and informal economic strategies rather than relying on state-dependent wage employment.

v. The resilience of Igbo entrepreneurship amid state constraints

Despite the constraints described above, Igbo entrepreneurship has shown remarkable resilience and adaptability. The region's dense networks of apprenticeship, family finance, rotating savings (esusu), and trade associations have historically allowed capital formation and skills transfer outside formal institutions. Empirical studies of Igbo business clusters in cities such as Aba, Onitsha, and Nnewi document dynamic small- and medium-enterprise ecosystems that specialize in light manufacturing, auto parts, spare parts, electronics, and trading — sectors that thrive on flexibility, strong supplier networks, and rapid reinvestment of profits. The prevalence of informal credit mechanisms and apprenticeship training has allowed many entrepreneurs to scale horizontally and to reconstitute businesses rapidly even when formal bank credit is limited or state policy is unfriendly. Scholars argue that this adaptive entrepreneurship both compensates for—and is shaped by—historical marginalization: resilience is a response to constrained formal opportunities, yet it also limits the region's transition into capital-intensive, large-scale industrialization unless accompanied by improved property rights, infrastructure, and inclusive public policy.

THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF POST-WAR NIGERIA

Following the end of the Nigerian Civil War in 1970, the military leadership adopted a highly centralized political and economic structure that significantly altered the federal balance envisioned at independence. The military regimes of Yakubu Gowon, Murtala Mohammed, and Olusegun Obasanjo consolidated power at the center, diminishing the fiscal autonomy of the states (Suberu, 2001). Decrees such as the Petroleum Decree of 1969 and the Land Use Decree of 1978 effectively vested ownership and control of all mineral resources and land in the federal government, thereby eroding the derivation principle that had previously empowered regions to benefit directly from their resources (Ibeanu & Luckham, 2006). This centralization was justified under the guise of national unity and reconstruction, but it entrenched federal dependence on oil revenues distributed from Abuja (Ibeanu, 2008). Consequently, state governments became fiscally dependent and politically subservient, while the central government monopolized key levers of economic policy. This concentration of economic control deepened regional inequalities, weakened local governance, and laid the foundation for the persistent struggles over resource allocation and fiscal federalism in Nigeria's post-war era (Suberu, 2001; Watts, 2008).

More so, Oil became the cornerstone of Nigeria's economy after the civil war, shaping the political economy of the state and reinforcing structural economic imbalances between regions. The rapid expansion of oil revenues in the 1970s transformed Nigeria into a rentier state, where political power was tied to access to oil rents rather than productive economic activity (Watts, 2004). The federal government's exclusive control of oil resources marginalized non-oil-producing regions economically, while oil-bearing states such as those in the Niger Delta suffered environmental degradation and underdevelopment (Omotola, 2007). The centralized distribution of oil wealth fostered a culture of dependency and weakened agricultural and industrial productivity across the country. Additionally, oil politics institutionalized regional inequality by concentrating infrastructure and development projects in politically favored regions, particularly the North and parts of the West, at the expense of the East and the Niger Delta (Okonta & Douglas, 2001). The oil boom thus entrenched a pattern of uneven development, distorted federalism, and heightened socio-political tensions over resource control—a dynamic that continues to shape Nigeria's political economy (Ibeanu, 2008; Watts, 2008).

The post-war Nigerian state evolved into a patron-client system where political loyalty often determined access to state resources. Successive governments used patronage as a means of consolidating power and managing ethnic competition, thereby embedding corruption and inefficiency in public administration (Joseph, 1991). Military and civilian elites distributed oil rents through ethnic and regional networks, perpetuating inequalities in public service appointments, contract awards, and infrastructural investments (Akinola, 2011). Development projects were often concentrated in areas aligned with ruling elites, while marginalized groups, particularly in the South-East and Niger Delta, were systematically excluded from key state benefits (Suberu, 2001). This ethno-regional favoritism undermined meritocracy and eroded public trust in governance institutions. Consequently, the federal character principle introduced in the 1979 Constitution and reaffirmed in 1999 was intended to promote inclusivity but often served as an avenue for political manipulation and elite bargaining (Osaghae & Suberu, 2005). Patronage politics thus became a defining feature of Nigeria's post-war political economy, reinforcing both regional grievances and institutional weakness.

