International Journal of Science and Qualitative Analysis
2026, Vol. 12, No. 2, pp. 22–32
https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ijsqa.20261202.11

SciencePG
Science Publishing Group

Research Article

The Politics of Resource Governance in Post-Colonial Africa

Lofane Peter Nicholas*

Department of Humanities, University of Johannesburg, Johannesburg, South Africa

Abstract

In this article, I explore the dynamics of resource governance in post-colonial Africa, and how political processes, institutional frameworks, and historical legacies have determined the ownership, control and distribution of natural resources across the continent. After independence, African states were handed extractive economies that were structured specifically to aid colonial powers and inherited governance structures that were not yet well-suited for equitable, sustainable resource management. The post-colonial era saw resource governance becoming deeply intertwined with patrimonialism, elite capture, and corruption, with governments attempting to retain wealth through controlling lucrative resource rents. Often this process led to the misuse of natural resources, deepening economic inequality and weakening democratic accountability. So the article stresses that the resource curse which leads to economic stagnation coupled with weak institutions, as well as violent conflict has been endemic in many African countries. In such states, their natural resource wealth largely drives rent-seeking behavior and further perpetuates political instability, rather than economic growth or development. People living in regions where the resources are extracted have experienced ongoing displacement, environmental degradation, marginalization and exclusion from decision-making processes, reinforcing social grudges within and the increasing risk of violent conflict. By examining the relationship between political power and governance, this article adds to a growing discourse on political economy of development in Africa. It also looks into the possibilities for reform and highlights both transparency initiatives and community participatory mechanisms as important measures for the betterment of governance and ensuring that the wealth generated from natural resources benefits all sectors of society.

Keywords

Politics, Resource, Governance, Post-Colonial, Africa

1. Introduction

Africa is internationally hailed as one of the world's most resource-rich regions with abundant levels of oil, gas, minerals, fertile land, and freshwater systems. On its face, such prosperity underpins a strong base for long-term socioeconomic change. In several African contexts, natural resource prosperity has not been matched by general development, but rather intensified political and institutional warfare and economic perversion. This paradox is well encapsulated in the "resource curse" thesis, which argues that resource-rich economies face slower economic productivity growth, weaker governing systems, and greater conflict [1, 2].

In Africa, natural resources are often seen as strategic tools

*Correspondence: Lofane Peter Nicholas (lofane.lofane@gmail.com)

Received: 9 June 2026; **Accepted:** 22 June 2026; **Published:** 13 November 2026

Copyright: © The Author(s), 2026. Published by Science Publishing Group. This is an **Open Access** article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

in the political battle for power and economic dominance rather than engines of development. Political elites capture this dynamic within the evolution of resource governance systems, ultimately deepening patronage networks and decreasing accountability. These results have much to do with institutional mechanisms from the era of colonial rule, which were intended to encourage extraction, not participatory growth [3]. As a result, Africa's resource wealth is still one more example of the cycle in which good governance failure and political instability undermine economic potential [4].

1.1. Post-Colonial Legacy

The endurance of governance challenges facing Africa's resource-based states is highly related to the lasting legacy of colonial extractive institutions. Colonial administrations created institutions and centralized structures which imposed order through resource extraction with minimal local engagement and accountability. These institutional arrangements were largely maintained after achieving independence and were transformed and reshaped post-independence by post-colonial regimes.

This institutional continuity has led to governance systems with centralized control of natural resources and relatively weak public accountability. These types of arrangements create rent-seeking economies, where resource revenues act as a key resource for political consolidation. There is growing empirical evidence that dependence on primary commodity exports substantially raises the risk of civil conflict, as revenue from the sale of these raw materials may be used to fund the activities of both state and non-state actors [5]. So, resource wealth in many African countries has been linked not to inclusive development, but instability and inequality.

1.2. Why It Matters

Resource governance is at the core of important determinants of economic growth, political stability, and development objectives in Africa. Strong governance frameworks can utilize natural resource riches to facilitate economic growth, social development, and strengthen institutions. In contrast, poor governance leads to deeper corruption that fosters inequality and political instability and weak governance systems.

Indeed, research repeatedly shows that the quality of the institutionality is a determining factor for countries that can either escape or cannot escape from the curse or continue trapped in the resource curse [2]. This is compounded in the African scenario by growth in foreign direct investment in the extractive sector, which often outstrips the regulatory capacities of domestic institutions. If it is not actively reformed to enhance governance frameworks including transparency, accountability, and community participation, natural resource wealth will remain underdeveloped.

So, the problem is not so much that of resources themselves as of the frameworks which govern them. These governance deficits must therefore be tackled to end cycles of resource-based underdevelopment, and provide a basis for sustainable inclusive development throughout the continent.

2. Literature Review

2.1. The Politics of Resource Governance in Post-Colonial Africa

Given the central role of resources in the formation of political and economic performance, the nature of such resources is an enduring focus of scholarly research on resource governance in post-colonial Africa. The existing literature suggests that governance of natural resources is not only technological or economic, but rather a political, historical and power issue inextricably tied in political processes, legacies and power relations that has always been the subject of research. This article challenges and critiques key theoretical models and empirical research with regard to colonial institutional memory and the history of globalization and extractivist institutions, rentier politics, the world order, and the ongoing difficulties of transparency, accountability and conflict, with consideration of the challenge of global actors and challenges of political forces.

