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ABSTRACT

The terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 were a national tragedy. Communities across the United States and internationally both directly and indirectly affected by the terrorist attacks are in debate about how to appropriately memorialize such catastrophic events and loss of life. This thesis focuses on the response in New York City to remember and rebuild at the World Trade Center site.

This thesis explores spontaneous public responses to the events of September 11th by individuals, victims’ families groups and civic organizations that claim a stake in the memorialization and rebuilding of the World Trade Center site. During the first several months following the terrorist strikes, the absence of an inclusive decision-making process for remembrance and rebuilding at the World Trade Center site produced conflicts between stakeholders, particularly victims’ families, and New York decision-makers. To illustrate this tension between remembrance and rebuilding, this thesis discusses the “temporary memorial” development in New York City in March 2002 and the PATH train and site rebuilding disagreements that escalated during April 2002.

Traditional decision-making processes maintain the public voice at a distance from the decision-making powers. Elected and appointed officials arbitrate public voices that are restricted in advisory roles and produce final decisions. As an alternative, consensus building involves a range of stakeholders in decision-making roles. A consensus building process would earn civic endorsement, lead to a durable outcome and would capture this unprecedented opportunity for grieving participants and witnesses to engage in a planning process. The thesis argues that the Lower Manhattan Development Corporation, the state-city agency convened by New York Governor George Pataki to oversee development of Lower Manhattan and the WTC site, could convene a consensus building process. The process would provide neutral facilitation and management of stakeholders who select representatives for an open and ongoing dialogue about such contentious issues as sacred ground, rebuilding, memorialization, and economic recovery. A consensus building process is an inclusive conversation that could reach agreement on a plan of action for the rebuilding and memorialization on the WTC site. This process would recognize the rebuilding of the WTC site as one of the greatest planning projects in New York history. The process would embrace the diversity and number of stakeholders, the destruction and trauma on the site witnessed world-wide and the challenge of achieving agreement on a technically complex site in the center of one of the world’s leading financial marketplaces.
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CHAPTER ONE: Introduction

On September 11, 2001 two hijacked commercial airliners flew into the World Trade Center towers in Lower Manhattan. Within an hour and a half, both towers collapsed killing an estimated 2,823 people.\(^1\) Two hundred and twenty stories and 12 million square feet of the world’s largest office complex\(^2\) disappeared from the New York skyline. The World Trade Center was a landmark in the New York City skyline and an internationally recognized icon where more than 430 companies from 28 countries engaged in commercial activities.\(^3\) It was the workplace of 40,000 people, the daily destination of 150,000 people\(^4\) and the backyard to 25,000 Lower Manhattan residents.\(^5\) The destruction of the World Trade Center towers transformed the former trade center site into one of New York’s greatest planning challenges, triggering tensions between the immediate economic demands to rebuild and the preservation of the alleged sanctity of the site.

Money vs. Memory

The numerous debates that developed immediately following the collapse of the towers laid bare the emotional rift between those who identified the site as a sacred burial ground, a place where thousands had lost their lives in a violent act of terrorism, and those who perceived the site as a place to express to the world the power of America and who wished to rebuild the towers to symbolize the greatness of the city and the nation. Discussion began almost immediately among planners, architects, developers, politicians, residents, victims’ families, survivors, the nation and the world about remembrance and rebuilding on the World Trade Center site. Comparable only to a battlefield, rebuilding on a site where nearly 3,000 people were killed and disappeared in the center of one of the world’s greatest financial marketplaces is unprecedented in America. The conflicting opinions about what should be built in Lower Manhattan were viewed in the New York Times in late September as “a clash between the solid and the void, between a desire to reach into the future and an opposing desire to mourn, to recall, to hold a vigil that never ends.”\(^6\)

---

4. Ibid.
While the early debate discussed “rebuilding bigger” in retaliation to the terrorist attack, by the six-month anniversary of the events, the dominant debate was about “rebuilding better.” Tensions escalated between rebuilding the site as a vibrant mixed-use district (replacing the street grid that was obliterated by the Trade Center superblock in the 1970’s and introducing retail, office and cultural attractions) and honoring the very personal loss of life which identifies the site a sacred burial ground. Sharon Zukin, Professor of Sociology at Brooklyn College, assessed the dominant conflict at a February WTC Forum at Columbia University as one of “money versus memory” and how money and memory will harmonize.

Preserving Memory in the Cityscape

This tension between remembrance and rebuilding resonates because New York City has had a long history of overriding memory with money and financial opportunity and is probably the only major city that doesn’t “run its past as a business.” European cities, such as Paris, London and Rome and American cities like Philadelphia and Boston all have economies that depend significantly on the visibility of the past and can therefore derive a value from preservation and recognition of the past. Mike Wallace, Pulitzer-Prize winning co-author of *Gotham: A History of New York City to 1898*, argues that New York “is home to splendid history museums, historical societies, historic sites and landmarked buildings . . . [but it] allows its bounty to languish un-trumpeted.” Wallace launched the The Gotham Center for New York History at the City University of New York's Graduate Center “to boost the visibility, for citizens, tourists and students, of New York's badly under-appreciated and under-developed historical assets.”

Less visible than the history of most western cities, the historical memory of New York City may arguably be undervalued. In *The Creative Destruction of Manhattan*, Max Page explains the creation and recreation of Manhattan as creative destruction in which “capitalism inscribed its economic and social processes into the physical landscape of the city and into the minds of city people.”

---

9 Ibid.
11 Ibid.
Capitalism is the incentive for the continuous process of destroying and reinventing the built environment and it is the past which is often compromised for the opportunities of rebuilding for greater economic gains. Page argues that during the preservationist movement in Manhattan, the forces of capitalism in New York created a history of “indoor preservation” or remembrance of the City past through the assembling of artifacts in museums. By preserving the past in a museum rather than within the urban fabric, land could be developed for a use more financially valued than history. The historic precedent that New York’s constantly changing landscape offers the City no time or space for its own history fuels the tension between memorialization and rebuilding on the World Trade Center site.

Since the collapse of the towers, the preservation of the memory of the events of September 11th on the World Trade Center site will likely be considered less economically and financially valuable to New York than commercial rebuilding. Furthermore, the memory of the destruction of the towers is arguably only one history of the site, which prompts the question of whose history should be preserved. Some architects, planners, developers and New York residents believe that the historical memory of the site is not dominated by the destruction of the towers and the events of September 11th. Instead, some contend, what should be remembered is the character of the site before the tragedy, as host for three decades to a national monument that attracted people from all over the world. Many victims’ families however, believe that the memory of the events of September 11th and the memories of their lost loved ones should dominate the historical memory on the site.

**Precedence for Preservation**

The tremendous loss of life on the site renders it a cemetery for those still un-recovered. However, in Manhattan there is little precedent for preserving burial grounds. In a February 4, 2002 *New Yorker* article titled “Underfoot,” Adam Gopnik discusses the history of burial in New York and claims, “burying people [in New York City] was complicated by the demands of memorializing the dead which came into conflict with the city’s growth.” Gopnik interviews New York archeologist Diana Wall who explains that while Paris has Pere-Lachaise and London the Highgate Cemetery to honor the dead in the middle of the city, by the early 19th century Manhattan forbade churches to

---

13 Ibid. p. 3.
bury their dead in the city. The 18th Century African Burial Ground originally dominated five acres in Lower Manhattan but was completely covered by City Hall commons and government buildings by the early 19th Century. During development of a 1991 federal building expansion more than four hundred of an estimated twenty thousand burials were unearthed. These burials were preserved in a small yet significant corner parcel of the burial ground. The reported words of a councilwoman who declared, "you can't walk over the bodies of our African ancestors any more," provides some optimism for those wishing to preserve the WTC as a burial ground and who believe that walking over the ashes of their loved ones while engaging in commercial activity is profane.

Consideration of the site as a burial ground is far more complex than any precedent in Lower Manhattan. Physical evidence of the site as a burial ground may soon become invisible as the final debris is removed from the site and bodies are no longer buried beneath the rubble. Some argue that although the land is certainly sacred because it is the site of so many deaths, all the bodies will be removed and therefore the ground is not truly a cemetery. But, many victims' families believe that the site is "untouchable" and a cemetery because the energy, spirit, ashes and fragments of remains of their lost loved ones cannot be isolated and retrieved from the site.

Civic Groups Enter Debate

In the days following September 11th many agreed that the memorial should be considered first even as there were calls to rebuild the towers, bigger and taller than ever. In late September, Richard

---

15 Ibid.
17 Chakrabarti, Vishaan, SOM Architects, Personal Interview, March 2002.
Sennett, Professor at the London School of Economics, articulated the view that a “memorial to the victims must be the first element on the drawing board, and that the commercial use should then be adapted to that vision.”\textsuperscript{19} Outgoing Mayor Giuliani, stated in an interview with Barbara Walters on December 12, 2001, which marked the three-month anniversary of the tragedy, that “first and foremost a memorial needs to be considered. It would be a disservice to the history of our City and to this nation to do anything else. To do it in the reverse, to think about the commercial buildings, would not be right.”\textsuperscript{20}

Although initial World Trade Center site redevelopment debate was characterized by this separation of money versus memory, the priority to consider the memorial space first quickly became the focus. Some argue that it was outgoing Mayor Giuliani’s vocal support for a grand memorial that first and foremost solidified passions for a memorial.\textsuperscript{21} Civic groups in response to September 11th convened in November 2002, such as New York New Visions, Rebuild Downtown Our Town (Rdot) and the Civic Alliance, attempted to reconcile this tension between commercial development and a memorial by integrating mixed use development with a memorial. New York New Visions, along with several other civic groups, promotes the idea that the memorial is everything designed and built on the site and any transformation to Lower Manhattan.

\textbf{Should the Public Have Say?}

Numerous members of the public claim a stake in decision-making at the WTC site despite rebuilding rights held by private leaseholder, Silverstein Properties. Civic groups advocate for an open and transparent process of civic engagement. Some suggest that the public does have a stake in the redevelopment because the WTC site is public land owned by the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey, a bi-state public agency. Others who had daily contact with the towers and space around the towers believe that the site was public space because it was a transportation hub and had a public plaza. Many residents assert that the World Trade Center complex was a vital piece of the neighborhood as a landmark and as a gathering place, and the concourse provided essential retail amenities.\textsuperscript{22} But some argue that the lease to Larry Silverstein privatized the WTC site but that even

\textsuperscript{18} Horning, Diane, WTC site must be sacred ground, \textit{The Star Ledger}, March 11, 2002.
\textsuperscript{20} 20/20 with Barbara Walters, December 12, 2001.
\textsuperscript{21} Matt Higgins, Lower Manhattan Redevelopment Corporation, Personal Interview, March 2002.
\textsuperscript{22} http://www.gothamgazette.com/commentary/111.sanders.shtml, March 24, 2002.
prior to privatization, the complex never seemed like public space, even when operated by the Port Authority. The public interest in the site is tied to the nature of the terrorist attack on the towers, on the City, and on the nation as a public. Many argue that an open public decision-making process is necessary to honor the democratic principles that came under attack on September 11th. The publicness of the tragedy, in which millions of people witnessed the destruction, live, via television, contributes to a desire to participate in the rebuilding. Witnesses were helpless to prevent the destruction and have since been eager to contribute to the recovery and rebuilding. Michael Kuo who lost his father in the attack says, “I feel more than ever each day a fierce commitment toward public participation in the rebuilding process . . . I think we all need to have a sense of ownership in the project . . . The spirit of democracy should be the underlying metaphor in the built form that is to come.”

Precedence for Public Participation

There is no precedent in New York City to engage a consensus building process of this scale and complexity but New Yorkers claim that public participation is a priority. New York City Council Member Gifford Miller, in early February 2002 described “the most frustrating aspect of the efforts to rebuild [the WTC site] have been that all the stakeholders be given an opportunity to shape the process. I am hopeful we'll be able to address that in the future because it is important that everyone feel that they have a stake in the decision-making.”

In earlier eras, planning decisions made by physical planners depended almost exclusively on the expert knowledge of their profession. These decisions were considered democratic because the planners were enacting the intent of elected officials. In the 1950’s, federal governments and many municipal governments mandated direct citizen participation in physical planning through public hearings or comment periods, which were expected to help create legitimacy for the process. But hearings have been critiqued as being generally attended only by strong opponents and strong proponents for an issue making it difficult for decision-makers to weigh the sides. There is no objective method for decision-makers to determine whether vocal individuals represent their own personal interests or those of a broader constituency. Through urban renewal of the 1950’s and

---

24 “Rebuilding Lower Manhattan: A Political Challenge at Ground Zero,” Gifford miller, Speaker of the New York City Council, Here and Now, Boston NPR Station, February 8, 2002.
1960's urban planning was often the mastermind of powerbrokers claiming to upgrade urban slums. The development of the WTC towers is an example. Chase Manhattan Bank Chairman David Rockefeller, and his brother, New York Governor Nelson Rockefeller, created the bi-state Port Authority of New York and New Jersey to develop the WTC superblock of giant towers as grand as the problem of economic decline in Lower Manhattan they were trying to solve. By the 1970's, the public was beginning to recognize the failures of urban renewal and the era of master planning projects by political expert planners and demands for public participation emerged as the planning solution. More mechanisms for public participation were put into place including hearings and public comment periods but these processes continued to fail to engage fair representation of the many voices of the public. In the 1990's community visioning that invited the public to participate in imagining the future of a site or their city in a design charrette, or conversations expected to create more meaningful opportunities for public participation. Visionings are still not interactive with decision-makers and have often been criticized for achieving the agenda of the public agency or developer rather than the community. New York City has an opportunity to create a participatory process that could become the new planning paradigm in a city and nation calling for full civic participation in land-use decisions at the World Trade Center site.

Calls for Consensus

An informal process of communication between individuals, civic groups and the Lower Manhattan Development Corporation (LMDC) developed since Governor George Pataki created the agency in November 2001 to oversee the rebuilding of Lower Manhattan. Pataki appointed Chairman John C. Whitehead to the Board of Directors of sixteen city and state members. In January 2002, the LMDC responded to public demands for a decision-making process by inviting community leaders and representatives they identified as interested parties to comprise nine Advisory Councils. These groups represent families, residents, businesses, the arts, education and tourism, economic development, transportation, financial services and professional firms and function in an advisory role only. Although two General Board members are appointed to each advisory council, some on multiple councils, groups each convene with the LMDC separately which prevents collaborations and learning across stakeholder constituencies. A consensus building process would bring representatives from each of these stakeholder groups together with the developer, the landowner,

---

the city, and the state to create collaborative, multi-party decision-making. Consensus seeks unanimous agreement and must include stakeholders from a complete range of interests and often involves the hiring of a professional facilitator to provide a neutral position from which to identify stakeholders fairly and comprehensively. Larry Silverstein, leaseholder of the WTC site agreed in December 2001 that "we're all going to have to get together and work on a consensus that each of the constituencies is happy with."\(^{26}\)

New Yorkers have already begun to build the social capital necessary to identify stakeholders and representatives for a consensus process. One of the roles of the small-scale community dialogues proposed by the Civic Alliance of the Regional Plan Association (RPA) is to build networks between interest groups. According to University of California Berkeley professor Judith Innes, networks provide for many types of knowledge and information to flow through a system rapidly.\(^{27}\) Rapid flow of information enables constituencies to continuously revise their interests and allows representatives to receive efficiently more thoughtful input.

Civic groups such as Imagine New York of the Municipal Art Society and the Civic Alliance of the RPA have also organized large-scale multi-party facilitated visioning exercises and public conversations that provide another type of stakeholder interaction and public listening that Innes describes as "pseudo participation." A pseudo participation event offers limited or no opportunity for discussion between decision-makers and the public and the publics' role is advisory.\(^{28}\) Focus groups like the Civic Alliance's "Listening to the City," held on February 7, 2002 with five hundred public participants, could be called pseudo participation because it provides only brief encounters between stakeholders that do not aim to build lasting relationships and networks. Finding common community objectives and agreements and building community in the process even if for a few hours at least signals to the public that their interests and visions matter and may encourage them to continue to be involved in future participation opportunities. The "Listening to the City" meetings sponsored by the Civic Alliance may be helpful in informing the LMDC as a starting point for working with the public by taking the pulse of the city at intervals of every few months but does not

replace collaborative dialogues. The next step is to create a process that captures not only the outcomes from this work but engages civic stakeholder representatives to become decision-makers.

