

EPISTEMOLOGIES OF LEGITIMACY: RETHINKING GGIs THROUGH AFRICAN THOUGHT

Emmanuel Chukwujekwu Ikenga
&
Paul Ikechukwu Ogugua
Department of Philosophy
Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka

Abstract

This paper argues that prevailing theories of legitimacy in Global Governance Institutions (GGIs) are epistemically inadequate because they are grounded in Western proceduralism, formal authority, and technocratic rationality, while marginalizing non-Western moral knowledge systems. Drawing on African philosophy (particularly Ubuntu ethics, Innocent Asouzu's complementary ontology (Ibuanyidanda), and communitarian epistemologies), the paper reconceptualizes legitimacy as a relational, moral, and epistemic achievement rather than a merely institutional or procedural ideal. It suggests that legitimacy emerges through mutual recognition, epistemic reciprocity, and the co-production of norms between governing institutions and affected communities. Situating contemporary legitimacy deficits within the historical legacies of colonial epistemic domination, enables the paper expose how GGIs reproduce asymmetries of voice, representation, and knowledge, especially in the Global South. The paper finds out that African thoughts offer a reconstructive framework that challenges epistemic arrogance, foregrounds communal validation of authority, and demands participatory governance rooted in moral consonance. It concludes that without integrating relational and complementary epistemologies, GGIs may continue to suffer from legitimacy crises that cannot be resolved by procedural reform alone.

Keywords: African Philosophy, Complementary Ontology, Epistemic Legitimacy, Global Governance Institutions, Legitimacy, Ubuntu.

Introduction

The question of legitimacy lies at the normative core of global governance. Global Governance Institutions (GGIs) such as the United Nations, the International Monetary Fund, and the World Bank exercise extensive influence over political, economic, and social life across the globe, yet their authority is increasingly contested, particularly in the Global South. Standard accounts of legitimacy within political theory and international relations have tended to locate legitimacy in formal authorization, procedural correctness, legal rationality, and technocratic effectiveness. While these criteria are not insignificant, they rest on epistemological assumptions that are historically Western, culturally specific, and insufficiently attentive to diverse moral recognition and lived experiences. This paper argues that the persistence of legitimacy deficits in GGIs is not merely institutional or procedural, but fundamentally epistemic. African philosophy provides a critical vantage point from which to interrogate these

deficits. Unlike dominant Western frameworks that conceptualize legitimacy as an attribute conferred by institutional design or rule compliance, African epistemologies situate legitimacy within relational ontology, communal moral reasoning, and shared knowledge practices. Drawing on Ubuntu ethics, Asouzu's complementary ontology (Ibanyidanda), and communitarian theories of knowledge, this paper advances the claim that legitimacy is co-constituted through moral recognition and epistemic reciprocity between institutions and the communities they govern. Authority, in this view, is not simply exercised over subjects but emerges dialogically through inclusion, participation, and acknowledgment of epistemic agency.

This reconceptualization is particularly urgent given the historical context of global governance. The architecture of contemporary GGIs was shaped by colonial and post-war power structures that universalized Western epistemic norms while displacing indigenous systems of authority and moral validation. As a result, many GGIs continue to operate through epistemic frameworks that marginalize African voices, discount local knowledge, and privilege technocratic expertise over communal judgment. The legitimacy crises faced by institutions such as the IMF and World Bank (especially in Africa) cannot be adequately explained without accounting for this epistemic violence and its moral consequences. The central claim of this paper is therefore twofold. First, that dominant procedural and institutional theories of legitimacy fail to capture the moral and epistemic conditions under which authority is recognized as rightful in culturally plural contexts. Second, that African philosophical traditions offer not merely a critique but a reconstructive alternative: a framework in which legitimacy is understood as relational, ethically grounded, and epistemically inclusive.

The discourse proceeds as follows. It first examines the problem of representation and voice in GGIs, highlighting structural asymmetries that undermine claims to legitimacy. It then situates these problems within the historical legacy of colonial epistemic domination. Next, it develops the African philosophical foundations of epistemic legitimacy, focusing on Ubuntu and complementary ontology. Finally, it explores the implications of this framework for participatory governance and institutional reform of GGIs before concluding with broader theoretical and practical reflections.

