THE WORLD TRADE CENTER SITE: WHO WON? FISHER'S NARRATIVE

PARADIGM AND CONFLICTING NARRATIVES IN THE ANALYSIS OF

THE WORLD TRADE CENTER SITE CONTROVERSY

Except where reference is made to the work of others, the work described in this thesis is my own or was done in collaboration with my advisory committee. This thesis does not include proprietary or classified information.

_____
Nicole Bryanne Cann

Certificate of Approval:

_____
Robert Agne
Assistant Professor
Communication & Journalism

_____
David Sutton, Chair
Associate Professor
Communication & Journalism

_____
Sei-Hill Kim
Assistant Professor
Communication & Journalism

_____
Stephen L. McFarland
Dean
Graduate School

THE WORLD TRADE CENTER SITE: WHO WON? FISHER'S NARRATIVE

PARADIGM AND CONFLICTING NARRATIVES IN THE ANALYSIS OF

THE WORLD TRADE CENTER SITE CONTROVERSY

Nicole B. Cann

A Thesis

Submitted to

the Graduate Faculty of

Auburn University

in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the

Degree of

Master of Arts

Auburn, Alabama
August 7, 2006

THE WORLD TRADE CENTER SITE: WHO WON? FISHER'S NARRATIVE

PARADIGM AND CONFLICTING NARRATIVES IN THE ANALYSIS OF

THE WORLD TRADE CENTER SITE CONTROVERSY

Nicole Bryanne Cann

_____
Signature of Author

_____
Date of Graduation

VITA

Nicole Cann, daughter of Gregory and Sharon Cann, was born August 29, 1982, in Santa Clara, California. While attending University of Alabama in Huntsville for her undergraduate degree, she was a research assistant to Dr. Sonja Brown-Givens, as well as, a departmental honor scholar, student ambassador for her university, and Phi Kappa Phi member. She graduated Summa Cum Laude from University of Alabama in Huntsville with her Bachelor of Arts degree in Communication in May 2004. She began her graduate studies in August 2004 at Auburn University. While at Auburn, she presented four separate papers at conferences in the Southeast and Midwest. Also while at Auburn University, she worked as a graduate teaching assistant for various courses and solo taught Public Speaking and Introduction to Public Relations. She also assisted in the set-up of the Communication lab for Public Speaking courses. Nicole worked as the public relations director for the Jay Sanders Film Festival from Fall 2004 until Spring 2006. She will graduate with her Master's in Communication in August 2006 and she plans to continue instructing college courses in the fall.

THESIS ABSTRACT

THE WORLD TRADE CENTER SITE: WHO WON? FISHER'S NARRATIVE

PARADIGM AND CONFLICTING NARRATIVES IN THE ANALYSIS OF

THE WORLD TRADE CENTER SITE CONTROVERSY

Nicole B. Cann

Master of Arts, August 7, 2006
(B.A., University of Alabama in Huntsville, 2004)

113 Typed Pages

Directed by David Sutton

The controversy over the World Trade Center site was examined. Using Foss'
comprehensive examination of the narrative and Fisher's narrative paradigm fifty-six
articles from *The New York Times* were examined for the narrative fidelity and narrative
probability of the two main narratives, the right to mourn and the right to renew. The
analysis found that the two main narratives were in confliction. Consequently, the right to
renew narrative proved more dominant than the right to mourn narrative. Overall, the
analysis found that the constant confliction of the two narratives was a significant factor
in the delaying of the rebuilding of the World Trade Center site.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my parents for being my "wings." Even though I didn't receive my Christmas request twenty years ago, each and every day they have truly helped me soar. They dedicate a great deal of their life to keeping me happy, healthy, and successful, and for that I am forever grateful and dedicate this thesis to them. To my personal editor, my Mom, thank you for listening enthusiastically to my "I figured it out!" phone calls. To my Dad, thank you for your encouragement and financially supporting my trips to Target when I got stressed-out. Thank you to my sister, Kristina, and her husband, Kevin, for being a constant support system for me throughout my college career. Thank you to my thesis committee for being a positive support throughout this entire process. To Dr. Sutton, who helped me "put words on page," thank you for understanding my "sparkler-like" nature, and keeping my thesis going in one direction instead of twenty. To Dr. Agne and Dr. Kim, thank you for providing insightful comments and critiques, not only on my thesis, but throughout graduate school. To my fiancé, Brian, thank you for taking me to Sonic when I got writer's block, cooking dinner while I was revising chapters, and making me laugh each day. In the past six months I finished my thesis, became an aunt, and found the love of my life. While just one of these would be a wonderful gift, I am grateful to have obtained all three. With that being said, I would like to thank God for blessing me with a beautiful life.

Style manual or journal used: Publication manual of the American Psychological Association (5th ed.)

Computer software used: Microsoft Word for Windows XP

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

On September 11, 2001, at exactly 8:46:31 a.m., a jet plane crashed into the steel walls of the north tower of the World Trade Center (Thomas, 2001). Sixteen minutes and 28 seconds later at 9:02:59 a.m. another jet plane streamed toward the South Tower and crashed into the building between the 77th and the 79th floors (Dwyer & Flynn, 2005). Less than 2 hours later, both buildings collapsed.

Despite the vast devastation of the attacks to the area surrounding the World Trade Center (or WTC), workers managed to completely remove the 16 acres of debris in less than nine months ("Turner," 2002). Although the clean-up of the area proved remarkably quick, the reconstruction process has been a slow and painful venture. Four years after the attacks a great deal of the planning for the reconstruction of the WTC area still remains in the early stages. When writing about the reconstruction *The New York Times* journalist, Edward Wyatt, noted that "the rebuilding of Lower Manhattan has the makings of a bitter New York struggle, a dialogue of disparate views of grief, money, power, politics and design, inflamed by differing passions, but with no framework to reconcile them" (2002, p. 1). This "bitter New York struggle" is mainly between two groups: the surviving family members of the victims of the September 11th attacks who want to see an appropriate memorial built to commemorate the deaths of their loved ones, and various government agencies and business organizations which have an economic

1

interest in the redevelopment of the WTC area. For the surviving family members of those who died in the September 11th attacks, the design and placement of an appropriate memorial are of paramount interest. Initially the families demanded the following items: "the construction of a visitors' information center, a museum and learning center, a children's memorial center, transportation sites specific to the memorial, meeting areas and a separate center at the memorial for families of victims, with restricted access" (Wyatt, 2002, p. 1). The New York City government settled on a memorial, a drawing center, and an international freedom center for Ground Zero. The families immediately rejected the plans for the international freedom center and the drawing center, calling for their immediate removal. They also rejected the initial design of the memorial and have made more than 400 different suggestions for how it should be changed (Lower Manhattan Development Corporation, 2004).

