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FOREWORD

It is with great pleasure that I recommend to the reader this fascinating book. I had the honour of supervising the doctoral research by its author, Dr Chuanhui Wang, and never regretted accepting that task. There are several reasons why this book is fascinating and could be of interest to many lawyers and scholars. First of all, it provides an excellent insight into the historical development of law, politics and practice concerning the legal status of land and property in land in China since 1949. It explains a lot for anyone interested in the history of China, but also for those interested in the development of law and politics concerning land in any contemporary society, given its interesting analysis of the different social forces that influence this development. Understanding this history is also necessary in order to understand which reforms or developments are likely to be possible or not, or may have success or not, in contemporary China. Second, the book confronts different constitutional models and practices concerning the protection of property – especially the American, Chinese and Indian models and to some extent the German one – and shows their strengths and weaknesses in a comparative analysis, remaining at the same time well aware of the different historical and socio-economic contexts of these models. The author does not limit his analysis – as is often the case – to the law as it is written; he examines the implementation and application of the law in concreto and the difficulties encountered in realising the constitutional principles. The book also develops rather detailed practical reform proposals for China that are at the same time sufficiently ambitious and sufficiently realistic. The author is thus able to make those proposals that may in practice make a real difference for the protection of property in China and many other countries confronted with similar questions. For all these reasons, the book and the author deserve a wide audience.
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