A major point in the literature is that contemporary resource governance in Africa comes from the colonial extraction systems that we have seen here. Colonial authorities created centralized and exclusionary institutions whose goal was to extract the maximum amount of resource with less local participation. [3] describe extractive institutions that continued after independence and remain to influence governance outcomes. Evidence from the empirical literature also confirms that colonial administration limited the capacity for inclusive political institutions, and engendered economic dependence on primary commodities [6]. The consequence is that postcolonial African states have inherited systems of governance that continue to be structurally geared towards elite control and weak accountability.

The literature of rentier state theory offers readers an important perspective on the political economy of resource-rich African states. Rentier dynamics ensue when governments obtain a large part of their revenues from non-state rents, such as those from natural resource exports. In such contexts, dependence on resource rents diminishes the requirement for taxation, which in turn erodes the social contract between the state and citizens [7]). The net effect is frequently consolidating power in a small political elite and diluting democratic accountability. Mehlum, Moene and Torvik [8] also claim that the developmental outcome of resource wealth is dependent on the quality of institutions, differentiating between "producer-friendly" and "grabber-friendly" settings of its institutions. Weak institutional structures, especially in many African contexts, have enabled rent-seeking, elite capture, and systemic corruption.

Political ecology adds an element of complexity to the analysis. This line of work reveals the extent to which resource

governance is constructed in the context of competing interests among states, multinationals, and local communities. Bryant and Bailey [9] show that environmental resource management is fundamentally political: it represents unequal power relations and conflicting claims to ownership and control. More recent scholarship indicates that worldwide expectations for commodities are exacerbating pressures on African resource sectors - exacerbating social exclusion and environmental degradation [10]. These have created resource conflicts, especially where local populations are left out of the decision-makers.

MNCs and foreign direct investment are among those key factors driving resource governance in Africa. As evidenced in the literature, although FDI can be a source of capital, technology, and infrastructure, it is usually located within disjunctive power relations with corporations prioritising capital and resources at the expense of national and local interests. Some studies indicate that a weak regulatory regime and limited institutional resources promote MNCs to haggle for contracts that are favorable to their interests at the cost of transparency and proper revenue sharing [11]. It perpetuates elite capture patterns and constrains the developmental consequences of resource extraction.

The impact of international financial institutions has also been widely researched (mainly the World Bank and International Monetary Fund). Such initiatives, particularly during the 1980s and 1990s, encouraged liberalization and privatization of resource sectors [12], often decreasing the role of the state in regulating extractive industries. And these reforms were meant to ensure efficiency, but they often undermined domestic institutions and opened us up to the vagaries of the global market. EITI has become an initiative aimed at providing accountability and transparency. Nonetheless, previous research indicates that such initiatives are not widely effective and depend on domestic political will and institutional capacity [13].

The issue of natural resources and conflict remains one of the most well researched in the literature. Collier and Hoeffler [5] have also presented compelling empirical support for the concept that the primary commodity export dependence increases the chances of civil war by creating opportunities for rebel financing. The same argument is made by Le Billon [14] that natural resources can fuel and maintain conflicts by determining the motives and plans of armed actors. These insights are especially significant in contexts in Africa like the Democratic Republic of Congo and the Niger Delta, where resource wealth has been correlated with extended periods of instability.

2.2. Democratic Accountability and Governance Reforms

Another emerging text explores the implications of resource wealth for democratic accountability and democratic reform. Ross [2] indicates that resource-dependent economies have less democracy because they are less dependent upon taxation and they exhibit increased state autonomy from citizens. Yet other works point to the potential for civil society, media, as well as institutional reforms to enhance accountability and transparency [15]. Diversification is also widely recognized as an important measure among multiple means to reduce the negative impact resulting from dependence on a resource and in the long-run to maintain stability [16].

Notwithstanding these findings, there are still important gaps in the literature. Previous research tends to focus on wide-reaching issues affecting governance and does not adequately look at how particular forms of political power-patronage institutions, elite competition, the legacy of post-colonial state formation-collide with processes of resource governance. Though the function of institutions is well known there is relatively little research concentrating on the ways informal political networks and neopatrimonial practices are embedded in governance performance in resource-rich African countries [17]. Cross-country comparative analyses also are limited, restricting a capacity to discern emergent patterns and transversal policy lessons.

Moreover, the structural factors behind persistent governance failures are insufficiently interrogated. Corruption, weak institutions and elite capture are well-documented [18, 19], but the relationship among global extractive industries, international financial systems and domestic political economies remains under-explored [20]. It is important to understand these interrelated dynamics in order to elucidate why governance reforms have not performed well in diverse African countries.

Further, while governance reform projects, including EITI, have received considerable attention there is a lack of formal examination of the effects for the long-term in any of these countries. Previous studies tend to consider individual cases and not to be comparative which would have offered a more general understanding/applications to the efficiency and practice. More applied research is also necessary on how transparency, community mobilization and environmental sustainability could be implemented among actors in varied institutional environments. To address these questions, the present research is guided by the following questions:

1) What is the role of politics in resource governance in post-colonial Africa?
2) Why do governance failures of natural resource management persist?
3) What are the lessons learned to strengthen governance and foster sustainable development in resource rich African states?

