



Xenophobic Attack among Africans: A Contradiction to Ubuntu Solidarity

Polycarp Okafor¹, & Anacletus Ogbunkwu²

¹Philosophische Grundfragen der Theologie, Westfälische Wilhelms University of Münster, Germany

²Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies, Ebonyi State University, Abakaliki

Corresponding Author's E-mail: pcokafor2007@gmail.com

Abstract

Xenophobic attack in Africa is a fundamental vice that needs to be uprooted from humanity and in our modern world. The practice which involves killings, burning of houses, shops, businesses and elimination of people because they do not belong to particular ethnic group sends a wrong signal to the world about the Africans. The xenophobic attack of Africans against fellow Africans, measures as a clear contradiction to Ubuntu solidarity practice because the concept of Ubuntu appropriately defines African spirit of mutual support, communalism, togetherness, hospitality, kindness, sympathy and solidarity. Thus, Xenophobia is a direct attack to the tenets of Ubuntu solidarity that teaches mutual respect, justice and fairness, compassion, hospitality and African Communalism. This paper aims at a comparative study of the tenets of Ubuntu solidarity and the contradictions in xenophobic practices. In the same vein, this paper not only raises awareness on the heinous practice of xenophobia against the African spirit of Ubuntu but goes ahead to proffer solution towards eradicating this heinous practice. To achieve the set aim, this paper adopts qualitative method of research and the philosophical analytic method in order to determine the degree of contradictions between xenophobic attacks among Africans and African Ubuntu solidarity while using APA referencing style to document research findings. Similarly, this paper applies John Bowlby and Ainsworth attachment theory to determine the degree of disagreement of xenophobia to the African spirit of Ubuntu. The implication of this research is a return to the right practices of Ubuntu solidarity in order to mitigate and possibly eschew the tendencies of xenophobia in Africa.

Keywords: Xenophobia, Ubuntu, Solidarity, Africa, Communalism,

Citation of article: Okafor, P. & Ogbunkwu, A. (2025). Xenophobic Attack among Africans: A Contradiction to Ubuntu Solidarity, *African Journal of Politics and Administrative Studies, AJPAS*, 18(1):512-529

Date submitted: 18/05/2025 **Date Accepted:** 02/06/2025 **Date Published:** June, 2025

Conceptual Clarification

The concept of “Ubuntu” was developed from the culture of Bantu or Nguni people of South Africa. It was a traditional value or communal practice of togetherness, oneness and unity. Sakemi Idoniboye-Obu and Ayo Whetho argue that it is a value that was acquired in the society



and handed on from one generation to another by means of oral genres such as proverbs, fables, myths, story-telling and riddles. It could be described as a communal way in which the individual finds his meaning and existence in the community. For example, Ubuntu is commonly described as human nature, humanity and humanness (Idoniboye-Obu&Whetho 2016, Bryant 1963, Doke 1960). Gade (2013) argues that Ubuntu appears in writings since 1846 and has been in written resources from 1846 to 2011 and is defined as human quality. He argues that research indicates that from 1993 to 1995 that Nguni proverb “*umuntungumuntungabantu*” translated as “a person is a person through other persons” was used to explain the meaning of Ubuntu (Gade 2013).

Ubuntu as a concept could also mean virtue, greatness of soul, capacity of social self-sacrifice on behalf of others, generosity and solidarity (McLearen 1918, Thompson & Butler 1975). In the practice of Ubuntu, every individual’s humanity or personhood is preferably expressed through his or her association with others and theirs in turn through recognition of one another’s humanity. Ubuntu means that human beings are people through other people. It also recognizes both, the rights and obligations of every citizen in fostering individual and societal well-being and it also means a spirit of mutual support. This spirit of mutual support in Ubuntu can be interpreted as solidarity. Jordan Kush Ngubane (1988, 56) further writes “Ubuntu is a philosophy that encourages the common good of the society and incorporates humanness as the crucial part of human growth” (56). This implies that the emphasis of Ubuntu philosophy of Jordan Kush Ngubane (1988) is in communalism, togetherness, hospitality, kindness, sympathy and solidarity.

