

論 文

From the Assurance of Fundamental Rights to the Main Goal behind a Strategy of Good Governance: the Shift in Meaning of “Human Security”

Anne Gonon
Emmanuel Gonon

Introduction:

While the European Commission did not invent the concept of approximation, it did considerably broaden its scope of application. The concept is generally applied in a legal context and characterises the technical process for harmonising the legal frameworks of third countries (laws, codes, regulations) in order to facilitate their relations with the countries of the EU. However, in looking at the “philosophy” behind the EU’s relations with developing countries, one sees that the concept of approximation as a tool for heightened inter-understanding (even if imbalanced) extends beyond the legal sphere. Indeed, in this case, it is given a different register, more informal, which has to do with developing the societies of countries which receive EU assistance through its development aid programmes and projects. One of the themes on which the approximation initiative appears to be focused is that of human security.

The notion of human security emerged in the post-Cold War period, as the world was being recomposed under the guardianship of large financial organisations – major players in the process of economic globalisation. The term “human security” first appeared in the UN *Human Development Report 1994*¹. It emerged as the result of gradual change within the international organisation, which had come to realise that the development policies implemented thus far had failed, and decided to focus on individuals more than States². The notion was debated and redefined to signify:

...protecting vital freedoms. It means protecting people from critical and pervasive threats and situations, building on their strengths and aspirations. It means creating [political, social, environmental,

economic, military and cultural] systems that give people the building blocks of survival, dignity and livelihood (Commission on Human Security Report)³.

As expressed by Kofi Annan in 2001, “Human security, in its broadest sense, embraces far more than the absence of violent conflict. It encompasses human rights, good governance, access to education and health care and ensuring that each individual has opportunities and choices to fulfil his or her potential. Every step in this direction is also a step towards reducing poverty, achieving economic growth and preventing conflict. Freedom from want, freedom from fear, and the freedom of future generations to inherit a healthy natural environment -- these are the interrelated building blocks of human -- and therefore national -- security”⁴. It is a direction. The Millennium Development Goals (MDG) are clearly expressed, but a shift in meaning can already be seen: concern for individuals has been replaced by governance, a notion put forward by the World Bank beginning in the mid-1990s. As stated by the UN, “the MDGs cannot be attained without good governance.”

Development aid, the ineffectiveness of which had been illustrated time and time again, needed to be reconceptualised. One might say, as expressed by Wethes and Debiel, that “Human Security provides a powerful ‘political leitmotif’ for particular states and multilateral actors by fulfilling selected functions in the process of agenda-setting, decision-making and implication.”⁵

Shortly after the terrorist attacks of September 11, the European Union, seeking to affirm its role as a powerful political entity, also latched onto the notion. The European Commission went on to develop a security policy with the drafting of a number of texts containing the term. Henceforth, the territorial security of Europe would necessarily be linked to the policy on development aid for neighbouring countries, and the notion of “human security” would make this connection, becoming a “social norm”.

In this essay, we will look at the EU’s ties with the states of West Africa (ECOWAS) in regard to this notion of human security. We will also examine the standard-setting which occurs in the exchange between an aid donor and an aid recipient, both acting in the name of a shared notion of human security. The EU and ECOWAS provide an interesting framework for studying the meaning of this notion. They are connected by a very strong aid policy; indeed, 30% of European aid goes to the ECOWAS countries, but above all, ECOWAS,

like the EU, employs the notion of human security as a public policy tool. We will try to determine whether this notion creates a common framework between the two political/economic zones and to understand the nature of the ensuing ties between them.

1. Human security within the institutions

a) Breakdown of EU institutions

In the process of establishing itself as a supranational entity, the EU, at the start of the 21st century, implemented a common European Security and Defence Policy, managed by the European Defence Agency. The policy’s aim was three-pronged – conflict prevention, crisis resolution and response to fragile situations – and it was set out in a series of long texts organising the principles of European security policy⁶. With the European Security Strategy, aimed at creating “a safe Europe in a better world”, the EU’s main goal is to establish the security of its territory. Aside from terrorism, the strategy lists the main threat factors – the proliferation of arms of mass destruction, regional conflicts, the decline of the State, and organised crime – and proposes strategic goals. The EU defines a variety of tools for dealing with these situations. Appropriating the notion of human security without actually using the term itself, it also considers that this security can only be ensured if the countries with which it has ties are also secure, both territorially speaking and in terms of human development. “It is in the Union’s interest that countries on our borders are well governed.”⁷ Thus, in aid strategies, the security of States and the security of people are intertwined, and in order to manage these aspects, highly technical tools will need to be devised – tools which meet certain management criteria in terms of effectiveness, consistency and impact. Indeed, while aid is a priority in today’s world – a globalised world, destabilised by terrorism – it must also comply with the budget restrictions imposed by the member countries, and satisfy public opinion as NGO work in severe poverty situations continues to raise the stakes by increasing public awareness.

