

Repensar a comunicação comunitária a partir da filosofia africana

Rethinking community communication based on African philosophy

Ana Lúcia Nunes de Sousa¹

Resumo: *Este trabalho se propõe a estabelecer um diálogo teórico Sul-Sul entre as concepções contemporâneas da noção de comum e de comunicação comunitária. Parte de uma revisão bibliográfica narrativa sobre o tema, enfocando nas contribuições de Muniz Sodré e Raquel Paiva, mas também abordando outros autores ocidentais e latino-americanos. Logo, apresenta e reflexiona sobre a filosofia africana do comum, o Ubu-ntu, explicitando suas principais características. Por fim, argumenta a potência do Ubu-ntu para repensar e aprofundar os estudos de comunicação comunitária, a partir do sul global.*

Palavras-Chave: *Comunicação; comum; filosofia; sul global; Ubu-ntu.*

Abstract: *This work aims to establish a theoretical south-south dialogue between contemporary conceptions of common and community communication. It starts with a narrative literature review on the theme, focusing on the contributions of Muniz Sodré and Raquel Paiva, but also addressing other western and Latin-American authors. Then, it presents and reflects on the African philosophy of the common, the Ubu-ntu, explaining its main characteristics. Finally, it argues the power of Ubu-ntu to re-think and deepen the studies of community communication, from the global South.*

Keywords: *Communication; common; philosophy; south global; Ubu-ntu.*

1 Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro (UFRJ). Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brasil.
<http://orcid.org/0000-0003-1924-5297> E-mail: anabetune@gmail.com

Introduction

In Latin America, there are not only projects of community communication, but also theories about this type of communication. If, on one hand, we have this force of rebellious radio (CUBA, 1959) and Bolivian mining radio, on the other, we also have a theoretical thinking that emerges from these practices. And, as diverse as these practices are, the analytical perspectives end up following this move through the continent.

According to Kaplún (2007), communication ended up being populated by similar names as: alternative, popular, educational, community and citizen. Festa (1986) even pointed, in her research, 32 different denominations. Despite the diversity, we risk synthesizing a few Latin American approaches – without the intention of finishing them, but with the goal of understanding them in general to later go through the main proposition of this text – in three great lines: popular communication, alternative communication and community communication.

Mario Kaplún (1987)'s studies – Argentinian researcher, living in Uruguay – on popular communication influenced, and continue to influence, communication researches and projects in Latin America. In Brazil, the term was popularized by the studies of the Brazilian researchers Regina Festa (1986) and, mainly, Cicília Peruzzo (2009). Alternative communication, in turn, was the approach used by Margarita Graziano – Argentinian sociologist, living in Venezuela – and Máximo Simpson Grinberg – Argentinian journalist, who developed his career in the Autonomous National University in Mexico, whose main work date back to early 1980's. Lastly, community communication, which in the last decade has been object of research and practice of the Brazilian researcher Raquel Paiva and the Argentinian researchers Oscar Magarola and Nelson Cardoso.

Kaplún advocates that, in the popular communication, the communicative model must break with the idea of emitter and receptor to build a “emi-rec”, in other words, a horizontal communicative process, where everyone can be both emitters and receptors. Peruzzo (2009) also puts people as the main character of popular communication. According to

her, popular communication “is a political instrument of subordinate classes” (PERUZZO, 2009, p. 5) to express themselves. Berger (1989) gathered a few common traits found in the research about this theme: 1) expression of a context of fight; 2) critical-emancipatory content; 3) space of democratic expression; 4) people as the main character; 5) instrument of the subordinate classes. In this sense, for the popular communication, the foundation points towards the popular participation and the appropriation of the media in a horizontal manner.

Another concept fairly diffused in the Latin American context, alternative communication, has been a target of debate due to its inconstancy (BAEZA, 2011). Graziano (1980) saw in alternative communication a totalizing strategy, which should be a project of a political lead. To Grinberg (1986), this approach disregarded spontaneous praxis, leaving a series of important initiatives behind. According to him, it is the social use that transforms or not a media in alternative. In other words, “Alternative is all media which, in a context characterized by the existence of privileged sectors (...) implies an option to the dominant discourse” (GRINBERG, 1987, p. 30). This margin chosen as battle to the hegemony is also pointed by Sel (2009) and Peruzzo (2009). Therefore, the discursive battle appears as the central element of the alternative communication.

