

communist manifesto and the transformation of property relations

The Communist Manifesto and the Transformation of Property Relations

The Communist Manifesto, penned by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, is a foundational text in political and economic thought, offering a radical critique of capitalist society and a vision for a classless future. At its core, the Manifesto is a profound analysis of historical development, driven by class struggle, and it places immense emphasis on the concept of property relations as the bedrock of societal structure. This seminal work meticulously details how the ownership and control of the means of production have historically dictated power dynamics and social hierarchies. Understanding the Communist Manifesto's perspective on the transformation of property relations is crucial for grasping its enduring impact on revolutionary movements and contemporary debates about economic justice and societal organization.

This article delves into the core tenets of the Communist Manifesto, specifically focusing on its revolutionary proposals for altering existing property relations. We will explore Marx and Engels' critique of private property, their analysis of historical materialism, and their envisioned transition to a society where the means of production are collectively owned. By examining the Manifesto's arguments, we can gain a deeper appreciation for its historical context and its continuing relevance in discussions about economic inequality and the potential for fundamental societal change. This exploration will illuminate how the transformation of property relations is presented as the key to dismantling class oppression and achieving a more equitable world.

- Introduction to the Communist Manifesto and Property Relations
- Historical Context of Property and Class Struggle
- The Critique of Bourgeois Property
- Abolition of Private Property: The Central Tenet
- Mechanisms for Transforming Property Relations
- Impact and Legacy of the Manifesto's Ideas on Property
- Critiques and Counterarguments Regarding Property Transformation
- The Communist Manifesto's Vision for a Post-Capitalist Society
- Conclusion: The Enduring Significance of Property Relations in the Manifesto

Historical Context of Property and Class Struggle

The Communist Manifesto is deeply rooted in a historical analysis that posits class struggle as the engine of societal change. Marx and Engels argued that throughout history, societies have been characterized by the conflict between oppressors and the oppressed, most notably between the bourgeoisie (the owning class) and the proletariat (the working class) in capitalist societies. This struggle, they contended, is fundamentally driven by differing relationships to property, particularly the ownership of the means of production – the tools, factories, land, and raw materials necessary to produce wealth.

They trace this historical progression from earlier forms of society, such as ancient slave societies and feudalism, where property ownership and the associated power structures differed. In each epoch, the dominant mode of production and the resultant property relations shaped the social, political, and intellectual landscape. The transition from feudalism to capitalism, for instance, was marked by the rise of a new class, the bourgeoisie, who accumulated wealth through the ownership of nascent industries and commercial enterprises. This shift in property ownership fundamentally altered social structures, leading to the breakdown of old hierarchies and the emergence of new forms of exploitation.

The Dialectic of History and Property Ownership

Marx and Engels viewed history not as a linear progression but as a dialectical process, characterized by thesis, antithesis, and synthesis. In their framework, property relations represent a key element of the "thesis" of a particular historical period. The inherent contradictions within these property relations, leading to exploitation and alienation, form the "antithesis." The resolution of these contradictions through revolutionary upheaval, resulting in new property arrangements and a new societal structure, constitutes the "synthesis." This ongoing dialectic, driven by the tension between ownership and labor, propels historical development forward.

The accumulation of capital, a central feature of capitalism, is directly linked to the concentration of property ownership in fewer hands. As the bourgeoisie gained control of the means of production, they were able to extract surplus value from the labor of the proletariat. This imbalance in property ownership, according to the Manifesto, creates inherent instability and sets the stage for future conflict. The proletariat, having no means of production to call their own, are compelled to sell their labor power to the bourgeoisie for survival, thereby perpetuating the cycle of class domination.

The Critique of Bourgeois Property

The Communist Manifesto launches a scathing critique of what it terms "bourgeois

property," referring specifically to private ownership of the means of production under capitalism. This is not a critique of personal possessions, such as one's home or tools for individual use. Instead, it targets the system where a small class of owners controls the vast machinery of production, enabling them to exploit the labor of the majority.

The Manifesto argues that bourgeois property, while presented as a natural and just outcome of individual effort and merit, is in reality the product of historical exploitation and social coercion. It highlights how the bourgeoisie, through centuries of struggle and revolution, has abolished feudal property forms to establish its own dominance. Yet, in doing so, it has created a new form of exploitation, replacing the direct personal dependence of feudalism with the impersonal economic dependence of wage labor. The very concept of private property in the means of production is seen as the instrument of alienation and class antagonism.

