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ABSTRACT

This thesis investigates the New Partnership for Africa’s Development (Nepad) in order to engage debates about neoliberalism in African development policy. In identifying limitations with commentaries of Nepad and pervasive narratives of neoliberalisation, I employ an analytic of governmentality to reinterpret neoliberalisation as the governmental re-management of populations into societies of free, entrepreneurial, self-regulating subjects. Firstly, I investigate how Nepad makes Africa knowable and amenable to technical intervention in the form of “development”, particularly drawing attention to how the African subject is understood and the intimacy between technical solutions and expert diagnosis. Secondly, I explore four initiatives and techniques that attempt to render these rationalities reality. The conclusions elucidate how neoliberalism ought not to be understood as a monolithic, unrolling totality that simply implants itself through coercive power relations, but rather is comprised of a patchwork of rationalities, knowledges and discourses and given effect through prosaic governing practices.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Synopsis

Neoliberalism is often characterised by policies that deregulate and expand markets, instil fiscal control and encourage the unfettered expansion of free trade. Underpinning these policy decisions is an importance attributed to the capacity of the individual to make decisions free from government intervention, the respect for private property over public ownership, the claim that free markets efficiently and democratically distribute knowledge and resources (and thus maximise human welfare) and the emphasis on individual liberty as a means to maximise moral worth. The market is understood to be, in all respects, neutral and its effective functioning demands minimum state machinery. Such a political philosophy has arguably dominated politics and economics since the crises of the 1970s, which saw the subsequent emergence of Reagan and Thatcher eras in the North Atlantic and the breakdown of Keynesianism hegemony and the Fordist compromise. The concept of neoliberalism, as the dominant contemporary paradigm, has been central in much geographical work ranging from studies of state restructuring (Peck, 2001), city governance (Brenner and Theodore, 2002), environmental policy (McCarthy and Prudham, 2004; Igoe and Brockington, 2007), welfare reform (Peck and Theodore, 2001), and even critiques of the academy itself (Larner and LeHeron, 2005).

Whilst such reforms often originated in ‘the west’, it is as a development model that neoliberalism has been most controversial, manifesting itself most vehemently in the context of structural adjustment programmes (SAPs) during the 1980s and 1990s that were pioneered and imposed by the ‘unholy trinity’ (Peet, 2003) of neoliberalism: the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Trade Organisation (WTO). The consequences of these programmes in Africa have explicitly highlighted the tenuous capacity of this free-market and individualist model to fulfil its promised goals of economic growth and human development, let alone in an equitable, sustainable and democratic manner. As has been widely documented, the post-adjustment period bore witness to collapsing commodity prices (Loxley, 1990; Sahn et al., 1996), cuts in public provisioning such as basic healthcare (Marshall, 1990; Riddell, 1992), increases in wealth disparity (Crisp and Kelly, 1999) and increased vulnerability to environmental risks (Marquette, 1997; Kessler and Dorp, 1998). Yet, despite these undisputed failures, policies that are arguably “neoliberal” in disposition, although seemingly less ‘imposed’ than SAPs, remain salient in development thinking.
Indeed, the most recent offering of African development initiatives, the New Partnership for Africa’s Development (Nepad) signed in 2001, has been labelled as such an example (Bond, 2002, 2005; Melber, 2002).

Whilst providing an impassioned critique that is seductive in its teleological narrative of exploitation and dominance, the analysis of neoliberalism as presented by Nepad’s critics is found wanting. These critics (and it is notable that most accounts have been critical rather than celebratory) frequently confuse neoliberalism as both a cause and an effect, as a coherent, largely immutable and easily identifiable ideology, and particularly as an externally imposed set of policies. Their perception of neoliberalism possesses an internal logic that is inseparable from the ‘logic of capital’ and sets up false dichotomies between state and market, individualism and collectivism and, particularly, left and right. To treat neoliberalism as such a grand project imposed on people in a systematic, rolling out fashion is, Prince et al. (2006) argue, to assume more efficacy than deserved. The terms neoliberalism and neoliberalisation have become such common currency they have often been used to describe any contemporary policy agenda deemed to be undesirable and socially inequitable (Thorsen and Lie, 2006; Igoe and Brockington, 2007). In my opinion, analysts need to nuance and push their analyses of ‘neoliberalism’ and there has recently been a call in social sciences more generally (e.g. Ong, 2007:3), and geography in particular (e.g. England and Ward, 2007), to rise to this challenge.

Going beyond strictly analyses of policy and ideology, poststructuralist interpretations of neoliberalism as a particular manifestation of governmentality have contributed significantly to debates (Larner, 2000; 2009). By this term Michel Foucault meant the array of knowledges and techniques that are concerned with the systematic and pragmatic guidance and regulation of everyday conduct or, as is commonly quoted, “the conduct of conduct” (Foucault, 1991). Hence, contrary to a contraction of “the state” and of coercive state power compromising individual liberty, theorists such as Nikolas Rose (1999) and Thomas Lemke (2001) reconceptualise neoliberalism as a new form of governmentality; as a particular modality of advanced liberal government requiring the management of populations. In particular, this form of government has spawned a whole range of new disciplinary techniques that are premised on an (illusory) necessity to be free and the extension of the ‘liberties’ of market rationality into everyday forms of social, economic and political organisation. As Aihwa Ong (2006: 12) makes clear, rather than taking neoliberalism as ‘a tidal wave of market-driven phenomena that sweeps from dominant countries to smaller ones’, we could more fruitfully break neoliberalism down into various technologies of government that are productive of a particular kind of society and of particular types of subjects (Escobar, 1999; MacKinnon, 2000).
both Ong and Rose, these ideal neoliberal subjects are characterised as individualistic, self-regulating, self-responsible, self-maximising, market-orientated and entrepreneurial who are required to be free to exercise choice in their lives (see also Rose and Miller, 1992; Dean and Hindess, 1998; Lemke, 2001). It is within the context of this body of literature that an analysis of Nepad will be conducted, and as a consequence the research problem raised is how to conceptualise Nepad in terms of ‘neoliberal governmentality’.

Yet Mitchell (2006: 390) argues that current research “does not adequately engage with how and in what ways people are constituted and ruled as neoliberal subjects through the many ‘technologies’ and ‘assemblages’ so brilliantly outlined by the theorists”. So by engaging with the research problem, Mitchell’s concern raises the substantive question: What are the practices and technologies of government evident within Nepad that attempt to rework Africa into a society of neoliberal subjects?

**Aims**

Using this substantive research question, this thesis intends to address the problematic of “neoliberalism” present within Nepad, not simply as a class project for the consolidation of power or savage capitalism (as popular interpretations have claimed), but understanding it as a particular form of government that assembles techniques, practices, forms of knowledge and discourses. It attends more to “how” neoliberalisation occurs rather than simply “why” without reducing analysis down to capitalism and socio-economic relations. It draws attention to incoherence and discontinuity in neoliberal practices rather than totality and intent. Rather than seeing powerful processes driving neoliberalisation as coercive (e.g. through aid, loan conditionalities, military intervention etc.) it emphasises power as negotiated, decentred, often invisible and subtle, which work through everyday practice and thus, contrary to Gramsci, do not require consent. It also responds to Mitchell’s concern that a more thorough engagement with neoliberal governmentality as applied beyond theory is needed (see also O’Malley, 1996; Frankel, 1997).

On a practical and empirical level this research also aims to reopen what I have termed “the Nepad debate”. Critical attention to Nepad, mostly providing detailed but speculative accounts of its impacts and outcomes, was very prominent shortly after the signing of Nepad but has since subsided. Yet, Nepad still very much exists as an influential policy framework and therefore deserves continued attention, which is especially evident with the announcement by Miles Zenawi at the AU 12th Summit of Heads of States and Government in February 2009 that “[due to] recent events in the world around
us...the integration of NEPAD into the AU structures is even more necessary than before” (AU, 2009). It is also important to reopen critical attention to Nepad because, unlike structural adjustment which was characterised by a sort of ‘shock therapy’, the implications of Nepad are still unfolding. This reopening seems particularly pertinent at a time when the ideological lynchpin of so-called ‘neoliberalism’ is being challenged in light of recent financial crises, and when the political landscape of South Africa is undergoing tectonic shifts. It is in this current conjecture which lays the greatest potential for the production of alternative discursive strategies. Lastly, the research will obtain up-to-date information on the progress of Nepad, especially now that many initiatives are taking shape, which will be of use to others addressing Nepad or African development.

**Outline**

In the following chapter I intend to introduce three sets of literature that will frame this analysis of Nepad. Firstly I summarise the New Partnership for African Development and briefly set the context in a way that draws attention to the multi-scale, political economic as well as socio-cultural precursors I see as influential to its formation. Upon this foundation I will introduce academic debates and commentaries about Nepad to elaborate upon not only what Nepad is but also how it has been analysed. Secondly, I use geographers’ recent attention to the limits of neoliberalism as an analytical concept (e.g. Larner, 2002; Peck, 2004; Barnett, 2005; Sparke, 2006; England and Ward, 2007) to highlight holes in critical commentaries of Nepad whilst making a case for an alternative analysis. Thirdly, I briefly engage with the neo-Foucauldian literature to trace out key definitions, foundational concepts and to draw out themes that will be used in the analytical section of the research.

In chapter 3 I outline my methodology, in particular the procedure for amassing data and the techniques that will be used to analyse it. I also briefly engage with discussions concerning positionality and ethics in the context of policy analysis. Chapters 4 and 5 begin the work of excavating an understanding of Nepad as a form of neoliberal governmentality, and addressing the two sub-questions, with the former chapter addressing what Foucault termed “political rationalities” and the latter addressing the technologies of government that operationalise these political rationalities. Unlike the tendency in much Foucauldian inspired analyses, chapter 6 concludes with an attempt to put forward my own views on the strengths and weaknesses of Nepad.

---

1 In June 2005 then-vice president of South Africa, Jacob Zuma, was removed from office by then president Thabo Mbeki amidst allegations of corruption. Whilst writing this thesis Mbeki himself stood down, believed to be related to the political wrangling between the left leaning Zuma-faction of the ANC and loyalists to Mbeki. Zuma was recently elected as President of the Republic of South Africa in May 2009.
Chapter 2: (Re)reading the Nepad debate

What is Nepad?
The New Partnership for African Development (Nepad) is an economic development and governance strategy that aims to “provide an overarching vision and policy framework for accelerating economic co-operation and integration among African countries” (Nepad, 2002:3). It has become a significant framework through which donors and international institutions engage the continent (Smith, 2006). It was the result of a merger between two plans for the economic regeneration of Africa (Nabudere, 2002). The first was the Millennium Partnership for African Recovery Programme (MAP) which was led by then-President Thabo Mbeki of South Africa with then-President Olusegun Obasanjo of Nigeria and Algerian President Abdelaziz Bouteflika. Its key aims were to help Africa present a common front in its dealings with the developed world; to seek aid, debt cancellation and investment in return for good governance; and to unite countries against social and economic problems. The second contribution came from the Omega plan developed by President Abdoulaye Wade of Senegal as an effort to set goals and define the financial means to narrow the infrastructural gaps between Africa and the OEDC nations. A third, little cited, influence came from the Compact for Africa’s Recovery by the UN Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA). In July 2001, the Organisation of African Unity (OAU) Assembly of Heads of State and Government adopted the merged document under the name of the New African Initiative (NAI), later renamed as the New Partnership for Africa’s Development, which was signed and endorsed by 53 members (for a more detailed synopsis see Kanbur, 2001).

The leaders of G8 countries and other international development partners such as the World Bank and UN endorsed the plan shortly afterwards and announced their support through the "G8 Action Plan on Africa" in 2002 in Kananaskis, Alberta. Support included, amongst other things, an agreement to develop a plan for a peacekeeping force in Africa, a promise to rid Africa of polio, a commitment to improve global market access for African exports by tackling trade barriers and farm subsidies and increase in development aid for nations that ‘govern justly’2 (DFID, 2005). The European Union (EU) and China also indicated their support for the program. In September and November 2002, the United Nations General Assembly, in resolution 57/2 and 57/7 adopted the position that

---

2 Many of these promises were aimed at for 2005 and have not been forthcoming
Nepad should be the framework within which the international community, including the United Nations system, should concentrate its efforts for Africa’s development (UNECA, nd).

Nepad is officially a program of the African Union (AU) (which in 2002 replaced the Organisation of African Unity), which means that it gains pan-African legitimacy from the continent’s highest intergovernmental body. Yet, as Taylor (2005) points out, its authors were not keen on having it as part of the AU because of slow and cumbersome bureaucracy and the problems caused by negotiation down to “the lowest common denominator” in order to ensure pan-African solidarity. Despite its integration into the AU (whose headquarters are in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia), Nepad has its own secretariat based in Midrand, South Africa until recently under the head of Wiseman Nkuhlu (a South African)\(^3\) to coordinate its programmes and the construction of business plans for the priority areas.

Nepad’s primary objectives are four-fold. It aims to eradicate poverty, to promote sustainable growth and development, to integrate Africa in the world economy and accelerate the empowerment of women. These goals, in turn, are based on eight underlying principles outlined in the Nepad document (see figure 1). Nepad thus attempts to provide an integrated policy framework that openly links development, security, governance and democracy together. Yet, although Nepad identifies eight priority areas- political, economic and corporate governance; agriculture; infrastructure; education; health; science and technology; market access and tourism; and environment- much of the debate and attention given to Nepad focused overwhelmingly the economic and political principles underpinning it.

- African ownership and leadership, with broad and deep participation by all sectors of society
- Good governance as a basic requirement for peace and security, and sustainable political and socioeconomic development
- Development of Africa on its resources and the resourcefulness of its people
- Partnership between and among African peoples
- Acceleration of regional and continental integration
- Building the competitiveness of African countries and the continent
- A new intentional partnership that changes the unequal relationship between Africa and the developed world
- Partnerships with NEPAD linked to the Millennium Development Goals and other agreed development goal and targets

*Figure 1: The Principles of the New Partnership for African Development
Source: Nepad 2001*

\(^3\)Now Ibrahim Assane Mayaki, former Prime Minister of Niger (1997-2000)
**Nepad in context**

Yet, as Taylor (2005:2) notes, ‘Nepad has not...sprung from a vacuum’ and there are a host of predecessors that place Africa’s latest program for renewal within a broader historical and intellectual context as listed in table 1. Many scholars have looked at Nepad’s predecessors and the events leading up to Nepad (both in terms of years and decades) in greater depth (Bond 2002, 2004; Obi, 2002:np; Nabudere, 2002; Taylor, 2005: 15-45; Zack-Williams and Mohan, 2005:1-4) and is it not my intention to construct a teleological, step by step series of events culminating in Nepad. However, there are some (what I see as) key contextual points that should be made for the purpose of this research:

**What happens in Lagos stays in Lagos?**

Drafted in 1980, the Lagos Plan of Action (LPA) was a pan-African initiative tackling some of the key development concerns of Africa. From the late 1970s onward, Africa became progressively inundated with various plans and agendas aiming (to varying degrees) at promoting development and, later, democracy (see table 1) which tackled the question of Africa’s position in the post-colonial global political economy. Most resolutions adopted by African leaders through the OAU in the early years aimed for economic integration as a prerequisite for real independence. The Lagos Plan of Action (LPA) was the largest of such pronouncements and, like Nepad, emphasised inter-African trade, increased aid, restructuring of global trade relations and investment through regional co-operation (despite failed attempts launched in the 1960s) and the reduction of external debt.

Contrary to Nepad, though, the LPA was embedded in dependency-theory and the New International Economic Order (NIEO)\(^4\), vehemently defended import substitution and could be seen as a general goal of auto-centric development. Significantly, Africa’s problems were regarded as wholly exogenous and a legacy of colonialism, and it suggested solutions without outlining how they could be financed (Herbst, 1993). That the LPA failed, for most scholars, is ‘controvertible’ (Taylor, 2005: 21) because it was based on faulty assumptions about Africa’s economic condition and exonerated African leaders (many of whom were dictators and/or had seized power) whilst discounting widespread malgovernance. Its prescriptions were described as ‘economically illiterate’ by Clapham (1996: 176) and relied on three conditions, (i) that agricultural surplus extracted from the

---

\(^4\) The NIEO was a set of proposals during the 1970s put forward by developing countries to promote their interests by improving their terms of trade, increasing development assistance, developed-country tariff reductions, and other means. It was meant to be a revision of the international economic system in favour of these countries thereby replacing the Bretton Woods system, which had benefited the more development states that had created it.
agricultural sector was re-invested into industry, (ii) that peasants continued to produce at constant levels despite conditions that worked against them and (iii) certain heavy industries involved specialised manpower and sold to relatively large markets. As Ergas (1987) points out, ‘none of these conditions were really met in Africa’. What is especially important in comparing the LPA and Nepad is that neither can be understood as being exemplary of an ‘ideological standpoint’. Thus, placing these two in binary opposition or arguing that Nepad was “neoliberal” and top-down involves as much analytical depth as claiming that the LPA was “socialist”, of which it was not. Both were embedded in contemporary rationalities and politically dominant understandings of the root causes of the development problem. There are breakages, just as much as there are continuities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Aim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Lagos Plan of Action</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>To promote autocentric development and greater cooperation within Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The African Charter on Human and People's Rights</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>To encourage human rights on the continent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa's Priority Program for Economic Recovery</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>To target pressing development needs in Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAU Declaration on the Political and Social-Economic Situation in Africa and the Fundamental Changes Taking Place in the World</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>To emphasise Africa's determination to determine its own destiny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Charter on Popular Participation</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>To place ordinary African's at the &quot;centre of development&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Kampala Document</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>To stipulate that peace and stability are inseparable conditions for the basis of development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Abuja Treaty</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>To establish an African Economic Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Mechanism for Conflict Prevention, Management and Resolution</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>To promote peace and stability in Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cairo Agenda</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>To 're-launch' Africa's political, economic and social development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Common Position on Africa's External Debt Crisis</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>To find a common strategy for tackling Africa's debt crisis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Algiers Decision</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>To take a stand against unconstitutional changes in government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solemn Declaration</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>To establish principles for the sponsorship of democracy and 'good governance' in Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Constitutive Act of the African Union</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>To reform the Organisation of African Unity (OAU) into the African Union (AU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Omega Plan</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>To emphasise four development pillars of infrastructure: ICT, education, health &amp; agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The MAP/New Africa Initiative</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Foundation document to Nepad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Notable Predecessors to Nepad  
Source: Taylor (2005)
The following decades brought a flurry of African initiatives to the fore (see table 1), many of which were devised because predecessors had failed. The response by the ‘international community’ to the LPA (particularly considering the context of Cold War geopolitics) was particularly significant in promoting development orthodoxy. This response was manifest in the World Bank’s report entitled ‘Accelerated Development in Sub-Saharan Africa: An Agenda for Action’, notoriously known as the Berg Report. Aided by the fallout of the emerging debt crisis, it dramatically promoted free-market reforms, privatisation and other market-led panaceas, signalling the start of an era of Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs) (Taylor, 2005) and the declaration of the failure of state-led development in the developing world. What should be made clear, however, is that while structural adjustment remained dominant orthodoxy, it was nonetheless contested and not only when their weaknesses transpired into visible problems. SAPs faced many critiques and the principles of the LPA did not simply fade from purview; for example, UNECA’s African Alternative Framework to Structural Adjustment Programs for Socio-Economic Recovery and Transformation (AFF-SAP) emerged from Adedeji and other economists who were frustrated with the reorientation away from the LPA and with the increasing reliance of foreign experts for African economic decision making (Asante, 1991).

The Arusha Conference in 1990 (issuing The African Charter for Population Participation for Development) is also noteworthy. In contrast to Nepad, Arusha was a collaborative endeavour between African NGOs, governments and UN agencies, but as Taylor (2005) makes clear, it contained some basic tenets of Nepad such as concerns about the over-centralisation of power and the impediments to the effective participation of the African people in social, political and economic development. The Arusha Charter was soon followed by the United Nations New Agenda for Development of Africa (UN-NADAF), which was to contain elements that were to re-emerge in Nepad, particularly concerning the panacea of western-style liberal democracy. Thus, development programmes are never simply a collection of new ideas that all follow the same political philosophies or goals, as is evident with Nepad there are many aspects which are not necessarily new and find their origins in previous programs, many of which received far less criticism.

---

5 Although Taylor (2005) and Asante (1991) argue that the AAF-SAP was seen in many quarters as Adedeji’s project and an attempt to defend and justify the LPA.
**African Renaissance: rhetoric and agenda**

The end of apartheid in South Africa in 1994, as arguably the last bastion of colonialism in Africa, brought about a renewed sense of liberation and pan-Africanism (Campbell, 1996). It was on this wave of optimism and euphoria that the late-1990s saw a concerted attempt by a few select African presidents to repackage and exclusively redefine African development to the international community. The genesis of Nepad aside from the predecessors noted above, can also be sourced to Thabo Mbeki’s ‘vision’ of African Renaissance, as embodied in a 1997 document entitled ‘The African Renaissance: A Workable Dream’, arguably a product of a renewed pan-African agenda (Arnold, 2003). It suggested five areas of engagement: the emancipation of women from patriarchy, cultural exchange, the mobilisation of youth, the broadening and deepening of democracy and the initiation of sustainable economic development. South Africa, Barrell (2000) suggests, was to be at the forefront of this project in Africa and as part of a global coalition of nations (Brazil, India, Nigeria, and Egypt) that were keen on pushing a reformist agenda to the G8. But in spite of the impassioned rhetoric, the essential features of the African Renaissance and how to encourage development remained vague: ‘high on sentiment, low on substance’ (Vale and Maseko, 1998:277), and remained limited largely to politico-intellectual strata. As will be expanded on later, the implementation strategy void was to be filled with a commitment to the liberalisation of markets and liberal democratic institutions by Mbeki and his supporters. On the back of policies such as the African Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA) in 2000, this inner-sect of African leaders expected a *quid pro quo* from the developed world and the G8 for espousing such values, in particular a concerted effort to provide debt relief, larger flows of capital, reasonable trade policies and market access of African products.

Yet it is not just Mbeki’s African Renaissance that maintains the importance of African Unity. The recent AU chair appointment of Libya’s leader Muammar Gadaffi has propelled pan-Africanism back into the centre of African politics. Gadafi’s vision of a United States of Africa was at the heart of disputes at the AU summit in Ethiopia in February 2009 and at an AU Executive Council session in Tripoli in April 2009; here he called on the continent to speed up the integration process (BBC news 15/04/2009; News24 15/04/2009). To achieve his vision Gaddafi has called for the further implementation of Nepad as the constitutional backbone of foreign relations, economic and trade policy in Africa, despite blasting it as a ‘neo-colonialist venture’ at an AU summit in 2002 (Abraham, 2003). This has been significant turn of events for two reasons. Not only did the then interim-South African President, Kgalema Motlanthe, describe such a vision as incompatible with the interests of his
country (News24 15/04/2009), suggesting that South Africa’s interests with Nepad may be more economically motivated than in the political or cultural interests of Pan Africanism, but the common charge of Nepad as repackaged neoliberalism (as will be explored) or as the scaffolding of liberal-democracy sits uncomfortably with Gaddafi’s own socialist ideologies and principles\(^6\), his banning of political parties and trade unions and Libya’s poor human rights record. If anything, these political complexities illustrate the need to problematise and nuance what is meant by grand visions as “African renaissance”, “socialism” or, indeed, “neoliberalism”, how these materialise beyond the status of ideology or political philosophy and how they compete with other rationalities and problems of government.

**Getting into GEAR**

Whilst ‘neoliberal’ policies are often seen to be imposed from outside of Africa, the South African Growth, Employment and Redistribution (GEAR) strategy remains an important pretext considering Mbeki’s lead role in Nepad’s formation. GEAR was a series of policies implemented between 1996-2000, as drawn up by then-finance minister Trevor Manuel with the intention of achieving sustained annual real GDP growth of 6% or more by the year 2000 and creating 400,000 new jobs each year. The policy, often referred to as South Africa’s ‘neoliberal experiment’, was meant to increase investment, especially foreign direct investment (FDI), in the country to help achieve these goals. Many argue (e.g. Bond, 2000; Taylor, 2001) that GEAR was the clearest expression of the post-apartheid government’s commitment to open markets, privatisation, deficit reduction and FDI-led growth. It is significant because, during their time in opposition (under apartheid), the ANC espoused a socialist-tinged political platform that emphasised redistribution over liberalisation. The outcomes of GEAR’s implementation have been mixed with notable macroeconomic stability and discipline, and greater transparency, but it has impacted massively on wealth distribution and growth remained far below the target of 4.2 percent. Much like analyses of Nepad, the GEAR has been described as South Africa’s attempt to become a global middle-power, or as Taylor (2001: 144) describes: “a "bridgebuilder" between the global hegemons and those reluctant to follow their lead”, and, from a policy perspective, Nepad could be seen as a scaling up of GEAR into a continental programme.

\(^6\) Saying this, one cannot refer to socialism as a monolithic ideology that gets directly transplanted into reality either for Libya has begun implementing policies that one could argue are contradictory to socialist principles: market-oriented reforms, applying for membership of the World Trade Organization, reducing subsidies, privatising more than 100 government owned companies since 2003 in industries including oil refining, tourism and real estate. Such an observation resonates with Ong’s (2006) argument that neoliberal ideas often migrate to political environments such as the (post)socialist state or authoritarian formation without replacing the political apparatus or ideology
Whilst South Africa’s post-2000 economic policy contains many elements of GEAR, there has been a shift away from reliance on FDI towards an emphasis on domestic investment. In particular, the creation of jobless growth under GEAR has meant that the South African government has began to work through the state apparatus with the aim of enhancing service delivery, investment in human resources and research-intensive industries, the curbing of capital flight and brain drain (Streak, 2004). This reintroduction of the state into economic policy was present in Mbeki’s 2001 State of the nation address, where he announced the launch of the ‘Integrated Economic Action Plan’, also known at the microeconomic reform strategy. As will be elaborated on in the forthcoming discussion, the retention of the main principles of GEAR but with an attention to the microeconomic and reintroduction of the state is as prevalent in Nepad as it is in South African economic policy.

Away from inevitability
The events and figures influential in Nepad’s emergence are more extensive than presented here but three key observations need to be made. Firstly, the succession of development initiatives outlined in table 1 calls into question why the architects of Nepad believe that it will succeed where these others have failed. What makes Nepad so different that there is optimism that it will achieve similar goals to previous programmes? Secondly, the context of Nepad is messy. It originates from competing ideologies, interests and rationalities, all of which have power-relations at the centre of the conversation. Interestingly these relations span interrelating scales thus muddling exogenous and endogenous factors in Nepad’s formation. It is not adequate, in my opinion, to think of Nepad as either a culmination of events or originating from a single identifiable source. Thirdly, the concept of development is political. The Lagos Plan, the AOU/AU and other more recent initiatives highlight the cultural politics of pan-African development initiatives and how development policy is never simply a benign set of government documents but often articulate with other discourses and sentiments that are equally important in either validating or discrediting them. This research must aim to harness such complexity.

Reviewing the Nepad literature
For most proponents and optimists Nepad represents, as Joseph (2002) suggests, a new wave of recovery and renewal for Africa. The distinction between old and new plays a key role in dividing positive sentiment from negative opinion. Those commentaries that are more positive stress how distinct it is from antecedents such as the Lagos Plan of Action, the SAPs during the 1980’s and 90’s,
the Adjuba Treaty of 1991 and the introduction of poverty reduction strategy papers (PRSPs). Three commonly cited factors mark the change in policy direction and its anticipated success (Funke et al., 2003; Nsouli, 2004). The first is that Nepad is considered to be an African-inspired and African-led development agenda conceived and supported by African leaders. Here, the symbolism of “African-ownership” and the assumed commitment of leaders to “home-grown policy” re-emerge to mark a break from imposed solutions by foreign actors. This home-grown solution, Maloka (2006) concedes, may have been driven by elites but he acknowledges that, to date, no bottom-up programme has even been drawn up and that even the much-revered LPA was an elite driven affair. The theme of ownership is further exulted through the emphasis on intra-regional trade and co-operation (Luiz, 2006). Yet confusing this claim to African ownership, the centrality of ‘partnership’ is the second factor for success cited (Nsouli, 2004; also see Abrahamsen, 2004). Indeed, it is ‘partnership’ that is the key word in the title of the programme. Those stressing this partnership as genuine, productive and not simply thin rhetoric highlight the extensive support for this initiative by the international community and how Nepad recognises the need to negotiate a new relationship with donors (Tandon, 2002). These partners include UNECA, the IMF, African Development Bank (AfDB), the nations of the G8 and other transnational and international bodies who are invited to work with Nepad to achieve common goals. The joint emphasis on partnership and ownership signals a distinct break from past attempts at ‘African renewal’ and, some argue, the most important advance in development thinking for Africa in the past forty years (Amoako, 2002:1).

