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Claude Frederic Bastiat was a well-educated man of character, brilliant and...prophetic. His essay *La Loi*, written for the average person, was published in 1850.
Foreword

“Fred’s Law”. Short and sweet! An easy read with pictures galore.

Though the average American seems unaware of what Frederic Bastiat knew in the 1800s, the United States Constitution (written before he lived), was based on the Natural or God-given Rights of the individual.

Under the United States Constitution, the power of the federal government was limited (by separation of powers and a system of checks and balances). “Limited government” stands in contrast to the age-old playbook of dictators and kings. Under such tyrants (and by extension, their entire governments), kings or dictators or sometimes elected officials held unlimited power over their subjects and regulated every aspect of their subjects’ lives.

Under “limited government”, the United States federal government was in charge of very few things, such as a military to protect the country and dealing with issues between the states and between the states and foreign nations. All other powers were left to the states and cities and most of all to the individual, who would retain the power to keep his/her Natural Rights.

Do you want a bridge, a school or a certain kind of program in your city? Under the United States Constitution, which our elected state and federal representatives take an oath of office to uphold, we would vote at a local or state level as to whether we wanted to pay (a tax, a toll or a fee) for a new bridge, a road, a school, a program. These matters were not the job of the federal government.

It was not the job of the federal government to create a committee or an agency to write regulations on matters beyond their limited powers, nor Congress’s or the President’s job to tax us to pay for such operations. These matters were meant to be decided by you - on state and local levels. In this way you retained your individual power and your Natural Rights.

But the average person understands little about Natural Rights.

The solution is to take the “Fred’s Law” challenge! You can read it in less than an hour’s time...less time than it would take you to watch any one of your favorite half-hour TV shows twice. You read it and you feel your brain start to swell and grow inside your head...but in a good way!

Read it for fun or read Fred’s Law (The Jackpot Game) (also a free e-book), as part of a winner-takes-all prize game. Either way it’s a deal!

Fred’s Law pops!

(All quotes credited to FB herein are the words of Claude Frederic Bastiat and were written in 1850. Bracketed words within a quote are the words of the editors, not the author.)

Three sections of La Loi (on the universal vote issue in France in 1850) do not appear in this abridged copy of the first one third of Bastiat’s essay.
“The price good men pay for indifference to public affairs is to be ruled by evil men.” ~ Plato (424 B.C. - 348 B.C.)

“Just because you do not take an interest in politics doesn’t mean politics won’t take an interest in you.” ~ Pericles (430 B.C.)

“To God and posterity you are accountable for your rights and your rulers. See that you preserve them inviolate and transmit them to posterity unimpaired. Let not your children have reason to curse you for giving up those rights, and prostrating those institutions which our fathers delivered to you. - And that this happy state of things may continue, look well to the characters and qualifications of those you elect and raise to office and places of trust.” ~ Reverend Matthias Burnet (1749-1806)

“On every question of construction of the Constitution, let us carry ourselves back to the time when the Constitution was adopted, recollect the spirit manifested in the debates, and instead of trying what meaning may be squeezed out of the text, or invented against it, conform to the probable one in which it was passed.” ~ Thomas Jefferson (1803)

“If the law were confined to its proper functions, everyone’s interest in the law would be the same.” ~ Claude Frederic Bastiat, (1850)
Preface: The Law

The law perverted! And the police powers of the state perverted along with it! The law, I say, not only turned from its proper purpose but made to follow an entirely contrary purpose! The law become the weapon of every kind of greed! Instead of checking crime, the law itself guilty of the evils it is supposed to punish! If this is true, it is a serious fact, and moral duty requires me to call the attention of my fellow-citizens to it:

1. Life Is a Gift from [Nature or] God

We hold from the Creator the gift which includes all others. This gift is life -- physical, intellectual, and moral life. But life cannot maintain itself alone.

The Creator of life has entrusted us with the responsibility of preserving, developing, and perfecting it. In order that we may accomplish this, He has provided us with a collection of marvelous faculties. And He has put us in the midst of a variety of natural resources. By the application of our faculties to these natural resources we convert them into products, and use them. This process is necessary in order that life may run its appointed course.
Life, faculties, production -- in other words, individuality, liberty, property -- this is man. And in spite of the cunning of artful political leaders, these three gifts from the Creator precede all human legislation, and are superior to it. Life, liberty and property do not exist because men have made laws. On the contrary, it was the fact that life, liberty, and property existed beforehand that caused men to make laws in the first place.

