

'UBUNTU' ELEMENTS  
IN POLITICAL AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC  
ORGANIZATION: A PHILOSOPHICAL  
REFLECTION

DOI: 10.54664/KWXC2945

Philip Ogo Ujomu\*

**Abstract:** This paper tries to develop a tenable philosophical idea of Ubuntu as an endogenous construct for African socioeconomic and political development. The search for an African endogenous paradigm for sociopolitical and economic development is urgent given the real consequences of some dominant paradigms of alienation, exploitation, and marginalization. These values have altered or affected African behaviour and thinking. This transformation of the human person has raised issues about agency and the values underlying same. So, a development paradigm or philosophy of development for Africa or even the world at large requires an ethical basis for human existence in economic, political, and social order. Generally, social order in most parts of Africa is beset by the problem of a negative dominant social paradigm (DSP) or core social values of hatred, intolerance, the abuse of human rights, dehumanization, exploitation, authoritarianism, poverty, and oppression. This often leads to tension, violent conflicts, and wars. So, to build a viable and stable endogenous paradigm for development in most African sociopolitical environments we attempt to use the main pillar of interconnectedness among human beings which is central to Ubuntu as a social system and value system to underscore some key moral and democratic values required for human liberation and transformation. The research question is: What concrete elements or values of Ubuntu can be useful as paradigms of an endogenous African development? Specifically, our findings suggest that Ubuntu ethics is defined by a set of human values or qualitative correlates central among which are reciprocity, common good, peaceful re-

---

\* **Philip Ogo Ujomu** – Professor, Dept of Philosophy, Faculty of Humanities, Federal University, Wukari, Taraba State, Nigeria; e-mail: [pujomu@yahoo.com](mailto:pujomu@yahoo.com), [ujomuphilip@yahoo.com](mailto:ujomuphilip@yahoo.com)

lations, emphasis on human dignity and the value of human life as well as consensus, tolerance and mutual respect.

**Keywords:** Ubuntu, ethics, economy, politics communalism, community, human person, moral values.

## INTRODUCING THE PROBLEM

The problem of establishing and sustaining social and economic order is as old as the history of man. It refers to the diverse attempts to reconcile the individual and society. The concern is about searching for acceptable or tenable ways to define the relationship between human beings and between human beings and society. Let us present this issue theoretically. One of the major problems arising is the question of how to conceptualize human nature and to employ it in the explanation of the emergence of the civil society and the state as instruments for social order and social control. From the above certain fundamental questions or problems arise. First, is the problem of: What level or degree of independence, freedom and autonomy should individuals possess within, and in relation to the state? In other words, what is the extent of the power that society can exercise over the individual? The second problem centres on: What is the extent of power that can be exercised by the sovereign or ruler in a state, over the citizens? So, the fundamental task of a social philosopher is to provide justifications for certain conceptions of social order and political community (Ujomu and Olatunji 2014:170).

Put theoretically, Gamble (1981: 41–49) argues that it is the attempt to contrast the conditions of men after the emergence of the political community or state which was basically aimed at revealing what was distinctive about individuals and about society. So, an effort is made to propose the existence of a state of nature in a way that seeks to contrast the natural order with the social order. Therefore, when viewed against the background of the state of nature, the conception of the state that emerges is that of public power, definable through two main ideas: First, that it is a centralised power that tries to overawe all other powers in a given territory via its agencies. And

second, that the state is founded on consent, or a relationship between those who direct it and those who are subject to it.

Some hitherto restrictive conceptions of society in a historical perspective seem to be fraught with inadequacies which justify our need to rethink the imperative of a socioeconomic and political order that can fast-track African development using ethical and epistemological correlates. So, the idea of ubuntu is being proposed afresh as a possible response to the age-long philosophical question given that this situation leads us to a renewed and urgent quest for a more conceptually distilled and robust theory of ubuntu:

- i. How ought people to relate with one another?
- ii. What rules, knowledge, and norms can help human beings relate properly with others ethically, socially, and politically?

There are established views on human nature and human behavior in a social and political context. We seek a philosophical appraisal of Ubuntu. Is this possible? Or to put the question differently:

- i. What is distinctive about Ubuntu as a philosophical idea suitable for the development of Africa in this modern age?

The question of the proper way that human beings should behave in society remains a key issue in philosophy and has been an ancestral challenge for human society all through the ages. Philosophers, social studies scholars, and governments variously tried to tackle this concern. Humanity faces a continued struggle with human nature that reveals ancestrally negative elements such as hate, racism, colonialism, crimes, slavery, tribalism, corruption, greed, genocide, wars, and other vices. These negative features of human nature oppose and contest with the positive values of man (imagination, virtue, intelligence, kindness, choice, Will, creativity, humanitarianism, and so on). So, there is a struggle about the role of the human being as the primary material of the universe. Given the above situation, why ought human beings to desire a humane, cooperative, and humanistic social and political order? An answer could be that in every generation human beings struggled with control or strength versus helplessness or weakness and so human beings sought to work together to accomplish the insurmountable or what one person found unattainable. Like the philosophers of security will say security is beauty; beauty is

harmony. So family, village, clan, association, institution, city, state, amalgam, conglomerate, merger, partnership, commonwealth, country, world, and so on, were essentially efforts to identify, recognize, congregate, integrate, and organize people for a higher purpose of our common humanity.

Today as always, our common humanity is threatened by a wave of divisions, instability, disorder, and insecurity arising from the fact that some negative attributes of an individual or group's human nature (greed, ignorance, violence, hate, discrimination, unfair treatment, impunity, intolerance, authoritarianism and so on) can be projected into society as (corruption and bad governance, anachronism and irrational fear of the 'other', wars, hate speech, racism and ultra-ethnicity, genocide and crimes against humanity, apartheid, xenophobia, sectarianism and dictatorship, disobedience to the rule of law, inequity in resource distribution, lack of social justice, Nazism, jihadist extremism, tyranny, siege mentality, a cult of personality and abuse of power and so on).

This is life-threatening. So, to curb these human excesses we beam our searchlight on some binding forces of our common humanity which promote sharing and learning of common global experiences and threats. We push an argument for a conception of cross-cultural communication, extended conversational circumstances that promote mutual cooperation. This effort in part, requires a dialogical approach that applies human relational interaction to safeguard our collective human values, survival, and humanity. The modern world is increasingly becoming a global village where experiences are communicable and interactive such that an event in one region can inevitably affect other regions several thousands of kilometres away. Given such interconnections and the ensuing diversity, it is clear that basic social values of mutual respect, cooperation, and social justice cannot be overstated in nurturing responsible human persons and building stable viable human societies.