Alienation and Exploitation Under Bourgeois Property

A core element of the critique is the concept of alienation, which the Manifesto links directly to bourgeois property relations. Under capitalism, workers are alienated from the product of their labor because they do not own it; it belongs to the capitalist. They are also alienated from the process of labor itself, which becomes a means to an end rather than a fulfilling activity. Furthermore, workers are alienated from their fellow human beings, as competition and class division foster social atomization, and they are alienated from their own human essence, their "species-being," which is expressed through creative and free activity.

Exploitation, in the Marxist sense, is inherent in bourgeois property. The capitalist pays the worker a wage that is less than the value that worker creates. This surplus value, the difference between the value produced and the wage paid, is appropriated by the capitalist as profit, accumulating capital and further solidifying their ownership of the means of production. The Manifesto asserts that this exploitation is not a deviation from the capitalist system but its very foundation, perpetuated by the existing property relations.

Abolition of Private Property: The Central Tenet

The most radical and controversial proposal of the Communist Manifesto is the call for the abolition of private property in the means of production. This is the central thesis that distinguishes communism from other political and economic systems of its time. Marx and Engels are unequivocal: to end class oppression and exploitation, the private ownership of factories, land, and all instruments used to generate wealth must be abolished.

It is crucial to reiterate that the Manifesto distinguishes between personal property and private property. Personal property, such as clothing, housing, and everyday items, is not targeted. The focus is exclusively on the private ownership of the means of production, which is seen as the source of capitalist power and the mechanism of class division. The

abolition of this form of property is presented not as an act of confiscation for the benefit of individuals, but as a collective transfer of ownership and control to society as a whole.

Communism as a Reorganization of Property

Communism, as envisioned by the Manifesto, is fundamentally a reorganization of property relations. Instead of private ownership, it proposes a system of common or collective ownership. This does not mean that everyone owns everything equally in a chaotic manner, but rather that the means of production are owned and controlled by the community or the associated producers. This collective ownership is intended to eliminate the possibility of one class exploiting another through the control of productive assets.

The Manifesto suggests that under a communist system, the concept of "property" itself would be transformed. The idea of private ownership of the means of production would cease to exist, replaced by a social stewardship of resources. This would, in theory, allow for the rational organization of production for the benefit of all, rather than for the profit of a few. The abolition of private property is therefore the cornerstone upon which the entire communist edifice is built, aiming to create a society free from the inherent antagonisms of class-based ownership.

Mechanisms for Transforming Property Relations

The Communist Manifesto outlines a revolutionary path for achieving the transformation of property relations. It posits that this change cannot occur through gradual reform or democratic consensus within the existing capitalist framework. Instead, it necessitates a fundamental upheaval, driven by the proletariat themselves.

The Manifesto famously states, "The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win. Working Men of All Countries, Unite!" This call to action underscores the belief that the working class, by virtue of their sheer numbers and their shared experience of exploitation, are the agents of historical change. The mechanism for transforming property relations is, therefore, revolution – a conscious, organized, and forceful overthrow of the existing capitalist state and its legal structures that uphold private property.

The Role of the Proletarian Revolution

The proletarian revolution is envisioned as the critical juncture where the old property relations are abolished and new ones are established. It is not merely a political revolution aimed at changing governments but a social revolution that fundamentally alters the economic base of society. The seizure of state power by the proletariat is a necessary step to dispossess the bourgeoisie of their ownership of the means of production and to dismantle the legal and ideological apparatus that protects private property.

Following the seizure of power, the Manifesto suggests a transitional phase, often referred to as the "dictatorship of the proletariat." During this period, the working class would consolidate its power and begin the process of reorganizing society. This would involve taking control of the means of production and implementing measures to gradually eliminate capitalist influence and establish collective ownership.