Decision-makers declared that a consensus must be reached for the rebuilding of the WTC site but have not defined a process that would achieve consensus. Despite the presence of consensus in the vocabulary of government decision-makers, the absence of a consensus building process indicates a possible misleading use of the consensus concept. Charles Gargano of Empire State Development said in December 2001, “there’s going to have to be a consensus, cooperation between many, many people.”29 Is he using consensus (which means agreement) interchangeably with cooperation or rather cooperation to define consensus? If so, that could be the understanding of consensus that is referenced in discussions of the “emerging consensus”1 since April 2002. Alex Garvin, LMDC Vice President of Planning announced an emerging consensus during a panel discussion at the RPA Annual Assembly in New York City on April 26, 2002. Mayor Bloomberg told the New York Times on May 10, 2002, “you shouldn’t be surprised that there is a broad consensus. All the city planners have been saying the same thing. And it makes sense.”30 But this consensus he is referring to is only within professional stakeholders and decision-makers. The consensus is not only informed by the principles issued by professionals but refers to interagency cooperation rather than consensus among a range of civic stakeholders.

The emerging consensus declared by many decision-making agencies including the Mayor, and the LMDC emerged in April and early May 2002, during the same period the LMDC issued its Blueprint for Renewal and the Port Authority and the LMDC came to a negotiated agreement about who would have jurisdiction over the WTC site planning. During the same time, the LMDC agreed to co-host with the Civic Alliance (the umbrella organization and clearinghouse for public voice) “Listening to the City II,” a public conversation for the future of the WTC site. By endorsing the outreach of the Civic Alliance, the LMDC releases perceived obligations to conduct its own public outreach and the responsibility to manage public interest. This interagency cooperation may be the consensus to which decision-makers are referring.

This thesis explores how the absence of an inclusive decision-making process has produced conflict between stakeholders, particularly victims families and New York decision-makers. Decisions made during the nine months since the September 11th attacks, suggest that rebuilding interests will consider remembrance separately rather than harmonizing remembrance and rebuilding. With no mandate to participate in decision-making roles, potential relationships among victims’ families, survivors, residents, and civic groups have been compromised and social networks under-developed.

The Lower Manhattan Development Corporation should immediately hire a professional, neutral facilitator to initiate a consensus building process. The first task of a facilitator is to conduct convening assessments of the debating parties. A convening assessment determines the potential of a consensus building process by identifying and interviewing stakeholders and presenting the stakeholders with statements of interest, core issues and possibilities for mutual satisfaction. The stakeholders involved in a potential consensus building process experienced tremendous trauma and deciding the future of the WTC requires a creative and innovative decision-making process that engages the trauma rather than sanitizes the process.

Many New Yorkers believe that consensus is impossible because there are just too many stakeholders to satisfy. The findings of this thesis however, suggest that there are many individuals and groups already building and defining the stakeholder groups on a voluntary basis and that it would be worthwhile to conduct an assessment to determine the feasibility of a consensus building process. A consensus process could provide the framework for civic participation in decision-making and manage seemingly conflicting interests among parties. Furthermore, public participation in this process could produce a more equitable process, yield a more durable outcome and provide an unprecedented opportunity for grieving participants and witnesses to participate in the planning process.
CHAPTER TWO: Spontaneous Responses in New York

Since the attack on the World Trade Center “New Yorkers have transformed places throughout the city into spaces where, [individually] and jointly, [they] can remember, ask for help, bear witness, and offer testimony.” The process began within hours of the collapse of the WTC towers when families and friends rushed to search for the missing. Unable to access the site, families and friends rushed to post flyers of the missing. Subway stations, telephone booths and empty street corners in Lower Manhattan were transformed into spontaneous bulletins for the missing. By three o’clock on September 11th one New Yorker recalls that everything was already being done, so he rolled out paper on the sidewalk at Union Square, the closest public space to the site, and asked those who passed by to comment on the day. This became the first spontaneous public memorial in Union Square that would later be transformed into a memorial site and place of pilgrimage. Flyers accumulated at Union Square and were soon referred to as public memorials as search and rescue efforts at Ground Zero became recovery and the thousands of faces posted in the streets of New York no longer represented faces of the living.

As daily routines began again, the faces of the missing became part of the New York City landscape. The flyers accumulated so densely that it was difficult not to catch the eye of one of the thousands who smiled innocently from street walls. Passersby paused frequently in front of the flyers to reflect on the lives of the missing who after a few months were so familiar. A face seen on a flyer in September that remained there in April became a seemingly permanent member of the community. The persons missing flyers reveal physical characteristics intended to assist searchers in their efforts

2.1 Flyers Become Memorials

to locate injured victims. As time passes, viewers become bonded and feel kinship with those portrayed on the flyers. One passerby demonstrates the relationship he or she has begun to develop with the photograph of a missing person at Grand Central Station, “Every morning I see you smiling. I miss you. We never met.”

The flyers have transformed into active personal spontaneous memorials. Family and friends and passersby attach photographs of missing loved ones and news articles about the future of the site or the fallen heroes. Poems, gifts and flowers at fences and street walls have been placed where spontaneous memorials have accumulated. Some memorials began to take the shape of shrines as victims’ families and friends publicly offered personal artifacts and gifts to their loved ones. One missing person was offered a card wishing him “Happy St. Patrick’s Day, your first in heaven” at a fence near One Liberty Plaza.

**Spontaneous Public Memorialization**

Spontaneous public memorialization has become important in the remembering of public tragedy in the United States. Following the 1995 bombing of the Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City, thousands of visitors offered over a million mementos to victims of the bombing in the aftermath, permanently transforming the spaces surrounding the site into spontaneous memorials. The Vietnam Veteran’s Memorial in Washington D.C. has received hundreds of thousands of artifacts that have been placed at the wall by grieving visitors who feel that “the Wall elicits a physical response.” Grievers have come to public places and created spontaneous memorials to express their disbelief of senseless public deaths and to communicate publicly with their audience: lost loved ones, God, friends and family, strangers, and political leaders.

---

The desire to memorialize individuals who died suddenly and publicly has had a place in history since memorialization in Ancient Greece. A cenotaph as an “empty memorial” was created by the ancient Greeks for “anyone who perished by fire, was swallowed by a volcano, buried by lava, torn to pieces by beasts, devoured by sharks, or whose corpse was scattered by vultures in the desert.” In Ancient Greece, the cenotaph was a shrine to the soul of the dead when the body was disappeared or destroyed.

A Catholic tradition of spontaneous memorialization marks sites of death with crosses. Cross markers placed at the site of a sudden and accidental public death “manifest the belief that the souls of those who die unexpectedly and fail to receive the last Rites of the Catholic Church are suffering in purgatory’s purifying flames. The marker serves then as a lasting reminder for passersby to pray for the person’s soul and thus speed it’s eventual arrival into heaven.” Martha Cooper, Director of Photography at CityLore, the New York Center for Urban Folk Culture, claims that these centuries-old practices of roadside memorials have been popularized in areas of the United States influenced by Latin American Catholic culture. Cooper began photographing spontaneous memorials in New York in 1981 when she noticed that memorial walls were being created to commemorate relatives and neighbors who were dying untimely, often violent deaths on the City streets. Cooper discovered that outdoor memorial murals for those killed in New York City create new public spaces for community and ceremony as do the spontaneous memorials in response to September 11th.

Public spaces temporarily transformed by spontaneous memorials develop new meanings. Edward Linenthal in The Unfinished Bombing describes the fence surrounding the bombed Murrah Federal

35 Heathcote, Edwin, Monument Builders: Modern Architecture and Death, p. 11.
36 Linenthal, Edward, The Unfinished Bombing, 166.
37 Ibid.
38 Ibid.
Building site as sharing in the religious tradition of roadside shrines because it marks a place where life unexpectedly ended. Like the Vietnam Veteran’s Memorial, it is a site transformed by the diverse “motives and materials” people bring and, like the increasingly popular tradition of spontaneous memorials to victims of violence, it serves many purposes for those who visit. The fence served to provide space for mourning, it was a place to communicate with lost loved ones, an alter for prayer, a public forum for political expression and a place to participate. Just as passersby in New York City began to communicate with images on the flyers of the missing, in Oklahoma City, spontaneous memorial sites were places where one overwhelmed by the tragedy, could “person by person . . . leave something of oneself.”

America is a culture with a strong desire for immortality and the inability to accept the finality of death. Many families and rescue workers eight-months after the attacks refered to the dead at the World Trade Center as the “missing,” unable to equate disappearances with death. The memorials of personal possessions build something concrete, a recreation of the individual lost, bringing the individual back to life in the community where they lived and worked.

Religion and Death in a Secular Decision-making Process

Many people sought religion to answer questions about death. Religious iconography and language defines much of the spontaneous memorialization in New York City. Messages of “god bless” are ubiquitous in the streets. Questions of where God was on September 11th appeared everywhere, revealing that people were questioning their religious beliefs. However, just as many answers returned detailed explanations of the work of God that day. Superstitions of death, religious or
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otherwise may have been the impetus for some to deliver gifts and messages to the dead in Lower Manhattan where many family and friends appeared to be visiting spontaneous memorials to communicate with their loved ones. At Union Square visitors brought Christian votives, Jewish memorial “yahrtzeit” candles and candles petitioning saints from St. Anthony to Virgin Guadalupe to Siete Potencias de Africa from the Afro Cuban religion of Santeria.

The superstitions, the unknown and the religions beliefs related to death are certain to complicate the permanent memorial development process. Death and religion are very present in official discussions about the redevelopment of the World Trade Center site. The Lower Manhattan Development Corporation Family Advisory Council, convened to advise decision-makers, is comprised of victims’ families and half of its ex-officio advisory members are affiliated with a variety of religions institutions. LMDC Chairman John Whitehead has suggested that the memorial could include a chapel and some have called for a non-denominational cathedral on the site. Developing consensus for memorialization on the WTC site will require exploration of grieving in the context of a nation of many religions and determination of the public and privateness of religious traditions.

**Spontaneous Memorials Create Public Conversation**

At the secular memorials on the walls and in the streets of Manhattan, the memory of the individuals lost and the posting of media articles among the memorials has created a “noisy, unsolicited conversation.” The conversation is among the families, friends, residents and passersby who are shaping the memory of September 11th. Among many conversations at the walls and fences, the presence of media images and articles within the memorials reveals public commentary on the rebuilding and
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memorial process. A memorial wall in Grand Central Station has been posted with a news article, titled: “Should WTC steel be recycled: Families want answers first.” The concept of recycling the steel from Ground Zero is transformed by the location of the article, posted between the faces of two lost lives and above a poem entitled “Six Thousand Fallen Heroes.” Positioned among the individuals who were killed causes one to feel that the melting of the steel in the recycling is dissolving the ashes of these people and erasing the memory of the WTC towers much too quickly.⁴⁸

These spontaneous memorials—both secular and religious—marked the beginning of an informal process of memorialization in New York. Kristin Hass in *Carried to the Wall* discusses the gifts delivered to the Vietnam Veterans Memorial as a mode of public communication that reflects a need to negotiate the public meaning of the deaths and a determination, on the part of the ordinary citizens, to do the work themselves.⁴⁹ Hass describes the public creating memory at the Vietnam Veteran’s Memorial Wall as a “powerful grassroots vernacular for negotiating grief” and argues that if one listens to the unmediated community of citizens “speaking” at the Wall one can understand the public memory that they are seeking to preserve.⁵⁰

**Museumification**

The continuous presence of the faces of the dead and missing in spontaneous memorials builds public support for permanent memorialization. What began as ephemeral was soon selected for permanent collections around the City. Historians and photographers have been facilitating the anticipated incorporation of the spontaneous memorials into a permanent memorial by collecting and recording the memorials. The gifts and messages delivered to fences and walls in New York
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City are being preserved and photographed and reassembled in galleries. Removing the memorials from their original setting and assembling them among other artifacts of the aftermath may change their meanings, some of which is derived from their presence in the urban fabric where family and passersby can continue to interact with them. There is discussion that these memorial artifacts will be integrated into a permanent memorial museum perhaps characterized, as they are at the New York Historical Society exhibit “Missing: A Streetscape in Mourning,” as a “phase in the grieving process.”

The desire to spontaneously memorialize lost loved ones in public continues nine months after the events of September 11th. In Oklahoma City, Seven years after the 1995 Murrah Federal Building bombing, artifacts continue to be delivered to a preserved section of the original fence of spontaneous memorials. Many of the deliveries to the fence in Oklahoma City reveal the same public conversation at the Vietnam Veteran’s Memorial: artifacts while still communicating with the memory of the lost lives are making a more direct effort to communicate the memory of individuals with the public. In Oklahoma City many deliveries have notes attached that identify the artifacts with the name of the person who delivered it and contact information for visitors who would like a copy of a poem or story. At the Vietnam Veteran’s Memorial, many artifacts are delivered with notes attached by people who request to be contacted if their artifact should be selected for the Smithsonian Museum.

Memorialization of the individual lives lost on September 11th is one of the dominant narratives that can be heard from the spontaneous public.

2.7 “The Ground Zero Memorial” in March 2002
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memorials. Visitors are continuing to memorialize in public spaces in Manhattan. In March 2002
ArtAid hung “The Ground Zero Memorial” wall at the Union Square subway station, a banner of
names of all those who were killed in the terrorist attacks of September 11th. They requested, out of
respect for the victims and their families, that the memorial wall should not be written on. But
families, friends and New Yorkers quickly took advantage of the opportunity to communicate with
their lost loved ones and the passersby who would read their messages and attached photographs.
Within days, the wall was covered with personal sentiments. The desire to publicly memorialize in
response to September 11th has clearly persisted in New York City.

The presence of the memorials in the streets of the City reminds New
Yorkers to remember the tragedy of
September 11th and the individuals who
were lost. Perhaps more significantly,
however, the memorials ensure that
those who are creating and
personalizing the memorials are not
forgotten. The spontaneous memorials
are public forums where everyone who
participates is free of judgement and
can reflect on September 11th. Expressions at the spontaneous memorials are representative of many
affected by the tragedy across race, gender and class and are appreciated and respected across
traditional lines of separation. Spontaneous memorialization was the beginning of public
participation in the process to remember at the WTC site.

2.8 "The Ground Zero Memorial" in April 2002
CHAPTER THREE: Alliances and Affiliations Form

New Yorkers responded immediately to the tragedy of September 11th. Dozens of interest groups formed in the early months following the September 11th attack. Victims’ families built support networks and advocated for compensation for the loss of their loved ones. Some immediately discussed memorialization and preservation of the WTC site as sacred ground. Neighborhood activists, civic leaders, writers, designers, and architects contacted friends and colleagues to organize a response. Concerned residents and community leaders convened to find assistance for the thousands of small business affected by the attacks.53 In February 2002, Jim Biber of Pentagram Designs, reflected that New Yorkers became involved in the rebuilding of Lower Manhattan because they “needed cathartic release, to create a connection, to empower themselves, to find control and to design something.”54 Biber who became chair of the memorial committee for civic group, Rebuild Downtown Our Town (Rdot), asserted that “some people are anxious to have their name attached to an idea, while others are trying to make their lives better, and everyone is grieving.”55 Civic involvement was healing for the deeply traumatized City. In the months since the attacks, many individuals and groups worked to advocate for the best practices in planning the future of the WTC site.

Victims’ Families Groups

Within days of the collapse of the World Trade Center towers, families of the missing created networks of support. Dozens of groups are reported to have formed, some ad hoc and intimate others composed of hundreds of family members seeking support and advocating for compensation, respectful recovery of their loved ones, and a memorial to honor the lost lives. Although there is tremendous diversity among those who lost their loved ones, the great majority of the New York-based victims’ families groups were founded by widows and women who lost loved ones. The families’ immediate response to the incomprehensible was to publicly memorialize the lost lives. Simultaneously they organized and joined victims’ families groups.
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**September's Mission**

In New York, Monica Iken has become the leading spokesperson for a memorial to the victims at the WTC site. On the morning of September 11th, Iken, a school teacher received a telephone call from her husband of eleven months, Michael, who worked on the 84th floor of Tower Two. He called to alert her that an airplane had struck one of the trade center towers but that he was safe. Shortly after the call, Iken would witness from her television the murder of her husband as a second airliner flew into Tower Two. Two weeks after the attack, Iken founded September’s Mission and has since dedicated herself full-time to advocate for the preservation of all 16-acres of the WTC site as a memorial park that is a peaceful place to reflect, remember and honor the lost lives. Her position was endorsed by outgoing Mayor Giuliani who advocated for a “soaring monument” on the site of sacred and hallowed ground.