Representation and Voice: Whose Interests Do GGIs Serve?

GGIs are formal and informal organizations that facilitate international cooperation, regulation, and collective decision-making among states, NGOs, and other transnational actors (Routledge, 2025). These institutions address global challenges (e.g. climate change, trade, human rights) that exceed the capacity of individual states, some examples include the United Nations (UN), World Trade Organization (WTO), International Criminal Court (ICC), International Monitoring Fund (IMF), etc.

One of the central normative questions in assessing the legitimacy of global governance institutions (GGIs) is: whose interests do these institutions actually represent? The question of representation and voice implicates both democratic theory and theories of justice, asking whether global institutions speak for, listen to, and are accountable to those most affected by their policies. While GGIs claim universal mandates and ostensibly operate in the common interest, a closer philosophical and empirical interrogation reveals acute asymmetries in voice, agency, and influence. These asymmetries shape both the distributional outcomes of global policies and the perceived legitimacy of the institutions

that enact them.

At the heart of the representation problem is the tension between state-centric representation and individual or popular representation. Traditional international law and much of the practice of GGIs are premised on the sovereign equality of states: states are the primary subjects and representatives in international fora, and intergovernmental organizations derive authority from member states' consent. This state-centric model presupposes that state actors adequately represent their populations' interests in global negotiations. Yet this assumption is philosophically contestable. Political theorists of democratic legitimacy insist that legitimacy requires more than formal delegations; it demands responsive, inclusive channels that allow affected individuals and communities to influence decisions that materially shape their lives (Dahl, 1998). Iris Marion Young's critique of proceduralism is instructive here. Young argues that formal procedures of representation often leave out social groups that are structurally marginalized; she advances a model of inclusive representation that attends to group-differentiated voices and communicative structures that enable them to speak and be heard (Young, 2000). Applied to GGIs, Young's framework exposes how institutional design (voting rules, agenda-setting powers, and technical expertise) privileges certain actors (powerful states, major funders, transnational corporations, and technocratic elites) while sidelining weaker states, indigenous peoples, and subaltern communities. The implication is stark: even where states formally represent their people, the substantive voices of the poor, rural communities, and historically colonized peoples are often absent from decision-making processes, thereby weakening GGIs' claim to moral legitimacy (Walzer, 1983).

Contemporary debates about representation also turn on the contrast between territorial representation and functional representation. The former is the familiar model inherited from the Westphalian state system- representation according to territory and citizenry. The latter recognizes representation by interest or function- non-state actors, expert networks, and transnational civil society actors may claim representational legitimacy on the basis of expertise, moral authority, or the capacity to articulate global public goods. Advocates of functional representation (including some cosmopolitan theorists and proponents of global governance reform) argue that such plural representation models can correct state failures and augment democratic responsiveness at the global level (Held, 2004). However, critics caution that functional representation risks creating a technocratic elite insulated from democratic accountability, where expertise substitutes popular consent and where powerful epistemic communities can set agenda without meaningful public scrutiny (Selznick, 1992).

The empirical structure of GGIs reflects both patterns and pathologies. Consider the governance of major financial institutions: voting shares and decision-making clout in the IMF and World Bank remain heavily skewed toward advanced economies, particularly the United States and the European Union, thereby institutionalizing an inequality of voice that correlates with economic power (Woods, 2006). Even reforms aimed at incremental redistribution of voting power have been criticized as inadequate and slow, leaving developing countries structurally disadvantaged in the very institutions that shape their economic policies (Woods, 2007). Joseph Stiglitz's critique of global financial governance underscores how these imbalances produce policies (such as structural adjustment programs) that often fail to reflect the needs and preferences of local

populations but nonetheless impose profound social costs (Stiglitz, 2002).

Philosophically, this structural imbalance raises two related problems. First, procedural injustice: if those who bear the burdens of policy lack effective voice in its design and implementation, the procedural grounds for legitimacy are undermined. Second, epistemic injustice: marginalized groups are excluded from contributing knowledge about their contexts, means, and ends. As a result, policies are informed by truncated epistemic frameworks that privilege technical indicators over local knowledge and human flourishing (Fricker, 2007). Miranda Fricker's account of epistemic injustice (testimonial and hermeneutical) sheds light on how global institutions may systematically discredit or ignore the testimonies of certain populations, perpetuating illegitimate forms of governance (Fricker, 2007).