Transitional Measures for Property Reorganization

The Manifesto outlines a series of specific measures that the revolutionary state could implement to transition towards a communist society and its altered property relations. These are presented as practical steps to dismantle capitalist property structures and lay the groundwork for collective control:

- **Abolition of the right of property in land and application of all rents of land to public purposes.** This targets the ownership of land as a primary means of production and wealth accumulation, suggesting its nationalization or communal management.
- **A heavy progressive or graduated income tax.** This aims to redistribute wealth and reduce the accumulation of capital in private hands, thereby weakening the economic power of the bourgeoisie.
- **Abolition of all rights of inheritance.** Inheritance laws are seen as a mechanism for perpetuating private property and class privilege across generations. Their abolition would prevent the ossification of wealth and power within specific families.
- **Confiscation of the property of all emigrants and rebels.** This measure targets those actively opposing the revolution and seeking to undermine the new social order, aiming to neutralize counter-revolutionary threats and redirect their assets.
- **Centralisation of credit in the hands of the state, by means of a national bank with State capital and an exclusive monopoly.** This seeks to control the flow of capital, directing investment towards social needs rather than private profit and undermining the power of private financial institutions.
- **Centralisation of the means of communication and of transport in the hands of the State.** Control over infrastructure is seen as essential for the rational planning and distribution of resources in a collective economy.
- **Extension of factories and instruments of production owned by the State; the bringing into cultivation of waste-lands, and the improvement of the soil generally in accordance with a common plan.** This points towards state ownership and development of industries and agriculture, managed for the collective good.
- **Equal liability of all to labour. Establishment of industrial armies, especially for agriculture.** This suggests a societal organization where labor is a universal

duty, potentially leading to the abolition of the capitalist division between manual and intellectual labor.

- **Combination of agriculture with manufacturing industries; gradual abolition of the distinction between town and country, by a more equable distribution of the population over the country.** This envisions a more integrated and less stratified society, breaking down the oppositions that alienate individuals.
- **Free education for all children in public schools. Abolition of children's factory labour in its present form. Combination of education with industrial production, &c., &c.** While not directly about property, this highlights the societal restructuring that accompanies the transformation of property relations, aiming for a more holistic development of individuals.

These transitional measures are not presented as definitive ends in themselves, but as steps towards a future where the distinctions between classes wither away, and with them, the need for the state as an instrument of class rule. The ultimate goal is a communist society where the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all, a state of affairs made possible by the abolition of private property in the means of production.

Impact and Legacy of the Manifesto's Ideas on Property

The Communist Manifesto's radical proposals for the transformation of property relations have had a profound and lasting impact on global history, inspiring revolutions, shaping political ideologies, and sparking intense debate. Its influence extends far beyond the specific regimes that claimed adherence to its principles, embedding its core ideas about collective ownership and class struggle into the broader discourse on social justice and economic organization.

The historical trajectory of nations that attempted to implement Marxist-inspired policies often involved state-led initiatives to collectivize agriculture, nationalize industries, and abolish private land ownership. These attempts, while varied in their execution and outcomes, directly reflected the Manifesto's central argument that the redistribution and collective control of the means of production were essential for creating a more equitable society and dismantling class power.

Influence on Revolutionary Movements

The Manifesto's potent language and clear articulation of class conflict provided a theoretical framework and a rallying cry for countless revolutionary movements throughout the 19th and 20th centuries. From the Russian Revolution to movements in

China, Cuba, and various African and Latin American nations, the core demand for the abolition of private property and the establishment of a society based on collective ownership resonated deeply with populations experiencing significant economic inequality and political disenfranchisement.

These movements often saw the seizure of land from wealthy landowners, the nationalization of industries, and the restructuring of economic institutions as direct applications of the Manifesto's teachings on transforming property relations. The promise of a society free from the exploitation inherent in private ownership was a powerful motivator for mass mobilization and the overthrow of existing power structures.

Enduring Relevance in Contemporary Debates

Even in the face of the collapse of many states that identified as communist, the ideas presented in the Communist Manifesto regarding property relations continue to inform contemporary discussions about economic inequality, wealth distribution, and the role of the state. Debates surrounding issues like universal basic income, wealth taxes, the regulation of multinational corporations, and the need for stronger social safety nets can, in part, be traced back to the fundamental questions about property ownership and its social consequences that the Manifesto raised.

The Manifesto's critique of concentrated private wealth and its call for a more equitable distribution of resources remain relevant in a world still grappling with vast disparities in income and opportunity. While the specific historical context and the proposed solutions may be debated, the core concern with how property ownership shapes social power and individual well-being continues to be a central theme in political and economic discourse.