2. What Is Law?

What, then, is law? It is the collective organization of the individual right to lawful defense.

Each of us has a natural right -- from God -- to defend his person, his liberty, and his property. These are the three basic requirements of life, and the preservation of any one of them is completely dependent upon the preservation of the other two. For what are our faculties but the extension of our individuality? And what is property but an extension of our faculties?

If every person has the right to defend even by force -- his person, his liberty, and his property, then it follows that a group of men have the right to organize and support a common force to protect these rights constantly.
Thus the principle of collective [common] right — its reason for existing, its lawfulness — is based on individual right. And the [common] force that protects this collective right cannot logically have any other purpose or any other mission than that for which it acts as a substitute.

Thus, since an individual cannot lawfully use force against the person, liberty, or property of another individual, then the common force — for the same reason — cannot lawfully be used to destroy the person, liberty, or property of individuals or groups.

Such a perversion of force would be, in both cases, contrary to our premise. Force has been given to us to defend our own individual rights. Who will dare to say that force has been given to us to destroy the equal rights of our brothers? Since no individual acting separately can lawfully use force to destroy the rights of others,
does it not logically follow that the same principle also applies to the common force that is nothing more than the organized combination of the individual forces?

If this is true, then nothing can be more evident than this: The law is the organization of the natural right of lawful defense. It is the substitution of a common force for individual forces. And this common force is to do only what the individual forces have a natural and lawful right to do: to protect persons, liberties, and properties; to maintain the right of each, and to cause justice to reign over us all.

3. A Just and Enduring Government

If a nation were founded on this basis, it seems to me that order would prevail among the people, in thought as well as in deed. It seems to me that such a nation would have the most simple, easy to accept, economical, limited, non-oppressive, just, and enduring government imaginable -- whatever its political form might be.

Under such an administration, everyone would understand that he possessed all the privileges as well as all the responsibilities of his existence. No one would have any argument with government, provided that his person was respected, his labor was free, and the fruits of his labor were protected against all unjust attack. When successful, we would not have to thank the state for our success. And, conversely, when unsuccessful, we would no more think of blaming the state for our misfortune than would the farmers blame the state because of hail or frost. The state would be felt only by the invaluable blessings of safety provided by this concept of government.

Under a just government

It can be further stated that, thanks to the non-intervention of the state [federal government] in private affairs, our wants and their satisfactions would develop themselves in a logical manner. We would not see poor families seeking literary instruction before they have bread. We would not see cities populated at the expense of rural districts, nor rural districts at the expense of cities. We would not see the great displacements of capital, labor, and population that are caused by legislative decisions.

The sources of our existence are made uncertain and precarious by these state-created displacements. And, furthermore, these acts burden the government with increased responsibilities.

4. The Complete Perversion of the Law

But, unfortunately, law by no means confines itself to its proper functions. And when it has exceeded its
proper functions, it has not done so merely in some inconsequential and debatable matters. The law has gone further than this; it has acted in direct opposition to its own purpose. The law has been used to destroy its own objective: It has been applied to annihilating the justice that it was supposed to maintain; to limiting and destroying rights which its real purpose was to respect.

The law has placed the collective force at the disposal of the unscrupulous who wish, without risk, to exploit the person, liberty, and property of others. It has converted plunder into a right, in order to protect plunder. And it has converted lawful defense into a crime, in order to punish lawful defense. How has this perversion of the law been accomplished? And what have been the results?

The law has been perverted by the influence of two entirely different causes: stupid greed [called human greed later in the text] and false philanthropy. Let us speak of the first.

5. A Fatal Tendency of Mankind

Self-preservation and self-development are common aspirations among all people. And if everyone enjoyed the unrestricted use of his faculties and the free disposition of the fruits of his labor, social progress would be ceaseless, uninterrupted, and unfailing.

But there is also another tendency that is common among people. When they can, they wish to live and prosper at the expense of others. This is no rash accusation. Nor does it come from a gloomy and uncharitable spirit. The annals of history bear witness to the truth of it: the incessant wars, mass migrations, religious persecutions, universal slavery, dishonesty in commerce, and monopolies. This fatal desire has its origin in the very nature of man --
primitive, universal, and insuppressible instinct that impels him to satisfy his desires with the least possible pain.

