



Written by [Tom DeWeese](#) on July 30, 2026

The Scheme to Eliminate Private Property and Reorganize Human Society

"The moment the idea is admitted into society that property is not as sacred as the laws of God, and that there is not a force of law and public justice to protect it, anarchy and tyranny commence." — Founding Father John Adams.

Today, the very root of our nation's freedom, prosperity, and private property ownership by individual citizens, is under attack across the nation. Eminent domain is the weapon of choice to allow private corporations to simply take property at will under the excuse of the "common good." Wind and solar farms, carbon capture pipelines, and massive AI data centers now cover vital farmland and private neighborhoods. The property owners are given no choice in the matter. It's gone. How is that possible in a nation built on the very concept of private property ownership and protection?



AP Images
Susette Kelo's little pink house

For decades we have faced the globally organized juggernaut called "Sustainable" designed by powerful forces to completely change and control human society. However, from the very beginning of the plan our nation, which is based on the very concept of private property, has stood in the way.

Now, today, the tool every tyrant has ever dreamed of for complete control is in their hands – AI! So, the train for control is ready to leave the station, but the way is blocked by those infernal property rights! What to do to allow tyranny to commence?

Well, the real answer was found just over twenty years ago and is now in full swing. Here is the story. It started with five black robes named Stevens, Souter, Ginsburg, Kennedy, and Breyer. In 2005, the Supreme Court of the United States handed down an opinion that shocked the nation.

It was the case of *Susette Kelo, et al. v City of New London, Connecticut, et al.* The issue: "The government taking of property from one private owner to give to another private entity for economic development constitutes a permissible 'public use' under the Fifth Amendment."

In 2000, the city of New London saw a chance to rake in big bucks through tax revenues for a new downtown development project that was to be anchored by pharmaceutical giant Pfizer. The company announced a plan to build a \$270 million global research facility in the city.

The local government jumped at the chance to transform 90 acres of an area right next to the proposed research facility. Their plans called for the creation of the Fort Trumbull development project to provide hotels, housing and shopping areas for the expected influx of Pfizer employees.



Written by [Tom DeWeese](#) on July 30, 2026

There were going to be jobs and revenues A-Go-Go in New London. Just one obstacle stood in the way of these grand plans. There were private homes in that space.

No muss — no fuss. The city fathers had a valuable tool in their favor. They would just issue an edict that they were taking the land by eminent domain. To get started, the city created a private development corporation to lead the project. Its first priority was to obtain the needed property.

Put yourself in the shoes of the homeowners in that targeted neighborhood. You bought a home for your family. It's a place you could afford in a neighborhood you liked. The children made friends. You intended to stay for the rest of your life.

However, as you planted your garden, landscaped the yard, put up a swing set for the kids, and molded your land into a home, unknown to you, certain city officials were meeting around a table with developers. In front of them were maps and photographs of your home. They talked about dollars. Big dollars. Tax revenues for the city, huge profits for the developer. Expensive condos, hotels, and a shopping center with all the trimmings began to take shape.

You weren't asked for input or permission. You weren't even notified that your home was targeted until the whole project was finalized and the only minor detail was to get rid of you.

Susette Kelo bought a nice little pink house in that quiet neighborhood now targeted in New London. Little did she imagine that warm, comfy place would soon become the center of a firestorm. She'd spent a considerable amount of money and time fixing up her little pink house, a home with a beautiful view of the bay. She planted flowers in the yard, braided her own rugs for the floors, filled the rooms with antiques, and created the home she wanted.

Less than a year later, the trouble started. A real estate broker suddenly showed up on her door representing an unknown client. Susette said she wasn't interested in selling. The realtor's demeanor then changed with a warning that the property was going to be condemned by the city. Then, one year later, on the day before Thanksgiving, the sheriff taped a letter to her door, stating that her home had been condemned by the City of New London.

Then the pressure began. A notice came in the mail telling her that the city intended to take her land. An offer of compensation was made, but it was below the market price. The explanation given was that, since the government was going to take the land, it was no longer worth the old market price. Therefore, the lower price was "just compensation," as called for in the Fifth Amendment. It was a "fair price," the homeowners were told repeatedly.

Some neighbors quickly gave up, took the money and moved away. With the loss of each one, the pressure mounted. Visits from government agents became routine. They knocked on the door at all hours to demand that Susette sell. Newspaper articles depicted her as unreasonably holding up community progress. They called her greedy. Finally, the bulldozers moved in on the properties already sold. As they crushed down the houses, the neighborhood became unlivable. It looked like a war zone.

When a homeowner caved in and sold, the house was immediately crushed by the bulldozer. The next homeowner then came under great pressure to sell. More phone calls, threatening letters, visits by city officials at all hours, demanding they sign the contract to sell. Finally, the intimidation began to break down the most dedicated homeowners' resolve. In tears, they gave in and sold. Amazingly, once they sold, the homeowners were then classified as "willing sellers!" As each house was bulldozed the monster machine was moved next door to the next house, sitting there like a huffing, puffing dragon, ready to strike.