A communitarian and African philosophical critique sharpens these concerns by insisting that representation must be measured against relational inclusion and recognition. From the Ubuntu and complementarity perspectives this paper showcases the fact that legitimacy is not merely the aggregation of preferences through state proxies; it is the extent to which institutions recognize the moral worth of persons and communities as interlocutors in shared decision-making. This normative standard requires institutional mechanisms that go beyond formal representation: sustained consultative processes, subsidiarity arrangements that empower local actors, and modes of deliberation that respect cultural pluralism. The failure of GGIs to institutionalize such mechanisms results in what some African scholars term “epistemic marginalization” and “voice deficit,” whereby African states and civil societies are constrained in their capacity to shape global norms that directly affect them (Biakolo, 2000).

The role of global civil society and NGOs in remedying representation deficits is contested. On one hand, transnational advocacy networks, social movements, and nongovernmental organizations have successfully inserted new issues (e.g., debt relief, human rights, climate justice) onto global agendas and provided channels for subaltern voices to be heard at international fora. The Jubilee 2000 campaign and anti-apartheid mobilizations are case-studies of how civil society can augment democratic representation at the global level (Snidal, 2001). On the other hand, critiques of global civil society highlight problems of selective inclusion, funding dependency, and representational distortion. Many NGOs are themselves accountable to donors rather than to grassroots constituencies, and not all civil-society actors claim to represent the most vulnerable (Carothers, 1999). Thus, civil society is neither a panacea nor a simple proxy for democratic representation; its legitimacy-enhancing potential depends critically on its institutional embeddedness and accountability to constituencies.

Another locus of representational deficit is the domain of expertise. GGIs routinely rely on technocratic expertise to set standards, evaluate programs, and justify interventions. While expertise is indispensable for addressing complex transnational problems, it easily becomes a double-edged sword: technocracy can improve efficiency but may also entrench a form of authority without democratic grounding. The tension between expertise and democratic legitimacy has been debated by political theorists. Habermas's deliberative model suggests that legitimacy is best achieved when expert knowledge is subject to public deliberation and normative scrutiny, rather than dictatorial deployment (Habermas, 1996). In practice, however, expert-driven governance often bypasses robust

public deliberation, thereby producing policies that, though technically sound, lack popular acceptance and moral credibility (Slaughter, 2004).

Historical Context: Colonial Legacies and the Need for African Epistemologies

Understanding the epistemologies of legitimacy in GGIs requires situating them within the historical disruptions caused by colonialism and imperialism. Pre-colonial African societies often operated under governance models that prioritized communal harmony and relational ethics, as seen in systems like the Igbo village assemblies or the Ashanti confederation, where authority was legitimated through consensus and moral alignment with community values (Oguejiofor, 1996). Colonial powers, however, imposed hierarchical structures that privileged procedural formality over relational depth, leading to a legitimacy crisis that persists in post-colonial states (Mamdani, 1996).

This historical backdrop underscores the relevance of African philosophies in critiquing GGIs. For instance, the imposition of Western development models by institutions like the IMF have often exacerbated inequalities, as evidenced by structural adjustment programs in the 1980s and 1990s that prioritized fiscal austerity over social welfare (Stiglitz, 2002). Such interventions reflect an epistemic arrogance, projecting Western rationality as universal, which African thinkers like Wiredu (1996) argue undermines local moral frameworks. Ubuntu, as a relational ethic, counters this by insisting on governance that fosters interconnectedness and mutual respect.

Moreover, the global order post-World War II, with the establishment of GGIs, was shaped by Western powers, marginalizing African voices until the rise of decolonization waves in the 1960s. Even then, legitimacy deficits arose from the mismatch between global norms and local realities, leading to resistance movements and calls for epistemic decolonization (Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2018). African epistemologies, therefore, serve not only as critiques but as reconstructive tool for building inclusive global governance.