What is the logic or causality that drives the above analysis? The main point here is that human nature is capable of struggle and passivity, good and evil, right and wrong, justice and injustice. Is this paradoxical? Should we be bothered about this? Where is the value of

social order or social control? We may argue that moderating the individual human nature is an arduous task that man seems equipped for using corrective mechanisms such as conscience, family values, education, laws, culture and tradition, even critical intelligence and rationality. Despite these variables why does it seem that a human being still exhibits some unwholesome traits? What is the solution to this problem? Why should the Africans take this issue seriously? There is a concern for establishing and sustaining higher ideals of moral life, stronger value systems, and more inclusive social or human values for moderating human beings in society. In the society human beings are moderated by ethics or the science of human behavior which may be descriptive or normative. Other instruments of moderation or social control include statutes and rules, natural or positive laws, ethnic or religious practices, technology and technological styles, conventional customary or cultural ways of life, as well as, moral suasion and public opinion. It means then that human nature can be the subject of human nurture such that certain natural and social traits can be carried over into the human society through social life, politics, culture, laws, and other developmental behavioral value systems.

So, we may pose afresh the ancestral question of human relations with others in the universe as; how do we produce better, more decent, and productive human beings? Can Ubuntu theorizing help with this attempt in our world? The oppressive, one-sided, reckless, and careless use of the world's resources that have led to climate change and global warming have the prospect of extreme consequences that bring to the forefront, once again, the need for human beings to live together for mutual cooperation and the common good. The quest for the common good has been an ancestral quest since man appeared on earth and in this era, we are looking at the prospects of Ubuntu ethical and political values for fulfilling this desire or agenda of peaceful and progressive human interconnectedness, cooperation, respect, and interaction.

#### PROLEGOMENON TO THE NOTION OF 'UBUNTU' IN SOCIO-ECONOMIC LIFE?

The social and political have to do with the economic also. So, there is a need for an economic order or the application of the

means of production: land, capital or finance, labour or manpower, raw materials and tools into a mode of production that is a system of producing and distributing goods and services in society. Here lies the problem: Is the economic order the basis of social and political order? Or is it the socio-political order that defines and sustains the economic system? What happens when there is a conflict between them? Which one takes precedence? It is not advisable to over reach ourselves like Karl Marx did, by asserting that all other realms of life are strictly subservient to the material and specifically the economic. Obviously, this Marxian position is not completely true. Though the economy or the economic order, definitely has a very key role to play in human existence, yet there are other equally important spheres of human life. So, we need to provide an answer to a related question: Is there an economic basis of the socio-political? We may address this matter in a twofold manner: First, is to do a prolegomenon analysis of the issue and secondly, we need do a proper analysis of the socioeconomic order. Let us start by presenting an idea of a Master of ancient Greece as is the custom with philosophers. Specifically, Plato teaches us that security is beauty; beauty is harmony; harmony is when all the parts of a whole are working perfectly as individuals driven by the best natural talent reinforced by nurture or training. Also, all the parts are working perfectly together to form a whole or holistic system. Put simply interface and cooperation is required among human beings. It further means that we cannot easily separate the social, political, cultural, and the economic dimensions of life if we are to grasp the full meaning of life. These spheres appear to be different but are definitely interrelated parts of one whole human system.

The next question then is: What constitutes the logical foundation of the social, political, cultural, and economic? Is this a valid question? An answer may be that it is the “sociality” of human beings that drives all other things. Social life is seen in mutual respect and human cooperation for a common good or ultimate end or collective purpose such as survival, security, peace, society, justice, and lawful conduct among others. So, the causality of all human action is purpose or teleology; an end to be accomplished. If this is true then the reason for human cooperation is also twofold: First is that Na-

ture or the natural order poses a challenge to human beings. And for man to surmount these natural challenges the human being needs to pool energies and resources together with other human beings so as to understand and control events. Even the social order that was created by man's initiative and sustained by mutual cooperation, in turn requires much more human cooperation to keep it running smoothly. This is possibly why some defenders of the social science theory called "functionalism" would argue that human society as an artificial person is to be likened to a living biological organism and that all the members or dimensions of society are likened to the various parts of that living organism which operate individually as well as together for a holistic purpose; the survival and thriving of that being.

While functionalism is not a perfect theory and indeed some have criticised it for good reasons, yet the point here is that the theory raises a concern about inclusion, integration, contribution, interaction, membership, participation, embrace, involvement, harmony, and cooperation (call it any name). Our common destiny and our common humanity cannot be underestimated. It means that each human being as an individual can only do as much as he or she is able to do, which is how much really? From the cradle to the grave, the womb to the tomb, every human being needs the support, criticism, and participation of others. Everything is accomplished faster and more easily when humanity cooperates at different levels – family, clan, tribe, religious community, village, town, institution, organization, association, state, etc. After all, even human beings in the primitive hunter-gatherer era knew this and sought to live and work together at that crude level of primitive society. In fact, the entire history of social and political philosophy is about seeking better ways that human beings can live together for a common purpose and attain higher goals beyond the capability of any individual man or even tribe. Even at the level of the State, the causality is that though the state is an artificial creation, yet it is equally "organic," meaning that it is animated; it lives; it can take on the form or thinking or behaviour of whomever – whether evil or humane, good or bad, such as is directing or controlling it at any point in time. By so doing, the state creates its own auto-immunity, it

can rise above or outlive any individual or group pressure prevailing on it also.

Now to talk about the economic realm or sphere is to focus on the genius and labour of human beings and the ways men generate and distribute wealth, investments, revenue, goods, and services. A society's economy is boosted when there is creativity in the use of the means of production – land, labour or manpower, capital or finance, and natural resources to build up the real sector, service sector, and financial sector. Any society that hopes to establish and sustain a good, stable, and viable economy needs to adopt some basic social values of hard work, fiscal or financial prudence, commitment, tenacity, foresight, best practices, due process, discipline, good work ethics, comparative advantage in manufacturing and production, good balance of trade and balance of payment, good use of technology among others.

