

LEGITIMACY DEFICIT OF GLOBAL GOVERNANCE INSTITUTIONS (GGIs): AN AFRICAN PHILOSOPHICAL INTERVENTION

Emmanuel Chukwujekwu Ikenga

&

Paul Ikechukwu Ogugua

Department of Philosophy

Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka

Abstract

Debates on the legitimacy of global governance institutions (GGIs) have largely been framed within Western political and legal traditions, emphasizing legality, procedural rationality, and state-centric representation. Despite significant theoretical contributions from thinkers such as Max Weber, Jurgen Habermas, John Rawls, and David Beetham, global institutions continue to face persistent legitimacy deficits, particularly among nations in the Global South. This paper argues that these deficits are not merely institutional or procedural but fundamentally normative and epistemic. Drawing on African philosophical traditions (especially communitarianism, Ubuntu ethics, and Innocent Asouzu's complementary reflection), the paper advances a relational conception of legitimacy grounded in moral inclusion, dialogical recognition, and shared humanity. It finds out that GGIs fail to attain genuine legitimacy insofar as they marginalize African and other Global South voices, universalize Western rationalities, and privilege state or technocratic representation over communal participation. Through a mediation of the tension between universalism and pluralism using African philosophical resources, the paper proposes a reconceptualization of global legitimacy that moves beyond legal consent and procedural deliberation toward relational justice and epistemic reciprocity. This African philosophical reframing offers both a critic of existing global governance structures and a normative foundation for more inclusive and morally credible global institutions.

Keywords: African Thoughts, Global Constitutionalism, Global Governance, Legitimacy, Normative Pluralism.

Introduction

The question of legitimacy lies at the normative core of global governance. Institutions such as the United Nations, the World Trade Organization, the International Monetary Fund, and the World Bank exercise far-reaching authority over political, economic, and social life across the globe. Yet, despite their expanding influence, these global governance institutions (GGIs) are persistently confronted with accusations of democratic deficit, representational imbalance, and moral alienation-especially from the perspective of nations in Africa and the wider Global South. The central puzzle this paper addresses is therefore not whether GGIs wield power, but whether, and on what grounds they can plausibly claim to wield legitimate power.

Existing approaches to legitimacy in global governance have been dominated by Western

political theory and international legal scholarship. Classical sociological accounts, such as Max Weber's typology of legal-rational, traditional, and charismatic authority, emphasize the sources of obedience and institutional stability. Contemporary normative theories (most notably those of Jurgen Habermas, John Rawls, and David Beetham) extends the concept of legitimacy by grounding it in the democratic deliberation, public reason, moral justification, and consent. While these frameworks offer valuable insights, this paper argues that they remain insufficient for diagnosing the legitimacy crisis of GGIs. Their limitations stem from an overreliance on procedural universalism, state-centric representation, and epistemic assumptions that marginalize non-Western moral worldviews.

The core claim of this paper is that the legitimacy deficit of GGIs is not merely institutional or procedural but fundamentally relational and epistemic. Global institutions often comply with formal legality and even procedural norms, yet fail to achieve moral credibility among those most affected by their decisions. From an African philosophical standpoint, legitimacy cannot be reduced to legal consent or rational procedure; it must be grounded in relational inclusion, communal recognition, and dialogical engagement with diverse moral traditions.

The paper advances its standpoint in four stages. First, it examines classical and contemporary Western theories of legitimacy, highlighting their relevance and limitations in global governance contexts. Second, it analyzes the structural legitimacy deficits of GGIs, focusing on representation, accountability, and epistemic exclusion. Third, it introduces African philosophical perspectives as critical and constructive resources for legitimacy assessment. Finally, it advances an African philosophical mediation of the universalism-pluralism tension, outlining the normative conditions under which global governance institutions may attain genuine moral and political legitimacy.

