Academic Journal of Management and Social Sciences
ISSN: 2958-4396 | Vol. 17, No. 2, 2026

Transcending the Dilemma of Globalization: The View of Global Justice in the Theory of a Community of Shared Future for Mankind

Peixuan Liu *

Harbin University of Commerce, Harbin, Heilongjiang, 150028, China
*** Corresponding author Email:** 3192479568@qq.com

Abstract: Based on the analysis of the deep root of the dilemma of globalization and the theory of the community of human destiny, this paper constructs a triple composite framework of the idea of global justice in the community of human destiny, which is composed of relational justice, distributive justice and corrective justice. Through the practice in the field of public health crisis, it illustrate the effectiveness of the symbiotic justice of the theory of the community of human destiny.The theoretical contribution of this article lies in its systematic elaboration of the normative connotation of a community with a shared future for mankind as a new paradigm of global justice. Based on the critical absorption of Western justice theories, and grounded in Marxist community thought and Chinese wisdom of harmony, it provides a Chinese solution that combines moral appeal and practical feasibility for transcending the dilemmas of globalization.

Keywords: A Community with a Shared Future of Mankind; Global Justice; Globalization Dilemma; Global Governance.

1. Introduction

Today's globalization has fallen into a strange paradox: the interconnection of materials and the synchronization of information have reached an unprecedented height, and capital, goods and data weave an increasingly close picture of interdependence. However, psychological distance, trust deficit and the sense of development rupture are also unprecedented. The resurgence of trade protectionism, the intensification of geopolitical games, and the spread of Populism -- people had expected that technological interconnection would naturally bring about the integration of civilizations, but the reality is just the opposite. Instead of bringing about the "integration" of politics and civilization, the "integration" of technology has spawned estrangement, tear and resistance.[1] A fundamental question cannot be avoided: has the set of just compass guiding globalization deviated from the beginning?

The deep focus does not lie in the symptoms of uneven distribution, governance failure or civilization conflict, but in the fact that the existing global justice paradigm has been unable to integrate differences, build consensus and resolve risks. For a long time, the concept of global justice based on Neo liberalism regards market freedom as the highest principle and promises universal prosperity with formal equality of rights, but in practice it exposes a triple structural dilemma. First, the systematic rupture of rights and obligations: capital has gained the right to flow freely around the world, while the social and environmental costs caused by capital seeking profits are firmly locked within the boundaries of the nation-state and borne by the groups and places that lack the most affordability. Second, the deep unfairness under the cover of formal equality: the rules of Global trade, finance and governance are literally the same for all countries, but the right to formulate rules has been monopolized by a few developed countries from the beginning. Although developing countries "participate equally", they can only accept them passively in the established framework. Third, the mandatory narrative of a single Modernity: the special historical experience of the west is packaged as the universal iron rule of human development, and the society that does not conform to this model is belittled as "pre-modern" or "authoritarian", so global justice becomes a reprint of the hierarchy of civilizations. When this just narrative cannot respond to the legitimate demands of the global south, nor can it accommodate the desire for coexistence of multiple civilizations, globalization will fall into the contemporary paradox of "integration" and "separation". Those groups and countries left behind by globalization expressed their desire for justice in a way of rejection, but were summarily dismissed as "Populism" or "protectionism" by the old label, which further solidified the deadlock of global governance. It can be seen that the transcendence of the dilemma of globalization is by no means a technical policy repair problem, but a fundamental reconstruction of the concept of justice.

Although western political philosophers tried to respond to global inequality within the framework of liberalism, they were always trapped in a paradox: the more they tried to extend the logic of domestic justice to the world, the more exposed the fundamental limit of liberalism paradigm in dealing with global inequality. These theories simplify global justice to some form of "redistribution", which is politically prone to interference in the internal affairs of other countries, economically ignores the fundamental importance of the development of productive forces, and culturally ignores the different understandings of "justice" by different civilizations. More fundamentally, they have never really jumped out of the global political and economic order itself under the guidance of capital logic. As long as the "center periphery" dependency structure continues to be solidified by the international system, any "compensatory justice" within the existing framework is just a scratch. Marx once revealed that the capitalist community is an "illusory community"; Extending to the world, the Western led governance system is also an "illusory global community"[1].

