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Aggressors have often attacked sites of valued architectural heritage, believing such destruction will demoralize the targeted nation’s people and irreversibly shake the foundations of the marginalized culture. Of architectural structures that have been specifically targeted and fell victim to enemy attacks over the past decades however, many have been rebuilt in some capacity. This study considers the cases of Old Town Warsaw, the Stari Most in Mostar, and the former World Trade Center site in New York City to understand the ways in which local citizens engaged with the monuments tangible presence and intangible spirit prior to acts of aggression, during the monuments’ physical destruction, and throughout the process of rebuilding. From this analysis, it is concluded that while the rebuilding of valued sites of architectural heritage often reaffirms a culture’s resilience, there is no universal way to deal with the aftermath of the destruction of built heritage. Instead, the choices of if and how to rebuild are directly influenced by the political and economic conditions of a city after it experiences such architectural loss. By considering UNESCO and field standards on authenticity, cultural heritage, and
preservation methods, this study seeks to understand the various ways in which a society may choose to redevelop a site of architectural importance, embracing and exalting carefully selected memories after its intentional destruction during acts of war.
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INTRODUCTION

In war, aggressors often attack sites of valued architectural heritage, believing such destruction will demoralize the targeted nation’s people and irreversibly shake the foundations of the marginalized culture. Frequently however, aggressors have seen their tactics backfire as the people whom they sought to deliberately destroy become empowered to revitalize their buildings and reaffirm their cultural pride. While such calculated destruction has challenged those entrusted with architectural preservation and postwar redevelopment, the historic record shows even the most physically downtrodden nations have risen from their own ashes to recover their culture’s built heritage. Of buildings that have been specifically targeted and have fallen victim to enemy attacks over the past decades, many have been rebuilt in some capacity.

Unfortunately, the possible case studies to study such a trend are numerous. For the purposes of this particular study, however, it seems appropriate to choose three locations and peoples which are drastically different from one and other in their geography, temporality, circumstances of cultural attack, and ultimate choices in the rebuilding process in order to highlight the various ways in which attacks on architectural heritage have been rectified. Because many preservationists consider the reconstruction of Old Town Warsaw after World War II to be the cornerstone example of post-war architectural rehabilitation, this study begins by analyzing the Varsovian circumstance. Jumping approximately fifty years forward and moving to the Balkan Peninsula, the second case study considers the reconstruction of the Stari Most bridge in Mostar after the Bosnian War of the 1990s in order to consider the ways in which Warsaw’s
reconstruction affected the understanding of authenticity, and more over, the importance of reestabishing sites of important cultural heritage in order for a culture to reaffirm its collective identity post-genocide. Finally, this study concludes with an analysis of the September 11, 2001 attacks on the former World Trade Center in New York City. This last example brings this paper into contemporary relevance since the site is still undergoing major rehabilitation and development nearly a decade after the terroristic actions destroyed the Twin Towers.

Each of these case studies allows for an analysis of the intangible heritage of a site – the often invisible projection of societal values on to architecture. For the purposes of this paper, it is held that none of the considered destructive acts were justifiable under means of military necessity as defined by the Geneva Convention. The destruction of Old Town, the Stari Most, and World Trade Center were not for “definite military advantage,” but rather for the purposes of cultural genocide or weakening of the attacked society.¹

Although working within different circumstances, the people of all three of these locations chose to rebuild something on the attacked site to physically affirm their resilience. Each city’s reconstructions however, led to strikingly different results. As such, it can be concluded that there is no universal way to deal with the aftermath of the destruction of built heritage. Instead, the choices of if and how to rebuild are directly influenced by the political and economic conditions of a city after it experiences such

¹ This study therefore does not consider or analyze the concept of “military necessity” which was defined by the Geneva Convention as the requirement for militaries to limit their fire to “objects which by their nature, location, purpose, or use make an effective contribution to military action whose total or partial destruction, capture, or neutralization, in the circumstance ruling at the time, offers a definite military advantage.” See Geneva Conventions, Protocol 1, Article 52, 1949.
aggression. Moreover, the resilience of a population and its post-catastrophe preservation decisions are directly correlated to the tenor of the culture’s collective memories of the destroyed structure.

Each of these three case studies highlights the undeniable significance of architecture beyond the basic human need of shelter. Architecture is both an art and necessity, laced with cultural heritage, history, and both personal and collective memories. Often these various meanings are projected onto structures by the societies in which they stand. For Old Town Warsaw and the ancient bridge in Mostar, such affinities were created slowly, over centuries of the structures’ existence and the passing of countless generations; at the World Trade Center site, appreciation of the Twin Towers was less organic and arguably inspired by the terrorist attacks themselves. Disregarding the nuanced circumstances of particular sites, however, it is clear that many aggressors have been acutely aware of the cultural value of architecture since they so often choose to target buildings seen as symbolic of a culture’s identity. Likewise, preservationists and those involved in reconstruction efforts also acknowledge the value of not only the physical fabric, but the intangible emotions associated with former architectural sites as well. Whether or not such sites are recognized as historical before their destruction is irrelevant, as architecture – an art with which people must interact in their daily lives, thus projecting their own sense of selves and communal self to their built environment – is an intrinsic part of human life. The loss of a prominent structure within a cityscape changes the balance of that city and preservationists and redevelopers must work to restore and rebuild accordingly.
Old Town Warsaw was chosen as the first case study because it represents one of the earliest and most deliberate programs of modern, postwar reconstruction of historic architecture. During the Nazi occupation of the region between 1939 and 1944, over eighty percent of the city’s population was killed and eighty-five percent of the city’s historic architecture razed. The attacks within the Old Town district were particularly heinous, as members of the Third Reich were ordered to follow the Pabst Plan: a deliberate and calculated demolition of each and every historic structure in the center of Warsaw in attempt to carry out Hitler’s genocidal goals. Nazi intelligence believed that if the city’s architectural heritage were to be erased, any Varsovian who survived the war would have no desire to return to their destroyed city. However, just months after the Liberation in 1945, Varsovians did return and with the aid of their newly empowered socialist government, began to rebuild Warsaw’s historic core based on its seventeenth and eighteenth century cityscape. For a multitude of political and social reasons that this study will explore, Warsaw restored its architectural heritage to the style of a bygone era.

Nearly fifty years after Varsovian reconstructions began, the Bosniaks of Mostar in the Former Yugoslavia were confronted with a similar postwar, post-genocidal landscape in need of restoration. Particularly hard hit was the once integrated and peaceful resort town of Mostar where during the Bosnian Civil War, tensions between the Serbs, Bosniaks, and Croats came to a head. In 1993 Stari Most – the Old Bridge of Mostar which dated to the days of the Ottoman Empire – was targeted for its symbolic role and long history as the unifier between Christian, Orthodox, and Muslim citizens on the eastern and western banks of the town. As the bridge crumbled, the two ethnic groups
were physically segregated. At the end of the war however, Mostar received international aid to rebuild the historic bridge, using salvaged stones and the application of techniques that closely reflected its original construction method.

Because of their great successes and benchmarks in field of post-war urban reconstructions, Warsaw and Mostar have been written about at length by scholars and eyewitness participants. A 2007 Master of Science in Architecture thesis for the university of Florida by Marah al Aloul titled “The Destruction of Cultural Heritage by Warfare and Reconstruction Strategies: Lessons Learned from Case Studies of Rebuilt Cities,” and Christina Cameron’s article in the APT Bulletin from 2008 titled “From Warsaw to Mostar: The World Heritage Committee and Authenticity,” have attempted to take a look at Warsaw and Bosnia in concord. For that reason, the preservation of Old Town and the Stari Most serves as well-researched backdrops to a more extensive, new study of the redevelopment decisions made for the site of the former World Trade Center in New York City. While countless news articles, government documents, and scholarly works have been published on the facts, emotions, and aftermath of the September 11 terrorist attacks on the Twin Tower, there has not been sufficient consideration of the initial rationale and potential implications of the creation of an entirely new complex of buildings on the site. This study acknowledges that although the projects came to strikingly different conclusions, many of the same factors which inspired the Varsovian and Bosnian reconstructions were also at play in New York City.

While at first glance, there seem to be countless differences between the acts of deliberate cultural destruction in Warsaw and Bosnia versus that of Ground Zero, all
three sites can be analyzed for their rebuilding as acts of defiance against the perpetrators, and as attempts to reclaim historic identities. Varsovians located their identity in their prosperous seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, citizens of Mostar embraced their Ottoman heritage, and New Yorkers engaged in the World Trade Center redevelopment process to reaffirm their valuation of the democratic process and commercial enterprise. Like the original purpose of the World Trade Center, the redevelopment project would embrace economic aspirations, only this time, they would be even bigger, better, and stronger.

While the loss of life on September 11 cannot be compared to the years of genocide in Poland and the Balkans, nearly three thousand lives were lost in just one day, thus making September 11, 2001 the largest tragedy Americans had ever experienced on United States soil. After the initial recovery efforts, discussion on what to do with the 16-acre site of the former World Trade Center began. Suggestions included reconstruction of the Twin Towers or the development of an entirely new business and retail complex. Most citizens and politicians agreed and insisted upon the inclusion of a large memorial at the site. In New York City, memorialization became a high priority, where as in Warsaw and Mostar, such retention of memory for the events of war or the deceased were not as prevalent. Perhaps this was because the casualties at the European sites themselves were significantly lower: most of the Varsovian and Bosnian populations had been relocated to concentration camps or ethnic ghettos prior to the architectural destruction. Warsaw and Mostar were thereby not recognized as gravesites or sacred ground like the
World Trade Center site immediately was. In light of these most basic differences, architectural historian Martin Filler wrote in 2007:

no one dared to draw comparisons openly between Ground Zero and analogous sites of civic destruction abroad. […] Though civilian casualties at Ground Zero were without equal in American history, the death toll in countless urban bombardments six decades earlier was vastly higher. Yet to present such an indelicate argument at the time of the World Trade Center [redevelopment competitions] would have been considered scarcely less treasonous than to suggest that America’s military response to the attacks of September 11 was likewise out of proportion to the offence.²

Had the cities of Europe been left with massive memorials after World War II or the cities of the Former Yugoslavia left in ruins, the national landscapes would look strikingly different.

Unlike Warsaw and Mostar’s decisions to fully reconstruct their sites of architectural heritage and in essence, create a historic void by covering all traces of the acts of war in the 1940s and 1990s, the city of New York chose to highlight the scars of 2001 by developing the so-called tower footprints as the site of the National September 11 Memorial and Museum.³ Although the Twin Towers would have never been experienced from the ground – their massive heights almost guaranteed passers-by would have to strain their necks upwards towards the sky, and the footprints themselves were

³ It should be noted that this trend of leaving no physical evidence of bombed structures and devastated landscapes is not universal. London, for example, left a post-World War II ruin of Coventry Cathedral beside a newly built, modern cathedral. Likewise, the people of Hiroshima left a ruined exhibition hall at the center of their reconstructed city. By allowing the ruins to exist besides marks of progress and healing, the people of London and Hiroshima embraced their painful historic moments, physically preserved evidence of atrocities and from there, were able to rebuild. See Robert Bevan’s extended discussion on the effects of the destruction of cultural heritage in London and Hiroshima, in Germany on Kristallnacht, in the Balkans, and in Armenia. Robert Bevan, The Destruction of Memory, London 2006, pp. 27-60, 192.
never extant but rather filled by a retail concourse – the footprints became symbols of memory and the absence of both the tower and human remains.

As evidenced by these three examples, the choice of what to build after destruction is open ended and varies greatly between cultures and their varying political and economic circumstances. Because of their new political leadership, Varsovians chose to rebuild Old Town to the style of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries so that the newly empowered Socialists could be written into the city’s historic fabric. They could have just as easily chosen to design Old Town in the modern, socialist-approved architecture that was going up around the rest of the city, however, in an attempt to look forward after the atrocities of World War II, instead of way back into Varsovian history. Likewise, the Bosnian decision to find and reuse as many original stones as possible to rebuild the Stari Most with historic exactitude to celebrate their integrated cultural heritage and long history of trade negated the opportunity to build a bigger, industrial bridge appropriate for modern commerce and transportation. Considering these two case studies, the choice to build an entirely new skyscraper complex, not physically based on the late Twin Towers, was markedly different. It is important to note, however, the towers were never aesthetically appreciated but rather mercilessly critiqued for their modernism, lack of integration into the surrounding skyline and neighborhoods, and for their disruption of the streetscape. Furthermore, in contrast to the foundations and building frames that were revived in Old Town or the stones dredged from the river in Mostar, the collapse of the Twin Towers left little to no materials usable for reconstruction or preservation.
Despite this lack of authentic materiality, the impetus to “preserve” was still present in the majority plea to retain the tower footprints “from bedrock to infinity” and the quick discredit of Beyer Blinder Belle’s original redevelopment plan for the site which called for the restoration of the old, eighteenth century street grid to Lower Manhattan. In preserving the void of the footprints and the superblock that was developed during the Twin Towers’ construction in the 1970s, developers took on the role of preservationists of the intangible spirit and projected memories of the site. Just as Warsaw and Bosnia chose to rebuild in historic styles which reflected and redefined their cultural identities, New York chose to rebuild, but in a new style which embraced the World Trade Center’s intangible heritage since no tangible remains survived to allow for reconstruction with authentic materials. Authenticity at the World Trade Center site was represented in the intangible values of a democratic decision process, capitalistic prioritization, and the desire to build bigger and better than the Twin Towers which in their height and duplicity had originally stuck up from the New York skyline as bigger and better than all other skyscrapers.

Methods of Research

Since the creation of the Lower Manhattan Development Cooperation (LMDC) immediately following the attacks of September 11, contemporary news articles have offered day-by-day accounts of progress- or more often, lack of progress – at the site. While similar issues may have been extant during the reconstruction projects for Warsaw and Bosnia, the records of such conflicts have been lost either over the course of time, or
were inaccessible due to language barriers. This paper relies primarily on texts that have been published in English, of which thankfully, have been many. Concerning Warsaw, several contemporary sources were consulted including “A Plan for Warsaw,” published in *The Architects Journal* 1946, and “Reconstruction: Warsaw,” published in *Task* in 1948 by Polish architects Helene Syrkus, Szymon Syrkus, and Matthew Nowicki. More recent commentaries on the redevelopment of Warsaw have included Jerzy Elzanowski’s “Manufacturing Ruins: Architecture and Representation in Post-Catastrophic Warsaw,” *Journal of Architecture* 2010 which takes into considerations UNESCO and ICOMOS reactions to the reconstruction of the Old Town. Likewise, this study considers various UNESCO evaluations of Warsaw, and Michel Parent’s 1978 report from UNESCO’s Paris meeting which considered the eligibility of Warsaw’s Old Town to the World Heritage List.

Bosnia’s record of reconstruction has been documented in several forms, the primary being Andras J. Riedlmayer’s “Post-war Survey of Selected Municipalities,” published in 2002. Additionally *Rebuilding Mostar: Reconstruction in a War Zone* by John Yarwood in 1999 and UNESCO’s *Mostar: Urban Heritage Map and Rehabilitation Plan of Stari Grad* proved invaluable resources to understanding the technical, financial, and political components of the restoration of the Stari Most. Mehmed Bublin’s *The Cities of Bosnia and Herzegovina: A Millennium of Development and the Years of Urbicide*, 1999 and Patrice C. McMahon’s article “Rebuilding Bosnia: A Model to Emulate or to Avoid?,” 2005 offered theoretical underpinnings for understanding the history of Mostar, and the cultural importance of the Old Bridge.
Research on the progress at Ground Zero had to be approached differently than that of Warsaw and Bosnia since it is still a work in progress and because of the scarce number of scholarly publications on the redevelopment process. In 2004 two books were published on the subject: Peter Goldberg’s *Up From Zero* and Philip Nobel’s *16 Acres*. The former was supportive of the government and economic issues at play in Lower Manhattan, whereas the latter provided a more factually revealing account of the conflicts, controversies, and constraints on the former World Trade Center site. This study relies heavily upon Nobel’s research and uses Goldberg’s research only as a bibliographic reference. Additionally, a plethora of primary sources concerning the redevelopment of the World Trade Center was consulted. In this digital age, a striking majority of the press releases and fact sheets released by the various architects and developers involved have not been physically published and only present themselves in digital form. Countless news articles—particularly those written by David Dunlap, Charles Bagli, and Nicolai Ouroussoff for the *New York Times*—were also considered since in combination, they offer an accurate timeline of the site’s developments and varying public opinions; just a sampling of the most relevant and useful articles have been provided in the bibliography of this paper. On a more interpretive and scholarly level, the 2004 volume of *American Ethnologist* which focused on the memorialization of September 11 was an invaluable resource.

