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**Abstract**

West African postcolonial governance centralizes the mechanisms of people’s lives through mobility and security borders. In May, 1975, ECOWAS (Economic Community of West African States) was founded. The manner West African nations’ discourses are examined and evaluated through strategic plans regarding health issues and migration policies initiated an interrogative place where the regulation of people’s lives remains really unquestioned. In this paper, we seek to evaluate governmental discourses of ECOWAS in regard to biopolitics. In the present paper, we examine the ECOWAS official documents dealing with health and migration issues. We interest in the years between 2000 and 2023
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**Résumé**

La gouvernance postcoloniale ouest-africaine centralise les mécanismes de la vie des populations à travers la mobilité et la sécurisation des frontières. En mai 1975, la CEDEAO (Communauté économique des États de l’Afrique de l’Ouest) a été fondée. La manière dont les discours des nations ouest-africaines sont examinés et évalués à travers les plans stratégiques concernant les questions de santé et les politiques migratoires a instauré un espace interrogatif où la régulation de la vie des populations demeure rarement remise en question. Dans cet article, nous cherchons à évaluer les discours gouvernementaux de la CEDEAO au regard de la biopolitique. Dans le présent travail, nous analysons les documents officiels de la CEDEAO traitant des questions de santé et de migration. Nous nous intéressons à la période comprise entre 2000 et 2023.
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# **Introduction**

Regional organizations like ECOWAS remain operational links between nation as a space of collaboration and regulation. ECOWAS policy system remains productive and governing in regard to responses to crises like Ebola, COVID-19 and migration. Many ECOWAS texts and documents encode life management. They reflect colonial legacies in some way and participate in the surveillance and control of peoples. The present work is an analytic study of ECOWAS texts and communiques in regard to biopolitics, biopower and necropolitics.

This article is an evaluation of the manner ECOWAS construct peoples bodies’ control of lives in the regulation of borders and mobility. This is a guise of development strategies, security management and public health control. This work is a contribution to postcolonial governance studies. It highlights the way ECOWAS re-configure bodies through institution, regulation and identification. A page of *Foucault,* *Biopolitics, and Governmentality* reads “In the 1978 lecture series from the Collège de France, Foucault refers to a definition of government provided by Guillaume de la Perrière in an early modern tract on the art of government. Here, the government is conceived of as the “right disposition of things”. It is concerned with a “complex of men and things”: “men in their relationships, bonds, and complex involvement with things like wealth, resources, means of subsistence, the territory with its borders, qualities, climate, dryness, fertility, and so on.” From this perspective, the government not only focuses on governing humans and the relations that exist between humans. It also refers to a more comprehensive reality that includes the material environment and the specific arrangements and technical networks that relate the human and the non-human” (Lemke, Krasmann, and Bröckling, 2013:48).

Michel Foucault explains the relationships between human and non-human. From a postcolonial perspective, Foucault’s work explains that ECOWAS’ practices are distinct biopolitical logics for the governance of peoples and societies. This governance is regulated through laws and administration of life. This governance explains the interdependence between humans and materials as conditions of existence in an emerging world. Foucault sustains that ‘the right disposition of things’ offers an analytic symbol for critiquing governance and understanding policies of governance. ECOWAS is not simply a political organization, it remains an organizing people’s ‘right to live and die. This right is organized around issues of mobility, health and border regulation.

# Review of Literature

Foucault’s biopolitics is explained as the way modern power regulates populations’ trough practices of life, health and body’s management. This regulation is evaluated through power ability to regulate behavior and maintain order within territories. These ideologies are developed in Foucault’s and Mbembe’s works. Foucault’s biopolitics explains ‘the management of people’s lives through regimes of discipline, knowledge, and surveillance’. Achille Mbembe explains necropolitics (Mbembe, 2019) as the way postcolonial power and nation exercise sovereignty by deciding people who should live and die. Mbembe and Foucault provide analytic tools for governance wherever power and state exists. In addition, Agamben explains the legal-political system in the moments of crisis and normalization of exceptional power. In contrast, Comaroff explains postcolonial complexity in enforcing law and order in transnational spaces. Sarr offers a decolonial counterpoint explaining the desire of Africans to inherit biopolitical frameworks. Foucault, Mbembe, Agamben and Sarr explore the way social and political organizations like ECOWAS govern life and manage through regimes of power, exception and vision.

