University of Louisville

ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

5-2016

9/11 memorials : contested memory, competing narratives, and healing.

Jennifer A. Fraley
University of Louisville

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.library.louisville.edu/etd>

Part of the [American Art and Architecture Commons](#), [Other American Studies Commons](#), and the [Social and Behavioral Sciences Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Fraley, Jennifer A., "9/11 memorials : contested memory, competing narratives, and healing." (2016). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 2449.
<https://doi.org/10.18297/etd/2449>

This Doctoral Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. This title appears here courtesy of the author, who has retained all other copyrights. For more information, please contact thinkir@louisville.edu.

9/11 MEMORIALS: CONTESTED MEMORY, COMPETING NARRATIVES,
AND HEALING

By

Jennifer A. Fraley
B.A., Ohio Dominican College, 1997
J.D., Capital University Law School, 2001
M.A., Ohio Dominican University, 2006

A Dissertation
Submitted to the Faculty of the
College of Arts and Sciences of the University of Louisville
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy in Humanities

Department of Comparative Humanities
University of Louisville
Louisville, Kentucky

May 2016

Copyright © 2016 by Jennifer A. Fraley

All rights reserved

9/11 MEMORIALS: CONTESTED MEMORY, COMPETING NARRATIVES,
AND HEALING

By

Jennifer A. Fraley
B.A., Ohio Dominican College, 1996
J.D., Capital University Law School, 2001
M.A., Ohio Dominican University, 2006

A Dissertation Approved on

April 22, 2016

by the following Dissertation Committee

Dissertation Director, Shelley Salamensky, PhD

John Gibson, PhD

Benjamin Hufbauer, PhD

Lara Kelland, PhD

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my parents

Scott T. Fraley

and

Melba A. Fraley

for their constant love and support and for not losing their minds

every time I say I want to go back to school.

By the way, I hear Medical School is fun.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my mentor and dissertation chair, Dr. Shelley Salamensky. Thank you for all of your guidance, talking me back from the ledge, and answering all my emails. Thank you to Dr. Benjamin Hufbauer who signed onto the project in its earliest days, and whose classes also inspire me to create fun and stimulating projects in my own classrooms. I would also like to thank Dr. John Gibson for the countless meetings we had, and for always making me strive to “say it better.” I also thank Dr. Lara Kelland for stepping in and helping make this project happen.

To my parents, there are not enough ways for me to express my thanks. My mom for her constant proofreading, and dad for not letting her ignore my calls and emails and for always letting me vent. Thank you both for all of your support.

I would also like to thank Carrie Dugic for her love and support. You have always believed in me, and I thank you for pushing me to do more when I doubted myself. You were the first person to take this journey with me and I am so happy you are still here for these final steps. Your friendship is something I will always cherish.

Finally, I want to thank all my friends for their support; those back home and the ones I made during my time in Louisville. The trivia nights and photographs of baby animals were much appreciated!

ABSTRACT

9/11 MEMORIALS: CONTESTED MEMORY, COMPETING NARRATIVES, AND HEALING

Jennifer A. Fraley

May 14, 2016

In this dissertation I examine the role that monuments and memorials play in our lives including artistically, historically, and culturally. I begin by examining what monuments and memorials are and how these public works should be their own classification of public art. I argue there are many things these works can be (place of mourning, celebration, historical marker, etc.) and should not be (a single source for a historical accounting); yet, memorials do have the necessary condition of creating a referential relationship between the viewer and the memorialized objects. Without this relationship, the work fails as a memorial. Memorials are often looked to provide a historical accounting of these memorialized objects, but they should do so in a way that creates a narrative framework that gives the viewer the essential information while still allowing her the freedom to choose how to experience the work. These claims are explored through an in-depth analysis of the three, site specific, National 9/11 Memorials in New York City, Washington D.C., and Shanksville, Pennsylvania.

Chapter One defines and explains the necessary terminology as it will be used throughout the project. This includes creating a list of things a memorial should and should not do and why the narrative a memorial produces is so important. Chapter Two takes these ideas and analyzes the three, National 9/11 Memorials according to these guidelines. Chapter Three takes this analysis further by comparing the three memorials to one another to show how and where each can improve. Chapter Four then explores more practical applications of the works including their role as tools for healing both as therapeutic memorials and through restorative justice practices. Finally, ownership and financial responsibilities are discussed. This includes an exploration of Death Tourism and its application to memorials as tourist destinations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
DEDICATION.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	iv
ABSTRACT.....	v
LIST OF FIGURES.....	viii
INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER ONE: PUBLIC ART AND MEMORIALIZATION.....	11
CHAPTER TWO: 9/11 MEMORIALS AND MUSEUMS: A CASE STUDY.....	55
CHAPTER THREE: LEARNING FROM ONE ANOTHER: A COMPARISON.....	163
CHAPTER FOUR: HEALING, OWNERSHIP, AND DEATH TOURISM.....	198
REFERENCES.....	225
CURRICULUM VITA.....	241

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE	PAGE
1. Map of Human Remains	107
2. Dial and Discover Tours	128
3. Plans for Meaningful Adjacencies	175
4. Name Finder Tool	177
5. Detail from Name Finder Tool	178
6. Photograph of Brussels Street	198
7. Donation Image from Pentagon Website	214

**All other images are the author's own.

INTRODUCTION

When a traumatic event occurs in today's society, there seems little doubt that a memorial will be constructed to not only honor the innocent victims, but to help the survivors heal. Spontaneous memorials quickly appear at the location of the tragedy, and on social media. For example, after the recent terrorist attacks in Paris,¹ or sadly after this morning's attacks in Brussels,² there were flowers, candles, and mementos left at the locations of the attacks, and people worldwide showed their support by posting on social media sites such as Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram. This shared mourning seems to have become the first step in not only memorialization, but the healing process for both individuals and communities, local and worldwide. For many of us, this experience almost seems commonplace, but this commemoration of victims and finding healing through a public memorial is a recently new phenomenon. As Kirk Savage writes, until the late nineteenth century "traumas, no matter how devastating, did not merit commemoration in monumental form,"³—any attempt to do so would seem out of place.

The Civil War provoked the greatest era of monument building in the United States, and it was the first time in American history that we began to see all citizens be

¹ These attacks occurred on the evening of Friday, November 13, 2015.

² These attacks occurred on the morning of Tuesday, March 22, 2016.

³ Kirk Savage. "Trauma, Healing, and the Therapeutic Monument." *Terror, Culture, Politics: Rethinking 9/11*. Edited by Daniel J. Sherman and Terry Nardin. (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2006), 103-120.

considered for public commemoration. After the Civil War ended, most of the issues that led to the war were still not resolved, and many people thought public monuments would help yield a resolution. Lincoln was the first president to create a national cemetery for soldiers in an attempt to show memorials could and should be created for the “ordinary soldier.”⁴ Before this time, memorials and monuments were typically reserved for honoring the ruling classes and the elite: presidents, Generals, and war heroes. This shift in focus to the ordinary soldier made monuments more popular and they were beginning to be considered, as Savage writes, as a “genuine testimonial of the people’s memory.”⁵ However, most of the monuments and memorials that were created still tended to further the underlying hierarchical and patriarchal structures.

After the first World War, most of the monuments and memorials created paid homage to the soldiers who fought, and especially to those who died in battle. The most significant development in memorials at this time was the development of naming the fallen heroes on the memorial. Due to the massive number of casualties, more and more people wanted to see the names of the individual soldier casualties represented on the monuments and memorials. Part of the reason for this was so later visitors could understand the sheer volume of people who perished. These naming practices have now become almost standard for any memorial.

⁴ Kirk Savage. *Standing Soldiers, Kneeling Slaves*. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997), 5.

⁵ Ibid.

The next era that saw a shift in the design of monuments and memorials was during the Modernist time period after World War I. Philosopher of art Hilde Hein writes:

At the same time that it became more abstract, public art also became more explicitly communitarian. The audience no longer figured as passive onlooker but as participant, actively implicated in the constitution of the work of art. Effectively, the work's realization depends on the audience's bestowal of meaning upon it, a contentious social and political understanding.⁶

Memorials were no longer symbols of great victories and war heroes, but interactive exhibitions where the visitor, in a way, forged her own experience of the memorialized historical events.

Following World War II there was another shift in memorialization practices. Soldiers were still memorialized, but the non-soldier also became a prominent object of commemoration. This was due to the mass casualties of civilians who did not choose to be a part of the war; specifically those killed in the Holocaust and in the bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The public and state alike demanded that these victims of war also be represented in an official capacity.

After the Vietnam War, a new issue arose in American commemoration. How was it possible to create monuments for a war that was not won and was still surrounded by so much political turmoil? The answer to this is by what Savage calls the therapeutic monument: "It was not the Holocaust but the Vietnam War that produced the first truly therapeutic monument in the U.S."⁷ Here, the fallen and missing soldiers were

⁶ Hilde Hein. "What is Public Art?: Time, place, and meaning." *Arguing About Art: Contemporary Philosophical Debates*. Alex Neill and Aaron Ridley, editors. Second Edition. (London: Routledge, 2002), 439.

⁷ Savage, "Trauma, Healing, and the Therapeutic Monument," 106.

memorialized, but the focus was to be removed from the war itself. According to Savage, the role of the therapeutic monument is to “celebrate heroic service or sacrifice, as the traditional didactic monument does, but rather [it does this] to heal a collective psychological injury.”⁸ Maya Lin’s award-winning design for the Vietnam Veterans Memorial achieves this by focusing on the soldiers and by making the visitor an active participant in the work. As visitors walk through the memorial, they literally travel into the war and emerge on the opposite side; yet, they travel beside a wall of names of the fallen, shifting the focus from the war to those memorialized.

The Vietnam Veterans Memorial was dedicated on Veteran’s Day in 1982. The memorial is made of two walls, each wall is constructed of seventy granite panels that contain the 58,000 names of soldiers who died in the conflict. The names are listed in chronological order from the first killed in 1959 to the last one killed in 1975. Lin’s design was chosen as part of a planning competition that was open to the public in 1980. There were 1,421 submissions competing for the \$50,000 prize offered. Each design was displayed referenced only by a number; the jurors had no idea who had submitted the designs. After the jurors examined the submissions they were narrowed down two different times before the jury unanimously chose Lin’s design.⁹ Her design was chosen not only because of its adherence to the competition’s rules but its inclusion of the community in the work in the form of a high-gloss finish on the granite slabs. The names of the fallen soldiers are etched on these slabs; however, the viewer can also see her own

⁸ Ibid., 106. The therapeutic monument will be explored in depth in Chapter 4.

⁹ Jan C. Scruggs and Joel L. Swerdlow. *To Heal a Nation: The Vietnam Veterans Memorial*. (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1985).

reflection thus literally rendering her a part of the memorial. This was the key element of Lin's design. As Savage notes, the memorial "was deliberately anti-didactic: the visitor herself—not the monument—was supposed to create the moral understanding of the event."¹⁰ Lin strove to offer a framework for commemoration, but to leave the experience of mourning to the visitor.

Lin originally intended this to be an individual experience, but there was actually an unforeseen communal experience that developed. As Savage writes, the memorial "offers a shared experience, and that very collectivity gives it a power that more 'private' arenas of grief do not have."¹¹ The memorial came to be a place where people could gather and share in the mourning and healing processes. Art critic and philosopher Arthur C. Danto also saw the power of this shared memorial experience. In a review of a book that included photographs of the memorial, he writes, "It also contains some photographs, but there is really no way to imagine the memorial from them, or from any pictures I have seen. For that you must make a visit."¹² This remark highlights the power that experiencing the memorial in person has; there is something uniquely different from seeing a picture of it in a book to walking along its full length, finding oneself as a part of the work.

In today's world, commemorating victims is now as standard a practice as commemorating war heroes once was. Yet, these new memorials also seem to carry more responsibility than their predecessors. Memorials must now represent both the fallen

¹⁰ Savage, "Trauma, Healing, and the Therapeutic Monument," 106.

¹¹ Ibid., 107.

¹² Arthur C. Danto. *The Wake of Art: Criticism, Philosophy, and the ends of taste*. (Australia: G+B Arts International, 1998) 158.

victims, usually through naming practices, and the larger event simultaneously. As Savage notes, they must suggest “a new kind of meaning that embraces both the reality of individual suffering and the collective significance of that suffering.”¹³ They also tend to involve more of a communal effort in the design process and decision. Victims’ family members, survivors, and community members in the locale the event occurred all now feel as if they have a right to be a part of the memorialization process. In the case of both the Flight 93 and World Trade Center Memorials, family members did play an important part of the design competition. Memorials also are now looked to provide a healing or therapeutic element, to follow Savage, for not only those personally affected by the tragedy, but the larger community and even the world.

In this project, I explore the ways in which the three National 9/11 memorials attempt to fulfill these expectations while representing the largest loss of American life, from terrorism, within the United States. Each memorial strives to represent the larger events of the day, individual victims, along with survivors, family members, the nation and even the world. The memorials also claim each is a place to remember and reflect while also being a space of hope and healing. This project seeks to discover whether they achieve these endeavors.

Additionally, one cannot, and should not, discuss 9/11 without mentioning those who carried out the attacks. Yet that is precisely what the memorials and the museum seem to be attempting. I will examine each work to show not only how the perpetrators are represented, but how they are notably absent, and what this absence means. The

¹³ Savage, “Trauma, Healing, and the Therapeutic Monument,” 114.

hijackers were a group of nineteen men from four different middle-eastern countries who came to the United States at various times from early 2000 to 2001. They were part of the radical Islamic al-Qaeda network. According to Khalid Shaikh Mohammed, confessed mastermind of the 9/11 attacks, “The purpose of the Sept. 11 attacks... was to ‘wake the American people up.’ By hitting civilian targets, he said, he would shock Americans into recognizing the impact of their government’s actions abroad, including supporting Israel in its fight against Palestinian militants.”¹⁴ What is interesting to note is the memorials’ and museums’ almost total lack of information about the terrorists and their motivations actually further removes the role the terrorists felt the United States played from the narrative offered to the viewer. To not discuss these issues in the works, is to ignore a large part of the history surrounding 9/11 and to foster a culture of selective remembering. As Erika Doss writes, “the absence of historical referents to the perpetrators of terrorism helps shroud these memorials; by effacing the agents of terror, terrorism memorials efface their intentions and encourage a blurring, or evasion, of causality.”¹⁵

In Chapter One of this dissertation, I define the necessary terminology and how it will be applied throughout the work. These definitions include clarifying what is meant by public art and how monuments and memorials have an additional, necessary condition that distinguishes them from other forms of public art. In this chapter, I also explore what responsibilities and duties a memorial has, and what it should or should not do,

¹⁴ Mazzetti, Mark. “Portrait of 9/11 ‘Jackal’ Emerges as He Awaits Trial.” *New York Times*. 14 November 2009.

¹⁵ Erika Doss. *Memorial Mania: Public Feeling in America*. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010), 141.

mirroring Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett's expectations of the modern museum.

Monuments and memorials are then individually defined and it is explained how they differ from one another. Public memorials are also distinguished from private memorials. Finally, I clarify the meaning of the term "narrative," and the influence of this narrative is examined by focusing on how a memorial creates a narrative and how these narratives have historically influenced a memorial's meaning.

In Chapter Two, I offer an in-depth analysis of the three National 9/11 Memorials located in New York City, Washington, D.C., and outside Shanksville, Pennsylvania. In my analysis of the New York memorial I also include the National 9/11 Memorial Museum as an extension of the memorial. I then gauge the success or failure of each work according to three aspects. The first of these is the question of whether the memorial fulfills the designers intentions in actually providing the visitor the chance to experience what the mission statement calls for, and what the designers intended for them to experience. Second, each memorial is analyzed to see if a referential relationship is created between the visitor and the memorialized historical events. Finally, I explore the narratives produced by the memorials to see whether they achieve the balance of offering a narrative framework that provides necessary information while still allowing the visitor the freedom to experience the memorial in her own way. As effective memorial narrative, I argue, is one that offers the viewers the flexibility of seeing different perspectives and experiences while still providing the essential elements of the narrative.

In Chapter Three, I further the analysis in Chapter Two by comparing certain elements of each memorial to one another. These elements incorporate an in-depth

exploration of how the individual victims are represented, including how each memorial names these victims and represents any associations between the victims as, for instance, family members or coworkers. I also examine the ways in which each memorial represents the events of 9/11 as a whole including how the hijackers who carried out the attacks are portrayed. I then compare the narratives the memorials produce first in terms of the memorial alone, and then with tools such as audio tours, guided tours, and published materials offered at the respective locations.

Finally, in Chapter Four, I look at more practical applications of each memorial; specifically, whether it can be considered a therapeutic memorial by Kirk Savage's standards, or something more along the lines of the restorative justice practices that have recently developed in the field of U.S. criminal law. In this chapter, I also explore issues surrounding the financial responsibilities of these memorials. Most people believe these works are owned and maintained by the Federal Government, but that is often not the case. In this section I explore questions of who "owns" the work, who paid for its original construction, and who now covers its maintenance and operational costs as well as issues of fundraising, marketing, and notions of Death Tourism.

Through in-depth analysis of the three national 9/11 memorials – how they are designed to function, what narratives they produce, and how they compare to one another – I attempt to demonstrate the important roles monuments and memorials play in shaping the ways in which people, places, and events are historicized, as well as the roles they play in the individuals' and communities' lives. Memorials are charged with many more responsibilities than the average visitor is equipped to realize, each of which is vitally

important to shaping not only visitors' experience but -- ultimately -- the ways in which histories are inscribed, cemented, and received.

CHAPTER ONE

PUBLIC ART, MEMORIALIZATION, AND NARRATIVE

When four planes crashed into the Twin Towers, the Pentagon, and a field in rural Pennsylvania, the United States was traumatized and many people felt victimized, if only temporarily. However, there was very little doubt there would be some sort of official memorial created at each location. This seemed obvious by the thousands of temporary memorials that sprung up, not only at the sites of the three physical attacks, but instantly across the nation and even the world. These temporary memorials seemed to reflect a collective national, or even global, consensus that honored the innocent victims of the attacks and sympathized with the American people. Within ten years of the incident, permanent memorials opened at all three sites of the physical attacks to honor those who perished and to offer the world a place of remembrance.¹⁶ Laurie Beth Clark notes, “There may not be a single other example in the world of where a memorial process was so quickly conceived and enacted.”¹⁷ However, what is interesting about many memorials in contemporary America is that they are not the voice of a unified nation, as they often

¹⁶ This is in reference to the official guidebook published for the NYC 9/11 Memorial. Allison Blais and Lynn Rasic. *A Place of Remembrance: Official Book of the National September 11 Memorial*. (Washington D.C.: National Geographic, nd.)

¹⁷ Laurie Beth Clark. “Ethical Spaces: Ethics and Propriety in Trauma Tourism.” *Death Tourism: Disaster Sites as Recreational Landscape*. Brigitte Sion, editor. (London: Seagull Books, 2010), 21.

are believed to be, but sites of heated debate, conflicts, and propaganda used to create a false ideology. Such ideas are explored in-depth by Erika Doss when she writes that these sites are the sources of some of the most heated debates of public feeling in America: “While trauma is the organizing theme of terrorism memorials, its representation is often superficial and mostly oriented toward the restoration of social order and revitalization of presumably shared national norms.”¹⁸ By focusing on the false ideologies created through the narrative they offer the viewer, the conflicts surrounding them are often overlooked, and the narrative that develops eventually appears as the voice of a single, unified nation and over time is looked at to provide the historical accounting of the objects they memorialize.

Memorials can be seen as “symbolic capital”¹⁹, meaning that they play a fundamental role in shaping and directing the perception of a national identity, and this role has been greatly increased since the mid 1990s.²⁰ This increased drive for memorialization has become a type of “memorial mania” as Doss writes, that reflects contemporary America’s acknowledgment of “public feelings as a source of knowledge.”²¹ Instead of focusing on the historical realities of an event, these memorials, and the narratives they offer, are often relied upon by viewers for supplying the critical information about the incident. Memorials seldom offer the entire historical accounting of what is memorialized and should not be considered as *the* quintessential source for historical representation. So what *is* a memorial, and what *should* a memorial do, and

¹⁸ Doss, *Memorial Mania*, 133.

¹⁹ Ibid., 10.

²⁰ Ibid., 19.

²¹ Ibid., 50.

how should it carry this responsibility out? Are there also things a memorial can not or should not do?

As I will explain in the following pages, a memorial:

- Creates a relationship between the viewer and the memorialized historical event and/or objects

- Offers a place of mourning

- Offers a place of healing

- Commemorates/memorializes specific people, person, place and/or events

- Is a theatre, a stage for demonstrations, protests, and celebrations

- Offers historical information of past events

- Creates a narrative framework of past events

- Is a work of art that can be appreciated

- A tool for reflecting on the collective consciousness of a community

- A tourist attraction

- Provides a symbolic cemetery

Meanwhile, a memorial should not:

- Stand as the sole source of historical information

- Overly control the narrative so as to offer only one accounting

- Be so vague as to offer no historical accounting or narrative

- Be a neutral ground with no message

As Harriet F. Seine postulates, “it is impossible to build a neutral memorial: the site, shape, inscription, and so on all convey a message”²² and if a memorial is neutral in nature then it will most likely fail as a memorial. So how can a memorial balance all of these roles while shouldering the responsibility of providing information and a narrative that is not too vague or too controlling?

In light of these questions, in this chapter I will seek to, first, define memorials and monuments as a category of public art; next to explicate the differences between memorials and monuments; and then to distinguish public from private memorials. Finally, I will show the importance of narrative in regards to memorials.

Public Art

Memorials are often seen as works of public art, markers of cultural identity, and sources of conflict. However, before this can be discussed, we must first establish what it means to be a memorial; these areas of conflict will be discussed later in the chapter. In discussions in contemporary philosophy, it is commonly held that works of public art should be appreciated in the same way we appreciate all other works of art. However, memorials are created to do something additional; they have a specific memorializing message that must be communicated and they are created for this purpose. Through monuments and memorials, we look to commemorate and memorialize important persons, places and events and to preserve these notable subjects for future generations. As Arthur C. Danto has written, “[w]e erect monuments so that we shall always

²² Harriet F. Seine. *Memorials to Shattered Myths: Vietnam to 9/11*. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2016), 20.

remember, and build memorials so that we shall never forget.”²³ For example, the Vietnam Veterans Memorial is typically understood to perform more functions than those expected by the public of a work like Richard Serra’s *Titled Arc*;²⁴ we expect something additional, something more, of it since it is a memorial. It is this *additional* that is the concern of this project. The Vietnam Veterans Memorial’s status as a memorial raises the possibility that it is not the same thing as more neutral works of public art (such as *Titled Arc* or the public sculptures of Alexander Calder) and should not be heralded as the standard to which all other works of public art are held because it is in a distinct classification of public art. In the words of Noël Carroll,

[M]emorial art, of course, has several functions. But one function of public memorial art is to commemorate the past for the present — to recall to mind exemplary events and persons and to link their significance to the ongoing culture, contributing thereby to the definition of cultural identity and indicating the direction in which the culture should continue....I do not intend to suggest that the function of art as such is exclusively something like the transmission of the ethos of a culture. That is one function; promoting aesthetic experience, suitably construed, is another. Each type of art should be evaluated in terms of the functions it serves, both in terms of how well it discharges that function and how worthy that function is.²⁵

To highlight this distinction, I turn to a recent anthology widely used in introductory courses in Aesthetics and Philosophy of Art²⁶, where the debate about public art is usually illustrated with philosophical papers and journalistic reports about two works: Maya

²³Danto, *The Wake of Art: Criticism, Philosophy, and the Ends of Taste*, 153.

²⁴ This is not to say that is *all* works of public art do.

²⁵ Noël Carroll. “Art and Recollection” *The Journal of Aesthetic Education*. Volume 39, Number 2, Summer 2005, p 5, 9.

²⁶ Alex Neill and Aaron Ridley, editors. “Public Art” in *Arguing About Art: Contemporary Philosophical Debates*. Second Edition. (London: Routledge, 2002), 422-470.

Lin's Vietnam Veterans Memorial and Richard Serra's *Tilted Arc*. *Tilted Arc* is often thought to be an example of unsuccessful public art, while the Vietnam Veterans Memorial is thought to be an example of successful public art. But it is not clear that the Vietnam Veterans Memorial is, indeed an example of public art—or that public art is *all* it is. Works of public art are usually understood as the expression of a single artist, are placed for the aesthetic appreciation of the community, are often a reflection of the community, and will enhance the use of the public space. *Tilted Arc* failed in certain respects of these expectations, and the process of its removal is surely ripe fodder for philosophical reflection.²⁷ More successful works of public art, such as Alexander Calder's colorful metal sculptures, such as *Cheval Rouge (Red Horse)*, 1974, at the National Gallery of Art Sculpture Garden, do achieve success in these aims and have remained valued expressions of a community. Michael Kelly suggests that when examining these cases we must be more specific about the nature of the public art at issue²⁸ and that is especially true when looking at memorials. When viewing works such as the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, do we really want to claim these works only attempt to achieve the same aims as *Tilted Arc*? I assert that memorials have an additional responsibility, and the explanation of this additional duty will be the subject of this project.

This additional responsibility can be seen by examining a memorial through its representation in a recent popular media article: Marla Brown Fogelman's accounting of her experience of the National World War II Memorial in Washington D.C. as described

²⁷ This will be discussed in more detail later in the chapter.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 428.

in her 2012 *The Washington Post* article.²⁹ Upon her first visit to the site, Fogelman found the memorial to be aesthetically displeasing and stated it left her “stone cold.”³⁰ Because of this, she concluded the memorial to be ineffective as a work of art; however, when she returned to the memorial years later with her parents, she discovered it was not the design elements that made the memorial effective but something altogether different. While Fogelman does not name this something different, I propose that the differences between the two experiences were due to what I call her “memorialization awareness” being triggered. When Fogelman first perceived the memorial, she was only examining its aesthetic qualities and through this she expected to be moved and found the memorial unsuccessful when she was not; hence, the memorial did not create a referential relationship between her and the objects it memorialized. Yet, when she returned to the memorial she had a completely different experience because her memorialization awareness was triggered and the aesthetic elements she had previously found lacking were no longer the foundations to her experience. Fogelman became aware of the people, places, and events the memorial commemorated (the memorialized historical events) and through this, her experience of the memorial changed. I assert that when she first saw the work, she was only perceiving it as a work of art to be valued for its aesthetic value and she limited her experience to a critique of its aesthetic elements. When she next perceived the work, she looked at it as something more and opened herself up to the full realm of possibilities it offered. Because she no longer limited herself to the genre

²⁹ Marla Brown Fogelman. “The Beauty of an Ugly Memorial.” *The Washington Post*. 25 May 2012.

³⁰ Ibid.

specific terminology of aesthetics, her experience of the memorial completely changed. Her original examination ignored many of the important elements of the National World War II Memorial that make it a memorial and more than just an object to be aesthetically appreciated. Specifically, when she examined the intersection of aesthetics and the work's cultural significance, a referential relationship between her and the memorialized historical events was forged, and her judgment of the effectiveness of the work completely evolved. It is these intersections that will be one of the focal points of this project.

This project will first attempt to outline these characteristics and show why monuments and memorials should be considered their own unique division of public art. This distinction can be seen through the necessary condition of memorialization awareness: which is the ability of the physical memorial to create a referential relationship between the memorialized historic events or objects, a specific person, people, place, and/or events, and the viewer. This can be assisted by various tools offered: signage, audio tours, guided tours, and printed materials; but ultimately it is the memorial itself that carries the burden of creating this awareness. I will start by identifying the differences between monuments and memorials and then focus the remainder of the work on memorials. In establishing memorials as a distinct classification of public art, I will explore how memorialization awareness is created through the referential relationship and explain how this is a necessary condition of all memorials. Next, I will distinguish between two kinds of memorials: public and private, and discuss the differences in each, focusing on the role of public memory, the intentions

of the artist/creator, the object memorialized and the possible limitations of time constraints. In the remainder of the work I will then focus on memorials, with the idea that many of the theories offered can be equally applied to monuments.

Monuments and Memorials Defined

To begin the exploration of monuments and memorials, we must first establish what exactly makes a monument or a memorial what it is. Are they the same thing? Are they another form of public art, or is there something distinctly unique to each that makes them different from other art forms? I take the stance that monuments and memorials are often works of public art; however, they are distinct from other art forms due to the object(s) they commemorate. While monuments and memorials have elements of sculpture, architecture, and other characteristics of public art, they find their value not only in their physical elements but in the memorialization-awareness (the intention and ability to bring a specific, person, people, events to the mind of the viewer) they evoke in the viewer. If monuments and memorials cannot create this awareness in the viewer, by establishing a relationship between the memorialized historical events and the viewer, they lose their value as markers of commemoration, yet they often remain works of public art.

This distinction between public art and monuments and memorials can be seen by again comparing Richard Serra's public sculpture *Tilted Arc* and Maya Lin's Vietnam Veterans Memorial. Serra's sculpture was installed in Federal Plaza, Washington D.C. in 1981 and was commissioned by the Federal Government's General Services

Administration as a part of an effort to commission more works of public art.³¹ Hilde Hein writes, the program sought “to enhance the image of America through its government buildings by placing distinctive works of contemporary American art in public view.”³² However, after just eight years the work was removed and destroyed because the public³³ did not see enough value in the work.

Tilted Arc was made of weatherproofed steel and was twelve feet high, 120 feet long, and two and a half feet wide and sat in Federal Plaza in lower Manhattan. As Gregg M. Horowitz details, there were some immediate objections to the work, but these objections were largely dismissed because “expressions of displeasure are typical at first when ant public art is installed.”³⁴ It was not until 1984, when William Diamond of the GSA, the same organization that commission the work, took notice of the complaints and convened a public hearing to discuss the work. After the public hearing, a panel voted four to one to remove the work; even though the majority of community members that testified at the hearing wanted to keep the work. Horowitz writes, there was a shift in how public spaces were viewed in the 1980s and these spaces began to be seen not only for their civic value, but for the potential danger they might impose to the public.³⁵ In the

³¹ Gregg M. Horowitz. “Public Art/Public Space: The spectacle of the *Tilted Arc* controversy.” *Arguing About Art: Contemporary Philosophical Debates*. Alex Neill and Aaron Ridley, editors. Second Edition. (London: Routledge, 2002), 446-456.

³² Hein, “What is Public Art?: Time, place, and meaning,” 436-445.

³³ This term rises a separate issue as to who this public actually is. At the public hearing, more people testified in favor of keeping the work than those who wanted it removed; yet, a panel of five individuals who were supposed to represent the public, voted four to one for its removal.

³⁴ Horowitz, “Public Art/Public Space: The spectacle of the *Tilted Arc* controversy,” 446.

³⁵ Ibid.

end, it was decided that the work not only disrupted the space, but provided a potential danger to the very public it was intended for.³⁶

The Serra case shows the power the public has in determining what is or is not acceptable in public art. Serra claimed his intention in the work was to disrupt the space and force those who used the plaza to have to interact with the sculpture. Traditionally public art is considered any art that occupies public space and is put there for the enjoyment of the public. A distinction between public art and memorials is that public art does not necessarily depend on the space it occupies for its meaning and a memorial often does, for example, the 9/11 Memorial in New York City or the Flight 93 Memorial in Pennsylvania. Serra's sculpture, contrary to the artist's claims, could have been constructed and/or moved to another location. However, Serra claimed the location of the work was part of the original design and to relocate it would be to change the fundamental intention of the work. Serra fought the removal of his work through the court system, but he eventually lost. The Serra case shows that a public work of art cannot impose one set of aesthetic principles or political beliefs on the public. The public (a term that again raises another set of issues) must be considered in constructing a successful piece of public art, Horowitz writes, "to be public, art must be created with a recognition on the artist's part of the people who constitute the 'public' of public art, whoever they are."³⁷ A work must find a balance between aesthetic and public issues; Serra's claims had more to do with defending his sculpture as a piece of art, than as a piece commissioned for public enjoyment and use. The controlling public found no

³⁶ Ibid. This included claims that it could be used as a "blast wall for explosives"

³⁷ Ibid., 460.

inherent value in the work because it did not speak to them or represent any of their ideas, in other words it created no relationship between the work and the viewer. If the work had a commemorative aspect to it, such as being made to honor victims of some tragedy, or war, it likely would have had a better chance of surviving. Without this connection, the public did not feel connected to the work and overall there was little objection to its removal³⁸.

In contrast, Maya Lin's Vietnam Veterans Memorial can be viewed as an example of a successful work of public art, but more importantly it shows the additional task a memorial has. A monument or memorial must foster a relationship between the memorialized historical events and the viewing public. W.J.T. Mitchell asserts that "artists working on public art can no longer mediate their relations with the public on their own (modernist aesthetic) terms. They must now submit themselves to negotiations with the public about what is art,"³⁹ and in the case of a monument or memorial, this can be done by creating a relationship between the viewer and the memorialized historical events through the work itself. Lin's design for the memorial was chosen as part of a blind competition. The competition had several specific guidelines that Lin adhered to; however, the aesthetic design was her own creation. Lin's work was successful because she listened to what the public wanted and she was able to provide some of these aspects. However, Lin did not include all ideas blindly; her effort to represent diverse views was

³⁸ It is to be acknowledged there was a movement and efforts to save the artwork, but those with voting power wanted the work removed. It was also the GSA who paid for its removal. The entire process (public hearing, trials, and removal) cost the GSA more than it had originally commissioned Serra for the work.

³⁹ W. J. T. Mitchell, editor. *Art and The Public Sphere*. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1992), 465.

done with careful aesthetic and social consideration. Serra worked alone and was evidently only concerned with self-expression. Lin was concerned with her own point of view, but she also understood the importance of the public's reception of the work because she understood the work, as a memorial, had to create some sort of relationship between the memorialized historical events and the viewers. Lin created a work that many individuals could visit and have both an individual experience with, and still understand what the memorial represents, the soldiers who lost their lives in the conflict.

As these two examples show, a work of public art, especially monuments and memorials must take into account the feelings of the public that will be interacting with the work because they must create a relationship between this public and the memorialized historical events. If visitors to the Vietnam Veterans Memorial were not perviously aware of the fallen soldiers, the memorialized historical events, the memorial would still succeed as a successful work of public art, but it would fail as an effective memorial, and could be victim to the same claims that led to *Tilted Arc*'s removal.

It is also worth discussing the difference between monuments and memorials. As previously mentioned, Danto states "we erect monuments so that we shall always remember, and build memorials so that we shall never forget."⁴⁰ By this Danto claims memorials are created when there is some sense of loss, and monuments are built in celebration of grandeur. Monuments commemorate the memorable and embody the myths of beginnings while memorials ritualize remembrance and mark the reality of ends. While monuments make heroes and celebrate triumphs, Danto writes, "[t]he

⁴⁰ Danto, *The Wake of Art: Criticism, Philosophy, and the Ends of Taste*, 153.

memorial is a special precinct, extruded from life, a segregated enclave where we honor the dead.”⁴¹ However, this distinction is becoming more conflated in present times. For example, the National World War II Memorial, that opened in 2004 in Washington D.C., was built in remembrance of those who served in the war. While it is called a “memorial” it is not dedicated to just those who died in the conflict, like the Vietnam Veterans Memorial. The World War II Memorial encompasses both of Danto’s claims about monuments and memorials in one work of art. I assert that as the construction of monuments and memorials continue, these lines will become even less distinct. However, this does not cause a problem in the current analysis because both monuments and memorials have the necessary condition of triggering a viewers’ awareness through a referential relationship between the memorialized historical events⁴² and the viewer.

From this point on, this project will focus mainly on memorials, with the understanding and expectation that many of these claims can equally be applied to monuments.

Public and Private Memorials

When examining memorials there are two distinct types: private and public. While each triggers memorialization awareness in the viewer, there are important distinctions between the two. Each will be discussed in turn.

⁴¹ Ibid., 153.

⁴² If a further distinction is wanted between monuments and memorials, we could call the relation created between the memorial and the viewer “memorialization awareness” while asserting the relationship created between the monument and the viewer is “commemoration awareness.” However, I believe this distinction is unnecessary because both of these are evoked through the same process and both are necessary conditions for the success of the work.

Private Memorials

Private memorials depend upon an individual's personal experience with the object(s) that is memorialized. This means the individual must have some personal knowledge of or experience with the memorialized object that triggers memorialization awareness, or helps create the referential relationship. For example, when I look at my grandfather's tombstone it is more than a simple grave marker; it triggers in me a remembrance of past times, such as playing in the field behind his house, seeing what bike license plates he collected from the Honeycombs cereal he was always eating, or taking walks with him in the graveyard across from his house and hearing stories of people long gone, who I never met, yet whose lives fascinated me. To someone who had no experience with or knowledge of my grandfather, this tombstone would not create a relationship between my grandfather, the memorialized object, and the viewer, it would just be another grave marker. While the stranger would most likely understand what the tombstone represented, for her it would not be a memorial because it does not bring to her mind an awareness of the object memorialized. While she is aware that it represents someone who has died, it does not give any other content about the memorialized object.

These intentional private memorials do have a public aspect, but this is a more generalized knowledge of what the memorial represents and not a knowledge of the specific memorialized object (usually a person). This can also be seen in roadside crosses. While driving down the freeway and seeing a white cross along the side of the road, I know that it has been constructed because an individual has died here; however, this is not a private memorial for me because I have no awareness of the object memorialized. If I know this cross is placed where my friend perished, then I have some experience with/knowledge of the object memorialized and the cross becomes a private memorial. The phrases “experience with” or “knowledge of” are both used because in-person, face-to-face interaction of the memorialized object is not necessary. I can look at my great-grandmother’s tombstone and while I never met her, I still have some knowledge of her. Because of this knowledge this is not just a tombstone, but it is a private memorial because it creates a relationship between me and the memorialized object. This awareness is not reflection of a direct experience with her, but perhaps is of stories I was told about her or photographs I saw of her. So even though I do not have any direct experience of her (filled intentions if speaking in terms of phenomenology) my memorialization awareness can be evoked through my knowledge of her.

Private memorials do not have to be intentionally created, they can be unintentional or spontaneous. The above examples, tombstones and roadside crosses, are intentionally created memorials. This means they were constructed for the purpose of creating a memorial and therefore they were intentionally created to arouse memorialization awareness. My grandfather’s tombstone was created to memorialize my

grandfather. However, private memorials can also be unintentionally created; for example, I now own rings that were once my grandparents'. When the rings were originally created they were meant to be jewelry, my grandmother's fortieth anniversary ring and my grandfather's wedding ring, it was only after I inherited⁴³ them that they became a private memorial. My grandmother died when I was still in elementary school (1985), and my grandfather kept her ring in a teacup, on a bookshelf in his living room, for over twenty years. Eventually he removed his wedding ring and also placed it in the cup. It was always understood that I, as the only granddaughter, would eventually inherit my grandmother's ring. When my grandfather passed away in 2006, my aunt gave me both my grandmother's and grandfather's rings. I took the rings and joined them together into one ring, that I now wear everyday.

When I experience the rings they evoke my memorialization awareness of both of my grandparents. When someone else views my ring, she may admire its aesthetic beauty, but it does not act as a memorial for her; she has no knowledge of the memorialized historical events, meaning no relationship is formed between her and my grandparents. This is akin to their tombstones, but unlike the tombstones, the rings were not originally intended to serve as a memorial, they were meant to be jewelry. Another example would be when a friend's father passed away, the father had a pipe and this pipe came into the son's possession. For the son, this pipe has become a memorial; when he looks at the pipe he experiences his father through

⁴³ No living person can have an heir.

memorialization awareness in the same way I become aware of my grandparents through my ring. For anyone else, the pipe would be a pipe, not a memorial. Unintentional private memorials seem like they could encompass almost any object and this claim is largely true. Since the memorials are private, they only need to involve the individual and the object that triggers the memorialization awareness (the pipe, the ring) of the object memorialized (my grandparents, his father). It does not matter that my ring or my friend's pipe do not trigger the memorialization awareness of others, it only matters to the individual they are a memorial for, me and my friend, respectively. The opposite will be shown for public memorials.

Private memorials can also be spontaneously created, meaning that they come into existence without any intention or design of them being viewed as a memorial; it is the actions of others that transform these once ordinary objects into memorials. Both of the above examples, the rings and the pipe, can be viewed this way, or it could be something much simpler. For example, when I was in college, a friend of mine perished in a car accident; he lost control of his car and hit a tree. Friends and family started putting flowers and other mementos around the tree, and years later, it was still seen to have a special connection to the friend who died. To others, once the flowers and mementos were gone, this tree was just a tree with no special meaning, but to those who knew of its significance, it was still a type of memorial. This idea will be further explored in the public memorials section and in the analysis of the Survivor Tree in Chapter 2.

