

CRISIS IN AFRICA

A. ZANZOLO

THREE YEARS AGO, Africa seemed on the threshold of a great new advance. Patriots throughout the Continent had been inspired by the first Summit Conference, held in the old City of Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, in May 1963. The Conference had been a triumph of organization, and an extraordinary demonstration of the tenacity with which Africa fought for unity and influence in the world. Never before, we felt, had the people and leaders of an entire Continent, felt and expressed so strongly their identity of interests and purpose. Language, ethnic, geographical, religious and even ideological differences which the alien intruders had for so long made use of to divide, subjugate and dispossess us of land and liberty, were set aside. Nasser, Nkrumah, Selassie, Keita, Senghor, Balewa, Nyerere, Ben Bella, stood together as brothers and spoke one language: the language of African patriotism and renaissance.

Reading the record of the proceedings, the resolutions and the Charter of the Organization for African Unity one cannot fail to capture the moving spirit of the Conference. Measures to liquidate the remaining colonial territories and to replace white minority governments by democratic ones dominated discussions and led to the appointment of the Decolonization Committee of Nine amid high hopes of speedy victory. All-African organizations in the economic, social and military fields were established to facilitate united action for the benefit of the whole Continent. The basis for a strong anti-imperialist bloc in the United Nations was laid. A foreign policy of non-alignment and anti-colonialism for peace was established. Imperialism was on the retreat and Africa was on the march.

It cannot be said that these bright hopes have been fulfilled. Admittedly since the Summit of 1963 more states have achieved independence. Kenya and Zanzibar in 1963. Malawi and Zambia in 1964. The Gambia in 1965. And more are due to be independent this year. Yet the outlook on the Continent is one of crisis and apprehension.

The general counter-offensive of imperialism in the world has hit our Continent very hard.

The first clear sign that imperialism had decided on new tactics in Africa occurred, as could be expected, in the Congo (Leopoldville). The hated Tshombe was imposed on the people of the Congo whose revolution in 1964 was making great strides and appeared on the verge of a breakthrough. This was followed in November 1964 by the astounding invasion of the revolutionary capital Stanleyville by Belgian paratroops with British and American logistic and diplomatic support. This crime was compounded by the fact that at the precise moment negotiations were taking place in Nairobi relating to the evacuation of foreigners from Stanleyville. The indignation of the African states knew no bounds. But to the imperialists the cold-blooded reality was the inability of the Africans to counter the move effectively. The imperialists were emboldened by their success in temporarily liquidating the gains of the revolutionary movement in the Congo with the help of White mercenaries from South Africa. More was to follow.

During 1965 a series of events designed to create disunity and conditions of instability throughout Africa took place. Prominent progressive leaders were assassinated including Premier Ngendandumwe of Burundi, Pio Pinto of Kenya and Ben Barka of Morocco. A calculated and sustained ideological and propaganda campaign of lies and slander against progressive governments and individuals was carried on with increasing vehemence. Any leaders prepared to stand up for Africa were and are being personally discredited in all manner of ways. Elected civil governments have been replaced by military ones in a series of coups that have followed one another with monotonous regularity. Last but not least the most ruthless imperialists history has known—the British—have tolerated a rebellion by the White minority in Rhodesia on the grounds of squeamishness at the possibility of bloodshed! The move was really to prevent the emergence of an independent Zimbabwe.

Tragically, in the face of all these problems the African states have been divided and growingly opportunist.

In such a huge Continent as Africa the background to these events is naturally so varied as to make generalization hazardous. Nor is understanding helped by the veritable stream of analyses and comment from the imperialists and their servitors which aim to mislead rather than shed light on events. From these sources come allegations of the inability of Africans to govern themselves. They speak of 'chaos' and corruption on the part of African politicians. They speak of alleged African predisposition to 'violence'. Such 'analyses' by apologists for the 'Western' way of life—they are, of course, a reflection of

centuries of the colonialist 'master-race' ideology—cannot fail to rouse every emancipated African to furious anger. Of course, we hate and cannot afford corruption in our struggling, poverty-stricken countries—the very corruption taught and imported to Africa from the countries of the West where corruption, the offshoot of capitalist greed and inhumanity, is the very way of life; where Presidents and Prime Ministers and entire Cabinets are notoriously in the pockets of the big financiers and armament manufacturers; where vast scandals involving millions of pounds or dollars, exceeding the entire budget of any African country are cynical newspaper commonplaces. And how dare they speak of 'African violence'—they whose war dead is counted in tens of millions, soldiers, civilians, women and children, bombed and roasted in air raids, gassed in extermination camps; they who rain death from the skies in Vietnam, explosives, napalm, poison gas and chemicals to kill the crops and murder the villagers.

