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INTRODUCTION

Early in the history of city and regional planning as an area of professional study there emerged a comparatively small group of capable and energetic men who guided its development. These men followed the groundbreaking at the turn of the century and built planning into the organized profession which it had to be in order to expand rapidly to meet the great need following World War II. Planners today still owe much to these men, for they shaped the patterns of planning thought, law, administration, education, and the professional organization which we use today. This thesis is devoted to the contributions of Alfred Bettman, one of the most influential of these men.

Alfred Bettman was born in Cincinnati, Ohio, on the 26th of August, 1873. While growing up there he developed a great enthusiasm for his city, an enthusiasm which later led him to try to improve it and, eventually, to improve cities everywhere. His parents were moderately well-to-do and were able to help send him to Harvard University. There he received his bachelor of arts in 1894 and then remained to take his master of arts and law degrees in 1898.¹ Bettman always cherished this Harvard association and later returned to serve on the visiting committees of the depart-
ments of government and regional planning and to lecture on planning and law. It was an appropriate honor that his collected planning papers should be published in the Harvard City Planning Series, to which he had earlier contributed in another volume.

To avert from the beginning any impression that Bettman's only interests were the law and city planning, a brief glance at his personality is in order. Although he was not the robust athletic type, he had a deep love of the outdoors. Whenever possible on his vacations he sought a secluded retreat in the north woods of Canada, often at one of his favorite spots, the Georgian Bay region of Ontario. He was a skilled woodsman and fisherman, as much a perfectionist in this as in planning.

Bettman was equally at home in a very urban and urbane environment. Perhaps he enjoyed the wilderness so much because, by contrast, it sharpened his perception of the city. He was interested in classical music, art, and literature. As a keen observer of human life he loved to travel to new cities and to different cultures. Whenever he was in New York City he tried to catch the latest musical comedy playing Broadway, and, in another contrast, he loved slapstick comedy, so different from his own dry, intellectual humor.

In addition to being a member of many organizations related specifically to planning and urban affairs, Mr. Bettman was a member of the American Political Science Association. He was particularly interested in the history of political parties, their function in a democracy, and their adequacy in representing the electorate. As a
final example of the diversity of his interests, he was also a
member of the American Sociological Society. It is important to
call attention to these latter two interests, since they show that
Mr. Bettman had a broad approach to urban studies and problems--
political and social as well as legal. This type of broad approach
is essential to any good city planner and was especially so for
those who were shaping future thinking and practice in the field.

After receiving his law degree, Mr. Bettman returned to
Cincinnati and for the next ten years gained a wide background of
legal experience in private practice. Also during this period, in
1904, he married Lillian Wyler.

Not until 1909, at the age of 36, did Mr. Bettman first
enter public service. From 1909 until 1911 he served as assistant
county prosecutor for Hamilton County (Cincinnati) and then in 1912
he switched to the city government for two years, serving as city
solicitor in a short-lived reform government. This was the era
in Cincinnati of boss George B. Cox and his lieutenant, Rud Hynicka.
Cox, and later Hynicka, were among the most corrupt of the big city
bosses in this period of bossism. Undoubtedly these years spent in
close contact with the evils and inefficiencies of one of the era's
typical big city governments were important in shaping Bettman's
interest in good local government.

At this time there was growing in the city the reform
feeling which culminated in the establishment of the Charter Party
on June 15, 1924. Under the leadership of this party, the city
voted 2:1 in November for a new charter and a complete revision was accomplished in 1925. The sudden shift from very bad to very good government effected by this group was widely hailed and the Charter Party continues today as a local political party interested only in clean and efficient government. This group has provided a solid base of support for planning in Cincinnati. Fortunately for the planning profession, the Charter Party had many other capable people to provide continuing leadership, so there was no need for Mr. Bettman to devote his efforts to general reform instead of channeling them into his special interest in city planning.

This special interest produced many contributions to the field, and in this paper I shall try to group them into three general areas. These areas are by no means mutually exclusive, but they will serve as a framework. The first area covers his work as a citizen interested in planning and relates principally to his activity in his home town and state. The second covers his work as an attorney and relates to his writing of model legislation and various other legal activities. The third covers his contributions to the development of city and regional planning as an organized profession and relates to his activities in connection with professional organizations.
I. MR. BETTMAN'S CONTRIBUTIONS TO PLANNING AS A CITIZEN

Alfred Bettman's earliest important contributions in the planning field came after his service as city solicitor. Recognizing, along with many others, the need for reforming local government and the importance of comprehensive planning in any such reform, he worked for the establishment of enabling legislation in Ohio to permit the creation of city planning commissions. The legislation, as passed in 1917, was written by Cincinnatians, including help, of course, from Mr. Bettman.

Although the bill had had strong Cincinnati support, the City Council, which was no longer in the hands of the reform group, failed to avail itself of the provisions of the new law. One of the principal objections of the City Council was the clause requiring an extraordinary majority of two-thirds of the Council in order to approve a recommendation departing from the plan prepared by the planning commission. This concept was considered very important by Bettman and he maintained that it was essential in order to insure the strength of the planning commission in the face of political pressures from the legislative body. In all of the enabling legislation which he later wrote he invariably included this extraordinary majority clause as at least a desirable option.
Also, Mr. Bettman was convinced that the as yet undecided question of the constitutionality of zoning and official plans would inevitably be decided favorably. He pressed this point on the strength of his legal background, seeking to combat the timidity and negative thinking which arose from constitutional doubt. From the beginning of his involvement in planning's complex legal questions, Bettman felt that the courts would accept any reasonable legislation based on the increasing amount of expert study accumulating in favor of the need for planning and zoning. However, he stressed that all legislative and administrative acts must be based on such expert study or they would be open to legitimate attacks as arbitrary or unreasonable.

Although the groups interested in establishing planning in Cincinnati and Hamilton County were unable to get any action from City Council creating anything but a powerless advisory commission until late in 1918, they continued to gain strength and effective organization. In 1919 the United City Planning Committee, consisting of twenty-seven civic and business leaders, was revitalized with Bettman as president. This group immediately began raising funds for a comprehensive or master plan and began seeking out trained and experienced consultants to do the work.

