

Beyond Western Individualism: African and Chinese Philosophical Alternatives in Ontologies of Being, Relationality and Society

Dr. Taling Tene Rodrigue

Lecturer, Research Fellow from Cameroon, Director of the Center for African Film & TV, Vice Director of the Center for Francophones Studies, Institute of African Studies, Zhejiang Normal University, China. 688 Yingbin road Jinhua Zhejiang, China

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51244/IJRSI.2025.12120134>

Received: 15 December 2025; Accepted: 20 December 2025; Published: 17 January 2026

ABSTRACT

This paper undertakes a critical comparative analysis of African and Chinese philosophical alternatives to Western individualism, examining how these non-Western traditions conceptualize being, relationality, and society in fundamentally distinct ways. The hegemony of Western individualism—rooted in Cartesian epistemology, liberal social contract theory, and rights-based political discourse—has profoundly shaped global understandings of personhood, prioritizing the autonomous, self-sufficient individual as the primary unit of moral, political, and ontological analysis. However, this paradigm increasingly faces scrutiny for its inadequacy in addressing the relational, communal, and holistic dimensions of human existence that characterize African and Chinese philosophical traditions.

Through systematic comparative philosophical and textual analysis, this study examines core African concepts including Ubuntu (Interdependency), Ntu (vital force), Ujamaa (communal economics), and Ma'at (cosmic order), alongside Chinese Confucian principles such as Ren (仁, benevolence), Li (礼, ritual propriety), Dao (道, The Way), and Tianren Heyi (天人合一, unity of Heaven and humanity). The analysis reveals profound convergences between these traditions: both ground personhood in relationality rather than individual essence, emphasize communal welfare and social harmony over individual autonomy, conceive reality as unified through vital energy rather than divided into separate substances, and integrate human existence within cosmic and natural orders.

These philosophical complementarities carry significant implications for contemporary China-Africa relations, particularly the shared vision of building a “Community with a Shared Future for Mankind.” By providing non-Western foundations for international cooperation grounded in mutual respect, reciprocal benefit, and common destiny, African and Chinese philosophies offer robust alternatives to zero-sum competitive models derived from Western individualism. This paper argues that these relational ontologies can enrich global political-philosophical discourse, contribute to decolonizing international relations theory, and foster more holistic understandings of human flourishing that honor both individual dignity and communal belonging.

Keywords: Ubuntu, Confucianism, Western individualism, Comparative philosophy, China-Africa relations, Community with a Shared Future for Mankind

INTRODUCTION

Contextualization: The Hegemony of Western Individualism in Global Philosophical Discourse

The dominance of Western individualism in contemporary philosophical discourse has profoundly shaped global understandings of personhood, society, and human existence. Rooted in the Enlightenment tradition and epitomized by René Descartes' famous dictum “Cogito, ergo sum” (“I think, therefore I am”), Western philosophy has long prioritized the autonomous individual as the primary unit of moral, epistemological, and political analysis (Descartes, 1641/1996). This individualistic orientation, which emphasizes personal autonomy, rational self-determination, and individual rights, has become the normative framework through which

modernity itself is understood, influencing everything from constitutional law and human rights discourse to economic theory and educational philosophy. The Cartesian revolution established “the thinking self” as the indubitable foundation of knowledge and existence, creating a philosophical tradition that treats individual consciousness as ontologically and epistemologically prior to social relationships.

The liberal tradition further consolidated this individualistic paradigm through social contract theories proposed by Thomas Hobbes, John Locke, and Jean-Jacques Rousseau, who conceptualized society as originating from agreements among free, self-interested individuals who consent to government for the purpose of securing individual rights (Locke, 1689/1980; Rousseau, 1762/1997). Locke’s theory, particularly influential in shaping modern democratic institutions, treats individuals as possessing natural rights to life, liberty, and property that precede and constrain political authority (Locke, 1689/1980). Government legitimacy, in this framework, depends fundamentally on the protection of individual rights and consent of autonomous individuals who remain ontologically and morally prior to social institutions.

The Western liberal tradition has thus constructed a vision of personhood characterized by what critics describe as a “self-contained and self-sufficient” individual (Giddens and Sutton, 2021, p. 112). This conception treats the self as ontologically prior to social relationships, with personal autonomy and independence serving as the highest values. As contemporary scholarship notes, this individualistic framework emphasizes “individual agency, independence, and personal rights” as the defining features of human existence (Chirkov et al., 2003, p. 98).

Problem Statement: The Limitations of Western-Centric Paradigms

The Western-centric paradigm has increasingly faced scrutiny for its inability to adequately address the relational, communal, and holistic dimensions of human existence that characterize non-Western philosophical traditions. Critics argue that Western individualism fosters social atomization, diminishes communal bonds, and contributes to what scholars term “hyperindividualism”—an excessive prioritization of personal autonomy at the expense of collective responsibility and social cohesion. In fact, the Kenyan philosopher Mbiti argues that, liberal tradition’s construction of individuals who exist independently of social relationships has proven inadequate for understanding human flourishing in contexts where communal belonging and relational interdependence are recognized as fundamental to personhood itself (Mbiti, 1969).

The problem extends beyond mere cultural difference to fundamental philosophical limitations. Western individualism’s emphasis on self-sufficiency and independence obscures the fundamental interdependence that characterizes human existence, creating philosophical and practical difficulties in explaining moral obligations to others, justifying communal goods that override individual preferences, and fostering social solidarity necessary for addressing collective challenges. Furthermore, research suggests that societies characterized by extreme individualism do not necessarily produce greater life satisfaction or human flourishing compared to those emphasizing communal values and interdependence. The promise of freedom through isolation may prove illusory, as meaningful autonomy requires supportive social contexts and recognition from others.

The hegemonic status of Western individualism in global philosophical discourse thus represents not merely an intellectual limitation, but a form of epistemic injustice that marginalizes equally sophisticated non-Western philosophical traditions. African and Chinese philosophies, with their emphases on relationality, communal well-being, and cosmic harmony, offer profound alternatives that have been systematically excluded from mainstream philosophical canons and international relations theory. This exclusion has practical consequences, shaping development models, governance structures, and international cooperation frameworks in ways that may be fundamentally incompatible with the values and social ontologies of non-Western societies.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY

This paper provides a systematic comparative analysis of African and Chinese philosophical alternatives to Western individualism. It establishes five primary aims: examining Western individualism’s historical roots from Cartesian epistemology through liberal theory; analyzing core African concepts like Ubuntu, Ujamaa, and Sankofa that emphasize relational personhood; investigating Chinese Confucian principles including Ren, Li,

and Tianren Heyi that structure life around harmony and reciprocal relationships; conducting rigorous comparative analysis to identify convergences and divergences between these traditions; and drawing implications for contemporary China-Africa relations and the vision of a “community with a shared future.”

Guided by the key research question of “How do African and Chinese philosophical traditions conceptualize being, society, and personhood through relational and communal frameworks, and what are their implications for challenging Western individualism, informing cross-cultural philosophical dialogue, substantiating China-Africa cooperation, and contributing to global political-philosophical discourse on communal ethics and shared futures?”, the study employs a comparative, hermeneutic, and critical methodological approach that engages canonical texts and key concepts from Western, African, and Chinese philosophical traditions.

The methodology consists of four integrated components:

- First, textual analysis of primary philosophical sources, including Descartes’ Meditations on First Philosophy, Locke’s Second Treatise of Government, classical Confucian texts such as the Analects (Lunyu), Mencius, and Xunzi, as well as contemporary African philosophical works by Mbiti, Menkiti, Gyekye, Ramose, Wiredu, and Metz.
- Second, systematic conceptual analysis of core philosophical concepts, examining how terms such as “personhood,” “relationality,” “community,” “harmony,” and “cosmic order” function within each tradition, with attention to both similarities and divergences.
- Third, comparative philosophical analysis employing both “analogue comparison” (examining relations among doctrines) and “counterpart comparison” (elucidating parallels concerning concepts or problems), recognizing that concepts perceived intuitively as analogous seldom correspond adequately given different historical and cultural contexts.
- Fourth, critical engagement with historical developments, and critiques of each tradition, avoiding both uncritical celebration of non-Western philosophies and dismissive rejection based on Western philosophical standards. This critical stance recognizes that philosophical traditions are historically dynamic, internally diverse, and subject to legitimate contestation regarding interpretation and contemporary application.

The methodology is grounded in the recognition that achieving mutual intelligibility across diverse philosophical frameworks requires understanding structures and functions of concepts as influenced by language, culture, social organization, and historical experiences. Carefully interpreting these non-Western alternatives clarifies both what is problematic in prevailing Western individualism and how alternative frameworks allow for different forms of personhood and social organization.

Western Individualism as Philosophical Hegemony

Historical and Philosophical Background

The philosophical architecture of Western individualism developed over centuries, emerging from a confluence of religious, institutional, and intellectual transformations that progressively centered the individual as the primary unit of reality, morality, and politics (Giddens and Sutton, 2021). While this framework is not monolithic, its core features provide essential context for understanding the alternative communal ontologies offered by African and Chinese thought.

Medieval and Renaissance Foundations

The ideological seeds of individualism were sown in late antiquity and cultivated throughout the Middle Ages. A pivotal shift occurred around 400 CE with the Western Church’s Marriage and Family Program, which actively dismantled kin-based institutions in favor of nuclear family structures (Henrich, 2020). This institutional change promoted traits of independence and personal achievement, shifting focus from the extended clan to the individual soul. The medieval emphasis on individual salvation and personal moral responsibility before God laid crucial groundwork for later secular individualism (Taylor, 1989).

