

From Cartesian Rationalism to Ubuntu Ethics: A Philosophical Reorientation of Peace Frameworks in Africa

Castor Mfugale

Catholic University of Mbeya

castor.mfugale@cuom.ac.tz

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4713-8341>

Abstract:

This study critically examines the philosophical foundations of peace frameworks in Africa, contrasting the epistemological and ethical assumptions of Cartesian rationalism with the relational moral ontology of Ubuntu ethics. Cartesian-derived peace paradigms, grounded in abstract reason, individual autonomy, and procedural justice, have shaped liberal peacebuilding approaches but often fail to address the moral and relational dimensions of conflict. Ubuntu, emphasizes interdependence, communal responsibility, and moral repair, providing an ethically robust and culturally resonant framework for peace. This paper explores three objectives: (1) the epistemic and moral limitations of Cartesian rationalism in peacebuilding, (2) Ubuntu as a relational moral ontology capable of sustaining social cohesion and reconciliation, and (3) the operationalization of Ubuntu principles into practical peace frameworks in African contexts. By integrating philosophical critique, normative analysis, and empirical insights, this study proposes a pluralistic, dialogical model of peace that bridges moral theory with institutional practice.

Keywords: Cartesian rationalism, Ubuntu ethics, Sustaining Peace

1. INTRODUCTION

The problem of cultivating sustaining peace in Africa raises not only political and socio-economic questions but also deeply philosophical ones. Contemporary peace frameworks on the continent often import conceptual resources drawn from Western Enlightenment thought, above all the model of individual reason and neutral, procedural justice exemplified by Cartesian rationalism. Cartesian epistemology, with its methodological doubt and privileging of a detached rational subject, shaped modern Western notions of autonomy, rights, and the public sphere (Descartes, 2016; Gatto, 2021, 2021; Grosfoguel, 2013, 2013; Sarkar et al., 2024). While these ideas have been important for developing institutions of governance and human rights, they can also produce approaches to conflict that emphasize abstract legal categories and individual claims at the expense of relational, communal, and restorative dimensions essential to many African societies.

African philosophical traditions, by contrast, foreground relational personhood and communal belonging as the moral ground of social life. Classic

ethnophilosophical accounts emphasize a web of social obligations and spiritual embeddedness that make the community the primary context for moral identity (Kubow, 2025; Letseka, 2012; Makhetha, 2024; Masipa et al., 2024; Mbiti, 1969; Nxumalo & Mncube, 2018, 2018; Wrage et al., 2024). Building on this ground, contemporary African philosophers have articulated ubuntu as a normative framework that reconceives personhood as “a being-in-relation”, summed up in formulations such as “I am because we are” (Knappert, 2021; Kornienko, 2023, 2023; Letseka, 2012; Nelson, 1990; Van Wyk, 1995). Ubuntu thus shifts moral attention from atomized rights-bearers to intersubjective flourishing, prioritizing reconciliation, mutual care, and restorative practices over purely retributive responses. This philosophical reorientation has important consequences for peace theory and practice. The experience of transitional justice in Southern Africa and the moral leadership reflected in reconciliation projects suggests that ubuntu-informed norms can supplement Western legal frameworks by embedding accountability within practices of communal repair

and mutual recognition (Tutu, 1999). Philosophical work has further refined ubuntu into a defensible moral theory that addresses common objections concerning vagueness and individual liberty while retaining its communitarian core (Metz, 2011). By reconstructing concepts such as dignity, responsibility, and justice through the lens of relationality, ubuntu offers conceptual tools for sustaining peace that are epistemically and culturally consonant with many African contexts.

This study surveys the philosophical genealogy and practical implications of shifting from a Cartesian, individualist paradigm to an ubuntu-based ethic for peace. It (1) maps the principal features of Cartesian rationalism that have shaped dominant peace frameworks, (2) recovers key strands of African thought that ground ubuntu as an ethical alternative, and (3) evaluates empirical and normative arguments for integrating ubuntu-inspired practices into conflict transformation, reconciliation, and institutional design. In so doing, the article aims to move beyond a simple dichotomy between “Western” and “African” thought and to articulate a dialogical, pluralist framework in which universal commitments to human dignity and accountability are reinterpreted through relational moral vocabularies that enhance legitimacy, sustainability, and local ownership of peace processes.