Community communication, in turn, more than defining itself through discourse, would be centered in its social proposition (PAIVA, 2003), in the commitment with the communities where it is located and in the expansion of rights and duties for the citizen (PERUZZO, 2004). Both Paiva and Peruzzo point, also, to the need of plurality of voices in the construction of messages, in the shared management of media and in the active and horizontal participation of the community, in the contribution to education and culture, etc. Cardoso (2007 and 2000) and Magarola (2005) suggest that the community communication, theoretically, would be linked to Marxism, to reception studies, to the Theology of Liberation and Freirean theories.

What is interesting to know is that, even if many of these projects are developed in ancestral territory of indigenous and African descendent people, theories that dialog with these worldviews aren't usually pointed as sources of these practices. The goal of this article is not to add one more concept to the dispute, but to offer a perspective weren't very explored until then. Among the many concepts we listed, we believe community communication has many elements that enable an analysis of this concept through an African perspective.

Therefore, we propose to think about the community communication through this world view, in other words, we suggest a view that considers the points of view, systems and modes of thinking and living in African roots (NOGUERA, 2011). This perspective, despite of structural racism, crosses the Brazilian culture in a deep manner, transforming African philosophy – specifically the *Ubuntu* theory – in an important epistemological source to think about community manifestations in our society. It is important to mention, as Clifford (2014) suggests, that the community philosophy of Ubuntu (GYEKYE, 2003; MENKITI, 1984; RAMOSE, 2003) is not a rival to the community ideas proposed by other currents. Therefore, we propose a contemporary theoretical dialog, South-South, about concept, coming from the theories of Sodré (2014) and Paiva (2003) – Also approaching other authors – to then land in the meanings of Ubuntu philosophy and to rethink community communication.

The fight for the common and communication

According to Sodré (2014, p. 9), humans are communicating beings “because they relate or organize symbolic mediations (...) according to a common to be shared”. Communication has, thus, in its deeper meaning, the idea of “sharing”, “being a part of something” or “putting in common” (SODRÉ, 2014, p. 10). Paiva (2003, p. 10) also links common to communication, when he deffenda that community is a metaphor for “the construction of a new form of social bond”.

Paiva (2003) is emphatic when he affirms there are many paths to understanding community. We extend this assertive to the notion of

common. Sodr  (2014) points towards the epistemological need of making a distinction between common and community, being the first an ontological disposition and the second a subjectivation, manifested in different forms for each specific community. In “The Science of Common: notes for the communicational method, published in 2014, Sodr  performs a deep epistemological analysis about the common. In this text, we chose not to go further this distinction, but to prioritize points of confluence, linking to Paiva (2003)’s suggestion, which says that, when reflecting about the common, it is important to avoid falling in idealization, transforming it in a lost and unreachable paradise.

When we talk about common – mainly considering the irruption of protests in various parts of the world that demanded it, in 2011 – one takes a political stance. Choosing the “community possibility” (PAIVA, 2003, p. 55) is to assume there is a real possibility of building a world in which the “common” can have a say in the issues that affect them. In this sense, the slogan “we are the 99%”, advocated by the *Occupy* movement, seemed strongly related to the demand of a common to be shared. When we speak about sharing, we are bringing up the idea of solidarity, which is a “strategy of those which, due to living in scarcity or in the border, build a particular knowledge of coexistence and local experience” (PAIVA, 2003, p. 19). Therefore, is fairly comprehensible that the ideas surrounding the common and the need of solidarity appear with more strength in the moments of explosion of cyclical crisis of capital, as it been occurring since 2008.

Hardt and Negri (2011) defend that the common gets instituted as a political project. Laval and Dardot (2015) point towards the idea that the concept, as defined by Hardt and Negri, would be conformed by four dimensions: 1) What nature gives at all times; 2) What is universally generated by social life; 3) What historically results from each time of the capital; and 4) what characterizes contemporary fights. Therefore, the common of Hardt and Negri (2011) is a sufficiently wide concept to cover “air, water, the fruits of the land and all the kindness of nature” (p. 10): “The knowledge, languages, codes, information, affection”; the

biopolitical production, which has in its place a wide network of cooperative producers; and, lastly, all the learning process within the processes of political struggle, such as the “immanence of decision-making within the crowd” (p. 14).