The African, Carribean and Pacific Countries (ACP) region holds a key position in this aid policy, for historical as well as economic reasons; the EU is seen as a favoured destination for intercontinental migratory movement.

The Directorate-General for Development and Cooperation (EuropAid) manages aid under the European Development Fund (EDF). More than 30% of the aid goes to the countries of Africa, which, according to the terms of the European Commission Responsible for Development and Humanitarian Aid, Louis Michel (10th EDF Launch Conference, November 2007), are recognised as essential partners. The policy is guided by a liberal principle which places the focus on three main goals: promoting the development of trade with the EU, promoting the country's internal economic development, and limiting migration among the workforce.

The Cotonou Partnership Agreement, signed for twenty years in 2000 (and revised in 2005), defines the framework for how relations between the APC, on one hand, and the European Community and its member states, on the other, will be conducted at different levels, such as the Council of Ministers, the Committee of Ambassadors, and the Joint Parliamentary Assembly. Adopted by the European Council of 14-15 December 2005, the Africa-EU Strategy was designed to promote interaction between Europe and Africa at all levels: i.e. with Pan-African institutions such as the African Union (AU), regional organisations such as ECOWAS or SADC (Southern African Development Community), and national authorities. It is a political platform which plays a substantial role in the implementation of public development aid for Africa; indeed, the EU views regional integration as a sustainable development mechanism which both serves as a proxy to development aid and uses regional mechanisms to help offset the effects of stability problems within a country. In concrete terms, it is implemented through thematic EU-Africa partnership agreements and takes the form of annual EU programmes aimed at helping achieve the MDGs through mainly political means (dialogue, peacebuilding policy, promoting human rights), but also by calling on the role of non-state actors, i.e. means which could be classified under the generic term “governance”. Governance has become a priority in many aid providers' development policies and cooperation programmes, as illustrated in the 2006 European Commission text, “governance in the consensus on development”. The shift in meaning of “human security” toward governance reflects a new approach in human development aid, which hinges on the security of States: this portmanteau has become something of a paradigm in international political science, signifying “the processes for steering public action”, and in

more general terms, the mechanisms of "government without government", to borrow Rosenau's expression. It is interesting to note how the EU seized on the term, considering the role of experts (or the scholarly world) in the construction of the EU's institutional policies. It refers to "good governance practices", but to critics who consider the term to be "imprecise, of poor descriptive power and of a true ideology", Didier Georgakakis insists on the fact that "the use of the term governance is not always related to ideology, and in its various uses, it refers to practices which are usually far from being guided by anything approaching an 'idea'".⁸

b) Human security and governance in African institutions: a consistent project

For the EU's closest African partners, such as ECOWAS, the African Union, NEPAD (New Partnership for Africa's Development), or the Non-State Actors, the notion of human security is closely linked to the process of emergence and consolidation of States after decolonisation, in which the security of the territories was yet to be constructed⁹. Thus, as much the physical security of people as the security of the States is at the core of the notion where the two dimensions were seen as complementary¹⁰. According to Thomas Kwasi Tiekou, the notion of human security emerged very early on in Africa, on the initiative of two public figures seeking to establish an effective Pan-Africa movement with a view to creating the conditions for peace in the region¹¹. One of these figures was Nelson Mandela, and the other was Ahmed Salim Ahmed, a Tanzanian diplomat who had already expressed these ideas in the early 1990s during the Kampala Movement. After attempting to incorporate this notion into the aim of the Organisation of African Unity (OAU), the supporters of human security scored a success when the OAU became the AU in 2001. By including the definition of human security in article 4, entitled "Principles" of the *Constitutive Act*, the African Union (AU) played a key role in promoting the ideas linked to the notion of human security, and showed that while its guiding priority was protecting the integrity of the territories¹² and maintaining peace, it was also concerned with the rights and well-being of individuals¹³. Subsequently, the notion regularly came under attack, and in article 1.f of the *African Union Non-Aggression and Common Defence Pact*, signed in 2005, human security was redefined as:

The security of the individual in terms of satisfaction of his/her basic

needs. It also includes the creation of social, economic, political, environmental and cultural conditions necessary for the survival and dignity of the individual, the protection of and respect for human rights, good governance and the guarantee for each individual of opportunities and choices for his/her full development.

Furthermore, eager to control its aid, the AU launched the NEPAD initiative, which directly included the aims of human security in its organisation within the five domains: agriculture and food security, climate change, regional integration and infrastructure, human development and economic and corporate governance. Thus, the notion of governance now included the principle of human security.