African Philosophical Foundations of Epistemic Legitimacy

African thought emphasizes that knowledge and morality are inseparable from communal contexts. In Ubuntu philosophy, legitimacy arises from relationships of mutual recognition and responsibility. Ramose (1999) articulates Ubuntu as grounded in the principle that “a person is a person through other persons” (p. 49), underscoring that to govern legitimately is to recognize the interconnectedness of human agents and to act in ways that enhance the collective flourishing of the community. This maxim highlights that human excellence and legitimacy are not individualistic achievements but emerge through relational affirmation: “One is enjoined, yes, commanded as it were, to actually become a human being” through others (Ramose (1999), as cited in Metz, 2019). Unlike Western models that often treat legitimacy as the output of institutional design, African epistemologies insist that legitimacy is co-constituted by the governed, reflecting their moral reasoning, lived experiences, and cultural understandings (Asouzu, 2007). This relational epistemology contrasts with individualistic paradigms, where legitimacy is often derived from abstract principles or hierarchical structures.

In African contexts, epistemic validity stems from communal validation, where knowledge claims are tested against collective moral horizons. For GGIs, this means legitimacy cannot be assumed through universal declarations but must be earned through ongoing dialogue that respects diverse ontological commitments. As Tutu (1999) illustrates in the context of South Africa's Truth and Reconciliation Commission,

Ubuntu-inspired processes prioritize healing and reconciliation over punitive justice, demonstrating how relational ethics can legitimize transitional governance.

Innocent Asouzu's complementary ontology (Ibuanidanda) provides further theoretical depth. Asouzu posits that knowledge is not isolated or self-contained but emerges from interconnected systems of being and thought. He emphasizes that “no single perspective can claim absolute knowledge” because reality demands complementary integration of missing links (Asouzu, 2004, p. 95). Applied to GGIs, this implies that institutional authority is epistemically legitimate only when it incorporates the perspectives, needs, and moral frameworks of those governed. The failure to engage in such epistemic reciprocity constitutes a deficit of legitimacy, rendering interventions morally and politically problematic (Asouzu, 2013). For example, in global health governance, institutions like the World Health Organization (WHO) often overlooks indigenous knowledge systems, leading to ineffective responses in African contexts (Chigudu, 2020).

Broadly, complementary ontology challenges the binarism inherent in Western dualistic thinking (self/other, global/local) by advocating for a harmonious integration of missing links in reality. This approach aligns with broader African communitarian epistemologies, where truth is not absolute but emerges from shared experiences (Gyekye, 1997). In GGIs, adopting such foundations could mitigate legitimacy crises by fostering inclusive knowledge production.

Reframing Legitimacy Beyond Proceduralism

From an African philosophical standpoint, legitimacy cannot be reduced to procedural formalities such as elections, charters, or technocratic protocols. While these mechanisms are necessary, they are insufficient without ethical validation from the communities affected. This epistemic dimension underscores the importance of participatory engagement and hermeneutic dialogue between GGIs and local actors. For example, African communities often evaluate governance interventions based on moral consonance: whether policies align with communal norms, enhance social harmony, and respect local epistemologies (Ramose, 2002). This perspective aligns with contemporary critiques of global governance, which argue that institutional legitimacy is not self-generated. As Oguejiofor (2001) observes in discussing the African predicament, Western epistemological dominance often projects notions of rationality as universal, yet “much of Africa is in a precarious state” precisely because of such impositions that ignore local moral and epistemic realities (p. 7). African philosophical critique challenges this assertion that epistemic legitimacy must be dialogically earned, recognizing the cognitive and moral agency of subaltern actors in the Global South (Asouzu, 2007). Such critiques resonate with postcolonial theories that highlight the delegitimation effects of imposed norms (Scholte & Jongen, 2022).

Such a reframing exposes the limitations of procedural legitimacy in multicultural settings. Procedural correctness may ensure efficiency, but without epistemic alignment, it risks cultural imposition. African thought thus advocates for a wholistic legitimacy that integrates procedural, moral, and epistemic elements, fostering governance that is responsive to lived realities rather than imposed ideals. This is evident in critiques of international human rights regimes, where universal declarations often clash with local moral systems leading to resistance (Mutua, 2002).

