

The Lubogo Framework for Ubuntu Constitutionalism: A Master Record of Twenty Original Theories, Tests, Principles, And Doctrines in African Jurisprudence

Isaac Christopher Lubogo*

Suigeneris Consultancy, Kampala, Uganda Doctor of Law Fellow (Ongoing), Makerere University School of Law, Uganda

***Corresponding Author:** Isaac Christopher Lubogo, Suigeneris Consultancy, Kampala, Uganda Doctor of Law Fellow (Ongoing), Makerere University School of Law, Uganda.

Citation: Lubogo, I, C. (2026). The Lubogo Framework for Ubuntu Constitutionalism: A Master Record of Twenty Original Theories, Tests, Principles, And Doctrines in African Jurisprudence. *Journal of Arts and Humanities*, 2(1), 01-07.

Abstract

This paper presents the Lubogo Framework for Ubuntu Constitutionalism — a comprehensive, operationalised, and multi-jurisdictionally applicable framework for Ubuntu constitutionalism in African legal scholarship. Developed between 2024 and 2026 through doctoral research at Makerere University School of Law and related scholarly projects, the Framework comprises twenty original theories, tests, principles, and doctrines organised into five jurisprudential clusters. It translates Ubuntu from an ethical and cultural tradition into an operational jurisprudential architecture capable of informing constitutional reasoning, criminal accountability, bail and detention, decolonisation, semiotics, and diagnostic evaluation of judicial reasoning. The study uses doctrinal and conceptual legal analysis to consolidate the Framework, define the relationship among its twenty components, and identify its constitutional safeguards and limits. The results show a cumulative architecture moving from diagnosis of relational deficits through irreversibility-conscious reasoning and humanitarian approaches to detention, toward semiotic and decolonial constitutional analysis and diagnostic evaluation. The Framework is presented as a scholarly proposal for constitutional reasoning, not as a replacement for constitutional supremacy, legality, individual rights, precedent, or institutional competence. Its intended implication is to make Ubuntu capable of doing identifiable analytical work in Ugandan and wider African constitutional scholarship.

Keywords: Ubuntu, Constitutionalism, African Jurisprudence, Relational Justice, Decolonization, Constitutional Theory

Introduction

Ubuntu has long been invoked as an ethical vocabulary of African relationality, dignity, community and human interdependence. The difficulty for constitutional scholarship is to move from invocation to operation: what does Ubuntu actually require a court, legislature, administrator or constitutional designer to do? The Lubogo Framework addresses that problem by converting Ubuntu into a structured jurisprudential architecture. It does not propose that Ubuntu displace constitutional supremacy, legality, individual rights,

precedent or institutional competence. Rather, it asks how those commitments can be interpreted and developed while taking relational personhood seriously.

The Framework emerged through doctoral research at Makerere University School of Law and a series of related scholarly projects between 2024 and 2026. It is presented here as a master record of twenty original theories, tests, principles and doctrines. The purpose is both intellectual and practical: to preserve the architecture of the Framework in a single authoritative record and to provide a reference point for future scholarship, judicial analysis and law reform.

Materials and Methods

This is a doctrinal and conceptual legal research paper. No human participants, animals, interviews, surveys, or experimental interventions were used. The materials consist of the author's doctoral research on Ubuntu and Ugandan law, the consolidated jurisprudential framework developed between 2024 and 2026, and related legal and scholarly materials identified in the source record. The method is analytical rather than empirical: the paper identifies, defines, organises, and relates twenty proposed theories, tests, principles, and doctrines into five clusters. The analysis also examines the constitutional boundaries within which the proposed framework is intended to operate, including legality, constitutional supremacy, individual rights, precedent, and institutional competence. The purpose is consolidation and conceptual operationalisation, rather than statistical measurement or empirical causal inference.