Legitimacy: Max Weber's Typology

One of the most foundational contributions to the understanding of legitimacy comes from the work of **Max Weber**, the influential German sociologist and political economist. In his analysis of legitimate authority, Weber delineated three distinct types of authority or *Herrschaft*- **legal-rational, traditional, and charismatic**. These typologies not only serve to classify different forms of legitimate rule but also highlight the sociological underpinnings of political obedience and the sources of institutional authority (Weber, 1978).

Legal-rational authority is perhaps the most prominent in modern governance systems and closely aligns with bureaucratic institutions and constitutional democracies. According to Weber, this form of legitimacy is grounded in **impersonal rules and norms**, where obedience is owed not to a particular leader, but to a set of legally established procedures and offices. In legal-rational systems, authority is exercised by officials who derive their power from the legal order itself. Their legitimacy is based on **rationally enacted laws** and the presumption that these laws are applied **universally and impersonally (Weber, 1978)**. Modern bureaucracies, the rule of law, and constitutionalism exemplify this type of authority. In these systems, institutional legitimacy is sustained by predictability, rule-bound behavior, and the assumption that

legal structures are just and rational. Weber's legal-rational model is thus foundational for contemporary discussions of **institutional legitimacy** in both domestic and global governance contexts (Beetham, 1991).

Traditional authority is grounded in **custom, heritage, and long-standing practices**. In societies where this form of legitimacy prevails, obedience is owed to an individual or institution by virtue of established tradition and inherited status. Monarchies, hereditary chieftaincies, and patriarchal systems often operate on this basis. Leaders are considered legitimate because they are part of a **continuum of tradition**, and their authority is accepted as part of a normative, cultural, or sacred order (Weber, 1978). Unlike legal-rational authority, which relies on formal procedures, traditional authority depends on **continuity and stability** rooted in the past. The legitimacy of traditional authority is often resistant to change, and reform may be seen as illegitimate or even sacrilegious. In Weber's view, traditional authority is less adaptive and more vulnerable to disruption when challenged by modern, rationalized systems (Mommson, 1984).

Charismatic authority is based on the **personal qualities and extraordinary character of an individual leader**. Such a leader commands legitimacy through what Weber describes as “**charisma**”- an exceptional quality that inspires devotion and emotional attachment from followers. Charismatic leaders often emerge in times of crisis or transition, offering revolutionary visions or promises of renewal (Weber, 1978). This form of legitimacy is **radically personal** and often exists outside the bounds of traditional or legal institutions. It is highly **unstable** because it depends entirely on the perceived exceptionalism of the leader. Once the charismatic figure dies or fails to perform, their authority typically wanes- unless it becomes routinized into a legal or traditional framework. Examples include religious prophets, revolutionary leaders, and populist figures who claim a unique mission or moral superiority. In the context of global governance, charismatic authority may manifest in **non-institutionalized forms** of leadership, such as influential civil society actors, global movement leaders (e.g., Greta Thunberg or Nelson Mandela), or even high-profile UN envoys whose legitimacy stems more from **moral appeal** than institutional role.

Weber's typology offers a lens through which to analyze how legitimacy operates in different governance systems, including the global level. **Legal-rational authority** underpins many international institutions, such as the United Nations or the World Trade Organization, which rely on formal rules and treaties. However, **traditional authority** continues to play a role in regional institutions grounded in historical ties or cultural norms (e.g., the African Union or Commonwealth). Meanwhile, **charismatic authority** explains the influence of non-state actors or global icons whose authority transcends formal structures. Importantly, Weber recognized that these types of legitimacy are not mutually exclusive. In practice, institutions may derive legitimacy from **hybrid sources**- combining legal rationality with traditional practices or charismatic leadership. Understanding these dynamics is essential for critically evaluating the **legitimacy claims of global governance institutions**, especially in a world marked by political complexity, cultural diversity, and contested authority.

Contemporary Political Theory: Habermas, Rawls, and Beetham

While Max Weber's typology of authority (legal, traditional, and charismatic) laid the

sociological groundwork for thinking about legitimacy, **contemporary political theorists** have extended and refined the concept by integrating it with **democratic norms, justice, deliberation, and institutional justification**. This section briefly explores key contributions from **Jürgen Habermas, John Rawls, and David Beetham**, each of whom has developed normative frameworks for understanding when authority can be considered morally and politically legitimate in a modern or global context.