The economic interest groups, including the Port Authority of New York and the Lower Manhattan Development Corporation, want to see the rapid rebuilding and renewal of the destroyed World Trade Center Site. The WTC area includes over 12 million square feet of property that once housed restaurants, retail shops, hotels, and commercial businesses. These commercial businesses included the more than 430 companies housed within towers 1 and 2 of the World Trade Center. The companies included business services, law firms, financial institutions, retailers, communications, marketing firms, engineering institutions, employment agencies, medical offices, and transportation (CoStar Group, 2001). In 2002 the Lower Manhattan Development Corporation with the help of their designer, Daniel Libeskind, introduced their proposal to rebuild and renew the area with their "master plan." Since the introduction of the

master plan the economical groups attempted to appease some of the family members' wishes, yet remain strident in their plan to refurbish the area economically.

In early 2006, New York City Mayor Michael Bloomberg stated that construction of the site would commence despite no specific compromise between the groups and the continuance of overwhelming protests of family and friends of victims of September 11th, 2001 (Westfeldt, 2006). Indeed the rebuilding process has become Wyatt's (2002) foreseen struggle, housing a myriad of narratives about the type of place that the World Trade Center site should become. In addition Wyatt (2002) correctly assumed that a framework to deal with these numerous narratives would be noticeably absent. As a communication scholar, I will create this framework by evaluating the conflicting narratives of the families and economic groups to explain why the rebuilding process has taken so long.

The Rebuilding Process Debate and the Narrative Paradigm

The four-year standstill of the rebuilding process can be most appropriately explained by Walter Fisher's narrative paradigm. The depth and breadth of the discussion about the rebuilding relates to Fisher's belief that human beings are story-tellers. Fisher found his interest in the link between narratives and rhetoric through a book by Alasdair MacIntyre that proposed humans gained distinction based upon their need to share narratives. MacIntyre (1981) stated "man is in his actions and practice, as well as his fictions, essentially a story-telling animal" (p. 201). The notion of humans as story-tellers influenced Fisher's (1984) development of the narrative paradigm. A distinct counter-argument to the traditional "rational-world paradigm," Fisher based the narrative paradigm on humans instinctual practice of telling stories.

Since the introduction of the narrative paradigm in 1984, researchers have used the narrative paradigm in a myriad of studies including: the AIDS risk narrative, group therapy discussions, partisan platforms, reality television, parenting techniques, folklore, conceptualization of welfare recipients, and ancient Indian philosophical texts (Brinson & Brown, 1997; Eaves & Savoie, 2005; Gring-Pemble, 2001; Roberts, 2004; Smith, 1989; Stroud, 2002; Wood, 2005). Many of these studies seek to expand and evolve the narrative paradigm and its central concepts (Gring-Pemble, 2001; Roberts, 2004; Stroud, 2002). However, the current study will apply the traditional concepts of Fisher's narrative paradigm, narrative fidelity and narrative coherence, as they aptly define the rhetoric surrounding the rebuilding of the World Trade Center area.

Documents to be Studied

As I began my rhetorical critique of the September 11th rebuilding debate, I was confronted with a seemingly unending bulk of narratives. Like other rhetorical critics, I had to select particular pieces out of which I could create a "meaningful text" (Dickinson, 2005, p. 274). I took the position of an outside reader of newspaper articles covering the conflicting narratives of rebuilding from personal and economic groups. To locate the newspaper texts I used the *Lexis-Nexis* database because it contained full-text articles. I used the search words of "World Trade Center," and "memorial," "footprints," "rebuilding," "controversy," "sacred ground," "hallowed ground," "master plan," "rebuilding," "design," "aesthetics," "reason," "narrative," "hero," "economics," "politics," "family," and "culture." I believe the correlation of these terms with the term World Trade Center brought an applicable amount of documents that could be used as texts for my study.

4

I examined 56 newspaper articles that covered the month of September from 2001 to 2005. I focused on the month of September because it is the anniversary month of the September 11th, 2001 attacks. This focus was driven by the idea that during September media coverage of any event relating to September 11th is generally higher than in other months of the year. I also chose to focus only on articles from *The New York Times* because this newspaper has a high percentage of coverage of September 11th and the coverage of the personal and economic groups. This is evident in their dedication of over 922 articles to just the September 11th memorial conflict. In addition the editors and reporters of *The New York Times* express a personal interest in the conflict not only because of their location in New York, but also because of their tendency to report on a larger variety of stories that do not always make national papers. Dickinson (2005) agrees with the validity of using only *The New York Times* to study events of September 11th by stating that "*The New York Times* was particularly important [in discussing September 11th] for the ways it simultaneously served New Yorkers and a national readership as one of the three 'large, nationally influential newspapers'" (p. 274).

I used quotes, commentary, and paraphrased information from each of the articles. While the use of fragments of different articles is not readily an apparent study, the weaving of the different fragments together to create a story is often explored. Kitch (2002) agrees with this idea by stating "'discontinuous facts…become intelligible only when woven together as stories,' when the details of occurrences are assembled into a narrative structure in which 'events seem to tell themselves'" (p. 296). In addition Kitch argues that frequently news stories use the narrative story form in which to piece together particular events. While some critics may claim that this narrative journalism brings in

too many mythological characteristics to a story, that is not the area that is addressed within this venue. Myth or reality, the discussions within *The New York Times* are examined for their narrative probability and fidelity, and the amount to which narrative conflict affects the outcome of rebuilding Ground Zero.