Results

The twenty contributions fall into five connected clusters. The Ubuntu Deficit Cluster diagnoses failures of relational accountability in criminal justice. The Irreversibility Cluster addresses constitutional situations in which legal decisions can produce permanent human loss. The Bail and Detention Cluster develops relational approaches to pre-trial detention and humanitarian release. The Semiotic and Constitutional Cluster addresses the absence, suppression or estrangement of Ubuntu as an explicit constitutional sign and proposes a broader constitutional reorientation. The Measurement and Diagnostic Cluster supplies tools for identifying and comparing the presence, latency or deficit of Ubuntu in legal reasoning.

Ubuntu Deficit Cluster

Ubuntu Deficit Theory

Collective wrongdoing prosecuted selectively can produce a structural disintegration of relational accountability. Ubuntu Deficit Theory identifies the point at which a criminal-justice outcome may be procedurally valid while remaining relationally incomplete. The deficit arises where systemic wrongdoing is collapsed into individual guilt, institutional causation disappears behind procedural closure, or enforcement becomes narratively selective rather than structurally coherent. Core proposition: fragmentation of accountability may preserve the appearance of justice while weakening its relational completeness.

Ubuntu Deficit Test (UDT)

The Ubuntu Deficit Test operationalises the preceding theory through four diagnostic questions: (1) Was accountability applied consistently across similarly situated actors? (2)

Was responsibility mapped across the full causal chain, or truncated at convenience? (3) Does the outcome restore relational balance, or merely conclude a prosecution file? (4) Does the result produce moral coherence or merely institutional relief? The Test is diagnostic; it does not replace ordinary criminal-law requirements.

Relational Criminal Jurisprudence

Relational Criminal Jurisprudence argues that criminal responsibility can be examined within the full causal architecture of collective wrongdoing without abolishing individual guilt. It deepens criminal-law analysis by asking not only who committed an offence, but how wrongdoing was institutionally assembled and distributed across relationships.

Relational Accountability Theory

Accountability is relational as well as procedural. Selective prosecution can therefore be analysed not only as an equality concern but as a failure to preserve coherent relationships among the State, accused persons, victims and the wider community. The theory supplies a relational lens for examining consistency and structural completeness in public prosecution.

Irreversibility Cluster

The “If Not, But” Principle

Where law produces avoidable irreversible harm despite a less restrictive and dignity-preserving alternative, constitutional reasoning should explain not only the action taken but why the alternative was rejected. The principle introduces a counterfactual dimension into rights adjudication without displacing proportionality or legality.

Ubuntu Counterfactual Test

The Test asks: if a less restrictive, dignity-preserving alternative existed, why was it not adopted? Its function is to expose omissions in reasoning where the human consequences of a legal choice may be permanent. It is a diagnostic question, not a substitute for the governing legal test.

Doctrine of Irreversible Harm

Where legal deprivation produces permanent, non-remediable loss, constitutional balancing should expressly account for irreversibility. A later acquittal, appeal or remedy cannot necessarily restore a human experience that was permanently missed. The doctrine therefore foregrounds the temporal and remedial character of constitutional harm.

Irreversibility-Conscious Reasoning

This mode of reasoning supplements conventional proportionality by requiring explicit attention to harms that cannot subsequently be undone. It challenges constitutional analysis to distinguish reversible inconvenience from permanent dignitary loss.

Temporal Presumption Doctrine

The longer State detention continues without trial, the stronger the constitutional and relational case for examining whether continued coercion remains justified and whether humane temporary relief is available. Time is therefore treated as legally relevant to the assessment of coercive power, while remaining subject to positive law and applicable safeguards.

Bail and Detention Cluster

Compassionate Bail Test

A structured approach to exceptional humanitarian circumstances. Its four considerations are: irreversibility of the event; whether attendance is central to human dignity as relationally constituted; whether State risks can reasonably be mitigated through conditions or escort; and whether denial would cause disproportionate and irreversible emotional or dignitary harm. The Test disciplines discretion rather than creating an unbounded entitlement.