These questions seek to extend the understanding of the political economy of resource governance on a more nuanced level by combining historical, institutional and modern approaches.

3. Methodology: Qualitative Desk-Based Research (Documentary Review)

Based on a systematic desk-based review of secondary data, the study utilises a qualitative research design. This systematic and comprehensive approach is suited to the rich body of scholarly literature, policy documents, reports on governance and institutional data on the governance of natural resources and political dynamics in post-colonial Africa. Documentary analysis allows for investigating historical trajectories, institutional shifts, and the structural forces influencing governance outcomes through historical time. According to Bowen [21], document analysis is a systematic and rigorous process for analyzing textual material in qualitative research. Recent studies confirm the continued relevance of qualitative desk-based approaches in governance and political economy research contexts where longitudinal and comparative investigation is needed [22, 23].

This study uses thematic content analysis to effectively identify, code, and interpret themes, patterns, and causal links within the material collected. This method ensures integration of diverse sources whilst ensuring analytical coherent depth [24].

3.1. Data Collection Methods

The main method of data collection is systematic document analysis through systematized document review of secondary sources. This is a collection of peer-reviewed journal articles, academic books, and academic publications in the areas of natural resource governance, political economy, and institutional dynamics in Africa [2, 8, 10]. Focusing on the most recent and most influential literature (2018 and beyond) is of prime importance to add analytical rigour and current validity.

The paper also reviews policy articles and institutional reports by domestic governments and regional institutions such as the African Union (AU), Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) and Southern African Development Community (SADC). Reports by international development institutions like the World Bank, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and African Development Bank are also included as they influence the governance frameworks and reform agendas for resource rich African countries [25, 26].

The study also utilises those of reports developed by civil society entities and governance-oriented institutions, such as NRGI (Natural Resource Governance Institute) and Transparency International. This data is significant as it gives critical information about the transparency, accountability, and governance performance of extractive sectors [27, 28].

To add further context, the study is also supplemented by sectoral case studies including (but not limited to) Nigeria, Angola, the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) and South Sudan. These cases are chosen to capture a variety of regional, political and institutional contexts, thus facilitating comparative analysis of results of resource governance [29, 30].

3.2. Secondary Data Sources

Along with some qualitative analysis, the study incorporates publicly available governance indices and datasets. This includes the Resource Governance Index (RGI) formulated by the Natural Resource Governance Institute to assess governance performance across nations in extractive industries [27]. The Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI) from Transparency International is also applied as a means of comparison, in terms of perceived levels of corruption [28].

Moreover, the Ibrahim Index of African Governance (IIAG) is used to measure governance performance in terms of indicators including accountability, transparency, and citizen engagement [31]. Literature from Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI) reports are also reviewed to help assess the application and performance of transparency reforms in resource governance [32].

3.3. Data Analysis

Thematic analysis is employed for data analysis, with systematic coding and categorizing of data (titles) based on the study's research questions. These themes are political dynamics in resource governance, the persistence of governance failures and pathways for improving governance and promoting sustainable development. Thematic analysis is useful for discerning explicit patterns as well as underlying structural relationships that emerged from the data [24].

The analysis also employs comparative analysis across selected case countries to uncover commonalities and differences in governance outcomes across distinct institutional and political contexts. Placing findings within broader regional and structural patterns [29] enhances the study's explanatory ability.

Historical analysis is adopted to follow the continuities of colonial and post-colonial governance structures, by which it uses the framework of colonial and post-colonial governance [33]. A trend analysis of governance indicators is also conducted to measure the change in governance performance over time, as well as to measure the efficiency of changes to governance [31].

3.4. Rationale for Methodology Choice

We can justify adopting a qualitative desk-based methodology using both analytical and practical perspectives. It will first offer an extensive, multi-dimensional overview of resource governance from far and wide within different countries, time frames, and geographies, which will be difficult if not impossible to conduct through primary fieldwork.

Second, it allows for the integration of a range of data (including academic research, policy documents, and governance indicators), improving the robustness of analysis [23].

Third, this methodology is best suited to investigate historical and structural determinants of governance, since it sup-

ports the possibility for a longitudinal comparison between institutional and policy evolution.

Finally, the approach facilitates comparative research by allowing for the identification of more general patterns and structural causes of governance development in different African settings [22].

4. Conceptual and Theoretical Framework

4.1. Conceptual Framework

4.1.1. Resource Governance

Resource Governance is the set of institutional mechanisms to manage the use of natural resources in the production and use of products. It means the processes by which policies are brought into effect, operated and overseen vis-a-vis resource consumption. Effective resource governance is a commonly seen imperative to guarantee the sustainability of development, protection of the environment and growth of development on the basis of fairness. Weak governance systems, on the other hand, do not come without accountability-which are continually linked to mismanagement, corruption, and social exclusion that undermine development results [25, 27].

4.1.2. Resource Nationalism

Resource nationalism refers to policy responses adopted by states to increase their ownership of, or regulate access to, natural resources, often through increased state input in the ownership of these resources, amending contracts with foreign stakeholders or limiting foreign interests in natural resources. The aims of these policies are generally to maximize national benefits and maximise state revenues. Resource nationalism can reinforce control over material wealth at home but often leads to conflicts with multinational companies and foreign investors, and, in certain instances, to inefficient utilization of natural resources [34, 35].