Furthermore, the concept of Xenophobia is made up of two words “xeno” and “phobia”. The words comes from the Greek words ξένος (xenos), meaning “foreigner”, “strange”, and φόβος (phobos), meaning “fear”. This gives rise to a literal definition of xenophobia which is the fear of foreigners. The Oxford English and Webster dictionaries define it as “deep-rooted fears towards foreigners” and “fear of the unfamiliar”, respectively. According to Crush (2020), xenophobia in the context of this discussion is deep-rooted hatred of foreigners. Different African countries had different reasons to expel people of other countries based on either political or economic challenge or quagmire. In Africa, some of the clear manifestations of xenophobia have been either the threat of expulsion of foreign nationals, or unjust deportation, and in other instances,



conflicts or violent attacks meted against non-nationals most often forcing many non-nationals to return to their various countries. The concept of Ubuntu solidarity has attracted the attention of many scholars not only because of the humanness and uniqueness of its practice that is peculiar to Africans; but also because of its postulation as a concept capable of uniting the whole of Africa. Unfortunately, xenophobic attacks by Africans against fellow Africans in their various African countries seem to be a contradiction to this humane practice of Ubuntu solidarity.

Using the analytic research method and APA referencing style, this paper makes a critical overview of Ubuntu solidarity practice; the intricacies and complexities in the practice, so as to find out the loopholes in the exercise of Ubuntu solidarity practice. The major finding shows that African practice of homogenous solidarity is a major cause of xenophobia. More so, using John Bowlby and Ainsworth attachment theory to determine the degree of disagreement of xenophobia to the African Ubuntu, this paper asserts that both concepts are mints of contradictions and inversely proportional to the development of Africa as a nation. Among the major recommendations to this situation is a return to Heterogeneous Ubuntu solidarity model rather than homogenous Ubuntu model of solidarity in Africa.

African Ubuntu Solidarity

Ubuntu solidarity is an African concept that has attracted the attention of many scholars in our contemporary era. Desmond Tutu (1997, 78), one of the biggest advocates of Ubuntu, argues, for the traditional philosophy of Ubuntu. Thus, he said: “Ubuntu symbolizes the backbone of African spirituality and moral conduct.” On another note, he upholds that Ubuntu is very hard to render into a western language. He thus holds: “In Africa we have something called “Ubuntu” in Nguni languages or “botho” in Sotho, which is difficult to translate into English. It means the essence of being human. It speaks of the fact that my humanity is caught up, is inextricably bound up, in what is yours. I am because I belong” (Tutu 1997, 78). The emphasis of Tutu (1997) is that it is an African concept distinct from western philosophy and it is also the philosophy of humanism. After Nelson Mandela had used it as a philosophical concept during the apartheid and from there it started attracting attention of various scholars. One may argue that after 1994, Ubuntu left South Africa and started attracting the attention of many scholars from all



over Africa and beyond. For example, Gade (2017) argues that Ubuntu was used in the political process that led to the creation of Zimbabwe. As a concept, some scholars in our contemporary era like Michael Battle, Barbara Nussbaum, Niels Wiedtmann, Thaddeus Metz, Samkanges, Michael Tellingner, Michael Onyebuchi Eze, M. Munyaradzi, Tapuwa Mubaya and Christian Gade among others started various debates and contributions. Weidtmann (2019, 135), for example, argues that “the concept of Ubuntu has attracted the attention of philosophers for a couple of reasons. Among them, the fact that the concept of Ubuntu is common to different peoples of Sub-Saharan Africa is certainly a prominent one. Another reason may be found in its being present in everyday life.”

In summary, even though there are many interpretations, debates or contemporary studies on Ubuntu philosophy, Ubuntu is a moral philosophy, an African humanism and a contested social philosophy that could be interpreted as solidarity practice of Africans originating from the Bantu people of South Africa. On the other hand, the solidarity practice seems to be homogeneous in nature and practice. This is because the people of Bantu of South Africa are people of the same tradition, religion; they have the same language, the same culture, the same custom, the same value as a people. Therefore, one can say that they practiced a homogenous solidarity. Homogenous solidarity is a solidarity that is based on family ties, tribal ties, etc. This homogenous solidarity could be seen as mechanical solidarity as defined by Emile Durkheim whereby mechanical solidarity is seen to be operational in traditional and small-scale societies. In simpler societies (e.g., tribal), solidarity is usually based on familial network or kinship ties. Thus, Jörg Althammer (2019), holds that mechanical solidarity in Durkheim is found in cohesive social entities characteristic of small, tribal or traditional communities. This is actually the type of solidarity that is practiced in typical African rural settings. Hence, if someone is from my family, kindred or village, I can show solidarity. If the person does not fall into this setup, then I am not obliged to show solidarity. Solidarity in this sense is limited to the people of my race, tribe, family, kindred and is not meant to be a universal practice. It is a solidarity that excludes people that do not belong to the same family, kindred or tribe.

Moreover, in the writings of the scholars on the concept of solidarity in Ubuntu Philosophy, one may argue their writings from the perspective of micro, mechanical or homogenous solidarity.



