

apartments (306) and row houses (574) with five additional detached, single-family units. Probably the best example of coordinated community building, the town included a cooperative store and the Citizens Association, which facilitated community organizing. Incorporated in 1937, Greenbelt, like the other two towns, functioned under the manager-council form of government, using payments in lieu of taxes to fund public services including those offered by the county and state. Greenbelt also most closely adhered to the superblock form of development. At Greenhills, which was incorporated in 1938, a total of 676 units were completed, with 24 detached homes, 420 row houses, 80 duplexes, and 152 garden apartments. Also incorporated in 1938, Greendale as initially completed included the largest number of detached dwellings (274) in addition to 208 row houses and 90 duplexes. Though each community contained considerable acreage for expansion, only Greenbelt accommodated new development within the first 10 years—1,000 apartment units for defense workers, completed in 1941. Designed to continue the existing superblock plan, the housing was disconnected from the rest of Greenbelt and not of the same quality.

In 1949, Congress passed Public Law 65 outlining the federal government's intent to completely divest itself of the three towns, then being managed by the Public Housing Authority. The primary concerns of the program's supporters included maintaining the greenbelts, cooperative initiatives, and community ownership of land. While these advocates negotiated with lawmakers to include a right of first refusal to cooperative nonprofit housing groups representing current tenants or veterans, and while the federal government did sell significant sections of the greenbelt areas in each community to local park and recreation departments, the law did not require adherence to an overall master plan. Thus, consistency with existing development patterns was not ensured. By 1954, the Public Housing Authority had completed divestment with the only significant sale of units (1,635) for cooperative ownership occurring at Greenbelt. By the 1960s, major highways cut through the town sites and speculation had resulted in significant increases in property values and divergent development patterns.

—Kristin Larsen

See also Garden Cities; Howard, Ebenezer; New Towns; Regional Planning Association of America; Stein, Clarence S.; Tugwell, Rexford Guy; Wright, Henry

Further Readings and References

- Arnold, J. L. (1971). *The New Deal in the suburbs: A history of the Greenbelt Town Program, 1935–1954*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press.
- Knepper, C. D. (2001). *Greenbelt, Maryland: A living legacy of the New Deal*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Mayer, A. (1968). *Greenbelt towns revisited*. Washington, DC: National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials.
- Stein, C. (1957). *Toward new towns for America*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

GREENWICH VILLAGE, NEW YORK

Originally settled in 1644 by 11 African American men, formerly indentured servants, Greenwich Village largely remained a rural area throughout the 17th and 18th centuries. As a result of a series of urban epidemics—in which thousands from elsewhere in Manhattan fled to the area—and the general expansion of New York City, the Village was incorporated into Manhattan in the course of the 19th century. With real estate prices plummeting at the turn of the 20th century, the middle and upper classes moved north of the Village, whereas many immigrant families moved into Greenwich Village. They were soon to be accompanied by individuals representing the Village's most famous and cherished image: the bohemian. From the 1900s on, the public's vision of Greenwich Village would be dominated by the area's apparent difference from mainstream U.S. American culture.

The idea of *difference* resulting from the relative isolation of the Village from the rest of New York City was always prominent in the rhetoric of outsiders as well as Villagers. However, Greenwich Village has always depended on the interaction with the larger metropolis and the nation for its construction of identity. When other parts of Manhattan were plagued by a series of epidemics in the early 19th century, it was to Greenwich Village that people fled, increasing its population fourfold between 1825 and 1840. This partly coincided with New York City's general expansion north and the imposition of a rigorous grid system on the streets of Manhattan. Greenwich Village managed to avoid this imposition of rationalization and thus remained an idiosyncratic area of irregularity and Old World charm within a modern administrative

metropolis. The powerful idea of *difference* was born, but it was a concept that foreshadowed a more general all-encompassing shift: the creation of distinct residential areas. With downtown Manhattan transforming into a high-intensity commercial district, the middle and upper classes relocated to the quieter areas in the north. This reorganization of urban space not only produced the typically modern separation of work and residence; it was also bound up with the developing class system, since many of the working class remained downtown, thus spatially fixing social difference.

In the first decades of the 19th century, a thriving African American community lived in Greenwich Village: African Americans operated the Grove Theater at the corner of Bleecker and Mercer streets in the 1820s, black musicians played in theaters along Houston Street, ministers founded independent black congregations, and politically oriented newspapers such as *The Colored American*, *The Rights of All*, and *Freedom's Journal* were published. However, with the rising real estate prices as a result of the Village's transformation into a fashionable residential area, as well as racial conflict between working-class blacks and whites, many African Americans abandoned the area and moved to districts such as Harlem.

By the mid-19th century, Greenwich Village was firmly established as a residential area for affluent whites. Painters and other artists took residence in the University Building (1835–1894), since it was here that they could come to know possible patrons and other influential people. Others rented rooms at the Tenth Street Studios at West Tenth Street, which was the first structure in the United States specifically designed as a studio building. Important writers such as Mark Twain, Walt Whitman, Tom Paine, and Henry James also left their mark on the Village through their lives and literature. In particular, James used the Village setting in his work and was partly responsible for creating its legendary status in the first place through his 1881 novel *Washington Square*. Many of these and other artists frequented Pfaff's, a beer cellar just north of Bleecker Street. Managed by Henry Clapp, who also founded the literary journal *The Saturday Press*, the café was clearly inspired by bohemian life in Paris.

