

UNITED WISDOM

Ubuntu: humanity through relationships and questions about this idea

Relationships and Intimacy

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

R-20-N04 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Ubuntu: humanity through relationships and questions about this idea

Epigraph

> *living example of Ubuntu*

Mogobe Bernard Ramose in his interview with Derek Hook, *To whom does the land belong?*, Psychology in Society 50 (2016), web line 98. A fragment of his own assessment of Robert Sobukwe's hospitality when recalling a visit. This is a particular historical voice, rather than a description of all African cultures. Interview.

What this article is about

Talking about humanity through relationships can recall a simple truth: we do not create language, care or shared life alone. Yet the philosophical question extends beyond the fact of dependence. Which relationships deserve respect? Must a person share every opinion of their community? Does dignity remain with someone who cannot currently help others? If these questions disappear behind a warm word about unity, relationships can become another test of usefulness. It therefore matters to distinguish mutual participation, the moral assessment of an action and the human worth that a group does not award as a prize for obedience.

We will consider two particular texts: Mogobe Bernard Ramose's interview about Sobukwe and Thaddeus Metz's philosophical reconstruction from 2011. Their subjects and ways of arguing differ. These are not a single African voice, a survey of every version of ubuntu or a proven psychological technique. Alongside them, we introduce hypothetical scenes involving a small reading circle. They support questions about recognition, help and difference; they do not portray an African community. The article establishes neither a legal outcome nor a mandatory process of reconciliation. A substantial objection to the basis of dignity remains open, and readers can assess the argument without accepting an entire doctrine.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

I. A philosophical claim differs from the fact of dependence

A person learns words from others, uses things made before their arrival and encounters care in different forms. Recognising these circumstances does not yet determine what is morally right. The existence of dependence does not entail an obligation to preserve every form it takes. Relationships can be supportive, limited, unequal or cruel. Calling everything that exists community would remove philosophy's ability to distinguish these cases. Humanity through relationships requires us to consider their quality: how people treat one another, what they make available and what position they leave for someone who does not match the expectations of those around them.

In the selected text by Metz, ubuntu is reconstructed as a normative theory, rather than a description of every people's life. It aims to explain the value of relationships and grounds for moral action. The number of social contacts alone therefore cannot test it. Someone can be surrounded by people while remaining subject to their arbitrary power; someone with few meetings can sustain a caring connection. These are our editorial questions about the quality of participation. They are not findings from a study of loneliness, and they do not establish how much interaction any reader needs to lead a full life.

It also helps to distinguish two claims about becoming a person. One concerns how moral attentiveness develops through relationships. Another could imply that without the group's approval someone has no worth at all. We should not move unnoticed between them. We can recognise the importance of teachers, loved ones and shared history without giving them the power finally to determine another's humanity. If language about development becomes a threat to remove dignity for refusal, the subject has changed. We are discussing the authority to decide who counts as sufficiently human to deserve respectful treatment, rather than the possibility of moral growth.

A counterexample is a small conversation in which everyone understands that the subject is simply a good action, rather than a person's status. We need not suspect hidden coercion in every compliment. People can value participation and notice its quality. But when an assessment justifies access to speech, care or protection from humiliation, the distinction matters. We can ask what specifically follows from praise or blame. Making this distinction does not devalue moral judgement. It keeps the judgement focused: a particular action deserves assessment, but that assessment need not absorb the person's entire human life.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

II. Hospitality in Ramose's account has its own history

In the interview with Ramose and Hook, Ramose recalls visiting Sobukwe and connects his welcome with ubuntu. The account belongs to a conversation about political isolation, colonial dispossession of land and recognition of humanity. It cannot be reduced to pleasant service for visitors. Mutual presence matters against the background of a particular struggle and injustice. We read Ramose's testimony and philosophical position without accepting every historical or legal assertion in the interview as independently established fact, and without treating this episode as his entire body of work.

This context changes the question about hospitality. Sometimes someone comes to express support and is themselves welcomed by the person they hoped to support. Care need not move only from the strong to the weak. In our hypothetical reading-circle scene, Alisa brings Viktor a book, and he asks attentively about her new undertaking. Both can participate, though their forms of participation differ. This is an invented example, rather than a modern reenactment of the visit to Sobukwe. It lets us consider reciprocity without assigning a single benefactor in advance, to whom the other must forever respond only with gratitude.

