

2006

## A Bibliography of Sources on “Public Use” in Eminent Domain

Lauren A. Wiggins

Timothy Sandefur

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.chapman.edu/chapman-law-review>

---

### Recommended Citation

Lauren A. Wiggins & Timothy Sandefur, *A Bibliography of Sources on “Public Use” in Eminent Domain*, 10 CHAP. L. REV. 235 (2006).  
Available at: <http://digitalcommons.chapman.edu/chapman-law-review/vol10/iss1/5>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Fowler School of Law at Chapman University Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Chapman Law Review by an authorized administrator of Chapman University Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [laughtin@chapman.edu](mailto:laughtin@chapman.edu).

## A Bibliography of Sources on “Public Use” in Eminent Domain

*Lauren A. Wiggins\* and Timothy Sandefur\*\**

### 1840

Note, *Constitution of the State of South Carolina and of the United States*, 22 AM. JURIST & L. MAG. 434 (1840).

### 1871

Note, *Municipal Aid to Railroads*, 5 AM. L. REV. 754 (1871).

### 1872

Comment, *Is the Iowa Law, That “Cattle are Free Commoners,” Constitutional?*, 6 W. JURIST 297 (1872).

### 1873

Comment, *The Taking and Flowage of Lands for Mill Purposes*, 7 ALB. L.J. 305 (1873).

### 1885

Comment, *Eminent Domain—Public Use*, 32 ALB. L.J. 477 (1885).

Note, *Eminent domain can only be exercised for—Legislature of Missouri has no power to authorize city to issue bonds for private benefit—Public use*, 19 AM. L. REV. 313 (1885).

### 1891

Alfred Roland Haig, *The Law of Eminent Domain in Pennsylvania*, 39 AM. L. REG. 449 (1891).

Note, *Eminent Domain—Powers of Cemetery Associations—Constitutional Law*, 44 ALB. L.J. 527 (1891).

### 1894

Charles C. Dickinson, *Leading Limitations upon the Exercise of*

---

\* First Year Law Student, U.C. Davis School of Law.

\*\* Staff Attorney, Pacific Legal Foundation. J.D. 2002, Chapman University School of Law; B.A. 1998, Hillsdale College.

236

*Chapman Law Review*

[Vol. 10:235]

*the Right of Eminent Domain*, 1 CORNELL L.J. 1 (1894).

**1896**

Leonard M. Daggett, *Taking Corporate Shares by Right of Eminent Domain*, 5 YALE L.J. 205 (1896).

**1900**

JOHN LEWIS, A TREATISE ON THE LAW OF EMINENT DOMAIN IN THE UNITED STATES (2d ed. 1900).

**1902**

Note, *The Extent of the Power of Eminent Domain*, 15 HARV. L. REV. 399 (1902).

**1903**

Comment, *Due Process of Law*, 37 AM. L. REV. 801 (1903).

Hon. Alton B. Parker, *Due Process of Law*, 11 AM. LAW. 431 (1903).

Christopher G. Tiedeman, *Government Ownership of Public Utilities*, 16 HARV. L. REV. 476 (1903).

**1906**

Note, *Public Use in Eminent Domain*, 6 COLUM. L. REV. 46 (1906).

**1909**

PHILIP NICHOLS, THE POWER OF EMINENT DOMAIN (1909).

Edward S. Corwin, *The Supreme Court and the Fourteenth Amendment*, 7 MICH. L. REV. 643 (1909).

**1910**

Book Note, 10 COLUM. L. REV. 491 (1910) (reviewing PHILIP NICHOLS, THE POWER OF EMINENT DOMAIN (1909)).

Note, *Constitutional Law—Eminent Domain—Public Use*, 10 COLUM. L. REV. 665 (1910).

**1912**

Francis J. Swayze, *Judicial Construction of the Fourteenth Amendment*, 26 HARV. L. REV. 1 (1912).

**1914**

Note, *Restrictions upon Property Adjacent to Public Parks*, 27

2006] *Bibliography ("Public Use")* 237

HARV. L. REV. 486 (1914).

Note, *Estates in Fee Simple—Determinable Fees in America—Property Taken by Eminent Domain*, 27 HARV. L. REV. 388 (1914).

Comment, *Public Use in Eminent Domain*, 23 YALE L.J. 274 (1914).

H. C. K., *Constitutional Law: Limitation of the Fourteenth Amendment on the Eminent Domain Power of the States in Comment on Recent Cases*, 2 CAL. L. REV. 318 (1914).

### 1917

Book Note, 65 U. PA. L. REV. 711 (1917) (reviewing PHILIP NICHOLS, *THE LAW OF EMINENT DOMAIN* (2d ed. 1917)).

Edward S. Corwin, *The Extension of Judicial Review in New York: 1783–1905*, 15 MICH. L. REV. 281 (1917).

PHILIP NICHOLS, *THE LAW OF EMINENT DOMAIN* (2d ed. 1917).

### 1918

Comment, *What Constitutes a Public Use*, 32 HARV. L. REV. 169 (1918).

### 1920

Comment, *Actionable Injuries in Street Regulation*, 33 HARV. L. REV. 451 (1920).

Comment, *Condemnation of Property Against Use for Apartment Building*, 18 MICH. L. REV. 523 (1920).

William E. Britton, *Constitutional Changes in Eminent Domain in Illinois*, 2 U. ILL. L. BULL. 479 (1920).

Note, *Necessity for Acquiring Property Sought to be Condemned*, 15 ILL. L. REV. 278 (1920).

### 1921

Note, *Eminent Domain—Public Use—Condemnation of Property Already Devoted to Public Use*, 7 VA. L. REV. 656 (1921).

### 1927

Comment, *Constitutional Law—Eminent Domain—Michigan Constitutional Provision*, 26 MICH. L. REV. 194 (1927).

