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When it comes to the market (one is tempted to write "The Market"), we speak as if it is an entity with "a mind and a memory of its own," writes Richard E. Hurcourt in *The Illusion of Free Markets*. Philosophers call this a category mistake - that is, talking about a thing in one category as if it belongs to another. Even if we know the market isn't a person or a thing you could meet on the street, we have the unyielding tendency to talk as if it were.

Our market ("needs, don't we all") and we worry about how the market behaves (rather badly, usually). The market must be free or it won't perform, we might say. And if "the market" is an opacity that swallowing fair hair and stemming the door on her manager - not

Instead, our "free markets are far from free," Hurcourt notes. Though this isn't the central problem. It is the madness about markets and their regulation, about the popularity of a particular idea (the rationality of free markets), and its consequences. But, given the illusion (or delusion) that markets are free, Hurcourt asks us to consider "whether or not to regulate. Instead, the only question is how the existing and prospective kinds of regulation distribute wealth."

Harcourt traces the genealogy of attitudes: the way that the "rationality of free markets," became a believable idea. He sees a close connection between free market capitalism and the United States system of incarceration. Such critics - T. H. Marshall's concept is that the connection is "too much of a stretch. Considering that U.S. style lock'em up justice has led to"

We are in the habit of forgetting, therefore, that what happens in the market has a lot to do with how we behave and what we need, not the other way around. The tendency also leads us to see the market as sacrosanct, our faith in it unshakable, despite the shake-up we've endured over the last couple of years. Hurcourt observes that the end of the twentieth century "saw a virtual canonization of market organization as the best, indeed the only effective, way to structure an economic system. This dominant view "has had a powerful influence," he writes. But, the common understanding of for-profit firms as vehicles of production, competition as the root of efficiency and choice, and government as sole protector of free-market rules relegated to maintaining the infrastructure is - let's say - just a bit of "folk theory," a rather simplified version of the standard textbook model of economics,

the highest incarceration rate in the Western world, "therefore (21 million as of 2010), Hurcourt's book deserves a fair read. The Illusion of Free Markets is well researched, with plenty of backstory and enough history to make your teeth itch. Hurcourt traces the regulation of markets from 17th-century France, where bakers might be arrested for selling underweight bread, to the influence of Adam Smith, an early theorist who saw "pricing as a prerequisite" rather than a hindrance to the economy. Next stop: Chicago (with a lot of intellectual connecting the dots in between) where the Board of Trade "is the free market." To our modern eyes "at least, the economic of the free market in the Western world."

Harcourt's book is no summertime read. It may take you until summer to wrap your mind around the complexities of his claims. For those willing to make the intellectual effort, it is time well spent. Even if you disagree with the facts, the apples, knowing the roots of our fascination with the market pays off. If there is anything we can be sure of, the capricious of the market will continue for some time. It ain't over until the fat lady sings, RN