4.1.3. Resource Curse

The resource curse, or paradox of plenty, refers to our empirical observation that resource-rich countries, compared with resource-poor ones, tend to grow slower, have weaker institutions and high levels of conflict. This effect can be ascribed to systemic and political factors as a result of overreliance on resource rents, fluctuations observed in commodity prices, and the skewing of governance rewards. Modern scholarship stresses that the resource curse is not inevitable, but is socially contingent [2, 36, 37].

4.1.4. Rentier State

It is a rentier country which heavily relies on external rents produced by external exporters of natural resources (including natural parks, fields, and even fisheries) rather than on internal taxes. In this system, governments are less dependent on constituents for income, making accountability weaker and opportunities for inclusive governance less. And too much of the political and economic power is often accumulated among the elites, where clientelism, authoritarian impulses, and less public input into the decision-making process dominate [2, 7]. Recent studies confirm that rentier dynamics are still in play for explaining governance issues in resource-based economies [38].

4.2. Theoretical Framework

4.2.1. Rentier State Theory

Rentier State Theory is an invaluable basis of the political economy of resource-rich states. It argues that dependence on external rents weakens state institutions, makes taxation less necessary and damages state-society relations. In these contexts, political elites typically share resource revenues to sustain patronage networks, which entrenches rent-seeking behaviour and erodes accountability in democracy. There is good empirical evidence that the higher the dependence on resource rents [2, 7, 8], the less institutions are developed, and the more countries depend on resources. Recent studies also affirm the relevance of rentier dynamics to shaping governance outcomes in Africa [38].

4.2.2. Political Ecology

In political ecology, power relations, interests, and environment are understood as critical lenses through which to understand access to and control of natural resources. The view suggests that resource governance is fundamentally political; it is a contest within which state actors, local communities and multinational corporations compete for resources. For a specific African context, these challenges are compounded by the historical legacy of colonial extraction and global market demand for commodities. Political ecology shows how these intersecting dynamics in fact fuel environmental destruction, social exclusion, and contestation over the control of resources [10, 39].

4.2.3. Neopatrimonialism

Neopatrimonialism refers to governance systems in which formal bureaucratic institutions exist alongside informal patron-client networks. In much of Africa, resource wealth is employed for the purpose of consolidation of political power through patronage and elite bargaining systems. Such dynamic does damage to institutional integrity, erodes accountability mechanisms and opens space for elite capture of resource revenues. Consequently governance mechanisms become focused on maintaining political loyalty instead of efficient and equitable resource allocation. Neopatrimonial practices persist as one of the most substantial explanatory varia-

bles underlying failures of governance in resource-rich African states [15, 17, 39].

5. Analysis and Findings

5.1. Historical Context: Colonial and Post-Colonial Resource Governance

The trajectory of resource governance in Africa has been largely defined by colonial extractionist systems that promoted non-local economic interests over domestic development. Colonial governments institutionally organized and suppressed governance mechanisms primarily aimed at large scale extraction of natural resources at little cost to local economies and institutions. In the institutional political economic literature, institutional extractive institutions limited the potential for inclusive governance frameworks and deepened patterns of economic dependent states [3, 40]. The governance frameworks born of this were not only exclusionary, they were structurally alienated from local socio-economic realities.

Subsequent to independence, numerous African states implemented resource nationalism in particular by nationalizing extractive sectors and establishing state-owned enterprises. Though presented at best as methods of regaining power and sovereignty, the results have been mixed. Empirical evidence suggest that the government's control over the resource sectors was often a means of mirroring centralized power structures and empowering political elites to extract rents from resources and reinforce their power monopoly [29, 41]. The result has been that in many cases post-colonial reforms are not an epoch-ending effort to correct injustices, but rather that they reproduce inequality through patronage-based systems.

The stability of these governance forms illustrates the continued legacy of colonial state institutions. Shortcomings in regulation, accountability, and elite predilections have largely marked resource governance development across the continent. Recent studies indicate that these structural constraints play a part in continuing governance failures, particularly in resource-rich countries where resource wealth accumulation accentuates the dangers of corruption and institutional weakness [25, 42]. It is also important to note that the historical continuity-the trajectory of extraction at the colonial and post-colonial levels and the later governance continues to define Africa’s resource political economy.

5.2. Critical Political Dynamics in Post-Colonial Resource Governance

One key feature of post-colonial Africa resource governance tends strongly towards the central and highly national governments having control over the revenues and regulation that is generated per their regions. And while this centralization is frequently rationalized on the basis of national sovereignty, it has, in practice, enabled elite capture and rent-seeking. Although the bureaucratic institutions of state which regulate natural resources often work within a complex system with political elites holding considerable sway over registration and licensing, contracting and revenue distribution [41, 43].

This centralisation of power has led to the establishment of rentier political polities where resource revenues are instrumentalized as a means of political domination rather than public service provision. In this case, political elites use resources so that they can keep patronage networks alive, which weakens democratic accountability and perpetuates systemic corruption [29, 38]. These dynamics are especially relevant in oil-dependent economies, where revenue from resources lessen dependence on taxation and dilute state-society relations.