While this study originally set out to focus only on the preservation of sites deliberately destroyed through acts of war, it became clear almost immediately that heritage destruction and heritage reconstruction were both intrinsically connected to the
creation and preservation of individual and collective memory. The choice to rebuild, and then what to build, is a multifaceted expression of a culture’s values and often, of the ruling political party’s philosophy. In Warsaw, for example, although the city experienced the loss of over half its population, memorialization of its victims was scarce. The impetus to rebuild was a propagandistic ploy sponsored by the new Polish Socialist regime. Likewise, since no fatalities were directly inflicted by the destruction of the Stari Most, the rebuilt bridge became a site of historical memory rather than a site for fallen citizens. Ground Zero was different in that the attack on the Twin Towers and their subsequent collapse claimed nearly three thousand lives. Americans simultaneously clamored to memorialize lost civilians and public servants, while also attempting to memorialize lost architecture. Although the Twin Towers were not formally recognized as historic landmarks in the same way that the Old Town district and the Stari Most had been before their destruction, the people of the New York area reacted to the disappearance of an iconic structure along the Manhattan skyline as if it were a defining part of their cultural identity. A general study of memory theory has nuanced the unpacking of these phenomena, particularly the interesting ways in which New Yorker’s changed their feelings towards the Twin Towers after the terrorist attacks. Robert Bevan’s book *The Destruction of Memory: Architecture at War* and an edited volume titled *Acts of Memory: Cultural Recall in the Present* were critical resources while analyzing the reconstruction efforts at all three case study locations.

In first considering and then departing from the already extensive studies of reconstruction in Warsaw and Bosnia, the following pages seek to understand the ways in
which New Yorkers’ memories of the Twin Towers changed just seconds after their collapse: once considered to be two offensive blemishes on the Manhattan skyline and disruptions to the fluidity of the Downtown neighborhoods, New Yorker’s became immediately and intimately fond of the towers. Such affinity proliferated through the commercially produced memorabilia with silhouettes of the Twin Towers commanding “never forget,” and the ongoing battles regarding redevelopment and memorial plans with cries to protect the victims – or more literally the towers’ – memory from “bedrock to infinity.”

Ultimately, through analysis of various resources, this paper seeks to examine how three different cultures have chosen to preserve memories and project particular meanings onto sites that have fallen under deliberately destructive acts of aggression. While the impetus to preserve a culture’s memory after it has been attacked seems universal, the extent to which reconstruction is carried out in a particular heritage environment varies greatly. Often, as seen in the case of Warsaw and Mostar, reconstruction has created a palimpsest by erasing all traces of war and destruction. In the case of Ground Zero, excavation of the tower footprints, originally filled by retail spaces, reconstructed a memory of a built environment that was never experienced when the towers themselves existed.

It is important that preservationists, redevelopers, and all those potentially involved in rehabilitation of such sites are made aware of the various tensions and hurdles that may arise from economics and politics, and public reactions. Furthermore, questions of authenticity both in materials and in the historical record must be brought to the fore in
order to understand the implications of reconstruction on a culture. Since the debates over inclusion of Warsaw Old Town on the UNESCO World Heritage List in 1980 in spite of its full twentieth century reconstructions, issues of how to preserve, and more overly, what to preserve, have challenged twenty-first century preservationists. In Bosnia-Herzegovina, the reconstruction of the Stari Most in identical architectural form after purposeful demolition proved to the world, and ultimately the citizens of Bosnia themselves, Bosnian fortitude and persistence. Even so, scholars have questioned whether it can be considered cultural preservation. Although the convoluted project at Ground Zero awaits completion, it too might appropriately be understood as a preservation, not of the physical fabric of the former World Trade Center site since little remained to be saved, but of American ideas about economy and freedom. As such, the redevelopment of Ground Zero might be understood as preservation of the intangible, twentieth century heritage of Lower Manhattan.

This paper seeks to understand how preservationists and developers, their funding governments, and non-governmental organizations have negotiated the emotional and tenuous highways of rebuilding after sites of cultural heritage become wartime casualties. Every day around the world, war-torn sites are threatened by vandalism, looting, and eminent destruction. In light of the looting of Iraq National Museum to Saddam Hussein’s attempts to rebuild ancient Babylon in his honor, to the destruction of the Bamiyan Buddhas and more recent conflicts in Egypt and other nations undergoing political change, it seems doubtful that the need for preservationists and developers to deal with questions of how to preserve tangible or intangible heritage after acts of war
will come to an end in the near future. In light of Old Town, the Stari Most, and the former World Trade Center, it can be concluded that there is no universal method of post-war reconstruction. Rather than to suggest one method is more correct or successful than another, this study objectively considers three ways in which physical voids may be reconstructed in attempt to restore cultural memory, with or without erasing the history of the destructive acts themselves. Ultimately, it considers preservation at sites where there is little more to preserve than intangible memory.
OLD TOWN, WARSAW

While the catastrophic legacy of Nazi Germany has been memorialized in countless Holocaust museums and memorials throughout the world, Warsaw, the capital city of Poland which saw sixty of its population murdered between 1930 and 1944 under Nazi occupation, chose not to memorialize within its historic district. The city’s post-war rebuilding efforts deliberately covered remnants of Nazi occupation and Polish resistance by clearing away the ruins of war and rebuilding the city’s Old Town to a style pre-dating World War II by centuries. Varsovians deliberately chose one version of their history to exalt over another and embraced the rebuilding process as an opportunity for national rebirth and redefinition.

In choosing to immediately reconstruct the cultural center of the city with astounding speed, historic exactitude, and architectural detail, Varsovians under the auspices of the new Socialist government attempted to reclaim their pre-Nazi identities while simultaneously eradicating hundreds of years of Polish history. In many ways, with 85% of its architecture destroyed, Warsaw was a blank canvas for architectural reconstruction and a clean slate on which to rebuild carefully selected memories propagated by the newly empowered Soviet government that took over postwar Poland. To understand the socialists’ desire, and ultimately, the Varsovian citizens’ complicit excitement to rebuild the Old Town district of Warsaw in such a historically specific style, one must first understand something of the tumultuous history of the Polish people.

While the exact date of the founding of the city of Warsaw is unclear, most historians use 1285-1300 for their chronologies. The region west of the River Vistula
quickly grew and by the sixteenth century the medieval town had become a ducal seat which enjoyed nearly fifty years of peaceful prosperity. Wealthy burgers and merchants settled in the district now called Old Town. In the 1650s, sixty percent of the city was leveled and seventy percent of the population killed by invading Swedes, Hungarians, and Transylvanians. These attackers pillaged the city of cultural objects and art works, thus sending the region into a cultural and economic recession.

In 1683 King Jan III Sobieski began to rejuvenate Warsaw by encouraging Baroque building projects. The city enjoyed growth and prosperity until 1795 when Poland lost its independence to the Prussians. At that time the golden century of Warsaw came to an end, the Town Hall was demolished, and all administrative offices moved outside of the area. With the district abandoned, many of Warsaw’s poorest residents began to move into the Old Town. As a result, the area fell into disrepair for a century until in 1910 the Polish Society for the Protection of Historic Buildings purchased a house in Old Town near the old market square and established its organizational headquarters. Despite decades of political turmoil, the society’s presence and advocacy led to a gradual repopulation of the Old Town by cultural and scientific societies, artist and scholars. When Poland regained its independence in 1918, Warsaw was once again recognized as the unified nation’s capitol. By the middle of the 1930s, Warsaw had become a beautiful city of Europe and its people were enjoying their peaceful independence.

4 These historical facts are present in various sources, however for a concise and accessible timeline of Varsovian history, see the city’s official website at www.e-warsaw.pl/miasto/historia.htm.
But then came the Blitzkrieg; the first bombs of World War II dropped by the Luftwaffe upon the city of Warsaw. While the city did not sustain substantial damage during these earliest raids of 1939, over the five-year course of the war eight hundred thousand Varsovians (sixty percent of the city’s population) were killed and eighty percent of the city’s architecture was razed.\(^6\) Nazi tactics employed to carry out non-Aryan genocide – coined by Ralphea Lenkin during the Nuremburg Trials and defined by the United Nations as “acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part a national, ethnic, racial, or religious group” – included more than calculated murder and deportation of Jews to concentration camps.\(^7\) As Nazi party leader Hands Frank wrote in his diary, “Warsaw will get what it deserves – complete annihilation,” via the Nazi weapon of choice: the destruction of architecture.\(^8\)

The Nazi party aimed to completely deprive the Polish people of their future, their past, and their memory, and to ensure the Poles would not attempt to repopulate their cities. In 1942, the Reichsführer of the Schutzstaffel, Heinrich Himmler, sent a message to the governor of Warsaw demanding

a general plan for the destruction of the city ghetto should be submitted to me. In any case, we must arrive at the stage in which the residential area which exists at present for 500,000 subhumans [Jews] and which has never been suitable for Germans, will disappear from the face of the area, and the city of Warsaw with its million inhabitants which has always been a center of agitation and rebellion should be reduced in size.\(^9\)

\(^6\) These first attacks destroyed about 12% of the city and damaged the Royal Castle. For details, see Jerzy Elzanowski “Manufacturing Ruins: Architecture and Representation in Post-Catastrophic Warsaw,” *Journal of Architecture* 15, 2010 pp. 76-79.
\(^8\) Bevan 2006, p. 97.
\(^9\) *Ancient Monuments Society* 1959 p. 78.
This part of the “final solution” was only a small portion of the Pabst Plan – fifteen drawings and a model for the rebuilding of Warsaw for occupancy by one hundred thirty thousand Germans, after successful depopulation of Polish inhabitants.\(^{10}\) As Polish Jews from the environs of Warsaw were gathered and transported to the Warsaw Ghetto to await embarkment to concentration and labor camps Nazis troops began to methodically destroy the city’s architectural fabric section by section, following Hitler’s orders that “Warsaw [had] to be pacified, that is, razed to the ground.”\(^{11}\)

The city was divided into zones and destruction began; the most important buildings with relation to Polish history were the first ones marked for the Demolition and Annihilation Squads.\(^{12}\) Risking their lives, some of the most prominent pre-war Varsovian architects and city planners began to secretly prepare for reconstruction of what was inevitably going to become an annihilated city.\(^ {13}\) While the Warsaw Technical University was prohibited from practicing measured architectural drawings and photographic documentation, students and professors continued their planning and architectural studies under the guise of Nazi-permitted mechanical drafting.\(^ {14}\) The sketches and documents were stored at the Piotrkow Monastery until the end of the war, and were predated so that if found, they would appear to have been created before Nazi

---

10 Ibid p. 77. These plans were drawn by German architects Hubert Gross and Otto Numberger. A concentration camp, Kozentractionslager Warschau, was created exclusively for the extermination of the Varsovian population in 1942. It was closed after the Warsaw Uprising.


12 Ibid, p. 81. Although the details and circumstances are unclear, university professor Stanislaw Lorenz obtained special permission to reenter the city to take documentation out of the Warsaw Technical University. He hid his smuggled collection in the Piotrkow monastery as well.

13 Elzanowski 2010, p. 73. See also N. Gutschow and B. Aain, *Yemichtung und Utopie: Stadplanung Warschau 1939-45*, Hamburg 1994 for more about this underground planning committee.

14 It is unclear why mechanical engineering drawings were permitted.
As architectural historian Jerzy Elzanowski recorded, “one of their documents, a directive for Warsaw reconstruction, was written by the light of the flames of the burning city and hidden in POW camps until the end of the war, when it had become a seminal reference for the reconstruction.” Additionally, a secret Studio for Architecture and Town Planning was directed by one of the foremost Polish prewar architects, Szymon Syrkus. Although he was eventually shipped to Auschwitz, he helped ensure the built heritage of Warsaw was methodically recorded by Poles, just as its stones were being methodically destroyed by Nazi commanders.

Before the war, Varsovians had classified nine hundred fifty-seven buildings as important monuments; seven hundred eighty-two of these were destroyed and one hundred forty-one partially demolished by the end of the war, thus raising the destruction of the historic portion of the city to a staggering ninety-seven percent. When General Dwight Eisenhower visited Warsaw after the war, he was appalled: “I have seen many towns destroyed during the war, but nowhere have I been faced with such extent of destruction executed with such bestiality.”

“She defies the storm,” had been the motto of Warsaw before WWII because the nation had been challenged by countless invaders over its history. Even though during World War II, it seemed too much of the world that Warsaw and its motto may have met its match, just two months after the Liberation in January of 1945, the Department of Historic Architecture and planner Stanislaw

---

15 Ancient Monuments Society 1959, p. 80 notes that “after the war, the Warsaw technical University retroactively accredited twenty-three graduate papers, nine doctoral dissertations, and eight postdoctoral studies.”
16 Ibid p. 79. The author does not provide the name of or additional information regarding this document.
17 Ibid. p. 82. It was not just Warsaw which had its culture targeted. Berlin, for example had about 70% of its buildings lightly damaged and 11% destroyed. Warsaw, however, had over 80% total eradication.
Jankowski began to work with the newly created Bureau for Reconstruction to erect scaffolding to protect surviving historic structures from further collapse. Although the Poles had suffered incalculable losses during the war in concentration camps, random executions, and terrors which may never be fully understood, Varsovians found the energy to rebuild as if it were necessary for their own recovery of self. While the population of the city was just one-third of the prewar Warsaw, the city was determined to regain its status as the center for Polish cultural life.\textsuperscript{18}

Conservation and reconstruction on such an enormous scale had never been done before, and would have surely “defeated people less determined,” according to the Ancient Monuments Society’s reflections in 1959.\textsuperscript{19} Despite a low population, the death of numerous architects and planners, and substantial economic setbacks, conservation efforts pushed onward.\textsuperscript{20} The city was combed for some one hundred thousand remaining mines and extensive cleanup efforts began to clear over seven hundred million cubic meters of rubble.\textsuperscript{21} As ruins in the Old Town were investigated for stability, it was determined that many of the ground floors could be unburied and restored, and many of the preexisting roads and utilities could also be rehabilitated. A ten year program was designed for reconstruction, allowing one year of preparatory work, followed by three, three-year stages of building and restoration.\textsuperscript{22} By 1948 most of the scaffolding had been

\textsuperscript{18} H.V. Lanchester, “Reconstruction of Warsaw,” \textit{The Builder} 1947, pp. 286-97. The Prewar population of Poland was 35 million people, versus the 24 million people (a loss of over 30%) at the end of the war. Warsaw had a population of 1.3 million people in 1939 and just 164,000 on the day of liberation in 1954. Just eight months later, the population had risen to 366,000.
\textsuperscript{19} \textit{Ancient Monuments Society} 1959, p. 27.
\textsuperscript{20} It is unclear where the funding for reconstruction came from.
\textsuperscript{21} Lanchester 1947, p. 296. No sources tell where this rubble was taken.
\textsuperscript{22} While this paper focuses on the reconstruction within the Old Town area, around the region, new businesses, administration, and political districts were also being constructed. The government created a
erected for the reconstruction of the buildings along Old Town’s Market Square. While some surviving ironwork was reused and incorporated into the newly constructed historic district, handcraftsmanship skills needed to be revived in order to recreate the “old feel” of the city. According to preservationist Anthony Tung, socialism actually helped in this effort as it became an official state enterprise to revive lost construction arts. Socialism also determined the style in which Old Town was reconstructed as the newly empowered socialist government tried to state its authority by relating itself to the history – via architecture and culture – of nostalgic Warsaw. According to Anthony Tung, for Communists, the rebuilding of Warsaw would be a tool for propaganda, the creation of a model city of social justice. For non-Communists living under Communist rule, recreating the historic core would be an act of symbolic moral resistance. Through a fusion of disparate motives, the new metropolis would be a symbol of national pride, a city of accumulated memory, and a city of dreams.

As President Boleslaw Bierut said to the new Polish congress in July 1949, “New Warsaw is to be the capital of the socialist state. We must fight consciously and with deliberate diligence to give our town a definitely ideological stamp.” While this sent most of Warsaw into the era of social realist architecture, marked by wide avenues, neoclassical structures, and the massive Palace of Culture, Old Town was retained as an independent periodical, printed by the Reconstruction Office, which reported on the city’s progress. In order that the historical qualities of Old Town not be disturbed by the growth of the rest of the city, a tunnel for the East-West Highway was built to run under the historic district’s center. This was only possible because the buildings had not yet been reconstructed. Had the historical buildings still been on their foundations, the tunnel would not have been possible as it would have threatened the structures’ stability. In some ways then, the destruction of Old Town allowed for the district to become a more modern and integrated area of the city, while of course, still retaining its “historic” qualities. See “A Plan for Warsaw,” The Architects Journal 103, 1946 p. 252.

23 Tung 2001, p. 87.
24 Tung 2001, p. 84. It is interesting to note that although the Royal Castle was a symbol of Varsovian freedom until it was dynamited by the Nazis in 1944, the Castle was not rebuilt until the 1980s just before the fall of the iron curtain because it was seen as symbolic of aristocracy, in direct conflict with socialist rule.
historic district for a poignant political purpose: the new Soviet Socialist government needed to legitimize itself after having aided the Nazi’s attack of Warsaw in 1939 and waiting in silence during the Warsaw Uprising in 1944.