Nelson M. Mandela (2004), the former President of South Africa said: “The values of human solidarity that once drove our quest for a humane society seem to have been replaced or are being threatened, by a crass materialism and pursuit of social goals of instant gratification. One of the challenges of our time without being pietistic or moralistic, is to re-instill in the consciousness of our people that sense of human solidarity of being in the world for another and because of and through others” (Solidarity in Ubuntu, 5th Steve Biko Lecture, University of Cape Town, South Africa, 10th September, 2004). Notably, the Ubuntu solidarity practice in South Africa is intrinsically practiced along tribal, religious, cultural and ethnic lines.

Ubuntu Solidarity Practice among Africans:

Ubuntu solidarity practice among Africans can be likened to homogeneous solidarity. From the postulation and the Ubuntu cultural practice; the theory of solidarity and its analysis; one may argue that the solidarity of Ubuntu is being practiced as a homogenous solidarity. This is also true of some African countries. In Nigeria, for example, among the Igbos of South East there is also the practice of homogeneous solidarity of Ubuntu. A clear manifestation of it is “Umunna” solidarity which can be interpreted as the practice of Ubuntu solidarity that is homogenous in nature. “Umunna” as explained in the former chapter just like Ubuntu originated from two words “umu” (children) and “nna” (Father). Naturally, “Umunna” literally speaking means “children of the same father”. “Umunna” is used in Igboland to denote kindred or inter-relatedness. “It is difficult to think of an Igbo person not having an “umunna”. The belief in common ancestors as the source of their being underpins participation in the “Umunna” family structure” (Osunwokeh, 2015, 4). Also, he states that the “qualification for “umunna” membership is simply birth into the nuclear family that constitutes the “umunna”. Marriage into the nuclear family also qualifies a woman as a member of “umunna” the nuclear family belongs to.” “Umunna” is in itself an extended family that comprises of people who share past, present and future together.

Solidarity among “umunna” is mostly limited to fellow “umunna” in the traditional Igbo setting. This means that “umunna” solidarity is restricted to the people of the same kindred. Every Igbo person belongs to a particular “umunna”. The solidarity as practiced in “umunna” is exclusively shown to fellow members of “umunna”. Thus, this solidarity in Umunna is only a homogenous



solidarity which is not all inclusive and can be likened to the solidarity that is practiced by these tribal South African children. It is a solidarity of exclusion.

Another example is the solidarity as practiced by “umuada” and age grade (“Otu-Ogbo”) in the traditional Igbo setting of Nigeria. These practices of solidarity in the Igbo culture and tradition are all micro or homogenous in nature. “Umuada” as daughters of the land have their traditional practices of solidarity which is known and is exclusively done to those who belong to the group of “umuada”. Thus, if you do not belong to the group of “umuada”, they do not have any obligation of expression of solidarity. This is also applicable to the age grade group. Thus, the solidarity practiced by these groups is the homogenous solidarity.

Nyerere (1967) developed a network of concepts such as “group solidarity”, “compassion”, “respect”, “dignity”, and “collective unity” to convey an idea of Ubuntu. This analysis is likely not far from the solidarity which various groups express among themselves in the traditional African setting. This practice of group solidarity is likely the mechanical or homogenous solidarity practiced by “umunna”, “umuada” or “otu-ogbo” in the traditional Igbo setting of Southeastern Nigeria as mentioned above and in the previous chapter. Hence, belonging to these groups is the criterion to merit solidarity. This implies that without membership to the group, one is not entitled to the group’s solidarity.

In Yoruba culture and tradition of Nigeria, “aso-ebi” for example, is one of the important cultures of solidarity. This is the culture of sewing uniforms or particular dress style among family members for particular family outing or ceremonies. The original idea of “aso-ebi” was to easily identify family members during some big ceremonies. It was also meant to serve as a way of reinforcing social identity and solidarity among group members. This practice of “aso-ebi” in Yoruba land is only for the family members. Non family members are all exempted from the “aso-ebi” solidarity practice. Thus, this solidarity practice is homogenous in nature.

Among Hausa people of Nigeria, their religion, modes of dressing, food, marriage and language are all special to them. The Hausa were famous throughout the middle Ages for their cloth weaving and dyeing, cotton goods, leather sandals, metal locks, horse equipment and leather-working and export of such goods throughout the West African region as well as to North Africa.



As a people, they have their various cultural ways in which they practice solidarity. Their religion, Islam, is a binding force of solidarity. This solidarity according to their traditional practice is shown only to fellow Muslims. Thus, Muslims regard Christians as infidels to be killed in order to receive ten virgins as a reward in heaven. This homogenous practice of solidarity by Muslims is the origin of Christian and Muslim religious conflicts in Nigeria which is still prevalent in Nigeria as of today. The conflict could be seen in Hausa- Fulani Herdsmen conflicts all over Nigeria and Boko Haram insurgency in Nigeria as earlier explained in the previous chapter. The conflicts continue to escalate daily in various parts of Nigeria. Thus, homogenous practice of solidarity in Nigeria has proved a threat to national unity, national development and a fundamental cause to ethnic and religious conflicts.