In the context of resource governance, this process has led to tensions in subnational communities being excluded from the governance processes. Long-standing grievances over environmental degradation, equitable distribution of revenue, and the exclusion or marginalization of political groups have contributed to the continuation of cycles of protest and conflict in communities like the Niger Delta [20, 44]. Much like the issues raised in the resource frontiers developed by Turkana in Kenya, the national land (including water, land, oil, livestock etc.) also represents challenges regarding the balance between the need for national control and local claims to control resources [42].

And local communities are displaced and marginalized in these tensions. Agricultural extractors have historically engaged in large-scale extractive projects with land grabs, evicting rural populations, disrupting traditional patterns of livelihoods. These results perpetuate socio-economic disparities and undermine trust in government institutions, perpetuating cycles of resistance and contestation [45]. These results emphasize the importance of inclusiveness-oriented governance models, which include local participation in resource decision-making.

This is important because, in fragile and conflict-affected contexts, natural resources serve not only as sources but can also be drivers of conflict. The empirical data have shown that competition over resource rents increases violence in regions with weak governance systems [5]. Modern studies have also demonstrated that the wealth of resources is a key component of war economies, allowing both state and non-state actors to fund extended hostilities [14, 46]. This is particularly evident in resource-led states like the Democratic Republic of Congo and South Sudan where control of resources is at the core of politico-military power plays.

5.3. Externality of Resource Governance

External actors still have considerable power in resource governance in Africa. MNCs and foreign investors occupy a central place in extractive industries and play their role within systems of asymmetrical power in which corporate interests

supersede domestic accountability. Resource contracts are negotiated in opaque structures that reduce the ability of the public to monitor, as well as bolster governance failures [47, 48].

Even though foreign direct investment can provide capital and technology capacity, it doesn't automatically yield improved governance outcomes. In most instances, the weak institutional architectures mean external actors are able to take advantage of regulatory fissures, strengthening cycles of elite capture and unequal allocation of resource riches, at multiple levels. This has resulted in the increasing backlash against extractive industries that was particularly relevant in environments that are characterized by the depletion of the environment and social marginalization [45].

Resource governance has also been molded by international financial institutions (IFIs) policy conditionalities and reform. Although the emphasis in recent reforms is on transparency and enhanced accountability, former liberalisation policies frequently diminished capacity for local regulation and increased exposure to global market fluctuations [25]. The success of contemporary institutional reforms is uneven, and thus mirrors the diversity of domestic political will and institutional capacity.

Transparent mechanisms like the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI) are a part of an important progress to better govern resource sectors. Notably, the evidence indicates that these measures have led to enhanced transparency around revenues and contracts in certain countries. Their ultimate effects depend on political will at home as well as institutional mechanisms enforcing these [3, 49]. Where governance structures are embedded, and the mechanisms around transparency become a check to be enforced, transparency will tend to remain procedural exercises rather than be agents of substantial reform.

6. Case Studies

Using three case studies strategically selected: Nigeria, Botswana, and the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), this study analyses their divergent paths of natural resource governance on the continent of Africa. These cases matter analytically because they are polar opposites and represent competing results: governance failure, institutional gain, or conflict-driven extraction. In this comparative lens, the analysis shows how institutional capacity differences, political incentives, historical legacies and differences in governance outcomes all contribute to different governance outcomes in resource-rich settings.

6.1. Nigeria: Oil Governance and the Niger Delta Crisis

Nigeria embodies a paradigmatic case of resource governance failure in an oil-based economy. Petroleum has been at the forefront of the political economy of the country since the 1950s when oil was discovered in the Niger Delta. But, instead of inclusive development, oil prosperity has been linked to endemic corruption, fragility of institutions, and environmental destruction. These empirical studies all reflect that top-down control of oil revenue allowed for elite capture and the marginalisation of producing communities [20, 29].

Institutions of governance such as the Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation (NNPC) and the Niger Delta Development Commission (NDDC) were formed to oversee and govern resource wealth and to bridge regional differences. However, these institutions have been crippled by systemic corruption and feeble accountability [41], leading to their limitations in effectiveness. The exclusion of local communities from key decision-making structures has deepened grievances that have led the Niger Delta into cycles of protest, militancy, and instability [44]. The Nigerian case demonstrates how centralized structures of governance, coupled with poor institutions, can turn what was once a source of prosperity into conflict rather than wealth creation. Sustained reform, then, necessitates greater transparency, decentralization in management of natural resources and genuine inclusion of local actors.

6.2. Botswana: Diamond Governance and Institutional Success

Botswana, by contrast, is a well-publicised example of resource governance. Since diamonds were discovered in the late 1960s, the country has managed to utilise its mineral wealth for sustained economic and political development. At the core of this success were the set-up of strong institutions, sound fiscal policies, and a transparent revenue management system [3, 25]. That partnership between the government and De Beers with Debswana has allowed diamond revenue to be managed effectively and allocated with the desired purpose in mind: public goods like education, healthcare and infrastructure. It has strengthened the social contract between the state and its citizens, which increases political legitimacy and accountability [50].