Based on this diagnosis, this paper puts forward the core

Outline: the transcendence of the dilemma of globalization requires a shift from the Neo liberal paradigm of "redistributive justice" to the paradigm of "symbiotic justice" contained in the community of human destiny. This paper attempts to systematically interpret the concept of a community with a shared future for mankind as a new theory of global justice, which contains the logic of justice that transcends the traditional Western Paradigm - expanding global justice from static "distributive justice" to a composite structure that covers three dimensions of "relational justice", "distributive justice" and "corrective justice".[2]

This paper is not only a response to the poverty of Western global justice theory, but also a supplement to the Chinese discourse in the field of global justice. For a long time, the discussion of global justice has been almost entirely dominated by western academia, and the voice of non Western civilization has been ignored or subordinated. This paper tries to provide a possible solution with both theoretical depth and practical concern for the transcendence of the dilemma of globalization based on the paradigm of "symbiotic justice" rooted in the wisdom of "harmony" of Chinese civilization and the thought of Marxist community.

2. Construct

The foundation of the theoretical reform of the community of shared future of mankind stems from its unique dual ideological foundation. The first is the contemporary echo of Marxist community thought,[3][4] which not only soberly recognizes the reality of "two systems coexisting", but also firmly points to the ultimate goal of the free and all-round development of all mankind, and establishes the historical tension of the coexistence of practical feasibility and ideal transcendence; The second is the creative transformation of the Chinese culture of "harmony in diversity", the cosmological view of "the unity of heaven and man", intercourse perspective of "harmony amid diversity" and the social view of "the world is for the public", which provide an organic and holistic philosophical basis for global justice, which is different from the Western contract theory, and make the cultural ideal of "shared appreciation of beauty" serve as a footnote to of the new concept of justice.

2.1. Relational justice

The reconstruction of global justice by the concept of a community with a shared future for mankind began with a profound ontological revolution: withdraw from the "atomized individual" or "Hobbesian jungle" preset in the west, and establish "symbiosis" as the basic way to understand the world. In the face of climate crisis, pandemic and other risks, mankind has been thrown into the ship of common destiny. Marx's thought of "man is a kind of existence"[5] has thus obtained a new reality. The highest principle of global justice must change from "how to divide the boundary of interests" to "how to maintain common survival". "Symbiotic logic" is therefore not only a description of the state of existence, but also a normative starting point of the new global idea of Justice: justice is no longer a strategic choice of zero sum game, but an ethical response to "how do we live together", requiring that the fate of the "other" be taken into account in "self", and establishing a new ethical foundation with sustainable symbiosis as the core.

On this basis, relational justice reshapes the relationship dimension of global justice with "heterogeneous coexistence" and "mutual recognition", and traces the inquiry from "interest distribution" to "relationship construction". "Heterogeneous coexistence" is a positive recognition of the differences of Civilizations: "harmony in diversity". The prosperity of civilizations depends on diversity. It opposes "system export" or "civilization transformation", respects countries' independent choice of development path, developed countries no longer monopolize the right to define "good society", and developing countries do not need to justify themselves according to external standards. "Mutual recognition" is the respect for the subjectivity of others on the basis of equality, which requires that we should not talk about superiority and inferiority based on strength, and practice sovereign equality. "Things in the world can only be done by the governments and people of all countries through consultation". It advocates a new partnership with symbiosis as the ethical link, emphasizes "partnership and non alignment", surmounts suspicion with trust, and dispels confrontation with common development. More importantly, relational justice also breaks the epistemological injustice of Western centrism, endows the countries in the south of the world with equal subject status as knowledge producers and rule makers, and substantially rebuilds the foundation of trust in international relations.

In the dialogue with western justice theories, the concept of a community of shared future for mankind critically absorbs various reasonable elements: It neither pursues the homogeneity of Rawls' system, nor hopes on Habermas' global constitutional project, nor is it limited to Nussbaum's list of individual abilities. Instead, it takes "symbiosis" as the ontological premise, and "heterogeneous coexistence" and "mutual recognition" as the normative principles, and constructs a new global ethics that not only recognizes the intermediary role of national sovereignty, but also transcends narrow national interests. It redraws the boundary between "us" and "them", and internalizes the responsibility for "others" into the inevitable requirement of symbiotic destiny -- just as the obligation to work together in the same boat stems from the reality of facing the storm together. "Common but differentiated responsibilities" has thus become the core criterion of global justice. It not only recognizes the common responsibilities of all countries, but also faces up to the special historical responsibilities of developed countries, finding a balance between morality and utility. Through the wisdom of "harmony but difference", this ethics dissolves the tension between universalism and particularism. It does not eliminate the subjectivity of the nation-state or fall into relativism, but is committed to building an organic whole of beauty, beauty and common. As Marx said, "only under the conditions of a real community can individuals obtain their own freedom."[6]. This justice plan is not only a contemporary echo of Marx's "real community" thought, but also a creative transformation of China's "world" feelings in the modern global order.