Lastly, the new endorsement of good governance is seen as crucial to Nepad’s success (Luiz, 2006). Alex de Waal (2002), although generally critical, is positive towards a renewed attention to governance issues as a means of fostering growth and reducing poverty. Most celebrated of all is the formulation and introduction of the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM), which is a key subject of chapter 5. The APRM is regarded as a cornerstone and the key ingredient of Nepad as it was ‘sold’ to the G8 (Taylor, 2005) and a demonstrable and welcomed declaration of African states’ commitment, at least in policy, to good governance (Akinrinade, 2002:3). Jacques and Lesetedi (2005) note how the APRM is a radical departure from previous practices when commitments to good governance were made through multi-lateral agreements, and thus it has been argued that Nepad represents ‘a new generation of enlightened African leaders [who have] now decided to stake Africa’s claim to the twentieth century” (Hope, 2002:387). These three factors, Gelb (2002: 10) notes, should lead to sustainable development, economic growth and greater integration of Africa into the global economy.
Critics of Nepad, on the other hand, have been neither few nor far between. The policies promoting this integration are precisely what has been sharply criticised by activists, some civil society groups and scholars, both inside and outside of Africa, as they see the global system as the primary cause of African poverty and underdevelopment. They contend that ‘while many of its stated goals may be well intentioned, the development vision and economic measures that [Nepad] canvasses for the realization of these goals are flawed’ (Codesria/TWN-Africa, 2002:2). Adesina et al. (2006) are also critical of Nepad’s market-oriented framework, arguing that it is wholly inadequate for mapping a credible development strategy and, as Nabudere (2002: 64-70) argues, cannot be trusted to alleviate poverty in Africa let alone reverse its marginalisation. Instead, it is claimed, what has resulted is a neoliberal development plan with a narrow focus on market liberalisation, one that fails to address issues of equity in income distribution (Keet, 2006) and gender (Randriamaro, 2006) and, as such, will only serve to exacerbate Africa’s social crises and global patterns of uneven development. They argue for an agenda with greater focus on issues of equity and social justice that serves people, rather than markets, and which privileges state expenditure, inter-sectoral linkages, and regional integration over market liberalisation. Even the policies that seek to develop democracy and good governance are argued by Olukoshi (2002) to spark more questions than answers because of the narrow interpretation of democracy, thus contributing further to what Ake (2000) has described as the ‘democratization of the disempowerment of the African people’. As a result, it is not so much the aims of Nepad that are deemed problematic but rather the foundations upon which it is based.

African leadership is also considered an obstacle. Aside from debates on corruption, failed states and neo-patrimonialism, Obi (2002) is dubious of African leaders’ ability to follow through with these policies and ambitious goals because of the overbearing influence of the Bretton Woods Institutions’ (BWIs). Indeed Loxley (2003) and Chabal (2002) are sceptical of precisely how ambitious these goals are. Unsurprisingly considering his role in previous African development policies, Adedeji (2002a:11) is more scathing, suggesting that “there is always a childlike naivety among African leaders and policy makers that rhetoric and reality are the same and that claiming ownership tantamounts to having ownership”. There are particularly concerns around African countries’ previous attempts to finance their own development through regional integration and Anymedu (2006) argues that

---

7 BWI refers specifically to the World Bank and International Monetary Fund whereas international financial institutions (IFIs) is more broad and includes actors such as the World Trade Organisation and multilateral banks such as the African Development Bank (AfDB)
mobilising internal resources, such as domestic savings, is essential if African countries are to reduce their dependency on external financing. Despite the respectable rhetoric, there is general skepticism not only about what Nepad is, but also the likelihood of it ever achieving its goals because of poor leadership and resource management.

Contrary to Nepad’s claims to African ownership, the critical literature draws attention to the undemocratic and non-consultative process by which Nepad was formed (e.g. NALEDI, 2003:10; Ukiwo, 2003; Adesina et al., 2005), and how only heads of states and their nominated experts were active in the formulation and adoption of the development framework (Lefusi, 2004). The civil society Indaba8 noted that ‘Africa and her people have not been involved in devising this path of development’ (CSI, 2002: 27) and, in this vein, Adedeji (2002a:21) argues that ‘until Nepad becomes owned by the people of Africa, its civil society and grassroots’ then the initiative will not, and cannot, take off. Furthermore, Nabudere (2002) and Olukoshi (2003:26) suggest that by being developed primarily through consultation with the donor community, Nepad is more donor-orientated rather than orientated towards the people of Africa. These continued questions of ownership raise competing understandings of the relations between various actors involved in the formulation and implementation of Nepad.

Nearly all critical accounts make clear that the key influence in the production of Nepad lay with the Bretton Woods Institutions and the influence of the western states and donors that financially and politically support them. Not only do they wield the coercive power that determines the agenda and flow of resources, but they are criticised for perpetuating a globally hegemonic ideology of what constitutes sound economic practice: neoliberalism. The extent of such influence varies though; with Adesina (2002 citing Bond, 2001:4) seeing Nepad as neoliberalism imposed by the IMF and World Bank like ‘knots in the economic rope tied around the necks of ordinary people getting ever tighter and digging ever deeper’, to an emphasis on how Nepad gives ‘individual G8 countries, and the G8 as a whole the leverage to define their priorities and procedures...to a continent whose resources have been plundered over centuries’ (Obi, 2002:np). Taylor (2005) even goes as far as to make a charge of Nepad as another ‘neo-imperialist agenda’ (see also Ngwainbi, 2005) arguing that Nepad’s heavy reliance on the receptivity of Western capital has resulted in an extremely restricted agenda. It is with this in mind that Nepad has flippantly been referred to as ‘knee-pad’: a metaphor

---

8 A forum of civil society groups paralleling the official government forum at the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) in Johannesburg
implying the cushioning that African leaders have created whilst being on their knees to the west (see Orakwue, 2002).

A distinct thread running through the debate, which I have termed ‘the South African hegemony thesis’, draws attention to South Africa’s unique role in the formation and execution of Nepad. This critical literature not only highlights the role that Thabo Mbeki played as the architect of the MAP (the foundation for Nepad), but points to the similarity between Nepad and GEAR, of the location of Nepad’s secretariat in Midrand (in Gauteng, South Africa) and how ANC policy ‘talks left but acts right’ (Bond, 2005). There is also speculation over the role of South African business in promoting free-market ideology with Daniel et al. (2003) providing evidence that the current expansion of South African capital into the African continent is of ‘unprecedented dimensions’. This literature also raises critical questions over the Nepad strategy of sub-regional and continental integration as a form of neoliberal globalisation (Obi, 2002). According to Gelb (2002: 36), Nepad ‘represents the clearest expression thus far of South Africa’s national interests on the continent’.

Rather than being the victim of what Mbeki has previously termed “global apartheid”, these critics make a persuasive case that South Africa’s influence over Nepad reflects an adoption of neoliberal values by South African elites who are, in effect, reproducing an economic apartheid fractured along class lines whilst simultaneously reinforcing a global system that perpetuates inequitable and uneven development. In particular Patrick Bond (2001, 2004, 2005) has suggested that, after an era of political and economic isolation, Nepad is the perfect vehicle through which South Africa can assert its economic and political hegemony on the rest of Africa. Accordingly, rather than African ownership, ‘South African ownership’ may be a more apt description of the programme.

Despite the range of positions amongst critiques, the analyses of Nepad all coalesce around an interpretation of the program as a continuation and ‘recycling [of the] neoliberal agenda of the BWIs’ (Adesina, 2002: 14). In particular, they chart a clear trajectory traced from the structural adjustment era up to Nepad whereby, as Obi (2002: 4) puts it, ‘there was an effort to throw away the ‘adjustment’ bathwater but keep the ‘neoliberal’ baby…which was then re-named, and sold to another generation of African leaders who had risen to power on the crest of the democratic wave’. Elsewhere, critics argue that Nepad does in fact mark a departure, but a departure from earlier attempts at alternative development models (for example, as embodied in the LPA) and an
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9 A similar argument is put forward by Ezeoha and Uche (2005) who argue that an “entrepreneurial” group of South African businesses see Nepad as a channel for expanding their markets in high profit and less competitive African countries, and thus, are in a better position to create jobs, training, indigenous labour and establishing basic infrastructure. The basic argument is similar to the “South African dominance” thesis, but the outcomes are regarded as far more positive and beneficial.
internalisation of the core principles of the SAPs by African leaders. This sense of continuation is shared by Taylor and Nel (2002: 166) who warn that Nepad serves to legitimise, rather than restructure, existing global relations and ideologies to which African countries have been a victim. Those accounts, such as Adesina (2002), drawing most explicitly on Marx and Gramsci, emphasise Nepad as a distinct ‘class project’; the newest phase of the rolling out of an ideological plan by a self-serving trans-territorialised class (e.g. Bond, 2003, 2004; Taylor 2002) or the African ruling class (e.g. Obi 2002)\(^\text{10}\). This prevalent perception of continuation is summed up by the often used phrase ‘old wine in new bottles’ (see Melber, 2002).

Yet such a view seems so engrained in the Nepad literature that critics elide an analysis of neoliberalism itself, instead seeing it as a given. At times neoliberalism serves as a synonym for free markets or the globalisation of capital, others merely as a signifier for slim-states in conjunction with export-oriented policies, or even as a critique of policies deemed to be hostile to the poor. It is fair to say that, as Maloka (2006: 94) remarks, any initiative that “reads like any other structural adjustment” automatically generates a series of expected critiques. In many respects ‘neoliberalism’ has become so self-evident – often used to describe any contemporary policy deemed to be undesirable (Thorsen and Lie, 2006; Igoe and Brockington, 2007) – that it has become both a causal factor for why Nepad exists, as well as a description of what Nepad is.

**Rethinking neoliberalism**

It is my contention that analytical terms such as “neoliberalism” and “neoliberalisation” need to be interrogated. The debate on Nepad has been shoved into a familiar narrative of neoliberalisation (and, in some instances, neoliberal globalisation) which becomes synonymous with the expansion of capital and markets sweeping across the world as a means to overcome the crisis of accumulation. It is not that this perception of Nepad is somehow ‘wrong’ or unhelpful, however understanding neoliberalism requires greater nuance and not, as Ong (2007: 3) raises concerns about, ‘the blunt instrument of broad categories and predetermined elements and outcomes’ often used in contemporary accounts. If not, the result can arguably be the very naturalisation and inevitabilisation of the process being critiqued (cf. Gibson-Graham, 1996). Responding to such reductionist tendencies,
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\(^\text{10}\) Even Abrahamsen (2004:1457), who takes a noticeably Foucauldian approach of decentred power in her analysis of development ‘partnerships’, writes off Nepad early on in her analysis as a ‘commitment to neoliberal norms and values’, with little to elucidate what she means by this.
many geographers have sought to redefine and reinterpret understandings of neoliberalism and neoliberalisation, getting the term to “do more work” for them. This literature usefully exposes some limitations of current commentaries on Nepad.

Firstly, thinking of neoliberalism as a grand abstraction lends itself to assuming a degree of coherence and absoluteness. The consequence is not only that of inevitability but also the obfuscation of difference and an often premature claim to similarity. This is evident when, for example, Adesina (2002: 5) argues that:

*While there has been significant shift in the language of deploying the neoliberal policy instruments, from the early days of orthodox stabilisation and liberalisation agenda and the current so-called post-Washington Consensus, the core values remain the same*

Claiming that the ‘neoliberal’ values of structural adjustment resemble those of Nepad centres analysis upon similarity rather than the interrogation of difference. Current conceptions, as Ong (2007) makes clear, view neoliberalism as a dominant structural condition that projects totalising social change, in much the same way as critics of Nepad see neoliberalism as definite and pervasive. Many geographers advocate looking at neoliberalism in the plural (Larner, 2003; England and Ward, 2007; Hart, 2008). Barnett (2005) would not disagree but warns of thinking of variations of neoliberalism as simply mutations of a pure and proper form. His concerns are relevant when Nepad and PRSPs are described as “structural adjustment with a face”, which simplistically suggests that structural adjustment is neoliberalism *par excellence* and that Nepad simply represents a softer variation of it. Of course the term “neoliberalism” can serve to unite diverse positions that challenge its orthodoxy (such as with the Bamako Declaration) but, at the same time, we must be aware that it can be problematic ascribing general, taken-for-granted features to temporally and spatially variable phenomena as what the Nepad literature has been prone to. It is with this realisation that England and Ward (2007) are keen to make a distinction between neoliberalism as an end-state or idea and neoliberalisation as a set of processes consisting of a multiplicity of openings and closures.

Such a trap that views fundamental similarities and coherence lends itself to making generalised accounts of historical epochs (Larner, 2000:12) or of development as a linear trajectory of paradigms from colonial exploitation to the post-independence developmental state through to a roll-backed, privatised “neoliberal” era. It then becomes easy to see dominant paradigms as facing no opposition, counter-hegemonic tendencies or internal contradictions. As alluded to when discussing the Lagos Plan of Action, the political changes since the 1960’s, generally in government policy and more specifically in development policy, cannot be sufficiently interpreted as a straightforward swing
from the left to the right (Larner, 2003 is even skeptical of our automatic association of neoliberalism with the ‘New Right’), from public value to private values and from collectivism to individualism. Yet such a treatment of history is especially prevalent in current analyses of Nepad:

‘the essentially neo-liberal framework that informs the economic principles and direction spelt out in the NEPAD document represents a set back in the African quest for a return to the path of sustained economic growth and development’ (Olukoshi 2003: 26).

With reference to the above quote, one wonders exactly when this path was: the admirable attempts at, but spectacular failures of, African socialism? The western-propped dictatorships of the 70s and 80s? Exploitative colonial regimes? Like many narratives of neoliberalisation, policy is interpreted as progressing towards an end-state, only to have a distinct era attributed as being ‘neoliberal’ alter or reverse this course of time.

In turn, thinking in terms of neat historical epochs also obscures the potentially messy actualities of “neoliberalisation”: recognising instead that coherent ideas, principles or rationalities do not necessarily translate into realities simply by their existence or pervasiveness. Larner (2003) suggests that what we have conventionally thought of as “hegemonic neoliberalism” or have characterized as an economic tsunami (Ong, 2007) could just as well be a tenuous set of ad hoc and negotiated set of practices. To some extent Brenner and Theodore (2002: 353) concur, stressing that market-driven transformation is not ‘a fully actualised policy regime, ideological form, or regulatory framework’. But on the other hand, the debate in Nepad (which focuses almost entirely on economic policies) fails to recognise how neoliberal processes can be observed beyond the economic realm: in the social and the political, for instance. It is in the tension between neoliberalism and neoliberalisation where the accounts of Nepad have often come unstuck, by charging that Nepad reflects “neoliberalism” yet poorly (if at all) elucidating how it is often negotiated in everyday politics, is articulated in socio-cultural contexts or how it effects change beyond merely written government policy.

The geography of the spaces of neoliberalism or the process of neoliberalisation is also problematic for accounts rely on a spatial imaginary of ‘centres’ and ‘margins’, ‘cores’ and ‘peripheries’, and ‘north/south relations’. In the Nepad literature, neoliberalism is inexorably something external to Africa that is largely imposed coercively (conditionality, trade agreements, debt obligations, private sector lobbying etc.). Such positions are often communicated in quite militaristic, albeit still seductive, language exemplified by Bond (2005):
It is here that the West’s ongoing conquest of Africa – in political, military and ideological terms—requires not only the reproduction of neo-liberalism but also good governance and anti-corruption gimmicks.

Geographers in particular are beginning to problematise these constructions (e.g. Rankin and Shakya, 2007; Larner, 2009) in works where a solid understanding of geographical relationships is often absent. Their perspective recaptures a sense of relationality that does not assume that neoliberalism is a project from the global ‘north’ imposed from outside and which can often resemble existing practices as has been shown in the case of Argentina (North, 2007) or New Zealand (Larner, 2002).

The common accusation that Mbeki’s African renaissance was little more than a decoy for the mass acceptance of neoliberalism through Nepad emanates from the Marxist theorisation of the state as nothing other than a tool in the service of capitalist reproduction (see Taylor Gooby, 2002 for a critique). In this perspective, the state can be nothing other than an organisation-for-itself. The result can be unhelpful conspiracy theories which Li (2007:287 n.22) has criticised for narrowing analysis and neglecting how forms of government aim to ‘improve’ populations in order to gain legitimacy. I would argue that whilst the ‘state’ is implicated in some sense in capitalist reproduction, it is useful to use an analytic that is not reducible to “the state” and does not conceive of power as the sovereign actions of centralised bodies such as the “South African state” or “the IMF”. If the logic of government can always be uncovered by understanding the “logic of capital”, then that is really all one ever really needs to know (Clarke, 2004). Indeed, an added concern is that the vilification of ‘the state’, as complicit and instrumental in capitalist exploitation, can ironically find alliances with those who would prefer to see a withdrawal of government intervention from the socio-economic sphere altogether.

Upon reflection, it seems as though critical studies of Nepad have actually stopped short of providing anything particularly critical at all. Indeed, as will be elaborated on later, this narration of neoliberalisation has been supported by an exceptionally selective reference to the Nepad documents themselves and is based on an overly economic purview. Although keen to challenge taken-for-granted conventions, it is not necessarily my aim to make a case for existing international power relations or to stand on a platform of free-market fundamentalism. Indeed the work on Nepad so far has provided valuable insights, the value of which forecloses the need to reproduce such an analysis. My unease, however, is that without engagement with alternative interpretations of neoliberalism in analyses of Nepad, we restrict the potential to envisage a politics that does not subscribe to the romanticism of rebellion, revolution and class conflict. As a result, current analyses of Nepad are seductive and the sentimental heartstrings that are tugged in discussions of poverty, neo-imperialism,
exploitation and injustice narrow the space for critique of those accounts. If neoliberalisation is a ‘multi-vocal and a contradictory phenomenon’ (Larner, 2000:20) then it is my contention that an analysis of its characteristics and processes should also be.

Applying an alternative analytic
Geographers such as Wendy Larner (2000; 2009), Kim England and Kevin Ward (2007) have helpfully categorised how research has approached or interpreted neoliberalism (see table 2), detailing the key characteristics that these works have identified as being neoliberal, or central to neoliberalisation. They recognise the early contributions of (neo)Marxist or political economic perspectives of neoliberalism as a form of ideology or economic doctrine but also document the important emergence of post-structuralist accounts that are oriented towards Foucault’s later work on governmentality and neoliberalisation as a process (England and Ward, 2007). Whilst it is evident that the abundance of Nepad literature has addressed neoliberalism as a form of ideology, state form, or policy agenda, there remains an obvious potential for addressing using a lens of governmentality. This approach is attractive because of its power-as-decentred perspective, its rejection of teleology or inevitability, its emphasis on contingency, breakages and continuities, as well as the attention to subject formation, power and knowledge which provides nuance in understanding how ideals or government objectives are translated into tangible realities. On the one hand, amidst the abundance of similarity in the Nepad literature, such a shift in thinking remains largely absent in this body of work and as such there is massive potential to contribute by adopting an alternative approach. On the other hand, Larner (2002: 12) points out that ‘the governmentality literature has not paid a great deal of attention to the politics surrounding specific programmes and policies’. With these two observations, it is apt to identify the overall research problem as: how Nepad can be understood through an analytic of neoliberalism-as-governmentality?
How neoliberalism has been approached | Interpretation/definition of ‘neoliberalism’ | Examples of work given
--- | --- | ---
Larner (2000) Policy | Marketisation, deregulation, privatisation, reduced state | MacEwan, Peet and Hartwich, Campbell and Pedersen
Ideology | State strategy for sustained capital accumulation, mode of social regulation, political discourse monopolised by hegemonic groups | Hall, Peck and Tickell, Harvey, Jessop, Jenson
Governmentality | A system of meaning, disjuncture, governing from a distance, less governance but not less government, citizen-as-responsible | Rose, Dean, Hindess, Lemke

England and Ward (2007) Ideology | Political dominance exercised through the formation of class-based alliances that produce a coherent, common-sense, program of ideas about the world and how these are best solved. A worldwide strategy for accumulation. | Johnston and Saad-Filho, 2005; Mieskins Wood, 2003; Harvey, 2005, 2006
Policy and Programme | Transfer of ownership from public to private sector (in the name of efficiency). Deregulation, liberalization, privatization | Cammack, 2003
Governmentality | Relations among and between peoples and things might be imagined, assembled, and translated, to effect co-ordination at a distance. Construction of autonomous, responsibilized, entrepreneurial neoliberal subjects. | Larner & LeHeron, 2002; Ren, 2005; Rose 1996

*Table 2: Summary of Larner (2000) and England & Ward (2007)*

Before discussing the merits of the governmentality approach, it is important to note that it is difficult and undesirable to draw a stark and simplistic division between what has been regarded as two theoretical ‘camps’. For the most part, both paradigms are not as monolithic and unified as often appreciated and the rapprochement between political economy and poststructural interpretations of neoliberalism is increasingly evident in recent work (e.g. Peters, 2001; England *et al.*, 2007; Li, 2007; Rankin and Shakya, 2007). A modicum of accommodation of both sets of approaches is at the bottom of most analyses for as, Peck (2004:403) remarks, ‘both endeavors are weakened if they fail to acknowledge the important contributions of the other’ (see also Larner, 2003). Some (e.g. Barnett, 2005:8), on the other hand, argue that the two approaches are irreconcilable and represent a
‘marriage of convenience’ because ‘they imply different models of the nature of explanatory concepts; different models of causality of determination; different models of social relations and agency; and different normative understandings of political power’\(^{11}\). Whilst these critiques and limitations are acknowledged, governmentality does not inherently neglect the differential material positioning of actors within the global political economy (it simply does not reduce analysis to notions of “class” and “ideologies”)\(^{12}\). Foucault himself did not necessarily see his work at odds with Marxian political economy:

“As long as one [quotes Marx to be recognised], one is regarded as someone who knows and reveres Marx, and will be suitably honoured in the so-called Marxist journals. But I quote Marx without saying so, without quotation marks, and because people are incapable of recognising Marx’s texts I am thought to be someone who doesn’t quote Marx. When a physicist writes a work of physics, does he feel it necessary to quote Newton and Einstein?” (Foucault 1980b: 52)

Although he argued that power was decentralised and capillary, it was not to deny that power can simultaneously be concentrated in certain institutions or corporations or other formations within an exploitative economic system (see Kumar, 2007). It is, however, the more subtle and dispersed forms of power – which operate through us, with our consent and in conjunction with domination – that need to be elucidated and contested when pioneering an alternative politics, and yet which have largely been neglected in accounts of Nepad.

**Foucault, Neoliberalism and the Problem of Government**

For Foucault (2008) and the neo-Foucauldians, neoliberalism constitutes a new mode or governmentality\(^{13}\) linked to the rise of advanced liberal government: government typified by its attempt to govern at a distance (Dean, 1999; Rose, 1999; Hindess, 2002; Lemke, 2002; Ong, 2006, 2007)\(^{14}\). Foucault (1991) defined ‘government’ as the attempt to shape human conduct by calculated means, ranging from the governing of others in all aspects of life to the governing of the self (Foucault, 1991), with the well-being of populations as the target. For him government is neither a form of political sovereignty nor an inherent property of the state, instead it should be thought of as a

---

11 Although Sparke (2005) suggests that Barnett has a too narrow focus on governmentality and a limited review of accounts of neoliberalism
12 It should be noted that Foucault, as Read (2009) points out, brackets what could be considered the “ideological” dimension of neoliberalism and its connection with the global hegemony of capitalism
13 A ‘mentality of government’ has also been used to describe this
14 Foucault himself was characteristically vague over what was meant by governmentality. Other similar definitions include the “art of government” (Burchell, 1991:78), a ‘guideline’ for the analysis he [Foucault] offers by way of historical reconstructions embracing a period starting from Ancient Greece (sic) through to modern neo-liberalism”(Lemke, 2001:2) or the Techniques and strategies by which a society is rendered governable” (Jones, 2007:174).
historically shifting ensemble of disciplinary practices ‘to structure the field of possible action of others’ (Foucault 1982: 221). It is this principle that has been explored in the context of self-help (Rimke, 2000) and self-esteem (Cruikshank, 1993), colonial rule (Scott, 1995), environmentalism (Agarwal, 2005) and also development (Ferguson, 1990; Escobar, 1995; Li, 2007). These studies show that it is not only governments that govern, but any institution or body that – through “programmes of rule” – shapes, guides or orders the total lives of individuals through educating desires and configuring habits. Hence, as a development programme attempting to change the material and behavioural characteristics of Africans’ lives, Nepad thus provides an appropriate case study to explore through this framework.

Governing at a distance requires the creation and promotion of new subjects who come to understand themselves, and their relationship to government, in different ways. To achieve the goals of neoliberal government, individuals must come to recognise and act upon themselves as free and responsible, governing in this way means governing through the freedom, desires, instincts, motivations and aspirations of subjects rather than in spite of them (Rose, 1996a: 155; also Burchell et al., 1991)\(^\text{15}\). And, because, as Rose (1999: 49-50) suggests, advanced liberal regimes govern the governed indirectly and through a multitude and alliance of non-state agents that the question of consent thus never arises. For this reason, neoliberal government does not abandon the will to govern but sees failures as needing to be overcome by inventing new strategies of government that will succeed\(^\text{16}\). At the centre of these strategies is the extension of market principles into the organisation of political, economic and social life whereby individuals are disciplined to become more responsible, self-disciplined, self-maximising and enterprising, to stimulate their ‘natural’ senses of individual duty and obligation that is instrumental in their active self-government and self-advancement\(^\text{17}\). Therefore, building on Foucault’s (1980a, 1997) argument that subjectivity cannot exist prior to the exercise of power, we can fruitfully break neoliberalism down into various technologies and strategies of government that are productive of a particular kind of society and of particular types of subjects (MacKinnon, 2000; Ong, 2007).

\(^{15}\) Such a view of a free society at once resonates with and transcends Isaiah Berlin’s (1969) two concepts of liberty in which he argued that Western society was determined by “negative liberty” which represented an absence of constraint on individual action, in contrast to “positive liberty” which posited self-mastery and determination. The latter, Berlin argued, would inevitably lead to a concentration of totalitarian and centralised power. See Berlin, I. 1969 “Two Concepts of Liberty” Four Essays on Liberty. Oxford: Oxford UP.

\(^{16}\) For a more thorough genealogy of the emergence of neoliberalism a form of advanced liberal rule see Rose (1996) pp. 50-62

\(^{17}\) Examples include the reclassification of the mentally ill as “clients”, Thatcher’s restructuring of education system in the UK that allowed parents to “shop around” for schools, or the introduction of new public management into the civil service.
Government can be analysed in two ways, which will assist in structuring the analysis (Rose and Miller, 1992). Firstly,政府alities can be analysed as political rationalities confronting the ‘problematics of rule’, as practices for forming and justifying idealised schemata for representing reality, analysing it and remedying it. Further political rationalities have an epistemological character in that they exemplify particular conceptions of the subjects to be governed, rendering reality thinkable in such a way that it is acquiescent to political programming and intervention (Rose and Miller 1992: 17). Secondly, governmentality can be understood as an array of technologies of government, referring to the strategies, techniques and procedures (Foucault, 1988; Lemke, 2001). Hence, governing is not just about the imposition of idealised schema, but the complex assembling of forces (legal, professional, financial), disciplinary techniques (calculation, examination) and devices (surveys and charts, systems of education) that aim to regulate decisions and actions of individuals and groups. These technologies and devices have neither the unity nor the functionality usually ascribed to them (Rose, 1996) and provide, in hindsight of the critiques above, an exceptionally useful lens through which to understand neoliberalism as a form of governmentality.

An analysis of Nepad also provides an exceptionally useful means of addressing gaps in the governmentality literature. Firstly, Ong (2006: 14) highlights that whilst ‘it is obvious that neoliberalism as political rationality is not confined to … liberal democracies, it has barely been investigated outside North Atlantic situations’, likewise Ferguson and Gupta (2002) also charge analysis of neoliberal governmentality to be “strikingly Eurocentric”, providing great potential for an African case study. Secondly, there have been calls for such an analytic in the realm of critical development studies. Whilst major inroads have been made by the likes of Escobar (1995), Ferguson (1990), Li (2007) and others in understanding the axes of knowledge-power, the effects of certain discourses and the modalities of rule implicated by development schemes, Corbridge (1997:180) argues that whilst ‘it is right that the concept(s) and practice(s) of development are rendered problematic…we need to understand and constantly challenge the particular forms of governmentality that are sponsored in its name’ (emphasis added). Lastly, Mitchell (2006: 390) argues that current research on governmentality ‘does not adequately engage with how and in what ways people are constituted and ruled as neoliberal subjects through the many ‘technologies’ and ‘assemblages’ so brilliantly outlined by the theorists’. So by engaging with the research problem of how to understand Nepad as a form of “neoliberal governmentality”, Mitchell’s concern raises the substantive question: What are the technologies of government evident within Nepad that attempt to rework Africa into a society of ideal neoliberal subjects?
This substantive question consists of two logical sub-questions that correspond to the two ways that governmentality can be analysed. The first is: *what are the ideal subjects that Nepad aims to create?* This question attempts to engage with the concept of political rationalities and the creation of an arena of intervention, the identification of deficiency and attempt to render governmental problems technical and amenable to solutions. And secondly: *by what means does Nepad attempt to do this?* This sub-question usefully engages with the theme of technologies of government through which subjects become crafted according to the articulation of governmental rationalities and goals. The overall research question seeks to bring a fresh light to analyses of both Nepad and neoliberalism by drawing attention to more subtle ways within the development context whereby individuals become sculpted and resubjectified as neoliberal subjects.
Chapter 3: Research Design

Method outline
The methodology is divided into two distinct sections corresponding to the requirements of each of the two sub-questions (see figure 2). To address the first sub-question (*what are the ideal subjects that Nepad aims to create, and why?*) a discourse analysis of all available Nepad material was carried out, with particular focus on the base document which was signed by African leaders (Nepad, 2001). Through this process, appropriate case-studies were selected so that the second sub-question (*through what means does it aim to do this?*) could be addressed. The methods used to address this question required (a) a combination of content (and discourse analysis) on documents focused on or related to the case-studies in question, (b) an engagement with academic research/literature and (c) a thorough search for commentaries, opinions, newspaper articles, institutional material from outside of Nepad. All three were mutually reinforcing. Emailing and phone interviews were carried out with key figures at Nepad in order to supplement data gathered and to query any ambiguities found in the research.