Critiques and Counterarguments Regarding Property Transformation

While the Communist Manifesto's call for the abolition of private property has inspired significant historical movements, it has also been met with considerable criticism and counterarguments. These critiques often focus on the practical implications of such a radical transformation, the potential for unintended consequences, and alternative perspectives on property ownership and economic organization.

One of the most enduring criticisms centers on the concept of private property as a driver of innovation, economic growth, and individual liberty. Opponents argue that by removing the incentive of private ownership and profit, communism stifles individual initiative and leads to economic stagnation and inefficiency. The Manifesto's proposed state control and collective ownership are often viewed as inherently bureaucratic and prone to corruption, ultimately failing to deliver on its promises of prosperity.

Economic Efficiency and Incentives

A primary concern raised by critics is that the abolition of private property would eliminate crucial economic incentives. The pursuit of profit, the ability to accumulate wealth, and the freedom to control and dispose of one's own property are seen as fundamental motivators for hard work, investment, and entrepreneurial activity. Without these incentives, critics argue, individuals would have little reason to innovate, take risks, or produce efficiently.

The Manifesto's vision of a society where the means of production are collectively owned, and distribution is based on need, is often portrayed as utopian and unrealistic. Critics question how such a system would function in practice, pointing to historical examples where centrally planned economies struggled with issues of resource allocation, quality control, and consumer satisfaction. The absence of market mechanisms, driven by private ownership, is seen as a significant drawback.

Individual Liberty and Property Rights

Another significant line of critique focuses on the relationship between private property and individual liberty. Many liberal and libertarian traditions argue that private property rights are not merely economic arrangements but are intrinsically linked to personal autonomy and freedom. The ability to own, control, and use property as one sees fit is considered a fundamental aspect of individual sovereignty.

The Manifesto's proposal to abolish private property is therefore seen by these critics as a direct assault on individual liberty. They contend that empowering the state or collective to control all the means of production leads to an overreach of governmental power and a reduction of individual freedoms. The fear is that such a system would create a society where the state, rather than individuals, dictates economic activity and, by extension, many aspects of personal life.

Historical Failures and Alternative Models

The historical experiences of nations that attempted to implement communist economic models, characterized by widespread abolition of private property, are often cited as evidence against the Manifesto's propositions. Critics point to economic inefficiencies, shortages, suppression of dissent, and the concentration of power in the hands of a ruling elite in these countries. These outcomes are interpreted as direct consequences of dismantling private property and centralizing economic control.

Furthermore, alternative models of property ownership and economic organization exist that aim to address inequality and exploitation without resorting to the complete abolition of private property. Concepts like social democracy, worker cooperatives, and more robust forms of regulation and redistribution within capitalist frameworks are presented as viable

alternatives that seek to temper the excesses of capitalism while preserving individual liberties and market mechanisms. These models suggest that a more equitable distribution of wealth and power can be achieved through reform rather than revolution and the wholesale rejection of private property.

The Communist Manifesto's Vision for a Post-Capitalist Society

The Communist Manifesto does not merely offer a critique of capitalism; it also articulates a vision for a future society that arises from the ashes of the old, fundamentally reshaped by the transformation of property relations. This post-capitalist society is characterized by the absence of class divisions, exploitation, and alienation, all of which are seen as direct products of private ownership of the means of production.

In this envisioned future, the abolition of private property in the means of production is the linchpin that allows for the realization of a truly free and cooperative society. The elimination of the bourgeoisie as a distinct class, and the cessation of the proletariat's exploitation, would remove the fundamental source of societal antagonism. This would pave the way for a new mode of social organization where collective well-being supersedes private profit.

Abolition of Classes and Exploitation

The most significant feature of the post-capitalist society described in the Manifesto is the abolition of social classes. When private ownership of the means of production is eliminated, the economic basis for the division of society into an owning class and a working class disappears. Without a class that owns the factories and land, there can be no class that is compelled to sell its labor power to survive.

Consequently, exploitation, defined as the extraction of surplus value from labor by owners of capital, would cease to exist. Production would be organized not for the profit of a few, but for the benefit of all. The fruits of labor would be shared more equitably, leading to a society where the material needs of everyone could be met. This fundamental shift in property relations is presented as the key to unlocking human potential and fostering genuine social progress.