Iken continues to support a memorial park on the WTC site despite some victims’ families advocating for the tower footprints. As decision-making in Lower Manhattan has turned directly to the planning of the WTC site since April 2002, Iken focused her efforts to ensure that the interests of the victims’ families, survivors and rescue and recovery workers are considered in the process. Iken advocates for discussion of the question of what is sacred space? She suggests that spiritual leaders, philosophers, ethicists, psychologists and anthropologist have been absent from discussions and that engaging them may offer insight into appropriate uses for the site that respect the souls of the dead and that do not violate the sacredness of the site. Iken also asserts that it would be “shortsighted to underestimate the potential of having a large space dedicated to a [park] and that New York’s Central Park and Chicago’s Lincoln Park and the National Mall in D.C. provide evidence of “the enduring economic, social and cultural value of such places.”

September’s Mission has joined The Family Group, a consortium of five victim’s families groups that convened in the aftermath of September 11th. The Family Group is an umbrella of New York area family groups including September’s Mission, 9-11 Widows and Victims Families Association, Give Your Voice, WTC United Families Group and Families of September 11th. The Family Group, Iken claims, represents two thousand family members.
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9-11 Widows and Victims' Families Association

Marian Fontana, founder of 9-11 Widows and Victims' Families Association joins Iken in promoting discussion of the nature of activities appropriate for a sacred site. Fontana lost her husband Lt. Dave Fontana who was one of twelve firefighters lost from the New York Fire Department, Squad 1 in Park Slope, Brooklyn. Fontana told the New York Post in December 2001, that on the morning of September 11th, “a little before 9 a.m., David called to say he had just finished his 24-hour shift. ‘I’ll meet you in 10 minutes,’ he said.” It was their eight-year wedding anniversary and they had planned to celebrate at the Central Park Boathouse and the Whitney Museum. Fontana founded 9-11 Widows and Victims' Families Association in response to the firefighter protest at Ground Zero on November 2, 2001 when Giuliani proposed scaling down the number of firefighters and rescue workers who had been working at the site since September 11th to fifty from as many as one hundred and fifty daily. 9-11 Widows and Victims' Families Association’s most important goal has been the dignified recovery of the firefighters from ground zero. Fontana advocates for memorialization and rebuilding on the WTC site and discussion of alternative uses for the WTC site such as a library, open space and museum that would honor the sanctity of the site.

Families of September 11th

The families of the victims of the commercial airliners that flew into the trade center towers have been a strong advocacy and lobbying group. Outside the City of New York, Carrie Lemack of Cambridge, Massachusetts founded Families of September 11th. Her mother, Judy Larocque, was on American Airlines Flight 11. Lemack claims her group advocates for over eight hundred family members nationally from almost all fifty states. Lemack focuses much of her victims’ families’ advocacy work lobbying in Washington D.C. She, like Iken and Fontana was appointed to the Lower Manhattan Development Corporation (LMDC) Families Advisory Council with Families of September 11th Vice President, Thomas Roger of Longmeadow, Massachusetts who lost his daughter, Jean Roger, a fight attendant on American Airlines Fight 11. Families of September 11th advocates for an appropriate memorial built on the WTC site and considers the tower footprints sacred ground where their loved ones' lie. Families of September 11th has chapters in New York,
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Boston, and Virginia. "As far as I know, this is the only group with a national base," said Stephen Push of Great Falls, Virginia, one of the group's founders. His wife, biotechnology lobbyist Lisa Raines, was aboard the plane that crashed into the Pentagon.61

**Families on Common Ground**

Families of the victim’s of September 11th are located throughout the country but the majority of the lives lost were people from New York, New Jersey and Connecticut and is reflected in the many groups concentrated in the tri-state area. There are likely dozens of organized victims families groups some include, Give Your Voice, founded by Jennie Farrell who lost her brother James Cartier on the 105th floor of Tower Two, based in Wantagh, Long Island; the WTC United Family Group founded by 25-year old Anthony Gardner who lost his oldest brother Harvey Joseph Gardner III on the 83rd floor of Tower One headquartered in Belleville, N.J.; Families of September 11th in Boston, Virginia, and New York; 9-11 Widows and Victims' Families Association based in Brooklyn; Voices of September 11th founded by Beverley Eckert whose husband Sean Rooney was killed on the 98th floor of Tower Two, based in Stamford, Connecticut, Hispanic Victims Group founded by William Rodriguez, and Windows of Hope for victims’ families in the food and hospitality profession, directed by Darlene Dwyer both based in Manhattan.

There is no consensus among families about the future of the World Trade Center site. Although several spokespersons have emerged immediately after September 11th to represent the victims’ families, they continue to remind decision-makers that within these constituencies there are families whose interests have not yet been explored because they are still grieving or are disenfranchised. There are many strong voices that demonstrate families feel first and foremost the former WTC site is sacred ground but there appears to be no agreement about how sacred ground should be redeveloped. Some families are actively interested in shaping a memorial on the site, while others are deeply attached to the site as sacred and hallowed ground where the remains of their loved ones have not been recovered. Still others believe the site should be rebuilt with mixed-use development or with new trade center towers. Mike Kuo of New York, who lost his father on September 11th, says that what he misses most about visiting his father at the WTC is the view from his office. "Any

memorial on the site should recognize the verticality that we lost," Kuo says. "I feel sadness that, for the rest of my life, the 11th day of each month will be a kind of anniversary. But I would like to know that on the 11th day of each month, I can take my feelings of sadness and look up at the New York City skyline and see the new WTC as a shining beacon of a new future."

There are many families who have not joined family groups. Families outside of New York City and the tri-state area may have difficulty finding a community. Some killed in the attacks were attending a breakfast trade show, the Risk Waters Financial Technology Congress, held on September 11th on the 106th floor of the North Tower at Windows on the World, and their survivors may not have a strong personal attachment to the site because the identity of the individual lost is more deeply rooted elsewhere. One victims' family member living in Pennsylvania who lost her boyfriend in the attacks says that she does not have a strong attachment to the site and believes that it is because her boyfriend had recently been transferred to New York from abroad and had only been working in the Trade Center six months. "I feel that I do not need to be at the site to have a moment with my boyfriend but," she says, "that could change." It may be too early still for some grieving families to have explored their attachment to the site. Families of the 1993 WTC bombing when eleven people were killed have expressed interest in being included in the memorial process. The memorial to their family members in the WTC plaza was destroyed in the attack.

Increasingly, victims’ family groups have been joining efforts and sharing interests to unite their positions. Anthony Gardner, who founded WTC United Family Group said in December 2001 that tensions had developed among some groups. "I've seen certain groups that don't want to work with other groups. There's not going to be one official group. There's going to be a network of affiliated groups working together for a common purpose." Bob Monetti, president of Victims of Pan Am 103, one of two family groups formed after the 1988 terrorist attack says "I can't conceive of the 9-11 people being in a single group, "It's just too many people." The family groups are somewhat separated by age, ethnicity and geographic location and socio-economic background but the leadership of these groups met at the end of April 2002 to discuss their common interests. Despite
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the diversity, spokespersons for two thousand family members of The Family Group and eight hundred members of Families of September 11th consider the site sacred ground.\textsuperscript{66}

**Civic Groups Claim a Stake**

There was a tremendous initiative among New York Area residents to claim a stake in the future of Lower Manhattan following the destruction of the WTC. Neighborhood activists, civic leaders, writers, designers, and architects placed telephone calls to friends and colleagues to consider what to do. Several civic groups were conceived in October and November 2001 because of a strong network of activists and professionals who organized their interests. One civic group leader asserted that "you have to have an in, and be connected to be invited into a leadership role in a civic organization. Having an influence on decision-making is "all about access to who decides and that means who you know."\textsuperscript{67} Architects, designers and planners convened New York New Visions; the Lower Manhattan residential community organized Redevelop Downtown Our Town (Rdot); community and arts organizations formed Imagine New York of the Municipal Arts Society; and the Regional Plan Association created the Civic Alliance to coordinate public voices. Wall Street Rising, organized in response to September 11th, and dozens of existing civic resources; the Alliance for Downtown New York; the New York City Partnership; and Manhattan Chamber of Commerce are working to restore business in Lower Manhattan. The Community Board 1 of fifty appointed neighborhood representatives communicates between Lower Manhattan residents and decision-makers through monthly public meetings and hearings.\textsuperscript{68} NYNV, Rdot, Imagine New York and the Civic Alliance are working to influence the rebuilding of Lower Manhattan by developing best practices and principles for rebuilding the WTC site and Lower Manhattan, to promote communication among civic groups, and provide opportunities for public discussion and visioning workshops.

**New York New Visions**

New York New Visions (NYNV) was convened by the New York Chapter of the American Institute of Architects, the American Planning Association and the American Institute of Graphic
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\textsuperscript{68} Community Board 1 represents residents of Lower Manhattan, Tribeca and Little Italy. It is one of fifty-nine neighborhood based boards in the borough of New York. The community board is an advisory board to city officials and agencies and has charter power that is rarely enacted due to lack of funds.
Artists in November, 2001. New York New Visions soon coordinated with the efforts of the Real Estate Board of New York, and the Department of City Planning New York City Partnership whom had formed the New York Infrastructure Task Force- NYC Rebuild, headed by Marilyn Taylor of SOM Architects. Taylor, a founder of NYNV is also principle architect at Skidmore, Owings and Merrill whose client is Silverstein Properties, the leaseholder of the WTC site. During a three-month process over 350 individuals who claimed to represent 30,000 constituents from architecture, engineering, planning and design organizations in New York convened to discuss the future of Lower Manhattan. NYNV conducted seventy-five interviews with families, rescue workers, property owners, students, educators and residents to inform the New York New Visions “Principles for the Rebuilding of Lower Manhattan” issued by the group of professionals in February 2002.

New York New Visions advocates an open and inclusive public memorial process that integrates with permanent memorials with a vibrant mixed-use community in Lower Manhattan. NYNV advocates that “the successful rebuilding of Lower Manhattan, if carried out with sufficient high purpose, would also be a memorial in itself.” This principle reinforces the role of the architect in the rebuilding as it advocates no separation between everything built on the site and memorialization.

Redevelop Downtown Our Town, Rdot

In the immediate aftermath of September 11th Liz Abzug, consultant, activist, and Tribeca resident “felt compelled to do something constructive,” having lost several friends in the destruction of the towers. Abzug, founded Rdot with friends Susan Szenasy, Editor in Chief of Metropolis Magazine and Beverly Willis, Director of the Architectural Research Institute. Rdot is a coalition of Lower Manhattan residents, businesses, community and business associations, artists, colleges, professionals, architects, and designers. The coalition represents the voices of thousands of people directly affected by the destruction of the World Trade Towers and seeks to create a 21st century living, and working, environment. The group meets regularly at Pace University, just blocks from Ground Zero, to develop a collective vision to revitalize Lower Manhattan that promotes spiritual revitalization and economic recovery and claims to be the voice of Lower Manhattan.
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In February 2002, Rdot produced an Interim White Paper for rebuilding Lower Manhattan that stated, “planning must honor the World Trade Center site as a sacred, hallowed burial ground. A burial ground is a quiet, peaceful, contemplative and serene place for reflection, grieving, and remembrance, now and in the future.” These convictions reflect the deep emotions and the “intensely personal expectations for the graveyard” of the WTC site of a neighborhood, having been so directly affected by the events of September 11th.

**Imagine New York**

What have we lost as a result of September 11? How have we changed? What should happen on the World Trade Center site in the future? Imagine New York of the Municipal Art Society (MAS), a non-profit urban design and preservation organization posed these questions at two hundred “Imagine New York: Giving Voice to the People's Visions,” workshops during two weeks in April 2002. Staff at MAS developed Imagine New York in November 2001 who believed that the public voices in the tri-state area of New York, New Jersey and Connecticut must be heard in the WTC site rebuilding. Eva Hanhardt, Director of The Planning Center says “that any and all decisions regarding the remembrance and renewal of the World Trade Center site must include the needs and visions of all who have in some way been affected by September 11.” Imagine New York, she believes, has the potential to become one of the most significant civic participation projects in the city's recent history.

Imagine New York visioning workshops were facilitated by trained volunteers recruited from within participating neighborhoods and through citywide volunteer organizations. The ideas generated through the workshops are being collected and categorized, and representatives from the workshops will be invited to a town hall meeting scheduled for June 2002 for discussion and synthesis of the ideas generated at the workshops. Holly Leicht, Director of Design, Planning and Advocacy at MAS reported in late April 2002 that the data processed from the workshops, although not finalized, demonstrated significant common interests. The most common was the interest for decision-makers
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to development a planning process that includes public voices which the current process was alleged not to be achieving.\textsuperscript{75}

\textit{Civic Alliance to Rebuild Downtown New York}

Robert Yaro, Director of the Regional Plan Association of New York, New Jersey and Connecticut convened The Civic Alliance to Rebuild Downtown New York in November 2001 to develop strategies for the redevelopment of Lower Manhattan in the aftermath of September 11\textsuperscript{th}. The Civic Alliance became a coalition of more than 75 business, community and environmental groups. Yaro was concerned that the abundance of public voices disbursed among multiple civic groups would more effectively reach decision-makers if it were consolidated under the Civic Alliance. The Civic Alliance has since become the umbrella for civic planning efforts for the rebuilding of Downtown New York, working collaboratively with New York New Visions and Rdot.

The consolidation of public voices to the management of the Civic Alliance has created some competing tensions among civic groups, not unlike those among victims' families groups. Some civic groups feel that the variety of public voices have been consolidated too quickly by the Civic Alliance, positioning itself as the primary informant of public voices to the LMDC.\textsuperscript{76} Tensions may have escalated because the RPA has a long history working in New York politics. The RPA has been working with metropolitan area governments of the tri-state region since 1922 and the relationships already developed with New York City, particularly during development and advocacy for the most recent Regional Plan, "A Region at Risk," released in 1996, some interpret as the end of a grassroots civic process.

The Civic Alliance draft Planning Framework to Rebuild Downtown, released at the end of April 2002 proposes a series of Civic Alliance managed community dialogues. One of the key findings of the Memorial Working Group, chaired by Marian Imperatore and Jill Learner, is that an official memorial process needs to recognize that no clear consensus has developed about the memorial.\textsuperscript{77} The report proposes small community dialogues and larger public listening forums like \textit{Listening to the City} (convened by the Civic Alliance on February 7, 2002) in which more than five hundred New
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Yorkers representing government, planning and architecture, professionals, community residents and businesses, victims’ families and rescue and recovery workers participated. The LMDC agreed to co-host with the Civic Alliance, *Listening to the City II*, which is expected to convene five thousand participants in July 2002 in a city-wide public conversation about the future of Lower Manhattan.

Recognition by civic leaders that small-scale community dialogues on the memorial have been absent from the process is an important contribution. The stakeholder list for the dialogues as published in the draft Planning Framework to Rebuild Downtown includes victims families, survivors, emergency rescue and recovery workers and volunteers, neighborhood residents and businesses, schools, religious leaders and the interested public. Unlike the city-wide public conversation that is expected to convene five thousand participants together once, in the same space for a half-day, these community dialogues are designed to build relationships and networks among groups and provide leaders with greater understandings of their constituency’s interests. These dialogues create the social capital necessary to develop interests and strengthen effective stakeholder communication. This will enable constituencies to select representatives for the consensus building process proposed in this thesis as an alternative decision-making process.

Without key stakeholders in decision-making roles engaged in dialogues, this effort initiated by the Civic Alliance should not be mistaken for or substituted for the consensus building process. The Civic Alliance draft Planning Framework does not propose to include decision-makers in the dialogues such as Silverstein Properties- the developer, SOM- the architects, Westfield- the leaseholder of the former WTC retail space, the Port Authority, Battery Park City Authority, the Empire State Corporation and representatives from the Mayor’s Office, and the Governor’s Office and the LMDC. The Civic Alliance is offering to listen to public voices and build civic relationships through community dialogues but these activities continue to position the public in an advisory rather than decision-making role.

The response to September 11th by a network of New York architects, designers, activists, planners, writers and academics to claim a stake in the rebuilding of the WTC site established multiple venues for public learning and conversation. While the civic groups either developed within existing organizations or affiliated themselves with well-connected individuals or respected firms or
organizations, the victims' families groups are entirely grassroots. Many spokespersons for the victims' families have no political ties in New York City and little experience negotiating their voice in a highly competitive, complex power structure. An opportunity to build alliances across constituencies could help advance the victims' families agenda that is perceived to be adversarial.