2.2. Distributive justice

Whether Rawls's "universal law"[7][8], Pogge's "global resource dividend" [9] or Singer's utilitarian aid, they share a deep presupposition: global justice is the transnational transfer of existing wealth, the "total cake" of the global economy is regarded as a fixed amount, and justice is simplified as stock cutting. However, this logic is immersed in static distribution, but it is indifferent to the wealth creation process and ignores the structural obstacles to the independent development of developing countries. It keeps arguing about

how much "fish" should be given to the poor, but never asks why the poor have no "fishing nets". Therefore, the reconstruction of global justice must return to the origin of development and explore a new paradigm that takes into account wealth creation and fair sharing.

It is based on this diagnosis that the concept of a community of shared future for mankind takes "co construction and sharing" as the core, turns the global distribution justice from the static "redistribution" paradigm to the dynamic "developmental distribution" paradigm, and realizes the deep change from "giving people fish" to "giving people fish". "Co construction" constitutes the first important meaning: it regards each country as an equal participant in development, rather than a passive recipient. The "belt and road" initiative is a model practice - through infrastructure connectivity, it can complement the development weaknesses of participating countries and change the moral logic of global cooperation. The empirical study shows that it has stimulated the endogenous growth momentum through industrial cooperation and technology transfer, and realized the fundamental transformation from "blood transfusion" to "hematopoiesis". "Sharing" establishes the value principle for fair distribution: co construction is the premise of sharing, and sharing is the destination of co construction. Sharing is not absolute average, but to let each participant share the results fairly according to their contributions and needs, so as to achieve inclusiveness and inclusiveness. As Xi Jinping pointed out, "we should not only make a big cake, but also divide it well" [10]. Through infrastructure connectivity, "co construction and sharing" is promoting the structural change of international production relations and making the global development pattern from one-way dependence to two-way win-win.

On the basis of the co construction and sharing mechanism, the concept of a community with a shared future for mankind further promotes distributive justice from the distribution of "things" to the development of "people", with common development as the ultimate value. The old paradigm focuses on how much the poor countries "get" rather than what the poor countries "become". This idea of justice that sees things but not people often makes the recipient countries more dependent on aid. The community of a shared future for mankind advocates the development idea of "people-centered", emphasizing that every country, large or small, rich or poor, can obtain equal development rights, fair opportunities and sustainable capacity. The ultimate criterion of global distributive justice is not how much wealth the rich countries have transferred, but whether the living conditions of every member of the global village have been truly improved. The commitment of "not letting any country fall behind" has revived the ideal of common prosperity promised by globalization.

Common development also means the recognition of the "right to development" as an inalienable human right. Development is not a gift given by others, but the right of each country to be independent. In addition, "common development" brings intergenerational justice into view and clearly puts forward the principle of "sustainable development", which not only guarantees the needs of contemporary people, but also does not endanger the ability of future generations to meet their needs. The global distributive justice with common development as the ultimate goal tells the world that the common prosperity of mankind is not a utopian dream, but a long-term cause that requires the joint participation, construction and maintenance of all countries.

2.3. Corrective justice

If relational justice lays the ethical foundation of "how to coexist", distributive justice establishes the development logic of "how to share", corrective justice faces a deeper Institutional Dilemma: how to correct the procedural injustice that has been solidified in the global governance system for a long time. The reason why the old order dominated by the West continued to reproduce inequality lies in the injustice of its procedure itself. The concept of a community with a shared future for mankind takes "common consultation and governance" as the core principle, reshapes the procedural legitimacy of global governance, and ensures that all countries, big or small, strong or weak, can achieve real equality in participation.

The logical starting point of corrective justice is a sober judgment of procedural monopoly in the old order. In the key institutional arrangements of contemporary global governance, "procedural justice" has long served as a screening mechanism that is fair in appearance but actually serves specific interests. It is in the face of this profound procedural injustice that the principle of "consultation" shows a unique theoretical impact. President Xi clearly pointed out that "the fate of the world should be jointly controlled by all countries, international rules should be jointly written by all countries, and global affairs should be jointly governed by all countries."[11].This thesis fundamentally negates the old model of a few big powers controlling the decision-making power, and establishes the right to participate as an inalienable right of governance. "Consultation" is not a technical appeal, but a normative declaration to fundamentally reset the power structure of global governance. It requires procedural justice to move from formal equality to substantive equality, and from superficial participation to real empowerment. The extension of "co discussion" to "co governance" is the inevitable requirement of corrective justice from concept to system. Co construction and co governance requires that the consensus formed by democratic consultation be institutionalized into the governance framework at the global, regional and field levels. The global governance initiative advocates maintaining the international system with the United Nations as the core, promoting the governance reform of the International Monetary Fund and the world bank, enhancing the voice and voting weight of developing countries, and giving play to the complementary role of new multilateral financial institutions such as the Asian investment bank and the new development bank. The essence of these propositions is not to overturn the current order, but to improve the existing governance structure through the institutionalized correction mechanism.