In some African countries there is a similar practice of homogeneous Ubuntu solidarity which tends towards tribal lines. Traditional communities in countries like Kenya, Ghana, Cameroon, among others also practice homogenous solidarity. Kenya, for example, has indigenous ways in which solidarity has been practiced among the various ethnic groups. The majority of Kenyans belong to Bantu tribes- Kikuyu, Kamba and Luhya. There are also Nilotic tribes -Luo, Maasai, Kalenjin and Turkana, the Hamitic people - Turkana, Samburu and Rendille. The people of Kenya are group oriented rather than individualistic. “Harambee” is a word that comes from Bantu, which means, “to pull together” or “to work together.” The concept is essentially about mutual assistance of contribution in form of cash, manual labour, mutual effort, mutual responsibility, community self-reliance and common good (Waithima, 2012). This principle has historically been practiced as solidarity among the ethnic groups which has its roots in co-operative farming or herding. Harambee is a concept used to express traditional solidarity among the people of Kenya. Notably, it can be interpreted as homogeneous solidarity.

Fourier (Fourier, 2013) developed an early political concept of solidarity. He developed his idea on solidarity in his utopian project of the Phalanx. The Phalanx is a group of buildings where some 1,500 people have chosen freely to associate, live and work together in common households. The Phalanx presupposes a harmonious community, where each of the members (but only members) can draw on the solidarity of the other members. Solidarity is hence restricted to the members of the common household” (Fourier, 2013, 5). In the later works, Fourier



recognized the lapses and later formed an advanced theory of solidarity. Thus, this theory that is restrictive, exclusive and community-based understanding of solidarity Fourier developed into a universalistic conception of solidarity (Stjerno 2004). Suffice to say that what was practiced by these tribal children is this type of restricted solidarity (Phalanx) which Fourier (Fourier 2013) earlier proposed to the members of the common household. In other words, they were meant only to show solidarity to their fellow tribal children.

The solidarity developed by Fourier in Europe can be linked to the solidarity which Nyerere developed for the people of Tanzania. “*Ujamaa*” (Swahili word where “Jama” means a “Family”) is also a homogenous solidarity practice in the traditional Tanzania. In his quest to find some special African identity upon which to base his theory, Julius Nyerere saw in the traditional African society some basic characters of humanism, brotherhood and communalism. He said that Africans have a strong sense of family-hood that creates harmony and co-operation among all the members of the community. The community has a cultural practice of solidarity which is inherent among the people. Seeing this practice, Nyerere, appealed to people and developed the philosophy of “*ujamaa socialism*”, a political system as well as a world-view and a gateway to Africa’s true selfhood (Waithima 2012). He said: “I was the first to use the word “*Ujamaa*” in order to explain the kind of life we wish to live in our country. The word “*Ujamaa*” denotes the type of life lived by a man and his family – Father, Mother, Children and near relatives” (Okolo 1993, 94).

Julius Nyerere began to think of a solidarity that will be all embracing, all-inclusive in nature. Therefore, the solidarity that will extend to both people of the same tribe and other tribes, a solidarity that will extend to a community and non-members of the community, etc. Nyerere’s ambition was to reassert the idea of family-hood into the modern African communities with the hope that his proposed socialism would be the true ideology at home with African culture. This he called African brotherhood, with its roots in African extended family system. These brotherhood, togetherness and family-hood depict a “community spirit” which considers all people as brothers. Thus, he commented: “Our recognition of the family to which we all belong must be extended yet further – beyond the tribe, the community or even the continent to embrace the whole society of mankind. This is the only logical conclusion for true socialism” (Nyerere



1967, 170). This concept of solidarity expansion from Julius Nyerere can be likened to heterogeneous solidarity.

Xenophobic Attacks and the African Experience

Ubuntu concept of African solidarity has been grossly undermined by the emergence of xenophobic attacks and other related forms of divisions across tribal lines in South Africa and in Africa in general. Thus, the xenophobic attacks of Africans against other Africans in their country have posed a very big question to the application of Ubuntu concept of African solidarity. It is worthy of note that South Africa is the origin of the concept of Ubuntu solidarity. Notably, Ubuntu is an African principle of social and humane living which was nurtured and developed from the Bantu people in South Africa. It is an African communalism rooted in solidarity. This principle defines and maintains the equality of people irrespective of their color, race or religion as was proposed by Nelson Mandela and other proponents of Ubuntu. But in the midst of this wonderful humane solidarity practice, it is affected by the xenophobia of Africans against fellow Africans. South Africa which is supposed origin of this practice of humane and solidary living is not exempted. Thus, a look at xenophobic attacks at this point is necessary.