Friendliness alone, however, does not remove unjust conditions. Someone may receive a warm welcome while being unable to speak about an important difficulty. A host may offer refreshments while expecting agreement with every opinion. We then need to consider the gesture and what follows it. The article does not establish a standard for correct hosting. It preserves the question of recognising another as a participant with an answer of their own. The kindness of a particular action matters, but cannot replace consideration of power, exclusion and the actual conditions under which people can continue a shared life.

Nor should we transfer another's history to ourselves for the sake of an attractive resemblance. An uncomfortable reading-circle evening does not become colonial dispossession. A meeting organiser does not acquire the role of a historical liberator by invoking ubuntu. The scale and circumstances differ. We can compare the limited question of how recognition appears while preserving the disproportion between the events. Such reading calls for modesty: the philosophical idea remains connected to its source, and an everyday editorial scene does not appropriate the experience, struggle or authority of people encountered through a particular historical testimony.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

III. A shared purpose and care do not mean the same thing

Metz distinguishes identification with others from solidarity: joint activity and concern for their good. In his version, these combine within the moral ideal of community. This is a particular philosophical construction, rather than a measurement our circle has already passed. We should not declare the presence of one feature proof of every other. People can coordinate their actions well while remaining indifferent to how they affect a participant. They can care for someone without sharing every project. Our scene explores the meaning of the distinction; it does not establish that any individual case is sufficient for possessing ubuntu.

Alisa, Ilya and Viktor prepare a shared reading. They have divided the chapters and agreed on a time, but their usual format is inaccessible to Viktor. If the arrangement merely requires him to adapt, coordination has not yet answered the question of care. The participants can find out which option is accessible without promising to remove every limitation. The meeting may change, or they may fail to find a suitable solution. The moral question is not exhausted by everyone completing the common plan. It matters whether they considered another's actual circumstances or treated his participation as material for a result already selected and closed to discussion.

In another hypothetical case, Ilya helps someone who does not belong to the circle and has no intention of joining. Care here does not necessarily require accepting a common name. If assistance depends on membership, that additional price needs to be named. Not every resource limit is unjust: a group may have a particular task and few opportunities. Yet being unable to help everyone differs from requiring people to regard only insiders as worthy of respect. We can acknowledge an action's limits honestly without turning them into a final assessment of every outsider according to whether they belong to our present common undertaking.

The words togetherness and care also require content. People may use them identically while meaning different things: following a schedule, attentive conversation, material assistance or protection from humiliation. Such divergence does not necessarily destroy relationships. It calls for clarifying a particular subject. In our scene, asking what specifically will become accessible to Viktor is enough; a declaration of complete unity is unnecessary. A philosophical ideal helps pose the question without supplying a ready-made procedure. Participants create the specific arrangement for continuing under known conditions, with limits that a beautiful term alone cannot remove.

IV. Recognising dignity is not a reward for moral success

In the interview, Ramose argues that human dignity was not previously absent but could be made invisible. This is his position in a conversation about racism and humanity. Our reading asks a particular question: does recognition discover worth or issue it by permission? We derive no present-day legal procedure from this. The editorial distinction is more modest: people can fail to recognise another, but their failure should not itself become proof that the other lacks human worth. Otherwise, the power to exclude would gain the right to justify exclusion simply through having carried it out.

Viktor stops helping the circle regularly. We can consider which task remains unfinished and whether he accepted a promise. But answering for a task differs from judging whether he deserves respectful treatment at all. His role may change, earlier access may depend on its conditions, and relationships may cool. The article does not guarantee the preservation of every possibility. It does not permit these changes to serve as sufficient grounds for humiliating someone or denying their significance as a person. Specific responsibility remains because it is considered separately from total moral expulsion for one limited answer.

The reverse mistake uses dignity to justify any action and avoid assessing harm. If Ilya discloses another's private information, a general formula about humanity cannot settle the question. We can name the action, its consequences and permissible grounds for restricting participation. Respect does not require granting previous access without conditions. It requires us not to turn the assessment of an action into permission for any form of treatment. Our text determines neither a punishment nor a legal outcome. It distinguishes protection of the affected person from humiliating another for the satisfying feeling that the group has finally purified itself of a bad participant.