Preview

The remainder of this thesis involves four chapters. Chapter II consists of a literature review. The literature review focuses on two main sections: a review of past rhetorical studies that focus on memorials that encountered controversy, and a review of critical studies that consider the mourning process in relation to memorials. Chapter III features the methodology focusing on Fisher's narrative paradigm. Chapter IV features the analysis of the texts encompassing articles focusing on public opinion rhetoric surrounding the creation of the WTC memorial. Chapter V discusses the additional findings and conclusions for the study.

CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

Any critic who studies the controversy over the rebuilding of the World Trade Center area will soon find themselves with a multitude of popular articles and press discussing the debate. However, when it comes to the scholarly discussion of other controversial memorials, the pool of available documents narrows quite a bit. The first section of this chapter discusses how the World Trade Center became a national icon representing strength and the economy. The second section of the chapter explains inextricable link between the World Trade Center site and World Trade Center Memorial. The third section discusses the past literature on memorials and specifically looks at how the story of the memorialized affects the memorial. The fourth section of this chapter will review case studies that looked at conflicting narratives.

The History of the World Trade Center: How a Structure Becomes a National Icon

In order to properly understand the conflicting narratives one must first look at the narrative of the World Trade Center before its demolishment. Looking at the narrative of the World Trade Center gives a general view of the type of character and theme the families are attempting to memorialize and the economical groups are attempting to rebuild. From its completion in 1973 to its destruction in 2001, the World Trade Center's character encountered controversies over its size, meaning, and appeal. However, despite debate over its aesthetic, nationally and internationally people viewed the World Trade Center as being an economic strong-hold. The correlation of economic might and the

trade center was mainly due to its housing of more than 400 companies and welcoming approximately 15,000 visitors daily (Gillespie, 1999; CoStar Group, 2001).

The story of the World Trade Center began in 1921 when the New York City government established the Port Authority in order to construct and expand the transportation of New York City. The Port Authority became closely identified with economic strength, operating and managing the bulk of the city's transportation system, which includes five airports, a railroad, bus stations, bridges, tunnels, and ports (Langewiesche, 2002). The Port Authority attempted to wield this economic strength in 1966 when New York City's economy was floundering. The Port Authority's plan to refurbish the economy was to select Tishman Realty and Construction Company to begin construction of the World Trade Center, believing the trade center would bring back the connection between economic might and New York City (Chernick, 2005; Gillespie, 1999). Contrary to the Port Authority's predictions, the World Trade Center's introduction in the 1970s only further compromised an area suffering from "economic recession, weakening demand, and high vacancy rates" (Chernick, 2005, p. 67). In addition, opponents of the Trade Center declared the towers to be inefficient, costly, and unattractive (Gillespie, 1999). Despite the initial problems of the trade center, in the 1980s the economic problems began to lift, and from 1990 to 2001 the World Trade Center area secured the reputation as an economic stronghold both nationally and internationally.

The reputation of the World Trade Center was not only based upon its economic vitality, but also upon its innovative design. The design and building of the World Trade Center area was unique and futuristic. The distinctive design of the World Trade Center

was created to prevent the intense wind pressure on the top of the buildings. In addition the steel beams were fire-proof (Gillespie, 1999). Also, each floor was built to contain fires on specific levels until they were put out. While in the past other skyscrapers were required to have over five stairwells, due to new city codes only three stairwells were held in each of the main towers (Dwyer & Flynn, 2005). Due to the fact that fires could be contained on each floor, three stairwells were deemed an adequate amount. This set-up of only three stairwells was typical of new high-rises because fires could be contained on each floor.

Along with its innovative design, the complete World Trade Center encompassed a vast area in New York. All six towers of the World Trade Center occupied a combined area of over 13 million square feet with towers 1 and 2 occupying more than 4 million square feet each (Chernick, 2005). Because of the vast amount of space it covered the World Trade Center was the only skyscraper in the nation with its own police department (Gillespie, 1999). The police department provided a source to regulate the average of "35,000 tenants and 15,000 visitors" who came to the World Trade Center each day (Gillespie, 1999, p. 210).

The story of the World Trade Center forever changed on the morning of September 11th. Immediately after the attacks narratives about September 11th emerged. These narratives were displayed through 90 hours of uninterrupted television coverage of the attacks (Foner, 2005). Magazines and newspapers across the nation paralleled the television coverage. Political and economic groups used this media coverage to immediately begin espousing their thoughts on the attacks. For example, journalists and the government proclaimed the actions "terrorist attacks" and the United Nations

estimated that the collapse of the World Trade Center caused the unemployment of 24 million people internationally, and 15 million people internationally sank further into poverty (Artefaqs, 2006).

The preceding information about "terrorist attacks" paved the way for a myriad of discussions about who to blame for the attacks and what kind of retaliation should follow. However, more appropriately suited for this thesis is the discussion of the personal and economic controversy of rebuilding a now devastated area. The United Nations economic statistics were only a small piece of a discussion that would bring conflict between family members of victims of the attacks and the economic interests for the next four years.

<div align="center">The Site and the Memorial: The Inextricable Link</div>

When the World Trade Center site is completely rebuilt, it is expected to house the World Trade Center Memorial. However, a growing controversy that began shortly after the attacks threatens not only the building of the memorial, but also the rebuilding of the site. In 2001, after the September 11th attacks, individuals began contemplating what would replace the World Trade Center. At the time some wondered if the area would ever be rebuilt. However, government officials were quick to announce that rebuilding was inevitable and necessary for the recovery of New York City. There was also no question that a memorial for the thousands of victims of the September 11th attacks would be built at the site. Therefore, the rebuilding of the World Trade Center Site and the building of the World Trade Center Memorial have been inextricably linked from the beginning. Thus, the discussion of controversy over memorials and museums lays the groundwork to discuss the controversy of not only the World Trade Center Memorial, but also the World Trade Center Site.