### 1928

Annotation, *Public Benefit or Convenience as Distinguished from*

238

*Chapman Law Review*

[Vol. 10:235]

*Use by the Public as Ground for the Exercise of the Power of Eminent Domain*, 54 A.L.R. 7 (1928).

**1929**

Note, *Constitutional Law—Due Process—Excess Condemnation*, 29 COLUM. L. REV. 1151 (1929).

Edgar Bronson Tolman, *Eminent Domain—Taking for Public Use—Places of Historical Interest*, 15 A.B.A. J. 291 (1929).

**1930**

T. D. Havran, *Eminent Domain and the Police Power*, 5 NOTRE DAME LAW. 380 (1930).

M. R. Konvitz, Note, *Municipal Corporations—Eminent Domain—Limitations*, 7 N.Y.U. L. Q. REV. 743 (1930).

**1931**

Joseph M. Cormack, *Legal Concepts in Cases of Eminent Domain*, 41 YALE L.J. 221 (1931).

**1935**

Note, *Constitutional Law: Slum Clearance and Eminent Domain*, 20 CORNELL L.Q. 486 (1935).

Note, *The Power of a State to Condemn Land for a Federal Park*, 44 YALE L.J. 1458 (1935).

T. S. McPheeters, Jr., Note, *“Public Use” in Federal Eminent Domain*, 20 ST. LOUIS L. REV. 140 (1935).

Samuel L. Samuel, Comment, *State and Federal Power of Eminent Domain*, 4 GEO. WASH. L. REV. 130 (1935).

**1936**

Note, *Slum Clearance and Low-Cost Housing Program as Public Use*, 35 MICH. L. REV. 148 (1936).

John W. Brabner-Smith & V. Joyce Brabner-Smith, *The National Housing Program*, 30 ILL. L. REV. 557 (1936).

Note, *Eminent Domain for Slum Clearance Purposes*, 5 GEO. WASH. L. REV. 131 (1936).

Note, *Eminent Domain: Slum Clearance and Low-Cost Housing Program As Public Use*, 22 CORNELL L.Q. 161 (1936).

**1937**

Robert H. Skilton, *Governmental Efforts in Slum Clearance*, 11

2006] *Bibliography ("Public Use")* 239

TEMP. L.Q. 538 (1937).

Wayne E. Babler, Comment, *Public Housing and Slum Clearance as a "Public Use,"* 36 MICH. L. REV. 275 (1937).

### 1938

J. B. Steiner, *Excess Condemnation,* 3 MO. L. REV. 1 (1938).

### 1940

Note, *Validity of California Housing Acts,* 8 GEO. WASH. L. REV. 862 (1940).

Recent Case, *Power of the United States to Condemn Land Devoted by a State to a Public Use,* 24 MINN. L. REV. 870 (1940).

Philip Nichols, *Condemnation for Public Housing,* 5 LEGAL NOTES ON LOC. GOV'T 122 (1940).

Philip Nichols, Jr., *The Meaning of Public Use in the Law of Eminent Domain,* 20 B.U. L. REV. 615 (1940).

Robert P. Kneeland, Recent Decision, *Power of the Federal Government to Condemn Land in Public Use for an Inconsistent Federal Use,* 39 MICH. L. REV. 163 (1940).

### 1941

Robert Keeton, Note, *Constitutionality of Low-Cost Housing and Slum-Clearance Legislation,* 19 TEX. L. REV. 181 (1941).

### 1942

Arthur Lenhoff, *Development of the Concept of Eminent Domain,* 42 COLUM. L. REV. 596 (1942).

Myres S. McDougal & Addison A. Mueller, *Public Purpose in Public Housing: An Anachronism Reburied,* 52 YALE L.J. 42 (1942).

### 1944

Comment, *Urban Redevelopment,* 54 YALE L.J. 116 (1944).

### 1945

Julius H. Miner, *Some Constitutional Aspects of Housing Legislation,* 39 ILL. L. REV. 305 (1945).

### 1946

Note, *Public Use in Eminent Domain,* 21 N.Y.U. L.Q. REV. 285 (1946).

240

*Chapman Law Review*

[Vol. 10:235]

**1947**

Andrew L. Weil & Amelia Scigliano, Comment, *Urban Redevelopment*, 9 U. PITT. L. REV. 74 (1947).

Note, *Eminent Domain*, 22 IND. L.J. 346 (1947).

**1948**

Harold Gondelman & Edward T. Tait, Note, *A Municipal Transit Authority for Pittsburgh: A Solution if Bankruptcy Reorganization Fails*, 10 U. PITT. L. REV. 29 (1948).

Note, *Applicability of the Fourteenth Amendment to Private Organizations*, 61 HARV. L. REV. 344 (1948).

**1949**

Note, *Eminent Domain—Public Use—Necessity*, 20 TENN. L. REV. 624 (1949).

Note, *The Public Use Limitation on Eminent Domain: An Advance Requiem*, 58 YALE L.J. 599 (1949).

William H. Brown, Jr., *Urban Redevelopment*, 29 B.U. L. REV. 318 (1949).

James S. Holmberg, Comment, *Municipal Powers and the Public Purpose Doctrine*, 21 ROCKY MOUNTAIN L. REV. 277 (1949).

**1950**

Lloyd S. Elkins, Jr., Note, *Power to Condemn Dwelling-houses and Surrounding Premises for Highway Purposes*, 28 N.C. L. REV. 403 (1950).

JULIUS L. SACKMAN & RUSSELL D. VAN BRUNT, NICHOLS' THE LAW OF EMINENT DOMAIN (3d ed. 1950).

**1951**

Morree Levine, Note, *Public Use, Public Policy and Recent Developments in the Law of Eminent Domain*, 1 BUFF. L. REV. 147 (1951).

**1952**

Charles J. Fain, *The Use of the Power of Eminent Domain by Missouri Electric Cooperatives*, 17 MO. L. REV. 159 (1952).