NO EASY ANSWERS

But setting all this odious colonialist propaganda nonsense aside, it is clear that serious new problems have arisen; events which need analysis and which superficial sweeping generalizations cannot explain.

That many of these events are complex indeed a few examples will illustrate.

In Nigeria a pro-Western government with a strong feudal basis was overthrown amid widespread popular acclaim. It is not yet clear who planned the military take-over. The men in charge of the government received their mandate to rule from the former Federal Council of Ministers. The junior officers of the army who are alleged to have mutinied are still in custody. This would suggest that power was given up by the civil authorities to the senior army and police officers to forestall further development of the situation in a really fundamental, political and social change. The feudal land-owning ruling class in the North has handed over power to the growing, more self-confident bourgeoisie centred in West and Eastern Nigeria. Is this really what happened? To the bourgeoisie the essential need is for a strong unitary government, an end to feudalism and corrupt government which are a brake on expansion and business. So there has been some advance. But have the shrewd Nigerian bourgeoisie robbed the people of an even greater advance?

In Algeria the extremely popular President, Ben Bella, was removed from his position on the eve of the Afro-Asian Summit conference by his own government. There has been very little change of personnel in the government at the top. The Algerian revolution seems to be

in a state of immobility, moving neither to the right or left and reflecting continuing sharp conflicts in the leadership of the ruling F.L.N. Widely differing assessments of the events continue to be made even within progressive circles.

In the Congo the government of Tshombe was dismissed by Kasavubu who in turn was overthrown by General Mobutu. In the Congolese political jungle it is difficult to choose between either of these gentlemen. They shared in the murder of Patrice Lumumba and are all incorrigible stooges of Western imperialist interests. The changes of government reflect contradictions within the camp of the imperialists themselves.

In Uganda the feudal monarch of Buganda attempted a coup to remove the government of Premier Obote. In a swift counter-move the Premier removed the Kabaka Mutesa II from his position as head of state and introduced a new constitution establishing the Uganda People's Congress more firmly in power. But the first act of foreign policy of the new regime was to invite Mobutu to pay a state visit to Uganda.

In Ghana the national democratic regime of Dr. Kwame Nkrumah was overthrown by a patently anti-Socialist and pro-Western military and police junta. But supporters of Nkrumah's Ghana have been deeply disturbed by the apparent failure or inability of the masses of working people, or even of the Party members, to rally to the defence of a government which had done so much for Ghana and placed their country in the vanguard of Africa's progress. The defection of many of Nkrumah's senior colleagues, and the lack of mass resistance cannot but arouse questions as to the extent of conscious public participation in democratic processes, and lend weight to Thomas Hodgkin's grave allegation: 'The cult of Nkrumah's personality . . . was used by the Old Guard to cover up deficiencies in party organization and strategy. The committed Socialists within the Party were in a definite minority and . . . they had no effective body of mass support.' (*Labour Monthly*, April 1966.)

These few examples (and one can add many more) will suffice to show how difficult it is to make any accurate assessment of the coups and other events on our Continent; and how dangerous to try to work out an over-simplified generalization that would meet every case.

But in all cases, certain outstanding facts stand out.

The first is that, behind all the recent disturbances on our Continent, and to whatever extent local class and other differences appeared, is an overall strategy of international imperialism designed to frustrate the progressive aims of the African revolution, to re-establish capitalist

patterns and imperialist influence, and—in the long run—to re-colonize Africa.

The second is that the method of military coups and take-overs, and the almost total absence of democratic mass participation, shows a failure thus far, to build real revolutionary vanguards capable of bringing about fundamental transformations and awakening the masses to fight consistently for themselves, their own state and their own future.

The third is that in every case the imperialists and local reactionaries have made full use of the corrosive weapon of anti-Communism. They have taken advantage of lingering prejudices against Communism existing in the minds even of sincere patriots and revolutionaries, or of their opportunist fear to defend the rights of Communists to participate with other anti-imperialist fighters in the vital tasks of national construction and the evolution of policy and concepts. The result has been a blurring of vital problems and realities.