As much as we make an effort to list or simplify the forms of common, we cannot lose sight that “the common is felt before being thought or expressed, therefore, it is something that is directly residing in existence” (SODRÉ, 2014, p. 204) and emerges from “a point of convergence” (SODRÉ, 2014, p. 238), of the bonds established in being together daily. The role of communication in this process, would be, in the sense defended by Sodr  (2014), to organize all of these dimensions of common and the invisible bonds that unite them.

These bonds, points of convergence, visible and invisible ties, engender a relationship between human beings. The community is “the own being in relation” (PAIVA, 2007, p. 19). This concept of community as relation is also proposed by Nancy (2000, p. 17): “The being itself that defines itself as relation, as not absolute and it is desired – at least this is what I intent to say – as community”. To Nancy (2000, p. 26), “community is what has a place always through the other and for the other”. Community lets clear that “there is no singular being without another singular being” (NANCY, 2000, p. 39), what converges with the ideas of Negri (2010, p. 412) to whom there is no possibility of thinking the human being as a lonely body, because it only exists in relation to the other. The meeting between beings, this putting the “being in common”, is, therefore, a political decision. It is, for example, a decision that Tunisians had to take when disobeying the law order and leaving, as a people, to the streets to follow the burial of Mohammed Bouazizi, in 2011, during what became known as “Arab Spring”; or the Egyptians, in 2011, answering to the call of Azma Mahfouz to take to the streets in defense of the country’s democracy. Deciding to make that the meeting between bodies and experiences become possible, that is implemented in the action of “being in common”, that the relation, that the bond, that

the opening for the other exists, this is the decision that is taken each time a popular movement is formed and takes to the streets.

Coming from the analysis of “how the space with the other is founded in the essence of being, being possible to perceive oneself as it is discovered through the eyes of others” (PAIVA, 2003, p. 87) we will perform a small digression as an addition of the text. The fortitude of sharing the space and meeting of perspectives in the construction of common, defended by Paiva, it get clear, for instance, in the gathering of protesters that, even in mask, could recognize themselves after months in the street, during the cycle of protests in 2013 in Rio de Janeiro, or in the applause of teachers to young people dressed in black, the Black Blocks, during the protest of October 15th, 2013, also in Rio de Janeiro. This example is also illustrative to understand how “we do not intend to abstract the interaction of differences in the community regimen (PAIVA, 2003, p. 100). The differences within this shared space are possible because, as affirmed by Nancy (2010) there is no common being, there is being “in” common. What is shared isn’t, therefore, being, but the “exposure of being, the declination of self, the tremor without face of the exposed identity: we share ourselves” (NANCY, 2010, p. 423).

To Esposito, what unites individuals in a community is nothing in common. Therefore, he proposes that “it isn’t the proper, but the improper – or, more drastically, the other – that characterizes the common” (ESPOSITO, 2003, p. 31). The author also explains that the community is not a fusion of individuals that results in a bigger individual, it is not a collective bond that unites individuals that were apart and is not a form of being. The community would be, according to Esposito’s interpretation (2003), the interruption of the closure of subject.

When we talk about closures and openings, we also arrive to Rancière, which has one of the most interesting propositions to thin about the idea of community in contemporary days. Rancière (2010) proposes a community as an opposition, a community that puts at stake a common world within another common world. According to him, “modern

politics was made out of these opening of common worlds that put a community within another one” (RANCIÈRE, 2010, p. 426).

This political community exists in a specific moment. “Each time bodies affirm a capacity and fill a distinctive place of the ones that are normally attributed to them” (RANCIÈRE, 2010, p. 427). Here we can also bring back the example of the Tunisian or Egyptian people mentioned before, once the political community are established precisely when these women and men decide to occupy a different place of the ones designated for them. It is in this action of sharing what was private that is established the common, and creating an opposition is what “breaks the rules of inclusion and the modes of visibility that are ordered to them” (RANCIÈRE, 2010, p. 425). It is precisely in this moment which, unexpectedly, appears politics and, because of that, according to Rancière, the community is strictly political and the politics is community-driven.