One major problem with an economic order is that it tends to establish and sustain unequal relations in the mode of production and distribution. This is especially the case with capitalism. This is why you notice that except in the Marxian formulation of a primitive society and some African variants of communalism, almost all other key modes of production such as feudalism, capitalism, and even socialism in their cruder forms and stages promote class antagonism, exploitation, levies, taxes, tributes, expropriation of surplus value, individualism, 'winner-takes-it-all' syndrome, profiteering, inequality, dehumanization, alienation, deprivation, avarice or greed, corruption, misappropriation, squalor, otherness, discrimination, commodification and other modes of psychological and physical oppression and segregation of human beings. These are the clear and concrete dangers arising from the internal contradictions and mismanagement of the economic order. This then is the paradox of the capitalist economic order; a creator of wealth and promise of a comfortable life, yet a harbinger of unacceptable social inequality and inequity of wealth among human beings.

So, the question arises: How can the capitalist economic order retain the "sociality" of man? Some attempts to answer this question led to the creation of socioeconomic systems that put humanity back at the front of economic activity and benefits. The idea is to provide

some social checks and balances using ideas variants of ideas such as communism, communitarianism, philanthropy, labour – oriented industrialization, trust funds, Foundations, Federalism, Regionalism, small and medium-scale entrepreneurship, Cooperatives, welfarism, sustainable development goals, corporate social responsibility, and so on. However, some of these approaches, in turn, have been criticised too. The main issue to be appreciated is that in a socioeconomic system wealth, goods, and services need to be produced and shared equitably and sometimes compassionately. This is the “ideal” of a communist system.

Again, it is best that the natural resources, amenities, taxes, and wealth that a sub-region, state, zone, community or tribe produces is used to grow that local environment. The idea is to produce what you consume and grow at your own pace. This is the natural, pragmatic, and conservative way to do things. This is linked to the idea that a tribe or person does what he is best suited to do naturally or by nurture using the principle of comparative advantage. When one does what he is best suited to do, there is integration and complementary co-existence with others in a mutually cooperative and beneficial manner. There is also decentralization because each territory or region can govern itself and its resources better and appropriately and so that issue of over concentration of power is minimized. These are the basic elements of a stable, viable, and sustainable socioeconomic system. All of the above are the products of human thought and actions over the ages. Any economic order that promotes human greed and need-less exploitation as well as institutional leakages may not be able to function smoothly to generate wealth and ensure human well-being. These appear to be threats to ubuntu as a general way of life or an ethical perspective or even a philosophy of social organization. Let us analyse a moral philosopher’s view.

Adam Smith as a moral philosopher was well recognized for his contributions to ethics, logic, and political economy in his two works *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* and *The Wealth of Nations* (Samuels 1977: 189, Cropsey 1987: 635–636, Stokes 2003: 107). Adam Smith was a philosopher of economics who was widely known for the promotion of arguments to defend certain values of the liberal economic

tradition not solely as an economic doctrine but more importantly as a moral and philosophical system (Niel 1986: 611& 616, Oliver 1997: 152). He pushed for an empirical view of the human being and human society whereby because human nature was egoistic there was a need for a supervening power to moderate the affairs of men in a socially harmonious manner (Cropsey 1987: 639). The clincher here for Smith ought to be that a way ought to be devised whereby the commitments and concerns of individuals could coincide with the commitments and concerns of the entire society or the rest of the social members (Niel 1986: 612, Oliver 1997: 152). This idea can be attained when we have some unintended results of intended actions at the individual and social levels. Especially, such results would be beneficial to the society as a whole. Put in its simplest form the construct is that when a person intentionally serves his own interest, especially at the level of using his talent or what he knows best to do, then he unintentionally serves the interest of the entire society or others in the society (Powers 1956: 224, Stokes 2003:107). It means that there is an identity between the public and private advantage as a core value of Smith's philosophical theory of economic life of the society (Laird 1927: 42).

Another pillar of Smith's theory is the desire to accumulate or save. Naturally, every human being attempts to improve her/his condition (Laird 1927: 43). How can this be done? There appeared to be two domains where such a harmonization could be attained. These were the areas of defining a work ethic and constructing a conception of private property (Oliver 1997: 152). He argued against all obstacles or hindrances to the nurturing and appropriation of a free spirit, that is, the spirit of exercising one's enterprise. Such obstacles he rejected included a sense of nobility or exclusion that stopped others with talent from growing in the direction of free competition. Once there is free competition, the necessary result will be economic progress or expansion, enterprise, and the distribution of the value upon goods and labour in the best possible manner (Oliver 1997: 153). So, here lies the interface – the fact that individuals exist but cannot survive on their own for any reasonable length of time unless they moderate their egoism and work inadvertently with others to build a society based

on human collective values of sympathy, cooperation, common good, and community.

#### THE SOCIAL ORDER AND THE POLITICAL ORDER AS TRADITIONAL MEANS OF HUMAN ORGANIZATION

We see from the above analysis that society is very important in helping human beings attain fulfillment, just as human beings are important in sustaining society. There are two traditional ways of maintaining order in a human community: the social and the political. First is the political order. This is a means of social control based on the obedience to law and order as well as adherence to the rule of law by government and citizens of larger societies or countries. In such a society laws are central to peace and development because these embody properly laid down rules, regulations, statutes, and laws by the political and legal authorities, which are binding on all members of society without exception. In the political order, affairs are conducted formally or officially and the focus is on statecraft for the common good as well as political authority for the collective security of all. However, the political order is always under attack by subversive and insidious forces of deception, manipulation, terrorism, fraud, ethnicity, impunity, mistrust, and nepotism among the rulers and the ruled. This truncates efforts to attain the public good within the political order.

Secondly, the social order presumes regularity, stability, predictability, and organisation arising from kinship ties, associations, and friendly relations. Organization and control of social life are central to social order using the tool of negotiation and bargaining arising from balancing the conflicts of interests existing among individuals and the society. The social order operates within smaller groups such as ethnicities, tribes, family as a system of control using blood ties, morals, customary and traditional practices as well as ways of life. When the social order is expanded into a social system or scheme of social relations then it can also be applied to larger human formations such as countries using rules, regulations, laws, moral codes and cultural practices. In this manner, a social order defines the political, economic and social roles, rights, and duties of people. Unfortunately, social order is easily threatened by the antagonism and restiveness of

dominant or provincial ethnic and religious groups that have put their directing principles and values of egoism, hate speech, intolerance, and injustice ahead of human values. Despite these mechanisms or strategies for managing humanity, there are still problems hence the need for a continuous search for an ethical or political principle or value for dealing with the tendencies in human behaviour.