Ubuntu Bail Theory

Bail decisions can be assessed through the relational dimensions of the accused's life: family, dependants, community and social responsibilities. The theory treats dignity as relationally constituted while recognising that detention may still be justified under ordinary constitutional and statutory criteria.

Mufumbiro Test

The Mufumbiro Test structures relational bail analysis around four questions: relational harm beyond the individual; Ubuntu-informed accountability by the State; availability of restorative alternatives to detention; and preservation of dignity through community relationships.

Procedural Absolutism

Procedural Absolutism describes a systemic condition in which legal form is treated as dispositive despite catastrophic human consequences. It is a diagnostic concept applicable beyond bail, including other fields where rigid procedure may obscure the human reality before the decision-maker.

Humanitarian Release Doctrine

The Doctrine argues that international human-rights law contains resources capable of supporting a structured doctrine of humanitarian release, including protections concerning liberty, humane treatment and conditions of detention. The contribution is to organise those resources into a coherent relational framework rather than to create an unrestricted release power.

Semiotic and Constitutional Cluster

Semiotic Estrangement Theory

Ugandan courts may employ reasoning consonant with Ubuntu without naming Ubuntu as a constitutional signifier. Semiotic Estrangement Theory distinguishes the normative content that is present in judicial reasoning from the sign that remains institutionally underdeveloped. The theory therefore addresses both substance and legal language.

Ubuntu Decolonisation Deficit

Colonial legal structures often positioned indigenous normative systems as informal or subordinate. The post-colonial constitutional order may inherit aspects of that epistemic hierarchy. Ubuntu Decolonisation Deficit identifies the remaining structural gap and treats constitutional renewal as requiring engagement with sources of legal meaning, not merely historical commentary.

Ubuntu Constitutional Dispensation Theory

A new constitutional dispensation need not mean textual replacement alone. It can also mean a reorientation of the constitutional sign system through which law understands dignity, community, rights and governance. Ubuntu Constitutional Dispensation Theory therefore supplies the macro-level destination of the Framework while preserving constitutional supremacy and rights protection.

Measurement and Diagnostic Cluster

Ubuntu Dividend Index

The Ubuntu Dividend Index is a criteria-based diagnostic tool for assessing the degree to which legal reasoning recognises relational and Ubuntu values. It is not intended as a numerical score imposed on judges. Its purpose is to identify normative visibility, doctrinal visibility, relational consequences, remedial consequences, precedential consequences and broader constitutional consequences.

Three-Category Typology

The Typology classifies judicial engagement into three broad categories: Explicit Ubuntu, where the value is named and deployed; Latent or Ubuntu-consonant reasoning, where relevant relational values operate without being named; and Ubuntu Deficit, where reasoning or consequences disclose a significant absence of relational considerations. The categories are analytical rather than evaluative rankings of judges.

But for Ubuntu Test

The But For Ubuntu Test asks a causation-style question: but for the absence of Ubuntu-informed reasoning, would the relevant harm, omission or accountability failure have occurred? The question is designed to expose potentially constitutionally relevant omissions and to identify where relational analysis might have changed legally relevant considerations, relationships, remedies or precedent.

Discussion

The results show that the twenty contributions are best understood as an integrated jurisprudential architecture rather than as isolated propositions. The principal scholarly implication is methodological: Ubuntu is treated as a source of legally relevant reasoning that can be made visible, tested, and discussed without displacing the constitutional order. The framework therefore distinguishes normative proposal from positive law. Its concepts are analytical and reform-oriented; their adoption by courts, legislatures, or other institutions would require appropriate constitutional, statutory, or jurisprudential authority.

Relationship Between the Five Clusters

The Framework is cumulative. The Deficit Cluster supplies diagnosis; the Irreversibility Cluster supplies a temporal and remedial sensitivity to permanent harm; the Bail and Detention Cluster demonstrates operational application to liberty and humane treatment; the Semiotic and Constitutional Cluster explains why Ubuntu may remain normatively present yet doctrinally under-recognised; and the Measurement and Diagnostic Cluster supplies tools for systematic analysis. The clusters therefore move from diagnosis, through application, toward constitutional transformation and evaluation.