**Governor George Pataki Guides Government Recovery Strategy**

Civic Groups are among a complex network of decision-makers that claim to have rights to the planning and rebuilding of the WTC site. The civic responses were followed by formalized government recovery efforts. The decision-makers shaping the process include, the Governor, the LMDC, the landowner-the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey, the leaseholders-Silverstein Properties and Westfield, America, and the Mayor have a stake in the rebuilding of the site. The civic responses were followed by formalized government recovery efforts. Within days of the attacks, New York Senators Charles Schumer and Hilary Rodham Clinton secured $21.3 billion in federal funds from President George W. Bush to rebuild Lower Manhattan. The funds were allocated for an intermodal transit facility, an economic stimulus package, transportation, telecommunications and energy infrastructure, and FEMA.  

**Oversight and Planning: Lower Manhattan Development Corporation**

The first response to organize decision-making in Lower Manhattan by Governor George Pataki in the aftermath of September 11\textsuperscript{th} was to create the Lower Manhattan Development Corporation in November 2001, a subsidiary of the Empire State Development, charged with oversight, planning and coordination of the rebuilding and revitalization of Lower Manhattan (defined as everything south of Houston Street). The LMDC, with a $2 billion federally allocated budget, disburses funds for residential and business recovery and to organizations for restoration or rehabilitation activities, compensation for damage, and facilitating participatory processes in the planning and rebuilding of Lower Manhattan.

Governor Pataki appointed LMDC Chairman John C. Whitehead and half the 16-member Board of Directors which governs the agency. In November 2001 when Pataki created the agency, he held
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seven of the eleven LMDC appointments creating a state to city ratio of more than double state representation. Outgoing Mayor Giuliani appointed four members to the board and incoming Mayor Michael Bloomberg appointed an additional four members in April 2002. At the beginning of May 2002, Pataki appointed the final member to the board.

The Board of Directors is composed of twelve men and four women, the majority of whom are business and financial executives. There is one architect, several members with real estate development experience, a former Port Authority executive, and one community member. The Governor’s final appointment to the Board was Thomas Johnson whose financial experience was compatible with the Governor’s appointment preferences while satisfying the long awaited appointment of a victims’ family member to the Board. Johnson lost his son in the WTC attacks. The Governor who had previously excluded victims’ families from the decision-making positions revealed his apparent discomfort with the presence of the tragedy in the decision-making process and maintained some reservation about the idea that a victims’ family member who sustained such trauma could still be interested in economic recovery. In a May 14, 2002 press release Pataki stated Johnson is “committed to rebuilding and revitalizing New York City. With decades of experience in the banking industry, he brings to the Board unique perspective on complex financial issues involved in stimulating the resurgence of Lower Manhattan. While [he] and his family sustained a tremendous personal loss on September 11, they are nonetheless eager to help the City recover from this terrible tragedy.”

This statement highlights the Governor’s perception that those who lost loved ones in the attacks of September 11th are not eager to recover and that remembrance and rebuilding are not compatible. Furthermore, Pataki’s selection of Johnson to the Board reduces the range of family voices with potential influence because Johnson’s wife, Ann Johnson is on the LMDC Families Advisory Council. There are an estimated 2,823 families who lost loved ones in the attacks and Pataki selected two members of the same family to represent those voices. This may be Pataki’s strategy to create alliances between the Families Advisory Council and Board of Directors.

In January 2002, the Governor and Mayor assembled nine LMDC Advisory Councils including constituency representation by families, residents, finance, business, economic development, tourism, arts and culture and transportation. At the end of April 2002, the LMDC agreed to a
memorandum of understanding with the Port Authority that the Port Authority of New York and
New Jersey, which owns the land would have jurisdiction over the all aspects of the rebuilding of the
WTC together with the LMDC but the LMDC would manage the memorial development process.

Landowner: The Port Authority of New York and New Jersey
The Port Authority of New York and New Jersey, a bi-state regional agency was conceived in 1921
to manage the regional transportation systems including tunnels, bridges, bus terminals and airports.
In the 1960's the Port Authority acquired the Hudson and Manhattan Railroad which became the
PATH rapid transit system in a bi-state deal that included the development of the World Trade
Center towers. Pataki holds more power over the Port Authority than New Jersey Governor James
E. McGreevey, who has generally been absent from decision-making process since September
11th. Although a bi-state agency, the Port Authority of New York maintains planning power and
the Governor of New Jersey has veto power, allowing him to enter the process after the plans have
been developed.

The Governor maintains control of the Port Authority through his appointment of half the board
and of the Vice Chairman, Charles Gargano. Gargano is also Chairman and Commissioner of
Empire State Development (ESD) which is New York State's economic development agency. The
ESD, with co-headquarters in Albany and New York City, is supported by a network of eighteen
offices throughout the state and around the world. The ESD helps businesses start-up, relocate,
establish a presence or expand operations in New York. The Empire State Development is
expected to be the agency that disburses the $19 billion in federal funds for Lower Manhattan
expected from the President.

Leaseholders: Silverstein Properties and Westfield, America
In July 2001, just six weeks before the WTC attack, the Port Authority released development rights
of the WTC site to Silverstein Properties in New York City history's biggest real estate deal, valued
at $3.2 billion. Silverstein's lease for which he makes monthly payments of $9 million gives him legal
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rights to rebuild what was there on the site with approval from the Port Authority. "It's pretty clear that Silverstein can rebuild, under our agreement, what was there before," said Charles Gargano, the Port Authority's vice chairman. Just days after the attack, Silverstein was quoted in the press as having said “we will rise again” but he has always agreed that 110-story office towers may not be appropriate and continues to suggest several smaller towers. In January he said he would like to build a performing arts center, a hotel and condominiums on the site. Any discussion of rebuilding on the site is contentious with some victims' families. One family member who lost her son in the attacks has said, “the site is a graveyard with no tombstones so if we have a cultural center there, people will be dancing on my son’s grave.” Silverstein has been less vocal about his plans for the WTC site since January 2002 when he focused his attention to the rebuilding of 7 World Trade Center, destroyed on September 11th on a parcel opposite the former WTC. The Port Authority maintains control over what can be rebuilt on the site because anything other than what was exactly there must obtain approval from the Port Authority. "If [Silverstein] wants to deviate and change the design, then he has to get approval from the Port Authority," Charles Gargano said. "And obviously, that means he's going to need the approval."

Westfield America Inc. a unit of Australia's Westfield Group, had joined Larry Silverstein in buying the 99-year lease on the World Trade Center. Westfield held a lease for 440,000 square feet of retail, which generated annual sales in excess of $900 per square foot. That compares with the national average of $341 per square foot, according to the International Council of Shopping Centers. The Westfield Group is one of the world's leading shopping center organizations involved in funding, developing and managing regional and super regional shopping centers. Since the release of proposed restorations of a street grid on the WTC site, Westfield argued that “bisecting the plaza

---

83 Panel Discussion, RPA Assembly, April 26, 2002.
85 Ibid.
86 Ibid.
87 Victim's Family Member, RPA Assembly, April 26, 2002.
with streets would fragment retail space and make it less valuable." Westfield expressed preference for an entirely enclosed suburban-type retail mall at the WTC site.

New York Mayor Bloomberg Responds

At the time of the attack on the trade center towers, Rudolf Giuliani was Mayor. His legacy remains in his praised management of the disaster and compassion in the immediate aftermath and his board member appointments to the LMDC Board of Directors. He is remembered for his passionate declaration of the WTC site as sacred and hallowed ground and his subsequent call for a “soaring monument” to those killed in the attacks and the priority first and foremost for a memorial at the site. In November 2001 Mayor Michael Bloomberg was elected. His redevelopment power lies in his four appointments to the LMDC board, the city appointees on the Empire State Development Board and the City Planning Commission, which approves zoning changes. The Governor has demonstrated that the rebuilding of Lower Manhattan is a task of the State. City decision-making under the leadership of Mayor Bloomberg, with regard to remembrance and rebuilding has been far less visible than state-level decision-making. The development of temporary memorials for the six-month anniversary of September 11th in the chapter that follows was an opportunity for Mayor Bloomberg to establish precedent for decision-making at the city-level.

CHAPTER FOUR: Decide and Defend

The events of September 11th emotionally attached many stakeholders to the WTC site. Government decisions to remember and rebuild at the WTC site have been contentious, provoked by this emotional attachment. Several examples of contentious decisions include: the firefighters protest on November 2, 2001 against the scaling down of search and rescue workers on the site; the recycling of WTC steel; a firefighter's memorial that proposed the recreation of white firefighters raising the American flag at ground zero as multi-racial; site accessibility and viewing platforms; and a proposed fence on the site perimeter to shield office workers from ground zero. The decision-making by elected and appointed officials and government agencies without the involvement of key stakeholders has resulted in delays, disruptions and distortions of rebuilding. However, some of these decisions have benefited from civic counter proposals. Integration of public input into the outcome is proving to be much more acceptable to a wider audience when the public has intervened. For example, architects, planners and designers pursued the Port Authority’s proposal to erect a shielding “curtain” on the perimeter of ground zero that was intended to block the view of the devastated site from returning office workers. Civic groups have transformed the proposal into a “viewing wall” that recognizes ground zero as a pilgrimage site and honors the public interest to view the rebuilding.\(^2\) The proposal is a much more respectful design that reduces the wall from forty feet in height to fourteen feet and creates continuous viewing along the perimeter with porticos for more intimate viewing. Decision-making in New York City continues to demonstrate arbitrary and ad hoc exclusion of public stakeholders despite the potential for better outcomes that satisfy more interests.

Examination of the decision to develop a temporary memorial to mark the sixth month anniversary of the events, the rebuilding of the PATH train and site planning for the former WTC demonstrate that decision-making patterns are creating conflict among stakeholders. In the case of the temporary memorial, the City was forced to consider public opinion because residents threatened public protest. The outcome, which was to locate the temporary memorial Sphere in Battery Park rather than Battery Park City, was a more sustainable proposal than that advanced by government officials.

\(^2\) Civic Informant, NYNV, April 2002.
because the park is a public space in a non-residential area that offers the greatest public access. The openness and accessibility of the park provided anonymity for the victims' families who did not want to become a spectacle. The lack of discussion about the nature of the WTC site as a sacred site of mass destruction has provoked conflict about rebuilding the PATH train and requests for site planning proposals. Victims' families are dismayed that they have not been invited to discuss rebuilding on the ground where they assert the ashes of their loved ones remain.

Decisions for a temporary Memorial "Sphere"

To mark the sixth month anniversary of the events of September 11th and the lives lost, the mayor working with the LMDC decided to create a temporary memorial. This process demonstrates the decision-making dynamics between the mayor and the LMDC and the lack of stakeholder participation in this decision-making arrangement. In February 2002 the LMDC and Mayor Bloomberg agreed that the rescued bronze “Sphere” by sculptor Fritz Koenig that once stood in the World Trade Center plaza and was damaged but not destroyed was an appropriate artifact for a temporary memorial. In 1971 the Sphere was dedicated as a monument to world peace through international trade and after September 11th Mayor Bloomberg stated, it symbolized “the resiliency of the American spirit.” Fritz Koenig said the incorporation of his creation in the interim memorial ensured that the "memory of the place where people worked and met would be truly represented."

Public vs. Private

The Sphere was a convincing temporary memorial because it was an artifact of the World Trade Center and one of two pieces of public art that survived the tragedy. Since September 11th many
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visitors have made the pilgrimage to ground zero for an opportunity to bear witness to the
destruction of September 11th and memorializing the Sphere provided an opportunity to witness an
authentic anomaly of survival after the collapse. But, the mayor and the LMDC were preparing the
memorial to be a private place for the families to mourn and reflect. Locating the site for the
temporary memorial was constrained by accommodating the victims’ families to place the memorial
within reasonable proximity of the site compounded by issues of inaccessibility related to recovery
efforts and debris removal from the crime scene at Ground Zero. Based on the perceived interests
of the families and the physical constraints, the LMDC determined that a small park in Battery Park
City, north of the Gateway Plaza residential apartments was the most feasible site for a temporary
memorial for the families and residents to visit.

The selected site concerned architects, planners and designers who were cautious about the decision
to privatize public space. The City’s plan was to site the Sphere at a public park in Battery Park City as
a temporary memorial and private place for family members and neighborhood residents to reflect
and to mourn. The “Tribute in Light,” two beams of light projecting from ground zero was to be
the public temporary memorial.

Architects, planners and designers were concerned that a public mourning was being endorsed as a
private matter and that a public park was being temporarily converted to a private space. New York
New Visions convened a meeting of their Temporary Memorial Subcommittee, chaired by architect
Diana Balmori on February 28, 2002 to discuss guidelines for temporary memorials. The Temporary
Memorial Subcommittee agreed that restricting access to a public park violates the spirit of an
agreement between Battery Park Authority (who owns the land) and the city that designates the park
as public open space. Privatizing mourning in a public space may suggest proprietary grieving and
diminish the events of September 11th as a public tragedy. One meeting participant said that
memorials in public spaces have the potential to equalize grieving by making it public. The interests
of planners, architects and designers at this New York New Visions Subcommittee meeting centered
on civic values, particularly the value that even under extraordinary circumstances public space
should always remain accessible to the public.
Victim's Families Claim Little Stake

The victims' families had little stake in the temporary memorial. Members of the Families Advisory Council agreed that the proposed memorial was acceptable but Monica Iken, founder of September's Mission and representative of families on the Families Advisory Council, said she and the families she represents did not choose the artifact of the memorial. Christy Ferrer, the Mayor's liaison between the victims' families and the government said, "the families are so focused on the permanent memorial that as long as the gesture of the temporary memorial was respectful, the location was not critical." However many family members did not necessarily agree to the temporary memorial site. "I personally would have no connection to any memorial outside ground zero," said Michael Cartier co-founder of family group, Give Your Voice. "My brother James has yet to be found and if he's anywhere, he's buried somewhere at Ground Zero. And I wouldn't want to go anywhere else but there." Monica Iken who represents two thousand families in a consortium of five family groups including Cartier's Give Your Voice, did not speak out in favor of the temporary memorial on Ground Zero, the location much of her constituency may have preferred. Iken, like Ferrer, had decided to focus her interests on the permanent memorial. While some expressed the true meaning of a memorial to be only at the site, other family members were concerned that locating the temporary memorial in Battery Park "could evolve into a permanent memorial location" off Ground Zero. But it was construction and planning workers at the site who attested that on March 11th building an interim memorial at the disaster site was less feasible because the recovery would still be underway.

City Responds

Battery Park City residents feared the Mayor was establishing proprietary grieving and promised to publicly challenge the legitimacy of the process. Vocal resident opposition to the location of the memorial in Battery Park City quickly reached the City and Madelyn Wils, chair of Community Board 1 and the only resident of Lower Manhattan to serve on the LMDC convened an emergency
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community meeting the evening of March 1, 2002.
Moments before the meeting Wils claimed to have received a call from the Mayor whose concerns for his legitimacy must have cautioned him to notify the community that he would consider alternative sites should the community not welcome the memorial. Chris Glaisek, on behalf of the LMDC tried to excuse the unspoken loss of legitimacy in the process by saying “the process was late in getting started because we are all still grieving.” Wils apologized empathetically at the meeting for not having worked more closely with the Battery Park City residents and apologized for the “media-misinformation about a hasty selection of the site for the temporary memorial.” She assured attendees that the LMDC had done an exhaustive and serious search for the best site for the temporary memorial and that Mayor Bloomberg was deeply concerned about the residents. Chris Glaisek of the LMDC, attested to having conducted the research to select possible sites. The LMDC was operating within the constraints of the area around the site continually changing as the recovery progressed, rendering the access to possible locations unpredictable. Residents grew skeptical of the selection of the park when Glaisek produced a photograph of the proposed site which residents believed misrepresented the park as unsightly, underutilized and unmaintained, which they believed furthered the City’s interests by suggesting that in exchange for temporary use
of the space, the City would make permanent improvements to the park that would have a lasting benefit for the community.