Memorials and Museums: Competing Stories and the Creation of Controversy

Controversy over story leads to controversy over a memorial (Browne, 1999; Prosise, 2003; Blair, Jeppeson, & Pucci, 1991). In short, the reflection of the story about an event, individual, or issue can cause debate based on discrepancies with the past and present meaning of that particular event, individual, or issue. Looking at how the controversy over a story leads to the controversy over a memorial will explain how the story of the WTC led to the controversy that surrounds the site and the memorial.

The Crispus Attucks Memorial

Crispus Attucks' story, like his memorial, was surrounded in controversy. In 1770 Crispus Attucks was killed during the Boston Massacre (Browne, 1999). The controversy of Attucks involved the conflicting stories of Attucks as hero and Attucks as rebellious. While many believed that Attucks justly revolted, others believed that the revolt was unjustified and the massacre only brought embarrassment to Boston. The controversy over Attucks' story led to controversy over Boston's building of a Crispus Attucks memorial. The controversy proved both diverse and conflicting. Browne (1999) agreed with this diversity and confliction stating that "arguments for and against the memorial ranged across a variety of contexts and media, seldom were elaborate, and often desultory" (p. 179).

Those who made an argument for the Crispus Attucks Memorial wanted to make sure the story of the Boston Massacre would not cause African Americans to lose "their identity, difference, or their own unique past" (Browne, 1999, p. 173). Those who made an argument against the memorial questioned the story of Attucks and his real role in the

11

massacre. This argument was further supported when some of those who first supported the memorial later came to question the true significance behind the memorial. Much of this struggle over Attuck's role related to the story of the massacre. The widespread story of the massacre portrayed an intense rebellion against other Americans. Thus, individuals divided on how to specifically identify with Attucks: as a hero, martyr, or rebel (Browne, 1999). Overall, division over an individual's story is common in accordance to the creation of memorials.

The Sojourner Truth Memorial

Mandziuk (2003) discussed how the multiplicity of narratives that encompassed Sojourner Truth proved problematic in making the decision on one statue to represent her being. Sojourner Truth's story represented not only what could be, but also what should be for the nation. Truth was widely described as an impassioned activist of freedom and women's rights (Mandziuk, 2003). However, her story was shrouded by both truths and falsities. Some depicted her as having a quiet essence, while others described her with the fervent will that follows her legend today (Mandziuk, 2003). The disparities over how she spread a narrative for a nation caused controversy in deciding how a memorial could properly illustrate Truth's meaning. Mandziuk (2003) stated that

> the dispute [over the memorial] brings into sharp focus the racial divisions among feminist and women's groups, the patriarchal and political battle lines drawn around gendered histories and identities, and the arguments about what would be a proper space for such public memories to reside" (p. 279).

Some wanted Truth's memorial to represent the political essence of what she stood for, others wanted her to be reflective of a place, an idea, an organization, or a group. Overall,

12

the controversy of Truth's memorial lied within the controversy over her story. Memorial supporters wanted Truth's story to adjust to their particular story about Truth.

The Beit Hashoah Museum of Tolerance

Prosise (2003) also looked at the adjustment of stories to fit one's own agenda in relation to the Beit Hashoah Museum of Tolerance. Prosise (2003) considered the Beit Hashoah Museum of Tolerance designers' desire to create a museum that represented not only the Holocaust story, but also expressed the need for more acceptance of diversity. Thus, at its beginning the Museum of Tolerance took a specifically political direction. This political direction is not unusual as in recent years other designers have combined memorializing with a political message (Prosise, 2003).

Critics of the museum believed it did not properly tell the Holocaust story. For example, Lisus and Ericson (1995) believed that the concentration on mainly electronic media within the museum simply appeases people visiting the memorial and does not provide them with a true representation of the Holocaust. In addition to Lisus and Ericson's argument, Prosise (2003) states "critics also argue that the memory of the Holocaust promoted by the museum is inauthentic, and the spectacle and the media do orient audiences toward the present" (p. 362). Thus, for many the Beit Hashoah Museum failed to tell the personal story of the Holocaust. However, the Beit Hashoah Museum is not the only place of its kind to be criticized for its political stance (Prosise, 2003).

The Vietnam Veterans Memorial

The Vietnam Veterans Memorial also received criticism for being overly political. Critics first believed the Vietnam Veterans Memorial told an overly political story based on its design and placement. Sitting below ground the black V reaches 10 feet at its

center and covers 496.5 feet. Engraved on the glossy black granite are the names of the 57,939 men and women who lost their lives or disappeared during the Vietnam War. Some Veterans called the design shameful and others withdraw their support of its construction (Foss, 1986). After encountering this criticism the government compromised and agreed to have another memorial near the original memorial designed. After the compromise the original design was constructed and dedicated in November 1982. Two years later the compromise, a memorial depicting three diverse soldiers, was dedicated near the original memorial.

Despite the original controversy visitors to the memorial found it to be a positive experience. Foss (1986) supported this positive response stating "the opposition and negative reaction to Lin's design that surfaced prior to the construction of the memorial has quieted as a consequence of its overwhelming favorable reception by visitors" (p. 328). Thus, even though controversy arose because the memorial appeared to tell an overly political story, now one of the most attractive features of the memorial is its ability to tell a multiplicity of stories. Similar to the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, Civil Rights related memorials have also encountered controversy for the struggle between "consensual values and state power" (Gallagher, 1995, p. 110).

The Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial

Like many of the preceding examples, The Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial, or King Memorial, in Atlanta is entangled with its historical story. Like the Vietnam Veterans Memorial and the World Trade Center Memorial controversy, some of this entanglement is a result of the memorial's location (Gallagher, 1995). The King Memorial is placed within close proximity to the King Center for Nonviolent Social

14

Change, or King Center. The King Center hosts a variety of continuous programs that work towards the prevention of violence and the creation of more equality. Thus, the King Memorial and King Center are inextricably linked by King's political nonviolent stance. However, in contrast to this nonviolent stance the King Memorial and King Center are also located within close proximity to an area of Atlanta that has fallen from a thriving area to a neighborhood plagued with the effects of poverty, violence, and unemployment. As Gallagher (1995) states it "clashes directly with the coupling of the Memorial and the Center for Nonviolent Social Change, and the location of the Memorial within a larger community in need of social change" (p. 116). Thus, the memorial is a continuing narrative about the clash between violence and nonviolence that King, himself, met with during his life and civil rights movement. Hence, the memorial's location serves as one of the most prominent reminders of its historical basis.