Epistemic violence obviously arises when dominant knowledge systems marginalize alternatives (Spivak, 1988). In GGIs, this manifests as the prioritization of quantitative metrics over qualitative communal insights. African philosophies counter this by emphasizing resistance through epistemic reclamation. For instance, Ubuntu promotes a form of legitimacy rooted in empathy and shared humanity, which can inspire resistance to exploitative global trade policies (Lutz, 2009).

Complementarity, Moral Epistemology, and Participatory Governance

Asouzu's principle of complementarity offers a robust framework for rethinking GGI legitimacy. Complementarity posits that truth and normative authority emerges through the harmonization of multiple perspectives, each contributing partially to the moral and epistemic whole (Asouzu, 2004). As Asouzu (2007) explains, this involves avoiding “ethnocentric reduction” by recognizing that “human interdependence is a constant theme” and legitimacy arises from mutual complementary reflection among beings. In practice, this requires that GGIs co-produce governance frameworks with local stakeholders, ensuring that policies are not externally imposed but mutually constructed. Such an approach recognizes that legitimacy is simultaneously moral, epistemic, and procedural, grounded in the dynamic interplay of global norms and local realities (Asouzu, 2013).

This complementary model resonates with Ubuntu's ethic of relational personhood, where the ethical status of governance derives from its capacity to sustain human dignity within interconnected communities (Ramose, 1999). GGIs that adopt such epistemic frameworks are more likely to foster durable legitimacy, as their policies reflect both universal principles and culturally situated knowledge. Conversely, institutions that disregard this epistemic dimension risk perpetuating moral alienation, resistance, and delegitimization.

Participatory governance, informed by these principles, transform power dynamics. It shifts from top-down imposition to collaborative knowledge production, where moral epistemology guides decision-making. This is not only enhances legitimacy but also improves policy efficacy by incorporating diverse insights, reducing the epistemic blind spots inherent in monolithic frameworks. For example, in climate governance, complementarity could integrate African indigenous knowledge on sustainable land use, addressing gaps in global agreements like the Paris Accord (Chirisa et al., 2016).

Comparative Analysis with Western Theories

In order to highlight the distinctiveness of African epistemologies, a comparative analysis with Western theories is instructive. Western legitimacy theories, such as those from Habermas (1975), emphasize communicative rationality and procedural discourse ethics, assuming a neutral public sphere. In contrast, Ubuntu and complementary ontology embed rationality in relational contexts, critiquing the atomistic individualism of liberal theories. For instance, while Weber (1922) defines legitimacy through rational-legal authority, African thought views it as ontologically relational, where authority flows from communal bonds rather than bureaucratic structures. This comparison reveals how Western models often perpetuate inequalities in global governance by universalizing particularistic norms (Zaum, 2013). African approaches, by promoting epistemic humility, offer a bridge to hybrid models that harmonize global and local ethics (Tallberg et al., 2018).

Practical applications illuminate the transformative potential of African thought. Consider the IMF's interventions in African economies. Structural adjustment programs, focused on procedural fiscal reforms, often ignores local moral economies, leading to social unrest and legitimacy erosion (Mkandawire, 2015). An Ubuntu-informed approach would prioritize relational justice, involving communities in policy design to ensure collective flourishing.

Similarly, UN peacekeeping missions in Africa, such as in Sudan or the Democratic Republic of Congo, have faced legitimacy challenges due to cultural insensitivity (Autesserre, 2010). Applying complementary ontology could foster dialogical partnerships, integrating local epistemologies for more effective conflict resolution. In environmental governance, the integration of indigenous knowledge in the Convention on Biological Diversity echoes complementarity, though implementation remains uneven (Shengji, 1995). These cases demonstrate that African epistemologies can mitigate delegitimation by emphasizing participatory and morally consonant interventions.

Implications for Global Governance

Rethinking legitimacy through African epistemologies has significant implications for GGIs. First, it necessitates institutional reflexivity. GGIs should critically examine the assumptions underlying their normative frameworks and policy prescriptions. Second, it underscores the centrality of participatory processes, where affected communities are not passive recipients but active co-authors of governance norms. Third, it highlights the ethical responsibility of epistemic humility, acknowledging that local moral and cognitive systems possess validity independent of Western standards (Oguejiofor, 2001). Practically, this approach could transform mechanisms such as conditionality enforcement, human rights monitoring, and climate interventions. For instance, in environmental governance, epistemic legitimacy would require integrating indigenous ecological knowledge into global policy frameworks. Similarly, in development projects, local communities should participate in needs assessment, project design, and monitoring; ensuring that interventions are both contextually relevant and morally consonant (Ramose, 2002).