2. Cartesian Rationalism and the Epistemic Architecture of Dominant Peace Frameworks

The intellectual architecture of dominant peace frameworks is inseparable from the epistemological revolution inaugurated by Cartesian rationalism. Descartes’ methodological reduction of knowledge to the certainty of the cogito established a model of reason grounded in epistemic self-sufficiency, abstraction, and detachment from the social world (Descartes, 2016; Gatto, 2021, 2021; Grosfoguel, 2013; Sarkar et al., 2024). This shift did not merely redefine knowledge; it reconfigured moral agency and political imagination by positing the rational individual as the primary unit of ethical and juridical analysis. Peace, within this paradigm, emerges not as a moral relation but as a rationally engineered condition secured through institutional order.

From a philosophical standpoint, Cartesian rationalism entails a thin moral ontology: the human subject is conceived prior to and independently of relational embeddedness. This ontological priority of the isolated subject subsequently informs Enlightenment political theory, particularly social contract traditions in which peace is conceptualized as a rational compromise among competing self-interests (Hobbes, 2005). Even Kant’s cosmopolitan vision of perpetual peace, while normatively richer, remains grounded in procedural rationality and juridical universalism, where moral progress is mediated through law rather than lived ethical relations (Kant, 2019).

Contemporary peace frameworks especially liberal peacebuilding models inherit this rationalist legacy by privileging technocratic solutions, institutional design, and legal accountability mechanisms. Conflict is rendered intelligible primarily through formal categories such as sovereignty, rights violations, and compliance deficits. While these categories are normatively indispensable, their epistemic dominance often marginalizes what phenomenological and hermeneutical traditions would call the lifeworld of conflict-affected communities: histories of humiliation, moral injury, broken trust, and symbolic violence. As a result, peace becomes an external imposition of order rather than an internally reconstructed moral horizon.

At a deeper level, Cartesian rationalism reinforces a series of dualisms of reason or emotion, subject or object, justice or reconciliation that shape peace practices in subtle but consequential ways. Retributive justice frameworks, for instance, presuppose a moral subject capable of being isolated, judged, and sanctioned independently of communal bonds. Yet in many African contexts, wrongdoing is experienced not only as a legal violation but as a rupture in the moral fabric of community. The rationalist emphasis on individual culpability thus risks addressing symptoms of violence while leaving its relational ontology untouched.

Critical peace scholars have increasingly questioned whether peace grounded primarily in rational-institutional logic can achieve ethical depth or social durability. Richmond’s critique of the liberal peace underscores how universalist rationalism can

function as a form of epistemic dominance, delegitimizing local moral knowledge and practices (Richmond, 2009). Similarly, Mac Ginty's notion of hybrid peace reveals the tension between externally imposed rational frameworks and internally generated moral orders that resist full formalization (Mac Ginty, 2010). These critiques suggest that the problem is not rationality per se, but its elevation to an exclusive epistemic authority.

From a higher-order philosophical perspective, the limitation of Cartesian rationalism in peacebuilding lies in its failure to account for relational moral ontology the idea that personhood, responsibility, and dignity are constituted through intersubjective relations rather than merely regulated by law. Peace conceived within a Cartesian horizon risk becoming a procedural equilibrium rather than a shared ethical achievement. This insight invites a paradigmatic rethinking: peace must be reconceived not only as a rational arrangement but as a moral practice rooted in recognition, mutual vulnerability, and communal restoration.

Recognizing these philosophical limits does not entail rejecting universal norms or rational institutions. Rather, it calls for their ontological re-grounding. By exposing the epistemic and moral assumptions embedded in Cartesian rationalism, this section opens conceptual space for alternative ethical frameworks capable of sustaining peace at the level of lived social relations. Ubuntu ethics, as will be shown in the next section, offers such a framework by articulating a relational conception of personhood that integrates justice, reconciliation, and communal flourishing into a coherent moral vision.