Politics appear when those who don't have time, take the necessary time to raise as inhabitants of a common space and to show that their mouth perfectly emits a language that speaks of common things, not only a scream that shows suffering. This distribution and redistribution of places and identities, this sharing of spaces and times, of the visible and the invisible, the noise of language, constitute what I call “the division of sensitive”. The politics consist in resetting the division of sensitive, in introducing new subjects and objects, in making visible what wasn't, in listening as beings that equipped with language the ones that weren't considered more than noisy animals (RANCIÈRE, 2005, p. 13-14).

Politics is what happens when we establish an opposition, creating this new community, which is political, in which we create new relations, new meanings, new places for the bodies and new forms of identification (RANCIÈRE, 2010). The class conflict is a conflict between to forms of community, the one who wants to makes this new political community visible and the one who wants to stop this process (the police community).

The possibility of rethinking the common and community through politics and politics through common allows us to have a reflection

equipped with revolutionary power – that is deemed necessary – to understand the protest movements that are developed in the contemporary world. The community of the 99% fights to introduce new subjects and objects, so that the population could be considered equipped with words and action, putting their bodies in streets and squares; transforming the barricades in places of repositioning of the common.

This repositioning of the common can be seen up close during the fights developed in the last years of Latin America. Specifically approaching the Bolivian case, Aguillar (2017) affirms that a popular community political horizon was open, whose central knot was the “collective re appropriation of the material wealth available, of the possibility of deciding over it, in other words, its management and use” (p. 36).

The struggle embodied by the Bolivian people in the last two decades was about inverting the power order, “seeking to institute the right to decide in common about the existing material wealth”, in relation to the water, hydrocarbons, land and territory. The logics of common, defended with guns by Bolivians, were focused in the conservation and care of material resources collectively available. They demanded to be treated as beings equipped with words and that the decisions on subjects that affect everyone should be collective.

Through this experience, Aguillar (2017) defends that “the common is what is had or shared collectively by many” (p. 74). Within this community, the women and men that share this common are the ones who establish the rules for use and transmission of rights for the next generation. This production of logic of common can be seen as a “contemporary practical update, founded in old collective knowledge internalized – and reproduced – by the ones that are associated to the goals of the present” (AGUILAR, 2017, p. 73).

This production logic of the common, observed in many countries of Latin America (Abya Ayla), instigates us to propose a glimpse of the common through Afro-centric notions, which strongly inhabit the imagination and social practices in Brazil. In the next section, we will present

some reflections about community through African Philosophy, more specifically coming from the concept of Ubuntu.

The Common and Ubuntu

Analysing the common through an African perspective means to propose a view that considers the points of view, systems and modes of thinking and living in African roots (NOGUERA, 2011). This perspective crosses deeply the Brazilian culture, which justifies, therefore, recurring to the African philosophy to think expressions of common in our society. It is worth mentioning, as suggested by Clifford (2004), that the community philosophy of Ubuntu does not rivalize with the community ideas proposed from other landmarks of thinking, being, even, an object of analysis in the previous section of this text. It is important to locate how the general ideas about the common, approached through Afrocentricity, dialog with the ones defended by the Eurocentric philosophy. However, it is not the coincidence that calls our attention, but the fact that this relation wasn't object of analysis and reflection previously. Ramose (2005, p. 4) argues that thinking an African philosophy "was deemed impossible as experience, once the African population was considered, by nature, incapable of producing any philosophy". Thus, thinking through the African philosophy has a "liberating" dimension for the author, which we also take on this text.

The theoretical source we call for this approximation is the South African black philosophy, coming from the Banto people and developed, in theoretical and written form, from the 1980s, mainly in South Africa and Zimbabwe. Thus, when we refer to this concept, in the text, it is important to have in mind this context of development. However, African philosophers argue that the "communal or community" (GYEKYE, 2003, p. 349) character of the African thinking is clearly expressed and is the line marking these cultures, according to Gyekye (2003).