Agamben’s *State of Exception,* (Agamben, Giorgio, 2005)Comaroff’s *Law and Disorder in the Postcolony* (Comaroff, Jean, and John L. Comaroff**,** 2006) and Sarr’s *Afrotopia* (Sarr, F. (2016)offer an exploratory lens through which ECOWAS’ role as biopolitical phenomenon remains important to explain. These works include studies of disease control such as Nguyen’s work (Nguyen, 2018 & 2019), identification’s systems like Breckenridge’s and Szreter’s work, (Breckenridge, K., & Szreter, S. (Eds.). (2012) and migration like Adepoju’s work (Adepoju, A. (2010)). The present paper explores ECOWAS as a regional apparatus of biopower demonstrating the health and migration policies and discipline bodies. They produce compliant subjects, and manage risk in the name of regional stability and development.

1. **The Situation in ECOWAS**

The foundation of ECOWAS in May, 1975 is a supranational body that explains foster regional need of integration, development and collective security. The ECOWAS official documents in regard to the epidemic preparedness plans and migration protocols engage in a bureaucratic and technocratic vocabulary masking political stakes for the management of people’s lives.

A page in *Society Must Be Defended: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975–1976* reads “Biopolitics deals with the population, with the population as a political problem, as a problem that is at once scientific and political, as a biological problem and as power’s problem. And I think that biopolitics emerges at this time” (Foucault, M., 2003:245). Foucault explains biopolitics as ‘the act of making people the central of political power’. Accordingly, people, are biopolitical entities to be managed and regulated. Foucault makes it clear that biopolitics exists at the moments when government treat people as scientific and political problem, subject to surveillance, health policies, statistical regulation and reproduction control. This exploration marks a shift from sovereign power, the right to kill, in regard to biopower, the power to ‘make live and let die’ by the organization, normalization and optimization of people’s lives. This is symbolic to the structure of human and non-human conditions.

In the present work, we engage in exploring the way ECOWAS’s health and migration policies operate like technologies of biopower. The explored documents and information in this paper are the regulation of an entire category of life and death. It is an exploration of who is protected? Who is excluded? Covid-19(2020-2022) and Ebola (2014-2016) remain symbols of biopolitical logics.

1. **The Methodologies**

We use qualitative approach and interpretations in order to analyze health and migration policies in ECOWAS. These analysis and exploration will be elaborated through the mechanisms of biopolitics and biopower.

* 1. **Theoretical Framework and Analytical Lens**

The analysis is firstly guided by Foucault’s concepts of biopolitics and biopower. Michel Foucault explains the strategies and rationalities through which people’s lives and living processes are managed in regard to power. Biopower, the present exercise of this postcolonial power, operates at two major levels: anatomo-politics of people’s bodies through disciplining and biopolitics of the people through regulation.

* 1. **Data Collection**

The information explored in this paper are the treaties and protocols of ECOWASrelated to free movement of persons, residence, and establishment, the regional health policies, disease surveillance strategies, and responses to epidemics, documents in reference to migration inthe regional migration sector, guidelines for border management, and initiatives addressing irregular migration, human trafficking, and migrant rights, and reports of ECOWAS.

These documents were accessed through the official ECOWAS websites and relevant regional policy databases. The selection of documents focuses on the explicitly articulated policy objectives, strategies of implementation, and normative frameworks for the governance of population and health management within ECOWAS space with post-2000 reflecting contemporary challenges.

* 1. **Data Analysis**

We will proceed through thematic coding by reading the documents in order to identify recurring themes, key concepts and policy objectives. The collected documents undergo a multi-stage qualitative content and discourse analysis. Some codes developed deductive and inductive styles of life management. From the perspective of ‘disciplining the body’, ‘population management’, ‘risk management’, and ‘epidemic control’. Added to these, there are other issues like ‘irregular migration’, ‘disease outbreaks’, which are framed, and the way people are categorized like ‘migrant’, and ‘vulnerable groups’. The exploration paid attention to the manner notions of ‘stability’, ‘development’, ‘security’, and ‘compliance’ are built and legalized through policy discourse.

Biopolitical mapping, the last version that involves mapping themes and discourses into the theoretical framework. This study engages three central questions:

1. The way ECOWAS policy documents conceptualize and manage ‘life’
2. The way biopolitical tools of surveillance, classification, mobility restrictions are organized.
3. The manner the representation of these images reflect biopolitical organization.

# Results

The following subsections explain the sectorial parts of health and migration through ECOWAS organization. They explain the way the documents and administrative tools are used to manage people’s lives, to condition people, and control them. These elements refer to biopolitical tools in the way postcolonial West African regional organizations make people’s lives controlled and under surveillance through political and administrative tools.