**Place Attachment**

The neighborhood was concerned that decision-makers had not personally consulted them as they had done with the victims’ families the previous day at an LMDC convened Families Advisory Council meeting. While many victims’ families have vocalized their interest for a quiet place close to ground zero to visit their lost loved ones, Battery Park City residents felt that close to the site was anything but a quiet place to mourn. Residents described their lives raising children among the chaos of the debris removal and the heightened security in the neighborhood as a living nightmare. One Gateway Plaza resident said about the memorial placement the “problem is that it’s here all the time. We don’t have a choice to visit it. It’s always here.” “Let’s be given the option to choose or not to choose to go to the memorial,” another resident said. Many residents agreed that while victims families could chose to visit the memorial and leave it behind, residents would have to live with it constantly. This discussion revealed that the residents felt disempowered to choose the fate of the identity of their neighborhood by the events of September 11th. The WTC site was the backyard to thousands of families who live in Lower Manhattan and whose children played in the WTC public plaza. Undoubtedly many residents of Lower Manhattan were profoundly attached to the WTC icon that dominated the NYC skyline beckoning international recognition as a symbol of money, power, and prestige.

The tragedy of September 11th has permanently disrupted the attachment that individuals had to the identity of Lower Manhattan as home their home and the home of the WTC towers. In *Place Attachments* Barbara Brown and Douglas Perkins assert that

---

100 Resident, Community Board 1 emergency meeting, March 1, 2002
individuals become attached to places through a series of unrepeatable experiences that bond people to their environment. Place attachment provides anchors in life and orients individuals to who they are and individual and communal attachments to place are emotionally embedded in identity. In the immediate aftermath of the attacks, residents spoke on the intensity of the loss of the towers as a vivid loss of identity, like a lost friend or a lost limb. Suellen Epstein who has lived and run a small business in her loft on Murray Street since 1978 said, “there's like a whole part of my body that doesn't exist any more.” The WTC was a monument with a strong identity and the events of September 11th disrupted the social and physical fabric of the community, destroying attachments to familiar places and leaving residents to reattach their identity to a destruction site. During the Community Board 1 meeting residents exposed the anxiety of having lost their power over place as decisions about the identity of their surroundings and ultimately themselves have forever changed and is continuing to transform. The opposition to locate a memorial in Battery Park City was a testament to the residents’ uneasiness about the changing identity of their community. As one resident said “let's not make Battery Park City into Memorial Park City,” referencing two existing permanent memorials in the neighborhood, the New York Police Officers memorial and the Irish Hunger Memorial.

Residents sought to regain control over their community and their identity. They passionately attempted to gain legitimacy for their identity by personally introducing themselves and offering the number of years they have resided in the community followed by their detailed evacuation experience on September 11th living in Lower Manhattan in the aftermath. Such introductions gave legitimacy to their interests and claimed expert knowledge of their experience. Many discussed the traumatized lives of their children to sensitize

\[101\] Altman, Low, Place Attachments, p. 280.
decision-makers to the impact of September 11th and the aftermath on delicate and impressionable lives; in a sense, to call for protection of a future generation from further neighborhood disruption and intrusion by the traumatic memory of September 11th.

Residents began to call themselves “survivor victims” to elevate their positions as both survivors and victims. They are survivors of September 11th because they escaped Lower Manhattan following the attack and survivors because they have continued to live in Lower Manhattan despite the void, the health risks, loss of amenities and noise pollution caused by the recovery and rebuilding efforts. They are victims because their neighborhood was attacked and many lost their homes and everyone lost many civic amenities in the neighborhood. An estimated 30,000 of the 50,000 residents in Lower Manhattan were displaced in the first few days and weeks after September 11th. Many residents have decided to move out permanently and thousands were still unable to occupy their homes months after the attacks. Those who returned sought to have their resiliency recognized and their commitment valued as a powerful force of social and economic recovery in Lower Manhattan.

Representation

Among many residents providing personal testimony, some did not object to the temporary memorial in Battery Park City but instead suggested that the problem was lack of representation. A Gateway Plaza resident said, “we really feel that we need a seat at the table. Survivors victims need a seat at the table.” Madelyn Wils addressed the comment by saying that she is a Lower Manhattan resident of 16 years and that she is also on the Lower Manhattan Redevelopment Corporation Advisory Board. Madelyn Wils is a prominent and dedicated neighborhood advocate but residents were not convinced that her personal narrative matched theirs. The trauma of September 11th has prompted residents to share their stories and assert that their experiences are part of a resident victim and survivor narrative that exposes the interests that must be negotiated in the decision-making. Battery Park City is a community deeply impacted by the tragedy but conflicted about their position in the decision-making process when for many it was not their loved ones they lost but their neighborhood. They may be unsure how their interests are valued in a hierarchy of interests. Monica Iken, founder of September’s Mission said, “I understand how they feel. We were robbed of
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our future. They were robbed of their neighborhood." The agency had not predicted that the families and the neighbors would share an understanding and was “surprised that families wanted to accommodate the residents.” The LMDC and the Mayor had not created a decision-making environment in which dialogues among constituencies would build understandings and de-escalate contentious issues among stakeholders and failed to consider all stakeholder interests before arriving at a decision.

Madelyn Wils, urging members to work together said “all we want to do is make people feel comfortable” but achieving comfort required endurance. The residents were in tears and victims’ families were sitting generally silently but likely feeling uncomfortable to be put in a position where their grieving was clearly being pitted against what the community felt was their unacknowledged grieving. In this process the families still intensely grieving did not express their interests in light of the all too familiar sadness and loss that overwhelmed the room by the residents of Battery Park City. Families who were present listened as residents used passionate language to describe themselves as “survivor victims.” Residents used language that began to blur the grieving line between lost loved ones and lost neighborhood.

The residents had been led to believe by decision-makers that the families had chosen the site for the temporary memorial and had advocated for the artifact. But one family member, on behalf of other victims’ families stated that families had chosen neither the artifact nor the site but had been presented with the temporary memorial and simply agreed that it appeared appropriate and respectful. This information revealed that decision-makers, in an effort to be sensitive to families, were creating grieving hierarchies in which some interests would be recognized before others.

The decision-making process for the temporary memorials at the six month anniversary of the attack enacted the decision-making arrangement established following September 11th in which the LMDC staff informs the Family Advisory Council of decisions with the mayor and governor as final arbitrator. While the LMDC maintained an open door policy, it had not engaged in much outreach; therefore, only those voices that actively pursued the agency were heard. This decision-making
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approach generated the contention because decisions were made exclusively by experts and elected and appointed officials and released for public reaction. When significant opposition arose that threatened the legitimacy of decision-makers, an emergency Community Board meeting was convened. The urgency with which the meeting was convened escalated the pressure on the residents to convince decision-makers that their interests matter and challenged the sensitivity of the process under the tragic circumstances. In the process of advocating their interests, the residents and the families were pitted against one another and as one board member said “I wish the process was more collaborative. I realize we are experiencing almost the same type of grieving [as the families] and it should not be us against them.” Christy Ferrer, who lost her husband, Port Authority Executive Director, Neil Levin, and has since been appointed as the Mayor’s liaison to victims’ families, reminded attendees that “this is just the beginning and we are going to have to work together for a long time.” Many residents confessed that they had not yet had an opportunity to meet victims’ families and this meeting changed their perceptions. The temporary memorial conflict that decision-makers created between families and residents was a result of a lack of communication between decision-makers and residents and all affected stakeholders. The community meeting was an opportunity for residents and victims’ families to learn that their interests were overlapping. Residents and families had lost control of decision-making power over many aspects of their lives as a result of the terrorist attacks on September 11th. Many wished to be given an opportunity to participate in decision-making in recognition that they had been personally impacted.
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Creating Community Dialogues

In response to the meeting the emergency Community Board 1 Meeting on March 1, 2002, Board member Carol DeSaram, convened a small meeting with victims families and residents to begin developing relationships between victims families and residents. DeSaram was displeased with the planning process as it was employed for the temporary memorial. She highlighted the lack of dialogue between the Mayor and the public and was surprised that the Mayor called the emergency meeting when he knew that the residents opposed the temporary memorial in their neighborhood which implies that he knowingly risked provoking a conflict. DeSaram argued that the families and the neighbors were traumatized and should have been involved in a discussion about the temporary memorial rather than in a battle to overturn decisions already made without public input. DeSaram held the dialogue with victims’ families and residents to provide them with an opportunity to discover each others’ interests.

During this dialogue, residents learned that the widows who were often present at the Community Board meeting but who never introduced themselves or participated in the discussion were silent because they were offended by some of the language being used at the meetings. To the victims’ families casual use of words such as “grid” and “property values” carried deeper meanings. The word grid, for example, was disconcerting for the victims’ families because it implied the creation of a street grid on the site and people stepping on the ashes of their husbands. Victims’ families learned that their lives were deeply tied to the neighborhood residents because, as one resident explained, “the ashes of your loved ones are in our neighborhood and are now permanent residents in our community.”109

The conflict created by the temporary memorial and the success of this dialogue has led to a proposal released by the Civic Alliance Memorial Working Group in April 2002 to host a series of community dialogues to build relationships and networks, first within common interest groups and then across constituencies. This social capital building is the necessary foundation on which to develop a consensus process for the memorial because it creates cohesion within groups and
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resolves some misunderstandings and contentions among stakeholders. And, as DeSaram envisions, these dialogues will empower people to make better decisions.110

The process of creating a temporary memorial highlighted the importance of dialogue between government and public and the critical participation of the residents in neighborhood land-use decision-making. The residents traumatized by the events of September 11th are struggling with the new identity of their neighborhood. One resident Karen Bender, a writer who lives at Independence Plaza said, "you have this feeling that you should look at [the site], that you need to look at it. It's a weird balancing act. You want to honor the people who died, but you don't want your life defined by it."111 Rebuilding of the WTC site is a land-use negotiation that is re-negotiating the identity of a neighborhood and its residents who have already experienced a tremendous transformation in their living space.

Decisions to Rebuild

Hundreds of New Yorkers, government agencies, architects, planners, developers and individuals watched the unveiling of a simulated plan for a revitalized transportation system in Lower Manhattan at the Regional Plan Association Assembly in Manhattan on April 26, 2002. While computer simulated images of trains were displayed passing through Ground Zero, victims' families stepped outside the room. Dismayed by the prospects of trains running through the gravesites of their loved ones, whose ashes they believed were still at ground zero, they began mapping the subsurface space at ground zero. “This is where my husbands’ body was found,” one widow said to the others pointing to a site on the map where the PATH train reconstruction would soon pass.

PATH Train Through Ground Zero
The tension that developed in the initial aftermath of September 11th between the desire to rebuild and the desire to remember has become a conflict between economic interests and sacred ground. Many of the victims’ families feel strongly that the WTC site is sacred ground and are interested in defining the qualities that the site should possess as a sacred site before rebuilding begins anywhere on the 16-acres. But the Port Authority who owns the PATH train that formerly ran through ground zero has already begun rebuilding the system while rescue workers continue to recover
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human remains at the site. In private meetings with family members of the LMDC Family Advisory Council, Governor Pataki, Mayor Bloomberg and the Lower Manhattan Development Corporation have all vowed not to move forward with site rebuilding without consensus from the families.\textsuperscript{112} And in a public statement Governor Pataki asserts that, "as we work to rebuild Ground Zero, we must also honor those who died in the way they deserve to be honored. For we must never forget that Ground Zero is, as Lincoln said about Gettysberg, "a final resting place for those who gave their lives that a nation might live."\textsuperscript{113} Some families are vocally challenging Pataki to demonstrate how in the rebuilding of the PATH train without their input is he honoring those who died on the site.

Victims' families have been given no opportunity to engage in dialogues with decision makers about their positions on the rebuilding of the PATH train. At monthly Families Advisory Council meeting families air their concerns but the meetings are no dialogues with decision-makers where the parties come to a mutual understanding. In individual meetings with state and city officials, families express their concerns and are offered sympathy but there is not dialogue to understand and resolve the tensions. In the May 20, 2000 New Yorker, LMDC Chairman Whitehead told writer Paul Goldberger, that the other day a "a poor woman from out of town" had come to see the site for the first time and was visiting the room set aside for families to view the site at the LMDC offices. The women asked to speak to an official so Whitehead responded. He stated that when the woman saw
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the workers laying subway tracks, she broke down and said that is where she thought her husband had died. Whitehead’s response to Goldberger when he asked what he said to her was, “what is there to say? I tried to comfort her. I told her that there were places that could give her help, and I directed her to them.” Whitehead made it clear that the LMDC’s job is to build. Many victims’ families want to speak to officials not to receive sympathy and counseling referrals. This woman was likely not crying just for the loss of her husband, but she was crying because rebuilding on the site before the last of the remains are recovered was disrespectful and traumatizing. The decision-making approach of the LMDC is a listening process and in that process they do not ask victims’ families what they want. Victims’ families feel railroaded because decision-makers have not engaged them in a dialogue about their interests. There could be a creative solution to rebuilding on a sacred site but Whitehead did not explore that because he does not believe the role of the LMDC is to remember.

The rebuilding of the PATH train is quickly sealing possibilities for memorialization and setting precedent for the nature of sacred ground and that is creating tensions with victims’ families. Some family members anticipated that subsurface space could become part of a broader concept of memorialization on the site that included an underground memorial and the PATH train may be interfering with that.

Decisions for Site Planning

In addition to the rebuilding of the PATH train, the LMDC initiated the beginning of the WTC site planning by issuing a Blueprint for Renewal and planning principles for the WTC site in early April. Two weeks following the Blueprint, a request for proposal was issued for an urban design firm to plan the WTC site and Lower Manhattan.

Blueprint for Renewal

On April 9, 2002, following a 20-day listening period the Lower Manhattan Development Corporation published “Principles for Development and Preliminary Blueprint for Lower Manhattan,” a detailed plan of action. The Blueprint states that “LMDC will work closely with the victims’ families and survivors in developing a memorial process, as well as the Port Authority, the
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leaseholders, and all of the groups and agencies involved to come to agreement on a final plan."\textsuperscript{117} This statement reveals that the LMDC will first and foremost engage victims’ families and survivors in developing the memorial process and then the Port Authority and leaseholders, suggesting a stakeholder hierarchy that has not yet been fully explored nor brought to consensus. Following consultation with those stakeholders, the LMRC will apparently work less closely with groups and agencies involved. But it is unclear if “involved” refers to both groups presently involved and those yet to be formed and recognized.

The Blueprint further suggests that the LMDC has already found consensus on proposed ideas because it states that “the memorial will stand as an eternal tribute to the victims, the enduring strength of democracy, a celebration of freedom, and a testament to the resurgent power of the city and the nation. Like \textit{The Sphere} that once stood in the plaza, it will reflect the free exchange of ideas, goods, and services among diverse peoples that the World Trade Center embodied.”\textsuperscript{118} This statement indicates that the LMDC believes it has heard from interested parties and there is an assumed emerging consensus for what the memorial will embody. The World Trade Center had been less than economically viable space with a high vacancy rate. It had 17\% vacancy rate and only since 1996 when the city filled fifty stories of one tower with its own departments and the Port Authority had space in the other tower.\textsuperscript{119} The LMDC does not state that there will be a process to hear from stakeholders to determine the memorial and does not acknowledge that some stakeholder groups may not have provided input.

A lengthy process has yet to be undertaken to determine what the memorial will be and what experience it will offer its visitors. The LMDC refers to the memorial in the singular and many stakeholders would still like to explore the possibility of more than one memorial on the site including New York New Visions who refers to the memorial in the plural in their published guidelines. The LMDC references the symbolic meaning of “The Sphere,” and yet there is no consensus that the symbolic meaning of the Sphere is meaningful to interested memorial development constituencies. The Blueprint does not suggest what the memorial “could” mean, rather it states what the memorial \textit{will} mean.

\textsuperscript{117} \url{www.renewnyc.com}, April 13, 2002.  
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In a press release issued by the LMDC on April 9, 2002, Governor Pataki “commend[ed] the LMDC for developing a set of principles to guide the redevelopment and for reducing many of the goals and proposals for the World Trade Center site to one simple document.” Is the decision-making process ready for reduction? The LMDC has proceeded to issue proposals for the memorial in an un-facilitated process in which stakeholders do not have an official mandate to participate. Without a facilitator, there is no independent body to evaluate and organize the process to ensure that all the stakeholders are involved and that a range of interests are represented in the decision-making.

In a subsequent meeting with Governor Pataki following the release of the Blueprint, families expressed outrage that a 'blueprint' of the LMDC's plans for lower Manhattan was released to the press on April 9th, because news stories indicated the plans were drafted after a consensus was reached that included the victims' families even though there had been no consultation with any of the family groups. Families were upset that the plan called for reinstatement of PATH service through Ground Zero, where remains had been found, through underground areas considered to be 'sacred and hallowed ground'. The families demanded a halt to the work being performed on PATH and Subway lines that protrude into Ground Zero.