Corrective justice must also face its boundaries and limits honestly. First, it faces the tension of the real power structure - vested interests will not voluntarily give up privileges. The concept of a community with a shared future for mankind provides a gradual strategy of "promoting change in cooperation and seeking breakthroughs in consultation", and provides inclusive alternatives through the creation of new institutions to drive stock adjustment through incremental change. Second, there are limitations in the function of the system itself: Although the system can change the distribution of voting rights, it is difficult to eliminate the technological gap and discourse hegemony in a short time. Therefore,

corrective justice and distributive justice must work together to fill the capacity gap through co construction and sharing, and provide the basis for substantive participation. Third, it faces a profound ethical dilemma: how to avoid tacit consent to injustice while adhering to procedural legitimacy when the co-operation process encounters non cooperation. The concept of a community with a shared future for mankind insists on resolving differences through dialogue and consultation, and opposes the pursuit of justice by unfair means, so as to prevent violence in the name of justice. Corrective justice refuses to grant any country the privilege of a "just judge". It relies on the rules jointly built by all countries in equal consultation and the common value consensus of all mankind. The supreme authority of global justice does not belong to any country, but to the common will of all mankind. It is this character of self reflection that distinguishes corrective justice from the arbitrary arrogance of the old Global Justice - It knows what it can and cannot do; It has both the firm courage to rectify the unjust world and the humility to face its own limitations.

2.4. The internal connection of triple justice

The triple justice in the concept of a community with a shared future for mankind is not a patchwork of isolated principles, but a close logical loop. This organic whole starts from the ontological foundation of relational justice. It ends the subject dilemma of the old paradigm with "symbiotic logic", declares that the subject of justice is the fate and common "we", and provides an ethical foundation for subsequent distribution and correction. On this basis, distributive justice responds to the core concern of "how to share results", transforming the symbiotic fact of "helping others is helping yourself" into the practical logic of "co construction and sharing", which is not only the extension of relational justice, but also its practical confirmation. However, only ethical consensus is not enough to resist the inertia of the old order. Therefore, corrective justice appears as the escort of the system, breaking the monopoly of the old rules through "joint consultation and governance", and embedding shared value into the institutional arrangement. The three are connected in two directions and empowered by each other: relationship provides power, distribution provides basis, and correction provides guarantee. If any link is missing, the structure will be unstable. This logical closed loop echoes the ternary framework of "common interest responsibility value". From the perspective of historical materialism, it is a systematic transcendence of "illusory community" and turns global governance from hegemonic logic to a real symbiotic community. The complete construction of this theory provides a solid normative support for globalization to move towards a community of shared destiny.[12]

3. Practice

The power of theory must be tested in explaining and responding to the problems of the real world. As one of the most violent global crises since the 21st century, the COVID-19 pandemic has proved the objectivity of symbiotic logic as the ontological basis of global justice in an irrefutable way. The virus ignores national boundaries, races and ideologies, and its spread without distinction between ourselves and the enemy makes any coping strategy based on the isolated nation-state doomed to be in trouble.

In this context, the practice of human health community driven by the concept of community with a shared future for mankind provides a new paradigm beyond vaccine nationalism. In the fight against the epidemic, China has not only taken decisive measures at home, but also provided assistance to the world within its capacity. By the end of 2022, China had provided hundreds of billions of supplies to 153 countries and 15 international organizations, supplied more than 2.2 billion doses of vaccine, and sent 37 medical expert teams. These actions are not one-way aid or moral handouts under the old paradigm, but common security practices under the guidance of symbiotic justice. The human health community, with the primary purpose of protecting lives, adheres to the sense of integrity and cooperation in the same storm, and emphasizes not the handouts of rich countries to poor countries, but the solidarity in the face of common threats.

More profoundly, the human health community is not a one-time crisis response plan, but a long-term institutional framework for global public health governance. It advocates the establishment of a normalized international coordination mechanism, strengthening the construction of the global disease monitoring network and emergency response capacity, promoting the equitable allocation of global public health resources, and ensuring that every country can obtain timely early warning, sufficient supplies and fair vaccine supply in the face of epidemic situations. The essence of these propositions is to institutionalize the global justice concept of a community with a shared future for mankind into the long-term framework of global public health governance, so that the commitment of "no country left behind" is transformed from a moral appeal to an institutional arrangement.