While each of the preceding memorials encountered controversy about the story they told, other memorials were created with little controversy. Memorials such as the Oklahoma City Memorial and Pentagon Memorial were designed and constructed with little opposition. Looking at the design and construction of these two memorials lays the foundation to discuss comparisons between memorials that face opposition and memorials that do not.

Memorials Created With Little Controversy

While some memorials encounter distinct and continuous criticism other memorials are designed, approved, constructed, and dedicated with little to no opposition. The Oklahoma City Memorial and Pentagon Memorial are two of these memorials.

The Oklahoma City Memorial

The Oklahoma City Memorial fulfills the requirement to appease mourners because of the circumstance that surrounds the memorial's creation. Basically, because the government involved the families from the beginning of the design process there was little opposition to the memorial ("Design," 2000). The federal government created a group to listen to the families' ideas for a design. After receiving the families' design ideas, a group of 350 volunteers held a competition to pick a design. Overall, the families felt involved in the creative process, feeling that their story would be told because they had an input on how the memorial would look ("Design," 2000). Therefore, a year after the process began the memorial design was chosen with little controversy ("Design," 2000).

Visitors believed the story of the attacks correlated with the design of the memorial. For example, the memorial features nine silent rows with 168 chairs, a quite reflecting pool, a children's area that holds chalkboards where children can compose their thoughts for those lost, and a "Survivor Tree," an American elm that shows a powerful defiance to the terrorist attack because it withstood the attack ("Design," 2000). The families agreed with visitors' beliefs that the design of the memorial appropriately told the story of the victims of the Oklahoma City bombing. For example, when the memorial was dedicated in 2000 family members described it as bringing peace.

In addition to the agreement with the memorial, there was little opposition to placing an adjacent museum and library to the Oklahoma City Memorial. The Memorial Institute for the Prevention of Terrorism, a federally funded group, constructed an adjacent museum and library (Schuster, 2005). The purpose of both the museum and

library is to prevent future terrorist attacks by providing the public with a wealth of information about terrorism and the prevention of terrorism (National Memorial Institute for the Prevention of Terrorism, 2006). Despite this political message, the director of the adjacent museum stated "the story will be told simply, without drama" (Associated Press, 2000).

Pentagon Memorial

Another memorial that encountered little controversy was the Pentagon's memorial for the September 11th 2001 attacks. In less than one year after the attacks of September 11th, the Pentagon had rebuilt its damaged offices and created a memorial with little controversy. In May 2002 the clearing of the debris of the World Trade Center towers was finished. The same month the Pentagon completed its memorial that "includes biographies of those who were killed and names of victims engraved on a wall, much like the Vietnam Veterans Memorial" (McIntyre & Starr, 2002, p. 2). In August 2002 the damaged area of the Pentagon was reconstructed and employees returned to work in the new offices. In that same month, the Pentagon construction contractors placed a time capsule containing memorabilia of the attacks into one of the reconstructed walls. This memorabilia included cards, military patches, fire patches, and police patches of the lost, an October 11th, 2001 memorial service program, a plaque naming the 184 Pentagon attack victims, and photographs (McIntyre & Starr, 2002). The Pentagon was able to construct and dedicate a memorial within only a few months.

The Influence of the Setting

In my analysis I will argue that one of the most important elements affecting the narrative of the World Trade Center site is the setting. In the past four years, much focus

has been given to the design of the World Trade Center Site and the World Trade Center Memorial. Thus, it is important to create the groundwork to show that the setting proves a much more influential factor than the actual design of the site or memorial. Since the unveiling of the design for the World Trade Center Memorial, much public opinion and media compared the design to the Vietnam Veterans Memorial. The following will explain how the two memorials are similar in design and controversy, yet how they differ based on their location.

When judges of the World Trade Center Memorial design competition selected Michael Arad's design, it immediately carried the label of being distinctly postmodern. Comparisons between Arad's memorial design and another memorial, the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, soon followed (Arad & Walker, 2004). Family and friends of the victims of the September 11th, 2001 terrorist attacks complained about the design, calling it bleak, desolate, and unmoving (Kilroy, 2004). However, the World Trade Center Memorial is not the first of its kind to encounter such controversy. Just as the WTC Memorial and Vietnam Veterans Memorial carried a label of postmodern architecture, their designs both encountered a great deal of controversy from their beginning stages.

The World Trade Center Memorial Design Controversy

Arad's design, Reflecting Absence, won the World Trade Center Memorial Competition. Arad's design was immediately compared to the Vietnam Veterans Memorial for its minimalist focus (Rothstein, 2004). Arad's design featured sweet gum trees, open courtyards, and reflecting pools that are "reminders of the absence" (Arad & Walker, 2004). Part of the memorial sits below ground and featured a hollow room containing another pool and the names of the September 11th victims. A small

18

passageway connects the pool and a small alcove for visitors to leave memorabilia. The plaza level displayed part of the original foundations of the towers. The design was intended to be a "mediating space" belonging "both to the city and to the memorial" (Arad & Walker, 2004).

Family members, such as Anthony Gardner, believed the design's simplicity did not appropriately represent the story of September 11th. Gardner called the design "unacceptable, [and] failed to convey the horror of the attack" (Associated Press, 2004). Arad revised and re-presented his design on January 14th, 2004. Michael Arad will remain the designer, however, the incorporation of the various ideas people have for the memorial will make the permanent memorial very different from the designer's first version.