As in Europe, it seems that the aim of associating the implementation of true governance with the notion of human security was mainly adopted by the institutions, as a guide for the AU policies, as well as at the regional level with ECOWAS, and was mainly known and supported by the elites and NGOs. However, one cannot make the generalisation that the notion was introduced into the national legislative instruments, given that certain countries, such as Libya, Kenya and Sudan, rejected it on the grounds that they saw it as means adopted by western countries “to pursue their cultural colonialism project”¹⁴.

This mistrust raises a valid question: what influence does the Western world have over the circulation of ideas such as human security? However, in the view of Thomas Tieku and Deng and Zartman, there are specific African (indigenous) characteristics in the both the comprehension and implementation of the notion.

c) The international circulation of the ideas and people promoting the notion

Thomas Tieku laments that the notion of human security is confined to the elite, political or intellectual spheres. In the case of human security (as for governance), the fact is that these notions are mainly tools proposed by intellectuals and politicians. The idea’s history is marked by the names of public figures of international renown, such as Nelson Mandela, the Nigerian Obasanjo, and Kofi Annan, who wanted Africa to take charge of its destiny and reconcile States and individuals. Kofi Annan’s position allowed him to propel this new concept into the international or regional arenas, but this appears to have only succeeded in sparking an academic discourse. It is in this sphere

that the idea has generated the most initiatives, in terms of both field research and the creation of NGOs. The most renowned work being done in Europe in the area of human security is by the team working under Mary Kaldor, a researcher at the Centre for the Study of Global Governance within the London School of Economics and Political Science. Since the early 2000s, the team has diligently worked to bring structure to the notion, to conceptualise it and make it into a true political tool. Reviews, field reports and proposals submitted to the EC illustrate the lobbying work being done to disseminate the notion, which has had a hard time gaining ground in Europe, or even in the United States; efforts are also underway to promote this school of thought in Africa¹⁵.

Some of the team’s African researchers have been involved in the creation of British NGOs such as International Alert, founded in 1987, or the Centre for Democracy and Development (CDD), founded in 1997, one goal of which is “to promote peace and human security in West Africa”. For our purposes here, what interests us about these two NGOs is their role in co-founding, with ECOWAS, an NGO platform called WACSOF (West Africa Civil Society Forum), created in 2003¹⁶. The stated goals of this platform are like those of a conventional platform: developing civil society to ensure the vitality of the public space and let the voices of ordinary people be heard. It receives 63% of its funding from the George Soros Foundation, otherwise known as OSIWA (Open Initiative Society for West Africa); the second-ranked donor is ECOWAS, which provides only 19% of its funding. The platform’s goals are directly related to the notion of human security: verifying whether the national legislations under the ECOWAS treaties properly integrate this notion, and setting up national and regional inspections and guidelines on the status of human security in West Africa.

There is also the African Human Security Initiative (AHSI), a network of seven non-governmental African research organisations which have joined forces in the aim of “benchmarking the performance of key governments in respect of human security issues”¹⁷.

The African NGOs or platforms have adopted this notion of human security. Working hand in hand with governments in some cases, and in opposition or even in the absence of government in others, they strive to restore the voice of individuals in the decision-making or development

processes. It is true that the NGOs are still often either international, with a preponderance of Anglo-Saxon NGOs, or African but based on the model of Western NGOs. This leads one to think that these are places in which Western ideas are firmly entrenched, not only due to the long-standing practices of these NGOs, but also because these practices are taught through seminars and manuals, allowing members to quickly become operational by learning time-tested techniques. This suits the urgency of the needs in an area of the world in which, with some countries shaken by repeated crises, only non-governmental organisations can provide aid and fill the role of protecting society which traditionally belongs to the State, even though this can be perceived as a threat to security.

The fact is that although the idea of connecting the security of States with the security of individuals supports both the EU policy on aid for Africa and the policy of the various African institutions, the term “human security” has not been readily adopted in Europe, where “governance” is the preferred term, revealing an inclination towards conventional views of the power of State. The term has a more promising outlook in Africa, notably thanks to the growing influence of the NGOs which promote its wider use. It is as if, in Africa, alongside the conventional definition of good governance, there also needs to be a perspective on fairness and social justice, as Emile Gnimba, ambassador of the African Union, expressed at the closing ceremony for a focus group on the *Support Study of the European Commission Governance Facility and related Incentive Tranche (2006-2011)*.

It can be seen that it is not because words are in circulation that they have a uniform meaning. In fact, there appears to be a process of mutual appropriation and translation which is dictated by respective needs, or even power dynamics.