![Figure 2: Summary of methodology](image-url)
There are a number of advantages of using these secondary data sources. It provides an unobtrusive method that can be reviewed repeatedly, especially as these documents are published in English and are in formats which can be easily transported by email, accessed over the internet (through the Nepad or AU websites) or, at least, sent by post. Of the literature that exists on neoliberal governmentality (e.g. Mitchell, 2006; Prince et al., 2006) there has been a tendency to focus on analysing official discourses as read through government policy documents, which suggests a valid approach to the research problem¹⁸. Lastly, official reports are a significant vehicle in framing and shaping development debates, and as Grewal (2008:56) argues, ‘policy publications are the flagship publications of policy bodies and one significant means of by which policy bodies communicate [and market] their development paradigm to the public’. They are thus central to the construction and reproduction of discourse and therefore of critical use to researchers.

Stage 1a: Identifying relevant policy documents for analysis
The initial research proposal, which sought to draw key comparisons and breaks between Nepad and the SAPs, revealed a number of access issues and consequently prompted a reorientation of the project towards a focus exclusively on Nepad and also grounded in governmentality studies. Although Nepad consists of one base document, which was exceptionally important for outlining the objectives and visions of the policy agenda, there are a series of other documents that were analysed. As a consequence I use a particularly general definition of “policy”, referring to numerous documents that constitute Nepad more generally. Although not an exhaustive list, these included: policies, constitutions, declarations, communiqués, speeches, annual reports, memoranda of understanding, recommendations and working papers.

These documents have been organised into four interrelated tiers in order to prioritise analysis and organise the large corpus of data. The most important or relevant of these are tabulated in table 4 in the appendix. The first tier of documents contains those core policies and principles central to Nepad, such as the Nepad base document itself, the Summary Report of Nepad, the Summary of Nepad Action Plans and the Nepad Priority Projects and Programmes. The Nepad website¹⁹ is especially useful for identifying what the secretariat regards as core documents and has them readily downloadable in both full and abridged formats. These were the most important documents and were used to understand the vision of Nepad, in particular how it diagnoses

¹⁸ Although this had led to criticisms of analyses being seamless in appearance and unrealistically top-down
deficiency and the need for improvement, how it perceives and conceptualises an ideal Africa, and by implication its vision of how Africans ought to conduct themselves or be conducted in order to get to that point. Similarly, they clearly outline certain principles which it expects Africans to adopt in order to realise the stated goals. These documents were therefore important to the first sub-question and to understanding governmental rationalities.

The second tier of documents were related to the priority areas of Nepad\textsuperscript{20}, outlining various initiatives (such as the African Peer Review Mechanism or the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme, the All-Africa Public Sector Awards), objectives, recommendations, resolutions and programmes that have been created to achieve the goals and principles outlined in the core documents. These documents came to elucidate the connection of rationalities and desired subjectivities with techniques designed to achieve those desired qualities (i.e. governmental technologies). The analysis of this tier began to reveal appropriate case-studies for the second sub-question.

A third tier consisted of communiqués, speeches, reports, summaries, press releases, guidance notes etc. that supplemented tiers one and two. These documents were particularly important in understanding the routine practices (i.e. what they actually do) and operations (i.e. how they work, where, by whom, for whom) that give Nepad effect and for tracing dominant and non-dominant discourses from official documents to more everyday and mundane governmental procedures. This tier of documents also showed how policies and technologies of government were described, justified and communicated to the development community and African public. Indeed, because coercive power is often ineffective and illegitimate, part of the power inherent to government is how technologies and rationalities are willingly accepted and taken-up by those subjects who they seek to control and mould.

A fourth tier consisted of the precursors to Nepad: the MAP, Omega plan and the New African Initiative. These documents are also readily available from the Nepad, APRM and UNECA websites and were useful to contextualise and trace how Nepad emerged from them, in particular the transferability of certain valued principles, objectives and constructions of ideal African subjects that either remain unchanged (because they remain dominant), were altered (because they were negotiated) or remain in tense contradiction (because they were co-contested). Less focus is drawn to this tier because these precursors do not outline or describe any techniques or initiatives designed to

\textsuperscript{20} The priority areas of Nepad are: the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM), economic governance, market access and agriculture, human development (health, education and ICT), infrastructure, science and technology, and environment.
bring out the desired subjects they demarcate as desirable. The Lagos Plan of Action, on the other hand, was especially important for tracing continuities and disjunctures between it and Nepad.

**Stage 1b: Discourse analysis**
The process of discourse analysis involved two procedures occurring side-by-side. The first required the organisation of data through codes in order to generate linkages of themes across documents and as a method of keeping track of the development of initial ideas and themes (Cope, 2005). This was done by reading through the documents and policies gathering and generating a series of codes. This coding exercise also allowed for a superficial engagement with what Nepad was, what it consisted of and what it aimed to do etc. Through background reading and initial analysis a series of codes quickly emerged, and these codes developed as the research continued. In this instance, there was no formal structure to this coding so as to prevent restricting my interpretation and, as a result, the codes were a combination of descriptive (in vivo) and analytic codes (see Cope, 2005).

The second procedure involved a more formal analysis of discourse. It is important to recognise that attempts at subject formation and the formation of technologies of rule also operate beyond the level of the material and concrete at the level of discourse. Indeed, uncovering dominant discourses can uncover the more subtle workings of power and Foucault (1971; 1997) recognises how subjectivity (and the process of subject formation) is intertwined with relations of power-knowledge and the production and reproduction of discourse. Although discourse analysis is largely interpretive, Powers (2001) provides a loose methodological structure to discourse analysis. Her outline is fairly extensive but can be condensed and summarised as three stages. The first stage is to conduct a *genealogy* of the discourse, i.e. uncovering the historical emergence of a system of notions and rules for the construction of meaningful statements, justifications, and the concrete material realities and procedures for determining truth and falsity in a discourse (Rawlinson, 1987). This stage was carried out in two ways: through an engagement with the literature on neoliberalism and development policy and through an investigation into the context of Nepad through speeches, news articles, NGO reports and information provided by current literature. Furthermore, tiers three and four of my collected data referred explicitly to both context and origins and the tracing of themes and discourses present in Nepad to their wider discursive context. The second stage involved a structural analysis of tier one and two documents which addressed the general issues outlines below (Dreyfus and Rabinow, 1983):

- the ‘system of differentiations’ or privileged access
- the ‘types of objective’ of one group over another
- the ‘means of bringing power relations into being’ that reveals surveillance systems, threats, and dismissals
- the ‘forms of institutionalisation’ such as bureaucratic structures, and
- the ‘degree of rationalisation’ required to support power arrangements

The structural part of discourse analysis answered the following required questions (Powers, 2001):

- On the axis of knowledge: What are the objects and subjects of the discourse? What differentiates between these objects and subjects? How does a discourse create a subject out of an object?
- On the axis of authority: How does a discourse preserve its socially constructed right to pronounce truth?
- On the axis of value or justification: How does the discourse justify the technologies of power that it constructs for its purposes and how does the discourse justify suppressing other discourse that challenges its dominance.

Lastly, Powers (2001) suggests conducting a power analytic which involves the careful reading of the discourse with a view to discerning discursive patterns of meaning, contradictions and inconsistencies that illuminate power relations. Such an analytic will account for the social production of subjectivities and institutional orders that are frequently assumed to be natural.

Stage 2a: Case-studies and content analysis

During extensive engagement with the Nepad material, I began to list potential case-studies which could help address the second sub-question (see table 3). Prior to the formal writing up of this research, I was familiar with the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM) and accordingly knew that it was a highly applicable and useful starting point for understanding how Nepad attempts to craft democratic and responsible African leaders. What I was aiming to do was uncover further initiatives through which Nepad aimed to create its desired subjects. This task proved difficult largely because, as an implementation agency, Nepad does not create projects per se (see page 55), rather it co-ordinates efforts between regional blocs, national states and other governmental and non-governmental groups. Nonetheless, four appropriate case-studies were selected, highlighted in bold in table 3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case study</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reasons for non-/selection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The African Peer Review Mechanism</strong></td>
<td>An initiative that encourages African leaders to submit themselves to peer review in order to ensure that internationally agreed standards of good governance, human rights and sound economic management are being adhered to.</td>
<td>The key selling point of Nepad to the international community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The All African Public Sector Innovation Awards</strong></td>
<td>A set of awards for African public sector employees who have demonstrated exceptional “innovation” in their delivery of public services</td>
<td>Extensive literature on the subject, often controversial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Civil Society Forums</strong></td>
<td>A series of meetings whereby Nepad officials were able to engage with the opinions of civil society groups</td>
<td>Has its own website with an abundance of up-to-date information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health points at Nepad’s e-Schools</strong></td>
<td>A method of promoting health literacy to African schoolchildren via the e-School project</td>
<td>Provides great scope for a discussion of innovation and knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The African Science, Technology &amp; Innovation Indicators Initiative</strong></td>
<td>An initiative to build Africa’s capacity to develop and use STI (science, technology and innovation) indicators.</td>
<td>Fairly recent initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nepad business foundation</strong></td>
<td>A body of businesses that believe in the Nepad principles and aim to do so ‘through the delivery of sustainable projects for the benefit of the African people and the prosperity of the African continent. The body meets to network, identify opportunities, disseminate information and ultimately bring projects to fruition.’</td>
<td>Necessary to make the analysis seem less ‘top-heavy’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nepad Human Development Plan</strong></td>
<td>An integrated strategy which addresses African education, health, ICT skills.</td>
<td>Nepad’s engagement with civil society groups is a contentious and important issue that needs to be addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nepad’s education and health improvements</strong></td>
<td>Analysis required a focus on initiatives that worked on individual African citizens</td>
<td>Analysis required a focus on initiatives that worked on individual African citizens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nepad’s education and health improvements</strong></td>
<td>Also a recent project and thus possible to gain new and up-to-date information</td>
<td>Also a recent project and thus possible to gain new and up-to-date information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nepad’s education and health improvements</strong></td>
<td>Seemed to fit arguments about standardisation and audit, albeit weakly.</td>
<td>Seemed to fit arguments about standardisation and audit, albeit weakly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nepad’s education and health improvements</strong></td>
<td>Very relevant to a governmentality debate (esp. development goals, statistics and policy making), but potential links to subject formation very vague</td>
<td>Very relevant to a governmentality debate (esp. development goals, statistics and policy making), but potential links to subject formation very vague</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nepad’s education and health improvements</strong></td>
<td>Poor personal experience with science and technology initiatives</td>
<td>Poor personal experience with science and technology initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nepad’s education and health improvements</strong></td>
<td>Interesting group that fully endorses Nepad and sees business and being able to fulfil Nepad’s economic and social groups</td>
<td>Interesting group that fully endorses Nepad and sees business and being able to fulfil Nepad’s economic and social groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nepad’s education and health improvements</strong></td>
<td>Not clear whether it is directly related to Nepad</td>
<td>Not clear whether it is directly related to Nepad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nepad’s education and health improvements</strong></td>
<td>Once again, relation to subject formation is vague</td>
<td>Once again, relation to subject formation is vague</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nepad’s education and health improvements</strong></td>
<td>Useful for looking at “human” development is to be promoted, what techniques are recommended, what behaviours are promoted etc.</td>
<td>Useful for looking at “human” development is to be promoted, what techniques are recommended, what behaviours are promoted etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nepad’s education and health improvements</strong></td>
<td>However, does not provide any initiatives or tangible ‘technologies’ per se. Is thus more of a set of guidelines that envisages desirable subjects but without specifying how this is to be achieved</td>
<td>However, does not provide any initiatives or tangible ‘technologies’ per se. Is thus more of a set of guidelines that envisages desirable subjects but without specifying how this is to be achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nepad’s education and health improvements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The second sub-question comprised of five areas of focus: what were the technologies being examined? How did they operate in an institutional setting? What rationalities underpinned their existence? How did they attempt to bring about desired subjects? What articulations and negotiations were evident in their operation? To gather data that could address this question, three methods were used. Firstly, discourse and content analysis was carried out in very much the same way as described above but was focused exclusively on the case-studies at hand. All relevant academic literature was consulted not only to engage with other researchers’ arguments but also as a source of information. Literature on the latter three selected case studies (and the non-selected case studies) was scarce, if present at all. News archives such as allAfrica.com, iol.co.za, AfricaNews.com were all exceptionally useful for finding relevant news articles and commentaries, and similarly, search engines Google and Copernica were also used to amass relevant material such as government, non-governmental or inter-governmental documents. Whilst data collection generally progressed in this order, there was a continual re-engagement with and amassing of literature, official documents and other published documents or material (see figure 2).

**Stage 2b: Interviews**

Once the majority of the analysis was completed, key contacts at Nepad (or other relevant organisations) were approached by email in order to provide information that was necessarily for a fuller empirical analysis of the selected case-studies. It was hoped that interviews would be able to reveal (beyond that done by document analysis) how aspect of Nepad had changed over time, some of the conflicts and problems it has faced, any unintended consequences and its own internal problem solving practices. Contact details were found online. The desire was that, in a similar manner to snowball sampling, these keymasters and gatekeepers would provide further useful connections and contacts. This was, at times, the case. However, there was a very poor response rate to introductory emails and the plan shifted to making direct phone calls which became less of an interview and more of a fact-finding discussion (see table 5). The initial intention was also to establish contact with academics in the field, but this was given less priority (prompted by time constraints), because there was already enough material readily available from activists, academics and NGOs on Nepad more generally. It is emphasised that interviews were not a core methodology but were used to add nuance to the analysis.
Other methodological considerations

Ethics
The ethical considerations of this project were significantly reduced by not involving vulnerable human research subjects, discussing socially sensitive topics or requiring consent for inclusion into the research. Nor was I conducting research involving access to records of personal or confidential information or inducing psychological stress or anxiety upon research subjects. The only ethical issues involved my relationship with my informants/interviewees (through email or in interview), whereby I was required not to mislead gatekeepers into giving me documents that I needed (Finch, 1984; Miller and Bell, 2002). I found, however, that I needed to negotiate the disclosure of enough detail so as to provide adequate information on the nature of the project, with the concealment of aspects of the project which could be misinterpreted by some gatekeepers as “too critical” or “too radical”.

Reflexivity, partiality and positionality
Whilst there have been many discussions of positionality and reflexivity in interviews and focus groups (e.g. McDowell, 1992; Radcliffe, 1994), observations have not been widened to include document analysis like that used in this project. The need to acknowledge situated knowledges and positionality derives from the observation that the sort of knowledge made depends on who its makers are (ibid.). Even as a researcher looking at the particularly sterile subject of policy and ostensibly detached from the social realities of my research topic, I am still nonetheless embedded within this research through a number of means. For example, my own personal experiences and interests in Africa (both as traveler in 2005, 2006 and 2007, and as researcher in 2007) are extremely influential in how I construct my own discourses and imaginative geographies of the continent. Indeed, my positionality as also means that I am coming at the question with a preformed and Eurocentric perspective of the construction of subjectivity that may differ from more ethnographically sensitive accounts of African subject formation. Furthermore, my motives are also part of my embeddedness, which are skewed far more towards intellectual curiosity and challenge than engagement with forms of social activism or policy recommendations.

Whilst my positionality was mediated by people I spoke with and emailed, of greater significance (and barely discussed in the methods literature) is the acknowledgement of my audience as impacting how and what knowledge is produced, the style of the presentation of findings and the determination of valid knowledge. Indeed, Duncan and Ley (1993) remind us that despite how we
present our work, an audience will always produce a different interpretation to it than an author intends illustrating how the relationship between researcher and audience is as much a site of power as the relationship between researcher and research subject.

This piece of work does not strive for objectivity; indeed, it makes use of thinkers such as Foucault who decried the concept of absolute truth. It is also inevitably partial, not only in being unable to assess Nepad from ‘all angles’ and in *magnum opus* depth but also because my gaze is not holistic or total and does not pretend to be. Such god-trick perspectives include questions of the politics of representation in that, as researchers, ‘we are inextricably bound up with questions of authority, communication and representations’ (Radcliffe, 1994: 28). Indeed, this methodology and the selection of particular methods over others is itself a process through which, Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992) remind us, we construct our ‘objects of research’ and through which they are made knowable.

*Acknowledging Limitations*

The nature of the question and the selection of methodology orient this project towards a focus on only policies and the dominant discourses embedded within those documents. As a result, it provides only a narrow and top-down focus on how governmental institutions envisage ideal subjects and attempt to create them, as supposed to how governmental policies ‘take’ in everyday situations and how they interact with existing social and cultural formations (Larner, 2002; Barnett, 2005). In particular, one of Barnett’s discontents with theories of neoliberalism is that they ‘residualise the social’ and cannot recognise what he calls ‘bottom-up governmentality’ (2005: 10), which is arguably a call for localised, small-scale ethnographic analyses. This is not to say that studying “attempts” at subject formation are not worthy, merely that it provides a narrow. However, in defense, studying these attempts must always precede the study of how they play out ‘on the ground’ thereafter and could be foundational for further research at PhD when a more significant period of ethnographic research could be afforded.

Although key documents of Nepad were freely available and thus greatly overcame problems of access there were, however, limitations involved in relying solely on documents posted online. Firstly, there was no obligation for the Nepad Secretariat to post every single document that it produces, and the posting of selective documents online may be intended to provide the appearance of being totally open and accountable. Secondly, there appears to be a significant gap in the
chronology of the documents that have been posted online, with many documents coming out in June 2005 but with few after 2007. My intuition suggests that there may be more recent documents that will be useful. Thirdly, there may be important material that Nepad administrators feel is generally unimportant but which, for me, are not. It was hoped that these issues would be overcome through interviews and establishing connections but, as already stated, my response rate and the information that I needed was not to the extent anticipated.

A limitation and problem with using a fairly predefined theoretical framework is that it is prone to creating an overly deductive account which forces aspects of Nepad into it. Critiquing the governmentality literature is not necessarily a primary objective but in understanding how the case relates to the theory, how the case may not relate to the theory has also become clearer and thus provide source of discussion. However, this is not to suggest that somehow a governmentality approach is more susceptible to this type of deduction because, after all, this research responds to the reduction of Nepad that suffer from this reductionism, only with a predefined Marxian political economy framework.

An inherent limitation of the theoretical framework is the charge often made against Foucault concerning his often incapacitative relativism which advocates that not only are that all claims to truth also claims to power, but that all discourses are equally as legitimate depending on their social context. Since it becomes hard to see which constructions might be worthy of our support, so the tendency can be to withhold support or political stance altogether resulting in work that can be regarded as overly descriptive and sterile. However, as Kendall and Wickham (2006) argue, it is often at the unmasking of one of truth and the replacement of another where the moment of critique becomes possible. This is strived for in the conclusion of this research.
Chapter 4: Examining Political Rationality and the Construction of Ideal Subjects

In this first analysis chapter I want to focus attention towards how Nepad typifies advanced liberal rule, and neoliberal rationalities (Rose, 1999). The notion of a political rationality provides a means of addressing widely accepted nostrums and theoretical assumptions that currently inform policymaking but which, according to Dean and Hindess (1998: 7), cannot be viewed simply as the implementation of any particular political or economic theory or social standpoint. Although government is a complex activity, political rationalities exhibit certain discernible regularities (Rose and Miller, 1992: 178; Beeson and Firth, 1998). They specify the goals and principles to which the activities of government should be directed, and as a result how problems become understood as problems. In this sense the goals outlined by Nepad are “development”, directed towards subjects deemed to be “undeveloped”. Secondly, political rationalities take their particular form in relation to the way in which the objects of government are conceived: their field of visibility. For example, how one understands the causes of underdevelopment in Africa has implications for how development is attempted and who can do the developing. Likewise, political rationalities specify particular subjectivities as desirable or assumed, which can be captured by what I term “homo economicus Africana”. Political rationalities are therefore regimes of thought that construct reality, interpret the role of government and construct the object of government.

For the reasons outlined above, Nepad therefore characterises a form of government attempting to conduct conduct. Such political programming involves not only the will to govern but, more specifically, the will to improve: the attempt to direct conduct and intervene in social processes to produce desired outcomes and avert undesired ones (Li, 2007: 264). James Ferguson’s fantastic and epoch-defining work on development in Lesotho applies Foucault and an analytic of governmentality to the work of development21 and thus forms a useful starting point. In particular, I am interested in how Nepad conceptualises Africa and development, how it asks certain questions about the world, draws on certain knowledges over others to answer them and marks out and justifies an arena of intervention to act upon them. I ask: how does Nepad understand and articulate the causes and features of “the African development” problem? What are the problems that it is

---

21 Others too have provided equally as compelling accounts e.g. Li, 2007; Watts, 2003
mandated to solve? How do diagnoses of deficiency (including the knowledges that support them) and the need for intervention become shaped by the solutions that are at hand? These are more general analytical questions about development but focused on Nepad in particular.

But I also want to move beyond Ferguson’s observation that development discourse constructs underdevelopment, which has now become fairly well accepted in post-structuralist accounts of development. I want to begin disaggregating what we mean by “development”, and how, within contemporary political rationalities, Nepad understands this underdevelopment to be the cause of a particular combination of different deficiencies inextricably linked to certain taken-for-granted, and market-based, solutions. As Abrahamsen (2000: 47-66) has suggested, a key task of critical development studies is not to focus on ‘any notion of correct or incorrect theories of development, or getting waylaid by notions of the right or wrong development strategy’, rather, she notes, we should instead focus our attention ‘on the discourse itself… in order to expose what it silences and evades and how it legitimises certain options and excludes alternative futures.’ Whilst Ferguson questions “development” more generally, I aim to question: Why this type of development? Why are these deficiencies (and not others) deemed to be in need of intervention now and why are certain characteristics (the goals of overcoming these deficiencies) deemed more desirable?

**Constituting the object of development**

The base Nepad document is especially useful for addressing some of these questions for it explicitly paints a distinctive picture of Africa: one urgently in need of development. It is clear that Africa’s current condition is deemed undesirable, not just by the architects of Nepad, but by a whole global discourse about “the African development problem” which necessitates change from a lesser to a more desirable state through the process of improvement (Mathews, 2004). There is now a wide-ranging literature that questions the épistème of development which need not be retraced here, although it is useful to draw on Ferguson (1990) who points out that ‘like ‘civilisation’ in the nineteenth century, development is the name not only for a value, but also for a dominant problematic or interpretive field through which the impoverished regions of the world are known to us. Within this interpretive grid a list of everyday observations are rendered intelligible and

---

22 What Foucault termed the episteme refers to “a conceptual grid that delimits the possibility of all knowledge in a given period and within which a culture orders the world and construes truth and reality”

23 Often referred to as post-development thinkers, although I aim to use this terminology sparingly, if at all. What is important to realise is how such critiques draw attention to the basic assumptions underpinning development initiatives and suggest that the discourses of development are, themselves, implicated in power relations often perpetuating inequitable relations by constructing the Third World as the first world’s underdeveloped ‘other’
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meaningful.’ Nepad relies on such an interpretive grid, one that has hardened for decades into a coherent concept that has come to be “development”.

Nepad communicates this difference by being laden with references to underdevelopment in the form of ‘poverty’ and ‘backwardness’. The condition of Africa is invariably diagnosed by contrasting certain aspects of it (its trade, health, security, technology, education levels etc.) with Western notions of what it means to be developed. It differentiates and discriminates, which, as Rose (1999:57) reminds us, is central to all forms of diagnosis. This comparison is none clearer than in the second point of the introduction where Nepad states: ‘The poverty and backwardness of Africa stand in stark contrast to the prosperity of the developed world’ (para. 2), reflecting how Africa becomes defined as primitive backwardness against a modern, progressive and morally superior West. It is surprising to find such self-disdaining language supposedly authored by African leaders yet, such a representation is nothing new; as Mudimbe (1988) has argued; Africa’s alterity and Otherness is central to the very idea and invention of Africa in the western imaginary. Thus, Nepad reproduces this problematic western imaginary despite proclaiming to be African in origin. The term backwardness calls to mind modernisation theory which understands development to be a natural linear process through which all societies’ progress, throwing off “backwardness” and “tradition” as modernity is embraced. Africa is also seen as “playing catch-up” with the developed world as paragraph 65 so clearly illustrates:

“The objective of the New Partnership for Africa’s Development is to give impetus to Africa’s development by bridging existing gaps in priority sectors in order to enable the continent to catch up with developed parts of the world.”

However, this discourse of backwardness often finds an uneasy juxtaposition with the term “underdevelopment” which, on the other hand, has connotations of dependency theory, ironically deployed when arguing for greater integration into the global economy,

1. [...] The Programme is anchored on the determination of Africans to extricate themselves and the continent from the malaise of underdevelopment and exclusion in a globalising world.
14. [...] Accordingly, the New Partnership for Africa’s Development must preserve this common heritage and use it to build a universal understanding of the historic need to end the underdevelopment and marginalisation of the continent.

24 Sometimes I will refer back and forth to this notion of “the West” as shorthand for high-income industrialised nations. Nepad never explicitly states “the West” and instead refers to the developed world. However, whilst this clearly erases part of the non-western developed world (Japan, Korea, Middle Eastern States), many have pointed out that Nepad is primarily directed to “the West” and the G8 who are the largest donors to Africa, and who, are the largest promoters of democracy and liberal economics. “Development” has also been charged to be a particularly European/Western concept (Escobar, 1995)
46. [...] The United Nations Millennium Declaration, adopted in September 2000, confirms the global community's readiness to support Africa's efforts to address the continent's underdevelopment and marginalisation.

The presence of these discourses are often in tension but they nonetheless work together to present an image of a desperate and behind Africa. They emphasise the Eurocentric trajectory of development discourse at the same time as structuring a hierarchy of progress which inevitably positions the developed world at the top and all others, namely Africa, at the bottom, as substandard, as deficient.

As well as establishing a dangerously narrow image of Africa and a homogenous and idealised image of the developed world, this concept of progress reinforces a schema that assumes that the developed world is how the world ought to work. As well as closing off alternative futures and politics, it valorises knowledge originating the developed world as central to unlocking the "development problem" and, as a consequence, clearly laying out a role for Western intervention into the social problems of Africa. This role is rhetorically shifted through the emphasis on "partnership" between the developed and non-developed world but the implicit assumption is nonetheless that the developed world can not only provide the capital for African development but also the knowledge and expertise. It is with this regard that Ferguson (2006: 8) argues that Africa is understood as a deviation from the western norm which consequently leads to a profusion of solutions and panaceas that attempt to bring Africa in line with 'universal standards'. The consequence is that Nepad (and it is not alone in the field of development programmes) normalises western values and the western development path. This is despite the fact that firstly, many thinkers (inside Africa and outside) have proposed that such a path of development involving ecological destruction, social polarisation, the marginalisation of indigenous culture and values and 'ethical bankruptcy' (see Esteva, 1992; Escobar, 1995; Matthews, 2004b) may not be desirable for any region and secondly, past attempts to implement western political (and to a lesser extent economic) systems in Africa raises questions over the universal validity and desirability of such systems. Indeed, this position forecloses understanding the multiple ways in which components of "the West" actually came to be a group of industrial, high-consumption, high-income countries.²⁵

²⁵ In other words that within Europe, particularly, there have been many so-called development paths, the same applies to the USA and also the Asian Tigers. Most notably with the latter two examples, protectionism played an especially important role in their development path, a concept that has been discredited in Africa with the fundamental catastrophes of ISI and the post-independence "development state" and since the prominence of structural adjustment policies and globalisation. Particularly see Chang (2002) who puts development theory in a historical perspective, arguing that developed nations have been prone to "kick the ladder".
Since development is understood through a predominantly western-centered vision of intelligibility, much of the Nepad strategy is based upon an identification of lacks and differences between the “developed” world and what Mbembe describes as ‘the absent object’. The result is the planning of ways to eliminate these differences through various initiatives such as the ‘market access initiative’ or ‘bridging the digital divide initiative’. The severity of these perceived differences are evoked through terms such as “bridging the gap” (para. 55) and “overcoming chasms” (para. 8). Such rationality is also evident where the characteristics of the developed world (such as extensive telecommunications networks or infrastructure) are identified as aspirations:

97. Infrastructure is one of the major parameters of economic growth, and solutions should be found to permit Africa to rise to the level of developed countries in terms of the accumulation of material and human capital.

These differences, created by the normalisation of the western development path, are also applied to less tangible explanatory factors for Africa’s underdevelopment, for example:

22. At independence, virtually all the new states were characterised by a shortage of skilled professionals and a weak capitalist class, resulting in a weakening of the accumulation process.

Here, we see a Euro-centric narrative of a history of classes, industrialisation, professionalisation and capital accumulation. But, the contradiction is that the statement prior argues that colonialism led to the “subversion of traditional structures, institutions and values” (para. 21) which seems to posit a pre-colonial ‘African development path’ that was disrupted. What is nonetheless clear is that Nepad’s view of development is one of assimilation with the developed world, and thus less about following an African path or direction (cf. Chabal and Daloz, 1999) and more about willingly following in the footsteps of “the developed world”. Such a position is deeply problematic and contradictory in a development strategy that is said to be central to an “African Renaissance”.