Human behaviour is critical to the survival of the human race. The question arises: How can human behavior be managed or controlled socio-politically and economically? An examination of the idea of Ubuntu dwells significantly on its social and ethical dimensions. Can there be an African philosophical input to this conversation? What connects human thoughts to theory formulation and then to practice or social life? Can the Africans survive without strong endogenous analytical reasoning, theoretical analysis, and conceptual frameworks for conceptualizing and explaining reality? Thought or thinking is essential to human life anywhere. A human being that exhibits problems with thinking deeply and properly can pose a danger to himself and others. This is clear evidence of the value of logic which theoretically and scientifically separates good from bad thinking using arguments, rules, axioms, formal systems, meta-logic, and so on. Logic is important to human life, because just as an athlete trains the body rigorously to excel in the mental and physical aspects of sports, most academic disciplines and their sub-branches train the human mind mostly, to become calculative, systematic, adept, and rigorous in processing ideas and mental categories. Specifically, the Africans are now challenged on the need to think right; allow their thought to dwell on posterity using adaptable and ingenious basic human values that promote life and well-being such as consensus, fair treatment, critical appraisal, respect for others and knowledge, lawful behavior and tolerance of diversity of human experience for building stable and viable social and political order on the continent. Global modernity and civilization in so far as these relate to contemporary Africa shows that some knowledge and practices considered anachronistic are still being practiced.

In this contemporary era, we notice that some people in social and public life across Africa face a very serious problem of separating

right and wrong behaviour in the public domain. This is particularly seen in a local case study of Nigeria, where poor public ethics and public trust have triggered corruption, abuse of power, disruption, instability, disorder, and disrespect for human dignity and the well-being of the people at different levels of society. We are challenged to seek better ways of improving the way people behave in the public arena, hence, an urgent need to improve the ethical quality of performance in social, public, and professional life, to promote security, communal living, and ethics among professionals. One effective way of addressing this problem is to evolve an alternate progressive ethical culture, by pursuing domestic policy that conceptually and evidentially elevates the pedestals and domains of moral conscience or consciousness among those who formulate, implement, or influence social policies in different areas of public life – in Government, Business, Education, Law, Medicine, Science and Technology as well as Communication using more inclusive or integration oriented human values of Ubuntu.

The African continent by and large, faces development challenges in the technological, economic, and socio-political aspects that are defined and tackled taxonomically and restrictively thus leading to conflict and dislocation in the economic, social, and political orders. On the one hand, conceptualizing development traditionally compels us to see it specifically in terms of the technological, economic, or political advancement of a country or race. Yet, there is the imperative of construing the development question holistically so as to highlight the concern for humanity. Here, the holistic approach suggests on the one hand, the pooling together of concomitant aspects of development such as we have in the core values combined to form the Millennium Development Goals or Sustainable Development Goals [MDG or SDG]. On the other hand, a holistic view, in a more important way, highlights a man-centered ethical view of development, without which even the technological and physical could be contradicted and compromised. This man-centered view, in turn, accommodates major humanistic and ethical elements or dimensions that define and promote human survival. So, the ethical and humanistic approach, in

turn, also converges with the concept of Ubuntu to emphasize on the human condition and the human interest.

#### CONCEPTUAL CLARIFICATION OF UBUNTU-RELATED SOCIOECONOMIC CONSTRUCTS

Let us clarify some concerns. Conceptual issues are important in the quest for knowledge as a way of simplifying, clarifying, analyzing, evaluating, and theorizing.

#### COMMUNITARIANISM: A WESTERN OFFSHOOT OF LIBERALISM OR INDIVIDUALISM

Communitarianism is something quite different. Kymlicka holds that communitarianism rejects liberalism because the liberal ideology is too individualistic and often ignores the fact that human beings desire and rely on communal relationships in order to attain their life goals and full human development. To show that communitarianism is a contested notion, he highlights the fact that scholars have tried to differentiate a backward-looking conception from a forward-looking approach to communitarianism. This point is consequential because communitarianism may not easily be able to provide a definite or single position about how human beings should relate to themselves (Kymlicka 2006: 368–369).

Be that as it may, an essential feature of communitarianism is that though the individual is the basic material of the universe just as individualism or liberalism professes, and that everything needs to work to the individual's benefit, yet in a very important sense the individual has an obligation to the society. This obligation, in a deep sense, creates a situation where the individual can no longer say categorically that he is more important than the society. This is because, without society, the individual will have no meaning as a social, political, economic, and even ontological being. The point is that without society the individual cannot achieve the fullest potential of his individuality. This is a delicate issue. So even though the individual exists in a liberal society, the individual needs to play a part in the development of the society. He needs to be socially aware and responsible. He owes the society something in return for society and its other members allowing the individual's talents and abilities to blossom under a liberal order. A person cannot realize his full potential until

he accepts and upholds values that are uniquely reposed and delivered by society, or social living in the community. What is central to communitarianism is that it is a social and ethical principle that tries to define the proper place of the individual as a primary element of the social order. Its acceptance compels the fashioning of a unique set of logic and meanings for related ethical and social concepts such as rights, duties, obligations, benefits, and burdens. Let us review an alternate ideology standing against capitalism and liberalism, which is the notion of communism.

#### COMMUNISM: A TELEOLOGICAL ADVANCEMENT BEYOND FEUDALISM, CAPITALISM, AND IMPERFECT SOCIALISM

Communism is for some political theorists such as the Marxian scholars and Marxists, the end of human political history. Communism is the idea that human society arrives at an endpoint after evolving through so many stages: primitive, feudal, capitalist, and socialist. The endpoint of the communist vision refers to a classless, egalitarian social system where the privately owned, class bound, and profiteering structures of the existing state system (local and international) that promote oppression, domination, antagonism, and inequality are removed or eliminated. What is essential to communism is that it is a political system of a nation, state, or nation state or group of countries, that stands against competing ideologies of liberalism and capitalism. Communism highlights the evils of capitalism mainly its tendencies to engage in crass profiteering, discrimination, antagonisms, dehumanization, and exploitation of the human being, his labor, and his production. Communism defends egalitarianism as an ideal even if it cannot attain this end in reality and defends a form of universal or global humanism which stands against social, racial, and economic discrimination and inequality among human beings. It tries to slow down selective humanism associated with class distinctions and the teleology of dehumanization and exploitation attending it. Communism is an outcome of the disagreement among social and economic classes. It seeks to build economic structures and policies that seek to counteract massive disparities in ownership and control of wealth and other resources.