Another feature of private memorials is they are usually limited by time constraints; eventually there will come a time when no person's memorialization

awareness will be specifically evoked by the memorial. Using the above examples, there will most likely come a time when no person remains alive who has any experience with or knowledge of my grandfather. When this time occurs, his tombstone ceases being a private memorial⁴⁴ and becomes something else, an object, a gravestone. This is because there is no longer any individual who is capable of having her memorialization awareness triggered by the memorial. In other words, when the stranger looks at the gravestone, she sees a marker for someone who died, but there is no referential relationship created between him and the memorialized object, my grandfather. The same idea applies to the rings and the pipe. While I see the rings and my friend sees the pipe as memorials, we may be the only individuals who do so. Once we are no longer in existence, or have the ability to have our memorialization awareness elicited by the objects, they cease being memorials and revert back to objects, rings and a pipe. They still function as jewelry and a pipe respectively, but they are no longer private memorials.

These temporal constraints do not mean the physical memorial can never be a memorial again. At a future time, some individual may happen along my grandfather's tombstone and see that his surname, Fraley, is the same as his and he may become intrigued by this and begin to research my grandfather. From this inquiry he may discover many things about my grandfather and his life. While the future Fraley never met my grandfather or even anyone with knowledge of him, he is able to gain knowledge about him. After this knowledge has been obtained, the tombstone may become something more to him, something that brings to his mind some aspect of my grandfather

⁴⁴ It can still be seen as a public memorial in a general sense because most people will still understand what a gravestone represents.

through the relationship the memorial creates; thus, triggering his memorialization awareness. Therefore what was no longer a memorial becomes a memorial again.

Interestingly, we typically do not think of these private memorials as public art, because even though they are often “in public” they are not created for public consumption, meaning they are created for a small group of individuals and not the “public” as a whole. While these private memorials may have some of the same aesthetic ideals as works of public art, we tend to look at them as held out for some other purpose, specifically personal memorialization. This is especially true for intentional private memorials. However, those of us who enjoy exploring old cemeteries would be hesitant to assert that all private memorials are not public art and we would be correct in that hesitation. What exactly is the balance between these two claims needs further exploring, however for the current work, it will only be stated that these private memorials are not rigidly classified as public art nor dismissed as not public art.

Public Memorials

Memorials are created with a specific message they are attempting to communicate and public memorials are created for the purpose of attempting to communicate this message to all viewers that experience the work. Unlike private memorials that are created for a specific, small audience, to be successful, public memorials must create a referential relationship between the memorialized historical events and almost every viewer. Like private memorials, public memorials may be intentionally or spontaneously created, and they also carry the necessary condition of

creating a relationship between the viewer and the memorialized historical events.

Unlike private memorials, the viewer does not have to have personal experience of the memorialized historical events; I can stand in front of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial and experience the fallen soldiers without ever knowing any personally. Admittedly, I do know some historical information about the Vietnam War. Yet, even without a viewer having this information, a public memorial must provide the necessary framework so an individual who views the work can create some sort of relationship with the memorialized historical events. This is a daunting task for a memorial, but it is one that must be achieved for the work to be an effective public memorial.

If a public memorial does not create this relationship with the majority of viewers, and only creates a relationship with a small number of individuals, it fails as a public memorial. This is not to say it fails as a memorial completely, but it fails as a *public* memorial. Noël Carroll argues

The function of memorial art is to depict what is significant about what it memorializes, to recollect the past in order to galvanize a commitment in the hearts and minds of viewers to following the example of the virtues and ideals enshrined in the memorial artwork. In this way, memorial art discharges one of the central functions of art — namely, instilling the ethos of the culture in its members.⁴⁵

For example, if I look at Reflecting Absence at the 9/11 Memorial in New York City and only have my memorialization awareness triggered due to some personal experience with or knowledge of an object memorialized and nothing else, I am experiencing the work only on a personal level and it functions as a private memorial. It would be the same

⁴⁵ Carroll, “Art and Recollection,” 7.

experience as my looking at my grandfather's gravestone and being reminded of my time with him. Public memorials are designed to do more because these works must create a relationship in the viewer regardless of any personal knowledge of, or experience with, the memorialized historical events. Public memorials are often able to create this relationship through the narrative they offer the viewer.⁴⁶ This narrative can create the relationship in a few ways; first, by informing the viewer of the memorialized historical events and thereby giving her some personal knowledge of them. Second, the narrative offered can reflect some common collective consciousness through shared norms and values and this can lead the viewer to be aware of the memorialized historical events. As long as a public memorial can evoke a viewer's memorialization awareness by creating a relationship between the work and the majority of viewers, it will survive as a public memorial. However, while Carroll's claim that a memorial should depict what is significant about the objects it memorializes, the viewer should also be informed about who is doing the memorialization, and what the intended message was. Memorials must necessarily create a referential relationship between the viewer and the memorialized historical events, but they should not offer a single narrative or depict a limited "ethos of a culture."

An illustration of an unsuccessful public memorial can be seen by examining the Confederate Monument, located in Louisville, Kentucky dedicated to the Confederate dead.⁴⁷ I do not have any personal experience with the specific objects memorialized, the

⁴⁶ The importance of, and problems with narratives will be addressed in the following chapters.

⁴⁷ Ferdinand von Miller. *Confederate Monument, Louisville*. 1895. Granite and Bronze, Louisville, Kentucky.

dead Confederate soldiers, but I am familiar with them through general knowledge. When I look at the memorial, my visual perception of the monument founds my awareness of what it is memorializing: the fallen soldiers. In other words, the work creates a relationship between me and the memorialized historical events; without the monument, I would not have my memorialization awareness triggered, I would never

have had my historical consciousness of the fallen soldiers evoked without first experiencing the work. Therefore the work is effective as a *private* memorial, but to be a public memorial, it must create this relationship in most viewers. This is where it fails as a public memorial. When the work was created it was specifically designed to show the importance of fighting for and defending the Confederacy and the ideals of the Confederacy; it meant more than just the objects (the fallen soldiers) it memorialized. Yet that narrative has now largely been lost and the work, for most viewers, no longer creates any sort of relationship reflecting this narrative or to the memorialized historical events. For instance, the monument has a prominent place near the campus of The University of Louisville: it is located in the middle of one of the main paths walked by students daily. However, when asked about the work, most students have no idea what it is, only that it has something to do with the Confederacy.⁴⁸ It should be noted that Kentucky was never a part of the Confederacy, and the placement of the memorial can be

⁴⁸ And this knowledge is based mainly due to the negative press about the Monument's presence on the campus.

seen as a type of falsification of history. The once public work no longer creates a referential relationship between the viewers and the memorialized historical events through a connection to the collective consciousness or with the narrative it offers and therefore, it fails as a public memorial. Therefore, I experience the work as a private memorial to the events memorialized due to my individual knowledge and experience of the work, to most other viewers this relationship is not created. Due to my own knowledge

surrounding the work, the memorial triggers my historical consciousness⁴⁹ of the memorialized events. The Confederate Monument may still be viewed as a work of public art and a private memorial, but not as a public memorial. It is to be noted that the Confederate Army was invested in more than slavery, and while war and death are never to be taken lightly, it is difficult, as an anti-racist, to feel the emotions the monument evidently seeks to evoke in the viewer.

A successful example of a work that still creates this relationship can be seen in the Vietnam Veterans Memorial. I have the same generalized knowledge of the historical events memorialized as I do for the Confederate Monument, and I have no personal experience with the objects. However, when I experience the Vietnam Veterans

⁴⁹ This will be discussed further below.

Memorial my memorialization awareness is triggered by the additional values reflected by the memorial through the collective consciousness of the community and that ultimately creates the necessary relationship. How this collective consciousness is manifested is unique for each memorial. For example, this could be created in the Vietnam Veterans Memorial's literal reflective design, the significance of its placement on the National Mall in

Washington, D.C., the availability of informative materials at the site, the onsite personnel, and/or by the objects that are constantly left by the community. It is clear to most viewers that this memorial is not only to be experienced as a work of art, but rather that it has some additional purpose. Focusing on the reflective design, as I, the viewer, stand in front of the work, I see myself reflected within the wall of names. Even if I do not have a personal knowledge of the individuals those names represent, I can understand that these were people who lost their lives in the war. This information is in some way

supplied by the narrative surrounding the memorial either from signage, the pamphlet, the other visitors, or my own understanding of what a listing of names on a work such as this represents. By triggering my

own historical consciousness of the Vietnam War, I become aware of the memorialized historical event. For example, I have learned about the war in school, I have seen movies based on the war, such as *Platoon* or *Forrest Gump*, and I remember my parents and grandparents discussing the soldiers they knew who perished in the war. In fact, my parent's hometown, Beallsville, Ohio, had the highest soldier mortality rate per capita in the United States.⁵⁰ I recall hearing my parents discuss the nine or so classmates that were killed; they still know their names and when they died. When I experience the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, my memorialization awareness is triggered and activates all of this historical information, and through it I am aware of the fallen soldiers the memorial represents.

Another example, is through a commonly shared belief that those who have perished while serving their country should be honored. Because I, the individual, value this belief and the memorial shows the collective consciousness of the community also values this, a relationship forms between myself and the community through the listing of the names, or through the memorialized historical event. Due to this connection, I become aware of the memorialized historical event and the memorial is successful. This relationship can be created in a variety of ways through the memorial; the important factor is the relationship *is* created. How this is created, and what the relationship symbolizes can change and grow. The key element is that this shared experience creates some connection to the memorialized historical events. Additionally, if one believes that works of art, by their very nature, are fixed, this shows that as the public perception of the

⁵⁰ My father's graduating class of 1964 consisted of 52 students and my mother's class of 1965 had 42 students.

work changes this aspect of the meaning can also change. However, these connections do not necessarily have to change the meaning of the work, but they may expand it so more viewers can discover/experience the memorialized historical events. What must remain consistent for the memorial is the majority of viewers are aware of the original memorialized historical events. If visitors to the Vietnam Veterans Memorial were not aware of the fallen soldiers, the memorial may still succeed as a successful work of public art, but it would fail as a successful public memorial.

As the above examples allude, public memorials are ideally not limited by time constraints because they do not require an individual to have experience with, or knowledge of, the specific objects memorialized. When they are designed it is with the intention that the work will continue to create a relationship between the viewer and the memorialized historical events even after all those individuals with personal experiences of the objects memorialized have ceased to exist. For example, there are no longer any individuals alive that had any personal experience with Abraham Lincoln, yet his memorial still has value as a public memorial because it still creates a relationship to the object it memorializes (Lincoln). One way it does this is through the community's continued values in the fight for equality and Civil Rights for all, an idea that was not the original intentions of the community. As Harriet Seine notes in *Memorials to Shattered Myths*, the original ideal of the work “emphasized Lincoln’s role as the savior of the nation rather than the emancipator of the slaves.... Over time as the site was variously used to commemorate significant moments in the civil rights movement, the emphasis of

the memorial shifted.”⁵¹ Even though the community’s perceived value in the memorial has changed, as long as it helps to create a relationship between the viewer and the memorialized object, it is still an effective tool for memorialization. The intention of these public memorials is that all viewers, regardless of when they view the memorial, will find a connection to the memorialized historical events, and this connection will last into perpetuity.

As has been shown, public memorials are not always successful in the continued need to reflect the collective consciousness of a community through memorialization awareness. If memorialization awareness is only triggered by some personal experience or knowledge of the objects memorialized, then the public memorial becomes a private memorial. The work is then limited to the possible time constraints of private memorials as discussed above. Like private memorials, public memorials can come back into existence as both private (same process as above) and as public memorials. If a memorial begins to reflect the collective consciousness of a community once again, it can regain its status as a public memorial. Lets take the example of the failed public memorial of the Confederate Monument to create an example where this may occur. Say there was a movement to relocate or to simply remove the memorial because it is no longer thought to be valued by the community. Suddenly, there is an overwhelming outpouring of support for the memorial from the community and protests are held to protect the memorial. Due to a change in circumstances the community has once again placed value in the work and these values can be reflected through the memorial. This renewal of

⁵¹Senie, *Memorials to Shattered Myths: Vietnam to 9/11*, 2.

value does not necessarily have to be the same values that the work originally reflected. As long as the work evokes memorialization awareness in the viewer this change in the collective consciousness of a community is not important.

Like private memorials, there are two aspects of intentionality when examining public memorials: intentionally designed works, and spontaneous works that are later intentionally adopted by a community. First, many public memorials are specifically planned, designed, and created to trigger memorialization awareness by creating a relationship between the viewer and the memorialized historical events. These works are created for the same reasons as private memorials, to memorialize some certain person, people, place and/or event; yet, there is something more to these memorials. While a private memorial depends on the individual having some personal knowledge of or experience with the individual memorialized historical events that triggers memorialization awareness, public memorials are not dependent on this personal interaction with the memorialized historical events. Public memorials will trigger memorialization awareness in the viewer regardless of any intimate knowledge of the person, people, places and/or events that are being memorialized. This is usually created through the narrative a memorial offers the viewer and its connection to the collective consciousness of the community. This collective consciousness could be a reflection of a community's understanding of the events, the understood importance of the events, and/or the desire to memorialize more than just objects. For example, while the three main 9/11 Memorials⁵² all pay direct tribute to the individual lives that were lost (the

⁵² These are the memorials located at the sites of the 2001 9/11 attacks: New York City, The Pentagon, and Pennsylvania.

memorialized historical events) that is not the sole purpose of the works. They also represent the community's attempt to understand and cope with the events; Kirk Savage calls these works "Therapeutic Monuments."⁵³ These ideas are seen through the words of those directly involved in the designs of the 9/11 Memorials. As Paula Berry, a Memorial Juror for the World Trade Center 9/11 Memorial and whose husband was killed in the South Tower, stated "Nothing we do, of course, will ever replace what we lost that tragic day. But by choosing a fitting memorial, we can honor the lives, spirits, and the courage of our loved ones."⁵⁴ These words show the desire to create a fitting memorial; therefore, a relationship can be created to any viewer who also believes in the need to create the memorial to honor those who were lost regardless if she knew anyone who perished personally.⁵⁵ The following words of Paul Murdoch, the architect of the Flight 93 Memorial in Pennsylvania, exemplify the thought that the space is to be seen as more than a work of art, "Timeless in simplicity and beauty, like its landscape, both stark and serene, the Memorial should be quiet in reverence, yet powerful in form, a place both solemn and uplifting."⁵⁶ If these memorials were only able to create a direct link to the objects they memorialized through firsthand experience, they would function more like private memorials and would require personal experience with or specific knowledge of the memorialized historical events. In the present example, this would be the individuals who lost their lives, but these public memorials can create the required referential relationship through something other than a direct reference to a personal experience of

⁵³ Savage, "Trauma, Healing, and the Therapeutic Monument."

⁵⁴ Berry, Paula as quoted in Blais, *A Place of Remembrance*, 118.

⁵⁵ A more in-depth look at Therapeutic Monuments will be given in Chapter 4

⁵⁶ *Flight 93*. Pamphlet from Flight 93 National Memorial, National Park Service, N.D.

the memorialized historical events, such as seeing yourself reflected in the Vietnam Veterans Memorial.

This intention to create a relationship can clearly be seen in memorials that are held out for public display. The artists specifically design and create works that will trigger this memorialization awareness in individuals by referencing some characteristic in the viewer that triggers awareness of the memorialized historical events. This may be done by making the viewer aware of the memorialized historical events directly, or by reflecting some part of a collective consciousness that then triggers an awareness of the memorialized historical events. For example, according to the memorial's mission statement, the Oklahoma City National Memorial was built for the 168 individuals who lost their lives in the 1995 bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building. The memorialized historical events are the 168 victims, and "those who survived and those changed forever."⁵⁷ If someone visits the memorial who has no personal knowledge of anyone who perished, or even any knowledge of the bombing, the memorial can still create a referential relationship between her and the memorialized historical events. When the viewer walks through the park and views the field of empty chairs, she knows the work has been created for some reason. Why, because rarely do we experience fields of massive empty chairs, and the supporting documentation, museum, visitors center, and other available information all give her a clue that something additional is going on here. The memorial triggers this questioning, and it is through this desire to answer these

⁵⁷ "Oklahoma National Memorial and Museum," *Oklahoma National Memorial and Museum*, 2014-2016, oklahomacitynationalmemorial.org.

questions that she becomes aware of the memorialized historical events. Usually these answers are found through the narrative the memorial offers the viewer.

If the memorial can create a relationship in the viewer by a shared collective consciousness, this will also lead to an awareness of the memorialized historical events. As written on the website dedicated to The Oklahoma City National Memorial, the mission reads “May all who leave here know the impact of violence. May this memorial offer comfort, strength, peace, hope and serenity.”⁵⁸ This statement is a reflection of what a community values, or what it valued at the time of the memorial’s creation. Specifically that the work was not to just memorialize those who perished, but to reflect the community’s desire that this would not happen anywhere else, to anyone else. Specifically, Kirk Savage explains, that by experiencing the effects of the violence, the community “hope[s] that their trauma will not be revisited on others.”⁵⁹ Take the same viewer as above, when she experiences the memorial, she becomes aware of the suffering of those who were affected by the bombing. Because she too can understand and value the desire to not have this trauma perpetuated onto others, she finds a connection to the collective consciousness of the community that created and values the work, and through this connection, the effects of trauma, she becomes aware of the memorialized historical events, the victims of the trauma. Through this connection to the collective consciousness, the viewer is now aware of the memorialized historical events without ever having known them individually, or personally. As Savage writes, “the therapeutic monument must invent a new kind of meaning that embraces both the reality of

⁵⁸ Ibid.

⁵⁹ Savage, Kirk. “Trauma, Healing and the Therapeutic Monument,” 116.

individual suffering and the collective significance of that suffering”⁶⁰ and through this meaning, the necessary referential relationship can be created.

Public memorials can also be spontaneously created without any specific, intentional design; however, these works must still create a relationship between the viewer and the memorialized historical events. This relationship is shown much clearer because it is the actions of the community, motivated by a relationship they already feel with the object(s), that creates this type of memorial. The clearest example of this would be the Survivor Tree at the 9/11 Memorial in New York City.⁶¹ This tree withstood the collapse of both Twin Towers and was incorporated into Michael Arad and Peter Walker’s design for the park surrounding Reflecting Absence. There was nothing distinguishing the tree as any different from those that had been planted as part of the design. However, the community learned of its existence and began to leave mementos and tie ribbons around it. The tree began to be treated as a memorial because the community believed it reflected the desire and will to survive in the wake of such horror. The community spontaneously created a memorial out of the tree by making it a symbol of a greater idea they wanted memorialized. The Survivor Tree is not a tombstone for those who perished, and is not a statement about the durability of trees, but it finds its value as a memorial because of the relationship it creates with the viewer and in the collective consciousness of the community it represents. Without this relationship, it would just be a tree. The Survivor Tree now has a railing around it and a plaque explaining its importance to the

⁶⁰ Ibid., 114.

⁶¹ A detailed analysis of the Survivor Tree is in Chapter 2.

9/11 Memorial, but these additions are not what made it a memorial, the desire of the community did.

Narrative

The implied narrative a memorial offers its visitors is of vital importance. A narrative that is too limited and constricting will only offer one accounting of the events and will most likely, over time, become relied upon as the historical accounting of these events. However, a narrative that does not offer any framework or direction can be too vague so as to give no information about, or create a connection to, the memorialized historical events. As Marita Sturken writes about the World Trade Center 9/11 Memorial, “The narratives that have been layered on Ground Zero reveal the complex convergence of political agendas and grief in this space, as if, somehow, the production of new spatial meanings will provide a means to contain the past, maintenance the grief, and make sense of the violent events that took place there.”⁶² One would not want to visit a memorial and have no idea what is actually being memorialized; if this was the case, the work would fail as a memorial. So how does a memorial find this balance of offering enough information without completely controlling the narrative? As it turns out, that is not an easy task to answer, and the answer varies from work to work.

Before this balance can be discussed though, it must first be established what exactly a narrative is and why is it so important to memorials. According to Noël Carroll, a “narrative is a form of discourse that is a distinct from argument, scientific explanation,

⁶² Marita Sturken. “The Aesthetics of Absence: Rebuilding Ground Zero.” *American Ethnologist*, Vol. 31 No. 3, 312.

analysis, diagnosis, prayer, and so forth....a narrative belongs to the class or genus of representations of states of affairs, events, or sequences of states of affairs and/or events.”⁶³ Daniel D. Hutto defines narrative as, “those complex representations that relate and describe the course of some unique series of events, however humble, in a coherent but selective arrangement.”⁶⁴ A narrative is not merely a listing of historical information or statistical data, but a purposeful retelling in order to create meaning from the events. As Carroll continues, “on some accounts, what it is to comprehend a narrative is to be able to construct the story from the discourse. A narrative is a representation of a sequence of events with a positive degree of narrativity relative to the genre to which it belongs.”⁶⁵ Thus the narrative surrounding a memorial should give enough information about the memorialized historical events so the viewer can construct a (mostly) accurate accounting of the events and from there, in some way understand the significance of the work. The role of a memorial is to create through the narrative framework supplied, an organized accounting of the events so that they give meaning and offer the viewer a narrative connection that allows room for thought on the part of the viewer. This accounting should give adequate information, but not overly control the narrative. For example, when experiencing Reflecting Absence, the two large bottomless waterfalls that stand in the voids where the footprints of the Twin Towers once were, the viewer should be able to understand the work memorializes the individuals that perished in the 9/11

⁶³ Noël Carroll. “Narrative.” Noël Carroll and John Gibson, editors. *The Routledge Companion to Philosophy of Literature*. (London: Routledge, 2015), 1.

⁶⁴ Daniel D. Hutto. (editor) *Narrative and Understanding Persons*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 1.

⁶⁵ Carroll, “Narrative,” 6.

attacks on the United States; however, the narrative should not give so much information that it seems to become the only possible accounting of the events, or what Carroll calls the “event description.”⁶⁶

Perhaps the best way to understand this is to think of a memorial not offering a single narrative, but instead establishing a framework that allows the viewer to access the needed historical information, while also leaving enough openness that allows the viewer to experience the emotional complexity surrounding the memorialized historical events. For example when I stand in front of Reflecting Absence, I understand through the framework offered that the names listed are of those who perished in the 9/11 attacks and through this, I become aware of the memorialized historical events. When someone else stands in front of Reflecting Absence, perhaps she is more aware of the bottomless waterfalls that, to her, symbolize the idea of permanent absence. Through the framework offered, she reflects on what this absence represents, the victims, and this connection brings her to an awareness of the memorialized historical events. So both the viewer and I experience the work in different ways, we both attempt to make sense of the horror that occurred there and we work through this knowledge in different ways, but it is the framework offered that eventually leads us both to the memorialized historical events. The memorial defies a simple understanding of the events surrounding the memorialized historical events, and seeks instead to foster this complex experience. Every memorial must negotiate this complexity on its own terms and with its own materials, meaning its distinct artistic form.

⁶⁶ Carroll, *Ibid.*, 2. Event description identifies an event.

Gregory Currie explains this idea of framework in more detail: “A narrative is an artefact, wherein the maker seeks to make manifest his or her communicative intentions. When the audience grasps those intentions, they have a grip on what the events of the narrative are, and how they are related.”⁶⁷ Thus, the maker of the memorial should strive to create a framework that directs or guides the viewer to the memorialized historical events. Currie adds, “Makers of narratives tell their stories by getting us to see what their story-telling intentions are. And a narrative is expressive of its framework in so far as that framework is indicated to us, not via our recognition of the maker’s intention but by less reasoned, more affectively driven and perhaps more automatic process.”⁶⁸

Therefore, it is not important that the viewer be aware of the memorial maker’s intent to make the viewer aware of the memorialized historical events, only that the viewer become aware of what is memorialized. In a public memorial, the offered framework is what leads the viewer to this awareness. Currie endorses this openness: “The framework will usually be vague and incomplete; it rarely does more than guide our responses in a general way. But the narrative’s story is vague and incomplete as well: no story manages (or seeks) to determine the world of its happenings with precision and completeness.”⁶⁹

So for the memorial, the narrative should provide the necessary information to help foster a connection between the viewer and the memorialized historic events, and not seek to complete the story but to challenge the viewer to work through the complexity of the events be they emotional and/or cognitive.

⁶⁷ Gregory Currie. “Framing Narratives.” Hutto, Daniel D. (editor) *Narrative and Understanding Persons*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 18.

⁶⁸ Ibid., 18-19.

⁶⁹ Ibid., 19.

This narrative framework also helps the viewer understand how she is supposed to respond to a memorial. As Currie writes “the framework itself partly determines how we are to take things that are said about the story’s events.”⁷⁰ He then quotes philosopher R. Moran on this subject, “Adopting this framework helps us ‘to notice and respond to the network of associations that make up the mood or emotional tone of a work.’”⁷¹ For example, when standing in front of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, the viewer can come to understand, through the framework offered (such as the printed materials, the physical work itself, the other visitors) what her emotional response should be. It is understood that this is a place of quiet reflection, and was built to honor the deceased and the missing. The framework does not tell the viewer how they specifically should respond to the work, but it does give insight into the overall emotional tone. Yet, even in this suggested response the memorial maker should not attempt to offer *the* correct response to the work. Currie writes, “It is reasonable to think that the author is well-placed to make suggestions about how to respond to the story, but not reasonable to think him or her in a position absolutely to dictate terms.”⁷² For the narrative to achieve this goal, it needs to maintain a certain amount of openness so the viewer can attempt to work through the complexity of understanding that typically surrounds a memorial. Again, how this is created is different for every memorial, and is determined by the degree of control offered through the narrative framework. So how does a memorial find this balance between providing an adequate framework of narrative so as to help create a

⁷⁰ Ibid., 20.

⁷¹R. Moran, as quoted in Ibid., 18.

⁷² Currie, “Framing Narratives,” 42.

relationship between the memorialized historical events and the viewer without overreaching? This is not a question that can be answered easily and the way this balance can be achieved varies from memorial to memorial.

In an article from *The New Yorker*,⁷³ Adam Gopnik further explores these issues of narrative and memorialization in relation to the World Trade Center 9/11 Memorial. Gopnik writes, “The American memorial style is powerful as an engine of pathos but is obviously limited as a language of representation. It feels, but it cannot show.”⁷⁴ With this statement he is claiming a memorial can relate to the feelings the viewing public has on the issue, but it cannot show the entire truth. He also describes the specific message the memorial instills in its visitors as: “we are here to remember and have an ambition to let us tell you what to recall; the boast that we have completely started over and the promise that we will never forget.”⁷⁵ Gopnik is referring to the memorial’s insistence that the viewer be aware of the victims as a way of controlling what message the viewer takes away from the memorial and additionally how it burdens the viewer with a duty to never forget those who perished. This also adds to the idea that “we, as Americans stand united” to never forget these victims and in doing so, we are doing something against the terroristic acts. This is akin to Erika Doss’s claim that in the United States, memorials to the victims of terrorism are often portrayed as the public’s way to stand up against terrorism;⁷⁶ however, these memorials frequently also show the public’s fears about the

⁷³ Gopnik, Adam. “Stones and Bones: Visiting the 9/11 Memorial and Museum.” *The New Yorker*. July 7 & 14, (2014), 44.

⁷⁴ Ibid., 44.

⁷⁵ Ibid., 38.

⁷⁶Doss, *Memorial Mania*, 118.

state of the nation and the vulnerability to its citizens.⁷⁷ They falsely perpetuate the idea that America has a collective national narrative that is founded on social stability and unity. By believing in this message, many Americans can then feel more secure and protected in their day-to-day lives. By never forgetting, Americans are maintaining the false belief in a collective national identity of not only victim-hood but in solidarity against a common enemy. Gopnik's claim that "the memorials' end is to sacralize their subject in a way that shames anyone who contests its centrality."⁷⁸ For example, the leaders of the United States used these horrible tragedies to justify become warmongers against the "aggressors," and the memorials seem to shame the viewer who would broach this subject into silence. This might relate to Doss's assertion that fears about the memorials triggering future attacks are also denied and those who object to the construction of the memorials on these grounds are often shamed and dismissed as "giving into" the terrorists or "letting the terrorists win."⁷⁹

Gopnik also points out that the images of the terrorists have been moved to a lower level of the museum and are shown on a smaller scale than any other images. This again downplays the role of the hijackers and makes this narrative subservient to the larger narrative. Additionally, images of the falling bodies of those who leapt to their deaths from the Twin Towers have been moved to a side alcove "so that visitors are both invited and discouraged from looking,"⁸⁰ Gopnik observes. This change in the narrative

⁷⁷Ibid., 119-120.

⁷⁸Gopnik, "Stones and Bones: Visiting the 9/11 Memorial and Museum," 42.

⁷⁹Doss, *Memorial Mania*, 144

⁸⁰Ibid., 40.

further leads to the blurring and evasion to possible causality on the part of America.

These ideas are not limited to current monuments and memorials. In his book *Standing Soldiers, Kneeling Slaves*, Kirk Savage explores how the history of slavery and its violent end was told in public space-sculptural monuments in 19th century America.⁸¹ Savage writes that the Civil War provoked the greatest era of monument building in the United States and it was focused around three main themes. These themes were: the meaning of race, the experience of war, and the function of the public monument; and all three of these combined to change the American sense of nationhood.⁸²

After the Civil War and the end of slavery there were still conflicting ideas about what race, citizenship and equality meant in the United States. Savage writes, “Reconstruction demanded nothing less than that the nation and its people reimagine themselves.”⁸³ Yet how could the implied narratives help the nation to reimagine itself when it still could not come to a consensus of what this new image should be? Savage claims that public monuments were often held out as tools to show resolution and consensus; when in fact there typically was none. However, the monuments were imposed on the public domain because they attempted to give historical closure to the masses by forming history into a rightful pattern that allowed both individuals and the community to move on from the commemorated events. Of course there were many African-Americans who perhaps did not accept this point-of-view, and other additional citizens who also disagreed with the imposed message, much as is still true today. The

⁸¹Savage, *Standing Soldiers, Kneeling Slaves*, 3.

⁸² Ibid.

⁸³ Ibid., 4.

process of commemoration is usually full of conflict, but the final product, the monument, tried to offer a fixed narrative of events. It is important to note that he is not asserting that these monuments actually represent the factual history of the events rather, he asserts that they are markers of a false ideology that puts forth only a partial retelling of history and erases events that could not be adequately resolved so that they could “move onward.”

These monuments allowed much of the nation to ignore the cruel history of slavery and see themselves as both hero and savior. Often the conflicts, issues, and controversies surrounding Reconstruction were erased from the public works. The “Standing Soldier, Kneeling Slave” monuments and memorials that became popular in the later 19th century are prime examples of this phenomenon. Through the text Savage shows this struggle to represent individuals with an exploration of the African-American body in pre and post Civil War America and comes to the conclusion that for the most part the role of the white man again became the powerful symbol of the public (most notably seen through Abraham Lincoln) and the black body once again was pushed to the margins.⁸⁴ These works put forth an image of a benevolent white man, who out of the goodness of his heart or a duty to the nation, frees the downtrodden slave who, still wearing his broken shackles, shows his gratitude by kneeling at his savior’s feet. As Savage writes, “Typically the monuments made no attempt to represent the historical forces or ideologies that had motivated these men [the standing saviors] and driven the

⁸⁴Ibid., 210.

nation in its military campaigns.”⁸⁵ These works only celebrated the greatness of the nation through the acts of a very few individuals in very precise situations. This is clearly seen in Thomas Ball’s Freedman’s Memorial to Abraham Lincoln (1876)⁸⁶ located in Washington, D.C.. In this work, the entire history of slavery is compressed into a single act of emancipation. Savage writes in *Monument Wars* that “The monument aimed to bring the whole phenomenon of black slavery, which had bedeviled and scarred the capital city since its founding, to a happy conclusion that would confirm, once again, the moral greatness of the nation.”⁸⁷ With these monuments, the public could look at the great act of emancipation and the freed slave as the summary of slavery and the conclusion to this part of American history. Because the work only offers one narrative of the memorialized event, slavery, it is reinvented in a way that denies or ignores much of the actual history. This is precisely why designers need to be aware of the power of the narrative a memorial puts forth and to be sure to not overly limit or control that narrative. On this factor, a memorial will be deemed effective if it offers a framework that allows its viewers the opportunity to see the various narratives that it can yield and does not invent only a single narrative that holds itself as *the* historical accounting of an event.

In conclusion, the traditional aim of a memorial is to convey a certain narrative. This is achieved by the particular way the memorial frames the narrative it offers while maintaining a sense of openness. Memorials are "true" only insofar as they seem to

⁸⁵Savage, Kirk. *Monument Wars*. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005), 82.

⁸⁶ Ball, Thomas. Freedmen’s Memorial to Abraham Lincoln. 1876, Washington, D.C.

⁸⁷ Savage, *Monument Wars*, 82-83.

display...one people united by one memory.⁸⁸ However, as Doss writes, “questions of representation and agency, and disagreements over dominant cultural assumptions that all Americans share the same understandings of public history and public space”⁸⁹ have become key approaches in the scholarship of monuments and memorials. Current scholarship shows that these works are seldom the voice of a unified nation and should not be looked to for a complete historical accounting. It is only when we explore the creation, reception, and conflicts surrounding these works that we begin to see the complex layers and understand that they do not offer the truth, but actually show us that a single, unified view of history is almost impossible. However, that is not to say that all accountings must be considered as reliable sources of historical information and represented in a memorial. For example, those who adhere to the “9/11 Truth movement” or “Truthers,” (those who assert the attacks of 9/11 were not the acts of religious extremists, but a government conspiracy) are not included in the memorials or museums, and they are rightly excluded.

⁸⁸Savage, *Standing Soldiers Kneeling Saves*, 6.

⁸⁹Doss., *Memorial Mania*, 349.

CHAPTER TWO

JUDGING A MEMORIAL: THE NATIONAL 9/11 MEMORIALS AND MEMORIAL MUSEUM, A CASE STUDY

Jan Assman discusses “[c]ultural memory” as a form of collective memory, in the sense that it is shared by a number of people and that it conveys to these people a collective, that is, cultural, identity.”⁹⁰ In Assman’s view, to be successful, a memorial must call to the viewers’ mind some element of the cultural narrative or identity. A memorial must evoke some awareness of a collective past through the object(s) memorialized. Yet, as I will argue in this chapter, it is not necessary for the memorial to offer a single, specific accounting of an event— nor would a monolithic historical narrative be desirable, or ideally effective.

If one is to follow Assman’s formula, the only condition for memorialization is the prompting of public awareness. Memorials are often sites of controversy and conflict; as such, it may be difficult to determine which narrative is “correct,” and the predominance of a singular narrative may preclude some viewers’ identification with the scenario presented in the site. I will theorize this notion of identification as I proceed, but at the very least it refers to a kind of connection a memorial attempts to establish between

⁹⁰ Jan Assman. *Cultural Memory Studies. An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook*. (Berlin, New York 2008), 109-118.

the viewer and that which it seeks to memorialize. I will refer to this as memorial identification, and how it can be created in a variety of ways. This connection could be empathetic⁹¹, meaning the viewer identifies with the memorial from a first-person point-of-view through the experiences of another. As John Gibson writes: “Empathy makes possible an especially intimate and powerful form of *identification*. It underwrites our capacity to feel not *just* for another but *as* another. To this extent, empathy has as its goal the overstepping, in emotion, of the space that runs between oneself and another.”⁹²

Therefore, in the case of memorials, this empathetic identification could help the viewer feel as if she had a personal connection to the memorialized historical events when no direct connection actually exists. For example, when looking at a memorial that lists the names of the victims, she, the viewer, can look at these names and try to understand what it would feel like to be a parent of one of the deceased. Through this imaginative process, she can attempt to understand how this parent feels and through this, identify with the parent. In this fictional scene I am weaving, the memorial encourages a variety of emotional and philosophical reactions. By feeling “as and because”⁹³ of the parent’s feelings, the viewer now identifies with the memorialized object through this empathetic connection. Or this identification could be more sympathetic than empathic in nature, meaning it is created through a third-person understanding of what happened to someone else instead of a first-person experience, as and because of, the other’s experience.

⁹¹ Empathy comes from the term *Einfühlung* that was coined in the 18th century by Robert Vischer and was first applied to understand how a person can respond to a work of art. Some may claim that we cannot empathize with a memorial because it is an object; however, memorials are objects that are often created to excite thought and feelings in viewers.

⁹² John Gibson. “Empathy.” *The Routledge Companion to Philosophy of Literature*. edited by Noël Carroll and John Gibson. (London: Routledge, 2015), 234.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, 236.

Sympathy is typically thought to be experienced as an “affective verdict” which is why sympathy often takes the form of pity. Sympathy is created when the viewer’s “affective verdict” tries to produce a response to another’s experience. Take the same viewer and mourning parent as above, but instead of trying to experience the memorial as the parent, she looks at the parent’s suffering and feels pity for the parent, in this way maintaining a sense of difference from the experience of the parent and herself. For example, the viewer sees a mother weeping at a memorial dedicated to children who were killed in a mass shooting, one of the children was her own. The viewer looks at the grieving mother and feels sorry for her suffering, yet the viewer does not feel the grief herself as a first-person experience, but she makes an “affective judgment” about what the mother is feeling and she pities her. This third-person experience is sympathy. This pity is a judgement and it is through this affective concern for the parent’s suffering, and not her own feeling of suffering, that the viewer connects to the memorialized object.

Further, this identification can also be imaginative in nature. In this type of identification, the viewer tries to understand the memorialized historical events by imagining herself as them, or in them. Finally, this identification can be philosophical in nature; this is created through the viewer’s attempt to understand the memorialized historical events by thinking, attempting to think, and ultimately understand a perspective other than one’s own. It focuses on a lesson learned and shows no real, if any, interest in an emotional identification of the offered narrative. This philosophical identification can be on a political, historical, or even moral level. Regardless of how this identification is created, it is through this memorial identification that the work turns the memorialized

events into objects of concern for the viewer and creates a connection between the memorialized events and the viewer. I have just listed four possible types of identification but there can be, and probably must be, more theories of identification, and of course the complexity of different sites will create a variety of these identifications. I highlight these devices only to the extent it can help one understand memorials better.

A memorial may present the narrative as the historical truth, or the “official version,” and in many viewers’ eyes, this then becomes the full reality of the events. Thus, for maximum complexity and impact, memorials that foster a multiplicity of viewpoints, inviting viewers to engage actively with what is presented and draw their own conclusions, are the most effective. They provide an occasion for a rich kind of affective and cognitive experience. However, there may be memorials that strive for simplicity, and this is perfectly acceptable, but most works are more philosophical. It asks the viewer to see something as a problem, and while it may not try to offer an answer, it raises a larger question: how could this happen? At the same time, in most cases, a memorial does not give the viewer complete freedom in creating the narrative. One would not want to go to a Holocaust memorial and see no mention of the genocide attempted by the Nazi Party. I am going to examine memorials that negotiate and attempt to navigate these various concerns. So how does a memorial find this balance, and what other factors contribute to the success or failure of the work?⁹⁴ This chapter offers a guide for judging a memorial and applies these principle to specific memorials. Each one I study, I take to be exemplary examples of this phenomenon.

⁹⁴ See list of possible roles/functions of a memorial in Chapter 1.

Narratives v. Interpretations

This section will focus on the three National 9/11 Memorials⁹⁵ and determine whether they are effective as memorials, including examining the narratives they provide. These memorials have all become specific, sacred places in the eyes of those who visit them and in the eyes of the nation. What was once a basically ‘no-name’ place in Pennsylvania now carries major significance, and the World Trade Center in New York City has become the site of a national disaster and no longer stands unrelated to the rich history of the area. As such, they are not only helping to shape the identity of the nation, but they offer an accounting of the events they memorialize; an account that is beginning to be read as a historical truth of the events regardless of other, conflicting information. Yet, this is not to say that a memorial should in no way attempt to offer a narrative, there must be something that connects the viewer to the objects memorialized. How is this fine balance achieved? Is it fair to expect this of every memorial? My answer is yes because it is precisely this relationship between the memorial and the memorialized historical events that separates memorials from other works of public art. To be a successful memorial, the work must produce a connection in the viewer between the work and the historical events it memorializes.

Much like Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimlett explored the essential elements and functions of a museum⁹⁶, this chapter attempts to explore these ideas as relating them to

⁹⁵The World Trade Center 9/11 Memorial and Museum, The Pentagon 9/11 Memorial, and the Flight 93 Memorial in Shanksville, Pennsylvania

⁹⁶ Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimlett, *Destination Culture*. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998). Here she explores the value of exhibiting objects in situ versus in context; how/if an object should be textualized; what is more important: the artifact or the text; and the main role of the museum: to display or to educate. Also examined are the limitations/freedoms of exhibiting humans (zoological versus theatrical) and how museums became substitutes for theaters.

memorials, and then establish a method of critiquing memorials, and then applies this standard to the three National 9/11 Memorials and the 9/11 Memorial Museum. I will be examining these memorials and determining their level of effectiveness in three ways. First, I will look at the original intentions and goals of the designers and planners of the memorials and see whether the works, in fact, uphold these standards and accomplish the goal(s) it was designed to achieve. Second, I will explore whether, and in what ways, the memorial creates a referential relationship between the viewer and the memorialized historical events; a necessary condition for a work to be a memorial. Last, I will explore the narrative the memorial extends to the viewers. The success of this narrative will be determined by its balance between providing essential historical information and creating a framework that creates a somewhat open and flexible interpretation or experience. As stated previously, my contention is that a memorial should not offer only one interpretation of an event; to do so is to overly control the message of the memorial and the potential this single narrative will become accepted as fact. A successful memorial narrative should be one that offers a framework of information on the memorialized historical events, but does so in a way that offers the viewer the flexibility to see different perspectives of the memorialized historical events and to experience or acknowledge the conflicts that normally surround a memorial while still understanding the essential elements of the narrative.

