

**Déjà Vu Preservation:
Advocacy in Greenwich Village in the Postwar Period and at the Turn of the Millennium**

By Melissa Baldock

Greenwich Villagers practically invented modern preservation advocacy in New York City, and sixty years after they first took to the streets to protest demolitions, historic preservation has become ingrained in the psyche of both Village oldtimers and newcomers. After all, it was in Greenwich Village that the godmother of neighborhood activism, Jane Jacobs, developed her theories of what makes a neighborhood work by observing the streets around her home on Hudson Street. It was also in the Village that Jacobs put these theories to the test in numerous Village fights, standing up to Robert Moses (the ultimate preservation villain) and his urban renewal schemes. Although she was the most well-known, Jane Jacobs was far from alone in these David versus Goliath battles. Jacobs was just one of many feisty, persistent, and incredibly forward-thinking Villagers who fought to save, both on a small and a large scale, the buildings and way of life in the Village.

So many preservation battles were fought on the front lines of Greenwich Village in the postwar period that a book could be written on the subject. From the urban renewal proposed for south of Washington Square Park and along the far western blocks of the Village, to the proposed multi-lane highway through Washington Square Park and the proposed Lower Manhattan Expressway; and from the possible replacement of the Jefferson Market Courthouse with a 16-story residential tower, to the fight to preserve all Village buildings with zoning and landmarking protections, it seems as though Villagers in the 1950s and 1960s were constantly forming new organizations to focus on specific buildings and issues, strategizing in their living rooms, protesting in the streets, gathering on the steps of City Hall, testifying in front of city agencies, meeting behind the scenes with political insiders, and coming up with publicity stunts to attract attention. As the *New York Herald-Tribune* remarked in 1960, “Civic organizations sprout in the Village like dandelions in a country lawn: when others say ‘You can’t fight City Hall,’ Villagers say instead: ‘Let’s form a committee.’”¹

The postwar period in Greenwich Village, like in other New York City neighborhoods, brought with it a construction boom and unbridled destruction of historic buildings. At the same time, a new middle class constituency was moving into the neighborhood. Attracted by the Village’s bohemian reputation and cheaper rents, many of these new residents were professionals who held a strong sense of the neighborhood’s unique qualities. These newcomers joined lifelong Villagers in taking great offense to the

destruction of their neighborhood, and together their tireless efforts to save the architecture, history, and culture of Greenwich Village were unprecedented, groundbreaking, and largely successful.

The postwar apartment building boom hit the Village's major avenues, particularly Fifth and Sixth Avenues, the hardest, but even the side streets were not immune to the demolition of small-scale mid- and late-nineteenth-century dwellings and stables for large-scale apartment buildings. In 1959 alone, the *New York Times* reported that 20 new apartment buildings were planned for the Village.² The historic buildings on these development sites ranged from artist studios with incredible cultural histories in modest vernacular structures to buildings with extraordinary historic and architectural qualities. Lost between World War II and the designation of the Greenwich Village Historic District in 1969 were portions of the famed Washington Square North Greek Revival row, Richard Morris Hunt's Studio Building on 10th Street, the Brevoort Hotel on Fifth Avenue, James Renwick, Jr.'s Rhinelander Gardens on 11th Street, and the Mark Twain House on Fifth Avenue and 9th Street, also designed by Renwick. As these demolitions and new developments were carried out by private developers on private land, the Villagers' protests and calls to action could rarely stop the destruction in the short term. However, it propelled them into motion to work for better long-term solutions for the neighborhood.

In 1959, a group of Villagers formed Save the Village to come up with a comprehensive approach to preventing the destruction of historic buildings, the construction of large-scale apartment buildings, and the eviction of Village residents, many of whom were artists, from their apartments. Arnold Bergier, a sculptor, was one of the founding members of Save the Village and its first president, as he himself was being evicted from his studio on 10th Street for the construction of a high-rise apartment building. Other key people involved in Save the Village were Alan Marcus and Doris Diether, who is still very much involved in Greenwich Village community issues, having served on the local community board since 1964 (and hence the longest-running community board member in the city).

Save the Village developed four goals to help protect the neighborhood: change the zoning in the Village to maintain its existing low-rise character; strengthen rent laws to prevent evictions; institute zoning for historic preservation; and fix violations in buildings that landlords had neglected.³ Not long after its formation, Save the Village had already collected over 10,000 signatures in support of its efforts.⁴ Villagers were clearly upset with the destruction of their neighborhood and ready to take action.

Unlike earlier groups that had formed around specific issues, Save the Village looked beyond the preservation emergencies to try to figure out how the long-term goals of protecting the Village could be attained. Just as buildings were being torn down and new apartment buildings were taking their place, the City Planning Commission was working on completely overhauling the NYC Zoning Resolution for the first time since its creation in 1916. This provided Villagers and other New York neighborhoods interested in historic preservation the forum in which they could raise their concerns before the people who had the power to affect change. Through the process, Villagers convinced the City to zone most of the Village as R6, the lowest of any neighborhood in Manhattan, ensuring that new buildings would not be out-of-scale with the neighborhood and alleviating the pressure to destroy small-scale historic buildings. However, Villagers, like their counterparts in Brooklyn Heights, were not successful in persuading James Felt, chair of the City Planning Commission, to institute historic or aesthetic zoning to truly protect the character of their neighborhood. Felt refused to deal with the historic preservation issue until after the zoning reform passed.⁵

Of more immediate concern than the historic preservation zoning was the fact that the new R6 zoning, which would be an improvement over the existing zoning, would not take effect immediately. Once the City adopted the zoning, there would be a grace period of one year during which developers could file under the old zoning. To the Village, waiting for the new zoning to pass and then for the grace period to expire would have been disastrous. Doris Diether has estimated that developers were planning over 100 new buildings in the Village just prior to the passage of the new zoning, although many of them had yet to file plans.⁶ Working with Village architect and zoning expert, Robert Weinberg, Save the Village set to work advocating for changing the existing, 1916-era zoning to low-rise, in order to prevent further destruction and out-of-scale development. The tactic worked; while the real estate interests were concentrating on the bigger picture of the city-wide rezoning, Save the Village got the existing Village zoning lowered.⁷

Once the City Planning Commission largely addressed the Village's concerns, Save the Village became a supporter of the revised zoning resolution, even though it did not include the historic and aesthetic zoning and it was still not perfect. Just a few years after the zoning passed, Save the Village and other Villagers were back at the City Planning Commission asking the agency to correct some holes in the revised 1961 zoning. For instance, two of the Village's most beloved hidden courts, Patchin Place and Milligan Place, off Sixth Avenue between 10th and 11th Streets, were still zoned for large-scale developments. A proposed 18-story building would have decimated the quaint, narrow lanes. The Committee for the

Preservation of Patchin and Milligan Place formed to advocate for a zoning change that would reduce the height of allowed buildings and alleviate the demolition pressure on these iconic Village streets. Once again, Villagers were a step ahead of the developers and were able to protect key, iconic Village streets well before the Landmarks Law.