2. The nature of the standard: analysis of the assessment criteria – an area complementary to standards.

The notion of human security was put forward in UN discussions at the end of the 20th century, and gradually inserted into the discourse on governance in order to establish guidelines for EU aid projects. The idea was that the only way poverty could be reduced was by implementing financial

targets, requiring the deployment of management and process follow-up operations, which in turn inculcated new behaviours, new working habits, and new ways of thinking based on specific standards. Moreover, promoting this notion de governance offered a clear advantage in that, since “measuring progress in democratic governance has recently proved to be feasible”¹⁸, it facilitated the planning, follow-up and conclusion of aid programmes, and the involvement of numerous partners in the project, including the private sector.

a) Governance is assessable

Given its polysemous nature, the word governance lent itself to a multi-dimensional approach (political, social, cultural and technical)¹⁹. The technical aspect is covered through the development of a number of indicators. The Paris Declaration of 2005 established the aid field much like a field of engineering, subject to explicit guidelines based on budgetary efficiency and results. The Paris Declaration on Development Aid Effectiveness (2005) is the text of reference for the management of aid, and thus for understanding the philosophy behind it: ownership, alignment, harmonisation, results and mutual accountability²⁰. In light of its defined missions, the text defines the role of the partner countries and donor countries, and sets out twelve progress indicators. On the basis of this Declaration, the EU-Africa Strategy defines the political framework for developing and funding the target projects.

The question of assessability is central to EU aid policy, and over the past decade, a wide range of engineering tools have been developed to measure the results of aid and determine the lessons learned through the implementation of aid programmes. The complexity of the assessment procedures, which can be consulted on the *EuropAid* website, seems inconsistent with the stated goal of transparency: an invitation to tender system with European research centres, application of different criteria at each stage of the project concerned (planning, identification, formulation, involvement and assessment), and the production of training manuals for those in charge of in-progress and programme-end assessments make the overall system difficult to comprehend. The highly technical nature of the system’s design and assessment tools reflects a tendency specific to Europe: i.e. the central role in the European construction project which experts have played, and continue to play, a role they increasingly share with research institutes and even NGOs, which, due to

this technical aspect, have acquired valuable know-how in carrying out their missions.

Accustomed to the notion de governance as signatories of numerous texts from various international organisations, the countries of Africa have developed their own assessment tools in this area, such as the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM). This mechanism was established at the same time as the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD), and recognised in a UN resolution in November 2002 (resolution 57/2)²¹. This initiative was launched by South Africa, and the countries of Africa insist on the truly African nature of the project in its entirety. The documents on the APRM were discussed and adopted at the 6th Summit of the NEPAD Heads of State and Government Implementation Committee held on 9 March 2003, in Abuja (Nigeria). In one of these documents, the *Declaration on Democracy, Political, Economic and Corporate Governance*, in which the heads of African governments committed to "eradicate poverty" by working together to attain a series of four goals, article 28 mentions the APRM as a tool for promoting "adherence to and fulfilment of the commitments" in that it "spells out the institutions and processes that will guide future peer reviews, based on mutually agreed codes and standards of democracy, political, economic and corporate governance"²². At present, 29 of the 52 UA member countries are taking part in the mechanism, and of these, only 12 (mostly English-speaking, but also a few countries of the French-speaking tradition such as Tunisia and Mali) have already been assessed.

b) The convergence of assessment tools

We will now look at how the scope of governance is assessed, and which criteria are promoted in the European monitoring system and in the NEPAD /APRM monitoring system, which claims to be an expression of a distinctly African tradition of political discussion²³.

EU aid falls within the scope of policies set up by African institutions such as the AU, ECOWAS and UEMOA (Union Economique et Monétaire Ouest-africaine), which also receive support from other institutions (UN agencies, etc.) and consequently also use these institutions' assessment tools. Thus, many different, sometimes contradictory, assessment tools can potentially be involved.

For our purposes here, we will limit our analysis to the governance assessment tool promoted by the EU, GAP, and the NEPAD tool, the APRM. This comparison is all the more relevant following focus group of 7 and 8 June 2011 organised by the African Institute of Governance on the theme of the *Support Study of the European Commission Governance Facility and related Incentive Tranche* (2006-2011), during which it was reaffirmed that the EU Council had called for “improving the ties between the APRM and the governance action plan”.