3. Ubuntu Ethics as a Relational Moral Ontology for Peace in Africa

Ubuntu ethics presents a radically different conception of moral agency, personhood, and peace from Cartesian rationalism. Emerging from African philosophical traditions, ubuntu articulates an ontology in which persons are constituted through their relationships with others, emphasizing interdependence, communal responsibility, social cohesion and mutual protection (Metz, 201; Mfugale et al., 2025; Ramose, 1999). Expressed in idioms such

as "*Umuntu ngumuntu ngabantu, Ujamaa*, to mean "*I am because we are*", ubuntu asserts that ethical and political life is inseparable from relational embeddedness, thereby situating moral evaluation within the network of communal interactions rather than within abstract, atomistic rational subjects. Ethical responsibility, within this framework, emerges not from abstract universal rules but from one's embeddedness in a web of social relations, mutual care, and shared vulnerability (Mbiti, 1969; Ramose, 1999).

Ubuntu's ethical vision fundamentally reframes conflict itself, in which, violence is not merely a violation of legal norms but a rupture of relational integrity that diminishes the moral standing of both the perpetrator and the community. Harm is understood as communal rather than purely individual, and its consequences reverberate across social bonds (Gade, 2011). Restoration, therefore, requires more than retributive punishment; it necessitates dialogue, acknowledgment of wrongdoing, truth-telling, and processes of communal reintegration that place reconciliation at the center of moral reasoning (Augustine, 2001; Ehlers, 2017; Murithi, 2006).

South Africa's Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) illustrates this ethical logic in practice. Through public confession, moral accountability, and the possibility of forgiveness, the TRC operationalized ubuntu by prioritizing the restoration of broken relationships over punitive justice, seeking to reconstitute a shared moral community after apartheid (Fourie, 2010; Tutu, 1999). As Tutu famously argued, without forgiveness and restored relationships, there could be no genuine future peace grounded in human dignity (Tutu, 1999).

Comparable ethical frameworks are evident in local restorative justice practices across Africa. In northern Uganda, the *Mato Oput* ritual emphasizes truth-telling, symbolic reconciliation, compensation, and the reweaving of kinship ties following grave wrongdoing, reflecting the belief that justice must heal social relationships rather than merely sanction offenders (Andersen et al., 2017; Baines, 2007; Finnstrom, 2010). In post-genocide Rwanda, community-based *Gacaca* courts combined accountability with broad communal participation,

aiming to rebuild trust, enable coexistence, and restore moral order at the grassroots level (Amani, 2021; Clark, 2010; Ruvebana & De Brouwer, 2013; Ugorji, 2019). Similarly, elder-led mediation councils found in many African societies privilege consensus, apology, restitution, and social harmony over adversarial legalism, reinforcing ubuntu's normative claim that peace is sustainable only when relational trust is restored and intergenerational moral continuity is maintained (Murithi, 2006; Wiredu, 1998). Collectively, these examples demonstrate that ubuntu is not merely an abstract ethical ideal but a lived moral praxis one that situates peace, justice, and human flourishing within the ongoing responsibility to sustain, repair, and deepen human relationships.

From a theoretical standpoint, ubuntu dissolves several dualisms entrenched by Cartesian rationalism. It bridges reason and emotion, acknowledging that affective capacities such as empathy, remorse, and care are constitutive of moral judgment. It unites justice and reconciliation by insisting that accountability and relational repair are mutually constitutive rather than antagonistic. Furthermore, ubuntu reconceptualizes human dignity as inherently relational: an individual's moral worth is realized through the recognition and affirmation received from the community, challenging liberal individualist paradigms that treat dignity as intrinsic and independent of social context (Metz, 2011). This relational conception offers a holistic ethical framework for peace, integrating moral psychology, social ontology, and normative rigor.

Ubuntu also provides a critical lens on contemporary peace interventions in Africa. Liberal peace approaches often rely on universalized legal norms, institutional reforms, and procedural mechanisms, yet they frequently fail to engage the moral and relational dimensions of conflict, leading to partial, externally imposed, and sometimes fragile peace. Ubuntu-informed frameworks, in contrast, emphasize participatory processes, local epistemic authority, and culturally resonant mechanisms of conflict resolution, thereby enhancing both the legitimacy and effectiveness of peace initiatives (Mangaliso & Mangaliso, 2006; Metz, 2011). By centering social relations as the locus of moral and political life, ubuntu enables peacebuilding to move beyond formal

compliance toward deep ethical and social transformation.