In addition to the many private developments, the postwar period saw government-sponsored destruction of the Village. Although in theory the neighborhood should have had a say in planning for its future, the reality of the Robert Moses-era urban renewal plans meant that neighborhoods like the Village were practically powerless to stop the decimation. The many different government-sponsored projects in the Village were in fact all part of Moses' larger grand scheme for lower Manhattan. Nevertheless, the City presented the plans to the community as if they were each just a small, independent project. As Jane Jacobs noted, "And then sooner or later, to the horror of many people, it became clear what these disjointed pieces added up to."⁸

In the early 1950s, Robert Moses first targeted the South Village, an Italian-immigrant neighborhood south of Washington Square Park. Originally, Moses proposed to demolish nearly 30 blocks south of West 3rd Street to Spring Street, from Mercer Street to Sixth Avenue above Houston Street and from West Broadway to Sixth Avenue below Houston.⁹ The Lower West Side Civic League formed to oppose the demolition of these residential blocks. Due in part to the community opposition, Moses eventually did drop the proposed urban renewal for the blocks west of West Broadway (now LaGuardia Place above Houston Street). However, he did go forward with the demolition of the loft buildings east of West Broadway above Houston Street for Title 1 redevelopment that involved the construction of high rise towers on superblocks.

Although originally intended for middle-income housing, the City transferred these superblocks to New York University, which was undergoing its own controversial and destructive expansion around Washington Square Park. Villagers cried foul over the urban renewal that benefited the university and took away most of the middle-income housing that should have been available to them. The City, however, ignored their protests, just as NYU had done when it systematically desecrated nearly all the historic buildings along Washington Square South.

From the late 1940s through the early 1960s, NYU transformed the south side of Washington Square Park from a quaint collection of small-scale nineteenth-century buildings to a modern campus for its ever-

growing student population in the Village.¹⁰ Known as “Genius Row,” the south side of the park was marked with a collection of modest mid-nineteenth-century brick buildings converted into Greenwich Village studios. In these buildings, such “geniuses” as Stephen Crane, O. Henry, Willa Cather, and Alan Seeger wrote and painted. Villagers formed a committee to protest the demolition of these important buildings. However, as Anthony C. Wood notes, “though useful in some struggles, embarrassment alone would not be enough to stop the demolition.”¹¹

Up against Robert Moses’ seemingly unstoppable power and New York University’s potent influence, it is amazing that Villagers did not throw in the towel. Remarkably, they continued to fight tougher and tougher battles, and moreover, they even started to win. One of the best-known victories was the defeat of Moses’ proposed multi-lane highway through Washington Square Park. In 1952, Shirley Hayes, a Village mother whose children used the playground in the park, read an article in the paper mentioning that the existing roadway through Washington Square would be widened to accommodate higher volume and higher speed traffic. Hayes, outraged at the danger the roadway would create for the children who played in the park, immediately contacted other Village mothers, including Edith Lyons, and formed the Washington Square Park Committee. The group was grassroots through and through, raising money and asking for help through the area’s schools and churches.¹²

Hayes and her fellow park mothers wanted to defeat more than the enlargement of the roadway through the park; they decided to take it a step further and fight to close the park to traffic entirely. At first, her and her group were alone in this aim, as the rest of the neighborhood was focusing on how to negotiate with Moses and reduce the size and impact of the highway. Tony Dapolito, long-time community board member and community leader, remarked, “we were negotiating and we got it to the point where then maybe [the roadway] wasn’t going to be depressed, and maybe it wasn’t going to be 48 feet, it was going to be 36. And then we had it down to 30. And the meanwhile there’s Shirley saying, ‘Close the park to traffic.’”¹³ No matter what the community leaders were negotiating, Hayes kept pushing for the elimination of traffic entirely.

The battle raged on for years without victory or defeat. In 1958, Ray Rubinow, who worked for the J.M. Kaplan Fund and who had been instrumental in the efforts to save Carnegie Hall, realized that there were too many different groups and interests involved in efforts to defeat the highway through the park.¹⁴ He helped establish, along with several other influential New Yorkers – including Jane Jacobs, Robert Jacobs, Norman Redlich, Eleanor Roosevelt, Margaret Mead, and Lewis Mumford – the Joint Emergency

Committee to Close Washington Square Park to Traffic. The cumbersome name came at the suggestion of Jane Jacobs, who saw the value of putting the narrowly-defined mission of the group in the organization's title. The Joint Emergency Committee (JEC) brought to the table the expertise and influence that Shirley Hayes and her grassroots efforts had lacked.¹⁵

The JEC had two brilliant ideas that ensured the success of their campaign to close the park to traffic. One was simply to ask for a temporary closing of the park to traffic. Moses and his traffic experts warned that if automobiles and buses were prevented from going through the park, the rest of the streets surrounding the park and the Village would be so overrun with traffic that Villagers would beg the City to allow traffic again through the square. Jane Jacobs and the JEC, however, were confident that the closing of the park to traffic would have no such horrendous effects, and that the opposite in fact would be true. By asking for only a temporary closure of the park to traffic, the JEC made its request seem more innocuous to the politicians. If the loss of the traffic thoroughfare through the park was indeed a travesty, the politicians could easily reverse their decision.

The second shrewd and ingenious idea of the JEC was to use an upcoming election for its own means. The Greenwich Village Democratic party and all of its politicians had long been controlled by Carmine DeSapio, the district leader and boss of Tammany Hall. Shortly after the 1956 presidential election, as the Village was fighting to protect its neighborhood character, a group of young, reform-oriented Democrats, led by Carol Greitzer and Ed Koch, formed the Village Independent Democrats (VID) and aimed to stir up Village politics. By 1958, the VID had asserted itself as a real threat to DeSapio's long-held power. DeSapio was up for re-election for district leader, and the JEC threatened that if he did not use his influence to close Washington Square Park to traffic, its members would do everything they could to ensure his defeat. On the other hand, if DeSapio helped them close Washington Square Park to traffic, the JEC would give him lavish public praise and support his re-election.

DeSapio held great influence over the Board of Estimate, the municipal body that had the authority to temporarily close the park to traffic, because, in essence, he controlled the Manhattan Borough President, Hulan Jack. Jack, in turn, could convince the other four borough presidents to vote either for or against traffic in the park, thereby ensuring either measure's passage. The JEC's strategy was controversial within the group, as many of its members were staunch supporters of VID and did not want to support DeSapio's re-election, even if he were to close the park to traffic. Nonetheless, the strategy worked—in October 1958, the Board of Estimate voted to close the park to traffic. As a result, the JEC profusely

thanked DeSapio and supported his re-election. Looking back, Jane Jacobs remarked, “as far as I know this was the first instance in which a citizens’ group, a citizens’ movement, deliberately and—some people thought cold-bloodedly—used an election for their purposes and their cause, instead of letting the election divide and shatter them.”¹⁶

Even though the closing was at first just temporary, the JEC knew that the real victory had been won. As the JEC predicted, there was no major traffic disruptions, and people quickly saw how nice the park was without major traffic. Years later, Jane Jacobs remarked, “So pleasant and effective were the results of shutting off Washington Square to traffic that I don’t think anybody after that, not that I remember, ever seriously suggested opening the roadway again.” The park was finally permanently closed to automobile traffic in 1959 and to buses in the early 1960s.