In the 10th EDF (2007-2011), the European Commission budgeted a governance programme (2006-2011) called the Governance Action Plan (GAP). The structure of this programme reflects the importance placed on the connection between human development and democratic governance, and also shows the EU’s commitment to not allowing the World Bank alone to lay down the standards of governance. According to the Plan, there are six components of “good governance” – democratisation, human rights, rule of law and administration of justice, civil society, public administration and decentralisation – which are to be promoted in the name of the principles of participation and ownership, equity, organisational adequacy, transparency and accountability, conflict prevention and anti-corruption, through the implementation of various programmes. The original idea is “positive conditionality”: countries receive payment of an additional incentive tranche according to their results, which are determined using a Governance Profile.

Within this framework, the Governance Profile is a document drawn up for each aid recipient country, which identifies the country’s main weak points and therefore the priority areas for improvement. The Profile document assesses nine points which differ slightly from those used by the World Bank and mainly focus on the political aspects: Political governance/democracy, Political governance/rule of law, Government effectiveness, Economic governance, Internal and external security, Social governance, International and regional context and Quality of the partnership. Each point is analysed from different angles, which, as is to be expected, reflect the values considered fundamental by the European Commission: the death penalty and freedom of thought. More surprisingly, however, the question on the country’s judicial system also covers the possible existence of a religious or traditional system which may operate alongside the modern system. The questions are designed to

determine the real nature of the existing governance. However, the approach relating to Europe's interests is sensitive on points relating to economic governance; for example, it raises the question of how natural resources of strategic importance for the country's economy (mineral resources, wood, diamonds, etc.) are managed, and it places considerable importance on the country's compliance with international agreements. In short, it would appear that the EU has taken care not to orient its questions towards a "European" conception of governance; it appears to want to encourage the appropriation of conditionality. However, by seeking to determine the extent of the country's integration in the international community, particularly with regard to assets which are considered "global commons", it reveals an interest in the security of its own territory and economy. The document is completed with the country in question and serves as the basis for devising a Governance Action Plan which in turn is used to negotiate the financial support. The GAP and Strategy Country Paper are viewed as commitments serving as the basis for awarding a financial incentive. This document has been fairly well-received by the countries of the AU as a basis for undertaking reforms. It appears, in fact, that most GAPs refer to documents created for the implementation of the APRM.

The APRM is a mechanism which has been in operation for several years, and in 2011, certain points, including the questionnaire, were revised according to critical feedback that had been received²⁴. It is also a tool for assessing the overall status of the country participating in the operation, since the four assessment areas cover governance in the broad sense of the word, larger than that expressed in the OECD reviews. In the view of Kofi Annan, "Good governance means creating well-functioning and accountable institutions – political, judicial and administrative – which citizens regard as legitimate, in which they participate in decisions that affect their daily lives and by which they are empowered."²⁵ Participation in the mechanism is voluntary, which means that not only have some countries of the AU not signed the APRM text, but that the decision to implement it or not is left up to the governments. If a country chooses to implement this assessment, it has to comply with five steps in the process which can be briefly outlined as follows:

- A preliminary step during which the country assesses and identifies the organisations within its civil society, and sets up what is called the Focal Point (APRM structures within the country);

- Step 1, the self-assessment which is carried out using a questionnaire sent by the APRM secretariat; the country drafts three documents (diagnosis, preliminary action programme aimed at correcting the weak points identified, and an in-depth study of the country) which help create a list of the major issues;
- Step 2, a verification tour of the country by a team directed by a member of the Steering Panel, with consultations to check the validity of the updated information;
- Step 3, the team prepares a report based on the commitments made in the preliminary action programme, proposing amendments, through discussion with the government concerned;
- Step 4, the final assessment report is drawn up, along with the National Action Plan which will be presented to the Forum of Heads of State and Government (i.e. the peer review);
- And lastly, Step 5, the assessment report is published and officially presented to the regional and sub-regional structures such as ECOWAS, the Pan-African Parliament, etc. This assessment must be completed within a period of six months; the assessment cycle is intended to be repeated every two or four years. The assessed country must then implement the NAP (National Action Plan) aimed at improving the weak points identified.

The Questionnaire, drafted in accordance with the *Objectives, Standards, Criteria and Indicators for the African Peer Review Mechanism* issued by the NEPAD Heads of State and Government Implementation Committee (2003), was established to serve as a common self-assessment basis for all countries. It was initially intended as a document to be distributed to a limited number of specialists, but as the rules encourage a high level of public participation, it was distributed on a much larger scale. Composed by the APRM secretariat, this questionnaire is submitted to the country's Focal Point, which handles the distribution. This is only one component of the file that the country must compile, a sort of guide²⁶, but due to the highly technical nature of the questions, a number of specialised research groups had to be solicited to assist with the survey work²⁷.