Critically, ubuntu should not be interpreted as parochial or incompatible with universal human rights. Philosophical elaborations by Ramose, (1999) and Metz, (2011) demonstrate that ubuntu provides a normative structure capable of addressing concerns about individual liberty, moral responsibility, and institutional accountability. Its principles can be systematized and integrated with formal governance structures without losing their relational character, offering a dialogical bridge between African moral epistemologies and global ethical norms. In doing so, ubuntu reconceives peace as an ethical achievement rather than merely a legal or procedural state, emphasizing the cultivation of moral relationships alongside institutional order.

In this vein, ubuntu ethics constitutes a robust philosophical alternative to Cartesian rationalist models of peace. By grounding moral agency, justice, and reconciliation in relational ontology, ubuntu provides conceptual tools for understanding and enacting peace in African contexts. Its relational approach attends to the lived experiences of communities affected by conflict, prioritizes restorative practices over retributive formalism, and embeds normative authority in shared ethical life. As such, ubuntu represents not merely a culturally specific tradition but a philosophically sophisticated framework for reorienting peace theory toward sustainability, legitimacy, and moral depth. The subsequent sections will explore how these principles can be operationalized within contemporary African peacebuilding initiatives, illustrating the practical and theoretical integration of ubuntu with institutional frameworks.

4. Integrating Ubuntu Ethics into Practical Peace Frameworks in Africa

Building on the critique of Cartesian rationalism and the philosophical exposition of Ubuntu ethics, requires to translate these insights into operationalizable frameworks for peace in African contexts. The challenge lies in bridging the gap between moral theory and institutional practice; i.e., the way in which Ubuntu's relational ontology and communitarian ethics are institutionalized within

peacebuilding practices, justice frameworks, and governance systems without reducing their moral depth to procedural instruments. Addressing this question requires both normative reasoning and empirical sensitivity, highlighting the interplay between ethical ontology, social practice, and institutional design.

4.1 From Relational Moral Theory to Operational Frameworks

Ubuntu reconceptualizes peace as a moral achievement embedded in social relationships, rather than as merely the absence of conflict or the establishment of formal institutions. From this perspective, sustainable peace requires attention to three interconnected dimensions as presented in *Table 1* below.

Table 1: Ubuntu-Informed Peacebuilding Framework

Policy Pillar	Core Ubuntu Principle	Key Instruments	Implementation Actors	Expected Outcomes
Restorative Justice	Relational repair	Truth-telling; reconciliation; reintegration	TRCs; community courts; mediators; elders	Social cohesion; moral repair; reconciliation
Participatory Governance & Local Knowledge	Consensus and shared authority	Dialogue forums; inclusive decision-making	Elders; women's councils; youth groups; local authorities	Legitimacy; compliance; sustainable governance
Communal Capacity - Building & Social Resilience	Interdependence and solidarity	Education; economic empowerment; cooperatives	Communities; civil society; local government	Resilience; reduced tensions; durable peace

Conflicts often produce moral and relational injuries that endure beyond the cessation of hostilities, thereby necessitating restorative justice approaches. Ubuntu-informed approaches emphasize

reconciliation, accountability, and reintegration over punitive measures. Truth-telling, community hearings, and mediated dialogue serve not merely as procedural exercises but as ethical processes for reconstituting relational integrity (Tutu, 1999). Mechanisms such as TRC exemplify how Ubuntu principles can guide national-scale restorative interventions, promoting both moral repair and social cohesion.

Above this, the process requires Participatory Governance and Local Knowledge Integration. A core tenet of Ubuntu is that moral and political authority emerges relationally, through dialogue, consensus, and communal recognition. Peace frameworks informed by Ubuntu prioritize participatory decision-making, recognizing local epistemic authority and cultural norms as legitimate sources of guidance. In post-conflict contexts such as Rwanda and Northern Uganda, initiatives that integrate community elders, women's councils, and youth forums demonstrate how local moral authority can complement formal governance, thereby enhancing legitimacy, compliance, and sustainability (Mangaliso & Mangaliso, 2006; Metz, 2011).