The Vietnam Veterans Memorial Design Controversy

The controversy of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial is a result of the memorial's ability to be interpreted in a multiplicity of ways. Sitting below ground, the memorial is a large black V that reaches a height of 10 feet at its center and covers 496.5 feet. Engraved on the glossy black granite are the names of the 57,939 men and women who lost their lives or disappeared during the Vietnam War. The structure is both personal and political. Researchers noted that a myriad of different meanings could be brought to the memorial (Blair, Jeppeson, & Pucci, 1991; Carlson & Hocking, 1988; Foss, 1986; Haines, 1988). The shape of the memorial could be seen as anti-war, the distinct V favoring the peace signs of the mid to late 1970s (Foss, 1986).

In contrast, for many visitors the strategic design of the memorial is deeply personal. Visitors to the site talk to the memorial, cry at the memorial, and leave so many

personal objects that an entire archive was created specifically for the memorial (Carlson & Hocking, 1988; Foss, 1986). While the Vietnam Veterans Memorial has been the subject of several scholarly articles, it is interpreted by each scholar differently. This shows the myriad of meanings one can bring to the memorial, and what they can also take away from it. Blair, Jeppeson, and Pucci (1991), Ehrenhaus and Davis (1989), Foss (1986), and Haines (1986) all discussed the controversy and compromise over the Vietnam Veterans Memorial. After the compromise the memorial quickly grew in popularity. Visitors found the memorial to be calming, using it as a place of redemption and mourning (Carlson & Hocking, 1988). Thus, despite its initial deep controversy the Vietnam Veterans Memorial managed to overcome its adversity and become one of the most visited memorials in Washington D. C.

The Similarities of the Two Memorials

The Vietnam Veterans Memorial and World Trade Center Memorial are similar in their likeness and in their ambiguity. DeRose and Haskins (2003) argued that individuals' view of public art in a public space determined what type of memorial would be suitable for the World Trade Center area. They echoed the thoughts of Foss (1986) and Ehrenhaus and Davis (1989) by arguing a memorial should be ambiguous enough that a multiplicity of meanings could be derived from it. They stated "the most suitable memorial will therefore encourage the sound of multiple and contradictory voices" (DeRose & Haskins, 2003, p. 17). Despite the numerous comparisons to the Vietnam Veterans Memorial and World Trade Center Memorial the two are distinctly different. They are different not based on their appearance, but based on their placement.

The Differences of the Two Memorials

The Vietnam Veterans Memorial is located in Washington D.C. and is only one of many national memorials located in the area. Therefore, the memorial stands in the proximity of only other memorials. In contrast, the World Trade Center Memorial will be located in an urban area that is destined to be rebuilt. The memorial will be located within close proximity of commercial buildings, shopping centers, organizational skyscrapers, and cultural centers. Thus, there is not only a controversy over the design of the memorial, but also over the location.

Another distinction between the Vietnam Veterans Memorial and World Trade Center Memorial is the reception of conflicting narratives. After its construction previous critics praised the ability of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial to carry a multiplicity of meanings and still be well received. However, much of the debate of the World Trade Center Memorial surrounds the refusal to welcome conflicting narratives. The families believe their narrative must dominate all other narratives in order for the World Trade Center Memorial to tell its appropriate story (Dunlap, 2005). Other researchers looked at how conflicting narratives cannot always coexist peacefully (Atkinson, 2003; Jorgensen-Earp & Jorgensen, 2002; Tonn, Endress, & Diamond, 1993).

Conflicting Narratives: Case Studies that Involved Controversy

Several studies consider conflicting narratives and controversy (Atkinson, 2003; Jorgensen-Earp & Jorgensen, 2002; Tonn, Endress, & Diamond, 1993). These studies explained the situation in which many narratives seem feasible and believable, however, when in confliction one narrative tends to dominate. Each study looks at the ways in which a different group of narrators attempt to convince their audience to accept their

narrative as the most feasible and the most probable. Atkinson (2003) states "it is the rhetor's hope that the narrative's audience will adopt their reality over that of another" (p. 171). Some of the narratives under examination vary drastically in their story, while others contain subtle differences. In addition one of the narratives focuses on how an opposing narrative tries to pull a dominant narrative down. In summation, exploring each of the narratives in-depth presents a basis to compare the conflicting narratives in the discussion of the World Trade Center site.

Fleming v. Florey: The Narrative of Penicillin's Discovery

Jorgensen-Earp and Jorgensen (2002) discussed narratives that were based on the same story. In their 2002 study, Jorgensen-Earp and Jorgensen discussed the discovery of penicillin and the narratives that followed. After the discovery of penicillin two main narratives emerged based on the possibility of a Nobel Prize. These two narratives were presented by Alexander Fleming and Howard Florey, who both discovered penicillin almost simultaneously. Each believed they deserved the credit for their discovery, and while each did receive a Nobel Prize, today Fleming is distinctly more noted for the discovery than Florey. Jorgensen-Earp and Jorgensen (2002) noted that the subtle differences in each discoverer's narrative about their discovery led to Fleming's prominence.

Fleming's achievement as the most notable discoverer was based upon his narrative that focused more on the popular than on the scientific. Jorgensen-Earp and Jorgensen (2002) argue "that Fleming is credited in the public mind as the discoverer of penicillin is partially due to his construction of a narrative of discovery that invited more popular participation and appealed to a beleaguered nation at war" (p. 73). Florey failed

22

to encapsulate the role as primary discoverer because of his reliance on science to explain his discovery. Jorgensen-Earp and Jorgensen (2002) state "by favoring a traditional scientific narrative of citation and precedent, Howard Florey may have missed an opportunity to present his story in popular terms" (p. 83). Basically, while both narratives discussed the same discovery, Florey's tendency to focus his narrative on scientific reason was significantly outweighed by Fleming's narrative of serendipity and providence. While Fleming was criticized within several scientific circles, he nonetheless remained the notable discoverer of penicillin over time. Overall, Jorgensen-Earp and Jorgensen (2002) encapsulated the idea that similar narratives containing only subtle differences could led to two very different endings. These subtle narratives were created in part as responses to each other. Consequently, Atkinson's (2003) study looked at narratives created in response to each other.