After several years of fund raising and negotiating with the City Planning Commission on the subjects of the scope of the plan and the financing of it, Mr. Bettman and a committee of four appointed by him prepared a contract with the Technical Advisory
Corporation, consulting engineers from New York City, to prepare the official plan. Under Bettman’s chairmanship the United City Planning Committee laid out a truly comprehensive scope for the master plan. The plan was to cover the entire existing and probable future metropolitan area, regardless of political boundaries. Furthermore, it was not only to cover the preparation of a building zone ordinance and map, but also population projections, thoroughfare, traffic, and transit analyses, rail and waterways improvements, community development, park, playground, school, and other public building location studies, street structures, overall appearance, flood control, and garbage and waste disposal. The plan concluded with a discussion of methods of financing the improvements and of the administrative organization needed to carry out the plan. It is greatly to the credit of the citizens of Cincinnati and the United City Planning Committee that they envisioned from the start the true scope of a master plan and to the credit of the Technical Advisory Corporation that they fulfilled these objectives very competently. There can be no doubt as to the importance of the role Alfred Bettman played at this time as chairman of the United City Planning Committee.

Because precedents were few, the consultants themselves had to develop many of the study techniques used. The zoning ordinance and map were based on detailed review of every property in the city and were coordinated with other parts of the plan. In this area particularly Bettman stressed the importance of sound basic studies
by professionals. In addition he emphasized that zoning should be approached as a tool to bring about desirable land use patterns and not as an extension of nuisance law necessary to protect existing landowners. Since the preparation of the plan was completed before the 1926 Euclid vs. Ambler Realty Co. case, Bettman was definitely one of the men leading the way in legal thinking in this area.

This was the first such truly comprehensive plan for a major metropolitan area and after its adoption served as model for others for years to come. It would be difficult to assess the full impact of the 1925 plan activity in the country. However, it is safe to say it proved that such a comprehensive approach could be undertaken and brought to a conclusion and that it was the essential approach for metropolitan area planning. Because the plan was both broad in scope and specific in detail and because it had the support of local civic leaders, it became an effective guide for the development of the city and not merely a one-shot consultant's report. Furthermore, the city was fortunate in retaining as full-time planning engineer Ladislas Segoe, who had been director of the Technical Advisory Corporation staff which prepared the plan. This helped to insure that it would not be shelved, and further insured that someone familiar with the plan would be available to keep it up to date in the face of changing conditions, as the plan pointed out must be done.

The association between Mr. Bettman and Mr. Segoe, which originated with their work on the 1925 plan, developed into a close
personal friendship during which the two men exchanged much planning thinking to their mutual benefit. Mr. Bettman was always aware of his own lack of technical planning knowledge and sought the advice of the best minds in the field. In turn, he always felt that planners must heed the advice of a knowledgeable lawyer when dealing with planning's legal matters. To emphasize this, he once recommended in a talk that people who spoke out in areas in which they had no professional competence should be sentenced to work for a year in the field of which they claimed knowledge.

By 1926 Cincinnati had an officially adopted master plan, zoning map and ordinance, an effective and respected planning commission (supported by public funds as of July 1, 1926), an effective and respected full-time planning engineer, all in the context of the new, well-administered, city manager form of government. Mr. Bettman had been influential in the development of each of these factors.

With the declining need for the United City Planning Committee, it had been disbanded. However, Bettman's knowledge and experience were put to work again soon through his appointment in June, 1926, to the City Planning Commission. This appointment involved Bettman in the day to day work of planning which was going on in the city. Spurred by his increasing sense of the importance of city planning in local government, he quickly became one of the most active members of the commission. Two weeks after his appointment he made a motion that the planning commission prepare a bond
budget and five-year major improvement program in conjunction with all the major governmental agencies in the county. He had grasped early the idea, suggested to him by the master plan, that the planning commission should act not only as the principal coordinating body for the geographic location of public and private land uses but also should coordinate the timing and financing of public improvements. This is a good example of Mr. Bettman's farsighted thinking. It has taken many years for capital improvement programming to become accepted as an important function of the planning department of local government.

In addition to his close scrutiny of all the other various matters which came before the commission, Mr. Bettman found time to review each zoning change request from both a planning and legal point of view. More than once the minutes of the commission indicate that his advice was instrumental in avoiding a legal snarl over zoning. Also, it was primarily Mr. Bettman, working directly with the planning staff, who revised the subdivision ordinance, helped to coordinate it with the surrounding areas, and drafted a mapped streets ordinance. When Mayor Murray Seasegood resigned as chairman of the planning commission in 1930, it came as no surprise that Bettman was at once elevated to the chairmanship.

These depression years were, of course, a time of very unsettled conditions in the field of planning. Decreased revenues were forcing cities everywhere to tighten budgets, and planning, somewhat of a frill in the eyes of most politicians, quickly came
under pressure. In Cincinnati, with Bettman serving as attorney for the defense so to speak, the planning commission and staff continued their activity without serious curtailment. Had the commission and staff not proved their worth in the preceding years, their case would have been much more difficult to present. Later, when the New Deal stimulated interest in planning again, particularly from a social and economic point of view, this continued activity put the city in a much better position to move quickly and effectively when the public works and public housing programs of the mid-thirties were introduced.

The continuation of unabated planning activity in the late thirties and early forties helped prepare the city for the post-World War II period. It was apparent by then that the 1925 plan was in need of complete revision and updating. Long before the war had ended, the City Planning Commission, still under the chairmanship of Mr. Bettman, began the groundwork for post-war planning. A top quality staff, along with nationally recognized consultants, was assembled and adequate funds were appropriated for a new master plan. The planning commission's minutes and correspondence file containing Mr. Bettman's letters testify repeatedly to the importance of his influence in securing the needed public and private support and funds to attract this staff. By the end of the war, Cincinnati, far ahead of most major cities, was moving at top speed on the new plan. Although Bettman did not live to see the plan adopted, it was fittingly dedicated to him as a continuing memorial to his efforts in
creating it.

When Bettman died in 1945 city planning lost a truly fine example of the dedicated citizen. Mr. Bettman, a very modest person, had little to gain from his efforts; he was interested solely in doing his public duty for the community in which he lived. During the thirty years he was directly involved in public service, he guided the committee which produced Cincinnati's and the country's first comprehensive metropolitan area master plan, served on and was chairman of the City Planning Commission which worked to carry it out, and then he began the work to create a second master plan to meet the new conditions he saw developing. Throughout all of this time he lent the weight of his personal dignity and integrity to planning and contributed the thinking of his able mind to solving day to day planning problems.