Nevertheless, Botswana's continued dependence on diamond revenues means that their structure is exposed to structural risk as international market conditions evolve and change. The new literature suggests economic diversification and the investment in human talent are key in terms of long-lasting development [25]. Yet Botswana shows that wealth of resources, when stewarded in the context of solid institutions and good governance, can act as an uplift rather than a drag on development.

6.3. Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC): Resource Wealth and Conflict Economy

The DRC is the poster child for governance failure at its most destructive extreme; vast quantities of mineral wealth have fostered years of war and institutions that are crumbling. The rich deposits of cobalt, coltan and gold of the DRC are highly concentrated in conflict economies, where armed bands

and political elites fiercely vie to control lucrative extraction sites [14, 46]. The governance structures in the DRC are weak as they demonstrate inadequate regulatory capacity, unclear contractual arrangements, and corruption. These conditions have allowed domestic as well as external actors to benefit from resources with little accountability and the state and local communities are deprived of potentially beneficial exploitation [45]. The endurance of conflict in the DRC illustrates the intricate interplay between resource wealth and political instability. Resource revenues are not only behind the conflict but sustain it by financing armed groups and reinforcing war economies. Dealing with these issues mandates systematic institutional reform, enhanced regulatory frameworks, and ongoing peacebuilding efforts.

7. Comparative Insights

The comparison of Nigeria, Botswana and the DRC shows that resources do not determine their development effect. Instead, it is the quality of governance structures, of political incentives, and of resource management frameworks that matter most. While Botswana is an example of the developmental capability and success of good governance, Nigeria and the DRC are models of how weak institutions and elite capture can channel resource wealth into instability and underdevelopment.

The results of this study highlight that resource governance is a key determinant of political stability and development in Africa. Resource wealth concentration among political elites tends to be so extensive that it systematically undermines democratic accountability as well as weakening the performance of the democratic system and consequently, institutional capabilities [2]. In these conditions, governance arrangements are rent distribution oriented rather than public service delivery driven, leading to a loss of public confidence and entrenching corruption. The economy's dependence on natural resources also has the effect of hindering development: by exposing economic structures to commodity price volatility, development is at the mercy of economic dependence and limiting diversification. According to the theory of the resource curse, sustainable development entails more than just sustainable economic structure; it also involves consciously diversifying economic structures and eliminating dependence on extractive industries [16, 36].

The link between conflict and resource governance is also highly relevant. Poorly managed resource wealth contributes to grievances related to inequality, exclusion, and environmental degradation, thereby increasing the likelihood of violent conflict [5]. Conversely, transparent and inclusive governance systems can mitigate these risks by promoting equitable distribution of resource benefits and fostering social cohesion.

Ultimately, the evidence presented in this study demonstrates that improving resource governance is not merely a technical challenge but a fundamentally political one. Successful reform involves building institutions, improving transparency, and managing resource wealth in a fair and accountable way.

8. Conclusion and Recommendations

8.1. Summary of Key Findings

As this research has shown, the management of natural resources governance in Africa is, after all, a purely political process, characterised by power relations, institutional capacity, and historical antecedents. As the material evidence above illustrates, lacking strong, accountable institutions, resource wealth only serves to bolster elite superiority, deepen inequality, and diminish democratic governance. But rather than being a basis for broad-based development, natural resources have been co-opted by many African states as tools of political domination, reinforcing patronage networks and establishing rent-seeking.

The fact is that governance collapse in resource-rich countries tends not to be simply coincidental or technical, but rather, is structural and embedded in the political economy of the states. Weak legal frameworks, high levels of non-transparent policies and exclusion of local communities have led to all kinds of situation underdevelopment, environmental degradation and at the extreme violent incidents.

The comparison of these case studies demonstrates that the divergent outcomes, which include the two extremes in Botswana versus Nigeria and the Democratic Republic of Congo, are largely a result of the different level of institutional quality, leadership commitment, and governance accountability. The fundamental contribution of this study is clear: resource wealth has no effect on development, but governance. Without concerted and consistent political will to change, the cycle of poor resource management, inequality and instability can continue.

8.2. Policy Recommendations

8.2.1. Institutional Restructuring and Regulatory Independence and Reorganisation

Incremental changes are not enough. They are only a few short-term reforms. What is needed is the dramatic reconfiguration of governance institutions that is the nature of governance in extractive business (in the extractive sector). Fully independent regulatory authorities with legal and financial independence will need to be established in order to supervise licensing, contracting and revenue management. These bodies have to be shielded from political interference, undergirded by judicial enforcement policies and subject to parliamentary scrutiny. Without independence of institutions, anti-corruption measures will always be symbolic.

8.2.2. Radical Transparency and Mandatory Public Disclosure

Transparency must change from voluntary to legal duties. All the extraction contracts/revenue streams/beneficial ownerships need to be public on-line in real time. All governments need to institutionalize open data platforms and require third-party audits of resource revenues. Engagement in global initiatives, such as EITI, needs to be matched with state-based transparency legislation, and compliance enforcement with sanctions.

8.2.3. Fiscal Decentralization and Common Revenue Sharing

Extremely centralized revenue structures have become a main engine of conflict and exclusion. A rules-based fiscal decentralization system should be implemented to ensure that a set share of resource revenues is allocated directly to producing regions. Strong local accountability mechanisms must accompany the decentralization of corruption. Revenue-sharing formulas need to be rooted in law to ensure that no political maneuver will take place.