Request for Proposal

The Port Authority and the LMDC had not settled their decision-making structure until the LMDC issued a request for proposal for the WTC site planning. On April 10, 2002 the Lower Manhattan Development Corporation issued a request for proposals for an urban planner to complete designs for Lower Manhattan and the WTC site. But within only a few days the request was withdrawn because Port Authority officials said they had not been adequately consulted and the LMDC was moving too quickly. According to the Daily News, Port Authority Chairman Jack Sinagra said “we can't lose sight of the fact that it's the Port Authority's property and the Port Authority's responsibility for whatever is created on the site.” Two weeks later, on April 24, 2002 the Port
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Authority issued an RFP “in cooperation with the LMDC”\textsuperscript{125} for a site design and request for a transportation study of Downtown Manhattan. The Port Authority and the Lower Manhattan Development Corporation are said to have agreed to a memorandum of understanding that gives the LMDC the lead role in planning oversight for a memorial while the Port Authority, as landowner will have decision-making power over all other trade center site development.\textsuperscript{126} This negotiation demonstrates that the decision-making structure had not yet been determined even eight months after the attack.

The joint RFP requests a planning study of transportation and urban design of the World Trade Center by a consultant to design space on the WTC site for offices, a hotel, retail, services, and memorial uses. The Port Authority asserts that these will be the specific site uses including commercial even though the LMDC “Blueprint for Renewal” that was released on April 9, 2002 did not suggest commercial development on the site. The proposals in response to the Port Authority RFP were submitted May 6, 2002. The Port Authority received thirteen proposals, representing fifty firms. A deadline of July 1, 2002 was set for initial plans including a memorial, and a second deadline for further development of the design options and a final proposal for the WTC site “deemed most feasible by the Port Authority and the LMDC” is to be completed by Dec. 1, 2002.\textsuperscript{127}

This rush to secure plans for the WTC site and create new more aggressive timetables is in response to criticism that planning was moving too slowly in Lower Manhattan, according to the press. Criticism of a slow effort to rebuild the WTC site from Andrew M. Cuomo, a Democratic candidate for Governor in the November 2002 election, is said to have accelerated the planning process.\textsuperscript{128} For this reason some family members hope that the RFP is just an exercise to ease political pressures and not solid decision-making.\textsuperscript{129} Others fear, however, that this will narrowly define the uses on the site to memorial, office, retail, hotel at the expense of more creative and thoughtful memorialization that considers alternatives to a single parcel. Iken of September’s Mission is concerned because the parameters of the RFP for hotel and commercial uses deny discussion of the qualities deserving of a sacred site. While some victim’s families promote a memorial park, other

\textsuperscript{125} Port Authority RFP, April 25, 2002.
\textsuperscript{126} Wyatt, Edward, Trade Center Plans Are Speeded Up After Criticism, New York Times, April 24, 2002
\textsuperscript{127} Port Authority RFP, April 25, 2002.
\textsuperscript{129} Kuo, Michael, victims’ family member, April 26, 2002.
widows and families fear the RFP restricts creative memorialization and the sacredness of the entire site by proposing to parcel the site.\textsuperscript{130}

Victims’ families are not the only stakeholders who are intimately tied to the sacredness of the site. Victim’s families are concerned that they were not in the position to go to battle for the rebuilding and decision-makers would move forward while they are still grieving. But after site planning proposals were submitted in May 2002, they are not the only voices advocating for the memorialization of sacred ground. The victims’ families have the support of many members within the firefighter, rescue worker, former employees of the WTC, survivor and resident constituencies. These are people who were directly affected by events of September 11\textsuperscript{th}, many of whom have been working at ground zero since September 11\textsuperscript{th}. Of the 2,830 missing on the WTC site on September 11th, only a few bodies were recovered. There are 1,986 individuals declared dead or missing who have not been found, their remains are likely ashes on the site.\textsuperscript{131} Survivors who generally have been absent from much of the discussions about memorialization at the WTC site are expressing their desire for the footprints of the towers to be open space. An LMDC Board member said in an LMDC meeting on April 29, 2002 “will we acquiesce? I don’t know.”

There has been no discussion with families about the site as the final resting-place of their loved ones and some say that the site clean up has been disrespectful of the dead. Removing remains and dumping them in Fresh Kills Landfill for sorting disrespects the possibility of the ashes of thousands among the debris.\textsuperscript{132} Although removing debris has been necessary to recover human remains, many families feel they would have appreciated sensitivity from decision-makers for respectful “recovery” rather than “clean-up” of the site.\textsuperscript{133} The LMDC may chose to re-examine its interactions with victims’ families. Some family members of the LMDC Advisory Council claim that the LMDC has never asked them what their interests are and has provided no forum for negotiation. Instead families assert that in their capacity on the LMDC Advisory Council they are presented with information upon which decisions have already been made and are given the opportunity to react and provide feedback.\textsuperscript{134} This form of participation has rendered a process in which families feel
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powerless under circumstances created without choice. They may disapprove of the actions passed down to them even if recovery intentions are fair.

The state and the city have determined that their obligation to restore economic vitality to Lower Manhattan is resting heavily on clearing and preparation of the WTC site for infrastructure development. Removing from view the destruction of September 11th is deemed critical to attracting businesses, residents and patrons to Lower Manhattan. Decision-makers have likely feared that involving victims’ family members in decision-making will slow the process and allow emotions to enter the process. Some widows have perceived that decision-makers are not inviting families into decision-making roles because they bring only emotions and not expertise to the process.135 However, in addition to many family members having extensive traditional qualifications such as higher education from the top universities in the country or relevant professional experience, all have an expertise in grief.136 Grief must be present in the rebuilding process for the site to bare its rightful identity as a sacred site.

The Advisory Councils are not serving families and other interest groups in constructive dialogues. Instead the LMDC presents decisions to the families who then battle to reverse decisions already made rather than influence decisions that have yet to be made. A dialogue is necessary to engage decision-makers and families where families can express their interests and reveal the underlying meaning of their reservations about rebuilding. Families are still mourning and find it disrespectful that the City is planning the site and rebuilding the PATH train without consideration of the families’ interests. Families object to commercial use because the nature of the activity is a value conflict with the death on the site.

Discussion for rebuilding New York has never ceased to tout the importance of engaging democracy for an inclusive participatory process. The Civic Alliance proposes that, “the long-term civic and economic health of the city and the region, as well as the nation as a whole, depends on making the right decisions. We all have a stake in an outcome that will have such a profound impact in New York City its environs and the nation’s image.” The Civic Alliance suggests that maximizing public involvement will help generate the best ideas and the broadest support for recommended
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outcomes. The LMDC has engaged a democratic process, committed to listening to the public voice, however the process to date is not well defined. The LMDC has undoubtedly been flooded with advocates and while the agency has been contacted by interested parties, they have not conducted their own outreach to identify stakeholders and determine the reliability and accuracy of represented interests.

---

CHAPTER FIVE: Planning in the Shadow of Trauma and Conflict

The World Trade Center site was permanently transformed into a site of catastrophic destruction since the moment the towers were struck by two airliners and millions of people witnessed the fire, the fall of the towers and the instant murder of thousands. The events of September 11th can never be isolated or removed from the site, even as the ruins and remains are recovered. From the moment one approaches the site it is changed and will forever be sacred ground. The current decision-making process for the rebuilding of the WTC development in New York takes as implicit the tragedy of September 11th and in so doing does not raise questions about the nature of the site as a disaster site.

The decision-making for the temporary memorial, the PATH train rebuilding and the WTC site planning demonstrates a decision-making process that listens, decides, announces decisions and responds or rejects public feedback. The LMDC Advisory Council and the Lower Manhattan Community Board are the forums created for public expression of grievances or concerns but there is no obligation on the part of decision-makers to act on public objections. Public participation is not designed to build consensus. In a traditional public hearing the objective is information sharing. Communication is one-way. Public officials present findings, and attendees present their comments. These interactions are highly scripted with little effort to enter a dialogue. 

Stakeholder interests not accounted for in the decisions risk the ongoing possibility of conflict that could delay and distort the rebuilding of Lower Manhattan. Confrontations between decision-makers and victims’ families, could thereby become the dominant memory of the memorial development.

An alternative process to traditional adversarial public participation is consensus building. Consensus building could provide an opportunity to reach agreement on a plan of action for how to proceed with memorialization and rebuilding on a site of catastrophic destruction. A consensus building process would provide a forum to frame the challenge to harmonize memory and money on the WTC site. The process first and foremost would identify diverse stakeholders, establish ground rules for sensitivities to the presence of trauma and grief and open dialogue about

---

memorialization and the interaction between sacred ground and economic recovery. Rebuilding Lower Manhattan is a technically complex process that requires highly skilled professional expertise. Consensus building does not replace the expertise required to rebuild Lower Manhattan with public discretion. Instead, it creates a process for learning, understanding and joint agreement between the public, victims’ families, residents, survivors, local businesses, landowners, leaseholders, government agencies and elected and appointed officials. Consensus building recognizes the profound collaboration that must take place between professionals and experts in engineering, architecture, finance, economics, business and community development and a range of public stakeholders to achieve a sound process and durable outcome.

Challenges for a Consensus Process
Development at the WTC site will pose challenges no matter how it moves forward. The issues of sacred ground, trauma and grieving, timing, identifying diverse stakeholders, stakeholder hierarchies, language, and uncertainties over what constitutes a memorial require a forum for discussion and agreement.

Sacred vs. Profane
The greatest challenge for the rebuilding of Lower Manhattan is the alleged sacredness of the former World Trade Center site where almost three thousand people were killed. For many victims’ families the site is sacred. John Lynch who lost a son in the WTC tragedy claims “Ground Zero is a battlefield. When thousands of New Yorkers went to work that morning, they were going to war, but nobody told them.” Lynch compares the WTC to Gettysberg. “In dedicating the national cemetery at Gettysberg, Abraham Lincoln said: "We cannot consecrate — we cannot hallow — this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here have consecrated it." The heroes of Sept. 11 consecrated the ground. Those who desecrate it will be subject to the harsh judgment of future generations. Stephen Push of the Families of September 11, says building commercial buildings in the exact spot where the towers stood would be "sacreligious" but commercial buildings could be built on some part of the site, as long as it didn’t interfere with the families' wishes. But Sally Regenhard founder of the Skyscraper Safety Campaign whose son died in the attack, said, "I'm
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absolutely categorically opposed about building a commercial building. And I actually do have a lot of reservations about any type of building there.”

Stakeholders have yet to decide what the nature of the WTC site as sacred should be. While in the strongest sense sacred means "worthy of religious veneration and to consecrate: to devote irrevocably to the worship of God and devoted to one service or use." The meaning of sacred can be broader to simply mean “highly valued and important.” Apart from diverse interests among families, decision-makers have not opened dialogue with stakeholders to discuss sacred at the site and determine what is appropriate development on sacred ground.

The uneasiness that families in New York feel with the development on the site where their loved ones died is not unlike discussions that took place in Oklahoma City following the 1995 terrorist bombing. In the aftermath of the Oklahoma City Bombing the issue of sacred ground arose in the context of the closing of a section of Fifth Street where people died. The Oklahoma City Memorial Task Force agreed that “this area is considered sacred ground and it is a hallowed place deserving of the respect and solemnity associated with great loss. As a space changed forever, it deserved in their minds the same status of a battlefield, where great suffering and death was commemorated in numerous ways among them a commitment to physical preservation of a historic landscape and extreme sensitivity to acts of defilement, such as commercial intrusion.” One family member who lost his father on the site of the Murrah Building in Oklahoma City questioned appropriate behavior on the site. While his father died on Fifth Street, he wondered if the street was reopened how many people would drive over the site of their deaths. And how many drivers would be appalled if they learned they had driven over sacred ground.

In an open and inclusive consensus process, discussions in Oklahoma City gave people an opportunity to learn and understand the interests of others. While many in Oklahoma spoke of the site as ‘sacred ground’ saying that “rebuilding there, conducting business as usual would defile the

---
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site... [others] said a new building would signal defiance of terrorism.”¹⁴⁵ Some wanted Fifth Street reopened to signal healing and a move to normalcy. Opening it would “remove the obvious and constant reminder of that tragedy.”¹⁴⁶ Those who called it sacred ground were confronted with arguments that “don’t immerse yourself in tragedy, move on with life and you’ll recover” which was met by anger from many family members and survivors.¹⁴⁷

Families in New York do not know the exact location of the remains of their loved ones so determining where to reserve space for a memorial has led many to object to only partial memorialization on the site. Monica Iken, founder of September’s Mission said, in a March 2002 interview, “my husbands’ energy was last on that site and whether his ashes ended up in Brooklyn is irrelevant. He disappeared somewhere on that site.”¹⁴⁸ Many families are likely to have no remains of their loved ones recovered and not knowing where on that site lives were lost has led Iken and the families she represents to advocate for the entire 16-acres as a memorial park. Carrie Lemack founder and president of Families of September 11th believes that reserving the entire site for a memorial park is unlikely to win the attention of decision-makers. Following discussions with the leaseholder, Silverstein, and LMDC Chair Whitehead, Lemack believes that the tower footprints are a reasonable compromise. Other family groups including Windows of Hope offering support and advocacy to families of food service professionals believe the site is a burial ground of their loved ones.

The boundary of the site is contested in New York City. The LMDC Blueprint for Renewal locks out the possibility that all 16 acres of the site would be a memorial because it proposes that a street grid be returned to the site which was obliterated for the WTC towers superblock. The debate about the boundary of a memorial at the WTC is not unlike the ongoing debate at Gettysberg. The size of the battlefield has always been a source of tension between administrators of the park and residents of the town.¹⁴⁹ The ongoing conflict is one of residents feeling threatened by the expanding boundaries of the park and preservationists feeling threatened by growth near the site overstepping the boundary of the park. Some local residents fear that they are living in an “island town” in a vast
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This is the same sentiment expressed by residents of Battery Park City who already are feeling the spontaneous memorials surrounding Ground Zero spilling into their neighborhood. The addition of a temporary memorial would turn the Battery Park City into Memorial Park City. At Gettysberg, William F. Goodling, a Republican congressman from Pennsylvania spoke for the pro-development forces as well as for a secular interpretation of the battlefield in 1980 when he said that the government should not be obligated to buy “every piece of land where a Union or a Confederate soldier stepped.” Many New Yorkers share this sentiment about the WTC site.

The USS Arizona Memorial at Pearl Harbor, like Gettysberg and the WTC site raise the question of appropriate physical and ideological boundaries. The USS Arizona like the World Trade Center site is recognized by many as the final resting place for families loved one. The ship’s 1,177 crewmen who lost their lives on December 7, 1941 have never been recovered from the ship. The memorial is “designed as a shrine, built over the sacred relic,” but discussion is ongoing about whether the boundary of sacred space is the perimeter of the ship or whether it extends to the entire Pearl Harbor Bay.

Trauma and Grieving

The trauma suffered on September 11th is incomprehensible. The response of decision-makers has been to listen to those who were most directly affected and are grieving the loss of their loved ones but not to engage in their trauma. Some community leaders have expressed concern that decision-makers are not responding to victims’ families because the presence of their trauma is perceived to create a volatile process. Liz Abzug co-founder of Rdot reports that decision-makers who were directly affected by the events of September 11th are the strongest proponents of the victims’ families interests because they understand the deep impact and trauma of the events. Outgoing Mayor Rudolph Giuliani who witnessed people jump from the top of the trade center towers and was almost killed as the towers collapsed, is the only politician who called for the entire site to become a memorial. New York Senator Charles Schumer who thought for five hours his daughter
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was missing in the collapse of the towers credits his five hours of trauma as having appealed to the sensitivities of U.S. President George W. Bush and helped secure $21.3 billion in federal funds for New York City.\textsuperscript{156}

The deaths of nearly of 3,000 people on the WTC site requires patience and sensitivity. The best precedent in the United States for a process that fully engaged the trauma and grieving of a terrorist attack in site planning is Oklahoma City. In Oklahoma City, Robert Johnson who headed the memorial development process says that people were hesitant to work with families of the Oklahoma City tragedy because “for some task force volunteers, especially those who were used to organizational efficiency, adjusting to a rhythm of mourning that was intertwined with memorial planning was difficult.”\textsuperscript{157} Johnson said that he “learned how to listen and learned great patience with the process.”\textsuperscript{158} While the media has questioned the absence of an official process and the near invisibility of LMDC Chairman Whitehead, it is likely that the first six months were intentionally cautious to account for mourning. However, now that the LMDC Preliminary Blueprint for Renewal was released, and an urban designer was selected to the WTC site planning, it should not be a signal that all stakeholders are ready to move forward. Patience will be necessary throughout the process and particularly in the initial rebuilding phase.