Although Villagers did not at first realize it, Robert Moses’ proposal to run a multi-lane highway through Washington Square Park was a by-product of his urban renewal projects south of Washington Square Park and of his proposed Lower Manhattan Expressway. Originally, Moses had wanted to give the new urban renewal projects he was developing along West Broadway, south of the park, a prestigious Fifth Avenue address, necessitating connecting West Broadway with lower Fifth Avenue through Washington Square. In addition, Moses had intended for an exit or entrance ramp for the Lower Manhattan Expressway to be located near West Broadway, which would bring high speed and high volume traffic up West Broadway and through Washington Square Park to connect with lower Fifth Avenue. The Regional Planning Association originally proposed the Lower Manhattan Expressway in the 1920s, but it took Robert Moses to revive it in the postwar period and a coalition of activists from all of the many neighborhoods it would have destroyed to defeat it.

Cutting across the Lower East Side, Little Italy, SoHo, and the South Village, and connecting to the West Side Highway, going through portions of the far West Village, the Lower Manhattan Expressway would have wreaked havoc on several neighborhoods and countless residents and building owners. Because the expressway was going to have a detrimental effect on the far western stretches of the Village, near where she lived, Jane Jacobs joined the fight, along with Tony Dapolito of the South Village, Hy Harmatz of Ratner’s restaurant on the Lower East Side, and the leaders of the Church of the Most Sacred Heart in Little Italy. Like earlier battles, the fight to defeat the Lower Manhattan Expressway was long and frustrating. However, Villagers had already defeated Moses in Washington Square Park, and armed with a

coalition of neighborhood leaders throughout Lower Manhattan, they were prepared to fight to the bitter end.

By 1962, advocates had convinced the City to drop the plans for the Lower Manhattan Expressway, but the State continued to push for its construction throughout the rest of the decade. In 1968, the State made a final attempt to go through the required public review process in order to construct the highway. The hearing, like many at the time, and sadly like many now, was a joke. According to Jane Jacobs, it was clear that what low-level officials were present were not interested in the public's input.¹⁷ Although accounts of exactly what happen differ, at one point, Jane Jacobs led the audience across the stage in a march. In the chaos, the stenographer's tape fell out and started to unravel. Jacobs and the others proceeded to destroy the tape, arguing that if there was no tape of the hearing, the hearing, which was required by law, did not take place and the expressway could not go forward.¹⁸ The police arrested Jacobs and charged her with "second-degree riot, inciting to riot and criminal mischief."¹⁹ For unrelated reasons, Jacobs left the Village later that year, settling with her family in Toronto; the other leaders continued without her, and the demise of the Lower Manhattan Expressway finally officially came in 1971.²⁰

Another victory for which New Yorkers can thank Jane Jacobs is the defeat of the proposed urban renewal along the Greenwich Village waterfront. The far western blocks of Greenwich Village was traditionally less residential and more industrial in character than the blocks to the east because of the activity along the Hudson River. In 1960, the elevated freight rail line now known as the High Line was torn down in the Village below Gansevoort Street, leaving a series of vacant lots in the neighborhood for redevelopment. It was in the paper a year later that Jacobs first read about the proposal to "study" not only these vacant parcels but 14 whole blocks from Christopher to West 11th Streets, from Hudson Street to the Hudson River, for urban renewal. Jacobs lived within the proposed urban renewal area, and the project stood for everything that she was arguing against in her seminal book, which was nearing completion, *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*. Where the municipal government saw a blank slate in which 14 blocks of the neighborhood could be completely demolished, reconfigured, and rebuilt as superblocks, Jacobs saw a working, mixed-use, mixed-income neighborhood that needed just small improvements and infill, not massive change.

Almost immediately, Jacobs and her neighbors formed the Committee to Save the West Village, and the group elected Jacobs and fellow neighbor Donald Dodelson as chairs. Although the prospect of

“studying” the neighborhood seemed innocuous at first, Jacobs soon realized that the City already had decided that urban renewal would take place on these blocks. Prior to the “study”, the City had lobbied for Title 1 urban renewal funds and commissioned architect renderings intending to “bulldoze the place, wipe them out, put up these high rent apartments, in one of these sterile schemes.”²¹

The Committee sought the help of Lester Eisner, a friend of one of its members who worked for the federal government in urban renewal. His information and advice were essential to the success of the group’s advocacy efforts. One of the most important pieces of advice that he gave Villagers was that they should not offer any suggestions as to how the project could be improved. The government required that urban renewal projects seek community input, and by offering any suggestions, no matter how small or inconsequential, the government would consider the community participation requirement fulfilled. The Committee urged its members at all public hearings not to say anything beyond the fact that the designation of the blocks as an urban renewal area should be removed.²² Once the urban renewal scheme was defeated, the residents would focus on planning for their own neighborhood the way they wanted it to be.

Eisner also encouraged the Committee to take on its own meticulous survey of the neighborhood, documenting building conditions, number of residents, uses, etc., in order to prove that the area was not blighted, as the government claimed. The Committee trained volunteers who carefully compiled the survey, although the City all but ignored the results. At the same time, the Committee sent out notices to neighbors encouraging them to keep up the appearances of their buildings and streets. One announcement urged Villagers to “show [their] best face, sweep up, keep the garbage pails covered” because “any moment a man may drive by who may influence a deciding vote. Will he decide that this neighborhood [sic] must be saved?”²³ This announcement was likely hung in the area’s churches, bars, and coffee shops, which were used as centers through which information could be quickly and effectively dispersed.

Despite the presence of a dubious middle-income housing “neighborhood” group, MICOVE, which supported the urban renewal, the Committee to Save the West Village continued to grow stronger and more effective in its stance that the residents did not want urban renewal on their blocks. With the motto “Not a Sparrow Shall Be Moved,” the group gathered more and more evidence of how the area was not a slum and should not be slated for whole-scale urban renewal. Fortunately, the fight did not drag out over years as other battles had done. According to Jacobs, “the way this whole thing ended finally was that

Mayor Wagner was convinced that there was no sense in trying to go further with this—that opposition to it only grew by the day—that he became convinced that we really never would give up.”²⁴

Having defeated the urban renewal designation, the Committee to Save the West Village changed its name to the West Village Committee and began to plan, according to the neighborhood’s principles, for additional housing in the area. The plan involved no demolition, but rather constructing, on vacant land, walk-up infill buildings that fit with the character of the neighborhood. Focusing on the land formerly occupied by elevated railway, the Committee hired Perkins & Will architects for the ground-breaking new housing design. Unfortunately, the lack of enthusiasm on the side of the City and rising construction costs delayed the project and compromised many of its best design details. Nonetheless, today the West Village Houses, completed in 1974, stand as a counterpoint to the destruction wrought by urban renewal in the 1950s and 1960s.