Nor can moral development be declared complete once and for all. Someone can care in one undertaking, make a mistake in another and change their answer after learning more. If praise makes them an unconditional representative of goodness, noticing an error becomes difficult. If blame declares them forever deprived of humanity, the possibility of recognising change disappears. Our questions need a more precise scope. What actually happened? Which responsibility belongs to this action? What remains unknown? We can then discuss moral work without competing for the permanent title of most humane participant, and without claiming authority to distribute dignity among people.

V. The capacity for relationships leaves a difficult objection

In section 3.3, Metz grounds dignity in the capacity for community, distinguishing it from successful actions. Yet he introduces a threshold of that capacity: some human beings do not have dignity in the specified sense within his theory. He retains other moral status for them and does not permit arbitrary treatment. This substantial difficulty cannot be hidden behind a general promise of equal recognition. Our objection concerns the foundation: why should human worth depend on such a threshold? The article does not use this classification as a criterion for treating readers or the people around them.

In a hypothetical scene, a participant cannot respond in the expected way. They remain silent, need assistance or cannot currently sustain the common conversation. None of these facts gives the group knowledge of their entire capacity for relationships. A philosophical concept should not become an everyday test of response speed or usefulness. The article also does not diagnose anyone or propose assessing their condition. It is enough to notice observation's limits: the absence of an expected action does not establish the absence of dignity, and what is unknown confers no authority to assign someone less human worth for the convenience of an explanation.

Even if a philosophical theory can distinguish dignity from other moral status, readers may ask whether this distinction is enough. They can acknowledge the precision of an author's terms without accepting their foundation. For example, a requirement of respectful treatment can be formulated without testing the capacity to reciprocate. This is our editorial ethical proposal, rather than a conclusion attributed to Metz. We do not declare the dispute settled by one sentence. It concerns the basis for protecting a person and how to avoid excluding those who do not fit a chosen image of an ideal participant in relationships, or whose abilities remain unknown.

The objection does not render every relational idea useless. It identifies a place where a particular version needs further justification. We can value care and shared life without making the capacity for them the sole basis of human significance. We can agree with part of an argument while retaining a difference over the basis of dignity. That response has more content than choosing complete loyalty to a doctrine or its complete rejection. It leaves readers real work: seeing what specifically the theory explains, what limit it creates and which requirement of respect they want to maintain regardless of agreement with this philosophical solution.

VI. Community is not reducible to the majority’s voice

In the version by Metz that we read, morally valuable community is not reducible to fulfilling the majority's wishes. This helps distinguish an ideal of relationships from an arrangement actually adopted by a group. If the circle votes for one format, the number of votes alone does not explain why it respects everyone. Conversely, one person's disagreement does not automatically cancel a decision. Our question concerns grounds and conditions of participation. It does not establish a universal right of minority veto. Philosophical language can make a distinction visible, but cannot replace the particular rules for choosing that are available in this situation.

Ilya thinks unity means never objecting to the organiser. Alisa replies that togetherness can include a question about the proposal. In the hypothetical scene, it helps first to establish which action is being called destructive: disagreement, threats, disclosure or refusal of one task. These differ. If an opinion is automatically declared hostility, the group may protect the convenience of authority under the name of care. If every violation is justified by a right to speak, protection of others disappears. Consideration needs a precise subject, rather than one word that decides in advance that every action by a side is either humane or wholly inadmissible.

Different forms of togetherness also exist. A reading circle, a state, a family and a historical movement have different foundations and obligations. We cannot transfer a solution from one level to the others without examination. Our text does not derive a state's structure from a conversation between three people, or prescribe a political norm from an image of hospitality. Scale matters: a voluntary meeting does not possess all the power of a public institution, while an institution affects people who did not choose each of its arrangements. Mentioning relationships opens a question about this power without confirming its justification merely because it acts in the name of community.