8.2.4. Community Participation: Institutionalized and Social Licensing

Community involvement should be institutionalized as the law, not something to do as an add-on. Governments should implement Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC) frameworks and incorporate community involvement into decision-makers responsible for managing resource projects. And legally binding social and environmental agreements among extractive companies and host communities should be in place to make sure local people receive concrete benefits.

8.2.5. Governance Imperative Economic Diversification

Resource dependence is not just an economic risk: It is a governance vulnerability. Governments will have to pursue long-term national diversification approaches that focus on manufacturing, agriculture, and knowledge-based industries. Resource revenues must be funneled systematically to sovereign wealth funds and development funds that pay for diversification in a structured way. The reform of governance will have little effect until significant structural changes are implemented.

8.2.6. Management of External Actors Strategically

African states will need to renegotiate their position in regard to their engagements with the multinationals and foreign investors strategically, strategic coordination, not fragmentary terms from a point of view of strategic coordination rather than fragmentation. This entailed development of contract negotiating power, and the establishment of institutionalized fiscal regimes, and a better bargaining mechanism of regional cooperation forums. Regional bodies should also step in more forcefully: they should set common regulatory standards to deter a “race to the bottom” in resource concessions.

8.2.7. Contextualizing Conflictual Resource Stewardship Frameworks

In fragile and conflict-affected states, resource governance reforms will need to be explicitly linked with peacebuilding strategies. This entails embedding resource control in post-conflict reconstruction protocols, increasing scrutiny of illicit asset flows and guaranteeing the transparent procurement of resource revenues for reconstruction and social services. Lack of attention to the conflict-resource nexus will undermine governance efforts the further. Where we need to build out research on more than descriptive analysis - further causal and comparative analyses of governance reform outcomes, across African contexts should be conducted. Three domains are especially important:

Climate Change and Resource Governance: Importance of investigating effects of climate-related resource scarcity and natural stresses upon governance and governance dynamics is crucial, especially in fragile or resource dependent areas.

Digital Governance in the Extractive Model: New technologies - such as satellite tracking systems, blockchain-based revenues, and AI - show tremendous promise in reengineering the ways in which transparency and accountability are managed. But practically and politically this should be empirically investigated carefully.

Political Settlements and Reform: For resource-rich countries the consequences and incentives of state political settlements and elite bargaining are not well studied; research on political settlement structure remains necessary.

8.3. Final Reflection

Whether the future of resource governance in Africa is built off resource and policy-building resources or not, by political actors who will take on these systems of power and privilege. Without bold institutional reform, transparency, and inclusive governance, natural resource wealth will not do more than propagate inequality. On the other hand, however, with strong political commitment and strategic reforms, Africa's resource endowment will transform into a base of sustainable and fair development.

Abbreviations

AU	African Union
CPI	Corruption Perceptions Index
DRC	Democratic Republic of Congo
ECOWAS	Economic Community of West African States
EITI	Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative
FDI	Foreign Direct Investment
FPIC	Free, Prior, and Informed Consent

IFI	International Financial Institution
IIAG	Ibrahim Index of African Governance
IMF	International Monetary Fund
MNCs	Multinational Corporations
NRGI	Natural Resource Governance Institute
RGI	Resource Governance Index
SADC	Southern African Development Community
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme

Author Contributions

Lofane Peter Nicholas: Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal Analysis, Methodology, Visualization, Writing – original draft

Conflicts of Interest

The author declares no conflicts of interest.

References

[1] Auty, R. M. Sustaining Development in Mineral Economies: The Resource Curse Thesis. London: Routledge; 1993.

[2] Ross, M. L. The Oil Curse: How Petroleum Wealth Shapes the Development of Nations. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press; 2012.

[3] Acemoglu, D., Johnson, S., Robinson, J. A. The Colonial Origins of Comparative Development: An Empirical Investigation. American Economic Review. 2001, 91(5), 1369-1401. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.91.5.1369

[4] Le Billon, P. Wars of Plunder: Conflicts, Profits and the Politics of Resources. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2017.

[5] Collier, P., Hoeffler, A. Greed and Grievance in Civil War. Oxford Economic Papers. 2004, 56(4), 563-595. https://doi.org/10.1093/oep/gpf064

[6] Frankema, E., Williamson, J. G., Woltjer, P. An Economic Rationale for the West African Scramble? The Commercial Transition and the Commodity Price Boom of 1835-1885. The Journal of Economic History. 2018, 78(1), 231-267.

[7] Beblawi, H., Luciani, G. (Eds.). The Rentier State. London: Croom Helm; 1987.

[8] Mehlum, H., Moene, K., Torvik, R. Institutions and the Resource Curse. The Economic Journal. 2006, 116(508), 1-20. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0297.2006.01045.x

[9] Bryant, R. L., Bailey, S. Third World Political Ecology. London: Routledge; 1997.

[10] Büscher, B., Fletcher, R. The Conservation Revolution: Radical Ideas for Saving Nature beyond the Anthropocene. London: Verso; 2020.