These implications extend to conflict resolution and economic policies, where complementary ontology could facilitate hybrid models blending global standards with local ethics. Prioritizing epistemic reciprocity, could enable GGIs mitigate accusations of neo-colonialism, building trust and cooperation across cultural divides. Recent proposals like the Pandemic Treaty could benefit from Ubuntu principles to ensure equitable vaccine distribution, addressing global health inequalities (Erundu et al., 2021).

Conclusion

This paper has argued that the legitimacy crisis confronting Global Governance Institutions cannot be resolved through procedural reform or institutional redesign alone. At its core, the crisis is epistemic and moral. GGIs continue to exercise authority through knowledge frameworks that marginalize the voices, experiences, and moral reasoning of those most affected by their decisions. Through interrogating legitimacy following African philosophical traditions (particularly Ubuntu ethics and Asouzu's complementary ontology), this study has reconceptualized legitimacy as a relational achievement grounded in moral recognition,

epistemic inclusion, and communal validation.

African epistemological reasoning exposes the limitations of dominant Western theories that reduce legitimacy to legality, efficiency, or procedural compliance. In contrast, they insist that authority becomes legitimate only when it resonates with the moral horizons and lived realities of communities, and when governance is practiced as a dialogical process rather than a technocratic imposition. From this perspective, the persistent delegitimation of GGIs in Africa is not accidental but structurally produced by epistemic exclusion, asymmetries of voice, and the lingering legacies of colonial domination.

In summary, the paper contends that a genuinely legitimate global order must be epistemically plural and morally grounded. GGIs that fail to recognize the epistemic agency of African societies (and of the Global South more broadly) will continue to face resistance, mistrust, and moral deficit. Embracing African epistemologies is therefore not merely an ethical gesture but a practical necessity for building sustainable, inclusive, and genuinely legitimate global governance institutions.

References

- Asouzu, I. I. (2004). *The Method and Principles of Complementary Reflection in and beyond African Philosophy*. University of Calabar Press.
- Asouzu, I. I. (2007). *Ibuanyidanda: New Complementary Ontology Beyond World-immanentism, Ethnocentric Reduction and Impositions*. LIT Verlag.
- Asouzu, I. I. (2013). *Ibuanyidanda (complementary reflection) and Some Basic Philosophical Problems in Africa Today: Sense experience, "ihe mkpuchi anya" and the Super-maxim*. LIT Verlag.
- Autesserre, S. (2010). *The Trouble with the Congo: Local Violence and the Failure of International Peacebuilding*. Cambridge University Press.
- Biakolo, Emevwo (2000). Categories of Cross-Cultural Cognition and the African Condition. *African Studies Review* 43(2), 20-26.
- Bollyky, T. J., Hulland, E. N., Barber, R. M., Collins, J. K., Kiernan, S., Moses, M., & Dieleman, J. L. (2022). Pandemic Preparedness and COVID-19: An Exploratory Analysis of Infection and Fatality Rates, and Contextual Factors Associated with Preparedness in 177 Countries, from Jan 1, 2020, to Sept 30, 2021. *The Lancet*, 399(10334), 1489-1512.
- Carothers, Thomas (1999). *Aiding Democracy Abroad: The Learning Curve*. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
- Chigudu, S. (2020). *The Political Life of an Epidemic: Cholera, Crisis and Citizenship in Zimbabwe*. Cambridge University Press.
- Chirisa, I., Dumba, S., & Mukura, T. (2016). Innovative, Adaptive and Survivalist Strategies by Small Cooperative Businesses in Zimbabwe: Implications to Entrepreneurship Development. *Urban Entrepreneurship* (pp. 1-15). Springer.
- Cornell, D., & Muvangua, N. (2011). *Ubuntu and the Law: African ideals and Postapartheid Jurisprudence*. Fordham University Press.
- Dahl, Robert A (1998). *On Democracy*. Yale University Press.
- Erundu, N. A., Aniebo, I., Kyobutungi, C., Midega, J., Okiro, E., & Okumu, F. (2021). Open Letter to International Funders of Science and Development in Africa. *Nature Medicine*, 27(5), 742-744.
- Fanon, F. (1963). *The Wretched of the Earth*. Grove Press.