This trend accelerated with the Renaissance revival of classical humanism, which celebrated human dignity and the capacity for self-determination. Renaissance thinkers recovered ancient Greek and Roman texts emphasizing individual virtue, rational inquiry, and civic participation, creating new cultural space for celebrating individual achievement in arts, sciences, and statecraft. The subsequent Protestant Reformation further entrenched individualism by championing a personal relationship with the divine and private scriptural interpretation, thereby undermining hierarchical ecclesiastical authority and elevating the primacy of individual conscience (Weber, 1905/2002).

The Cartesian Revolution

The Enlightenment period solidified individualism as a core philosophical doctrine, moving from religious conscience to rational autonomy. René Descartes' famous proposition "Cogito, ergo sum" ("I think, therefore I am") marks the philosophical birth of the modern individual (Descartes, 1641/1996). By grounding all certainty in the solitary, thinking subject, Descartes established an introspective and self-referential model of the self, known first and foremost as a non-extended, immaterial thinking substance (*res cogitans*) separate from the external world and even from one's own body (*res extensa*).

This Cartesian turn represented a radical reorientation in philosophy. As contemporary scholars note, Descartes "did what, for the god-fearing scholastics, would have been almost inconceivable: he identified reason itself as the locus of one's transcendental essence" (Colli, 2023, p.3). The cogito placed the individual mind at the foundation of all knowledge, establishing the autonomous, rational subject as the primary epistemological and ontological category. This dualistic framework created what philosophers call the "mind-body problem": if mind and body are fundamentally different substances, how can they interact? Yet despite conceptual difficulties, Cartesian dualism profoundly shaped Western understandings of personhood, consciousness, and the relationship between mental and physical phenomena.

Liberal Political Philosophy and Social Contract Theory

Building upon Cartesian foundations, Enlightenment political philosophers reconceived society as a construct of pre-existing individuals. Thomas Hobbes argued that social order emerges from a contract between individuals motivated by self-preservation in a hypothetical "state of nature" characterized by competition and insecurity (Hobbes, 1651/1996). John Locke posited that individuals possess inalienable natural rights to life, liberty, and property that precede and constrain the state, with government legitimacy depending on consent and protection of these rights (Locke, 1689/1980). Jean-Jacques Rousseau proposed that free individuals voluntarily create political authority through a social contract to protect common interests while preserving individual liberty (Rousseau, 1762/1997).

These social contract theories share fundamental assumptions about the ontological and moral priority of individuals over society. As one scholar explains, the liberal conception "treats individuals as ontologically and morally prior to society, with social bonds viewed as instrumental means to protect individual interests" (Sandel, 1982, p. 54). Political authority must be justified by demonstrating that it protects individual rights, with government serving as a neutral arbiter among competing autonomous individuals rather than as an active cultivator of communal virtue or collective welfare.

Kantian Moral Autonomy

Immanuel Kant provided the ethical capstone to Enlightenment individualism, arguing that true morality stems from individual autonomy. For Kant, the individual is a self-legislating agent who derives universal moral laws through reason alone, making the individual will the source of moral authority (Kant, 1785/1998). Kantian autonomy represents the capacity to act according to principles one gives oneself through rational deliberation, independent of external authorities, traditions, or social pressures. This conception establishes individual rational agency as the foundation of human dignity and moral worth, with respect for persons requiring recognition of their status as autonomous legislators of universal law.

Core Features of Western Individualism

The legacy of these historical developments manifests in several core features that collectively define Western individualism as a philosophical and cultural paradigm:

Ontological Individualism

Western individualism asserts the ontological primacy of the individual as the fundamental unit of reality and analysis. Individuals are conceived as self-contained substances possessing inherent properties, capacities, and boundaries independent of particular social relationships. Personal identity is understood as self-authored through individual choices, with authenticity requiring freedom from external social constraints that might distort one's "true self." This atomistic conception treats social relationships as secondary to individual existence and potentially threatening to personal autonomy (Sandel, 1982).

Epistemological Individualism

Following Descartes, Western epistemology privileges individual rational cognition as the foundation of knowledge. The method of systematic doubt seeks certainty through individual consciousness, establishing the thinking self as the indubitable ground of knowledge (Descartes, 1641/1996). This epistemological individualism extends through the Enlightenment tradition, emphasizing individual reason, empirical observation by autonomous subjects, and scientific method as the primary paths to truth. Knowledge is conceived as an individual achievement, with communal wisdom and ancestral knowledge relegated to secondary or preliminary status subject to rational individual critique.

Moral and Political Individualism

Western ethics, flowing from the autonomous individual, is predominantly rights-based and universalist. Grounded in the work of thinkers like Locke and Kant, it prioritizes the protection of individual liberties, agency, and natural rights through universal moral laws derived from reason (Kant, 1785/1998; Locke, 1689/1980). The purpose of morality is to safeguard the individual's sphere of freedom from interference by others or the state. Political legitimacy derives from consent of autonomous individuals and is measured by capacity to protect pre-existing individual rights rather than to cultivate communal virtue or collective well-being.

Economic Individualism

In the economic sphere, individualism manifests as the promotion of personal economic interests within free market systems. Adam Smith's theory of the "invisible hand" suggests that, individuals pursuing rational self-interest unintentionally promote collective welfare through market mechanisms (Smith, 1776/1994). This economic individualism emphasizes private property rights, freedom of contract, and minimal state interference in economic activity, treating individuals as rational utility-maximizers whose voluntary exchanges create optimal resource allocation.

Methodological Individualism

In social scientific methodology, individualism requires that all social phenomena must be explained through the actions and motivations of individuals. Methodological individualism, championed by economists like F.A. Hayek and philosophers like Karl Popper, insists that social structures, institutions, and collective entities have no independent causal power but are merely aggregations of individual behaviors and choices (Hayek, 1944/2007). This approach rejects holistic explanations that attribute causal efficacy to social wholes, communities, or cultural systems.

African and Chinese Communalism: Philosophical Alternatives

African Philosophical Alternatives: Ubuntu and Beyond

Ubuntu: "I am because we are"

In stark contrast to the Cartesian cogito stands the African philosophical concept of “Ubuntu”, which fundamentally challenges Western assumptions about the nature of personhood and being. Ubuntu, derived from Nguni Bantu languages (including Zulu and Xhosa), is commonly translated as “I am because we are” (Mbiti, 1969; Tutu, 1999). This formulation inverts the Cartesian logic by asserting that individual existence and identity are not self-evident facts of isolated consciousness but rather emerge through relationships within community. The Zulu phrase “Umntu ngumuntu ngabantu” (“A person is a person through other persons”) succinctly captures this understanding that one’s identity is intrinsically linked to the community and the social bonds one cultivates (Shutte, 2001). As Kenyan philosopher and theologian, John Mbiti famously articulated: “I am, because we are; and since we are, therefore I am” (Mbiti, 1969, p. 106). This philosophical formulation establishes community as ontologically prior to individuality, reversing the Western liberal assumption that society is constructed by pre-existing autonomous individuals.

Core Principles of Ubuntu

Ubuntu’s philosophical system is built upon several interconnected principles that collectively define African communalism (Ramose, 1999):

- First, the principle of humanity (Botho) emphasizes a universal bond connecting all humanity and prioritizes communal welfare over individual success. This principle establishes that one’s full humanity is realized not in isolation but through recognition of and participation in shared human community.
- Second, communalism stresses the importance of the community’s welfare, fostering solidarity, cooperation, and mutual support. The community is not merely an aggregation of individuals but an organic whole whose flourishing creates conditions for individual well-being.
- Third, respect and dignity involve recognizing the inherent worth of every person regardless of social status, ethnicity, or background. Ubuntu’s emphasis on universal human dignity paradoxically emerges from its communal foundations: because all persons participate in shared humanity, each deserves recognition and respect.
- Fourth, compassion and empathy center on caring for others’ well-being and demonstrating kindness in all interactions. These are not optional virtues but essential capacities that constitute personhood itself.

These principles are not merely abstract ideals but are expressed through cultural practices such as communal rituals, reverence for elders, collective child-rearing, shared resource management, and restorative approaches to justice that prioritize reconciliation and restoration of social harmony over retribution.

Personhood as Ubuntu’s Achievement

The philosophical foundations of Ubuntu reveal a fundamentally different understanding of being itself. African philosophy conceives personhood not as an inherent or autonomous quality but as a status bestowed through relational engagement within community. As philosopher Ifeanyi Menkiti argues in his influential essay “Person and Community in African Traditional Thought,” personhood is achieved through meaningful social participation and moral development, making the individual “a center of moral and social relations” rather than a pre-social atomic entity (Menkiti, 1984, p. 172). This conception means that one can be more or less of a person depending on one’s moral conduct and contribution to community. A newborn infant possesses biological humanity but must develop full personhood through social integration, moral education, and demonstrated virtue. Inversely, one who acts in ways that violate communal norms and undermine social harmony diminishes their own personhood. As Menkiti explains, “as far as Africans are concerned, the reality of the communal world takes precedence over the reality of individual life histories, whatever these may be” (Menkiti, 1984, p. 171).

This relational view challenges Western notions by suggesting that individual identity cannot be divorced from communal obligations and that personal ethics are grounded in the quality of relationships and contributions to collective welfare. Desmond Tutu eloquently articulates this principle: “My humanity is caught up, is inextricably bound up, in yours. We belong in a bundle of life. We say ‘a person is a person through other

persons.’ It is not ‘I think therefore I am.’ It says rather: ‘I am human because I belong. I participate, I share’ (Tutu, 1999, p. 31).