Withholding agreement need not mean withholding every form of care. Viktor can criticise the chosen book and help with another undertaking. Alisa can respect his answer without finding his argument convincing. This difference can preserve a substantive conversation without false sameness. Yet we do not guarantee that the circle will receive it calmly or remain unchanged. Relationships sometimes change. A philosophical ideal does not remove the cost of divergence. Its meaning here is to keep the moral value of a connection distinct from compulsory agreement on every opinion, and to avoid making every dispute proof of a complete absence of humanity.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

VII. Reciprocity does not require identical contributions

Alisa organises the meeting, Ilya brings books, and Viktor participates rarely. Their possibilities differ. We can consider accepted tasks without ranking human worth. Sometimes an undertaking really needs a particular person to complete it; refusal creates a difficulty that should not be concealed. But the difficulty concerns the undertaking's arrangement, rather than making someone an inferior grade of community member. If a participant's significance is measured only in useful hours, relationships have changed their subject. They have become a way to distribute recognition according to productivity. Our editorial question preserves the possibility of help and responsibility without requiring everyone to have identical resources or forms of participation.

Nor must someone in need quickly become a benefactor to justify receiving care. Possibilities change over time; help may remain asymmetric. The article promises neither unlimited resources nor every group's ability to provide what is necessary. We can name the limits of support honestly without accusing those who lacked support of insufficient humanity. If specialised assistance is needed, our example cannot replace it. A philosophical view should let us see actual need and constraints, rather than forcing both parties to portray ideal reciprocity in order to match an attractive formula about completely shared life.

Care does not automatically give someone the right to direct its recipient. Ilya brought Viktor a book, but did not acquire authority to tell everyone about his private circumstances. Alisa organised help and still needs an appropriate scope of information. Sometimes someone accepts one action and does not accept another. Participation remains specific. This limit does not make assistance cold or foreign to relational philosophy; it is our question about how care avoids becoming subordination. The fact of dependence does not imply that help must come with unconditional access to all another person's decisions, words and subsequent connections.

Sometimes participants already understand these conditions and need no separate analysis. We need not turn every kindness into an accounting exercise in consent. But when expectations diverge, we can name one subject: which assistance is accepted, what it permits and which expectation was not accepted. Reciprocity then remains a human possibility, rather than a demand for immediate payment. It can appear differently or remain asymmetric. Our example does not establish a universal moral exchange rate. It respects actual contributions and the fact that a person is not exhausted by today's ability to respond in a way convenient to the group.

VIII. Appealing to relationships does not require reconciliation at any cost

If trust has been violated in the circle, the word community does not determine a mandatory outcome. Someone can want to restore contact, be unready for it or choose another continuation. A demand for immediate forgiveness can conceal responsibility. A promise of final expulsion can conceal the possibility of a proportionate restriction. The article supplies neither a legal nor a therapeutic solution. It proposes keeping the subject clear: which harm has been identified, which action needs consideration and which contact is actually possible? No philosophical ideal should turn a dangerous conversation into a mandatory test of an affected person's humanity, or sufficient proof that another participant has changed.

In the argument by Metz that we read, the value of relationships does not justify every means of increasing general friendliness. For our scene, the question is simple: may one participant be required to endure humiliation because that makes meetings more convenient for the others? Our article answers no as an editorial ethical proposal. It does not derive a local protection procedure from the philosophical text. Actual dangerous circumstances need appropriate information and assistance. Here, it is enough not to make the number of preserved relationships the sole measure of moral success, for which specific treatment of a person within those relationships can be ignored.

Where contact is possible, it need not be comprehensive. People can discuss one task without renewing former closeness, acknowledge an action without a general pledge or limit participation on known grounds. Our scene leaves the options open. It does not promise that precise words will restore trust. Another person may disagree or fail to respond. Respect for this reality keeps philosophy from becoming a script for a compulsory happy ending. Relationships matter, but a particular connection can have a limit that cannot be removed by recognising its importance or urging everyone immediately to feel their shared humanity.

Where threats, coercion or risk exist, direct contact is not prescribed. A private note or declining the exercise does not indicate a lack of care. A suitable arrangement depends on circumstances; no universally safe sequence is offered here. This limitation belongs to our proposal to readers, rather than a claim that every ubuntu author has resolved each problem of protection identically. We do not present what the article considers desirable as proven content of an entire tradition. A philosophical question about humanity can coexist with recognising that a specific situation requires separate factual work, available support and choices that a general text cannot make for someone.