**1953**

Note, *Incentives to Industrial Relocation: The Municipal*

2006] *Bibliography ("Public Use")* 241

*Industrial Bond Plans*, 66 HARV. L. REV. 898 (1953).

Marvin H. Kraus, Recent Case, *Urban Redevelopment Projects*, 22 U. CIN. L. REV. 514 (1953).

Daniel R. Mandelker, *Public Purpose in Urban Redevelopment*, 28 TUL. L. REV. 96 (1953).

#### 1954

Comment, "Conservation"—A New Area for Urban Redevelopment, 21 U. CHI. L. REV. 489 (1954).

Charles F. Barnwell, Note, *Slum Clearance and Public Housing*, 3 J. PUB. L. 261 (1954).

Robert Kratovil & Frank J. Harrison, Jr., *Eminent Domain—Policy and Concept*, 42 CAL. L. REV. 596 (1954).

Walter Marston Sharman, *Some Recent Developments in Community Redevelopment Laws*, 6 HASTINGS L.J. 80 (1954).

#### 1955

Note, *Public Use as a Limitation on Eminent Domain in Urban Renewal*, 68 HARV. L. REV. 1422 (1955).

Patricia Frohman, Recent Case, *Public Parking Facilities—Failure to Control Rates Charged as Determinative of Public Use*, 23 GEO. WASH. L. REV. 778 (1955).

Corwin W. Johnson, *Constitutional Law and Community Planning*, 20 LAW & CONTEMP. PROBS. 199 (1955).

Donald F. Oosterhouse, Recent Decision, *Public Use Requirement and the Power of Eminent Domain*, 53 MICH. L. REV. 883 (1955).

#### 1956

Recent Case, *Condemnation of Property for Lease of Parking Facilities to Private Operators is for Public Use Despite Preclusion of State Control Over Parking Rates*, 104 U. PA. L. REV. 1114 (1956).

Gardner Cromwell, *Condemnation and Redevelopment*, 28 ROCKY MOUNTAIN L. REV. 535 (1956).

Bernard V. Fultz, Comment, *Billboard Regulation in Ohio*, 17 OHIO ST. L.J. 116 (1956).

#### 1957

Jack J. Kitchin, Note, *What is a Public Use in Eminent Domain?*, 4 ST. LOUIS U. L.J. 316 (1957).



242

*Chapman Law Review*

[Vol. 10:235]

**1958**

Roger P. Marquis, *Constitutional and Statutory Authority to Condemn*, 43 IOWA L. REV. 170 (1958).

**1959**

Duncan S. MacAffer, Note, *What Constitutes a Public Use*, 23 ALB. L. REV. 386 (1959).

**1960**

George F. Fox, Jr., Note, *Power of Urban Redevelopment Agency to Condemn Private Property for Resale to Private Individuals*, 34 TUL. L. REV. 616 (1960).

**1961**

Jan Z. Krasnowiecki & James C. N. Paul, *The Preservation of Open Space in Metropolitan Areas*, 110 U. PA. L. REV. 179 (1961).

**1962**

Allison Dunham, *Griggs v. Allegheny County in Perspective: Thirty Years of Supreme Court Expropriation Law*, 1962 SUP. CT. REV. 63 (1962).

Harold E. Hurst, *Constitutional Law: The Validity of Urban Renewal in Colorado*, 39 DICTA 149 (1962).

Recent Decision, *Condemnation to Prevent Incipient Blight of Area*, 29 BROOK. L. REV. 160 (1962).

**1963**

Stephen S. Boynton, Note, *Components of Eminent Domain: An Ancient Tool for Contemporary Use*, 15 S.C. L. REV. 943 (1963).

Note, *Condemnation of Private Property for a Non-Public Purpose*, 9 N.Y. L.F. 364 (1963).

Ernest M. Haddad, Note, *Constitutional Restrictions on the Use of Public Authorities in the New England States*, 43 B.U. L. REV. 122 (1963).

Frank J. Miele, Recent Decision, *Condemnation of Predominantly Vacant Area with No Physical Blight*, 38 NOTRE DAME LAW. 210 (1963).

**1964**

Note, *State Constitutional Limitations on the Power of Eminent Domain*, 77 HARV. L. REV. 717 (1964).

MARTIN ANDERSON, THE FEDERAL BULLDOZER: A CRITICAL

2006] *Bibliography ("Public Use")* 243

ANALYSIS OF URBAN RENEWAL, 1949–1962 (1964).

John S. Detlor, *Public Use—Why and What: Why Is "Public Use" Required*, 3 WILLAMETTE L.J. 11 (1964).

Hans Linde, *Justice Douglas on Freedom in the Welfare State: Constitutional Rights in the Public Sector*, 39 WASH. L. REV. 4 (1964).

Roger L. McManus, Recent Decision, *Broader Powers to Take Private Property for Public Use*, 62 MICH. L. REV. 1065 (1964).

Joseph L. Sax, *Takings and the Police Power*, 74 YALE L.J. 36 (1964).

John Allen Stephens, "Public Use" for Purposes of Eminent Domain, in *Iowa*, 13 DRAKE L. REV. 95 (1964).

### 1965

Note, *Taking of a Fee Simple for Obtaining Construction Materials for Highway*, 50 IOWA L. REV. 1270 (1965).

Recent Development, *Purely Economic Justifications Sufficient to Permit Exercise of Federal Eminent Domain Power—United States v. Certain Parcels of Land*, 64 MICH. L. REV. 347 (1965).

Note, "Public Use" as a Limitation on the Exercise of the Eminent Domain Power by Private Entities, 50 IOWA L. REV. 799 (1965).

W. Paul Gormley, *Urban Redevelopment to Further Aesthetic Considerations: The Changing Constitutional Concepts of Police Power and Eminent Domain*, 41 N.D. L. REV. 316 (1965).

Julius L. Sackman, *The Right to Condemn*, 29 ALB. L. REV. 177 (1965).