Additional African Philosophical Concepts

While Ubuntu provides the most widely recognized articulation of African communalism, a broader landscape of concepts enriches African philosophical thought:

Ujamaa (Swahili), meaning “familyhood,” refers to extended family, communal economics, and social sharing. Julius Nyerere, former President of Tanzania, promoted Ujamaa as a cornerstone for national development, arguing that it represented an operative principle aimed at restructuring society along the lines of African family structures emphasizing collective ownership and mutual aid (Nyerere, 1968).

Harambee (Swahili), meaning “all pull together,” embodies collective social action and unity in pursuing shared goals. This East African concept emphasizes communal mobilization for common projects, from infrastructure development to social support, reflecting the principle that community challenges require collective responses (Mbithi and Rasmusson, 1977).

Sankofa (Akan): The West-African Principle of Retrieving Ancestral Wisdom

Often symbolized by a bird looking backward, teaches learning from the past for future good, emphasizing ancestral wisdom as foundation for moral life. This principle urges looking backward to move forward wisely, seeing past traditions and ancestor wisdom as essential foundations for current moral cultivation (Dei, 2010). Sankofa originates from the Akan language of Ghana and literally translates to “go back and get it” or “return and fetch it,” composed of three Akan words: san (“to return”), ko (“to go”), and fa (“to fetch, to seek and take”). The most famous proverb associated with Sankofa states: “Se wo were fi na wosankofa a yenkyi,” which translates as “It is not wrong to go back for that which you have forgotten” or “There is no shame in returning to retrieve what you have forgotten.” In contemporary application, Sankofa invites reflection on how to address current social injustices by learning from past movements for change, how traditional practices can inform sustainable relationships with the environment, and how understanding historical roots of conflicts can bridge divides and promote peace. As a timeless concept transcending borders and generations, Sankofa affirms that human flourishing depends on honoring ancestral wisdom while moving courageously into the future.

Ma’at (Kemet): Ancient Egyptian Goddess of Truth, Justice, and Cosmic Order

Ma’at was an ancient Egyptian goddess and philosophical principle embodying truth, justice, harmony, balance, and cosmic order. Her name means “that which is straight,” and she represented one of Black Egypt’s most fundamental concepts. Depicted as a winged woman with an ostrich feather, Ma’at governed the universe—from celestial bodies to human conduct—maintaining order against Isfet (chaos). She served as the guiding spirit of Egyptian justice, with judges wearing her image as symbols of authority. The 42 Laws of Ma’at established moral guidelines for all social classes. Most significantly, in the “Weighing of the Heart” ceremony, the deceased’s heart was weighed against Ma’at’s feather to determine afterlife destiny. Pharaohs invoked her name to legitimize their rule, and her influence permeated Egyptian wisdom literature, emphasizing benevolence and social harmony. Ma’at represents an ordered and balanced moral cosmos that aligns with the fabric of the universe itself, establishing that justice and ethical conduct reflect cosmic principles rather than mere human convention (Karenga, 2004).

Ntu/Nsi (Bantu), in many Bantu philosophical traditions, names a fundamental, universal life force or vital energy that underlies and animates all that exists. In this view, reality is not made up of inert, self-contained substances, but of interrelated forces that continually affect one another. Placide Tempels, a Belgian missionary in his classic study “Bantu Philosophy,” captures this by saying that “Force is the nature of Being, Force is Being, Being is Force,” meaning that to exist is to be a dynamic center of power in relation with other forces, not a static “thing.” (Tempels, 1959, p. 51) On this account, humans, animals, ancestors, natural phenomena, and even objects are all nodes or concentrations of Ntu, differing in intensity and quality of force rather than in kind. This vital-force metaphysics supports a deeply relational worldview: actions are understood as

modifications of the web of forces, so morality, health, misfortune, and social harmony are interpreted in terms of how well these forces are balanced, enhanced, or diminished. It also contrasts sharply with substance-based metaphysics in much Western philosophy, replacing the idea of fixed essences with a picture of reality as ongoing, interactive process.

Seriti (Sesotho/Lesotho) in Sesotho thought refers to a person's spiritual presence, "aura" or "shadow," which expresses their moral and spiritual quality. It is understood as a person's (spiritual) energy that can grow, weaken, or be damaged through one's actions, relationships, and character. A person with strong seriti is seen as dignified, trustworthy, and influential, attracting respect and support; someone with diminished seriti may face social marginalization or misfortune. Seriti is not purely individual: it is shaped by family, ancestors, and community, and its effects radiate outward, impacting others for good or ill. Moral development, right conduct, and proper ritual are therefore viewed as ways of strengthening seriti, with concrete social and spiritual consequences that extend beyond the self. This concept suggests that moral development produces tangible spiritual and social effects that extend beyond the individual (Setiloane, 1976).

Ukama (Shona) in Shona thought is a relational concept that understands personhood and community through an extended web of kinship linking humans, ancestors, other living beings, and the land itself. It goes beyond biological family to include neighbors, strangers, animals, rivers, forests, and spiritual beings as part of one interconnected moral community. In this view, to be human is to stand in right relationship with all these others, so ethical life involves caring for people, environment, and spiritual relations together rather than separating "society" from "nature." Ukama thus grounds responsibilities of reciprocity, respect, and care toward the natural world, treating ecological harm as a breakdown of kinship, not just a technical problem. Ukama represents the relational kinship network that extends beyond blood ties to encompass connections with nature and others, establishing that human community includes non-human beings and the natural environment (Murove, 2007).

Òrì (Yoruba) in Yoruba thought is a rich concept that refers to a person's inner spiritual "head," destiny, and defining life-path. It is understood as the aspect of a person chosen or received before birth, which shapes character, talents, and the broad outline of one's life. Òrì is not just fate imposed from outside; it is also a kind of inner moral-spiritual compass that must be cultivated through good character (ìwà), ritual, and wise choices. Fulfilling one's Òrì means aligning daily decisions, aspirations, and relationships with this deeper destiny. Crucially, Yoruba philosophy holds that true realization of Òrì cannot be purely individualistic: a good destiny is achieved in harmony with one's family, community, and the moral order of the cosmos. Thus, Òrì links individual vocation and communal responsibility, insisting that personal flourishing and communal well-being properly go together. This concept addresses predetermined or chosen destiny and intrinsic nature that must be fulfilled harmoniously, balancing individual destiny with communal obligations (Gbadegesin, 1991).

Chinese Philosophical Alternatives: Confucian and Related Traditions

Confucian Relationality: The Self as Center of Relationships

Chinese Confucianism offers a parallel yet distinct alternative to Western individualism through its emphasis on relationality, social harmony, and moral cultivation within communal contexts. While Confucianism differs from Ubuntu in certain philosophical details, both traditions share fundamental intuitions about the primacy of relationships, the importance of community, and the cultivation of virtue through social engagement.

In Confucian thought, the self is not conceived as an autonomous, pre-social substance but as a dynamic center of relationships, defined and actualized through participation in a structured social and ethical web. An individual is not an entity who later enters into contracts or relationships; rather, one's identity is constituted through a web of specific social roles articulated in the Five Cardinal Relationships (Wǔlún, 五伦): ruler/subject (jūn-chén, 君臣), father/son (fù-zǐ, 父子), husband/wife (fū-fù, 夫妇), older/younger (zhǎng-yòu, 长幼), and friend/friend (péng-yǒu, 朋友) (Confucius, Analects 12.11).

These relationships are not merely descriptive social positions but are fundamentally ethical, prescribing specific duties, obligations, and attitudes. This forms a system of "role ethics," where being a good person means fulfilling the responsibilities of one's roles—as a dutiful child, a benevolent parent, a loyal friend, or a just ruler

(Rosemont and Ames, 2016). The self is thus understood as the sum of its roles, and self-cultivation is the process of perfecting one's performance within this relational network.

Ren (仁): Benevolence and Co-humanity

At the heart of Confucian philosophy lies the concept of Ren (仁), commonly translated as benevolence, humaneness, or co-humanity. Ren represents the highest Confucian virtue and embodies the foundational principle of shared humanity exemplified through displaying kindness and compassion within the broader human community (Confucius, *Analects* 12.22). The Chinese character for Ren combines elements representing “human” (rén, 人) and “two” (èr, 二), highlighting the inherently relational aspect of humanity—one becomes human through relationships with others.

As Confucius teaches, Ren is manifest through proper conduct in relationships and encompasses benevolence, trustworthiness, courage, compassion, empathy, and reciprocity. The principle “A benevolent person loves others” (rénzhě ài rén, 仁者爱人) establishes love and compassion as the basic connotation of Ren, emphasizing that moral cultivation begins with caring for family and extends outward to society and all beings in concentric circles of care (*Analects* 1.2).

Confucian ethics prioritizes both external harmony (maintaining good relationships with others and the outside world) and internal harmony (cultivating inner peace and moral balance). The principle of zhōng (忠, loyalty) and shù (恕, reciprocity/empathy) guides moral action: “Do not do to others what you do not wish yourself” (*Analects* 15.24) and “If you desire to sustain yourself, sustain others” (*Analects* 6.30). This reciprocal ethics emphasizes that moral behavior emerges from putting oneself in another's position and extends kindness throughout the social network.

Li (礼): Ritual Propriety and Social Grammar

The cultivation of Ren is guided by and expressed through Li (礼), commonly translated as ritual propriety, rites, or ceremonial norms. Li encompasses rituals, etiquette, and norms of proper conduct that structure social interactions, providing the objective framework for harmonious living (*Analects* 1.12). Li is the external social grammar that gives concrete form to Ren. While Ren is the inner substance of humaneness, Li is the outer form through which it is practiced and transmitted across generations.