Bierut strategically insisted on a reconstruction plan in a style which would pre-date the Soviet’s betrayal of Varsovians. The new regime aimed to appear “at the vanguard of the efforts to celebrated unity by repairing the damage inflicted by Nazis” and ignoring their passive role in such destruction.\(^{26}\) The socialist regime recognized late nineteenth and early twentieth century architectural styles as capitalistic, where as construction of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries represented Polish autonomy. As Minister for Public Administration Wladyslaw Wolski stated in 1950, Varsovians and their government “chose the best period for [them] from a cultural and social point of view [acting] boldly and avoid[ing] certain unpleasant periods.”\(^{27}\) In addition to these socialist motivations, the chosen restoration period also reflected the style to which Varsovians first reconstructed Warsaw at the turn of the eighteenth century after the attacks of the Swedes, Hungarians, and Transylvanians.

The Varsovians had been burned once before and rose from the ashes; the destruction of World War II allowed for a second incarnation of the Phoenix city and spirit. Recovery of architectural drawings, plans, sections, elevations, and details, in addition to prints, paintings, drawings, and photographs smuggled out of the city during the war and compiled from sources throughout the world created the basis for the

---

\(^{26}\) Goldman 2005, p. 144. According to Goldman, this hasty reconstruction led to improper conservation and archaeological work on materials that did survive the war.

\(^{27}\) Translated and quoted in Goldman 2005, p. 172 from Piotr Majewskuj, “Zamek Krolewski w Okresie bledow I wypaczen,” (The Royal Castle During the Times of Errors and Distortion).
rebuilding of Old Town. One of the major referents became the paintings of historic
district by Italian artist Bernardo Belotto from the years between 1767 and 1799. Soon,
the ground floors were occupied by coffee shops, bars, and small businesses, while the
floors above were transformed into historic flats with modern amenities like electricity
and indoor plumbing. Around Market Square, now called Market Place, a post office,
tourist bureau, and headquarters for cultural and scientific societies were built, facing the
newly constructed Warsaw History Museum, Historical Institute of the Polish Academy
of Sciences, and Society for the Historians of Art. 28 By 1951 the first people had moved
into the newly constructed Old Town, and by 1959, just fourteen years after the end of
the war, nearly all of Warsaw’s Old Town had been rebuilt.

Rebuilding of Old Town

The impetus to rebuild – and to rebuild at astounding speeds in the wake of
tremendous destruction and loss of life – marks Warsaw Old Town as a recreation of not
only architecture, but a culture that came before the anthropogenic attacks of the Nazi
army. Although the reconstructed district became a symbol of the nation’s perseverance,
pride, and history, as well as its hopes for the future, its total reconstruction with specific
emphasis on a return to the Baroque cityscape ignores all twentieth century Varsovian
cultural experiences within Old Town. By building upon the ashes of war and basing
plans largely on the paintings of Belotto from the end of the eighteenth century,
Varsovians actively worked to negate the trauma of war by leaving no trace of Nazi

destruction. Ruins were cleared to make way for newly fabricated structures. In choosing reconstruction rather than preservation of ruins or total redevelopment, Warsaw decided to champion historic grandeur over contemporary memory.

In light of the physical, economic, and cultural loss the people of Warsaw endured through World War II, perhaps it is no surprise that the Varsovian people felt compelled to redefine themselves and their culture as a way of rising above the horror of Nazi ideologies. Survivors were challenged to find ways to remember a time when Warsaw had enjoyed freedom and cultural stability. The citizens did not choose to remember or memorialize war-torn Warsaw, but instead, to celebrate the city its people had once known. Reconstruction of a bygone era honored the memory of a free Warsaw and covered all remnants of suffering by producing memories that were directed away from the actual traumatic events of the Holocaust. In the case of Poland, a nation which saw its population drop nearly forty over the course of the Second World War, memory transformed into a desire to remember the peace prior to the Blitzkrieg. For Warsaw in particular, remembering bygone years became the mechanism under which Varsovians could reclaim their cultural identity.

The traumatic scars of war were a collective experience and the entire Varsovian culture needed to redefine itself in order for its surviving individuals to move forward, but the decision to restore Warsaw Old Town to its seventeenth and eighteenth century appearance ultimately neglected layers of Varsovian history including the most recent

---

and raw memories of World War II. Elzanowski notes that the few authentic ruins that somehow survived the postwar cleanup efforts are now hidden and “decay behind the facades of socialist realist housing or peek out from behind modernist blocks.” Rather than creating expansive memorials, Varsovians engaged in historic reconstruction in an effort prove to the Germans, to the world, and most importantly, to the Polish people living under new Socialist leadership, that the spirit of the city was alive and well; it would prove the Nazi tactics of cultural heritage annihilation via architecture a failure.

Reconstruction of the Old Town reclaimed the Varsovian historic past and recreated a tangible memory for the city’s surviving population while, at the same time, literally building the communist rulers into the very foundation of the city. The reconstruction of Old Town allowed for the reconstruction of a new Polish identity and history which included socialism. Hiding ruins in attempt to glorify Polish sovereignty, however, allowed for a numbing of the Polish public to all trauma of 1940s Warsaw. Such distaste for the historic traces of war and negative history is still extant, as exemplified by the official website for the city of Warsaw which boasts “between 1939 and 1944 over eighty-four percent of Warsaw was completely destroyed, with the city center bearing the brunt of the damage,” but laments that “in spite of the Herculean

31 Elzanowski 2010, p. 17. For more on the memorials throughout Warsaw see pp. 74-79. Some scholars including Shoshana Felman have accused the Poles of washing their hands of the Holocaust by placing it within Biblical terms: the Jews were the wealthiest citizens and were killed by the will of God for their greed; it was payback for the killing of Christ. According to Felman, some Rabbis even believed the Holocaust was God’s will. See Shoshana Felman. “The Return of the Voice: Claude Lanzmann’s “Shoah,” in Shoshana Felman and Dori Laub (eds.) Testimony: Crises of Witnessing in Literature, Psychoanalysis, and History, New York 1992, pp. 263-264.
rebuilding work that has since taken place, the odd bullet scarred wall or pre-war

tenement can still be found."32

The reconstruction of Old Town Warsaw was not preservation in the truest sense
of the word since a majority of the original materials at the site had been lost during the
war. Additionally, the chosen reconstruction reflected the Varsovians desire to rewrite
their own history, deliberately covering the history of German occupation and the hellish
battle ground Old Town had become as Nazi’s attempted bodily, cultural, and
architectural erasure.33 Even so, Warsaw has since been recognized as a unique example
of restoration in the form of total reconstruction, not of what had been destroyed in an act
of war, but of an historic epoch centuries removed from the physical destruction of the
Old Town by Nazi troops. According to international theories applicable around the time
of Warsaw Old Town’s completed reconstruction, only anastylosis was permitted: new
materials were supposed to be distinguishable from the old in any partial reconstruction.34

The rebuilding of Warsaw challenged the very notion of material versus spiritual

authenticity. Eventually, UNESCO ceded Warsaw’s importance not for its seventeenth

31 For firsthand accounts of Warsaw’s attempt to move on as a proud nation, see Wojciech Kalinowski.
“The Development of Polish Architecture as Seen through the Nationwide Program of Historic
Preservation,” in “Proceedings of the Seminar on Architecture and Historic Preservation in Central and
of Architectural Historians 28, 1979, pp. 129-30. The proceedings were part of a conference organized by
the Central Board for Museums and Protection of Historical Monuments within the ministry of Culture and
Art in Poland.
34 Old Town did not conform, specifically, to the terms laid out in the preamble of the Venice Charter of
1964 in which historic monuments must be “in the full richness of their authenticity.” See The Venice
Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites, 1964, Preamble. Furthermore, the
reconstruction did not reflect the standards described by the UNESCO World Heritage Committee
Operational Guidelines of 1977 under which historic sites must “meet the test of authenticity in design,
materials, workmanship, and setting.” See United Nations Education Scientific and Cultural Organization
Intergovernmental Committee for Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, Operational
It was inscribed however, after much debate in 1980.
and eighteenth century historic value, but for the value it had as a locus of unity and hope after World War II. It was added to the World Heritage List in 1980.

In light of that inscription, and after countless ICOMOS meetings and iterations of the UNESCO Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention, the Guidelines were finally amended in 2005 to allow for considerations of the intangible “heritage, spirit, and feeling” as criteria of authenticity for inscription on the List.\(^{35}\) In the case of Warsaw, rebuilding embraced the intangible political and emotional meanings of the site. Varsovians did not cover their past so much as they became a very part of it by redefining it. Survivors took an active part in building the foundation for their future; it would be a future on their own terms, built on the strength and perseverance represented in their chosen architectural reconstructions. Reconstruction may not have preserved a linear history and it certainly obliterated a historic period, but in the end it led the people of Warsaw towards a healing process crucial to both Polish and world heritage.

In the early 1990s, the states of the former Yugoslavia erupted into violent civil war in which ethnically and religiously diverse peoples were viciously pitted against one and other. Not unlike the Nazi genocidal actions of World War II, the Croats, Serbs, and Bosniaks each attempted to destroy the people and culture of their enemy nation. Like Poland which had experience relative peace in the years leading up to the World Wars, until the mid-twentieth century, the region around the nation now called Bosnia-Herzegovina was arguably one of the most ethnically diverse and integrated areas of the world. Situated in the south-eastern portion of Europe along the Adriatic Sea, the warm Mediterranean region had long been treasured as a crossroad between the East and the West. Historically, the area had been a central point between the Roman Catholic Western Roman Empire and the eastern seat of Constantinople and the Greek Orthodox Church. Throughout the centuries, the area’s geography had made it a welcoming host for both Islamic civilizations expanding from the Fertile Crescent and Slavic populations which migrated down into the Balkan Peninsula.

In the mid-fifteenth century, the region became part of the Ottoman Empire and experienced a massive influx of Islamic and Oriental cultural influences. Meanwhile, Catholic and Orthodox congregations retained their autonomy. Such broad religious and cultural tolerance has been attributed to Sultan Mehmed II’s guarantee of religious rights to the Bosnian Franciscan friars in 1463. His edict set the tone for a nation where at least

---

four major religions were practiced openly, often with prayers sung in any combination of Bosnian, Turkish, Persian, or Arabic.\textsuperscript{37} Such a vibrant diversity of cultures was amplified by and contributed to an active trade and commerce system which quickly grew in size and importance.

To accommodate commercial success, an intricate network of roads and bridges was developed to link the many small towns to outlying cities and to the expansive landscape of the East-West trade roots. Some of the more famous building projects included the Visegrad Bridge (1577) and the Stari Most in Mostar (1566).\textsuperscript{38} In 1878 the region became part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. The following decades were characterized by an acute interest in development and a disregard for historic architecture as countless older structures were torn down to make way for more modern construction. Most Medieval roads and bridges were forsaken for new steel-girder bridges and railways, however, the Stari Most in Mostar survived. With the Austro-Hungarian Empire, the prosperous medieval feudal system also came to an end and thus disrupted the longstanding socio-economic hierarchy that had long allowed for the region’s prosperity; Muslims became impoverished and as a result, much of their architecture fell into a state of disrepair. Thus, between 1918 and 1941, the region experienced a period of stagnation and regression and became internationally recognized as the Kingdom of the

\textsuperscript{37} Bublin 1999, p. 75. The Sultan’s edict predated John Locke’s treatise on religious tolerance by over 200 years.

\textsuperscript{38} Bublin 1999, pp. 87-89. See also UNESCO, \textit{Mostar: Urban Heritage Map and Rehabilitation Plan of Stari Grad}, Florence 1997, pp. 15-17. The Visegrad Bridge was added to UNESCO’s list of World Heritage Sites in 2007 and the Stari Most in 2005.
Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, or what is now more commonly referred to as the Old Yugoslavia.\textsuperscript{39}

Within just a few years, Old Yugoslavia fell to Nazi power during World War II and its Serbians, Romanian, and Jewish citizens were subject to the same execution policies as the Jews of the north eastern European nations. With decreased population and economic instability, the nations of Old Yugoslavia redrew their borders and redefined political alliances as was symptomatic of most Eastern European nations after the war. Bosnia-Herzegovina became one of the six individual states – including Croatia, Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia, and Slovenia – within the resulting Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (SFRY). Under the new government, the region experienced over forty years of intense industrialization and urbanization. During the 1970s and 1980s, Bosnia-Herzegovina in particular saw massive increases in the construction of sports stadiums, cultural complexes, healthcare centers, schools, and governmental facilities, in addition to the constant increase in modern, residential buildings. Old neighborhoods were razed and new housing developments were erected, but still the Stari Most spanned proudly between the banks of Mostar. With new roads, utilities, and airports, Bosnia-Herzegovina came out as a proud, modern nation by hosting the Winter Olympics in 1984.

This relative peace was disrupted in the summer of 1991 when, for a series of complex political reasons outside the scope of this paper, the republics of Croatia and Slovenia both ceded from the SFRY; Macedonia soon followed their lead and the entire

\textsuperscript{39}From the start of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century, the history of the region becomes extremely complicated. The nuances of national boundaries and cultural definitions are beyond the scope of this paper.
region erupted in civil war. In 1992, Bosnia-Herzegovina declared its independence from SFRY and its once peacefully integrated citizens were poised against one and other in a political and religious battle that put Orthodox Serbs against Catholic Croats and Muslims. By March of 1992, the streets of the Bosnia-Herzegovina capital of Sarajevo were aflame as Serbs provoked incidents in order to “cleanse the territory of all ethnically unsuitable residents.”

What had once been a peaceful haven for artists, authors, and travelers and an international example of interracial cohabitation, Bosnia quickly became a devastating smudge on the map of Eastern Europe as citizens were killed, moved into ethnic ghettos, or exiled. Between 1991 and 1994 Serb forces gathered maps of the former Yugoslavia so that they could plot precise artillery fire in order to inflict the most cultural damage possible. As Bosnian Federal Culture Minister Dr. Sabrina Husedzinović recalled, the Bosnian Serbs “had the co-ordinates of each and every building – it didn’t happen by chance.”

In Sarajevo, the City Hall which housed the National Library was destroyed; In Foca, all Ottoman buildings were demolished including several mosques dating to the mid-sixteenth century; In Mostar, Serbs shelled the Muslim ghetto in the Old Turkish Quarter on the eastern side of the Neretva River.

For the purposes of this paper, Mostar serves as a particularly poignant case study: with a pre-war population of one hundred twenty thousand citizens, Mostar was diversely inhabited by Muslims, Catholic, and Orthodox communities. According to a 1991 census, Mostar had the highest number of mixed-ethnicity marriages in the nation.

---

40 Bublin 1999, p. 139.
By 1992, however, Families were literally torn apart as Orthodox Serb shells rained down on the city’s Islamic architecture. Most Serbs had moved out of the city, but fifty thousand Muslims continued to hold their ground in the heavily decimated Old Turkish Quarter on the eastern banks of the Neretva River. As the war escalated, Mostar was cut off from communication, food, water, and other supplies. In April 1993, fights in the streets of the city left 42 dead and Serb troops prohibited United Nations troops from reaching the remaining Muslim population on the eastern bank. In August the UN was finally allowed to drop ready to eat packages via aircraft, provided half of all medical and edible products were surrendered to the offensive troops. Meanwhile, the surviving Muslims were systematically relocated to concentration camps. By the end of the year, sixty percent of all buildings on the eastern banks of the Neretva River were uninhabitable.