Michael Sorkin asserts that “every memorial invents the event it recalls.”⁹⁷ In some ways this claim is true. A viewer usually turns to a memorial as a dependable

⁹⁷ Michael Sorkin. *Starting from Zero: Reconstruction Downtown New York*. (New York: Routledge, 2003), 68.

source of both memorialization and historical accuracy and as such, a memorial can invent or reinvent actual events. A memorial is often the only way some viewers will ever experience any part of the memorialized historical events. For example, I have no recollection or association of any person who perished in the Vietnam War, but when I visit the Vietnam Veterans Memorial in Washington D.C., I become aware of those who are memorialized there. As mentioned previously, the memorial triggers the historical consciousness that I have and brings this awareness to my attention. This historical consciousness varies from person to person, but it is the memorial that triggers it, bringing the information to the forefront of the viewer's awareness. In this way, the awareness is created, or invented, by the memorial itself, so accordingly, Sorkin's claim is true. However, this power of triggering and invention is something memorial designers need to be aware of and the reason that memorials should offer more than one narrative.

In conclusion, the three main questions that determine a memorial's success are, first, does the memorial fulfill the original intentions and goals of the designers and planners; does it uphold these standards and accomplish the goal(s) it was designed to achieve? Second, and most importantly as this is the only necessary condition of successful memorials, does the memorial create a referential relationship between the viewer and the memorialized historical events? Can the viewer identify with the memorialized historical events in some way? Finally, what narrative does the memorial extend to the viewers? Is it sufficient to foster the referential relationship without being too controlling and limiting in its scope while also providing the necessary framework for the viewer to understand the epistemic nature of the work?

Application of the standards: An Analysis

The National 9/11 Memorial located in New York City, New York, is most likely what most people envision when discussing 9/11 memorials; but, before the memorial can be discussed, we must make clear what actually is the memorial. Unlike the other two locations, the World Trade Center (WTC) site originally consisted of sixteen acres of land and included the damage done to a large number of neighboring buildings. When a memorial was first discussed, many people wanted the entire site to be memorialized; however, as time passed, the size of the memorial grew smaller and smaller until the main desire was to preserve the footprints of the Towers (ironically enough the footprints had already been cleared away). As Sorkin noted in August 2002, almost all plans for the entire site to be a memorial were gone, “As of now, the ‘footprints’ of the Towers have come to serve as a metonymic representation of the larger space of this tragic event.”⁹⁸

⁹⁸ Sorkin, *Starting from Zero*, 67.

The NYC 9/11 site now largely consists of the lofty Freedom Tower, designed by Daniel Libeskin, Reflecting Absence, designed by Michael Arad and Peter Walker, and the 9/11 Memorial Museum. But what is considered the official memorial? Most people agree that Freedom Tower, while a significant sight, is not part of the Memorial. Arad's Reflecting Absence is what most people think of when discussing the memorial and what appears on the downloadable application published by the 9/11 Memorial. However, since its opening in May 2014, many also consider the 9/11 Memorial Museum to be a part of the Memorial. It is located between the two pools of Reflecting Absence and the visitor must walk through at least half of the park and pass one pool to get to the museum's entrance. This makes the visitor feel as if she is not actually entering a different location but more just an extension of the Memorial. While the memorial park containing Reflecting Absence is free and open to the public, the museum has a controlled entrance, charges an admission fee, and visitor's must walk through security to enter the museum. However, these additions still are not enough to make it feel like a separate entity. This examination will first look at Reflecting Absence as the memorial alone but will then examine the museum as an additional, but not required, aspect of the Memorial.

The official 9/11 Memorial, Reflecting Absence, was designed by Michael Arad who added landscape architect Peter Walker to design the park-space. Reflecting Absence consists of two large waterfalls that stand where the original footprints of the Twin Towers once were. Again, these are not the original footprints that were left from the Towers, those had been removed as part of the process of clearing Ground Zero. The

waterfalls, which are the two largest manmade waterfalls in North America, drain into a central void that seems bottomless. This is intended to represent the continuing absence of those who perished. The pools are surrounded by a metal frame that contains the names of all of those who perished in the events of 9/11, not just those who died in NYC, and also the names of the six individuals who were killed in the 1993 bombing of the WTC. The memorial opened September 11, 2011.

After Daniel Libeskind won the original design competition focusing on Freedom Tower, a second completion was held to decide what to do with the remaining acres. The winning memorial design was chosen from over five thousand entries representing forty-nine states and sixty-three different countries.⁹⁹ A thirteen member jury, which included artists, architects, prominent arts and cultural professionals, 9/11 victims' family members, a resident and business owner from lower Manhattan, and representatives from

⁹⁹ Blais, *A Place of Remembrance: Official Book of the National September 11 Memorial*, 135-137.

both the Governor's and Mayor's offices, chose Michael Arad's Reflecting Absence with ten out of thirteen votes. It was always intended that a museum be a part of the site, but the plans for the museum were a separate project. Arad's explains his intentions for the memorial thusly:

I have a sense of hope looking forward that this memorial will be successful in creating this quiet, reverent place of contemplation that allows people to gather and find communication with each other. The site is so powerful that we need to do very little. It would be very easy to bring something to this design that would completely upset the balance of this place and focus attention on whatever we think right now is the most important thing. For me, the goal in the design has always been to remove all of the excess, to remove all of the distracting details, and to really bring the site to its essence, to its core.¹⁰⁰

Arad was able to achieve this by creating a space that is very basic in its design. The memorial consists of the two large pools surrounded by the names of the victims and little else. There are no exhibition panels like at the Flight 93 Memorial that tells the visitor about the events of the day. There is an information booth where visitors may pick up a pamphlet to read about the events of 9/11, and there is also an app that visitors may download which gives options to search for names, listen to stories, search cobblestones, and to learn more about the memorial. Yet, these things are not distracting and are optional to the visitor and not part of Arad's design. In fact, Arad's design was at first seen as too basic and it was only after it was recommended to him by the jurors that he added Peter Walker to the design team and the park-like atmosphere that we see now was created.

¹⁰⁰Michael Arad, designer of the 9/11 Memorial

Reflecting Absence achieves the designer's intentions because it offers visitors both a place of quiet reflection and a space to gather and collectively commemorate. When the visitor walks up to the pools and reads the names of the victims, the sounds of the waterfalls drown out all other noises. The visitor is no longer aware of the sounds of Lower Manhattan and becomes only aware of the memorial itself. Because of this, the visitor can quietly reflect and contemplate the meaning of the memorial. However,

unlike the Flight 93 Memorial, the NYC memorial is also successful in creating a space where people can gather and communicate with one another. This is available through the park-like atmosphere that surrounds the two pools. Here square benches are available for visitors to sit on. The design of these benches seems to encourage conversation. There is easily enough room for four adults to sit on each bench, but they do not all sit in a row facing outwards. The design makes it so people can easily face one another and

carry on a conversation. The area is also full of grassy green patches (which visitors are not allowed to walk on) and is full of trees which offer shade. The openness and ease of accessing these benches makes the location ideal for communication and further achieves the designers' goal.

The official Mission of the memorial, as stated on both its webpage and in the pamphlet available to visitors, has four goals. First to “remember and honor the thousands of innocent men, women, and children murdered by terrorists in the horrific attacks of February 26, 1993 and September 11, 2001.”¹⁰¹ Second, the mission asks others to “respect this place made sacred through tragic loss.”¹⁰² Third, to “recognize the endurance of those who survived, the courage of those who risked their lives to save others, and the compassion of all who supported us in our darkest hours.”¹⁰³ An finally, “may the lives remembered, the deeds recognized, and the spirit reawakened be eternal beacons, which reaffirm respect for life, strengthen our resolve to preserve freedom, and inspire an end to hatred, ignorance and intolerance.”¹⁰⁴ The memorial does achieve all four of the goals in the mission statement; however, the third and fourth goals are more clearly carried out with the addition of the Memorial Museum. The only real recognition of endurance and survival that is recognized in the outside portion of the memorial is through the celebration of the Survivor Tree. The Survivor Tree is a Callery Pear tree that was part of the landscape of the original World Trade Center and stood on the east

¹⁰¹ 9/11 Memorial. “[about:Mission](#)” National September Memorial and Museum, 2015. [911memorial.org](#).

¹⁰² Ibid.

¹⁰³ Ibid.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid.

side of the site between WTC 4 and WTC 5.¹⁰⁵ After 9/11, the tree was discovered during the cleanup process. It was badly damaged but still alive. Rebecca Clough¹⁰⁶ started the campaign to save the tree after seeing how it “bolstered the spirits of her fellow recovery workers.”¹⁰⁷ It was transported to the Arthur Ross Nursery in the Bronx. Here, the NYC Department of Parks & Recreation worked to keep the tree alive and eventually nursed it back to health.¹⁰⁸ This tree was not intended by Arad or Walker to become a part of the memorial itself; the original plans included oak trees that came from locations near the three attacks and did not include the Survivor

Tree.¹⁰⁹ As the lore of the tree became more well known, Ronaldo Vega continued the campaign for returning the tree to the WTC complex.¹¹⁰ After various turbulent events, the Survivor Tree returned to the site in December 2010 with a public ceremony where New York City Mayor Michael R. Bloomberg commented on the tree’s survival and how

¹⁰⁵ Allie Skayne. *The Survivor Tree: A Story of Hope and Healing*. 9/11 Memorial: National September 11 Memorial and Museum. ND, 6.

¹⁰⁶ Clough was an employee of the New York City Department of Design and Construction and was working at Ground Zero as part of the recovery effort.

¹⁰⁷ Skayne, *The Survivor Tree: A Story of Hope and Healing*, 11.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., 11.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., 12.

¹¹⁰ Ibid., 13.

its story inspired so many people. The public embraced the lore surrounding the tree and made it into a spontaneous memorial.¹¹¹ Visitors would leave mementos around the tree and would tie ribbons on the tree. By 2015, the legend of the tree had grown to the point where it is now prominently displayed on magnets, greeting cards, T-shirts and there is a book that can be purchased at the Museum Gift shop titled: *The Survivor Tree: A Story of Hope and Healing*. A more thorough analysis of the narrative provided through The Survivor Tree will be examined later in this chapter. For the purposes of fulfilling the official mission of the memorial, the tree adds to the memorial's effectiveness by celebrating surviving the disaster and the tree also serves as an example of endurance. One survivor stated the tree "was emblematic of endurance and that, 'it's important that we all remember our innate capabilities to preserve in the face of terror.'"¹¹²

The larger memorial also achieves the second aspect of success; it clearly establishes a referential relationship between those who come to view the work and the memorialized historical events. While one entering into the park-like space may not at first realize she has actually entered into a memorial, she will become instantly aware of this fact upon seeing the two large waterfalls in the footprints of the Towers and seeing the names of the victims carved into the panels surrounding each pool. These names seems to stand as a type of tombstone for each victim and helps create a sympathetic identification between the viewer and those who lost a loved one. The names surrounding the pools only add to the knowledge that this is something other than a

¹¹¹ See Chapter One for full definition and classification of a spontaneous memorial.

¹¹²Keating Crown as quoted in Skayne pg. 22. Escaped from the 100th floor of the South Tower on 9/11.

public park. The viewer becomes aware of the memorialized historical events without ever having a personal connection to them. The marked presence of absence in the space also makes the viewer question what was once there and helps foster a cognitive identification. When I stood in front of these pools, I wanted to know more about what was once there and how it came to be absent. This awareness is only intensified if the viewer also enters into the Memorial Museum.

The names of the victims are the only text of Reflecting Absence and because of this, here, more so than any of the other memorials, the listing of the names creates a narrative. The viewer is only given the text of the victims' names and is reminded of the loss of life and not the events that possibly lead to the attack or to the men that carried out the act. We are reminded of what Doss asserts about this, "when names are a memorial's only script, standing alone without benefit of plot or moral, they can be reduced to a deceitful narrative of national consensus."¹¹³ This narrative is based only on an incomplete accounting of the events; any representation of these evildoers is left out of or completely downplayed in the memorial. Doss states "the absence of historical referents to the perpetrators of terrorism helps shroud these memorials; by effacing the agents of terror, terrorism memorials

¹¹³ Doss, *Memorial Mania*, 152.

efface their intentions and encourage a blurring, or evasion, of causality.”¹¹⁴

However, this is only one narrative offered by Ground Zero. As Marita Sturken maintains, “the narratives that have been layered on Ground Zero reveal the complex convergence of political agendas and grief in this space, as if, somehow, the production of new spatial meanings will provide a means to contain the past, maintenance the grief, and make sense of the violent events that took place there.”¹¹⁵ While the above narrative offers an accounting of the victims of the event, others are directed to concerns of healing for both individuals and the nation.

Memorials can also offer the public a unique opportunity to feel as if they have become involved in the healing process. “Specifically, memorialization, like public apology, does this by providing a type of symbolic engagement with the past, importantly but not exclusively in order to repair the harm that was done,”¹¹⁶ writes Blustein. After the fall of the Twin Towers, Ground Zero was converted into a sacred space and many felt they had the right to control what was done with this locality. Sturken writes “In some ways, immediate discussion of a memorial allowed people to begin to construct narratives of redemption and to feel as if the horrid event itself was over—containable, already a memory.”¹¹⁷ Planning for a memorial began immediately and an international competition received over 5,000 entries with ideas of what should be done to the sixteen

¹¹⁴ Ibid., 141.

¹¹⁵ Sturken, “The Aesthetics of Absence: Rebuilding Ground Zero,” 312.

¹¹⁶ Jeffery M. Blustein. *Forgiveness and Remembrance: Remembering Wrongdoing in Personal and Public Life*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 229.

¹¹⁷ Sturken, “The Aesthetics of Absence: Rebuilding Ground Zero,” 321.

acres. The LMDC¹¹⁸ held a “Listening to the City” forum where over 5,000 people participated. Additionally the LMDC conducted over 200 town meetings to give the public the opportunity to weigh in and become involved with the planned memorialization. The community’s involvement in the memorialization offered many a chance to feel as if they had become a part of the process and gave them an outlet to deal with private loss as a part of a greater community dealing with a public tragedy.

This narrative, however, is not directly evident to all visitors. There are no plaques or signage explaining the community’s involvement in the design process. There is one brief mention of the design competition in the pamphlet visitors may obtain at the memorial. This narrative is more for those individuals who participated in the process and for those who have direct knowledge of these events; almost making this aspect of the memorial more on point with a private memorial than a public one.¹¹⁹ Yet, it is included as a narrative because it encompasses such a large number of individuals and is more fully developed by the Memorial Museum.

The Survivor Tree also offers an additional narrative of the events surrounding 9/11; however, this narrative pulls the focus away from the fallen victims and instead looks to those who survived the event. The classification of who survived is not just limited to the people and first responders who escaped the Towers’ collapse but to the entire city of New York, the United States and possibly the world. A brief history of the tree is given above, but what is important here is how the public narrative surrounding the

¹¹⁸ Lower Manhattan Development Corporation- established to coordinate the rebuilding

¹¹⁹ For more on this distinction see definitions in Chapter One.

tree has changed over the few years the memorial has been open to the public. Upon my visit in 2013, I observed the tree and was made aware of its significance because of the small fence surrounding it and the items left at the base of the tree. In the pamphlet offered at the site, there is a small image of the tree and a total of nine sentences explaining the significance of the tree. The only mention of the tree's connection to endurance is "standing just west of the south pool, it embodies the story of survival and resilience that is so important to the history of 9/11."¹²⁰ Upon my return visit in May of 2015, The Survivor Tree had grown in both size and significance. As more people learned of the story of the tree, its popularity grew and it became a symbol of hope and survival. This theme was picked up by those who run the 9/11 Memorial and Museum and The Survivor Tree is now at the center of a dominant narrative offered by the site. As Skayne notes, this accounting is one of "resilience and renewal, an emblem of rebirth at the World Trade Center site."¹²¹ In May of 2011, before the memorial officially opened, President Obama placed a wreath at the Survivor Tree,¹²² and after the memorial opened on September 12, 2011, survivors tied blue ribbons to the tree and the public began to leave tributes ranging from flowers to badges. This narrative is also carried further when the viewer visits the 9/11 Gift shop and comes into contact with the many items celebrating the Survivor Tree and offering its story. The book *The Survivor Tree: A Story of Hope and Healing* claims to tell the history of the tree but it is a propagandistic work that links the role of the United States to the resilience of the tree. While this

¹²⁰ *9/11 Memorial Guide*. Pamphlet. Pitney Bowes, ND, obtained at the 9/11 site in 2013.

¹²¹ Skayne, *The Survivor Tree: A Story of Hope and Healing*, 24.

¹²² *The Survivor Tree* makes it a prominent point to state that this event occurred after Osama bin Laden was killed by U.S. troops thereby linking the tree to efforts to avenge 9/11.

storyline seems like the plot of a children's book, the book is in fact intended for a more mature audience, and is full of color photographs and not childlike illustrations. The text of the book includes a paragraph that references the desperate search for survivors and the bleak reality that only eighteen were found and how hope was finally given up that any more would be discovered. Then, in the next paragraph the tree is found, badly hurt and scarred, but still alive. This language likens the tree to the human survivors and offers the tree as a substitute for those who were never saved. The tree's journey of healing and then returning to the WTC site becomes emblematic of those who did not survive. The tree is referred to as "the ultimate symbol of survival and recovery"¹²³ and throughout the text it is constantly celebrated for surviving every hardship it has encountered from 9/11, to uneven distribution of regrowth (caused because it was planted too close to an adjacent fence) to weathering a storm. The tree is heralded for surmounting these obstacles and returning to its rightful place at the World Trade Center. This narrative creates a type of connection from the old WTC that was destroyed to the new WTC and fosters a narrative of survivorship. By focusing on the tree, and not the victims, visitors can believe everything was not lost, destroyed by the terrorists, and there is some positive outcome from the events of 9/11. *The Survivor Tree* concludes by claiming that as the tree blooms each spring, as it did at the original WTC, it "bears witness to the possibility of renewal and serves as a living reminder of our shared strength in the face of even the most unimaginable tragedy."¹²⁴ Through the narrative the tree offers, the United States is not a victim but a survivor. Much like the narrative

¹²³Skayne, *The Survivor Tree: A Story of Hope and Healing*, 29.

¹²⁴ Ibid., 32.

offered by the Flight 93 Memorial, the legend of the Survivor Tree tries to create a narrative that casts the United States not as helpless victim, but active agent. This narrative is not as controlling as the one offered by the Flight 93 Memorial because it is one of many narratives offered by the WTC Memorial. If it were the only one proffered by the memorial, then it would be deemed unsuccessful because of its attempt to control the narrative; however, with the multiple narrations provided, it is not seen as representing the only version of the historical realities surrounding 9/11.

The opening of The National September 11 Memorial Museum on May 21, 2014, further added to the narrative, and this section will explore the museum as an extension of the 9/11 Memorial and will focus on the narrative created by the museum. The mission statement of the Memorial Museum is to:

bear solemn witness to the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 and February 26, 1993. The Museum honors the nearly 3,000 victims of these attacks and all those who risked their lives to save others. It further recognizes the thousands who survived and all who demonstrated extraordinary compassion in the aftermath. Demonstrating the consequences of terrorism on individual lives and its impact on communities at the local, national, and international levels, the Museum attests to the triumph of human dignity over human depravity and affirms an unwavering commitment to the fundamental value of human life.¹²⁵

The Memorial Museum achieves the goals of its mission statement thus fulfilling the first aspect of success. The museum is loaded with images, artifacts, and exhibits that help accomplish this mission. Some examples of this are: the Reflecting on 9/11 exhibition and accompanying Recording Studio where visitors can go and record their own recollections of the day/events, making the visitor an active part of the museum; *Rebirth at Ground Zero*, an eleven minute time-lapsed film that focuses on the reconstruction of Ground Zero; and the large art piece titled *Trying to Remember the Color of the Sky in That September Morning*,¹²⁶ created by Spencer Finch, which prominently displays the quote “No day shall erase you from the memory of time” from Virgil’s *The Aeneid*, Canto IX, verse 447. The Memorial Museum also achieves the second aspect of success because the entire museum, and almost everything within it, establishes a referential relationship between the visitor and the memorialized historical events creating memorialization awareness in the viewer.

¹²⁵ 911memorial.org “The Memorial Museum Mission” also printed on the museum map as the Welcome

¹²⁶ Spencer Finch. *Trying to Remember the Color of the Sky on That September Morning*. 2,983 Watercolor on Paper, 2014.

What is most important about the museum though is how it attempts to control the narrative surrounding 9/11. When linked to Reflecting Absence, a clear, focused narrative develops and holds itself as the historical accounting of the events surrounding 9/11. However, the sheer size of the museum, the many displays, artifacts, and the potential freedom a visitor has in viewing these objects, all simultaneously offer a variety of narratives that are linked by the common core of the mission statement. So, in some ways the museum controls the narrative too much; yet, it still has the potential to offer a variety of perspectives. There are many factors that add to these narratives; the following is an accounting of some of them.

Admission to the museum costs twenty-four dollars for adults and for an additional twenty dollars, visitors can take an hour long guided tour through the museum. I decided to do this as part of my first experience of the museum. The tour follows the same entry path that all visitors must take to get to the main floor of the museum itself so for this section the narrative is basically the same for all visitors regardless if they take the guided tour or not. After visitors have paid their admission fee and pass through security, they descend one level and proceed to the concourse lobby where they meet the tour guide. Visitors are first warned that some of the exhibits may contain disturbing and graphic content. Then they begin their journey to the main museum area, or the Exhibitions and Education level, as the museum map refers to it. As visitors walk through the introductory exhibits they first encounter a large photograph showing the skyline of NYC complete with the Twin Towers. This is one of the last known photographs showing the Towers, and it was taken on the morning of September 11,

2001. This image reminds the viewer of what once was there before the attacks, and what was lost as a result of the terrorists' actions.

Next, there is a large map that shows the flightpaths of all four planes and their eventual destinations. The first exhibit visitors walk through is called "We Remember" and is a sound scape. Here visitors listen to different

people from all over the world discuss their recollections and reactions during the attacks and directly after. These voices create a connection between the viewers by playing on their emotions. For those who lived through the attack, it forces them to reflect on where they were and how they felt at the time and brings back the turbulent emotions of the day.

Some of the messages are also projected onto panels the visitors walk around so they become completely immersed in the exhibit. As the visitor proceeds from "We Remember," she comes to an overlook that offers a view of the slurry wall on the left and looks out over the Last Column. The walk from the beginning of the exhibit to this location is very important because it literally takes the visitor through the events of the day: first to what was once there, to experiencing how it was lost, to seeing what remains. Due to this transition, the visitor is actually aware of the results of the terrorists' efforts and is emotionally connected to the events.

At this point in the guided tour, as we stood looking at the Slurry Wall and down at the Last Column, our guide took the time to make many claims about the authenticity of the museum and the items within it. I was very curious as to why these claims had to be made over and over; it was as if he was assuring the visitors that everything they were about to see and hear was the absolute truth of the events. We then proceeded down the slope. Projected on either side of us were images of the homemade signs of the lost that covered lower Manhattan directly after the Towers' collapse. These images shift and the guide asserted that they changed from missing persons' posters into individual memorials once it was clear no more survivors would be found. Looking at the faces of those who we, the tourists, knew had perished, and knowing someone was desperately searching for them, made us again aware of what was lost that day.

We then proceeded to the final staircase that leads to the main exhibit floor. Here we saw the “Survivor Stairs”, a staircase that was blocked from damage and where thousands of people were able to flee from the Towers. The stairs we walked down ran parallel to the Survivor Stairs, almost as if we were also fleeing to safety. The guide did highlight how this event was also one of the most successful evacuations in history, a fact that is often overshadowed by focusing on the lives that were lost.

The Exhibition and Education level is the main floor of the museum. Here visitors may wander around various exhibits and artifacts that are placed around the North and South Tower pools that extend down into the museum, always making the visitor aware of the pools’ presence, and thereby aware that this is where each Tower once stood. Beneath each Tower are separate exhibits that visitors may choose to enter on their own; they are not part of the guided tour. These will be discussed in detail in the upcoming paragraphs.

The guided tour then continued to a large piece of the antenna that had once crowned the North Tower. Here we were told the story of how this antenna continued to broadcast until the Tower collapsed. The reason this was possible was because the six workers who were broadcasting were on the 106th floor when Flight 11 struck the building. These individuals knew they could not escape the building so they all remained at their workstations and continued to broadcast. All six people

perished when the Tower fell. The story transforms this piece of metal into a reminder of these six specific people who perished and connects the listener emotionally to the piece. However, what is interesting is there is no depiction of these individuals and no listing of their names so the viewer is informed about them but never knows who they individually were; they are massed into a group of victims to be honored for their bravery.

The tour then moves on to view a firetruck that was parked in front of the WTC. The front of the truck has been smashed, and from certain angles it is almost unrecognizable as a firetruck. The guide then informs us of the story about the firefighters who were "riding heavy" to get to WTC site.

“Riding heavy” means they had more firefighters in the truck than they normally would so that as many first responders as possible (eleven members that day) could get to the site as quickly as possible. All eleven firefighters perished. We also learned about the captain’s “lucky helmet” that had always kept

him safe; he was not wearing it on September 11, 2001 because it had been sent out for repairs. The helmet is now in a glass case displayed by the fire engine. This story again makes the horrors of the day more real to the listener because you feel in a way that you have come to know these firefighters and you feel their loss more profoundly; yet, except for the captain, we never learn their names. Three months after taking this tour, as I write this, I do not remember the individual captain’s name, but I do recall the story and the feeling of loss I experienced at the time.

Our tour then traveled into an area that focused on the rescue effort, the recovery from the event, and the eventual clean up of the site. I found it very interesting that in this section there is a large metal column from the South Tower that visitors are allowed to touch. Right next to this bent and twisted column there is an interactive exhibit where

visitors can write a message onto a screen and it will be projected, for a short time, onto the Slurry Wall. At this point in the tour we were encouraged to touch the fallen beam and were also told how the slurry wall stood strong during the fall of the Towers and even after, thereby protecting lower Manhattan from flooding. By touching this beam and “writing” on the wall, visitors become actively engaged in the recovery efforts and can literally see and feel themselves as a part of the strength of the wall.

One of the last objects we considered was core column 1001B, The Last Column; this was the final object removed from Ground Zero. It is a core column of the South Tower and was still connected to the bedrock. The recovery and clean up workers admired it for its strength and resilience. After the remains of missing members from FDNY Squad 41 were found nearby, a squad member wrote “SQ 41” on the column.¹²⁷ Many of the other workers wrote messages on the column and left tokens and pictures of lost loved ones. At the end of the cleanup process, it was cut down and a funeral procession was held as it

¹²⁷ *Building History: Archaeology and Architecture*. Audio Tour provided by 9/11 Memorial Museum. Produced by Acoustiguide.

was removed, including bagpipers, and full military honors. The Last Column seemed to stand in place of the thousands of bodies that would never be recovered from Ground Zero. Our tour guide told us this column represented the "Best of humanity." Mark Wagner, an architect, who after 9/11 was one of several people asked to help identify key pieces of the original World Trade Center says the Last Column has "become a symbol of hope and perseverance, as well as a tribute to those killed in the attacks."¹²⁸

From here we went to a display case which showed the "Worst of humanity." The objects within the case focused on the hunt for Osama bin Laden including a shirt worn by a SEAL Team member. As we looked at the case our guide told us of the story of bin Laden's discovery and eventual death at the hands of the American forces. This final part of the tour leaves the viewer feeling as if justice has been served, at least in some way, and that those responsible for the attacks have been punished by the United States. Yet, the nineteen men that carried out the hijackings are not mentioned anywhere in the tour or in this display.

Overall the tour carries out the intentions of the museum especially in its desire to show "the triumph of human dignity over human depravity and affirms an unwavering commitment to the fundamental value of human life."¹²⁹ Throughout the tour we heard

¹²⁸ Ibid.

¹²⁹ Ibid., 911memorial.org.

many stories that celebrated both those who survived and those who perished. The tour definitely has a direct relationship to the objects memorialized because that is the purpose of the tour, to educate visitors about the memorialized historic events, for this reason the tour was also successful in the second aspect. As I experienced and later reflected on the tour, I identified with the memorial on many levels; I imagined what it must have been like to be in New York City that day; I sympathized with the families searching for their missing loved ones; I empathized with those same individuals as the missing posters went from search tools to memorials; and I learned about and understood the events of 9/11 in a new way. The tour was a little less effective in relation to controlling the narrative; however, this is also expected from the nature of the tour. A visitor should expect a tour to offer a more controlled narrative of the objects memorialized, and that is true for this tour. While the tour guide related tales and facts to us, there was definitely an overarching narrative of honoring the individuals and the United States for their heroic acts. As with many memorials, the larger political issues were ignored, including mentioning of the hijackers, in favor of a controlled narrative. For these reasons alone, the tour offers an accounting that is fragmentary and incomplete. However, this should not be surprising based on the nature/goal of a guided tour. If visitors continue through the museum and interact with the other exhibitions and artifacts, the controlling force of the tour lessens and visitors are offered various additional narratives. I would only deem this aspect completely unsuccessful if the visitor came into the museum, went on the guided tour, and immediately left without interacting with any other exhibit, display or artifact, a scenario that is highly unlikely due to the design of the museum.

This assessment is also true of the other tour options offered by the museum. While each of the offered tours control the narrative in various ways, each additionally provides visitors the freedom to explore the museum in whatever order they prefer, and there is no commentating during either of the major exhibitions. Besides the discussed guided tour, the museum offers two other tour options: suggested pathways, and audio tours. The first can be accessed and printed from the official webpage, and the second can be heard from personal cellphones or by handheld devices available at the Information Desk. The audio tours are mentioned on the museum map; however, there is no mention of the suggested pathways,¹³⁰ visitors must discover these on their own when planning their visit.

The Suggested Pathways are found online under the “Visit the Museum” tab. When the viewer clicks on “Tours,” all of the available tour options appear. The viewer can book her guided tour, see where to access the downloadable application to access the audio tours, and download a PDF of the Suggested Pathways. When the viewer chooses the Suggested Pathways option, it first recommends taking a guided tour or to use the audio tours. If the Suggested Pathways are still desired, there are three different options: two ninety minute tours, and one, one hundred-twenty minute tour. Each of these tours simply suggest how the visitor should navigate the museum and the approximate amount of time that should be spent at each stop. The tours’ only narrative that is given is a brief explanation of what each stop entails. For example, all three tours suggest the visitor “Visit *In Memorial*, a contemplative space that honors the 2,983 people killed in the

¹³⁰ 9/11 Memorial Museum Map. Bryan Christie Design, Brochure design by WeilCo. New York.

terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 and February 26, 1993.”¹³¹ It is recommended the visitor spend “about 15 minutes”¹³² viewing the exhibition, no other information is offered. These short descriptions are relatively the same for each suggested stop; they offer a general description, but no real narrative.

The main difference between the two ninety minute tours is one includes visiting the historical exhibition *September 11, 2001*, and the other does not. Instead it suggests visitors view the film *Rebirth at Ground Zero*, spend more time along the Tribute Walk, and watch more of the media installment *Reflecting on 9/11*. The one hundred-twenty minute tour includes the historical exhibit and watching both films. All three tours follow the same general pathway, and it is which exhibition the viewer chooses to see that changes the experience. The only suggestions for choosing a specific pathway are the time available and if the visitor is in a group or not; the ninety minute tour skipping the historical exhibition is recommended for groups, but there is no explanation of why this is so.

As mentioned above, these Suggested Pathways do not offer much commentary that attempts to control the narrative, and the route they suggest seems more to do with helping the visitor traverse the museum than with controlling the narrative. The only real way these appear to influence the narrative is by the suggested times for each stop. It could be inferred that stops with more time allowed are more important than others. For example, in the ninety minute tour, without the historical exhibition, visitors are encouraged to spend fifteen minutes in the *In Memoriam* exhibition, but only ten minutes

¹³¹ 9/11 Memorial. “Suggested Pathways download” 911memorial.org.

¹³² Ibid.

in Foundation Hall where many artifacts, including the Last Column and the Slurry Wall are displayed. This may lead the visitor to believe that the exhibition is more important than the artifacts located in Foundation Hall. Other than this possible inference, the Suggested Pathways seem to offer the visitor a tool that can help her navigate the museum within a specific, limited timeframe.

However, if the visitor chooses the audio tour option, the offered narrative becomes more controlling. These tours were produced by Acoustiguide and can be downloaded onto a personal device for free, or the visitor can rent a device at the Museum Information Desk. There are five tour options, including three main tours that are available in a variety of languages. There is also a tour in American Sign Language for the hearing impaired, and an audio description tour for the seeing impaired. If the listener downloads the app, she does not have to be on location to listen to the tours; in fact, I listened to all three from my home after I had returned from my visit to the museum. Each tour is presented in a series of stops; the visitor can choose to follow the stops in the suggested order, or they can select their own path. Additional features of each stop include a link to a map so the visitor knows she is in the correct location for the tour stop, and a transcript of the audio. All three tours have a main narrator and various interviews including survivors, victims' family members, first-responders, and architects. The three main tours are: *Witnessing History*, *Discovering History*, and *Building History*, each focusing on presenting the museum from a different viewpoint. The Suggested Pathways download recommends listening to all three tours, but this seems like an unlikely scenario because some of the material is covered in all three. For example, all

three have a stop titled “The Last Column,” it seems doubtful the listener would stand in front of the Last Column and listen to all three tours discuss the same information.¹³³

The *Witnessing History* tour offers the most controlling narrative of the three tour options. This tour provides an overview of the events surrounding 9/11 and it is intended for a mature audience. It is narrated by Robert De Niro, an avid New Yorker, and includes many emotional first-hand accounts by those who were directly impacted by the day’s events. This tour creates an emotional connection with the viewer, and it is through this shared experience that it controls the narrative. The following will focus on just a few ways in which the tour does this.

From the very first tour stop, the audio creates a connection with the listener. De Niro introduces himself and tells the listener to find a comfortable place to sit or stand. Then background information on the events of 9/11 are given while low, slow music is played. This music helps to create a very somber atmosphere. De Niro then tells his personal story of the day, that he was a few blocks from the World Trade Center and he witnessed his “home, his city”¹³⁴ be attacked. He further claims that everyone’s sense of history changed, there was now “the time before 9/11 and the time after.”¹³⁵ This language creates a connection not only to De Niro and New York City, but leads the viewer to think of how her own life changed, making the events even more personal.

¹³³ I am currently trying to find out if these tours are tracked and which tour is the most popular. I would guess it is the *Witnessing History* tour.

¹³⁴ *Witnessing History*. Audio tour provided by 9/11 Memorial Museum. Produced by Acoustiguide.

¹³⁵ Ibid.

This emotional connection is furthered by the various interviews that are a part of almost every tour stop. For instance, when learning about the survivor stairs, Kayla Bergerson, director of media relations for the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey, tells her experience. She was working on the 68th floor of the North Tower when she was told to evacuate. She said she felt the South Tower collapse, and she feared they would be next. She recalls escaping down the Vesey stairs (now known as the Survivor Stairs) five minutes before the North Tower collapsed. Burgers concludes by stating, these “thirty-eight steps were the difference between life and death for so many people.”¹³⁶ This first-person account of survival makes the importance of the stairs seem more real, especially as the listener is looking at them. De Niro concludes this tour stop by again, creating a direct connection to the listener by stating, “these stairs remind us that we are all survivors, living in a world defined by the events of the unforgettable day.”¹³⁷

The tour has many accounts like the above example, but the most emotional ones are actually optional. When listeners arrive at the *In Memoriam* exhibition, De Niro explains what the exhibit is and gives some general facts about the victims; such as their age range (two and a half years to eighty-five) that the victims were from more than ninety nations and “were a cross section of humanity.”¹³⁸ Again, a personal connection is made with the listener when he asserts, “It could have been any of us. In that sense, this Museum is about all of us.”¹³⁹ At this point the listener is encouraged to experience the

¹³⁶ Ibid., tour stop 2: “Survivors’ Stairs.”

¹³⁷ Ibid.

¹³⁸ Ibid., tour stop 8 *In Memoriam*.

¹³⁹ Ibid.

exhibition. There are two optional remembrances the listener can hear. The first is of Lachanze Sapp-Gooding whose husband Calvin Gooding was a trader at Cantor Fitzgerald, and had an office on 104th floor of the North Tower. The listener is informed that Lachanze was eight months pregnant with their second child at the time of the attacks. The remembrance is about the last night she spent with her husband, and how he was comforting their fussy daughter. She recalls going to check on them and finding him asleep on the floor holding their daughter. The story concludes with her remembering him grabbing the newspaper, and kissing her goodbye as he left for work.¹⁴⁰ That was the last time she ever saw him. As she tells this touching story, music plays softly in the background adding to the emotional impact.

De Niro then introduces forty-five year old Joseph Gerard Leavey, a Lieutenant with the NYFD at Ladder Company 15. The listener is informed that he made it to the 78th floor of the South Tower before it collapsed. He left three children behind. His daughter Caitlin was ten at the time of the attack and she is then heard telling of her father's love of being a fireman and how his courage has fueled her own desire to help others heal through a community of kids, and how the support she received after 9/11 makes her want to give back.¹⁴¹ These two accounts are extremely personal, and I can personally attest to their emotional appeal. As previously mentioned, I listened to this tour while sitting in my home in Louisville, Kentucky months after visiting the museum, and I was still moved to tears. I can only speculate how emotional it would be to be

¹⁴⁰ Ibid., tour stop Remembrances.

¹⁴¹ Ibid.

standing within the *In Memoriam* exhibition looking at the faces of the thousands who perished, while hearing these remembrances.

This emotional connection plays a very significant role in the offered narrative. By providing such heartbreaking stories, while soft, slow music is played, the tour strongly suggests to the viewer what she should be feeling at this moment, and how she should be experiencing the memorial. Again, this is not to say these feelings are in some way incorrect, but that, at this point, the narrative framework is abandoned, and a more controlling narrative is provided. If a listener did not feel a sense of sorrow or loss, she may think she is not experiencing the museum correctly. It is precisely when the narrative tries to do too much and begins to instruct viewers on the correct response that it changes from an informative framework and wades into the dangerous area of becoming emotionally manipulative.

The *Witnessing History* tour is filled with not only interviews and first-person accounts that help create this controlling narrative, but the music periodically used and the inclusive language furthers this control. This is again not to say the tour should have no control over the offered narrative, but when it begins to tell listeners how they should personally experience the memorial, that is suspect. One should not walk away from the tour thinking 9/11 was a happy occasion, but how the listener feels about the memorialized historical events should be left to her. It is the role of the memorial, and its tools, to provide the framework that allows the visitor to shape her own, informed experience.

What is interesting is this very control, that is sometimes overreaching in the *Witnessing History* tour, is acceptable in the *Discovering History* tour due to its intended audience. The *Discovering History* tour is designed for children between the ages of eight and eleven and those accompanying them in the museum. The goal of this tour is to help those who have no personal experience of 9/11 (these children were not yet born) understand the significance of the museum. The tour does this in a way that is appropriate for a young audience. The narrator for this tour is a young girl named Clara Neubauer who was born in New York City on September 11, 2001. She tells listeners that “something significant happened that day”¹⁴² that still has an impact on society today. The tour does not ignore that nearly 3,000 people lost their lives that day at the hands of terrorists; in fact, Clara explains who terrorists are, and what their goals are, but she does not go into specific details about the terrorists in the 9/11 attacks except to say they were nineteen men. This telling of the tragedy is most evident on the third tour stop, where the listener is standing in front of the crushed firetruck from Ladder Company 3. Here Clara talks about the first responders who saved thousands of people and the important, but scary work firefighters do everyday. The listener then hears from Steve Gonzalez, a now retired firefighter who was a member of Ladder Company 3. He tells the listener he was not supposed to work that day, but when he heard about what was going on, he rushed to help. He arrived just after the second Tower had collapsed and he states, “All I could think was, I gotta find my company.” Clara explains that sadly he never found them and only found the crushed truck. This is one way the tour helps these

¹⁴² *Discovering History: For Children and Families*. Audio tour provided by 9/11 Memorial Museum. Produced by Acoustiguide.

younger visitors understand the magnitude of what occurred here, but in a way that is not meant to terrify or traumatize them.