Written by [Tom DeWeese](#) on July 30, 2026

Eventually Susette's little pink house stood nearly alone in the middle of a destruction site. Over 80 homes were gone, seven remained. As if under attack by a conquering army, she was finally surrounded, with no place to run but to the courts. The United States was built on the very premise of the protection of private property rights. How could a government possibly be allowed to take anyone's home for private gain? Surely justice would finally prevail.

Under any circumstances the actions of the New London government and its sham development corporation should have been considered criminal behavior. It used to be. If city officials were caught padding their own pockets, or those of their friends, it was considered graft. That's why RICO laws were created.

Finally, her case was heard by the highest court in the land. It was such an obvious case of government overreach against private property owners that no one considered there was a chance of New London winning. The city was backed in its appeal by the National League of Cities, one of the largest proponents of eminent domain use, saying the policy was critical to spurring urban renewal with development projects.

Property-rights legal foundations, particularly the Institute for Justice, came to Susette's rescue to serve as her advocate before the high court. They were joined by a wide array of groups such as the American Association of Retired Persons (AARP) and the late Martin Luther King Jr.'s Southern Christian Leadership Conference. Truly this was seen as a civil rights case.

The Supreme Court had always stood with the founders of the nation on the vital importance of private property. There was precedent after precedent to back up the optimism that they would do so again. However, to the shock of everyone involved, private property rights sustained a near death blow that day.

This time, five black robes named Stevens, Souter, Ginsburg, Kennedy, and Breyer shocked the nation by ruling that officials who had behaved like Tony Soprano were in the right and Susette Kelo had no ground to stand on, literally or figuratively.

These four men and one woman ruled that the United States Constitution is meaningless as a tool to protect individuals against the wants and desires of government. Their ruling in the Kelo case declared that Americans own nothing. After deciding that any property is subject to the whim of a government official, it was just a short trip to declaring that government could now confiscate anything we own, anything we create, anything we've worked for — in the name of an undefined common good.

In defending the decision, Justice John Paul Stevens simply wrote, "Promoting economic development is a traditional and long accepted function of government." He mentioned not a word about the long tradition of government in the United States that had always stood for the rights of the individual. Not surprisingly, *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post* supported the decision.

Justice Sandra Day O'Connor, who opposed the Court's decision, vigorously rebutted Stevens' argument, as she wrote in dissent of the majority opinion, "The specter of condemnation hangs over all property. Nothing is to prevent the state from replacing a Motel 6 with a Ritz-Carlton, any home with a shopping mall, or any farm with a factory."

Justice Clarence Thomas issued his own rebuttal to the decision, specifically attacking the argument that this was a case about "public use." He accused the majority of replacing the Fifth Amendment's "Public Use" clause with a very different "Public Purpose" test. Said Justice Thomas, "This deferential shift in phraseology enables the Court to hold, against all common sense, that a costly urban-renewal



Written by [Tom DeWeese](#) on July 30, 2026

project whose stated purpose is a vague promise of new jobs and increased tax revenue, but which is also suspiciously agreeable to the Pfizer Corporation, is for a ‘public use’.”

Incredibly, after the Supreme Court decision that literally destroyed the nation’s oldest and most revered right of private property ownership, it turned out that the entire action by the New London government had been for absolutely nothing. There was no great “revitalization” of downtown. No jobs. No development. Nope. The New London development was never completed. The proposed hotel-retail-condo “urban village” was never built. The developer failed to come up with the necessary funds. Pfizer, whose employees were supposed to be the clientele for the project, pulled out and abandoned their planned research facility. Instead, they decided to merge with a new partner, Wyeth. Rather than completing the New London project, the two pharmaceutical giants decided to create a combined facility in another city.

The land where Susette Kelo’s little pink house once stood remains undeveloped to this day. In the aftermath of 2011’s Hurricane Irene, the now-closed New London redevelopment area was turned into a dump for storm debris such as tree branches and other vegetation. No tax revenues are generated by the now-wasteland of government greed. But the precedent of the *Kelo* decision for government takings of land across the nation has grown to unimaginable levels.

So, in a five to four vote, the Supreme Court said that it was okay for a community to use eminent domain to take private land or destroy and reorganize an entire neighborhood, *if* it benefited the community in a positive way. Specifically, “positive” meant unquestioned government control and more tax dollars.

The *Kelo* decision changed the rules. The precedent was set. Land can now be taken anytime at the whim of a power elite. The tyrants now have the tool for control they’ve always dreamed of. The tyrants call it the common good! Mission accomplished.

About Tom DeWeese:

Tom DeWeese is founder and president of the American Policy Center and an internationally recognized expert on the issue of Sustainable Development and its attack on private property. He is the author of three books, including *Now Tell Me I Was Wrong*, *ERASE*, and *Sustainable: The WAR on Free Enterprise, Private Property, and Individuals*.





Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative,
non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



Subscribe

What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.