Michael J. Schimberg, Recent Decision, *Economic Saving to the Government as the Sole Motivation for the Taking*, 40 NOTRE DAME LAW. 234 (1965).

J. Michael Warren, Comment, *Conservation and Rehabilitation of Housing: An Idea Approaches Adolescence*, 63 MICH. L. REV. 892 (1965).

Harold Wimberly, Comment, *Compensation for Public Use—Congressional Action and the Fifth Amendment*, 32 TENN. L. REV. 615 (1965).

### 1966

Daniel B. Benbow, *Public Use as a Limitation on the Power of Eminent Domain in Texas*, 44 TEX. L. REV. 1499 (1966).

Harold D. Colston, Note, *Public Use in North Carolina*, 44 N.C. L. REV. 1142 (1966).

James J. Costello, *Challenging the Right to Condemn*, 1966 U. ILL. L.F. 52 (1966).

Ralph W. Dau, Comment, *Problems in Condemnation of Property Devoted to Public Use*, 44 TEX. L. REV. 1517 (1966).

J. Harold Mimbs, Comment, *The Meaning of the Term "Public Use"—Its Effect on Excess Condemnation*, 18 MERCER L. REV. 274 (1966).

Eugene J. Morris et al., *Variations in Land Use Controls*, 1 REAL PROP. PROB. & TR. J. 431 (1966).

Michael Nachwalter, *Substantive Due Process in Florida*, 21 U. MIAMI L. REV. 99 (1966).

Robert Tate, Note, *Requirement of Public Use for Expenditure of Public Funds: A Reappraisal of the Narrow Doctrine*, 28 U. PITT. L. REV. 329 (1966).

### 1967

Edward R. Lawrence, Jr., *Leasing of Air Space Above Public Buildings—The Public Use Doctrine and Other Problems*, 28 U. PITT. L. REV. 661 (1967).

Emerson G. Spies, *Property*, 53 VA. L. REV. 223 (1967).

Hazel Armenta Straub, Note, *Diminishing Property Rights*, 69 W. VA. L. REV. 170 (1967).

Larry A. Strickland, Note, *Condemnation of Private Property Which Is to be Traded for Property Needed in a Public Project Is Unconstitutional*, 5 HOUS. L. REV. 198 (1967).

### 1968

David L. Callies, *Commonwealth of Puerto Rico v. Rosso: Land Banking and the Expanded Concept of Public Use*, 2 PROSPECTUS 199 (1968).

Roger A. Cunningham, *Scenic Easements in the Highway Beautification Program*, 45 DENVER L.J. 167 (1968).

Wm. Ronald Hulen, *Abusive Exercises of the Power of Eminent Domain—Taking a Look at What the Taker Took*, 44 WASH. L. REV. 200 (1968).

Laurence V. Senn, Jr., Note, *The Public Use Requirement*, 46 N.C. L. REV. 663 (1968).

### 1969

Comment, *The Public Use Doctrine: "Advance Requiem" Revisited*, 1969 LAW & SOC. ORD. 688 (1969).

2006] *Bibliography ("Public Use")* 245

Robert E. Capron, *Excess Condemnation in California—A Further Expansion of the Right to Take*, 20 HASTINGS L.J. 571 (1969).

### 1970

John D. Johnston, Jr., *Land Use Control*, 1969/70 ANN. SURV. AM. L. 49 (1970).

John D. Johnston, Jr., *Developments in Land Use Control*, 45 NOTRE DAME LAW. 399 (1970).

Henry W. McGee, Jr., *Urban Renewal in the Crucible of Judicial Review*, 56 VA. L. REV. 826 (1970).

### 1972

Martin J. King, Comment, *Rex Non Protest Peccare??? The Decline and Fall of the Public Use Limitation on Eminent Domain*, 76 DICK. L. REV. 266 (1972).

### 1978

Lawrence Berger, *The Public Use Requirement in Eminent Domain*, 57 OR. L. REV. 203 (1978).

### 1980

Errol E. Meindinger, *The "Public Uses" of Eminent Domain: History and Policy*, 11 ENVTL. L. 1 (1980).

### 1983

Susan Crabtree, Note, *Public Use in Eminent Domain: Are There Limits After Oakland Raiders and Poletown?*, 20 CAL. W. L. REV. 82 (1983).

Steven M. Crafton, Comment, *Taking the Oakland Raiders: A Theoretical Reconsideration of the Concepts of Public Use and Just Compensation*, 32 EMORY L.J. 857 (1983).

Laura Mansnerus, Note, *Public Use, Private Use, and Judicial Review in Eminent Domain*, 58 N.Y.U. L. REV. 409 (1983).

Thomas Ross, *Transferring Land to Private Entities by the Power of Eminent Domain*, 51 GEO. WASH. L. REV. 355 (1983).

### 1984

Note, *Takings Clause*, 98 HARV. L. REV. 225 (1984).

William Epstein, *The Public Purpose Limitation on the Power of Eminent Domain: A Constitutional Liberty Under Attack*, 4 PACE L. REV. 231 (1984).

Cass R. Sunstein, *Naked Preferences and the Constitution*, 84 COLUM. L. REV. 1689, 1723–27 (1984).

### 1985

Thomas J. Coyne, Note, *Hawaii Housing Authority v. Midkiff: A Final Requiem for the Public Use Limitation on Eminent Domain?*, 60 NOTRE DAME L. REV. 388 (1985).

James Geoffrey Durham, *Efficient Just Compensation as a Limit on Eminent Domain*, 69 MINN. L. REV. 1277 (1985).

RICHARD A. EPSTEIN, *TAKINGS: PRIVATE PROPERTY AND THE POWER OF EMINENT DOMAIN* (1985).

Mark C. Landry, Note, *The Public Use Requirement in Eminent Domain—A Requiem*, 60 TUL. L. REV. 419 (1985).

### 1986

Russell A. Brine, Note, *Containing the Effect of Hawaii Housing Authority v. Midkiff on Takings for Private Industry*, 71 CORNELL L. REV. 428 (1986).