In 1992 the Society of Sarajevo Architects had written to over one hundred allies, calling attention to the terms of Hague 1954 and the Geneva Convention. Although their attempts were futile, the Society published their annual magazine as a special war-time edition, titled “Warchitecture.” This publication, in concord with an engineering study which explored the impact of the infrastructural damages, succeeded in catching the attention of the international public and successfully portraying the severity of demolition. In reaction, the Council of Europe’s Parliamentary Assembly Committee on Cultural Education sent missions to Bosnia-Herzegovina and published the first of what would become ten reports while the war still raged. Submitted on 2 February 1993, “A

---

Cultural Catastrophe in the Heart of Europe” recorded the “deliberate destruction of cultural property in the absence of overriding military necessity,” thus accusing the fighting parties of war crimes in violation of international law.44

The report acknowledged the inclusion of bridges in circumstances of military necessity as a way to prohibit movement of troops or supplies however qualified that such a rationale was only applicable to the destruction of modern bridges. According to their criteria and based on international laws of war, the historic Stari Most could not be considered under military necessity. Croats turned a blind eye, however, and on 9 November 1993, at 10:30 in the morning, the already heavily bombarded bridge fell into the Neretva River as citizens stood by in helpless horror. The Croat Defense Council maintained their bombardment was a strategic act of resistance against offensive Serb attacks, but scholars and international lawyers have refused to accept their defense as a viable excuse for the destruction that ensued.45 While Bosnian Croat general Slobodan Praljak claimed, “these rocks [of the Stari Most] hold no value,” most other Bosnians disagreed and readily shared their affinities towards the bridge, and mourning of its destruction:46

46 Bublin 1999, p. 9. In light of such emotions, Praljak was put on trial with five other Croat leaders by the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia. According to the original indictment on 2 March 2004, Praljak and others were accused of “crimes against humanity, grave breaches of the Geneva Conventions, and violations of laws or customs of war, including appropriation and destruction of property. The indictment goes on to state that Muslim structures were “destroyed or severely damaged […] to ensure Muslims could not, or would not, return to their homes and communities,” acknowledging the wanton destruction of the Stari Most, “an international landmark.” The destruction of the Old Bridge was specifically considered under “Count 21: Destruction or willful damage done to institutions dedicated to religion or education, a violation of the laws or customs of war.” It is not clear why the bridge destruction was not considered instead under “Count 19: The extreme destruction of property, not justified by military necessity and carried out unlawfully and wantonly, a grave breach of the Geneva Conventions of 1949,” or
[…] Some are killed or die each day, but they only declare a day of mourning on the day of the destruction of the Old Bridge. Because with the death of the Old Bridge their hearts are ripped out. For them, it has the same significance as Notre Dame for Parisians […] the Old Bridge was their common identification, regardless of the religion of the nation they belong to. 47

[…]. A continent [Europe] has just permitted a black hole to appear on its face. [It] stood by the heartless and unscrupulous barbarians. It did not understand the unity of the Bridge and Man. Architecture here never had imperialistic intentions. It has always been in harmony with internal human horizons. 48

[…]. Why do we feel more pain looking at the image of the destroyed bridge than the image of massacred people? […] Perhaps because we see our own mortality in the collapse of the bridge. We expect people to die, we count on our own lives to end. The destruction of a monument to civilization is something else. [It] was built to outlive us; it was an attempt to grasp eternity. It transcends our individual destiny. A dead woman is one of us – but the bride is all of us, forever. 49

As evidenced by these reactions, it is clear the Stari Most was a physical manifestation of Bosnian culture and more poignantly, the primary symbol of the people of Mostar – a town which name means “bridge watchers” – who directly identified themselves with the history of the Ottoman bridge. Because of its long history as a connection between the east and west banks of the Neretva River, thus linking religions and ethnicities with its architectural grace, the bridge represented what Bosnia-Herzegovina once was and hopes for what it could become. Loss of the bridge not only physically bisected Mostar, but also created an emotional fissure and void of cultural identity. Rebuilding was necessary for the survival and pride of Mostar.

“Count 20: Wanton destruction of cities, towns, or villages, or devastation not justified by military necessity, a violation of the laws or customs of war.” See www.icty.org, Case No. IT-04-74-T, ICTFY vs. Jadranko Prlic, Bruno Stojic, Slobodan Praljak, Milivoj Petkovic, Valentin Coric, and Berislav Pusic. The case was heard from 6 April 2004 through 2 March 2011. At the time of the completion of this paper, sentencing had not been declared by the trial jury. These indictments were amended in 2005 and 2008, however the crimes relevant to this study were not affected. 47


49 Quoted in Bevan 2006, p. 20 from an article by Slavenka Drakulic on 14 November 1993, published in The Observer.
Rebuilding of the Stari Most

By 1995, after four years of war, two hundred fifty thousand killed, and two million citizens of Bosnia-Herzegovina in exile, a peace agreement was reached in Dayton, Ohio between the presidents of Bosnia, Croatia, and Serbia, under the supervision of United States President Bill Clinton. As part of the agreement, the Institute for the Protection of the Cultural, Natural, and Historical Heritage of Bosnia and Herzegovina began to compile data on the status of the nation’s resources. It was found that in addition to the Stari Most, one thousand four hundred fifty-four historic monuments were destroyed or damaged through the course of the war. Of those, four hundred forty were totally razed and three hundred eighty-nine considered functionally unstable. Of the sum count, over one thousand demolished were Islamic, one hundred eighty-two Catholic, and twenty-eight Orthodox sacred sites. Additionally, vast necropolises had been covered in rubble, and institutes like libraries, museums, schools, and hospitals were found to have been systematically destroyed. Like the destruction of

\[50\] Bublin 1999, p. 240.
\[51\] Bublin 1999, p. 243. The Reconstruction Department of the European Union Administration also created a taskforce, headed by John Yarwood to record the damage in Bosnia. Like the Institute, the EU Administration found that 87% of the architecture along the eastern banks of Mostar had been damaged, 22% of that heavily. 55% of the west had been damaged, but only 2% of that heavily. Many cultural and religious centers were deliberately damaged including the Church of St. Peter and St. Paul, the famous minaret of Koski Mehmet Pasa mosque, the Old Austrian Command Building, Austrian and Ottoman Baths, the Symphony Orchestra Building, Museum of Herzegovina, industrial sites, and the Old Bridge with its fortifications Halebinovk and Tara towers. See Yarwood 1999, p. 1-11. A similar study was conducted in 2002 by Cambridge University. The report was authored by Andras J. Riedlmayer and titled “Destruction of Cultural Heritage in Bosnia-Herzegovina, 1992-1996: A Post-War Survey of Selected Municipalities.” Generally speaking, these studies found over 90% of mosques had been heavily damaged or destroyed in 19 towns, many of which dated to the Ottoman Empire and had been previously listed as national or local monuments. The Cambridge study also notes that most of the damage to minarets seemed
Warsaw by the Nazi program of Aryanization, the deliberate and calculated demolition of Mostar was a semiotic issue in which buildings were treated as signs referring to a concept according to the following formula: architecture is a large, visible part of a culture’s heritage and cultural heritage is what defines a people and gives ethnic or religious groups their identity, therefore, the destruction of the Stari Most (or any treasured site in the built environment) can be understood as a symbolic attempt to destroy people via destruction of their cultural heritage.\textsuperscript{52} In Bosnia, architectural destruction was a deliberate act on the part of the perpetrators to destroy cultural identity as a method of destroying and demoralizing the population.

Robert Bevan has called such architectural destruction “proto-genocidal” while other scholars like historian Martin Coward have gone so far as to call it “urbicide.” Like genocide, defined by Raphael Lemkin as “intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnic, racial, or religious group,” deliberate architectural destruction attempts to destroy a particular group through the destruction of that group’s history.\textsuperscript{53} In the case of Bosnia, the attack on religious architecture and cultural monuments like the Stari Most attacked not only physical history, but the intangible memory of peaceful coexistence to have been after the exodus of Muslims from the area. See Riedlmayer 2002. See Bevan 2006, p. 207 for more on international laws and conventions including Hague 1954, Geneva 1977, and Hague 1999 Protocol Revision. Bevan also argues for a revisitation of the 1948 Genocide Convention to include “Cultural Genocide” at least in circumstances where it is intrinsically linked to mass murder, even if such mass murder cannot quiet be considered genocide in and of itself. This type of revision might make instances like that of September 11\textsuperscript{th} punishable as war crimes, as “architecture is not just maimed in the crossfire; it is targeted for assignation or mass murder.” Bevan 2006, p. 210.


\textsuperscript{53} United Nations 1948 Article 2. For more on genocide in Bosnia, see Coward 2003, p. 154-155.
between groups. In Bosnia, like in Warsaw fifty years prior, urbicide was a gateway to genocide.

Urbicide in Mostar created two distinct zones that through their geographic separation prohibited the conflicting groups from rectifying their co-existence. The destruction of the Stari Most created a deep fissure between forced homeogenous peoples, ignoring centuries of pluralistic cohabitation within the city. Rebuilding however, in the poignant words of Bevan, “can be as symbolic as the destruction that necessitates it [for it] creates new touchstones for collective memory.”54 Within the still politically charged and dangerous environment of Mostar, John Yarwood was appointed head of the Reconstruction Department of the European Union Administration which had been given political control of the city by the Dayton Accord because of its unique social and religious tensions. Yarwood’s mission included the survey of over six thousand houses, thirty public buildings, twenty-five schools, twenty health buildings, seventy water projects, and five bridges including the Stari Most.

In 1997, just two years after the end of the war, funds were contributed by the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, World Monuments Fund, the Aga Khan Trust, and World Bank for the rehabilitation of the Stari Grad historic district which surrounded the Old Bridge. Preservationists began to research the historical photographs and documents which explained restoration and conservation efforts on the Stari Most during the middle of the twentieth century.55 Findings were analyzed by the Department of Civil

---

55 UNESCO 1997. Albert Kahn was a French businessman and travel enthusiast who took photographs and hired others like Jean Bruhnes to do geographical surveys of Bosnia. These photographs helped UNESCO realize that some of what was thought to be “old” were actually modern reconstructions or modern
Engineering at the University of Florence, reported by UNESCO, and presented to the Administration of Mostar. The resulting Master Plan took just five months to compile and advocated various levels of preservation within the district including restoration, reassembly, restructuring, rebuilding, and partial or full demolition. It was decided that the Stari Most be reconstructed based on detailed analysis of the original construction and finishing methods, digitally rectified historic photographs, and as many salvaged stones that could be dredged from the river as possible. In UNESCO’s words, “given the importance of the Bridge, its reconstruction could assume a symbolic significance; it is therefore very important to understand the structural capabilities of the bridge in its original configuration.”

The rebuilt bridge was completed just five years after plans were first published. While the larger project of restoring the entire Stari Grad was initially critiqued by the Mostar Office for Reconstruction and Development’s director Radoslav Udovicic for its lack of consideration for shared services between the city’s banks and its failure to draw significant attention to the city’s Austro-Hungarian historic period, in the end, the bridge spanned the river banks in proud unit. The project employed local artisans and builders designed to look old, since they did not appear in the historical photographs. See p. 170. See also “World Monuments Fund and Aga Khan Trust for Culture Celebrate Revitalization of Historic Mostar,” 22 July 2004. Press release, online available: http://www.wmf.org/sites/default/files/press_release/Aga-Khan-Mostar.pdf. Preservationists also considered the 1967 report by Dr. Krsmmanovic H. Dolarevic titled “Sanacija Starog Mosta in Mostaru,” which noted that between 1954 and 1964 the Stari Most had undergone cleaning, restoration, and conservation at the request of the Office for Conservation and Maintenance of Cultural Monuments and Natural Rarities of the Town and District of Mostar.

UNESCO 1997, p. 170. See pp. 171-182 for analysis of the bridge’s geometry, materials, construction techniques, and connection to public parks, sidewalks, and structures.

and led to the creation of the Stari Grad Agency which will continue to monitor the
reconstruction and preservation of sites in the upcoming years.

In her 2005 article that poses the title question, “Rebuilding Bosnia: A Model to
Emulate or to Avoid?” Patrice C. McMahon notes that the physical reconstruction of
Bosnia under the European Stability Initiative in early the early 2000s was uneven and
remarkably unsuccessful.  

In Mostar however, much of the historic fabric of the city was
rebuilt using the most authentic materials and methods possible.  

Because of this, the historic bridge area was nominated for inclusion on UNESCO’s World Heritage list
several times, however was deferred in 1999, 2000, and 2003. In light of its own 1980
caveat that Warsaw must not be used as precedent for the inclusion total reconstruction
on the List, UNESCO waited for the entire reconstruction project in the Stari Grad to be
complete and its historic boundaries clearly delineated before making its final decision.

By that time, the UNESCO 2003 Operational Guidelines had been approved, and as such,
allowed for consideration of intangible heritage when considering a site’s universal
value.  

In light of these changes, the UNESCO advisory board, ICOMOS, noted that the
Old Bridge in particular was

---

58 Patrice C. McMahon. “Rebuilding Bosnia: A Model to Emulate or to Avoid?” *Political Science
Quarterly*, v. 19 Winter 2004-2005, p. 570. The European Stability Initiative (ESI) is a non-profit
organization, founded in 1999 in order to analyze the political situations in South East Europe. While ESI’s
work is focused on the recreation of government and policy, physical reconstruction in Bosnia became
entwined in their research and policy suggestions.

59 The reconstruction, however, did consider practical elements of contemporary building uses and adapted
structures accordingly. This may be a reflection on the passing of the Nara Document on Authenticity in
1994, during the Bosnian War which redefined the terms of authenticity in historic preservation,
considering varying definitions of authentic between cultures. The Nara Document legitimized layers and
adaptations, while acknowledging that “authenticity is in practice never absolute, always relative.” See

that had been explored years earlier in the Nara Document on Authenticity including the value of cultural
based on in-depth and detailed, multi-faceted analyses, relying on high quality documentation, and almost every required condition has been fulfilled. The authenticity of form, use of authentic materials and techniques are fully recognizable […] the reconstructed bridge has a kind of truthfulness, even though in strictly material terms a considerable portion is not identical or original pieces.61

As such, the intangible values of the bridge were recognized as having been restored, thus allowing for recognition of its universal value. In accordance with Criterion (vi) under which ICOMOS recognized Mostar as “a place of memory, in the same manner as the Historic Centre of Warsaw,” complying with the criterion’s requirement that the site be “directly or tangibly associated with events or living traditions, with ideas or with beliefs,” the site added to the World Heritage List in 2005.62

Although the site was exalted for its role as a symbol of hope, cultural peace, and “universal symbol of coexistence of communities from diverse cultural, ethnic, and religious backgrounds […] in the face of overwhelming catastrophes,” the reconstructed Stari Most effectively negated all such fissures and catastrophes.63 Just as the Varsovians had removed all traces of their peoples’ and architecture’s destruction during World War II by rebuilding Old Town in a pre-twentieth century style void of bullet holes and ruins, Mostar’s memory was sterilized as the physical structure was restored in pristine condition. In Bosnia, like Warsaw, the rebuilding efforts aimed to cover an

---

uncomfortable past but in doing so, created historical voids which ignored contemporary realities: at the time of the Stari Most’s reconstruction, the city of Mostar remained divided with the west bank predominantly occupied by Catholic Croats and the eastern bank by Muslims. More than a physical reconstruction of an historic monument, the recreated Stari Most was an attempt at recapturing a bygone era of peace and cohabitation.

Even with an accurately reconstructed bridge at its heart, it may never be possible for Bosnia to reestablish the multi-ethnic unity it once cherished. With their monument rebuilt, the people of Mostar live with constant erasure of their modern cultural heritage, history, collective memory, and reality as a city which experienced the horrors of civil war. Nazi destruction of Warsaw and the Serb/Croat destruction of Mostar were both conscious acts on the part of the perpetrators to destroy cultural identity as a method of destroying and demoralizing the population. Just as the Varsovians rebuilt Old Town to recall better times, the rebuilt Stari Most is a physical manifestation of the unified culture and rooted sense of self that the people of Mostar struggled to regain after the war. The rebuilding of the Stari Most not only considered the aesthetic and practical transportation needs of the city, but also aimed to deliberately reclaim Bosnian identity in hopes that if the bridge could rise again, so too could the citizens of Mostar.
WORLD TRADE CENTER, NEW YORK CITY

Approximately fourteen thousand employees were present in the Twin Towers on Tuesday, September 11, 2001 at 8:46am when hijacked American Airlines Flight 11 crashed into the North Tower between the ninety-third and hundredth floors. Half of the tower’s 61 support columns were destroyed on impact and the sprinkler system was disabled. Fire spread, trapping approximately one thousand people above the hundredth floor. Since fighting the massive fire at such an elevation proved impossible, first responders shifted their focus to evacuation of the lower floors.

While the fires burned, the occupants of the South Tower were told by way of an intercom announcement at 8:55 that evacuation was not necessary even though the ranking Port Authority police officer on scene, Sergeant Al de Vona, had insisted both towers be evacuated within minutes of the first crash. By 9:00, occupants of the South Tower’s attempts to follow de Vona’s original orders for egress were made difficult by bottlenecking of evacuees at the three, centralized staircases. Three minutes later, the South Tower was struck at five hundred ninety miles per hour by hijacked United Airlines Flight 175. Just like the North Tower, the South Tower had half of its support columns destroyed and fire began to spread. The structural aluminum became molten and

---

64 Most of the trapped employees were of the brokerage firm Cantor Fitzgerald. They were unable to access the roof because the exit had been sealed after the 1993 World Trade Center bombing. Over sixty people jumped from the North Tower.


66 According to Atkins 2008, this was a result of the post-1968 building codes which reduced the necessary number of egresses and the style of fire protection. Furthermore, any subsequent New York City building codes were a non-issue for the Twin Towers at their construction since the builder, the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey, “as a regional entity was not required to follow building codes” p. 125.
steel degraded as the inferno raged at one thousand five hundred degrees. Just fifty-six minutes later, the South Tower collapsed: the upper section fell east and south, damaging the Bankers Trust Building; lower sections fell north and west upon the Marriot Hotel. At the time, the loss of life was incalculable.

The North Tower collapsed at 10:28am, two hours after impact. Probable cause for the longer burn-time of the North Tower has been attributed to the higher point of impact, thus the mass supported by the burning floors was not nearly as heavy as that of the South Tower. While the delayed collapse undoubtedly allowed for more occupants to escape the North Tower, officials and the American public watching the events unfold on their television screens feared the worst. Although it was removed from the Twin Towers, the building at 7 WTC also caught fire. Demoralized by their losses in the Twin Tower, the New York Fire Department chose to let 7 WTC burn for seven hours until it too collapsed.