Much of the tour focuses on specific artifacts and details, such as finding a certain name on the Last Column, and not on the horrific events of the day. The central theme of the tour is one of hope and what great things can be accomplished when people come together in the face of great tragedy and this idea is more prevalent than the theme of tragedy. This is shown through the works of art created by children in the Tribute Walk, and especially through the story of the Maasai people from Kenya. Clara tells how the Maasai people wanted to do something to comfort the American People. They did this by giving fourteen of their sacred cattle to the United States. These cattle are very important to the people and they felt “to heal a sorrowing heart, give something that is dear to your own.”¹⁴³ A banner was created to celebrate the gift and this is on display in the Tribute Walk. Clara informs the listener that “we are all part of one global community, connected to each other through acts of kindness and compassion.”¹⁴⁴ The tour concludes by saying “hope and freedom will always win out when people come together to help each other.”¹⁴⁵

Overall, this tour does control the narrative offered, but in this case it is acceptable. It is acceptable because of the young audience for whom it is intended. Here, those who created the tour needed to not only offer enough of a narrative framework so that those with no personal memory of 9/11 could understand it, but they

¹⁴³ Ibid.

¹⁴⁴ Ibid.

¹⁴⁵ Ibid.

had to do so in a way that was appropriate for the young audience. The tour does a good job of presenting facts about the tragedies of 9/11, and educating the listener about the significance of the event. The tour also encourages the listeners to be curious about some of these events and to think about what it means to them. This line of questioning will hopefully help children remain curious about 9/11 and to further their investigation and desire to understand of these events as they grow older.

The *Building History* Tour is the least controlling narrative of the three. This is mainly due to its focus on providing a narrative framework structured around the architectural elements of the World Trade Center, and not creating an overly emotional connection with the listener. The tour is narrated by architect Mark Wagner, who, after 9/11, was one of several people asked to help identify key pieces of the original World Trade Center for scientific and preservation purposes.¹⁴⁶

The tour begins with traditional bagpipes and drums playing, bringing images of official funerals to the listener's mind; however, this music quickly fades out as Wagner begins speaking. He provides background information on the construction of the World Trade Center and calls the new plaza a place of "both commemoration and renewal."¹⁴⁷ The listener then has the option of listening to Reflecting Absence architects Michael Arad and Peter Walker discuss their design intentions along with a brief commentary by Craig Dykers, architect of the museum pavilion. Of the three, Arad's piece is perhaps the most laden with emotion, but this is due to his inspiration for creating Reflecting

¹⁴⁶ *Building History: For Children and Families*. Audio tour provided by 9/11 Memorial Museum. Produced by Acoustiguide.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid.

Absence. He wanted to create a public space that would show a sense of absence that cannot be replaced. He calls the twin waterfalls “containers of memory and emptiness.”¹⁴⁸ While this may seem like an emotional appeal to the listener, it is not because here, it is Arad telling the listener how he felt and what he wanted the space to represent. He in no way is telling the listener this is how she should feel.

Many of the stops are the same as the other two tours including: the Survivors’ Stairs, the Box Column Remnants, and the Last Column. However, where the *Witnessing History* tour focused on the more emotional aspects of these, the current tour focuses on their architectural and structural significance. For example, where the *Witnessing History* tour focuses on the Survivor Stairs leading people to safety, the *Building History* tour focuses more on the desire to preserve them as an important personal and historic landmark. Another example of this difference is when discussing the Slurry Wall; here, the tour focuses on how the wall was able to survive the collapse of the Towers and keep the area from flooding.

This is not to say there are no emotional moments within the tour, but these moments do not overtake the narrative. For example, when discussing the Survivor Glass, an element only discussed in this tour, visitors are standing in front of a panel of glass. The Twin Towers had more than 40,000 narrow windows and they were designed this way because the original World Trade Center designer, Minoru Yamasaki, was afraid of heights and he insisted on narrow windows to make those inside feel secure.¹⁴⁹ The window the viewer is looking at was once located on the 82nd floor of the South Tower

¹⁴⁸ Ibid.

¹⁴⁹ Ibid., tour stop 11.

and fell in the collapse, but it did not shatter. Recovery workers found this and marveled at it and employees from Tully Construction made sure the intact window was saved. Jan Szumanski, of Tully Construction, wanted it to be displayed for what he thought it symbolizes, that “we might be hurt as a nation, but we don't break. We'll always come back.”¹⁵⁰ Again, while this story has an emotional appeal, most of the details are about how the window was found and subsequently found its way to the museum.

Overall, this tour is very effective in creating a narrative framework for the listener without trying to control how the listener experiences the museum. It includes information on the buildings that once stood there, how and why the Towers fell, and informs listeners about the technological advancements that are in the new Freedom Tower to prevent an event such as 9/11 from happening again. In the tour's concluding section (if they are listened to in the suggested order), Daniel Libeskind, architect of the Master Plan for the World Trade Center project, calls the Slurry Wall the most dramatic element that survived the attack.¹⁵¹ He then likens the strength of the Wall to the strength of the nation, writing “The foundation withstood the unimaginable trauma of the destruction and stand as eloquent as the U.S. Constitution itself, asserting the durability of democracy and the value of individual life.”¹⁵² This connection links the tour to the very foundations of the nation and he concludes by saying, “here we can gather...to experience the intimate stories of loss, compassion, recovery, and hope that are central to the narrative of the attacks and their aftermath.”¹⁵³ This concluding message brings the

¹⁵⁰ Ibid.

¹⁵¹ Ibid., tour stop 13.

¹⁵² Ibid.

¹⁵³ Ibid.

tour full circle and the listener is again reminded of the memorial and museum's mission and overall narrative.

It is interesting to note that all three tours largely avoid discussing the hijackers and their motivations for carrying out the attacks. The only time they are even directly mentioned is when the listener is informed that the four planes were hijacked. There is no discussion of what motivated these attacks or who the hijackers were or even where they were from. This absence keeps the focus on the victims, but ignores many of the political conflicts surrounding 9/11. In the *Discovering History* tour, the narrator explains to the young audience that nineteen men hijacked four airplanes and what a terrorist is, but it offers no specific details about why these men carried out their mission. Instead it simply explains that terrorists “use violence to try to frighten people and impose a particular point of view.”¹⁵⁴ This is as close as any of the tours come to mentioning the motivations behind the attacks.

At the conclusion of the guided tours, or during the self guided tours, the visitor is then free to explore the two exhibitions offered: *In Memoriam*, with the accompanying Tribute Walk, and the Historical Exhibition. Visitors are permitted to take photographs along the walk but no photography is allowed within the exhibits. Photography is not allowed in the *In Memoriam* exhibit out of respect for the victims, and their families, many of who donated very personal objects for the exhibition.¹⁵⁵ The *In Memoriam* Exhibit is a large square room located under the South Tower pool and the walls are

¹⁵⁴ *Discovering History: For Children and Families*. Audio tour provided by 9/11 Memorial Museum. Produced by Acoustiguide, History tour stop 1.

¹⁵⁵ Colleen Patterson, e-mail message to author, March 9, 2016.

covered with photographs of the 2,977 people who died in the 9/11 attacks (all three sites) and from the 1993 WTC bombing. These photographs almost seem like yearbook pictures with the person's name printed under his/her image. The photographs cover all four walls. There are also interactive tables spaced around the room; here the visitor can click on an individual's image and hear a short biography about him/her. In the center of the exhibit, there is an interior room with black walls and benches around the perimeter. Large reproductions of the victims' images are projected on the walls, one person at a time, and statistical information about the person is also displayed. There is an audio recording of the person's name, and many individuals also have recordings of someone "remembering" or paying honor to them. What I found most interesting about this exhibition was that most people moved through it very quickly. Many walked around the room once, entered the center room and only stayed there a minute or two and then continued around the room and exited the exhibit. While this was not true of all visitors, it seemed to be the norm for most. It almost seemed as if being confronted with the names and likeness of every victim was too much to take in at once and the central viewing room becomes too personal with the voices of parents, spouses, and friends transforming the projected image into a once living, breathing, person. This part of the museum is very successful in achieving its goals, to remember the fallen. Here, visitors have no choice but to be constantly reminded of the individuals who lost their lives. The exhibit also creates a referential relationship between the viewers and the memorialized victims; in fact, that is the entire goal of this exhibit. As I stood there looking at all of the faces of the victims I sympathized with the families and friends that lost loved ones. This

was much like my experience as I stood looking at the names carved in Reflecting Absence. The narration is somewhat controlled here because, again, visitors are made aware only of the loss of life and not of any other surrounding or contributing factors. However, like the guided tour, I do not think this single narrative is misrepresentative because, while it is the only narrative offered by the exhibit, it is not the only narrative offered by the museum as a whole.

Surrounding the *In Memoriam* exhibition is the Tribute Walk, here, visitors tend to linger and spend more time looking at objects that were left or sent to Ground Zero. It seems these inanimate objects are much easier for visitors to process. The Tribute Walk consists of items such as quilts and motorcycles designed to pay remembrance to the

victims. This exhibition is effective in the way it leaves the narrative open to the viewer. Taking the Tribute Walk and *In Memoriam* exhibit together, there is the clear overreaching theme of remembrance, but how the viewer chooses to remember is largely left to her. Some may view the photographs, others may listen to the audio remembrance, and those needing a little more distance between themselves and the images of the dead can focus their attentions on the Tribute Walk.

The second exhibition is the Historical Exhibition, here no cameras are allowed; however, I believe this has more to do with the intention of keeping the flow of visitors moving through the exhibition in a timely manner and not an attempt preserve or to limit the reproduction of the artifacts. I was informed by Colleen Patterson, Collections & Exhibitions Coordinator at the National September 11 Memorial & Museum that this was part of the reason, but there are two other contributing

factors. The first is many of the objects on display are on loan from third parties who have placed limitations on allowing these items to be photographed. The second reason is many of the objects are paper-based or are light-sensitive and need to be protected.¹⁵⁶ This exhibit contains 65% of the museum's artifacts.¹⁵⁷ How this exhibition is designed walks the viewer through a "historical" timeline of the day's events. Artifacts, video footage, audio recordings, photographs, and display panels reflect where the viewer is during the events of the day. For example, after the first Tower¹⁵⁸ was hit, there are audio clips playing of people trapped in the Tower calling home. There is also a video looping of the moment the second plane hit the South Tower and the debris falling to the ground. Visitors seem to have two reactions to this video, either they stop and stare at it as it loops

¹⁵⁶ Ibid.

¹⁵⁷ 9/11 Memorial. National September Memorial and Museum, 2015. 911memorial.org.

¹⁵⁸the North Tower

a few times or they tend to glance at the screen, realize what is being played, and quickly avert their eyes and continue walking.

Other content that is deemed “graphic” has been placed in side alcoves with warnings that these small spaces contain content that may be difficult for viewers to experience. One such alcove plays audio recordings of eyewitness reactions to the events and a second alcove contains images of what has come to be known as the “falling man” images.¹⁵⁹ This area shows projections of photographs of people who chose to jump from the burning buildings in an attempt to control their own fates. What is interesting is the images are projected onto the wall and each is only shown for about three seconds. In this way the exhibit controls how long visitors may look at these pictures, as if spending more time with them would be too painful.¹⁶⁰ As Adam Gopnik writes, by placing these images away from the main viewing area, “visitors are both invited to look and discouraged from looking.”¹⁶¹ Along with the projected images there are also various quotes from eyewitnesses commenting on the falling people including Victor Colantano’s accounting “While we still looked up, a man jumped from the building. White shirt, black pants, end-over-end tumbling to the ground...At that instant, the Towering glass and metal mass of billowing smoke became human.”¹⁶² These quotes serve the purpose of making the viewers see these “falling men” not just as objects falling but as human beings who were offered a horrible choice: stay in the building and burn, or

¹⁵⁹Photos by Richard Drew, AP Photo; Jose Jimenez/Primera Hora, Getty Images; David Surowiecki, Getty Images

¹⁶⁰ I am waiting to hear back from the museum if this was their intentions.

¹⁶¹ Gopnik, “Stones and Bones: Visiting the 9/11 Memorial and Museum,” 40.

¹⁶² Quote on wall of 9/11 Memorial Museum Historical Exhibition.

jump. This connection makes the images even more horrifying because they make the viewer more empathetically aware of the lives that were lost and horrific way some were lost.

Much like the earlier video playing the moment when the Towers were hit, there is also a video playing on repeat of the South Tower collapse. Here the video is above the viewers' eye level forcing her to look up at the collapse, much like the viewers on the street that day did. Here, many people stood and watched the Tower collapse in stunned silence. What was interesting was many viewers watched the collapse a few times before moving on. Next to this looping video there is another side alcove that plays the voices of individuals from within the Tower; again the side alcove has a warning and provides tissues. Many of these messages are from those in the North Tower right after the South Tower fell and they are deeply emotional. Through these voices, the listener begins to feel how these eventual victims felt and there is the overarching understanding that the individuals behind these voices have now accepted their eventual fate. After leaving this alcove there is another video, this time of the North Tower collapse. Those emerging from the alcove understand the voices they just heard were from people who died in the collapse. Finally, there are images that were taken from space that show the smoke from the collapse with audio of the astronauts commenting about the collapse. These images from space seem to highlight how massive the destruction was, truly making it otherworldly.

The remainder of the exhibition consists of recovered artifacts including: many shoes, keys, firefighter helmets, and images of news coverage from around the world.

Sally Jenkins writes, “Like it or not, to most Americans the steel and debris of the World Trade Center has become more than just wreckage. It has alchemized into relics, not just by fire but by memory and trauma. Larger spiritual meanings have been imputed to it because of whom or what it touched.”¹⁶³ However, what is most interesting in these final areas are not so much the artifacts themselves, but the rooms in which they are displayed. Through factors such as the color of the walls, the materials the floors are made from, the lighting, and the music being played, a clear narrative comes through to the visitor whether she is aware of it or not. For example, in the first artifact area reached, right after the visitor has experienced the collapse of both Towers, the walls are painted in dark blues, the lighting is very dim, the floors are either hardwood or concrete. These factors give a sense of coolness and emptiness to the areas. There is also memorial or church-like music being played creating a sense of reverence, but there are areas where alarms are going off. This cacophony of sound creates a confusing atmosphere and gives the visitor a small hint of what it must have been like during the event. In these areas there is very little conversation. In fact, while I was walking through the area two men began to have a conversation and they were immediately shushed by other patrons who viewed their talking as rude and even disrespectful. As Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett writes, a museum can be a sacred space that offers its visitors “a place to mourn”¹⁶⁴ and these men seemed to be violating the appropriate behavior for this environment. As Laurie Beth Clark writes, “Regulation of behaviour is often less explicit than in the aforementioned

¹⁶³ Sally Jenkins. “9/11 memorials: The story of the cross at Ground Zero. *The Washington Post*. (September 8, 2011).

¹⁶⁴ Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, *Destination Culture*, 139.

cases; it is accomplished through architecture, example to interaction. Buildings and spaces are designed in ways that communicate norms of behaviour.”¹⁶⁵ I compare this feeling of reverence and the creation of sacred space to my experience at The Alamo. Yet, at The Alamo, there are signs informing the visitors this is a sacred space and conversation is to be limited. There is a small passage in the museum map that states, “The 9/11 Memorial Museum is a place of solemn reflection...proper decorum, personal behavior, and conduct are required from all visitors as all times,”¹⁶⁶ but this is often overlooked. In fact, I only discovered it upon my return when I specifically went looking for it. However, the standard is still enforced in the 9/11 museum, not by the map, but the idea is implied through the design and implemented by the visitors.

The next room visitors walk into has the words “Before 9/11” displayed on the wall. Here the walls are painted in a light gold hue and the floors are carpeted. The lighting is brighter but still somewhat subdued. Overall the room has a much warmer and welcoming feeling to it and the mausoleum experience of the previous room is not present. This area seems to offer the visitor a break from viewing the evidence of destruction, but in actuality it reminds the viewer of what was lost. The walls are covered with movie posters featuring the iconic New York City skyline with the Twin Towers standing as sentinels over the city. These posters include *Godzilla*, *Working Girl*, *The Secret of My Success*, *New York Stories*, and many others. There are also various advertisements featuring the skyline and many snapshots of the city’s skyline. In the center of the room there is a very large model of both Towers; literally letting the visitor

¹⁶⁵ Clark, “Ethical Spaces: Ethics and Propriety in Trauma Tourism,” 12.

¹⁶⁶ 9/11 Memorial Museum Map. New York: WeilCo., ND.

experience them one last time. This room serves as a reminder to the visitor of what was once there and is now gone. While at first it seems like a reprieve from the death and destruction, it is in fact a direct link to the memorialized historical events: the Towers and those who perished.

After seeing what was lost, the viewer moves into the next area, the “Recovery” section. Here the walls are again a warmer color and the floors are still carpeted. Visitors seem more comfortable with having conversations in this area. It is also in this area where those who perpetuated the attacks are exhibited. A film focusing on the rise of Al-Qaeda is played and there is a small exhibition panel with the images of the hijackers displayed. The panel is placed at waist level, the viewer has to crouch down to really see the lower photographs, and all nineteen images are placed on this one small sign, it is maybe two feet by three feet. Very little focus is put on the attackers, almost as if to stop visitors from questioning the motivations behind what occurred and to instead give a literal face to those who caused the terror. As noted by Gopnik, the “last night” letter is also displayed, but there is no translation so most visitors are unable to read the text.¹⁶⁷ As Gopnik translates, the “last night” letter contains essential information for understanding the hijackers’ motivations:

And so the deeper truth that religious fanaticism was the whole of their horrible cause—that, in the last-night letter, God is cited a hundred and twenty-one times—is elided. It is disquieting to be reminded that the women-in-paradise promise, which sophisticates have widely thought to be a claim made by Western propagandists, is right there too. The

¹⁶⁷ Gopnik, “Stones and Bones: Visiting the 9/11 Memorial and Museum,” 40.

terrorists did not hate us for our freedom; they hated us for our lack of faith.¹⁶⁸

Gopnik further writes that though the placement of the hijackers' images and the lack of translation, the museum does a better job of ignoring these issues than illuminating them.¹⁶⁹ From here, the visitor moves into a room with a large map that projects the timeline of the day's events as seen through the planes, their flightpaths, and eventual crash sites. When put together with the images of the hijackers, these displays almost seem to be saying to the viewer "this is who caused the events, and this is how they did it, blame them."

From here, the "Recovery" area continues with an "After 9/11" section. In this area the walls are painted a somber grey and the floors are tiled. This color scheme and cool flooring removes the warmth that was felt in the previous room. Again, there are tissues and holders placed around the room for the convenience of the grieving visitors. In this room the homemade posters of the missing, that were created by those searching for lost loved ones, are displayed along with pieces of the many spontaneous memorials that were erected around Ground Zero. Images from the funerals of those who were lost are also displayed. These include crying firefighters in uniform, saluting their fallen comrades. These images are especially poignant because the firefighters and first responders became the image of strength after 9/11, and to see these men and women in tears adds to the emotional appeal of the works, i.e., if they are crying then things must be very, very sad. There are also videos of different memorial and funeral events playing in

¹⁶⁸ Ibid., 40.

¹⁶⁹ Ibid., 40.

this area. The well known Ground Zero Cross¹⁷⁰ is also exhibited in this section. The Cross at Ground Zero was found by excavators on September 13, 2001. It consists of over two tons of twisted metal that resembled a cross. Workers say this is “proof that God had not abandoned Ground Zero.”¹⁷¹ Father Brian Jordan got permission for the cross to be removed and it was placed on a pedestal, on site, at Church Street. Here weekly religious services began to be held. Father Brian said, “We had Jews, Muslims, Buddhists. People who believed or didn't believe. It was a matter of human solidarity. Whether you believed was irrelevant. We needed some type of fellowship down there”¹⁷² and the cross manifested into a physical representation of that need. When the final plans for the site were decided, it was unclear what would happen to The Ground Zero Cross that had offered comfort to so many. Amidst objections from various groups, The Ground Zero Cross now has a place in the 9/11 Memorial Museum. How does this accident of debris become a relic? Nancy Johnson, director of the World Trade Center Artifacts project states “Wreckage becomes relic when it is associated with people and experiences that brought you joy”¹⁷³ or in the case of the World Trade Center Cross, it brought comfort.

Also in this area is information about the recovery of human remains. This includes a map that charts where human remains were discovered.

¹⁷⁰Jenkins, “9/11 memorials: The story of the cross at Ground Zero.”

¹⁷¹ Ibid.

¹⁷² Ibid.

¹⁷³ Ibid.

This horrific map¹⁷⁴ drives home the point of how wide spread the destruction was.

The final area in the exhibition asks the question (literally, it is written on the wall) “How do we remember?” This room consists of very small displays and images of how different groups of individuals have attempted to move on after the attacks. These include various activities from the fundraising efforts of Girl Scout troops to marathons that are held in honor of 9/11. Here, images of Reflecting Absence and the official campaign to memorialize 9/11 are shown. From this room the visitor can exit back into the larger museum space.

Overall this exhibition is also very effective. It clearly carries out the museum’s mission of bearing witness to the attacks of September 11, 2001; however, the attack of February 26, 1993 is largely overshadowed. In fact, except for the images of the victims who perished in the *In Memoriam* exhibition, I can not recall any other display that featured the 1993 attack. That is not to say there is none, but as a visitor (one who was even taking notes and looking at the museum with a critical eye) I cannot bring to mind any display that focused solely on the 1993 attack. Therefore, in this aspect the museum’s mission is unsuccessful.

The exhibition creates a referential relationship between the visitors and the memorialized historical events. It does this by creating a connection on many levels: through empathy, sympathy, imaginatively, and cognitively. This is what the purpose of the entire exhibition is, to show and remind viewers of what was once there, how it was

¹⁷⁴ “Map of the Distribution of Human Remains After 9/11.” [ProCon.org](http://wtcmuslimcenter.procon.org/view.resource.php?resourceID=4007) 29 September 2010, as used in *New York Post*. 10 September 2010. <http://wtcmuslimcenter.procon.org/view.resource.php?resourceID=4007>

lost, and what has happened since that loss. If one had no experience with or memory of the 9/11 attacks, after visiting this exhibition she would feel as if she was a part of the history. While this may be a traumatizing event, it successfully fulfills a necessary condition of the exhibition.

The final aspect dealing with the narrative the exhibition offers its visitors is a little more problematic to judge. When taken individually, the exhibition does create a narrative that focuses on the horrors of the day's events, and it seems to tell the visitor who is directly to blame for the tragedy¹⁷⁵ while still downplaying the hijackers' motivations. The lighting, the paint colors used, the type of flooring, the videos, images, and sounds emitted all add to this single narrative; however, the exhibition does what it intended to do, and warns visitors it will do; it creates a historical accounting of the events and it does so through artifacts. So in terms of the standards I am holding all memorials to, the Historical Exhibit would be better served to offer more, better, historical accounting, and be less emotionally manipulative. Yet, at the same time, this does not mean the entire museum as a memorial is not effective because when taken into context with the many other exhibitions and displays, visitors have the freedom to choose where they will go, what they will see, and even how long they will examine each artifact. Because of this, the exhibition carries out an important role, it provides and displays artifacts that all, in some way, provide evidence of the historical accounting of the events.

Holland Carter of the *New York Times* writes of the museum

¹⁷⁵ See previous comments on the images of the hijackers.

Within its narrow perspective, maybe because of it, the museum does something powerful. And, fortunately, it seems to regard itself as a work in progress, involved in investigation, not summation. I hope so. If it stops growing and freezes its narrative, it will become, however affecting, just another Sept. 11 artifact. If it tackles the reality that its story is as much about global politics as about architecture, about a bellicose epoch as much as about a violent event, it could deepen all our thinking about politics, morality, and devotion.¹⁷⁶

While I agree with Carter's desire to see the museum as a "work in progress" full of investigation and constantly growing, I fear that parts of it have already become stagnant, especially in the Historical Exhibition. As stated above, some of the displays, lighting and overall environment seem to only add to emotional manipulation of the viewer. The additional tools, such as the guided tours, audio tours, and printable walking paths tours, offered by the museum also add to this controlled narrative. These tools tell the visitor how to view much of the museum and even how much time should be allotted for each stopping point. The gift shop, full of "We Remember" and "Never Forget" memorabilia also furthers this narrative. However, to say an exhibition or memorial can have no narrative is a false statement and not what is being argued here. One would certainly not want to visit a Holocaust memorial and see the Nazis portrayed in a positive or even neutral manner; this would be a disservice, and by attempting to not overly control the narrative, the creators would have actually created a new, misleading narrative in its place. The creators of the 9/11 Memorial Museum have, for now, found a balance between offering a historical framework and creating a narrative that, through the sheer

¹⁷⁶ Holland Carter as quoted in Griggs, Mary Beth. "The 9/11 Memorial Museum Opens to the Public." smithsonian.com. 20 May 2014. Web. 14 June 2015.

size of the museum, its artifacts, and the freedom it offers its visitors is not overly limited or too emotionally manipulative when viewed, in its entirety, as a memorial.

In truth, the museum has a difficult role to play. It is looked to for supplying an accounting of the historical facts of the day; yet, it must do so in a way that the visitors, many who have first-hand memories of the day's events, find acceptable. This is why artifacts that have been deemed too difficult to view have been tucked away into small side alcoves where only the brave, or brazen few, dare to venture. Currently, the museum must find a way to balance representing the historical realities of the events and acknowledging the delicate nature of the viewing audience. This may become easier over time, as more of the viewing audience is further removed from the events of the day; but, by that time it may be too late. The exhibitions as they now stand may, by that time, already be binding as the correct historical accounting and any changes to them may be difficult to procure. Carter is correct that the museum must acknowledge the global political ramifications of the day's events and that it must continue to challenge how the viewer sees and remembers 9/11.

The second memorial to open, The Flight 93 National Memorial in Somerset County, Pennsylvania, is more effective in fulfilling its designers' intended aims. The original plans of the Flight 93 Memorial did not require anything other than a place of quiet reflection to honor the heroes who gave their lives there.¹⁷⁷ The memorial is dedicated to the forty people who perished on United Airlines Flight 93 when it crashed

¹⁷⁷ The original plans for the site have been altered over the previous two years with the addition of a Visitors' and Learning Center currently under construction. (May 2015) These additions will be discussed in the following section.

into a field outside of Shanksville, Pennsylvania. It was paid for mainly by private endowments and the Flight 93 National Memorial Act, which also made the Memorial part of the National Park System.¹⁷⁸ The design was chosen by “the Partners,” a collective group of members from the Families of Flight 93, the Flight 93 Memorial Task Force, the Flight 93 Advisory Commission, and the National Park Service; as part of an international competition. The selected design was submitted by Paul Murdoch Architects and Nelson Byrd Woltz Landscape Architects. The Memorial opened to the public September 10, 2011; however, much of the site is still under construction with an intended opening on September 11, 2015.¹⁷⁹ This expansion includes a Visitor and Learning Center, Flight Path Walkway, 40 Memorial Groves with a Wetlands Bridge to

¹⁷⁸ Flight 93 National Memorial (National Park Service). Department of the Interior. Updated 25 April 2014. Web. 27 April 2014.

¹⁷⁹ The Visitors Center did open in September 2015, but my onsite analysis occurred before this date.

the Memorial Plaza, and additional parking.

The Flight 93 Memorial's mission statement is "'A common field one day. A field of honor forever.' May all who visit this place remember the collective acts of courage and sacrifice of the passengers and crew, revere this hallowed ground as the final resting place of those heroes, and reflect on the power of individuals who choose to make a difference."¹⁸⁰ The collaborative organizations who helped develop the memorial state the memorial's three purposes are to "honor the passengers and crew members of Flight 93 who courageously gave their lives, thereby thwarting a planned attack on Washington, D.C.; allow the public to visit the site and express their feelings about the event and the passengers and crew of Flight 93; and, respect the rural landscape and preserve the solemn and tranquil setting of the crash site of Flight 93."¹⁸¹ The architects and designers of the site have largely been successful in achieving the first two intended purposes of the memorial; however, regarding the success of the third purpose, respecting the rural landscape, I now doubt its effectiveness due to the current construction.

The visitor must drive to the memorial site because it is located in rural, Somerset County, Pennsylvania. The landscape is decidedly rural, hilly, and wind turbines decorate the horizon. The winding two-lane road that leads to the memorial has not been enhanced in any way. When the visitor arrives at the location, she turns onto another two-lane road and drives by the large National Parks sign announcing the memorial (see above image). Many visitors stop here to take pictures including snapshots of the family

¹⁸⁰ Flight 93 National Memorial Mission Statement. nps.gov.

¹⁸¹ *Flight 93*. From the approved notes of the Flight 93 Mission Statement meeting. From the Flight 93 Memorial webpage. nps.gov.

in front of the sign as if it were any other National Park.

The road continues on for around three miles winding through the rural landscape. Finally, the visitor arrives near the memorial plaza. Upon my first visit to the site in May 2013, the road led directly to the single available parking area. The observations discussed will be based from this first visitation and then the changes in the site will be discussed based on visiting the site again in May 2015. When arriving at the parking lot the visitor is warned that this is a trash free park and that all refuse

should be left in the parking area. As stated in the official policies of the memorial:

“**Trash-Free** - The memorial is a trash-free park. Please respect the memorial by taking your trash with you. Trash bags are provided for your convenience.”¹⁸² This alerts the visitor that this park is unlike most National Parks and should be treated as such. The visitor then proceeds to the Memorial Plaza where a courtyard of signs offers an accounting of the events of 9/11. Most notable are the first two signs which proclaim “America Attacked!” and “Mayday!” followed by signs detailing the passengers claims of "We're going to do something", the after crash investigation, the site since September 11, 2001, and a panel with photographs of the passengers and crew of Flight 93. By reading these panels, the visitor becomes immersed in the story of Flight 93 and how the crew and passengers were responsible for stopping the terrorists' attack. Also available

¹⁸² Flight 93 National Memorial webpage: Basic Information.

on the first panel is a pamphlet detailing the events of the day including the headline “America Attacked” and an image of the U.S. Capitol Building (the suspected target of the terrorists) and the smoke cloud after Flight 93 crashed. These items all make the visitor aware of the courageous acts of the crew and passengers and they set the tone of honoring these people, fulfilling the first intention of the designers.

The only building on the site is a small shelter area that holds a wall of remembrance. This wall is simply a covered wall on which visitors may attach a handwritten memory on paper that is provided. This is one of two places the visitor may express her own feelings about the event. The other area is along the black walkway that frames the crash site and leads from the Memorial Plaza to the Wall of Names. Along this black walkway there are several niches where visitors may leave mementos much

like tokens left at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial. These two locations do offer visitors an opportunity to express their feelings, thus fully achieving the second intention of the memorial.¹⁸³ As viewers look at these niches, they can then look out onto the open field where Flight 93 crashed. The end of the crash site is marked with a large sandstone boulder. The trench that was made by the impact of the plane has been filled in and the ground supports regrowth of the natural vegetation. There are no signs or other markings along the walkway except for small placards informing visitors they may dial a number and listen to an audio description on their phones.¹⁸⁴ Finally, visitors arrive at the large, white Wall of Names. This work consists of forty marble panels, one for each crew member and passenger who died on the flight. Each panel is inscribed with the name of a victim and these names are listed in alphabetical order. These names appear with the first and middle name on one line with the last name directly below. This was done for more practical than aesthetic reasons; some of the names were too long to fit on one line, so the choice was made to put them all on two lines to give a sense of uniformity. The Wall of Names is installed in an accordion pattern to resemble the movement of the plane in the moments before it crashed. Visitors may stand next to this wall and look through a wooden fence into the crash site and see the plane's final resting place. Like the Pentagon Memorial, each victim has his/her own individual memorial segment. Here there is a very slight space between each panel; however, unlike the Pentagon Memorial, these individual panels are linked together to form one large work. This linking of the

¹⁸³ The newly opened Visitor and Learning Center offers more opportunities for the visitor to express their feelings.

¹⁸⁴ The audio tour will be discussed in detail later in this chapter.

panels more directly makes each person part of the collective whole that was Flight 93 and enforces the designers' intentions of celebrating the combined heroic efforts of these people. This unification is also shown in the alphabetical listing of the names.

According to Barbara Black, Chief of Cultural Resources at the Flight 93 National Memorial, the names are arranged in this manner to ensure there was no “perceived hierarchy” around those onboard the plane. She said they felt this order was more supportive of the intended message of unity, and that it did not separate the crew and passengers from one another.¹⁸⁵

In regards to the designers’ fulfilling their intentions and upholding the goals of the memorial, the most unsuccessful aspect of this can be seen in the third stated goal of respecting the rural landscape. When I first visited the memorial in May 2013, the rural landscape was well respected and it felt as if the memorial was part of the landscape; however, upon revisiting the site in May, 2015, I found this tranquil environment had

¹⁸⁵ Barbara Black, telephone interview by Jennifer A. Fraley, March 8, 2016.

May 2013

May 2015

been shattered. The easiest way to explain away this is to claim that the site is now an active construction zone; however, while I admit this is affecting the current atmosphere, I believe the problems will remain upon the project's completion.¹⁸⁶ In 2013, the memorial was surrounded by the rolling hills and it truly felt as if it was a part of the landscape. Now, with the addition of the walking bridge, and most especially the Visitors Center, the area feels like it is one large complex that is completely separated from the surrounding landscape. For example, when standing at the Wall of Names in 2013, the visitor could look both at the crash site and up to the sky where the plane descended. Now, the Visitor Center completely dominates the horizon (see above images) and this is before construction is completed. The Wall of Names is no longer part of the landscape but seems overshadowed by the planned center. The walking bridge also cuts through the

¹⁸⁶ I am planning on another visit now that the construction is complete to see if these claims are still true.

landscape and divides the large field that ran along the memorial. While these additions will most likely enhance the memorial when they are completed, they separate the memorial from the landscape and greatly differ from the rural landscape in direct opposition to one of the original planned themes. Perhaps once construction is completed and the landscaping is thriving this will change, but this visitor has very strong doubts.

The Flight 93 Memorial accomplishes the second level of success; it clearly establishes a referential relationship between the memorialized historical events and those who come to view the work. The viewer becomes aware of the memorialized historical events, Flight 93 and its passengers, as soon as they encounter the first sign and proceed along the three mile drive to the crash site. This transitional space serves as an area for the visitor to begin reflecting on the events of the day and the course of the doomed flight. Because of the literature and signage offered throughout the memorial, the viewer also becomes aware not just of the journey of Flight 93, but of all the events surrounding the 9/11 attacks, including the role of al-Qaeda. The Flight 93 Memorial is much more obvious in its representation of these events and the viewer is made aware of them, as intended, through the prominent display of the information and the interactive tools available. This information helps to create a strong imaginative identification, the viewer can easily see herself as part of the events. Personally, I found that walking parallel to the crash site and then standing at the Wall of Names, knowing that it reflected the movement of the plane in the seconds before it crashed, very powerful, and I imagined what it must have been like to experience the event. This identification further lead to both a sympathetic and empathic identification with the victims. This is all accomplished

before the completion of the Visitor Center, and one can only assume once this area is completed, the message will be even stronger.

It is on the third level of critique that the memorial is not as effective; the work attempts to overtly control the emotional response of the viewer. Instead of limiting the focus to the various historical realities of the event, the memorial supplies much emotionally charged information about the incident with the intent of fostering a very specific reaction in the viewer; that the crew and passengers were heroes who sacrificed their own lives to save others and viewers should both mourn their deaths and feel a sense of gratitude for their sacrifice. While this accounting seems to be an accurate chronicle of the events, the overly emotional materials are too manipulative in their retelling of the events. It could make a viewer feel as if she is experiencing the memorial incorrectly if she does not experience the work in the way it seems to be promulgated.

This dominant narrative can clearly be seen in two of the first exhibit panels the

visitor encounters “America Attacked!” and “Mayday!” and in the pamphlet available for visitors on the “America Attacked!” panel. Erika Doss argues “[c]ontemporary American memorials embody the feelings of particular publics at particular historical moments, and frame cultural narratives about self identity and national purpose”¹⁸⁷ and are not a trustworthy account of historical facts. The Flight 93 Memorial is a prime example of this phenomenon. In the midst of the horrors of September 11, 2001, the information that was soon published in the media about Flight 93 seemed to give the nation hope and a feeling of having some control over the events of the day. In New York City and Washington, D.C. there seemed to only be scores of victims who had been caught unaware and were unable to do anything to stop the attacks. This created a sense of helplessness in many people.¹⁸⁸ By focusing on the attempt of the crew and passengers to take back control of the plane and the success in deterring the plane from reaching its intended target (The US Capitol Building in Washington, D.C.) those who died in the crash became active agents protecting the country and were no longer seen as helpless victims. This narrative is supported by “official” interpretations of the recordings from the Cockpit Voice Recorder, and other messages from the website, and the memorial continues to promulgate this accounting. However, when one reads the official transcript from Cockpit Voice Recorder, the line “Let’s Roll!” (popularly seen as the evidence the passengers fought the hijackers) never appears,¹⁸⁹ nor does it appear in the summarized

¹⁸⁷Doss, *Memorial Mania*, page number.

¹⁸⁸ This is not to say there were no heroic acts at these locations but these were performed in reaction to the physical attack.

¹⁸⁹ United Airlines Flight #93 Cockpit Voice Recorder Transcript. Government Exhibit P200056T, 01-455-A (ID). As posted on the Flight 93 Memorial Website. 14 January 2016.

versions of the various phone calls made from the passengers and crew of the flight.¹⁹⁰ In fact, most of the information from the thirty-seven phone calls are based on the notes collected from interviews conducted by FBI agents, notes from the 9/11 Commission, and only three of the phone calls were actually recorded.¹⁹¹ The report containing this information even makes mention that it is largely comprised of secondhand information, or hearsay: “All information based on the best available data and evidence. Direct transcripts are noted. [There are three instances of this] Quoted content is cited. Most of the quoted material comes from FBI reports and notes, but is not a direct transcript of a recording unless specifically noted as such.”¹⁹² Yet even based on this circumstantial evidence, this narrative of heroism adds a much needed positive aspect to the self identity of the nation in one of its weakest moments. By focusing on the alleged acts of these individuals instead of any other details, a narrative of action is created and the national identity of the powerful United States is maintained. Through these forty people, the nation itself felt as if it had acted and was not just a passive victim to terrorism. However, as Doss states, these accountings are not trustworthy sources of historical data and should not be treated as such; yet, that is exactly what the memorial is attempting to do through the single focused narrative it offers the visitor. Although we do not know all of the specific details, it seems the basic narrative of the Flight 93 story withstands

¹⁹⁰ Flight 93, “Phone Calls from the Passengers and Crew of Flight 93.” A posted on the Flight 93 Memorial Website. 14 January 2016. This information came from interviews with Lisa Jefferson who Beamer was talking with while on Flight 93. nps.gov.

¹⁹¹ I have found conflicting information about this. Some sources claim three calls were recorded, others state it was four. The entire transcript of these calls are not available. Barbara Black informed me that quotes from these recordings are used in the Visitors Center, but due to the emotional content, they are not fully available.

¹⁹² Flight 93, “Phone Calls from the Passengers and Crew of Flight 93.” A posted on the Flight 93 Memorial Website. 14 January 2016. nps.gov.

scrutiny. The plane was hijacked by four men, the crew and passengers learned of the other attacks, they decided to fight back, and because of these actions, the hijackers crashed the plane sooner than planned. These accountings are not in question, but it is the memorial's overt attempts of emotional manipulation that become problematic to the narrative.

The mission statement for the memorial is, "A common field one day. A field of honor forever. May all who visit this place remember the collective acts of courage and sacrifice of the passengers and crew, revere this hallowed ground as the final resting place of those heroes, and reflect on the power of individuals who choose to make a difference."¹⁹³ Also prominently displayed on the Flight 93 website is the passage:

Because of the quick and determined actions of the passengers and crew, Flight 93 was the only one of the four hijacked aircraft that failed to reach the terrorists' intended target that day. The passengers and crew showed unity, courage, and defiance in the face of adversity. Today the National Park Service, its volunteers, and its partners work to honor their sacrifice and to try to understand more fully the legacy of Flight 93 and the other events of 9/11.¹⁹⁴

The theme of this message is repeated throughout the memorial on the exhibit panels displayed and on the offered pamphlet. One of the first things the visitor reads on the pamphlet is part of the mission statement, "A common field one day. A field of honor forever."¹⁹⁵ This is followed by a list of the crew and passengers as well as a very short accounting of the events of September 11, 2001, followed by a map charting the course of

¹⁹³ Flight 93 Mission statement, nps.gov.

¹⁹⁴ Ibid, "The Flight 93 Story."

¹⁹⁵ Ibid.