Ubuntu is the base, the foundation, the source in which this African philosophy is born and developed, according to Gyekye (2003) and Ramose (2005). Thus, to think through the Ubuntu perspective is to

think through African philosophy, basing oneself in the Banto principle “*umunto, ngumuntu nga bantu (motho he motho ka bantho)*”, which, according to Ramose (2003, p. 272) means “being a humane person is to affirm your own humanity through recognizing the humanity in the other, and coming from this base, establish human relationships between themselves”.

Ubuntu, explains Ramose (2003) is an ontological and epistemological category of African thinking of the people of the Banto language², which keeps the union and indivisibility. *Ubu* is existence and is always guided towards the development of humanity itself, manifesting itself in particular forms and modes of being. *Ntu* is the point where this existence takes on a concrete and particular form of being, in the process of continuous human development. Thus, *Ubu* is always guided towards *Ntu*. Saying that *Ubu* is always guided towards *Ntu*, in Noguera’s (2011) explanation, indicates that a human being can only be perceived as such when humanizing other human beings. The process of de-humanization, which is in the root of racism, for instance, stops the human being from developing their own humanity, because when they do not recognize the humanity of their equal, a human is converted in a being incapable to recognize themselves.

Another important aspect to understand *Ubuntu*, still linked to the totality and indivisibility of the concept is the tridimensional inter-relation of being. In order to perceive oneself as a being, as *Ubuntu*, it is necessary to be in balance with three aspects of the dimension of life experience: 1) the first, *Umu-ntu*, which enables speech, consequently enables the being’s knowledge; 2) the relation with the *abaphansi*, which are the ones that already left the world of the living, the ones whose material existence was discontinued in a concrete and bodily form, but continues to live, free, in contact and guiding the world of the living. A free translation of *abaphansi*, according to Ramose (2005), would have spread through Africa and its diasporas as “*ancestors*”; 3) the

2 The Banto languages are spoken by over 200 million people, in 22 of the 54 African countries, in the region of Níger-Congo. It had a strong influence in the Portuguese language – or *pretuguês*, to Lélia Gonzalez – spoken in Brazil.

third dimension would be the beings that are yet to be born, the beings of the future, whose task to do would be emerge through the living. The being, in *Ubuntu*, would be, therefore, linked to the ones who exist in a material form in the present, to the ones who came before us and the ones that will come after us, revealing a holistic understanding of existence. Life, being, in all its experiences, is linked to these three dimensions for the African philosophy.

Therefore, for the communities with African roots, this concept is extremely important, being mandatory the care with the *abaphansi* and with the beings of the future. The ancestors have the task of guiding and protecting the family and the community of the living. In the world view through *Ubuntu*, the leader of the community, along with the elders, needs to cultivate a strong relationship with their *abaphansi* or ancestors.

For the thinking based in *Ubuntu*, the human person is a being that is necessarily community-driven, inserted in a complex context of interdependent relationships (GYEKYE, 2002; MENKITI, 1984), beginning through the tridimensional understanding of being, but not stopping there. The being is never seen as an isolated individual, but rather immersed in a thread of community relations that partially define them. This “partially” is extremely important. To Gyekye (2003), the community has a big role in *Ubuntu*, since it is through the relationships within that the human being finds themselves, perceives themselves, complete themselves. All of this philosophy is centered in human character, understanding that rationality and morality would be acquired by the being through community living (CLIFFORD, 2004). Therefore, this “community me” is not handcuffed and locked inside a community structure. It is meaningful to call attention to the fact that through a “Afro perspectivist” view, the community does not define a person’s personality, even if it is the key for it do emerge and also its source of power.

The community can be interpreted as a “group of people linked through interpersonal bonds, biological or not, that are considered as members of a group and have interests, objectives and values in common” (GYEKYE, 2003, p. 351). The bond of the human being with the

community is present when and while there is common interests and values to be shared. The bond, reminds Sodré (2014), is “of symbolic nature, of energy or strength” (p. 301).