While on the City Planning Commission, Mr. Bettman's daily contact with the planning problems of a large city and the administration of a planning office provided him with the essential practical background for his contributions to planning in other areas. In terms of nationwide influence, the most important of his contributions were in the field of planning law.
II. MR. BETTMAN'S CONTRIBUTIONS TO PLANNING AS A LAWYER

Although Mr. Bettman increasingly was devoting his time to planning, he never entirely gave up his "bread and butter" profession as a lawyer with the firm of Moulinier, Bettman, and Hunt. He was an extremely able lawyer and had a recognized position in the profession quite apart from his legal activity in the planning field.

In addition to the previously mentioned positions as Assistant County Prosecutor and City Solicitor, he served from 1915 to 1917 as special assistant in the War Division of the U.S. Attorney General's office. At the same time he served as attorney for the trustees of the Cincinnati Southern Railway (a city owned railroad leased to the Southern Railroad). He was also a director and general counsel for the Title Guarantee and Trust Company of Cincinnati.22

Bettman was an acknowledged authority on criminal prosecution and headed the Division of Prosecution of the Cleveland (Ohio) Foundation Survey of the Administration of Criminal Justice, and wrote the report for that division. He also served as advisor on prosecution to the National Conference on Law Observance and Enforcement. This was the eleven man commission appointed by President Hoover to study the breakdown of law enforcement during the prohibition era. It was under the chairmanship of George Wickersham,
and was popularly known as the "Wickersham Commission." In 1931
he wrote the report "Survey Analysis," which was published with the
other Wickersham reports. In yet another area of law, from 1923 to
1939 Mr. Bettman was a member of the Judicial Council of Ohio,
established to make recommendations on the reorganization of the
judicial system of the state. 23 Finally, he wrote several reports
on various public utility franchise questions. 24 That Alfred Bettman
had any time at all to devote to planning and planning law is amazing.

But Alfred Bettman did find time—a great deal of it. As
early as 1917 he had worked on the drafting and passing of Ohio's
first legislation permitting the establishment of planning commissions.
This was just the first of many enabling legislation matters to which
Mr. Bettman devoted his legal talent. The drawing up of such legis-
lation was especially important to Bettman, for as a lawyer, he knew
that carefully worded basic legislation could provide a solid founda-
tion for the activity of the planning commissions and staffs which
would be working under it and would be essential in defending against
the inevitable suits attacking these activities. Enabling legislation
may endure for a long time, and Bettman knew that only if the seeds of
sound planning philosophy are planted in this dry legislative wording
will they eventually grow and bear fruit for the duration of the
legislation.

Once he had whetted his talents in the area of enabling
legislation, the field continued to be one of his prime interests.
Eventually he went on to author four model planning laws, all of
which are still being used. They were originally published as a group in 1935 in Volume VII of The Harvard City Planning Studies and are still in use in the third edition of the International City Managers’ Association’s well-known Local Planning Administration. A brief review of some of the key provisions of these acts will serve to point out many of Mr. Bettman’s ideas and views.

In his "Municipal Planning Enabling Act" Mr. Bettman calls for a six-man planning commission composed of four citizens and two ex officio members—a city councilman and the chief executive of the city. Bettman felt strongly that the executive and legislative branches of the local administration should be represented directly on the planning commission, although the majority must, of course, be citizen representatives. To him it was essential that the links between the planning commission and the legislature, which must approve its actions, and the administration, which must carry out or cooperate with its recommendations, should be direct, personal, and formally established. He felt that the wholly separate planning commission would not be able to keep in touch with the day-to-day problems of the city and would have difficulty in making its voice heard where it counts. Bettman’s experience with this arrangement in Cincinnati was quite satisfactory, but it does leave the commission open to the introduction of a strong element of election-oriented politics. It also may result in a busy chief executive not taking the time to attend planning commission meetings. On these points, Mr. Bettman felt that the strong citizen representation should help
offset the first and that the elevation of planning to its proper role in local government would reduce the likelihood of the second. 26

Another point that Bettman emphasizes in his model law is that the planning function must be independent of the regular administrative structure of the government. 27 The planning staff and/or consultants should be hired by and report directly to the commission. The commission in turn would report to the legislature and the executive, basing its report on the professional advice received. He held that this would greatly facilitate the coordination of the activities of various departments through the planning commission, since the coordinating effort would come from outside and above and not from within any one department. Bettman realized that the separation could not be absolutely complete, however, and therefore made it clear that the planning function would be financed out of regular funds appropriated by the council.

The most important clause in the act, from a planning point of view, is that dealing with the scope of the master plan. Here Bettman laid out a truly comprehensive range of activity within which the planning commission should work in developing the master plan. This breadth of approach on Bettman's part shows, perhaps, how much he was a planner at heart who happened to have a legal background, rather than a lawyer with a secondary interest in city planning.

His model law made it mandatory that a planning commission "make and adopt a master plan for the physical development of the
municipality, including areas outside of its boundaries which, in the commission's judgment, bear relation to the planning of the municipality." In this way he made it very clear that planning transcends political boundaries and that plans which fail to take into account the city's environs do not fulfill the duty of the commission. There are planners and master plans which, to this day, fail on this score.

It is worth noting that in this model legislation, which was first published in 1935, Mr. Bettman included "the general character, extent and layout of the replanning of blighted districts and slum areas" as one of the aspects of physical development that could be included in a master plan. He thus anticipated the planning needs created by the Housing Act of 1949. In fact, by saying "blighted districts and slum areas," he was anticipating the trend since 1949 to broaden the scope of that act from slum clearance to full-scale urban renewal. In this regard, it is interesting to cite an article written by Bettman in 1934, in which he spoke against the idea then prevalent that public housing could be used to clear slums. He pointed out that only if good planning showed that the area was suitable for housing should it be rebuilt with housing, and if housing was not appropriate then the area should be redeveloped with whatever was appropriate as shown by the master plan for the community. It was at least twenty years before this sound approach was written into most redevelopment legislation.
The next section of his enabling law, on the general purpose of the master plan, again shows breadth and strength. The legislation makes it mandatory that the commission make "careful and comprehensive surveys and studies"\textsuperscript{31} of existing and future conditions. It can be assumed Bettman realized that a poorly conceived or hasty master plan might be legally attacked on this point but that he wanted to strengthen the pressure on the planning commission to base its recommendations and master plan on a solid foundation.