Flight 93 titled “Charting the Heroic Action of the Passengers and Crew” and a large image of the Capitol Building. On the opposite side, the pamphlet states “America Attacked” and is full of images of the crash site and small paragraphs detailing the day. A paragraph sandwiched between images of the crash site claims “The 9/11 Commission reported that the hijackers, although remaining in control of the plane, must have judged that the passengers and crew were mere seconds from overcoming them....The crash site is 18 minutes flying time from Washington, D.C. The action of unarmed passengers and crew thwarted and defeated the terrorists’ plan.”¹⁹⁶ Following this accounting are drawings of the planned memorial to honor these heroes directly linking the memorial to this specific accounting of the events.

The “Mayday!” exhibit panel sets the scene for the events of the day and includes such phrases as “Still some factors are beyond their control.”¹⁹⁷ This quote is discussing the delayed departure of Flight 93 due to heavy traffic, but it already plants the seed that the hijackers never had full control of the plane or the situation. The “America Attacked!” exhibit panel continues this narrative by discussing the four planes that were crashed and the nearly 3,000 people who were killed. The right side of the panel contains another paragraph about the heroic actions of those on Flight 93 and how they stopped the terrorists’ plan of reaching Washington, D.C. “Alerted to the events at the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, the forty unarmed passengers and crew of Flight 93 take quick and determined action. Their revolt prevents Flight 93 from reaching the terrorists’

¹⁹⁶ Flight 93 pamphlet.

¹⁹⁷ Flight 93 Memorial exhibit panel.

intended target.”¹⁹⁸ The panel is dominated by a photograph taken directly after the crash of Flight 93 and features a large smoke cloud over the serene farmland. These words and images again, further establish the narrative of these “ordinary people” dying for their heroic actions.

The next panel, “We’re going to do something” again furthers the narrative. In each panel the same story is told: the plane was hijacked, the passengers and crew acted, the plane crashed. However, in each panel slightly more detail is given of these events. For example on the “America Attacked!” panel the visitor reads the passengers “were alerted to the events at the World Trade Center and the Pentagon” while on the “We’re going to do something” panel the visitor reads the passengers and crew discovered this

information from the friends and family they were calling from the plane. This slight change in the story adds more detail and makes the passengers and crew members seem

¹⁹⁸Flight 93 Memorial. “America Attacked!” exhibit panel.

more human and therefore more relatable to the visitor as they travel from panel to panel. The panel then informs the visitor that these ordinary people, formed a band and tried to take control of the plane and it was due to this attempt to regain control that the hijackers then downed the flight. The visitor then continues to a panel showing images of the passengers and crew who perished thereby giving the heroes names and faces. The final panel in this area covers the investigation conducted after the crash and mentions that there were enough remains of each person to identify all on board. This gruesome message now triggers horrible images in the visitor's mind of how the smiling faces on the previous panel perished.

From these panels, the visitor has a clear narrative of the events of the day. While not a large amount of information is given, the clear message is the passengers and crew fought back, and because of these actions, the hijackers were unable to carry out their plan of attacking the U.S. Capitol Building. After reading these entry panels, the visitor then proceeds down the long black walkway to the Wall of Names, with the crash site on her left. Again, only the victims' names are prominently displayed on each panel.¹⁹⁹

The mission statement, the above passage, and the exhibit panels are just a few of the examples of how the memorial attempts to control the narrative of the events. By focusing only on the heroic acts of the passengers, an accounting that is broadly based on speculation and myth, the narrative of the memorial becomes the retelling of how these people gave their lives to save the nation. As Doss predicted, the memorial embodies "the

¹⁹⁹ The crew are designated by their job titles, a passenger's name appears in kanji and the unborn child of a pregnant passenger is also noted in etchings on the wall, but they are left white and are harder to see.

histories and feelings that respective Americans choose to remember at particular moments.”²⁰⁰ Americans remember the passengers of Flight 93 as heroes and the memorial reinforces this by supplying only a narrative that supports that belief. The only text on the actual memorial is on the Wall of Names and it is simply a listing of the names of each passenger. Doss writes, “When names are a memorial’s only script, standing alone without benefit of plot or moral, they can be reduced to a deceitful narrative of national consensus.”²⁰¹ When the visitor stands in front of the Wall of Names, they are confronted only with the narrative of those who perished and how they died, ignoring any other realities surrounding the events such as the motivations of the hijackers. When future visitors to the memorial, who may not have a strong historical accounting of the events, are presented with the narrative the memorial offers, they may come away with an accounting of 9/11 that is not historically accurate or the entire accounting. An example of an altered narrative as accepted historical fact can be seen through Kirk Savage’s exploration of the “Standing Soldiers, Kneeling Slaves” memorials that were prominent in the American landscape in the 19th century. Based on these works, the public that views them largely accepts the narrative that the white soldier (or Lincoln) freed the poor black slave who shows his gratitude by thankfully kneeling at his savior’s feet.²⁰² When the narrative a memorial presents begins to be substituted as a true reading of a historical event there is the clear danger of a biased and erroneous accounting. It is because of this that the Flight 93 Memorial is problematic. The memorial tries to offer only one

²⁰⁰ Doss, *Memorial Mania*, 60.

²⁰¹ Ibid, 152.

²⁰² This is discussed in detail perviously. Savage, *Standing Soldiers, Kneeling Slaves*, 15.

accounting of the memorialized historical events and it does so in a way that leads the visitor to believe this narrative is an accurate accounting of the historical facts.

Narratives and theories that disagree with this accounting are in no way represented in the memorial design.²⁰³

Yet, when other tools for exploring the memorial are added, this control lessens. Throughout the memorial there are small signs that offer a “Dial and Discover” option for visitors. These are either hung on short posts by themselves, or they are

Signs like the one above indicate a tour stop.

attached to the larger display panels (see above images). These stops lead to audio segments, focusing on different aspects of the memorial, that visitors can listen to on their personal cellphones. There are three different tours available: an Orientation tour, a Story tour, and a Design tour. Each of these tours consist of a narrator giving additional information and each stop lasts from one to five minutes. What is interesting about these tour stops is that instead of furthering the controlled narrative created by the memorial design, they actually tend to counter it. These tour stops are mostly full of factual information that help create a narrative framework that supports the memorial. In fact, there is little that references the emotional aspects of the Flight 93 story that the memorial design tends to center around. There is no music and no first person accounts that play

²⁰³ These will be discussed later in the project.

such an influential role in the other memorials' audio tours. Brendan Wilson, Lead Park Ranger, at the Flight 93 National Memorial, who developed and narrates these tours, stated the tours are to be a tool that will guide visitors, and not attempt to tell them how they should feel about the memorial. He further stated they are to offer more information so visitors can create their own experience;²⁰⁴ they are intended to help create "a neutral space"²⁰⁵ for visitors. When experienced while at the memorial, these tour stops do assist in diluting the controlling narrative created by the memorial design; however, that is only if the visitor chooses to listen to the majority of the available seventeen stops. If only a few are listened to, the dominant narrative of the memorial still takes precedent.

Visitors first encounter the Orientation tour at the Park's main entrance. This stop gives historical information about the area, including a discussion of past mining practices and the current reforestation effort. The second stop on the Orientation tour is at the Memorial Plaza and is more of a short generalized greeting. This stop was created before the Visitors Center opened and does not acknowledge its existence, it assumes this is the visitors' next stop after the entry. There is really nothing in either of these stops that directly references the narrative of the memorial. They are more orientated to helping the visitor get to the memorial itself.

Of the three tours, the Story tour has the most emotional appeal, but even this is limited to a few stops. The Story tour is meant to be heard while exploring the display panels in the memorial plaza. This tour has six different stops that tell the story of Flight

²⁰⁴ Brendan Wilson, telephone interview by Jennifer A. Fraley, March 10, 2016.

²⁰⁵ Ibid.

93. Much of this information is also available through the display panels; however, the audio tour gives many more details about the events. For example, most of the first stop, Story Tour Stop 201, discusses the possible target of Flight 93 as the Capitol Building in Washington D.C. Much of this information was discovered in 2006 at the criminal trial of Khalid Shaikh Mohammed, mastermind of the 9/11 plot. The information is offered in a very factual manner and actually consists of so much information that it may overwhelm the listener. The same is true of the next tour stop: Time. This stop explains that Flight 93 was the last plane hijacked due to its delayed takeoff. There are many departure times and flights mentioned in this stop, again making it overwhelming to the visitor. Both of the stops offer the information in a very dry, almost scientific way that really does not illicit an emotional response in the viewer. This actually can help to counteract the emotional response created from the display signs. For example, Story Tour 201 is to be heard while looking at the “America Attacked!” sign and Story Tour Stop 202 is supposed to be experienced as the viewer is looking at the “Mayday!” sign.²⁰⁶

The next two tour stops are more forthright in their attempt to control the narrative by appealing to the emotions of the visitor. Although they are still narrated by the same unaccompanied voice, the language changes and becomes more personal. For example, Story Tour Stop 203 is entitled “We’re going to do something” and by its very title references the passengers’ decision to fightback. The tour begins by explaining how “these ordinary airline passengers and crew”²⁰⁷ witnessed “the terrorists murdered a flight

²⁰⁶ The small sign promoting visitors to the tour stops are attached to the left edge of the “American Attacked!” and “Mayday!” signs.

²⁰⁷ *Flight 93*. Story Tour.

attendant and stabbed one passenger seated in first class, and incapacitated the pilot and co-pilot.”²⁰⁸ This language makes the viewer not only aware that these people were ordinary people, just like them, but it also establishes the traumatic events they witnessed. The stop continues to tell how the passengers and remaining crew were then forced to the back of the plane where thirteen of them made various phone calls. It was through these calls they “learned the shocking news” of the other attacks and they “quickly realized that this was unlike any previous hijacking and that Flight 93 was part of a larger attack on America.”²⁰⁹ This language focuses on America being under attack and starts the transformation of the ordinary people into protectors of the nation. The listener is then informed that after learning of the other hijackings the passengers decided to act and this “led to a vote and a collective decision to fight back.”²¹⁰ However, the tour also notes they waited “until they were over a rural area” to begin the assault, showing how they were concerned about those on the ground. However, it is never explained how they knew they were over a rural area, or if the plane was even low enough for them to realize this. This narrative is important because it adds to the heroic effort of these people, the heart of the memorial design. The tour stop concludes by

²⁰⁸ Ibid.

²⁰⁹ Ibid.

²¹⁰ Ibid.

describing the noises heard in the moments before the crash and then directs visitors to the boulder that sits at the end of the crash site. The display panel accompanying this tour stop has images of the still smoking crash site and the badly damaged Flight Data Recorder. These images are exceptionally poignant now that the listener has learned this was the final result of the passengers' effort to save others.

The next stop, Story Tour Stop 204, continues this emotional discourse by discussing the crew and passengers. This stop is to be experienced while standing in front of the sign that displays the names and images (see previous image). This combination literally shows the visitor who these people, who perished trying to save others, were. The tour stop gives some very general information about the passengers, but experiencing it while looking at their likeness it makes the victims relatable to more people, and therefore their deaths are felt harder. The stop concludes by stating "A few knew each other, but most were strangers. When faced with a great and tragic challenge, they as a group, decided to take action."²¹¹ The remainder of the Story Tour returns to more factual evidence about the recovery effort and the process of building the current memorial. Again, these offer more of a narrative framework to the listener instead of a controlled narrative.

The final tour, the Design tour, has

²¹¹ Ibid.

various stops that coincide with where the visitor is standing while walking along the memorial path to the Wall of Names. The tour offers factual information focusing on the memorial including the architects' intentions, the incorporation of natural elements into the design, and future plans for the site. What is most interesting about this tour is how it encourages listeners to reflect on specific aspects of the memorial by asking a series of questions. The first stop, 301: A Memorial Landscape, stresses that the memorial can be experienced in many ways and it is up to the individual to discover her own experience.²¹² It further states the memorial "acknowledges a time of violence, but offers a place of healing."²¹³ The stop concludes by asking visitors to reflect on what the memorial will mean to them and how will the place speak to them. This questioning is unique to the Design tour and it is extremely valuable for creating an open experience for the visitor. The Design tour does an exceptional job of offering a framing narrative, but then it gives visitors the freedom to decide how they personally will experience the memorial. For example, Tour Stop 304: Severe and Serene, discusses how the memorial is supposed to be a place that is both uplifting and serene; yet, it also acknowledges the violence that occurred there. Specifically how "the severe black wall is envisioned as a way to mark the crash site"²¹⁴ and the niches that are available for visitors to leave tributes to the fallen. The tour also points out the renewal of growth in the fields and how what was once scorched earth is now a field of wildflowers. It concludes by directly asking the visitor "how does this place speak to you?"²¹⁵ By focusing on specific design

²¹² Ibid.

²¹³ Ibid.

²¹⁴ Ibid.

²¹⁵ Ibid.

elements, the tour gives visitors a framework so they can understand the significance of these elements, but it then challenges visitors to experience the memorial on their own. This type of narrative continues for the remaining tour stops. While there are a few moments where the narrative becomes more controlling, overall it provides a framework and then leaves the rest to each visitor. More than any other element, this Design tour offers the “menu” Wilson wants visitors to experience.

The tour stops can be experienced anywhere and are available at any location by calling the provided number. Wilson stated they were not meant to be heard only while at the memorial (like the Pentagon audio tour, see below), but were designed so they could assist visitors wherever they were.²¹⁶ Overall, the tours do an adequate job of supplying visitors with factual information; however, this information can be overwhelming and confusing at times. The tours do need updated to reflect the new additions of the Visitors Center and Overlook. Surprisingly, the tours do a good job of expanding and not directing the narrative surrounding the memorial. After I personally experienced the memorial and saw how the design attempted to control the narrative, I expected more of the same from the tour stops. Of the three different tours, the Design tour is the most effective because it not only offers a framework, but it encourages visitors to ponder about not only what occurred there, but what it means to them, personally. When the tours are experienced, they help make the narrative offered more successful. But, these tours are optional and most visitors do not listen to all seventeen stops, thus negating the success. Since Wilson is in charge of updating both the tours and upcoming publications,

²¹⁶ Brendan Wilson, telephone interview by Jennifer A. Fraley, March 10, 2016.

it will be interesting to see if these will follow the path of the Design tour, or if they will follow the memorial design and try to direct the narrative. It will also be interesting to see if the hijackers are represented more in the new tours, and the within the Visitors Education Center.

It is to be noted, when the tour stop phone number is called from a cellphone, the caller receives a text that directs her to a link that will “unlock more unique info with the NPF Flight 93 mobile app.” This website offers the same audio tours with a very few accompanying photographs. This website really does nothing more to expand the narrative of the audio tour and is therefore not discussed in here detail.

The first of the three National 9/11 Memorials to open was the America's Heroes Memorial located inside the Pentagon, the home of the U.S. Department of Defense.

This smaller memorial opened in September 2002, after repairs to the Pentagon were finished. The memorial consists of photographs and biographies of the victims along with five panels where the victims' names are displayed.²¹⁷ The memorial is also adjacent to a small chapel. Since this smaller memorial is located on the inside of the Pentagon it is only accessible if visitors take the guided tour of the interior of the Pentagon; therefore making it unavailable to many visitors. In fact, I only learned of this exhibit after I returned home and was unaware of its existence while I was onsite. Upon learning of this, I wondered if this memorial was only supposed to be a temporary memorial for the workers at the Pentagon and if it should be seen more as a private memorial for those individuals. As it stands, there is really no reference to it in the larger, outside, public memorial and when researching the Pentagon 9/11 Memorial it is usually only discussed as a side note, if it is discussed at all. In fact, there is no mention of it on the official webpage of the Pentagon Memorial,²¹⁸ and when I searched for "America's Heroes Memorial" on the same page, it came back with no results. This leads me to conclude that this memorial was not intended for public consumption. This conclusion was affirmed by Kaitlin M. Hoesch, Executive Administrator & Special Projects Manager for the Pentagon Memorial Fund. She informed me this original memorial inside the Pentagon was not intended for public use and was more for those who worked at the Pentagon. She said this is evident by the stricter security measures that were enacted at the Pentagon directly after 9/11 that would not have permitted the public access to the work. The America's Heroes Memorial is now part of the guided Pentagon tour, but it

²¹⁷ U.S. Department of Defense. "Defense.gov News Photos." Web. 21 February 2015.

²¹⁸ pentagonmemorial.org last checked on February 25, 2016

was not created for this purpose.²¹⁹

The larger, outside, official memorial was, according to the brochure provided onsite, made to honor “the 184 people whose lives were lost at the Pentagon, and on American Airlines Flight 77, their families, and all those who sacrifice so that we may live in freedom”²²⁰ first broke ground in 2006, as part of the Phoenix Project and was designed by Julie Beckman and Keith Kaseman of the Kaseman Beckman Advance Strategies architecture firm. The firm was selected from over 1,100 entires. The family

²¹⁹ Kaitlin M. Hoesch, telephone interview by Jennifer A. Fraley, March 3, 2016.

²²⁰ *The National 9/11 Pentagon Memorial*. pamphlet from the site. (June 2013).

members, architects, and select Washington, D.C. public figures that composed the selection committee stated “The Memorial should instill the ideas that patriotism is a moral duty, that freedom comes at a price, and that the victims of this attack have paid the ultimate price...We challenge you to create a Memorial that translates this terrible tragedy into a place of solace, peace, and healing.”²²¹ It is interesting to note this is the only place where those who perished are referred to as “victims.” Everywhere else in the memorial, and even on the website dedicated to the memorial, the deceased are referred to as “those who perished,” “family members and friends who are no longer with us,” and most commonly, “heroes.” This shift in terminology is designed to alter how the viewer thinks of those who perished from passive victims to heroes who bravely died for their country. This is reenforced on the pamphlet available to visitors that reads, “The 184 souls lost in the terrorist attack at the Pentagon on September 11, 2001, when hijacked

American Airlines Flight 77 crashed into the Pentagon, were mothers fathers husbands, wives, children, brothers, sisters, coworkers, Flight Crew, friends, patriots.”²²²

The memorial was officially dedicated on September 11, 2008, and consists of 184 Memorial Units, one for each of the heroes. These are made of cantilevered, steel and

²²¹ The National 9/11 Pentagon Memorial. pentagonmemorial.org Web.

²²² *The National 9/11 Pentagon Memorial*. pamphlet from the site. (June 2013).

granite benches that rise from the ground with a small, shallow “reflecting pool” underneath and the hero’s name etched into the end of the bench. If the hero had any relatives that also perished at this location, their name(s) appear on a small plate on the edge of the reflecting pool. The official audio tour claims these plates make it possible for “family members lost to be forever linked”²²³ additionally “forever binding the family together.”²²⁴ The benches are placed in diagonal lines across the field according to birth year, youngest to oldest. These ages are shown by stainless steel age lines that bisect the field. These lines begin with a plaque that denotes the birth year on the perimeter of the field and then run the length of the memorial. There is also a large gap between the 1990 row and the 1979 row to show the age difference between the young children who perished and the adults. This gap reenforces the horror often associated with the death of young children. The benches face in one of two directions, if you read the hero’s name and look up and see the sky, the person was on board American Airlines Flight 77 (59 people), if you look up and see the Pentagon, the person was inside the building at the time of the attack (125 people). The benches are all confined within a gravel field of small light colored pebbles. The intention of the stabilized gravel is to “allows visitors to hear their footsteps as they walk through the park”²²⁵ with the intention of making them more aware

²²³ Audio tour, pentagonmemorial.org.

²²⁴ Ibid.

²²⁵ pentagonmemorial.org, “Interactive Map.”

they are in a different space. The entire field is surrounded by a stone walkway, a collection of eighty-five Crepe Myrtle trees, and an Age Wall that rises corresponding with the years on the benches as they progress.²²⁶ The Age Wall starts at three inches tall, the age of the youngest victim, and ends at seventy-one inches, the age of the oldest person who perished.²²⁷ According to the brochure, the Wall also serves the additional function of “draw[ing] the eye to the Memorial for drivers passing by on Washington Boulevard and the adjacent Arlington County Bike Path, while ensuring solitude for visitors.”²²⁸

The name of this project, the Phoenix Project, conjures images of rebirth and renewal, the phoenix literally rising from the ashes so that life may continue. However, the memorial that was constructed does not seem to follow in the spirit of the phoenix it

²²⁶ The descriptions of the memorials are from my personal experiences with the works.

²²⁷ Three year old Dana Falkenberg and seventy-one year old retired Navy veteran John D. Yamnicky

²²⁸ *The National 9/11 Pentagon Memorial*. pamphlet from the site. (June 2013).

was named after; it is a solemn place of reflection and remembrance, and not one of rebirth, instead death and the dead preside. As stated above, the memorial does answer the call of the selection committee. The Pentagon Memorial is most assuredly a place where the viewer is aware the “victims have paid the ultimate price”²²⁹ with their lives, because the field resembles a graveyard and the memorial benches appear to be gravestones rising from the gravel. This was also affirmed by Kaitlin Hoesch when she stated that many of the school children who visit the memorial ask if people are buried there.²³⁰ It so closely resembles a graveyard that visitors seem hesitant to walk into the pebble covered field of benches perhaps because they feel as if they are walking over the bodies of the victims. Instead, they tend to remain on the path that encircles the memorial field. In fact, when I visited the memorial there were several school groups taking tours of the site, all remaining on the surrounding pathway, and when I stepped into the field to get a closer look at the benches, there were audible gasps from the groups as if I was walking on the graves of these fallen heroes and by doing so, disrespecting them.

The architects proclaim their goal in creating the memorial was to “envision a memorial that simultaneously affords intimate and collective contemplation through silence within a tactile field of sensuous experience. It sets out to permanently record and express the sheer magnitude of loss through an architectural experience of place radically different than what we encounter in our daily lives.”²³¹ While they created a place of

²²⁹ Ibid.

²³⁰ Kaitlin M. Hoesch, telephone interview by Jennifer A. Fraley, March 3, 2016.

²³¹ pentagonmemorial.org., architect’s statement.

silence, they were less successful in fulfilling their desire to create a place where visitors could and would experience the “tactile field of sensuous experience.” The intentions of the designers are clear: a field of benches where people can sit and literally reflect (in the small pools under the benches). In fact, the audio tour “encourage[s] you to find a comfortable place to sit or explore the park and imagine, reflect on, and revisit the reality of that tragic morning on this, the very site where it happened.”²³² The reality of the memorial is that in their attempt to create this field as a separate space, the designers did so in a way that made it so “other” that visitors do not feel as if they can enter into the memorial, that it is off limits. Part of this is due to the resemblance of the benches to gravestones. The benches are made mainly from granite, making them physically resemble many gravestones, and they are equally spaced in a way that also reminds the viewer of a graveyard. The benches themselves are uncomfortable and awkward to sit

²³² Audio tour, pentagonmemorial.org.

upon due to their height and the pools of water underneath. The “reflection pools” are located directly below the benches so that anyone sitting on them would run the risk of stepping into, or dipping her feet into, these pools. When I visited the site I did not see one person sitting on the benches nor attempting to sit on them and very few people were touching the benches in any way. Most visitors confined their exploration to the path encircling the field and viewed the benches from a distance thus missing many of the finer details.

Jeffery M. Blustein writes that the public memorial’s “purpose is to affirm the dignity of victims and help repair relationships damaged by violence and repression.”²³³ While the Pentagon Memorial does an excellent job of showcasing the sacrifices of those who perished there, it fails in its attempt to repair the damage done by the violent acts. It offers no functional place for visitors to “provide opportunities for the sharing of memories, for co-remembering²³⁴ as Blustein claims memorials should provide to assist in the public healing process. Applying these standards and the designers own attempt to create a space that “simultaneously affords intimate and collective contemplation through silence within a tactile field of sensuous experience,”²³⁵ the memorial does not function as effectively as it could or as it was intended. Thus the memorial is partially unsuccessful in fulfilling its designed intentions.

The memorial does accomplish the second level of success; it clearly establishes a

²³³Blustein, *Forgiveness and Remembrance: Remembering Wrongdoing in Personal and Public Life*, 227.

²³⁴ Ibid.

²³⁵ The National 9/11 Pentagon Memorial. pentagonmemorial.org Web.

referential relationship between the viewer and the memorialized historical events. The viewer becomes very aware of the memorialized historic events, the fallen heroes, instantly upon entering the site. This connection can be created through memorial identification be it empathetic, sympathetic, imaginative, or cognitive. In my experience of the memorial, sympathetic memorial identification seems the most prominent. Again, this may be due to the memorial field's resemblance to a graveyard. When I stand in the front of the memorial I see all the "tombstones" and think of what it means to have lost a loved one. While I personally have no connection to anyone who perished here, I can judge what someone who does must experience and I feel pity for their loss and suffering.

This leads me to reflect more on the memorialized individuals, and this identification solidifies my connection to the work.²³⁶

Through this introspection of the victims, the viewer is also aware of the larger events of 9/11. While the Pentagon Memorial is much more subdued in its representation of the larger events surrounding 9/11, the viewer is made aware of them, as intended, through the prominent display of the date and through interactive tools available.

²³⁶ This analysis is not saying that sympathetic identification is the only or even the "best" identification, only it is what *this* viewer experienced strongest.

The narrative produced by the Pentagon Memorial is one of loss and solitude. This memorial, while representing the individual victims as a group, also pays more direct attention to each person who perished than the other 9/11 Memorials. Each hero is given his/her own bench that stands unattached from anything besides the gravel field, as an almost mini-memorial, or likened to a private memorial²³⁷ or tombstone. This construction allows the viewer to experience each bench as a private memorial and as if she was walking through a graveyard. In this way, every victim is individually honored and it is only when the work is viewed as a whole that the larger narrative of 9/11 becomes the focus. While this was seen as a negative in fulfilling the designers' intentions, here it works as a positive aspect of the memorial.

Unlike the other two main 9/11 Memorials, there is little that forces a narrative about the attack. The only direct reference to the attacks are on the two entry stones the viewer passes as she makes her way towards the memorial field and in the small two-sided pamphlet that is offered to visitors.²³⁸ On the sign, one sentence refers to the 9/11 attacks and the date and time of the crash is noted on the ground, The Zero Line, as the viewer walks into the field and on a foundation stone on the Pentagon itself; otherwise the site is free from any other direct representation of the events of September 11, 2001; including any direct mention of the hijackers or their motivations for carrying out the attacks. As with the other memorials, this absence keeps the focus on the victims and

²³⁷ This distinction is discussed in detail in Chapter 3.

²³⁸ This pamphlet was available on the site in 2013, and is still the one offered to visitors to this day. The term pamphlet is also loosely used; the term flyer might be better suited because it is a small two sided publication.

avoids creating a narrative that may seem to give the terrorists and their motivations a public platform. The pamphlet itself is very simple and states “In remembrance of the events of September, 11, 2001, The Pentagon Memorial Honors the 184 people whose lives were lost at the Pentagon and on American Airlines Flight 77, their families, and all those who sacrifice so that we may live in freedom.”²³⁹ on the front and the reverse side offers a relatively straightforward accounting of the crash and a description of the memorial. This lack of any overtly direct narrative gives enough of a framework that it allows the viewer the freedom to create or maintain her own interpretation of the memorial, while still understanding the necessary information surrounding 9/11. Because of this, the memorial is successful in relation to the narrative it offers because it does not attempt to force a single narrative onto the viewer. In its avoidance of a single narrative, the memorial allows various narrations and meanings to be discovered by the viewer while it maintains its purpose: memorialization. However, if the visitor chooses to listen to the available audio tour, this narrative becomes more controlling and the level of success slightly diminishes.

When visitors first approach the memorial, there are signs that inform them they may dial a phone number and listen to an audio tour of the site; this is also noted on the available pamphlet.

²³⁹ *The National 9/11 Pentagon Memorial*. pamphlet, (June, 2013).

When I last visited the Memorial in 2014, there were two options: a shorter twelve minute tour or a longer twenty-four minute tour. The longer tour is also available on the memorial's webpage; however, there is no mention of the shorter tour.²⁴⁰ The tour begins before the visitor enters into the Memorial and it literally walks the visitor through the work explaining the significance of certain design elements.²⁴¹ The tour begins with a disclaimer informing the listener that due to the serious nature of the subject matter, some parts might be "inappropriate for young children and distressful for those personally impacted by the events of 9/11."²⁴² The listener is then told to precede to the first black entry stone; here a brief background of the memorial and the design competition is given and the inscription on the stone is read to the listener. The tour informs the listener that this passage captures the "real purpose" of the memorial and that "we will never forget."²⁴³ The listener is then told to walk to the second black entry stone. While the visitor walks, there is patriotic music, full of drum rolls, playing in the background adding to the overall atmosphere. The second entry stone contains the names of the 184 people who perished at the Pentagon. The audio and stone both reference the sites of the other attacks and claim these places have now become "sacred sites." This area is the Memorial Gateway and is "meant to be a point of thought and remembrance before

²⁴⁰ According to Kaitlin M. Hoesch, both tours are still available at the memorial. She said the shorter tour was created because studies showed many visitors were disconnecting halfway through the longer tour. Interestingly enough, after the shorter tour became available, more visitors began listening to the entire longer tour. The only difference in the two tours is the longer tour has the first person accounts included.

Kaitlin M. Hoesch, telephone interview by Jennifer A. Fraley, March 3, 2016.

²⁴¹ You can listen to the tour from any location, but it is harder to follow if you are not on site or had visited it before.

²⁴² Audio tour, pentagonmemorial.org.

²⁴³ Ibid.

entering the memorial itself.”²⁴⁴ The entry stones, the music, and the words of the tour help to set the overall mood for the memorial; it is meant to be a sacred place of mourning and remembering not only those who perished here but all the 9/11 victims. If one were to enter the memorial without listening to the audio, this might still be somewhat evident, but the tour ensures the listener understands this overall theme.

Next, the visitor is instructed to walk to the Zero Line, the official entry into the memorial. Here the date and time of the attack are inlaid in stainless steel into granite. While walking, the visitor is given some background on the Pentagon itself, focusing on

²⁴⁴ Ibid.

its massive size: it is the largest low-rise office building in the world, each wedge is large enough to contain the entire U.S. Capitol building,²⁴⁵ it is made of five sides, has five stories, and contains five inner rings of offices. Interestingly the number 555 corresponds with the height of the Washington Monument, bringing further images of nationalism to the informed visitor. The narrator informs the listener that the Pentagon is dedicated to protecting *our* national interest, and it is the “most recognized symbol of strength, power and freedom in the world.”²⁴⁶ These inclusive lines directly connect the viewer to the Pentagon by reminding her it is there to protect her national interests. The additional imagery of the strength of the Pentagon only reinforces how horrific a violation this attack was to the American psyche.

The visitor then enters into the memorial itself, stepping over the Zero Line. The memorial is positioned so that it is in the direct flight path of Flight 77 in the final moments before it crashed into the Pentagon. The tour then informs the listener about important design aspects of the memorial, from the perimeter bench, to the meaning of the age lines. Here the viewer is asked to walk to the 1998 age line. As she walks, she is informed about the benches, the nameplates, the family plates within the reflecting pools, and the significance of the direction of the benches. This is all explained using Dana Falkenberg’s bench. The choice of this bench is important, not only because it is the first bench visitors encounter as they walk from the Zero Line, but due to the fact that she was also the youngest victim at three years old. The tour repeatedly stresses her age and this

²⁴⁵ Audio tour, pentagonmemorial.org.

²⁴⁶ Ibid.

brings to mind the innocence often associated with young children. The audio also lists the names of the four other young victims, again stressing the death of these innocent children. There is also a large gap between the 1990 age line and the next row of benches, 1979, this is again to highlight the difference in the ages between the youngest victims and the adults who perished.

The tour then instructs the viewer to walk to the 1961 age line. During this walk, more information is given to the viewer: the meaning of the Age Wall, how the memorial was “designed to engage the senses in every way”²⁴⁷ from the crunching gravel underfoot to the sounds of the running water, to the shine of the stainless steel in the benches. Once the viewer is at the 1961 age line, they are instructed to look at the Pentagon. This is the precise point of impact, between the first and second floors, and it is highlighted this is “just six windows from the exit doors.” This

note seems to enforce how close the victims were to possible escape; yet, they did not make it. This almost makes their deaths seem more tragic due to the proximity of these doors. There is now a charred black

stone that was pulled from the original building and was reset into the foundation of the repaired structure. This stone is inscribed with “September 11, 2001” forever linking the structure of the building to the attack.

²⁴⁷ Ibid.

At this point in the tour, the viewer is encouraged to “find a comfortable place to sit or explore the park and imagine, reflect on, and revisit the reality of that tragic morning on this, the very site where it happened.”²⁴⁸ The tour does not end here but is a collection of interviews including witnesses remembering what a beautiful, warm, sunny morning it was and what a routine day it had been. The narrator talks about some of the “normal” events of the day, a young couple leaving on their honeymoon, the fifth and sixth grade students leaving for a National Geographic Conference and how “for all it was a beautiful start to a beautiful day”...a pause...then in a lower tone...” nobody knew what lay ahead.”²⁴⁹ The next interview is of Ted Olsen, Solicitor General for the United States. Here, he remembers the phone call he received from his wife, Barbara, who was on Flight 77. Olsen discusses the information his wife relayed to him, but there is a sense of sadness to this, because the listener knows this will be the last conversation Olsen has with his wife. This segues into statistics of the last moments of Flight 77, including how it was traveling at 500 miles an hour, and a description of the left engine hitting the ground and the nose coming into contact with the Pentagon at 9:37AM.

There are two interviews with survivors who were inside the Pentagon and who were both injured. One of these survivors, John Yates, remembers that he had been watching the news coverage of the World Trade Center from New York on television with coworkers. He had been standing with a group of five other people, and he was the only one who survived. The second survivor interviewed, Raquel Kelly, recalls looking for

²⁴⁸ Ibid.

²⁴⁹ Ibid.

her phone after the crash and seeing her own hand on fire. After these accountings, the tour then lists the casualties: 184 perished: 59 on the plane, 125 in the Pentagon, and the five hijackers, who are not considered part of the official death count. This is the only mention of the hijackers in the entire tour; this absence highlights the idea that the memorial is dedicated more to the individuals who perished, and not necessarily to the larger political issues surrounding 9/11.

The rescue and recovery effort is briefly discussed, including an interview with Larry Everett, a first-responder, who states it was between two to three-thousand degrees within the Pentagon and their equipment should not have protected them, but they were able to stand there and fight the flames. In his own words, there “is really no explanation”²⁵⁰ as to how this was possible. This interview gives the listener the impression that there was some other force in play that was perhaps protecting the first-responders. Next, Eleana Myorga, discusses the phone calls from concerned citizens who wanted to help that started pouring in. She states the one that “broke her heart” was of an eighty year-old World War II Veteran who said he was still in shape and he still fit into his flight uniform, and that he was “ready to report.”²⁵¹ The listener cannot help but feel a moment of pride for these individuals who just wanted to assist their countrymen. This section ends with the narrator stating that ten days later, the “crime scene” was turned over to the FBI. This terminology directly brings to mind images of yellow police tape, and reenforces the idea that this ground, where the listener is standing, was the crime

²⁵⁰ Ibid.

²⁵¹ Ibid.

scene for 184 murders.

Violins begin to play as the tour transitions into a discussion of the memorial dedication seven years later. Jim Laychak, whose brother David was killed in the Pentagon, gave a moving speech at the dedication ceremony and much of it is reproduced in the tour including: “we want people to remember, we want people to remember what happened here, we want people to remember our loved ones, we want people to remember the feeling that swept through our country after 9/11, that feeling of taking care of all those who were in such pain.”²⁵² The narrator calls these words of hope and inspiration. Laychak claims the “Pentagon memorial will provide a sense of closure and comfort to all of those who are still in pain” and how it offers family members of the victims “a special connection to those that they lost.”²⁵³ He concludes his speech with his desire that everyone who visits the memorial will come away with a “sense of hope and inspiration because the memorial represents what great things can happen when we all work together to create something good.”²⁵⁴ These parting words, from someone who suffered such a personal loss, emphasize that this was a site of destruction and terror, but from that, people came together and created something memorable. At this point, the narrator thanks the listener for visiting the memorial and informs her of where she can find more information on how she can “support the memorial for future generations.”²⁵⁵ As a list of sponsors and contributors is read, the music becomes almost triumphant and

²⁵² Ibid.

²⁵³ Ibid.

²⁵⁴ Ibid.

²⁵⁵ Ibid.

swells then ebbs into the softer notes of a piano signaling the end of the audio.

As one would expect of a tour provided at the memorial, by those who run the memorial, the narrative is somewhat controlled. However, the audio tour offered at the Pentagon Memorial is not overly controlling like those offered by the design of the Flight 93 Memorial and guided tour at the World Trade Center Memorial.²⁵⁶ This tour offers important information to help listeners understand the events that occurred, but it does so by offering a framework of information that allows the viewer some freedom in her reactions to the events. While the audio does have moments of controlling the narrative, these are relatively few, and only seem to control specific elements of the memorial, and not the overall narrative. Some examples of this control are: the use of background music to help set the atmosphere, the emphasis on the deaths of the youngest victims, the selection of interviews included within the tour, and the absence of the hijackers and their motivations.

The audio tour could have consisted only of the voices of the narrator and the individuals interviewed, there was no specific need for the addition of background music. However, this music serves two purposes; the first is to simply fill up dead airtime, especially in transitional moments when the listener is walking from location to location, and when the tour is switching topics. The second purpose of the music is more directly linked to the narrative. The music helps to create a specific atmosphere; such as, when the tour begins there is patriotic music playing. By patriotic I am referring to music that

²⁵⁶ For a more in-depth discussion of this see the following chapter.

is associated with marches and linked to American ideals. This music is often played at events such as parades and firework displays. This music helps create a link between the viewer and these ideals. Another example this musical influence is when the violins are prevalent; these low, almost weeping tones help to instill a sense of sadness and mourning. It is fitting that this occurs as the tour is transitioning from the events of 9/11 to the memorial's dedication ceremony. The memorial and the ceremony were created to memorialize those who perished. While this music does influence the listener, it is not overdone nor does it dominate the audio; it is more of a suggestion to aid in interpretation.

An area where the narrative is more directly controlled is through the repeated emphasis on the deaths of the youngest victims. While it makes sense for the tour to use Dana Falkenberg's bench to explain the different significant elements of the benches, it is the first bench visitors encounter, the tour stresses many times that she was the youngest victim at only three years old. The tour also lists the names of the four other young victims, something it does not do for the remaining victims. Other victim's names are only mentioned if his/her bench is of significance (1961 marking the impact site on the Pentagon), or if an interviewee references them (David Laychak and Barbara Olsen). As mentioned above, this emphasis on the killing of children adds to the idea that the victims were innocent. We tend to more closely associate children, specifically young children, with innocence. By establishing the innocence of the first five victims, and by making the listener aware of their ages as she walks past their benches, this idea of innocence is then shared with the remaining victims as the viewer continues through the memorial.

This is one way in which the tour directly affects the narrative because a viewer who is not listening may not notice the significance of the year 1998. By this I mean, when a viewer sees the year 1998, during her visit to the memorial in 2016, she may only think that was eighteen years ago and not make the connection that a person born in 1998, who died in the attack, was only three years old at the time. The audio tour ensures the listener is aware of this fact. Again, this is a way the tour directly affects the narrative, but it is not too controlling. The information may trigger the idea of innocence in the listener, but this is not guaranteed. The viewer may think “wow, that person was young” and never associate youth with innocence. Due to this open association, this particular aspect of control, by itself, is not singularly detrimental to the overall narrative of the tour.

The final and most direct way the audio tour affects the narrative is through the interviews that were selected to be included in the tour. These interviews all seek to establish some personal connection (empathetic, sympathetic) with the listener. These connections then influence how the listener experiences the memorial. For example, Ted Olsen’s interview does not seem overly emotional, but when the listener realizes his wife perished in the attack, she may feel sympathy for the suffering Olsen endured due to the loss of a loved one. As she stands in the memorial looking at the victims’ benches, the visitor knows one is for Olsen’s wife. This interview made her more aware of the personal loss that each bench represents. This shift in perspective can change how she experiences the memorial. While she is aware that each bench represents a victim, she may not have been directly aware of the suffering of those associated with each victim.

Because of this interview, she is now aware of this, and her experience of the memorial is altered.

Additionally, the two interviews of survivors of the attack offer a side of the narrative that is absent without the audio tour. While walking through the memorial, there is no direct representation of those who survived, or any reference to them. By listening to both John's and Raquel Kelly's interviews, the listener is not only made aware of the physical suffering they both experienced but the emotional trauma they still must endure. These interviews create a level of awareness in the listener that was not there before and may change how she views the memorial. Perhaps the viewer is now thinking about the memorialized victims, but also those who survived. This creates another narrative that may not have been present to the listener without the tour.