The impacts of the attacks were felt throughout the nation as Americans tried to comprehend such devastation on American soil. As residents and workers in Lower Manhattan were evacuated, rescue workers from the tri-state area and beyond began to mobilize. Meanwhile, Vice President Dick Cheney was relocated to a secure bunker, and

---

67 Structural steel weakens at 300 degrees Fahrenheit and loses half its strength at 1100 degrees Fahrenheit. For more on the engineering statistics and failures, see “Testimony of Dr. W. Gene Corley on Behalf of the American Society of Civil Engineers before the Sub Committee on Environment, Technology, and Standards and Sub Committee on Research of the US House of Representatives Committee on Science (May 1, 2002)” reprinted as Doc. #25 in Stephen Atkins, The 9/11 Encyclopedia, Westport, CT 2008, pp. 428-434.

President George W. Bush and his aides attempted to analyze the situation. As reports of two additional crashes of hijacked planes into the Pentagon in Washington DC and a field in Shanksville, Pennsylvania came in, all flights out of the United States were stopped and the nation’s borders were closed. Through tears and dust with a new sense of mortality and fallibility, America held its collective breath, not knowing how to react after multiple terrorist attacks on its own soil and in the “greatest city in the world.”

When the Twin Towers collapsed the instantaneous loss of life was tremendous. Unlike Old Town Warsaw which saw its population deported to concentration camps before architectural destruction truly began, and Mostar which saw its citizens held up in ethnic ghettos on the river banks, New York watched as steel, glass, and Twin Tower occupants fell helplessly to the streets of Lower Manhattan. For this obvious and tragic difference – the loss of thousands of lives at the very site of architectural annihilation, rather than the solemn relocation of citizens elsewhere to await their deaths – the World Trade Center site became an instant memorial and massive gravesite for unidentified victims. Unlike Warsaw and Mostar which could energetically rebuild their lost sites of architectural history for political and cultural identity purposes, the people of New York were faced with the problem of memorialization and redevelopment. The tenuous line between the two themes would come to define the recovery process at the World Trade Center site and now, nearly a decade after the attacks, debates still rage.

In many ways, the site of the Twin Towers might be seen in parallel existence with something like the site now occupied by the Hiroshima Peace Memorial Park. Just as thousands lost their lives instantly with the towers’ collapse, so too did thousands of
Japanese civilians die when the atomic bomb was dropped on the city of Hiroshima. While much of that city was eventually redeveloped, the Atomic Bomb Dome was deliberately preserved in order to give respect to all those who died, and to retain tangible history of the event. In Hiroshima, the inclusion of ruins contributes to a feeling of authenticity that both Warsaw and Mostar lack. Rather than cover all traces of disaster and effectively create a historic palimpsest, Japan embraced its most tragic historic moment of the twentieth century. Although developers at the World Trade Center site sought to retain the tower’s footprints to preserve some level of authenticity and contemporary history like had been done in Hiroshima, a closer look at the project reveals the process in New York parallels neither Warsaw or Bosnia, nor Hiroshima. It was loaded with political, economic, and memorial complexities that must be unpacked in order to understand the eventual decision to combine new development with the creation of memorial pools in the so-called “tower footprints.”

After the attacks, what many people seemed to ignore was since that since their creation, the Twin towers were mercilessly critiqued for their intrusion upon Lower Manhattan’s skyline and street plan. Unlike Old Town Warsaw which occupied a fond spot in the hearts of Varsovians for its seventeenth and eighteenth century grandeur, and far from the subtle message of unity implied by the Stari Most, the Twin Towers were disliked. Even though over time their monumental size had insured them an iconic presence in the New York skyline, serving as a beacon for those entering the city from New Jersey, landing at one of the region’s airports, or simply trying to locate themselves amongst the often allusive geography of Manhattan, it seems the Twin Tower were most
beloved after their destruction. As Marita Sturken has written, “this fervent embrace of
the towers, two buildings that went mostly unloved while standing [can be seen] as a kind
of displacement, a mourning not for the buildings themselves but for what they
represented an earlier, more innocent time of unabashed urban skyscrapers and their
dramatic push to the sky.”

69 While Americans immediately interpreted the terroristic attacks as assaults on the
American value of freedom, it must be noted that the Twin Towers were not explicit
symbols of Americana. The World Trade Center was not a center of civic pride as the
Old Town district of Warsaw had been. Furthermore, since they were modern structure
which only dated to the 1970s, the Twin Towers did not have the historic importance of
the Ottoman-era Stari Most. What New Yorkers seemed to cling to after the towers’
collapse was the abstract essence of the towers: the hubris which inspired Chase
Manhattan Bank Chairman and founder of the Lower Manhattan Development
Association David Rockefeller to team up with the Port Authority of New York and New
Jersey to hire architect Minoru Yamasaki to build not one, but two, of the tallest
skyscrapers in the world and three lower buildings with a cumulative ten-million square
feet of office space at a time when it that much real estate in Lower Manhattan was
unnecessary. During the original construction process, a twelve block area was cleared
for the project, closing five streets and demolishing countless historic buildings to form a
sixteen-acre “superblock” for the World Trade Center. It was precisely this hubris that

69 Marita Sturken. *Tourists of History: Memory, Kitsch, and Consumerism from Oklahoma City to Ground
survivors, city residents, and politicians exalted as they lobbied for the site’s redevelopment as “bigger and better” than it ever had been.

Instead of considering the way other cities were rebuilt after destruction, at Ground Zero, the designs immediately aimed to memorialize and build in an unprecedented scale. Like the rebuilding of Warsaw and Mostar which had deliberate political intentions, however, the redevelopment at Ground Zero was always colored by patriotic zest and a deliberate impetus to defy the success of terrorism. Although developers ultimately chose not to rebuild the Twin Towers, the final plans, including a massive memorial site, retail and office space, four buildings, and one massive tower which would soar to 1,776 feet in the air (symbolic of the year of American independence) to become the tallest building in the world, do not completely disregard the history of the site. Although the physical structures were not reproduced, the redevelopment efforts and capitalistic motivations replay the 1970s history of the site’s development battles in a twenty-first century arena.

At the time of the Twin Tower’s original construction, the vertical expanse of office space was critiqued for being superfluous. Even though architect Minoru Yamasaki’s one hundred and ten foot towers were an engineering feats of great importance, the public did not appreciate their intrusion on the New York skyline. Prior to their construction, most skyscrapers were less than eighty floors since elevator restrictions prohibited ease of vertical traffic. The invention of the express elevator allowed for “sky lobbies” at the forty-fourth and seventy-eighth floors of the Twin Towers, where passengers could get off and transfer to local elevators to continue to their
own office elevations. The towers also used progressive tube-style construction which took advantage of newly developed structural steel that was significantly stronger than older building materials and allowed for support columns to be located only along the exterior of the building. As a result, all the elevators and staircase could be located within a central shaft, and each floor was uninhibited by columns. Furthermore, the Twin Towers’ proximity to the Hudson River and subsequent water table necessitated the development of a brand new method of foundation construction called the slurry-trench method. In the end the massive towers reached one hundred and one stories tall, each floor measuring one square acre.70

The public’s response to the towers, however, ignored their innovation and marked them as intrusions for their lack of economic and real estate sense. This sentiment was compounded by the United States economic recession in the 1970s which made renting office space in the Twin towers nearly impossible. Developer David Rockefeller was essentially bailed out by his brother and then New York City Governor Nelson Rockefeller who moved several government offices into the towers. For some time, they were the two tallest buildings in the world and despite the initial negative reaction by the public for their lack of style and economic viability, the towers became an intrinsic, unavoidable landmark on the New York City skyline.

Office space in the towers and surrounding buildings were at capacity during the 1990s, however public opinion of the World Trade Center soured once again when on 26 February 1993 a terrorist’s truck bomb exploded in a parking garage under the complex.

70 Eric P. Nash. *Manhattan Skyscrapers*, New York 2005, p. 130-137. The South Tower measured 1,368 feet tall. The North Tower measured a shorter 1,362, however reached to 1,727 feet when the rooftop antenna was included in the measurement.
killing six people. The towers rebounded once again as giants impossible to ignore both within the commercial real estate world and as part of the postmodern cityscape. By 2000, the site was ninety-five percent occupied with over forty-two thousand employees working within twelve million square feet of commercial office space in the Twin Towers, four adjacent buildings, hotel and conference facility, and successful specialty retail center.71 The North and South Towers, 1 WTC and 2 WTC respectively, were owned and operated by the public agency Port Authority of New York and New Jersey until June of 2001 when all but fifteen floors were privatized and transferred to developer Larry Silverstein of Silverstein Properties under a ninety-nine year lease. After September 11, 2001, had the Twin Towers been rebuilt in their historic form like Old Town and the Stari Most had been, nothing of their tumultuous and tenuous intangible history would have been preserved. Instead, developers embraced the intangible heritage of the site – deliberately or not – and pushed forward a proud plan that like the original 1970s construction, was motivated by American aggrandizement and capitalistic fervor.

The legacy of the attacks themselves goes well beyond the scope of this paper as it winds down a road of patriotism, jingoism, the “War on Terror,” and reevaluations of American values. While it is difficult to discuss the process of rebuilding without paying due credence to the memory of the people who lost their lives on that day, this study attempts to focuses on the architectural losses of September 11th at the World Trade

---

71 This information was compiled by LMDC as part of a bi-annual report stipulated by Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA). In this case, funding agencies included the Federal Transit Administration, Federal Highway Administration, and the US Department of Housing and Urban Development. Because of the close proximity of the memorial and redevelopment site to the PATH Terminal and Rt. 9A Project, the research and evaluation efforts were coordinated between agencies and commissions to produce just one report, the first having been submitted on 31 March 2004. Reports from 2004-2010 are available at www.renewnyc.com/content/pdfs/coordinated_DOE/03-31-04.pdf. Environmental impact statements were also generated.
Center and the subsequent efforts of redeveloping the site that became known as Ground Zero.\textsuperscript{72}

Planning at Ground Zero

From the start, there seemed to have been two distinct schools of thought regarding if and how the World Trade Center (WTC) should be restored. Former New York City Mayor Ed Koch, Donald Trump, architect Richard Meier, and countless other lesser known supporters wanted to rebuild replicas of the Twin Towers; alternatively, Governor George Pataki and WTC site lessee Larry Silverstein favored new and different construction designed to allow for the greatest economic growth and revitalization of the Lower Manhattan neighborhoods. Representing the camp of “rebuilters,” architect Robert A. M. Stern spoke to the Friends of the Upper East Side Historic Districts just a week after the attacks:

\[\text{[\ldots] whatever its shortcomings as a work of architecture the WTC was a powerful symbol of our city. It was a landmark. Oh the tricks history plays on our aesthetic senses; how we now miss this imperfect monument. Landmarks are important. Buildings bear silent witness to what we do, what we believe. They are our immortality on this earth. And when a landmark is torn down we lose witness to our humanity. Buildings are at once silent witnesses and yet they speak.}\textsuperscript{73}\]

\textsuperscript{72} Of the casualties in New York City on September 11, 147 were passengers and crew of the two planes, 412 were rescue workers, and 2,190 were occupants of the Twin Towers at the time of the crash impact or collapse. Deputy Assistant Chief of the Fire Department of New York said “that day we lost 2,752 people at the World Trade Center, 343 were firefighters. But we also saved 25,000 people. And that’s why people should remember because firefighters and rescue workers went in and they knew it was dangerous, but they went in to save people. And they saved many.” Quoted in Thomas H. Kean, Lee H. Hamilton, and Benjamin Rhodes, \textit{Without Precedent: The Inside Story of the 9/11 Commission}, New York 2006, p. 306. Also note, the discrepancy of the death toll appears in several sources and might be accounted for by the inability to match some names of the missing to remains found at the World Trade Center site, or the dates of particular statistic and quote publications relevant to the official declaration of the Medical Examiner after the end of recovery efforts on 28 May 2002.

While many architects had undoubtedly visited Ground Zero after the attacks (notably Frank Gehry and Rem Koolhaas), most remained mute on the matter. As Philip Nobel wrote in his book on the Future of Ground Zero, for architects “to exercise their professional expertise would [have been] crass, yet all the time the public clamored for it.”

By just three days after the attack, an initial inspection carried out by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) ruled out “significant damage outside of a well-defined border” immediately surrounding the smoldering Twin Towers. Buildings facing the site like 130 Liberty Street and 90 West Street were determined to have been severely impacted while three blocks away, structures were physically unaffected.

Clearing efforts continued through October, but Governor Pataki recognized the eventual need to move Ground Zero beyond the status of crime scene and back into the fabric of the city. In anticipation of future site development, he created the Lower Manhattan Development Corporation (LMDC).

---

77 LMDC was originally called the Lower Manhattan Redevelopment Corporation, but the prefix “re-” was removed to prevent any implication that the Corporation was dedicated to rebuilding the Twin Towers. The creation of this group was just days before Mayor Rudi Giuliani’s term was up and republican Mayor Michael Bloomberg was elected. Meanwhile, New York art and architectural drawings dealer Max Protetch sought design proposals from 125 architects as early as October 2001. Only about half answered because it was either seen as too soon after the tragedy, or the architects did not want to give away their concepts just yet to a hypothetical, unofficial contest. The submissions were displayed at the Protetch Gallery in Chelsea in 2002 and later 58 objects were sold to the Library of Congress for $408,140. Martin Filler commented that “in its improvisational organization, hasty mounting and empty imagery, the Protetch exhibition can be seen as unintentionally prophetic of the creative fiasco that was about to ensue in Lower Manhattan.” See Filler 2007, p. 266.
leading partner of Goldman Sachs, became the director and was given order to make
“decisions based on an inclusive and open public process,” in finding ways to
memorialize those lost on September 11th, revitalize Lower Manhattan, make
infrastructure improvements, provide a comprehensive transit plan, and connect the site
to the rest of Lower Manhattan through sustainable designs and developments south of
Houston Street.78 Furthermore, the LMDC was entrusted with the preservation of “the
historic character of lower Manhattan and the existing civil and cultural value of its
cityscape.”79

While LMDC struggled to organize, the people of New York City had already
marked the Ground Zero site as a memorial, posting photographs of the missing, flowers,
American flags, tokens to love ones lost, prayer cards, and countless other types of
artifacts. Many of these were attached to the construction fences that lined the blocks
around Ground Zero or placed on the ground in Union Square Park.80 Six months after
the attacks, the Tribute in Light Memorial shone from two banks of forty-four spotlights

---

78 LMDC was at first a subsidiary of Empire state Development Corporation (ESDC) in political attempt to
ensure Pataki’s control over the commission since the ESDC was run by Pataki’s political supporter

79 Lower Manhattan Development Corporation, “Principles and Revised Preliminary Blueprint for the
Future of Lower Manhattan,” 11 July 2002. Online Available:
www.renewnyc.com/content/pdfs/principles/Blueprint071102.pdf. The communities of Lower Manhattan
were defined to include Battery Park City, the Financial District, South Street Seaport, Chinatown, the
Lower East Side, TriBeCa, and SoHo.

80 Many of these artifacts will make their way in to the memorial museum, but scholars have critiqued the
museums obvious constriction by interior spaces. While it will be public, there has been talk about needing
to charge admission in order to subsidize operating costs. Ethnologist Setha Low in particular, considers
that long before the events of September 11, American “public” interior spaces had been closed off to a true
public through patrols, bag searches, and ID requirements. Low cites the Citicorps atrium, in addition to the
plethora of gated communities and pos apartments with doormen, and explores the process of
remembering, suggesting that people do not go to structured memorials to heal, but rather to organic
locations. Considering the diverse response to September 11, Low concludes there cannot be one
homogenous way to remember or memorialize. See Setha M. Low, “The Memorialization of September 11:
Dominant and Local Discourses on the Rebuilding of the World Trade Center Site,” American Ethnologist
32, 2004, 329-331. While these types of reactions are necessary components to any rebuilding or memorial
development process, they are beyond the scope of this study at this time.
from the largely excavated pit at the base of where the Twin Towers formerly stood. The one mile high towers of light could be seen up to twenty-five miles away.\textsuperscript{81} Around that time, the \textit{New York Times} and other media outlets had begun to recognize the site as a tourist destination and began publishing articles about where to eat downtown after seeing Ground Zero. Vendors began to sell postcards and kitsch memorabilia ranging from the somber prayer card to the more cartoonish snow globes, crystal replicas of the Twin Towers, and bumper stickers that urge tailgaters across the nation to “Never Forget.” While Ground Zero was not accessible to the public during the early recovery efforts, a plywood viewing ramp was eventually built adjacent to St.Paul’s Chapel. Crowds grew so that tickets were eventually required to access the ramp.\textsuperscript{82}

Around the same time, amateur and professional architects began to submit ideas for the site’s development. News outlet CNN posted an archive of these images online and Newsday created a “DIY Memorial Generator” where people could click and drag icons to arrange towers, parks, plaques, and foundations in attempts to create their own design.\textsuperscript{83} Likewise, \textit{The New Yorker} solicited proposals and the submissions ranged from the comical (two, one hundred ten-story structures built entirely underground; one

\textsuperscript{81} Marita Sturken wondered if this Tribute, with two blue streams of light, was a tribute to the loss of life, or the loss of the buildings themselves. The Tribute in Light has since become an annual memorial event on September 11. See Marita Sturken. “The Aesthetics of Absence: Rebuilding Ground Zero,” \textit{American Ethnologist} 31, 2004, p. 319.
\textsuperscript{82} The tickets were available between 11:00am and 6:00pm, but often sold out before 1:00pm. The lines were often 45 minutes long and visitors were only permitted on the platform for 30 minutes. For more on the consumption of traumatic history, see Adrian Parr, \textit{Deluze and Memorial Culture: Desire, Singular Memory, and the Politics of Trauma}, Edinburgh 2008 and Sturken 2007. See also William Logan and Kiep Reeves (eds.), \textit{Places of Pain and Shame: Dealing with Difficult Heritage}, New York 2009; Paul Williams, \textit{Memorial Museums: The Global Rush to Commemorate Atrocities}, London 2007; K.E. Foote, \textit{Shadowed Ground: America’s Landscape of Violence and Tragedy}, Austin 1997; G.J. Ashworth and R. Hatmann, \textit{Horror and Human Tragedy Revisited: The Management of Sites of Atrocities for Tourism}, New York 2005. UNESCO’s proliferation of World Heritage sites to Auschwitz (1997), the Hiroshima Atomic Bomb Dome (1997) and Nelson Mandela’s site of imprisonment (1999) support the claims of these authors.
\textsuperscript{83} Nobel 2005, p. 69.
hundred ten, one-story buildings) to the somber and the practical. Marita Sturken has categorized these solicited and unsolicited designs as “part of a cultural working through, rather than [just] indicators of innovations of architectural designs.” These ranged from replicas, to new designs, to retention of the void left behind after the attacks as not to “erase the erasure.” Philippe de Montebello of the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York City suggested that the World Trade Center’s surviving neogothic skin should be preserved and somehow incorporated in to a memorial. While his suggestion called to mind the preservation of ruins after World War II at sites like Hiroshima Peace Memorial Park and England’s Coventry Cathedral, it was ignored. Others well intentioned designers submitted their ideas directly to their congressmen who often passed the plans on to New York City Mayor Michael Bloomberg, former Mayor Rudolph Giuliani, Pataki, Silverstein, or even the Whitehouse. Most of these unsolicited designs however, ended up at the LMDC where they joined seven boxes worth of over four thousand items.