In South Africa, prior to the black majority take-over of power in 1994, there were xenophobic attacks but for want of space, we shall give brief summary of the xenophobic attacks. Note that there are some instances of xenophobic attacks from 1994 till date but we shall concentrate on the recent ones.

J.A. Du Rand, J.M. Vorster & N. Vorster (2017, 11) argue that from 2017 to 2018, the xenophobic attacks increased tremendously in South Africa. In December 2018, there were at least 529 xenophobic attacks of South Africans against fellow Africans leading to 100,000 displaced people, 309 deaths and 901 physical assaults, looting of 2,193 shops (Crush 2020, 5). In 2019, precisely, from 1st to the 5th of September, there were riots which were xenophobic in nature which were geared towards fighting the nationals of Africa, particularly Nigerians in Johannesburg and other parts of South Africa (Rand et al 2017). These xenophobic attacks range from looting of shops and businesses owned by other African nationals, burning their shops, to killings of people. It was a terrible situation.



Notably, the xenophobic violence of South Africans against Nigerians in September 2019 is rated as the height of it (Burke 2019). Reacting to this attack, Femi Gbajabiamila - the Speaker of House of Representatives of Nigeria - argues that “Nigeria must not waste more time on niceties or mere words, but come out with full measures against South Africa as backlash to the incessant killing and destruction of properties of its nationals in the country in the name of xenophobia” (Gbajabiamila 2020). Peter Obi, the former Governor of Anambra State, on 4th September, 2019 condemned the xenophobic attacks and asked Nigerians in South Africa to come together as brothers and sisters and protect one another. He reminded South Africans of the unflinching support Nigerians had given to South Africa during the apartheid struggle and insisted that what Nigeria would need from them at all times is love and accommodation (Obi 2020). The President of South Africa, Cyril Ramaphosa, on 6th September 2019, addressed the country admitting that at least 10 people were killed in the xenophobic attack by South Africans against fellow Africans.

Similarly, in Nigeria, Ghana, Uganda, Angola and South Africa, there were also various xenophobic attacks. The causes of these xenophobic attacks differ. Suffice to say that xenophobic reactions were fundamentally caused by economic factors. In Kenya and Chad, xenophobic attacks were caused by the war on terror. On the other hand, politics and economic factors caused xenophobic practices in Cote d’Ivoire and Equatorial Guinea. Moreover, various crimes committed by foreigners are the fundamental causes of xenophobia in Tanzania, Burundi and Congo Brazzaville. In Angola, for example, various thefts of natural resources that belonged to Angola led to the mass expulsions of Congolese from Angola. “In 2004, the Angolan government expelled an estimated 100,000 Congolese from Angola. It did not stop there: Over 160,000 Congolese were expelled between December 2008 and December 2009” (Adebajo 2011, 82). Later on, the Angolan government restated its position through its Foreign Minister who declared that Angola, “will never give up its right to protect its natural resources and its right to repatriate citizens who are acting in a way which does not benefit the country” (Chinomona and Maziri 2015, 82). In response, the Congo Kinshasa government in 2009 expelled 50, 000 Angolans in retaliation to the mass expulsion of Congolese from Angola” (Siegel 2009, 23).



Moreover, in November 1969, in Ghana, when Kofi Busia occupied the Prime Ministerial position, he introduced the Aliens Compliance Order, targeted at expelling undocumented aliens. Particularly, the Aliens Order implies that aliens who had no work permit must get them within a period of two weeks or are meant to leave the country (Gocking 2005, 156). Prior to the introduction of the order, there had been an emerging general perception of foreigners as the cause of ‘large-scale unemployment that had befallen Ghana (Aremu&Ajayi 2014, 176). Later on, foreigners were being restricted by certain laws in the kind of business they were to engage in, so as to foster a kind of protection for Ghanaians thereby preserving the business for the latter. Also, The Ghana government also approved and celebrated the institutionalization of xenophobia as a nationalistic concept to ensure the availability of jobs for the people of Ghana.

Nigeria is not left out in the xenophobic attacks on fellow Africans. Between 1970 and 1980 in Nigeria, following the political and economic situation of oil boom, there was an influx of the people of Ghana who came to look for “greener pastures”. They took up menial jobs to live well in Nigeria. In 1983, the then President of Nigeria- ShehuShagari gave an executive order that any non-citizen without proper immigration documentation should leave Nigeria and this led to mass exodus of Ghanaians. About 2 million people were affected and this led to the popular slogan “Ghana must go” (Lawal 1983).