Jürgen Habermas: Legitimacy through Deliberative Democracy

Jürgen Habermas, a German philosopher and sociologist, is perhaps the most influential thinker in **deliberative democratic theory**. His theory of legitimacy is grounded in **communicative rationality**, where political authority is legitimate if and only if it arises from **public, rational deliberation among free and equal citizens (Habermas, 1996)**. In this view, legitimacy is not merely a matter of legal validity or historical tradition but must be anchored in **democratic processes that respect the autonomy and participation of all affected individuals**. In *Between Facts and Norms*, Habermas (1996, p. 287) articulates his “discourse theory of law and democracy,” arguing that **legitimacy is achieved through a process of inclusive, open dialogue**, where laws and institutions can claim legitimacy only if they are the outcome of **free public reasoning** and can be defended to all citizens. This has direct implications for global governance institutions, which are frequently criticized for their **democratic deficit** and lack of inclusive deliberation. Habermas also distinguishes between **procedural legitimacy** (the rightness of decision-making processes) and **substantive legitimacy** (the justice or fairness of outcomes). In global contexts, Habermas (2001) advocates for a multilayered legitimacy structure that combines national democratic sovereignty with **supranational deliberative bodies**- a vision exemplified in his writings on the European Union and global constitutionalism.

John Rawls: Legitimacy and the Reasonable Political Order

John Rawls, a central figure in Anglo-American political theory, offers another influential perspective on legitimacy, rooted in **justice, public reason, and political liberalism**. In *Political Liberalism*, Rawls defines legitimacy as the condition in which **political power is exercised in accordance with a constitution the citizens can reasonably be expected to endorse (Rawls, 1993)**. His notion of legitimacy is grounded in the **idea of overlapping consensus**, where diverse moral, religious, and philosophical doctrines converge on shared political values and principles of justice. For Rawls, a legitimate political order must satisfy **two essential criteria**: it must be **justifiable to all reasonable citizens**; it must be grounded in **public reason**- a mode of justification that appeals to commonly shared political values rather than comprehensive moral or religious doctrines. Although Rawls focused primarily on domestic political legitimacy, he extended his framework to international relations in *The Law of Peoples* (Rawls, 1999). There, he proposed a conception of global justice and legitimacy among “peoples” rather than individual persons, grounded in respect for human rights, sovereignty, and fair terms of cooperation. However, this extension has faced criticisms for not going far enough in addressing **individual-level justice** or **institutional accountability** in global governance. Nevertheless, Rawls's emphasis on **moral justification, mutual respect,**

and **shared principles** remains vital for evaluating the legitimacy of global institutions, particularly those purporting to uphold universal values such as human rights and development goals.

David Beetham: The Normative Structure of Legitimacy

David Beetham offers a more empirically grounded yet normatively robust account of legitimacy that bridges political sociology and democratic theory. In his seminal work *The Legitimation of Power*, Beetham argues that legitimacy must be understood as a three-dimensional concept involving: legality: conformity to established rules; justifiability: the normative justification of those rules in terms of shared beliefs and values; consent: the expressed approval by those subject to the rules (Beetham, 1991). What distinguishes Beetham's theory is its emphasis on normative justification as a core component of legitimacy- legitimacy is not merely a matter of legality or stability, but requires moral credibility in the eyes of the governed. Legality alone, he argues, is not enough; institutions must also align with the value systems and normative expectations of the people they govern. Beetham is particularly critical of Weber's idea that legitimacy is reducible to belief or perception. For Beetham, legitimacy must be objectively demonstrable- it is not enough that people believe an institution is legitimate; one must also show that the institution meets moral and procedural standards that justify that belief. This model is especially applicable to global governance institutions, which often operate in environments where legal authority is weak or diffused, and where legitimacy must be derived from broader normative justifications- such as human rights, global justice, environmental sustainability, and participatory decision-making. Beetham's framework offers a powerful tool for critically assessing whether global institutions enjoy genuine normative legitimacy or merely de facto compliance.