- Fricker, Miranda (2007). *Epistemic Injustice: Power and the Ethics of Knowing*. Oxford University Press.
- Gyekye, K. (1997). *Tradition and Modernity: Philosophical Reflections on the African Experience*. Oxford University Press.
- Habermas, J. (1975). *Legitimation crisis*. Beacon Press.
- Habermas, J. (1996) *Between Facts and Norms*. MIT Press.
- Held, David (2004). *Global Covenant: The Social Democratic Alternative to the Washington Consensus*. Polity Press.
- Henderson, E. A. (2015). *African Realism? International Relations Theory and Africa's Wars in the Postcolonial Era*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Lutz, D. W. (2009). African Ubuntu Philosophy and Global Management. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 84(3), 313-328.
- Mamdani, M. (1996). *Citizen and Subject: Contemporary Africa and the Legacy of Late Colonialism*. Princeton University Press.
- Mkandawire, T. (2015). Neopatrimonialism and the Political Economy of Economic Performance in Africa: Critical reflections. *World Politics*, 67(3), 563-612.
- Mutua, M. (2002). *Human Rights: A Political and Cultural Critique*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S. J. (2018). *Epistemic Freedom in Africa: Deprovincialization and Decolonization*. Routledge.
- Oguejiofor, J. O. (1996). *The Influence of Igbo Traditional Religion on the Socio-political Character of the Igbo*. Fulladu Publishing Company.
- Oguejiofor, J. O. (2001). *Philosophy and the African Predicament*. Hope Publications.
- Ramose, M. B. (1999). *African philosophy through Ubuntu*. Mond Books.
- Ramose, M. B. (2002). The Ethics of Ubuntu. P. H. Coetzee & A. P. J. Roux (Eds.), *Philosophy from Africa: A Text with Readings* (2nd ed., pp. 324-337). Oxford University Press.
- Rawls, J. (1971). *A Theory of Justice*. Harvard University Press.
- Routledge (2025). *Global Governance Institutions*. Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy, "Global Justice."
- Selznick, Philip (1992). *Law, Society, and Industrial Justice*. Transaction Publishers.
- Scholte, J. A., & Jongen, H. (2022). Inequality and Legitimacy in Global Governance: An Empirical Study. *European Journal of International Relations*, 28(2), 281-306.
- Shengji, P. (1995). *Banking on Biodiversity: Reports from the Field on Biodiversity Conservation*. China Environment Series, 1, 1-10.
- Slaughter, Anne-Marie (2004). *A New World Order*. Princeton University Press.
- Snidal, Duncan (2001). The Political Economy of Debt Relief: Lessons from Jubilee 2000. *Global Governance* 7(3), 287-290.
- Spivak, G. C. (1988). Can the Subaltern Speak? C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds.), *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture* (pp. 271-313). University of Illinois Press.
- Stiglitz, J. E. (2002). *Globalization and its Discontents*. W.W. Norton & Company.
- Tallberg, J., Bäckstrand, K., & Scholte, J. A. (Eds.). (2018). *Legitimacy in Global Governance: Sources, Processes, and Consequences*. Oxford University Press.
- Tutu, D. (1999). *No Future without Forgiveness*. Image.
- Walzer, Michael (1983). *Spheres of Justice: A Defense of Pluralism and Equality*. Basic Books.

- Weber, M. (1922). *Economy and Society*. University of California Press.
- Wiredu, K. (1996). *Cultural Universals and Particulars: An African Perspective*. Indiana University Press.
- Woods, Ngaire (2006). *The Globalizers: The IMF, the World Bank, and Their Borrowers*. Cornell University Press.
- Woods, Ngaire (2007). The Globalizers and the Governed: Reforming International Financial Institutions *International Affairs* 83(6), 1113-1116.
- Young, Iris Marion (2000). *Inclusion and Democracy*. Oxford University Press.
- Zaum, D. (2013). *Legitimizing international Organizations*. Oxford University Press.