By internalizing Li, individuals learn to manage their emotions and desires, ensuring that their actions align with their social roles and contribute to a predictable, orderly society (Xunzi, *Xunzi* 19). Confucius emphasized that without Li, Ren becomes mere sentiment without practical application: “Respectfulness, without the rites (Li), becomes laborious bustle; carefulness, without the rites, becomes timidity; boldness, without the rites, becomes insubordination; straightforwardness, without the rites, becomes rudeness” (*Analects* 8.2).

Ren and Li work concurrently to foster social harmony: Ren provides the ethical motivation for proper conduct, while Li provides the structured forms through which this motivation is expressed. Without Ren, Li becomes empty, mechanical ritual; without Li, Ren lacks the structure needed for practical application in complex society.

Harmony (和) and Cosmic Order

The Confucian emphasis on harmony (Hé, 和) as a central value distinguishes it from Western individualistic frameworks. Confucianism teaches that social harmony results from every individual knowing their place in the natural order and fulfilling their role well (*Analects* 1.12). The concept extends beyond interpersonal relations to encompass cosmic harmony, as expressed in the ideal of Tianren Heyi (天人合一), the unity of Heaven and humanity.

This principle asserts an ontological unity between humans and nature/the cosmos, rejecting hard boundaries between self, society, and environment (Tu, 1985). As the classical text *Zhongyong* (Doctrine of the Mean) states, “Equilibrium is the great foundation under Heaven, and harmony is the great way under Heaven. In

achieving equilibrium and harmony, Heaven and Earth maintain their appropriate positions and the myriad things flourish” (Zhongyong 1).

Confucian philosophy presents harmony as both a metaphysical and moral concept that describes how the world operates and prescribes how human beings should live. The Yijing (Book of Changes) establishes “The Grand Harmony” (Tài hé, 太和) as the most important ideal, asserting that “the myriad things all keep on their own path of life. Thus they preserve the grand harmony.” This cosmic harmony is achieved through the constant changes and interactions of different things, with equilibrium serving as the foundation.

Dao (道), The Way, and Cosmic Natural Order

The concept of Dao (道), often translated as “The Way,” represents the cosmic natural order, underlying principles, and path of virtue in Confucian thought. While most extensively developed in Daoist philosophy, Confucianism also employs Dao to describe the proper order of human affairs aligned with natural processes and cosmic patterns (Hall and Ames, 1987). The pursuit of Dao involves understanding natural patterns, aligning human conduct with cosmic order, and cultivating virtue that harmonizes individual, social, and natural dimensions of existence.

As the Confucian thinker Dong Zhongshu taught, “The entire Dao between Heaven and Earth culminates in the beauty of harmony,” achieved through the balance of yin (阴) and yang (阳) forces (Dong, Chunqiu Fanlu 42). The principle of harmony guides interpersonal relationships through the maxim “harmony but not sameness” (hé ér bù tóng, 和而不同), which emphasizes coexistence of different things in favorable relationships while maintaining distinct identities (Analects 13.23).

Additional Confucian Concepts

Yi (义, righteousness) describes righteous action appropriate to context, emphasizing that moral conduct requires sensitivity to particular circumstances and relationships rather than mechanical application of universal rules.

Zhi (智, wisdom) represents practical wisdom developed through study, reflection, and experience, enabling one to discern proper conduct in complex situations.

Xin (信, integrity/trustworthiness) establishes that moral character requires consistency between words and deeds, making one’s commitments reliable foundations for social trust.

Xiào (孝, filial piety) reflects gratitude toward parents and ancestors, ensuring family harmony and intergenerational continuity. Confucius considered filial piety the root of all virtue, the foundation from which other moral capacities develop (Analects 1.2).

Junzi (君子, exemplary person/gentleman) represents the Confucian ideal of the morally cultivated person who has internalized virtues and knows how to act appropriately in all circumstances, serving as moral exemplar for others.

Datong (大同, Great Unity) envisions a harmonious communal society where property and welfare are shared, representing the Confucian utopian vision of universal peace and prosperity.

Key Concepts Comparison in African and Chinese Philosophies and Contrast with Western Individualism

Conceptual Analysis: Relationality, Interdependence, Harmony, Community, and Being

Relationality and Interconnectedness

Relationality refers to the philosophical position that relations are ontologically fundamental—that entities are constituted by their relationships rather than possessing independent essence prior to interaction.

African Perspective: Both African and Chinese philosophical traditions place relationality at the center of their understanding of being, self, and cosmos. In African philosophy, the concept of Ukama represents the relational kinship network that extends beyond blood ties to encompass connections with nature and others (Murove, 2007). This notion parallels the Chinese concept of Tianren Heyi, the unity of Heaven and humanity, which asserts that human sociality extends into the natural and cosmic worlds, erasing hard boundaries between self, society, and environment. Both perspectives reject the Western tendency to conceive of individuals as fundamentally separate from their social and natural contexts.

The African concept of Ntu/Nsi provides a metaphysical foundation for this relational ontology. Ntu refers to a universal life force or vital energy that permeates all existence, creating a dynamic, interpenetrating vital essence connecting all beings. As scholars explain, Ntu is “the fundamental life energy that connects every living entity” and serves as “the very essence of humanity and the source from which all life springs” (Jahn, 1961, p. 100). This vital force theory suggests that reality is fundamentally dynamic rather than static, with being conceived as force or energy in constant interaction.

Chinese Perspective: The Chinese philosophical concept of Qi (气) offers a parallel understanding of reality as constituted by vital energy. Qi represents “the generative, flowing force permeating cosmos and beings” and serves as the dynamic principle underlying all phenomena (Zhang, 2002, p. 157). Like Ntu, Qi describes an interpenetrating vital essence that blurs mind-matter boundaries and provides a metaphysical foundation for explaining being and becoming. Both concepts present alternatives to Western substance dualism by conceiving reality as fundamentally unified through shared vital energy rather than divided into separate mental and material substances.

Contrast with Western Individualism: Where Western philosophy, particularly following Descartes, conceives individuals as self-contained substances with fixed properties existing independently of relationships, African and Chinese philosophies understand beings as nodes in networks of relationships, with identity emerging from and constituted through these connections. The ontological priority shifts from individual substances to relationships themselves.

Communal Being and Interdependence

Communal being refers to the philosophical position that community is ontologically and morally prior to individuals, with personhood emerging through communal participation rather than preceding it.

African Perspective: The principle of communalism represents a core concept shared by African philosophies. In African thought, communalism emphasizes that the community's welfare takes precedence over individual success, fostering solidarity, cooperation, and mutual support. The concept of Ujamaa exemplifies this principle, referring to extended family, communal economics, and social sharing. Julius Nyerere promoted Ujamaa as a cornerstone for national development, arguing that it represented an operative principle aimed at restructuring society along the lines of African family structures (Nyerere, 1968).

Similarly, the East African concept of Harambee (“all pull together”) embodies collective social action and unity in pursuing shared goals. These principles understand that interdependence is not merely a social arrangement but an ontological reality. As African philosophy teaches, “A person is a person because of other persons. Without community, the individual cannot fully realize or affirm their personhood” (Menkiti, 1984, p. 172).

Chinese Perspective: Chinese Confucian ideals resonate with African communalism. The concept of Datong (大同), meaning “Great Unity,” envisions a harmonious communal society where property and welfare are shared (Li, Liji 9). This Confucian utopian vision aligns with Ujamaa's emphasis on collective well-being, social justice, and shared resources, with both traditions rejecting exploitative individual materialism. The Chinese principle of Gongtong (共同), meaning commonality or togetherness, further reinforces the cooperative spirit essential to social harmony.

Confucianism teaches that individuals achieve humanity (Ren) through social engagement in building human relationships, and only through active harmony can this ideal be realized. The Five Key Relationships structure

social life, with each relationship entailing reciprocal responsibilities that bind individuals into communal wholes (Confucius, Analects 12.11).

Contrast with Western Individualism: Western social contract theory conceives society as constructed by pre-existing autonomous individuals who voluntarily associate for mutual benefit, treating community as instrumental to individual interests. African and Chinese communalism reverses this priority, viewing individuals as products of community whose very capacity for selfhood depends on communal participation.

Harmony, Balance, and Cosmic Order

Harmony refers to the balanced, dynamic equilibrium among different elements that enables flourishing, extending from interpersonal relations through social order to cosmic processes.

African Perspective: The concept of harmony serves as a fundamental organizing principle in both African and Chinese philosophies, though with distinct cultural expressions. In African thought, the Egyptian concept of Ma'at embodies cosmic and moral order, balance, justice, and truth (Karenga, 2004). Ma'at represents an ordered and balanced moral cosmos that aligns with the fabric of the universe itself, establishing that ethical conduct reflects cosmic principles.

The African and Chinese conceptions of harmony extend beyond abstract cosmic principles to practical guidelines for social life. African philosophy emphasizes that maintaining harmony through community involvement is essential for human welfare and flourishing. Social harmony requires individuals to fulfill their communal roles appropriately, creating stability through reciprocal duties and mutual care.

Chinese Perspective: This principle resonates with the Chinese concepts of Dao (道, the Way), Li (理, Principle), and Yi (义, Righteousness), which together describe cosmic natural order, underlying principles, and righteous action in context (Hall and Ames, 1987). Confucian philosophy presents harmony as both a metaphysical and moral concept that describes how the world operates and prescribes how human beings should live.