# Health Policies

Between 2000 and 2023, ECOWAS health policies yielded mixed results in terms of governance, institutional capacity-building, and the management of peoples. Critical discourses of key ECOWAS documents include Regional Strategic Health Development Plans of the years 2003-2007, 2010-2015, and 2016-2020, and WAHO’s reports.

ECOWAS adopts a biopolitical logic. In this biopolitical context, health and migration protocols limit human rights and remain in the management of risks that disease, mobility and borders are symbolized. From the control of HIV/AIDS to Ebola and COVID-19 containment, public health strategies remain a shift re-activating care to proactive surveillance and the risk of people-level management. The recent Regional Strategic Health Development Plans called RSHDPs (West African Health Organisation, 2003) symbolize health sector management for access to epidemic surveillance. It fosters regional integrity and promotes responses to epidemics. In consequence, health issues become elements of the body's regulation, control mobility, and standardize people’s data across borders. The latter is another form of biopolitical power. Added to this; the technologies like biometric health cards and digital immunization records are elements of mechanisms and control.

WAHO mainly harmonizes health protocols across ECOWAS. These efforts led to the initiation of ECOWAS RCSDC, the standardization of epidemic preparedness frameworks for the promotion of cross-border cooperation, and the progress of malaria control, and reproductive access through the results referring to the disparities in regional capacities. In consequence, the introduction of biometric ID systems, health passports, and digital control platforms that deepen techno-scientific governance in postcolonial Africa. These elements are tools used between health policy and the control of migration. It mainly facilitates mobility and surveillance over people’s movements.

# The Regulation of Migration

ECOWAS’s Protocol Regulating to Free Movement of Persons, Residence and Establishment, first signed in 1979, and remains one of the main legal texts of ECOWAS that reflect regional vision of facilitating integration and mobility across member states. This protocol proposes three-phase implementation. The first is the Right of entry without visa for up to 90 days. The second remains the right of residence which is based on employment and legal means of support. And the third, the right of establishment to regulate and manage enterprises. This protocol has undergone several revisions such as the supplementary protocol A/SP.A/7/85 addressing the right of residence, the protocol A/SP.1/7/86 which covers the right of establishment, the protocol A/SP.1/01/05 of 2005 that improves travel documentation and border control and introduces ECOWAS Travel Certificate and biometric ID cards, and the 2012’s revision emphasizing security, biometric identification, and enhance cooperation in order to manage irregular migration and trafficking. The latter re-affirms members’ states commitment to non-discrimination and equal treatment. In a biopolitical perspective, the protocols regulate peoples by satisfying access based on legal status, economic productivity, and security considerations. These documents and information reflect governing through positioning peoples as subjects of freedom and control through mobility (ECOWAS, 1979; ECOWAS, 2005; ECOWAS, 2012).

Traoré’s “West Africa Institute Annual Report 2019” (Traoré, D., 2019) is an annual report that outlines the multifaceted contributions of regional integration. Based in Praia, Cabo Verde, WAI (West Africa Institute) explains knowledge production, dialogue policy, and elite training through strategic partnerships with African and European institutions. This work explains the collaborative relationships between ECOWAS, ECDPM, and UNESCO in governance, regional policy, education and human rights and innovation. The establishment of academic mobility programs and Master’s-level training in regional integration. The late 2019 efforts have produced the fact that WAI have contributed to the development of regional policies and strategic frameworks like the ECOWAS Strategic Plan and the Science and Technology Action Plan (ECOPOST).

*WAI Evaluation of the 2011-2015 ECOWAS* (Traoré, D., & Ogunkola, O., 2015) *The Regional Strategic Plan* explains ECOWAS’s strategic objectives. This evaluation is based on seven member states. The thematic findings demonstrate performance across strategic goals with strengths in peace and conflict management without forgetting the weakness in institutional coordination and resource mobilization. ECOWAS Regional Biosurveillance Framework for Ebola and COVID-19 (ECOWAS Commission & WAHO, 2020); West African Health Organization, 2021; World Health Organization, 2020; WAHO, 2017). The coordinating response mechanism that ECOWAS developed through the specialized agency WAHO between the years 2014-2016 and 2021 was to establish integral regional surveillance systems for detecting rapidly what they call abnormalities. It was an amazing cross-border collaboration in epidemiological data sharing and coordinated emergency preparedness and risk communication. These bio-surveillance protocols in ECOWAS made the creation of RCSDC and later RCSD, the deployment of Rapid Respond teams (RRTs), implemented community-based surveillance (contact tracing) and collaborated with international partners like WHO, CDC Africa, USAID. This is exactly an event-based surveillance and syndromic surveillance system. By using digital tools like the Surveillance Outbreak Response Management and Analysis System, ECOWAS has initiated real-time genomic control. These result through regional surveillance, cross-border alert, and Integrated Disease Surveillance and Response.