There can be no successful revolution, it has been correctly observed, without a revolutionary theory. The broad ideas of African nationalism and the fight for political independence which sufficed to unite our people and carry them to the present stage of advancement, are not sufficiently precise and scientific to enable us to build up our strength and unity to resist the new counter-offensives of imperialism, to liberate the enslaved areas of Portuguese and White Supremacy colonialism, to assert African unity, greatness and prosperity.

Nor is it enough to proclaim broad generalizations about 'African socialism' which are so vague and undefined as to permit (as in the case of Kenya and Senegal) blatantly capitalist policies and neo-colonialist practices to masquerade in their name.

It is high time that the revolutionary democrats of Africa came together to hammer out the theoretical and practical basis of resistance to imperialism and fresh advances for the cause of freedom, unity and socialism. To any such synthesis the African Marxists—though they do not pretend or claim to have all the answers ready-made—have an indispensable and invaluable contribution to make.

It is understandable that the emergence of scores of new states with their own historical, cultural and economic background should have given rise to much fresh and creative thinking in all schools of thought—not least among Marxist-Leninists. The weakness and even the absence of organized Marxist parties in Africa has meant that much of the discussion has been dominated by trends other than and even hostile to Marxism-Leninism. Inasmuch as the primary responsibility for applying the science of Marxism-Leninism to Africa belongs to African Communists their small numbers have rendered

the voice of Leninism weak on some vital and important issues. The views of Marxist-Leninists on such matters as the Leninist theory of the state as applied to African conditions; the character and nature of the revolutionary party; the meaning of leadership in party and state; the state of transition for the transformation of backward countries into progressive modern ones; the role of the masses in the management of the state and in production have not been heard as clearly as they should be.

But this is changing at a rapid rate. The attempted isolation of Africa from progressive ideas by the imperialists who still control much of communications and publishing on our continent is coming to an end. New Communist and Revolutionary Democratic parties are arising. Parties which began as fronts of national liberation are slowly beginning to realize the need for consistent revolutionary theory without which there can be no revolutionary party. The assertion of the need for an 'African personality' has given way to the realization that our ideas and attitudes must be not only African but scientific . . . international.

STATES, CLASSES AND PARTIES

Much of importance has been written by African thinkers and statesmen on the question of the state and democracy. There have also been interesting practical attempts in some African countries to put these theories into practice.

At the very outset Kwame Nkrumah declared in favour of a state in which only one party was permitted. He described such a state as essential to unify disparate tribes and to foster national unity. Julius Nyerere has not only expressed himself forcefully on these problems but his country has conducted elections recently in terms of his ideas with results which require much study. In reports to the conference of the Democratic Party of Guinea President Sékou Touré has set out his ideas on the nature and character of the Guinea state and party. So have Leopold Senghor, Modibo Keita, Gamal Nasser and others.

But the polemic on state structure and on political parties has been conducted within narrow limits. The arguments used have been largely to counter those of Western political commentators who have tried to foist their concepts and institutions on Africa. Thus, Africans have felt obliged on the one hand to reject the Western model of democracy. The tendency was to deal with the problem of the state and party from an institutional point of view only. Hardly any attempt was made to examine the organization of young states of Africa on

a social and economic—in fact on a class basis. If this was done at all it was limited to two very doubtful propositions. One was the assertion contained in much of President Nyerere's writings on the subject that there was no tradition for multi-party parliamentary institutions in Africa. This went hand-in-hand with the attempt to create an analogy between the single national party with the traditional gathering of the people in tribal times. This argument is contrived. All societies in the world have passed through the tribal stage of customary law in which clan gatherings took decisions and which had no political parties organized as we know them in modern times. Secondly, there was the attempt to deny the existence of classes in Africa and thus to deny the validity of applying a class analysis to present-day African society. This was supposed to be some sort of back-handed slap at Marxism-Leninism. The Marxists did not discover or invent classes in society. What they have done is to describe the consequences of the division of society into classes. There has not really been a comprehensive socio-economic discussion of party and state organization as applied to African states. This is not surprising.