Constitutional Safeguards and Limits

The Framework is not a theory of majoritarian or communal supremacy. Ubuntu cannot be invoked to extinguish individual rights, bypass constitutional text, disregard legality, undermine institutional competence, or displace binding precedent without lawful justification. Nor does the Framework equate Ubuntu automatically with every customary practice, African tradition or communal preference. A practice may be consistent with Ubuntu, inconsistent with it, or unrelated to it. The analytical task is therefore one of reasoned constitutional engagement.

The Framework is likewise not a numerical judicial ranking system. Its diagnostic concepts are designed to expose dimensions of reasoning that may otherwise remain invisible. “Deficit” refers to an identified absence in the Ubuntu dimension of analysis; it is not a conclusion that a judge is incompetent, that a judgment is generally unlawful, or that a different outcome was necessarily legally required.

Application and Scholarly Development

The Framework was developed through the author’s doctoral research on Ubuntu and Ugandan law and through related scholarly submissions concerning criminal accountability, detention, constitutional semiotics, decolonisation and judicial reasoning. The original Framework record reported application across a wider body of Ugandan judicial decisions. Subsequent doctoral work refined portions of the jurisprudential analysis into controlled case corpora and more explicit distinctions among explicit, latent and deficit reasoning. Those later refinements should be understood as methodological development of the Framework rather than as replacement of its original architecture.

Conclusion

The Lubogo Framework for Ubuntu Constitutionalism constitutes a unified jurisprudential architecture of twenty original theories, tests, principles and doctrines. Its central contribution is operational: it seeks to make Ubuntu capable of doing identifiable analytical work in constitutional law rather than remaining merely rhetorical. The Framework proceeds from relational accountability and the diagnosis of Ubuntu deficit, through irreversibility-conscious reasoning and humanitarian approaches to detention, to semiotic and decolonial constitutional analysis and diagnostic measurement. Its proposed constitutional renewal remains bounded by legality, rights, constitutional supremacy, institutional competence and the rule of law.

Authorial Record

The twenty theories, tests, principles and doctrines recorded in this Master Record are presented as the original intellectual contributions of Isaac Christopher Lubogo, developed between 2024 and 2026 in the course of doctoral research and related scholarly work. This record is intended to preserve the architecture of the Lubogo Framework for Ubuntu Constitutionalism as a consolidated scholarly and intellectual-property reference.

Declarations

Originality and exclusive submission: This manuscript is an original scholarly work and is not currently under review by another journal. The author confirms responsibility for its content and approves its submission.

Funding: No specific external funding was received for this research.

Competing interests: The author declares no competing interests.

Ethics statement: Ethics approval is not applicable because the study involved no human or animal subjects, interviews, surveys, or identifiable personal data.

Data availability: No empirical dataset was generated or analysed. The paper is based on doctrinal and conceptual legal research and the scholarly source record identified below.

Author contributions: Isaac Christopher Lubogo conceived the framework, developed the methodology and conceptual architecture, conducted the legal and normative analysis, drafted the manuscript, revised the manuscript, and approved the final version.

References

1. Lubogo, I. C. (2026). The Lubogo Framework for Ubuntu constitutionalism: A master record of twenty original theories, tests, principles, and doctrines in African jurisprudence. SSRN.
2. Lubogo, I. C. (2026). Ubuntu and the law in Uganda: Towards a new constitutional dispensation [Doctoral research, Makerere University School of Law].
3. Lubogo, I. C. (2026). Ubuntu as legal sign: The semiotics of an African constitutional value in Ugandan law. *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law*.
4. Lubogo, I. C. (2026). The Lubogo Framework for Ubuntu Constitutionalism: A Master Record of Twenty Original Theories, Tests, Principles, and Doctrines in African Jurisprudence.