Amy E. Kellogg, Note, *Hawaii Housing Authority v. Midkiff: The Continued Validity of the Public Use Doctrine*, 47 OHIO ST. L.J. 521 (1986).

Thomas W. Merrill, *The Economics of Public Use*, 72 CORNELL L. REV. 61 (1986).

### 1988

Monica Whalen, *The Case of Eastlake Stalls: Washington's State of Confusion Regarding the Public Use Limitation on Eminent Domain* (March 1988) (unpublished student research paper, University of Washington School of Law) (on file with Marian Gallagher Law Library, University of Washington School of Law).

### 1993

Dennis J. Coyle, *Takings Jurisprudence and the Political Cultures of American Politics*, 42 CATH. U. L. REV. 817 (1993).

Jan G. Laitos, *The Public Use Paradox and the Takings Clause*, 13 J. ENERGY NAT. RESOURCES & ENVTL. L. 9 (1993).

Jed Rubinfeld, *Usings*, 102 YALE L.J. 1077 (1993).

Glen E. Summers, Comment, *Private Property Without Lochner: Toward a Takings Jurisprudence Uncorrupted by Substantive Due Process*, 142 U. PA. L. REV. 837 (1993).

2006] *Bibliography ("Public Use")* 247

### 1994

Thomas Darren Barker, Comment, *Public Use, Private Taking and Economic Growth or Disney's Latest Eminent Domain-Ticket Attraction*, 21 W. ST. U. L. REV. 547 (1994).

### 1995

Roger Clegg, *Reclaiming the Text of the Takings Clause*, 46 S.C. L. REV. 531 (1995).

Douglas T. Kendall & James E. Ryan, "Paying" for the Change: *Using Eminent Domain to Secure Exactions and Sidestep Nollan and Dolan*, 81 VA. L. REV. 1801 (1995).

Elizabeth A. Taylor, Note, *The Dudley Street Neighborhood Initiative and the Power of Eminent Domain*, 36 B.C. L. REV. 1061 (1995).

### 1996

Kevin L. Cooney, Note, *A Profit for the Taking: Sale of Condemned Property After Abandonment of the Proposed Public Use*, 74 WASH. U. L.Q. 751 (1996).

Buckner F. Melton, Jr., *Eminent Domain, "Public Use," and the Conundrum of Original Intent*, 36 NAT. RESOURCES J. 59 (1996).

### 1998

Donald J. Kochan, "Public Use" and the Independent Judiciary: *Condemnation in an Interest-Group Perspective*, 3 TEX. REV. L. & POL. 49 (1998).

### 1999

Joseph J. Lazzarotti, *Public Use or Public Abuse*, 68 UMKC L. REV. 49 (1999).

Edward D. McKirdy, *The New Eminent Domain: Public Use Defense Vanishing in Wake of Growing Privatization of Power*, 155 N.J. L.J. 1145 (1999).

Jennifer Maude Klemetsrud, Note, *The Use of Eminent Domain for Economic Development*, 75 N.D. L. REV. 783 (1999).

Nathan Alexander Sales, Note, *Classical Republicanism and the Fifth Amendment's "Public Use" Requirement*, 49 DUKE L.J. 339 (1999).

### 2000

Frank Aiello, Note, *Gambling with Condemnation: An Examination of Detroit's Use of Eminent Domain for Riverfront*

*Casinos*, 46 WAYNE L. REV. 1639 (2000).

Tim Benedict, Note, *The Public-Use Requirement in Washington After State ex rel. Washington State Convention & Trade Center v. Evans*, 75 WASH. L. REV. 225 (2000).

Keasha Broussard, Comment, *Social Consequences of Eminent Domain: Urban Revitalization Against the Backdrop of the Takings Clause*, 24 LAW & PSYCHOL. REV. 99 (2000).

Mark A. Graber, *Naked Land Transfers and American Constitutional Development*, 53 VAND. L. REV. 73 (2000).

Stephen J. Jones, Note, *Trumping Eminent Domain Law: An Argument for Strict Scrutiny Analysis Under the Public Use Requirement of the Fifth Amendment*, 50 SYRACUSE L. REV. 285 (2000).

Peter J. Kulick, Comment, *Rolling The Dice: Determining Public Use in Order to Effectuate A "Public-Private Taking"—A Proposal to Redefine "Public Use"*, 2000 L. REV. MICH. ST. U. DETROIT C.L. 639 (2000).

Pioneer Institute for Public Policy Research, *The Power To Take: The Use of Eminent Domain in Massachusetts* White Paper No. 15 (Dec. 2000) (prepared by Michael Malamut).

Lara Womack, *Private Property and the Power of Eminent Domain*, 28 REAL EST. L.J. 307 (2000).

## 2001

Peter Sepulveda, Comment, *The Use of the Eminent Domain Power in the Relocation of Sports Stadiums to Urban Areas: Is the Public Purpose Requirement Satisfied?*, 11 SETON HALL J. SPORT L. 137 (2001).

Derek Werner, Note, *The Public Use Clause, Common Sense and Takings*, 10 B.U. PUB. INT. L.J. 335 (2001).

## 2002

Matthew P. Harrington, *"Public Use" and the Original Understanding of the So-Called "Takings" Clause*, 53 HASTINGS L.J. 1245 (2002).

Brian R. Harris, Note, *Private Road or Public Use? The Landlocked Property Dilemma: A Constitutional and Economic Analysis of Private Road Acts*, 80 U. DET. MERCY L. REV. 149 (2002).

Jennifer J. Kruckeberg, Note, *Can The Government Buy Everything?: The Takings Clause and the Erosion of the "Public Use" Requirement*, 87 MINN. L. REV. 543 (2002).

2006] *Bibliography ("Public Use")* 249

Eric Douglas Larson, *The Walser Decisions and Constitutional Condemnation Conundrums*, 29 WM. MITCHELL L. REV. 499 (2002).