6. Property and Plunder

Man can live and satisfy his wants only by ceaseless labor; by the ceaseless application of his faculties to natural resources. This process is the origin of property.

But it is also true that a man may live and satisfy his wants by seizing and consuming the products of the labor of others. This process is the origin of plunder.

Now since man is naturally inclined to avoid pain -- and since labor is pain in itself -- it follows that men will resort to plunder whenever plunder is easier than work. History shows this quite clearly. And under these conditions, neither religion nor morality can stop it.

When, then, does plunder stop? It stops when it becomes more painful and more dangerous than labor.
It is evident, then, that the proper purpose of law is to use the power of its collective force to stop this fatal tendency to plunder instead of to work. All the measures of the law should protect property and punish plunder.

But, generally, the law is made by one man or one class of men. And since law cannot operate without the sanction and support of a dominating force, this force must be entrusted to those who make the laws. This fact, combined with the fatal tendency that exists in the heart of man to satisfy his wants with the least possible effort, explains the almost universal perversion of the law. Thus it is easy to understand how law, instead of checking injustice, becomes the invincible weapon of injustice. It is easy to understand why the law is used by the legislator to destroy in varying degrees among the rest of the people, their personal independence by slavery, their liberty by oppression, and their property by plunder. This is done for the benefit of the person who makes the law, and in proportion to the power that he holds.

7. Victims of Lawful Plunder
Men naturally rebel against the injustice of which they are victims. Thus, when plunder is organized by law
for the profit of those who make the law, all the plundered classes try somehow to enter - by peaceful or revolutionary means -- into the making of laws. According to their degree of enlightenment, these plundered classes may propose one of two entirely different purposes when they attempt to attain political power: Either they may wish to stop lawful plunder, or they may wish to share in it.

Woe to the nation when this latter purpose prevails among the mass victims of lawful plunder when they, in turn, seize the power to make laws! Until that happens, the few practice lawful plunder upon the many, a common practice where the right to participate in the making of law is limited to a few persons. But then, participation in the making of law becomes universal. And then, men seek to balance their conflicting interests by universal plunder. Instead of rooting out the injustices found in society, they make these injustices general. As soon as the plundered classes gain political power, they establish a system of reprisals against other classes. They do not abolish legal plunder. (This objective would demand more enlightenment than they possess.) Instead, they emulate their evil predecessors by participating in this legal plunder, even though it is against their own interests.

It is as if it were necessary, before a reign of justice appears, for everyone to suffer a cruel retribution (the plundering becomes painful because it does not work) -- some for their evilness, and some for their lack of understanding.
8. The Results of Legal Plunder

It is impossible to introduce into society a greater change and a greater evil than this: the conversion of the law into an instrument of plunder. What are the consequences of such a perversion of the law? It would require volumes to describe them all. Thus we must content ourselves with pointing out the most striking.

In the first place, it erases from everyone’s conscience the distinction between justice and injustice.

No society can exist unless the laws are respected to a certain degree. The safest way to make laws respected is to make them respectable. When law and morality contradict each other, the citizen has the cruel alternative of either losing his moral sense or losing his respect for the law. These two evils are of equal consequence, and it would be difficult for a person to choose between them.
The nature of law is to maintain justice. This is so much the case that, in the minds of the people, law and justice are one and the same thing. There is in all of us a strong disposition to believe that anything lawful is also legitimate. This belief is so widespread that many persons have erroneously held that things are “just” because law makes them so. Thus, in order to make plunder appear just and sacred to many consciences, it is only necessary for the law to decree and sanction it. Slavery, restrictions, and monopoly find defenders not only among those who profit from them but also among those who suffer from them.

9. The Fate of Non-Conformists

If you suggest a doubt as to the morality of these institutions, it is boldly said that “You are a dangerous innovator, a utopian, a theorist, a subversive; you would shatter the foundation upon which society rests.”

If you lecture upon morality or upon political science, there will be found official organizations petitioning the government in this vein of thought: “That science no longer be taught exclusively from the point of view of free trade (of liberty, of property, and of justice) as has been the case until now, but also, in the future, science is to be especially taught from the viewpoint of the facts and laws that regulate [...] industry (facts and laws which are contrary to liberty, to property, and to justice). That, in government-endowed teaching
positions, the professor rigorously refrain from endangering in the slightest degree the respect due to the laws now in force.”