From the perspective of the framework of triple justice, the human health community shows systematic normative power in different dimensions. At the level of relational justice, it confirms the symbiotic relationship of human beings in front of the deadly virus from the ontology; At the level of distributive justice, it opposes treating vaccines as pure commodities, and advocates that they should be fairly provided to all countries as global public goods; At the level of corrective justice, it promotes the reform of the global coordination mechanism of the World Health Organization, enhances the voice of developing countries in international public health decision-making, and makes global health governance move from a closed structure dominated by a few big countries to an open structure with multiple participation.

4. Conclusion and Prospect

At this point, the core question driving all the arguments is: what kind of global justice is needed to overcome the dilemma of globalization? The answer is clear - the key is to move from the "redistribution justice" of Neo liberalism to the "symbiotic justice" of the community with a shared future for mankind. This paradigm shift replaces confrontation logic with symbiotic logic, reshapes the global justice system with the triple composite structure of relational justice, distributive justice and corrective justice, and realizes the systematic transcendence of the western traditional idea of justice in the logical starting point, core principles and practical path.

This transcendence is not a total negation of the old paradigm, but a profound dialectical sublation, which not only overcomes its structural defects, but also retains the reasonable core of individual rights and universal justice. Symbiotic justice breaks through the self circulation of western theories within the framework of "redistribution", and provides a more inclusive and effective Chinese plan for

coping with global challenges. It is the creative development of Marxist community thought in the 21st century. Although the transition from "normative ideal" to "operational theory" is still facing challenges, this new paradigm, rooted in the common destiny of mankind, has already demonstrated the great power of Reshaping Global Justice in theory and practice.

The most fundamental academic contribution of this study is to systematically interpret the concept of a community of shared future for mankind as a global justice theory with normative depth, and build a triple composite justice framework with "symbiotic justice" as the core. In addition to its contributions, this study also opens up a broad space for future academic exploration. First, the triple justice framework needs to be further operationalized and transformed into an evaluable system design; Secondly, we need to carry out in-depth dialogue with Rawls' contract theory and Amartya Sen's feasible ability theory through interdisciplinary collaboration to deepen comparative research; Thirdly, the methodology should move from normative speculation to pluralistic integration, and develop specific measurement dimensions to enhance the explanatory power. More importantly, the theoretical construction of symbiotic justice needs to be promoted in two-way dimensions: it is not only rooted in the fertile soil of traditional culture such as Confucian benevolence and Taoism's unity of heaven and man, but also more widely involved in international academic dialogue. In the end, the value of this theory lies not in providing a definitive answer, but in opening a continuous question: how can global justice achieve common prosperity while respecting the diversity of civilizations. From "the world is for the public" to "living things in harmony", the wisdom of communication of Chinese civilization for thousands of years has radiated new vitality in the era of globalization.

References

[1] Liu, B. (2025). "Anti-Globalization" from the Perspective of Global Justice. Globalization Studies, (02), 116-141..

[2] Huang, Z. F. (2026). The Paradigm Revolution and Systemic Reconstruction of Global Governance by the Concept of a Community with a Shared Future for Mankind. Zhongzhou Academic Journal, (01), 34-41.

[3] Marx, K., Engels, F. (2012) Selected Works of Marx and Engels (Vols. 1-4). People's Publishing House, Beijing.

[4] Marx, K., Engels, F. (1848) The Communist Manifesto. London.

[5] Marx, K. (1932) Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844. Marx-Engels Institute, Moscow. (Original work written 1844)

[6] Marx, K., Engels, F. (1932) The German Ideology. Marx-Engels Institute, Moscow. (Original work written 1845-1846)

[7] Rawls, J. (1971) A Theory of Justice. Harvard University Press, Cambridge.

[8] Rawls, J. (1999) The Law of Peoples. Harvard University Press, Cambridge.

[9] Pogge,T. (2002) World Poverty and Human Rights: Cosmopolitan Responsibilities and Reforms. Polity Press, Cambridge.

[10] Xi, J. P. (2017) The Governance of China (Vol. 2). Foreign Languages Press, Beijing.

[11] Xi, J.P. (2022) The Governance of China (Vol. 4). Foreign Languages Press, Beijing.

[12] Zheng, Q., & Ding, L. Q. (2025). Critique of Western Global Justice Theories and the Practical Approach to Building a Community with a Shared Future for Mankind. World Philosophy, (02), 92-102.