The *2008 ECOWAS Common Approach on Migration* (ECOWAS, 2008) remains an important moment in the system governance of ECOWAS. The latter refers to the collective position of ECOWAS on migration in the control of borders by the establishment of migrant’s rights. The shared communique in the field serves as biopolitical apparatus-the regulation of life through mechanisms of regulation, monitoring, and optimizing. Through this biopolitics’ lens of Foucault, (Foucault, M., 2003), the common approach represents a strategic shift in the way peoples become objects of governmental concern, not only economic agents and security, they remain biological and political subjects to be managed through technologies of control and care. This is inherited in data harmonization and biometric identification as modern techniques of subjectivization and control used to classify, sort, and manage migrants across national boundaries.

In consequence, the document institutionalized a way of governing in the regional concern that aims to rationalize the guise of development, security and human rights. This is exactly the postcolonial state’s *entanglement* with regard to global regimes of governance, a context in which ECOWAS emerges as a site of resistance and complicity with transitional control systems. By considering migration as a problem to be resolved and governed through standardized frameworks, ECOWAS internalized neoliberal rationalities while aligning its policies with world migrant actors like the International Organization for Migration (IOM).

The duality of need of protection for migrants and regional security of need for security and regional security mirrors the colonial legacy of categorizing African bodies as objects of intervention reflecting Achille Mbembe’s call for *necropolitics* (Mbembe, A., 2001) the sovereign power to decide people who should live and lust die, in this specific case-*who may move and who must stay.*

# Postcolonial Control of Nations through Regional Organizations

WAHO aimed to consolidate regional health security and strengthen systems across ECOWAS member states. It emphasizes some key regulations like harmonizing health policies and legislation, free movement of health professionals, regional pharmaceutical regulation in order to create a unified market, disease surveillance and coordinated response to epidemics, and the Universal Health Coverage for children and mothers. It refers specially to biopolitical perspective in regard to health, the controlling life. In this context, power is not simply the right to kill, it remains the right to manage life, what Foucault calls ‘administration of bodies and calculated management of life’. Through this mechanism, ‘*people remain political problem that is scientific and political, as biology and power remain explained by Foucault’* (Foucault, M., 2003:245).

These cited works explain that ECOWAS integration and global agendas reveal mechanisms of soft power and influence in structuring. Disease surveillance and mobility of health frame integration elements and serve population management systems. WAHO reflects postcolonial control exercise through bureaucratic rationality, donor conditions and technocratic integration. This remains an example of enabling and constrain sovereignty reflecting people whose interests are prioritized.

The ECOWAS Biometric Identity Card Program (Ajibade, A., & Traoré, S., 2019; Amoore, L., 2006; ECOWAS, 2016) is a core regional ideology that reveals the enhancement of free movement of persons and strengthens security and identity management. It was launched in 2016 and replaced the travelling certificate. This biometric tool remains a quintessential biopolitical tool in Foucauldian sense-it marks a renovation from governance through laws to governing through administration of life. By creating biometric data control (fingerprints, digital photographs, demographic information) in ID systems, ECOWAS operationalizes a regime of control and classification where rights to move freely become conditional upon digital legibility. This is an instrument of regional logic and reifies colonial logics of cataloguing, mapping, and minoring African bodies promoted by partners like EU and IOM. The continuum 2016-2023 timeline marks an increase of ECOWAS internal governance with global counterterrorism and border security paradigms. This demonstrates that ECOWAS states are shaped by external funding priorities. The ECOWAS Biometric regulation demonstrates the way postcolonial Africa governs life through data and exemplifies biopolitical rationalities where freedom of movements is no longer a human right but a privilege. Rather than make a decolonial mobility, it makes a re-insertion of new digital borders of separation.

# Discussion

Postcolonial administration remains characterized by a mixing of inherited colonial systems that evolve the structures of states and organization. This set of strategies, policies and mechanisms through which power not only governs, power remains an organizing, managing and optimizing life itself in postcolonial context. The management of power and its organization include health, morality, mobility and productivity. Foucault’s shift from sovereign power (the right to kill) to biopower is a form of power that explores the way people are made to ‘live or let die’. He explains that modern power governs through techniques as it remains with the case of ECOWAS techniques of biometrical surveillance and movement control of individuals and laws for the regulation of social order. Public health remains controlled through vaccination campaigns, sanitary systems and pandemic. These can be exemplified by Ebola and COVID-19 in the ECOWAS region. The regulation of refugee camps, border surveillance and biometric registration require an exact instruction of biopolitical control through the mechanisms of power. This biometric ID has created a space of surveillance and surveillance.