Robert Moses and the government’s urban renewal projects cannot be blamed for instigating all of the preservation battles in the Village in the 1950s and 1960s. Some battles started when an under-appreciated historic structure was presumed obsolete prematurely. Such was the case with the Jefferson Market Courthouse, designed in 1876 in the High Victorian Gothic style by Vaux and Withers. Not long after its completion, the courthouse was named one of the country’s ten most beautiful buildings. However, by the postwar period, years of neglect and deferred maintenance had taken its toll. It ceased being a courthouse in 1945, and subsequently, various city agencies made use of the building but were far from proper stewards of the fading architectural gem. The courthouse had been on a list of architecturally important buildings put together by the Municipal Art Society in 1954, but it took neighborhood activists to bring the momentum and drive to ensure the building’s survival.²⁵

Although Margot Gayle lived just down the street from the courthouse on 9th Street, she credits Alan Burnham of the Municipal Art Society with first opening her eyes to the beauty of the building. She, like other Villagers, just thought of it as a “tired, uninteresting building.”²⁶ However, by the mid-1950s, it was becoming more and more apparent that the courthouse’s future was in jeopardy. After vacating the courthouse, the City put it on a list of buildings that were available to city agencies in need of space. If no city agency stepped up to take the courthouse, the site would be auctioned off to a private developer. No city agency wanted the Victorian antique, but the West Side Savings Bank was more than interested in the property for construction of a high-rise apartment building.

At a Christmas party in 1957, Margot Gayle began discussing the plight of “Old Jeff” with other notable Villagers, including Philip Wittenberg.²⁷ They formed a group, and in an unusual strategy move, decided to focus attention first on advocating for the repair of the clock on top of Jefferson Market. Thus the Committee of Neighbors to Get the Jefferson Market Courthouse Clock Started was formed. Philip Wittenberg served as its chair, with Gayle, Robert C. Weinberg, Ruth Wittenberg, Stanley Tankel, and Edith Lyons as other key players.

The group concentrated first on getting the clock started because the public generally thought that the courthouse was derelict and outdated. On the other hand, the clock was a practical Village landmark that most people missed and wanted to see restored. The Committee raised over \$3,000, primarily from small donations and the sale of Jefferson Market holiday cards. Its members garnered over 10,000 signatures and the support of 65 groups. Their aim was simple, to the point, and fairly easily accomplished. With enough funds raised, and the support of Mayor Wagner, the Committee was able to rehabilitate the clock and electrify its operation. As the *Herald Tribune* reported in 1960, “The Winnah!—C.O.N.T.G.T.J.M.C.C.S. [Committee Of Neighbors To Get The Jefferson Market Courthouse Clock Started]”²⁸ Not only did the Committee succeed in repairing the clock and making it functional, it also fulfilled the second goal of raising appreciation of the building and awareness of its potential loss.

While the Committee was publicly working on getting the “Old Jeff” clock running, its members were strategizing privately about finding a new use for the building so that it could be permanently saved. At first, they considered a cultural center, but when they realized that the New York Public Library was looking for a larger space for its Jackson Square branch, the fit seemed promising. To investigate further, the Committee asked Harold Edelman’s students at Pratt to study whether the building could be adapted for library use. The students went to work, and came back with the answer the Committee had hoped to get – “Old Jeff” was both structurally sound and easily reconfigured on the interior for library use.

Once the clock was officially repaired, the Committee of Neighbors morphed into the Committee for a Library in the Jefferson Market Courthouse to advocate for the new use. Luckily, after many more petitions and some behind the scenes political maneuvering, the Committee was able to win Mayor Wagner’s support. The New York Public Library, however, still was not enthusiastic about the notion of using the old courthouse as its new branch, preferring a new building instead. With the Mayor’s insistence, the library eventually warmed up to the idea. After several rounds of pushing to get the needed funds in the municipal budget, the project finally went forward. The City hired architect Giorgio

Cavaglieri for the conversion in 1962, work started in 1964, and in 1967, the Jefferson Market Courthouse officially opened as a branch of the New York Public Library.

Looking back, Margot Gayle remarked that, although her and her colleagues were ultimately successful in their efforts, “There was no precedent for what we were doing, and there was very little community feeling about saving old buildings, so we couldn’t really use that. We just used every tool at hand and worked fast to keep the building from being auctioned off, really. I really am amazed to think how close that building came to being gone.”²⁹ The Jefferson Market advocacy was described by Ada Louise Huxtable at the time as a “tour de force of intelligent obstinacy,” as the group defeated a “municipal obstacle course of bureaucracy and unconcern.”³⁰ This “group of hardheaded sentimentalists,” as the *New Yorker* called them, proved that a seemingly hopeless building could be saved with some hard work, sweat, and political strategizing.³¹

The conversion of the old Victorian courthouse into a library was groundbreaking for the New York City preservation movement in more ways than one. An early example of adaptive reuse, it showed that old buildings can be preserved on their exterior but updated for new use and modern facilities on the interior. However, the fact remained that the model created by the Jefferson Market advocates had little chance for success for buildings in private hands. Political maneuvering was more difficult, if not impossible, with private developers, and until the Landmarks Law was passed in 1965, preservation advocates throughout the city were still facing Herculean tasks on a regular basis.

By the early 1960s, the Village was entrenched in several different preservation battles. As the *Village Voice* reported in 1960, “Mayor Wagner learned last Monday—if he did not already know—that the watchword of Greenwich Village is ‘Save.’ Save the housing, save the Square, save the coffee houses—SAVE the Village.”³² The passage of the Landmarks Law in 1965 unfortunately did not allow preservationists in the Village to finally relax. On the contrary, the Landmarks Law brought with it a new Village preservation fight. Despite the fact that Villagers had been calling for historic preservation protections since the late 1940s and that Villagers played a key role in pushing for the creation and the passage of the Landmarks Law, the Village would not be the first, or even among the first ten historic districts designated in New York City. Moreover, for a period of time it seemed very likely that the Village’s many nineteenth-century streets and vernacular buildings would be left out of the landmark protections.

After the passage of the Landmarks Law, the City became nervous about protecting the Village in its entirety as the neighborhood had long wanted. According to Norman Redlich, a Villager who was a lawyer in the City's corporation counsel office during the early years of the Landmarks Law, the Village "was not the Vieux Carre in New Orleans. You couldn't point to a whole series of buildings that had architectural distinction. Greenwich Village was an idea, it was a concept."³³ At the same time, the City recognized that the Landmarks Law's constitutionality was questionable in the early years of the Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) and that the agency's actions were highly susceptible to lawsuits. Although the LPC originally proposed one large Village historic district, constituting most, although not all, of the Village and encompassing over 2,000 buildings, the agency scrapped this plan in favor of a series of 18 small districts that left out about one-third of what had been proposed originally in the larger district. As one Villager put it, the 18 districts would result in "isolated little clusters of 19th century houses...[that] will come to serve as a mere stage backdrop to lend a measure of badly-needed charm to a landscape overwhelmed by dozens of huge and graceless apartment houses."³⁴

In response to the proposal for 18 small districts, veteran Village neighborhood advocates Verna Small and Ruth Wittenberg formed the Greenwich Village Historic District Council with the specific mandate of pushing for one, large, unified Village historic district. The Council was another Village umbrella group consisting of already-established Village neighborhood organizations such as the Association of Village Homeowners, the Greenwich Village Association, the West Village Committee, the Washington Square Association, and others. Villagers were up against powerful real estate interests that wanted as little landmarking as possible and the uncertain legal footing of the Landmarks Law, but they were accustomed to fighting for their neighborhood against these seemingly omnipotent forces. The Greenwich Village Historic District Council inundated the municipal government with telegrams calling for the large historic district, and its members testified passionately at hearings. Supposedly, at one hearing regarding the historic district proposals, "Mrs. Wittenberg shouted and Mrs. Small cried and [Geoffrey Platt, chair of the LPC] was overcome."³⁵