Finally, the inclusion of sections of Jay Laychak's speech during the dedication ceremony creates a narrative that directly reflects the memorial's mission. Jay asserts that the memorial is a place that offers its visitors hope, comfort, and closure. He reiterates that what occurred there was a horrific event, but what has been created from that was something great. Through his speech, Jay's words serve to enforce the significance and meaning of the memorial, that a work that "translates this terrible tragedy into a place of solace, peace, and healing"²⁵⁷ has been created. Listeners are more likely to feel a personal connection to these words when they hear them spoken by someone who was directly affected by the attack than by reading them on a sign, in a

²⁵⁷ The National 9/11 Pentagon Memorial. pentagonmemorial.org Web.

pamphlet, or online. This connection, created through the audio tour, reinforces the original narrative of the memorial. While this is a direct attempt to control the narrative, it is not enough to deem the work wholly ineffective in this respect. For the same reasons the narrative framework of the entire memorial is acceptable, so too is the audio tour. It offers the listener additional information, and reinforces some aspects, but it still leaves much interpretation to the viewer.

On the official Pentagon Memorial webpage, the audio tour is available to download and there is also an accompanying video. The video uses the same soundtrack as the audio tour, and this is accompanied by a reel of different photographs. The photographs are sometimes panned across, zoomed in and out on, and in the transition from photo to photo, the video usually fades to black. The photographs usually depict what is being talked about, for example, when the entry stones are discussed, the images are of these stones. There are only a few photographs that depict any of the violence surrounding the events, and of these, only two photographs show any fire, meaning they were taken very soon after the crash. There are patriotic images such as President Bush with his hand over his heart, standing under an American Flag and the iconic image of first responders unfurling the American flag from the roof of the Pentagon. Overall, the video really does not add much to the audio tour nor the narrative. The people interviewed are not shown, with the possible exception of Jim Laychak.²⁵⁸ Many of the photographs shown are easily accessible online and there are many other available

²⁵⁸ A photograph of a man talking at a podium is shown while Jim is heard speaking, but the viewer can only assume this is actually Jim.

images, in this writer's opinion, that are much more thought provoking and depict the memorial in a more compelling fashion. Watching this video in no way substitutes for visiting the actual memorial.

Of the three National 9/11 Memorials, the Pentagon is the least extensive; it consists mainly of the Memorial Park, the audio tour, and the website. When compared to the massive memorial and museum in New York City, the large newly opened Visitors' Center, Learning Center, and Wetlands Bridge at the Flight 93 Memorial, in addition to the various interactive apps, guided tours, and websites available for both of these locations, the Pentagon Memorial appears to be lacking. Those who run the Pentagon Memorial have also realized this and are striving to remedy this disparity. The Pentagon Memorial Fund is currently working on expanding the memorial's depth by creating the 9/11 Pentagon Visitor Education Center. The written need for this Center is:

The events of 9/11 are unforgettable. Everyone carries their own distinct memory of where they were and what it felt like when they first heard about the attacks. And yet the Pentagon's story of that day still needs to be told. The 9/11 Pentagon Visitor Education Center will be a place where visitors from around the world can learn about the events of September 11, 2001, the lives lost, and the historic significance of the Pentagon Memorial site.²⁵⁹

The desire to teach visitors about the history and significance of the site is one of the main goals of the future Center: "Among the hundreds of thousands of visitors to the Memorial each year, few know that this memorial is different from all others in Washington, D.C. in that it is located where the event took place. Research showed that

²⁵⁹ pentagonmemorial.org "Project Information"

there is a unique teachable moment at the Memorial to explain the events on 9/11.”²⁶⁰ To do this, the Pentagon Fund has named National Geographic as the official education partner. This partnership maybe because seven of the victims on Flight 77 were associated with National Geographic. The Pentagon will also be collaborating with many other organizations including the the National September 11 Memorial and Museum, the 9/11 Tribute Center, and the Flight 93 Memorial/National Park Service.²⁶¹ In 2013, a business plan and renderings for the proposed Center were developed. The Center will be located near the memorial and will include a multi-media interactive exhibit space, a Children’s Education Area, a Reflection Area, conference and meeting rooms, an Auditorium, and Sky Terrace,²⁶² and if it follows the example of the other memorials, a gift shop. As of now, ²⁶³ the project is still in the fundraising stages, with the desire that it will be finished and opened as part of the twentieth anniversary of September 11, 2001.²⁶⁴ It will be interesting to see when this project is completed if the memorial will still successfully maintain the delicate balance of offering a narrative framework without trying to overly control this narrative in its attempt to “help others understand the day the world changed.”²⁶⁵

²⁶⁰ Ibid.

²⁶¹ Ibid.

²⁶² Ibid.

²⁶³ This was last reviewed in March 2016.

²⁶⁴ Kaitlin M. Hoesch, telephone interview by Jennifer A. Fraley, March 3, 2016.

²⁶⁵ pentagonmemorial.org “Project Information”

Conclusion

As I sit here writing this section I have the television on and there is a breaking news report of Pope Francis's visit to the WTC 9/11 Memorial.²⁶⁶ Here, as the Pope is shown praying in front of Reflecting Absence, the commentators are making continual statements about the number of victims that are remembered in the bronze plates. Over and over again, Scott Pelley of CBSNews keeps saying "2,977...2,977" to remind the viewers of the loss of lives that are memorialized at the site. The Pope then walks into the Museum and the commentary shifts to a discussion of the museum being "a living museum" and there is speculation about what artifacts he will examine including the crushed firetruck previously discussed. The image then shifts to the inside of the museum where the Pope will be holding an interfaith service. The stage is set up beside the Last Column and the Slurry Wall serves as the backdrop.

This "Breaking News" confirms the important role the events of 9/11 still play in the lives of individuals today. And it begs the question, are the 9/11 Memorials and Museum so effective because many of us still have vivid memories of experiencing the events of September 11, 2001 or is it because they are successful as memorials? The answer to this will only be revealed as those with little to no memory of the events of the day come to age and visit the memorials themselves and share what they experience. This time is soon approaching, currently²⁶⁷ in my classes of mostly first and second year undergraduates, they tell me they have some memories of the day but for the most part it

²⁶⁶ 11:15 AM on Friday, September 25, 2015.

²⁶⁷ in 2015.

is just a feeling of being scared and remembering their parents were upset and scared over something that happened that day. In a few years, those with no personal memory of September 11, 2001 can help inform us if the memorials are truly successful in creating the necessary referential relationship between the memorialized historical events and the viewer or if they are now only so successful because of the vivid personal memories visitors still carry with them. Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett declares that “objects can no longer draw visitors the way they once did.”²⁶⁸ It will be interesting to ask this group of individuals what brought them to the memorials and what the narrative of 9/11 is both before and after they visit the sites to see what influence the memorials have on the narrative they walk away with and what power these objects continue to hold.

²⁶⁸Kirshenblatt-Gimblett. *Destination Culture*, 7.

CHAPTER THREE

LEARNING FROM ONE ANOTHER: A COMPARISON

While each of the National 9/11 Memorials is effective in various ways, it is when they are compared to one another that their differences become apparent. They all have something to offer the other, and could be improved by adapting aspects that have made the other memorials more successful. At their core, each seeks to memorialize the victims of September 11, 2001, and to pay tribute to the survivors, families and friends of the deceased. All three also make special mention of the many individuals who have been a part of the rescue and recovery mission: from first-responders, volunteers, to the spirit of support felt from the American people and much of the world. This chapter will compare the three memorials in the hope of offering a critique on how each could improve. The New York City Memorial Museum will also be discussed, but will not be as critically compared to the Flight 93 Memorial and the Pentagon Memorial because at the time of my research, neither location had a museum, or even a visitors' center to compare.²⁶⁹

²⁶⁹ The Flight 93 Memorial has since added and opened the Visitors Center and Education Center (Opened Summer 2015) and the Pentagon Memorial is working to create the 9/11 Pentagon Visitor Education Center (still in fundraising stages as of March 2016).

More Than a Name: Representing the Individuals

When reflecting on the events of September 11, 2001, we often think of the 2,977 people who lost their lives. Yet, unless we have a personal connection to them, many of us tend to think of these people in categories: World Trade Center, Pentagon or Flight 93. While this classification is not incorrect, it tends to diminish the individuals. As Dominick LaCapra argues, “losses cannot be adequately addressed when they are enveloped in an overly generalized discourse of absence.”²⁷⁰ So how does each memorial ensure that the individual victims are adequately represented within the larger context of 9/11? All three memorials physically list the names of the victims in some way. As Erika Doss writes, “naming is an act of claiming, an assertion of inclusion; to be named is to be acknowledged.”²⁷¹ Naming has almost become a requirement in modern memorials, we expect to see the victims’ names somewhere on the work. Doss continues by stating that naming is “also controversial because it seems to consider who is important, who counts the most...names are familiar, comforting, and recognizable signs of real people, literal evidence of humanity.”²⁷² So within memorials that name all the victims, how does an individual remain an individual while still being part of a collected group?

The Pentagon Memorial seems to give the most individualized attention to each victim. Every victim has a bench of his/her own, with his/her name inscribed on it. These benches are placed on age lines that also denote the victim’s year of birth. The

²⁷⁰ LaCapra, Dominick as quoted in Doss, *Memorial Mania*, 145.

²⁷¹ Ibid., 150.

²⁷² Ibid., 151.

year of death is not needed because it is understood that all of the benches represent individuals that perished on September 11, 2001. Visitors can go and find a specific victim's bench and leave mementos on it for that victim, something that is not easy to do at Reflecting Absence. These benches can almost be seen as mini memorials, one for each victim. However, when viewed together, these are not as individualized as they may first seem. Every bench is exactly the same size, shape, and color. They are all placed on the appropriate age line with uniform spacing. They face one of two directions, either towards the Pentagon or to the open sky. The only difference is the name engraved on the bench and possibly on the family plate within the reflecting pool; both of these attributes are only noticeable upon viewing the bench up close. When experiencing these benches from a distance, they all appear identical and lose their uniqueness. What up close seems to pay honor to the individual, from afar in fact conforms the individual to the group. The benches are spaced throughout the memorial much like gravestones are placed in a graveyard; yet, they lack the diversity typically found within many graveyards.

Additionally, the Pentagon's victims' names are included on the second entry stone. Here they are listed in alphabetical order along with their birth year and military rank and affiliation when appropriate. No other personal information is given, but no associations to other victims are shown. This impersonal listing also detracts from the uniqueness of each victim but, it does serve a purpose. As Doss writes, "Naming is typically used in contemporary memorials to secure understandings of national unity"²⁷³ and that is the intent of this listing. The Pentagon Memorial official webpage does have a

²⁷³ Ibid., 150.

“Biographies” section that includes photographs and a written biography of every victim. This database can be searched alphabetically or by birth year. There is also a link to the biographies of those who perished at the World Trade Center in New York City and aboard Flight 93 in Shanksville, Pennsylvania.

The Flight 93 Memorial also pays tribute to each victim as an individual, but this is not as obvious as it is in the case of the individual benches at the Pentagon Memorial. The Wall of Names took the importance of individual representation into consideration within its design, even though this may not be apparent when first viewing the work. Each of the forty victims has his/her own panel in the Wall, that is engraved with his/her name. Some of these panels also have additional details that reflect the individual; such as, the flight crew’s titles, and Toshiya Kuge’s name in kanji written by his mother.²⁷⁴ At first, the Wall appears to be a single, solitary work consisting of forty connected panels, but when the viewer looks closely she will see there is a slight space between each panel. This separation is to acknowledge that every victim was an individual and should be recognized as such. As stated in the audio Design Tour, the Wall “acknowledge[s] that these were individual people...but if one steps back, the forty individual panels become one wall, reminding us of their combined determination.”²⁷⁵ This is a very interesting element to the design because the overarching theme of Flight 93, tends to focus on the importance of the crew and passengers working as a united whole and not as individuals.

Throughout the display panels and printed materials available at the memorial, the

²⁷⁴ Barbara Black, telephone interview by Jennifer A. Fraley, March 8, 2016.

²⁷⁵ Flight 93 audio tour: Design Tour.

crew and passengers are listed as a group and in alphabetical order. Much like the entry stone in the Pentagon Memorial, this listing diminished the uniqueness of the individual victims. However, since I first conducted research there, the Visitors Center has opened, and I have been informed that more of an effort to relay the stories of each victim has been made through various efforts, including an oral histories collection that has over eight-hundred and fifty entries.²⁷⁶ The official webpage of the Flight 93 Memorial also offers full biographies for each victim that is searchable by name. This site has links to both the New York City 9/11 Memorial and Pentagon Memorial official webpages too.

The World Trade Center National 9/11 Memorial and Museum in New York City bears a heavier burden in its attempt to represent each victim as an individual, as it not only has the largest number of victims to account, but it additionally lists *all* of the 9/11 victims and the victims of the 1993 World Trade Center bombing. When one analyzes Reflecting Absence alone, the New York City memorial represents each victim as an individual less than the other two memorials. As shown above, at the Pentagon every victim has his or her own memorial bench, and at the Flight 93 Wall of Names, each victim has their own, individual panel. At Reflecting Absence, the only information given is the names and the geographic location of the victims when they perished: such as Flight 11, Ladder 16. The names are not listed alphabetically or by any other visually apparent system, such as birth year, and they seem to be almost randomly placed on the panel.²⁷⁷ Due to this, the bare listing of names is unsuccessful at treating the victims as

²⁷⁶ Barbara Black, telephone interview by Jennifer A. Fraley, March 8, 2016.

²⁷⁷ The actual arrangement and importance of this order will be discussed in the following section.

individuals and instead seems to only represent them as a larger group.

However, once a visitor accesses the many tools available for interpreting the memorial, this begins to change. The most obvious example of this is the Name Finder tool that is available at kiosks on site, through the memorial's webpage, and through a downloadable app. This tool not only helps the visitor find a victim's name, but it also links to a photograph and biography of the victim. This tool takes the name and transforms it from an item on a list to a meaningful representation of an individual's life.²⁷⁸

This individual representation is also reenforced when the visitor visits the 9/11 Memorial Museum, *In Memoriam* Exhibition. Within this exhibit, photographs of each victim are displayed on the Wall of Faces. This Wall of Faces is a large four-sided room with eight by ten photographs covering much of the available space. Each photograph is labeled with the individual's name. Adjacent to the Walls are touchscreen tables that allow visitors to click on these same images and discover additional information about each person. This information includes photographs shared by family and friends, images of objects that were personal to the victim, and audio remembrances by family, friends, and coworkers. There is also an interior room with black walls and a bench that rings the perimeter of the room. On these walls rotating images of an individual victim are displayed, along with biographical information. While these images are displayed, various audio recordings play that give more information about the victim. These

²⁷⁸ See discussion of this below and for a visual representation of the Name Finder.

recordings are shared memories and reflections from friends and family members.

Through this interior exhibit, the 2,977 victims are all remembered individually and each one has his/her moment as the sole focus of the visitors.

Additionally, the official webpage of the 9/11 Memorial and Museum has various links to the biographies of the victims who perished at the World Trade Center, along with those who perished at the Pentagon, on Flight 93, and in the 1993 World Trade Center bombing. Due to the sheer number of individuals that must be represented, the New York location seems to fail in representing each victim as an individual, but upon a deeper investigation it successfully offers the necessary tools to learn about every victim independently.

Meaningful Adjacencies?

As discussed above, each memorial lists the names of the victims in some way: Flight 93 has the Wall of Names, the Pentagon Memorial has each name inscribed on individual benches, and Reflecting Absence has the names etched into the bronze panels that surround the waterfalls. The importance of including the individual names has also been examined above, but there are other implications of these names. By listing the names of the victims together, each victim is forever associated with the memorial, the events of 9/11, and the other victims. When they are only listed on the work, with no other connection, it appears as if the events of 9/11 are the only common denominator they share. Yet, for many of these victims, that is not the case, most were not strangers to

one another; many of them were family members, friends, and coworkers. All three memorials attempt to show this association, but they all do so in different ways, and none do so with complete success.

The most physically obvious attempt to link the victims is at the Pentagon Memorial. Here the memorial has name plates in the reflecting pools list other family members who perished in the attack. However, these plates lack vital information. They only list the names and birth year of the other members, there is nothing that denotes what the association is. The viewer must assume they are somehow linked but may not be sure how. For example, four

members of the Falkenberg family died when Flight 77 crashed into the Pentagon. On Zoe Falkenberg's bench, the viewer can see the family plate in the reflecting pool. Zoe's name is listed on the end of her bench and the pool contains the names and birth years: Leslie A. Whittington 1955, Charles S. Falkenberg 1956, Dana Falkenberg 1998. One would assume those with the same last name are family members, but there is nothing denoting Leslie's relationship as Zoe's mother. If not for the inclusion of the birth year, one would not even be given a hint of what their relationship might be. Another example of this is Diane M. Simmons's bench. Simmons was also on Flight 77 traveling with her husband George. In the pool under Diane's bench, George's name and birthdate appear

(1944) but there is nothing that denotes him as her husband; for all the viewer knows, they may have been brother and sister. These associations could be made clearer with the addition of what the relationship was. Thus under Zoe's bench the plate could potentially read:

Leslie A Whittington (mother)	1955
Charles S. Falkenberg (father)	1956
Dana Falkenberg (sister)	1998

and the plate under Diane M. Simmons's could read:

George W. Simmons (husband)	1944
-----------------------------	------

Additionally the year they were married could also be included: (husband, m.19__).

These slight changes would clarify the relationship of the listed names.

Another way in which these plates fail to convey adequate information is that they only link family members; any other associations are not recognized either in the memorial park or directly on the website. Many of the individuals who perished within the Pentagon were coworkers, but these associations are not noted. Additionally on Flight 77 there were three students, accompanied by three teachers, who were traveling to the Channel Islands to visit the National Geographic Society's National Marine Sanctuary.²⁷⁹ As part of this trip, two employees of National Geographic were also on the flight.²⁸⁰ None of these people were related to one another, but they were traveling as a group. When one walks through the memorial, there is nothing that links these

²⁷⁹ "Are We Civilized, Or Merely Domesticated?" whatreallyhappened.com Bernard Brown, 11; Asia Cotton, 11; Rodney Dickens, 11; Sarah Clark, 65; James Debeuneure, 58; Hilda Taylor, 58.

²⁸⁰ Joe Ferguson, 39 and Ann Judge, 49.

individuals together making it seem as if this association is not important. During the audio tour there is some mention of younger students traveling with teachers to a National Geographic Conference, but their names are not given.²⁸¹

On the official website for the Pentagon Memorial victims can only be searched by name or birth year, there is no tool or even graphic showing any association. If one were to read each biography, she may find these associations but they are in no way obviously denoted. For example when reading the biographies for the students and teachers, the reader discovers they were all traveling to the same location and some of them were from the same school, but this relationship must be ascertained by the astute reader. By adding a search tool that links these relationships, such as the one available for the World Trade Center Memorial, readers could discover more about the victims.

Reflecting Absence at the New York City National 9/11 Memorial is the most successful of the three works in terms of noting the various relationships of the victims. This is extremely important for this memorial, not only because it had the most victims, but Reflecting Absence also lists the names of those who perished on Flight 93, at the Pentagon, and in the 1993 World Trade Center bombing. This is done in two different ways. The first is physically obvious when looking at the listed names: larger associations such as Flight number or the first-responders who perished are listed with those they served with, and are marked by name (Flight 77, ladder, Battalion, Engine). For example two first-responders from Ladder 16 perished in the attack. The visitor can

²⁸¹ Pentagon audio tour, pentagonmemorial.org.

see “Ladder 16” in gold on the nameplate, and then Robert Curatolo’s name followed by Raymond E. Murphy’s name. This makes it clear to the viewer that these men worked together.

The second way Reflecting Absence links the relationships between victims is through what designer Michael Arad calls meaningful adjacencies. Arad struggled while attempting to decide how to arrange the names of the 9/11 victims on the memorial. He claimed this was the hardest part of the design because he did not want to list the names in what he considered the “usual organization” meaning alphabetically or chronologically. Arad admitted “Frankly, I broke down and cried.”²⁸² He finally came up with a system that at first looks haphazard but is actually full of these “meaningful adjacencies.” In this system victims that were somehow linked in life (worked together, were friends, family, etc.) remain together on the memorial. This became very important for not only Arad, but for the meaning of the memorial itself, to the families of the victims, and all who visit the site.

Arad worked tirelessly to represent the wishes of many without seeming to claim one group of victims was more important than another. As Tom Johnson, whose son perished in the attacks, is quoted as saying , “any attempt to establish a hierarchy of loss

²⁸² Blais, *A Place of Remembrance: Official Book of the National September 11 Memorial*, 138.

is to deny the absolute measure of the tragedy visited equally on each victim and to diminish the value we put on life—all life.”²⁸³ As Arad stated that no attempt was made to “impose order on this suffering.”²⁸⁴ The purpose of these meaningful adjacencies is to make the listing order powerfully meaningful because the listed names would forever be linked with family members, friends, coworkers, and those sharing geographical location. Arad said “what is most gratifying to me is that I can imagine friends and family members who lost loved ones coming to the site and seeing names they know next to one another, and I hope taking some solace in that moment of tribute.”²⁸⁵

The names are first arranged in different groups. In the pools surrounding the North Tower: those working or visiting the Tower, those aboard Flight 11 that crashed into the North Tower, and the victims of the 1993 bombing, which occurred below the North Tower. In the pools surrounding the South Tower: those working or visiting the Tower, those aboard Flight 175 that crashed into the Tower, those who perished in the Pentagon, those onboard Flight 77 that crashed into the Pentagon, those onboard Flight 93, and the first-responders. Within each of these groups colleagues were then linked together; such as the 73 employees of the Windows on the World restaurant are listed together. Entire families who perished are listed with the husbands’ and wives’ names linked and the children(s) name appearing directly below them. Interestingly enough, the

²⁸³ Ibid., 162.

²⁸⁴ Ibid.

²⁸⁵ Ibid, 169.

Falkenberg family discussed above is listed together on the South Tower pool.²⁸⁶ Here they are linked together because of the meaningful adjacencies when other arrangements, such as those used at the Pentagon, have separated them. Families could also ask for adjacency requests where specific victims would be linked; most of these were because they had some relationship with one another before the attacks. This arrangement also made it possible for the names of the school children, teachers, and National Geographic employees, who were traveling together on Flight 77, to be listed together; something that would not have been possible following an alphabetical arrangement. In all, over 1,200 requests were submitted, but not all of these were for people who knew each other before that day.²⁸⁷ An example of this, that highlights the emotional importance of the meaningful agencies, are the names of Victor Wald and Harry Ramos. Both men worked

²⁸⁶ See image of rendering of the family that would later be constructed on the South Tower pool. Blais, *A Place of Remembrance: Official Book of the National September 11 Memorial*, 176.

²⁸⁷ Ibid., 169.

in the South Tower, but they did not work together, and there is no indication they knew each other before that day. According to witness accounts, Victor had trouble descending the staircase and decided to stop and wait for help. Harry stopped and told him “I am not going to leave you.” He didn’t, they both perished when the Tower collapsed. Victor’s wife asked for their names to be linked because they died alongside one another.²⁸⁸ This request was honored and the two names are now forever linked on panel N-63.

Some of these meaningful adjacencies are physically apparent when looking at the memorial, such as family members with the same last names and those listed by the names of the Flight they were on. Yet, many of these associations are not obvious to the uninformed viewer, she may just see what appears to be a random listing of victims. However, there are electronic directories available on hand to search for the names; the pamphlets that are available at the memorial (in many different languages) also explain the idea of the meaningful adjacencies and include a small map showing where the geographic adjacencies are located. These meaningful adjacencies are apparent on the downloadable 9/11 Memorial App and on the Name Finder tool on the official webpage: 911memorial.org. Both of these tools can be accessed through a visitor’s personal mobile device. When searching for a name, users can search by criteria used to create the meaningful adjacencies including: physical location at the time of the attack, employer or affiliation, first responder unit, and flight. Through these criteria alone, the associations

²⁸⁸ Barton, Jake. *TEDtalk: The Museum of You*. Filmed May 2013, posted September 2013. TEDSalon NY2013. Web.

of the victims become evident. When a specific name is chosen, another screen appears that gives biographical information on the victim, it tells where the name is located, and there are also links that will show the geographical group adjacencies and the requested adjacencies. When one of these is selected, the connection is highlighted; however, the reason for the requested connection is not explained, it only states it was requested by next-of-kin or affiliations.

These tools, while not a physical part of the memorial, make it easy for the visitor to discover the connections many of the victims had with one another. Of the three memorials, Reflecting Absence does the most complete and thorough job of showing the visitors the various links that exist. The only improvement might be to show why the names were requested to be linked on the memorial in cases where it is not apparent what the association was. It could be that these adjacencies are known and meaningful for

[SEARCH RESULTS](#)

SOUTH POOL: PANEL S-69
 Zoe Falkenberg

[PRINT MAP](#)

[SEND SMS OR EMAIL](#)

ANI	FLIGHT 77	DAVID M. CHARLEBOIS	TODD H. REUBEN	MARI-RAE SOPPER	J. JOSEPH FERGUSON	CHARLES A
L. FRASER	CHARLES F. BURLINGAME III	JENNIFER LEWIS	GEORGE W. SIMMONS	DIANE M. SIMMONS	DORA MARIE	MENCHACA
CIA	MARY JANE BOOTH	KENNETH E. LEWIS	NORMA LANG STEUERLE	ROBERT PENNINGER	YENENEH BETRU	JAMES D. I
CORRIGAN	MICHELE M. HEIDENBERGER	SANDRA DAWN TEAGUE	LESLIE A. WHITTINGTON	CHARLES S. FALKENBERG	ANN C. JUDG	
	RENEE A. MAY AND HER UNBORN CHILD	YVONNE E. KENNEDY	DANA FALKENBERG	ZOE FALKENBERG	CHANDLER	RAYMOND KEL

Zoe Falkenberg
 November 8, 1992 – September 11, 2001

BORN IN: University Park, Maryland
LIVED IN: University Park, Maryland

GROUP: Flight 77

AFFILIATION:
 Flight 77, Passenger

REQUESTED ADJACENCIES:
 Charles S. Falkenberg, Leslie A. Whittington, Dana Falkenberg

Requests for adjacent names were made by next-of-kin or affiliations.

those who requested them and are a type of private memorial within the larger public memorial. Luckily enough, Reflecting Absence shows these relationships for all of the victims of 9/11 and not just those who perished at the World Trade Center, filling a gap left by both the Pentagon and Flight 93 Memorials.

The Flight 93 Memorial had a lighter memorial load to bear than the other two memorials because, to begin with, it had fewer people to memorialize. It had to deal only with the passengers on the plane; there were no casualties on the ground like there had been in both New York and Washington, D.C. Secondly, there were not as many associations between the passengers onboard the plane, meaning those who did know each other were mostly in groups of two. The exception to this, and the largest association, is the flight crew and the memorial denotes this association in three ways.

The first is on a display panel walking into the memorial; here the flight crew is shown first, with their job titles, followed by an alphabetical listing of the remaining passengers. The second way the flight crew is acknowledged is on the Wall of Names. The names on the forty white, marble panels appear in alphabetical order including, each crew member's name.

Additionally, below the crew's names, their official titles are engraved. This special marking makes it clear to all visitors which victims were members of the flight crew. The final way the crew is denoted is on the pamphlet that is available to all visitors who tour the memorial. Upon opening the pamphlet, the names all of the victims are listed, but the flight crew is listed first under the heading "Crew Members" this is followed by "Passengers" and then a listing of the remaining victims.

Other than the flight crew, the Flight 93 Memorial does not make any special attempt to show other associations. The names of the passengers are listed in alphabetical order on the above mentioned display panel, on the Wall of Names, and in the pamphlet.

Lauren Catuzzi Grandcolas's name is followed by "and unborn child" on both the Wall of Names (see Image below. Image was darkened to help show the engraving) and in the pamphlet. However, this is not a feature unique to the Flight 93 Memorial, in fact there are eleven names on the various 9/11 memorials inscribed with these words or the words "and her unborn child."²⁸⁹

There was only one married couple aboard Flight 93, Donald and Jean Peterson who were traveling together on vacation. Since they shared a last name, they are listed together in all printed materials and their panels in the Wall of Names are adjacent, but there is nothing that denotes what their relationship was, viewers are left to infer this on their own. When viewing the Wall of Names, the display panel, and the pamphlet, no other associations are evident; however, Reflecting Absence shows there were four other meaningful adjacencies between the passengers of Flight 93. Marion R. Britton and Waleska Martinez were coworkers traveling to a conference together. William Cashman and Patrick Driscoll were long-time friends taking a hiking vacation together. Patricia Cushings and Jane C. Folger were not only friends vacationing together, but sisters-in-law. Joseph DeLuca and Linda Gronlund were boyfriend and girlfriend traveling together for vacation.²⁹⁰ I only discovered these relationships by using the Name Finder tool for Reflecting Absence and seeing that each of these pairings had been requested by next-of-kin or affiliation. After finding these, I then returned to the biographies on the Flight 93 official webpage, and upon reading these, I learned how the victims were

²⁸⁹ Blais, *A Place of Remembrance: Official Book of the National September 11 Memorial*, 183.

²⁹⁰ Flight 93 webpage, "Biographies," nps.gov.

linked. There is nothing on the memorial or the webpage that shows these direct links.

As one can see, it is also not easy to discover these adjacencies. Since none of these names are alphabetically adjacent, they do not appear together anywhere on any materials

available through the Flight 93 Memorial, or even on the Wall of Names.

The designers of the Flight 93 Memorial could have easily constructed the Wall of Names so these associations

were in some way displayed, either by placing the panels next to one another or creating some system of symbols. Perhaps, they felt it was more important to support the narrative surrounding Flight 93 and make the passengers appear more as one united group, and not highlight that ten of the thirty-three passengers had some previous affiliation with one another. In conversation, Barbara Black, Chief of Cultural Resources at the Flight 93 National Memorial, has affirmed this was the intention of the design. She said it was deemed more important for the message they wished to convey to show the personages as a united whole. She went on to explain why all the names are listed alphabetically here, without separating the crew and passengers, unlike the other parts of the memorial. This was so no hierarchy would appear within the Wall. Black also informed me that the designers were very aware of what was being planned, and the difficulties, surrounding the memorial in New York City, and this was something those

designing the Flight 93 Memorial hoped to avoid.²⁹¹

Representing 9/11

Despite the importance of remembering the individuals who lost their lives in the September 11, 2001 attacks, the events of that day will forever be linked. Much like the bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki are often associated with one another, the three site specific locals of the 9/11 attacks will be forever associated. Due to this connection, it is also important for the individual memorials to pay respects to the larger events of the day. All three memorials do this in varying ways with varying levels of success. Any lack in representing the larger events is not to be seen as an insult by the memorial designers, but is to highlight the differences in the memorials' intended purposes.

The most obvious, and most effective, representation of recounting the events of 9/11 is at the New York City Memorial. The memorial accomplishes this in several ways. First, as discussed above, the names of *all* 9/11 victims are engraved in the panels that surround Reflecting Absence. The other two memorials both make mention of the other victims in their published materials, but there is no naming of these individuals on the memorials themselves. By placing the names of all the victims on Reflecting Absence, the memorial shows that it is not only honoring the victims that perished at that location, but it equally is memorializing all victims. This listing of the total victims avoids creating any sort of hierarchy that seems to hold a certain group above the others. The

²⁹¹ Barbara Black, telephone interview by Jennifer A. Fraley, March 8, 2016.

Name Finder tool, that is an important part of Reflecting Absence, also furthers this idea. With the application, photographs and biographies of all victims are instantly available, something that is not offered by the other memorials. Both the Pentagon and Flight 93 Memorials have links to the biographies of the victims, but this is done by creating a link to the other memorials' webpages. For example, when on the Flight 93 webpage, if one wishes to learn about those who perished at the Pentagon, the viewer must click on the link that redirects her to Pentagon Memorial's webpage to find this information.

The 9/11 Memorial Museum in New York also offers a narrative of all the events surrounding September 11, 2001, and not just the events as they unfurled at the World Trade Center. The museum's mission is to "bear solemn witness to the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 and February 26, 1993. The Museum honors the nearly 3,000 victims of these attacks and all those who risked their lives to save others."²⁹² In this mission statement, it in no way distinguishes between the separate locations and views the various incidents of the day as one attack. Further, the museum strives to show "the triumph of human dignity over human depravity and affirms an unwavering commitment to the fundamental value of human life."²⁹³ This goal again, makes no distinction between the sites of the attacks.

Throughout the museum, there are timelines that depict the many events of the day, and not just those that occurred in New York such as a large map that shows the

²⁹² *9/11 Memorial Guide*. Pamphlet. Pitney Bowes, ND, obtained at the 9/11 site in 2013.

²⁹³ *Ibid.*

flightpaths of all four planes.²⁹⁴ Also, in the various walking tours that are available online and through the downloadable app, the larger historical framework surrounding 9/11 is told, not just the story of the World Trade Center. Some may argue the

museum tends to focus on the New York events more than the others, but this is due to not only the large number of victims who perished in New York, but because of the enormity of artifacts that were available from this location. Unlike the other two locations, there were two separate incidents in New York and both of these, especially the second moment of impact, were captured on film. Due to its location, there were also many more first-person accounts of the events. Additionally, while this memorial and museum does a good job of being inclusive, it is the World Trade Center Memorial and it should be expected that the museum has more artifacts from this location and at times focuses on telling the site's specific story. It does reference the other locations including videos and artifacts retrieved from these locations; however, many of these artifacts have been reserved for the other site specific memorials. For example, the Flight 93 Memorial kept many of the artifacts from that location because it had intentions of creating its own Visitors Center in the future where these items could be displayed.²⁹⁵

²⁹⁴ Original map is in color. This image has been edited to best show the information.

²⁹⁵ Something that has become a reality with its opening in September 2015.

Finally, the *In Memoriam* Exhibition within the museum previously discussed, also pays tribute to all 9/11 victims and the victims of the 1993 WTC bombing. Within the Wall of Faces, there is again no hierarchical arrangement of the photographs, and all of the victims are highlighted within the interior exhibit in no specific order. Again, this was done to avoid showing preference to any specific group. The available interactive tables have biographies of all victims and the personal artifacts displayed within the exhibition are periodically rotated so more victims can be represented in this manner.

The Flight 93 Memorial also makes reference to the larger events of 9/11; however, this is done with the intention of adding to the story of those on Flight 93. The narrative surrounding this memorial focuses on the heroic efforts of the passengers and crew and their attempt to take back the hijacked plane. On both the available pamphlet and the “America Attacked!” display panel there is a general description of the hijacking of the four planes. The pamphlet and display panels go on to tell the viewer how those onboard Flight 93 learned about the events taking place at both the Pentagon and World Trade Center through phone calls they placed to loved ones and emergency personnel. After realizing they were part of a larger terrorist attack, the passengers made the decision to attempt to regain control of the plane.²⁹⁶ These references to the other hijackings and subsequent crashes are the only direct mention of the Pentagon and World Trade Center attacks.

The Flight 93 Memorial’s mission statement also highlights its focus on the events

²⁹⁶ *9/11 Memorial Guide*. Pamphlet. Pitney Bowes, ND, obtained at the 9/11 site in 2013.

that occurred at the site: “‘A common field one day. A field of honor forever.’ May all who visit this place remember the collective acts of courage and sacrifice of the passengers and crew, revere this hallowed ground as the final resting place of those heroes, and reflect on the power of individuals who choose to make a difference.”²⁹⁷ Furthermore, The Wall of Names only lists those who perished onboard Flight 93; the available brochure also only lists these victims. The official website for the memorial does have links to the other memorials’ webpages to access the remaining victims’ biographies. This lack of representing all of the events connected to 9/11 is not intended as a slight to the other victims, but instead shows the memorial’s focus on creating a specific narrative through the memorial. It will be interesting to discover if the newly opened Visitors Center and Education Center also focuses mainly on this narrative or if there the narrative is opened to include more of the events surrounding 9/11.

Finally, the Pentagon Memorial can be considered the least successful of the memorials in representing the larger events of September 11, 2001. Much like the Flight 93 Memorial, the Pentagon Memorial focuses mainly on those who perished at its location. When entering into the Memorial Gateway, there is a reference to the victims of the World Trade Center and onboard Flight 93 on one of the two black entry stones. The available brochure states the

²⁹⁷ Flight 93 National Memorial Mission Statement.

Pentagon Memorial is “In remembrance of the events of September 11, 2001,”²⁹⁸ but it then focuses solely on the narrative surrounding the Pentagon crash, and the design elements of the memorial. The only other mention of the various victims is on the backside of the brochure where it concludes with the statement, “The Pentagon Memorial is the First National Memorial dedicated to the horrific events that unfolded on September 11, 2001—events that claimed 184 lives at the Pentagon, and thousands more around the United States.”²⁹⁹ The Zero Line does have the date “September 11, 2001” inlaid in the stone, which seems to acknowledge the other sites, but directly after this is “9:37 AM” the time when Flight 77 crashed into the Pentagon. Like the Flight 93 Memorial webpage, the Pentagon’s does offer links to the other memorials so that these can be explored, along with the biographies of the other victims.

This lack of connection to the larger events surrounding 9/11 has been noted and included in the mission statement for the needed construction of a Pentagon Visitor Education Center. This statement reads, “The events of 9/11 are unforgettable...The 9/11 Pentagon Visitor Education Center will be a place where visitors from around the world can learn about the events of September 11, 2001, the lives lost, and the historic significance of the Pentagon Memorial site.”³⁰⁰ This mission statement shows the desire to create a space that not only offers more information about the events that occurred at the Pentagon, but to teach visitors about the larger events of September 11, 2001.

²⁹⁸ *The National 9/11 Pentagon Memorial*. pamphlet from the site. (June 2013).

²⁹⁹ Ibid.

³⁰⁰ *9/11 Pentagon Visitor Education Center at the Pentagon Memorial*. Gaithersburg, MD. pentagonmemorial.org..

Representing the Perpetrators

The four planes that were hijacked on September 11, 2001 were all part of a large plot allegedly masterminded by Osama bin Laden and Khalid Shaikh Mohammed. After 9/11, when al-Qaeda claimed responsibility for the attacks, these men become the most sought after enemies of the United States. As investigations continued, more information about the nineteen men who physically carried out the attacks was discovered including who they were, where they were from, when they came to the U.S., and what flights they helped hijack. However, these men, and the role they played in the events of 9/11, are largely downplayed, and at times, even ignored by the memorials. These men are almost always talked about as one collective group as either “hijackers” or “terrorists.” The only individual focus seems to be centered on bin Laden; in fact, Khalid Shaikh Mohammed is not mentioned anywhere except on links through the memorials’ webpages that discuss his ongoing criminal trial.

How the perpetrators are represented in each memorial is important because when their role is diminished or even ignored, it shifts the focus from why 9/11 happened to who it happened to, the victims. While this is the role of the memorials, to honor these victims, to ignore those who carried out the attacks and their motivations for doing so, is to suppress a section of the historical framework that visitors should have the opportunity to understand.

The Pentagon Memorial offers little to no information about the terrorists who carried out the attacks. The only way they are represented in the physical memorial is through their actions. On the second entry stone there is reference to “acts of

terrorism,”³⁰¹ but there is no information on who carried out these acts. On the offered pamphlet, the only mention is of the “terrorist attack” that “hijacked” Flight 77 and lead to “the horrific events”³⁰² that took the lives of 184 individuals. This same narrative continues on the official webpage for the Pentagon Memorial.

The Flight 93 Memorial deals with these men more often, but in much the same generalized manner: hijackers, terrorists. The main reason why the hijackers are mentioned more in the Flight 93 memorial is due to the narrative of the Flight 93 story of the passengers fighting back against the aggressors. The terrorists are only represented in the physical memorial on the written words on the display panels, and again this is as part of the offered narrative of the story. The pamphlet continues the generalized narrative, but there is more information available on the webpage. Here, the accounting of phone calls received from the plane offers a physical description of the men, and some of their actions. Additionally, the webpage has a “Sources and Detailed Information” section that contains more information about the hijackers such as: who they were, where they were from, what their intended target was, and what was the larger plan.³⁰³ This memorial offers more information about the terrorists, but again, it is framed in such a way as to further the intended narrative of heroism, and not in an effort to truly educate the visitor.

The World Trade Center National 9/11 Memorial and Museum supplies the most information about the terrorists; however, that information is also largely generalized and subservient to the role of the victims. In *Reflecting Absence*, there is no reference to the

³⁰¹ Second entry stone, Pentagon Memorial.

³⁰² *The National 9/11 Pentagon Memorial*. pamphlet from the site. (June 2013).

³⁰³ Pentagon Memorial webpage. “Sources and Detailed Information” section. pentagon memorial.org.

hijackers at all. The only reference to them in the outside memorial is in the offered pamphlet which explains “On a clear Tuesday morning, 19 terrorists from the Islamist extremist group al-Qaeda hijacked four commercial planes.”³⁰⁴ This is the only direct reference until the visitor travels into the museum.