The exploration and analysis of selected ECOWAS documents between 2000 and 2023 reveals a biopolitical phenomenon wherein migration are strategic domains. The *Strategic Plan on Health*, *Common Approach on Migration (2008)*, and biometric registration are evident in managing tools and configurations in the regulation of technologies of surveillance and security. Health policies illustrate the security demand and technological framework of people’s governance. This is exemplified by the focus of epidemic preparedness, and transnational disease surveillance as response to public health and governance across borders. This example of Foucault”s biopolitics of state intervention in the biological life of peoples where power remains strategic.

In consequence, migration policies exhibit the promotion of regional mobility through instruments like the Protocol on Free Movement of Persons and the integration of biometric technologies, border controls and data-driven governance. Therefore, the governance of health and migration remains a site of sovereignty where biological regimes embodied by Mbembe’s *Necropolitics* reveals the power to let people die or live in the management of risks, and bodily vulnerabilities. This call for Giorgio Agamben’s notion of *bare life* in reference to Agamben’s *Homo sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare life* (Agamben, G., 1998).--situation in which people’s lives are regulated but politically not considered. Biopolitical rationality remains; in this sense, it becomes a tool of care and control where visibility and invisibility, integration and fragmentation remain very recurrent. ECOWAS’s policies of health and migration reveal recurrent presentation of biopolitical governance where postcolonial states govern through life-bodies, borders, data, and discourses.

*Afrotopia* (Sarr, F., 2016) proposes a radical shift from the non-African models of governance and development. Sarr’s criticism of the dominant biopolitical order which is inherited from colonial regimes as being alien to African historical experiences and the traditions of philosophy. Sarr views Foucault’s biopolitics to be insufficient for thinking African futures. For Sarr, biopolitics reduces life to administration and control (technocratic and neoliberal terms). Sarr advocates for a decolonial politics of vitality that centers interests on relational ethics, reparative sovereignty and community autonomy. On a page of *Afrotopia*, we read «L'Afrique n'a personne à rattraper. Elle ne doit plus courir sur les sentiers qu'on lui indique, mais marcher prestement sur le chemin qu'elle se sera choisi. Son statut de fille aînée de l'humanité requiert d'elle de s'extraire de la concurrence, de la compétition, de cet âge infantile où les nations se toisent pour savoir qui a le plus accumulé de richesses, de gadgets technologiques, de sensations fortes, de capacité de jouissance des biens et plaisirs de ce monde, et peu importe si cette course effrénée et irresponsable met en danger les conditions sociales et naturelles de la vie humaine » (Sarr, F., 2016:152). Sarr explains that African should not run along the paths that colonizers dictate. The fact that ‘Africa is the eldest daughter of humanity’ suggests that African nations should carry profound historical responsibilities. Rather than mimicking and trying to catch up with their ancient colonizers, Africa should chart its own lineage-a road in its own values, priorities and history. This remains a call for epistemic sovereignty. In other words, it is a call for Africans to define themselves through their own norms of life, development, governance, and collectivism. Sarr considers governance as a form of moral and creative act, not copying. It must be rooted in historical memory, spiritual vitality and cultural regeneration. Sarr’s approach resonates with decolonial and anti-colonial thinking like those of Walter Mignolo and Boavantura de Sousa Santos. He calls for de-linking from Western universalism and he suggests the construction of pluriversal worlds in which African cosmologies, institutions, and lifeways should be central.

**Conclusion**

The present paper has evaluated the way biopolitical rationalities have shaped ECOWAS’s governance practices in two specific domains: health and migration. It has revealed that life is administrated, regulated, and rendered governable in postcolonial West Africa through population management-this enterprise embedded in global regimes of security, development, and surveillance. This article demonstrated that ECOWAS’s policies are not only framed in terms of regional solidarity and mobility, it reflects technocratic and securitized logics for the instrumentalization of health and migration.

ECOWAS reflects a subject of governance and call for critical re-thinking in the way power operates in postcolonial Africa through regulation, inclusion and optimization. Unfortunately, governing in a postcolonial world should reflect more that institutional interventions, it requires reflection on life’s value, politics of care and the building of futures beyond control and calculation.
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