IX. A similar question does not make different teachings one system

In the selected interview, Ramose speaks within a historical conversation about justice; Metz constructs a particular normative theory. We compare them without portraying a direct dispute between the authors that these texts do not contain. Their tasks, foundations and the force of particular conclusions differ. The question of recognising dignity can connect our reading without making the versions identical. Our editorial criticism is also not declared the internal voice of every traditional community. It has its own authorship and limits. Readers should see where a source speaks, where our distinction begins and which important difficulty still lacks a final answer.

Resemblance to other teachings about care also needs limits. We can encounter a similar question about attentiveness to a person without claiming that ubuntu, Confucianism and a contemporary psychological theory mean the same thing. This article has not researched the relevant primary texts of those other systems. We therefore do not prove their unity or attribute agreement with the selected account of dignity to them. It is enough to preserve the question of comparison for separate research. The appearance of a familiar word does not remove differences in context, power, moral foundations or what a particular version of a teaching regards as a proper human life.

Plurality also applies to Africa. Two named authors confer no authority to describe one character belonging to all the continent's cultures. We cannot attribute a special communality to every person, or contrast entire peoples as necessarily caring and necessarily solitary. Our text examines particular works. We can read them carefully, dispute them and recognise the significance of their questions without portraying people collectively according to origin. This limit does not diminish philosophy's substance. It enables assessment of the actual argument while preserving the right of many other voices to exist outside our small selection and the editorial question chosen for it.

Finally, our everyday application remains a proposal rather than a measured effect. The reading circle has not been studied, its conversations are invented, and the practice below has not been tested as a way to increase humanity or strengthen community. A convincing account does not transform a historical episode and a normative theory into an experiment. We can use a distinction for one question without treating the result as confirmation of the whole doctrine. If a conversation becomes clearer, that is a specific result for its participants. If it does not, there is no need to accuse someone of accepting ubuntu insufficiently well and therefore failing to obtain a promised transformation that the article has no basis for guaranteeing.

X. The value of relationships leaves room for a difficult question

In one hypothetical outcome, the circle clarifies its format, Viktor accepts an accessible part of participation, and disagreement over the book remains. This is not proof of ideal unity. In another outcome, they find no common format, but no one is declared without human worth. In a third, factual circumstances may require ending a particular contact. Our examples do not choose a universal outcome for readers. They show that considering relationships can leave different answers open. Community has value while its description retains actual people, limits and consequences, rather than only a desirable image to which everyone must conform.

The article's central question differs from questions about a family name or personal choice within a group. Here we consider the philosophical basis of humanity, particular versions of ubuntu and an objection to a capacity threshold. This does not rename every conversation about autonomy. It matters that a relational theory can ask about care while itself needing criticism of its basis for dignity. We should not conceal this tension for a finished image of a tradition. Its presence helps us read more precisely: value what has been explained, notice exclusion and preserve a requirement of respect where a philosophical solution still seems insufficient or unconvincing.

We can accept the idea of moral development through relationships without accepting a complete system. We can maintain a strong objection while still recognising the significance of hospitality, joint activity and care. That response need not become permanent membership of a school. It remains a reader's work with an argument. What does the source actually claim? Which distinction does it enable? Whom might its foundation leave outside? Which part of our application needs justification of its own? These questions do not remove difficulty with one word, but keep a warm formula from quietly deciding the entire area of dignity and duties for people.

Humanity through relationships remains a substantial question if relationships do not become the sole authority assigning a person's worth. Moral actions need assessment, help needs reality, togetherness needs specific conditions, and philosophical theory needs the possibility of objection. None guarantees easy agreement. We can maintain dignity within our own editorial requirement of respect, without measuring it by usefulness or hiding the disputed basis we have read. Ubuntu then becomes a subject of attentive conversation with particular authors, rather than a mandatory slogan instructing everyone to stay together regardless of circumstances or their own answer.