Thus, if there exists a law which sanctions slavery or monopoly, oppression or robbery, in any form whatever, it must not even be mentioned. For how can it be mentioned without damaging the respect which it inspires?

Still further, morality and political economy must be taught from the point of view of this law, from the supposition that it must be a just law merely because it is a law.

Another effect of this tragic perversion of the law is that it gives an exaggerated importance to political passions and conflicts, and to politics in general.

10. The Answer Is to Restrict [Confine] the Law

I know what might be said in answer to this; what the objections might be. But this is not the place to exhaust a controversy of this nature. I wish merely to observe here that this controversy over universal suffrage (as well as many other political questions) which agitates, excites, and overthrows nations, would lose nearly all of its importance if the law had always been what it ought to be.

In fact, if law were confined to protecting all persons, all liberties, and all properties; if law were nothing more than the organized combination of the individual’s right to self defense; if law were the obstacle, the check, the punisher of all oppression and plunder -- is it likely that we citizens would then argue much about the extent of the franchise?

Under these circumstances, is it likely that the extent of (an issue such as) the right to vote would endanger that supreme good, the public peace?
Is it likely that the excluded classes would refuse to peaceably await the coming of their right to vote? Is it likely that those who had the right to vote would jealously defend their privilege? If the law were confined to its proper functions, everyone’s interest in the law would be the same. Is it not clear that, under these circumstances, those who had a particular right (like voting) could not inconvenience those who did not vote?

11. The Fatal Idea of Legal Plunder

But on the other hand, imagine that this fatal principle has been introduced: Under the pretense of organization, regulation, protection, or encouragement, the law takes property from one person and gives it to another; the law takes the wealth of all and gives it to a few -- whether farmers, manufacturers, ship owners, artists or comedians. Under these circumstances, then certainly every class will aspire to grasp the law and logically so.

[In the case of the right to vote] [t]he excluded classes will furiously demand their right to vote -- and will overthrow society rather than not to obtain it. Even beggars and vagabonds will then prove to you that they also have an incontestable title to vote.

They will say to you: “We cannot buy wine, tobacco, or salt without paying the tax. And a part of the tax that
we pay is given by law -- in privileges and subsidies -- to men who are richer than we are. Others use the law to raise the prices of bread, meat, iron, or cloth.

“Thus, since everyone else uses the law for his own profit, we also would like to use the law for our own profit. We demand from the law the right to relief, which is the poor man’s plunder. To obtain this right, we also should be voters and legislators in order that we may organize Beggary on a grand scale for our own class, as you have organized Protection on a grand scale for your class.

“Now don’t tell us beggars that you will act for us, and then toss a petty amount of money to keep us quiet, like throwing us a bone to gnaw. We have other claims. And anyway, we wish to bargain for ourselves as other classes have bargained for themselves!”

And what can you say to answer that argument!

12. Perverted Law Causes Conflict

As long as it is admitted that the law may be diverted from its true purpose -- that it may violate property instead of protecting it -- then everyone will want to participate in making the law, either to protect himself against plunder or to use it for plunder.

Political questions will always be prejudicial, dominant, and all-absorbing.

There will be fighting at the door of the Legislative Palace, and the struggle within will be no less furious. To know this, it is hardly necessary to examine what transpires in the [...] legislatures; merely to understand the issue is to know the answer.

Is there any need to offer proof that this odious perversion of the law is a perpetual source of hatred and
discord; that it tends to destroy society itself? If such proof is needed, look at the United States [in 1850]. There is no country in the world where the law is kept more within its proper domain: the protection of every person's liberty and property. As a consequence of this, there appears to be no country in the world where the social order rests on a firmer foundation. But even in the United States, there are two issues -- and only two -- that have always endangered the public peace.

13. Slavery and Tariffs Are Plunder

What are these two issues? They are slavery and tariffs. These are the only two issues where, contrary to

the general spirit of the republic of the United States, law has assumed the character of a plunderer. Slavery is a violation, by law, of liberty. The protective tariff is a violation, by law, of property.
It is a most remarkable fact that this double legal crime -- a sorrowful inheritance from the Old World -- should be the only issue which can, and perhaps will, lead to the ruin of the Union.