### 2003

DANA BERLINER, PUBLIC POWER, PRIVATE GAIN (2003).

Steve P. Calandrillo, *Eminent Domain Economics: Should "Just Compensation" Be Abolished, and Would "Takings Insurance" Work Instead?*, 64 OHIO ST. L.J. 451 (2003).

Nicole Stelle Garnett, *The Public-Use Question as a Takings Problem*, 71 GEO. WASH. L. REV. 934 (2003).

Nancy K. Kubasek, *Time to Return to Higher Scrutiny in Defining Public Use*, 27 RUTGERS L. REC. 3 (2003).

Camarin Madigan, *Taking for Any Purpose?*, 9 HASTINGS W.-NW J. ENVTL. L. & POL'Y 179 (2003).

Thomas J. Posey, Note, *This Land Is My Land: The Need for a Feasibility Test in Evaluation of Takings for Public Necessity*, 78 CHI.-KENT L. REV. 1403 (2003).

Wendell E. Pritchett, *The "Public Menace" of Blight: Urban Renewal and the Private Uses of Eminent Domain*, 21 YALE L. & POL'Y REV. 1 (2003).

Timothy Sandefur, *A Natural Rights Perspective on Eminent Domain in California: A Rationale for Meaningful Judicial Scrutiny of "Public Use,"* 32 SW. U. L. REV. 569 (2003).

Mary Kay Schuft, Note, *Walser Auto Sales, Inc. v. City of Richfield*, 644 N.W.2d 425 (Minn. 2002): *Why the Minnesota Decision That Seemed So Wrong Was Right*, 26 HAMLINE L. REV. 463 (2003).

Jeffery W. Scott, *Public Use And Private Profit: When Should Heightened Scrutiny Be Applied to "Public-Private" Takings?*, 12 J. AFFORDABLE HOUSING & COMMUNITY DEV. L. 466 (2003).

Jennifer M. Young, Recent Development, *The Constitutionality of a Naked Transfer: Mandatory Lease-to-Fee Conversion's Failure To Satisfy a Requisite Public Purpose in Hawai'i Condominiums*, 25 U. HAW. L. REV. 561 (2003).

### 2004

Alan T. Ackerman, *The Changing Landscape and Recognition of the Public Use Limitation: Is Hathcock the Precursor of Kelo?*, 2004 MICH. ST. L. REV. 1041 (2004).

Mark Brnovich, *Condemning Condemnation: Alternatives to Eminent Domain* (Goldwater Inst., Pol'y Rep. No. 195, 2004).



Eric R. Claeys, *Public-Use Limitations and Natural Property Rights*, 2004 MICH. ST. L. REV. 877 (2004).

Benjamin D. Cramer, Note, *Eminent Domain for Private Development—An Irrational Basis for the Erosion of Property Rights*, 55 CASE W. RES. L. REV. 409 (2004).

Steven J. Eagle, *The Public Use Requirement and Doctrinal Renewal*, 34 ELR 10999 (2004).

Micah Elazar, Comment, *“Public Use” and the Justification of Takings*, 7 U. PA. J. CONST. L. 249 (2004).

James W. Ely, Jr., *Thomas Cooley, “Public Use,” and New Directions in Takings Jurisprudence*, 2004 MICH. ST. L. REV. 845 (2004).

Lee Anne Fennell, *Taking Eminent Domain Apart*, 2004 MICH. ST. L. REV. 957 (2004).

William A. Fischel, *The Political Economy of Public Use in Poletown: How Federal Grants Encourage Excessive Use of Eminent Domain*, 2004 MICH. ST. L. REV. 929 (2004).

Paul Gessing, *Eminent Domain Abuse: If They Can't Tax It, They'll Just Take It*, NATIONAL TAXPAYERS UNION ISSUE BRIEF 148, Aug. 25, 2004, [http://www.ntu.org/main/press\\_issuebriefs\\_printable.php?PressID=636&org\\_name=NTU](http://www.ntu.org/main/press_issuebriefs_printable.php?PressID=636&org_name=NTU).

James E. Krier & Christopher Serkin, *Public Ruses*, 2004 MICH. ST. L. REV. 859 (2004).

Katherine M. McFarland, Note, *Privacy and Property: Two Sides of the Same Coin: The Mandate for Stricter Scrutiny for Government Uses of Eminent Domain*, 14 B.U. PUB. INT. L.J. 142 (2004).

Adam Mossoff, *Foreword: The Death of Poletown: The Future of Eminent Domain and Urban Development after County of Wayne v. Hathcock*, 2004 MICH. ST. L. REV. 837 (2004).

Ralph Nader & Alan Hirsch, *Making Eminent Domain Humane*, 49 VILL. L. REV. 207 (2004).

Keith E. Sealing, *Real Property Law*, 54 SYRACUSE L. REV. 1359 (2004).

Ilya Somin, *Overcoming Poletown: County of Wayne v. Hathcock, Economic Development Takings, and the Future of Public Use*, 2004 MICH. ST. L. REV. 1005 (2004).

Bruce Tepper, *Federal Court Limitations on Redevelopment Agencies*, L.A. LAW., Mar. 2004, at 12.

Corey J. Wilk, *The Struggle Over the Public Use Clause: Survey*

2006] *Bibliography ("Public Use")* 251

*of Holdings and Trends, 1986–2003*, 39 REAL PROP. PROB. & TRUST J. 251 (2004).

## 2005

Peter M. Agnetti, Comment, *Are You Still Master of Your Domain? Abuses of Economic Development Takings, and Michigan's Return to "Public Use" in County of Wayne v. Hathcock*, 79 ST. JOHN'S L. REV. 1259 (2005).

Jacob E. Amir, *A Review of Takings Under Kelo v. New London in Light of General Constitutional Principles and its Impact Upon Zoning Laws Restricting Socially Unacceptable Enterprises*, 32 WESTCHESTER B.J. 13 (2005).