The museum largely continues the generalized accounting of the terrorists hijacking the planes, but there are two areas in which this narrative is expanded. The first is within Foundation Hall in the Exhibitions and Education Center where there is a glass display case highlighting the capture of Osama bin Laden. As previously discussed in Chapter 2, the guided tour makes a point to explain to visitors the role bin Laden played in the al-Qaeda organization, and the heroic efforts that Americans made to ensure his capture. This display offers more information, but it is only focused on bin Laden, and not the other perpetrators. The second place is within the Historical Exhibition, in fact, this area contains the most information offered at any of the three memorials. Here, there is a short film discussing the rise of al-Qaeda, and in a smaller side section, the nineteen hijackers are actually shown. First, there is a display panel that provides photographs of each man, but this panel is small, perhaps two feet by three feet and is very low to the ground. The visitor has to bend at the waist to get a good look at the hijackers’ faces. There is also a video on loop that shows some of these men clearing airport security. Finally, the Last Night letter is displayed, but this is offered with no translation making it unreadable to most visitors. While the museum offers more information about the hijackers and their motivations, this is still limited and displayed in a way so that it is

³⁰⁴ *The National 9/11 Pentagon Memorial*. pamphlet from the site. (June 2013).

overlooked by many visitors. Personally, I do not recall seeing the video or the Last Night letter during my visit to the museum. This information is bolstered by the official webpage. Here, in the “Teach + Learn” section under “FAQ about 9/11” there is more detailed information about the hijackers, Islam, al-Qaeda, and the motivations of the terrorists.³⁰⁵ This information helps visitors to understand the larger framework of 9/11 that the memorials themselves tend to overlook and ignore.

There are many reasons why the roles and motivations of the perpetrators have been downplayed in the works. The main reason is the goal of all three memorials is first, and foremost, to memorialize those who were killed in the attacks. Another reason is by discussing the terrorists, the core focus shifts away from the victims. As Kirk Savage claims, focusing on the terrorists may be seen as giving them a platform in an area that is inappropriate.³⁰⁶ This was a concern of many family members who did not want the terrorists to be represented in the memorials or museum in any way. The President of the 9/11 Memorial, Joe Daniels, addressed this concern in an interview by stating the “ terrorists' sole purpose would be to provide historical context”³⁰⁷ and this would be within the museum only.

They certainly will not be in the memorial section. I recognize this is a tough issue because this is a site where so many people were murdered. It's a site where 40 percent of all the family members never got a stitch of human remains back from their loved ones so it is a sacred site. At the same time, our mission in the museum is also to educate. The future generations that are growing up now - my son, 7 years old, ask me, 'Why did it happen?' And including the terrorists, their

³⁰⁵ pentagonmemorial.org.

³⁰⁶ Savage, “Trauma, Healing, and the Therapeutic Monument,” 111.

³⁰⁷ Daniels, Joe as quoted in “Audio: 9/11 Hijackers part of historic narrative, not focus of Memorial Museum (update).” by Michael Frazier. *The MEMO Blog*. 20 January 2014.

images, which will be evidence photo images from the FBI . . . these are criminal mug shots essentially. It's just a part of the story and we're going to do it in a way that is sensitive to families that are coming. It won't be near the memorial exhibition, but it will be in the museum.³⁰⁸

While none of the memorials desire to give the terrorists' rhetoric a platform, their role in the larger events that frame 9/11 needs to be somehow included to give visitors an adequate historical framework.

Directed Narratives

This section focuses on comparing the different narratives that each memorial offers its visitors as discussed in Chapter 2. These narratives come from not only the design of the memorial itself, but the many tools that are available to visitors, from audio tours to printed materials and how these various tools influence the offered narrative. Each memorial attempts to supply its visitors with an adequate framework so they can understand the importance of the memorialized historical events without directly telling visitors how they should be personally experiencing the work. Each memorial does this in different ways, and with varying degrees of success.

While each memorial should be experienced and judged on a case-by-case basis, if one is going to create such a work, the Pentagon Memorial's design is the best example of the three by creating a narrative that leaves the viewer free to experience the work as she wishes. Visitors are able to walk around the memorial as they choose, and stop at

³⁰⁸ Ibid.

their leisure. There is also minimal signage; the two entry stones give very basic facts about 9/11, and the available pamphlet focuses more on how to read the specific design elements of the memorial. An example of this is explaining the significance of the direction the memorial benches face, or how families are linked by the family plaque.

However, this experience changes dramatically if the visitor chooses to listen to the audio tour, especially the longer version that includes interviews of those who were directly impacted by the day's events. The tour seems to be more focused on creating an emotional response in the listener through the use of dynamic music and first-person accounts. Whereas when walking through the memorial, the experience can seem almost impersonal, like walking through a graveyard where the visitor does not personally know the deceased. The tour brings the horrific events of the day and the need for the creation of the memorial into focus. The tour is able to accomplish this through the stories of those who were in the Pentagon and survived the attack, and those who were left behind to mourn loved ones who perished. When one hears John Yates remembering being "blown through the air" and waking up in the hospital three days after the attack, or of Raquel Kelly's experience of looking down and seeing her hand on fire,³⁰⁹ it creates an emotional response in the listener and they cannot help but be moved by this experience. These first-hand accounts create a sympathetic and possibly even an empathetic identification between the listener and the survivor.

As one would expect of a tour provided at the memorial, by those who run the

³⁰⁹ Pentagon Memorail audio tour.

memorial, the narrative is somewhat controlled. The design of the Pentagon Memorial offers important information to help listeners understand the events that occurred, but it does so by offering a framework of information that allows the viewer some freedom in her reactions to the events. However, the audio tour does seem to take more control of the narrative. Overall these moments of overt control are relatively few and seem to focus on specific elements of the memorial and creating an emotional connection with the listener, and not overtaking the entire narrative.

What is most interesting about the Flight 93 Memorial and separates it from the Pentagon Memorial, is its apparent goal to control the narrative of the events that occurred on September 11, 2001, through its very design.³¹⁰ The design attempts to offer one, controlled narrative that becomes the historical record of the events. However, once the audio tours are presented, these seem to dilute this single narrative and leave more of an open narrative to the viewer to discover. These audio tours have the exact opposite effect of the Pentagon audio tour. Where that tour creates an emotional response, the offered Flight 93 tour stops are much more focused on providing basic information and have little that attempts to influence the listener's emotional response. There is only the narrator's voice, there is no music and no first-hand accounts. When speaking with Brendan Wilson, Lead Park Ranger, at the Flight 93 National Memorial, who developed and narrates these tours, he stated his desire is to create tools that will guide visitors, but not tell them how they should feel. He wishes to offer visitors a "menu" so they can

³¹⁰ See Chapter 2

create their own experience.³¹¹ These tours are in the process of being updated now that the Visitors Center is open; however, Wilson would like to keep these tours very informative in nature and leave the memorial itself to create an emotional connection with the visitors.³¹²

Overall, the narrative offered by the Flight 93 Memorial is more controlling than the other two memorials, but the available audio tour is the least controlling. These audio tours are dedicated to offering listeners a narrative framework of the events, something the memorial itself does not do. Interestingly enough, there is very little mention of the story of Flight 93 (as it is often referred to through the memorial plaza and accompanying documentation) in the audio tours. While these tours seem to dilute the controlling narrative, it must be remembered, these are optional additions, and many visitors do not listen to all seventeen of the tour stops.

The narrative produced by the World Trade Center 9/11 Memorial falls somewhere in-between the Pentagon Memorial and the Flight 93 Memorial. While the World Trade Center Memorial design does control the narrative more so than the Pentagon Memorial, it is far less controlling than the design narrative of the Flight 93 Memorial. This is largely due to the sheer size and scope of the New York City memorial and its accompanying museum. Upon entering the memorial, the visitor first experiences Reflecting Absence and the openness of this design leaves much of the interpretation to the individual viewer. As the visitor stands before the waterfalls and looks at the names

³¹¹ Brendan Wilson, telephone interview by Jennifer A. Fraley, March 10, 2016.

³¹² Ibid.

of all the victims, they understand the work represents loss. That the names are of those who perished in the attacks; yet, how the visitor processes this information is largely up to her. Because of this design, the memorial gives an effective narrative framework, so the visitor can experience the work in her own way.

However, this openness can change once the various tools available at the memorial (brochures, downloadable apps, audio tours, guided tours, suggested pathways) are experienced. If a visitor to the memorial only takes a guided tour, this may be the only narrative she experiences and what is said in this tour may become the complete accounting of the events. When this happens, the narrative offered is too controlling, but if the visitor experiences a variety of these tools, the narrative becomes more open. By attempting to represent all 9/11 victims and their stories, the World Trade Center Memorial and Museum offer so much information that by its sheer volume it becomes less controlling of the narrative. Here, visitors can choose how they want to experience the memorial. The various tools offered do an acceptable job of structuring the appropriate narrative framework, but it is largely left to the visitor to decide what her experience will be, and how she will process and analyze the offered information. When designing their new materials, those responsible for creating the tools for the Flight 93 Memorial should look to the World Trade Center, because here they have successfully created a menu of tools and approaches that truly leave the experience up to the visitor all while supplying them with the necessary framework.

Conclusion

At their core, each memorial seeks to forever memorialize the victims of September 11, 2001, and to pay tribute to the survivors, families and friends of those who perished. They all attempt to create a space where visitors can mourn, heal, learn, and pay tribute to all those who were impacted by the events of September 11, 2001. Yet, how each memorial does this is, in some ways, unique and in other ways, creates a theme of inclusion that runs through all three works. The story of 9/11 is still developing and it will be interesting to see as the memorials themselves physically expand how that narrative is changed. It will also be intriguing to discover how the next generation, that has little to no personal connections or memories of the day, will experience these same works.

CHAPTER FOUR

HEALING, OWNERSHIP, AND DEATH TOURISM

Memorials are tasked with the roles of commemoration and creating relationships between viewers and the sites or objects they present as tokens of remembrance. Yet, there are many other roles a memorial may fulfill. One that has become more prevalent since Maya Lin's Vietnam Veterans Memorial is that of agency in survivors' healing process. This chapter explores some of the ways in which memorials attempt to achieve this, with reference to the theories of Kirk Savage and practices surrounding the field of American Legal Restorative Justice. This chapter will also explore some of the practical

questions surrounding memorials such as who pays for the memorial's construction? Does that payment then constitute ownership and, if not, then who owns the work? Does this owner relationship create a duty of financial obligation for the maintenance of the memorial and, if not, who pays? Must a memorial support itself, and if so how? Are there ethical considerations that must be addressed when a memorial is attempting to raise the necessary funding to keep it in existence? This chapter seeks to begin the conversation about these topics and the issues that surround them.

Memorials as a Tool for Healing

Alain de Botton writes that “art is a therapeutic medium that can help guide, exhort and console its viewers, enabling them to become better versions of themselves.”³¹³ This is something all three National 9/11 Memorials strive to do. They not only make claims of offering visitors a place to remember the tragic loss, but also to heal. Additionally, all three memorials express a desire to be seen as a “symbol of hope for the future”³¹⁴ in their published materials. So how does a work of art accomplish this? De Botton writes that “One of the unexpectedly important things that art can do for us is teach us how to suffer more successfully.”³¹⁵ This is important because, as humans, we must first suffer and grieve before we are able to heal. These memorials offer visitors a place to gather and mourn those who were lost, but to also see the hope for the future. As a publication from the New York City 9/11 Memorial says, “May the lives

³¹³ Alain de Botton. *Art as Therapy*. (London: Phaidon Press, 2013), 5.

³¹⁴ 9/11 Memorial pamphlet.

³¹⁵ de Botton, *Art as Therapy*, 26.

remembered, the deeds recognized, and the spirit reawakened be eternal beacons, which reaffirm respect for life, strengthen our resolve to preserve freedom, and inspire an end to hatred, ignorance, and intolerance.”³¹⁶ Again, de Botton emphasizes the importance of this, “We have a proclivity to lose hope: we are oversensitive to the bad sides of existence. We lose out on legitimate chances of success because we fail to see the reasonableness of keeping going at certain things.”³¹⁷ If memorials only offered visitors a place to mourn, they would become more like graveyards, and this is not their intended purpose. The goal of the National 9/11 Memorials is for visitors to understand the loss of the victims and the tragedy that occurred, but they also want visitors to experience the hope for the future. In these memorials, this hope may be seen through the combined efforts of those who helped in the rescue and recovery efforts directly after the attacks, and in those who come to pay their respects and learn at the memorials.

Another way the memorials help people to heal is to remind them that they are not alone in their grief. As de Botton writes, “Many sad things become worse because we feel we are alone in suffering them....We need help in finding honour in some of our worst experiences, and art is there to lend them a social expression.”³¹⁸ By providing a common place to gather, the memorials are purposefully creating a shared space of mourning. Just as the Vietnam Veterans Memorial accidentally did this, the designers of the 9/11 Memorials made it an intentional part of their designs. As Savage writes of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, it “offers a shared experience, and that very collectivity

³¹⁶ 9/11 Memorial pamphlet.

³¹⁷ de Botton, *Art as Therapy*, 64.

³¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 26.

gives it a power that more ‘private’ arenas of grief do not have,”³¹⁹ so too does the shared experience of the 9/11 Memorials.

Therapeutic Memorials

In his article “Trauma, Healing, and the Therapeutic Monument” Kirk Savage defines a therapeutic memorial as one whose “primary goal is not to celebrate heroic service or sacrifice, as the traditional didactic monument does, but rather to heal a collective psychological injury.”³²⁰ He considers Maya Lin’s Vietnam Veterans Memorial the first American therapeutic memorial. Lin’s design was therapeutic because it was the visitor who made meaning from the memorial, and not the work telling the viewer how she should feel. Savage writes, “The monument is not a fixed moral text or image, but rather a flexible, multifaceted space in which ‘to evoke feelings and create memorable experiences.’”³²¹ As the viewer sees her own reflection within the walls of names, she feels connected to not only the work, but the individuals the names represent. This can be accomplished without any personal knowledge of the fallen or missing soldiers. As Lin stated about her design, it “brought to a sharp awareness of such loss, it is up to each individual to resolve or come to terms with this loss. For death is in the end a personal and private matter, and the area contained within this memorial is a quiet place, meant for personal reflection and private reckoning.”³²² As part of Lin’s design, the visitor is in charge of making meaning from the memorial, and through this freedom, Savage claims

³¹⁹ Savage “Trauma, Healing, and the Therapeutic Monument,” 107.

³²⁰ Ibid., 106.

³²¹ Ibid., 109.

³²² Ibid., (106 quoted from Lin’s competition entry).

there is a type of healing. However, as earlier noted, and will be discussed in detail shortly, the public aspect of this mourning is what gives the work its true therapeutic power.

These therapeutic memorials are especially important when commemorating the victims of a tragic event. In a way, they help survivors find some sort of meaning out of what is emotionally incomprehensible. Historically, memorials honored those who made a sacrifice, those who had made some choice, and therefore some control over their own destiny. As Savage writes, “Traditionally, monuments celebrated heroism, the very opposite of powerlessness. They reaffirmed the power of great men to take action, to transform the world for the better or save it from peril.”³²³ However, victims, by definition did not have that opportunity to choose. The very term victim implies that the choice was taken away from one. For example, those people working in the World Trade Center chose to go to work on the morning of September 11, 2001. They did not choose to become part of a terrorist plot, nor did they choose to risk their lives as a part of their jobs like the first-responders did. Ultimately, many of them played no active role in their own deaths, they did not give up their lives, their lives were taken. How is this commemorated, how is meaning found when the meaning behind the violence, the deaths is not understood? Savage claims it is this very notion that gives the memorial its meaning, “as if in that one fixed set of unarguable human losses the monument finds its moral center and its justification.”³²⁴ The point of the therapeutic memorial is not to understand why what happened occurred, but to understand that the loss suffered is worth

³²³ Savage, *Monument Wars*, 237.

³²⁴ *Ibid.*, 109.

memorializing. According to Savage, the therapeutic memorial attempts to “assign, implicitly or explicitly, a meaning to the traumatic event that makes it worthy of collective response,”³²⁵ this meaning is found not necessarily in understanding why the perpetrators did what they did, but in the collective loss that is suffered. As further explained by Savage, “The highly charged significance of the memorial’s collective space, where the process of coming to grips with death is social and participatory, inviting action as much as reflection, and creating bonds with others that transcend the solitary ego.”³²⁶ Through this shared experience, the memorial becomes therapeutic. As mentioned above, the Vietnam Veterans Memorial offered viewers this shared experience. Although it was not intended as part of Lin’s design, according to Savage, this became the most significant aspect of the work. In fact, Judith Herman, a known psychiatrist whose work focuses on traumatic stress³²⁷ considers Lin’s memorial “probably the most significant public contribution to the healing of [Vietnam] veterans.”³²⁸ It is through the public’s shared mourning experience that the Veterans find validation that many had previously not experienced. In this way, the work not only offers solace to the visitors, but also to the soldiers who survived the war; thereby, working as a therapeutic memorial in at least two significant ways.

Yet, as Savage notes, individuals die everyday in senseless tragedies. What makes certain individuals’ deaths worthy of commemoration while others are not? From the above example, it seems it is precisely because these deaths were not individual, nor

³²⁵ Ibid., 109.

³²⁶ Ibid., 275.

³²⁷ Judith Lewis Herman. *Trauma and Recovery*. (United States: Basic Books, 1992), 70.

³²⁸ Herman as quoted in Savage “Trauma, Healing and Therapeutic Monuments,” 107.

private that makes them worthy of public commemoration. Savage calls this “the paradox of the therapeutic monument: the more intense the focus on each individual victim, the less the monument justifies itself because the less there is to distinguish this particular loss from all the other traumatic losses suffered in any society.”³²⁹ This means that therapeutic memorials cannot be constructed for the traumatic death of every individual, or —sadly in today’s increasingly violent world for every traumatic event. To do so would lessen the meaning of the memorials and their therapeutic ability. If citizens found a memorial on every street corner, they would soon be seen as common place, and lose their healing power, eventually becoming just another old, dead man on a horse. This is one of the objections to these modern therapeutic memorials: that each must make a choice and decide which deaths are worthy of memorialization. For example, in the recent months many in the United States have said “we stand with Paris,” “we stand with Brussels,” but why do we not stand with Ankara³³⁰ or Pakistan?³³¹ What makes one attack, or victims’ deaths more tragic than another? This question should be unanswerable, and I propose examining these victims through Restorative Justice practices offers survivors the opportunity to heal through every traumatic event, not just those deemed worth of memorialization.³³²

Additionally, in the desire to focus on the shared public loss, therapeutic memorials tend to ignore the role the perpetrators played in the tragedy. Using the

³²⁹ Savage, “Trauma, Healing, and the Therapeutic Monument,” 113.

³³⁰ Tuesday, March 22, 2016. Above image was taken on the streets of Brussels hours after the attacks. Photograph from Pieter Maurits Van.

³³¹ Sunday, March 27, 2016. ISIS claims responsibility for a bombing of a park where mostly women and children were celebrating Easter.

³³² This will be discussed in more detail later in the chapter.

Oklahoma City Memorial as his example, Savage writes the therapeutic memorial often “does not urge visitors to understand why these people were targeted.”³³³ He points out that there is no mention of Timothy McVeigh at the memorial, and that this is done intentionally, because to do so would put too much attention on the perpetrator and seem to offer them, as Savage notes, “a public platform, to bolster their sense of agency at the expense of those victimized.”³³⁴ This would be to remove the focus from the victims and shift it to those who carried out the tragedy. However, this is precisely what Erika Doss criticizes about these “trauma” memorials: “the absence of historical referents to the perpetrators of terrorism helps shroud these memorials; by effacing the agents of terror, terrorism memorials efface their intentions and encourage a blurring, or evasion, of causality.”³³⁵ By focusing on the therapeutic aspect, much of the historical information is removed or ignored. For example, the political conflicts surround the Vietnam War, the role of Timothy McVeigh in the Oklahoma City bombing, and the political and religious motivations of the nineteen men who hijacked four planes on September 11, 2001.

Because of these issues, Savage claims that therapeutic memorials are caught on the horns of a dilemma, “One wonders how memorials of healing or of conscience will ever really succeed if they do not reach out beyond their own boundaries of victimhood and embrace what we might call ‘coalitions of the suffering,’ alliances that find strength in alleviating one another’s injury rather than ignoring or belittling it.”³³⁶ He hoped the National 9/11 Memorials would be able to address these issues in ways different than the

³³³ Savage, “Trauma, Healing, and the Therapeutic Monument,” 111.

³³⁴ Ibid., 111.

³³⁵ Doss, *Memorial Mania*, 141.

³³⁶ Savage, *Monument Wars*, 295.

Vietnam Veterans Memorial and the Oklahoma City Memorial had. However, his hopes did not come to fruition. Instead of solving this dilemma, the three National 9/11 Memorials actually function in the same way. This is not to say they are lacking, but that they also face the same dilemma. As previously discussed, they all effectively “guide visitors to reflect on the problem in particular ways,” and “still leav[e] room for understanding to evolve”³³⁷ as Savage desired, but they also have to balance the role of the individual against the larger events of the day, and all three largely ignore the role of the perpetrators. It will now be for future memorials to solve this dilemma. The following section looks to restorative justice practices as a possible guide to solving the dilemma of the therapeutic memorial.

Restorative Justice

In the American legal system, when one party suffers a legal wrong, the guilty party is expected to make some sort of recompense or restore the injured party to her position as it was before the harm occurred. Under this system, if Sam takes something from Mary, he then owes her something of equal value so she no longer suffers a loss. Recompense is to make amends to one for the loss or harm she suffered, or as it is defined in *Black's Law Dictionary*, “remuneration paid for goods or other property.”³³⁸ In this situation, if Sam destroys Mary's flowerbed, he must then pay Mary to not only replace the cost of the damaged goods, but Mary may be compensated for her lost time.

³³⁷ Savage. “Trauma, Healing, and the Therapeutic Monument,” 115.

³³⁸ *Black's Law Dictionary*. Henry Campbell Black, sixth edition. (St. Paul: West Publishing Co., 1990).

Restitution is the legal term for restoring one to her original position before any harm occurred, again defined as, “the act of making good or giving equivalent for any loss, damage or injury.”³³⁹ When Sam causes harm to Mary, he must now either replace what he damaged, or give compensation for the harm she suffered, usually in the form of money. While these considerations seem like they may play a role in deciding who has the financial responsibility of constructing memorials, this, in actuality is often not the case. Usually the injuring party is either not available for legal prosecution or, even if they were, they would not have the funds necessary for the construction and maintenance of a memorial. This burden usually falls on either a government or a private entity to raise the necessary funding to create a memorial. Additionally, this method of memorial making usually does not assist in the healing of a community that has experienced an event that is worthy of memorialization. However, a different legal practice may be more beneficial; by adopting some of the principles of the relatively new legal field of restorative justice, memorials can become a tool that will help a community understand the trauma and heal. This application of restorative justice practices through memorials may seem like a stretching of the principles, but it is akin to John P. J. Dussich’s idea that, “Restorative justice is usually found operating within the juvenile and criminal justice systems. However, like a flower growing from a rock, restorative justice principles thrive in unusual places, often outside traditional systems.”³⁴⁰

³³⁹ Ibid., 1313.

³⁴⁰ John P.J. Dussich and Jill Schellenberg, editors. *The Promise of Restorative Justice New Approaches for Criminal Justice and Beyond*. (Boulder: Lynne Ripener Publishers, 2010).

As discussed above, modern memorials are often expected to serve as more than tools of commemoration; they can also function as healing tools for individuals and communities. Perhaps by paralleling the tenants of restorative justice practices, memorials can offer additional means of healing besides the shared mourning that is central to Savage's theory. According to legal scholar John Braithwaite, restorative justice is the legal practice of focusing on the needs of the victims of crimes in order to bring "together all stakeholders affected by some harm that has been done (e.g., offenders, their families, victims and their families, affected communities, state agencies)." ³⁴¹ The intent of restorative justice practices is to bring about an agreed upon decision that will allow all parties to a crime the chance to heal and right the wrongs that were suffered. Currently in the United States, these practices are largely used in criminal law cases, I propose that their application can also be applied to the use of memorials as a tool for fostering the healing of individuals and a given community. Applying this theory also offers an explanation of why communities have recently become more involved in the design and construction of memorials than ever before. The goals of restorative justice are similar to Savage's goal regarding the therapeutic memorial, but Savage explores these therapeutic works only as the viewer experiences them. Restorative justice practices give the injured parties the opportunity to become actively involved in the memorialization process as a means to healing.

Restorative justice is not a means of restoring the community to where it was before the trauma occurred, but a way to acknowledge the loss and offer the community

³⁴¹ John Braithwaite and Heather Strang. "Introduction: Restorative Justice and Civil Society." *Restorative Justice and Civil Society*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 1-13.

an opportunity to be involved in the memorialization process with the ultimate goal of helping the community process the trauma and begin to heal. Bonnie J. Redfern writes, “The pathway toward reconciliation and peace with loss seems to parallel the process of peacemaking in restorative justice. Bringing these common themes into focus makes it possible to envision a pathway to experience peace amid conflict.”³⁴² Nils Christie claims that “the needs and wishes of the victims should take center stage in addressing the harm.”³⁴³ Howard Zehr, a leading scholar in the field, follows this ideology in *The Little Book of Restorative Justice*³⁴⁴ by outlining three questions that should be addressed in restorative justice practices. These questions are: first, identifying who has been hurt; second, what are the victims’ needs; and third, who has the obligation to address these needs and put right to the harm.³⁴⁵ As these questions apply to memorials, those who have been hurt can encompass a large class of individuals: survivors, victim’s friends and family members, those who live in the community where the event occurred, and arguably anyone who feels as if the event affected their lives in a negative manner. Second, deciding what the victims’ needs are is something that must be decided on a case-by-case basis. However, in regards to memorials, there is a central belief that the victims need some sort of public acknowledgement and memorialization. The third question, who has the obligation to address these needs, is also subject to the particular

³⁴² Bonnie J. Redfern, “Hope and Reconciliation with Grief.” *The Promise of Restorative Justice New Approaches for Criminal Justice and Beyond*. edited by John P.J. Dussich and Jill Schallenberg. (Boulder: Lynne Ripener Publishers, 2010), 227.

³⁴³ Christie as quoted in Calhoun, Avery. “Introducing Restorative Justice: Re-Visioning Responses to Wrongdoing.” *The Prevention Researcher*. Vol. 20(1), (Feb 2013), 3.

³⁴⁴ Howard Zehr. *The Little Book of Restorative Justice*. (Intercourse: Good Books, 2002). Print.

³⁴⁵ Zehr as quoted in Calhoun, Avery. “Introducing Restorative Justice: Re-Visioning Responses to Wrongdoing.” *The Prevention Researcher*. Vol. 20(1), (Feb 2013), 3.

situation, but often in cases of large tragedies with higher death counts, there is a popular belief that the government shoulders this responsibility.

It should also not be mistaken that restorative justice provide a set of rules that must be followed; instead, it offers guidelines to achieve specific goals. According to Zehr, these goals include: “putting key decisions in the hands of those most affected by crime, mak[ing] justice more healing and, ideally more transformative, and reduc[ing] the likelihood of future offenses.”³⁴⁶ Zehr further writes these goals require victims to not only be a part of the process, but to be satisfied with the results. Finally, the outcomes must help to repair the harm done and help victims achieve a sense of closure.³⁴⁷

Memorials provide the opportunity for two of the three goals to be accomplished by first offering survivors the opportunity to play a key role in the decision making process by involving them in a memorial’s design and mission. Second, this involvement is intended to give these same people the opportunity to heal by helping shape how the victims are to be memorialized and giving them hope for the future. As Zehr states, “Restorative justice is considered a sign of hope and the direction of the future.”³⁴⁸ This hope and direction can be seen in Michael Arad’s words discussing his inspiration for create Reflecting Absence, “I walked up to that fountain, and it just changed completely how I felt about what I had witnessed. The sense of dread and despair didn't evaporate to

³⁴⁶ Zehr, *The Little Book of Restorative Justice*, 37.

³⁴⁷ Ibid. 37-38.

³⁴⁸ Ibid., 4.

nothingness, but there was this sense of hope and compassion that came in, and all of a sudden I wasn't facing it alone.”³⁴⁹

Memorials can offer the public a unique opportunity to feel as if they have become involved in the healing process. As Blustein notes, “Specifically, memorialization, like public apology, does this by providing a type of symbolic engagement with the past, importantly but not exclusively in order to repair the harm that was done.”³⁵⁰ After the fall of the Twin Towers, Ground Zero was converted into a sacred space and many felt they had the right to control what was done with this locality. Blustein writes, “In some ways, immediate discussion of a memorial allowed people to begin to construct narratives of redemption and to feel as if the horrid event itself was over—containable, already a memory.”³⁵¹ Planning for a memorial began immediately and an international competition received over 5,000 entries with ideas of what should be done to the sixteen acres. The Lower Manhattan Development Corporation (LMDC)³⁵² held a “Listening to the City” forum in which over 5,000 people participated. Additionally the LMDC conducted over 200 town meetings to give the public the opportunity to weigh in and become involved with the planned memorialization.³⁵³ Eventually, the larger area was to be designed by Daniel Libeskind, including the Freedom Tower designed to stand 1,776 feet tall, and Michael Arad and Peter Walker

³⁴⁹Jenkins, “9/11 memorials: The story of the cross at Ground Zero. *The Washington Post*.

³⁵⁰ Blustein, *Forgiveness and Remembrance: Remembering Wrongdoing in Personal and Public Life*, 229.

³⁵¹ Sturken, “The Aesthetics of Absence: Rebuilding Ground Zero,” 321.

³⁵² Established to coordinate the rebuilding

³⁵³ Lower Manhattan Development Corporation. renewnyc.com

were chosen for their Reflecting Absence design. The role of the community in representing the design of these memorials is a direct reflection of the community's attempt to cope with and adequately represent the horrors and trauma that were experienced. In the formation of these memorials, the community played a very active and interreginal role in choosing the winning design and even in the design itself. For example, Michael Arad, the winning designer of Reflecting Absence at the World Trade Center National 9/11 Memorial originally did not have any landscape design incorporated in his submission; but, after the community at large and jury members reviewed the design, they recommended he add this element. Arad then enlisted the help of landscape architect Peter Walker and with this added element eventually won the design competition. Without successfully incorporating the desires of the community, it is likely that Arad would not have won the competition highlighting the importance of the public involvement in these works. The memorial opened September 11, 2011, and it commemorates the 2,977 individuals killed there, including six who died in the 1993 bombing of the World Trade Center. The community's involvement in the memorialization offered many a chance to feel as if they had become a part of the process and gave them an outlet to deal with private loss as a part of a greater community dealing with a public tragedy. This involvement achieves a goal of restorative justice.

Another key element of restorative justice is the desire to stop criminals from repeating their actions. While this goal is applicable to memorials in which the aggressors are held accountable, many times this is not the case. For example, the aggressors in the 9/11 attacks either perished or were part of an organization that could

not be forced to participate in the memorialization process. However, the participation of the aggressors is not a necessary condition for memorials to be an effective tool in the application of restorative justice. When discussing the goals of restorative justice legal scholar Avery Calhoun explains that the process is not perfect and "[w]hile there may never be closure after the death of a loved one, there are ways forward that can help make life seem meaningful again."³⁵⁴ One of the ways is through active participation in the memorialization process. As Savage writes, it is "through the emotionally clarifying agency of the memorial, sorrow becomes more controllable and tolerable."³⁵⁵ As this sorrow becomes more tolerable, it offers a sense of closure. This is not to say the hurt is gone and the healing is complete, but the victim can, through the design, construction, and dedication of the memorial, find a sense of closure.

While most of the above discusses restorative justice practices as they are applied to larger public memorials, these ideas are also applicable on a smaller and even an individual basis thus, making them available to a wider audience and conditionally able to help more people heal. Therapeutic memorials tend to focus only on large scale tragedies that affect a significant number of people through a shared loss. Restorative justice practices also allow for this, but can additionally be used for the countless tragic deaths that occur daily.

³⁵⁴Calhoun, "Introducing Restorative Justice: Re-Visioning Responses to Wrongdoing," 3-6.

³⁵⁵ Savage, "Trauma, Healing, and the Therapeutic Monument, 9.

Death Tourism: The need for public support

There are many administrative, financial, and technical responsibilities that surround the creation and maintenance of a memorial. As mentioned before, after tragic events, society expects some sort of memorial to be created, but who is financially responsible for this, the government, the perpetrators, the public? Often the perpetrators are not available or financially viable to shoulder this responsibility, so it falls to some other entity. Many people assume it is the U.S. Government that should and does provide the funds for these works, but that is often not the case, and even when it does supply initial funding, this usually does not continue to support the memorial into perpetuity. The National 9/11 Memorials are supported by a variety of means.

The Pentagon Memorial was created and is maintained by the Pentagon Memorial Fund, a 501(c)3 non-profit, and was incorporated in May of 2003 by victims' family members "to raise funds to build and maintain a simple, but meaningful memorial near the site of the attack for all to visit"³⁵⁶ and to repair the damages done to the Pentagon.

While the U.S. Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, is a member of this non-profit and helps with the costs of maintenance and operations, it does not provide full financial support. In fact, there are three prominent places in the memorial's webpage that encourage visitors to make a donation to the fund: a "Make A Donation" tab right beside the search bar, the large blue box (see image) that is the first link

Your help is needed to
preserve the Memorial
for future generations of
visitors.

**MAKE A
DONATION**

³⁵⁶ pentagonmemorial.org.

available to visitors, and in the bottom right corner is the logo for the Pentagon Memorial Fund with the slogan “remember, reflect, renew.”³⁵⁷ There is also information about how to donate to the fund on the printed pamphlet available on location. While the Pentagon Memorial is currently financially stable, as shown through public financial statements, it does not have the necessary funds to expand; thus a fundraising campaign is currently underway to raise these funds. This includes a new brochure that is dedicated solely to these fundraising efforts for the proposed 9/11 Pentagon Visitor Education Center. Kaitlin Hoesch, Executive Administrator & Special Projects Manager for the Pentagon Memorial Fund, stated there have already been some large donations to this fund, and the hope is the center will open in 2021.³⁵⁸

The World Trade Center National 9/11 Memorial operates in much the same way as the Pentagon Memorial. While there has been, and continues to be, support from the Federal Government, especially in building the work, most of the financial support now comes from outside donations. As it is stated on the official memorial website, “The National September 11 Memorial & Museum is only possible because of your support.”³⁵⁹ Additionally, with the opening of the Memorial Museum, admission fees, the cafe, and gift shop³⁶⁰ profits also provide financial support. The operations of the Memorial and Museum were eventually transferred to the The National September 11 Memorial & Museum at the World Trade Center Foundation, Inc., a non-profit organization dedicated to the maintenance and support of both. The World Trade Center

³⁵⁷ Ibid.

³⁵⁸ Hoesch interview.

³⁵⁹ 911memorial.org

³⁶⁰ Concerns of these will be discussed below.

memorial is by far the largest of the three, and therefore requires more financial support; however, it also receives the largest amount of donations from public corporations and private sources. These many sponsors can be seen on the memorial's webpage. Like the Pentagon Memorial, the World Trade Center Memorial also offers visitors many chances to donate. While on location visitors can purchase tickets to the museum, eat in the cafe, and buy merchandise in the gift shop. Included in the memorial's available printed pamphlet, there is information on how to make a ten dollar donation by simply texting "HOPE" to a provided number. There are also multiple ways visitors to the website can donate to the fund: there is a simple "Donate" tab located in the upper right corner of the webpage, and a link at the bottom of each page titled "Give." Additionally there is a "Get Involved" tab that informs visitors about various fundraising opportunities including sponsoring a cobblestone that will be displayed in the memorial and sponsoring a seat within the museum's auditorium. The website also has a link to the museum store so visitors can shop the collection from home. Items include apparel, books, jewelry, posters, and gifts, to name just a few categories. The Federal Government does give yearly support but this support covers less than twenty percent of the yearly operating costs.

The Flight 93 National Memorial is the only of the three national memorials that is fully supported by the Federal Government. This is through the Flight 93 National Memorial Act (P.L. 107-226) that was passed by Congress on September 24, 2002, and signed into law by President George W. Bush. The Act "Established a Memorial at the September 11, 2001, crash site of United Airlines Flight 93 in Stonycreek Township,

Somerset County, Pennsylvania, to honor the passengers and crew of Flight 93."³⁶¹ The Act also designated the National Memorial as a unit of the National Park system placing it under the supervision of the U.S. Department of the Interior. Due to this designation as a National Park, the Federal Government owns and is responsible for all aspects of the memorial. Unlike the other two memorials, the Flight 93 Memorial does not rely on the contributions of outside sources, admission fees, or gift shop and cafe revenues for support. In fact, in the newly opened Visitors Center food and drinks, besides bottled water, are not permitted; however, there is a bookstore for visitors. Donations directly to the official memorial are not possible, but donations can be made to the National Park Services as a whole.

A private-partnership was established before the Act was passed, that included families of Flight 93, Friends of Flight 93, the National Park Foundation, and the National Park Services. The partnership began the efforts to create a memorial, and this partnership continues today as a charitable partner to the official memorial. The Friends of Flight 93 sponsors different events, such as the plant-a-tree campaign that is part of the reforestation effort, and also provides volunteer guides to answer questions at the memorial.³⁶² These guides are not official Park Rangers. While the Friends of Flight 93 often work in conjunction with the official memorial, it is a separate entity. Donations can be made directly to this unofficial organization.

³⁶¹ Flight 93, [nps.gov](https://www.nps.gov/flight93/)

³⁶² Friends of Flight 93 National Memorial. flight93friends.org.

Death Tourism

Visiting the location where a famous leader is buried or where an infamous battle occurred is not a recent tourist development. However, as memorial sites have evolved to commemorate victims, so too has the consumption of these sites changed. Brigitte Sion labels this phenomenon “negative sightseeing;”³⁶³ others have labeled it dark tourism, trauma tourism, thanatourism (*thanatos* in Greek is the personification of death), grief tourism, and death tourism. Philip Stone, “defines dark tourism as ‘the act of travel to sites associated with death, suffering and the seemingly macabre,’”³⁶⁴ while Laurie Beth Clark writes “Trauma memorials are called upon to serve multiple functions for these complex constituencies, which include education, mourning, healing, nationalism and activism.”³⁶⁵ Regardless of how it is labeled, the theory behind death tourism explores how and why we not only create memorials, but more what our behavior at these memorials should be. Is it permissible to play on the park-like atmosphere surrounding Reflecting Absence? According to Adam Gopnik’s experience, no. Here he witnessed children playing on benches and being yelled at by a guard to get down.³⁶⁶ So what happens when memory and tourism meets? Is it acceptable to have a gift shop and a cafe on the location where thousands died? Sion asks, “How are memory and trauma mediated by tourism?” and within this “intersection of tourism and memory—how [does] tourism serve and abuse memory?”³⁶⁷ Marita Sturken specifically refers to this in regards

³⁶³ Brigitte Sion, ed. *Death Tourism: Disaster Sites as Recreational Landscape*. (London: Segull Books, 2010), 1.

³⁶⁴ Ibid., 2.

³⁶⁵ Ibid., 3.

³⁶⁶ Gopnik, “Stones and Bones: Visiting the 9/11 Memorial and Museum.”

³⁶⁷ Sion, *Death Tourism: Disaster Sites as Recreational Landscape*, 4.

to the World Trade Center Memorial, “The status of Ground Zero and its relationship to the merchandising of memorabilia at the site demonstrate the complex ways in which memorialization and history-making intersect with tourism and the production of kitsch and curios.”³⁶⁸ The concept of Death Tourism largely asks these questions and, ultimately, there are no set rules that must be followed, instead, these inquiries seem to rely on a case-by-case analysis of what is acceptable behavior or not.

As shown above, two of the three National 9/11 Memorials depend on voluntary participation for financial support, and the World Trade Center Memorial also depends on visitors coming and spending money for museum admissions, guided tours, at the cafe, and in the gift shop. As Sturken writes, “The transformation of Ground Zero from a place of emergency to a place of tourism is not in conflict with the desire to see it as sacred ground. Tourist locations, like sacred sites, are places of pilgrimage.”³⁶⁹ Tourists traveling to New York City make a point of stopping at Ground Zero, as it is still largely referred to, much like they plan to stop at the Empire State Building or The Statue of Liberty. However, labeling these memorials as tourist destinations raises concerns. For example, is it permissible to eat lunch in the relaxed, outdoor atmosphere? If a site needs to generate revenue, is a gift shop permissible and, what items can and should it sell? If there is a cafe on the grounds are there limits to what should be served? Clark suggests it is our “sense of propriety that comes into play when we consider what we might allow to

³⁶⁸ Sturken, “The Aesthetics of Absence: Rebuilding Ground Zero,” 316.