In constructing and articulating Africa’s underdevelopment, many of the images of the continent or the showcasing of problems that are used within Nepad resonates with what Smith (2006) has termed the discourse of ‘African tragedy’ (also Myers 2001). The closing statement of the document particularly draws on a device Myers calls the “mother-and-child suffering imagery”:

---

26 And note how the rhetoric of ‘renaissance’ is also highly Eurocentric
27 A speech by French President Nicholas Sarkozy’s in Senegal has been widely condemned by many African intellectuals for many reasons, amongst them the line “The tragedy of Africa is that the African has never really entered into history” which at once both ahistoricised Africa in a typically colonial fashion but also drew on the discourse of tragedy. Henry Kissinger has also remarked “the continent is a tragedy; it is also a challenge”. See also articles like Easterly and Levine (1998) “Africa’s Growth Tragedy: Policies and Ethnic Divisions”.
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205. In fulfilling its promise, this agenda must give hope to the emaciated African child that the 21st century is indeed Africa’s century  

This device not only (re)creates the perceived representation of Africa by development agencies through emotive words such as ‘crisis’, ‘failure’, ‘problem’ and ‘weak’, but it suggests that firstly there is something particularly African about the “African development problem”, and secondly that these problems are rife across the whole continent. It resonates with Myers’ (2001) and Ferguson’s (2006) observations that Africa is frequently represented as a place where things go wrong. In this case, the tragedy discourse singles out Africa to be a special case, different from even “the developing world”  

which creates the logic that Africa needs to be more like the rest of the world – economically, politically and socially – which can only come about by bringing Africa into the “global fold” (i.e. through integration in world trade) and by bringing it in line with ‘universal standards’. The document recreates the Africa of famine, war, poverty and corruption in such a way that it signals urgency for “development” to overcome such endemic failures (see Jarosz, 1992)

Indeed, it is noticeable how it is Africa – as a continent, a totality, a whole – that is constructed as the unit of analysis (cf. Ferguson, 2006). In this sense, Africa is treated as a whole which is to be acted on (strikingly merging countries north and south of the Sahara). This objectification of the whole continent is clear in the document’s conceptualisation of “African resources” (para. 12, para. 20), “African’s culture” (para. 10), “African goods and services” (para. 98), “African best practice” (para. 138), “Africa’s capacity for planning” (para. 185) “African’s participation and leadership” (para. 187) and so on and so forth. Such analytical demarcation for diagnosis and intervention means that Africa becomes conceived as a “quasi-individual” constituting a natural economic (and cultural) unit (cf. Ferguson, 1990: 62). Furthermore, Nepad consistently makes use of the designation of “African leaders”, itself an erroneous and vague category referring to a diversity of democratic leaders, despots and monarchs as well as left-leaning, liberal and right-wing governments and particularly effacing the role of certain leaders like Mbeki, Obasanjo and Bouteflika who were instrumental in pushing Nepad. Whilst this Africanisation also works as a display of solidarity to the developed world against which it is posited, the effect is also to present an “African development problem’ or the ‘African economy’ as needing a set of ‘African development solutions’. Here the role of African ownership becomes especially powerful. Paragraph 137 in the environment initiative particularly demonstrates this Africanisation:

28 This quote is particularly worth mentioning, for it responds to the World Bank’s 2000 report called “Can African Claim the 21st Century?”, if anything highlighting the donor-centric positioning of Nepad
29 Similar to Ferguson’s observations about how Lesotho was diagnosed as an LDC
It should be mentioned here that Africa will host the World Summit on Sustainable Development in September 2002, and that environmental management forms the basis of the Summit. What is striking here is that it is not Johannesburg, and not even South Africa, that is holding the WSSD; but Africa. It is exemplary of how geography, places, borders, cultural differences, internal politics and conflicts are all erased and homogenised and replaced with the object of analysis and the arena for governmental intervention: Africa.

Statistics and numbers are instrumental devices used as part of the inscription and accumulation of knowledge about Africa, African problems and the African population. Ian Hacking (1981, 1986) has written extensively on the emergence of liberal government and the corresponding expansion of numbers being published concerning “the population”, this argument need not be recapped here. In Nepad though, like all development initiatives, the African population emerges as bearing an array of deficiencies and (in)capacities understood to be problematic through the application of statistically determined norms or standards of living which, needless to say, is almost entirely premised on the developed world (once again) (e.g. para. 4 “There are only 18 mainline telephones per 1000 people in Africa, compared with 146 for the world as a whole and 567 for high-income countries”). However, a major problem with numbers is their manipulation in that they can be read differently by different people or they can avoid asking questions which fall outside of the boundaries of the “irreal spaces” created by governmental statistics. For example, Nepad is premised on the assumption that Africa’s problems are caused by its marginalised from the global economy but statistics produced by UNCTAD suggest that 70pc of FDI flow to the African continent is concentrated in only five countries: Angola, Egypt, Morocco, Nigeria and South Africa (UNCTAD, 2000). Numbers never tell the whole story, indeed that may not be possible, yet they are crucial for the exercise of power and the operations of government by adding a layer of truth and validity to the regimes of development knowledge.

Introducing Homo Economicus Africana

In addressing development, what constitutes “suitable” or “legitimate” solutions are related to a particular governmental conception of human nature. Within the neoliberal political rationality there exists a notion of human beings – cultivated by classical economists in the eighteenth and nineteenth century and liberal theorists of the twentieth – as rational, self-interested and calculating: as homo
economicus. Engaging with these theories, Foucault argued in his lectures to the Collège de France that neoliberal political rationality adopts a moral imperative that humans should be able to exercise choice and freedom (see also Rose, 1999: 50-61) in how they conduct themselves, free from the direct intervention of the state. With this observation in mind, what is significant about Nepad is that whilst Africa may be constructed as impoverished, backward and corrupt, Nepad posits that Africans are innately entrepreneurial, innovative and democratic:

23. Many African governments did not empower their peoples to embark on development initiatives to realise their creative potential

57. The leaders of the continent are aware of the fact that the true genius of a people is measured by its capacity for bold and imaginative thinking, and its determination in support of its own development

With this emphasis on the individual rather than the socio-structural, the solutions to African development are explicitly placed with “the people” as they are now considered to be the proper, and most capable, experts and agents for development. The aim is for Africans to be reconstituted, as Nepad states, as architects of their own self-upliftment (para. 27) a concept that saturates all Nepad literature (to which Homo Economicus Africana can be considered to be a short-hand). Such an objective is not only supported by a moralistic imperative of freedom but is considered more effective in achieving the goal of development: by devolving responsibility down to the individual and letting “natural” instincts operate through “natural” entities such as community, enabling the “natural” course of development.

This theme of Homo Economicus Africana is not only evident in excerpts from the Nepad document, but it also emerges across some of Nepad’s central themes. For example in Nepad, as in

---

30 Homo economicus, or economic man, was first used by John Stuart Mill in the 19th century although it is associated with thinkers such as Adam Smith and David Ricardo. It refers to the model of homo sapiens that acts to obtain the highest possible well-being for himself given available information about opportunities and other constraints, homo economicus is seen as rational in the sense that well-being is defined by the utility function is optimised given perceived opportunities. Cf. homo sociologus (where individuals work, not for selfish means, but to fulfil social roles).

31 As Foucault (Lecture 21, March 1979) shows, neoliberals even interpret the penal system as needing to respond to a supply of crimes with punishment as a means of constraining the negative externalities of specific actions. Crime is thus a market, like any other regulating the distribution of criminality (see Lemke (2001)).

32 By this I mean that whilst in classical economic theory, homo economicus was deemed to be universal, homo economicus Africana is a sub-set of this (in a Linnaean fashion) which is particularly more development orientated and needed to address the African development problem (thus mirroring the shift from universal, one-size-fits-all policies of the BWIs towards a greater sensitivity towards the local).

33 As captured by the point 21: “Colonialism subverted hitherto traditional structures, institutions and values or made them subservient to the economic and political needs of the imperial powers. It also retarded the development of an entrepreneurial class, as well as a middle class with skills and managerial capacity.”
development discourse more widely, a shift is evident towards rhetorical tools and techniques such as “capacity building”, for instance, paragraph 23:

Today, the weak state remains a major constraint on sustainable development in a number of countries. Indeed, one of Africa’s major challenges is to strengthen the capacity to govern and to develop long-term policies

There are 51 references to the term “capacity” alone within Nepad, which draws on the rationality that the individual, as the agent of development, is to be given the capacity – the tools, the environment, the rights, other assistance – in order to take responsibility for their own future and effect change for and of themselves (see Phillips and Ilcan, 2004). The emergence of building capacity correlates to the neoliberal reconfiguration of African’s into ‘human capital’:

64. The challenge for Africa, therefore, is to develop the capacity to sustain growth at levels required to achieve poverty reduction and sustainable development. This, in turn, depends on other factors such as infrastructure, capital accumulation, human capital, institutions, structural diversification, competitiveness, health, and good stewardship of the environment.

The recent concept of human capital – which anchors many “human development” strategies in Nepad – involves, Read (2009) argues, workers coming to see themselves not as workers but as companies of one who are keen to invest in their own future output34. Rather than a focus on labour necessary to promote industrialisation, government now seeks to encourage the imparting and uptake of new skills (understood as necessary investments) which are deemed crucial within a new knowledge economy, something Nepad is especially focused on (see para. 6, 332, 164, 165). This represents a more fundamental shift not simply at the macro level (from Keynesianism to free-markets) but in defining the desirable traits of subjects who are to be instrumental in the development process.

If the solutions to Africa’s problems lie with Africans themselves then the role of government then becomes significantly reconfigured. Government (as in the state and development programmers) is no longer seen as providing development, as such; rather they are understood as enabling development to take place. Nepad makes this fairly clear on several occasions by using the capacity-building discourse, for example:

34 This is especially evident in the document “Developing African Higher Education” from May 31, 2001. This document also endorses the outsourcing of educational functions for a “leaner structure”, the commercialisation of research and the commodification of knowledge. See: http://www.nepad.org/2005/files/documents/22.pdf
86. State capacity-building is a critical aspect of creating conditions for development. The state has a major role to play in promoting economic growth and development, and in implementing poverty reduction programmes.

The African state is thus a promoter of development and growth through the encouragement of investment in particular but also, as argued above, through the promotion of particular desired behaviours by its citizens. Such a mode of government inevitably operates within the logic that human capacity and expertise itself, once freed, is capable of development; reformulating the role of government as not bringing “development” as such, but to create the environment and condition whereby development becomes possible. As Barry et al. (1996: 10) note within Western contexts: ‘in the styles of neo-liberal political reason that began to be formulated after the Second World War, it was the responsibility of political government to actively create the conditions within which entrepreneurial and competitive conduct is possible’. For all the policies and economic philosophies that may have been applied to Africa, it is here where neoliberal governmentality is most apparent: the role of government as enabler not provider.

These conceptions of the African subject, however, are problematically assumed to pre-exist the working of power. They are constructed as innate and natural and merely lying dormant waiting to be released. Colonialism, former developmental states or, indeed, dictatorships are charged with retarding the maturity of these desired characteristics through their overly-centralised and/or coercive power. Whilst not overt, this is implicit throughout when Nepad refers to past mismanagement and related this to projected self-improvement, for example:

52. Africa, impoverished by slavery, corruption and economic mismanagement, is taking off in a difficult situation. However, if the continent’s enormous natural and human resources are properly harnessed and utilised, it could lead to equitable and sustainable growth [...] 53. This is why our peoples, in spite of the present difficulties, must regain confidence in their genius and their capacity to face obstacles and be involved in the building of the new Africa.

Whilst Nepad assumes that homo economicus Africana already exists and that the role of government is to nurture and utilise this, from a governmentality perspective this relationship is reversed so that homo economicus Africana is as much an effect of power as it is the target. This subjectification occurs through the design and implementation of certain devices, technologies, legislations,

---

35 Political government is a term often used in the Foucauldian literature to refer to ‘the state’
36 In a similar way Cruikshank (1999, chapter 3) describes how the War on Poverty constructed “the poor” and “the powerless”, Ferguson (1990) as we have seen details the construction of “the undeveloped”, Rankin (2003) “rational economic women” and Agrawal (2005) “good environmental subjects”.
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governmental actions which are also a means of measuring and evaluating these desired capacities (as will be explored in chapter 5).

This presumption of a reality that already exists has a three-fold effect. Firstly, these ideal neoliberal characteristics are normalised and universalised. They are regarded as being apolitical, acultural and asocial features of individuals based on the knowledge that, when left to be free, human are rational actors fully-capable of self-government and self-improvement. There thus exists an explicit ethical case for intervention that allows subjects to come to think of themselves as free (cf. Rose, 1999) in order to free themselves from the tyranny of poverty and state oppression. Secondly, as already mentioned, there then exists a consequent need for governments and other development institutions to get the environment right, for leaders not to intervene directly but, by governing at a distance, using the market and managing the relation between man and things in such a way that this spirit and essence can be freed. Thirdly, and most significantly, the combination of these two points indicates that governments must attempt to remove the impediments to this natural march of progress (cf. modernisation theory) towards both liberal democracy and capitalism. Such an assumption is also present in paragraph 45 which states that “democracy is spreading”, and is also apparent in Nepad’s perspective of the historical consequences of colonialism: that colonialism primarily hindered this natural march of progress (para. 18-25). The consequence, or assumption, is that both liberal democracy and capitalism are portrayed as inevitable and natural human conditions (cf. Fukuyama, 1992).

The solution-deficiency-outcome matrix
With this teleological development path of capitalism and liberal-democracy established, the solutions to Africa’s development problems fold into methods which attempt to get to this end-point faster. The result is the deployment of solutions already “proven” to work in the Western context. This observation seems to resonate with one of Ferguson’s central tenets: that deficiencies are often diagnosed according to the solutions that development practitioners have to hand. He argues that the object of development becomes reconfigured and known in such a way that it is primed for technical interventions that are deemed to be universal and in society’s interest. Such a process in development has been described by Li (2007) as the process of “rendering technical”, intimately linked to certain forms of acceptable knowledge produced by expertise whereby deficiency A requires

37 Such a logic underpinned the Sachs led shock therapy of 1990s post-communist Russia
solution B which leads to outcome C. For Nepad, the lack of democracy becomes solved by techniques to bring about democracy (para. 49), the lack of regional infrastructure becomes solved by road, rail, pipeline and fibre-optics building programs (e.g. para. 98), the lack of skilled human capital becomes solved by education and training (para. 117), the lack of accountability becomes solved by auditing techniques (para. 152), the lack of market access for African goods becomes solved by the negotiation to open western markets (para. 153). It becomes very difficult to distinguish what comes first: the solution or the problem.

As well as identifying what Africa or Africans lack, this same logic can also be applied to past development initiatives. As Ferguson (1990) reminds us, development can always be made better; the model can be perfected or repaired. This perfection involves the introduction of new techniques designed to remedy the flaws in past schemes. For example, a failure of previous initiatives is identified as their “questionable… ownership” (para. 42) and the corresponding solution to this problem becomes the rhetoric of “African ownership” despite opinions from some commentators that Nepad is simply a ‘western wolf in African sheepskin’ (Adebajo, 2003). Similarly, aid is reinterpreted as a problem that entrenched dependency (para. 5), thus the solution is the search for private capital or the deployment of PPPs. Interference from former colonial powers or transnational institutions is identified as a problem and thus the solution becomes the reconceptualisation of development as a “partnership”. The “inadequate attention to the provision of social services” provided by SAPs is diagnosed as a problem and thus a solution is a programme more oriented towards health, education and such. As Ferguson (1990: 285) notes: “pointing out errors and suggesting improvements is an integral part of the process of justifying and legitimating development interventions”, they ensure the replicability of the development machine (see also Li, 2007: 18-19). Even the failures of the SAPs cannot be totally derided as bringing about no change, for these failures and the activism which politicised them could be seen as important to the emergence of a paradigm where states and governments are placed back into the picture (albeit partially), a wealth of cynicism and criticism that questions orthodox free-market reforms and “shock therapies” and the promotion of good governance. As Foucault’s (1979) analysis of the prison shows, there are always re-inventions as well as unintended outcomes of programmes of rule.

But, if Africans are naturally entrepreneurial, economically rational and democratic, and if these qualities are to be nurtured by government so that Africans can be agents of their own development, then why has economic and social transformation not occurred and how are governments expected to bring these changes about? What are the reasons for the lack of progress?
One clue is found in paragraph 27 when Nepad charges that the definition of development has previously been misunderstood, which thus led to disempowerment and irresponsibility:

27. The challenge is for the peoples and governments of Africa to understand that development is a process of empowerment and self-reliance. Accordingly, Africans must not be wards of benevolent guardians; rather they must be the architects of their own sustained upliftment.

Rose’s analysis of advanced liberal governmental is key here for he suggests that the emergence of the governmental strategies of responsibilisation (read: self-reliance) and empowerment are intimately connected to the consolidation of advanced liberal rule. He argues that government’s obligation to free their citizens means that they must be empowered and learn to take responsibility, thus ensuring individual freedom and the ability to exercise choice, a sort of negative liberty masquerading as positive liberty (cf. Berlin, 1958). Furthermore, the resemblance between paragraph 27 and Rose’s discussion of advanced liberal rule is uncanny. These two strategies are heavily intertwined with the two aspects of Nepad that were used to promote it to the international community, and which its supporters claim distinguish it out from previous development programmes: African ownership (responsibilisation by handing over control, empowerment through the ability to make choices) and partnership (empowerment by conceptually reconfiguring the donor-recipient model of development, responsibilisation by being in a committed relationship with partners). African ownership and partnership will be recurring themes in section 2, but it is worth highlighting how Nepad rationalises and frames these two strategies.

Empowerment as development/government strategy

Through Nepad we learn that for Africans to develop they need to be empowered in order to be instrumental in their own self-government and released from centuries of exploitation. The rationale is that development was unable to occur because: “African governments did not empower their peoples to embark on development initiatives” (para. 23), implying that “the people” would have developed if government had enabled them to do so. Whilst empowerment as a tool of development has been a recent phenomenon (Crewe and Harrison, 1998) particularly focused on gender (e.g. through microfinance, WID initiatives), Nepad widens to the entire African population (although Nepad and para. 86 does also have a gender dimension). What is significant is that empowerment becomes more of a means – towards development, integration, economic prosperity – than necessarily an end in itself. It is understood as a strategy that can potentially place Africans (more generally) back into the world order rather than, as discussed, being left out (para. 14). It states that
this repositioning will be achieved through a sense of identity and realisation of Africa’s importance to humanity. For example:

Modern science recognises Africa as the cradle of humankind. As part of the process of reconstructing the identity and self-confidence of the peoples of Africa, it is necessary that this contribution to human existence be understood and valued by Africans themselves.

Needless to say that not all Africans need to be empowered further (Mugabe and Gaddafi being two that come to mind) but what is being suggested is typical of advanced liberal rule which reconfigures the relations between state, knowledge and citizen. Cruikshank’s (1993) work on the self esteem movement in California is especially analogous here for she suggests, empowerment is not limited to the personal domain, as its goal is a new politics and a new social order. The similarities are striking, like the self-esteem movement, Nepad promises to solve social problems by creating a revolution – not against capitalism, patriarchy, neo-colonialism – but against an undesirable way of Africans governing themselves.

Responsesibilisation as development/governmental strategy
Related to empowerment, albeit distinct, is the encouragement of Africans (and African leaders in particular) to become more responsible. This sense of responsibilisation is linked to what Jacques Donzelot (1991) has termed procedures of “contractual implication”, which involves offering individuals and collectives active involvement to resolve the kinds of issues ordinarily held to be responsibility of governmental agencies. As Ashurst (2002: 37) notes: “[Nepad] chimes with this new approach of ownership ... which just a few years ago, foreign lenders were happy to prescribe from Washington”. The sentiment is particularly expressed by Paul Wolfowitz when President of the World Bank in 2004: “I take my hat off to the leaders of Africa and Mr Mbeki in particular. There is a new leadership now that is taking responsibility to get rid of corruption. Africa is on the move”. This sentiment of “authorship” (as World Bank literature calls it) is also phenomenally clear in the Nepad document. For example, each time the term ‘African’ is written it is nearly always (except concerning the issue of pharmaceuticals) in a context of taking on a responsibility to fulfil goals:

1. The Programme is anchored on the determination of Africans to extricate themselves and the continent from the malaise of underdevelopment and exclusion in a globalising world.

---

38 Both are notoriously authoritarian and have received much attention for what is widely regarded as malgovernance
39 See point 124 and point 185
7. Across the continent, Africans declare that we will no longer allow ourselves to be conditioned by circumstance.

77. Aware of that requirement, Africans must make all efforts to find a lasting solution to existing conflicts

49. To achieve these objectives, African leaders will take joint responsibility for ...

However, the price of this involvement is that they must assume active responsibility for these activities, both for carrying them out and, for their outcomes. It involves, as Lemke (2001: 201) notes, "shifting the responsibility for social risks such as illness, unemployment, poverty, etc., and for life in society into the domain for which the individual is responsible and transforming it into a problem of ‘self-care’". This shift is arguably understood in moralistic terms; as both a moral obligation of donors to pass responsibility and of African leaders to accept this responsibility. Within some international policy circles, Hoogvelt (2002:24) speculates, ‘it must have been thought that... that the pain of structural adjustment would be easier to bear if the people felt that they had voted for it themselves....democratisation, in an ironic and cruel twist, became a way of placing the blame for structural problems of African economies squarely on African governments’. Although Nepad deems the state to still be an important instrument in the process of development, it too must act in a responsible manner to its citizens. Part of this process, paradoxically, requires the handing over of responsibility to individuals.

The ethico-politics of global responsibilities

Interestingly, this discourse of responsibility is deployed in Nepad rather strategically. Contrary to Nepad acting as an anti-politics machine40 (cf. Ferguson, 1990), it leverages a certain narrative of colonial history (para. 18-23), images of African crisis and global issues and recasts African development as a global responsibility: an ethico-politics (Rose, 1999: 192) if you will. Smith’s (2006: 11) argument that these discourses and representations form the basis for self-perpetuating truths that ‘operate in tandem with the structural violence of the poverty’ is problematic because it conceives of a discourse producer (the powerful) and a victim of discourse (the disempowered). Instead I would argue that Nepad manipulates a variety of contemporary discourses such as a post 9-11 discourse of global security, failed states and transnational criminality to position Africa as a potential centre for the production of order-challenging terrorists:

40 The original thesis edit discussed this concept in more detail, please author for removed text
2. The continued social exclusion of the vast majority of its people constitute a serious threat to global stability.

181. The converse of such an initiative, that is the collapse of more African states, poses a threat not only to Africans, but also to global peace and security. For industrialized countries, development in Africa will reduce the levels of global social exclusion and mitigate a major potential source of global social instability.

There is also a discourse of sustainable development which argues that protecting the African environment, encouraging Africans to become more environmentally aware and sensitive, is an imperative within the larger global effort to combat environmental destruction. Note how this destruction is understood in terms of individual/community behaviours:

12. Africa has a very important role to play with regard to the critical issue of protecting the environment. [...] The New Partnership for Africa’s Development will contain a strategy for nurturing these resources and using them for the development of the African continent while, at the same time preserving them for all humanity.

13. It is obvious that, unless the communities in the vicinity of the tropical forests are given alternative means of earning a living, they will cooperate in the destruction of the forests. As the preservation of these environmental assets is in the interests of humanity, it is imperative that Africa be placed on a development path that does not put them in danger.

Contrary to many critiques that see Nepad as passively endorsing global inequality, the document does nonetheless suggest that the inequitable trading relations of the international system are a key obstacle to African development (although one could argue that this was included to pacify anticipated critique). One could call this a limit to government. It is a rare, but firm, acknowledgement of structural impediments but one which is still understood through the lens of self-improvement, self-direction and competitiveness. If anything it highlights how structure and agency are not necessarily autonomous:

30. [...] At the same time, the enhanced mobility of capital means that borrowers, whether governments or private entities, must compete with each other for capital in global rather than national markets. Both these processes have increased the costs to those countries that are unable to compete effectively. To a large extent, these costs have been borne disproportionately by Africa.

---

41 Indeed, what is that we mean when we refer to the ‘structural’? When Mbeki argues to Tony Blair that the rules of trade need to be reformed, and frames this in a discourse of responsibility, at what point does this become ‘structural’?

42 It is interesting to see how global structures have impacted Africa, and not Africans, thus impersonalising the costs of the global economy, globalisation and structural adjustment
33. On the other hand, greater integration has also led to further marginalisation ... In the absence of fair and just global rules, globalisation has increased the ability of the strong to advance their interests to the detriment of the weak, especially in the areas of trade, finance and technology. It has limited the space for developing countries to control their own development, as the system makes no provision for compensating the weak. The conditions of those marginalised in this process have worsened in real terms. A fissure between inclusion and exclusion has emerged within and among nations.

Indeed Nepad argues that uneven development, quite paradoxically, is adversative to globalisation and the continued functioning of the whole capitalist system:

39. The imperative of development, therefore, not only poses a challenge to moral conscience; it is, in fact, fundamental to the sustainability of the globalisation process43.

What these tactics nonetheless show is how Africa is positioned as a necessary and responsible investment, it provides a much needed counter-interpretation to the idea of responsibility at a merely the individual level and brings multiple goals (at a variety of scales) into alignment. However one could argue that Nepad recasts this ethical dimension into a transactional relationship, whereby investment into African development will yield positive outcomes for humanity at large. Phrases such as “the scar on the conscience of the world”44 are clear landmarks of such a discourse and imaginary which casts African development as a global responsibility. Indeed, to suggest that such tropes are signifiers of powerlessness (like Smith) is to assume that African leaders are totally dominated by foreign leaders or institutions. The reproduction of these representations do not produce the effect of powerlessness; rather they can be harnessed and negotiated in the production of counter-dominant discursive strategies.

Transnational governmentality and multiple targets
Although I discuss targets for a particular kind of development (one that promotes entrepreneurship, responsibility, empowerment etc.) it would be wrong to assume that Nepad fails to subdivide this target. On the one hand Nepad is an agenda for development, and thus a governmental means of creating Africans with desired qualities, in Nepad this is often expressed as “the African people”. As argued, ‘the people’ are seen to be the primary drivers of development in Africa. On the other hand,

43 This should not be read as a total endorsement of the globalisation of capital, for it is said within an explicit reference of the need to bring the state back into development in order to steer the extent to which globalisation can be harnessed. For example it states that: “Experience shows that, despite the unparalleled opportunities that globalisation has offered to some previously poor countries, there is nothing inherent in the process that automatically reduces poverty and inequality.”

44 As famously spoken about by Tony Blair at the UK Labour Party conference on the 2nd October, 2001
African leaders declare that they have a “common vision and [...] firm and shared conviction, that they have a pressing duty to eradicate poverty [...]” (para. 1). In this sense, African leaders constitute Nepad’s second “target group” who are to ‘translate the deep popular will into action’ (para. 53), ‘to learn from their own experiences’ (para. 71), ‘to encourage investment’ (para. 185): to improve their conduct as ‘good leaders’. This self-betterment is captured by the discourse of good governance, central to which is the protection of human rights and promotion of multi-party democracies, market-economies and people centred development (see para. 7 and chapter 5). It is not just Africans themselves that are to modify their practices and behaviours in order to achieve their own self-development, but African leaders themselves must take on responsibility to modify their own practices of rule in order to bring about development.

The result of this dual-targeting of Nepad is that leaders seem to be extracted from the body-politic of Africans, as responsible for governing themselves better for the sake of the population in their care. The dualism is not so simple when African leaders also recognise themselves as part of the subject of “African people” as evident, for example, by the “we” in paragraph 7: Across the continent, Africans declare that we will no longer allow ourselves to be conditioned by circumstance (para. 2). The effect is that all Africans (leaders, business people, workers) must all come to understand themselves as having a responsibility and role within the development process. The effect is the reification and universalisation of desirable traits (i.e. responsibilisation, empowerment, entrepreneurship) which are seemingly applicable across all areas of government, from the state (political-government), to NGO’s and civil society, down to the government of the self.

If African leaders are to preside over the government of Africans, then who or what is presiding over African leaders, what is the diagram of power being articulated here? Where does intentionality lie? Critics argue that the west is “pulling the strings” of Nepad, governing at a distance and urging African governments to be more empowered and responsible, defining responsibility has the uptake of neoliberal policies. Nepad is then understood to be formed of self-imposed conditionalities and, the rhetoric of African ownership mere poetics obscuring the real levers of power: a ‘post-colonial governmentality’ if you will, and thus a potentially simplistic imposition of Foucault onto a dependency theory model (as is evident with Smith’s 2005a analysis). Such a position is seductive giving the widely documented imposition of structural adjustment, but the diagram of power is still utilises a basic understanding of power as coercion, and of ideology propagating the interests of “the powerful”. It also involves a vertical topography of power (Ferguson and Gupta,
2002) and fails to answer how it is that we come to understand the west as above Africa or, for that matter, the African state above its citizens with civil society closer to ‘the people’ (Ferguson, 2007).

It is important to recognise the importance of other actors that are called upon in order to “govern at a distance” replacing formal government with informal techniques of government (Lemke, 2001: 11). The Nepad base document makes it very clear that for development to be effective, leaders have to enlist a whole host of non-state actors:

41. What is needed is a commitment on the part of governments, the private sector and other institutions of civil society, to genuine integration of all nations into the global economy and body politic.

Similarly, Nepad’s list of active partners complicates any state-centric model. It is heavily financed by a state-owned South African Development Finance institution called the Industrial Development Corporation (IDC). Nepad’s listed partners are all largely inter-governmental organisations: UN Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA), African Development Bank (AfDB), Development Bank of Southern Africa (DBSA), Investment Climate Facility (ICF), African Capacity Building Foundation, Office of the UN Under-Secretary-General and Special Adviser on Africa, the IDC as well as the multilateral financial institutions. Transnational NGOs (such as ActionAid or Médecins Sans Frontières) and civil society organisations (such as the African Social Forum or the Civil Society Indaba) are also important actors on the scene of Nepad in one way or another. All of these organisations may have bases in Africa, but it would be fallacious to assume that, with their operations and donors similarly stretched across national territories, they are either African or “belong” to the West. Thus, the notion of transnational governmentality articulated by Ferguson and Gupta (2002) is a useful concept to evoke here for it encapsulates at once the strategies of discipline exemplified by the WTO and SAPs, the NGOs which provide ostensibly state-like services, the politicians instrumental in the formation of Nepad, Nepad’s development partner organisations and the transnational alliances forged by activists and CDOs. This apparatus cannot be understood as being above the state, or challenging it from below, similarly it is not a replacement of nation-states (as problematic as this term is within the African context) but overlays and coexists with it.