It is indeed impossible to imagine, at the very heart of a society, a more astounding fact than this: The law has come to be an instrument of injustice. And if this fact brings terrible consequences to the United States -- where the proper purpose of the law has been perverted only in the instances of slavery and tariffs -- what must be the consequences in Europe, where the perversion of the law is a principle; a system?

14. Two Kinds of Plunder

Mr. de Montalembert [politician and writer] adopting the thought contained in a famous proclamation by Mr. Carlier, [chief of Paris police] has said: “We must make war against socialism.”

According to the definition of socialism advanced by Mr. Charles Dupin, he meant: “We must make war against plunder.”

But of what plunder was he speaking? For there are two kinds of plunder: legal [by perversion of the law] and illegal.

I do not think that illegal plunder, such as theft or swindling -- which the penal code defines, anticipates, and

punishes-- can be called socialism. It is not this kind of plunder that systematically threatens the foundations of society.

Anyway, the war against this kind of plunder has not waited for the command of these gentlemen. The war against illegal plunder has been fought since the beginning of the world. Long before the Revolution of February 1848 [in France] -- long before the appearance even of socialism itself -- France had provided police, judges, gendarmes, prisons, dungeons and scaffolds for the purpose of fighting illegal plunder. The law itself conducts this war, and it is my wish and opinion that the law should always maintain this attitude toward plunder.
15. The Law Defends Plunder

It is my wish and opinion that the law should always use the legal system against plunder...But it does not always do so. Sometimes the law defends plunder and participates in it. Thus the beneficiaries are spared the shame, danger, and scruple which their acts would otherwise involve.

Sometimes the law places the whole apparatus of judges, police, prisons, and gendarmes at the service of the plunderers, and treats the victim (citizen who wants his Natural Rights protected) -- when he defends himself -- as a criminal.

In short, there is a legal plunder, and it is of this, no doubt, that Mr. de Montalembert speaks.

This legal plunder may be only an isolated stain among the legislative measures of the people. If so, it is best to

wipe it out with a minimum of speeches and denunciations -- and in spite of the uproar of the vested interests.

16. How to Identify Legal Plunder

But how is this legal plunder to be identified? Quite simply. See if the law takes from some persons what belongs to them, and gives it to other persons to whom it does not belong.

See if the law benefits one citizen at the expense of another by doing what the citizen himself cannot do without committing a crime.
Then abolish this law without delay, for it is not only an evil itself, but also it is a fertile source for further evils because it invites reprisals.

If such a law -- which may be an isolated case -- is not abolished immediately, it will spread, multiply, and develop into a system.

The person who profits from this law will complain bitterly, defending his acquired rights.

He will claim that the state is obligated to protect and encourage his particular industry; that this procedure enriches the state because the protected industry is thus able to spend more and to pay higher wages to the poor workingmen.

Do not listen to this sophistry by vested interests. The acceptance of these arguments will build legal plunder into a whole system. In fact, this has already occurred. The present-day delusion is an attempt to enrich everyone at the expense of everyone else; to make plunder universal under the pretense of organizing it.

17. Legal [Legalized] Plunder Has Many Names

Now, legal plunder can be committed in an infinite number of ways. Thus we have an infinite number of plans for organizing it: tariffs, protection, benefits, subsidies, encouragements, progressive taxation, public schools, guaranteed jobs, guaranteed profits, minimum wages, a right to relief, a right to the tools of labor, free credit, and so on, and so on. All these plans as a whole -- with their common aim of legal plunder -- constitute socialism.

Now, since under this definition socialism is a body of doctrine, what attack can be made against it other than a war of doctrine? If you find this socialistic doctrine to be false, absurd, and evil, then refute it. And the more false, the more absurd, and the more evil it is, the easier it will be to refute. Above all, if you wish to be strong, begin by rooting out every particle of socialism that may have crept into your legislation. This will be no light task.
18. Socialism Is Legal Plunder

Mr. de Montalembert has been accused of desiring to fight socialism by the use of brute force. He ought to be exonerated from this accusation, for he has plainly said: “The war that we must fight against socialism must be in harmony with law, honor, and justice.”