Furthermore, the process requires deliberate investment in communal capacity-building and the cultivation of social resilience. Ubuntu emphasizes the interdependence of community members, implying that social capital and relational networks are essential resources for peace. Practical interventions thus extend beyond immediate conflict resolution to include education, economic empowerment, and civic engagement initiatives that strengthen communal bonds. For example, cooperative agricultural programs in East Africa illustrate how relational ethics can guide resource sharing, mutual accountability, and the cultivation of collective responsibility, thereby, reducing social tensions and fostering durable peace (Mbiti, 1969, 2002; Mfugale, 2025).

4.2 Reconciling Ubuntu with Institutional Rationality

A critical challenge lies in integrating Ubuntu's relational ethics with the formal institutions of modern states. Cartesian rationalism and liberal governance models often frame institutions in universalistic, proceduralist terms, emphasizing

codified law, bureaucratic efficiency, and abstract individual rights. Ubuntu does not reject these institutions but calls for their ethical reorientation, embedding relational values into governance structures. This integration requires three key strategies as presented on *Table 2* below.

Table 2: Operational Dimensions of Ubuntu in Peacebuilding

Model Component	Core Orientation	Institutional Mechanisms
Ethical Institutional Design	Relational accountability	Community oversight committees; participatory budgeting; restorative justice tribunals
Hybrid Peace Approaches	Integration of local moral orders and formal systems	Customary mediation in courts; community elders in monitoring mechanisms
Moral and Civic Education	Communal cultivation of ethical virtues	Civic education programs; school curricula; public moral campaigns

Ethical Institutional Design: Institutions should be structured to incentivize relational accountability rather than mere rule-following. This may involve community-based oversight committees, participatory budgeting processes, or restorative justice tribunals that mediate between formal legal authority and local moral norms. Such designs operationalize Ubuntu principles by making communal recognition and reconciliation integral to institutional functioning (Metz, 2011).

Hybrid Peace Approaches: Ubuntu aligns naturally with the concept of hybrid peace, which recognizes that externally imposed rationalist frameworks must interact dynamically with local moral orders (Mac Ginty, 2010). Hybrid peace strategies can formalize Ubuntu-inspired practices within state institutions without eroding their legal coherence. For instance, integrating customary mediation procedures into formal courts or incorporating community elders into post-conflict monitoring mechanisms can bridge the gap between universalist law and relational ethics.

Moral and Civic Education: The sustainability of Ubuntu-informed peace frameworks depends on cultivating an ethos of relational responsibility across society. Civic education, school curricula, and public campaigns can emphasize empathy, collective accountability, and moral repair, fostering a culture of peace that complements formal legal structures. This aligns with the African philosophical insight that ethical virtues are cultivated communally rather than imposed solely through rational instruction (Ramose, 1999).

5. Ubuntu as Ethical Foundation for Relational and Sustainable Peace

The integration of Ubuntu into practical peace frameworks carries profound theoretical implications. First, it challenges the universalist assumptions of liberal peace theory, highlighting the limits of procedural and rationalist models in contexts where social cohesion, moral repair, and relational trust are central to communal life. Second, it demonstrates that ethical ontology and institutional design are mutually constitutive: sustainable peace emerges from the interplay between relational moral commitments and formalized governance structures. Third, it provides a model for epistemic pluralism, recognizing that local moral knowledge, communal wisdom, and lived ethical experience are indispensable for effective peacebuilding (Richmond, 2009).

Normatively, Ubuntu-informed frameworks redefine the metrics of success in peacebuilding. Rather than measuring peace solely through the absence of violence, electoral participation, or legal compliance, Ubuntu emphasizes the restoration of trust, the repair of moral relations, and the flourishing of communal life. This approach aligns with contemporary philosophical arguments that peace is both an ethical and social achievement, not merely a technical or institutional outcome (Ehlers, 2017; Metz, 2011; Tutu, 1999).