**Conclusions: On rationalities, problems and subjects**

This chapter has sought to make sense of the political rationalities underpinning Nepad and, in doing so, attempted to understand how the African subject, and the ideal African subject, is conceptualised in Nepad. I have aimed to use previous studies on development to draw attention to the ways in
which problematisations and the objects of development are constructed through policies which themselves are made possible through relations of power. In other words it has addressed the question of Nepad’s “field of visibility”. A recurring theme with these political rationalities is that solutions, deficiencies and intended outcomes are all interrelated and work to reinforce one another. The argument being articulated is not so much that Africans are therefore somehow unentrepreneurial, undemocratic and incapable of self-government or exercising choice. Such a position would simply flip the binary, producing an afro-pessimistic essentialisation of the African subject. Rather, I have attempted to show how fundamental assumptions about “human nature” or Africa can determine what types of intervention or what objectives Nepad sets out to achieve are considered legitimate and appropriate. It is in this sense the Lemke (2001) has argued that neoliberalism is not simply an ideological rhetoric or a political economic reality but a political vision that endeavours to create a social reality presumed already to exist.

The analysis of Nepad has prompted thinking through the analytic of governmentality. Firstly, the analysis has had to take “governmentality” outside of its Western origins, showing how Nepad and African governments attempt to conduct conduct. Secondly, it has required thinking of power as decentred but also of government as beyond the state in an era of transnationality. Third, it has recognises that programmes of rule can have multiple targets for intervention but the rationalities underpinning this intervention can be identical. Furthermore, I have alluded to a modified metaphor of “the anti-politics machine“ inscribed by Ferguson, one which recognises how contemporary development initiatives are often political and they are strategic about these politics. As Foucault (1979, 1991, 1997) highlighted, power is not always oppressive but productive: a strategic game through which subject positions and interests are all produced. It is at this site of political strategy and negotiation where counter-dominant discursive strategies can be produced.

The notion of a political rationality has avoided the conspiratorial narrative that notions of “neoliberal ideology” are prone to. The reasons and rationalities for reforms or policies cannot be attributable to a monolithic ideology which determines all and is possessed by all. Political rationalities require analysing how government logic is constructed, how neoliberalism functions as a ‘politics of truth’ (Lemke, 2002: 58) and how the governed subject (the object of government) is diagnosed as deficient in ways that thus require new forms of conduct. In this sense, neoliberal political rationalities structure Nepad’s field of possible government action and make the practices of development, and hence the exercise of power, possible (after all, ‘practices cannot exist without a certain regime of rationality’ (Foucault 1991)). Furthermore, what we could term ‘neoliberal ideas’
are not simply inserted here and there, but they depend on the redefinition and transformation of the terrain upon which the power of government is exercised: assumptions, problematisations, solutions are all fundamental to the construction of this terrain.
This chapter intends to build on the analysis carried out in chapter 4 by illustrating how these neoliberal political rationalities are operationalised. Political rationalities cannot be divorced from the mechanisms or technologies through which thinking about government is put into effect; ‘if political rationalities render reality into the domain of thought... technologies of government seek to translate thought into the domain of reality’ (Miller and Rose, 1990: 8). For this reason, technologies of rule are the means through which government is exercised and the initiatives and techniques by which subjects are made knowable and crafted according to governmental ambitions. For example, tax returns, electoral rolls, registers of property, and censuses are often quoted as techniques for creating knowledge that constitutes the population, whereas structures such as prisons, hospitals, social welfare schemes, schools, transport systems as described as being technologies. Forms of government rely on these techniques and technologies, which are both effects and capillaries of power, in order to regulate the conduct of conduct.

I have taken four case studies with variable targets for improvement, two are technologies that aim to sculpt “good governance” (one aimed at African leaders and the other at civil servants), one aims to promote the liberal-democratic values of civil society and targets African citizens, leaders and politicians alike and one looks at how Africans are encouraged to take care of themselves in a more efficient and rational manner.

**Nepad: Governing from a distance**
Since this chapter aims to tackle questions about how rationalities are operationalised, this prelude aims to briefly introduce the institutional apparatus of Nepad, which arguably attempts to enact the values enshrined in the base document. Nepad differs from previous African development plans most markedly through the deployment of mechanisms that implement and monitor, which were largely missing from the LPA and AAF-SAF.

**The Nepad Structure**
The Nepad Heads of State and Government Implementation Committee (HSGIC) takes overall responsibility for the political leadership of the Partnership, it is also the political nexus between the
AU and Nepad and reports to the AU Summit of Heads of State and Government at least once a year (see figure 3). The Committee meets three times a year to monitor and guide the implementation of Nepad. As mandated by the OAU Summit of July 2001 and ratified by the AU Summit of July 2002, four countries represent each of the five regions of the AU on the HSGIC representing its character as a continental programme. The full membership of the Nepad HSGIC is as follows:

**Central Africa:** Cameroon, Congo, Democratic Republic of Congo, Gabon.

**East Africa:** Ethiopia, Madagascar, Sudan, Rwanda.

**North Africa:** Egypt, Algeria, Libya, Tunisia.

**Southern Africa:** South Africa, Namibia, Malawi, Lesotho.

**West Africa:** Nigeria, Senegal, Mali, Benin.

The primary function of the HSGIC committee is to provide the necessary political leadership and commitment to Nepad and also to prioritise the policies and programmes (Interview 1).

Figure 3: The Nepad-AU organogram
Source: http://www.iss.co.za/Pubs/Papers/70/Fig2.gi

A Steering Committee reports directly to the HSGIC and assembles the personal representatives of the heads of state and government that sit on the HSGIC (see figure 3). The Steering Committee is in charge of “developing the Terms of Reference for the identified programmes and projects and with overseeing the work of the Secretariat“, as well as responsible for overseeing projects and programme development (Nepad, nd). It is this body that exercises considerable influence within Nepad because it is composed of personal representatives of the most powerful leaders in each of Africa’s regions and sets the agenda of the HSGIC (Interview 1). Furthermore, because it has such direct access to the HSGIC it can effectively bypass the processes of the AU
Commission which is unable to exercise control of the Nepad agenda, a source of contention between the Nepad Secretariat and senior staff of the Commission. This institutional arrangement has, however, allowed Nepad initiatives to move more efficiently and promptly than if fully embedded with bureaucratic and infrequent AU structures (Machele, 2006).

The primary role of the Nepad Secretariat, located in Midrand South Africa, is to provide administrative and coordinative support to the Nepad process. The secretariat staff organise meetings for Heads of State and also hold meetings with stakeholders and partners. The sub-division of the Secretariat reflects various areas of Nepad’s work and expertise (e.g. education, health, market access), all of which is headed by the executive head (Dr. Ibrahim Assane Mayaki and his deputy, Dr. Hesphina Rukato). African expertise and knowledge is crucial to the secretariat’s authority and the successful implementation of the programme, as the website makes clear:

The NEPAD Secretariat fosters the implementation of the NEPAD vision through harnessing world-renowned expertise from individuals and relevant institutions. The staff of the Secretariat comes from across the African continent, from diverse disciplines, skills and experiences. This knowledge base is able to unblock obstacles[…]

The decision for Nepad to have its own secretariat and the choice to have it located in South Africa is particularly significant. Despite a decision taken at the 2003 AU Summit in Maputo, Mozambique to integrate the Secretariat into the AU Commission in Addis Ababa, and even though it is often said that these “arrangements are transitional” (Nepad, 2002b) it seems as though this restructuring is unlikely to occur any time soon.

Distant Government
Nepad’s legal personality and identity continues to be a source of confusion in academic and policy circles. The misinterpretation that the 100 Nepad Secretariat members are mandated to bring development to millions of Africans is fairly prevalent. Rather, official documents by Nepad’s architects describe it as a programme that “provides … the overall strategic framework for engagement” (Nepad, 2001) meaning that Nepad is chiefly a policy framework and not an implementation agency. The Secretariat, under the direction of the HSGIC and the Steering Committee, merely facilitates policy harmonisation among African countries, while the countries themselves are required to execute values, projects and policies (Machele, 2006). The countries may opt to do so through private agents from the business sector, but this would be done on a service provider basis. Furthermore, Nepad encourages the adoption of its frameworks and strategy into
national policy as well as externally-influenced planning instruments such as the IMF Medium Term Expenditure Frameworks (MTEFs) and World Bank/IMF PRSPs (Buch, 2003). As well as its facilitative role, Nepad structures make available political support and monitoring techniques concerning implementation of the overall framework into national policies. It is also responsible for monitoring and evaluating progress on the strategies that it devises, emphasising its guiding, rather than intervening, function.

The significance of this structure from the perspective of advanced liberal government and neoliberal rationalities is three-fold. Firstly, Nepad is often in tension with the African Union, another institution that also stakes its identity on African ownership and pan-Africanism. Consequently, the extent to which Nepad and the AU ought to be integrated is constantly negotiated (Taylor, 2005; Interview 1). Secondly, the core Nepad structures do not create projects as such, making it more difficult to analyse in terms of successes or failures. It is worth noting that many of the initiatives discussed in this chapter have actually been spun off to external partner agencies (the AAPSIA, the CSFs) or had their own organising body created (the APRM, the e-Africa commission) which are related to Nepad, but are semi-autonomous. Thirdly, the Nepad secretariat can be conceptualised as a body that encourages the conduct of conduct through harmonising, co-ordinating, advising, organizing, monitoring and facilitating, all authorised by its claims to development expertise. It does not intervene directly, something that the AU is more inclined (and is mandated) to do, but monitors and guides at a distance. Its decentralised structure and interactions with national governments, stakeholders, NGOs and other so-called “development partners” also confuses any notions of concentrated power, adding further to understanding Nepad as representative of transnational governmentality through its subsequent endorsement and definition of good practice. Importantly, it does all this with a strictly African identity and sense of ownership.

The African Peer Review Mechanism: The panopticon of good governance
The African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM) is largely considered to be the most innovative aspect of Nepad, claiming to represent African leaders’ genuine endorsement of the principles of good governance (Funke and Nsouli, 2003; Nsouli, 2004). It was also particularly effective in gaining support for Nepad inside and outside of Africa, as Taylor (2005) quotes the Scandinavian ambassador as saying, “It was this that captured our imagination and made Nepad that much easier to sell” (Mail and
Guardian, Johannesburg, Nov 8 2002). Within the current conjecture, poor governance has been identified as a root problem in African development discourse (see Abrahamsen, 2000) and is thus the object of technical, rather than political, intervention. The APRM is one such intervention. The mandate of the mechanism is to:

\[\text{[\ldots] foster the adoption of policies, standards and practices that lead to political stability, high economic growth, sustainable development and accelerated sub-regional and continental economic integration through sharing of experiences and reinforcement of successful and best practice, including identifying deficiencies and assessing the needs for capacity building}\]

(Nepad, 2002a: 1).

Central to identifying these “policies standard and practices” requires participating states to conform to the standards of the ‘Declaration on Democracy, Political, Economic and Corporate Governance’ which was approved by all member countries at the 3rd HSIC meeting in Rome, in June 2002. This declaration defines the values of ‘just, honest, transparent, accountable and participatory government and probity in public life countries’ (Nepad, 2002b para. 8). Members are required to both submit to and facilitate periodic peer reviews, and generally be guided by agreed parameters for good governance at both the political and economic levels.

The Panel of Eminent Persons and the APRM Secretariat are central to the process of peer review (see figure 4). The former consists of prominent and highly-respected Africans who were nominated by participating countries, shortlisted by a Committee of Ministers and appointed by the HSGIC. Each country to be reviewed is assigned to one of the seven eminent persons, who consider and review reports, and make recommendations to the APR Forum. As of August 2009, the members consist of Graça Machel (Mozambique), the current wife of Nelson Mandela, former-wife of late-Mozambican president Samora Machel and a prominent African women’s rights campaigner; Domtilla Mukantaganzwa (Rwanda) former executive secretary of the National Service of Gacaca Jurisdictions (i.e. post-genocide reconciliation); Dorothy Njeuma, ex-minister of education in Cameroon; Adebayo Adedeji45 (Nigeria), ex-head of the UNECA, Mohammed Babes, Head of the National Economic and

---

45 Whilst an in-depth evaluation of this document would itself be revealing, there is not enough scope to do so here. Nonetheless, the declaration involves the reaffirmation of the responsibility of Africans for African development, an adherence to democracy (the rule of law, equality, individual/collective freedoms, human rights, multi-party elections and the separation of powers), transparent and accountable government, proper economic governance (control of wasteful spending, promotion of market efficiency, encouragement of private financial flows, budgetary transparency) and socio-economic development (gender equality, partnerships between government and a, private sector b, civil society, strengthening of the RECs, enhancement of human capital). Interestingly, these values are espoused as being “global”. See Nepad, 2002b.

46 As Taylor (2005) notes, what is interesting is that before being recruited onto the Panel, Adedeji (a key architect of the Lagos Plan) was a prominent critic of Nepad, denouncing it for rejecting the LPA and AAF-SAP. According to Adedeji, Nepad was
Social Counsel (CNES) in Algeria and Bethuel Kiplagat, former Kenyan ambassador and current Executive Director of Africa Peace Forum. Significantly, the members of the panel are nominated due to their “high moral stature and [demonstration of] commitment to the ideals of Pan Africanism” (although such ideals are not explicitly outlined) who, moreover, have “expertise in the areas of political governance, macro-economic management, public financial management and corporate governance” (Nepad, 2002a: 2). It is noticeable how technical expertise is conflated with high morals and ideals of Pan-Africanism, and that all of the experts have never been politicians or, at least, have been out of government for several years emphasising their supposed impartiality. Furthermore, despite their status as experts, they are required to assess countries according to the standards of the ‘Declaration on Democracy, Political, Economic and Corporate Governance’, the ‘Objectives, Standards, Criteria and Indicators for the APRM’ and other techniques listed by the APRM secretariat. As Rose (1996: 56-7) notes with advanced liberalism, not only is expertise located outside of the state but even the domain of expertise is held to account.

The APRM is carried out under the leadership of this Panel of Eminent Persons and the technical support of the APR Secretariat. The APRM secretariat works with three “APRM strategic partners”- the AfDB, UNDP and UNECA- who, as of June 2009, are allowed to attend forum meetings

---

47 Former members include Marie-Angelique Savané (Senegal), former head of the UN Population Fund’s Africa Bureau and Chris Stals, ex-head of the South African Reserve Bank
48 Which include transnational codes of conduct such as The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Convention on the Political Rights of Women, the Code of Good Practices on Transparency in Monetary and Financial Affairs et al.
but who cannot participate in the deliberations of the heads of state. The APRM process itself consists of five stages that are defined in the APRM Base Document (Nepad, 2002a), the APRM Organisation and Processes document (Nepad, 2003c) and discussed in detail in the ‘Guidelines for Countries to Prepare for and to Participate in the APRM’ (Nepad, 2003d). ‘Stage one’ is the preparatory process both at the level of the APR Secretariat and the national level. It consists of a questionnaire sent to participating countries on the basis of the ‘Objectives, Standards, Criteria and Indicators’. The country then develops a self-assessment according to the questionnaire criteria. The country is also required to prepare a preliminary programme of action based on existing policies, programmes and projects. In the meanwhile the APR Secretariat compiles a research document on the country and, upon receiving the self-assessment and the preliminary programme of action, will prepare an Issue Paper intended to ‘guide’ the country in the review process. If the APR Secretariat assesses that particular issues require more in-depth analysis, it makes arrangements for a partner institution to conduct an additional assessment. Upon completion of the technical assessment, the report is sent to the APR Secretariat and the APR Panel. The preparatory stage is therefore a base of self-direction and self-reflection for the assessed countries prior to the rolling out of expertise, and a stage for the gathering of knowledge by the APR panel.

‘Stage two’ involves the APR Team visiting the country to hold extensive consultations with a variety of stakeholders: ‘government, officials, political parties, parliamentarians and representatives of civil society organisations (including the media, academia, trade unions, business, professional bodies)’ (Nepad, 2002a). ‘Stage three’ involves drafting the report prepared on the basis of the Background document and the Issue Paper prepared by the APR Secretariat, and the information provided in the country during the consultations held with the stakeholders. ‘Stage four’ involves the submission of the APR Team’s report to the APR Secretariat and APR Panel which, after consideration, is then submitted to the APR Forum for further deliberation and the formulation of actions deemed necessary in accordance with the mandate of the APR Forum. ‘Stage five’ is the final stage of the APR Process. It involves making the report and related actions public, and six months after consideration of the report by the APR Forum, the report will be formally and publicly tabled in key regional and sub-regional structures. As of May 2008, 29 countries had formally joined the APRM by signing the MOU on the APRM49; half of the AU’s 53 countries (UNECA, nd). Figure 5 below depicts the various stages that each of the APRM countries have arrived at.
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49 Algeria, Burkina Faso, Republic of Congo, Ethiopia, Ghana and Kenya signed the MOU in March 2003; Cameroon, Gabon and Mali in April and May 2003; Mauritius, Mozambique, Nigeria, Rwanda, Senegal, South Africa, Uganda, Egypt and Benin in March
African enough?

However, the institutional arrangements of the APRM have not been without internal conflict. A particular example of this concerns how the APRM was to harmonise and work with the AU Conference on Security, Stability, Development and Cooperation in Africa (CSSDCA)\(^5\), a Nigerian initiative which predates Nepad by several years. Yet South Africa, and Mbeki in particular, pushed that the APRM Secretariat be located in the UNECA (based in Addis Ababa) and based upon the UNECA Governance Project because “This will ensure that the APRM is independent, effective, professional and credible” (Nepad, 2002c). During the 4th HSIC meeting, which coincided with the AU Summit in Durban in July 2002, Nigerian president Obasanjo argued that the UNECA was non-African and inappropriate for it represented the interests of the international financial institutions such as the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank (a common perception in African politics, as Cilliers

---

5 As the name indicates, its core values and 50 specific key performance indicators deal with inter-state security, democracy/human rights/good governance, economic/development issues and with coordination between sub-regional groupings
(2002) points out). The Nigerian president’s position was generally interpreted as a defence of the view that the CSSDCA Unit within the AU Commission should coordinate all aspects of peer review.

The Nepad Secretariat held a workshop in Cape Town in October 2002 to build upon the Steering Committee meeting in Addis Ababa and develop indicators, benchmarks, framework and content for the review process. The secretariat reported that the meeting in Addis Ababa decided to appoint the UN Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA) and the African Development Bank (AfDB) to prepare indicators and benchmarks for the operationalisation of the APRM. Eventually the UNECA argued in favour of a two-track approach with one track focusing on democracy and political governance which the UNECA recommended should be undertaken by persons or institutions appointed by the Panel of Eminent Persons. The second track would cover economic and corporate governance issues. Of these, the UNECA would deal with economic governance issues while the AfDB focused on banking and financial standards. This practical consideration, together with the need to present a compromise acceptable to Nigeria and the Commission of the AU, were the considerations that saw this position proposed before the Abuja meeting. The final compromise may not have been what Africa’s development partners wanted, but it was politically necessary (Cilliers, 2002).

Three relevant observations stem from this political wrangling. Firstly, technologies of rule are not merely transplanted from drawing board to society but the nature of politics moulds and remoulds plans and schemes according to competing discourses (such as African ownership, good governance, effective accountability etc.) and interests. Secondly, it is apparent that such schemes do not become laid out on a flat surface but must also negotiate with alternatives that are similar in appearance, intent or purpose. Thirdly, this moulding comes from a variety of sources that cannot be adequately described as internal politics or external influences, indeed such a binary between internal and external is worth deconstructing when we consider institutions such as UNECA and the AfDB that position themselves along transnational and intergovernmental networks of power, even though they may be perceived as representing “external interests”.

**Operationalising self-regulation and discipline**

The analytical significance of the APRM is that it is entirely voluntary, unlike the CSSDCA process which was intended to be inclusive of all AU member states. It is not forced onto any African

---

51 An important factor in understanding this shift is the increasingly precarious domestic situation in Nigeria in the run-up to presidential elections.

52 By South African Deputy Foreign Minister Aziz Pahad
government; rather the African leaders choose to enter into these commitments and to do so regularly. The Rome meeting, and the final APRM base document, expressed the hope that the APRM was to be “an instrument voluntarily acceded to by African members of the African Union for the purpose of self-monitoring, ...[and] will foster the adoption of policies, standards and practices that will lead to political stability, high economic growth, sustainable development and accelerated regional integration of the African continent” (Nepad, 2002c: np). The role of the APRM Secretariat is not to coerce countries to participate; rather it is responsible for providing administrative and logistical support for Peer Review Teams, and maintaining extensive database information on political and economic developments in all participating member countries. Perceived foreign interference, as noted, is politically sensitive and the APRM, the IMF point out, ‘is seen as an essential feature of this new sense of ownership and accountability [in African development initiatives]’ (Funke and Nsouli, 2004: 35). The APRM is also largely internally funded, with the Sirte meeting communiqué highlighting that Algeria, Egypt, Nigeria and South African had each contributed one millions dollars or more to the operating budget (Nepad, 2009). In the broader context of neoliberal governmentality, the APRM can be understood as an institutionalised form of self-discipline whereby African leaders and their governments subject themselves to detailed reviews and monitoring by other African leaders and eminent figures, all being monitored and guided as a distance by the Nepad and APRM secretariats.

What is revealing is that there are no punishments for countries and leaders that fail to meet the various criteria established. Although some have noted how such a feature is inevitably going to weaken the effectiveness of the process (e.g. Taylor, 2005), it nonetheless illustrates that the APRM is exemplary of a non-coercive form of power attempting to enforce democratic standards and accountability. As Rose reminds us, liberal government is premised on subjects coming to understand themselves as free to make choices, so long as they are the right choices. The AU Chairman at the time, Joaquim Chicanos, stressed that no sanctions were needed to make the review effective since ‘punishment will come by itself because investors will shy away’ (cited in Abrahamsen, 2004). Likewise Funke and Nsouli (2004) note that “countries not willing to accede to the APRM or to follow the recommended measures will in one way or another be exposed to the downside risks of inaction.” Thus, there is an obligation for leaders and their governments to take part in this assessment to avoid appearing to the rest of Africa and the world to be unaccountable or irresponsible.
Chicanos’ quote is indicative of the extension of market logic into this liberal form of government. Holding the whole organisation of the ARPM together is less the ethical political will to strive towards humans rights and effective government (after all, in the Nepad framework democracy is frequently envisaged as a technical means towards development rather than an end in itself) but a mechanism whereby countries are audited and classified according to various grades: “Nepad compliant”, “Aspiring to Nepad compliance, but in need of assistance”, “Wilfully non-compliant” or “Post-conflict countries requiring reconciliation and reconstruction” (Business Day, Johannesburg, November 4). In this sense, the ARPM is a device through which to rank the political environment or measure the investment risk of a certain country. In principle, donors are willing to enter into partnerships with all developing countries but the onus is on them to prove that they are responsible and willing to govern themselves prudently. There is also significant reward coming in the form of the new Investment Climate Facility (ICF) headquartered in Dar es Salaam, which finances projects to improve the continent’s business environment. It provides assistance only to countries that have joined the APRM. The result of the APRM is also used by donors to decide whether or not they would qualify for debt cancellation through HIPC and will also be used by investors (and thus bringing in FDI) who cite corruption as the primary dissuasion for investing in Africa (see Herbert, 2003).

In the context of technologies of rule, it is also revealing how the use of certain techniques – that is to say ‘mutually agreed indicators’, questionnaires, definitions of the elements of governance, scores, audits, reviews by experts – are central to the operation of this technology. These techniques aim to “put right what is identified to be amiss” (Nepad, 2002a: 22), emphasising a targeting and corrective role of the mechanism and the rendering technical of governance. The result is the reduction of democracy and good governance to a set of universal and measurable standards and criteria, constituted by a fabric of other African and global declarations and conventions, and the consequential re-organisation of government to fit into these predetermined categories. For as Power (1997) reminds us, to be audited, an institution/organisation must actively transform itself into
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53 The vision conjured up is that of investors “shopping around” in Africa for suitable opportunities
54 The ICF has been endorsed by African leaders and is financed by multinational corporations, the governments of the UK, Ireland and the Netherlands, the European Commission and the World Bank’s International Finance Corporation. It would be problematic to assume that these governments “pull the strings” of the APRM seeing that the ICF was launched in 2006 (at the World Economic Forum in Cape Town) whereas the APRM was devised in 2001/2. See: http://www.icfafrica.org/en/about-background.html
55 Democracy and Good Political Governance, Economic Governance and Management, Corporate Governance, Socio-Economic Development (see www.aprm-international.org)
56 For a fantastic recent example on such techniques being implemented by civil society organisations at the national scale see the case study of the “Parliamentary Scorecard of Uganda’s Members of Parliament”. See http://www.aflia.org/publications/index.php?id=7
an auditable commodity, that is structured to conform to the need to be monitored. Notably, the Nepad base document (para. 7) highlights some of these characteristics of democracy: the protection of human rights, people-centred development and market-oriented economies. It should be noted, however, that the APRM is not entirely universalising with imposed hurdles requiring all countries to reach the same universal standard by a specific time. Rather, the APRM encourages a process through which the initial review serves to benchmark the difference between extant country practice and targets. Thereafter Nepad, with the assistance of the international community, would support measures to close the gap. The tell-tale emphasis is on self-betterment and demonstrating a commitment to move towards common standards and practices, and thus to display something I would term, the “will to self-improve” (cf. Li, 2007).

Thus it represents a clear divergence from previous expert-evaluation and conditionality-based lending towards self-assessment and self-imposed conditionalities that recognise ‘common values and standards’, and which presumably will help to increase both private investment and bilateral aid. It moves away from a coercive form of power (in the form of the imposition of macro-economic policies that are designed to promote open markets) to using market-like mechanisms themselves (a sense of competition, as well as seeking comparative advantage of being more accountable and conducive for investment) to promote ‘good practices’ of political and economic governance that are often market-orientated (i.e. the promotion of external trade, private sector investment, deregulation). Indeed, the emphasis in neoliberal thought upon competition as supposed to exchange (as posited by classical liberalism) (Foucault, 2008) is evident in the transformation from conditionality (i.e. the exchange of loans for political or economic reforms) to the fostering of a competitive environment by a governing body (i.e. Nepad, not a national-state). At the same time, measures of transparency, peer-evaluation, institutional effectiveness are all framed in seemingly moralistic, natural, and widely respected terms of ‘improving standards’ and ‘empowerment’ yet, because of their inherent policing and disciplining, such techniques of ‘accountability’ are not as emancipatory or democratic as they appear (Power, 1997). The very fact that there has been expressed hope from the Bretton Wood’s institutions and the G8 that through this process, donors will be able to abandon conditionalities and external monitoring processes altogether (Abrahamsen, 2004; Smith, 2006) raises questions over how the APRM is not simply ‘conditionality in disguise’ but a mechanism for self-discipline and government from a distance.
Articulations and failures: The Zimbabwe Question

Nepad’s commitment to democracy, as upheld through the APRM, is claimed to be a major paradigm shift for African development, yet many have been quick to acknowledge out the failure of the first test: the 2002 Zimbabwe election (e.g. Cilliers, 2002; Taylor, 2005). In the run-up to the presidential election of April 2002 election in which Robert Mugabe was “re-elected”, Zimbabwe was gripped with systematic economic collapse and the neglect of law and order. It is this election and the subsequent events that, Taylor argues, exposed the empty rhetoric regarding democracy and human rights emanating from Nepad’s promoters, particularly Thabo Mbeki and Olusegun Obasanjo. The public responses to Zimbabwe by many African leaders, including promoters of Nepad, saw a broad alignment with dictators like Mugabe and against – intriguingly – the so-called partners in the West, upon which Nepad’s success ultimately hinges. In 2002 there was enthusiastic talking up of the legitimacy of the elections, an observer team from the (then) OAU said the elections were “transparent, credible, free and fair” (Daily News, Harare March 15, 2002)57, Nigerian observers in Zimbabwe approved Mugabe’s victory, and Tanzania’s Benjamin Mkapa (who at the time was a member of Nepad’s HSIC) asserted that Mugabe was “a champion of democracy”. Yet, as with what was re-iterated in 2008, when Western actors are outspoken or punish aggressors they are promptly denounced as imperialists or neo-colonial. After the election, Morgan Tsvangirai remarked: if this [Mbeki and Obasanjo’s response] is an expression of the so-called African solutions to African problems, or an early manifestation of the so-called Nepad peer review mechanism, then Africa is fated to remain a beleaguered and crisis-ridden continent for a very long time” (Mercury, Durban, January 24, 2003).

The fall out of the 2008 elections also caused widespread concern that the principles enshrined by Nepad were still not being lived up to. The widely publicised elections crisis saw flawed elections, widespread violence, torture and intimidation and other widespread human rights abuses by pro-Mugabe supporters after it emerged that contender Morgan Tsvangirai had won the first round of the presidential election (although not by enough to secure victory). Although it should be noted that Zimbabwe was not, and has not been, a part of the APRM process, Thabo Mbeki’s tactic of “quiet diplomacy” over 'megaphone diplomacy' with Robert Mugabe, despite stern opposition from the G8, UN, EU, Botswana and other African countries, has been widely criticised for being weak, ineffective and undermining Nepad. The stance from an AU Summit on July 1st 2008, although a

57 Many of these newspaper sources were found in, and thus accredited to, Taylor (2005). Their contextualisation within my arguments are my own
moderate condemnation of the election, encouraged the formation of a government of national unity although opposition was not much stronger than this.

The significance here is less of Nepad falling at the last hurdle – because in 2002 it was still in its infancy – or about it and the AU being “ineffective” in the subsequent 2008 disputes, but more about what this example illustrates about the contradictions evident within Nepad. Firstly, it is important to note that an underlying rhetoric of Nepad is the concept of African solidarity. As noted in chapter 4, Africa becomes the object of development and African leaders also become homogenised into a group who aim to present a common voice for the good of the continent in relation to the developed world (Nepad, 2001:1). In this respect, the concept of African ownership becomes extremely important for insulating against criticism from outside of Africa. Yet there is an assumption in Nepad that African leaders will be impartial in dealing with each other, that they both possess the political will to deal with each other and that leaders will volunteer themselves for peer review. These assumptions are elucidated in the context of the Zimbabwe elections where principles of African ownership and solidarity are in clear juxtaposition with other principles of international democratic standards and human rights.