But why does not Mr. de Montalembert see that he has placed himself in a vicious circle? You would use...
the law to oppose socialism? But it is upon the law that socialism itself relies. Socialists desire to practice legal plunder, not illegal plunder. Socialists, like all other monopolists, desire to make the law their own weapon. And when once the law is on the side of socialism, how can it be used against socialism? For when plunder is abetted by the law, it does not fear your courts, your gendarmes, and your prisons. Rather, it may call upon them for help.

To prevent this, you would exclude socialism from entering into the making of laws? You would prevent socialists from entering the Legislative Palace? You shall not succeed, I predict, so long as legal plunder continues to be the main business of the legislature. It is illogical -- in fact, absurd -- to assume otherwise.

19. The Choice Before Us

This question of legal plunder must be settled once and for all, and there are only three ways to settle it:
- The few plunder the many.
- Everybody plunders everybody.
- Nobody plunders anybody.

We must make our choice among limited plunder, universal plunder, and no plunder. The law can follow only one of these three.

Limited legal plunder: This system prevailed [in France] when the right to vote was restricted. One would turn back to this system to prevent the invasion of socialism.

Universal legal plunder: We have been threatened with this system since the franchise [vote] was made universal. The newly enfranchised majority has decided to formulate law on the same principle of legal
plunder that was used by their predecessors when the vote was limited [in France].

No legal plunder: This is the principle of justice, peace, order, stability, harmony, and logic. ["If the law were confined to its proper functions, everyone’s interest in the law would be the same." FB ...And therefore we would see peace, order, stability, etc.] Until the day of my death, I shall proclaim this principle with all the force of my lungs (which alas! is all too inadequate). # (Claude Frederic Bastiat 1801 - 1850)

THE END (Part I)

Note from the editor:

One of the reasons legal plunder is not now recognized as a problem is that it usually appears as part of the cost of doing business (business overhead; rent, employees, electricity, raw materials plus cost of attorneys and payoffs in lawsuits - valid or bogus); the actual victim of the plunder is the consumer, and because the plunder is built into the cost of the product, the consumer is ignorant about the plunder.

Since people get used to thinking of their net (take home) income as what they can spend, they start to think in terms of 'I make $500 a week', even though the gross (total earned before taxes) might be $700 per week. Then they take the $500
and buy items that -- have the price of the socialist plunder (whatever it takes to pay for state and federal entitlement programs), lawsuit plunder, and taxes and fees (plunder from perverted laws) built into the cost! Most often people don’t blame the high cost of the product on legal plunder because they can’t see it and because they are unaware that the law has been perverted.

These lawsuits we hear about where people are suing the government for something or other...Well guess what? They, in most cases, are going to plunder you, as that money always comes from those who pay the taxes. If a private business gets sued, they then add that on to the cost of their product. The lawsuit could be totally bogus because a false lawsuit is now considered a legal way of plundering. Businesses, big or small, and government all take lawsuit settlements in stride. It’s considered part of doing business and the cost of the legal plunder is passed on to you, the customer.

What about the guy who collects too much on an insurance claim from the insurance company? Ah, he thinks the insurance company has plenty of money but what does the insurance company do? Yup, retaliatory plunder; they pass the legal plunder on to the rest of us and on and on. A big business plunders its buyers so that it can pay off those who sue them, rightfully or not; the government plunders with taxes and fees so that businesses (its cronies), citizens (on entitlement programs) and other countries (in the name of compassion) - often ones who hate us and use the money for their leaders rather than the good of their people - can get plunder too.

Since everyone does this, people rationalize and few seem to realize it’s wrong. How about the legal plunder where the government (in spite of the billions in taxes and fees they have taken) spends way more money than they have, then borrows money, using you and your children as collateral. Another legal plunder.

So it goes until we have built ourselves the society that Bastiat speaks of: a pirate society where plundering is universal. Everyone wants to make or capitalize on existing laws so that they can plunder someone else and get away with it. Such a society cannot go on forever and does not end well. (See illustration: “Universal plunder is against their best interest”...) #

Mike Benoit, 2012

Recommended reading:
The Law, by Claude Frederic Bastiat, free downloads (entire text) (also available in Spanish on Wikipedia)
Fred’s Law (The Jackpot Game) (free e-book)
The 5000 Year Leap, by Cleon Skousen
(Look for Fred’s Law, Part Two)
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