The centralization of power, oil dependency, and patronage politics have had profound implications for federalism and nation-building in post-war Nigeria. The erosion of fiscal autonomy has weakened the federal principle of shared sovereignty, turning states into administrative extensions of the center (Elaigwu, 2007). As a result, intergovernmental relations are marked by dependency and competition for federal allocations rather than cooperative development. The uneven distribution of oil rents and public investment exacerbated regional inequalities, fueling persistent ethnic and secessionist agitations—most notably the resurgence of pro-Biafra movements (Ikeanyibe & Ojukwu, 2020). Moreover, the dominance of rent-seeking politics has undermined national integration and economic diversification, as political elites prioritize access to oil rents over long-term productive growth. Consequently, Nigeria's federalism remains a fragile framework, sustained more by elite bargains than by genuine interregional trust and participation (Suberu, 2001). Nation-building efforts thus face structural constraints rooted in the political economy of the post-war state, where centralized control and inequitable development perpetuate disunity and underdevelopment.

CONTEMPORARY DIMENSIONS OF IGBO MARGINALIZATION

Since the end of the Nigerian Civil War in 1970, the Igbo of the Southeast have continued to experience systemic exclusion from the highest levels of political power and uneven access to federal resources. Despite the "No Victor, No Vanquished" rhetoric, post-war Nigerian politics institutionalized Igbo marginalization through elite consensus and federal structures that favor the North and West (Suberu, 2001). The concentration of political power in Northern-dominated military and civilian elites effectively sidelined Igbo representation in the executive, legislative, and security sectors (Nwosu, 2018). Since 1966, no Igbo person has held the presidency or even substantive control over key national institutions such as the army, police, or oil sector parastatals. This persistent political exclusion has reinforced a sense of alienation among the Igbo, who perceive themselves as excluded from Nigeria's post-war nation-building project (Osaghae, 1998).

The political architecture of the Fourth Republic (1999–present) has deepened this pattern. Electoral alliances and zoning arrangements within major political parties often exclude the Southeast from presidential consideration. The Peoples Democratic

Party (PDP), for instance, zoned the presidency to the North and South-West in successive electoral cycles, marginalizing Igbo candidates despite their consistent support for the party (Omodia, 2020). Similarly, the All Progressives Congress (APC) under Muhammadu Buhari's administration (2015–2023) disproportionately concentrated federal appointments and infrastructural projects in Northern and Western regions (Onuoha, 2016). The Federal Character Principle enshrined in Section 14(3) of the 1999 Constitution—intended to ensure equitable representation—has often been violated or applied selectively, leaving the Southeast underrepresented in the federal civil service, armed forces, and revenue allocation (Agbo, 2021).

Resource allocation patterns further demonstrate this imbalance. The Southeast receives one of the lowest shares of federal infrastructure spending despite being a key commercial hub. For instance, while the Niger Delta has benefited from specialized intervention agencies such as the Niger Delta Development Commission (NDDC) and the North enjoys consistent federal investment in agriculture and infrastructure, the Southeast lacks any comparable federal agency dedicated to regional development (Ezeibe & Okonkwo, 2022). The collapse of the regional economic institutions of the First Republic and the subsequent centralization of oil revenues under military rule deprived the Igbo states of fiscal autonomy and productive investment (Ibeanu, 2008). This economic marginalization is compounded by neglect of critical infrastructure such as roads, railways, and airports in Igbo areas, further constraining regional growth.

In essence, Igbo exclusion in political leadership and resource distribution reflects a structural imbalance in Nigeria's federal system. The intersection of ethnic politics, rentier state practices, and historical grievances perpetuates Igbo marginalization in the post-war and contemporary eras. Without institutional reforms to ensure fair representation and equitable resource allocation, the Southeast's political alienation will continue to undermine national unity and democratic legitimacy.

SOCIOECONOMIC INEQUALITIES AND UNDERDEVELOPMENT OF THE SOUTHEAST

The socioeconomic condition of Nigeria's Southeast region continues to reflect the structural legacies of post-war neglect and systemic marginalization. Although the Igbo are widely known for their entrepreneurial dynamism and resilience, the region suffers from chronic underdevelopment, poor infrastructure, limited industrial investment, and federal neglect in capital projects (Anyanwu, 2019). The collapse of the Eastern Region's industrial base during the Civil War and the implementation of punitive post-war economic measures—such as the "twenty pounds policy" and the abandoned property decrees—crippled the region's recovery and set it behind other regions in economic growth (Nnoli, 2008). Successive governments have failed to implement targeted developmental programs comparable to those established in the North (e.g., the Northern Development Corporation) or the Niger Delta (e.g., the NDDC), thereby institutionalizing inequality in federal resource distribution.