The Questionnaire is an 88 page document broken down into four thematic sections, each of which has been defined by goals, questions and criteria. In all,

there are 25 goals, 58 questions and 183 indicators, which are divided between the four sections: Democracy and political governance, Economic governance and management, Corporate governance and Socio-economic Development²⁸. In examining the content of the Questionnaire, one finds the values and standards considered as fundamental in accordance with the standards of the conventions, protocols and declarations signed by the countries of the AU. The nature of the questions on democracy and governance indicate positive recognition of democratic institutions, rule of law, decentralisation and the separation of powers. The questionnaire covers the status of the rights of minorities, women, children and vulnerable groups, including displaced persons, and consequently, the question of the independence of the Judiciary. While the term “human security” is not used explicitly in the phrasing of the questions, it is what encompasses all of these non-civil and non-political rights, and is therefore suggested implicitly. The defining characteristics of the questionnaire are that it requires a high level of expertise (27 forms of expertise are apparently required to complete it) and a strong understanding of the term governance in a limited sense: it does not examine the issue of the country’s implementation of the treaties it has signed. Unlike in the EU’s understanding of governance, the APRM also covers corporate governance and raises questions on the working conditions. It assesses two essential aspects of this governance: the governance of development, with questions on economic and corporate policy, and development policy and efficiency (the socioeconomic aspect). This interest in corporate governance is clearly seen in the NAP cost allocation: the two largest amounts are allocated to two themes – companies and socioeconomic development²⁹. The APRM’s “innovativeness” is hailed by many, but others point out problems considering the soaring expectations regarding its effectiveness³⁰. The APRM works as an early warning system which attempts to read how the country is perceived, which is why it requires the involvement of as many people as possible. As the information it provides is used in combination with two other types of documents, it does not need to be statistically efficient. In the words of Martin Vielajus³¹, the APRM is intended “much more as a process of narrative and exploratory assessment” which will be incorporated into the additional statistical documents required in Step 1.

c) Technicism and insatiable civil society

These highly complex, continually changing assessment systems present two characteristics: 1) their technicism and 2) the difficulty of defining the persons concerned. In addition, they lack transparency and allow the fear that they could be manipulated for personal use.

The EU and NEPAD/AU place major importance on expertise. The tools are designed to define crisis-prevention situations as accurately as possible, and the experts are constantly trying to improve them based on their self-assessments in the field. Thus, by adopting governance as the focus of the aid policy implemented under the 10th EDF, the EU tried to consider subtler aspects, such as time, and sought to take duration into account, to consider the fact that working on practices requires more gradual change and that acquiring "good" habits takes time. The APRM, on the other hand, wants to incorporate more factors which can be measured more accurately. As we can see, the field of aid is ever-changing in its constant quest to improve efficiency, but there is a flip-side to this pursuit of ever-greater expertise. In response to the EU's growing complexity, the countries of Africa have raised the issue of dissemination or "extension", not only for the lay people called on to take part in the national survey consultations, as in Gabon, but also for the experts who manage the surveys, as the phrasing of the questions and the use of highly technical terms can actually hinder the process.

Implementing the APRM not only serves to identify weak points in the governance of the countries concerned, but is also a learning experience for the people who use it. The follow-up process is in fact very educational and an effective training tool for certain communication skills, as it requires working in collaboration with partners from all horizons (civil society, entrepreneurs, civil servants, trade union representatives). The process also trains users in engineering methods by requiring the use of tools for assessing the work carried out. But this type of use of the APRM is not the only means of learning new skills in terms of verifying information, research collaboration, etc. The questionnaire, which is provided by the APRM secretariat, can be adapted to specific aspects of the country using it, but one cannot overlook the fact that distribution of this tool does have the effect of standardising the expertise to some extent, a phenomenon which is clear to the people involved in the mechanism.

The question of expertise is closely linked to the role of civil society, the development of which is a key aspect of the EU governance project. But where do these experts come from, and what role do they play? Whether in the preparation of programmes and tools or in carrying out the surveys, the EU calls on experts (researchers, members of specialised NGOs, academics, lawyers, doctors, etc.). The surveys are also tied to this realm of international experts: the African states and their organisations, NEPAD/African Parliament, Think Tank, the European institutions and member countries, the civil society organisations, and the UN institutions. The experts have usually worked in one or more of these institutions and know each other. The same is true of the APRM, and training experts is an essential part of its implementation. But in choosing the terms “peers” or “eminent persons” for the members of the Panel, NEPAD has tried to place the emphasis on the quality of the expertise and expert, stressing the integrity of the people called upon to fulfil these functions, their “moral probity and their commitment to the ideals of Pan-Africanism”³². In addition, the private sector needs to be involved in the process, both to establish the tool’s legitimacy with the authorities and to use its financial influence to apply pressure in ways that can help achieve the commitments.