Another Ubuntu principle that may be linked to the logics of common is sharing, expressed in the proverbs “*Gikuyu, Kiunuhu gitruagwo*” and “*Feta kgomo o tshware motho*”. The first one warns that greed does not feed, the second one affirms that in case of having to choose between human life preservation and wealth possessions, it is imperative to choose the first option. Generosity is fundamental in this lifestyle, and here, as suggested by Noguera (2011), it isn’t about charity, but the idea that personal achievement necessarily goes through the achievement of other human beings. Thus, “it means to work collectively and making the result of this efforts a wide field for circulation and enjoyment of all people” (NOGUERA, 2011, p. 149). More than that, as explained by Noguera (2011), *Ubuntu* is a proposition of re-existence in a collective manner, in which experiences are exchanged and relationships are based in mutual support and constant learning with other human beings.

As philosophy and ethics (RAMOSE, 2003), *Ubuntu* can be seen as a universal value, in any place or time in which there is humanity of human beings, and, by extension, their equality in this human condition. When proposing this view, we think it is essential to overcome the epistemological racism and value African philosophy beyond the exoticism, adopting that their principles are not applicable only to the African continent, the diaspora or small groups. Therefore, Clifford (2004, p. 242) proposes three primary forms or three contributions of the *Ubuntu* philosophy for the theories about common:

1. it keeps the focus of community-driven people in a strong form in the human being;
2. prevents the differentiation between communitarianism and collectivism;
3. it makes unavoidable the moral dimension of communitarianism.

When affirming that Ubuntu contributes in this three forms to communitarianism, Clifford (2004) mainly calls attention on how, when approaching the common through this theoretical landmark, is possible to keep focused in the idea of the human. That allows that, once surpassed the sociological discussion, one can think in a more basic sense of where we share the common: humanity. Considering that all people are human will allow the world to see itself as a big community that shares that common character.

Community Communication and Ubuntu

We believe that *Ubuntu*, as a concept originated from African Philosophy, mainly with Banto origins, whose assumptions are centered in the community can, potentially, contribute with original reflections on how the community communication performed in contexts like Brazil, strongly influenced by cultures and lifestyles of African roots. We trace below some parallels between community communication and *Ubuntu*.

According to Ubuntu, we consider that each person holds knowledge, so, therefore, everyone can contribute in a valuable manner for the community in its entirety (CLIFFORD, 2004). The recognition of the other and their value within the community (RAMOSE, 2003) is the base for the establishment of community relations. This assertive corroborates with the basic idea of community communication, which sees horizontality of the community communication (KAPLÚN, 2007) as an imperious need.

Ubuntu also defends that people are capable of articulating their own needs and the possible solutions for their problems, which is in perfect consonance with the ideas of Paiva (2003) and Peruzzo (2004, 2009), when we mention community control, shared management, and active and horizontal participation as unavoidable characteristics of community communication.

Another connection we found between these two perspective is pointed out by Clifford (2004), who defends that narrating from a *Ubuntu* view allows criticism, resistance and deeply contributes to the

communicative ethics, which also is in agreement with the principles that defend a critical position facing the dominant discourses and positions as a necessary battle to community and alternative communication (GRINBERG, 1987; SEL, 2009).

In addition to these parallels we mentioned, there is a dimension of *Ubuntu* which we still haven't found in the studies of community communication, but we believe is a new aspect that can help re-think community communication in contexts like the global south: the tridimensional relation of being (RAMOSE, 2005).

This relationship argues that the being is linked to a *Umu-ntu*, which enables speech and knowledge of self. This first aspect lead us to reflect on how the need of building our own voices is what takes us to community communication and how, many times, the projects of community communication make the community power emerge, "the knowledge of self". The second and third aspect of this tridimensional relationship, in this hypothesis, lead us to think about the need of, in community communication, re-link ourselves, in contemporary days, with "the ones who came before us and the ones will come after us". What we intend here is to think on how community communication could benefit with the link between members of community communication of yesterday – for instance, the ones who initiated community radio and TV in the 1980s – with the new members, that are developed, mainly in social network and media on the Internet, always thinking of making community communication a democratic and horizontal path for the communities of tomorrow.