Together, Habermas, Rawls, and Beetham provide a **rich theoretical vocabulary** for evaluating legitimacy in a world increasingly governed by transnational institutions. While Weber's typology emphasizes the origins of authority, these modern theorists focus on the **normative and democratic conditions** under which power can be legitimately exercised. In global governance, where institutions often lack direct electoral mandates or territorial sovereignty, these normative frameworks become especially significant. However, recent empirical research on global governance legitimacy supports the view that formal legality and procedural inclusion are insufficient conditions for moral legitimacy. Drawing on large-scale survey data across multiple regions, Lisa Dellmuth & Jonas Tallberg demonstrate that citizens' legitimacy judgments of global governance institutions diverge sharply from those of political elites, particularly in Africa and other parts of the Global South (Dellmuth & Tallberg 2023). Dellmuth et al (2022) also made similar observations. Their findings show that institutions perceived as procedurally correct may nonetheless lack social acceptance and moral credibility among affected populations. This empirical evidence reinforces the argument advanced in this paper that the legitimacy deficit of GGIs cannot be resolved through institutional design alone but requires deeper forms of normative recognition and inclusion.

Global Constitutionalism and the Legitimacy of Global Governance

Global constitutionalism refers to the **emergence of constitutional principles and legal**

norms beyond the nation-state, suggesting that global governance is evolving toward a system that mirrors constitutional order- one based on **rule of law, human rights, checks and balances, and public accountability (Dunoff & Trachtman, 2009)**. Although the global system lacks a single, unified constitution, scholars observe a **quasi-constitutional framework** taking shape through **binding international agreements, human rights conventions, the jurisprudence of international courts, and institutional practices** that resemble constitutional norms. The concept of global constitutionalism originates from efforts to **embed legal order, normativity, and legitimacy into the fabric of global governance institutions**. Key elements include: **hierarchy of norms** (e.g., *jus cogens* or peremptory norms); **binding judicial bodies** (e.g., International Criminal Court, WTO Dispute Settlement Body); **universal rights** (e.g., Universal Declaration of Human Rights); and **institutional restraint** (e.g., Charter-based limits on Security Council powers).

Ernst-Ulrich Petersmann (2010) contends that institutions like the **World Trade Organization** are governed by a “constitutional architecture” rooted in rule of law, due process, and fundamental rights: “The WTO's legal system reflects the evolution of international economic law from power-oriented diplomacy to a rights-based constitutionalism of trade governance” (pp. 47-49). **Habermas (2001)** sees global constitutionalism as the path toward a **post-national constellation**, where sovereignty is redefined by the increasing role of international law and democratic norms. He proposes a “**constitutionalization without a state**,” driven by human rights and deliberative legitimacy. **Anne Peters (2009)** adds that even though no formal world constitution exists, a **constitutional mindset** has emerged in the international legal order, exemplified by: **the UN Charter's quasi-constitutional status; the binding nature of international human rights treaties; and the growing influence of constitutional courts beyond borders**. Peters emphasizes the role of “**constitutional functions**” rather than constitutional forms. Institutions like the **UN Security Council** or **European Court of Human Rights** increasingly perform **regulatory and adjudicatory roles** akin to constitutional governance.

Despite the emergence of global constitutional norms, deep challenges remain in ensuring **democratic legitimacy, representation, and accountability**. One central critique concerns **representation**: Who speaks for “the people” in global institutions? Institutions like the **IMF, WTO, and UN Security Council** are dominated by powerful states or weighted voting mechanisms that **undermine equal voice**. For example, the IMF's quota system gives disproportionate influence to the U.S. and EU, marginalizing developing countries (Woods, 2006). **Consent** is also ambiguous in the global context. Treaties and charters are technically signed by sovereign states, but **the populations affected by global rules often lack meaningful participation or awareness**, rising concerns about **input legitimacy (Scharpf, 1999)**. **Accountability** mechanisms in global institutions are weak or fragmented. Unlike domestic constitutional orders, most global institutions **lack enforceable sanctions, recall procedures, or open electoral accountability**. As **Buchanan & Keohane (2006)** argue, “The legitimacy of global institutions depends on their being accountable to the people they affect, not merely to the governments that created them” (p. 410).