According to Marx, the keynote of communism is the abolition of bourgeoisie private property which symbolises the age-long exploitation of the many by the few. The communist social order is the outcome of a unique historical sequence of revolutionary class struggles. These series of class struggles have always pitched two contending groups, the oppressor and oppressed classes against each other. Marx holds that in the past, there were class conflicts among the freemen and slaves, the patricians and plebeians, and the lords and serfs (Marx and Engels 1990: 416, 419 & 426). It applies the wealth and resources of the society in a manner of distributive justice so that the human dignity and well-being of all members are properly and equally accommodated. Communism is a way of doing politics that objects to ownership of private property and crass profiteering an anathema. While communism and its opponent capitalism are largely western notions, we need to look at an indigenous African view of human society known as communalism.

#### COMMUNALISM: AN AFRICAN SOCIAL AND ETHICAL WAY OF LIFE

On its part, communalism is essentially the idea that the individual human person in Africa cannot be complete as a social being unless the rest of the society or community participates actively in his life, in fact, the other human beings in the society define or determine the identity of a person or personality of an individual. The others in the society say who an individual is. It means that an African is a total or complete human person only when the physical, mental, and spiritual aspects are combined with his or her social acceptability or communal recognition. Put simply, the individual's life has meaning only within the context of the meanings of the lives of others in the community. Communalism is a social ethic that is common in most parts of Africa.

In communalism, a value system is developed in which an individual is brought up to cultivate an intimate sense of obligation and belonging to quite large groups of people on the basis of kinship affiliations. It means that solidarity or the feeling of belongingness among people as well as a quest for consensus are central to communalism as an ethos. What is essential to communalism is that it is a system

of social organization and cultural life, of small tightly knit kinship societies or units of human association such as we find in Africa. African communities are defined by the fact that “they are knit together by a web of kinship relations and other social structures” (Mbiti 1969: 208). Communalism is seen in the customs and practices such as deep feelings and expressions of intimacy as well as joint ownership of land and ideas. In what way if any is communalism different from communism as a related concept? Let us review the binding force of various kinds of community.

### INSTITUTION AND INSTITUTIONALIZATION

Every human society possesses institutions of different sorts: political, economic, social, educational, religious, and cultural among others. An institution is easily known or defined through its logical and empirical properties. An institution is identified by the values it upholds and defends. It defends these values deeply because, inevitably, they are generally accepted by its members who have thoroughly internalized or imbibed them. So, an institution ensures that its members assimilate its core values, namely, a complex cocktail of duties, obligations, norms, expectations, and relationships; meaning that there is a process of inculturation or institutionalization. Put simply, an institution is a carrier or driver of values; it is a value system (Johnson 1961: 15, 16, 20 & 21), or a system of values (McLean 2004: 209), a goal oriented formal organization, with its own voice, plans, mission, structure, officers, symbols, rituals, choice(s) and action (Van Reken 1999: 198).

An institution originates or arises from the manner in which people or a nation arranges its values – what it desires, chooses, considers important, or of interest. Such an institution needs to emanate from the people’s free will, voluntariness as well as innate and acquired abilities. A people’s values arise from their behavior, choices, and experiences, thus the institution(s) arising thereof must possess the capability and ability to meet with the social expectations and needs of the people; to provide social order, directing principle, and stability. So, an institution is a signpost or mirror of the values of a people or nation; a product of choice and performance (McLean 2004: 209-212). Put simply, an institution is a public agent of the

State, a purposive organization with a set of well-defined features. For an institution to be effective it needs to be capable of being institutionalized. Institutionalization suggests that the institution and all that it embodies have taken root (Ujomu 2004: 33). Put simply, this institution must be reliable, viable and predictable in ways that are capable of responding to the needs of the people that formed it. Any institution that is alien or foreign in its formative Will and is not substantially reformed in its legal and institutional framework remains an ancestral threat to the people it coexists with a predator. It will remain nothing other than a wolf in sheep's clothing among the sheep; a perennial danger to everyone who does not Will it into existence by having the capacity to create, criticize, control, or legitimize it. So, there will be an issue of teleology and sovereignty seen in the contradiction between that institution's legal framework as opposed to its moral core and public morality. Yet some institutions are not able to attain these goals of decision making for the common good of all. Rather, such institutions have been perverted, violated, hijacked, and relegated, thus posing a threat to collective survival (Ujomu 2004: 31-33). This simply means that an institution cannot give what it does not have. So, when we create institutions, we seek security, efficiency and continuity of the more general rules of human social living that the people have adopted and adapted. Let us now examine the idea of human nature from a philosophical viewpoint.

#### UBUNTU AS A SOCIOECONOMIC AND POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

It seems that we ought to key into the quest to alter or change the behavior and experience of man from the natural tendencies of human nature. Human nature in most evidential cases seeks to be primitively egoistic, harmful to others, intolerant, anachronistic, oppressive, disobedient to the rule of law, emotional and disdainful of the rules of logic, human achievement, objectivity and sound reasoning. This is the truth about human beings. This is one reason why there is a need for Ubuntu. Ubuntu as a cosmology or a view of the universe or specifically a conception of human society needs to be examined seriously as an indigenous ethical or social alternative to the *status quo* due to certain gaps noticed in the modern world as a

whole. Such gaps are prevalent in both the developed and developing societies.

The above shortfalls can be summarized this way: In most societies in the world today, we currently experience a conflict between the affirmation of formal political freedom and its tolerance of racial, religious, tribal, and socioeconomic inequalities which breeds alienation and contradicts human dignity and freedom. This makes us question the inequality and imposition of selective humanism and exclusion strategies that pervade most parts of the world today. The reality of dehumanization and disempowerment focuses on a dominant value-system that pursues exploitation, lack of rule of law, and structural discrimination as core values. These features are easily seen for instance, in the hegemonic domination or might is right in international politics, bad governance of African rulers arising from a political culture of neo-colonial state-centralism, foreign imposed top-down social engineering, and other strategies of marginalization. Marginality and marginalization reflect a faulty existential belief in political and economic discrimination that causes problems for vulnerable people.

More specifically, there is a need to clarify, in what way(s) if at all, can a philosophical study of Ubuntu contribute to the theoretical and practical quest for development in Africa. What are the logical and empirical properties of a philosophical view of development? The material dimension of development calls for a careful application of the dividends of science and technology to exploit and control the physical environment, while the moral aspect of development is made up of the consistent endeavor in regulating, as well as improving human relationships via the promotion of equality and mutual cooperation (Igbafen 2003: 2-3). As such philosophical view of development basically examines the idea of agency or the human factor and the role of ideas in fostering development. Specifically, a philosophical quotient previews the role of the mental aspects of a human person in the development issue. That is the reason it has been argued that the singular task of development is the well-being of the human person through a dualistic notion of development as material and moral (Wiredu in Oladipo 2000: 121). Ubuntu and development share the

quest for human dignity and cooperation in common. Dignity and cooperation require a sense of fairness, negotiation, and dialogue as ingredients of a developmental social order built on human, humanistic, and humane values. Let us look at a few of these viewpoints as a backdrop to Ubuntu.