The Withering Away of the State

A direct consequence of the abolition of class antagonism, and therefore the need for a state apparatus to maintain class domination, is the eventual "withering away of the state." The Manifesto posits that the state, in all its historical forms, has served as an instrument of the ruling class to enforce its property rights and maintain its power over

subordinate classes. Once class distinctions are eliminated, the state, as a tool of oppression, would become obsolete.

In this stateless communist society, social organization would presumably be managed through collective decision-making and voluntary cooperation. The administrative functions that remain would be concerned with the efficient management of resources and the coordination of collective activities, rather than the enforcement of class-based laws. This vision represents a radical departure from all previous forms of political organization, predicated on the absence of class conflict rooted in property ownership.

The Free Development of All

The ultimate aim of the Communist Manifesto, enabled by the transformation of property relations, is the "free development of each" as the "condition for the free development of all." In a society free from the constraints of class struggle, economic insecurity, and alienation, individuals would be liberated to pursue their full potential. Education, creative pursuits, and personal fulfillment would become accessible to everyone, rather than being limited by one's class position or economic circumstances.

The Manifesto suggests that with the abolition of the division of labor that alienates workers from their work and from each other, individuals could engage in a variety of activities. People would not be confined to a single trade or profession dictated by economic necessity. This liberation from the limitations imposed by capitalist property relations would foster a society of well-rounded, creative, and self-actualized individuals, contributing to the collective good.

Conclusion: The Enduring Significance of Property Relations in the Manifesto

The Communist Manifesto, through its relentless focus on property relations, offers a powerful and enduring critique of capitalist society and a compelling vision for a radically different future. The central argument, that the private ownership of the means of production is the root cause of class struggle, exploitation, and alienation, continues to resonate in contemporary discussions about economic inequality and social justice. The Manifesto's call for the abolition of bourgeois property and its proposal for collective ownership have not only inspired historical revolutions but also continue to frame debates about wealth distribution, power dynamics, and the very structure of our economic systems.

Understanding the Manifesto's intricate analysis of how property ownership shapes history, creates class divisions, and dictates societal power structures is crucial for comprehending its lasting impact. The document's radical proposal for transforming property relations—moving from private to collective ownership—is presented as the necessary pathway to a classless society where exploitation is abolished, the state withers

away, and individuals are free to achieve their full potential. While the practical implementation and historical outcomes of movements inspired by the Manifesto remain subjects of intense debate and scrutiny, its core insistence on the centrality of property relations to societal organization ensures its continued relevance in the ongoing quest for a more equitable and just world.

Frequently Asked Questions

What is the central argument of the Communist Manifesto regarding property relations?

The Communist Manifesto argues that the history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles, and that the bourgeoisie, in its rise to power, has abolished feudal, patriarchal, and idyllic relations, replacing them with the naked self-interest and cash payment. It asserts that the bourgeoisie has concentrated property in the hands of a few, leading to the exploitation of the proletariat. The manifesto's core proposition is the abolition of bourgeois private property as the ultimate expression of this exploitation.

How does the Communist Manifesto propose to transform property relations?

The Communist Manifesto proposes to transform property relations by abolishing private property, specifically bourgeois private property, which it defines as the property of the majority of society. Instead, it advocates for the socialization of the means of production, such as land, factories, and mines, to be owned and controlled by the community as a whole, thereby eliminating class distinctions and exploitation.

What are the perceived benefits of transforming property relations according to the Manifesto?

According to the Communist Manifesto, the transformation of property relations, particularly the abolition of private property, would lead to the elimination of class antagonisms and the exploitation of one class by another. It envisions a society where the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all, fostering a more equitable and cooperative social order.

What critiques are often leveled against the Communist Manifesto's proposals for property relations?

Common critiques of the Communist Manifesto's proposals for property relations include concerns about the suppression of individual liberty and incentives, the potential for state overreach and authoritarianism, and the practical difficulties of managing a centrally planned economy without private ownership. Critics often point to historical attempts at implementing communism and the resulting economic inefficiencies and human rights abuses.

How has the concept of 'property relations' evolved in modern discourse compared to the time of the Communist Manifesto?