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 argue 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 for 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).

Recent work in international political theory highlight the growing role of expert authority in legitimizing global governance, often at the expense of participatory justification. Michael Zurn argues that global institutions increasingly rely on epistemic authority (claims to specialized knowledge) to justify decision-making in the absence of democratic consent (Zurn, 2018). While such authority may enhance efficiency, it also risks deepening legitimacy deficits where affected communities lack the capacity to contest expert judgments. This diagnosis aligns with African philosophical critiques of epistemic marginalization, reinforcing the claim that legitimacy requires not only knowledge production but dialogical accountability to those governed.

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, 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).

Contemporary global governance theory increasingly conceptualizes legitimacy as the outcome of ongoing normative contestation rather than stable institutional settlement. Jonathan Bexell et al argues that global governance institutions are embedded in continuous processes of legitimation and delegitimation, where different actors invoke competing standards (such as democracy, effectiveness, or justice) to challenge authority (Bexell et al., 2022). From this perspective, African critiques of GGIs are not external objections but integral components of global legitimacy struggles. The persistence of such contestation indicate that representation deficits are not merely technical flaws but symptoms of unresolved normative disagreement about who has the right to rule and on what grounds.

African Philosophical Perspectives as Lenses for Legitimacy

While Western scholarship often approaches legitimacy from contractualist, procedural, or cosmopolitan perspectives, African philosophy offers a distinctive lens that

emphasizes relationality, moral community, and the primacy of the common good. The communitarian and Ubuntu traditions, among others, provide normative resources for rethinking what makes global institutions morally and politically legitimate.

African communitarianism, as articulated by thinkers such as Ifeanyi Menkiti, Kwame Gyekye, and John Mbiti, posits that personhood is something to be achieved rather than given” (Menkiti, 1984). The individual becomes a person through participation in a moral community. This relational conception of the self stands in contrast to the liberal individualism that underpins much of Western political philosophy and, by extension, the normative framework of global institutions. In Gyekye's moderate communitarianism, the person is both autonomous and socially embedded; moral legitimacy, therefore, arises from the balance between individual rights and communal responsibilities (Gyekye, 1997). Applied to GGIs, this framework implies that legitimacy cannot rest solely on procedural rationality, legal consent, or formal representation. Rather, it must be grounded in relational moral inclusion- the capacity of global institutions to recognize and integrate the voices, experiences, and moral worth of all human communities, especially those historically marginalized in the global order.

The Ubuntu philosophy, prominent in Southern African thought and articulated by Mogobe Ramose, Desmond Tutu, and Thaddeus Metz, deepens this argument. Ubuntu, often summarized as “I am because we are,” conceives human dignity and legitimacy as products of interdependence (Metz, 2011). Ramose interprets Ubuntu as both an ontological and ethical doctrine that grounds political authority in the promotion of harmonious coexistence and reciprocity (Ramose, 1999). Thus, legitimacy within a global context should not merely reflect adherence to legal charters or rational procedures but the extent to which GGIs foster relational justice and mutual flourishing among peoples. This African orientation challenges the Weberian and Habermasian accounts of legitimacy that dominate global governance discourse. Weber's emphasis on rational-legal authority and Habermas's deliberative model of legitimacy, though valuable, are limited by their procedural universalism and their implicit assumption of rational consensus. From an Ubuntu perspective, legitimacy requires more than procedural consent; it demands ethical empathy, relational accountability, and the recognition of shared humanity. The alienation of African and other Global South voices in global policy decisions (through structural inequalities in voting power, economic dependency, and conditionalities) therefore signals not just political exclusion but moral delegitimization.