Intervening Narratives: Atkinson's exploration of Adbusters

Atkinson (2003) discussed a dominant narrative and the rising of a narrative in response to this dominant narrative. In other words, Atkinson looked at the campaign of Adbusters, a published magazine, which attempted to create an intervening narrative that would place holes in more prominent and embedding ad campaigns of larger multinational organizations. Adbusters is published by Media Foundation, a company that partakes in "culture jamming." Culture jamming involves actions that attempt to deter the public from the norms of participating in "consumption and capitalism" (Atkinson, 2003, p. 165).

The Media Foundation, and subsequently Adbusters, based an entire movement surrounding the concept of culture jamming called the "creative resistance" campaign. By

altering different common advertisement billboards, the "creative resistance" campaign

explained the idea of the problems with constant consumerism (Atkinson, 2003). There

are several notable features of their campaign to consider. First, they did not use one

cohesive narrative to tell their story. Instead they used bits and pieces to string together

the narrative of consumerism as problematic. Second, the creative resistance campaign

took the dominant narrative and altered it slightly to support their narrative. This

hegemonic trick helped to place an altering viewpoint on common advertisements

(Atkinson, 2003). In addition much of their narrative is built upon the defensive. The

creative resistance campaign seeks out materialistic and capitalistic tendencies in society

and then revolts against them.

Through their research Atkinson (2003) and Jorgensen-Earp and Jorgensen (2002)

found that when narratives compete or conflict ultimately a dominant narrative will win

out. This can affect how the public perceives a particular moment in history, or how they

perceive a particular organization. Thus, the two studies lay the groundwork to discuss

conflicting narratives of the World Trade Center site, as the dominant narrative has the

potential to affect not only how the public perceives a particular moment in history, but

also how they perceive the city of New York.

<div align="center">Conclusion</div>

The common theme of the critical and popular studies presented in this chapter is

that the story of a building, historical figure, event, or war can affect how individuals

approach a site, a memorial, or belief. Thus, while many of these studies did not use

Fisher's narrative paradigm directly, they all show how a story is a pivotal factor. In this

study I will use Fisher's narrative paradigm to explain the narratives surrounding the

<div align="center">24</div>

controversy of the World Trade Center site. The next section will give a discussion of Fisher's methodology and corresponding scholarly articles that explain the narrative paradigm.

CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

As previously stated, Walter Fisher introduced the concept of the narrative

paradigm in 1984. Finding fault with the traditional rational-world paradigm, Fisher

introduced the narrative paradigm to explain the idea that most human communication

was expressed through stories. Fisher believed humans held an essential story-telling

ability that allowed them to communicate various ideas, issues, and knowledge through

narratives. However, Fisher also believed that these stories must hold the ability to stand

up to scrutiny by their audience. Thus, Fisher (1987) introduced the concepts of narrative

fidelity, that contemplated the extent to which narratives "ring true," and narrative

probability, which contemplated the extent to which a narrative's parts "hung together."

If a story contained good fidelity and probability, Fisher (1989) argued, then an audience

would be more likely to accept, adhere, and understand the messages from the story (p.

56-57).

Fisher also related that a story did not stand alone; each story is only one of many

stories that can and do affect each other. If stories contained competing narratives, then

the validity of one story might outweigh the validity of another story, even though both

rang true for their audience. Overall, Fisher provided a useful rhetorical tool that,

although some scholars critique (Roberts, 2004; Rowland, 1987), provides applications to

the area of communication from its [inception] to the present day. The following presents

an overview of narrative criticism, and then the creation of Fisher's narrative paradigm,

followed by a summation of its basic concepts, and lastly an explanation of how it applies to the text.

<center>*Narrative Criticism: An Ancient Form of Rhetorical Criticism*</center>

The use of narrative criticism echoes both ancient and modern traditions. Historians can trace back the use of narrative criticism as early as Aristotle's Greece and Quintilian's Rome. Aristotle spoke about narrative extensively, including it as one of the six triads of the make-up of a drama (Grabe & Zhou, 2003). Narrative criticism grew considerably from Aristotelian times, now including elements such as Bormann's fantasy-theme analysis, Burke's dramatistic pentad, and Fisher's narrative paradigm. However, the basis of narrative criticism is much the same. Narrative criticism focuses on the drama or the story of life. It can evaluate controversies such as a shooting in Maine (Tonn, Endress, & Diamond, 1993), debates surrounding political party platforms (Smith, 1989), and the dramatic elements in the television news program *60 minutes* (Grabe & Zhou, 2003).

While narrative criticism contains a variety of methodologies for a rhetorical scholar to select, for the purpose of this study I will consider Fisher's narrative paradigm. Fisher's narrative paradigm provides the tools to suitably evaluate the news texts I am considering. In order to appropriately understand the paradigm and its uses, one must first understand the roots of the paradigm itself. While Fisher (1984, 1985) based the narrative paradigm on a myriad of resources, the most basic was the rational-world paradigm.

The Rational-World Paradigm

Fisher believed the narrative paradigm provided an extension or contrast to the rational-world paradigm. The rational-world paradigm is one of the oldest and most

<center>27</center>

essential paradigms found in rhetoric. Grounded in Aristotle's theory the rational-world paradigm views humans as "rational beings" who live within a world that provides researchable answers through the use of reason (Fisher, 1984, p. 4). The rational-world paradigm also requires a social setting, or community, that includes debate. The paradigm holds that the techniques of debate must be taught in order for it to be used correctly. Fisher (1984) stated "because being rational (being competent in argument) *must be learned*, an historic mission of education in the West has been to generate a consciousness of national community and to instruct citizens in at least rudiments of logic and rhetoric" (p. 4). Although Fisher agreed with the rational-world paradigm to a point, he believes that the paradigm has become overly specialized and a difficult fit in modern society. Fisher also complained that over time the paradigm has excessively habituated the skill of argument. Basically, the rational-world paradigm focuses too narrowly on the study of argument. Thus, Fisher's goal was to establish a new paradigm that captures the creativity of argument. This argument is judged on its own basis with how it makes good connections both internally and externally. Fisher (1984) stated "the narrative paradigm, may offer a better solution, one that will provide substance not only for public moral argument, but also all other forms of argument, for human communication in general" (p. 6).