³⁶⁹ Ibid., 317.

take place within the already designated and designed trauma sites”³⁷⁰ and “the ways in which we regulate behaviors at these spaces is a matter of etiquette (propriety).”³⁷¹

An example of this has already been explored in Chapter 2. While visiting the Historical exhibition within the 9/11 Memorial Museum, I encountered two men talking to each other. Immediately other visitors shamed them into silence. There were no signs posted asking visitors to refrain from speaking, and these men were not subdued by a museum employee. So why did other visitors feel the need to quite them? I propose that it was due to their physical location within the exhibition. We had just passed through an area that focused on the collapse of both Towers, and visitors were keenly aware of the loss of life that occurred through audio recordings and the many artifacts that were recovered within the debris. The surroundings where these men were talking also added to them being silenced. The walls were a darker color, the floors were hard and cool, and the lighting was low. After experiencing this loss of lives and devastation, visitors feel as if this is a time to mourn. Propriety has taught us that this is not the time nor place to hold a loud, obviously joyful, conversation. It is a time of reflection and silence. The men ignored these unwritten rules of etiquette, and were immediately chastised for their behavior.

Visitors to the National 9/11 Museum also do not seem to find it inappropriate for there to be a charge for admission. The cost to enter the museum is twenty-four dollars, and the museum has had a steady flow of visitors since its opening. Tickets for the guided tour of the museum cost an additional twenty dollars and a guided tour of the

³⁷⁰ Clark, “Ethical Spaces: Ethics and Propriety in Trauma Tourism,” 11.

³⁷¹ Ibid., 11.

memorial is an additional fifteen dollars. Visitors have remarked it is a way for them to “give something”³⁷² not only to support the maintenance of the museum, but to become a part of the commemoration and to fulfill a duty as an American.

Clark also argues that “gift shops reflect both the tenor and the content considered suitable for the locale (as well as economic and social factors).”³⁷³ There have been many complaints about the gift shop located within the museum. When a gift shop was first proposed, some people objected that it was not an appropriate place to be selling souvenirs, and there were fears the gift shop would mirror the hundreds of other shops selling “I Love NY” t-shirts, keychains, and bumper stickers. Some victims’ families also found the gift shop to be disrespectful, such as Diane Horning, whose son perished in 9/11 attacks, commented “To me, it’s the crassest, most insensitive thing to have a commercial enterprise at the place where my son died...I think it’s a money-making venture to support inflated salaries, and they’re willing to do it over my son’s dead body.”³⁷⁴ However, these fears were largely negated by an explanation that the gift shop would sell items commemorating and educating consumers about the events of 9/11. This emphasis on education, rescue, and recovery over trauma, according to Clark,³⁷⁵ is usually seen as an acceptable way to advertise items to be sold. However, once the gift shop opened, many of the items for sale seemed to violate these standards. Among these were Fire Department of New York coats for dogs, Survivor tree earrings, and a cheese

³⁷² Patricia Cohen. “9/11 Museum Fees Don’t Faze Visitors.” *The New York Times*. 22 May 2015 Web. 30 May 2014.

³⁷³ Ibid, 13.

³⁷⁴ Horning as quoted in Edelman, Susan. “The 9/11 museum’s absurd gift shop.” *New York Post*. 18 May 2014. Web. 18 May 2014.

³⁷⁵ Clark, “Ethical Spaces: Ethics and Propriety in Trauma Tourism,” 13.

plate shaped like the U.S. with blue hearts making the locations of the three attacks. Reporter Jen Chung found this particular item to be especially offensive and — again—“crass.”³⁷⁶ In a NYPost article, a visitor is quoted saying “As rotten and heartless as it may seem, it’s always about money. Educational books and T-shirts and posters that say, ‘Never forget 9/11’ are OK, but the dog vests and the cheap earrings need to go.”³⁷⁷ Chung celebrated the fact that a week after her article was published the cheese plate was removed and 9/11 memorial foundation president Joe Daniels told the Wall Street Journal “that victims' families would be consulted about what items are sold, ‘Once the public starts coming in, you learn so much. We in no way presume to get everything right. We will accept that criticism, absolutely.’”³⁷⁸ These items were removed because they seemed inappropriate for the location and the public’s denouncement of them led to their banishment.

However, some of these same items: plush dogs, FDNY coats for dogs, and brightly colored images of dogs are still available for purchase. How? They are now prominently displayed together and in celebration of the many rescue dogs who assisted in the recovery effort. As

³⁷⁶ Chung, Jen. “This 9/11 Cheese Plate Maybe The 9/11 Museum’s Most Tasteless Souvenir.” gothamist.com. May 22, 2014. 4.

³⁷⁷ Edelman, Susan. “The 9/11 museum’s absurd gift shop.” *New York Post*. 18 May 2014. Web. 18 May 2014.

³⁷⁸ Chung, Jen. “9/11 Museum Removes 9/11 Cheese Plate From Gift Shop.” gothamist.com. May 29, 2014..

predicted by Clark, this framing of items has been deemed acceptable. While the gift shop is mostly full of items that do follow this theme of commemoration and education (books, t-shirts, movies) there are still many items for sale that were deemed inappropriate just a year and a half ago, including “I love NY More Than Ever” t-

shirts, and, I am sorry to say, serving trays very similar to the aforementioned banished cheese plate. So what has changed? Not the gift shop, but perhaps our own sense of what is a breach of etiquette when discussing 9/11.

This seems to be the direction of death tourism and victim memorials in the United States. It will be interesting to see whether these standards remain the same or loosen even further over time. Perhaps as our memories of the events surrounding 9/11 start to fade, so to will our standards for acceptable behavior at the memorials. However, that brings us back to the necessary role of a memorial; it must create a relationship between the visitor and the memorialized historical events. If this relationship fails to manifest, then the visitor is likely to feel less of an obligation to conform to a high level of respect and decorum that is expected at newly opened memorials.

Conclusion

Memorials play a significant role in preserving the memories of the past for the future. These works are often meaningful, aesthetically pleasing, and/or powerful

markers of cultural identity. Whether this identity sparks positive associations or stands as a symbol of cultural strife, it informs us as to what once was and/or is now considered worthy of commemoration. When examining these works, we must critically examine those that only offer single narratives; because, an effective memorial should offer the viewer a narrative framework that conveys the essential historical information, yet allows the viewer freedom to determine her own experience of the work. While there are many things a memorial might or might not do, the only necessary condition is that it create a referential relationship between the memorialized historical events and the viewer for the past, the present – and the future.

REFERENCES

- 9/11 Memorial*. National September Memorial and Museum, 2015. 911memorial.org.
- 9/11 Memorial Guide*. Pamphlet. Pitney Bowes, ND, obtained at the 9/11 site in 2013.
- 9/11 Memorial Museum Map*. Bryan Christie Design, Brochure design by WeilCo. New York.
- 9/11 Pentagon Visitor Education Center at the Pentagon Memorial*. Gaithersburg, MD. pentagonmemorial.org.
- Adorno, Theodor W. Selections from *History and Freedom: Lectures 1964-1965*. Edited by Rolf Tiedemann, Translated by Rodney Livingstone. Cambridge: Polity, 2006. Print. "Lecture 1: Progress or Regression?"
- . "The Schema of Mass Culture." *The Culture Industry: Selected Essays on Mass Culture*. London: Routledge, 1991. Print.
- Arad, Michael and Peter Walker. Reflecting Absence part of the National 9/11 Memorial. NYC, NY. September 11, 2011.
- "Are We Civilized, Or Merely Domesticated?" whatreallyhappened.com
- Assman, Jan. Cultural Memory Studies. An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook, Berlin, New York 2008, S. 109-118.
- . *Cultural Memory and Early Civilization: Writing, Remembrance, and Political Imagination*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007. Print.
- Bailey, George W.S. "Art: Life after Death?" *Theories of Art Today*. Noël Carroll, editor. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 2000. Print. (160-174).
- Ball, Thomas. Freedmen's Memorial to Abraham Lincoln. 1876, Washington, D.C.

- Barber, Bernard. "Place, Symbol, and Utilitarian Function in War Memorials," *Social Forces* 28, No.1 (October 1949): 64-68.
- Barton, Jake. *TEDtalk: The Museum of You*. Filmed May 2013, posted September 2013. TEDSalon NY2013. Web.
- Becker, Carl. "Everyman His Own Historian," *The American Historical Review* 37, No.2 (Jan., 1932):221-236.
- Beckman, Julie and Keith Kaseman. Pentagon 9/11 Memorial. Arlington, VA. September 11, 2008.
- Bielstein, Susan M. *Permissions: A Survival Guide: Blunt Talk about Art as Intellectual Property*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2006. Print
- Black, Barbara, telephone interview by Jennifer A. Fraley, March 8, 2016.
- Black's Law Dictionary*. Henry Campbell Black, sixth edition. St. Paul: West Publishing Co., 1990.
- Blais, Allison and Lynn Rasic. *A Place of Remembrance: Official Book of the National September 11 Memorial*. Washington D.C.: National Geographic, ND.
- Blustein, Jeffery M. *Forgiveness and Remembrance: Remembering Wrongdoing in Personal and Public Life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014. Print.
- . *The Moral Demands of Memory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008. Print.
- Bourke, Joanna. "Remembering War," *Journal of Contemporary History* 39, No. 4 Special Issue: Collective Memory (October 2004): 473-485.
- Braithwaite, John and Heather Strang. "Introduction: Restorative Justice and Civil Society." *Restorative Justice and Civil Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Building History: Archaeology and Architecture*. Audio Tour provided by 9/11 Memorial Museum. *Produced by Acoustiguide*.
- Burning Bridges*. The International Institute for Restorative Practices. A RealJustice production, 2007. DVD.

- Boyer, Pascal and James V. Wertsch, editors. *Memory in Mind and Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009. Print.
- Cahn, Edmond. *The Moral Decision: Right and Wrong in the Light of American Law*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1956. Print.
- Calhoun, Avery. "Introducing Restorative Justice: Re-Visioning Responses to Wrongdoing." *The Prevention Researcher*. Vol. 20(1), Feb 2013, p. 3-6.
- Campbell-Dollaghan, Kelsey. "Norway's Lovely Memorial to the Worst Mass Shooting In Modern History." *Gizmodo*. 5 March 2014. Webpage. 22 April 2014, Web.
- Carroll, Noël. "Anglo-American Aesthetics and Contemporary Criticism: Intention and the Hermeneutics of Suspicion." *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, Vol. 51, No. 2, *Aesthetics: Past and Present. A Commemorative Issue Celebrating 50 Years of The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism and the American Society for Aesthetics* (Spring, 1993), pp. 245-252. Print.
- . "Art and Recollection." *The Journal of Aesthetic Education*. Vol. 39, No. 2 (Summer 2005). p 1-12.
- . *Beyond Aesthetics: Philosophical Essays*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001. Collection of Essays...many of the articles I am looking at are also in this collection. Print.
- . "Interpretation, History and Narrative." *The Monist*, Vol. 73, No. 2, The Theory of Interpretation (April 1990), pp. 134-166.
- . "Mass Art: The Debate Continues." *The Journal of Aesthetics Education*. Vol. 35, No. 3 (Autumn, 2001) pp 15-22.
- . *Philosophy of Art: a Contemporary Introduction*. London: Routledge, 1999. Print.
- . *A Philosophy of Mass Art*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998. Print.
- . "The Ontology of Mass Art." *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*. 55:2, Spring, 1997.
- Carroll, Noël and John Gibson, editors. *The Routledge Companion to Philosophy of Literature*. London: Routledge, 2015.
- Casey, Edward S. *The Fate of Place: a Philosophical History*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.

- . *Getting Back Into Place: Toward a Renewed Understanding of the Place-world*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1993.
- . *Remembering: A Phenomenological Study*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2000.
- Christie, Nils. "Conflicts as Property." *British Journal of Criminology*. 17(1), 1977, p. 1-15.
- Chung, Jen. "9/11 Museum Removes 9/11 Cheese Plate From Gift Shop." gothamist.com. May 29, 2014.
- . "This 9/11 Cheese Plate Maybe The 9/11 Museum's Most Tasteless Souvenir." gothamist.com. May 22, 2014.
- Clark, Laurie Beth. "Ethical Spaces: Ethics and Propriety in Trauma Tourism." *Death Tourism: Disaster Sites as Recreational Landscape*. Brigitte Sion, editor. London: Seagull Books, 2010. p. 9-35.
- Clear, Todd R. and David R. Krap, eds. *What is Community Justice: Case Studies if Restorative Justice and Community Supervision*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 2002. Print.
- Cohen, Patricia. "9/11 Memorial Museum Faces the Latest Hurdle: Its Opening." *The New York Times*, NYT NOW, 30 March 2014. Web. 8 April 2014.
- . "9/11 Museum Fees Don't Faze Visitors." *The New York Times*. 22 May 2015 Web. 30 May 2014.
- Cotter, Holland. "The 9/11 Story Told at Bedrock, Powerful as a Punch to the Gut." *The New York Times*, NYT NOW, 14 May 2014. Web. 14 May 2014.
- Crawford, Tad. *Legal Guide for the Visual Artist*. New York: Allworth Press, 1999. Print.
- Currie, Gregory. "Framing Narratives." *Narrative and Understanding Persons*. edited by Daniel D. Hutto. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007. p. 17-42.
- D'Amico, Daniel J. "A Legal and Economic Analysis of Graffiti." *Humanomics* Vol. 23 No.1, 2007. (29-38).

- Danto, Arthur C. *The Abuse of Beauty: Aesthetics and the Concept of Art*. Chicago: Open Court, 2003.
- . “Art and Meaning.” *Theories of Art Today*. Noël Carroll, editor. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 2000. Print. (130-140).
- . *The Transfiguration of the Commonplace: A Philosophy of Art*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1981.
- . *The Wake of Art: Criticism, Philosophy, and the ends of taste*. Australia: G+B Arts International, 1998.
- Davies, Stephen. “Aesthetic Judgements, Artworks and Functional Beauty.” *The Philosophical Quarterly*, Vol 56, No. 223, (April 2006). Print.
- . “Artists’ Intentions and the Intentional Approach.” *Definitions of Art*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991. Print.
- de Botton, Alain. *Art as Therapy*. London: Phaidon Press, 2013. Print.
- “Defending the Public Domain-The First Amendment, the Copyright Power, and the Potential of *Golan v. Gonzales*.” 61 Okla.L.Rev. 395 2008.
- Dewey, John. *Art as Experience*. New York: Minton, Balch & Company, 1934.
- Dickie, George. *Evaluating Art*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1988. Print
- Discovering History: For Children and Families*. Audio tour provided by 9/11 Memorial Museum. Produced by Acoustiguide.
- Doss, Erika. *The Emotional Life of Contemporary Public Memorials: Towards a Theory of Temporary Memorials*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2008.
- . *Memorial Mania: Public Feeling in America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010.
- . *Spirit Poles and Flying Pigs: Public Art and Cultural Democracy in American Communities*. Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1995.
- . "War, memory, and the public mediation of affect: The National World War II Memorial and American imperialism." *Memory Studies*. 2008:1:227. Print.

- Dunlap, David W. "Etchings at 9/11 Memorial Are Called Both Anguished Tributes and Vandalism." *The New York Times*. 27 May 2014. Website. 30 May 2014.
- Dussich, John P. J. and Jill Schellenberg, editors. *The Promise of Restorative Justice New Approaches for Criminal Justice and Beyond*. Boulder: Lynne Ripener Publishers, 2010.
- Edelman, Susan. "The 9/11 museum's absurd gift shop." *New York Post*. 18 May 2014. Web. 18 May 2014.
- Ehrenhaus, Peter. "Cultural Narratives and the Therapeutic Motif: The Political Containment of Vietnam Veterans." *Narrative and Social Control: Critical Perspectives*, Newbury: SAGE Publications, 1993. Print.
- Farr, Ian, Ed. *Memory: Documents of Contemporary Art*. London: MIT Press, 2012.
- Feldman, Franklin, et al. *Art Law: Rights and Liabilities of Creators and Collectors*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company. 1986. Print.
- Filler, Martin. "MoMA Loses Face." *New York Review of Books Blog*. January 14, 2014. Web. January 17, 2014.
- . "A Masterpiece at Ground Zero." *New York Review of Books*.
- Finch, Spencer. *Trying to Remember the Color of the Sky on That September Morning*. 2,983 Watercolor on Paper, 2014.
- Finkelpearl, Tom. *Dialogues in Public Art*. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 2000.
- Flight 93*. Pamphlet from Flight 93 National Memorial, National Park Service, N.D.
- Flight 93 National Memorial. Somerset, PA. Paul and Milena Murdoch designers, September 10, 2011.
- Flight 93. National Park Service. Department of the Interior. nps.gov.
- Flight 93, "Phone Calls from the Passengers and Crew of Flight 93." A posted on the Flight 93 Memorial Website. 14 January 2016. nps.gov.
- Fogelman, Marla Brown. "The Beauty of an Ugly Memorial." *The Washington Post*. 25 May 2012.

- Foote, Kenneth E., *Shadowed Ground: America's Landscapes of Violence and Tragedy*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2003. Print.
- Fraley, Jennifer A. *Various works*. Some ideas and small sections are from previously written, non-published materials created for the University of Louisville Humanities PhD program. 2011-2016.
- Frazier, Michael. "Audio: 9/11 Hijackers part of historic narrative, not focus of Memorial Museum (update)." *The MEMO Blog*. 20 January 2014.
- Friends of Flight 93 National Memorial. flight93friends.org.
- Gainer, Jason. "Dismantling the Frame: Site Specific Art and Aesthetic Autonomy." *British Journal of Aesthetics*. Vol. 49, no. 1, January 2009, p. 43-58.
- Gallagher, Victoria J. and Margaret R. LaWare. "Sparring with Public Memory: The Rhetorical Embodiment of Race, Power, and Conflict on the *Monument to Joe Louis*." in *Places of Public Memory: The Rhetoric of Museums and Memorials*. Greg Dickinson, et al, editors. Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 2010. Print.
- George, Alice Rose; Gilles Peress, Michael Shulan, Charles Traub. *Here is New York: A Democracy of Photographs*. Zürich: Scalo, 2002. Print.
- Gibson, John. "Empathy." *The Routledge Companion to Philosophy of Literature*. edited by Noël Carroll and John Gibson. London: Routledge, 2015.
- Gillis, John R., ed. *Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994.
- Goldberger, Paul. *Up From Zero: Politics, Architecture, and the Rebuilding of New York*. New York: Random House, 2004. Print.
- Goldstein, Barbara, editor. *Public Art By the Book*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2005.
- Gopnik, Adam. "Stones and Bones: Visiting the 9/11 Memorial and Museum." *The New Yorker*. July 7 & 14, 2014. Print.
- Gordon, Tammy S. *Private History in Public: Exhibition and the Setting of Everyday Life*. Langham: Altamira Press, 2010. Print.

- Gottschalk, Alfred. "Redemption Lies in the Hand of Memory." *Rediscovering Justice*. Joseph T. Angilella, S.J and Alan Ziajka, eds. San Francisco: University of San Francisco, 1998. Print, p 60-77.
- Griggs, Mary Beth. "The 9/11 Memorial Museum Opens to the Public." smithsonian.com. 20 May 2014. Web. 14 June 2015.
- Griswold, Charles L. and Stephen S. Griswold. "The Vietnam Veterans Memorial and the Washington Mall: Philosophical Thoughts on Political Iconography." *Critical Inquiry*, Vol. 12 No. 4, Summer, 1986. (pp. 688-719).
- Halbwachs, Maurice. *On Collective Memory*. Edited, Translated and with an Introduction by Lewis A. Coser. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1992. Print.
- Hansen-Glucklich, Jennifer. *Holocaust Memory Reframed: Museums and the Challenges of Representation*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2014.
- Hass, Kristin Ann. *Carried to the Wall: American Memory and the Vietnam Veterans Memorial*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998. Print.
- Hein, Hilde. "What is Public Art?: Time, place, and meaning." *Arguing About Art: Contemporary Philosophical Debates*. Alex Neill and Aaron Ridley, editors. Second Edition. London: Routledge, 2002. 436-445.
- Herman, Judith Lewis. *Trauma and Recovery*. United States: BasicBooks, 1992. Print.
- Hirsch, Marianne. *The Generation of Postmemory: Writing and Visual Culture After the Holocaust*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2012.
- . "Past Lives: Postmemories in Exile." *Poetics Today*. 17, No 4 (1996).
- . "The Witness in the Archive: Holocaust Studies/Memory Studies." *Memory Studies*. 2, No. 2 (2009) 151-170.
- Hoesch, Kaitlin M., telephone interview by Jennifer A. Fraley, March 3, 2016.
- Holly, Michael Ann. "The Melancholy Art," *The Art Bulletin* 89, No. 1 (March 2007): 7-17.
- Horowitz, Gregg M. "Public Art/Public Space: The spectacle of the *Tilted Arc* controversy." *Arguing About Art: Contemporary Philosophical Debates*. Alex

- Neill and Aaron Ridley, editors. Second Edition. London: Routledge, 2002. 446-456.
- Hutto, Daniel D., editor. *Narrative and Understanding Persons*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Inde, Vilis R. *Art in the Courtroom*. "Chapter 2: Richard Serra: Whose Property Is It Anyway?" Westport: Praeger, 1998. Print.
- Isenberg, Arnold. "Perception, Meaning, and the Subject Matter of Art." *Aesthetics and the Theory of Criticism*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1973. Print.
- Jenkins, Sally. "9/11 memorials: The story of the cross at Ground Zero." *The Washington Post*. September 8, 2011. Print.
- King, Thomas. "Forget Columbus." *The Inconvenient Indian*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2013. Print. (1-20).
- Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, Barbara. *Destination Culture: Tourism, Museums, and Heritage*. Berkely: University of California Press, 1998. Print.
- Kupfer, Joseph. "Experience as Art." *Art and Experience*. Ananta Ch. Sukla, editor. Westport: Praeger, 2003. Print. (57-70).
- Kwall, Roberta Rosenthal. *The Soul of Creativity: Forging a Moral Rights Law for the United States*. Stanford: Stanford Law Books, 2010. Print.
- Lamarque, Peter. "Tragedy and Moral Value." in *Art and Its Messages: Meaning, Morality, and Society*. Stephen Davies, editor. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1997. Print. (59-69).
- Levinson, Jerrold. "Messages in Art." in *Art and Its Messages: Meaning, Morality, and Society*. Stephen Davies, editor. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1997. Print. (70-83).
- Levinson, Sanford. *Written in Stone: Public Monuments in Changing Societies*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1998. Print.
- Lin, Maya. Vietnam Veterans Memorial. Washington, D.C. 1982. Granite.
- Maloney, Jennifer. "9/11 Museum Takes Action on Criticisms." *The WallStreet Journal*. May, 28, 2014. [wsj.com](http://www.wsj.com).

- “Map of the Distribution of Human Remains After 9/11.” [ProCon.org](http://wtcmuslimcenter.procon.org/view.resource.php?resourceID=4007) 29 September 2010, as used in *New York Post*. 10 September 2010.
<http://wtcmuslimcenter.procon.org/view.resource.php?resourceID=4007>
- Mazzetti, Mark. “Portrait of 9/11 ‘Jackal’ Emerges as He Awaits Trial.” *New York Times*. 14 November 2009.
- Meusburger, Peter. *Cultural Memories: The Geographical Point of View*. London: Springer, 2010. Print.
- Mitchell, Katharyne. “Monuments, Memorials, and the Politics of Memory.” *Urban Geography*. Vol 24, Issue 5 (2003).
- Mitchell, W. J. T., editor. *Art and The Public Sphere*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- Moore, Martha A. “Judge Grants 9/11 Health Settlement for Workers, First Responders.” abcnews.go.com, 6 June 2010.
- Murwaska-Muthesius, Katarzyna. “Oskar Hansen and the Auschwitz ‘Counter Memorial,’ 1958-59.” *ArtMargins*. May 2002.
- Neill, Alex and Aaron Ridley, editors. “Public Art” section in *Arguing About Art: Contemporary Philosophical Debates*. Second Edition. London: Routledge, 2002.
- Nelson, Robert S. and Margaret Olin, editors. *Monuments and Memory, Made and Unmade*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2003. Print.
- Noon, David Hoogland. “Operation Enduring Analogy: WWII, the War on Terror, and the Uses of Historical Memory,” *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 7, No.3 (2004): 339-366.
- Novitz, David. “Messages ‘In’ and Messages ‘Through’ Art.” in *Art and Its Messages: Meaning, Morality, and Society*. Stephen Davies, editor. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1997. Print. (84-88)
- Ochsner, Jeffery Karl. “A Space of Loss: The Vietnam Veterans Memorial,” *Journal of Architectural Education* 50, No.3 (Feb., 1997): 156-171.
- Osborne, Brian S. “Constructing Landscapes of power: the George Etienne Cartier monument, Montreal.” *Journal of Historical Geography*, 24, 4 (1998) p 431-458. Print.

“Oklahoma National Memorial and Museum,” *Oklahoma National Memorial and Museum*, 2014-2016, oklahomacitynationalmemorial.org.

Patterson, Colleen, e-mail message to author, March 9, 2016.

Pennebaker, James W. et al, editors. *Collective Memory of Political Events: Social Psychological Perspectives*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers. 1997. Print.

The National 9/11 Pentagon Memorial. pamphlet from the site. (June 2013).

The National 9/11 Pentagon Memorial. pentagonmemorial.org.

Phillips, Kendall R. editor. *Framing Public Memory*. Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 2004. Print.

Pollock, Della. “Memory, Remembering, and Histories of Change: A Performance Praxis.” in *The SAGE Handbook of Performance Studies*. D. Soyini Madison and Judith Hamera, editors. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, 2006.

Redfern, Bonnie J. “Hope and Reconciliation with Grief.” *The Promise of Restorative Justice*. John P.J. Dussich, Jill Schallenberg, eds. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2010. Print, p 227-242.

Ruth-Heffelbower, Duane. “Restorative Justice in Disaster Management.” *The Promise of Restorative Justice*. John P.J. Dussich, Jill Schallenberg, eds. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2010. Print, p 219-226.

Salamensky, S.I. “Noshing at the Necropolis: Trauma, Gastrotourism and Jewish Cultural Memory.”

Sandino, Jack, ed. *Spontaneous Shrines and the Public Memorialization of Death*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.

Savage, Kirk. *Monument Wars*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005.

—. *Standing Soldiers, Kneeling Slaves*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997.

—. “Trauma, Healing, and the Therapeutic Monument.” *Terror, Culture, Politics: Rethinking 9/11*. Daniel J. Sherman and Terry Nardin, eds. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2006. Print. p. 103-120.

- Schutz, Alfred. *The Phenomenology of the Social World*. Northwestern University Press, 1967.
- Scruggs, Jan C. and Joel L. Swerdlow. *To Heal a Nation: The Vietnam Veterans Memorial*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1985.
- Seixas, Peter. editor. *Theorizing Historical Consciousness*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004. Print.
- Senie, Harriet F. *Memorials to Shattered Myths: Vietnam to 9/11*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2016. Print.
- Senie, Harriet F. and Sally Webster. *Critical Issues in Public Art: Content, Context, and Controversy*. Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1992.
- Serra, Richard. *Tilted Arc*. 1981. destroyed.
- Shanken, Andrew M. "Planning Memory: Living Memorials in the United States During World War II," *The Art Bulletin* 48, No.1 (March 2002): 130-147.
- Simpson, David. *9/11: The Culture of Commemoration*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2006. Print.
- Sion, Brigitte, ed. *Death Tourism: Disaster Sites as Recreational Landscape*. London: Segull Books, 2010. Print.
- Skayne, Allie. *The Survivor Tree: A Story of Hope and Healing*. 9/11 Memorial: National September 11 Memorial and Museum. ND. Print.
- Sloane, David Charles. *The Last Great Necessity*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991. Print.
- . "Roadside Shrines and Granite Sketches: Diversifying the Vernacular Landscape of Memory." *Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture*, Vol. 12 (2005), pp. 64-81.
- Sorkin, Michael. *Starting from Zero: Reconstruction Downtown New York*. New York: Routledge, 2003. Print.
- Stewart, Ruth Ann, et al, editors. *Who Owns the Past? Cultural Policy, Cultural Property, and The Law*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2005. Print.

- Stewart, Susan. "Objects of Desire." *On Longing: Narratives of the Miniature, the Gigantic, the Souvenir, the Collection*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1984. Print.
- Sturken, Marita. "The Aesthetics of Absence: Rebuilding Ground Zero." *American Ethnologist*, Vol. 31 No. 3 (311-325).
- . "The Remembering of Forgetting: Recovered Memory and the Question of Experience." *Social Text* 57. Vol 16, No. 4 (Winter 1998).
- . *Tourists of History: Memory, Kitsch, and Consumerism from Oklahoma City to Ground Zero*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2007.
- Thelen, David. "Memory and American History," *The Journal of American History* 75, No.4 (Mar., 1989): 1117-1129.
- Thomas, Christopher A. *The Lincoln Memorial & American Life*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002. Print.
- Thomasson, Amie L. "The Ontology of Art and Knowledge in Aesthetics." *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 63:3 (Summer 2005) Print.
- Townshend, Adam Barrett. "Crashing by Design: Toward a Uniform Standard for Public Place Analysis Under Federal Copyright Law." 79 Notre Dame L. Rev. 2045 2003-2004.
- Trigg, Dylan. *The Memory of Place: A Phenomenology of the Uncanny*. Athens: Ohio University Press, 2012. Print.
- United Airlines Flight #93 Cockpit Voice Recorder Transcript. Government Exhibit P200056T, 01-455-A (ID). As posted on the Flight 93 Memorial Website. 14 January 2016.
- U.S. Department of Defense. "Defense.gov News Photos." Web. 21 February 2015.
- von Miller, Ferdinand. *Confederate Monument, Louisville*. 1895. Granite and Bronze, Louisville, Kentucky.
- Vowell, Sarah. *Assassination Vacation*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 2005. Print
- Walton, Kendall. "Categories of Art." *The Philosophical Review*, Vol. 79, No. 3 (July 1970), 334-367. Print.

- Warburton, Nigel. *The Art Question*. London: Routledge, 2003. Print.
- Weil, Stephen E. *Beauty and the Beasts: On Museums, Art, The Law, and the Market*. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1983. Print.
- Wilson, Brendan, telephone interview by Jennifer A. Fraley, March 10, 2016.
- Winter, Jay. *Sites of Memory, Sites of Mourning: The Great War in European Cultural History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Witnessing History*. Audio tour provided by 9/11 Memorial Museum. Produced by Acoustiguide.
- Wittgenstein, Ludwig. *Culture and Value*. G.H. Von Wright, editor. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1980. Print.
- . *Philosophical Investigations*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd. 2009. Print
- Young, James E. *The Art of Memory: Holocaust Memorials in History*. New York: Prestel, 1994.
- . “Between History and Memory: The Uncanny Voices of Historian and Survivor.” *History and Memory*. Vol. 9 No. 1/2 (1997) 47-58.
- . *At Memory’s Edge: After Images of the Holocaust in Contemporary Art and Architecture*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000.
- . *The Texture of Memory: Holocaust Memorials and Meanings*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993.
- Zehr, Howard. *The Little Book of Restorative Justice*. Intercourse: Good Books, 2002. Print.

FIGURES

1. Map of Human Remains: “Map of the Distribution of Human Remains After 9/11.” [ProCon.org](http://wtcmuslimcenter.procon.org/view.resource.php?resourceID=4007) 29 September 2010, as used in *New York Post*. 10 September 2010. <http://wtcmuslimcenter.procon.org/view.resource.php?resourceID=4007>
2. Dial and Discover Tours, screen capture from Flight 93 official webpage. nps.gov
3. Plans for Meaningful Adjacencies, image taken from: Blais, Allison and Lynn Rasic. *A Place of Remembrance: Official Book of the National September 11 Memorial*. Washington D.C.: National Geographic, ND, 176.
4. Name Finder Tool, screen capture from 911memorial.org, “Memorial—Explore—Find A Name”
5. Detail from Name Finder Tool, screen capture from 911memorial.org, “Memorial—Explore—Find A Name—Zoe Falkenberg”
6. Photograph of Brussels Street, taken by Pieter Maurtis Van, posted online, March, 22, 2016.
7. Donation Image, screen capture from Pentagon Website, [pentagon memorial.org](http://pentagonmemorial.org).

CASES AND STATUTES

16 U.S.C. §431-433: Antiquities Act (1906).

17 U.S.C. §106A: Visual Artists Rights Act (VARA) of 1990.

Flight 93 Memorial Act. Public Law No. 107-226

Gaylord v. United States 85 Fed. Cl 59 (2008)

Hearing before the Subcommittee on National Parks, Historic Preservation, and

Recreation. Second Session on “The status of Monuments and memorials, and new policies that have been adopted for locating new commemorative works in and around Washington, D.C. March 23, 2000.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Jennifer A Fraley

530 Belgravia Ct. #3
Louisville, KY 40208
(614) 325-8575

Email: Fraley27@gmail.com

EDUCATION:

2016:	Ph.D. Comparative Humanities, University of Louisville
2006	M.A. Liberal Studies, Ohio Dominican University
2001	J.D. Law, Capital University Law School
1997	B.A. Political Science, Ohio Dominican University

ACADEMIC EMPLOYMENT:

Current:	Adjunct Professor, Sullivan University
2013-Current:	Tutor for University of Louisville Athletic Department: Humanities, Art History, Political Science, History, Justice Administration
Fall 2015:	Part Time Lecturer, University of Louisville
2011-Summer 2015:	Graduate Teaching Fellow, University of Louisville

AREAS OF RESEARCH and TEACHING SPECIALIZATION:

Humanities, Art History, Law, Philosophy, Popular and Visual Culture, American Studies,
Media Studies, Legal History, History, and Justice Administration

COURSES TAUGHT:

University of Louisville (Humanities: 2011-Present)

HUM 151: Creativity and the Arts (Summer 2013-Fall 2014, Summer 2015,
Fall 2015)

HUM 151 Honors: Creativity and the Arts (Fall 2015)

HUM 152: Cultures of America (Fall 2011-Spring 2013, Spring 2015)

Sullivan University (Summer 2015-Current)

FYE 101: Information Literacy (Summer 2015-Fall 2015)

ENG 100: Introduction to Composition (Fall 2015)

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT:

2016 General Education Assessment Reader, University of Louisville

PUBLICATIONS:

- 2013 "Exhibition in Ekstrom Library Honors Grady Clay" in *The Owl*: University of Louisville Libraries. April 2013.
- 2013 "Castleman Sculptor Perry Won Praise From 1911 Testimonial Fund Committee" in the Cherokee Triangle Organization Newsletter. Volume XXII Issue 1, Spring 2013. Louisville, KY.

GUEST LECTURES:

- 2016 "The Art of the University of Louisville: A Guided Walking Tour." Faculty Presenter for the Commonwealth Center for Humanities and Society, University of Louisville, Louisville KY. Scheduled June 2016.
- 2014 "9/11 Memorials and Memory." for Humanities 673 Home and Homeland Class. University of Louisville, Louisville, KY. October 29, 2014.
- 2014 "Photographers of Manzanar." for Humanities 152: Cultures of America Class. University of Louisville, Louisville, KY. November 3, 2014.
- 2104 "The Role of the Community and the 9/11 Memorials." for Memorials and War Class. Georgetown College, Georgetown, KY. April 28, 2014.

PRESENTATIONS:

- 2014 "Monuments, Memorials and Memory: The Role of the Artist as the Interpreter of Collected Consciousness." Humanities Education and Research Association Conference. Washington, D.C., 27 Feb-1 Mar 2014.
- 2013 "Experiencing Monuments Through Merleau-Ponty's Embodied Consciousness." Interdisciplinary Coalition of North American Phenomenologists. Ramapo College, Mahwah, NJ, 24-26 May 2013.
- 2012 "The American Holocaust." Popular Culture/American Culture Association National Conference. Boston, MA, 11-14 April 2012.
- 2012 "The Underworld of Feminist Artistic Language: Challenging the Traditional Patriarchal Voice: Judy Chicago's The Dinner Party: Visual representation of feminist language." Kentucky Philological Association Conference, Morehead State University, Morehead, KY, 2 March 2012.

EXHIBITIONS CURATED:

- 2013 “The Preservation Conversation: Grady Clay on Louisville.” Ekstrom Library, University of Louisville, Louisville, KY, 29 April 2013-2 June 2013.
- 2013 “Inten(s)ion.” Co-curated with fellow classmates. Christ Church Cathedral, Louisville, KY. 9 May 2013-30 June 2013.

AWARDS AND HONORS:

- 2016 Dissertation Completion Grant
- 2015 Graduate Student Council Research Grant
- 2015 Humanities Division Research Travel Grant
- 2015 Red and Black Scholar Mentor, University of Louisville Athletics
- 2012 Faculty Guest Coach Award at University of Louisville Football Game.
Nominated and elected by current student athletes.
- 2012 Research Grant, Arts and Sciences Graduate Student Union, University of Louisville.
- 2012-2014 Travel Grant, Graduate Student Council, University of Louisville.
- 2011-2015 Graduate Teaching Assistant, Department of Humanities, University of Louisville.

PROFESSIONAL SERVICE:

Professional Organizations and Conferences

- 2014- 2015 President Association of Humanities Academics
- 2011- 2014 Treasurer Association of Humanities Academics (AHA)
- 2013-Present Graduate Teaching Assistant Elected Representative
- 2013- Conference Organizing Committee. “Re: Conference for the Humanities”
University of Louisville AHA Graduate Conference, March 23
- 2012- Conference Organizing Committee. “Re: Conference for the Humanities”
University of Louisville AHA Graduate Conference, March 22.
- 2011- Conference Organizing Committee. “Re: Conference for the Humanities”
University of Louisville AHA Graduate Conference, March 25.

Conference Charing:

2014 Humanities Education and Research Association Conference, Washington, D.C.

2013 The Louisville Conference, University of Louisville, Louisville, KY

2012 The Louisville Conference, University of Louisville, Louisville, KY

CAMPUS SERVICE:

Fall 2015 Representative for the Humanities Division at Campus Preview Event

Mentor

2014 Nadeem Zaman, Incoming Ph.D Student, Humanities, University of Louisville.

2013 Jessica Fletcher, Incoming Ph.D Student, Humanities, University of Louisville.

2012 Andrew Golden, Incoming Ph.D. Student, Humanities, University of Louisville.

2012 Sarah Pennington, Incoming Ph.D. Student, Humanities, University of Louisville.

2011 Jessica Cresseveur, Incoming Ph.D. Student, Humanities, University of Louisville.

COURSES TAKEN:

Fall 2014 ART 590: Special Topics, Toy Cameras

Spring 2014: ARTH 641: Murals in Renaissance Italy

ART 551: Photographic Techniques and Processes

Fall 2013: ARTH 621: Topics in Modern Art: Queer Art and Theory

PHIL 651: Philosophy of Art

HUM 699: Interdisciplinary Capstone Symposium

Spring 2013: ARTH 648: Curatorial Methods II

ART 351: Introduction to Black and White Photography

HUM 682: Studies in Culture: Religion and Literature of the American South

Fall 2012: ARTH 631: Topics in Asian Art: Nationalism

HUM 671: Interdisciplinary Seminar: Creativity and Madness

PHIL 605: Phenomenology

Summer 2012: HUM 595: Principals in Cultural History

Spring 2012: ARTH 595: American Art II

PHIL 635: Political Philosophy
 HUM 609: Interdisciplinary Theory: Arts and Humanities
 Fall 2011: ARTH 631: Topics in Asian Art: Modern Cities
 HUM 671: Interdisciplinary Seminar: Modernism
 WGST 692: Advance Topics in WGST: Feminist Religious Thought
 Spring 2011: HUM 662: Humanistic Studies II
 Fall 2010: HUM 661: Humanistic Studies I
 Fall 2005: LST 531: History, Ideas, and Values
 Spring 2005: LST 530: Love and Society
 LST 532: Human Rights
 Fall 2004: LST 552: The Theatre of the Absurd
 LST 510: Seminar: Critical Theory and Methodology I
 LST 586: Art, Politics, and Feminist Theory
 Summer 2004: LST 511: Seminar: Critical Theory and Methodology II
 Spring 2004: LST 585: Special Topics: Democracy: History of Ideas
 LST 502: Approach to Development of Civilizations
 Fall 2003: LST 521: Art and Our World
 Spring 2000: LAW: Law and American History
 LAW: Civil Rights
 Spring 1999: LAW: Legal History
 Fall 1998: LAW: Constitutional Law II
 Spring 1998: LAW: Constitutional Law I

LANGUAGES:

German: basic reading

Spanish: basic reading

ACADEMIC SOCIETIES--MEMBERSHIPS:

Association for Humanities Academics

Interdisciplinary Coalition of North American Phenomenologists

American Bar Association

Humanities Education and Research Association

Popular Culture Association

PHOTOGRAPHY CREDITS

2014 Kentucky Women's Book Festival, University of Louisville, May 17, 2014

2013 Threaded Realities Fashion Show, University of Louisville, April 18, 2013.
 Official Photographer of show and all marketing/advertising materials.

2013 “The Preservation Conversation: Grady Clay on Louisville.” Ekstrom Library,
University of Louisville, Louisville, KY, 29 April 2013-2 June 2013.