The question of the state is a very complex one. For obvious reasons the capitalists and those who serve them have surrounded this most vital question with much confusion for the deliberate purpose of perpetuating their rule and oppression of the mass of the people.

The state has not always existed in human society. There was a time in every society when there was no state. When there was no special apparatus for the systematic application of force and oppression of people. It is such an apparatus which is called the state. The period when there were no special units of soldiers, prisons, and a bureaucracy to oppress others is one which many of our people in Africa will remember. The period when there is no state is one which precedes the division of society into classes. *But wherever and whenever there is a division of society into classes the state emerges.*

In many parts of our continent before the imperialists came there was a predominance of customary law based on respect and authority of elders gathered in the Kgotla, Pitso, Inkundla or gathering of the people. There was no special category of people set apart to rule over others and who had at their disposal troops, prisons and other means of coercion. Society acted collectively as a whole in protection of itself.

It is generally speaking when slave society developed with the majority of the people oppressed as slaves that the state emerged. The few rulers and slave-owners owned the means of production, namely, the land, the tools and the human beings who worked for them as slaves.

One of the best-known slave societies was in fact established in Africa. In Egypt thousands of years ago a state emerged which was one of the earliest civilizations known to recorded history. This was a state based on slave labour. The state was highly developed and its creations still stand to this day in modern Egypt. The same applied to Ethiopia, where slavery was abolished in the lifetime of present-day generations.

In other forms of class society such as feudalism similarly the state is an essential part. In Nigeria before the arrival of the imperialists great feudal states were to be found. The Emirates of Northern Nigeria owned all the land which was worked on their behalf by oppressed serfs. The Emirs were served by great bands of troops and officials who collected taxes and punished the people. This was the feudal state. Similarly under capitalism the state is an essential part. In other words there is always in class society a special apparatus or group of people engaged in the job of ruling others by means of physical coercion in the form of soldiers, police and civil servants. The chief characteristic of the state (not the only one) is that it is a machine for maintaining the rule of one class over another. This is the essence of all states in the world without exception.

In 1917 the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia resulted in the formation of the U.S.S.R. This state was like all others an instrument of coercion of a class against another. But there was one radical and qualitative difference. For the first time in history there emerged a state of the labouring and working classes which oppressed the capitalists and landlords. This was a state of the overwhelming majority for oppressing the tiny minority. All states prior to 1917 had represented the few rich minority against the vast masses of the people who were poor. The U.S.S.R. was a state of the masses which suppressed the minority of exploiters, expropriated their ill-gotten gains and restored them to public ownership by the people as a whole. It is this which accounts for the insane hatred with which the U.S.S.R. was received by the capitalists who tried to strangle it at birth and failed. The Dictatorship of the Proletariat born in 1917 in the Soviet Union reflects the interests of the vast majority. The exploiters have been eliminated in the country. The state has no class to oppress inside the country and only exists to defend the revolution against external enemies and to assist revolutionary forces in other lands. It is this which enables the Marxist philosophers to do what the oppressors can never do—that is to discuss the question of the state with utmost clarity and frankness. The oppressors are dead scared to tell the people the truth about what the state is for. The more so as socialist states of the dictatorship of the workers and peasants have

appeared in larger numbers and are to be found in all continents. China, Cuba, the Eastern European states, the Asian Peoples' Republics, all these are new types of state which represent the majority and oppress a minority.

Whether a state has a parliament or not, whether there are many parties or one party, the prior question is the class or classes represented by the state in question. Whatever the outward form the reality of class interests will determine the character of the state in any country. This can be determined by objective data which do not depend on personalities or even on the short-term policies or tactics of the government in any country. Wherever there is a state it represents a class interest.

What of classes and parties? A great deal of unnecessary difficulty has been caused by the failure to define what classes and parties are, in much of the writings in Africa. Vladimir Lenin in a celebrated passage described the position thus:

'Everyone knows that the masses are divided into classes; that the masses can be contrasted to classes only by contrasting the vast majority in general, regardless of division according to status in the social system of production, to categories holding a definite status in the social system of production; that usually, at least in modern civilized countries, classes are led by political parties; that political parties, as a general rule are directed by more or less stable groups composed of the most authoritative, influential and experienced members, who are elected to the most responsible positions and are called leaders. All this is elementary. All this is simple and clear. Why replace this by some rigmarole, by some new Volapuk?'