In the end, the City abandoned the idea of the 18 separate historic districts and went forward with the large historic district. However, even the larger historic district that the LPC proposed did not include everything that the neighborhood wanted. Excluded from the district were the New York University-owned buildings along the south and east sides of Washington Square, the blocks south of the square known as the South Village, and the Greenwich Village waterfront blocks. The incomplete boundaries of this larger district not surprisingly resulted in tension among Village preservationists. Jane Jacobs, for

instance, believed that the northwest portions of the Village were “to be thrown to the wolves.” She pushed for the neighborhood to decide on its own boundaries and oppose any historic district that did not include everything that Villagers wanted.³⁶ Others, however, felt that having defeated the proposal for 18 small districts, they could not realistically get any more from the LPC. This type of debate – when to compromise and accept what one can get versus when to stick to one’s guns and risk getting nothing at all – is still faced every year in New York City neighborhoods, as what a community wants and what the City is willing to designate are rarely the same. The City officially adopted the larger historic district that omitted the south and west portions of Greenwich Village in April 1969, two decades after Villagers first called for the neighborhood’s protection. The Village, or at least most of it, had been finally saved.

Common among all the preservation successes in the Village in the postwar period was a critical combination of both self-taught neighborhood advocates and savvy professionals and political insiders. The stereotype of the 1950s and 1960s Village preservationist is certainly that of the feisty housewife who had no formal training on the issues she was addressing but who knew in her heart what was right for her own neighborhood and who would not take no for an answer. This, however, is only part of the story.

To be sure, many early Village preservationists were self-taught. They learned about buildings, architecture, traffic, city planning, zoning, and politics simply out of necessity. Edith Lyons, who was involved in the fight to close Washington Square Park to traffic, once noted, “I didn’t know about traffic, though I would go and testify as though I had devoted my life to a study of traffic.”³⁷ Similarly, Doris Diether, who is now a zoning maven, training communities about the ins and outs of the complicated NYC Zoning Resolution, has remarked that she took on the zoning and press relations tasks of the Save the Village group because no one else wanted to do it.³⁸ At the time, she knew nothing about zoning but she taught herself everything she needed to know to be able to use zoning as a tool to protect the Village. Jane Jacobs, who was often described as a Village housewife propelled into motion by the urban renewal of the postwar period, was also primarily self-taught. However, as a writer for *Architectural Forum*, she had access to people and ideas—albeit ideas which she often rejected—that she probably would not have had if she wrote for another type of magazine.

Working with these “feisty, feisty ladies who went out with the posters and petitions,” however, was a contingency of politically-savvy and well-connected professionals and insiders in the Village that helped open doors for these self-taught advocates. For instance, Ruth and Philip Wittenberg, who were involved in many of the preservation fights, were related by marriage to urban critic Lewis Mumford. The couple

also had many political and society connections. Margot Gayle, who was self-taught in terms of architecture and becoming the world's leading expert on cast iron, was not so uneducated when it came to politics. She ran for City Council in 1953, years before she got involved with the Municipal Art Society and started the fight to save Jefferson Market Courthouse, and she was also Democratic district leader. Gayle has drawn the connection between her political background and her success as an advocate, noting "if you want to be in a movement that involves city actions, it's a very useful background to have been an active participant in politics...I urge anybody who wanted to be a do-gooder in the city or the state to get involved in politics."³⁹ Gayle also worked for the Department of City Planning when the City was drafting the Landmarks Law, and she helped lobby City Council members to support the legislation.⁴⁰

In addition, there were no shortage of lawyers, architects, and planners in the Village in the 1950s and 1960s who cared passionately for their neighborhood and who could bring expertise and knowledge to the battles. Stanley Tankel, a Villager who also worked for the Regional Planning Association, brought these professionals together in the Greenwich Village Study, a group which aimed to help neighborhood advocates by producing the necessary research and findings needed to fight City Hall. Originally, the Study's purpose was broad; the professionals would try to create a plan for the Village's future that would represent the values of the community. However, when the battle to close Washington Square Park to traffic heated up, the study solely focused on proving that preventing traffic from going through the park would not have the disastrous effects that Robert Moses had predicted.

In many of the Village preservation battles, there were also behind the scenes conversations with political leaders that were just as essential as the homegrown community activism. For instance, Carmine DeSapio respected the advice of Norman Redlich, who was part of the Washington Square Joint Emergency Committee. Without Redlich's relationship with DeSapio, the tactic of using DeSapio's upcoming election to get the park closed to traffic may not have been so successful. Longtime community board member and Greenwich Village leader Tony Dapolito was also known for working behind the scenes with politicians like DeSapio and Borough President Hulan Jack on behalf of Village issues. Leticia Kent, writer and Village activist, noted that Dapolito loved "to tell you that a lot of the official versions [of Village preservation battles] are not true. Even the ones that I thought were true, because behind the scenes he was doing this, that or the other."⁴¹

Neither the community activism nor the behind the scenes deals alone could have resulted in the Village preservation success stories of the mid-twentieth century. As is the case today, both were equally essential

to affecting change in the neighborhood. Villagers' willingness to come out by the hundreds to protest, march, testify, etc., over and over again helped set them apart from other neighborhood advocates. However, the reality of politics is that even hundreds of people protesting in the streets is always not enough to convince politicians and the City to address an issue. Friends in high places are often needed.

Another key component of the Villagers' successes was their ability to get the attention of the press. Villagers have always come up with creative, and sometimes downright bizarre ways in which to show support or opposition to projects, thereby attracting more than their fair share of press and public attention. Perhaps because of the Village's reputation as haven for off-Broadway theater, avant garde art, and creativity, Village preservationists have never been shy about pulling a publicity stunt in order to get attention and further advance their goals.

Save the Village had probably some of the most creative protests; as Doris Diether has said, "sometimes you have to use a gimmick to get the public to look at the article. Most people don't read zoning articles."⁴² Save the Village certainly made zoning and tenant eviction demonstrations great fodder for the press. The group once spent \$50 to rent a pig to march with them at a protest in front of Governor Nelson Rockefeller's office in Midtown; the pig, although by all accounts obstinate and hard to manage, represented greedy landlords who were evicting tenants. Because of the pig, this otherwise ordinary protest was covered in the *New York Times*, *New York Daily News*, and *New York Herald Tribune*.

Save the Village staged more attention-getting demonstrations when supporting the new 1960s zoning resolution and asking for historic zoning for the neighborhood. In February 1960, the group arranged for the Loconik, a Salvador Dali-designed sight-seeing vehicle owned by the Hotel Albert, to take Villagers down to City Hall for the zoning hearings. The colorful and funky vehicle earned Save the Village a prominent photo in the *New York Times*.⁴³ A month later, when the City held another hearing on the new zoning resolution, Save the Village once again stole the attention of the press, dressing up in pre-World War I black derby hats, carrying signs that said "1916 Zoning is Old Hat," and riding in an early 1920s automobile.⁴⁴ In November 1960, the *Village Voice* reported on yet another of the group's stunts: "Save the Village Committee went to City Hall last Monday to demonstrate for better zoning laws. It turned out to be one of the wackiest sidewalk shows in the Hall's long history." Save the Village encouraged children to dress up in space suits to promote the group's bizarre demonstration theme, "Help Launch New York's Earthnik—New Zoning for More Inner Space."⁴⁵ These creative stunts were genius—after all, given the choice, is the press going to run a photo of people testifying in front of City Planning or are

the papers going to print an image of eccentric Villagers in a crazy car, old-fashioned garb, and space suits?