A detailed discussion of the post-election violence in Kenya in 2008 may also be an extremely apt case, especially seeing that Kenya had, by that time, already passed through the APRM process. The Kenya case is especially revealing (see footnotes below) since in recent weeks the Kenya Government has been blamed for not taking the APRM review seriously (Daily Nation, 11/08/2009), hinting at the process being simply a series of hoops through which governments must jump in order to comply with aid or FDI flows.

These two cases highlight an age-old problematic pertaining to the suitability of Western-style liberal democracy in Africa and of Western experts and scholars imprinting their model of an ideal state onto Africa (as so brilliantly addressed in work by Francophone scholars such as Bayart
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58 As has not been the case with countries like Liberia or the DRC, and notably Botswana which, according to Transparency International (2008) enjoys a reputation as being the least corrupt country in Africa.

59 It ought to be noted however that, far from discrediting the ARPM process, the Kenyan election violence actually illuminates the effectiveness and need to implement the ARPM process further and more effectively. As the ARPM report from Kenya (two years prior to the violence) noted: ‘There is a need for a healing of the nation. The process of national healing and reconciliation is unlikely to proceed as long as society is still polarized. In addition, without also addressing past crimes, corruption, marginalization and poverty, it is unlikely that reconciliation can be achieved.’ As Manby (2008) argues: The report did not shy away from highlighting issues of corruption, especially in land allocation, nor from the ethnic tensions ... It identified ‘overarching issues’ that Kenya would need to address, starting with ‘managing diversity in nation building’, and going on to filling the ‘implementation gap’ between policy and action on the ground; addressing poverty and wealth distribution; land reform; action against corruption; constitutional reform; and addressing gender inequality and youth unemployment. Kenya is also due to undergo a voluntary second review, originally set for July 4th - 14th 2009. See: http://www.reliefweb.int/rw/RWFiles2008.nsf/FilesByRWDocUnidFilename/ASAZ-7DRDBV-full_report.pdf/$File/full_report.pdf
(1993) and Chabal and Daloz (1999)). Whilst it is certainly not in the scope of this research to outline such a discussion here, it must be recognised that “commonly agreed standards” inaugurated by largely international multilateral institutions, are reflective of a particular Western development path, once again contradicting the concept of an African development path. For example, the Zimbabwean press repeatedly claimed that violence was inevitable and therefore holding violence-free elections in Africa was “next to impossible” (Herald, Harare, March 25, 2002) and that, given the logistics and institutional structures in the developing world, there were bound to be errors. Whether one agrees with this evaluation or not, there is nonetheless a clear contradiction to Nepad’s claim that democracy is a universal norm spreading across the continent, and a tension with complex social-cultural-political relations cannot be standardised by a technology such as the APRM.

**AAPSIA: Liberating Civil Servants to become Entrepreneurs of Government**

As part of Nepad’s ‘Programme on Governance and Public Administration’, the Secretariat in partnership with South Africa’s Centre for Public Service Innovation (CPSI) launched a continental Awards Project in 2007 called the All-Africa Public Service Innovation Awards (AAPSIA). The AAPSIA is, in effect, a competition amongst African government sectors (at national, provincial and local levels) aiming to ‘award successful and effective service delivery improvement projects and initiatives that have been achieved through the application of innovative approaches, methodologies and tools’ and, in particular, to ‘recognize creative initiatives [and] projects that reflect ‘out-of-the-box’ thinking’ (Nepad 2006: 4). This unconventional thinking is reinforced by a criterion that specifies that “the application of standard procedures and approached” will not be rewarded. Overall, the initiative’s long-term aim is to improve the ability of African state institutions to be more effective in addressing the socio-economic challenges of African societies.

The AAPSIA also intersects with the major theme of African ownership through its strong emphasis upon recognising and awarding “home-grown” ways of delivering services to communities in Africa. As such, Nepad works with regional and continental partner civil society organisations such as CAFRAD, CESPAM, CPSI, DPMF and AAPAM⁶⁰ and to deliver the AAPSIA. Funding was intended to
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⁶⁰ African Training and Research Centre in Administration for Development, Centre of Specialisation in Public Administration and Management (at the University of Botswana), Centre for Public Service Innovation, Development Policy Management Forum, African Association for Public Administration and Management
 originate from the European Union (EU), however was eventually secured from the German Technical Cooperation (GTZ). The AAPSIA also aim to promote regional partnerships and integration, thus promoting Nepad’s integration ambitions. The AAPSIA are understood as a means through which Africans can provide African solutions to African problems, for example, the concept document emphasises that “individuals and institutions in Africa have developed creative solutions appropriate to the context of the continent that have changed the lives of those who have benefited from them” (Nepad, nd). To ensure effectiveness and efficiency, public servants need to apply innovative solutions to difficult problems faced with limited resources, widespread poverty and uneven socio-economic development.

The initial Nepad concept report intended to use three categories for the competition, this was extended to five after consultation with CPSI and other stakeholders and then reduced back down to three, more all-encompassing, categories after realising financial constraints (African Union, 2008). The three categories of the AAPSIA are:

**A. Innovative Service Delivery:** This category recognises projects which improve service delivery to citizens, and the internal efficiency within the public sector.

**B. Innovative Partnerships between Government, Private Sector and Civil Society:** This category recognises creative partnerships, resulting in better cooperation between government and other social partners for the purposes of service delivery.

**C. Innovations in Systems and Processes of Governance:** This category applauds accountability, transparency and ethics in public service innovation. (Nepad, 2008)

The judging criteria emphasise cost-effectiveness, partnerships, accountability, efficiency and, on two occasions, ‘customer satisfaction’ reflecting the reconfiguration of government into a quasi-business venture. Curiously, the awards for winning in each of the categories are based on prestige rather than monetary remuneration; presumably to comply with the anti-corruption ethos that public service ought to be about duty rather than financial reward. Instead, the stated benefits of participation in the AAPSIA are: the inclusion of participants’ entries as part of the AAPSIA database, placement on a mailing list to receive notification of other (regional and international) public sector innovations, and a cost-reimbursed invitation for finalists to attend the gala AAPSIA ceremony. In addition, successful projects are ‘afforded the opportunity’ of having their experiences documented in the form of a case study for potential publication continentally and internationally (Nepad, 2006: 4), showing how the
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61 See Chabal and Daloz (1999) for how this may be inappropriate in an African context where the Weberian split between public and private office is argued to be not so distinct
designation of expertise itself becomes a prize. Thus, the incentive is, as stated, not monetary but the prestige that comes with developing new techniques and producing new, innovative knowledge and the subjectification of an example of best practice.

The evaluation process proceeds through three stages. The first stage involves the submission of nominations to regional partner organisations which check for compliance, these are then shortlisted by the screening panel, a selection of representatives from CPSI, AMDIN and the DPSA. The second stage consists of the evaluation panel62 which consists of representatives from government, academia and civil society. Representatives are selected by the Nepad secretariat. The final Evaluation Panel list is submitted to the Committee of Ministers of Public/Civil Service (of the AU) for review and confirmation (stage three), who review and finalise the decision. The AAPSIA concept report stresses that for transparency and accountability the overall evaluation process will be screened by a continentally recognised auditing firm.

Once again, however, the role of home-grown expertise is paramount to assessing what is worthy of recognition or not. Judges were selected according to their ‘excellent standing, who have done extensive work in the public sector’ (African Union, 2008: 13) and on the basis of their ‘expertise, experience and credibility to provide leadership and insight’ (Nepad, 2006). A balanced geographic spread was considered, emphasising the All-African nature of the programme; hence the panel represented southern, eastern, western and northern Africa. The 2008 judging panel consisted of Prof. Sheikh Ahmed Abdullah (Nigeria) from the African Management Development Institute Network (AMandin); Prof. John Forje (Cameroon) from the University of Yaoundé; Mr. Steve Katjiuanjo (Namibia) the Permanent Secretary, Department of Justice; Ms Bernadette Nzioki (Kenya) the Secretary to the Public Service Commission: Kenya and, the chair, Dr Ahmed S Elrafie (Egypt), the Minister Assistant for ERP Applications. In contrast to this diversity, the screening panel consisted entirely of South Africans. In a similar vein, the Government of Mauritius was chosen to champion the AAPSIA because of the perceived advances made in the Mauritian public service63. ‘Expertise’ for the AAPSIA noticeably entails not politicians or leading political figures but rather professionals purveying a particularly new form of knowledge, that of ‘public sector innovation’.

62 In 2008 this was set up with Dr A. S. Elrafie, Minister Assistant for Enterprise Resource Planning Applications of Egypt, as Chair, and comprising members each representing the five AU regions: Prof S. A. Abdullah of the African Management Development Institute Network (AMandin), Prof J. Forje of the University of Yaoundé of Cameroon, Mr S. Katjiuanjo, Permanent Secretary at the Department of Justice of Namibia, Madam B. M. Nzioki, Secretary to the Public Service Commission of Kenya.

63 In the AU report it explains that Mauritius’ public service is relatively small, hence service delivery and innovation is enhanced.
The 1\textsuperscript{st} awards were held in 2008 and 59 entries were registered. Of these, 35 entries entered the category of Innovative Service Delivery Improvement, 19 entries for the category of Innovative Partnership between Government, Private Sector and Civil Society, and 5 entries were for the Innovative Systems and Processes of Governance (United Republic of Tanzania, 2008). The final ceremony was held in Johannesburg on October 14\textsuperscript{th}.

**Old Wine, New Continent**
The concept of Public Sector Innovation is not new but can largely be traced to the philosophy of New Public Management that emerged in OECD countries during the 1980s (Hood, 1995; Metcalf, 1993), although Polidano (1999) notes that the uptake of this paradigm in the developing world had been notably partial. Examples of awards for government innovation are apparent at the national level (e.g. the Innovations in American Government Awards Program in the USA), the provincial/state level (e.g. the Alberta Innovation Awards), local level (e.g. the Speyer Quality Competition Award in Germany) and even the transnational level (e.g. the United Nations Public Service Awards). The AAPSIA are themselves closely related to the fairly recent South African CPSI innovation awards, an initiative of the South African Minister of Public Service and Administration which was launched in 2003, hence the partnership between the two bodies. The AAPSIA also operates under the guidance of the Pan-African Ministers of Public/Civil Service programme of the AU\textsuperscript{64}. What is particularly revealing is that whilst the solutions provided are deemed to be locally specific, innovation is nonetheless regarded (by the CPSI) as a transnational concept; necessary, proponents of the philosophy argue, for ‘those countries seeking to move ahead in the global marketplace’ (Kamarck, 2004: 44) where ‘only competitive nations will survive’ (Hookhoom, 2008: np).

This emphasis of the universality of innovation but the local specificity of solutions is captured by the AAPSIA promotional and concept material which specifically frames innovation around notions of African tradition. By this I draw attention to the AU process report which opens with a page devoted to innovative concepts in African literature, especially the epic *Things Fall Apart* by Chinua Achebe, and contends that ‘the twentieth century ushered in a period of phenomenal growth and innovation for African writers’ (African Union, 2008: 6). This whole section is analytically captivating in how it argues that Achebe’s innovation through writing allowed readers all over the world to ‘make

\textsuperscript{64} The Pan-African Ministers of Public/Civil Service meet formally every two years with the purpose of establishing the centrality of governance and public administration capacity for development
sense of the madness that was colonialism’. It then draws on South African writer Njabulo Ndebele who parallels the imaginative work of writers and the work of innovators in science and technology:

‘*Ndebele puts forward the simple premise that African people can imagine the change they want to see, they should dare to dream and imagine as writers and artists do.*’ (ibid: 6)

This concept of dreaming and imagining ‘as writers and artists do’ and the subsequent ‘advances’ made in African literature conceptually ties innovation as advancing African socio-economic development, thus forming the intellectual basis upon which the AAPSIA rest:

*The All Africa Public Sector Innovation Awards (AAPSIA) is a pertinent answer to the challenge posed by thinkers like Ndebele who advocate the growth and well-being of Africa through innovations created by Africans.* (ibid: 6)

This use of Achebe and, less so, Ndebele provides a fascinating insight into how global phenomena become reframed through culture. This device provides a rhetorical linkage between innovation in the public sector and great African cultural figures to not only recast innovation as rooted in African traditions (thus linking tradition with progress) but to capture the sense of Afro-optimism and Pan-Africanism which the AAPSIA, and Nepad, seeks to celebrate.

**Competitiveness, entrepreneurship, creativity**

As described, the APPSIA attempts to herald a revolution in governing practices. What is noteworthy is how the complex challenges to African development are recognised by the awards documentation as stemming largely from bureaucratic and government inefficiency (as supposed to anything supranational or structural). This is not to deny that project developers may be fully aware of these factors, but it highlights the anti-politics at work in how “problems” becomes detached from broader political processes, demarcated for intervention and acted upon with solutions. This sentiment is particularly apparent in the concept document:

*It [the AAPSIA] is an initiative aimed at responding to the general failure to recognise and implement innovative solutions on the continent and the resulting tendency to rely on imported package solutions to African state capability challenges*

By identifying the lack of innovation in government as a key obstacle to development or effective capacity building, the initiative clearly presents innovation as a solution. Indeed, it begs the question of how and why governments were never (or not perceived to be) “innovative” before? And also why
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65 A UN-organised conference attended by many Nepad and REC representatives in Addis Ababa in December 2006 had the particularly apt title “Regional Forum on Reinventing Government in Africa: Building Trust in Government”, no less supporting this argument that there is a desire by development practitioners to “reinvent” or “revolutionise” African governments.
contemporary initiatives such as public-private partnerships (PPPs) or e-Government are held up by the APPSIA to be exemplary of innovation and efficiency within the CPSI and APPSIA literature. The lack of innovation is simply one of unfulfilled potential that needs to be nurtured. This is evident by the aim of the Nepad Governance and Public Administration programme, within which the APPSIA is situated, which is to create ‘an enabling environment within the public sector for the development and nurturing of innovative ideas and initiatives’ (Nepad, 2006: 4, emphasis original). It is also worth noting the near identicalness to the mission statement of the South African CPSI, whose slogan is – interestingly – “unlocking innovation! For efficient and effective service delivery” (CPSI, 2008). As with all capacity building discourse, African innovation involves the release of latent internal skills and entrepreneurship – through, once again, an enabling environment – that is able to effect development.

However, far from supporting a retreat of the state, the APPSIA stress the importance of government in the development process. As the concept notes states, “the programme’s framework is based on the recognition that national governments, both separately and as a collective, are critical in efforts to achieve sustainable development in the continent” (Nepad, 2006: 3). However, this involvement is envisaged to be a particular form of government. Whilst the term entrepreneur is never explicitly used, the APPSIA attempt to encourage public sector employees to think of themselves as what Schneider and Teske (1992), amongst others, have called “political entrepreneurs”

66. This is clearly evident with the promotion of innovation as the solution to governmental problems and the “the generalization of an ‘enterprise form’ to all forms of conduct” (Burchell, 1993: 275). It is also apparent as governments are reconceptualised as a service provider to a particular market, customer or ‘stakeholder’ (i.e. the public), involved in particular transactions, which is clearly demonstrated by one of the marking criteria: “Be able to demonstrate levels of customer/citizen and other stakeholder satisfaction with the services but also in how innovation itself is conceived” (Nepad, 2006: 7). But it is especially revealing how risk-taking also plays a key, valorised role in this innovation when it states that the APPSIA are seeking “individuals who have been prepared to take risks and go against the tide to a certain extent, with the overall aim of improving services to the public, within respective local and/ or regional context” (Nepad, 2006: 4, emphasis added). Whilst excessive risk-taking is clearly not a desirable feature of government, it remains un-
clarified what these “risks” may be, how they are socially distributed and managed. These notions of risk-taking also seem to run contrary to discourses of responsibility and rational choice (as evoked in public choice theory). Yet they are undeniably part of the process of market-oriented reform of the public sector, if anything highlighting the internal contradictions and fractures of neoliberal rationalities.

This reconfiguration of the African public sector into a sector of political entrepreneurs borrows heavily from the Schumpeterian theory of entrepreneurship as a primary driver of social and economic change. The World Bank, in a study of innovation in African development more general, also embeds their understanding of innovation within a Schumpeterian framework (Oyelaran-Oyeyinka and Sampath, 2007). For Schumpeter67 (1950), an entrepreneur is understood to be someone willing and able to convert a new idea or invention into a successful innovation; a definition which finds massive parallels in the criteria being used to assess the AAPSIA and which resonates with the CPSI definition of innovation (which is quoted by the various promotional material):

*Innovation can be defined as the application of new ideas, which result in benefits through cost-savings, efficiency improvements and new products or services. Innovation therefore should not be equated to creativity, but rather be seen as the means by which the outputs of the creative process are put into practice”* (African Union, 2008: 7)

The very phrasing in the concept plan – “to revitalize governance and public administration through strengthening the capacity of state institutions” (Nepad, 2006: 3) – is heavily connotative of a form of creative destruction that sees outmoded and ineffective government models replaced by new, more dynamic systems produced through innovation. Indeed, the very notion of a *competition* for public services is itself the effect of a governmental rationality that extends market logic into the sphere of politics68. It is a rationality that understands competition as pushing maximum resource efficiency and lowering costs, as well as seeing a political marketplace saturated with antiquated ideas within which innovation will ultimately bring about rewards (political career advancement, popularity, effective projects).

Lastly, and perhaps, most significantly is how the AAPSIA and their conception of innovation is inextricably linked to discourses about “the knowledge economy” (OECD, 1996) or “learning economy” (Lundvall and Johnson, 1994). As Ong (2007) argues, neoliberal development shifts

---

67 Schumpeter’s Mark I theory is perhaps more relevant to his business-centered Mark II theory
68 Indeed, Foucault (2008) notes that it was the primacy of “competition” in the market-place, as supposed to “exchange”, which differentiated neoliberalism from classical liberalism
emphasis from the production of goods to the production of knowledge. These discourses are invoked in two ways. Firstly, knowledge and innovation are intricately intertwined, two sides of the same coin, because knowledge is seen as a major factor (just as ‘innovation’ was) to overcoming development obstacles:

*Building on previous initiatives, it [the AAPSIA] is rooted on a common understanding of the importance of... generating knowledge on the continent in order to improve the ability of African state institutions to more effectively address the socioeconomic challenges of African societies* (Nepad, 2006: 3)

Secondly, knowledge is also seen to be an asset to be shared within the African public arena and a vehicle for social networking whereby these political entrepreneurs can learn from one another in a productive way:

*The awards are not limited to recognition alone, but incorporate opportunities for capturing learning, impacting on policy decisions of government and establishing partnerships. (African Union, 2008: 8)*

Indeed, as the above quote suggests, this is regarded as itself a prize and opportunity to be harnessed. The importance of knowledge sharing was iterated by the guest speaker at the 2008 awards ceremony, Balkissoon Hookhoom, when he commented that “participation [in the awards and the awards ceremony] by the contenders must have been a useful learning experience”. This sharing and accumulation of knowledge and the consequential constitution of “good practice” clearly relates to peer-support and thus of self-reliance and responsibilisation, whereby African public sector workers can teach themselves rather than have ‘external’ knowledge imposed onto them.

It is especially significant that the process of the awards and details of projects submitted are captured on a database in an effort to, as the concept note states, ‘begin to build a knowledge bank of innovative work that is unfolding on the Continent’ (Nepad, 2006: 4). It is also planned that the AAPSIA database will be freely available to people from across Africa and internationally to use in research and development of new initiatives. I would argue that the sharing of knowledge is also a process of collective empowerment through enlightenment evident when the AAPSIA concept note states that it hopes entrants will ‘learn from one another through sharing experiences, build relationships and new partnerships that will hopefully result in new initiatives’. But, as Foucault (1979: 27) argued, power and knowledge directly imply one another...There is no power relation without the correlative constitution of a field of knowledge, nor any knowledge that does not

---

69 It is particularly telling how in describing innovation in Africa, the optic of ‘unfolding’ is connotative of the release of entrepreneurial spirit rather than the creation of it
presuppose and constitute at the same time power relations’. As a result the production and accumulation of this knowledge and the construction of expertise is axiomatically related to an increase in governmental power, which is in part made possible by such knowledge. The constitution of knowledge on innovation, the sharing of it, and the exercise of new initiatives that emerge from it thus enables the more effective exercise of government in order to reach Nepad’s development goals.

An interesting postscript to this analysis is to mention how innovation in government may spawn ideas and initiatives that are actually contrary to what one may call the “the neoliberal agenda”. In examining the documents and proceedings of the AAPSIA and the Ministers of Public Service, the issue of free and open source software (FOSS) emerged. In one meeting in 2007, the proceedings explicitly outline the potential of FOSS to improve access to service delivery, efficiency and effectiveness because ‘it had the potential to cut costs and also facilitated open communication between governments and citizens’. An unrolling of FOSS across the African public sector would follow other such initiatives being implemented other developing countries such as Venezuela (2004), Vietnam (2004), Peru (2005) and Ecuador (2008). The uptake of FOSS in Africa elucidates the ironies of globalisation, in that interconnectivity gives global presence to non/anti-capitalist exchange of products and ideas, but it works to illustrate to some extent the disconnects of “neoliberalism”.

First steps of an innovation revolution?
Despite the grand narratives being extolled by Nepad and the CPSI, there were however a number of factors stalling the APPSIA. Budgetary and time constraints forced departure from the original Nepad concept document, for example, the categories were reduced and the numbers of winners in each category were also reduced from five to three. Dr Busieka (interview 2) highlighted that key challenges for AAPSIA include sustainability, resource mobilisation, political leadership, cutting costs and popularising and marketing the awards. In particular, the AU report noted how the initial volume of entries was insufficient and, as a consequence, the deadline was extended 6 months from June to December (African Union, 2008). And, although the number of entries received was deemed satisfactory, the geographical spread of countries was particularly disappointing with ‘some members of the judging panel comment[ing] that not a single entry was received from Nigeria, the

---

71 Algeria, Egypt, Ghana, Kenya, Mauritius, Mozambique, South Africa, Tanzania, Uganda and Zambia (Hookhoom, 2008)
most populous country on the continent!’ (ibid: 12). The lack of Nigerian entries is remarkable considering the presence of a Nigerian on the judging panel. This, of course, could simply be a matter of the need for more ‘aggressive marketing’ (ibid: 12) and for the scheme to gain greater recognition beyond its first year, as the AU recommendations make clear, but it does nonetheless illustrate the limitations of continent wide schemes such as these.

Despite these acknowledgements after the 2008 awards, Nepad, the AU, CPSI and AAPAM all envisage that innovation can spread throughout the African public sector through such awards and continued recognition. There is great anticipation that there will be the need to contract an external auditing firm to count votes in forthcoming events. One of the unintended outcomes of the marketing visits to RECs was that the implementation of the AAPSIA ‘will achieve greater success with the establishment of governance and public administration focal points within the RECs’. The AAPSIA have also led the way for organisations such as the CPSI ‘to be replicated across the continent so as to promote and sustain innovation’ (African Union, 2008) which is also to be promoted through the enlistment of regional partner organisations used in the first stage of judging entries. This example draws attention to how ideas can spread across space, through forums where people exchange ideas and knowledge (in this case, ceremonies), through the consultation of governments by organisations to (in this case, the CPSI and Nepad) and all legitimised and made logical by a series of discourses and rationalities (in this case, that public sector workers should be more ‘innovative’).

“e-Health”: Care of the Self goes online

The creation of health care is central to governmental strategies for the improvement of the population. Foucault (1973) himself saw public health as a particular form of political technology used by modern states to exercise power located at the level of life itself. Thus, what he called “biopower” sought to control and organise whole populations through the regulation of sexuality, habits and well-being, amongst others. Many recent scholars have used a governmentality lens to interpret the neoliberalisation of healthcare in Western contexts highlighting policy agendas that reflect a normative privileging of the individual, the regulation of risk, a preference for private sector funding and provision for services, the integration of corporate management practices into the work of government and the reconceptualisation of the patient as a client (Petersen, 1997; Lemke, 2001; Prince et al., 2006; Teghtsoonian, 2009). Few studies have explored the pervasiveness or implications of these changes in health strategies across the developing world, thus indicating an area for
potential future research. Whilst the Nepad health strategy could be subjected to an extensive analysis of the type conducted in chapter 4, especially one tuned to biopolitics, there is neither the scope nor the space to do so. Nonetheless, there are a few particular observations in the Nepad health strategy, in particular a technology called “health points”, that I intend to use to continue my analysis so far.

**Overview of the Nepad Health Strategy**

Health has been adopted as a priority area for action by the Nepad Heads of State committee. Unlike the LPA, which focused largely on economic development, Nepad addresses health in a far more direct and holistic way. The strategy identifies key measures for strengthening health systems, improving partnership and communication with communities, and focusing local action on the identified leading burdens in Africa—malaria, HIV/AIDS, and obstetric emergencies (Nepad, 2003b). Through the mechanisms of the AU, African governments have signed up to the health strategy and are increasingly allocating at least 15% of their total budgets to health care in compliance with the Abuja target established in 2003 (African Union, 2003). The execution of this commitment by African governments is being monitored by the AU, and it has called on the international community to fill the $19bn shortfall in health financing that the WHO has determined that Africa is unable to finance using internal funds (Dare and Buch, 2005).

The health strategy divides health into two technical problem areas – (i) Communicable and non-communicable diseases and (ii) Conditions related to pregnancy and childbirth – which are expressed in statistics instrumental in determining and evaluating the general health of the “African population” relative to global norms (see chapter 4). The resulting deficiencies identified with African healthcare are:

- Too small-scale disease control programmes
- Weak health systems and services unable to target reduction in disease burden
- Low-safety in pregnancy and childbirth
- Inadequate empowerment for people to improve their health
- Insufficient resources
- Widespread poverty, marginalisation and displacement
- Inequitable reach of health services for those with the greatest disease burden.
The strategy then continues to discuss a series of “strategic directions” and “institutional arrangements” through which these problems may be corrected and how the vision of “an Africa rid of the heavy burden of avoidable ill-health, disability and premature death” (Nepad, 2003b: 14) may be achieved.

As the Nepad health strategy makes clear, healthcare is not simply a matter of total individual responsibility or the rectifying of moral failure since structural factors such as poverty, lack of resources and insufficient education are also acknowledged as determining factors. My aim here is not to present individualising discourses as entirely pervasive or hegemonic but rather as sitting side-by-side, often incoherently, with narratives of marginalisation and discussions of state-led health (e.g. Nepad, 2003b: 25). An additional emphasis in the strategy is placed on health workers and there is a call for investment to stem the brain drain and to produce the “right” multidisciplinary workforce in order to improve the performance of health systems. Initiatives such as "brain sharing" between nations, public-private partnerships in Africa (identified by Dare and Buch as having mixed outcomes) and expanded access to medicine and services are also detailed (Dare and Buch, 2005). Interestingly, the healthcare strategy acknowledges the importance of traditional medicine as a viable option, something Nepad shares with the LPA. This is hardly surprising seeing that many Africans trust and have access to this medicine and government can therefore aim to work through cultural knowledges and practices in the aim to foster self-regulation rather than against them. Although, admittedly, this position sometimes stands in tension with expressions such as ‘rational use’ and ‘appropriate’, and recent political spats in South Africa demonstrate the tense incongruence between traditional medicine and Western scientific approaches. Thus Nepad’s health strategy fuses discourses of modernity with traditionalism, of individual agency with structural determinism, and an appeal for financial aid from donors at the same time that it emphasises African ownership.

**Empowerment as Health Solution**

Despite internal incoherence of discourses, a noticeable diagnosis that Africans are not sufficiently empowered to improve their health is especially prevalent. In this sense, empowering people to be their own experts and to be able to make better-informed decisions is seen as a key solution for improving health and combating premature or unnecessary deaths. As the health strategy lays out:

---

72 Manto Tshabalala-Msimang who was Minister of Health from 1999 to 2008 under Thabo Mbeki received widespread international criticism for her emphasis on treating South Africa’s AIDS epidemic with vegetables such as garlic and beetroot, rather than with antiretroviral medicines. She is a firm advocate for traditional medicine arguing that traditional remedies should not become "bogged down" in clinical trials.
Knowing the importance of seeking health care early would also impact on deaths. For example, deaths of children from pneumonia could be reduced if parents were more aware of its easily recognisable symptoms - fast breathing, a cough and a hot body.

In examples such as this, the failing is not so much the unavailability of healthcare services, or the socio-economic conditions within which children with pneumonia are situated but rather the parents’ lack of empowerment. To an extent, the health strategy recognises these structural factors as well, the point is that there are inherently limitations to separating component parts of an action plan; ‘empowerment’ cannot be a solution on its own unless the facilities for the child are available.

Overcoming this disempowerment is to be achieved through knowledge, invariably resulting in health education programmes designed to promote “health literacy”, the buzzword of contemporary health literature. Nepad defines health literacy as “attaining the basic knowledge and skills to enhance a person and their family’s health in a manner that favourably influences attitudes and behaviour” (Nepad, 2003a). Health literacy therefore involves the education of subjects to become knowledgeable and empowered enough to be able to make rational and informed decisions about healthcare and the care of one’s self which in turn influences the direction of a subject’s behaviour and thoughts. This empowerment is not simply evident with the example above (i.e. self-diagnosis or knowledge of warning signs) but also with preventative behaviour such as the recommendations of using chlorine tablets to prevent water-borne diseases and bed-nets to prevent vector transited disease like malaria, and through the encouragement of certain desirable behaviours over others. These choices will lead to a reduced burden on already stretched healthcare systems and prevent a decrease in labour productivity. As the health strategy communicates, Africans ‘do not intentionally risk their or their families’ health and lives’ (Nepad, 2003a: 10), rather the problem appears to be the lack of knowledge resulting in poor decisions.