In the same paragraph he states that the master plan is to be used as a guide for the development of the community; he never looked on it as a blueprint for some final date when the community would cease to change. The master plans in which he had a hand in Cincinnati were designated by the year in which they were adopted, not by some future year when it was hoped everything would conform to the plan. It would seem self-evident that a master plan should be simply a guide for development and that it would require amending, detailing, and other changes, but this, too, is a point on which some of today’s plans and planners fall down.

Finally in this section on the purpose of the plan he goes beyond saying that the plan should guide development which will best promote public health, safety, morals, and order and adds "convenience, prosperity, or the general welfare, as well as efficiency and economy in the process of development."\textsuperscript{32} He did not shrink from these broader, less tested terms, for he felt they were necessary if planning was to have a legal base for the whole scope of activities.
it should properly encompass. Bettman wanted the basic legislation to permit and encourage the widest possible use of planning within the local government.

Section five of the model law reflects the lawyer Bettman. In it he details the manner in which the plan is to be adopted, so that there can be no question as to just what is or is not a part of the official plan. Undoubtedly his experiences had taught him that if this section were not specific and tight, planning commissions would avoid or confuse essential decisions or inadequately establish the validity of legal documents.

It is worth noting here that Mr. Bettman made no reference to a public hearing prior to the adoption of a master plan or any of its parts. There are, of course, differing opinions as to the desirability of hearings and Bettman almost certainly omitted them deliberately. Possibly he felt that the planning commission could more objectively carry out its responsibilities if it did not have to become embroiled in the debate, often bitter, engendered by hearings. Bettman's own experience in Cincinnati was generally favorable insofar as citizen interest was concerned and, perhaps, as a result he felt that public hearings were not essential for the protection of the public interest. In my own opinion, since, as shown below, the legislature delegates some of its power through the extraordinary majority to the planning commission, it would be desirable to increase the influence of the public directly on the commission. I believe the option of holding public hearings should
have been included in the model law so that a choice at the time of adoption could clearly be made.

I will pass over section six, which simply provides those miscellaneous powers needed by the commission to obtain any necessary public records, enter on land to make surveys, etc., in order to go directly to section seven. This section deals with the legal status of the plan and is thus related to section five. Again Bettman writes strong law. He says that once the plan or any part of it is adopted by the commission then virtually nothing can be authorized or constructed by a public agency or a private utility unless the location and extent of the facility shall first have been submitted to and approved by the planning commission. The decision of the planning commission is fortified by the requirement for a two-thirds vote of the city council to override it in the case of disapproval. (Bettman suggests in a footnote that even a three-fourths majority may be suitable depending on the size of the Council, showing how strongly he supported the idea of requiring an extraordinary majority to override the decision of the planning commission.) The commission would be limited by a requirement that their report be completed within thirty days of the submittal to it.

Obviously this provision puts considerable power in the hands of the planning commission, insofar as government or public utility action is concerned, once even a part of the plan is adopted. Such power can be two-edged and could seriously harm the community if the planning commission is not composed of able and progressive
citizens. The commission would be entrusted with a sizable portion of authority delegated from the legislative body, since a majority of the commission could reach a decision that a majority of the City Council could not reverse. (Note: it is curious that Bettman made this a one-way street, so to speak, by requiring a two-thirds Council vote to override a disapproval, but not to override an approval.) Bettman's own experience with the Cincinnati Planning Commission was generally favorable insofar as the quality of the commission members was concerned. As a result, Bettman may have been somewhat idealistic in his assumption that a lay planning commission, as opposed to professional planners, would always render a decision in the best interests of planning in the community. Not many commissions were, or are, as ably led, as supported by the community, or as well staffed as was his own.

Bettman himself defended the granting of this power to the planning commission. In a paper presented in 1935 to the Joint Conference on City, Regional, State and National Planning he said "... there still remains the question whether the grant is good or bad. However, where the agency does not possess the power of final decision, that agency's power is, in the last analysis, advisory." He argued that the proper function of the coordinating nature of planning required an approach and technique beyond any single administrative department and which must be independent of the legislative body; therefore, if this approach was to be strong enough to prevail it must be given more than merely advisory strength.
Undoubtedly Bettman realized that a provision such as this would be closely scrutinized in a model law before it was accepted. (Even today it would be so, and in the 1930's, when the very creation of a planning commission was a new thing, it would have been much more radical.) Bettman evidently took the approach that it was best to write strong model legislation and then fight to keep as much strength in the law as it went through the legislature.

The final major section of the model law represents an attempt to get at a problem which the planning profession to this day has not successfully met—that is, to create an effective regional planning commission. The model law is directed only toward smaller communities (under 25,000 population) in places which have a county or regional planning commission and does no more than permit some voluntary "regionalization" of planning activity. Alfred Bettman was aware of the importance of planning on a metropolitan area basis and, for that matter, on a state, regional, and national basis. Bettman knew this section was inadequate and probably hoped that as the profession advanced and acceptance of the planner increased that new techniques would develop for implementing regional planning. I think that were he alive today he would be sadly disappointed at the last twenty years progress in this area.

In evaluating this model act as a whole, and considering that it was drawn up approximately thirty years ago, it is a remarkably strong and balanced piece of legislation on which to base planning activity. Some changes would have to be made in it were it to be introduced in a legislative session today, but these changes would
be principally additions reflecting the greater knowledge of and support for the position of the planning commission and profession in the governmental structure. On the basis of his own statements on such matters as capital improvement programming, redevelopment legislation, regional planning, or highway zoning, for example, I am sure that Mr. Bettman would have been ready to lead the way in keeping his model legislation up-to-date.

Bettman published three other model acts relating to planning—covering subdivision regulation, mapped street lines, and the establishment of zoning controls. They also merit attention as the legal embodiment of some of Bettman's planning ideas and practices. In this paper I will cover only the more significant sections of each.

The first is the Standard Municipal Subdivision Regulation Act, which provides the legal basis for a broad control of land subdivision and development. Section 1 of the act delegates to the planning commission the platting authority for the city and extends the authority to three miles beyond the city limit in cities with a population of 25,000 or more. However, the planning commission becomes the platting authority only after it has adopted a major street plan, or a master plan including a major street plan, and has filed a certified copy of it with the county recorder. Thus the commission is properly required to put the horse in front of the cart before it can regulate subdividing.