Data from Nigeria's National Bureau of Statistics (2021) reveal that Southeast states record among the lowest federal capital allocations and poorest infrastructure indices in the country. Critical transport arteries such as the Enugu–Port Harcourt Expressway and the Onitsha–Owerri Road remain dilapidated despite their importance to national commerce (Ezeibe & Okonkwo, 2022). The region also lacks functional seaports and rail connectivity, forcing Igbo traders to depend on Lagos and Port Harcourt ports for import-export operations—an arrangement that increases business costs and constrains regional competitiveness (Onwudiwe, 2021). Similarly, the absence of major federal industries or government-supported special economic zones in the Southeast has restricted opportunities for employment and industrialization.

This uneven development is further reinforced by skewed patterns of public investment and political patronage. Federal institutions such as refineries, steel complexes, and major universities are disproportionately concentrated in the North and West, leaving the Southeast economically marginalized (Suberu, 2001). Even in periods of economic expansion, the region has not benefitted proportionally from national development plans or foreign direct investment (Afigbo, 2010). The withdrawal of federal attention has forced local actors and diasporic networks to fill the developmental void through private investments, remittances, and community-led initiatives—an indication of both resilience and state failure (Obasi, 2020).

Socioeconomic marginalization also manifests in high youth unemployment, migration, and insecurity. The Southeast records some of the highest rates of outmigration and youth underemployment, which have contributed to the growth of informal economic activities and urban congestion (Ezeani, 2019). The absence of federal social and industrial infrastructure has exacerbated social frustration and contributed to the appeal of secessionist ideologies among unemployed youths. The growing insecurity in the region, including clashes between IPOB affiliates and security forces, further undermines economic activity and discourages investment (Ikeanyibe & Ojukwu, 2020).

In summary, the underdevelopment of the Southeast is not a consequence of natural disadvantage but the result of historical and institutionalized state neglect. The concentration of federal investments elsewhere, combined with the Southeast's lack of strategic political leverage, has perpetuated economic inequality and alienation. Addressing these disparities requires an inclusive development policy that recognizes the need for balanced infrastructural investment, fiscal decentralization, and regional empowerment.

THE DISCOURSE OF NATIONAL RECONCILIATION AND RESTRUCTURING

The persistent sense of exclusion among the Igbo has revived national debates around reconciliation, restructuring, and the reconfiguration of Nigeria's federal system. Since the end of the Civil War, successive governments have rhetorically embraced national unity while avoiding substantive reforms that address structural inequities (Osaghae & Suberu, 2005). The "No Victor, No Vanquished" policy promised reintegration, yet post-war realities—such as discriminatory policies, economic deprivation, and underrepresentation—contradicted its intent (Achebe, 2012). In this context, calls for restructuring have emerged as both a political and moral discourse aimed at restoring equity and justice within the Nigerian federation.

Restructuring debates center on decentralizing power, revising the revenue allocation formula, and granting greater autonomy to the federating units. Advocates argue that true federalism—anchored in fiscal devolution, regional autonomy, and equitable representation—is essential for national reconciliation and stability (Elaigwu, 2007). For the Igbo, restructuring symbolizes both a pathway to self-determination within Nigeria and a remedy to decades of marginalization. Igbo leaders, intellectuals, and organizations such as Ohanaeze Ndigbo have consistently called for a return to regionalism or a constitution that guarantees fair access to political power and economic resources (Ezeani, 2019; Ojukwu, 2021).

However, the restructuring discourse faces resistance from entrenched interests benefiting from the centralized status quo. Political elites in regions advantaged by the current revenue and power structures—especially the North—often perceive restructuring as a threat to their economic and political dominance (Suberu, 2022). Consequently, national conferences and reform committees, including the 2014 National Conference, have produced recommendations for constitutional reforms that remain unimplemented. This inertia reflects the broader crisis of Nigeria's post-colonial federalism, where elite bargains override genuine democratic inclusion (Ikeanyibe & Ojukwu, 2020).