As the files of LMDC began to fill, it became clear that it was time to seriously

---

84 Sturken 2004, p. 320.
87 Nobel 2005, p. 71-72. Nobel notes that many unsolicited ideas found parallels in the solicited, professional architectural plans that made it through several levels of competition in later months. LMDC had told all submitters that they had “21 days to return a form waiving intellectual property rights and
consider the area of Ground Zero no longer as a disaster site or a site of recovery efforts, but instead a place in need of revitalization, rebuilding, and remembering.

LMDC released “Principles and Revised Preliminary Blueprint for the Future of Lower Manhattan” on 11 July 2002, pledging to revitalize the site in a human-scale which would reopen the “superblock” created by the original construction of the World Trade Center and reconnect existing neighborhoods. LMDC pledged to provide civic and cultural space in any development plan. Six preliminary designs by Beyer Blinder Belle were displayed at Federal Hall starting 16 July 2002. Each contained, to varying degrees, a permanent memorial, eleven million square feet of commercial space, open public areas and cultural centers, a transportation hub, and allotments for offsite residential facilities. The plans also included partial restorations of the old Lower Manhattan street grid, including extensions of Fulton, Greenwich, Liberty, and West Streets. From these six submissions, the LMDC planned to collect public opinion and select a final plan by December.88

At a public meeting called “Listening to the City” on 20 July 2002, however, each of the six plans were given ratings of “poor” and publically critiqued by New York Times architectural critic Herbert Muschamp and others for their mediocrity, thus leading to the
firm’s nickname of “Blah Blah Blah.” In their rejection of all six preliminary plans, the four thousand New Yorkers in attendance and made it clear that they desired a site which would be open at all times and serve mixed purposes. Furthermore, the public insisted that the tower footprints be preserved and West Street be made into a pedestrian promenade to connect Battery Park City with the rest of the neighborhood. Despite the citizen’s demands, Francis J. Lombardi, Chief Engineer for the owner Port Authority, and LMDC Chairman John C. Whitehead reminded the public that development efforts had to also consider the legalities of Mr. Silverstein’s lease on the World Trade Center. In attempt to save their efforts and image, the Port Authority and LMDC called the first round of submissions “starting points” meant only to inspire city-wide discussion, however from that moment, the rebuilding efforts at Ground Zero became a political and economically fueled debate in which no historical or citizen interests were seriously

---


91 While Port Authority looked for ways to break the lease agreement and transfer development rights elsewhere to respect the public development vision, their attempts were futile. Additionally, the financial stakes were striking: Port Authority made ten million dollars each month from rent; Silverstein was claiming the events of September 11th as two different attacks, by two different planes, on two different properties, thus justifying his suit of twenty-four insurers to double his entitlement to over seven billion dollars – more than enough money to redevelop the site. In the end of 2004, a federal jury awarded Silverstein $1.1 billion. Post 2002, p. 11. While there was talk about the Port Authority surrendering ownership of Ground Zero to the city of New York in return for ownership of LaGuardia and JFK airports (5,610 acres in Queens for 16 acres in Manhattan), the Port Authority renewed their airport leases in 2003 so the deal fell flat. The hope was that the city would be able to buy out Larry Silverstein and thereby use its own planning department which had been usurped by the LMDC and Port Authority. For more, see Nobel 2005, p. 127-128.
considered. “Listening to the City” was critiqued for creating “the illusion of power” in the minds of the people, when in reality, they had negligible clout.  

Just weeks after “Listening to the City,” LMDC launched the “Innovative Designs Study.” Select architects were invited to create a master plan for the development of the WTC site which included:

- Six and a half to ten million square feet of office space
- Six hundred thousand to one million square feet of retail space
- Open space and public parks
- Cultural and civic amenities (museums, education facilities, etc.)
- A subway, PATH station and room for future regional airport connections
- A “Grand Promenade” from West Street to Battery Park
- An international conference center and hotel
- Underground parking
- Preservation of the World Trade Center footprints
- The creation of a distinctive skyline
- Use of Green Technology
- Site access and security considerations

Nine new plans were displayed at Winter Gardens in December 2002 and garnered over twelve thousand comments from New Yorkers. LMDC announced two design finalists on 6 February 2003: Studio Daniel Libeskind and THINK. Days later, Libeskind was declared the winner with his design “Memory Foundations” which included such named...
parts as “The Park of Heroes,” “Edge of Hope,” and “Wedge of Light.” The design called for a 1,776-foot steel and glass tower at 1 WTC that was inspired by the jagged profile of the Statue of Liberty torch and the year of United States independence. It would be the tallest building in the world and provide 2.6 million square feet of office space on the first sixty-nine floors. The remaining thirty-three stories were to be occupied by restaurants and open space for wind turbines which would be used to power twenty percent of the building. As part of the Master Plan, Libeskind preserved the tower footprints and intended they be exposed down to the bedrock.

Despite the obvious inclusion of American pride and resilience in his towers’ plans, and the symbolic naming of parts and allowance for the creation of tower

95 Lauren Kogod and Michael Osman. “Girding the Grid: Abstraction and Figuration at Ground Zero,” Grey Room 2003, pp. 108. Kogod and Osman detail several of the nine initial proposals common respects to a grid-type frame. Although the original twin towers by Minoru Yamasaki were not built with respect to a grid, it somehow manifest itself and became very important in the proposals, perhaps because of the NYC Commissioner’s Plan of 1811 which put the city’s streets on an urban grid, or because of the grid’s relationship to postwar modernism. The authors apply Rosalind Krauss’s article “Grids” in the 1978 publication The Originality of the Avant-Garde and Other Modernist Myths. to the designs submitted: New York Four (NY4) also known as the “Dream Team” comprised of Richard Meier and Partners Architects, Eisenman Architects, Gwathmey Siegel and Associates, and Steven Holl Architects which included a grid with cantilever bridges connecting towers to resemble interlaced fingers; Norman Foster and Partners’ triangular structure grid which Foster claimed to be a more organic grid that was eco-friendly down to the air conditioning needs; SOM Team’s grid of nine square-plan towers huddled to reduce noise and wind, thus considering practical urban concerns without providing an iconic skyline. For more submissions and analysis, see pp. 111-121. See also Paul Goldberg, “Designing Downtown,” The New Yorker 6 January 2003, p. B4. The press surrounding the winner of the design competition was muddled as on 26 February the New York Times announced that THINK had won. Because Pataki thought THINK’s proposed towers looked like skeletons of the Twin Tower, however, he refused to support the plans and overruled LMDC’s choice of THINK. Meanwhile, John Whitehead had told Libeskind that he had in fact won. Marita Sturken speculates that Libeskind won because of his autobiographical claim of immigrant patriotism and past success designing the Jewish Museum in Berlin. See Sturken 2004, p. 321.

96 Kogod and Osman 2003, p. 115. Unfortunately, that had to be changed to just a 20-foot below grade pool in order to leave room for a bus parking lot, and the area reduced to just 3.5 acres to allow space for a transit hub. A memorial was not part of the original LMDC Innovative Design study, however Libeskind left space for one in leaving the footprints of the Twin Towers exposed. Critics speculate this may have led to his winning the commission since major political players like Pataki favored the provision for exposed footprints because it took into consideration the desires of survivors and victims’ families. For the parameters of the Innovative Design Study, see Lower Manhattan Development Corporation, “A Vision for Lower Manhattan: Context and Program for the Innovative Design Study,” 11 October 2002. Online Available: http://www.renewnyc.com/content/avisionforlowermanhattan.pdf
footprints to represent memories founded in the very core of the site, it was soon realized that Libeskind’s design would not be able to meet fast-track requirements set by Pataki so that construction on 1 WTC (renamed the Freedom Tower by Pataki) would begin by August 2004 when the Republican National Convention would be held in New York City. There was also concern Libeskind would be unable to meet the demands stipulated in Silverstein’s lease. Therefore, in December 2003, Libeskind was forced to meet with Silverstein’s preferred architect David Childs (a member of the mega-firm Skidmore, Owings, and Merrill (SOM)) so the two could coordinate their efforts on the Freedom Tower while keeping “in a manner consistent with the Libeskind vision.”97 When the joint project was revealed however, Libeskind was credited only as the “collaborating architect during concept and schematic design phases.”98

97 Nobel 2005, p. 219. Libeskind’s suggestions to build the memorial first, followed by the Church Street buildings, and finally the Freedom Tower were also not in concord with Pataki’s requirements that the Freedom Tower go up first as a replacement for the Twin Towers. Although it was not publicized at the time, it is now known that lessee Larry Silverstein had been working with architect David Childs on potential renovations for the World Trade Center site prior to the attacks of September 11th. When post-9/11 development efforts began, he called upon Childs to prepare designs appropriate for Silverstein’s profit projections. Childs accompanied Silverstein to the unveiling of Libeskind’s Master Plan, ready it seems, to step in to the role of Master Planner. Libeskind’s design was also critiqued by Herbert Muschamp for its aesthetic value and emotional manipulation, in particular, the Wedge of Light, into which sunlight was supposed to pour upon precisely between the time of the first plane’s crash, until the second tower fell on September 11 of every year. His calculations were found incorrect. Furthermore, Santiago Calatrava’s Downtown Grand Central Terminal, designed in white steel to look like a dove flying from a child’s hand, blocked the sunlight from the plot carved out for the Wedge of Light making its existence impossible. See Herbert Muschamp, “Balancing Reason and Emotion in Twin Tower Void,” New York Times 6 February 2003. For more on Libeskind’s career, see his self authored Point and Counterpoint, New York 2008.

98 Reprinted in Filler 2007, p. 278. A fact sheet was released in September 2010 and claims the Freedom tower will be safer and more energy efficient than any skyscraper built to date. For example, the entire structure will be encased in a curtain wall made of a new type of extra strong, insulated glass that will span between floors without mullions, thus marking a first in the history of skyscraper construction. The Plaza from which the tower rises contains a sustainable irrigation system which has received LEED Gold Certification. The Master Plan also includes considerations for 2 WTC by Foster and Partners, 3 WTC by Rogers Stirk Harbour and Partners, and 4 WTC by Maki Associates. 5 WTC will eventually be developed by Port Authority. 7 WTC was rebuilt immediately and opened in May 2006 because it was located atop a power station which provided electricity to downtown neighborhoods. It has since been called the safest skyscraper in the United States, going beyond building codes while remaining cost efficient and sustainable. It was named the first green office tower in New York and received Gold Status in the LEED
Meanwhile, urban planning and traffic studies were simultaneously conducted for several Downtown neighborhoods, perhaps motivated by the World Monument Fund’s (WMF) early involvement at the site. Despite the many reports which had confirmed physical damage was limited to the immediate area surrounding the former Twin Towers, WMF Vice President of Field Projects John Stubbs noted that his organization knew “from previous experience that affected areas are vastly larger than the actual disaster sites. The historic fabric of Lower Manhattan is something that might be overlooked in all the change that is ahead.”99 Stubbs feared planning efforts could vastly impact the sixty-five registered landmarks and six historic districts within a quarter square mile area of Lower Manhattan which include remnants of seventeenth century Dutch settlements, the African Burial Ground, nineteenth century tenements and “Five Points” slum, and twentieth century skyscrapers like the Woolworth Building.100 Stubbs noted that while “a lot of money is going to be spent rebuilding Lower Manhattan […] it will have a ripple effect on the historic resources nearby […] the voice of New York’s historic community must be at the table when decisions are made.”101 Considering the historical weight of these sites, WMF immediately added Lower Manhattan as location 101 on the Fund’s Program. It is currently two-thirds leased. See also Elizabeth Kubany, “One World Trade Center Architectural Fact Sheet,” 28 September 2010. Online Available: www.wtc.com/uploads/files/20100928120212PM_one-world-trade-center-architectural-fact-sheet.pdf. See also Emily Wright. “World Trade Center – The Never Ending Story,” New York Times 31 October 2008. 99 Erica Powell, “Beyond Ground Zero,” Archaeology 55, 2002, p. 22. See also J.E.C. “Heavily Damaged Buildings Surrounding Ground Zero Require Extensive Renovations,” Architectural Record, March 2002, p. 26; it was noted that the Winter Garden of the World Financial Center was slated to be fixed with $50 million within a year of September 11, 2001. As early as January 2002, 35% of the World Financial Center was occupied, while 130 Liberty Street was in need of stabilization and efforts that would take at least a year. The fate of Cass Gilbert’s 1907 building at 90 West Street was unclear since it was unknown if the renovations would be covered under the owner’s insurance policies. Similar fates affected 45 buildings in the area directly adjacent to the World Trade Center block. 100 Artifacts from the 5 Points archaeological site had been stored at the US Customs House at 6 WTC. The building and the ceramic, bone, and glassware artifacts it held were destroyed on September 11. 101 New York Times 2001.
2002 *List of 100 Most Endangered Sites* in hopes that the public would be made aware of the great historical resources at stake beyond the immediate site of Ground Zero.

Within a month after the attacks, WMF gathered groups including the New York Landmarks Conservancy, the Municipal Art Society, the Preservation League of New York State, and the National Trust for Historic Preservation to form the Lower Manhattan Emergency Preservation Fund (LMEPF). The LMEPF found that while each of these preservation groups (and others in the Downtown neighborhoods) had their own files, there was no central database for the cultural resources of the area thus making coordinated efforts difficult. In the spring of 2003, LMEPF published what they called the “most comprehensive survey to date of Lower Manhattan’s historic structures to assess the potential impact of proposed redevelopment plans on the historic fabric of the neighborhood.”

102 Three hundred buildings were assessed and mapped, seventy-five percent of which were found not to have any legislative protection. The study identified “Three Corridors of Concern” and urged LMDC, Port Authority, and the City of New York to “give every consideration to incorporating these sites into their overall plans:” Fulton Street for its commerce through the city in the 1860s and status as the former diamond capitol of the United States, its nineteenth- and early twentieth-century buildings including one of the area’s earliest skyscrapers and the first cast iron building;

---

102 World Monuments Fund, “New York Report: What Will Be the Fate of Lower Manhattan’s Landmarks as the City Rebuilds?” *ICON* Spring 2003, p. 36. LMEPF member, the New York Landmarks Conservancy offers a detailed account of the technical assistance provided at the World Trade Center site. See http://www.nylandmarks.org/programs_services/technical_assistance/projects/preserving_the_world_trade_center_site/. See also http://www.nylandmarks.org/about_us/greatest_accomplishments/lower_manhattan_emergency_preservation_fund/. 
Greenwich Street Corridor for its eighteenth- and nineteenth-century mansions; West Street for its twentieth-century commercial buildings in the Gothic and Art Deco styles.

While it is unclear if WMF’s warnings were seriously headed in the redevelopment process, a review of historic resources present at Ground Zero was completed in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 which requires all undertakings which use federal money (in this case FEMA funding) to carry out an assessment of cultural resources. This review determined the World Trade Center/Ground Zero site was eligible for the National Register of Historic Places based on:

Criteria A: Association with “historic events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.”