Once the major street plan is drawn up, the planning commission is required to adopt subdivision regulations which may control
land development by requiring it to conform to existing or planned streets or any other feature of the master plan. It may also call for the development to provide for light and air, recreation, and "a distribution of population and traffic which will tend to create conditions favorable to health, safety, convenience, or prosperity."\textsuperscript{35}

The act also provides that street grading and improving and the providing of public utilities by the developer may be made a condition precedent to acceptance of the plat. These may be provided by the posting of a performance bond with the city granted all powers necessary to enforce it.

Furthermore, the act makes it a misdemeanor (carrying a specified fine of not less than $100 or more than $500), for the county recorder to file a subdivision plat which has not been approved by the planning commission, thus placing the burden of enforcement directly on the administrative office. The act is rather stringent in the provision of penalties for the selling or negotiation for sale of unapproved lots, setting a fine of one hundred dollars per lot for each such sale or attempt. The planning commission can also cause to be vacated or removed any buildings on lots not approved by it.

Thus, typically, Bettman has worded the law so as to give the planning commission wide leeway in determining the nature of the regulations it wishes to establish. Where the law should be broad and flexible, Bettman makes it so and where it must be specific and tight, as in penalties or procedures, it is so.

The third model law which Bettman prepared is one not too
frequently used: the mapped streets act. This is principally due to the fact that the "official map" stage, which Bettman envisioned between the master plan and the actual construction of individual projects, has not been developed in most communities. This in turn is probably as much a result of the rapidity of change in the area of transportation as the failure on the part of planners to fill the gap.

What Bettman wanted was a legal tool to control building within the rights-of-way of streets shown on the master plan to be widened or extended, and thus preserve the integrity of the plan. Bettman himself realized that the law in this area was not well developed and that his model law was not as unequivocal as the other legislation he prepared. For example, he felt it necessary to provide an appeals board (the zoning appeals board, if such exists) which could grant a building permit within a mapped street line if (a) the property will not yield a reasonable return to the owner or (b) balancing the interests of the owner with those of the municipality requires in the interest of justice and equity that a permit be granted. This language is obviously not sufficiently strong to maintain the integrity of a streets plan unless the appeals board is unusually capable and public-spirited.

The concept of an intermediate step between the master plan and construction design is basically sound, but neither Bettman nor anyone else as yet has successfully solved the legal, political, and technical problems.
The fourth model law authored by Bettman is his Municipal Zoning Enabling Act. This model is excellent and reflects Bettman's strong personal interest in the field of zoning. Again the act is broad where this will give reasonable latitude to the planning commission and precise where necessary to prevent abuse.

The first section, the grant of power, gives the local legislative body virtually complete authority to regulate the use of land through zoning. Since the constitutionality of zoning was clearly established by 1935, when the Act was first published, Bettman was able to write a very strong and broad legal base for zoning into the model act. This grant of power is, of course, restrained by certain other provisions of the act dealing with the adoption and administration of the actual regulations.

Section two requires that the planning commission prepare a zoning plan, including maps and text, and that it certify this to the legislative body. They, in turn, may adopt them into law following a public hearing and other usual procedures. This section appears to me somewhat lacking in flexibility. The act requires that the text and maps shall represent the "recommendations of the planning commission for the regulation by districts or zones of the location, height, bulk, number of stories and size of buildings and other structures, the percentage of the lot which may be occupied, the size of yards, courts, and other open spaces, the density and distribution of population, and the uses of buildings, structures and land for trade, industry, residence, recreation, civic activities"
and other purpose.36 It might be that a planning commission would not want to regulate just these items. For example, it might not wish to regulate number of stories at all, or might wish to establish zoning categories to encourage cluster subdivisions or some other type of development in which few or no precise controls on side yards, setbacks, location, coverage, height, etc., would be wanted. This is not a serious shortcoming and the necessary broadening of the section could be accomplished as land development techniques and controls evolve.

The actual enactment by the legislative body is rather standard, with again the inclusion of the requirement for a two-thirds vote of the legislature to override the disapproval by the planning commission of any change or amendment to the text or map. (Note again that this is a one-way affair, with no provision of a two-thirds vote of the legislature to reverse an affirmative vote of the planning commission.) Section four, which applies to later changes and amendments, makes the same provisions for referral to the planning commission and requires the two-thirds vote for reversal of planning commission disapproval.

The fifth section provides powers to eliminate non-conforming uses. The establishment of procedures for this is made optional, but if they are adopted the legal basis is strong and sound. It permits a definite time period for the cessation of such uses and/or the establishment of a schedule of amortization. Bettman had the foresight to include this provision in the model law although the
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elimination of non-conforming uses has not been attempted by most communities and the mechanics of the law have not been too well worked out.

In the next paragraph, section six, the act provides for a board of zoning appeals if the legislative body wishes to have one. To Bettman, this provision was optional. He felt there was no clear-cut need for this troublesome body. However, if the board was established its powers were spelled out in detail in the act, particularly in regard to so-called "hardship" exceptions. It is clearly stated that the only legal basis for an exception in a "hardship" case is a condition inherent in the property itself. The act reads:

"The board of appeals shall have the following powers:

(1) . . .
(2) . . .

(3) Where, by reason of exceptional narrowness, shallowness, or shape of a specific piece of property at the time of the enactment of the zoning regulation, or by reason of exceptional topographic conditions or other extraordinary and exceptional characteristics of such piece of property, the strict application of any regulation enacted under this Act would result in peculiar and exceptional practical difficulties to or exceptional or undue hardship upon the owner of such property, to authorize, upon an appeal relating to said property, a variance from such strict application so as to relieve such difficulties or hardship, provided such relief may be granted without substantial detriment to the public good and without substantially impairing the intent and purpose of the zone plan and the zoning ordinance."³⁷

The long-run integrity of a zoning ordinance, of course, depends on the manner in which it is enforced. Bettman, like any good attorney, knew this and knew that a clause such as this was the only proper
basis for strict but equitable enforcement. Unfortunately, as some of his correspondence shows, he also knew how seldom zoning appeals boards follow this approach.38

The enforcement and remedies section gives the city and any affected property owner the power to use appropriate legal remedies to enforce the ordinance. The final section, an important one, provides that the more restrictive law shall apply if there is a conflict between the zoning laws and some other regulation.

In summary, this zoning enabling act is an excellent "model," one which takes the needs and goals of the planner and then spells out a legal way of reaching them. From a planning point of view this is the way law should be developed. Bettman, who was both a theoretical as well as "working" planner (as chairman of a planning commission and officer of professional organizations) plus a gifted attorney, combined the ideal background to do the developing. The results of his efforts were these model laws which could almost serve as the texts for a course on planning.