This effort has both the theoretical and practical dimensions that are required for the society to enjoy peace, order, security, and development. All stakeholders and social actors need to revise the ethical dimension of their lives, focusing on the foundations of society and the development of moral principles in the practical cultural situations of African public affairs. A theoretical and practical study of ethics fulfills the need to make philosophy more down to earth, by making professionals more intellectually responsive to ethical and social challenges in the environment and ethically guided decision-making in key areas of public life. The idea is to develop in decision-makers and administrators a high degree of sensitivity to questions of right and wrong, and of moral obligation in policy matters. Also, some effort will be made to address public ethics shortfalls and citizenship/trust issues that have compromised national development, civility among the citizens, and governmental efficiency. Lastly, there will be a desire to strengthen the intellectual foundations of our private and public lives by building a social and ethical system that will reinforce our main institutions, and engender feelings of tolerance, justice, equity, and fairness in a multi-ethnic and multi-religious society such as Nigeria.

Human beings are required to exercise freedom and responsibility as morally sensible and autonomous agents in private and public life. This is the basis of human dignity and moral sense. However, the exercise of freedom and responsibility among humans also depends on man's activities as a social being within a culture and society. Human beings as social creatures need to live together by having a sense of belonging and working for a common purpose. Peace and cooperation are, or at least, ought to be, the two major ends of social life in a human society. Social life is made interesting through the establishment of laws, morality, and conventions that promote the life of individuals and the society. The tussle between life-promoting values

and life-threatening values illustrates the dynamics of the contest for dominance between self-regarding values and other regarding values.

Put simply, man survives and thrives because he can separate life-promoting actions from life-threatening actions in terms of their deontology or rules and even more importantly their consequences or teleology. The former acts that promote life, are approved, desired, and considered desirable. The latter, which are acts that undermine life, are prohibited, punished and undesirable. The desirable or desired is defended by rules and positive rewards while the undesirable is deterred by punishment and disapproval. To a large extent, we may ask individuals, groups, nations, and the world at large to behave in a morally and socially responsible and responsive manner due to the fact that it is right to do so, too. Put simply, we encourage or promote moral norms and moral values due to the reasons behind and consequences of actions. This is the approach or understanding that has been defended by ethical universalism and utilitarianism.

We could introduce some extra justification here. Viscount Samuel is correct when he declares that “men’s actions are governed by their ideas: right ideas lead to good actions and good actions bring welfare: wrong ideas lead to bad actions and bad actions bring suffering and disaster” (Samuel 1956: 199). Our point is that ubuntu demands ethically or morally sound behaviour due to the fact that human beings are related to each other in time, space and history, by virtue of their direct interrelations and their common humanity. Human beings are interrelated because of the social necessity of mutual cooperation with the fellow human beings. Mutual cooperation is imperative due to the presence and reality of forces and elements that are greater than and far beyond human powers and comprehension. Such elements are, for instance, God, nature, providence, destiny, and history.

If the above is the case, then individuals can be useful to themselves and to others on the ground that they are provided with the right human values as directing principles of human behaviour as well as the enabling social opportunities and conditions in order to develop and be productive for the good of the self and of humanity. Interestingly the deep and foundational consequence of human interaction

suggests that people in fact do actually work for themselves when they work for others, or they feel that they are working for others. Much of the time, the things you do to or for others have a way of returning to you as positive or negative rewards. This is so due to the interrelationship between human beings and societies. Therefore, the reason for adopting the human values of ubuntu rests on the concept of purpose. This is the idea that, in applying the ubuntu principles or values to the life of the individual or humanity at large, we are working for a lower and higher purpose or end.

Every human being we may argue requires or even deserves this opportunity of the human, humane, and humanistic values of ubuntu, to fulfill himself and benefit the self and the rest of humanity. Individuals and groups grow and progress because people make sacrifices for others within families, communities, countries, and the world at large. Thus, the need for humans to be hurtful, hateful, wicked, cruel, and destructive of good and productive things, can be viewed or queried as an inimical action that is needless and perhaps ineffectual in the existential scheme of things. Ubuntu in its ethical dimension offers us a prospect for change in human nature as well as social and political life that can be positively consequential for the security, peace, and progress of humanity. Ubuntu seems to offer the interesting possibility of an ethical notion or concept that could be both teleological and deontological; it upholds a rule of interconnecting human beings using values such as humaneness, compassion, and the dignity of life. It also focuses on the positive outcome or goal of bringing different races and classes of people together for peace, progress, and survival.

At one level ubuntu can be said to be an idea or a belief about the way the good life should be, so it is normative or prescriptive. The concern about how one ought to live his life in the society remains one of the fundamental topics of philosophical investigation all through human history. A number of scholars have offered different responses to this question with varying degrees of success. Elements of the ubuntu ideal could be located in the works of scholars of different eras from all around the world (Mwase 2013) thus in our view endorsing its global inclinations and acceptability. Such personalities Mwase says include John Rawls, Desmond Tutu, Martin Buber, Mo-

handas Gandhi, and Immanuel Kant among others. Other prominent exponents of Ubuntu include Bill Clinton and Nelson Mandela. One immediate implication of this is that the primitive elements that comprise ubuntu as a cultural and historical experience can be universalized and so can be found within and across nations and tribes (Ujomudike 2016). Ubuntu is in a more important sense, a value system, a scheme of social relations, or a way of life that determines human personal and social actions in the cultural, political, and economic domains of life in a society. It can be seen as a principle for guiding and underwriting human behavior at the individual, group, national, and even possibly the international level (Ujomudike 2016). The absence of the human values of Ubuntu poses a threat to social life at the national and international levels and thus becomes a problem for urgent attention.

The key human values of democracy include giving people a voice and choice through participation and consent at least politically. Also, there are values of tolerance, accommodation, and respect for others through freedoms, dialogue, and rule of law, negotiation through lobbying, interaction, consensus, litigation, and public enlightenment, as well as the belief that a human being gives his best as an individual and a group member when he is a stakeholder or contributor to social life through ethical behavior, trust, compassion, commitment and living together for the common good. This constellation of human values that puts humanity first, agrees that self-preservation and life-promoting behavior are primary to the survival of all societies, and are easily seen as the basis of the link between Ubuntu and democracy.