Criteria G: The site was under 50 years old but had significant importance because of the impact and series of events on the city/state/region/national levels, particularly inclusive being the catalyst for the “War on Terrorism” in October 2001 and the creation of the US Office of Homeland Security on 8 October 2001 (later called the Department of Homeland Security). 103

Oddly, the points of eligibility noted by LMDC do not mention the larger historical significance of the site, dating back to the seventeenth century even though the relevant data does appear in other parts of the Section 106 Review Report. 104

---

103 LMDC 2004-2010. The eligibility was prepared by members of AKRF, Inc and Louis Berger Group Inc
104 LMDC 2004-2010. Ground Zero is not currently listed on the National Register. It could be considered, however, for a multitude of reasons including its original inhabitance by Algonquin Native Americans, Henry Hudson’s first landing in 1609 and subsequent Dutch colonization in 1625 under the Dutch West Indian Company, or the impressive engineering which filled part of the Hudson River to create what is now the TriBeCa neighborhood. Lower Manhattan might also be considered a district of major historic importance for its transformation from a rural area in the 1840s, to the home of the New York Mercantile Exchange in 1872 which gave rise to the vibrant textile and dry goods trade and so-called Financial District. Much of the original fabric and history of the area was sacrificed however, in the construction of the World Trade Center in the 1960s and 1970s.
Memorialization at Ground Zero

Based on the redevelopment history of other sites deliberately targeted in acts of war such as Old Town Warsaw or the Stari Most in Mostar, the LMDC had already dramatically departed from precedents when it decided not to replicate the Twin Towers. Although various unsolicited designs, letters to the editor, and testimonies at the “Listening to the People” meetings had expressed a desire to replicate the towers, the ultimate decision to build in new forms seems to have been politically and economically motivated: by Pataki’s engagement with the Republican National Convention and upcoming elections and his desire to show strength and power; by Silverstein’s opportunity for personal financial gain in innovative architecture and expansive office space; by Port Authority’s desire to show the world a better and stronger New York that was not tied to the past and was not shaken by terrorists’ attacks. Furthermore, the decided move towards innovation and new construction, foregoing any local or national post-catastrophic attachments to the Twin Towers themselves, embraced the intangible spirit the World Trade Center had always had as a progressively economic hub.

By choosing not to rebuild, the World Trade Center does not deserve to be considered preservation in the most accepted, physical sense. It does, however, become a project to preserve American ideas about economy and freedom, as evidenced by the design competitions, commercial decisions, and resulting plans. Furthermore, the inclusion of a large memorial at the site is in preservation not just of those who lost their lives on September 11, 2001, but also of the literal and tangible memory of the towers via
the construction of square foundations for Michael Arad’s memorial “Reflecting Absence.”

Unlike most cultures throughout history which, according to architect Bernard Tschumi have chosen to build their memorials which “mark tragic and devastating events [...] off site to avoid the implicit sacrifice of future development of cities to the past,” American’s clamored to dedicate a memorial at the center of the World Trade Center site to the memory of those lost on September 11.105 As explored earlier in this study, there was no such impetus in Warsaw or Bosnia and memorials to their own national tragedies of the 1940s and 1990s respectively are small and contested if even extant at all. Scholars have speculated on the modern, particularly American urge to memorialize, as seen in the proliferation of memorial museums, town memorials to various events and wars, and of course, the plethora of memorials on the National Mall in Washington DC.106 Ground Zero inspired the same desires and to a stronger degree because of the great loss of life on the actual site.

In 2004, LMDC initiated a competition for the design of the National September 11 Memorial and Museum at Ground Zero, mandating that it must “honor those who died, to recognize the endurance of those who survived, the courage of the rescuers who risked their lives to save the lives of others, and the unbearable number who died in so doing – as well as the compassion of all those who supported the victims’ families in

105 Tschumi 2003, p. 16.
their darkest hour.”107 Meanwhile, local residents like Madelyn Wils, the only representative from the Lower Manhattan neighborhoods on the LMDC board, insisted that the site not be left as a graveyard, but rather, urged for the site to once again belong to the people of Manhattan for shopping, work, and life, while allowing space for an appropriate memorial. The memorial competition was open to anyone over 18, whether or not their ideas fit within the Libeskind/SOM Master Plan. Contestants were urged, however, to respect the tower footprints and provide access to the bare bedrock, while also integrating the site with the surrounding urban fabric in co-ordination with the families’ of survivors continual cries of “from bedrock to infinity.”108

As touching as such sentiments were, the reality was that any memorial at the site would have to deal with the rumbling of subway and PATH trains below or beside it, a shopping center nearby, and commercialism and offices along the street level. The sacred would unavoidably have to be reconciled with the profane, memory reconciled with reality. Many submissions evoked the annual “Tribute in Light” memorial with titles like “Passages of Light,” “Garden of Lights,” and “Inversion of Light.” Others were more ponderous like “Reflecting Absence,” “Dual Memory,” and “Votives in Suspension.” Michael Arad’s “Reflecting Absence” was ultimately chosen for its poignant allowance of the “absence to speak for itself,” however the young Arad was required to team up with experienced landscape architect Peter Walker to execute the design.

108 Nobel 2005, p. 242. Even though this request was made, as early as the second anniversary after the attacks, most of the South Tower footprint and part of the North Tower was covered with platforms and tracks for the in progress PATH station. When satellite images of the tower’s location pre-9/11 are compared with current satellite images of the memorial footprints, it seems like their locations shifted from the original foundations. This can be seen on Google Earth, however require more detailed measurement and analysis in order to many any definitive statement.
The plan was edited down by the LMDC staff to allow it to function as both a sacred memorial and as a lively part of the city for downtown residents.\(^\text{109}\) Arad’s original memorial, an open field at street level with sunken memorial pools remained, however trees were added to the landscape and a private mourning chamber added to the North Tower’s footprint. According to Arad and Walker, ramps will lead down to the memorial space, replacing the sights and sounds of the city with the sound of falling water down the sides of the reflecting pools. At the end of the ramp, visitors find themselves behind a thin curtain of water looking into a vast pool that flows downward, surrounded by a ribbon of names in no particular order, reflecting the “haphazard brutality of the attacks [with] no attempt to impose order upon this suffering.”\(^\text{110}\) A path between the two pools provides a space for people to light candles or leave behind memorial tokens across from a private memorial chamber for victims’ families. At the far western edge, the slurry wall will remain exposed down to the bedrock and be perforated by an entrance to the Memorial Museum.\(^\text{111}\)

\(^{110}\) Michael Arad and Peter Walker, “WTC Memorial Team Statement for Winning Design “Reflecting Absence,”” January 2004. Online Available: [www.renewnyc.com/plans_des_dev/wtc_site/new_design_plans_memorial_statement.asp](http://www.renewnyc.com/plans_des_dev/wtc_site/new_design_plans_memorial_statement.asp). Casualties of the Fire Department of New York and the New York Police Department will be marked with their department’s insignia next to their names. The names of those never physically identified will also be included. Visitors will have the option of being guided to specific names by staff members or a printed directory, much like Maya Lin’s National Vietnam War Memorial on the National Mall. The haphazard way in which the names of those killed on September 11 in New York, Washington DC, and Pennsylvania, as well as in the 1993 World trade Center bombing will be placed around the memorial has suffered much criticism. Furthermore, there have been more general critiques about the selection of Arad’s design since it is so similar to Lin’s memorial with its geometric shape and somber, searchable name inscriptions. There was some backlash over the lack of figural representation as well, since Lin was a member of the Memorial Jury. For a list of other jury members, see “Memorial Center Advisory Committee Recommendations, April 2004. Online available: [www.renewnyc.com/memorial/memorial_center_draft_rec.asp](http://www.renewnyc.com/memorial/memorial_center_draft_rec.asp).  
\(^{111}\) As the memorial construction got underway, LMDC formed a Memorial Center Advisory Committee which included victim families, residents, survivors, first responders, historians, preservationists, and
While the whole concept of a memorial at the site of destroyed cultural heritage is in contrast with the reconstruction of Warsaw and Bosnia, the decision to leave the tower footprints as voids is even more peculiar. Although Warsaw and Bosnia arguably created historical palimpsests by rebuilding structures and abnegating the memory of urbicide, the 9/11 Memorial actually created a history which never was: the footprints never actually existed as foundations of the World Trade Center because the space was always occupied by a retail concourse. Excavation and eventual construction of the so-called footprints removed all trade of historic accuracy. In many ways then, the process at Ground Zero was just like the sterilization of Old Town Warsaw and the Stari Most. Not only was the physical evidence of the Twin Towers and September 11 attacks erased, but a new history was falsely created. The danger of such decision rings clear in the words of New York Mayor Michael Bloomberg who said “this memorial is not for us – although we have been entrusted with its creation. It is for our children and grandchildren. It is so those who visit that sacred ground know what happened there and why so many people died to protect our freedoms.”¹¹² What exactly the memorial will tell its visitors remains unclear as the site has yet to be completed and scholars lack historical distance.

¹¹² Matthew Higgins and Joanna Rose, “Architect Michael Arad and Landscape Architect Peter Walker Unveil Winning Design for WTC Site Memorial “Reflecting Absence,”” 14 January 2004. Interestingly, LMDC chair John Whitehead chose to delay the announcement of the jury until it was clear that Pataki would not interfere with the selection process as he had during the selection of the Master Plan. The memorial, however, was less contested and did not have to wrestle with any economic loyalties. See Nobel 2005, p. 240-244.
Progress at Ground Zero

By the time the twenty-ton granite corner stone was ceremoniously laid on 4 July 2004, the Freedom Tower’s projected opening had been moved up to 2009 – one year later than Pataki had originally intended. The overall plan for the building had also been revised to include fewer floors for office space since Silverstein was concerned about not being able to secure tenants since the public still expressed fear of another attack on a symbolic building like the Freedom Tower. Childs revised the plan so that a scaffold-like crown would account for one quarter of the total height allowing it to still reach 1,776 feet.113 By April of 2006, a new plan was approved by the Port Authority and projected 2015 as a possible completion date, inclusive of the Freedom Tower and four additional office towers designed by Foster and Partners (2 WTC), Richard Rogers Partnership (3 WTC), and Maki and Associates (4 WTC).114 These three smaller buildings comply with Silverstein’s office space mandate and will overlook the National September 11 Memorial from their various heights. 3 WTC and 4 WTC flank Courtland Street – rebuilt

113 American Ethnologist. “Forward,” 31, 2004, pp. 291-292. See also Associated Press article from 3 July 2004, “Construction Starts Sunday on WTC Site.” The cornerstone read, “To honor and remember those who lost their lives on September 11 2001 and as a tribute to the enduring spirit of freedom.” Clyde Haberman noted in his New York Times article on 26 September 2006, “Remembrance, Both Timely and Enduring,” that the stone was grammatically incorrect, needing a comma after “2001.” In July of 2004, Libeskind filed suit against Silverstein, claiming that the developer owed him over $800,000 in design fees. In the end, Silverstein paid Libeskind $370,000. See Atkins 2008. Currently, all architectural renderings of the Freedom Tower provided on the official website of the Lower Manhattan Development Corporation credit David Child’s parent firm Skidmore, Owings, and Merrill LLP (SOM). Likewise, the overall “Design Plan” provided is noted as having been written by SOM in December 2003, prior to their official takeover of the project from Libeskind’s initial winning designs. Other issues with the LMDC representation of the project include an outdated fact sheet which projects the project be ready for occupants by 2010. See www.renewny.com/plan_des_dev/wtc_site/new_designPlans/freedom_tower/default.asp and subsequent links for up-to-date status information.

114 Nicolai Ouroussoff. “At Ground Zero, Towers for Forgetting,” New York Times 11 September 2006. Ouroussoff has critiqued these towers for being less than the best work of each architect involved. He notes that in contrast to the fortress-like qualities of the Freedom Tower and the excessive stylization of Santiago Calatrava’s transportation hub, the three smaller towers are about forgetting since they “could be imagined in just about any western capital.”
into the former World Trade Center superblock as a pedestrian walkway – thus offering a
dramatic approach to the memorial site. Since retail stores will occupy the towers at street
level, there will be a dramatic clash between the sacred and profane motivations of the
site’s development.

Just a few months later, the NYPD insisted the Freedom Tower be moved further
form the curb to prevent damage if another car bomb like that of the 1993 terrorist attack
were to go off along the street. The ceremoniously laid cornerstone was dug up and
removed in what David W. Dunlap called an “acknowledgment that much of what passes
for progress at Ground Zero to date has been longer on symbolism than on substance.”

The block was returned to its creators at Innovative stone while the tower’s design was
reworked. In the end, the original parallelogram base was changed to a two hundred
square foot base that mirrored the former Twin Towers. The first thirty feet of the
structure was redesigned as a solid concrete and steel pedestal.

These changes elicited countless critiques from architectural and civic circles with
one of the most poignant distillations of emotions being Nicolai Ouroussoff’s New York
Times article, “A Tower that Sends a Message of Anxiety, Not Ambition (if Built),” in
which he wrote:

in a society where the social contract that binds us together is fraying, the most
incisive architects have found ways to create a more fluid relationship between
private and public realms. The lobby of Thorn Mayne’s Phare Tower in Paris, for
example, is conceived as an extension of the public realm, drawing on the

---

2006.
York Times 30 June 2005. The new project which called for reinforced stair and elevator shafts, better fire
proofing, and approval from structural engineers who simulated blast effects with proprietary software, was
estimated to cost $3 billion – a full $1 billion more than Libeskind’s first plans. See Atkins 2008, p. 126.
surrounding streetscape and tunneling deep into the ground to connect to a network of underground trains. By comparison, the Freedom Tower is conceived as a barricaded fortress [...] a concrete bunker. [...] it speaks less of resilience and tolerance than of paranoia. It’s a building armored against the outside world that we no longer trust.\textsuperscript{117}

As Martin Filler noted, the Freedom Tower and redevelopment of Lower Manhattan after September 11, 2001 “could have been an uplifting demonstration of imaginative urbanism.” Like the redevelopment of Warsaw or Mostar, it could have brought the city of New York together in renewed unity, but instead, it instead developed “through political pettiness and personal greed into just another New York schlock job.”\textsuperscript{118}

Real estate executives continued to criticize the project, insisting the market did not need, and would be negatively affected by, that much new office space. Furthermore, questions began to swirl about the availability of resources like steel and concrete since in New York two stadiums, the Goldman Sachs Headquarters, Jacob Javits Center Expansion, Moyniihan Station, Number Seven Subway Extension on the west side and construction of the Second Avenue Subway on the east side were simultaneously in progress. Urban planning professionals began to urge for the Freedom Tower to be rethought or scratched all together.\textsuperscript{119} Although during his term, Governor Pataki had pledged to provide government rent subsidies for the Freedom Tower, calling it “the center of commerce, culture, and community,” his successor Governor Elliot Spitzer called the Freedom Tower a “white elephant,” without economic viability and a

\textsuperscript{118} Filler 2007, p. 281.
“monument to governmental gridlock” during the 2006 gubernatorial campaign.120

Within three weeks of being in the office, however, Spitzer he changed his tone and insisted that based on higher occupancy rates in Lower Manhattan and a perceived economic upturn, the project suddenly seemed viable.121

By the fifth anniversary of the September 11th attacks, it became clear that tenant occupation of the Freedom Tower would be problematic. As round two of Freedom Tower construction began in April 2006, Silverstein transferred his rights as tower lessee back to the Port Authority because he no longer found it lucrative to invest in a multi-billion dollar tower without confirmed anchor tenants.122 Port Authority’s solution was to team up with federal and state agencies that agreed to be tenants in one million square feet of the 2.6 million square foot, not-yet constructed space, in hopes to draw tenants and faith Downtown. It seemed by this point the development of the World Trade Center site had spiraled into a desperate case of déjà vu. Even though the Twin Towers had been occupied by government tenants for years after their construction in the 1970s, the market was considerably cheaper; three and a half decades later, New Yorkers were not happy about footing the fifty-nine dollar per square foot bill.123

120 For more on this and other political seesawing, see Filler 2007, pp. 280-291.
121 Charles V. Bagli. “Spitzer, in Reversal, Is Expected to Approve Freedom Tower, Officials Say,” New York Times 13 February 2007. Upon entering office, Spitzer ordered a review of the Freedom Tower and subsequent buildings at Ground Zero. They found that 7 WTC was nearly two-thirds occupied and more generally, the vacancy rate for downtown offices had fallen over 3.5 percent in just one year. Despite Spitzer’s change of heart, developers and real estate investors continued to raise concerns about the tower’s value and viability. Developer Douglas Durst, in particularly spoke out vehemently against the tower development, “continuing in the footsteps” of his family: both his father and grandfather argued against the construction of the original World Trade Center.
122 Stewell Chan. “Plan to Fill Freedom Tower Stirs a Debate,” New York Times 20 September 2006. In return, Silverstein acquired rights to three towers along Church Street which he was required to rebuild by 2010. He received funding from unallocated Liberty Bonds to pay for 2, 3, and 4 WTC.
These tensions rekindled sentiments expressed in the earliest stages of LMDC plans for the development of Ground Zero in which the public championed a reconstruction of the Twin Towers. In a letter to the editor on 19 February 2007, Michael Koy of New Brunswick, New Jersey wrote that “the proper response to 9/11 is and always has been rebuilding the Twin Towers. There is no better way to heal our country’s wounds and to show terrorists everywhere that their actions are useless.” This echoes Philip Nobel’s text in 2005 in which he commented that the public had called for, through loudest applause at LMDC’s “Listening to the City” meetings, for a rebuilding of the Twin Towers. A submission to the original Innovative Design Competition by “Team Twin Towers” created a two, one hundred twelve story square towers with steel grill facades, and the northern tower with an antenna; they called it “the plan of the people,” and according to Nobel, it probably still was.