It is with this factor in mind that, instead of “civil society”, the EU prefers to use the term “Non-State Actors”. However, the latter term is vague enough to incite dangerous combinations, as N. Flamel has pointed out in a harshly critical article entitled “EU programmes for African civil societies: the ideology of transparency and hyperproceduralism”³³. The underlying demand for actors from civil society in order to meet the participation goals set out by the EU or NEPAD aid programmes brings all of the problems relating to civil society to the surface. The first problem is the omnipresence of major international NGOs, either in the field or in the financing of African NGOs. This omnipresence translates into a sort of monopoly, which jeopardises the ability to ensure a balanced representation of input from the different populations. Second, in the case of Africa, there is the problem of certain governments’ mistrust of these sometimes hostile partners who alter the political dynamics. Another problem is the use of consulting firms which put their own interests first. And the list goes on. If the aim behind the use of experts was to eliminate the risk of overlap, the role granted to civil society would require new

monitoring tools.

Conclusion

In examining the several years in which the joint assessment systems of the GAP and APRM have been in operation, one sees a convergence in the assessment practices, marking a victory for the world of measurable results. If we consider that the notion of governance can be understood, in the categories of standards defined by Zaki Laïdi as social preferences, those not imposed by constraint, those that Europeans can only defend if others share them... one could say that the emphasis on comprehensive principles such as transparency, autonomy, the participation of all, and the system's efficiency has succeeded in winning the support of most actors in the field of aid³⁴. However, by producing a tool specific to its scope, NEPAD has thus far been able to maintain relative autonomy in defining its guidelines in this area, promoting a broad notion of governance enhanced by its notion of Human Security. One has to look beyond the terminology to consider the various ways in which the meanings of the words are interpreted, in order to bring to light the differences fostered by different realms of thought and ways of life. However, if in the dialogue between partner countries, efforts are not made to identify the variations in meaning among the terms used, we can fear that, in the end, the new aid policies will continue producing the same results we have seen since 1945: failed development for the poorest countries and succeeding only in rallying the world around a minimal liberal creed that has largely demonstrated its flaws in the past. Moreover, by promoting the values of governance, the emphasis is placed on global concerns regarding global commons (environment, health, etc.). In shifting the focus from human security to governance, there is a risk of losing sight of the concerns of the African peoples – equity and social justice.

References

- 1 UN Report published in 1994, with the sub-title *New Dimensions of Human Security*.
- 2 The discussion on the term at the UN presented in: N. MacFarlane, and Y.F Khong, *Human Security and the UN – A Critical History* (Bloomington: University of Indiana Press, 2006).
- 3 Commission on Human Security, *Human Security Now – Protecting and Empowering People Final Report*, 2003.
- 4 Kofi Annan, *Secretary-General Salutes International Workshop on Human Security in Mongolia*, Press Release SG/SM/7382 (Ulaanbaatar, 8-10 May 2000).
- 5 T. Debiel, and S. Werthes, eds, *Human Security on Foreign Policy Agendas: changes, concepts, cases*, INEF Report 80/2006 (Duisburg: University of Duisburg-Essen, 2006).
- 6 *2003 European Strategy; EU Strategy for Africa* [COM(2005) 489 final]; *The European Consensus on Development* [Official Journal C46 of 24.2.2006]; *Code of Conduct on Complementarity and the Division of Labour in Development policy* [COM(2007) 72 final] and *EU Response to Fragile Situations* [COM(2007) 643 final]; *Security and Development 2007* (EU Council).
- 7 *2003 European Strategy*, 7.
- 8 Didier Georgakakis, “Introduction”, D. Georgakakis and Marine de Lassalle, *La «nouvelle» gouvernance européenne – Genèses et usages politiques d’un livre blanc* (Strasbourg: Strasbourg University Presses, 2008), 23.
- 9 Jackie Cilliers, *Human Security in Africa – A conceptual framework for review* (a monography for the African Human Security Initiative, 2004), 51.
- 10 *Ibid.*, 12.
- 11 Thomas Kwasi Tiekou, “African Union promotion of human security in Africa,” *African Security Review* 16 (2, 2007), 26-37.
- 12 See the Cairo Declaration, 1962, on the preservation of borders created through colonisation.
- 13 The innovative dimension of the process is analysed in the work by F.M. Deng, and I.W Zartman, *A Strategic Vision for Africa – The Kampala Movement* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2002).
- 14 Thomas Kwasi Tiekou, “African Union Promotion of Human Security in Africa” *Ibid.*, 33.
- 15 See the text entitled *A European Way of Security – The Madrid Report of the Human Security Group Comprising a Proposal and Background Report*, 2007, prepared by Mary Kaldor’s team.
- 16 Among the sub-regions of Africa, the region of West Africa, following the example of other unions between countries, promptly formed an economic union. The Economic Community of West Africa States (ECOWAS), overseen first by a Secretariat following its creation in 1975, and since June 2006 by a Commission, set up instruments to promote the economic development of its member countries. One such instrument is the economic and social council, which fulfils the role of providing analyses and input for the three executive bodies, i.e. the Community Parliament, the Council of Ministers and the Conference of Heads of State. Paradoxically, although the ECOWAS developed instruments designed to promote economic vitality in the sub-region, such as the free movement of persons between member States (as from 1978), it just as quickly adopted other instruments, aimed at conflict prevention and protecting the populations, for example.
- 17 The members include major research centres such as the South African Institute for International Affairs (SAIIA), the WANEP (West-Africa Network for Peacebuilding), the APFO (African Peace Forum) and the ISS (Institute for Security Studies).