The Yijing (Book of Changes) establishes “grand harmony” as the most important ideal, asserting that “the myriad things all keep on their own path of life. Thus they preserve the grand harmony.” This cosmic harmony is achieved through the constant changes and interactions of different things, with equilibrium serving as the foundation. As Dong Zhongshu taught, “The entire Dao between Heaven and Earth culminates in the beauty of harmony,...” achieved through the balance of yin and yang forces (Dong, Chunqiu Fanlu 42).

In Confucianism, harmony guides interpersonal relationships through the principle “harmony but not sameness” (hé ér bù tóng), which emphasizes coexistence of different things in favorable relationships while maintaining distinct identities (Analects 13.23).

Contrast with Western Individualism: Where Western liberalism emphasizes individual liberty and competitive pursuit of self-interest, with social order emerging from institutional constraints on conflict, African and Chinese philosophies view harmony as a positive ideal requiring active cultivation through proper conduct, ritual, and moral development.

Virtue, Moral Cultivation, and Spiritual Development

Moral cultivation refers to the lifelong process of developing virtuous character through practice, education, and social participation rather than merely following rules or maximizing utility.

African Perspective: Both African and Chinese traditions emphasize moral cultivation as central to becoming fully human. In African philosophy, the concept of Seriti refers to spiritual aura or moral weight, connecting one's moral quality to a spiritual force that influences social standing and effectiveness. This parallels the Chinese concept of De (德), meaning virtue or moral power, which represents the moral charisma one radiates through cultivated virtue. Both concepts suggest that moral development produces tangible spiritual and social effects that extend beyond the individual.

The African philosophy of Sankofa teaches learning from the past for future good, emphasizing ancestral wisdom as foundation for moral life (Dei, 2010). This principle aligns with the Confucian emphasis on studying history and rites (礼), particularly through the teachings of Xunzi and the concept of Wen (文, civilization/culture). Both traditions urge looking backward to move forward wisely, seeing past traditions and ancestor wisdom as essential foundations for current moral cultivation.

Chinese Perspective: In Confucianism, moral cultivation involves developing core virtues including Ren (benevolence), Yi (righteousness), Li (propriety), Zhi (wisdom), and Xin (integrity)—collectively known as the Five Constant Virtues (Wǔcháng, 五常). These virtues are cultivated through education, self-reflection, and proper conduct in social relationships. The ultimate aim is to become a Junzi (君子, exemplary person/gentleman), someone who has cultivated virtues and knows how to act appropriately in all circumstances (Analects 6.30).

This Confucian ideal of self-cultivation through moral education finds parallels in African philosophical concepts of personhood as something achieved through community participation and moral development rather than inherent individual properties (Menkiti, 1984).

Contrast with Western Individualism: Western Kantian ethics emphasizes individual rational autonomy and universal moral principles, with virtue consisting in acting from duty determined by reason alone. African and Chinese virtue ethics emphasize social learning, emulation of moral exemplars, and context-sensitive practical wisdom developed through lifelong cultivation in community.

Systematic Comparative Matrix of African and Chinese Concepts

The following matrix provides systematic comparison of key African and Chinese philosophical concepts, followed by discursive analysis:

<i>African Concept</i>	<i>Meaning & Role</i>	<i>Chinese Concept</i>	<i>Meaning & Role</i>	<i>Philosophical Comparison</i>
<i>Ubuntu/Unhu</i> <i>(Nguni/Shona)</i>	<i>Humanity through communal relationships; Personhood constituted relationally.</i>	Ren (仁) <i>Confucianism</i>	<i>Humaneness and benevolence expressed through right relationships. Highest Confucian virtue.</i>	<i>Both affirm relational personhood, moral cultivation, and priority of community over atomistic individualism. Ubuntu's emphasis on mutual recognition and shared humanity parallels Ren's focus on ethical conduct within web of relationships. Both reject self-sufficient Cartesian subject.</i>
<i>Ujamaa</i> <i>(Swahili)</i>	<i>Extended family, communal economics, social sharing. Collective ownership and mutual aid.</i>	Datong (大同) <i>Great Unity</i> ; Gongtong (共 同) <i>Commonality</i>	<i>Datong as ideal of harmonious communal society; Gongtong as cooperative social life. Property and welfare shared.</i>	<i>Both reject exploitative individual materialism and envision collective well-being, social justice, and shared resources as moral ideals. Ujamaa implemented as socialist development model; Datong remains utopian vision informing policy.</i>
<i>Harambee</i> <i>(Swahili)</i>	<i>"All together"; collective mobilization and social action for shared goals.</i>	He (和) <i>Harmony</i> ; Minzhu (民主) <i>People's Democracy</i>	<i>Harmony (He) and participatory democracy emphasizing collective action for public good.</i>	<i>Both stress collective participation and unity. Chinese harmony centers order and balance; Harambee emphasizes mobilization for shared goals. Each valorizes group success over private gain. He is both metaphysical principle and social ideal; Harambee is practical</i>

				<i>mobilization.</i>
<i>Sankofa (Akan)</i>	<i>Learning from the past for future good; ancestral wisdom guides present. Symbolized by bird looking backward.</i>	<i>Xunzi on rites and history; We n (文) Culture/Civilization</i>	<i>Moral cultivation through studying past, traditions, and rites. Culture as accumulated wisdom.</i>	<i>Both promote retrospective orientation: looking back to move forward wisely, grounding present moral life in ancestral or classical wisdom and tradition. Sankofa emphasizes recovery of lost heritage; Confucian study emphasizes mastery of canonical texts.</i>
<i>Ma'at (Ancient Egyptian)</i>	<i>Cosmic and moral order; balance, justice, truth. Universe governed by moral principles.</i>	<i>Dao (道) "The Way"; Li (理) Principle; Yi (义) Righteousness</i>	<i>Dao as cosmic natural order; Li as underlying principles; Yi as righteous action in context.</i>	<i>Ma'at and Dao/Li envision morally charged cosmos where justice and truth align with ordered universe. Yi and Ma'at link ethical action with cosmic balance. Both reject fact-value dichotomy, seeing morality embedded in cosmic structure.</i>
<i>Ntu (Bantu)</i>	<i>Universal life force; vitalism and interconnected categories. Force is being.</i>	<i>Qi (气) Vital Energy</i>	<i>Generative, flowing force permeating cosmos and beings. Material-energetic substance.</i>	<i>Ntu and Qi both describe dynamic, interpenetrating life-force that undercuts sharp mind-matter or self-world dualisms. Offer processual view of being and becoming. Alternative to Cartesian substance dualism. Reality as energy in constant transformation.</i>
<i>Seriti (Sesotho)</i>	<i>Spiritual aura, moral weight or status radiated by person. Moral quality as energetic force.</i>	<i>De (德) Virtue/Moral Power</i>	<i>Moral power or charismatic virtue. Moral quality as quasi-physical force.</i>	<i>Seriti and De treat virtue as energetic presence shaping social influence and standing, linking moral cultivation to quasi-spiritual efficacy. Both connect ethics with cosmology: moral character affects one's power/influence in world.</i>
<i>Ukama (Shona)</i>	<i>Relational kinship network beyond blood; connection with nature and others. Extended web of relationships.</i>	<i>Tianren Heyi (天人合一) Unity of Heaven and Humanity</i>	<i>Ontological unity between humans and nature/cosmos. No hard boundaries between realms.</i>	<i>Both dissolve hard boundaries between humans, society, and environment, positing extended community including nature and cosmic order. Reject nature-culture dualism. Humans embedded in larger ecological-cosmic whole.</i>
<i>Òrì (Yoruba)</i>	<i>Destiny, personal spiritual head, individual life's path. Pre-birth choice of destiny.</i>	<i>Ming (命) Fate/Destiny; Xing (性) Nature/Innate Quality</i>	<i>Predetermined or chosen destiny; intrinsic nature to be realized in harmony with Heaven (Tian).</i>	<i>Both frame destiny as personal yet relational, shaped by community, ancestors, or Heaven (Tian). Each urges alignment of individual path with larger moral-cosmic principles for fulfillment. Destiny is not pure determinism but framework requiring active navigation.</i>

Divergences between African and Chinese philosophies

The systematic comparison reveals several cross-cutting themes that illuminate profound philosophical complementarities between African and Chinese traditions. Despite profound convergences, important divergences merit attention:

Metaphysical emphasis: Chinese philosophy, particularly Confucianism, develops more elaborate metaphysical systems (Dao, Li, Qi, Yin-Yang) compared to most African traditions' focus on practical ethics and social life. However, this difference may reflect missionary and colonial distortions that portrayed African thought as pre-philosophical or merely cultural (Hountondji, 1996).

Hierarchical structure: Confucianism explicitly endorses hierarchical social relationships (Five Key Relationships) with asymmetrical duties, while Ubuntu often emphasizes more egalitarian mutual recognition. However, African societies also feature hierarchies (elders, chiefs, ancestors), so this difference may be one of emphasis rather than fundamental opposition.

Textual versus oral tradition: Chinese philosophy developed through written canonical texts (Analects, Mencius, etc.), while much African philosophy has been transmitted orally through proverbs, rituals, and practices. This affects modes of philosophical argumentation and authority structures but does not establish philosophical inferiority of oral traditions (Wiredu, 1996).

Historical development: Confucianism evolved through 2,500+ years of written commentary, debate, and synthesis with Buddhism and Daoism, while African philosophies faced disruption through slavery, colonialism, and missionary activity. Contemporary African philosophy thus involves both recovery of traditions and creative reconstruction for modern contexts (Gyekye, 1997).