\textit{Timing}

The presence of trauma and grieving impacts the pace of the rebuilding. Decision-making in New York in the aftermath of September 11\textsuperscript{th} has occurred in the presence of grieving and traumatized stakeholders. It is impossible to eliminate the psychological trauma from the process but many grieving stakeholders are absent from the process. Rdot, a community group comprised of Lower Manhattan neighbors convened a Memorial Committee in January 2002 and in February there were two committee members. Jim Biber, the committee chair explains that during the first six months of the aftermath, the residents were not ready to think about a permanent memorial. Residents experienced the traumatic events of September 11\textsuperscript{th} directly, many losing their homes and
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neighborhood. During the same period architects, designers and planners at NYNV had over fifty regular participants in a memorial committee and a temporary memorials committee.¹⁵⁹

There are many stakeholders who are not accustomed to participating in public processes. Some firefighters who have been at ground zero since September 11th were surprised to learn that there could be a public process where they could voice their interests. During interviews in March, many firefighters were surprised to learn that New Yorkers were already thinking about how to rebuild. Like the residents who were directly affected by the destruction in their neighborhood, the recovery pace of the firefighters and rescue workers was affected by their efforts at Ground Zero to uncover remains. Many firefighters were not ready to discuss permanent memorialization on the site but just as many were.¹⁶⁰ Every traumatized stakeholder is operating at personal pace of recovery.

Families are still grieving and may not participate because they are not ready but without them the process should not proceed. On February 20, 2002 Give Your Voice president, Jennie Farrell, commented that "it has become increasingly difficult for family members who are still struggling with their tremendous losses to be rushed into defining their view on 'long term plan' for the site's re-use. It can cause great pain to hear about 'ground being broken by a certain time' when the recovery effort is still ongoing."¹⁶¹

**Stakeholder Hierarchies**

The importance of honoring the lost lives of September 11th at the WTC is nearly uncontested. In New York belief that the interests of the victims' families are of highest priority creates a stakeholder hierarchy. Stephen Push of Families of September 11th acknowledges the rights of all those affected by September 11th, but says, "The interests of the families of the deceased trump all those other interests."¹⁶²
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Civic groups and government agencies continually position survivor interests second only to victims’ families. A survivor who escaped the collapsing towers questioned, “how could I have lived when so many died.” An employee of Morgan Stanley who arrived at work just at the moment to witness the first airplane crash into the north tower of the WTC wonders if she was “chosen” to survive and feels guilty for having witnessed the event while her co-workers endured a harrowing escape. She does not consider herself a survivor because she did not escape the towers.

Hierarchies also exist among those who are widows versus those who lost sisters or fathers or mothers. Widows seem to be receiving the greatest recognition to such an extent that at Ground Zero, all the family members have been elevated to widow status. Rich Mighdoll, a truck driver who has been hauling debris at Ground Zero since Sept. 13 commented "these are the widows" when he met families at a “public thank you message” held at the site on April 14, 2002. Mighdoll was using a term that commonly refers to all relatives of the missing and dead.

Survivor hierarchies are not unprecedented. These survivor hierarchies surrounding September 11th are not unlike the hierarchies that developed in Oklahoma City after the 1995 bombing of the Murrah Building. Many of the unspoken hierarchies in Oklahoma City ranked those injured, those who survived uninjured, those who died in the Murrah Federal Building and those who died in the Water Resources Building. In New York tensions among family groups may reflect the differences of where victims were when they died; those who died in the airplanes versus those who died in the towers. It is usual for victims families to identify the floor their loved one worked on, the higher the floor the more hopeless the victims’ chance of survival are perceived to have been therefore the more painful the images of the last moments of life. Hierarchies exist among those who have remains and those who do not. Victims families in reference to their lost loved ones often name the company of employment and for those killed working at Cantor Fitzgerald it has created an immediate community because so many were lost. But for many who lost loved ones at Cantor Fitzgerald, they felt forgotten in the immediate aftermath when attention was turned to the “heroes.” While the firefighters and rescue workers were called the heroes, some victims’ families
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were saddened by lack of recognition given to the hundreds of heroic acts that must have been performed among those who perished.\footnote{Victims' Family Member, Personal Interview, March 2002.}

Establishing stakeholder hierarchies will likely influence memorialization at the WTC. Edward Linenthal in, \textit{The Unfinished Bombing}, describes the stakeholder hierarchies as critical to defining the appropriate memory. Linenthal asserts:

it must strive for exactitude in what is being remembered, who is being remembered, and the forms through which remembrance is expressed. Such memorial precision is a way of paying what people understand as their debt to the dead. The construction of accurate memorial hierarchies is a volatile and important task, for the stakes are very high.\footnote{Linenthal, Edward, \textit{The Unfinished Bombing}, p. 195} Conversely, failure to accomplish this, to mischaracterize the significance of an event, to blur lines between different groups, or to commemorate in inappropriate ways is often perceived as an act of defilement, a polluting of memory.\footnote{Linenthal, Edward, \textit{The Unfinished Bombing}, p. 195}

In New York there has been an attempt to “blur the lines” between stakeholders. Families have been referred to as “victims families.” Residents of the surrounding neighborhoods in Lower Manhattan under the pressures of feeling unrecognized have attempted to position themselves as survivor victims, borrowing “victim” which seemed to resonate with decision-makers. Joining the victims’ families as survivor victims risks elevating themselves above survivors who evacuated the towers. Some residents may feel that distinction is accurate because while trade center employees survived the escape from their offices, residents feel their survival is distinct because not only did they escape from their homes but many lost their homes, their neighborhood and are continuing to survive living in the presence of the death and destruction of the terrorist attack interfere with the families' wishes.\footnote{Victims’ Family Member, Personal Interview, March 2002.}

\textbf{Language}

A significant yet subtle barrier to dialogue among stakeholders is the use of certain words that carry new meanings after September 11\textsuperscript{th}. Some victims’ families have been upset about the recovery
effort at ground zero being referred to as a clean-up because it implies the scattered remains of their loved ones are a clean-up rather than recovery. The rubble at Ground Zero has been called debris and some remark that human remains cover everything. The ashes of almost two thousand people who disappeared on the site and have not had their remains recovered are believed by some to be covering the rubble on the site. Some family members consider the site sacred and their use of the words sacred and hallowed ground require specific appropriate activities on the site while some professionals and decision-makers describe the site as sacred but the site has not limits to the appropriate activities that may take place on it.

Identifying Diverse Stakeholders

Decision-makers have expressed ambivalence towards a consensus building process because identifying individuals and groups among such diverse stakeholders seems a utopian venture. The scope of interested parties includes the woman who walked down seventy-four flights of stairs before the towers collapsed; the reporter who pulled survivors from the rubble; the 9-11 dispatcher who received dozens of calls for help on the morning of September 11th; the father who was accompanying his son to the first day of school who otherwise would have been in the towers; the mother whose son was in food service at Windows on the World; the wife who received the last phone call from her husband trapped on the 104th floor; the daughter who never received the last call from her mother; the child in Florida who wrote a poem for the firefighters; the person in Japan, and in Argentina and England who witnessed the attack via television. The stakeholder list continues to grow, including those who transported remains from Ground Zero to Fresh Kills, and the families of the nearly 500 nationals of countries other than the United States, from 91 countries who were officially declared killed in April 2002.\textsuperscript{171} Stakeholders are “persons or groups likely to be affected by, or who think they will be affected by, a decision—whether it is their decision to make or not.”\textsuperscript{172} But decision-makers should realize that not all stakeholders who have expressed interest in the rebuilding of the WTC site are interested in direct participation. Consensus processes often position stakeholders in “circles.” Circles of stakeholders are groups or individuals that want or ought to be included in decision-making but at different levels of intensity. Some stakeholders may be involved in a core negotiating team; others may choose to observe the process. And many will
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participate in community and virtual forums where their interests will be included in the process through key representatives.

**What Constitutes a Memorial?**

When the LMDC released its Blueprint they touted a memorial park which mislead the public to believe that the long awaited memorial park desired by the outspoken Monica Iken of September’s Mission had been honored. In fact the memorial park was a concept that envisions Ellis Island, the Statue of Liberty, the New York Stock Exchange and a proposed trade center memorial as key elements of a "Freedom Park" that could be marketed and operated as a single destination. A "Freedom Park" is a strategy to satisfy proponents of a park with a marketing concept rather than a memorialization concept on the WTC site. In May, Iris Weinshall, Planning Commissioner for the MTA stated that “in Europe, there are many grand terminals that are really testimonials and memorials to great times in European history and to great battles. Maybe the new downtown transportation terminal could be another memorial to the people who lost their lives on September 11.” The idea that everything that is built in Lower Manhattan is a memorial to the lost lives of September 11th is honorable and has been offered by NYNV but if all of this construction is a memorial and victims’ families have been promised participation in memorial decision-making then why are they not included in decisions about this memorial – the transit station memorial? If all of the transformations to Lower Manhattan are a memorial and anything built on the site is a memorial to those who lost their lives on September 11th, then the victims’ families should be participating in the decision-making about all the memorials.

The Lower Manhattan Development Corporation suggested that it will develop a process and host a design competition for the selection of a memorial design but that process will convene far after many other development decisions on the site have taken place, leaving unresolved some of the key issue at stake including, sacred ground and memorial boundaries, stakeholder diversity and hierarchies, and trauma and grieving. A consensus building process creates a sustained conversation among stakeholders enabling stakeholder participants to design a plan of action and guidelines. The disagreement at the center of the WTC site rebuilding is the balancing of memorialization and sacred
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ground and economic recovery and opportunity. A plan of action produced through a consensus process could determine the guidelines for rebuilding the site that were absent from the Port Authority Request for Proposal (RFP) for a Site Plan. The RFP suggested site uses that included office space, hotels, a new street grid and a memorial. There has been no multi-party agreement that these are the best uses for the site. The RFP left to the discretion of the urban planner to determine the location and scale of the memorial and all other uses on the site, requiring no public input. There is still significant disagreement about the size, location and scale of a memorial on the site. A consensus process clarifies and engages disagreement rather than suppressing or avoiding it.175

Chapter Six: Developing a Consensus Building Process

Decision-makers have been hesitant to involve families’ interests in the site planning because the positions in the most extreme appear irreconcilable: victims’ families want to preserve the site as a memorial park and the landowner, the leaseholder and city and state agencies and officials want to rebuild commercial office space. Positions, according to the Consensus Building Handbook, are what people say they must have and interests are the underlying reasons, needs, or values that explain why they take the positions they do. Interests can change when new information is learned or there is a deeper understanding of a problem. Consensus building provides an opportunity to negotiate interests that have been separated from positions.

The desire for a memorial park on the site or for the footprints to be reserved for a memorial, is a position, a public statement made by some victims’ families. Often a position is an exaggeration of what a person is really willing to settle on. The victims’ families interests, are that they do not want the deaths of their loved ones to be forgotten. They want the world to remember the individuals killed and they want to publicly commemorate their loved ones. Many widows have said, “I just want people to know how wonderful my husband was.” Some widows described their interests as a memorial with individual biographies and photographs. Interests when separated from positions are negotiable. The interests of the victims’ families are not adversarial to other stakeholder constituencies. It would be difficult to find a stakeholder who believes the loss of life should be forgotten or not honored. This is where the families and the decision-makers share common ground. How to commemorate is what could be negotiated in a consensus building agreement.

Another publicly stated position of many victims’ families’ is that they do not want people walking or stepping on their loved ones because the site is a burial ground, but some of the same people who have taken this position, also want the site to be a memorial park. When families describe an imagined memorial park, it is a place people visit to reflect on the loss of life. Visiting that park would require stepping on the ground where thousands of people were killed. Even the
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development of a park would require trespassing on the site, unless the site is permanently abandoned. These same families do not want the site unvisited as their position might suggest. Instead, their interests are again, to honor the lives of their lost loved ones. Their deeply held belief is that the site is sacred and hallowed ground and their interest is that decision-makers convene discussions about the nature of sacred ground. Many decision-makers and architects designing the site, have claimed the site is sacred ground and the final resting place of the almost two thousand lives un-recovered, but they have not publicly expressed the nature of the site as sacred ground and what activities are appropriate for sacred ground. It can therefore be inferred that their support for commercial office space is appropriate activity for sacred ground. A discussion between the parties – the families and the landowner, leaseholders, LMDC, the state and the city agencies and officials– could provide an opportunity for an agreement about what is the nature of a sacred site and how economic recovery and memorialization can harmonize. A consensus process creates joint gains for participant stakeholders by developing options that meet stakeholder interests.

Process Model

Consensus building has been used for a variety of disagreement and been convened by bureaucrats to settle such disagreements as land-use disputes, to development city charters, and negotiate international peace agreements. Lawrence Susskind, et al. has written prolifically on the consensus building model and assembled the contributions of fifty-two leading authorities and experts in The Consensus Building Handbook. The Handbook offers a comprehensive scope of the theory and practice of consensus building and presents this relatively new decision-making strategy as one that is increasing in popularity among bureaucracies. Susskind et al. provides a “Short Guide to Consensus Building” in The Handbook that outlines six steps for designing a consensus process. These steps include convening, clarifying responsibilities, deliberating, deciding, implementing agreements, and organizational learning and development.

Convening

A consensus building process is convened by an individual, group or agency. The LMDC, as the state-city agency with oversight of the development of Lower Manhattan, could be an appropriate convenor. The first step in the process is to hire a professional “neutral” facilitator to manage the
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process. The LMDC is not a neutral because its board members have ties to the state and city elected officials who appointed them. The facilitator should be someone who does not have a stake in the outcome. The role of the facilitator can also be to create trust in the process. Any agency facilitating their own process runs the risk of having their own agenda met rather than one that meets the needs of the group. If neutral individuals do not facilitate the meeting some stakeholders may arrange their interests in a way that meets expected, rather than authentic interests. For example, the LMDC repeatedly tells the Family Advisory Council that 75% of New Yorkers want mixed use on the WTC site. By announcing this number during meetings with families it further isolates them into a minority position and makes them feel that they are negotiating under the terms of the agency rather then in neutral territory. This is one example in which the LMDC is pushing their agenda hoping to be persuasive rather than listening to the interests without institutional interference.

The first task of the facilitator is to conduct a series of “convening assessments.” The convening assessments identify stakeholders and through extensive interviews, identify stakeholder interests, the core issues in disagreement and missing stakeholders. An assessment identifies stakeholders who then select their own representatives. Stakeholders identify proxies to represent hard-to-represent groups. The assessment demonstrates possible areas of overlapping interests and suggests potential mutual gains and is distributed to stakeholders so they have an opportunity to react to the core issues. The assessment also provides the cost associated with this process and the LMDC should determine if federal, state or city funds, or a combination of funding sources will underwrite the process.

**Clarifying responsibilities**

The facilitator who conducted the assessment may or may not be selected by the convening stakeholder representatives to continue managing the process. The stakeholder representatives then chose a facilitator and/or mediator and decide his/her responsibilities. While a facilitator brings meeting management skills to the process, a mediator helps parties’ resolve disputes and may convene groups before, during and after they come together. Some facilitators are skilled in both the mediation and facilitation. In the case of multiple parties, the representatives form an executive
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committee. The executive committee or steering committee should be composed of one individual from each stakeholder party and may consider appointing a chair that represents the process. The chair could be a rotating position but often it is appropriate to have the facilitator or mediator assigned to that role. The representatives set the ground rules and agenda for the convening and a timetable. The timetable is important so that early procedural matters that generally have a significant benefit of building relationships and establishing trust do not get rushed in order to get to the most difficult issues on the agenda.

**Deliberating**

The facilitator and mediator will assist the representatives to express interests, concerns and disagreements constructively and effectively. The representatives will likely disagree on relevant facts or technical data and require an agreement for joint fact-finding efforts. Agreement on relevant facts may require the identification of expert advisors and fact-finding subcommittees. To instigate dialogue, preliminary proposals may be prepared by the facilitator or mediator or a subcommittee. It is important to avoid authorship by one representative so the group may engage in brainstorming and modify groundrules and the agenda. The convening groups may change as some representatives may be recruited as unanticipated issues or concerns develop.