Xenophobic Attacks as a Contradiction to Ubuntu Solidarity

Xenophobic attack is fundamentally a contradiction to the Ubuntu solidarity practice in Africa. This is because one expects that Ubuntu solidarity has the capacity of uniting the whole of Africa but xenophobic attacks draw obvious contradiction to this claim. In an attempt to explore this contradiction of Ubuntu solidarity practice, Kingsley Okoro&ChinyereNkama (2018) in their article argue that the new development in xenophobic attacks in South Africa makes them feel disappointed. They, thus, argue that the world is full of contradictions and that contradictions seem to be the guiding principle governing the world and its social relationships. The reason of this disappointed view is that Kingsley Okoro wrote an article about the ideal of Ubuntu. He was in it projecting the socio-political philosophy and practice of humane living of Ubuntu. But a week later, there were several xenophobic attacks in South Africa. The contradiction of Ubuntu



philosophy with practices of xenophobia led to questions as follows: “Is the ideology in the socio-political field mere illusions of the mind? Is the ideology not meant to have practical relevance to human organizations and affairs? Is the ideology simply a mechanism of wheedling the simple-minded masses? Or is the ideology a mere deceptive device used by intelligentsia and the ruling class to achieve their whims and gaining power and political acceptability. These and more questions agitate our minds, more especially in relation to the current practice of xenophobia in South Africa, a nation distinguished for Ubuntu ideology” (Okoro&Nkama 2018, 116).

Similarly, Gert Breed &KwenaSemenya (2015) argue that Ubuntu, which is the traditional African cultural heritage, encourages harmony and the sense of pride is deteriorating in African communities. They held that the efficacy of Ubuntu is threatened by the growing xenophobic phenomenon in South Africa. They assert that this is evident that people no longer love one another and could be seen in the lack of trust amongst others and the people. Also, the social values of Ubuntu, which include sharing, caring and the respect of life, are no longer adhered to by the people (Breed &Semenya 2015). Furthermore, they argued that “xenophobia is the exact opposite of Ubuntu. In Ubuntu, we are able to look at the other in the eye, with xenophobia we look at each other with evil intentions and turn away from the other’s need” (Breed &Semenya 2015). Elizabeth Chinomona&EugineTafadzwaMaziri (2015) also argue that xenophobic attack in South Africa is as a result of narrow definition of Ubuntu to the benefit of South Africans without its extension to include foreigners. Therefore, xenophobia is an apparent contradiction of Ubuntu solidarity in Africa.

One can therefore say that xenophobia stands out as vice which seemingly tends to justify the Hobbesian principle of “*homo homini lupus*” in which case man is conceived as being a wolf unto his fellow man in a state of lawlessness and anarchy. In this case a particular group that shares common patrimony turns on others to treat them as foreigners and unleashes terror upon them. From our analysis so far, it is obvious that xenophobia has indeed left its own negative effects in the sands of time. Indeed the recent xenophobic developments bear a weighty effect on the African heritage, more so, it has dealt seriously with the African solidarity and the pan-Africanist movement for oneness and integrity in the black identity. Africa is known for its love



for oneness, love, hospitality and solidarity. In the olden days, many African nationalists, writers and other patriotic brothers fought strenuously for the African identity and solidarity. Indeed, the recent development has put a dividing line in the African solidarity contrary to what Mandela achieved and has envisaged. The wish of Nelson Mandela was to see what he termed the “Renaissance of Africa”, in other words, African solidarity. He professed Ubuntu which has its root in solidarity. The question that arises in this philosophical table of discussion is: how is this going to unfold and take place in Africa when xenophobia is polarizing the African people? In the light of the above, there is an urgent need for a concrete solution to this crisis of Ubuntu solidarity practice.

Heterogeneous Solidarity as Panacea to Xenophobia

Xenophobia is a direct contradiction to the spirit of Ubuntu. The basic question is why there is still the practice of xenophobia in Africa whereas Ubuntu is said to be an African reality characteristic model of togetherness. The answer to this situation is that Ubuntu solidarity in Africa can be said to be a homogeneous solidarity practice. Therefore, looking at the devastating homogeneous practice of solidarity in Africa which is clearly posited in the events of xenophobic attacks of Africans against fellow Africans in their country, and looking at other conflicts in Africa, there is need for a paradigm shift from homogeneous solidarity of Ubuntu to heterogeneous solidarity. This new model of solidarity centers on the establishment of rights and freedom in a civil society. In this heterogeneous concept, people will look beyond their culture or community, beyond their village or country and thus see everybody as one and sharers of equal rights and dignity.