At this point it is appropriate to discuss a piece of model legislation on which Bettman worked for several years, but which he had not completed at the time of his death in January of 1945. In fact, a card which he sent in December, 1944, to Myron Downs, Cincinnati Planning Director, mentions that he had been very busy, but that he was working on a revision of his state model urban redevelopment legislation and on an urban renewal bill for the Ohio Legislature.39
Bettman's views on what should be included in basic redevelopment legislation were clearly expressed by him in several of his papers. They are carefully reasoned and had they been followed more closely by legislatures, urban renewal as a planning tool might have been much more quickly accepted. Some of the more significant arguments he made, in planning journals, before legislative committees, and in his early draft model laws, are discussed below.

At the federal level "redevelopment" legislation has always been part of overall housing legislation. The 1949 Housing Act essentially called for redevelopment to clear slum housing areas and replace them with new housing, principally low-cost, which was a carry-over approach from the public housing legislation of the mid-thirties. This Bettman held to be wrong. He maintained that redevelopment was a tool for obtaining desirable land use patterns and for eliminating the various kinds of blight.

In a paper written in 1944 he said:

"The assumption that old blighted areas shall in the future, as in the unfortunate present, be for the income class now living there, regardless of where the industries are to be and the railroad terminals are to be and the business center is, is obviously not conducive to good redevelopment. Yet that is just what some of the redevelopment statutes do assume; indeed, some of the statutes are really housing and not urban redevelopment statutes."40

A few months later he told the Senate's Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Redevelopment much the same thing when he said:

"To prepare these areas, therefore, for a redevelopment or rehabilitation which would be socially and economically sound and stabilized, the replanning of the design and uses of these areas, in the light of the general master
planning of the whole urban territory in which they are located, is essential. This necessity is of the greatest importance for its bearing upon the procedure and the organization of the redevelopment and rehabilitation process; for this necessity indicates that any assumption either that blighted areas are coterminous or coextensive or identical with the slum areas or that areas now used for habitation should be rebuilt for habitation or which are now used for the habitation of a particular income stratum should be rebuilt for that particular income group--any such assumptions as these would lead to the tragic result that the rebuilding would simply institute the beginning of a new era of blight and instability which would accelerate a repetition of the social and economic wastes of which blight is the manifestation."41

Had this concept prevailed more strongly at the time that urban redevelopment legislation was being first enacted, there would have been a sounder approach to many of the early projects which set the pattern for those to follow.

Similarly, Bettman noted that the federal agency in charge of administering the assistance program ought to have no special interest in one field, such as housing or construction, for this would inevitably warp the quality of the replanning. He felt that the federal agency should have planning as its basic function or approach.42 This would eliminate the bias in a single land-use oriented approach but would require that the planner be well grounded in or advised on economic or social factors and real estate operations, since they are essential to the development and implementation of the land-use plan.

In fact, as the concept of redevelopment has expanded away from simply clearance for re-use to include a total approach to the maintenance, repair and replacement of the public and private physical
assets of the city, it is obvious that the traditional "city planner" is inadequate for the job. It now appears that the key factor is a competent administrator with a deep concern for and knowledge of today's urban civilization. The specialized knowledge in land use planning, design, real estate economics, finance, law, relocation, traffic engineering, etc., cannot be found in one man, but must come from specialists whose contributions are welded together by the administrator. Bettman, who happened to be a rather well-rounded planner, hoped that planners would become the leaders in city rebuilding, but the important quality is administrative ability, coupled with a sense for the urban community, which should not necessarily be the goal of planning training. This, it would seem to me, should properly be developed as a specialty of public administration, and that Bettman will prove to have been mistaken in looking toward planning for the coordinating control in urban renewal.

As already noted above, Bettman recognized the role of the federal government in redevelopment. Now, when there is increasing challenge to the federally aided nature of the program, it is worthwhile to review his statements. In the same statement for the Senate Subcommittee on Housing and Redevelopment mentioned above, he pointed out that the extent of blighted urban areas was truly national in scope and that urban blight is a blight on the entire national economy. He noted that some of the causes were national in nature, such as industrial location, railroad and highway networks, and aid to suburban development. But the reason which he called "most
"... the Federal Government takes from the localities revenues without which they cannot finance this redevelopment process. If, as is obviously the case, the revenues available to the localities are inadequate for all other activities and also for carrying on this urban redevelopment, then, to the extent of this additional need, it is the Federal Government which, under our present tax system, is absorbing the necessary additional tax revenue. The inhabitants of the localities pay the Federal income and some other Federal taxes. Perhaps the localities can furnish some of the necessary aid out of their general local tax revenues; but, if this very urgent restoration of the economic vigor of our urban territory is to be started and carried on vigorously, the localities must have some financial help from outside of themselves. They will and they should commit to repayment of the aid all funds they receive by way of ground rents or sales proceeds of the areas. Beyond that some aid from outside themselves is essential; and logically it seems that that aid should come from the Federal Government, which, under the existing tax system, is the recipient from the people of the localities of the monies which are needed for this purpose."

Since 1945 the national scope of the urban blight problem has not diminished, but increased, and the tax system has not changed, so that these arguments for Federal aid are still convincing.

Bettman's hope that planners and city planning would be the key factors in redevelopment may have been in error, but another foresight of his will probably prove to be much more accurate, and that is in regard to the leasing of redeveloped land. A statement he made in a 1944 paper clearly states his thinking. At that time he said:

"... the redevelopment area will be turned over to a redevelopment entrepreneur for the carrying out of the redevelopment plan; and in the formulation of statutory provisions on this phase of the legislation, some of the questions which arise are: shall the area be leased to the developer on a long-term lease or sold to the developer?..."
"Obviously the approved area plan should be carried out and the redevelopment corporation and all its successors in title be obligated to abide by it. In respect to this most of the existing statutes are rather vague or weak.

"The enforcement of the plan will not be easy. Some of the statutes prescribe that the developer shall give a bond. Any experienced lawyer knows how feeble a bond is as a mode of enforcement of complex and continuous obligations. The plan can be made to run with the land, similar to private covenants; but that would not dispose of the problem of modifications, and litigation is at best a clumsy mode of enforcing complex and continuous obligations. If the community retain the status of owner, the protection of the plan is easier and likely to be more effective. That is the advantage of leasing the area as compared with the community's parting with all title. However, it is doubtful whether the country is ready for a policy of extensive land ownership by the public, except as a part of the process of assembling the land for disposition to private owners or special public corporations. The chances are that, despite the benefits of a lease policy, the authority of the city to sell the area as well as lease it will be included in every redevelopment statute enacted during the present era.""