We are obliged to pose the following questions in order to apprehend the concept of Ubuntu:

- i. What is Ubuntu?
- ii. What constitutes the logical and empirical properties of Ubuntu?
- iii. Why should Ubuntu be taken seriously as a philosophical idea?
- iv. Can there be an African theory of Ubuntu as an indigenous ethical perspective?

The essence of ubuntu is the focus or reference to the interdependency of human beings; the idea that a human being is a complete person to the extent that the society gives him or her recognition as a person and allows him or her to realize the full potential and benefits of being a human person (Mwase 2013: 1-2). Also, ubuntu emphasizes the importance of other people or the society in the life of a human being. It highlights the fact that a person cannot do without others. Our individual lives are intricately and inextricably tied to the lives of others and we all need to cherish these interrelations and interconnections. The essentials of Ubuntu remain the emphasis on the fact that such interconnection should be guided by kindness, respect, cooperation, openness, accommodation, and willingness to work for others' interests. The difficulties that human beings encounter when pursuing the above goals and behavior illustrate clearly why Ubuntu is required. So, the philosophical basis of ubuntu rests on the belief in and realization of our common humanity; our sense or perception of being part of the whole human family.

Thus, the idea of Ubuntu retains a cocktail of features or values. Notable among such values or elements are respect for human dignity, the value of the human person, an ethic of care and compassion, as well as a push for key moral and democratic values such as consensus, dialogue, and tolerance among others. What is at the heart of ubuntu is a moral norm; a directing principle for governing human action; a pattern or principle of human relations; and a system of interaction by which human beings can positively develop themselves individually and collectively. More importantly, ubuntu is meant to foster a means of probable escape from or mitigation of certain egoistic, oppressive, denigrating, and conflictive elements inherent in human behavior as a result of his nature or nurture. Put simply, ubuntu promotes the desire to establish an ethical basis for human existence. Human existence may not make much sense unless there is room for an ethical dimension. What then is ethics? Ethics is the normative science of human behavior. It is the study of the way that human beings ought to behave and conduct their affairs in order to live properly, responsibly, and productively.

## UBUNTU AS THE VALUE OF HUMAN LIFE

The value of human life embraces other notions, such as respect for the rule of law, obedience to covenants or conventions, respect for the contributions of others as stakeholders, respect for fair treatment and fair play in social interaction, respect for human talent and attainment and respect for logical thinking and superior ideas as the driving force of social progress. So ‘we place a value on human life when we define a set of operative principles that determine our estimation of the human being as constitutive of certain features that earn him a particular treatment or consideration. The value of life is also related to our axiological premises for considering the human person to be deserving of certain goods (benefits or burdens) necessary for the rational pursuit of human well-being and happiness’ (Ujomu 2008, Ujomu P. O. and Olatunji F.O. 2013).

How is Ubuntu tied to human values? Human beings live by values or things that are important or desirable to them. Such things or values may not always be beneficial. But when something or a value is altogether of benefit, desirable, and important to man then it becomes a human value. Given that human behaviour is critical to the survival of the species or the human race, Ubuntu as a cosmology or conception of human society, needs to be discussed seriously as an ethical alternative to the *status quo* due to certain gaps noticed in modern society as a whole. Such gaps are prevalent in both the developed and developing worlds. Marginality is an ideologically false humanism that privileges a few over the many and affirms the domination of superior ability and power that yields immense gains in control and wealth that is disdainful and adverse in its teleology on other human beings. Certain globally pervasive yet problematic ideologies such as capitalism and colonialism, basically promote marginality due to their established values of alienation, exploitation, repression, dehumanization, and inequality of workers and aborigines. Essentially inequality and inequity breed a group of aggrieved, frustrated, and vulnerable people who may become a threat to themselves and others. These include rural dwellers, the low income earners, politicians, and business people disfavored by the current government in power, medium and low-level government workers, women, pensioners or

retired workers, rural peoples, uneducated people, physically challenged persons, destitute children, and the mass of unemployed and underemployed youth largely outside the coverage of human dignity and social welfare.

What sort of ethical correlates or moral values can emerge from the ubuntu principle to mitigate or slow down this surge of discrimination, inequity, and loss of human dignity at the national and international levels? It seems that the ethics or ethos of ubuntu avails us the opportunity to seek life promoting or life enhancing values. Values in themselves are things we desire, our choices, and things that are of interest to us. We require moral and democratic values that facilitate the realisation of a better quality or standard of life in the society. Certain positive moral and democratic values are aimed at promoting peace, justice, harmony, co-operation, consideration, compassion, honesty, and transparency among human beings (Ujomu 2016, 2019, 2020, and 2021). The three moral values crucial to the establishment of ubuntu in social order are the respect for human dignity, compassion, and justice.

Of particular importance is the value of respect for human dignity as a major element of ubuntu ethics. The dignity of the human person is maintained by imposing freedom, choice, and responsibility upon him. Responsibility is assured by the allocation of rights and corresponding duties. Rights and duties are ordained in order to ensure human dignity and respect. Some of the basic rights of man are inalienable, such as the right to life and protection of property, the right to be free, self-determining, and responsible. Such rights are more easily defended in some types of society rather than others. For instance, what are the key principles, features, institutions, and values of a democratic society that facilitate ubuntu ethics? The primary democratic values are freedom, equality, and justice. However, we may include tolerance, participation, dialogue, and fair treatment among others. What is the link between Ubuntu and such democratic values?

The idea is that there are certain ways of doing things that human beings ought to embrace because these promote human wellbeing, peace, stability, security, inclusiveness, actualization of individu-

al human potential, consensus, participation, and prosperity in the social system. Democracy ought to be encouraged due to some reasons outlined below. Democracy as a political or social system promotes certain values. Some of the key values of democracy affirm the basic fact that, despite the differences in human talents, gifts, strengths, and endowments, the similarities between men are more profound and significant than the differences between them. Such talents and diverse qualities can be used for the benefit of the human person and society.

More importantly, every man is recognised as a being that possesses equal moral worth, human dignity, moral responsibility, and freedom, just like any other man (Dewey 1963: 475, 1992: 321-322). Some of the equalities that democracy upholds may be social, economic, political, and legal. For instance, politically, a democracy allows each man the right to vote, and be voted for, and the right to engage in other forms of legitimate political association. Also, democracy affirms legal equality of every man before the law and the provision of equal opportunities for all. Democracy nurtures a sense of participation in social life and ensures that everyone retains a stake in the society and its resources, through socially just policies, opportunities, and actions. In this way, democracy ensures that everyone participates in promoting the social goods he has participated in producing. Democracy, by allowing each person to exercise his intelligence, talents and creativity, ensures that he is accountable as a stakeholder in the society. The individual can be seen to be valuable. He can add value and make a contribution to the social system. More so, by allowing popular elections, debate on issues of collective concern, freedoms of worship, speech, and association, and equality before the law, democracy offers individuals greater opportunity to realise their human potential. Ubuntu simply put is that principle that seems to allow the human being to attain his fullest potential in a manner co-terminous with other human interests.