Implications for Governance and Social Order: The Liberal State versus The Moral Community

Western Liberal State as Neutral Arbiter

The Western liberal tradition envisions the state as a neutral arbiter among competing autonomous individuals, with legitimacy derived from a social contract designed to protect pre-existing individual rights and liberties (Rawls, 1971). Government's proper role is limited to enforcing rules that allow individuals to pursue their own conceptions of the good life while preventing interference with others' similar pursuits. The state should remain neutral regarding competing visions of human flourishing, providing frameworks within which individuals exercise freedom of choice (Rawls, 1971, 1993).

This model emphasizes procedural justice—fair rules impartially applied—over substantive visions of the good. Individual rights constrain governmental power, and democratic legitimacy requires consent of the governed through mechanisms like voting, representation, and constitutional protections for minority rights. The ideal is limited government that protects individual liberty, property, and pursuit of happiness while avoiding paternalistic imposition of particular values or lifestyles.

African Communal Governance

African political thought, informed by Ubuntu principles, envisions the state not as neutral arbiter but as active cultivator of communal flourishing (Gyekye, 1997). The political sphere is oriented toward achieving consensus, reconciliation, and communal well-being. Leadership is judged by its ability to maintain social harmony, and the state's role extends to ensuring the basic socioeconomic conditions that allow for full participation in community life.

Ubuntu-based governance emphasizes deliberative consensus-building rather than majoritarian voting, recognizing all community members as stakeholders whose voices deserve hearing (Wiredu, 1996). Traditional African political institutions often featured councils of elders, public assemblies, and extended deliberation aimed at reaching decisions acceptable to all rather than imposing majority will on minorities. This consensual

approach prioritizes preservation of relationships and communal cohesion over efficiency or decisive individual authority.

Contemporary applications of Ubuntu to political theory have explored how these principles might inform modern constitutional democracies. Thaddeus Metz argues that Ubuntu can ground a robust theory of human rights, reinterpreting rights not as protections for individual autonomy but as safeguards for the capacity to participate in community (Metz, 2010, 2011). This reframing maintains practical protections for civil liberties, political participation, and socioeconomic welfare while grounding them in communal rather than individualistic foundations.

Confucian Moral State

Confucian political philosophy similarly conceives the state as a moral community responsible for cultivating virtue and collective well-being. The state's legitimacy is moral rather than contractual, based on the ruler's possession of the Mandate of Heaven (Tiānmìng, 天命). The ruler's duty is not merely to protect rights but to govern with benevolence (Ren), serving as moral exemplar to align the human realm with cosmic order.

The concept of Mandate of Heaven establishes that rulers govern legitimately only when they demonstrate virtue and care for people's welfare (Mencius 1B.8). If a ruler becomes corrupt or fails to prevent disaster and suffering, they are seen as having lost the Mandate, and the people have a right—indeed a duty—to replace them. This political philosophy embeds the ruler within a cosmic relational web, making them responsible not just to subjects but to the moral order of the universe itself.

The ideal Confucian society is hierarchical but its hierarchy is justified by moral cultivation and benevolent care flowing downward in exchange for loyalty and respect flowing upward. The state is conceived as an extension of the family, with the ruler as father-figure responsible for nurturing virtuous and orderly society (Analects 13.18). Political order depends not primarily on laws and institutions but on moral exemplars who inspire emulation and cultivation of virtue throughout society.

Contemporary New Confucians have explored how these principles might inform modern governance, proposing hybrid models that integrate democratic accountability with Confucian emphases on meritocracy, moral leadership, and harmony (Angle, 2012). These proposals seek to preserve Confucian insights about moral cultivation and communal welfare while addressing legitimate concerns about accountability and protection against abuses of hierarchical power.

Comparative Assessment: Strengths and Risks

Each model presents distinctive strengths and risks:

Western liberal neutrality protects individual freedom, religious and cultural pluralism, and minority rights against majoritarian or traditional oppression (Rawls, 1971). By limiting governmental power and requiring justification for constraints on individual liberty, liberal constitutionalism establishes important protections against tyranny. However, critics argue that liberal neutrality cannot be genuinely neutral as it privileges certain conceptions of autonomy, rationality, and self-interest while marginalizing communal values and thicker conceptions of human flourishing (Sandel, 1982). Moreover, the Cartesian dualistic framework that separates humans from the natural world, treating nature as *res extensa*—extended material substance governed by mechanical laws and devoid of intrinsic value, and positioning humans as possessors of *res cogitans* (thinking substance), standing apart from and above nature, relating to it primarily through instrumental domination and exploitation, not only has failed Westerns Liberal Governments for properly addressing environmental and humanitarian crisis, but has fueled the western global imperialism toward nature and other nations with slavery, colonialism, war, hunger and human migrations as direct consequences.

Ubuntu and Confucian communalism offer richer visions of human interconnection, moral cultivation, and collective flourishing, providing philosophical resources for addressing social atomization, environmental and social crisis that plague contemporary liberal societies. However, communalist philosophies face legitimate

concerns about individual autonomy, protection of dissent, and potential for communal tyranny. If communities define personhood and moral value, what protections exist for those whom communities reject or exclude (religious minorities, sexual minorities, political dissidents, or individuals pursuing unconventional life paths)? Can philosophies developed in relatively homogeneous traditional communities provide adequate frameworks for contemporary diverse, multicultural societies? These criticisms merits serious engagement as historical examples demonstrate that appeals to communal tradition have sometimes been used to justify oppression, discrimination, and exclusion (Oyowe, 2013).

Implications for Contemporary China-Africa Relations and Global Political Thought

Philosophical Foundations for a “Community with a Shared Future for Mankind”

The philosophical complementarities between African Ubuntu and Chinese Confucianism provide profound foundations for contemporary China-Africa relations and the shared vision of building a “Community with a shared future for mankind” (rénlèi mìngyùn gòngtóngtǐ, 人类命运共同体). This concept, central to Chinese foreign policy under President Xi Jinping, draws explicitly on traditional Chinese philosophy while resonating strongly with African communal values.

As official Chinese documents explain, the community of shared future emphasizes “common, comprehensive, cooperative and sustainable” approaches to global challenges, rejecting zero-sum competition in favor of “win-win cooperation” (Ministry of Foreign Affairs PRC, 2021). The philosophical foundations of this vision align closely with both Confucian and Ubuntu principles. The emphasis on mutual respect, equality, and common prosperity reflects Confucian ideals of reciprocity and harmonious relationships. The commitment to shared development, collective welfare, and addressing challenges together embodies Ubuntu’s principle that “I am because we are” —recognizing that individual nations’ destinies are interconnected with global community.

The vision of a “high-level China-Africa community with a shared future” represents an attempt to institutionalize these philosophical principles in practical cooperation through platforms such as FOCAC (Forum on China-Africa Cooperation) or initiatives such as BRI (Belt and Road Initiatives). The 2024 Beijing Declaration on “Building an All-Weather China-Africa Community with a Shared Future for the New Era” commits both sides to cooperation based on “sincere friendship and equality, win-win for mutual benefit and common development, fairness and justice, and progress with the times and openness and inclusiveness” (Ministry of Foreign Affairs PRC, 2024). This language reflects both Confucian emphasis on proper relationships and Ubuntu’s communal values.

African leaders have embraced this framework, recognizing its alignment with indigenous African values and its contrast with Western approaches that have often prioritized individual state interests over collective welfare (Kagame, 2018). The African Union’s Agenda 2063 similarly emphasizes Pan-African solidarity, collective prosperity, and shared destiny, creating conceptual synergies with Chinese visions of common development (African Union Commission, 2015).

Critical Interrogations and Potential Risks

While the philosophical complementarities between African and Chinese traditions provide conceptual resources for cooperation, critical interrogations reveal potential risks that must be carefully addressed.

Asymmetries of Power and Economic Relations

Despite rhetorical commitments to equality and mutual benefit, China-Africa relations involve significant asymmetries of power, economic development, and bargaining position (Ighobor, 2013). China is the world’s second-largest economy and a permanent UN Security Council member, while most African states are developing nations with limited leverage in global institutions. These structural inequalities create risks that appeals to philosophical complementarity might legitimize new forms of dependency or extractive relationships reminiscent of colonial patterns (Mohan and Lampert, 2013).

Critics argue that Chinese engagement in Africa has sometimes prioritized resource extraction, infrastructure contracts for Chinese companies, and strategic positioning over genuine partnership and African development priorities (Aidoo and Hess, 2015). While Chinese investment has funded significant infrastructure development—roads, railways, ports, telecommunications—questions persist about debt sustainability, environmental standards, labor practices, and whether projects genuinely serve African interests or primarily facilitate Chinese resource access and market expansion (Brautigam, 2009).

The philosophical vision of “shared future” and “win-win cooperation” requires critical examination against these material realities. Do these discourses genuinely reflect mutual respect, equality, and justice, or do they risk instrumentalizing traditional philosophies to legitimize asymmetrical relationships? Can Ubuntu and Confucian harmony support genuinely egalitarian partnerships, or might they be deployed to discourage criticism and suppress dissent under guise of maintaining harmonious relations?

Governance Models and Democratic Accountability

Both traditional Confucianism and some interpretations of Ubuntu have been criticized for potentially justifying authoritarian governance and subordinating individual rights to communal or hierarchical authority (Matolino, 2014). Confucian emphasis on hierarchy, deference to authority, and social harmony might be used to legitimize single-party rule and suppress political dissent. Similarly, Ubuntu’s emphasis on consensus and communal solidarity might discourage individual autonomy, protect traditional hierarchies from challenge, and marginalize those who deviate from communal norms.