Recent normative theory has extended Ubuntu ethics into contemporary global governance debates, particularly in relation to moral legitimacy beyond the state. Thaddeus Metz argues that Ubuntu offers a relational account of moral authority according to which institutions are legitimate only insofar as they promote shared identity, mutual concern, and social harmony among affected parties (Metz, 2021). This formulation moves Ubuntu beyond cultural particularism and positions it as a general normative theory capable of informing global institutional design. It strengthens the claim advanced in this paper that African philosophy provides constructive resources for rethinking legitimacy at the global governance level.

Innocent Asouzu's complementary reflection theory offers another philosophical framework relevant here. Asouzu's *Ibuanyidanda* philosophy emphasizes that reality is comprehensible only through the principle of mutual complementarity- "let's live together" (Asouzu, 2007). This metaphysical vision resists any hegemonic system of thought that privileges one perspective as absolute. In the context of GGIs, Asouzu's complementarity demands a pluralistic legitimacy, grounded in the dialogical inclusion of diverse rationalities and cultural values. The monological imposition of Western neoliberal rationality, often embedded in global institutional norms, violates this complementary ethic and thus undermines legitimacy. Similarly, Obi Oguejiofor has argued that African philosophy provides a hermeneutic critique of modernity's tendency to universalize local categories of reason (Oguejiofor, 2001). His call for "cultural re-interpretation of rationality" underscores that legitimacy in the global sphere must emerge from cross-cultural understanding rather than the dominance of one epistemic tradition. Oguejiofor's critique resonates with Emevwo Biakolo's analysis of "epistemic colonization" in global knowledge systems, where African modes of understanding are marginalized or dismissed (Biakolo, 2000). Thus, to achieve legitimacy, GGIs must address not only economic or procedural inequalities but also the deeper epistemological injustices embedded in their operational paradigms.

From this African perspective, legitimacy is relational, dialogical, and communitarian rather than hierarchical and procedural. The ethical community (not the autonomous will or procedural consensus) is the foundation of legitimate authority. For GGIs to be legitimate they must therefore embody the virtues of solidarity, reciprocity, and shared responsibility for global welfare (Wiredu, 1996).

Universalism-Pluralism Tension: An African Philosophical Mediation

The discourse on human rights lie at the normative heart of global governance. Institutions such as the United Nations, the World Bank, and regional bodies like the African Union derive much of their moral legitimacy from the claim to uphold universal principles of human dignity. Yet, the concept of universality itself has been subject to deep philosophical contestation. The dilemma is stark: while universalism provides a moral foundation for global justice, it risks erasing the cultural particularities and moral diversity that give meaning to human life. Conversely, pluralism protects cultural autonomy but may legitimize moral relativism and oppression. The problem of legitimacy for GGIs thus lies in navigating this tension without collapsing into either moral imperialism or ethical fragmentation (Mutua, 2002).

The modern articulation of universalism in human rights is traceable to the Enlightenment's rationalist humanism, which posits the existence of intrinsic and inalienable rights belonging to all individuals by virtue of their humanity. Philosophers like Immanuel Kant grounded these rights in the dignity of rational beings capable of moral autonomy (Kant, 1998). This view found institutional expression in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR, 1948), which proclaims the equality and freedom of all persons irrespective of culture, creed, or gender (UN, 1948). For global governance, this framework serves as both a moral charter and a political instrument legitimizing interventions in the name of humanity. However, the universalist project has been persistently criticized from postcolonial and communitarian perspectives for its Eurocentric assumptions. Critics argue that the UDHR and related frameworks reflect a

Western moral ontology (one that privileges individual autonomy, property rights, and secular rationality) while marginalizing non-Western values of community, spirituality, and relational personhood (Mutua, 2001). African philosophers have been particularly vocal in challenging this imbalance, emphasizing that the moral foundation of human rights cannot be divorced from the ontological context of human existence.