Whilst the health strategy recognises that there often individual circumstances (in this respect, this is an identifiable limit to government capacity), at the same time illnesses seem to stem from the problem of disempowerment in one way or another. As a result, empowerment, individualisation and responsibility are leveraged on an ethico-political platform of good practice, whereby self-sufficiency is brought into line with governmental goals of minimal intervention as a

---

73 A rather alarming statistic quoted in the health strategy is that “If no changes are made to avert maternal deaths the consequence will be 2.5 million maternal deaths, 49 million maternal disabilities and 7.5 million newborn deaths between 2001 and 2010 and a loss in productivity of US$ 45 billion” (Nepad, 2003b: 5). It is alarming not just because of the immensity of the potentially preventable loss of life but also because of the quantification of maternal death into a loss of monetary output! In this sense, life is calculated in terms of productivity, a striking example of the governmental exercise of biopower.
moral good and the provision of more effective treatment. This observation is exceptionally explicit in the health strategy report: ‘the challenge, however, is to create the circumstances in which the poor are the prime actors in their own programmes - in which they are enabled to take action to improve their own health’ (Nepad, 2003b). As has been evident with other responsibilisation discourses in Nepad, the African subject is required to become an architect not only of their self-upliftment, but in this case this responsibility extends to the maintenance of their body and the optimal improvement of their health.

Similarly whilst the economic constraints of health are acknowledged, more social-cultural factors are entirely bracketed out of the health strategy, particularly with regard to HIV/AIDS (see Caldwell et al., 1989 vs. Ahlberg, 1994). For example, the strategy recommends the use of condoms for the prevention of HIV/AIDS but there is little realisation of the religious barriers and/or cultural beliefs that impede the uptake of such clinically-proven preventative measures. Little is also said of the immense social stigma incurred by HIV-positive Africans which has been widely documented, especially in rural communities (Nyblade et al., 2003). Indeed, the controversies surrounding preventative schemes such as PEPFAR and the morally-driven conditionalities imposed by external funders are conspicuous by its absence (cf. Ferguson, 1990)\(^\text{74}\). The anti-politics at work here therefore seems to opt for more technical solutions over political or socio-cultural issues, which are seen to be overcome through effective knowledge transfer.

**Health meets e-School**

This knowledge transfer aiming to sculpt health literate Africans finds synergies with another Nepad “human development” project called the e-Schools initiative, a project launched in 2003 at the African Economic Summit in Durban. Having problematised Africa’s lack of ICT skills, the e-Schools initiatives is a continental wide project established by the Nepad e-Africa commission to address two Nepad objectives: to bridge the digital divide and to integrate Africa into the world. This integration is to be achieved by imparting ICT skills to young Africans in primary and secondary schools as well as harnessing ICT technology to ‘improve, enrich and expand education in African countries’ (e-Africa commission, 2008). Five private consortia led by AMD, Cisco, HP, Microsoft and Oracle have contributed just over US$5million to the Nepad e-Schools Demo Project and are involved with setting

\(^{74}\) One-third of prevention spending in 2006–2008 was required to be directed towards abstinence-­until-marriage programs and that all funded organizations signed an anti-prostitution pledge. PEPFAR also does not fund needle exchange programs. These conditions for abstinence only funding, however, were lifted in 2008.
up and maintaining the project for a year. The goal is to equip, using latest satellite and fibre-optic technology, all African primary and secondary schools with ICT apparatus such as computers, radios and television sets, phones and fax machines, communication equipment, scanners, digital cameras, copiers, etc., and to connect them to the internet. In each country, the e-Schools Initiative expects to “transform” all African secondary schools into Nepad e-Schools within five years of the implementation start date and all African primary schools within ten years of implementation start date (e-Africa commission, 2008). This means that, in total, the project hopes to target over 600,000 schools across Africa\(^75\) to become ICT enabled and connected to the e-Schools satellite network. The project is evidently exceptionally ambitious.

The significance to the case study here is that one of the objectives of the e-Schools initiative is to equip each school with what has been called a “health point” in order to make every learner health literate (Nepad, 2005a). The health point intends to serve as a source of health information for children, parents and health workers, as well as a means to undertake specific health interventions as may be required (e-Africa commission, 2008). It is envisaged that the health point will also be a means to encourage the involvement of communities in the initiative. The Medical Research Council of South Africa is the key governmental body providing assistance with the development, content and application of the health points, once again illustrating South African leadership and ‘expertise’ within Nepad’s initiatives.

Issues of health and of education are thus brought together as part of Nepad’s framework for “human development” which, like democracy and good governance, is seen to be a means and a pre-requisite to the overall goal of African development\(^76\). As is evident with the integration of health points into the e-Schools, the key to living a long and healthy life is seen to (at least, partially) reside with education and self-empowerment through the acquisition of knowledge. The use of ICTs allows for the more efficient extension of government over space by national education departments which had not been possible before – controlling curriculum, supplying information on health, monitoring education progress and promoting other government strategies – all indirectly, and skipping over the need to have health-professionals in villages. As a result, sheer remoteness or bureaucratic breakdowns in communication from local educators to education departments or clinic to health departments can be overcome through ICTs, increasing the ability for central government to extend

---

\(^75\) Interestingly, the sixteen countries that subscribed to the APRM review constitute the first phase of the project.

\(^76\) It therefore aligns with strategies for economic growth, infrastructure improvements (including water), sustainable human development (including education and gender), agriculture and the environment. There has also been expressed hope that the e-Schools network will also act as a platform for e-Governance and elections initiatives.
biopower in ways that meet national and, by the extension of logic, Nepad goals. The health points will allow for government to craft young Africans not only as ICT-literate entrepreneurs in the ‘emerging Information Society and Knowledge Economy’ (Nepad, 2005a: 2) but also into healthy and responsible individuals able to enact self-care from within.

CSFs: Patrolling the boundaries of political-society and civil society
In Chapter Four, the question of civil society as an intermediary between the ‘up-there’ state and the ‘down-there’ society was introduced. Using a series of workshops that were devised by Nepad called the “civil society forums”; I intend to build on some of the initial arguments made to illustrate how civil society is a carefully managed resource of advanced liberal government. The question of civil society has been considered by many widely-cited philosophers – Habermas, de Tocqueville, Gramsci, Gellner, and others – as well as many in-depth studies on the role of civil society in the African context (e.g. Ndewga, 1996; Chabal and Daloz, 1999; Comaroff and Comaroff, 1999) but the intention here is not to develop a complex theoretical argument about the constitution or position of civil society in Nepad but rather, as with all of the technologies discussed here, to delineate how neoliberal political rationalities become operationalised.

Nepad and CSO engagement
The formation of Nepad, whilst welcomed by many governments outside of Africa, was widely criticised by academics and organisations within Africa as having been concocted behind closed doors. As Bond (2003) recalls:

in late 2001 and early 2002, virtually every major African civil society organisation, network and progressive personality criticised Nepad’s process, form and content, and until April 2002, no trade union, civil society, church, women’s, youth, political-party, parliamentary, or other democratic force in Africa were formally consulted

Whilst initially sceptical, in July 2002 the Congress of South African Trade Unions (COSATU) and the African Section of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU/AFRO) eventually gave their support to the AU and Nepad (SADOCC, 2002), although calling for greater consultation and voicing concern that some economic policies could force cuts in social spending. Likewise, a proliferation of other declarations were made by a variety of other civil society organisations (CSOs) such as the 70 such groups which formed a coalition of over 100 CSOs known as the Malawi Economic
Justice Network, which welcomed Nepad "as a landmark in the process of shared aspirations for African unity" (Harsch, 2004). And in Algeria too, a coalition of 19 groups initiated a programme to popularise Nepad at literacy centres and among students and grassroots organisations. Former Nepad chief executive, Wiseman Nkuhlu, in a retrospective speech on Nepad in 2008 commented:

It is pleasing to note that much as it was extremely demanding in the first 18 months, by the middle of 2003 many African scholars, leaders of NGOs and trade unions that were sceptical at the beginning had been turned into fervent supporters of NEPAD. (Nkuhlu, 2008: np)

Nkuhlu’s quote provokes questions over exactly how engaged he was with the academic debates over Nepad, not reflecting well on his leadership. Current positions of CSOs (and scholarship) on Nepad remain diverse, ranging from uncritical support to absolute rejection, with many of the former being lauded by UNECA, Nepad and the AU as indicative of the support of “civil society”.

Civil society forums emerged as a technology of engagement, with workshops designed to enlist CSOs into Nepad. They emerged largely because of two factors; firstly, particularly in the initial years, as a response to the critique of Nepad’s perceived top-down and elite driven formulation and, secondly, to honour Nepad’s recognition that CSOs were “stakeholders in the development process” that needed to be engaged with alongside national governments and the private sector. It suggests that the formation of the forums, in the form in which they emerged (i.e. often highly publicised, invitation only, infrequent and irregular), were a rejoinder to these concerns. In addition, the exclusion of CSOs also threatened to undermine the much celebrated discourse of African ownership (Verway, 2005) and democracy. The centrality of civil society in contemporary development policy is intimately tied up with the ideas of ‘good governance’ leading Nederveen Pieterse (2001: 75) to note the ‘enormous increase of development funds being channelled or re-channelled through NGOs during the past two decades’. For Leftwich (1993), the post-structural adjustment failures, grassroots movements, as well as the collapse of communism and the readjustment of the Cold War international status quo as all play a major role in the emergence of this new development paradigm. Thus, civil society forums are also rooted within a larger discourse about good governance that has fairly specific historical roots.

---

The first civil society forum was held in Dakar in April 2002, followed by further meetings in Elmina (Ghana), Libreville (Gabon), Accra (Ghana) and Maputo (Mozambique). At the time of writing (July 2009), the status of the civil society forums is unclear. One could speculate that after enough CSOs had given their support to Nepad, the CSF was no longer necessary. In an expert group meeting held in Addis in May 2009 on the ‘Role of Private Sector and Civil Society in the Implementation of Nepad’ it appeared that civil society forums were no longer used, and that within Nepad itself there appeared to be “one desk” assigned to CSOs and the Gender Task Force acting as a bridge between the Nepad Secretariat and civil society. Rather, in its place, as shown by figure 6 (a slide taken from said conference), what had emerged was a network of regional/national Nepad units holding sporadic civil society discussions, the AU’s Economic, Social and Cultural Council (ECOCOCC) which is an advisory body designed to give CSOs voice within the AU institutions and decision-making processes, and also forums held with the Regional Economic Communities (RECs). Furthermore, the Nepad secretariat is often involved as a partner in other meetings such as the Europe-Africa Dialogue Process organised in Cape Town, Nairobi and Lisbon in 2003 by the North-South Centre of the Council

---

78 It is also worth noting that in the list of 36 participants, only 5 came from “civil society organisations”: Action Aid, Greener Africa, IGAD NGO Secretariat (dubiously intergovernmental and not non-governmental), the InterAfrica group and the Panafrcian Strategy & Policy Research Group

79 ECOCOCC is made up of civil society organizations from a wide range of sectors including labour, business and professional groups, service providers and policy think tanks,
of Europe. The Addis Ababa expert group\textsuperscript{80} acknowledged, however, the need to reintroduce the civil society forums as a means for centralising and formalising civil society engagement with the Nepad programme. The arguments outlined here focus on the CSFs but also draw on analyses of these other direct and indirect Nepad/civil society interfaces.

\textit{Pinning Down Civil Society}

A major problem that arises with the CSFs, and with engagements and partnerships with CSFs in all development initiatives, is what, or who, constitutes “civil society”. This categorisation of civil society is as problematic as the term “African” or even “private sector” and, in the African context, has been referred to as ‘conceptual confusion’ (Hearn, 2001). Formal definitions of civil society, too, are vague and diverse. For example, Cohen and Arato (1994) describe civil society as a space of potential “unconstrained discussion, consensus and social justice”, John Keane (2003) describes global civil society as being non-government (i.e. non-state but also including profit-seeking businesses, individuals, families, ethnic and religious identities) through to Gramsci who thought of civil society as a bulwark for the states and a source of resistance. Joseph Hanlon (2000) distinguishes between ‘real’ membership civil society struggling against governments and ‘contract’ NGOs being paid to do things for other people. Despite being a civil society forum, the Elmina CSF included ‘civil society organizations, government agencies, the diplomatic community, private sector, academia and the media from the region, including Egypt, Kenya, South Africa, Benin, Senegal, Algeria, Botswana, Ghana and delegates from other countries outside of Africa and international and local organizations attended (Nepad, 2003: np)’, and yet it says that there were just over sixty participants. This seems like an exceptionally small number of delegates to represent “the people” or indeed “civil society”, and the names of the civil society organisations in attendance, as well as the proportion of delegates from each of various listed groups is conspicuous by its absence. The minutes of the meeting conclude that “after three days of deliberations, Civil Society indicated their support for the Nepad”. Due to the state-civil society binary, civil society emerges as a technical rendering of “the people”\textsuperscript{81}; merely another stakeholder or partner that needs to be solicited and informed when making decisions.

\textsuperscript{80} Indeed, it is noteworthy (and a concern) that the need to engage civil society has been paralleled the need to engage the private sector and both are often put together within a vague technical category of “stakeholders”

\textsuperscript{81} As previously mentioned, Ferguson and Gupta (2002) refer to the ‘vertical topography of power’ which creates an imagination of the state being above the people and civil society being part of the people.
(Transnational) Civil Society and the Exercise of (Pan-African) Government

Whilst not denying the importance of opening up spaces in which more democratic forms of politics can operate, it is worth remembering that Foucault, contra to Habermas, Gramsci and others, argued that civil society was not separate to government (or even the state) but was intrinsically a part of it. For Foucault (see Hardt, 1995) civil society emerged as both an arena for state intervention and a collection of actors engaging with and relating to the state (Lemke, 2001). In other words, both the state and civil society can be understood as being a function of a constellation of institutions, charities, unions, research institutes, schools, print media and so on which all aim to govern through the conduct of conduct. By arguing that there is no “outside” to power, he is also denying the conventional analytical separation of political society from civil society. A few examples will illustrate the cross-constitution of civil society and the state, transcending the binary to see civil society itself as part of advanced liberal rule and particularly important for operationalisation of neoliberal political rationalities.

Firstly, the incorporation of civil society, through CSFs, is a means through which Nepad can govern more effectively through the dissemination of knowledge. As Mathews (2006a) has noted, these meetings are designed to be occasions for civil society organisations to receive information from the secretariat as well as for these organisations to suggest how they can best be involved in the implementation of Nepad. Looking through the meeting minutes and documentation, there is not a lot to suggest that CSOs have been given an opportunity to articulate their concerns about Nepad, let alone have these concerns attended to. Such is clear when considering the three objectives given for the Elmina meeting which aimed to:

-Strengthen the capacity of civil society institutions in to enhance their appreciation of Nepad
-Improve participation and empowerment of civil society institutions in the Nepad process and
-Empower civil society organisations to contribute to and monitor the implementation process of Nepad. (Nepad, 2003a: 2)

The theme of empowerment and capacity building remerges but, this time, the target is civil society itself. Without recanting arguments about the “hollowing out of the African state” (see Ferguson and Gupta, 2005; also Peck, 2001) these CSFs allow Nepad to operate at a distance through preconceived of the ‘community’ and ‘grassroots organisations’ that are constructed as free, responsible and self-governing. If development initiatives operate through these natural entities, it is seen as a more bottom-up, democratic and organic process (see Putnam, 2000). This rationale assumes that there are democratic African subjects simply waiting to be released and nurtured, rather than governmental
schemes and relations of power that mould them in this way, encouraging them to be civically-engaged, democratic Africans. Civil society becomes seen as a sphere (like the economy) that is self-regulating and self-sustaining only requiring the creation of conditions that enable natural systems to work\textsuperscript{82}. The past exclusion of CSOs is interpreted as a technical failure of previous development initiatives that can be corrected through a technology such as the CSFs: e.g. ‘8. We note that the overriding problem with previous development initiatives in Africa was implementation; therefore we believe that Nepad can be very useful if it undertakes project implementation with the collaboration of CSOs’ (UNEP, 2003: 2). The role of civil society in Nepad can be interpreted as one which involves taking on state-like qualities encouraging development at the, much valorised, level of the community.

Part of the ability to make rule more effective involves including select CSOs and aligning their interests, often portrayed in Nepad documents by terms such as “co-ordination” or “streamlining”. This strategy was particularly explicit in the May 2009 expert group in Addis where one of the aims was to formulate “existing pro-business and pro-civil society initiatives that align and promote the overarching objectives of AU/NEPAD”. In this sense, civil society is brought into being, as Barry et al. (1999: 9) note, ‘as both distinct from political intervention and yet potentially alignable with political aspirations’ (see also Li, 2007:265-266). The bringing together of a diversity of organisations requires balancing the requirements of stakeholders, but also giving various stakeholders “ownership” over their own areas of expertise, for example, women’s rights groups for advising on gender issues (see Madamombe, 2007), the Nepad business councils on market opportunities and so forth, yet whilst some of these groups may have contradictory goals they are nonetheless all encompassed under the loose title of Nepad’s development goals. This arrangement involves CSOs and social movements acknowledging a role to be played, as recognised by one civil society activist-researcher in her critical commentary on Nepad:

\textit{This would not entail South African organizations helping their government to sell Thabo Mbeki’s statesmanship to Africa and the world. This would be, for example, South African journalists comparing notes on press freedom with journalists in the neighbourhood, as proposed in a recent newspaper editorial. This would be about trade unions building regional solidarity, women’s organizations in one part of Africa speaking out against abusive cultural practices}

\textsuperscript{82} Beckman (1993: 21) notes that the neoliberal rationality is that “Socialism as well as post-colonial statism ... not only repressed civil society but prevented it from emerging. It is fatal for the state itself because it has not been subjected to the necessary discipline provided by the forces of civil society and has opened the way for authoritarianism, parasitism, and inefficiency.”
against women in another, and NGOs forming networks to do alternative reviews of governance in the NEPAD countries. These are all constructive ways for South African civil society organisations to buy into NEPAD without selling out their hard-won independence (Sturman, 2004: 37)

What is most apparent is that civil society is to, nonetheless, retain a separate identity from political-government, and required to work with Nepad in a way which “preserves the independence of civil society” (Nepad, 2003a: 12). Not only do these observations reiterate Burchell’s argument that civil society in brought into being as distinct but I would argue that civil society organisations must act within Nepad by thinking of themselves as separate to the state and the act of governing.

The capacity building of civil society also requires the building of a proper civil society by development experts. This creation of ‘proper’ civil society is none clearer than when looking at the funding sources, not just of the CSFs located within the boundaries of Nepad, but also for events that may be regarded as fringe or critical. In other words, at the same time as donors are funding Nepad, the same donors and partners are also funding conferences with the aim of critiquing Nepad (from the outside) (also see Hearn, 2001). For example, the National Labour and Economic Development Institute (NALEDI), together with the African Labour Researcher’s Network (ALRN), held an exceptionally critical regional workshop called “Building Alternatives to Neo-Liberal Globalisation: The Challenges Facing Nepad” in Johannesburg on the 22nd-23rd May 2003. The workshop brought together “labour researchers from the leading African research centres/trade union structures. The event also involved key researchers from other civil society formations and movements, to ensure that the labour perspective engaged those of wider civil society” (Neladi, 2003: 2). Curiously though, it was funded primarily by the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), the Canadian Labour Congress (CLC), and the Ford Foundation. Likewise, CIDA was instrumental in funding and providing logistical services to the African Social Forum in 2002 which led to the document “The Bamako Declaration: Another Africa is Possible!”. It is worth adding that this activist civil society group also curiously lists its partners as the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Italian Foreign Office as well as a host of other transnational NGOs such as Christian Aid, Action Aid, Oxfam America, the Canadian Catholic Church-funded Development and Peace/Développment et Paix and the Commonwealth Foundation. CIDA was also instrumental in gathering civil society representatives in Montréal from the 4-5th May 2002 to release a civil society statement opposing Nepad. This contradiction is not to suggest some kind of hypocrisy on behalf of G8 nations, but it does demonstrate exceptionally well that an analysis of monolithic “states” or “institutions” is limited.
More importantly though this example illustrates how goals of nurturing a “proper” or “thriving” civil society is targeted by development partners as part of the development process; it is not separate to, but essential for, the functioning of advanced liberal government.

Thus, it is a short step to see how a Western, liberal view of civil society as the counterweight to the state within the imaginations of Nepad architects is being crafted. Chabal and Daloz (1999) recognise that civil society itself is an essentially western concept, that instead African political systems operate through patron-client networks, and likewise Comaroff and Comaroff (1999) view any narrow formal distinctions between state and society, private and public as a “cheerful illusion”. Yet, African civil society is nonetheless presumed to pre-exist the working of power, apparent through the constant iteration of the need to build capacity as though it already exists, as well as the pouring of funds into CSOs who are seen to be more democratic and accountable than the African state (Beckman, 1993; Gyimah-Boadi, 1996; Hearn, 2001). The need for the capacity building of civil society is the answer to why, in the midst of the Structural Adjustment Policies, civil society did not rush in to fill the gap left by a reconstituted state. The separation of civil society and state in liberal political thought supposes that the state is consequently held to be accountable to civil society. CSOs, in this sense, are regarded as a force for surveillance. Such sentiment is echoed by Sturman’s critique that [Nepad] ... as a “pledge by African leaders” offers a position of critical distance for civil society to play the role of judge and jury” (Sturman, 2004). Likewise, the Elmina CSF meeting concluded that the role of civil society would be to “act as a watchdog by monitoring and evaluating the process of Nepad implementation”. The role of civil society in Nepad encapsulates advanced liberal rule: it is to watch the state, provide services, enable and empower citizens to think of themselves as free, it is to be a keystone of plural, democratic politics.

Indeed, it may be worth considering precisely how “democratic” such initiatives are. The very inability to recover all documents on who attends CSFs is concerning, as well as the particularly selective nature of the invitees that are disclosed. This criticism is not to suggest that all CSOs, including “grassroots movements” and community-based organisations (CDOs), are problematic but it is also worth critiquing how CSOs, also composed of unaccountable and unelected members (like the private sector) should come to occupy such an important place in development planning. As The Economist (2003) posed: ‘Who guards the guardians?’ Arguing against the dominant development orthodoxy, Riley (1998) and Harriss-White and White (1996) argue that democratisation and economic liberalisation can lead to reconfigurations or increases in corruption precisely because NGOs or other organisations have become such powerful yet unaccountable actors in development
planning and implementation (also see Crewe and Harrison, 1998: 5-6). In discussing various symptoms of beyond-the-state governmentality, Sywngedouw (2005: 2000) argues:

*given the diffuse and opaque systems of representation, accountability is generally very poorly, if at all, developed. In other words, effective representation has to be assumed, is difficult to verify and practically impossible to challenge. The combined outcome of this leads to often more autocratic, non-transparent systems of governance that—as institutions—wield considerable power and, thus, assign considerable, albeit internally uneven power, to those who are entitled through a selective random process of invitation) to participate*.

Recognising these issues, however, there has recently been momentum within Nepad delegations and UNECA calling for mechanisms that hold CSOs working with Nepad accountable (Kagoro, 2009), meaning that it is not just national governments who are to be monitored by external instruments. But as Jordan (Jordan and Tuijl, 2006: 54) make clear, ‘accountability is always political. The tools for measuring are developed by someone, made for someone, using a select method’. To her, then, it is not surprising that many monitoring systems are developed to ‘answer questions about NGO’s that donors feel need to be answered’. What is characteristic about these systems of accountability is that they interpenetrate, creating a web of accountability, performance targets, monitoring and evaluation while according organisations a certain autonomy of decisional power and responsibility for their actions (Rose, 1996: 56), which, I would argue, have the potential to cover up more than is revealed.

The CSFs also function to reinforce the boundary of “civil society inside Nepad” and “civil society outside of Nepad”. As well as through selected invitations by Nepad to CSFs, this boundary is policed through the use of discursive binaries such as for/against, with us/opposing us, a form of quasi divide-and-conquer declaring some elements of civil society to be outside of the Nepad process (because these CSOs fundamentally disagree with the tenets of the programme) due to their own shortcoming. There is also evidence that some NGOs are beginning to be cynical of other, more radical, organisations, for example, Grace Akumu, director of Kenya’s Climate Network Africa (an attendee of the Elmina CSF), argued that they should identify the positive aspects of Nepad, “because if all we see is negatives... then what is the point of getting engaged in it?" (Harsch, 2004: 10). Such sentiment was echoed by Thabo Mbeki who criticised sceptic and critics within civil society for both dragging the process down and being ill-informed about Nepad, stating that “[they should] come forward and ask what they can do... Ideology’ he stated “does not feed people” (Mbeki, 2002a). Mbeki’s comment exemplifies Bjorn Beckman’s (1993: 30) observations that parts of African CSOs
become redefined as “vested interests” and thus unable to answer on behalf of all of the African people, with Mbeki’s reference to “ideology” implying a specific, hostile and uncooperative group driven by ideology in relation to his own supposedly non-ideological standpoint and universal truth. Equally, the included CSOs are given a single voice amongst the private sector, governments, partners etc. which cosmetically includes civil society at the same time as containing critique because of their diversity. This closure is certainly evident by the lack of criticism apparent in any communiqué released by the CSFs. The consequent, and much flaunted, acceptance by ‘African civil society’ becomes, in the minds of the Nepad architects, AU and development partners, an acceptance by African people and a stamp of approval for the programme\textsuperscript{83}. Thus, dissent is instrumental for advanced liberal rule as it only encourages liberal-democratic values of civic engagement and plural politics but it forms a constitutive outside against which the reformist and included inside is normalised.

**Conclusions: On technologies and techniques**

As a means of answering the second sub-question, the above four case studies have attempted to illustrate the ways in which the neoliberal governmental rationalities outlined in the previous chapter are operationalised and attempted to be put into effect. In particular it has shown how technologies link up with theories, programmes or expertise. It has tried to illustrate the means through which *homo economicus Africana* (my shorthand for the ideal neoliberal African subject) is not only assumed to exist (i.e. in policy discourse) but is also nurtured and produced. Along with other documented technologies such as microfinancing (see Rankin, 2001) and carbon trading (see Toke and Lauber, 2007) which are also promoted through Nepad, these technologies are the more discreet driving forces through which re-subjectification and thus neoliberalisation occurs. Such a perspective contrasts with a view of neoliberal ideology or macro-economic restructuring simply bearing down on falsely conscious Africans.

Despite the diversity of case-studies, I have shown how there are common rationales underpinning them all, particularly in what is expressed to be desirable and, as chapter 4 highlighted, what social reality is presumed to already exist: a collection of potentially entrepreneurial, self-regulating and market-sensitive, democractic subjects. Yet at the same time I have also implicitly shown how each of these technologies, although individualising and nearly always based on economic

---

\textsuperscript{83} It is worth noting that critique of the G8-OECD is mostly apparent not in Nepad documents, but in material released by the CSFs. I would suspect that CSFs are therefore used as a tool for indirectly critiquing partners
logic, all point to “neoliberal idea”, thus highlighting it to be fractured; composed of and rendered truthful by a subset of knowledges and discourses such as New Public Management, theories of entrepreneurship, Rational Choice Theory, liberal-democratic political theory, neoclassical economics. Furthermore, these knowledge formations are difficult to geographically locate. They become enshrined in politically neutral and potentially incontestable concepts such as efficiency, freedom, self-fulfilment, innovation and rationality adding further to their dominance and foreclosing the possibility for counter-narratives or alternative strategies. For instance, within the contemporary development épistème, who would disagree with the necessity for democratic, accountable government in Africa, or the benefits of innovative thinking in government? Likewise, it is noticeable how neoliberal rationalities resonate with other political rationalities, for example, the concept of African ownership resonating with ideals of self-sufficiency, innovation resonating with ideals of entrepreneurship, democracy resonating with responsibility and self-reliance.\(^{84}\) The issue at hand is how these discourses determine what technologies and interventions are, and are not, legitimate as is evident by, for example, the particularly narrow view of democracy (liberal ideals which are reduced to tick boxes and audit sheets), innovation (related to efficiency and tangible outcomes rather than well-being or radical ideas), health (in the form of self-help and health literacy) or civil society (as implementers of policy rather than stakeholders in its production).

Furthermore, I have attempted to illustrate how these knowledges or governmental actions do not proceed unhindered. They also involve negotiations with competing ideas and discourses, alliances and the handling of critique. The emphasis here is on destabilising the imagery of neoliberalism as an all-encompassing, uncontested and steamroller ideology, not dismissing its existence. Instead, I illustrated how neoliberal governing practices (i.e. attempts to conduct the conduct of individuals through their freedom) are often more unsuspecting than the current Nepad literature has depicted them to be and the attempt to produce ideal neoliberal subjects always involves relations of power. The neoliberal rationalities of Nepad do not necessarily advocate the retraction of state power, influence or intervention. Rather, as Barry et al. (1996) have argued, neoliberalism provokes ‘the invention and/or deployment of a whole array of organisational forms and technical methods in order to extend the field within which a certain kind of economic freedom might be practiced in the form of personal autonomy, enterprise and choice’. The ‘Declaration of Democracy, Political, Economic and Corporate Governance’ suggests such a transition when it states

\(^{84}\) Ferguson (2006) has also noted this highlighting how Nepad’s African Renaissance discourse provided a rhetorical linkage of ‘neoliberal policies’ such as good governance, self-cleansing elites, renewal and national liberation, with African patriotism.
that: ‘globalisation and liberalisation does not mean that there should be no role for government in socio-economic development. It only means a different type of government’ (Nepad, 2002b para. 23). In this sense, neoliberal rule is not about the loss of power to the state or from “the people” and towards private interests or the disintegration of the “will to govern”, but more of a qualitative reconfiguration of it, the invention of new strategies of producing better subjects that are hoped will succeed where others have failed.
Chapter 6: Conclusions

The aim of this thesis was to explore and analyse The New Partnership for Africa’s Development (Nepad) through the theoretical lens of governmentality, whilst embedded within debates over the conceptualisation of “neoliberalism”. By doing so, I approached neoliberalisation from an alternative angle to what the current literature has done, preferring to see it as a distinct form of advanced liberal government that seeks to reconfigure subjects into free, self-regulating, entrepreneurial, market-oriented individuals. It has sought to make transparent those processes and programmes of rule through which Africans are governed. The intention was to mobilise and contribute to four bodies of literature: that addressing neoliberalism, that addressing neoliberal governmentality, that addressing Nepad, and that addressing critical perspectives towards African development. In this conclusion I want to first draw attentions to areas where research could be furthered. I then bring the discussion back to the literature that initially inspired an alternative framework by relating my findings back to how we can – as the subtitles suggested - re-think neoliberalism and re-read Nepad.