### CONCLUSION

Ubuntu remained an endogenous paradigm of development in Africa. We utilized Ubuntu ethics to countermand the current dominant social paradigm (DSP) of hatred, intolerance, abuse of human

rights, internal and external colonialism, dehumanization, exploitation, authoritarianism, poverty, and oppression that plagued the world and Africa specifically. Ubuntu as a value system or construct relied on the template of some key moral and democratic values for African liberation and transformation. Ubuntu ethics established a set of values whereby human beings lived according to certain human and humane principles such as reciprocity, common good, peaceful relations, emphasis on human dignity and the value of human life as well as consensus, tolerance, and mutual respect. Ubuntu ethical correlates served as materials that established stable and viable human relations in the national and even the international system. Ubuntu conceptualized as an ethical idea and praxis, was a powerful tool that made Africans more capable of tackling their natural and man-made existential predicaments.

## REFERENCES

Cropsey, Joseph. *Adam Smith (1723–1790)*, in Leo Strauss and Joseph Cropsey, edited. *History of Political Philosophy, Third Edition*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1987, pp. 635–659.

Dewey, J. 1963. “Morals and the Political Order.” in J. Santoni and R. Somerville edited. *Readings in Social and Political Philosophy*. New York: Anchor Books.

Dewey, J. 1992. “A Defense of Democracy.” in J. Burr et al. edited. *Philosophy and Contemporary Issues*. New York: Macmillan. pp. 320–324.

Gamble Andrew. *An Introduction to Modern Social and Political Thought*. London: Macmillan, 1981.

Igbafen, M. L. 2003. *Basic Issues and Theories in Philosophy of Development*. Ekpoma: A. Inno Printing Press.

Johnson, Harry. M. 1961. *Sociology: A Systematic Introduction*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Kymlicka, Will. 2006. “Communitarianism.” in Donald M. Borchert. edited. *Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Second Edition. New York: Thomson Gale. pp. 368–369.

Laird John. 1927. “The Social Philosophy Of Smith’s Wealth of Nations.” *Journal of Philosophical Studies*. (January) Vol. 1, no. 5. pp. 39–51.

Marx, Karl and Friedrich Engels. 1990. *Manifesto of the Communist Party*. In Mortimer J. Alder. Edited. *Great Books of the Western World*, 50 Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica Inc.

Mbiti, John. S. 1969. *African Religions and Philosophy*. London: Heinemann.

McLean, George F. 2004. “Institutional Patterns in Social Transformation.” In George F. McLean and Robert Magliola and Joseph Abah. Edited. *Democracy and Values in Global Times*. Washington. D.C.: Catholic University of America. pp. 207–225.

Mwase, Isaac M. T. 2013. *Aspects of Ubuntu for International Research Ethics*. Fifth Annual Teaching Skills in International Research Ethics (TaSkR) Workshop. Indiana University: Center for Bioethics. April 17 – 19, 2013. 1–27.

Nieli, Russell. 1986. “Spheres of Intimacy and the Adam Smith Problem.” *Journal of the History of Ideas*. Vol. XLVII, No.4. pp. 611–624.

Olusegun, Oladipo. 2000. “Nigeria in the Twenty-First Century, Challenges of Freedom and Development” in Olusegun Oladipo edited *Recall*. Ibadan: Hope Publications. pp. 120–130.

Powers, Richard H. 1956. “Adam Smith Practical Realist.” *The Southwestern Social Sciences Quarterly*. Vol. 37. No. 3. pp. 222–233.

Samuel, Viscount Rt. Hon. 1956. “Philosophy and the life of the nation.” *Philosophy*. XXXI. (118): 197–212.

Samuels, Warren J. 1977. “The Political Economy of Adam Smith.” *Ethics*. Vol. 87. No. 3. pp. 189–207.

Ujomu, P.O. 2004. “Democratic Institutions, Participation and the problems of social engineering in an African nation-state” *Perspectives on Democracy and Development in Post-Military Nigeria*. Kunle Ajayi and Bonnie Ayodele. Edited. Ibadan: Julius and Julius. pp. 30–54.

Ujomu, P. O. 2008. “The Bounds of Security Theorizing: Envisioning Discursive Inputs For The Rectification Of A Postcolonial Situation” Professor D. Adelugba D and Dr P. Ujomu 2008. *Rethinking Security in Nigeria: Conceptual issues in the quest for social order and national integration*. Dakar: CODESRIA. pp. 5–56.

Ujomu, P. O. and F. O. Olatunji, 2013. “The value of human life and a philosophy of national security for Nigeria: some theoretical issues.” *Annales Philosophici/ Annals of Philosophy*. Vol. 6. No. 1. (June) pp. 47–67.

Ujomu, P. O. and F.O. Olatunji, (2014). “Some models of social order in the history of philosophy.” *Redemptorist Studies/ Studia Redemptorystowskie*. Issue: 12. Vol. 12. No. 1. December. pp. 145–170.

Ujomudike, P. O. 2016. "Ubuntu Ethics." in *Encyclopedia of Global Bioethics*. ed. Dr. H. Ten Have. Edited Switzerland: Springer International. 2869–2881.

Ujomu, Philip Ogo. 2019. "Human Dignity and Social Order as Key Values for an Endogenous African Development." *AGATHOS: An International Review of the Humanities and Social Sciences*. Vol. 10. no. 2. pp. 267–281.

Ujomu, Philip Ogo. 2019. "Philosophy, Rationality and Decision-Making: Basic Techniques And Tools Of Building The Human Mind." *Philosophy. Философия*. Volume 28, Number 3. 251–263.

Ujomu, P. O. 2020. "Africa's Crisis of Social and Political Order and the Significance of Ubuntu Human Values for Peace and Development." *Culture and Dialogue 8 Special Edition On African Thought and Dialogue*. Volume. 8, pp. 97–115.

Ujomu, P. O. 2021. "Human Nature, Social Order and Ubuntu Human Values For African Development." *Divyadaan*. Vol. 32/1. pp. 55–66.