Heterogeneous solidarity concept is a solidarity model that is universal, civil and is without exclusion, whereby everyone, no matter the race, the colour, the tribe, ethnic group or religion is welcomed. Homogeneous solidarity concept is a solidarity practice that is practiced along tribal, ethnic, religious, cultural lines. They are the people of the same culture, tradition, religion, language, and of the same world view. One may note that the mindset of majority of the people with Ubuntu solidarity practice are so stereotyped and are based on kindred, tribe, village or ethnic or religious group. Such a mentality needs a re-orientation, the need for a step forward.



Thus, having seen that homogeneous solidarity and its practice in Africa has a problem of exclusion, one can see that there is a lack, in other words, an underlying problem.

As John Mbillah (2020, 3) puts it, the problem with Africa is hinged on negative solidarity. One may argue that heterogeneous solidarity is practiced in a civil society like in Europe whereby people see themselves from the eye of rule of law and rights with less emphasis on ethnic cleavages. Such a practice guaranteed by a democratic system with functional rule of law could end xenophobic attacks. One may argue that heterogeneous concept of solidarity is capable of offering solution to end xenophobic attacks. Thus, based on the analysis so far, the transition from homogeneous to a heterogeneous model of solidarity seems to be the answer. Nevertheless, to what degree can heterogeneous social philosophy contribute towards restoration of African solidarity, a solidarity that can lead to an end to xenophobia and foster conflict resolution among Africans?

Homogeneous solidarity practice has the problem of exclusion based on tribal, ethnic, language culture or religious affiliations. In this sense, people who do not belong to the group- ethnic, tribe, religion or community have no rights to enjoy the group's solidarity. This has been the cause of incessant xenophobic attacks of Africans against fellow Africans. No doubt this lack in homogeneous solidarity is supplied by heterogeneous solidarity which is more universal, civil, with less emphasis on tribal, racial, cultural differences. Therefore, examining the Ubuntu solidarity practice and the xenophobic attacks of Africans against fellow Africans; one may argue for the practice of Ubuntu to advance from homogeneous solidarity practice to heterogeneous solidarity practice. This advancement is capable of mitigating xenophobic attacks which in turn is possible of enhancing African unity, African peace and African solidarity.

In the light of the above, Julius Nyerere has this heterogeneous thought on solidarity when he started thinking of "Ujamma" concept beyond his country. In his concept of solidarity of Ujamma which is rooted in African community spirit of brotherhood, he advocated for an all-embracing concept of solidarity – a heterogeneous solidarity against the concept of micro, homogenous or mechanic solidarity. Hence, in traditional "ujamaa", solidarity is only practiced among the family members and the members of the community. But the new concept of solidarity of Nyerere is to include all men of all tribes and nations and religions. Even though,



the philosophy of Nyerere was expressed for the revival of the African practices and values of communal ownership and cooperation as practiced in the traditional African community, this concept of solidarity is apt towards better solidarity practice in Africa. This disposition mitigates possibilities of xenophobic attacks of Africans against fellow Africans thereby leading to conflict resolution and development in Africans. The solidarity that cuts across every dividing lines: namely the family, the tribe, race, colour, country, nations, etc. Thus, like Fourier who proposed a traditional form of solidarity and later developed it into a heterogeneous solidarity, Nyerere also proposed for Tanzanians a shift from the idea of homogenous solidarity to heterogeneous solidarity.

Conclusion:

Xenophobic attacks with its devastating effects have not only crippled the togetherness of Africans; but it has also created a very serious problem in the supposed African peace and unity and more so in African solidarity. Thus, there is then an urgent need for the restoration of African solidarity. The practice of Ubuntu solidarity is therefore to be advanced from homogeneous solidarity practice to heterogeneous solidarity practice. When this is achieved, Africans will now look at themselves beyond tribe, culture, religion, Ethnicity, or language and see themselves fundamentally as one, then nipping the xenophobic attacks of Africans against fellow Africans in the bud; thereby leading to global African solidarity and global peace.

REFERENCES

- Adebajo, A., (2011). *UN Peacekeeping in Africa: From the Suez Canal to the Sudan Conflicts*, LyneeRienner Publishers.
- Aremu, J., & Adeyinka, A., (2014). Expulsion of Nigeria Immigrant Community from Ghana in 1969: Causes and Impact. *Developing Country Studies*, 4 (10).
- Breed, G. & Kwen, S., (2015). Ubuntu, Koinonia and Diakonia, a Way to Reconciliation in South Africa? *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies*, 71, no.2. <https://dx.doi.org/10.4102/hts.v71i2.2979/>, (Accessed: 10.11.2024).
- Burke, J., (2019). Xenophobia Heightens with Calling of Mass Shutdown. *New Frame*, 2(12) available at: <https://www.newframe.com/xenophobia-heightens-with-calling-of-mass-shutdown/>, (Accessed: 21.11.2024).