This all begs the question of why the Twin Towers were not rebuilt, despite the public’s interest. An easy answer might be that the towers were not yet “historic” since they were just three decades old or that they had always been aesthetically unappreciated beyond easy recognition on the New York skyline pre-September 11, 2001. Ultimately, it seems as if an argument for the preservation of the intangible spirit of the site might be revisited and valued as the most important part of World Trade Center heritage. Eventually, themes of freedom imposed on the site by politicians after the attacks were

---

126 It may be considered however, that had the Twin towers survived, they may have been worthy of landmark status in several years. Given the current trends towards the preservation of modern architecture, despite aesthetic distaste by the general public, an acknowledgement of the towers’ engineering feats, if nothing else, would have merited their historic status.
shed. In a move which garnered little media attention but can be understood as a watershed moment for the site’s intangible preservation Port Authority decided to change the name of the Freedom Tower to simply 1 WTC. In renaming the structure, Port Authority aimed to shift the understanding of the building to a commercial office building rather than a civic symbol.

While it seems unlikely the tower will ever be appreciated independent of the events of September 11, 2001, the subtle name change inspired immediate results: in August 2010, magazine publishing house Conde-Nast signed a lease to occupy one million square feet of the 2.6 million square feet available at 1 WTC in 2014, making them 1 WTC’s first major tenant. With such a sizable portion of the structure accounted for, state and federal agencies would not need to occupy the structure in order to subsidize the $3.3 billion cost of construction. Port Authority believes the presence of the high-profile magazine publisher will draw other tenants willing to pay the high rent of the soon-to-be tallest building in the world. As Robert Yaro, President of the Regional Planning Association in New York stated, the lease with Conde-Nast represents a game-changing transformation of Lower Manhattan into a hub for creative industries, not just for financial services [...] it has been almost a decade since 9/11 and clearly people are now looking at this site and this building as one of the most well-located addresses in the region, not just as the sight of a national tragedy.

---


With the positive turn of events, stakeholders projected the entire World Trade Center site, inclusive of 1 WTC, four other office towers, the transit hub, memorial and museum would be open by 2014.\(^{129}\)

Even so, an article published in September 2010 points to a group of anonymous New York State officials and New York City developers who continue to call the project at 1 WTC a “folly” and “an emotionally induced miss-use of money.” Although no one would go on record, they critiqued the project’s employment as a political pawn that still does not make real estate sense. These officials critique the lack of scrutiny the project has received, noting that “even nine years later, the events surrounding 9/11 remain so emotional that it seemed somehow sacrilegious to ask tough questions about 1 WTC.”\(^{130}\)

Interestingly, even those who do not see logic in the development project like Douglas Durst who has gone so far as to take out ad space in newspapers stating his opposition to 1 WTC, have joined the bandwagon in hopes to reap financial benefits: through Durst Organization, he purchased about 10% of the building’s equity for one hundred million dollars. Durst now manages the building on behalf of Port Authority and will earn

---

\(^{129}\) Henry Goldman. “World Trade Center Rebuilding may Finish by 2014, Officials Say,” *Bloomberg* 7 September 2010. Online Available: wtc.com/news. This remains in contrast to the Lower Manhattan Construction Command Center’s (LMCCC) “Confidential Draft, Risk Analysis” of 14 July 2009 was leaked and published in the *Daily News* on 3 August 2009 as “Secret Report: Ground Zero Freedom Tower Construction Lags, Slated for 2018 Finish.” According to their analysis, the LMCCC estimated all components of the World Trade Center re-development would be between two and five years beyond Port Authority’s projections: National September 11 Memorial and Museum will not be open until 2013 as opposed to Port Authority’s insistence upon September 11, 2001; Likewise, while Pataki’s original fast-track projections had the Freedom Tower opened by 2008, later speculations by Port Authority pointed to December 2013; LMCCC believed the project would be done by January 2018 at best. This document was leaked immediately after Governor Paterson gave developer Larry Silverstein an ultimatum on 2 August which claimed the state and Port Authority was prepared to “redevelop the 16-acre site without him if necessary.”

\(^{130}\) Joe Nocera, “In Skyscrapers at Ground Zero, Sentiment Trumped Numbers” 17 September 2010.
substantial income from various tenant fees. He hopes to become cash-flow positive by
2019.\textsuperscript{131}

As of December 2010, 1 WTC had a completed curtain wall to the twentieth
story, with steel installed to the fiftieth and concrete poured to the forty-second.
Foundations were underway for 2, 3, and 4 WTC. Structural steel work was completed at
the National September Memorial and Museum Pavilion and the so called “survivor
tree,” a callery pear tree that was damaged but made it through the 9/11 attacks, was
replanted on site. The reflecting pools and waterfalls were completed, and the Memorial’s
planned opening on 11 September 2011, the tenth anniversary of the terrorist attacks, was
confirmed.\textsuperscript{132} After a commemoration ceremony, the site will be open to the public on
September 12, 2011 although visitor access will be monitored and limited since the site
will still be surrounded by the ongoing construction of 1 WTC and nearby towers.
Approximately \textfrac{3}{4} of the plaza will be accessible through just one of the four planned
accesses to the site. The Museum is scheduled to open in September 2012 with its grand
atrium which includes the seventy-foot “tridents” of the twin towers and private suite for
victim family members.\textsuperscript{133} The so-called Survival Staircase, put on the National Trust for

\textsuperscript{131} Nocera 2010.
\textsuperscript{132} Press Release by the National September 11 Memorial and Museum, “National September 11 Memorial
Museum Info Release,” 22 December 2010. Online Available at wtc.com. See also, Tom Topousis, “9/11
Memorial’s Fountains Flow: Waterfalls Cascade in First Moving Tribute to WTC Victims,” \textit{New York Post}
10 November 2010. Online Available:
\url{www.nypost.com/p/news/local/manhattan/memorial_fountains_flow_UBDbmfsTZnQXgL8bnU68L}.
Around the same time, Silverstein was named “Ernst and Young Entrepreneur of the Year” in recognition
of his development efforts at Ground Zero. See Silverstein Properties, “Silverstein Named Ernst and Young
Entrepreneur of the Year in the Real Estate, Hospitality, and Construction Category,” Press Release, 15
November 2010. Online Available: \url{http://www.wtc.com/news/rebuilding-ground-zero--larry-silverstein-
named-ernst--and--young-entrepreneur-of-the-year}.
\textsuperscript{133} These tridents will be visible from the Memorial Plaza because the atrium is covered in glass. Other
over-sized artifacts on view in the large space might include part of the North Tower antenna and a first-
responder fire truck.
Historic Preservation (NTHP) *List of Most Endangered Sites* in May 2006 because it was threatened by Larry Silverstein and designer Norman Foster’s planned office tower, will also be installed.\(^{134}\) Upon the opening of the museum, the link between the upper levels of the plaza and bedrock will be complete with a ramp toward artifact exhibitions, thus making the site both historical and memorial.

**Preservation at Ground Zero**

Any analysis of the events surrounding September 11, 2001 and the subsequent redevelopment and memorial efforts is troubled by the lack of details about the terrorist attacks and intentions. Many have speculated that the four hijacked planes were designed as attacks on the United States military via the attack on the Pentagon and unsuccessful hijacking which crashed into a field in Shanksville, Pennsylvania rather than possibly striking Camp David, and the American economy via the attacks at the World Trade Center. The citizens of the United States almost immediately interpreted these attacks as attacks on freedom, democracy, and other ideals American’s hold dear. While there is no hard evidence the terrorists aimed to completely knock down the Twin Towers in attempts to eradicate a culture, as was the case of the Nazi’s attack on Warsaw and the Serb’s attacks in Mostar, that was essentially the result: Americans quickly forgot all pre-attack sentiments towards the Twin Towers and began to embrace them as symbols of America.

Unlike the beloved Old Town and Stari Most, the Twin Towers were aesthetically unappreciated. On September 11th however, and in the immediate aftermath as people made rebuilding the towers part of their patriotic rallying cry, it seemed as if the recent past and negative opinion of the Twin Towers had been forgotten. As Eric P. Nash wrote in his 2005 text *Manhattan Skyscrapers*, “in their 28-year history, the Twin Towers had gone from being one of the more openly criticized features of the skyline to one of the most popular.”

After their collapse, towers were not remembered as the invasive and aesthetically jarring structures that they had always been, but instead, as beloved symbols which embodied tenants of the American Dream like urbanity, capitalism, and economic success.

Although it would have been passé to even mutter aloud in the aftermath of the attacks, the reality was, in Bevan’s words, that “thousands of people died on a very valuable piece of real estate.” This truth undoubtedly caused the messy competitions, announcements of commissions, and compromised Master Plan, itself mercilessly critiqued for its aesthetics and reflection on the financial and political demands imposed by the site, rather than the emotional and cultural needs of the public. These critiques recall nearly exactly the same types of criticism raised during the development of the original Twin Towers in the 1970s and thus, the entire twenty-first century redevelopment process might be understood as having captured the intangible spirit of the site; the memories of capitalism and freedom projected onto the Twin Towers and their post-9/11 footprints. In choosing a Master Plan which ensured the construction of bigger,

---

135 Nash 2005, p. 133.
more secure structures which reach to unprecedented heights and boast excessive office space, a retail concourse, and transportation hub, the project at Ground Zero embodies the intangible, commercial spirit of the former World Trade Center site, while still leaving space for a proper memorial.

In a Fox News interview on 9 December 2010, president of World Trade Center Properties Janno Lieber insisted that the development process would make New York “better than it was before,” and that “the city and the country will profit in the long run. […] The only question, and it’s a fair question, is how soon it will all be finished. The plan that we have now calls for three of the five office towers to be completed by late 2014.” When asked why the project has been taking so long, the spokes person returned to accepted rhetoric about the need for an open and democratic debate about what should be rebuilt on the site, the numerous governmental changes over the last decade in New York, New Jersey, the city, and within Port Authority, and the nationwide economic recession. While Varsovians and Bosniaks flourished after their speedy reconstructions, only time will reveal how the public will react to the never ending project creating a National September 11 Memorial and Museum and massive commercial redevelopment project at Ground Zero.

CONCLUSION

No sites of cultural heritage destruction can be completely analogous to one another. Old Town Warsaw, the Stari Most in Mostar, and the former World Trade Center site in New York, however, each represent sites intentionally destroyed by terrorists in opposition of the society’s values; all three sites were left with their own “ground zero” sites of utter annihilation, but all three sites chose to rebuild and reestablish their cultural identities. Warsaw was rebuilt by Socialists establishing themselves within the long history of the city. Mostar rebuilt to proved their resilience and move towards reintegration. New York City immediately latched on to the ideals of freedom, but soon embraced the longer history of the site through economy and capitalism, as demonstrated in the name change from Freedom Tower to simply 1 World Trade Center. Despite these subtle circumstantial differences, it can be concluded that there cannot be a singular formula for the preservation of cultural heritage destroyed by deliberate acts of aggression.

Despite the numerous critiques and pessimistic interpretations, the Master Plan for the redevelopment of Ground Zero is in many ways similar to the ways in which other cities faced by similar large scale, intentional destruction of cultural heritage and lives, have handled their own recoveries. The here studied Warsaw and Bosnia chose to rebuild their former cultural sites with exact, physical replicas, hoping that the rebuilding of structures would revive their culture and pride. At Ground Zero, New Yorkers and Americans chose not to rebuild two, twin towers that were aesthetically unappreciated,
but to rebuild the essence of why the site was valued: commerce, capitalism, and economic superiority. While the Old Town of Warsaw and Stari Most of Mostar were both historically appreciated works of architecture that absorbed the cultural values of Varsovians and Bosniaks respectively, the Twin Towers were never architecturally valued by the American people. Yes, they were absorbed into the iconic New York City skyline, but never were they valued as aesthetic masterpieces or as examples of a proud historic moment. Instead, what was valued in the Twin Towers and the larger site of the World Trade Center was economic prosperity and the American dream of upward mobility and urbanity. It was precisely those values that Americans felt the terrorists attacked, and so precisely those values which they chose to reestablish in the Ground Zero Master Plan through contemporary architectural styles with advanced ecological designs that would soar to heights worth gloating about.

Although his work focuses on analysis of memory related to the Holocaust through national days of remembrance and memorial museums, James E. Young has proposed several questions that are equally relevant in the study of the preservation of architectural heritage after destructive acts of aggression. Of particular relevance is his question as to whether national memories of tragic events can be “legislated and thereby legally prescribed” and if “an entire polis [can] be told what to remember, how, and why.” He goes on to ask if “national memory [is] a necessary fiction of the nation-state, whereby a heterogeneous polis is invited to mistake a shared memorial space, say a day or national museum, for shared memory.” In consideration of the political and economic tenors

surrounding the redevelopment of Warsaw, Mostar, and Ground Zero, the answer to each of Young’s questions is a resounding yes: Warsaw’s memories were manipulated to ignore the recent catastrophes and Soviet betrayals of World War II and embrace their eighteenth and nineteenth century prosperities and peace through rebuilding the Old Town in a historic style; through a rebuilding campaign, the people of Mostar were forced to ignore their segregations and recall years of coexistence in a heterogeneous society as the European Union Administration aimed to bring peace to the region; and, after much political influence, New Yorkers first told to remember and exalt their democratic rights to freedom, and in the end, celebrate their American, capitalistic and entrepreneurial roots. In each of these cases, the political affects on the sites of reconstruction were tremendous. Likewise, despite the amount of architectural fabric left to preserve, each of these sites focused substantially on an intangible message, and thereby the preservation of the intangible spirit of the site.

According to the UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage, “intangible cultural heritage” includes the

expressions, knowledge, skills […] that communities, groups, and in some cases, individuals recognize as part of their cultural heritage. This intangible cultural heritage, transmitted from generation to generation, is constantly recreated by communities and groups in response to their environment, their interaction with nature and their history, and provides them with a sense of identity and continuity, thus promoting respect for cultural diversity and human creativity.  

While this definition allows for the manifestation of intangible cultural heritage only in oral traditions, performing arts, social practices, rituals, and festive events, knowledge and practices concerning nature and the universe, and traditional craftsmanship, it can be

139 UNESCO 2003.
argued that the ideas and memories projected onto a site of tangible cultural heritage may also be considered valuable intangible heritage. The philosophies and values of a given culture, although not explicitly considered or protected under the UNESCO 2003 Convention, are representative of a culture’s spirit, uniqueness, and internal unity.

Both aggressors and those in charge of the rebuilding, preservation, and development of sites deliberately destroyed through acts of war have proven to be acutely aware of the intangible value of the spirit of a site to its culture. First, aggressors during World War II and the Bosnian Civil War identified important architectural structures which symbolized and embodied their enemy’s values and memories of peace and progress in attempt to demoralize the attacked civilization. After the wartime destruction, Varsovians and Bosnians acknowledge the very same intangible values their enemies had preyed upon as they rushed to restore their cities in attempt to reinvigorate their people and reclaim their cultural identities. As a result, abstract feelings of political autonomy and coexistence were built into the newly constructed apartments of Old Town and bridge of Mostar even as the Soviet government took hold in Poland and the cities of Bosnia remained ethnically polarized. Likewise, the terrorists who planned the attack on the Twin Towers targeted the structures for their perceived importance to the American people as a symbol of New York, the self-proclaimed “greatest city in the world.” As the towers fell, Americans too embraced the intangible spirit of all those who died on September 11, the dream of economic prosperity, and the belief in the value of freedom. In its development efforts, New York City looked not to reaffirm its physical past through recreation of the Twin Towers, but rather to boast ideals of democratic unity and
capitalistic strength. There seems to have been no more American way to exalt such intangible values through physical representation than by building the world’s tallest tower and dedicating it to freedom.

Unlike the rebuilding of Old Town Warsaw which took a decade and a half, or the admittedly smaller project of Stari Most which took less than ten years, a decade after the terrorist attacks Americans and the rest of the world still hold their breath for a completed project. In the mean time, it has fully taken on the spirit of the original Twin Towers, through debates over financing, structural stability, and skyline aesthetic. The project replayed the very history of the 1970s development of the World Trade Center site in its search for tenants and moreover, the new World Trade Center project continued the fragmentation of the Lower Manhattan streetscape in retaining a superblock, even as the memorial pools succeed in inviting pedestrians through the plaza. If on time, the opening of the Memorial on September 11, 2011 will be a landmark moment, but one still far from the finish line.
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