What this means in practice

If you wish, choose one small episode of participation without assessing your entire life. Name the common subject, actual care and what remained unknown separately. You need not decide who possesses ubuntu or claim a right to measure another's humanity. Ask which action was actually accepted and which human significance you risk linking too broadly to completing it. You may find a useful distinction or fail to find a suitable example. This voluntary practice establishes no dignity and does not require declaring yourself a supporter of a philosophical doctrine in order to attend carefully to people.

Where voluntary discussion is appropriate, choose one question: available assistance, a shared format or the meaning of an objection. Preserve the possibility of refusal and the limits of information. Do not use dependence as proof of an unconditional debt, or community as a demand for identical opinions. Where the situation is unsafe, direct contact and disclosure of plans are not prescribed. Legal or specialised circumstances need separate factual verification. Our outline cannot replace protection or necessary assistance, does not guarantee a calm reaction and does not justify dangerous treatment merely because it was carried out for unity or in the name of care.

Later, consider only the selected subject: has participation become clearer, has an accessible action appeared and which limit remains? Note separately any philosophical conclusion you have rejected or want to investigate further. You need not present a particular result as confirmation of an entire tradition. The exercise has not been tested as a way to improve relationships. It helps keep a conversation specific and human worth outside a ranking of services. We can attend to an actual connection, acknowledge its history and still leave open the difficult question of why respect for someone should not depend on how convenient their present participation is for others.

Key quotation

> *it was always there*

Mogobe Bernard Ramose, the same interview, web line 134; a short fragment of his own speech. The pronoun refers to human dignity, which his argument about racism does not regard as newly created by an act of recognition. This attributes Ramose's position; it is neither a legal conclusion nor a claim that every version of ubuntu grounds dignity identically. Text.

Connections between traditions

Text read	Question	Difference and limit
Ramose and Hook, 2016 interview	How do recognition and hospitality relate to humanity?	A particular South African history of justice, rather than every culture's voice or Ramose's entire body of work
Metz, 2011, sections 2–4.2	How can community, dignity and protection be grounded?	A normative reconstruction; the capacity threshold leaves a substantial objection, and other moral status is not concealed
Hypothetical reading circle	How do joint activity, help, opinion and human worth differ?	Editorial examples, rather than a portrayal of African everyday life or a tested technique
Other teachings about care	Is a similar question possible?	Their primary versions have not been researched here; identity with ubuntu is not claimed

Primary sources

1. Mogobe Bernard Ramose; Derek Hook. *To whom does the land belong? Mogobe Bernard Ramose talks to Derek Hook*. Psychology in Society 50 (2016), DOI 10.17159/2309-8708/2016/n50a5. SciELO. Personally read the complete interview body, web 76–164, and editorial framing 62–74. The interview took place on 23 August 2014 and was edited by Terblanche Delport and Ndumiso Dladla. Quotation locations 98/134 contain Ramose's own speech, rather than nested words by Sobukwe or a question by Hook. Historical and legal assertions have not been independently confirmed. Rights UNKNOWN; short attributed critical fragments, without complete import.

2. Thaddeus Metz. *Ubuntu as a moral theory and human rights in South Africa*. African Human Rights Law Journal 11(2), 532–559 (2011). Original journal PDF. Personally read the title, introduction and selected continuous sections 2, 3, 4.1 and 4.2, web 0–664, pp. 532–548; particularly definitions 245–271, the distinction between dignity and actions 491–533, and freedom 624–664. Neither the entire article nor current legal rules were read. The difference between lacking dignity according to the specified threshold and retaining moral status has not been omitted. Rights UNKNOWN; limited philosophical paraphrase without direct quotation or complete import.

Tags

ubuntu, humanity, relationships, community, dignity, recognition, care, solidarity, identification, togetherness, assistance, reciprocity, difference, disagreement, majority, participation, capacity, moral status, criticism, hospitality, justice, history, threshold, freedom, respect, coercion, limits, Ramose, Metz, Sobukwe, philosophy, United Wisdom

About the authors

Andrey Zarinsh is the author and founder of United Wisdom. He explores inner transformation, the unity of traditions, intercultural dialogue, and contemporary spiritual discipline. Instagram: @andrey.zarinsh.

Maria Evilkut is a coauthor of United Wisdom. Alongside research, she seeks to test these ideas in practice and observe how the principles of unity and mutual understanding work in real life between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.