- Chinomona, E., & Maziriri, E. F., (2015). Examining the Phenomenon of Xenophobia as Experienced by African Immigrant Entrepreneurs in Johannesburg, South Africa: Intensifying the Spirit of Ubuntu. *International Journal of Research in Business Studies and Management*, vol.2, no. 6.
- Fourier, C., (2013). *Social Solidarities: The Search for Solidarity in Sociology*. OASIS Research Center.
- Crush, J., (2020). *Deadly Denial: Xenophobia Governance and Global Compact for Migration in South Africa*. South African Migration Programme Research Centre.
- Siegel, D., (2009). *The Mazzel Ritual: Culture, Customs and Crime in the Diamond Trade*. Springer.
- Doke, M., (1960). *A Zulu Manual for Beginners With Exercises*. Longmans.
- Gade, C., (2017). *A Discourse on African Philosophy: A New Perspective on Ubuntu and Transitional Justice in South Africa*. Lexington Books.
- Gade, C., (2013). The Historical Development of the Written Discourses on Ubuntu, *South African Journal of Philosophy*. 2(13).
- Gbajabiamila, F., (2020). Xenophobia: No Need for niceties, Nigeria Must Retaliate, available at: <https://whirlwindnews.com/news/15191-Xenophobia-No-need-for-niceties-Nigeria-must-retaliate-Gbajabiamila/>
- Gocking, R., (2005). *The History of Ghana*. Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Hetherington, P., (1978). *British Paternalism and Africa 1920-1940*. F. Cass Pub.
- Kimenyi, A., (1979). *Studies in Kinyarwanda and Bantu Phonology*. Linguistic Research.
- Lawal, S., (1983). Ghana Must Go: The Ugly History of Africa's Most Famous Bag. *Mail and Guardian*.
- McLaren, J., (1918). The Wit and Wisdom of the Bantu as Illustrated in their Proverbial Sayings. *Sud-Afrikaanse Journal*, 14(18).
- Mandela, N., "Solidarity in Ubuntu", 5th Steve Biko Lecture, University of Cape Town, South Africa, 10th September, 2004.
- Mugumbate, J., & Nyanguru, A., (2013). Exploring African Philosophy: The Value of Ubuntu in Social Work. *African Journal of Social Work*, 3 (1).
- Nyerere, J., (1967). *Ujamaa: The Basis of African Socialism*. Freedom and Unity.



Obi, P., (2020). Xenophobia: Be Together, Protect Yourself, Obi Tells Nigerians in South Africa. available at: <https://whirlwindnews.com/news/15181-Xenophobia-Be-Together-protect-yourself-Obi-tells-Nigerians-in-South-Africa/>

Okolo, C., (1993). *African Social and Political Philosophy*. Fulladu.

Okoro, K., & Nkama, C., (2018). Ubuntu Ideality: The Solution to Xenophobic Practice in South Africa. *World Journal of Research and Review (WJRR)*, Vol.6, no.3.

Okumu, A., (2018). *Ubuntu Morality: A Remedy for Tribalism in Kenya*. LAP LAMBERT Academic Publishing.

Osunwokeh, C., (2015). Human Dignity Stance on Umunna Solidarity in Igbo Traditional Society: A challenge to African Christianity. *Journal of Scientific Research and Reports*, 8(2).

Rand, J.A., Vorster, J.M. & Vorster, N., *Togetherness in South Africa Religious Perspectives on Racism, Xenophobia and Economic Inequality*. AOSIS (Pty) Ltd.

Crush, J., (2020). Deadly Denial: Xenophobia Governance and Global Compact for Migration in South Africa. South African Migration Programme research Centre.

Stjerbo, S., (2004). *Solidarity in Europe the History of an Idea*. Cambridge University Press.

Talijaard, Z.L., (1981). *A Handbook of Zulu Language*. J.L. van Schaik.

Thompson, L., & Butler, J., (1975). *Change in Contemporary Africa*. University of California Press.

Tutu, D., (1997). *The Essential Desmond Tutu*. New Africa Books.

Waithima, A. K., (2012). The Role of Harambee Contributions in Corruption: Experimental Evidence of Kenya. *Investment Climate and Business Environmental Research Fund*, 16(12).

Weidtmann, N., (2019). The Historical Dimension of Ubuntu in Everyday Life. *Ubuntu and the Everyday in Africa*, James Ogude and Unifier Dyer, eds., Africa World Press.