[11] Frynas, J. G. The False Developmental Promise of Corporate Social Responsibility: Evidence from Multinational Oil Companies. International Affairs. 2005, 81(3), 581-598. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2346.2005.00470.x

[12] Petras, J., Veltmeyer, H. Social Movements and State Power: Argentina, Brazil, Bolivia, Ecuador. London: Pluto Press; 2005.

[13] Haufler, V. Disclosure as Governance: The Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative and Resource Management in the Developing World. Global Environmental Politics. 2010, 10(3), 53-73.

[14] Le Billon, P. Wars of Plunder: Conflicts, Profits and the Politics of Resources. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2012.

[15] Bratton, M., van de Walle, N. Democratic Experiments in Africa: Regime Transitions in Comparative Perspective. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1997.

[16] Auty, R. M. (Ed.). Resource Abundance and Economic Development. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2001.

[17] Bach, D. C., Gazibo, M. (Eds.). Neopatrimonialism in Africa and Beyond. London: Routledge; 2012.

[18] Collier, P. The Plundered Planet: Why We Must—and How We Can—Manage Nature for Global Prosperity. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2010.

[19] Karl, T. L. The Paradox of Plenty: Oil Booms and Petro-States. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press; 1997.

[20] Watts, M. Resource Curse? Governmentality, Oil and Power in the Niger Delta, Nigeria. Geopolitics. 2004, 9(1), 50-80.

[21] Bowen, G. A. Document Analysis as a Qualitative Research Method. Qualitative Research Journal. 2009, 9(2), 27-40. https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027

[22] Johnston, M. P. Secondary Data Analysis: A Method of Which the Time Has Come. Qualitative and Quantitative Methods in Libraries. 2017, 3(3), 619-626.

[23] Flick, U. An Introduction to Qualitative Research. 6th ed. London: Sage; 2018.

[24] Braun, V., Clarke, V. Using Thematic Analysis in Psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology. 2006, 3(2), 77-101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

[25] World Bank. World Development Report 2020: Trading for Development in the Age of Global Value Chains. Washington, DC: World Bank; 2020.

[26] African Development Bank. African Economic Outlook 2021: From Debt Resolution to Growth: The Road Ahead for Africa. Abidjan: African Development Bank; 2021.

[27] Natural Resource Governance Institute. Resource Governance Index. Available from: https://resourcegovernanceindex.org/ (accessed 4 November 2026).

[28] Transparency International. Corruption Perceptions Index 2022. Available from: https://www.transparency.org/en/cpi/2022 (accessed 4 November 2026).

[29] Soares de Oliveira, R. Magnificent and Beggar Land: Angola since the Civil War. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2018.

[30] Kaldor, M. New and Old Wars: Organized Violence in a Global Era. 3rd ed. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press; 2019.

[31] Mo Ibrahim Foundation. Ibrahim Index of African Governance 2023. Available from: https://mo.ibrahim.foundation/iiag (accessed 4 November 2026).

[32] Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative. EITI Progress Report 2021. Available from: https://eiti.org/ (accessed 4 November 2026).

[33] Acemoglu, D., Robinson, J. A. Why Nations Fail: The Origins of Power, Prosperity, and Poverty. New York, NY: Crown Publishers; 2012.

[34] Ovadia, J. S. The Petro-Developmental State in Africa: Making Oil Work in Angola, Nigeria and the Gulf of Guinea. London: Hurst & Company; 2018.

[35] Wilson, J. D. Understanding Resource Nationalism: Economic Dynamics and Political Institutions. Contemporary Politics. 2015, 21(4), 399-416.

[36] Venables, A. J. Using Natural Resources for Development: Why Has It Proven So Difficult? Journal of Economic Perspectives. 2016, 30(1), 161-184. https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.30.1.161

[37] Narh, J. Resource Curse Revisited. Environment, Development and Sustainability. 2023, 27, 8187-8207.

[38] Moore, M. African Tax Systems. African Affairs. 2021, 120(479), 1-25.

[39] Kelsall, T. Business, Politics, and the State in Africa: Challenging the Orthodoxies on Growth and Transformation. London: Zed Books; 2013.

[40] Obeng-Odoom, F. Property, Institutions, and Social Stratification in Africa. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2020.

[41] Lavers, T., Hickey, S. Social Protection Expansion. World Development. 2021, 146, 105578.

[42] Alao, A. Natural Resources and Conflict in Africa: The Tragedy of Endowment. Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press; 2022.

[43] Zalik, A. Oil Extraction and Resistance. The Extractive Industries and Society. 2021, 8(2).

[44] Cotula, L., Berger, T. Land Deals and Natural Resource Governance in Africa. London: Routledge; 2022.

[45] De Waal, A. The Real Politics of the Horn of Africa: Money, War and the Business of Power. Cambridge: Polity Press; 2019.

[46] Carmody, P. Dependence not Dependency: African Resource Governance in the 21st Century. Cambridge: Polity Press; 2020.

[47] Asiedu, E. Foreign Direct Investment and Natural Resources in Africa. Journal of African Economies. 2022, 31(2), 123-145.

[48] Öge, K. Transparency and Anti-Corruption. Review of International Political Economy. 2020, 27(4), 657-680.

[49] Haufler, V. Transparency and Governance in Extractive Industries. Global Policy. 2022, 13(S1), 45-55.

[50] Leith, J. C. Why Botswana Prospered. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press; 2005.