Reconciliation requires more than rhetoric—it demands institutional recognition of historical injustices and deliberate policies for inclusion. Initiatives such as equitable state creation, infrastructural balancing, and inclusive governance frameworks could help heal post-war wounds (Ojukwu, 2021). Moreover, integrating historical truth-telling and memorialization of the Civil War into national consciousness would promote empathy and mutual understanding across ethnic divides (Achebe, 2012). The absence of such acknowledgment perpetuates the psychological dimensions of Igbo marginalization and hinders national integration.

The current wave of agitation for restructuring, therefore, represents both a critique of the failed post-war reconciliation process and a vision for a reimagined Nigeria. For sustainable nation-building, Nigeria must transcend its politics of domination and adopt a constitutional order rooted in equity, justice, and true federalism. Such a transformation is not only necessary for the Southeast's reintegration but also for the stability and unity of the entire federation.

RISE OF NEW FORMS OF IGBO SELF-DETERMINATION MOVEMENTS (E.G., IPOB)

The resurgence of Igbo self-determination movements in the 21st century, particularly the Indigenous People of Biafra (IPOB), reflects deep-rooted grievances over political exclusion, economic marginalization, and historical injustices. While the Biafran secessionist struggle (1967–1970) ended militarily, the underlying issues that fueled it—federal inequality, ethnic discrimination, and the quest for self-determination—persisted (Nwauwa, 2019). IPOB, founded in 2012 under Nnamdi Kanu, emerged as a response to the perceived failure of Nigeria's federal system to ensure justice and inclusion for the Igbo people (Onuoha, 2016). Through mass mobilization, digital activism, and transnational advocacy, IPOB redefined Biafra not merely as a geographic secessionist goal but as a broader political project of identity reclamation and resistance against state marginalization (Ilechukwu & Okolie, 2021).

Unlike the militarized Biafran movement of the 1960s, IPOB employs both nonviolent civil disobedience—such as sit-at-home orders and international lobbying—and rhetorical confrontation with the Nigerian state. Its demands are framed within international legal norms of self-determination and human rights, seeking recognition through global platforms such as the United Nations and the African Union (Okeke & Nwangwu, 2020). However, the federal government's response has been characterized by securitization and repression, designating IPOB as a terrorist organization in 2017, deploying military operations in the Southeast, and arresting IPOB leaders (Amadi & Alumona, 2019). This heavy-handed approach has often escalated tensions, radicalized segments of Igbo youth, and deepened anti-state sentiments.

IPOB's rise also reflects broader generational and technological shifts. The group leverages social media platforms and diaspora networks to construct an alternative Igbo nationalist discourse that bypasses traditional elite mediation (Chukwuemeka, 2022). This decentralized structure allows IPOB to sustain influence across transnational spaces, connecting Igbo diasporas in Europe and North America with local activists in Nigeria. However, critics argue that IPOB's populist rhetoric and confrontational strategies risk alienating other ethnic groups and undermining interregional solidarity (Ikeanyibe & Ojukwu, 2020). Additionally, its confrontations with state institutions have sometimes disrupted economic activity in the Southeast, complicating the socio-political environment for regional development.

The rise of IPOB symbolizes a new phase in Igbo political consciousness—one that fuses historical memory, economic frustration, and global communication technologies. It underscores both the failure of Nigeria's federal integration project and the persistence of unresolved post-war grievances. Unless the Nigerian state addresses the structural causes of Igbo discontent—through dialogue, constitutional reform, and equitable governance—movements like IPOB will continue to challenge the legitimacy of the Nigerian federation.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study critically examined both the historical and contemporary dimensions of Igbo marginalization in post-war Nigeria, identifying the Nigerian Civil War (1967–1970) as a critical turning point that reshaped the political economy and socio-structural dynamics of the federation. Although the federal government declared a "No Victor, No Vanquished" policy to symbolize reconciliation, reconstruction, and reintegration, the implementation of post-war policies revealed deep-seated contradictions. Rather than fostering unity and inclusion, the federal agenda reinforced the marginalization of the defeated Biafran region, particularly the Igbo ethnic group. Policies such as the "Twenty Pounds Policy," which restricted Igbo individuals to a nominal twenty pounds regardless of their pre-war bank savings, severely impaired their post-war economic recovery and disrupted their entrepreneurial base (Achebe, 2012; Afigbo, 1981). This deliberate economic disenfranchisement created long-term structural inequalities that continued to affect the Southeast's capacity to compete economically with other regions.