(Lenin: 'Left wing' Communism—an Infantile Disorder)

Political parties combine persons having class interests. All parties represent classes. Sometimes they represent a single class. Or they may represent a coalition of classes with one class holding a dominant position. There is no political party in the world which represents no classes however loudly this is claimed to be the case. In fact the more strenuously class interests are sought to be concealed the more potent the class realities usually are.

STATES, CLASSES AND PARTIES IN AFRICA

Communists have always held that the fundamental truths of Marxism-Leninism will be applied in each country or continent in accordance with the specific historical background, traditions and culture of the people living there. The forms of state, the political parties, the institutions of Africa will inevitably bear the imprint of the African experience. But there are certain fundamental international characteristics which we share with the rest of humanity and to which our continent cannot be an exception.

The vast changes in Africa and the resultant emergence of new states confront our people with the necessity to replace imperialist regimes with indigenous states which truly represent our aspirations. In the African states despite some common features there is a great variety of conditions. One common feature is that the states have emerged in an epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism. They thus have an anti-imperialist content and aim not only at political but economic liberation. The commanding heights of the economy are still held by foreign imperialist interests. The local bourgeoisie is weak relative to the imperialist monopoly interests and suffers from the disadvantages of every late-comer trying to muscle into the market. This is a time of general decline of capitalism on a world scale. Hence all the new states including the most reactionary proclaim their aim to be the establishment of socialist society.

So in a number of African states the possibility arises of creating states of national democracy. This is a form of state representing a coalition of classes which are anti-imperialist. The aim of such a state is to control the budding capitalists in the country and to eliminate the positions of imperialism and thus provide a climate for profound social reforms and transform the former colonies into strong modern states. Parties and institutions are arising to lead the struggle for these transformations. It is in that direction that Mali, Tanzania and the U.A.R. are probably moving. It is to prevent just such development that reaction struck in Ghana and overthrew the government of Kwame Nkrumah.

The events in Ghana are a particularly bitter lesson also to show the need for revolutionaries to study the negative features that serve as soil for counter-revolution in Africa. The imperialists still control our best land, minerals, factories, raw materials, banks, insurance companies and trade. In many states independence was achieved by negotiation and did not come about through a victorious revolutionary struggle. The result is that the state apparatus of the former colonial power is taken over by the Africans whose leaders occupy only the top positions in dangerous isolation. The army and security forces are those trained by the former masters to suppress the freedom struggle. The Civil Services are full of those accustomed to serving the imperialists and look down on the masses. Such an apparatus is riddled with enemies of the freedom struggle in Africa and is a potent source of opposition to fundamental progress. Furthermore, the indigenous bourgeoisie although weak, relatively speaking, is growing fast particularly when its very existence is denied by our leaders! The small farmers and traders who abound in Africa engender capitalism and

the bourgeoisie continuously, daily, hourly, spontaneously, and on a mass scale'.

Class differentiation is proceeding. As the imperialists and their class allies within each country feel that the progressives are eroding their positions we can expect them to react violently with plots to overthrow governments by force. This has already happened. The question that arises is whether the states and parties we have in Mali, U.A.R., Algeria, Tanzania and others are effective instruments for the stubborn and ruthless class battles that now appear to be emerging.

National unity of all patriotic classes of workers, farmers, intellectuals and even sections of the capitalists will in most African countries be the basis of the national united front. Such a revolutionary front will in certain cases take the form of single national parties to which all progressive forces can contribute. But a recognition of the limitations of the single party is necessary. At the beginning, because of the nature of the struggle the national revolutionary party contains the indigenous bourgeoisie, sections of which are potentially anti-patriotic, vacillating and unreliable. Therefore leadership should not be left in the hands of this class but must be in the hands of the working class and poor peasants. A distinction needs to be drawn between the rich peasants and the poor. Also the absence of a firm consistent ideological base allows for the co-existence in the single party of different ideologies some of them hostile to scientific socialism. The influence of imperialism can be seen in the attitude adopted in some of the national democratic fronts to the Communists.