While the core idea of ownership and control of productive assets remains central, modern discourse on property relations is more nuanced. It encompasses discussions on intellectual property, digital property, communal ownership models beyond state control (like worker cooperatives), and the regulation of private property to address social and environmental concerns. The absolute abolition of private property as envisioned by Marx and Engels is less frequently advocated in mainstream politics, with more focus on mitigating its negative consequences.

Does the Communist Manifesto advocate for the abolition of all personal possessions?

No, the Communist Manifesto specifically targets the abolition of bourgeois private property, which refers to the private ownership of the means of production used to exploit wage labor. It does not advocate for the abolition of personal possessions that are the fruit of one's own labor, such as clothing, tools, or a home, stating, 'We have no desire to abolish this personal appropriation of the produce of labour, an appropriation that is left to maintain and reproduce itself, leaving no surplus wherewith to command the labour of others.'

Additional Resources

Here are 9 book titles related to the Communist Manifesto and the transformation of property relations, formatted as requested:

1.

The Communist Manifesto: A Modern Interpretation

This book offers a contemporary analysis of Marx and Engels' seminal work, focusing on its enduring relevance to understanding class struggle and the fundamental inequities embedded in capitalist property systems. It explores how the concepts presented in the Manifesto continue to shape discussions about economic justice and the potential for systemic change. The interpretation delves into the historical context of the Manifesto while highlighting its continued application to contemporary issues of wealth concentration and ownership.

2.

Capitalism and the Abolition of Private Property

This title directly addresses the core tenet of the Communist Manifesto concerning the transformation of property relations. It critically examines the historical and theoretical arguments for abolishing private ownership of the means of production. The book explores various proposed models for collective or state ownership and the societal implications of

such a radical shift.

3.

From Feudalism to Communism: A Property Rights Evolution

This work traces the historical trajectory of property ownership, starting from feudal systems and analyzing the emergence of capitalist private property. It then charts the theoretical path outlined by the Communist Manifesto towards a communist society, where property is transformed or abolished. The book investigates the social and economic consequences of these transformations across different historical periods.

4.

The Spectre of Collective Ownership

This book engages with the fear and resistance often associated with the idea of communal or state ownership, a central theme in the Communist Manifesto's critique of private property. It analyzes the historical and ideological responses to calls for property transformation. The author explores the practical challenges and potential benefits of non-private forms of ownership.

5.

Re-imagining Property: Post-Capitalist Possibilities

Building on the foundational critique of property relations presented in the Communist Manifesto, this title explores contemporary theories and movements that advocate for alternative models of ownership. It moves beyond a purely Marxist framework to consider diverse ideas for transforming how resources and the means of production are controlled. The book offers a forward-looking perspective on what a post-capitalist society might look like in terms of property.

6.

The State and the Means of Production: A Marxist Debate

This work delves into the complex relationship between the state and the ownership of productive assets, a key concern for those influenced by the Communist Manifesto. It examines different historical and theoretical approaches to how the means of production should be managed, often through the state, in the pursuit of a classless society. The book critically analyzes the efficacy and pitfalls of state control over property.

7.

Inheritance and Inequality: The Communist Manifesto's

Challenge

This title focuses on the role of inherited wealth and its impact on social stratification, a direct consequence of private property accumulation critiqued by the Communist Manifesto. It investigates how the concentration of property across generations perpetuates inequality. The book explores the Manifesto's proposals for dismantling such systems of inherited advantage.

8.

The Commons and the Critique of Private Property

This book draws a connection between historical notions of common ownership and the critiques of private property presented in the Communist Manifesto. It examines how the concept of "the commons" offers a historical precedent and a modern alternative to private accumulation. The work explores how reclaiming common resources can be a path towards transforming property relations.

9.

Revolutionary Property Transformation: From Marx to Modernity

This title provides a comprehensive overview of how the ideas about transforming property relations, originating with the Communist Manifesto, have evolved and been implemented or debated throughout history. It analyzes various revolutionary movements and theoretical shifts that have attempted to alter ownership structures. The book assesses the successes, failures, and ongoing relevance of revolutionary approaches to property.

[Communist Manifesto And The Transformation Of Property Relations](#)

Communist Manifesto And The Transformation Of Property Relations

Related Articles

- [communist manifesto basic ideas](#)
- [communication in social science us](#)
- [communist manifesto analysis for beginners](#)

[Back to Home](#)