The question of governance models becomes particularly salient in China-Africa relations, as China presents its development model of Socialism with “Chinese Characteristics” as alternative to Western liberal democracy (Zhao, 2010). Some African leaders have expressed admiration for China’s ability to achieve rapid development without Western-style democracy, multiparty competition, or human rights constraints. However, others worry that China-Africa cooperation might strengthen authoritarian tendencies, provide diplomatic support for repressive regimes, and undermine democratic accountability.

Philosophical engagement with Ubuntu and Confucianism must critically examine how these traditions can support democratic accountability, protection of dissent, and individual rights while maintaining emphasis on communal welfare and social harmony. Contemporary African and Chinese philosophers have explored these questions, proposing reconstructions of traditional concepts that integrate communal values with procedural protections for participation, deliberation, and human rights (Gyekye, 1997). These efforts demonstrate that traditional philosophies need not support authoritarianism but can ground alternative models of governance that prioritize collective welfare while protecting against abuses of power.

Economic Models and Distributive Justice

The philosophical emphasis on communal welfare, shared prosperity, and harmony raises important questions about economic models and distributive justice. Both Ubuntu and Confucianism have been interpreted as supporting more egalitarian, redistributive economic systems than Western capitalism permits (Nyerere, 1968; Qing, 2009). Ubuntu’s principles informed African socialism movements that emphasized collective ownership, redistribution, and prioritizing basic needs over individual accumulation (Nyerere, 1968). Confucian ideals of Datong (Great Unity) envision societies where resources are shared and exploitation is eliminated (Liji 9).

However, contemporary China operates a market economy with significant inequality (gap between rich and poor), private enterprise, and integration into global capitalism, while African economies feature both state-led and market-oriented models with varying degrees of inequality and redistribution (Lin and Wang, 2017). The question arises: can philosophical visions of shared prosperity and communal welfare be realized within capitalist frameworks characterized by competition, accumulation, and inequality? Or do Ubuntu and Confucian principles require more fundamental economic transformation toward cooperative, redistributive systems?

Cultural Integrity and Epistemic Justice

The philosophical rapprochement between African and Chinese traditions must navigate complex questions of cultural integrity and epistemic justice. Both African and Chinese philosophies have suffered from Western philosophical hegemony that dismissed them as pre-philosophical, merely cultural, or lacking rigor and systematicity (Hountondji, 1996). Recovering and reconstructing these traditions involves challenging Western epistemic dominance and asserting the philosophical validity of non-Western thought.

However, this recovery must avoid essentializing African or Chinese cultures, treating them as monolithic or unchanging, or romanticizing pre-colonial or pre-modern traditions while ignoring internal diversity, historical change, and legitimate internal critiques (Angle, 2012). Both traditions encompass diverse schools, contested interpretations, and ongoing debates about how traditional concepts should be understood and applied in contemporary contexts (Bell, 2008).

Furthermore, China-Africa philosophical engagement must avoid reproducing patterns of cultural imperialism where Chinese interpretations of shared concepts like harmony or community become normative, marginalizing African voices and perspectives. Genuine philosophical dialogue requires mutual learning, reciprocal influence, and recognition that African and Chinese traditions, while sharing important commonalities, also embody distinct insights, emphases, and normative orientations that should be preserved rather than homogenized.

Towards a Plural, Relational Global Ethics and Governance

Contributions to Global Ethics

African and Chinese relational ontologies contribute to global ethics in several important ways:

- First, they challenge the Western assumption that individual rights provide the only adequate foundation for morality and politics, demonstrating that relational responsibilities, communal welfare, and social harmony can ground robust ethical systems. This pluralization of ethical foundations enriches global moral discourse and creates space for diverse cultural expressions of fundamental values.
- Second, they offer philosophical resources for addressing collective action problems that Western individualism struggles to resolve—climate change, pandemic response, economic inequality, migration, and global governance. By emphasizing inherent human interdependence, shared destiny, and collective responsibility, Ubuntu and Confucianism provide compelling rationales for international cooperation and redistribution that do not depend on enlightened self-interest or hypothetical contracts.
- Third, they support development models that prioritize collective welfare, environmental sustainability, and long-term harmony over short-term individual gain and competitive advantage. The emphasis on “modernization that is just and equitable, modernization that is open and win-win, modernization that puts people first, modernization featuring diversity and inclusiveness, modernization that is eco-friendly, and modernization underpinned by peace and security” reflects integration of African and Chinese philosophical values into practical policy frameworks (Ministry of Foreign Affairs PRC, 2021).
- Fourth, they provide frameworks for conflict resolution and reconciliation grounded in restorative rather than retributive justice. Ubuntu’s emphasis on forgiveness, healing, and restoration of harmony—exemplified in South Africa’s Truth and Reconciliation Commission and Rwanda’s Gacaca Courts—provides practical models for addressing historical grievances and building peaceful coexistence. Confucian principles of maintaining harmony through proper conduct, reciprocity, and moral cultivation offer complementary approaches to preventing and resolving conflicts.

In brief, the philosophical complementarities between African and Chinese traditions offer crucial resources for developing more plural, relational global ethics that can challenge Western liberal hegemony while avoiding new forms of domination.

Decolonizing International Relations Theory

The philosophical engagement between African and Chinese traditions contributes to decolonizing international relations theory by challenging Western concepts and frameworks that have dominated the discipline. Concepts like sovereignty, balance of power, security dilemmas, and rational actor models reflect Western historical experiences and philosophical assumptions, particularly individualism and realism about human nature.

African and Chinese philosophies offer alternative conceptual resources. The notion of a “Community with a Shared Future” challenges state-centric sovereignty in favor of recognition of fundamental interdependence. The emphasis on harmony challenges realist assumptions about inevitable conflict and competition (Zhao, 2006). The relational conception of identity suggests that states, like individuals, are constituted through relationships rather than possessing fixed interests prior to interaction. This represents what scholars call “Theorizing from the Global South”—developing conceptual frameworks grounded in non-Western experiences, values, and philosophies rather than merely applying or adapting Western theories to non-Western contexts. By grounding cooperation in indigenous African and Chinese philosophical traditions rather than Western liberal frameworks, China-Africa partnership can develop approaches to governance, development, and international relations that reflect the actual values and priorities of participating peoples.

Suggestions: Integrative Frameworks for Global Ethics in Governance

The most promising path forward involves developing integrative frameworks that combine insights from Western, African, and Chinese traditions while critically examining limitations in each. Such frameworks would recognize that:

- Individual dignity and collective welfare are not necessarily opposed but can be mutually supporting when properly understood.
- Autonomy and interdependence are complementary rather than contradictory; meaningful individual freedom requires supportive social contexts.
- Rights and responsibilities must be held in balance, with rights protecting capacity for communal participation and responsibilities reflecting inherent human interconnection.
- Harmony and justice both matter; harmony without justice becomes oppressive conformity, while justice without harmony produces alienating conflict.
- Universal principles and cultural particularity both have value; universal human rights can be grounded in diverse philosophical traditions rather than exclusively Western liberalism.

These integrative frameworks would draw on the best of Western philosophy—its emphases on human dignity, procedural protections, critical inquiry, and individual liberty—while incorporating African and Chinese insights about relationality, harmony, communal welfare, and cosmic embeddedness.

CONCLUSION

Recapitulation of Main Arguments

This paper has undertaken a comprehensive critical comparative analysis of African and Chinese philosophical alternatives to Western individualism, examining how these non-Western traditions conceptualize being, relationality, and society in fundamentally distinct ways. The investigation has revealed profound contrasts between Western individualism and African-Chinese communalism across ontological, epistemological, ethical, political, and cosmological dimensions.

The analysis carries several important implications for philosophy as a discipline:

- First, it demonstrates that Western individualism, far from representing universal human insight, reflects culturally specific historical developments that should not be universalized. The Cartesian cogito, liberal social contract, and rights-based ethics embody particular assumptions about human nature and society that are neither self-evident nor universally applicable.
- Second, African and Chinese philosophies offer robust intellectual resources for reframing fundamental questions about personhood, ethics, and social ontology. The relational conception of self, vital force ontology, moral cosmology, and emphasis on harmony provide conceptual alternatives that can enrich global philosophical discourse and challenge Western hegemony.
- Third, comparative philosophy must move beyond models where Western concepts provide frameworks for understanding non-Western traditions. African-Chinese philosophical dialogue demonstrates that non-Western traditions can engage in mutually enriching conversation without Western mediation, challenging assumptions about the universality or necessity of Western philosophical categories.
- Fourth, the study calls for integrative frameworks that combine insights from Western, African, and Chinese traditions while critically examining limitations in each. Such frameworks would recognize that individual dignity and collective welfare, autonomy and interdependence, rights and responsibilities, harmony and justice, universal principles and cultural particularity can be held in productive tension rather than forced into binary opposition.

In a word, the philosophical complementarities between Ubuntu and Confucianism are not coincidental but reflect deep insights about human nature and social life that Western individualism has marginalized. However, these traditions must be critically engaged rather than romantically celebrated as both face legitimate questions about individual autonomy, protection of dissent, accommodation of pluralism, and potential for communal tyranny.

Implications in Contemporary China-Africa Relations

The philosophical complementarities between Ubuntu and Confucianism provide substantial conceptual foundations for China-Africa cooperation rooted in relational and communal paradigms. The shared vision of building a “Community with a Shared Future for Mankind” resonates with both traditions’ emphases on mutual respect, reciprocal benefit, and common destiny. The framework offers resources for addressing global challenges such as climate change, social inequalities, migration, pandemics, conflicts resolution and economic crisis that Western individualism struggles or fails to resolve. It also demonstrates that robust ethical and political systems need not be grounded exclusively in individual rights and autonomy but can emerge from relational responsibilities, communal welfare, and cosmic harmony. As Ubuntu teaches and Confucianism affirms: “we are human together, or not at all”.