**Deciding**

To maximize joint gains beyond just minimal satisfaction of interests, the results of every effort towards agreement should be continuously assessed. The facilitator assists the representatives to create improvements to the agreement and settle for overwhelming support if unanimity cannot be achieved. Consensus maintains its integrity if an agreement is reached by more than eighty percent of the group. The representatives may decide in the ground-rules what the appropriate level of support is for accepting an agreement.

**Implementing agreements**

The representatives in a consensus process are obligated to represent the interests of their constituencies and should be responsible for gaining agreement among their parties. The representatives should sign and commit to the final agreement and elected or appointed officials
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should ratify the results of the consensus process. Representatives should require that the agreement from the consensus process be incorporated into a master plan or adopted by the government and the agreement should be monitored for its implementation. Any agreement should include a mechanism by which the representatives can be reassembled if there is a change in circumstances or a failure of certain participants to implement the agreement.

**Organizational learning and development**

The rebuilding of Lower Manhattan is expected to continue for at least a decade. Many of the participants likely to engage in the consensus process have long-standing relationships but many new parties who have not had political experience would enter the process. Development of new and old relationships should engage representatives and the members of their constituencies across interest groups. Learning keeps people at the table because when the discussions engage people and they learn the interests of the other stakeholders, they in turn want to attend the meetings. In *The Deliberative Practitioner* John Forester asserts that when citizens participate in deliberations, they learn about strategies that will or will not work, learn about responsibilities and obligations as they assess proposed norms of action, and learn about themselves and the others with whom they might act. 182

Relationship building is one of the key outcomes of collaborative dialogues. Judith Innes and David Booher in “Collaborative Dialogue as a Policy Making Strategy,” suggests that relationships do not change a stakeholders’ interests but they change how they express those interests which allows for a more respectful dialogue. 183 This is evidenced by the dialogue that Community Board 1 Board Member Carol DeSaram convened in response to the temporary memorial emergency Community Board One meeting on March 1, 2002. During the Board meetings victims’ family members were present but did not speak and residents where highly vocal arguing that their voices were just as important as the victims families and that they are victims too. During a small dialogue with families and residents the groups learned that the way people were expressing their interests (particularly some of the language used) was offensive to the families and made them feel excluded from the conversation. In this more intimate dialogue the two groups were able to set some ground rules about communication which meant there could be “fewer surprises and more tolerance” when the groups convened at the larger setting of a community board meeting.
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The above stated steps adopted from Susskind's et al. consensus building model provide an overview of a proposed process but an actual application of this model involves designing a process individually adapted to the circumstances for the rebuilding of the WTC site and Lower Manhattan. Beyond the representative meetings, a consensus building process requires defining constituency interests and relationships. During the nine months since the attacks, stakeholder interests have been defined in the presence of trauma. While many stakeholders are grieving and have thereby been absent from the process, others in response to the trauma, have participated in the process. Consensus building could balance the representation of these interests by addressing the trauma.

**Addressing Trauma through Narrative Mediation**

Many of the stakeholders interested in building consensus for a memorial at the WTC site have been traumatized by the events of September 11th and telling the stories of their trauma is one way to increase learning and understanding of interests and build relationship and new narratives. Storytelling may be the most effective way to engage traumas. Dealing with trauma in the consensus process helps change perceptions, deepen relationships and commitments and then strengthens the group to empower them to take their interests to the public arena. The facilitator guides discussion about interests but because of the nature of the trauma, many stakeholder positions reflect interests that many not have been fully explored publicly because the process has provided minimal opportunities for dialogue.

The LMDC and the Port Authority are making decisions without the narratives of those directly affected and most traumatized. John Forester, in *The Deliberative Planner* asserts that “many accounts of political deliberation are too antiseptic, too free of the historical legacies of pain and suffering, racism and displacement, that citizens bring to decision-making arenas, we need to imagine and conduct political deliberations in new ways.” Forester believes that discussions should take place that involve working through past loss, whether it is of a loved one, a neighborhood or a monument where one worked everyday. Discovering the suffering of other stakeholders in ways that were not previously known to others may help parties to understand better not just needs, but possible future
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relations— and so future interests too.\textsuperscript{185} As referenced by Forester in the \textit{Deliberative Planner}, Judith Herman, states that “traumatic syndromes have basic stages of recovery—safety, restructuring the trauma story, and restoring the connection between survivors and their community.”\textsuperscript{186} Storytelling allows stakeholders to reconstruct the trauma story in a group and the “the support of the group enables individuals to take emotional risks beyond what they had believed to be the limits of their capability.”\textsuperscript{187}

In the presence of trauma, many stakeholders put-up defenses and withhold their suffering which discourages honest relationship building and my create mistrust. Storytelling helps a range of stakeholders learn the interests of other constituencies. Forester argues that there is value in public learning. He says that the public should enable voices in mourning for mutual learning, and public action that recognizes and responds to interests. He asserts that, “unless we understand more clearly the relationships between our re-presentation of trauma and public processes of mourning and identity re-formation, we are unlikely to sustain meaningful public deliberations in the shadow of trauma.”\textsuperscript{188} Trauma isolates and causes people to put up defenses but if groups can work through the trauma that is the key to bringing healthy people to the table to make decisions.\textsuperscript{189}

One way to develop interests in public dialogues is through narrative mediation. A narrative is a story. Storytelling allows people to “present non-formal knowledge in a compelling way.”\textsuperscript{190} Many people with stories may not be experts on issues related to the rebuilding of the WTC but storytelling creates legitimacy for an individual because they are valued as an expert on their own experience such as families, witnesses, residents, rescue workers. Experiences are central to understanding how to proceed with rebuilding the WTC site because it is essential to understand the character and identity of place that is getting remade and the people who are stakeholders in that remaking. Building stakeholder groups through narratives can be more inclusive because some people, especially in the case of those personally affected may not feel comfortable in the formal argumentation or public hearings. While some may be extremely vocal about their trauma, others may be silent. Small dialogues provide an environment where narratives can be shared more equally.

\textsuperscript{185} Ibid., p.206  
\textsuperscript{186} Ibid., p.210  
\textsuperscript{187} Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{188} Ibid., p.215  
\textsuperscript{189} Ibid., p.220
Narratives initially personal, once shared, can begin to reveal patterns and overlapping experiences that can then be examined for the interests they represent. Narratives may lead to a reframing of some of the experiences of other stakeholders. The individual narratives of trauma are so attached to values and emotions that they may appear nonnegotiable. Dialogues can help reshape personal narratives and discover patterns so that a group of individual narratives becomes a new narrative. This group narrative is then no longer attached to the deep values and identity of one specific stakeholder. Attachment is thereby transferred from the individual to interests of the group and is then negotiable.

Mediation theory and practice is built on the assumption that human beings are primarily motivated by fulfilling their own personal interests. Taking this assumption, interest-based theories of mediation work toward assisting disputing parties to find an underlying shared interest that was not identified earlier in the dispute so they can become motivated to address the presenting conflict. In this way parties are not giving anything up, or compromising. John Winslade and Gerald Monk in *Narrative Mediation: A New Approach to Conflict Resolution*, state that narrative mediation distinguishes itself from interest-based decisions because it proposes that people construct conflict from narrative descriptions of events. Storytelling places individuals in a larger narrative thereby changing the way that individuals see themselves in a conflict so as to open up new options for conflict resolution. Narrative mediation asks people to reflect on the effects that the stories have had on them rather than looking directly at what has been separating them. Surfacing underlying interests through the exploration of individual narratives among stakeholder groups may reveal that the dominant narratives that have been constructed by the power structure, by vocal leaders and particularly by the media, may need to be rewritten. This may influence the identification of representative.

**Barriers to Convening a Consensus Process**

There are several possible barriers to convening a consensus process. These barriers include the LMDC's likely hesitation that they and other key decision makers will be giving up power. The public may distrust the process if convened by a government agency, but gain credibly through the selection of a neutral facilitator and a range of stakeholder representatives. All of the barriers can
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easily be overcome with learning and understanding the process model and its principles increases communication between the convenors, the representatives and the stakeholder constituencies.

**Power and Authority**

The LMDC may be hesitant to convene a consensus process because of a misperception that decision-makers will be giving up authority and power. Judith Innes suggests that decision-makers often fear that consensus “raises the risk of absorbing citizens into the power structure rather than maintaining the distinction between the public sphere and the state.” Consensus building must achieve an agreement that satisfies all represented stakeholder interests. If appointed and elected officials have to give something up, there will be no agreement. The process should create opportunities for those who generally have power over others to continue to feel powerful. There is a potential to feel more powerful because public pressure often forces leaders to give in to angry publics to avoid confrontations. The desire to assert the current institutional power structure is demonstrated by the clear distinction that the LMDC has made about public interest groups serving not in decision-making roles but in advisory only roles in the Advisory Councils. The tradition in New York is such a model with the nine community boards that have no decision-making power and are only able to advise the government. Many community members contend that their interests are only reflected in the government decisions in which the two groups are in agreement.

Christopher Moore and Peter Woodrow argue in *The Consensus Building Handbook* that consensus building is a different source of authority—not power over others but power with others.¹⁹⁴

**Trust**

Government convenors face some challengers and barriers because of public mistrust, even if a neutral party is conducting the process. It is especially difficult if the government or a government agency has framed the issues. Government convenors can overcome this problem of lack of participant trust if they act openly and transparently, making clear the purpose of the convening, and involving the stakeholders every step of the way. The convenor should demonstrate a commitment to the ground rules adopted by all the parties, and to the implementation of the outcomes of the

---


agreement or various agreements along the way. Matching actions with agreements will establish their credibility and divert concerns about unfair or co-opted actions. 195

**Credibility**

The credibility of the process depends on the neutrality of the facilitator. Facilitation is the impartial management of meetings designed to enable participants to focus on substantive issues and goals. Facilitators develop the agenda, enforce ground rules, promote interaction and communication during meetings and bring issues to closure. A facilitator remains neutral and has no decision-making power. 196 Selecting the right stakeholder representatives depends on much more development of dialogues and narrative mediation among stakeholder groups to allow interests to present themselves for negotiation. Decision-makers must actively engage in outreach to identify stakeholder representatives who are truly representative of constituencies and are trusted.

New York may look to the Oklahoma City National Memorial development process as a precedent for creating a credible consensus building process. Oklahoma City faced similar issues of developing a credible process in the aftermath of the 1995 bombing of the Murrah Federal Building which killed 168 people 197. The Oklahoma City Mayor appointed community leader and attorney, Robert Johnson, to manage the process. Linenthal, in *The Unfinished Bombing* claims the credibility of the process was profoundly challenged when the Design Solicitation Committee recommended to the task force that architect Paul Spreiregen, who worked as a consultant and advisor to other memorials including Vietnam Veterans Memorial in D.C., propose an operational plan for a national open design competition. But the task force did not agree with the proposal because Spreiregen called for a jury of professionals to evaluate the designs privileged above all others. The primary task force goal was to ensure meaningful participation by those directly affected by the bombing. Spreiregen said that jury members would meet with working committees of families and survivors and officials so that the jurors could get an impression from the people they are serving but only in an advisory role. Spreiregen believed that the memorial was not for those closest to the tragedy because he thought that they would have already dealt with the trauma by the time that it was built and that the true purpose of the memorial was to “symbolize the rebirth of a community.” 198 He argued that the
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Vietnam Veteran's Memorial left veterans out of decision-making roles because people thought professionals would defer to them. Spreiregen was dismissed because he continued to believe that working with families and survivors would make the process volatile. From this, Johnson learned that the credibility of the project rested on the privileged place of the voices of family members and survivors.

The LMDC may find that it is important to determine if there is a privileged group among the stakeholders and establish a consensus process that will respond by balancing power so that all stakeholders are satisfied. The LMDC should consider the challenges faced by Oklahoma City. The deaths of nearly 3,000 people on the WTC site requires a patience and sensitivity in planning that was also endured in Oklahoma City. While the LMDC is attempting to be sensitive to victims' families needs by working with them in a separate and private manner in closed-door Advisory Council meetings, the LMDC should integrate families into the process. The consensus process would convene volunteers selected by their constituencies to represent them in a decision-making process. Constituent building should occur within the existing social structures including civic alliances, community groups, churches, clubs, etc. in order to reduce costs and deliver a fair and broad representation of voices. Although some new forums for discussion may be necessary, creating “special meetings” often has a “selecting” effect that excludes those whose daily schedule does not allow them to attend additional meetings or who may not feel they have a stake in the memorial. By operating within the success of existing committees and community groups the parties are likely to have greater confidence in the process. Consensus building creates an environment where parties with different values and power can have a dialogue. Raymond Gastil, the co-chairman for the task force for the Memorial Committee at New York New Visions said that during sessions of memorial discussion “when people felt included in the process, few wanted to exclude the voices of members of other groups.” A discussion would allow people to begin to trust one another.
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Conclusion: Between Remembrance and Rebuilding

The events of September 11th can never be isolated or removed from the WTC site, even as the ruins and remains are recovered. The site has been permanently transformed into a site of catastrophic destruction and the witnessed murder of thousands of people who disappeared on the site. It will forever be sacred ground. Many decision-makers and civic leaders propose that everything built on the WTC site and all transformations to Lower Manhattan, are a memorial. Implicit in this proposal is an acknowledgement that to build anything that does not honor the lives of those killed on the site is profane.

New Yorkers have not settled the debate between remembrance and rebuilding that began almost immediately after the towers collapsed and continues nine months after the attacks. State and City officials and agencies announced a consensus and have begun the rebuilding process with remembrance set-aside for a separate memorial process. The declared consensus refers to interagency cooperation and not the agreement of thousands of public voices including victims’ families that claim a stake in the rebuilding of the WTC site. The interests of a range of stakeholders, including families, survivors and individuals who would like to consider the nature of the sacred site in the decision-making arena, have been assumed incompatible with rebuilding. But whose voices will construct the stakeholder hierarchy and what historical memory will be valued on the WTC site?

Civic groups have made an important discovery that there is no consensus about memorialization at WTC site. In response, they propose community dialogues to define interests and build relationships and alliances among constituencies. But the development and organization of constituencies in community dialogues is unlikely to influence the rebuilding process unless decision-makers realize that there are many issues of disagreement in the public sector and, left unresolved, will likely delay and distort the process and outcome. The WTC site retains the memory of the towers and looks to a future of a new world-renowned landmark but it also possesses the memory of the destruction of September 11th. To sanitize the rebuilding process by excluding the destruction of September 11th and traumatized stakeholders from decision-making denies an unprecedented opportunity to harmonize remembrance and rebuilding.
Convening a consensus building process captures this opportunity to reduce the tension between remembrance and rebuilding and discover a place where interests harmonize. Consensus building establishes permanent relationships and conversation among a range of stakeholders who agree that rebuilding should not position itself in conflict with the lost lives and the victims’ families who seek to remember them and the events of September 11th. Consensus building provides an opportunity for stakeholders to explore creative solutions to memorialization on the WTC site. During the nine months since the attacks little or no dialogue about sacred ground, memorialization, trauma and rebuilding across stakeholder interests convened in the decision-making arena. The potential for the process to create innovative agreements is likely tremendous.

A possible agreement could explore transfer of Silverstein Properties’ air rights to the newly created surface area above the proposed depression (into an underground tunnel) of West Street. The surface area gained has been reported to be 16-acres or equal to the surface area of the WTC site. This would allow commercial development and economic recovery on new land created where the West Street is and the WTC could be opened for creative memorialization. A broader memorialization concept that memorializes the entire site could produce harmony between remembrance and rebuilding. For example, the memory of the victims’ of September 11th could be intimately integrated into the design of the site rebuilding: the sidewalk pavers could be material from the former World Trade Center, names of victims could be etched into the walls of the sides of buildings. Some buildings could have murals of historical images so visitor could be reminded of what was there before. Other buildings could have porticoes with images of lost lives or remnants of the spontaneous memorials. Trees and benches could have plaques with names. Stories of the lost lives and the events of September 11th as experienced by survivors and by those who witnessed the destruction could be told in the streets, on the sides of buildings and on the sidewalks. Photographs could be permanently installed along stretches of building walls. Markers could outline the perimeter of the footprint of the building. By incorporating the memory of the events of September 11th into the entire sixteen acres, many interests could be satisfied: the interests for the whole 16 acres to be a memorial; the interests for a living memorial; for naming names of victims and survivors; for biographies and stories; for recycled materials from the WTC to be integrated into the memorial; and for rebuilding. Satisfying all these interests creates new opportunities for rebuilding on sacred ground.
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