Save the Village was not alone in staging publicity stunts. In the fight to close Washington Square Park to traffic, several clever ideas were incorporated in order to get the attention of the press, the politicians, and the public. The Joint Emergency Committee needed a way to meet the goal of getting 30,000 signatures. Eleanor Roosevelt, who was one of the many influential supporters of the group, had a niece who lived in the Village and who was a model. The niece and her model friends agreed to walk around the Park with parasols that said, “A Park is Not a Parkway” and “Parks Are for People” in order to gather signatures. After the models secured the signatures, the JEC clipped all of the hundreds of pages of petitions together and rolled them around a rolling them pin. The Villagers brought the rolling pin to Carmine DeSapio as he was walking up the steps of City Hall, and the continuous roll of signatures to close the park to traffic rolled dramatically down the steps.⁴⁶ The JEC also made a float in the shape of a key, a symbol to lock traffic out of the park, for a May Day parade.⁴⁷

In fighting the proposed urban renewal along the western-most blocks of the Village, Villagers were growing weary of not being truly heard at the public hearings. At one hearing, members of the Committee to Save the West Village purchased pairs of cheap eye glasses at Woolworth’s and put tape in the form of an “X” on the lenses, symbolizing the marks on buildings that had been condemned to make way for urban renewal projects. According to Jane Jacobs, several hundred people were at the hearing, and the “X”-ed glasses “made such a splash and was so startling looking that the photographs that news people took of us appeared all over the world. We began getting clippings sent to us from Brazil, and from Europe...We began to become a symbol of what was wrong with urban renewal and [the] courage and indefatigability, which we sure had, of people fighting it.”⁴⁸

The stunts in which these Villagers so eagerly participated helped give them the reputation of being willing to do anything to protect their neighborhood. Then, as now, Villagers were always more than willing to come out by the hundreds to protest, march, testify, cheer, and jeer and were “ready to fight City Hall at the drop of a petition.”⁴⁹ The Village’s two local papers, *The Villager* and the *Village Voice*, were particularly thorough in their coverage of the Village’s struggles, battle by battle, but even the city-wide papers got involved when the fights became particularly juicy. It must have helped that the Village was a well-known neighborhood both within New York City and well-beyond, and that it had long had a reputation for social activism, avant-garde art, and being at the forefront of many of the twentieth

century's cultural movements. Greenwich Village had an appeal beyond its borders, and the press was more inclined than in other neighborhoods to cover the battles.

Today, New Yorkers have the Village preservationists of the 1950s and 1960s to thank for not only saving the neighborhood but also for demonstrating effective ways such preservation campaigns can be carried out. The Village's local community board, Community Board 2, continues to be one of the strongest and most involved in the city, as it was in the 1950s and 1960s, and even in this age of websites and blogs, *The Villager* is still the go-to source for coverage on the many different preservation and neighborhood issues in the area. Many 1950s and 1960s advocates, including Doris Diether and Carol Greitzer, continue to be active in Village community issues, lending their expertise and experience to the new issues that emerge. However, the Greenwich Village Society for Historic Preservation (GVSHP), founded in 1980, has emerged as a leader in the many preservation battles in the neighborhood. Inspired by the advocates of the 1950s and 1960s, GVSHP has fought tirelessly in the last ten years to protect the Village's unique character and sense of the place as the Village, like the city as a whole, has experienced a real estate and construction boom not seen since the postwar period.

In the last decade, GVSHP has focused on returning to the unsolved preservation battles of the postwar period, particularly the protection of the western and southern blocks of the Village that were omitted from the 1969 Greenwich Village Historic District designation. Thankfully, despite having no historic preservation protections, there was still enough historic fabric remaining in these areas to make the efforts worthwhile. In 1999, GVSHP formed the Save Gansevoort Market Task Force to focus on preserving and protecting the defining characteristics of the Meatpacking District. The neighborhood was rapidly changing, with high-end boutiques, restaurants, and nightclubs replacing the meatpacking establishments and new developments threatening the market buildings. Spearheaded by neighborhood activist Jo Hamilton and pioneering Meatpacking District restaurateur Florent Morellet, Save Gansevoort Market garnered incredible support for creating a historic district in this unique Manhattan neighborhood, making powerful alliances with the long-established the meatpackers as well as with the newer business owners. Save Gansevoort Market inundated the LPC with signed postcards, and the efforts attracted wide local and national press. Nonetheless, the creation of a historic district was not an easy sell to make to the LPC. Unlike Greenwich Village or even other commercial districts like SoHo and NoHo, Gansevoort Market does not have outstanding architecture. Although the neighborhood clearly has a "sense of place," as required by the Landmarks Law, a district comprised of so many commercial vernacular buildings was new territory for the LPC.

While seeking landmark protections, GVSHP and its Save Gansevoort Market Task Force also were working to exclude residential uses from the market area and to keep the area as viable as possible for the meatpackers still remaining. Landmarking can neither protect nor dictate use, and therefore zoning was the best tool at the neighborhood's disposal. The existing manufacturing zoning of the neighborhood helped to ensure that residential uses would be kept at bay. However, there was certainly formidable pressure from developers to undermine the manufacturing zoning and allow residential uses to seep into the area.

The new boutiques, restaurants, and clubs were less of a threat than residences because these establishments could co-exist with the meatpackers. The new, non-residential uses fit within the meatpackers' schedules to establish a real 24-hour neighborhood—the meatpackers would work from the early morning hours until the late morning/early afternoon, at which time the boutiques would open and shoppers would come to the neighborhood; and when the shops closed about 6 or 7 pm, the restaurants and clubs would just be opening and would continue into the early morning hours, when the meatpackers would again take over the area's activity. Residential use would throw off this delicate balance, creating a constituency that would demand quiet, truck-free, and carcass-free streets.

When the Department of Buildings approved as-of-right a 450-foot tall, part-residential/part-hotel on Washington Street in the Meatpacking District, GVSHP and the Save Gansevoort Market Task Force realized that this neighborhood and manufacturing neighborhoods throughout the city were now facing a new risk. The developer of 848 Washington Street convinced the city to allow in a manufacturing zone, for the first time ever, a building that was 49% occupied by residences as long as the remaining 51% of the building was reserved for hotel use (hotels are allowed as-of-right in manufacturing zones). GVSHP and its Save Gansevoort Market Task Force adamantly opposed this 51/49 ruling and launched a full-scale assault to convince the City to reverse the decision. The groups lobbied the area's elected officials and organized a citywide coalition, which included the meatpacking businesses and allied unions that represent meatpacking workers. In addition, GVSHP and Save Gansevoort Market spearheaded a letter-writing campaign to both the Department of Buildings and Mayor Bloomberg, inundating them with thousands of signed letters in opposition to the residences. Almost 18 months after the initial ruling, the City succumbed to the neighborhood pressure and reversed its ruling, thereby preventing as-of-right residential use in Gansevoort Market and in other manufacturing districts throughout the city.

