LAW AND COMMUNISM.

THE Land Nationalisation Society, of which a distinguished man of science is, strange to say, President, has not, in spite of unremitting exertions, succeeded in attracting much notice from the public. Since Mr. Henry George, whose perverted ingenuity made him an object of some interest, and who played such tricks with political economy as made the professors weep, returned to California, the body which he created or inspired has languished in comparative obscurity. Mr. George is said to be now engaged in the useful and honourable task of persuading his countrymen that their protective tariff cripples their industry and impoverishes themselves. Mr. Alfred Russel Wallace, who is, we believe, a Protectionist, carries on Mr. George's work of proving, or rather asserting, that private property in land is the legal recognition of theft. Mr. Wallace's deviations from the sphere of natural science, in which he has done such admirable work, have hitherto, if we mistake not, led him to adopt the doctrines of Spiritualists, Protectionists, and confiscators of that equity, unlike law, more than a portion of the earth's surface. Mr. Herbert Mills said, in an address before the Law and Communist Society, that the Crown is the landlord, without power to evict him, that the Crown is the landlord, without power to evict him, and that all land legislation shall be so framed as to "enact and give effect to this fundamental principle of personal manumit State sovereignty." If Mr. Wallace were made to-morrow "absolute owner" of the soil of England, according to the sense in which that term may be applied to the Crown, does he suppose that any one would give him sixpence for his legal right? As for the "State," it is not owner of the land at all, except in so far as it can forcibly appropriate, with or without compensation, any landowner. It is equally competent to take from Mr. Wallace the copyright of his books, the house that he lives in, and the clothes that he wears.

Why the Land Nationalisation Society should quote from Spenel to the effect that "the tenant or vassal hath "nothing in the property of the soil itself, but it remaineth "entirely with the lord," we must profess ourselves unable to understand the bearing of the question raised by the "State," it is not owner of the land at all, except in so far as it can forcibly appropriate, with or without compensation, any landowner. It is equally competent to take from Mr. Wallace the copyright of his books, the house that he lives in, and the clothes that he wears.
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