- 18 The Commission Communication, *Governance in the European Consensus- Towards a harmonised approach within the European Union*, [COM (2006) (421 final of 30.08.2006.)]4.
- 19 Here again, care must be taken with regard to the different traditions that use the term; in France, for example, there is greater emphasis on the social dimension than in Anglo-Saxon countries.
- 20 2007 OECD text which supplemented *the Accra Agenda for Action*.
- 21 The United Nations review *Chronicle Online* provides an overview of the debates, 2003/1.
- 22 Article 29, p.10 of the *Declaration on Democracy, Political, Economic and Corporate Governance*. Documents on the APRM are available online on the NEPAD website as well as the APRM website,-<http://aprm-au.org/>.
- 23 Anne-Cécile Robert, *L'Afrique au secours de l'Occident* (Ivry sur Seine: Les Editions de l'Atelier, 2008).
- 24 There are many studies in English, and somewhat fewer in French, but the work of reference is that published by two SAIIA researchers, Steven Gruzd and Ross Herbert, *The APRM, Lessons from the Pioneers*, 2008. A complete version can be downloaded from the NEPAD website.
- 25 Citation from the NEPAD publication, *Country Self-Assessment for the African Peer Review Mechanism*, 2004, 20.
- 26 Translated into all vernacular languages of the countries concerned; committed to presenting the specific needs of each country, it was revised in 2011 based on critiques submitted to the Panel.
- 27 NEPAD has published a guide for drafting the Questionnaire to be completed by the National Commissions, *Country Self-Assessment for the African Peer Review Mechanism*, *ibid*.
- 28 A critical analysis of the Questionnaire is set out in chapter 4 of the work of reference: Steven Gruzd and Ross Herbert, *The APRM, Lessons from the Pioneers*, *ibid*.
- 29 Table from the study by Adotey Bing-Pappoe, *APRM – Seven Countries*, (Africa Canada Partnership, March 2010), 8.
- 30 The original nature of the document is also subject to debate, as some see it as a tool imposed by aid providers.
- 31 Martin Vielajus, *Rapport du groupe aide au développement et gouvernance*, 2006 (<http://www.institut-gouvernance.org/fr/analyse/fiche-analyse-279.html>)
- 32 Mentioned in the NEPAD text, *Objectives, Standards, Criteria and Indicators for the APRM*, 2003.
- 33 N. Flamel, “Les programmes de l’Union Européenne vers les sociétés civiles africaines – idéologie de la transparence et hyperprocéduralité” from (plateforme-ong.au-senegal.com).
- 34 Zaki Laïdi, *La norme sans la force* (Paris, Sciences Po/ Les Presses, 2008).

要旨

ヒューマンセキュリティ (HS) の概念が初めて言及されたのは 1994 年の「国連人間開発報告書」の中であったが、この報告書は開発の基礎を国家に置いていた従来の政策の行き詰まりから人間を重視することへのシフトを表したものである。この概念はある国によって、とりわけ援助に関わる組織によって使用され、強い「ライトモチーフ的政治」となった。欧州委員会は特に近隣国の援助に関わる安全保障政策を作り上げたが、その政策の中で社会的規範として HS の概念がガバナンスの名のもとに反映されている。

アフリカ開発のための新パートナーシップ (NEPAD) という組織は開発政策分野において HS 的要素を含めたガバナンスの価値を強調し、独自の評価システムを作ることによって運営の自律性を今日まで保持することができた。しかし、EU においては共通の世界財を重視する一方、NEPAD は公平さと社会的正義という HS 的価値を重視するというガバナンスの理解は両者の間で異なる。開発援助の過程において自律性をいかに守るかということは NEPAD が抱える重要な課題である。