The Communists are ardent patriots and resolute fighters against imperialism. It is not for nothing that the enemies of Africa—the imperialists—direct their most vicious propaganda against the Communists. As the standard-bearers of Marxism-Leninism the Communists have inspired the mighty transformations that have occurred in the Soviet Union, in China, in the Peoples' Democracies of Eastern Europe and Asia, where formerly backward states have achieved amazing heights of scientific and technical progress. In the newly-liberated countries, wherever they are, Communists place their ideology at the service of the nation and apply the scientific ideas of Socialism to the building of strong states. Realizing this the imperialists endeavour at all times to isolate the Communists from the people. They know the Communists cannot be bluffed, bribed or diverted from the true path of revolution.

No genuine anti-imperialist has any need to fear the Communists. Those African leaders who join the imperialist game of anti-communism or slander the Socialist countries are in fact working against the ultimate interests of Africa and will gain no honour from the masses

of the people but only from the foreign imperialists. It is a matter for regret that in Kenya at present the K.A.N.U. government of President Kenyatta from which a great deal was expected by African revolutionaries is engaged in precisely such a campaign of anti-communism to the glee of all those imperialist forces which killed over one hundred thousand Africans during the struggle for freedom in Kenya. And it is those who opposed the imperialists and supported Kenyatta who are the object of slander and abuse today.

DEMOCRACY AND THE VANGUARD

It is time, then, for Africans to cast aside the false concepts imposed by imperialists and bourgeois ideologists, which try to contrast different types of state as 'democratic' or 'dictatorships'. Their so-called democracies are nothing but veiled dictatorships of the most reactionary classes, the dehumanized and utterly unscrupulous monopolies. Let us say quite plainly that we do not aim at the sort of 'democracy' which allows exploiters, indigenous and foreign, to do as they please, to corrupt and undermine the masses, to plot assassinations, military take-overs and farcical rigged 'elections'. We are for suppressing them by means of a vigilant dictatorship of the working masses, the urban and rural poor who live by their own labour.

But this dictatorship is a true democracy for the great majority of the people. Only so far as it really mobilizes the people and enables them to participate in the administration of the laws and the economy of the country can it succeed.

Nor can such a plan—the only plan that can really repel imperialism and build socialism—be implemented without a truly revolutionary vanguard Party, inspired with the revolutionary ideas of scientific socialism. Not all the members of such a Party need be Marxists—though it would be absurd to exclude the Marxists from its ranks. But one thing is sure, a Party of a new type is needed. It cannot be composed of every worker or peasant—otherwise it would cease to be a vanguard, a leading body. Still less can its membership be made up of incorrigible bureaucrats, careerists, parlour theoreticians, would-be capitalists on the make, or yes-men and mbongos, praise-singers, whose only talents consist of repeating flattering glorifications of this or that 'messiah' or inspired prophet. We need people who are part of the masses and who can think for themselves; people who can organize and inspire the masses to safeguard the gains of the revolution and march onwards to fresh conquests.

This is not only a question of passing good laws. In the U.A.R. good laws were passed against feudalism and for land redistribution,

but the cunning feudalists seek ways to circumvent these laws and when the poor peasants opposed them some of their leaders were assassinated. Of all societies, none stands more in need of mass participation than the building of socialism, and mass participation can only be ensured by the constant mobilizing, rallying, educating, inspiring role of a band of dedicated men and women who seek nothing for themselves and who study, practise and set an example of socialism in their everyday lives.

Participation of the masses is not satisfied by the holding of mass rallies from time to time at which harangues are delivered by political leaders. Nor can socialism be produced by a flood of propaganda or directives from government or party. Fundamental, social and economic changes are brought about by mass struggle whose every step is explained to the people who from their own experience gain confidence in the state and the leaders. Mass participation imposes severe responsibilities on the leaders of parties in government who must themselves be an example to the people by reason of their honesty, incorruptibility and willingness to make sacrifices greater than those of any in the interests of the struggle. Where the leaders of parties and states are accountable to the people for their mistakes and in public organizations which exercise actual power, the ordinary common people safeguard the gains of the struggle, prevent counter-revolution and lead the way forward.

The difficult period through which Africa has been passing these past three years will not have been in vain, if our people ponder deeply and correctly understand the meaning of these events. The imperialists and their African lickspittles may be rejoicing over some quickly won and easy victories. But these 'victories' run counter to the deepest and most pressing needs and aspirations of Africa. By clearing our heads and showing us the way forward these very reverses may well be the means of propelling the African Revolution forward on its next, far more fundamental and far-reaching phase.