Even with the reversal, hotels remained legal in the area. The construction of the Gansevoort Hotel on a prominent vacant parcel in the heart of the Meatpacking District signaled to advocates that if the LPC did not designate a historic district soon, more out-of-scale and out-of-place buildings like this zinc-clad, 13-story hotel would become the norm. Thankfully, in September 2003, the LPC officially designated the Gansevoort Market Historic District. As was the case in many of the earlier preservation battles, the community did not get all that it wanted. The sites that straddle the High Line west of Washington Street were excluded, as was the previously mentioned Gansevoort Hotel site. Nonetheless, what seemed like a pipe dream only years before became one of the city's most unique and groundbreaking historic districts.

After the designation of the historic district, Save Gansevoort Market continued to explore ways to protect the neighborhood's market character by protecting the market use in addition to the historic buildings. Many of the meatpacking establishments were looking to move to the Bronx, and therefore Save Gansevoort Market looked to other market uses that could be appropriate for the area. The group funded a study entitled, "The Meat Market Blooms," which investigated the feasibility of moving New York City's flower market to the Meatpacking District. The flower market was being pushed out of its location in the West 20s after that area was rezoned to allowed residential development, and the flower merchants needed a place, preferably in Manhattan close to their buyers, where they could operate side by side. Unfortunately, the study indicated that Gansevoort Market did not provide the necessary space for the flower merchants, and the move would require more municipal and state investment than the government was willing to commit. One of the main sites that the Meat Market Blooms study had eyed for the flower market is now being developed by the Whitney Museum of Art for a new museum. Without a doubt, the arrival of this major cultural institution and the opening of the park on the High Line in the Meatpacking District will bring further changes to the neighborhood's character. Some meatpackers are to remain on the site of the new Whitney museum, but the overall trend has been the replacement of the meatpackers with more restaurants, clubs, and boutiques. Despite the continuing loss of meatpackers, GVSHP and Save Gansevoort Market know that without their efforts to create the historic district and keep residential uses out of the neighborhood, little, if nothing, would remain of the historic meatpacking neighborhood.

With the major work in Gansevoort Market completed, GVSHP shifted its attention a few blocks south to the Far West Village/Greenwich Village waterfront—the same blocks that Jane Jacobs had fought tirelessly to save from urban renewal forty years earlier. The construction of three, tall, modern glass towers designed by Richard Meier starting in 2002 was a wake-up call to Villagers that this once backwater section of the Village was becoming the next hot neighborhood for high-rise development.

Because the area did include pieces of vacant land and several soft sites and the zoning in the neighborhood encouraged high-rise towers, GVSHP realized that the area's preservation required both landmarking to protect the historic structures and downzoning to ensure that any new development in the area fit the scale of the existing blocks. The organization developed in conjunction with neighbors both a landmarking and a downzoning plan and submitted these to the LPC and the City Planning Commission.

Experience had shown that just submitting a plan to the City was not enough to affect change; advocacy efforts were also needed to push the City to act. GVSHP again spearheaded the protest of new, out-of-scale buildings and the calls to save the area's historic character. Like the preservationists of the postwar period, GVSHP did whatever it could to get the attention of the City and the press. The organization staged several marches, demonstrations both on the steps of City Hall and in the neighborhood, press conferences, and town halls, and hundreds of Villagers attended these events. For a town hall meeting in December 2004, GVSHP constructed a three-foot by five-foot holiday card that said "Season's Greetings Mayor Bloomberg: All We Want for the Holidays is to SAVE OUR NEIGHBORHOOD." Hundreds of Villagers signed the card at the town hall, and a few days later, when GVSHP held a press conference on the steps of City Hall, the card was presented to Mayor Bloomberg in person as he walked into his offices. The timing was pure luck, but the stunt got the efforts to preserve the Far West Village featured on the local television channel, NY1.

Development threats were increasing day by day in the Far West Village, and GVSHP knew that if the City did not act to protect it soon, nothing of the historic neighborhood would be left. Thankfully, the City listened to the concerns of the neighborhood, and in a rare collaboration, the LPC and City Planning Commission worked together to put forward both a downzoning proposal and a proposal for two small historic districts and a series of individual landmarks in the neighborhood. The City's landmarking plan was not nearly as extensive as the one GVSHP and the neighborhood had promulgated, but it was clear that the City was not willing to budge on the landmarking boundaries. In addition, the City excluded two key development sites from the downzoning plan, paving the way for additional large-scale developments in the Far West Village. Throughout the adoption process for the rezoning, GVSHP continued to push the City to include these excluded sites, but to no avail. Nonetheless, GVSHP was successful in urging the City to move the downzoning through its Uniformed Land Use Review Procedure (ULURP) in record time in order to help stop the out-of-scale developments that were in the works. The Far West Village was officially downzoned in October 2005, and the two historic districts, the Greenwich Village Historic

District Extension and the Weehawken Street Historic District, were designated in May 2006. Greenwich Village advocates had fought and for the most part won another major preservation battle.

The seemingly never-ending development boom and institutional expansion in the Village has not allowed GVSHP to rest, and the organization is currently in the midst of several preservation battles. Following the successful campaigns to landmark the Meatpacking District and the Far West Village, GVSHP has put forward a proposal to designate a South Village Historic District. At the same time, the organization has reacted to several important preservation issues that have emerged in the Village. The most substantial is the St. Vincent's hospital proposal to demolish all nine of its buildings within the Greenwich Village Historic District and replace them with new development, most of which would be built by a private developer as luxury housing. Never before has demolition on such a large-scale been proposed in a New York City historic district, and the project is the largest proposed in the neighborhood since the era of Robert Moses. In addition, New York University has continued to be a thorn in the side of Villagers since the 1950s. In the last 35 years, NYU has built over three million square feet of space in the Village, and the university is now estimating that it needs to build or acquire an additional three million square feet in the Village in the next 25 years. GVSHP and Villagers cannot see how NYU can expand in the Village any further without seriously denigrating the neighborhood's historic character.

The South Village, St. Vincent's, and NYU are the major issues confronting Village preservationists, but there are still countless smaller issues threatening the historic character of the Village that come up on an almost daily basis. Fortunately, Villagers are still as eager as they were decades ago to sign petitions, protest, march, or do whatever it takes to prevent the destruction of their neighborhood. The feisty and fighting spirit of the Village advocates of the past carries on in the Villagers of today. In fact, take away the dates from quotes about Village advocates, and it is hard to tell if they were written in 1958 or 2008. For instance, the 1961 quote, "If there's anybody that loves to fight—and win—a good battle to save a landmark, it's a resident of Greenwich Village" still very much rings true today.⁵⁰ The torch has been passed to a newer generation of advocates in the Village, and therefore there is hope that these advocates can be as successful in the major battles of today as their predecessors were decades ago.

Melissa Baldock is the Director of Preservation and Research for the Greenwich Village Society for Historic Preservation (GVSHP). At GVSHP, she has worked on the campaigns to preserve Gansevoort Market and the Far West Village/Greenwich Village Waterfront. She is currently involved in the efforts to create a South Village Historic District and the community's opposition to the proposed redevelopment

of St. Vincent's. Ms. Baldock graduated from Columbia University's Historic Preservation program in 2003, where she wrote her Master's thesis on the revitalization of Coney Island.