Joshua E. Baker, Note, *Quieting the Clang: Hathcock as a Model of the State-Based Protection of Property Which Kelo Demands*, 14 WM. & MARY BILL RTS. J. 351 (2005).

Steven E. Buckingham, Comment, *The Kelo Threshold: Private Property and Public Use Reconsidered*, 39 U. RICH. L. REV. 1279 (2005).

Kristi M. Burkard, *No More Government Theft of Property! A Call to Return to a Heightened Standard of Review After the United States Supreme Court Decision in Kelo v. City of New London*, 27 HAMLINE J. PUB. L. & POL'Y 115 (2005).

Joel R. Burcat & Elizabeth U. Witmer, *"Fairness and Justice" Ought to Guide the Courts When Reviewing Legislative Determinations of "Public Use"*, 35 ELR 10108 (2005).

David L. Callies, *Public Use: What Should Replace the Rational Basis Test?*, PROB. & PROP., Mar./Apr. 2005, at 14.

Gabriel I. Chacón, *Generalized Economic Benefit is Insufficient Public Use to Justify Eminent Domain Under the Michigan Constitution*, 36 RUTGERS L.J. 1363 (2005).

Trent Christensen, Note, *From Direct "Public Use" to Indirect "Public Benefit": Kelo v. New London's Bridge from Rational Basis to Heightened Scrutiny for Eminent Domain Takings*, 2005 BYU L. REV. 1669 (2005).

Michael J. Coughlin, Comment, *Absolute Deference Leads to Unconstitutional Governance: The Need for a New Public Use Rule*, 54 CATH. U. L. REV. 1001 (2005).

James W. Ely Jr., *A Welcome Blow for Private Property*, PROB. & PROP., Mar./Apr. 2005, at 13.

Richard A. Epstein, *Kelo: An American Original: Of Grubby Particulars & Grand Principles*, 8 GREEN BAG 2d 355 (2005).

Sara B. Falls, Note, *Waking a Sleeping Giant: Revisiting the*

*Public Use Debate Twenty-Five Years After Hawaii Housing Authority v. Midkiff*, 44 WASHBURN L.J. 355 (2005).

Ashley J. Fuhrmeister, Note, *In the Name of Economic Development: Reviving "Public Use" As a Limitation on the Eminent Domain Power in the Wake of Kelo v. City of New London*, 54 DRAKE L. REV. 171 (2005).

Elizabeth F. Gallagher, Note, *Breaking New Ground: Using Eminent Domain for Economic Development*, 73 FORDHAM L. REV. 1837 (2005).

Leah Moren Green, Commentary, *The Erie Canal and the American Imagination: The Erie Canal's Effects on American Legal Development, 1817-1869*, 56 ALA. L. REV. 1167 (2005).

Christopher L. Harris & Daniel J. Lowenberg, *Kelo v. City of New London, Tulare Lake Basin Water Storage District v. United States, and Washoe County v. United States: A Fifth Amendment Takings Primer*, 36 ST. MARY'S L.J. 669 (2005).

Sonya D. Jones, Note, *That Land Is Your Land, This Land Is My Land. . . Until the Local Government Can Turn It for a Profit: A Critical Analysis of Kelo v. City of New London*, 20 BYU J. PUB. L. 139 (2005).

M. Ryan Kirkham, Note, *County of Wayne v. Hathcock: The Resurrection of the Public Use Limitation on the Power of Eminent Domain*, 32 N. KY. L. REV. 215 (2005).

Douglas W. Kmiec & Katherine Kmiec Turner, *Property Lost: The Takings Clause in the 2004 Term*, 8 PREVIEW U.S. SUP. CT. CAS. 471 (2005).

Nancy Kubasek & Garrett Coyle, *A Step Backward is Not Necessarily a Step in the Wrong Direction*, 30 VT. L. REV. 43 (2005).

Rachel A. Lewis, Note, *Strike That, Reverse It: County of Wayne v. Hathcock: Michigan Redefines Implementing Economic Development Through Eminent Domain*, 50 VILL. L. REV. 341 (2005).

Julia D. Mahoney, *Kelo's Legacy: Eminent Domain and the Future of Property Rights*, 2005 SUP. CT. REV. 103 (2005).

John B. Nesbitt, *Local Government*, 55 SYRACUSE L. REV. 1207 (2005).

Brent Nicholson & Sue Ann Mota, *From Public Use to Public Purpose: The Supreme Court Stretches the Takings Clause in Kelo v. City of New London*, 41 GONZ. L. REV. 81 (2005).

Alice M. Noble-Allgire, *Property Scholars Take Up Eminent Domain*, PROB. & PROP., Mar./Apr. 2005, at 11.

2006]

## Bibliography ("Public Use")

253

Arden Reed Pathak, Comment, *The Public Use Doctrine: In Search of a Limitation on the Exercise of Eminent Domain for the Purpose of Economic Development*, 35 CUMB. L. REV. 177 (2005).

Michael Rikon, *Bulldozers at Your Doorstep—The Debris of Kelo v. City of New London*, 7 LIS PENDENS 5 (2005).

Michael A. Ruh, Jr. & Matthew T. Lockaby, *Balancing Private Property Rights with "Public Use": A Survey of Kentucky Courts' Interpretation of the Power of Eminent Domain*, 32 N. KY. L. REV. 743 (2005).

Timothy Sandefur, *A Gleeeful Obituary for Poletown Neighborhood Council v. Detroit*, 28 HARV. J.L. & PUB. POL'Y 651 (2005).

Shelley Ross Saxer, *Eminent Domain, Municipalization, and the Dormant Commerce Clause*, 38 U.C. DAVIS L. REV. 1505 (2005).

Shelley Ross Saxer, *Government Power Unleashed: Using Eminent Domain to Acquire a Public Utility or Other Ongoing Enterprise*, 38 IND. L. REV. 55 (2005).