Ifeanyi Menkiti articulates a seminal African alternative in his theory of communitarian personhood. According to Menkiti, personhood is not an inherent attribute but an achievement realized through social recognition and moral participation in community life (Menkiti, 1984). Rights, in this sense, are not merely individual entitlements but expressions of relational obligations. The universalist notion that individuals possess rights independent of their social contexts thus appears, from this perspective, as an abstraction divorced from the moral reality of African existence. Kwasi Wiredu reinforces this by asserting that African ethics is humanistic but not individualistic; that the moral subject is always already embedded within the communal whole (Wiredu, 1987). Kwame Gyekye's moderate communitarianism, however, tempers this radical critique by seeking a synthesis between universality and cultural rootedness. Gyekye concedes that individuals do possess intrinsic worth but insists that this worth is realized and expressed within social frameworks that nurture it (Gyekye, 1997). For him, universality must not mean uniformity; rather, it implies the recognition that all human beings deserve respect while acknowledging diverse paths to realizing that dignity. This reconciliatory approach offers a valuable philosophical basis for constructing a plural universalism- a global human rights order that respects difference while affirming shared humanity. In a similar vein, Innocent Asouzu's *Ibuanyidanda* philosophy advances the principle of complementarity as a moral bridge between universality and pluralism. For Asouzu, every culture or worldview embodies a fragment of the universal human quest for meaning; none is self-sufficient (Asouzu, 2007). Imposing one moral framework on others is to commit what he calls "the logic of concealment" (Asouzu, 2007, p.215)- the error of absolutizing one's perspective while ignoring its dependence on others. From this complementary standpoint, global human rights discourse must operate not as a monologue of Western liberalism but as a dialogue of civilizations grounded in mutual recognition.

The universalist-pluralist tension also manifests in debates surrounding humanitarian intervention and conditionality. Global institutions often justify interventions- political, economic, or military- by invoking universal norms such as democracy, gender equality, or freedom of expression. Yet, these actions frequently disregard the historical and moral sensibilities of the societies they target. Frantz Fanon (also, Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o) describe this as the continuation of colonial domination through moral rhetoric- a "new imperialism of benevolence" that disguises power under the language of ethics (Fanon, 1963). African nations and other Global South nations, when coerced into adopting liberal norms as a condition for aid or legitimacy, thus experience not empowerment but epistemic and political subordination.

Charles Beitz, while defending the moral necessity of global justice, acknowledge that the realization of human rights must consider historical responsibility and structural inequality (Beitz, 2009). Thomas Pogge's concept of negative duties- the obligation not to perpetuate harm through unjust global institutions- implies that GGIs lose legitimacy

when their policies reproduce the very conditions of deprivation they claim to remedy (Pogge, 2002). This insight resonates with the African critique that moral universality without structural justice is empty rhetoric.

Obi Oguejiofor and Ike Odimegwu emphasize that the crisis of legitimacy in global human rights enforcement stems from the absence of hermeneutic reciprocity- the willingness of global institutions to interpret norms in light of local meanings. Oguejiofor warns that when human rights are perceived as alien impositions rather than communal commitments, they lose moral force among the people they intend to protect (Oguejiofor, 2001). Odimegwu further suggests that the path to genuine universality lies in cultural translation: the interpretive process through which global norms are re-rooted in indigenous moral vocabularies (Odimegwu, 2012). Thus, the philosophical challenge before GGIs is not whether universality or pluralism should prevail, but how both can coexist without domination. A morally legitimate global order must cultivate what Anthony Appiah calls cosmopolitan conversation- a respectful exchange that recognizes the partiality of all moral systems while affirming a shared concern for human flourishing (Appiah, 2006). Such dialogue transforms universality from a rigid blueprint into a dynamic moral horizon continually enriched by cultural diversity.

Remarkably, recent global political theory increasingly rejects rigid moral universalism in favour of dialogical approaches to norm formation. James Tully argues that legitimate global norms must emerge through ongoing intercultural negotiation rather than unilateral moral projection, emphasizing reciprocal recognition and mutual learning among traditions (Tully, 2014). This approach closely parallels African philosophical accounts of complementarity and cultural translation, suggesting that legitimacy is best understood as an evolving ethical relationship rather than a fixed moral blueprint. African philosophy thus anticipates and deepens this emerging post-universalist orientation in global legitimacy theory.