¹ "The Winnah!—C.O.N.T.G.T.J.M.C.C.S." *New York Herald-Tribune*. 8 Aug. 1960.

² "Apartment Boom Invades 'Village.'" *New York Times*. 22 Nov. 1959, p. R1. From ProQuest, 18 Feb. 2008.

³ Archer, Chris. "The Village's History Has Been A Fight For Preservation." *The Villager*. 12 Jun. 1986, Vol. 56, No. 19. The four points were stated differently in different articles and sources, but the choice was made to go with the four points as listed in this *Villager* article.

⁴ The first person to sign the petition was Albert S. Bard, the preservation pioneer who was the namesake of the Bard Act, the state law that enabled cities in New York State to enact their own measures to protect historic and aesthetic qualities. "Accelerate Drive to 'Save Village.'" *The Villager*. 12 Nov. 1959.

⁵ For a more thorough account of Greenwich Village's and Brooklyn Heights' efforts to get historic and aesthetic protections, see Anthony C. Wood's *Preserving New York: Winning the Right to Protect a City's Landmarks*, particularly chapters 7, 8, and 9 (New York: Routledge, 2007).

⁶ Doris Diether interviewed by Susan DeVries, 24 July 1996, Greenwich Village Society for Historic Preservation Archive.

⁷ Diether interviewed by DeVries, 24 July 1996.

⁸ Jane Jacobs interviewed by Leticia Kent, October 1997, Greenwich Village Society for Historic Preservation Archive.

⁹ Stern, Robert A.M., Thomas Mellins, and David Fishman. *New York 1960: Architecture and Urbanism Between the Second World War and the Bicentennial*. New York: Monacelli, 1995. p. 226

¹⁰ A more detailed account of the South Village urban renewal schemes and the NYU buildings built in the postwar period can be found in Stern's *New York 1960*. pp. 225-245.

¹¹ Wood, Anthony C. *Preserving New York: Winning the Right to Protect a City's Landmarks*. Routledge: New York, 2007. 174.

¹² Shirley Hayes interviewed by John Berman, 20 Oct. 2000, Greenwich Village Society for Historic Preservation Archive.

¹³ Anthony Dapolito interviewed by Vicki Weiner, 5 Oct. 1997, Greenwich Village Society for Historic Preservation Archive.

¹⁴ Miller, Lindsay. *Whose Park Is It Anyway: The Evolution of Preservation Advocacy; Case Study: Washington Square Park*. Columbia University Historic Preservation Master Thesis, 2007.

¹⁵ For a more thorough discussion of the battles in the 1930s, 1950s, and 2000s to defeat Washington Square Park proposals, see Lindsay Miller's 2007 Historic Preservation Master Thesis for Columbia University, *Whose Park Is It Anyway: The Evolution of Preservation Advocacy; Case Study: Washington Square Park*.

¹⁶ Jacobs interviewed by Kent, October 1997.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁸ Jacobs tells this story in an interview with Leticia Kent in October 1997. See also "Jane Jacobs Is Arrested At Expressway Hearing." *New York Times*. 11 Apr. 1968. p. 28 (From ProQuest 19 Feb. 2008); and "Mrs. Jacobs's Protest Results in Riot Charge." Richard Severo. *New York Times*. 18 Apr. 1968, p. 49. (From ProQuest 19 Feb. 2008).

¹⁹ Severo, Richard. "Mrs. Jacobs's Protest Results in Riot Charge." *New York Times*. 18 Apr. 1968, p. 49. (From ProQuest 19 Feb. 2008).

²⁰ For a more detailed account of the history of the Lower Manhattan Expressway, see <http://www.nycroads.com/roads/lower-manhattan/>

²¹ Jacobs interviewed by Kent, October 1997.

²² *Ibid.*

²³ "West Village Newsletter." From the Committee to Save the West Village to All Village Residents, undated, c. Mar. 1961, Greenwich Village Society for Historic Preservation Archive.

²⁴ Jacobs interviewed by Kent, October 1997.

²⁵ Wood p. 260

²⁶ Margot Gayle interviewed by Laura Hansen, 23 July 1996, Greenwich Village Society for Historic Preservation Archive.

-
- ²⁷ Many references date this Christmas party to 1959. However, in his book *Preserving New York*, Anthony C. Wood makes a case for the date more likely being 1957. See p. 267.
- ²⁸ “The Winnah!—C.O.N.T.G.T.J.M.C.C.S.” *New York Herald-Tribune*. 8 Aug. 1960.
- ²⁹ Gayle interviewed by Hansen, 23 July 1996.
- ³⁰ Huxtable, Ada Louise. “‘Old Jeff’ s’ Conversion: Preservation of the ‘Village’ Courthouse Marks Triumph of Will Over Realty.” *New York Times*. 28 Nov. 1967.
- ³¹ “Talk of the Town: The Bell.” *New Yorker*. 15 Sept. 1962.
- ³² “Save All! Villagers Tell Mayor.” *Village Voice*. 30 Jun. 1960, Vol. V., No. 38.
- ³³ “Norman Redlich Lecture,” NYU School of Continuing Education: Greenwich Village: History and Historic Preservation, 19 Nov. 1996.
- ³⁴ Kent, Leticia. “Saving Greenwich Village: In Pieces or as a Whole?” *Village Voice*. 29 Dec. 1966.
- ³⁵ Verna Small interviewed by Vicki Weiner, 15 May 1996. Greenwich Village Society for Historic Preservation Archive.
- ³⁶ Minutes of CB2 meeting, 18 Nov., 1966.
- ³⁷ Edith Lyons interviewed by Vicki Weiner, 19 Feb. 1997 and 3 July 1998 (ed. 19 Sept. 1998), Greenwich Village Society for Historic Preservation Archive.
- ³⁸ Diether interviewed by DeVries, 24 July 1996.
- ³⁹ Gayle interviewed by Hansen, 23 July 1996.
- ⁴⁰ *Ibid.*
- ⁴¹ Leticia Kent interviewed by Vicki Weiner and Anthony C. Wood, 8 Oct. 1997, Greenwich Village Society for Historic Preservation Archive.
- ⁴² Diether interviewed by DeVries, 24 July 1996.
- ⁴³ “Greenwich Villagers Give Colorful Backing to Zoning Change Plan.” *New York Times*. 18 Feb. 1960.
- ⁴⁴ “Turning Back the Clock.” *New York Times*. 15 Mar. 1960. p. 30.
- ⁴⁵ “Earthniks Display Devotion to Better Zoning for the City.” *Village Voice*. 24 Nov. 1960.
- ⁴⁶ Lyons interviewed by Weiner, 19 Feb. 1997.
- ⁴⁷ “Norman Redlich Lecture.”
- ⁴⁸ Jacobs interviewed by Kent, October 1997.
- ⁴⁹ Price, Raymond, Jr. “They’re Fighting Back in Greenwich Village.” *New York Herald-Tribune*. 3 Jan. 1960.
- ⁵⁰ Taylor, Carol. “Village Loves Its ‘Old Jeff,’ Red Face, Balky Clock and All.” *New York World Telegram/The Sun* 6 Sept. 1961.