6. Conclusion

This study has demonstrated that sustainable peace in Africa is less a technical or procedural challenge than a moral and philosophical one. Peacebuilding frameworks grounded primarily in abstract rationalism struggle to generate legitimacy and

durability when they remain detached from the relational worlds in which African communities live. By contrast, Ubuntu offers a coherent ethical orientation that anchors peace in shared humanity, mutual recognition, and communal responsibility. The core outcome of this analysis is the identification of Ubuntu as a viable normative foundation for peace that can be translated into institutional practice without undermining formal governance. When embedded through restorative justice mechanisms, participatory decision-making, and community-centered moral formation, Ubuntu enhances the credibility, inclusiveness, and resilience of peace processes. Peace, in this sense, emerges not merely as the absence of violence or the stability of structures, but as the restoration and nurturing of moral relationships.

Rather than opposing universal legal norms, Ubuntu reframes them within a relational ethic that values dialogue, reconciliation, and collective flourishing. This relational reinterpretation enables a hybrid and pluralistic peace model one that speaks both to global standards and local moral realities. The overall contribution of this work lies in showing that peace becomes sustainable when it is lived, recognized, and morally sustained within communities, transforming peace from an institutional outcome into an ongoing ethical practice rooted in African social life.

7. Acknowledgment

The author gratefully acknowledges the Catholic University of Mbeya for their generous financial support, which made the completion of this study possible.

8. Bibliography

- Amani, G. G. (2021). The Traditional Methods of Conflict Transformation in Africa: The Case of Gacaca Courts in Rwanda. *International Diplomatic Review Journal*, 1(1).
- Augustine, S. (2001). *Ubuntu: an Ethic for a New South Africa*. Cluster Publications.
- Clark, P. (2010). The gacaca courts, post-genocide justice and reconciliation in Rwanda: Justice without lawyers. In *The Gacaca Courts, Post-Genocide Justice and Reconciliation in Rwanda: Justice Without Lawyers*. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511761584>
- Descartes, R. (2016). *Meditations on First Philosophy*. In *Seven Masterpieces of Philosophy*. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511894695.169>
- Ehlers, P. J. (2017). *A Comparison of the Views of Augustine Shutte and Thaddeus Metz on African Philosophy and Ubuntu Ethics*. <http://etd.uwc.ac.za/>
- Finnstrom, S. (2010). Reconciliation Grown Bitter? War, Retribution, and Ritual Action in Northern Uganda. In *Localizing Transitional Justice: Interventions and Priorities After Mass Violence*.
- Fourie, P. (2010). Walk with us and listen: political reconciliation in Africa. *Global Change, Peace & Security*, 22(3). <https://doi.org/10.1080/14781158.2010.510276>
- Gade, C. B. N. (2011). The historical development of the written discourses on ubuntu. *South African Journal of Philosophy*, 30(3). <https://doi.org/10.4314/sajpem.v30i3.69578>
- Gatto, A. (2021). Cartesian modernity: A paradigm of interpretation. *Revista Portuguesa de Filosofia*, 77(2–3). https://doi.org/10.17990/RPF/2021_77_2_1007
- Grosfoguel, R. (2013). The Structure of Knowledge in Westernized Universities. *Human Architecture: Journal of the Sociology of Self-Knowledge*, 9(1).
- Hobbes, T. (2005). *Leviathan* 1. *Stand*, 19(1988).
- Kant, I. (2019). Perpetual Peace: a Philosophical Sketch. In *Kant: Political Writings*. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511809620.007>
- Knappert, J. (2021). Bantu Philosophy. In *Encyclopedia of African Religions and Philosophy*. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-024-2068-5_51
- Kornienko, O. (2023). Bantu philosophy in the history of African philosophy. In *Sententiae* (Vol. 42, Issue 3). <https://doi.org/10.31649/sent42.03.127>
- Kubow, P. K. (2025). Ubuntu: An African Moral Ethic to Advance a Critical Democratic Global Citizenship Education. *Educational Practice and Theory*, 47(1). <https://doi.org/10.7459/ept/470102>