In addition, this idea of continuity of the existence so shared among the Afro-diasporic community, which had its origin in the tridimensional relationship of being, could, certainly, collaborate in the maintenance of the projects of community communication, because thinking in communicative practice through this continuum of being enables a holistic understanding of existence, not only individual, but collective.

In this section, I intended to point some converging elements between Latin American approaches and the concept of *Ubuntu*, in addition to

another possible connection to think about community communication through the idea of the three-dimensional relationship of being, also present in *Ubuntu*. It is an approximation that still deserves more depth, but we can perceive, through these elements, how African philosophy can be a powerful support to re-think and deepen the studies of community communication, through a South-South dialog.

Final Considerations

The goal of this work was to propose another form of reflecting about the common, a form that, in our point of view, surpasses all relations and social practices of the spaces that were built through the myth of modernity, this based in the transatlantic traffic of people coming from the continent called Africa³. In addition, the Afro perspective, based in African philosophy is a tool for understanding the world wide and deep enough so that it can be applied beyond the contexts that were affected by the transatlantic traffic in a direct manner. We defend, thus, the universal aspect of African philosophy. This defense, as affirmed by Ramose (2005) is a shout of resistance and freedom, because it comes from an anti-racist premise and affirms that the people with African origin are beings capable of producing Philosophy and Science.

The African philosophy is still fairly unknown and marginalized in the Academic contexts and it was with great surprise that we faced their presuppositions and perceived how suiting was to think community communication through *Ubuntu*. The difficulty in finding texts of African philosophers and the ones who follow the Afro perspective is still challenging, in a way that is necessary to recognize that this work is still a first approximation to the concept and it needs to be further analyzed in the next years. However, it is important to locate that the ideas presented here, are, mostly, coming from primary sources of African philosophy.

What the theory of common in *Ubuntu* brings us is a way of interpret the human-centered common, since *Ubuntu* is the humanity of

3 Ramose (2005) raises the discussion that the name Africa as imposed by the “conquistadors” and that, therefore, should be used as a form of protest.

being itself, that is only perceived through the other; and here is not an other as someone to be avoided and/or feared, but as an other that enables that humanity be a common aspect to be shared with everyone. The holistic approach of interpreting African philosophy makes that it can see the individual in an isolated manner, but connected to a fairly complex thread, which goes through ancestry and by beings that are not still materially on Earth; by solidarity, generosity and the well-being of all community. Aspects that are the base of community communication, and, because of that, the theoretical gathering between these perspectives seem auspicious to us.

To wrap up, we can propose a thought on community communication through African philosophy, through *Ubuntu*. An Afro perspectivist community communication could be strongly linked to community bonds; more centered in the human and less dependent of technological apparatuses; narrated, decided and managed by the subjects themselves, with voice and agency, in a horizontal form, shared and democratic, inter-generational, respecting the elders and taking care of spaces, nature and the process for young people and the ones who will come next; and integrating among all people of the community.

References

- AGUILAR, R. G. *Horizontes comunitario-populares. Producción de lo común más allá de las políticas estado-céntricas*. Madrid: Traficantes de Sueños, 2017.
- BAEZA, Chiara Saéz. *Tercer sector de la comunicación. Teoría y praxis de la Televisión Alternativa. Una mirada a los casos de España, Estados Unidos y Venezuela*. 2011. Tese (Doutorado em Comunicação) – Universidad Autónoma de Barcelona, Barcelona, 2011.
- BERGER, Christa. *A Comunicação Emergente: Popular e/ou Alternativa no Brasil*. Porto Alegre: UFRGS, 1989.
- CARDOSO, Nelson. *Apunte para la Cátedra Taller de Comunicación Comunitaria. La comunicación desde una perspectiva de comunicación comunitaria*. Buenos Aires: Universidad de Buenos Aires, 2007.
- CARDOSO, Nelson. *Apunte para la Cátedra Taller de Comunicación Comunitaria. La comunicación comunitaria*. Buenos Aires: Universidad de Buenos Aires, 2000.
- CLIFFORD, G. Christians. *Ubuntu and communitarianism in media ethic. Ecquid Novi: African Journalism Studies*, v. 25, n. 2, p. 235-256, 2004.