At the end of the 19th century, many of the richer inhabitants had already moved north in order to escape the further expansion of New York City. This led to a general decline in real estate values in the Village, which in turn proved attractive to many immigrants. It

was this combination of low rents and dynamic ethnic life that also attracted the young people from all over the nation who became the Village's most famous export product: the bohemian. Similar to the Harlem Renaissance that peaked in the 1920s, the public emergence of the bohemian in Greenwich Village was directly related to the increasing penetration of mass culture in daily life as well as New York's central role as a publishing and entertainment center in the United States. Located in one of the major hubs of the country, many artists were able to find outlets for their work that at once spoke to citywide as well as national audiences. The public image of the bohemian, therefore, was above all the result of a dialogue between the Village artists and the local and national press and publics. On both sides, its appropriation enabled the imagination of a more human yet transgressive and exciting alternative to the constraints of the increasingly bureaucratized everyday life.

Village bohemianism in the early 20th century was characterized by a unique fusion of politics and art. The publication of *The Masses* between 1912 and 1917 was one of the clearest examples of this original fusion. Directed by a group of staff writers and the poet and philosophy instructor Max Eastman, the magazine became a forum for radical left-wing criticism. Political journalism was combined with artistic and literary experiments, thereby creating an explosive—if somewhat incoherent—mix of politics and aesthetics. These intellectual and political debates were, however, increasingly overshadowed by the entertainment factor of Greenwich Village. Certainly, most prewar intellectuals performed their bohemian role with considerable flair as well, and within the Village there had emerged a network of tearooms and restaurants dedicated to this alternative lifestyle. However, starting around the end of World War I, the celebration of this bohemian lifestyle attracted more and more outsiders and led to the transformation of Greenwich Village into a nightlife zone. There were a number of reasons for this shift. The extension of Sixth and Seventh Avenues south of the Village and the widening of these streets greatly improved the flow of transport to downtown Manhattan and, by doing so, destroyed the cherished illusion of the Village as a somewhat isolated backwater. It also increased the presence of tourists. Another reason was that quite a number of Villagers actually supported this tourist invasion. Already in 1914, for example, Guido Bruno opened his Garrett at 58 Washington

Square South, which incorporated an art gallery, lecture hall, printing house, press agency, and information office, almost purely dedicated to the tourists who arrived at Washington Square. Others specialized in guidebooks, maps, and picture postcards, sold bohemian clothing, or organized sightseeing tours. Finally, Prohibition played an important role, since it gave the Village the reputation of a place where one could still get a drink: either in the Italian restaurants with their homemade wine or in the many cabarets and speakeasies that offered the combination of exotic entertainment and alcohol.

Nevertheless, despite this increasing commercialization, the Village has usually managed to accommodate various alternative lifestyles and experimental artistic endeavors. For one thing, many lesbians and gays have made Greenwich Village their home throughout the 20th and into the 21st century. Christopher Street and the Stonewall Riots in 1969 are the most powerful landmarks in this regard, but gays and lesbians have been publicly visible in the Village since the days of the balls at Webster Hall in the 1910s and 1920s. Also, without the Provincetown Players and the Washington Square Players in this formative period, experimental theater in New York would have certainly evolved differently. The success of these groups did much to associate the Village with theater and paved the way for later experiments such as Erwin Piscator's Dramatic Workshop in the 1940s and the Living Theatre and emergence of the off-Broadway scene in the 1950s. Experimental work was also produced in other artistic fields: John Cage and the Merce Cunningham Dance Company collaborated on experimental dance pieces; jazz as well as folk music was being redeveloped at Max Gordon's Village Vanguard; and many of the abstract expressionists exhibited their works in numerous galleries. At the same time, although all of these activities took place in Greenwich Village, by the end of the 20th century it was no longer possible to speak of the Village bohemian in a communal sense. Artists no longer identified themselves as bohemians, but increasingly reacted to the opinions of their own small group of acquaintances as well as global discourses. Finally, living in this area became increasingly expensive and out of reach for the overwhelming majority of the immigrants and artists that constituted the population of the Village in the early 20th century.

—Bas van Heur

Further Readings and References

- Banes, S. (1993). *Greenwich Village 1963: Avant-garde performance and the effervescent body*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Beard, R., & Cohen Berlowitz, L. (1993). *Greenwich Village: Culture and counterculture*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- McFarland, G. W. (2001). *Inside Greenwich Village: A New York City neighborhood, 1898–1918*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Ware, C. F. (1994). *Greenwich Village, 1920–1930: A comment on American civilization in the post-war years*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

GRID PATTERN

A settlement design widely adopted in the Americas, the grid is generally characterized by a rectilinear matrix of streets dividing the landscape into standardized blocks that are then further subdivided into individual parcels. The English word *grid* is an abbreviation of *gridiron*, which in the context of urban planning refers to an orthogonal or rectangular street pattern. Many grids are structured around two central “baselines” that can each serve as a starting point for the sequential numbering of streets and houses. Depending on the distance between streets and on the geographical context, grids have come in different shapes (for example, rectangular or square) and sizes (for example, “open” grids that may extend equally in all directions as compared to “closed” grids that are confined by some barrier, such as topography or a walled enclosure). Various open spaces for squares, plazas, parks, and public buildings have often been incorporated into the general layout of grid plans in the Americas.

Pre-Columbian Grid Designs and the Spanish Colonial Grid

Over a century before European contact, the Aztec city of Tenochtitlán was laid out in a cross-axial formation, and although there is evidence that the original city contained a central plaza, the precise geometric pattern of the pre-Hispanic street system remains a subject of debate. Some scholars believe that when the Spanish conquered the Aztec Empire in the 1520s they built Mexico City upon the ruins of