Conclusion

This paper has argued that the legitimacy crisis confronting global governance institutions cannot be adequately explained or resolved within the dominant frameworks of legal rationality, procedural democracy, or state-centric representation. While Western theories of legitimacy (from Weber's sociological typologies to the normative models of Habermas, Rawls, and Beetham) provide indispensable analytical tools, they remain normatively incomplete when applied to a plural and historically unequal global order. Their shared limitation lie in an insufficient appreciation of relational, communal, and epistemic dimensions of legitimacy.

Foregrounding African philosophical traditions (particularly communitarianism, Ubuntu ethics, and complementary reflection) has enable this paper advance a reconceptualization of legitimacy as a relational moral achievement rather than a merely procedural or legal status. From this perspective, legitimacy arises not simply from rule-based authority or deliberative procedures, but from the recognition of persons and communities as moral interlocutors within a shared ethical horizon. The persistent marginalization of African states, civil societies, and epistemic traditions within GGIs thus constitutes not only a political exclusion but a form of moral delegitimization.

The paper's mediation of the universalism-pluralism tension further demonstrates that the

pursuit of global norms need not entail moral imperialism or cultural relativism. African philosophy offers a plural universalism grounded in complementarity, cultural translation, and shared humanity; one that affirms universal human dignity while resisting the absolutization of any single moral worldview. In this sense, African philosophy is not peripheral to global governance debates; it is normatively indispensable.

References

- Appiah, Kwame Anthony (2006). *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*. W.W. Norton.
- Asouzu, Innocent I. (2007). *Ibuanyidanda: New Complementary Ontology*. Lit Verlag.
- Beetham, David (1991). *The Legitimation of Power*. Macmillan.
- Beitz, Charle (2009). *The Idea of Human Rights*. Oxford University Press.
- Bexell, M., Jonsson, K. & Uhlin, A. (Eds.). (2022). *Legitimation and Delegitimation in Global Governance: Practices, Justifications, and Audiences*. Oxford University Press.
- Buchanan, Allen & Keohane, Robert O. (2006). The Legitimacy of Global Governance Institutions. *Ethics & International Affairs*, 20(4), 405-437.
- Dellmuth, L., & Tallberg, J. (2023). *Legitimacy Politics: Elite Communication and Public Opinion in Global Governance*. Cambridge University Press.
- Dellmuth, L., Scholte, J. A., Tallberg, J., & Verhaegen, S. (2022). *Citizens, Elites, and the Legitimacy of Global Governance*. Oxford University Press.
- Dunoff, Jeffrey & Trachtman, Joel P. (2009). *Ruling the World? Constitutionalism, International Law, and Global Governance*. Cambridge University Press.
- Fanon, Frantz (1963). *The Wretched of the Earth*. Grove Press,
- Gyekye, Kwame (1997). *Tradition and Modernity: Philosophical Reflections on the African Experience*. Oxford University Press.
- Habermas, Jürgen (1996). *Between Facts and Norms: Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy*. Trans. William Rehg. MIT Press.
- Habermas, Jürgen (2001). *The Postnational Constellation: Political Essays*. Trans. Max Pensky. Polity Press.
- Kant, Immanuel (1998). *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*, trans. Mary Gregor. Cambridge University Press.
- Menkiti, Ifeanyi (1984). Person and Community in African Traditional Thought. *African Philosophy: An Introduction*, ed. Richard A. Wright. University Press of America.
- Metz, Thaddeus (2011). Ubuntu as a Moral Theory and Human Rights in South Africa. *African Human Rights Law Journal* 11(2), 539 - 541.

Metz, Theddeus (2021). *A Relational Moral Theory: African Ethics in and Beyond the Continent*. Oxford University Press.

Mommsen, Wolfgang J. (1984). *Max Weber and German Politics, 1890-1920*. University of Chicago Press.