Glen H. Sturtevant, Jr., Note, *Economic Development as Public Use: Why Justice Ryan's Poletown Dissent Provides a Better Way to Decide Kelo and Future Public Use Cases*, 15 FED. CIR. B.J. 201 (2005).

Alyson Tomme, Note, *Tax Increment Financing: Public Use or Private Abuse?*, 90 MINN. L. REV. 213 (2005).

**2006**

Adrienne Archer, Comment, *Restricting Kelo: Will Redefining "Blight" in Senate Bill 7 Be the Light At the End of the Tunnel?*, 37 ST. MARY'S L.J. 795 (2006).

D. Benjamin Barros, *Home as a Legal Concept*, 46 SANTA CLARA L. REV. 255 (2006).

Randy J. Bates, II, Note, *What's the Use? The Court Takes a Stance on the Public Use Doctrine in Kelo v. City of New London*, 57 MERCER L. REV. 689 (2006).

Haley W. Burton, Note, *Not So Fast: The Supreme Court's Overly Broad Public Use Ruling Condemns Private Property Rights with Surprising Results*, 6 WYO. L. REV. 255 (2006).

Mark C. Christie, *Economic Regulation in the United States: The Constitutional Framework*, 40 U. RICH. L. REV. 949 (2006).

Charles E. Cohen, *Eminent Domain After Kelo v. City of New London: An Argument for Banning Economic Development Takings*, 29 HARV. J.L. & PUB. POL'Y 491 (2006).

Orlando E. Delogu, *Kelo v. City of New London—Wrongly Decided and a Missed Opportunity for Principled Line Drawing with Respect to Eminent Domain Takings*, 58 ME. L. REV. 17 (2006).

James W. Ely Jr., *Kelo: A Setback for Property Owners*, PROB. & PROP., Jan./Feb. 2006, at 14.

Richard A. Epstein, *The Public Use, Public Trust & Public Benefit: Could Both Cooley & Kelo Be Wrong?*, 9 GREEN BAG 2d 125 (2006).

John Fee, *Eminent Domain and the Sanctity of Home*, 81 NOTRE DAME L. REV. 783 (2006).

Matthew Howsare, *Kelo in South Carolina?: Economic Development Is Not a Public Use for Purposes of Eminent Domain in South Carolina*, 57 S.C. L. REV. 505 (2006).

Gideon Kanner, *The Public Use Clause: Constitutional Mandate or “Hortatory Fluff”?*, 33 PEPP. L. REV. 335 (2006).

Bradley C. Karkkainen, *The Police Power Revisited: Phantom Incorporation and the Roots of the Takings “Muddle”*, 90 MINN. L. REV. 826 (2006).

John C. Keene, *When Does A Regulation “Go Too Far?”—The Supreme Court’s Analytical Framework for Drawing the Line between an Exercise of the Police Power And an Exercise of the Power of Eminent Domain*, 14 PENN ST. ENVTL. L. REV. 397 (2006).

Michael A. Lang, Note, *Taking Back Eminent Domain: Using Heightened Scrutiny to Stop Eminent Domain Abuse*, 39 IND. L. REV. 449 (2006).

Honorable Leon D. Lazer, *Takings Cases in the October 2004 Term*, 21 TOURO L. REV. 809 (2006).

Brett D. Liles, Note, *Reconsidering Poletown: In the Wake of Kelo, States Should Move to Restore Private Property Rights*, 48 ARIZ. L. REV. 369 (2006).

Alberto B. Lopez, *Weighing and Reweighing Eminent Domain’s Political Philosophies Post-Kelo*, 41 WAKE FOREST L. REV. 237 (2006).

Michael McKnight, Comment, *“Don’t Know What a Slide Rule Is For:” The Need for a Precise Definition of Public Purpose in North Carolina in the Wake of Kelo v. City of New London*, 28 CAMPBELL L. REV. 291 (2006).

Thomas W. Merrill, *Six Myths About Kelo*, PROB. & PROP., Jan./Feb. 2006, at 19.

S. William Moore, *"Blight" as a Means of Justifying Condemnation for Economic Redevelopment in Florida*, 35 STETSON L. REV. 443 (2006).

Jeffrey B. Mullan, *My Land is Your Land: Re-examining Massachusetts Eminent Domain Law in Light of Kelo v. City of New London*, BOSTON B.J., May/June 2006, at 18.

John B. Nesbitt, *Local Government*, 56 SYRACUSE L. REV. 931 (2006).

R. Ashby Pate, Casenote, *Use of Eminent Domain to Promote Economic Development Held Constitutional*, 36 CUMB. L. REV. 407 (2006).

Thaddeus L. Pitney, Note, *Loans, and Takings, and Buildings—Oh My!: A Necessary Difference Between Public Purpose and Public Use in Economic Development*, 56 SYRACUSE L. REV. 321 (2006).

David Schultz, *What's Yours Can be Mine: Are There Any Private Takings After Kelo v. City of New London?*, 24 UCLA J. ENVTL. L. & POL'Y 195 (2006).

David Shultz, *The Property Rights Revolution That Failed: Eminent Domain in the 2004 Supreme Court Term*, 21 TOURO L. REV. 929 (2006).

Judge Robert Simpson & Joshua S. Mazin, *Current Trends in Pennsylvania Land Use*, 77 PA. B. ASS'N Q. 23 (2006).

Bruce Tepper, *The Weight of Kelo*, L.A. LAW., Mar. 2006, at 36.

David A. Thomas, *Why the Public Plundering of Private Property Rights Is Still a Very Bad Idea*, 41 REAL PROP. PROB. & TR. J. 25 (2006).

Paul W. Tschetter, Student Article, *Kelo v. New London: A Divided Court Affirms the Rational Basis Standard of Review in Evaluating Local Determinations of 'Public Use,'* 51 S.D. L. REV. 193 (2006).