So far, in this regard, he has been right, and the expanding interest in leasing redevelopment land bears out his feeling that cities would turn to this as public acceptance increased, and as knowledge in the area of redevelopment land control grows. It will be interesting to see how present land covenant techniques prove out as the changes due to the passage of time have to be reckoned with. If they prove unsatisfactory it may result in increased interest in and pressure for long-term lease arrangements for redevelopment.

Much of what Bettman criticized has been discarded in the evolution of redevelopment legislation, but sometimes only after expensive failures or years of litigation. Little of what he found desirable has not proven so, but again sometimes only after alternative approaches were found unworkable. Had Bettman lived a few years longer
to advance his ideas and later to defend them on the question of
constitutionality, the field of urban renewal might be much further
along than it is today.

Another important way in which Bettman contributed to plan-
ning law was as an attorney before the bar. He participated in at
least two major court tests bearing on planning, in addition to many
lesser cases. The first and most important of the two major cases is
the well known Village of Euclid vs. Ambler Realty Co., 47 Sup. Ct.
Rep. 114, on the constitutionality of zoning. Bettman prepared an
elaborate brief, amicus curiae, which, according to the recollection
of Robert A. Walker, was not delivered to the Supreme Court until after
they had, on first hearing, reached an unfavorable conclusion in the
case. Because of Bettman’s stature as an authority in the field of
zoning, they accepted the brief and, after a second hearing, handed
down a decision which reversed their preliminary conclusion. Bett-
man, in his brief, noted that there had been ten different state
supreme court decisions upholding zoning and that over forty state
legislatures had passed basic zoning enabling legislation. Had the
U. S. Supreme Court decided unfavorably there would have been a major
upheaval, to say the least, in the entire nature and use of zoning
throughout the country. This paper is not the place to go into the
legal quality of the brief, but it is an obvious masterpiece of legal
craftsmanship which thoroughly demolishes the case against zoning and
with equal thoroughness establishes its reasonableness and constitu-
tionality.
It should be noted that Bettman, undoubtedly, developed much of the legal thinking and research while working on a Cincinnati case, *Fritz vs. Messer*, 149 N.E.R. 30, in which the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio upheld the constitutionality of zoning in the state.

The other case of major national significance in which Bettman participated was *United States of America vs. Certain Lands in Louisville, Kentucky, et al.* 47 The arguments in this case laid the groundwork for those presented some ten years later in a case reported as *Cleveland vs. United States* (decided January 2, 1945) in which the constitutionality of public housing was upheld.

Again Bettman developed a beautifully documented brief demolishing the case against the public need for and nature of public housing and proving conclusively the affirmative position. It was this involvement with public housing and slum clearance in the thirties which laid the groundwork for Bettman's strong interest in redevelopment, and, with this cloud removed, he was able to see clearly into the real problems in the field. This is evidenced by his enabling legislation (see above) and other thoughts on the subject.

A different phase of Bettman's legal contributions was his legal groundwork in the field of regional planning and development. In 1933 he was appointed by President Roosevelt as a legal adviser to a commission to develop the Tennessee River Valley. From the work of this commission eventually grew one of this country's most significant planning projects, the Tennessee Valley Authority. 43

A few years later, along this same vein, he served as counsel
to the conference of delegates appointed to negotiate the Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation Compact, which was the legal agreement between the States in the watershed of the Ohio River to jointly force the improvement of the sewage and waste disposal facilities discharging into the Ohio River. According to Hudson Biery, leading pioneer of the compact, Bettman sat through all the conferences for two years and was very instrumental in shaping the final compact documents approved by the Congress in 1940. 49

It would not be proper to conclude this section on Bettman's contributions to planning as a lawyer without referring to another great service he rendered. From 1935, which was almost its beginning, until his death, Bettman wrote a section for the Newsletter of the American Society of Planning Officials called "Planning (Including Zoning) Law and Legislation." It would be impossible to determine the extent of the influence exerted by this column, but there can be no doubt that it was tremendous. This column, by the way, was continued by Walter Blucher until 1949, when it was expanded into a separate publication, the well known Zoning Digest. Since planning and zoning legal matters were not often well known during these years, many communities must have relied heavily on this column for advice or a boost on a difficult local problem. Bettman was particularly well suited for this job, since he was experienced in planning law, active on a local commission, a participant in local, state, and national groups, and was very able in expressing the law clearly and simply and in citing good examples for the lay official or less
experienced city attorney.

Bettman was always in the forefront in the field of planning law, as we have seen, for example, in his redevelopment work. He was actively seeking ways to meet the legal problems of the post-war era which he foresaw, and it is truly unfortunate that he did not live to face them as they developed. His contribution to planning as lawyer was already great, but he was not through thinking and working and would have had even more to contribute.
III. MR. BETTMAN'S CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PLANNING PROFESSION

One of Alfred Bettman's great wishes was to see the need for the "planning approach" to government, on all levels, accepted. That planning was both rational and desirable seemed so clear to him, but all through his work there appears a background note of concern over the failure on the part of the general public and officials to recognize this. In order to increase the acceptance of planning he realized it would be necessary to increase the professional knowledge and competence of planners and to build up the image of planning as a recognized profession. To Bettman planning was not merely urban design, or engineering, or economic and social analysis, but rather a unique unifying approach with its own special techniques. This idea he tried to bring home to others.

Obviously, one of the best ways to accomplish this would be to strengthen the organizations and associations related to the profession, and this Bettman certainly did. As the introductory biographical notes pointed out, Bettman was a willing joiner of groups which were of interest to him. Thus it is no surprise to find that he joined planning groups as soon as he became interested in the field.

Bettman was both a professional, as a lawyer, and a layman,
as a planner. He recognized the position of both points of view and was acutely aware of the need for a strong bridge between the professional planner and both the public official who had to carry out his plans and the civic leader whose support was necessary for their adoption. Perhaps for this reason the organization to which he made the most significant contribution was the American Society of Planning Officials.

When the American Society of Planning Officials was organized in 1934, Bettman became the new group's first president. By virtue of his strong personal interest in planning and government, his planning commission chairmanship and his almost professional knowledge in the field, he was a one-man amalgam of the people the American Society of Planning Officials was established to reach.