The abandoned property decrees that followed in states such as Rivers and Cross River further deepened economic dislocation, stripping many Igbos of their homes, lands, and commercial assets. These decrees, framed as administrative measures to stabilize post-war ownership disputes, in reality institutionalized dispossession and exclusion (Nwosu, 2018). The cumulative effect of these economic and legal barriers was the systematic erosion of Igbo wealth, which had been built through decades of mercantile and industrial enterprise prior to the war. Consequently, the Southeast became economically stagnant, lagging behind other regions in federal investment, infrastructure, and industrial development. Federal reconstruction programs disproportionately favored the northern and western regions, reflecting a deliberate political choice to reward wartime allies and consolidate power at the center (Osaghae, 1998; Suberu, 2001).

Under successive military regimes, the centralization of power and control over resources further entrenched regional inequality. The creation of a unitary fiscal structure—anchored in the nationalization of oil resources—shifted economic authority from the federating units to the central government (Siollun, 2009). This shift curtailed the fiscal autonomy of the states and enabled political leaders at the center to manipulate resource allocation for patronage and political loyalty. The Southeast, having limited access to the commanding heights of the military and federal bureaucracy, was systematically excluded from these distributive networks (Elaigwu, 2007). Consequently, state-led development policies became instruments of control rather than equitable growth. Key national infrastructural projects, including ports, refineries, and expressways, were concentrated outside the Southeast, reinforcing the region's economic marginalization and stifling its industrial potential (Ezeibe & Okonkwo, 2022; Onwudiwe, 2021).

In the post-military democratic era, these historical imbalances have persisted, albeit in more subtle forms. Political exclusion remains evident in the consistent underrepresentation of the Igbo in federal leadership positions, including the presidency, top military command, and strategic ministries. Despite Nigeria's federal character principle—which aims to ensure equitable representation—the Southeast has frequently received less than proportional inclusion in federal appointments and budgetary allocations (Afigbo, 2010; Suberu, 2022). The uneven implementation of this principle has entrenched perceptions of systemic bias and deepened mistrust between the Igbo and the Nigerian state.

Economically, the Southeast continues to experience high levels of unemployment, infrastructural decay, and limited federal investment in industrial and energy projects. Key transportation and trade facilities such as seaports, rail networks, and airports remain underdeveloped, compelling Igbo traders and manufacturers to rely on costly import and export channels through Lagos and Port Harcourt (Onuoha, 2016). This economic marginalization has hindered regional competitiveness and intensified migration of Igbo professionals to other parts of Nigeria and the diaspora, further depleting the region's human capital base.

In contemporary times, these structural and political exclusions have fueled the resurgence of Igbo self-determination movements, particularly the Indigenous People of Biafra (IPOB). The rise of IPOB represents a reaction to decades of perceived injustice, unaddressed grievances, and the failure of the Nigerian state to implement genuine reconciliation measures after the war (Ikeanyibe & Ojukwu, 2020; Nwauwa, 2019). The movement's popularity among the youth highlights the generational transmission of marginalization narratives and a growing disillusionment with the promise of Nigerian federalism. The federal government's heavy-handed response—characterized by arrests, proscription, and militarization—has often exacerbated tensions rather than addressing the root causes of alienation (Ilechukwu & Okolie, 2021).

Collectively, the findings underscore a persistent and interlinked pattern of exclusion rooted in the political economy of post-war Nigeria. The combination of historical dispossession, fiscal centralization, and inequitable governance has sustained a structure that privileges certain regions while marginalizing others. The Southeast's developmental stagnation cannot be understood in isolation from the state's deliberate economic and political strategies that emerged after the war. As this study demonstrates, post-war governance frameworks have produced not only material inequalities but also psychological alienation, weakening the sense of national belonging among the Igbo. Therefore, Igbo marginalization remains both an economic and existential question tied to the unresolved contradictions of Nigeria's nation-building project (Osaghae & Suberu, 2005; Ojukwu, 2021).

The legacy of post-war policies continues to define Igbo relations with the Nigerian state. The supposed reconciliation policy after the war failed to translate into substantive inclusion, as the Igbo region faced economic disempowerment, infrastructural decay, and political isolation. The twenty pounds policy, which denied returning Biafrans access to their pre-war savings, crippled post-war recovery and deepened the region's economic vulnerability (Achebe, 2012). Similarly, the abandoned property decrees in Rivers and other states deprived thousands of their assets, entrenching economic dispossession (Afigbo, 1981). Over time, federal projects and resource allocations have been disproportionately directed away from the Southeast, reinforcing the perception of systemic discrimination. These historical injustices are mirrored in the underrepresentation of Igbo elites in national decision-making, the concentration of federal appointments outside the region, and the deliberate neglect of strategic infrastructure such as seaports, railways, and airports (Onwudiwe, 2021; Ezeibe & Okonkwo, 2022). The persistence of these conditions reflects an incomplete post-war reconciliation and an enduring state bias that perpetuates regional grievances.