However, realizing this vision requires critical vigilance about asymmetries of power, economic exploitation, and potential instrumentalization of traditional philosophies to legitimize new forms of dependency.

REFERENCES

1. Aidoo, R. and Hess, S. (2015) 'Non-interference 2.0: China's Evolving Foreign Policy towards a Changing Africa', *Journal of Current Chinese Affairs*, 44(1), pp. 107-139.
2. Ames, R.T. and Rosemont, H. Jr. (1998) *The Analects of Confucius: A Philosophical Translation*. New York: Ballantine Books.
3. Angle, S.C. (2012) *Contemporary Confucian Political Philosophy: Toward Progressive Confucianism*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
4. Bell, D.A. (2008) *China's New Confucianism: Politics and Everyday Life in a Changing Society*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
5. Bell, D.A. and Metz, T. (2011) 'Confucianism and Ubuntu: Reflections on a Dialogue between Chinese and African Traditions', *Journal of Chinese Philosophy*, 38(S1), pp. 78-95.

6. Brautigam, D. (2009) *The Dragon's Gift: The Real Story of China in Africa*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
7. Chirkov, V., Ryan, R.M., Kim, Y. and Kaplan, U. (2003) 'Differentiating Autonomy from Individualism and Independence: A Self-Determination Theory Perspective on Internalization of Cultural Orientations and Well-Being', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84(1), pp. 97-110.
8. Colli, I. (2023) 'Descartes' Cogito and the Birth of the Modern Self', Ilario Colli, 19 August. Available at: <https://ilariocolli.com/articles/descartes-cogito-and-the-birth-of-the-modern-self> (Accessed: 11 December 2024).
9. Confucius (c. 479 BCE/1997) *The Analects* (Lunyu). Translated by D.C. Lau. London: Penguin Books.
10. Dei, G.J.S. (2010) *Teaching Africa: Towards a Transgressive Pedagogy*. Dordrecht: Springer.
11. Descartes, R. (1641/1996) *Meditations on First Philosophy*. Translated by J. Cottingham. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
12. Dong Zhongshu (c. 2nd century BCE/1996) *Chunqiu Fanlu* (Luxuriant Dew of the Spring and Autumn Annals). Translated by S. Queen and J. Major, in *Kingly Ambitions: The Han Concordance*. New York: Columbia University Press.
13. Forum on China-Africa Cooperation (2018) *Beijing Declaration - Toward an Even Stronger China-Africa Community with a Shared Future*. Beijing: Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China.
14. Gbadegesin, S. (1991) *African Philosophy: Traditional Yoruba Philosophy and Contemporary African Realities*. New York: Peter Lang.
15. Giddens, A. and Sutton, P.W. (2021) *Sociology*, 9th edn. Cambridge: Polity Press.
16. Gyekye, K. (1997) *Tradition and Modernity: Philosophical Reflections on the African Experience*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
17. Hall, D.L. and Ames, R.T. (1987) *Thinking Through Confucius*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
18. Hayek, F.A. (1944/2007) *The Road to Serfdom*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
19. Henrich, J. (2020) *The WEIRD People in the World: How the West Became Psychologically Peculiar and Particularly Prosperous*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
20. Hobbes, T. (1651/1996) *Leviathan*. Edited by R. Tuck. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
21. Hountondji, P.J. (1996) *African Philosophy: Myth and Reality*, 2nd edn. Translated by H. Evans and J. Rée. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
22. Ighobor, K. (2013) 'China in the Heart of Africa', *Africa Renewal*, April, pp. 6-9.
23. Jahn, J. (1961) *Muntu: An Outline of the New African Culture*. Translated by M. Grene. New York: Grove Press.
24. Kagame, P. (2018) 'Speech at the Opening Session of the Forum on China-Africa Cooperation Beijing Summit', Beijing, 3 September. Available at: <https://www.peaceau.org/en/article/address-by-h-e-paul-kagame-president-of-the-republic-of-rwanda-at-the-opening-ceremony-of-the-2018-focac-beijing-summit> (Accessed: 13 December 2024).
25. Kant, I. (1785/1998) *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*. Translated by M. Gregor. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
26. Karenga, M. (2004) *Maat, The Moral Ideal in Ancient Egypt: A Study in Classical African Ethics*. New York: Routledge.
27. Li, J. (ed.) (Liji) (c. 1st century BCE/1999) *The Book of Rites* (Liji). Translated by J. Legge, in *The Sacred Books of China: The Texts of Confucianism*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
28. Lin, J.Y. and Wang, Y. (2017) 'The China Model and Its Implications for Other Developing Countries', in J. Stiglitz and J.Y. Lin (eds.), *The Industrial Policy Revolution I*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 385-407.
29. Locke, J. (1689/1980) *Second Treatise of Government*. Edited by C.B. Macpherson. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing Company.
30. Matolino, B. (2014) *Personhood in African Philosophy*. Pietermaritzburg: Cluster Publications.
31. Mbiti, J.S. (1969) *African Religions and Philosophy*. London: Heinemann.
32. Mbithi, P. and Rasmusson, R. (1977) *Self Reliance in Kenya: The Case of Harambee*. Uppsala: Scandinavian Institute of African Studies.

33. Menkiti, I.A. (1984) 'Person and Community in African Traditional Thought', in R.A. Wright (ed.), *African Philosophy: An Introduction*, 3rd edn. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, pp. 171-181.
34. Mencius (c. 4th century BCE/2008) Mencius. Translated by D.C. Lau. London: Penguin Books.
35. Metz, T. (2007) 'Toward an African Moral Theory', *The Journal of Political Philosophy*, 15(3), pp. 321-341.
36. Metz, T. (2010) 'Human Dignity, Capital Punishment, and an African Moral Theory: Toward a New Philosophy of Human Rights', *Journal of Human Rights*, 9(1), pp. 81-99.
37. Metz, T. (2011) 'Ubuntu as a Moral Theory and Human Rights in South Africa', *African Human Rights Law Journal*, 11(2), pp. 532-559.
38. Metz, T. (2017) 'Replacing Development: An Afro-Communal Approach to Global Justice', *Philosophical Papers*, 46(1), pp. 111-137.
39. Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China (2021) *Working Together to Meet the Challenges of Our Times and Build a Better Future*. Beijing: Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
40. Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China (2024) *Beijing Declaration on Building an All-Weather China-Africa Community with a Shared Future for the New Era*. Beijing: Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
41. Mohan, G. and Lampert, B. (2013) 'Negotiating China: Reinserting African Agency into China–Africa Relations', *African Affairs*, 112(446), pp. 92-110.
42. Murove, M.F. (ed.) (2007) *African Ethics: An Anthology of Comparative and Applied Ethics*. Scottsville: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press.
43. Nyerere, J.K. (1968) *Ujamaa: Essays on Socialism*. Dar es Salaam: Oxford University Press.
44. Oyowe, O.A. (2013) 'An African Conception of Human Rights? Comments on the Challenges of Relativism', *Human Rights Review*, 14(2), pp. 117-134.
45. Qin, Y. (2016) 'A Relational Theory of World Politics', *International Studies Review*, 18(1), pp. 33-47.
46. Qing, J. (2009) *A Confucian Constitutional Order: How China's Ancient Past Can Shape Its Political Future*. Translated by E. Ryden. Edited by D.A. Bell and R. Fan. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
47. Ramose, M.B. (1999) *African Philosophy Through Ubuntu*. Harare: Mond Books.
48. Rawls, J. (1971) *A Theory of Justice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
49. Rawls, J. (1993) *Political Liberalism*. New York: Columbia University Press.
50. Rosemont, H. Jr. and Ames, R.T. (2016) 'Confucian Role Ethics: A Moral Vision for the 21st Century?', Göttingen: V&R Unipress.
51. Rousseau, J.-J. (1762/1997) *The Social Contract and Other Later Political Writings*. Edited by V. Gourevitch. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
52. Sandel, M.J. (1982) *Liberalism and the Limits of Justice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
53. Setiloane, G.M. (1976) *The Image of God Among the Sotho-Tswana*. Rotterdam: A.A. Balkema.
54. Shutte, A. (2001) *Ubuntu: An Ethic for a New South Africa*. Pietermaritzburg: Cluster Publications.
55. Smith, A. (1776/1994) *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. Edited by E. Cannan. New York: Modern Library.
56. Taylor, C. (1989) *Sources of the Self: The Making of the Modern Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
57. Tempels, P. (1959) *Bantu Philosophy*. Translated by C. King. Paris: Présence Africaine.
58. Tu, W. (1985) *Confucian Thought: Selfhood as Creative Transformation*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
59. Tutu, D. (1999) *No Future Without Forgiveness*. New York: Doubleday.
60. Weber, M. (1905/2002) *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. Translated by P. Baehr and G.C. Wells. London: Penguin Books.
61. Wiredu, K. (1996) *Cultural Universals and Particulars: An African Perspective*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
62. Zhang, D. (2002) *Key Concepts in Chinese Philosophy*. Translated by E. Ryden. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
63. Zhao, T. (2006) 'Rethinking Empire from a Chinese Concept "All-under-Heaven" (Tian-xia)', *Social Identities*, 12(1), pp. 29-41.

-
64. Zhao, S. (2010) 'The China Model: Can it Replace the Western Model of Modernization?', *Journal of Contemporary China*, 19(65), pp. 419-436.
 65. Zhongyong (Doctrine of the Mean) (c. 1st century BCE/2001). Translated by D.C. Lau, in *Confucius: The Analects (Lun yü)*. London: Penguin Books.