As first president (he served two terms), Bettman devoted his efforts toward getting the new organization on its feet. These were the years, during President Roosevelt's first term, when planning was in new and sudden favor in some quarters but in trouble in others, especially among local budget makers. Bettman's correspondence in 1936 with the able first executive director, Walter Blucher, gives a glimpse of the problems faced. References are frequent to such matters as raising funds, increasing membership, planning the annual conference, and providing the services that Bettman felt were so important a part of the raison d'être of such an organization. One of these services was the "Newsletter" and, of course, with it
Bettman's own important "Planning (Including Zoning) Law and Legislation" already referred to. In addition to these routine matters, Bettman also chaired a special Conference on City Planning Administration, held in Chicago in November, 1936.

After his terms as president, Bettman moved to the Board of Directors, where he served from 1938 to 1940. In 1941, following his increased interest in urban redevelopment legislation, he began a two year period as chairman of the American Society of Planning Officials Urban Redevelopment Committee.51 These were the formative years for his pioneering work in urban redevelopment enabling legislation.

As has already been suggested, Alfred Bettman was a conference-goer. He enjoyed the exchange of knowledge and did his best to contribute as much of his own knowledge as possible. He participated in many conferences of many groups and it would be impossible to track down all of his contributions. However, a review of his participation in the National Conference on City Planning, which later evolved into the American Society of Planning Officials annual conference, will provide a picture of his willingness to contribute. The first conference in which he took part was the 1913 meeting and the index of proceedings shows that he participated sufficiently to warrant a reference in twenty-four of the thirty-two years from then to the time of his death. He presented a total of nineteen major papers at fifteen different conferences and participated in extensive discussion thirty-two different times in fifteen different years. The topics
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on which he touched included, of course, many aspects of zoning law, other legislation, litigation and legal matters, plus planning administration, master plans, urban redevelopment and rehabilitation of blighted districts, acquisition of parks and open space, laying out regions for planning, and numerous others. 52

Besides participating in the conferences Bettman, in many years, had a hand in the development of the conference itself. He was for many years a member of the National Conference on City Planning which sponsored or co-sponsored the annual meeting. In 1914 he served as a member of the National Conference on City Planning's General Committee and in 1915 he served on the executive committee. In 1919-20, 1922-25, and 1930-36, he was on the Board of Directors, holding the office of Vice-president in 1930-31 and of President in 1932-33. Later, as first president and member of the Board of Directors of the American Society of Planning Officials, which became a co-sponsor of the annual conference, he continued his connection with its development. 53

As a result of his membership in the National Conference on City Planning he became a charter member of the American City Planning Institute, which became the American Institute of Planners in 1939, when it was formed at the 1917 annual conference in Kansas City, Missouri. As might be expected, by 1918 he was serving on the Board of Governors and thereafter was re-elected on five occasions for the following terms: 1919-20, 1924-27, 1928-31, 1935-38, and 1941-44. Although he never served as a major officer of the Institute, he did
contribute frequently to its meetings and publications and served on numerous committees. For example, he served as chairman of the committee on the Wagner Housing Bill from 1936 to 1939, after which it became the Committee on Planning Legislation with Bettman continuing as chairman until 1942. He also chaired the committee on the proposed neighborhood protection and improvement statute in 1939, and served on the committees on the place of the planning function in local government, 1940; on Federal regional bills, 1939; on planning criteria, 1939-40; and on other committees of a temporary or ad hoc nature set up by the Institute. Through his work on these many committees and through his speeches and writings Bettman was able to add much to the program and thinking of the Institute and in turn to the profession.

On the state level Bettman also participated actively. In 1919 he was one of the founders of the Ohio Planning Conference, which was only the second such state-wide citizens' group in the nation (Massachusetts was the first). On three occasions--1920-21, 1922-23, and 1932-33—he served as President of the Conference, and in the intervening years he was always active in the organization, particularly when it became involved in matters before the legislature.

Just to round out his organizational affiliations, it should be added that Mr. Bettman was a member of the British Town Planning Institute and the International Federation of Housing and Town Planning. Whenever and wherever people got together to talk about
planning Bettman was ready to join in the talk.

Bettman kept constantly active in the groups to which he belonged, working in various ways to strengthen them and to make them meaningful to their membership. There was seldom a time after he first became interested in city planning when Mr. Bettman was not serving as a president, committee chairman, board member, conference organizer, or otherwise contributing to the groups to which he belonged. Many men worked hard along with him during this period, but few worked harder.
CONCLUSION

This paper has tried to show the spectrum of planning activities engaged in by Alfred Bettman and thus to show how he has contributed and still contributes to what we call city and regional planning. It is not a complete record, since much material and many memories have been lost and since I know that I did not reach every source of information. For example, Bettman was counsel for the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and served as consultant to the National Resources Planning Board, for whom he drafted a planning statute for Puerto Rico, but I was unable to find sufficient documentation to properly discuss his work in these connections.56

Alfred Bettman was a truly remarkable man in the manner in which he combined knowledge, understanding, great energy, and imagination. He was not flamboyant or consciously dynamic, but he was a competent and hard worker who constantly sought to contribute in whatever way he could to the cause of rational government and good planning. As he grew older he never allowed his thinking to crystallize or stagnate. On the day of his death, January 21, 1945, he was on a train returning to Cincinnati from Washington and New York City where he had testified on urban redevelopment to a Senate committee on post war planning. He never stopped turning over in his mind new
ways to solve the problems which he saw around him.

His memory is preserved not only in his works but also by a memorial fund, raised by his many friends and colleagues as a token of the esteem in which they held him. The fund was used to sponsor the publication of his works by Harvard University; to make certain studies of the planning profession; and to bring a series of lectures on planning to Cincinnati, the city which he loved and which he constantly sought to improve.

The purpose of this thesis has been to review Alfred Bettman's varied contributions to the field of city and regional planning and in so doing gain insight into the historical development of the profession and into the development of planning thought and process. Such a review of Bettman's work is particularly suitable for this, since it relates to so many aspects of planning. His contributions have been discussed under three major headings, but, as was stated previously, these areas are not mutually exclusive. They are, in fact, closely related and are all tied together by his guiding principle, which perhaps can best be summed up in his own words—"... to make planning not merely fit into, but actually preserve and strengthen democracy."57
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