Addressing the deep-rooted issues of Igbo marginalization requires a deliberate shift towards inclusive governance and equitable resource distribution. True national integration must go beyond symbolic gestures to ensure balanced representation in political appointments, infrastructural development, and economic empowerment. Nigeria's federal character principle—originally designed to promote fairness—has often been implemented selectively, reinforcing rather than reducing ethnic disparities (Afigbo, 2010; Suberu, 2022). The federal government must adopt transparent allocation mechanisms that prioritize need-based development and reduce the concentration of federal projects in favored zones. Furthermore, national healing demands acknowledgment of the historical injustices endured by the Igbo people and the establishment of reconciliation frameworks similar to truth and reconciliation commissions. Such mechanisms would foster dialogue, restore trust, and promote emotional as well as structural reintegration of marginalized groups into the Nigerian project.

Reforming Nigeria's federal structure is essential to reversing the patterns of inequality and alienation rooted in post-war governance. A restructured federalism—anchored on genuine devolution of powers and fiscal autonomy—would empower states and regions to manage their resources and address localized developmental needs (Elaigwu, 2007; Ojukwu, 2021). This approach aligns with calls for political restructuring and regional autonomy, which seek to balance unity with diversity in a multi-ethnic federation. Strengthening state capacity and ensuring proportional representation at the federal level would promote accountability, reduce ethnic tension, and prevent secessionist agitations. Additionally, fostering inter-regional cooperation through inclusive national policies, education, and cultural exchange programs could serve as long-term instruments of reconciliation and nation-building. Ultimately, Nigeria's stability and progress depend on its ability to create a political economy that reflects fairness, inclusiveness, and justice for all constituent nationalities—particularly the Igbo, whose marginalization has remained an unresolved question since the end of the civil war.

REFERENCES

1) Achebe, C. (2012). *There was a country: A personal history of Biafra*. Penguin Press.
2) Afigbo, A. E. (1981). *Ropes of sand: Studies in Igbo history and culture*. University Press.
3) Afigbo, A. E. (2010). *Federal character: Its meaning and history*. Fourth Dimension Publishers.
4) Agbo, J. (2021). Federal character and the politics of representation in Nigeria's Fourth Republic. *Journal of African Studies and Governance*, 6(1), 45–62.
5) Akinola, O. (2011). The rentier state and the development crisis in Nigeria. *African Journal of Political Science and International Relations*, 5(5), 178–187.
6) Akinyemi, B. (1972). *The Organization of African Unity and the Biafran conflict*. Nigerian Institute of International Affairs.
7) Amadi, L., & Alumona, I. M. (2019). Human security, climate change and conflict in Nigeria: The imperative of the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals. *Peace Studies Journal*, 12(1), 27–45.
8) Anyanwu, K. (2019). The political economy of underdevelopment in Nigeria's Southeast. *African Review of Economics and Finance*, 11(2), 1–23.
9) Chukwuemeka, V. (2022). Digital nationalism and separatist movements in Africa: A case study of IPOB and online activism. *African Security Review*, 31(3), 230–248.
10) De St. Jorre, J. (1972). *The Nigerian Civil War*. Hodder & Stoughton.
11) Elaigwu, J. I. (2007). *Federalism and nation-building in Nigeria: The challenges of the twenty-first century*. Aha Publishing.
12) Ezeani, E. (2019). *Biafra, the making of a nation: Nigerian civil war and the quest for self-determination*. Veritas Books.
13) Ezeibe, C. C., & Okonkwo, E. (2022). Infrastructure, governance and regional inequality in Nigeria: Revisiting the Southeast question. *African Journal of Public Policy and Administration*, 8(1), 56–78.
14) Falola, T., & Heaton, M. (2008). *A history of Nigeria*. Cambridge University Press.
15) Gowon, Y. (1970, January 15). *Reconstruction, rehabilitation and reintegration: Post-war speech to the nation*. Federal Government Printer.