- Letseka, M. (2012). In Defence of Ubuntu. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 31(1). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11217-011-9267-2>
- Mac Ginty, R. (2010). Hybrid peace: The interaction between top-down and bottom-up peace. *Security Dialogue*, 41(4). <https://doi.org/10.1177/0967010610374312>
- Makhetha, T. (2024). Ubuntu Ethics: A framework for rehumanising social research with young people. *African Journal of Social Work*, 14(6). <https://doi.org/10.4314/ajsw.v14i6.9>
- Mangaliso, M., & Mangaliso, A. (2006). Unleashing the synergistic effects of Ubuntu: Observations from South Africa. In *Prophecies and Protests: Ubuntu in Glocal Management*.
- Masipa, M. J., Mdhluli, N., & Mphasha, L. E. (2024). Ubuntu, an Imperative Fingerprint of Morality in African Literature: A Case of Selected Works of J.J Thwala and O.K Matsepe. *Journal of Education and Learning Technology*. <https://doi.org/10.38159/jelt.20245107>
- Mbiti, J. (1969). African Religions and Philosophy. *Journal of Religion in Africa*, 2(2). <https://doi.org/10.2307/1594869>
- Mbiti, J. (2002). The African proverbs project and after. *Lexikos*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.5788/12-0-773>
- Metz, T. (2011). Ubuntu as a moral theory and human rights in South Africa. *African Human Rights Law Journal*, 11(2).
- Mfugale, C. (2025). Agricultural Transformation as a Driver of Youth Livelihoods: Evidence from BBT and AGCOT in Ruvuma Region, Tanzania. In *Asian Journal of Social Science and Management Technology* (Vol. 7, Issue 5). www.ajssmt.com
- Mfugale, C., Tegete, F., Hunja, T., & Msilimo, P. (2025). The Gift as Shared Humanity: A Cross-Cultural Phenomenology of Moral Obligation. *Perceived Credibility of Political News on Nigerian News Blogs, TzJMS*, 4(1), 45–61. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17843515>
- Murithi, T. (2006). Practical Peacemaking Wisdom from Africa: Reflections on Ubuntu. *The Journal of Pan African Studies*, 1(4).
- Nelson, M. (1990). The long walk to freedom. *Choice Reviews Online*, 28(04). <https://doi.org/10.5860/choice.28-2464>
- Nxumalo, S. A., & Mncube, D. W. (2018). Using indigenous games and knowledge to decolonise the school curriculum: Ubuntu perspectives. *Perspectives in Education*, 36(2). <https://doi.org/10.18820/2519593X/pie.v36i2.9>
- Ramose, M. B. (1999). The philosophy of ubuntu and ubuntu as a philosophy. In *The African Philosophy Reader*.
- Richmond, O. P. (2009). A post-liberal peace: Eireanism and the everyday. *Review of International Studies*, 35(3). <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210509008651>
- Ruvebana, E., & De Brouwer, A. M. (2013). The Legacy of the Gacaca Courts in Rwanda: Survivors' views. In *International Criminal Law Review* (Vol. 13, Issue 5). <https://doi.org/10.1163/15718123-01305001>
- Sarkar, Dr. A., Jain, Dr. N., Imran, Mr. A., Rajagopal, Dr. S., & Chowdhury, Prof. A. (2024). Descartes' "Cogito Ergo Sum": The Revolution and Critique of Rationalism. *Library Progress International*. <https://doi.org/10.53555/lpi.v44i3.2905>
- Tutu, A. D. (1999). No Future Without Forgiveness. *New Perspectives Quarterly*, 16(5). <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5842.1999.tb00012.x>
- Ugorji, B. (2019). Indigenous Dispute Resolution and National Reconciliation: Learning from the Gacaca Courts in Rwanda. *Journal of Living Together*, 6(1).
- Van Wyk, J. H. (1995). Long Walk to Freedom: The Autobiography of Nelson Mandela. *Koers - Bulletin for Christian Scholarship*, 60(4). <https://doi.org/10.4102/koers.v60i4.652>
- Wiredu, K. (1998). Toward Decolonizing African Philosophy and Religion. *African Studies Quarterly*, 1(4).
- Wrage, B., Papadopoulos, D., & Benz-Schwarzburg, J. (2024). Ubuntu in Elephant Communities. *Journal of the American Philosophical Association*, 10(4). <https://doi.org/10.1017/APA.2023.24>