On further research

In concluding this thesis, there remains a series of loose ends that will need to be addressed in successive research or, alternatively, which provide avenues for thinking beyond the confines of this research question. A major extension of this work could seek to look to how these technologies for ideal neoliberal subjects actually work ‘on the ground’ so-to-speak through ethnographic work (if possible) with more focus on unintended outcomes. For example, how successful is the health strategy (once it gets implemented through national policies) successful in making self-caring Africans? Indeed, how do the Nepad goals articulate with national intentions and policies? As Lemke (2002: 58) notes: ‘the relations between rationalities and technologies, programs and institutions are much more complex than a simple application or transfer…. history is not the achievement of a plan’. Indeed, many ethnographers have approached African subject formation in a very different to that presented here, and it would be worthwhile (with successive fieldwork or not) beginning to elucidate the articulation of the ‘western’ neoliberal ideal of the autonomous self with the concept of African ‘personhood’ whereby ‘far from being understood in terms of individual autonomy or self-sufficiency, [power’s] signature [is] control over the social production of reality itself’ (see Comaroff and Comaroff, 2001: 274). The picture presented here, whilst discrediting a narrative of ‘imposed
neoliberalism’ per se can often lapse into seeing Nepad, and the various technologies it spawns, as being a seamless and top-down governmental programme.

It also goes without saying that Nepad ought to be continually engaged with. In the name of democracy, it ought to be interrogated, not just by academics whose opinion is always going to be critical but by civil society and African citizens themselves whom have much more at stake. This means creating open forums and debates where people are invited to have a say in their own development and who, as people who either live in poverty or who own new businesses in Africa, can each contribute their own lived experiences and expertise to the pool of knowledge from which Nepad derives its power and influence. It also requires informing people ‘on the ground’ so-to-speak of Nepad and its implications. Yet, this engagement should avoid debilitating narratives, ideological stand-offs, and unilateral information exchanges and should instead aim to make space for alternative perspectives which can contribute to the cacophony of debate and the production of counter-hegemonic discourses.

It would also make fascinating research if a more thorough engagement with the continuities and breakages between the Lagos Plan and Nepad was carried out. Whilst engaging with the Lagos Plan of Action, there were noticeable overlaps (e.g. on the subject of entrepreneurship, self-reliance, educating Africans to be more productive) in rhetoric, but they often operated within very different discursive formations. For example entrepreneurship was framed as making the industrialisation process more efficient (to ‘provide the link between the innovative and productive systems’ [LPA para. 50]) and as a means to serve Africa’s peoples [LPA para 14.ii] rather than the global orientation and self-improving ethos of Nepad. An exposition and explanation of the rationalities, knowledge formations and desired subjects underpinning the LPA would provide a fantastic context for a project of greater length.

As alluded to, there needs to be greater thought on how the structural, or the political economic, interacts and enmeshes with the behavioural, individual and the governmental. This is an ongoing tension present not just in this work but other governmentality studies. Whilst there are clearly distinctive patterns in the way in which Nepad attempts to resubjectify Africans, how do these governmental practices relate to matters such as the debt crisis (to be discussed later)? Are factors such as these (commonly referred to in terms of states, coercive power and conditionality) to be reconceptualised through the lens of governmentality in order to fit with the analysis, or can they simply be explained off as “limits to government”? The consequence could be the descent into an economically or structurally deterministic account of neoliberalisation that simply transposes the
vocabulary of Foucault onto a model of Gramscian hegemony rather than a productive cross-fertilisation of theory (see Barnett, 2005). Either way, this thesis has tried to accommodate both coercive power with micro-processes and, by doing so, has illustrated the need to interrogate this relationship further (England and Ward, 2007).

Related to this, there remained a tendency to let an analytic of neo-colonialism or dependency theory creep into my interpretations. It was an issue wrestled with in chapter 5, but when being unable to indicate causality or origins more concretely the temptation was always to assign agency to the “west”, often creating a myopic eurocentrism, for example: the APRM was an indirect mechanism for the developed world to instill its form of democracy into Africa, Nepad was a Trojan horse cover for Western commercial interests in Africa, the discourses in Nepad were western in origin. Yet this binary of Africa-West is problematic because, with the emergence of Chinese influence in Africa, foreign relations are no longer as bi-polar as these models would suggest, nor can principles such as accountability, democracy, free trade be seem as ideals solely residing in the West or implausible to come from inside Africa. To get around this issue I invoked Ferguson and Gupta’s (2002) notion of transnational governmentality, however I feel that this is still a grey area that needs to be clarified in successive work.

**On “neoliberalism”**

Whilst Nepad had been analysed in great detail (often with overarching analytical frameworks that I was skeptical of), these analyses rarely looked beyond macroeconomic policy (free markets, pro-globalisation initiatives and market-oriented trade) or to the finer practices and modalities through which the stated goals were to be achieved. I would not place this thesis *in opposition* to this literature, my concern, however, was that this narrative is limited, partial and debilitating. As an example, the capital-centrism of political economic analyses regards all other policies and initiatives (e.g. the APRM or AAPSIA) as mere tag-ons; residuals in the institutional milieu that can only be explained as sweetening up foreign governments or aiming in the continued exploitation of the continent. Whilst this is not to say that the practices I examined did not result in subjects’ continued complicity in exploitative processes, this thesis aimed to move towards seeing these practices as embodiments of distinct contemporary governmental rationalities.

Power, as with all Foucauldian-inspired analyses, was at the heart of this discussion. A key aim was to think about neoliberalisation not in terms of coercion and dominance by a specific set of
actors such as “Washington” or the “G8” but rather as micro-processes, often beyond the state, that are less obvious. Furthermore, this focus required understanding power as productive (of new subject formations, knowledges and discourses) rather than oppressive. The objective was not to occlude or condone more tangible and structural power dynamics created by debt and material inequality, diplomatic and economic ties with former colonial powers, conditionalities which still play a major role in multilateral development agreements and lobbying by powerful cartels or business groups. Rather, attention to the use of knowledge as intricately intertwined with power, the instrumentalisation of power through governmental technologies and the conflict and production of alternative discourses were used to begin to deconstruct models of neo-colonialism, dependency or the view that ideology was pushed by one state onto another. Nepad is not disciplinary neoliberalism (pace Gill, 1995) nor is it coercive neoliberalisation (Bond, 2005), rather the examples of neoliberalisation detailed here operate through freedom and choice (Rose, 1999). The concept of empowerment was also deeply problematised, instead recognising how knowledge-power formations identify subjects as being disempowered and how empowerment often became synonymous for self-sufficiency and self-mastery away from state protection. In this sense, neoliberalism (the discourses that support it, the subjectivities produced, the knowledges and voices it privileges) can appear to be so natural a formation that it occludes criticism and more democratic and principled alternatives. Chapter 4 sought to denaturalise this taken-for-grantedness whereas in chapter 5 I worked to uncover the ways in which practice is moulded according to governmental ambition and objectives. The result was to suggest that there is nothing natural or inevitable about “neoliberalisation”.

It was important to move away from thinking of “neoliberalism” as a unified set of policies or of “neoliberalisation” as an unrolling process. As shown in this research, it can be useful to unpack the neoliberalisation process and think in terms of assembled institutions (Nepad, the AU, UNECA), dominant knowledges (e.g. that democracy leads to development), theories (e.g. public choice theory, neo-classical economics), discourses (e.g. of African ownership, solidarity), individuals (Thabo Mbeki, Tony Blair), other organisations (e.g. the Nepad business group, the African social forum) and, of course, technologies and initiatives (AAPSIA, peer-review). Whilst many of the technologies and knowledges recanted here all play a part in “neoliberalisation” - in reconfiguring subjects into entrepreneurial, responsible, market-sensitive and self-regulating subjects- would it be fair to equate them all as being neoliberal? It is in this sense that analyses of neoliberalism as a political philosophy or rationality, or neoliberalisation as a governmental process, must be sensitive to perceiving either
as totalities which retain the same characteristics if broken down into constituent parts in particular places.

As a result, neoliberalism does not simply become translated from ideal to reality, it is contested and negotiated, and competes amongst a variety of discourses and alternative practices. For example, in his exploration of neoliberalism, Jessop (2002) outlines four contemporary political paradigms: neoliberalism, neostatism, neo-corporatism and neo-communitarianism and lists typical policies pertaining to these. When looking at this list it is clear that elements of Nepad such as public-private partnerships, private and public sector audit, guiding national strategy, empowerment and decentralised regulation do not necessarily fit neatly into what he assumed to be the neoliberal vision of post-Fordist restructuring. According to Dean and Hindess (1998: 7) government is a complex activity, which cannot be viewed simply as the implementation of any particular political or economic theory. The incorporation of economic doctrines or political philosophies into governmental practice is always partial and necessitates connection with administrative techniques and forms of calculation’. Even Jessop (2002: 453) concedes that “it is better seen as one set of elements [amongst many]... than as a singular univocal and internally coherent discourse in its own right”, illustrating the need to disaggregate grand narratives.

Similarly, these processes and practices operate at multiple scales thus muddling our geographical understanding of neoliberalisation. Neoliberal practices may be both promoted and contested by G8 governments in much the same way as they can be homegrown in Africa or borrow ideas from other countries (e.g. public innovation awards), and all of the technologies discussed above muddle our conception of thinking about the spaces of ‘state-led’ development versus the spaces of ‘market-led’ development as though they were distinct, let alone mutually exclusive. I stressed how it was difficult to think of the origins of neoliberalism in simplistic binaries such as north and south or centres and margins but that neoliberal government is decentred, with ‘the state’ not so much the locus of power as a variety of transnational institutions and NGOs which normalise and perpetuate certain discourses and practices over others adding to their common-sense appearance, universality and solidity. These discourses consequently define the bounds of possible, or acceptable, action. The technologies outlined in this thesis also begin to explore how advanced liberal government is exercised in non-western contexts (cf. Ong, 2007), not necessarily being implanted from one country to another, but moving through channels of power-knowledge. A more geographically sensitive conception of ‘neoliberalism’ also appreciates how neoliberal rationalities can converge or articulate with situated institutions or practices rather than transforming them, as
was evident for example in the problems experienced by the APRM. From this perspective, neoliberalism is not situated above and prior to individuals and collectives but produced in and through human actions (Wilson, 2004).

It is in this respect that Nepad is new and is different. Many critics of Nepad see it as merely a continuation of “neoliberalism” as was evident in the Structural Adjustment Programs of the 1980s, and arguably, this parallel has given a great deal of leverage for protestors and sceptics. Old wine, new bottles was the common metaphor used by academics. Nepad is different, not necessarily in the way in which it acknowledges the failure of structural adjustment and consequently adheres to many premises of the “post-Washington consensus”, but in the way in which it has spawned and institutionalised a variety of techniques attempting to reconfigure the habits of the population, at the level of the community, the individual and the inner-self. What has been presented here is not a case of restructuring of economies at the macro scale as a means to change habits (e.g. liberalising markets to promote competition, curbing social spending in order to shock citizen-consumers into becoming autonomous subjects, or enforcing democracy through conditionality in the hope that politicians will become more accountable). Instead, unlike structural adjustment, Nepad has produced new micro-processes of governing that attempt to operate on the very thoughts and practices of individuals at a far more individualistic level. This is not necessarily structural adjustment, but subjectivity adjustment. As shown, this programme of rule involves the specific extension of economic logic through society not because, as Marx argued, everything has an economic base, but because Nepad attempts to create subjects who apply economic principles into their quotidian practices (as politicians, as civil-servants, as civil citizens, as schoolchildren). In this way, the “neoliberalism” exemplified by Nepad is very different, more covert than predecessors, more effective through the reconstruction and the intensification of government rather than the withdrawal of it.

Yet, despite these arguments, why has “neoliberalism” come to be interpreted as such a powerful and monolithic concept in recent studies of socio-economic and political change? To begin to answer this question, perhaps it is useful to quote Castree (2006: 5) who argues that ‘academic critics are made to feel important if the object of their animus appears to be hegemonic, global, and powerful: something that demands urgent critical scrutiny’. It is easier, and more politically arousing, to attribute causality to a monolithic abstraction than to examine such changes as unexciting practices operating at the level of the self. My argument throughout finds many parallels with Gibson-Graham’s
seminal book, *The End of Capitalism*, where they urge us to ‘smash Capitalism and see it in a thousand pieces’ (1996: 263-64): to thus think the unthinkable and *discursively* ‘destabilise’ capitalism, for we make ‘it’ as much as ‘it’ makes us. Such grand abstractions identified by academics, named, differentiated and acted upon shares much with Ferguson’s (1990) descriptions of the development consultant’s vision of the Basotho, of Lesotho and of development, in that it is not that these things do not exist *per se* but they are made knowable and problematised in distinct ways, and this problematisation has powerful effects.

On account of the diversity of the cases illustrated here, another important question is raised: when people resist or critique neoliberalism, what is it that they are critiquing? This problem requires reengaging with Larner (2000) and England and Ward (2007) who indicate that, whilst ‘neoliberalism’ may be a useful concept because it provides a common target for critique, it is important that scholars, activists, politicians, whoever, have a better concept of what it is that they are contesting. Like Gibson-Graham’s (1996) thesis, we should put neoliberalism in ‘its’ place and see ‘it’ as something somewhere, not everything everywhere: creating a post-capitalocentric geography, if you will. If this thesis highlights anything, it should be that neoliberalism is neither a hegemonic nemesis nor inevitable. It is embedded and constituted by practices that *can* be reconfigured, discourses that *can* be countered, knowledges that *can* be disputed and institutions that *can* be reconstructed from below. It is in the interstices of these components where changes can be made, voices can be heard and alternatives can be foregrounded.

**On Nepad**

Assessing the weaknesses of Nepad on a more normative level can begin to make advances in foregrounding alternative visions. Whilst a Foucauldian analysis is prone to recognising such evaluations as products of their own discourses, situated equally on their own axes of power-knowledge, I want to resist this hyper-relativism that can often produce stale analyses. It is my contention that too many governmentality studies resist projecting any type of political position. At the same time, however, I do not make a claim for truth, or claim to know what is best for Africa. My interest (as throughout this thesis) is rather to contribute to assessments of Nepad in the academic sphere that do not succumb to teleological narrative or consider Nepad as a totality. In many instances, this normative analysis will also illustrate global political-economic ‘limits to government’.

Perhaps the largest limiting factor for Nepad reaching its goals, and African development more broadly, comes down to the ability for African countries to pay off their external debts or have
them annulled. Nepad makes one of its aims to make its debt ‘sustainable’ (which was a focus for the MAP) but there is nothing particularly innovative about how it attempts to tackle this issue, instead advocating the Comprehensive Development Framework of the World Bank, PRSPs and the HIPC process\(^8^{5}\) (para. 155). Debt repayment may be interpreted within the discourse of responsibility, but numerous studies have illustrated that debt obligation continues to hamper any economic gains that are made by African countries or potential value capture from aid (e.g. Boyce and Ndikumana, 2002). The continuation of conditionalities under the Multilateral Debt Reduction Initiative\(^8^{6}\) of the OECD in July 2006 is also of grave concern for Africans truly directing their own development. Furthermore, with Nepad’s embeddedness within the discourse of good governance, a greater attention needs to be directed towards matters of odious debt forgiveness. The very definition of good governance relies on being positions in contrast to governing practices of corrupt and/or autocratic regimes, and yet the debts that were accumulated by those regimes (which were often the result of strategic Western or Soviet loans during the Cold War era) remain in place despite the need to break from the past. If African democracies or economies are to be truly given a chance then the removal of these financial legacies of need to be the first step in any viable African development strategy.

The faith in free markets, exhibited by Nepad ignores the fact that no highly-industrialised nation ever got to the economic position it is in now by adopting free-market policies (Chang, 2002). A problem with indiscriminate free-market philosophy is that its proponents have extracted sound economic theory from political-economic complexity or the realities of power-relations. This ‘expert knowledge’ is not only anti-political (cf. Ferguson, 1991) but anti-historical (see Chang, 2002) and anti-geographical. The taken-for-granted and naturalised relationship between trade-liberalisation, growth and development is symptomatic of this flaw. As Rodrik (2003) has argued for India and China (examples commonly cited by the World Bank) trade liberalisation followed the upturn in growth, not the other way round. The market as panacea to all economic (and social) problems has taken on such truth that it has clouded out alternative imaginations, strategies and definitions. It is not that unorthodox actions are prohibited, restricted by the dictates of a sovereign, their effect is that they are not seen as possible, closed off by the innate characteristics of a society made up of entrepreneurial, choice exercising, self-interested individuals. Yet, amidst dire financial crisis and international calls for more prudent regulation and restructuring of the international financial

---

\(^{85}\) The Highly Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) initiative was initiated by the IMF in 1996 following extensive lobbying by NGOs. It provides debt-relief to reduce external debt repayments to sustainable levels. Assistance is conditional on the national governments of these countries meeting a range of economic management and performance targets.

\(^{86}\) Largely considered to be an extension of HIPC
architecture, the opportunity for Nepad’s unified voice for Africa needs to be harnessed and put into effect.

The Nepad stance on democracy can be congratulated as a positive step. However, as expressed throughout the research, the concern is that it needs to be developed from within, with institutions appropriate to local situations, cultures and politics. Whilst democracy within South Africa and Botswana was encouraged from outside, it was not imposed and their current systems are a product of a multiplicity of internal social, political and historical factors (Good, 1997). The definition of democracy is also not universal, whilst the western prescription of liberal-democracy is perhaps hegemonic, countries and institutions can be democratic in their own specific ways, ways that can be African-centered or which do not substitute an effective state with civil society. Democracy is a polyvalent phenomenon and any study that advocates or claims one correct formation over all others should be viewed with cynicism. This ‘tactical polyvalence’ of discourse (Foucault, 1980a), stands in contrast to the attempt to “create” democracy through declarations by African leaders who promise to conform to “international standards”. At the same time, whilst civil society criticism has been interpreted by Nepad and its architects as presenting difficulty, this torrent of free speech and commentary is surely a positive signal compared to the dictatorial 1980’s when the LPA was released. In this case, arguing that Nepad is not ‘democratic’ is also narrow and unhelpful considering (as Kunbar, 2003 point out) the Heads of State who initiated the Nepad process in 2000/1 were predominantly elected by their populations which cannot be said of the Heads of State who drafted the LPA.

Yet, having said this, if Pan-Africanism and solidarity are to be meaningful concepts they have to be enacted not for the benefit of the leaders concerned but for the good of pro-poor development. This means that the role of more economically prosperous countries in Africa such as Nigeria, South Africa and Botswana are not only responsible for alleviating poverty in their own countries but must also leverage their position for the benefit of their smaller and less prosperous neighbours in ways that do not fashion internal colonisation (cf. Daniel et al., 2003). Likewise, there are times when solidarity amongst leaders (or, one may say, ‘elites’) ought to be used to mobilise against tyrants who continue to inflict human rights abuses on a daily occurrence. No amount of discursive relativism or attention to social constructionism can condone the actions of Africa’s big men like Robert Mugabe and Omar Al-Bashir. They should be removed from power not because these big men do not enact western style democracy or free market reforms but because they are responsible for destroying their countries (both economically and politically) and for taking lives. In this instance, AU opposition to the
ICC arrest warrant of the latter in 2009\(^{87}\) and quiet diplomacy towards the former in 2008 is concerning when this authority of Pan-African politics claims to endorse the values enshrined in Nepad\(^{88}\). Whilst unity in the face of foreign interference and coercion is commendable, these recent events severely problematise valorisations of ‘solidarity’.

Lastly, Nepad is a particularly grand plan with grand ambitions and statements. Its attempt to deal with health, democracy, education, corporate governance, the environment, conflict resolution at the continental scale means that its proponents are at risk of losing focus by taking on too many initiatives and goals without the manpower or faculty to instigate them. At the other end, however, opponents and critics have dismissed the grand schemes of Nepad in equally as grand terms and narratives (in particular, by charging it as being ‘neoliberal’). They thus miss the chance to get their alternatives heard or to support the parts of Nepad they may agree with and which they can and should influence by establishing an ideological all or nothing debate. This outright rejection closes off the possibility to engage with Nepad not just at the level of policy, or in the critique of ‘ideology’, but on the same plane of immanence: in the politics of the production of truth, polyvalent discourses and alternative subjectivities. Both positions risk losing sight of any potential to make concrete and sustainable improvements in the lives of Africans.

\(^{87}\) http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/7923102.stm

\(^{88}\) Although what is equally concerning is China’s and Russia’s veto of NATO (or UN) resolutions
# Appendices: Documents

Table 4: Documents listed on the Nepad website used in the research (other documents not from the website have been listed separating in the reference list.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document/Policy</th>
<th>Release Date</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The New Partnership for African Development</td>
<td>June 2002</td>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The New Partnership for African Development (summary)</td>
<td>August 2002</td>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Nepad Action Plans</td>
<td>May 2004</td>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPAD Priority Projects and Programmes</td>
<td>August 2002</td>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission for Africa: The Argument</td>
<td>March 2005</td>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Common Interest Report Of The Commission For Africa</td>
<td>March 2005</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>453 pages: exceptionally long, may need to focus on only certain areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Report Of the Workshop on the Implementation of Nepad</td>
<td>June 2005</td>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Report's 2002- 2005</td>
<td>2002-2005</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Need to find reports from 2005 to the present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPAD, Report to the HSIC,</td>
<td>July-October 2002</td>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Peer Review Mechanism (base document)</td>
<td>September 2003</td>
<td>Governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives, standards, criteria and indicators for the APRM</td>
<td>March 2003</td>
<td>Governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement on the evolution and purpose of the APRM</td>
<td>July 2003</td>
<td>Governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPAD HGSIC 3 - African Peer Review Mechanism: Organisation and Processes</td>
<td>March 2003</td>
<td>Governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declaration on the democracy and political governance initiative</td>
<td>June 2002</td>
<td>Governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declaration on democracy, political, economic and corporate governance</td>
<td>June 2005</td>
<td>Governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome Declaration on Harmonization</td>
<td>February 2003</td>
<td>Governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VARIOUS REPORTS DETAILING SUPPORT MISSIONS AND RESULTS OF THE APRM FOR VARIOUS COUNTRIES (inc. Ghana, Rwanda, Mauritius, Kenya and others)</td>
<td>2002-2005</td>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>For clarity, will map the countries that are participating in the APRM and note those that have yet to have reports commissioned. Then, will attempt to find them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire for Country Self-Assessment</td>
<td>October 2005</td>
<td>Governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme of objectives, standards, criteria and indicators for Country Assessment</td>
<td>October 2005</td>
<td>Governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Date(s)</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines for Countries to Prepare for and to participate in the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM)</td>
<td>October 2005</td>
<td>Governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outline of the memorandum of understanding on technical assessment and the country review visit</td>
<td>March 2003</td>
<td>Governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition for Sustainable Development</td>
<td>December 2001</td>
<td>Governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A variety of monthly newsletters documenting the APRM processes</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>Not all are listed on the website, apparently website is being updated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Peer Review Mechanism Organisation &amp; Process</td>
<td>March 2003</td>
<td>Governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various country reports</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framework for the All Africa Public Sector Innovation Awards (AAPSIA)</td>
<td>June 2005</td>
<td>AAPSIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resource development programme Nepal health strategy</td>
<td>January 2003</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridging the Digital Divide</td>
<td>June 2005</td>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>Consultancy report commissioned by Nepad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPAD and the African Institute for Capacity Building, supported by JICA, Concluded Partnership Agreement on Collaboration on Capacity Development and Poverty Reduction in Africa</td>
<td>July 2005</td>
<td>Human capital/ poverty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communiques released at the end of the Civil Society Forum at Elmina Libreville Accra Maputo</td>
<td>March 2002 – onwards</td>
<td>Civil society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African civil society declaration on the environment initiative</td>
<td>February 2003</td>
<td>Civil Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Principles for Effective Banking Supervision</td>
<td>September 1997</td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Pre-dates Nepad, need to look for some more up to date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Capital Flows Initiative</td>
<td>June 2005</td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme and Restoring Food Security in Africa’The Roadmap’</td>
<td>unspecified</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introducing the CAADP</td>
<td>May 2008</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>CAADP is a sub-division of Nepad and has its own website with more documents. Will need to focus on core publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepad secretariat Agriculture Unit Strategic Plan 2008-2013</td>
<td>January 2008</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resource development programme Nepad health strategy</td>
<td>January 2003</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declaration on the Peace and Security Initiative</td>
<td>June 2005</td>
<td>Security</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Nepad Spatial Development Programme (SDP) “Sector Stakeholder Workshops of the NEPAD MLTSF Infrastructure Study”</td>
<td>July 2007</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepad-IPPF: Regional Projects for the ADB and World Bank Collaboration</td>
<td>June 2005</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The relevance of the national system of innovation approach to mainstreaming science and technology for development in Nepad and the AU.</td>
<td>October 2003</td>
<td>Education / ICT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme area : combating climate change in Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action plan of the environment initiative of Nepad</td>
<td>June 2003</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Post-Conflict Reconstruction Policy Framework</td>
<td>June 2005</td>
<td>Security</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communiqué issued at the end of the ninth summit if heads of state and government implementation committee (HSGIC) of the New Partnership for Africa’s Development</td>
<td>February 2004</td>
<td>Governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPAD and the African Institute for Capacity Building, supported by JICA, Concluded Partnership Agreement on Collaboration on Capacity Development and Poverty Reduction in Africa</td>
<td>November 2005</td>
<td>Human capital / poverty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The 5th meeting of the Africa Partnership Forum co-chaired by the Rt Hon Hilary Benn MP, UK Secretary of State for International Development and, on behalf of Nigeria as Presidency of the AU, by Ambassador Tunji Olagunju, Chair of the New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD) Steering Committee and Finance Minister Dr Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala, as well as NEPAD Chief Executive Professor Firmino Mucavele.</td>
<td>October 2005</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Especially useful for illustrating some of the international relations involved in running of Nepad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communiqué Issued At The End Of The Third Meeting Of The African Peer Review Mechanism (Aprm) Panel Of Eminent Persons (Apr Panel)</td>
<td>November 2003</td>
<td>Governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communiqué Issued at End of RECs Seminar for CEOs</td>
<td>November 2003</td>
<td>Governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communiqué Issued at the End of the Workshop on the implementation of the NEPAD in ECCAS member states.</td>
<td>October 2004</td>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Short-Term Action Plan (STAP)Review of Implementation Progress and The Way Forward</td>
<td>May 2003</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communiqué issued at the end of the 1st/2nd/3rd/4th/5th/6th/7th/8th/9th/10th/11th/12th summit on the HSIG</td>
<td>2002-onwards</td>
<td>Governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VARIOUS PRESS RELEASES AVAILABLE AT:</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Most are no longer than 1 page long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL: 45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VARIOUS SPEECHES BY HEADS OF STATES AVAILABLE AT:</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Tend to be old speeches. Will be supplemented by speeches uncovered when establishing for context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL: 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VARIOUS SPEECHES BY THE NEPAD CHAIRMAN AVAILABLE AT:</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL: 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VARIOUS SPEECHES BY THE STEERING COMMITTEE AVAILABLE AT:</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL: 38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Millennium Partnership for the African Recovery Programme</td>
<td>May 2001</td>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Led by Thabo Mbeki of South Africa in conjunction with Olusegun Obasanjo of Nigeria and Abdelaziz Bouteflika of Algeria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMEGA plan for Africa</td>
<td>January 2002</td>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed by Abdoulaye Wade of Senegal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A New African Initiative</td>
<td>March 2002</td>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Merger of the OMEGA and MAP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5: List of ‘interviewees’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Date of call</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sudir Chuckun</td>
<td>Office of the Officer in-charge, APRM</td>
<td>10th August 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Mataywa Busieka</td>
<td>Director (African Affairs), Governance Department, South African Department of Public Service Administration</td>
<td>24th August 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victor Mathale</td>
<td>Private Sector initiatives, Nepad,</td>
<td>26th August 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendices II: AAPSIA Winners

Category: Innovative Service Delivery
Winner; Local Government Automation in the Arab Republic of Egypt
1st runner up; Friends of Mosvold Hospital; South Africa
2nd runner up MWACAFE Iron and Manganese Removal on Point Water Systems: Ghana

Category; Innovative Partnerships between government, private sector and civil society
Winner; Masibambane Water Sector Support Programme of South Africa
1st runner up; Nyakibale Midwifery Training School; Uganda
2nd runner up: the Dar Es Salaam 2000 Project: Tanzania

Category: Innovations in Systems and Processes of Government
Winner: Management Control of Chemicals; Tanzania
1st runner up: Environmental Education and Public Awareness; Mauritius
2nd runner up: Development Plan Systems, General Directorate of Civil Service; Algeria
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