16) Heerten, L., & Moses, A. D. (2014). The Nigeria–Biafra war: Postcolonial conflict and the question of genocide. *Journal of Genocide Research*, 16(2–3), 169–203. https://doi.org/10.1080/14623528.2014.936706
17) Ibeanu, O. (2008). Affluence and affliction: The Niger Delta as a critique of political science in Nigeria. *Inaugural Lecture Series No. 1*, University of Nigeria Press.
18) Ibeanu, O., & Luckham, R. (2006). *Niger Delta: Political violence, governance and corporate responsibility in a petro-state*. Centre for Democracy and Development.
19) Ikeanyibe, O. M., & Ojukwu, C. (2020). Ethno-nationalism and the crisis of federalism in Nigeria: Revisiting the Biafra question. *African Studies Quarterly*, 19(3), 45–68.
20) Ilechukwu, L., & Okolie, A. (2021). Separatist movements and the Nigerian state: A study of IPOB and national security. *Journal of Political Inquiry*, 14(1), 1–21.
21) Joseph, R. (1991). *Democracy and prebendal politics in Nigeria: The rise and fall of the Second Republic*. Cambridge University Press.
22) Madiebo, A. (1980). *The Nigerian revolution and the Biafran war*. Fourth Dimension Publishers.
23) Nnoli, O. (2008). *Ethnic politics in Nigeria*. Fourth Dimension Publishers.
24) Nnwankwo, A. (2020). *Nigeria: The challenge of Biafra*. Spectrum Books.
25) Nwauwa, A. (2019). From Biafra to IPOB: Ethnic nationalism in Nigeria and the prospects for a new separatism. *African Journal of History and Culture*, 11(3), 27–41.
26) Nwosu, B. (2018). Political exclusion and the quest for Igbo presidency in Nigeria. *African Journal of Political Science and International Relations*, 12(4), 41–52.
27) Obasi, I. (2020). Igbo diaspora remittances and development: A political economy perspective. *African Development Review*, 32(S1), S120–S133.
28) Okeke, R. C., & Nwangwu, C. (2020). The Indigenous People of Biafra (IPOB) and the crisis of Nigeria's federalism. *African Security Review*, 29(4), 345–362.
29) Okonta, I., & Douglas, O. (2001). *Where vultures feast: Shell, human rights, and oil in the Niger Delta*. Sierra Club Books.
30) Ojukwu, C. (2021). Federalism, restructuring, and the politics of national integration in Nigeria. *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*, 39(5), 611–630.
31) Omotola, J. S. (2007). From OMPADEC to NDDC: An assessment of state responses to environmental insecurity in the Niger Delta, Nigeria. *Africa Today*, 54(1), 73–89.
32) Omodia, S. (2020). Zoning, power rotation, and the politics of inclusion in Nigeria's Fourth Republic. *Review of African Political Economy*, 47(165), 559–573.
33) Onuoha, F. (2016). Challenges of integration and the resurgence of Biafra separatism in Nigeria. *Conflict Trends*, 2016(3), 35–43.
34) Onwudiwe, I. (2021). Economic governance and infrastructural development in Nigeria's Southeast: Revisiting the federal neglect debate. *Nigerian Journal of Social Sciences*, 17(2), 22–39.
35) Osaghae, E. E. (1998). *Crippled giant: Nigeria since independence*. Indiana University Press.
36) Osaghae, E. E., & Suberu, R. T. (2005). A history of identities, violence, and stability in Nigeria. *CRISE Working Paper No. 6*. University of Oxford.
37) Siollun, M. (2009). *Oil, politics and violence: Nigeria's military coup culture (1966–1976)*. Algora Publishing.
38) Stremlau, J. (1977). *The International Politics of the Nigerian Civil War, 1967–1970*. Princeton University Press.
39) Suberu, R. T. (2001). *Federalism and ethnic conflict in Nigeria*. United States Institute of Peace Press.
40) Suberu, R. T. (2022). Federal restructuring and the quest for national integration in Nigeria. *African Affairs*, 121(483), 405–427.
41) Uche, C. U. (2008). Oil, British interests and the Nigerian Civil War. *The Journal of African History*, 49(1), 111–135.
42) Watts, M. (2004). Resource curse? Governmentality, oil and power in the Niger Delta, Nigeria. *Geopolitics*, 9(1), 50–80.
43) Watts, M. (2008). *Curse of the black gold: 50 years of oil in the Niger Delta*. PowerHouse Books.