- COYER, K.; DOWMUNT, T.; FOUNTAIN, A. *The Alternative Media Handbook*. London: Routledge, 2007.
- ESPOSITO, Roberto. *Comunnitas. Origen y destino de la comunidad*. Buenos Aires: Amarrortu ediciones, 2003.
- FESTA, Regina. *Comunicação Popular e Alternativa no Brasil*. São Paulo: Paulinas, 1986.
- GRINBERG, Máximo Simpson. Comunicación alternativa: tendencias de la investigación en América Latina. In: GRINBERG, M. Simpson. *Comunicación alternativa y cambio social*. México, DF: Premia Editora, 1986.
- GRINBERG, Máximo Simpson. Comunicação alternativa: dimensões, limites, possibilidades. In: GRINBERG, M. Simpson. *A comunicação alternativa na América Latina*. Petrópolis: [s. n.], 1987.
- GYEKYE, Kwame. Person and Community in African thought. In: COETZEE, P. H.; ROUX, A. P. J. (Ed.). *The African Philosophy Reader*. New York: Routledge, 2003. p. 348-366.
- HARDT, Michael; NEGRI, Antonio. *Commonwealth. El proyecto de una revolución del común*. Madrid: Akal, 2011.
- KAPLÚN, Gabriel. La comunicación comunitaria en América Latina. In: DÍAZ, Bernardo (Org.). *Medios de Comunicación. El escenario iberoamericano*. Madrid: Fundación Telefónica, 2007.
- KAPLUN, Mario. *El Comunicador Popular*. Buenos Aires: Editorial Humanitas, 1987.
- KIDD, D. The global movement to transform communications. In: COYER, K.; DOWMUNT, T.; FOUNTAIN, A. *The Alternative Media Handbook*. London: Routledge, 2007.
- LAVAL, Christian; DARDOT, Pierre. *Común. Ensayo sobre la revolución del siglo XXI*. Barcelona: Gedisa, 2015.
- MAGAROLA, Oscar. *Aproximaciones al fenómeno de la Comunicación Comunitaria. Apunte de cátedra*. Buenos Aires: Universidad de Buenos Aires, 2005.
- MENKITI, I. A. Person and Community in African Traditional Thought. In: WRIGHT, R. A. *African philosophy: An Introduction*. Lanham: University Press of America, 1984, p. 171-181.
- NANCY, Jean Luc. *La comunidad inoperante*. Traducción de Juan Manuel Garrido Wainer. Santiago de Chile: ARCIS, 2000.
- NOGUERA, Renato. Ubuntu como modo de existência. Elementos gerais para uma ética afroperspectivista. *Revista da ABPN*, v. 3, n. 6, p. 147-150, 2011.
- PAIVA, Raquel (Org.). *O retorno da comunidade. Os novos caminhos do social*. Rio de Janeiro: Mauad X, 2007.
- PAIVA, Raquel. *O Espírito Comum. Comunidade, mídia e globalismo*. Rio de Janeiro: Mauad X, 2003.
- RAMOSE, Mogobe B. The ethics of Ubuntu. In: COETZEE, P. H.; ROUX, A. P. J. (Ed.). *The African Philosophy Reader*. New York: Routledge, 2003. p. 348-366.

RAMOSE, Mogobe B. *African philosophy through Ubuntu*. Harare: Mond Books Publishers, 2005.

RANCIÈRE, Jacques. A comunidade como dissentimento. In: *A política dos muitos. Povo, classe e multidão*. Lisboa: Editora Tinta da China, 2010.

SEL, Susana. Comunicación alternativa y políticas públicas en el combate latino-americano. In: Sel, Susana. *La comunicación mediatizada: hegemonías, alternativas, soberanías*. Buenos Aires: Consejo Latino-americano de Ciencias Sociales – CLACSO, 2009.

SODRÉ, Muniz. *A Ciência do Comum: notas para o método comunicacional*. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes, 2014.

On the Author:

Ana Lúcia Nunes de Souza – Professor of the NUTES institute of Education in Sciences and Health, working in the Lab of Educational Video and in the Post-Graduate Program in Education in Sciences and Health.

Date of submission: 08/24/2020

Date of acceptance: 02/04/2021