Humans as Story-Tellers

Fisher (1984) believed that humans possessed an essential need to communicate through the use of stories. Fisher (1985) saw people as "authors and co-authors who creatively read and evaluate the texts of life and literature" (p. 74). Thus, humans are those who provide symbolic meaning to their own created stories, while also assessing

the symbolic meaning of the stories they hear. These stories people create and assess include numerous texts that feature both oral and written communication (Brinson & Brown, 1997). Fisher's idea of a continual assessment of stories conveyed that a story should contain elements that can stand up to scrutiny. Therefore, in order for a narrative to be justifiable it must contain "good reasons" (Fisher, 1984). If a narrative provides good reasons it contains proof of a connection among various parties (Brinson & Brown, 1997; Wood, 2005; Young, 2005). Wood (2005) agrees by stating "not all stories are equally compelling and…human beings use a narrative form of rationality to judge the stories" (p. 107). Brinson and Brown (1997) echo Wood's claim when they state that good reasons "provide support for points of view by providing evidence" (p. 104). Essentially this evidence, or good reasons, must not only make sense but also display rationality. In relation to conflicting stories, the story that makes the most sense and displays the most rationality should, in theory, outweigh the less effective story.

Narrative Fidelity

Fisher (1987) referenced narratives that made sense as those that rang true. If a story rings true with its audience, then Fisher believed it contained narrative fidelity. Eaves and Savoie (2005) write "narrative fidelity refers to the ability to which a story adapts or relates to the audience's beliefs, values, or experiences" (p. 94). In short, a story must connect with numerous individuals or groups in order for it to be effective. Hollihan and Riley (1987) demonstrate when a story contains narrative fidelity in their study of a support group. They state "the story met the test for narrative fidelity because it resonated with their [the support group's] own feelings that they were essentially good people whose only failing had been that they were too permissive and not as tough as their own

parents had been" (p. 23). Furthermore, other studies find support for narrative fidelity

when people see that a story applies to them, "articulates their role," or displays

"trustworthy guides to action" (Brinson & Brown, 1997; Carpenter, 1986; Smith, 1989;

Wood, 2005). In contrast, if individuals find that the story does not "ring true" they are

apt to refute the story, or simply disregard it. Thus, the story must relate to a versatile

audience.

Narrative Probability

　　　Fisher (1984) believed that a good narrative must contain evident connections

within the narrative. In other words, the story must "hang together" (Fisher, 1984). Thus,

narrative probability combines all the different pieces of a story to see if it creates the

appropriate cohesive puzzle. When audiences assess this narrative puzzle, or story, they

consider a variety of characteristics including setting, characters, narrator, event,

temporal relations, causal relations, audience, and theme (Foss, 1996). People assess

these different characteristics based on the believability of each element and the

believability of the connections made between the elements (Eaves & Savoie, 2005). If

people can see how the different characteristics fit then they will, in theory, see the

narrative as coherent. For example, Eaves and Savoie (2005) demonstrate a television

show's accomplishment of narrative coherence through the show's dedication to air

continuously. They state "since the show is simultaneously broadcast on the web 24/7,

the viewers are able to see the contestants, the house, and the communication between

houseguests that are not aired on network TV" (p. 93). In short, because viewers feel they

can access the show at all hours then the show simply records events that happen in the

house without edit. Thus, viewers feel events that happen in the house parallel events that

happen to ordinary individuals. Therefore, narrative probability is established and the show and its stories gain popularity. In contrast, if a story does not make the appropriate connections within the story, then people are likely to see the story as invalidated (Brinson & Brown, 1997; Eaves & Savoie, 2005; Wood, 2005). The story will also be nullified if it first makes the appropriate connections but then fails to keep those same connections together. The story-teller who discredits his or her own story then encounters conflicting narratives.

Conflicting/Competing Narratives

Stories do not exist alone. Each narrative must be viewed within its wider context: the culture that the narrative relates to, the stories that precede and follow that narrative, and the audience that considers the narrative. Brinson and Brown (1997) state "stories do not exist in a vacuum; they reside in a cultural context in which other stories compete with their message" (p. 108). In essence a story must be able to not only "ring true" and "hang together," it must also be able to stand against other stories that contrast or parallel it. Occasionally narratives compete and a particular narrative emerges as the most dominant (Brinson & Brown, 1997; Jorgensen-Earp & Jorgensen, 2002; Tonn, Endress, & Diamond, 1993). Seeing which narrative emerges as the most dominant provides insight into the structure of the narratives and their fidelity and probability. It proposes the question: Can two stories have narrative fidelity and probability, yet one still emerges as the most valid? In Fisher's view, the answer is yes. Fisher (1985) argued that "meaning and value of a story are always a matter of how it stands with or against other stories" (p. 358). Thus, even if two narratives contain valid probability and fidelity on

31

their own, one narrative may prove to "hang together" and "ring true" better than the other narrative.

Conflicting narratives: A case study.

In their study of a deer hunting accident, Tonn, Endress, and Diamond (1993) supported the idea that if two narratives conflict then one will emerge as the most dominant. In the study the authors found that multiple narratives emerged after the shooting of Maine newcomer, Karen Wood, by a local hunter, Donald Rogerson. Those people who supported Wood presented a narrative of Rogerson as a careless detriment to an all-American family. In contrast, those people who supported Rogerson presented a narrative of Wood as an intruding outsider who failed to know the obvious rules of the area. Despite the prominence of both narratives, Rogerson's narrative eventually overcame Wood's narrative, which was seen through Rogerson being found not guilty of any crime. This example presents two narratives that existed within a large controversy, and one eventually outweighed the other.

Tonn, Endress, & Diamond (1993) addressed how Wood's death provoked considerable controversy because of several narratives. First, there was the preceding narrative about newcomers and Maine. Second, there was the preceding narrative about hunting season. Third, there were the conflicting narratives about Wood and her killer, Daniel Rogerson, after Wood's death. First, the preceding narrative about newcomers to Maine involved the idea that newcomers infringed on Maine's unique and historical land. Maine locals readily disputed the building of new subdivisions in areas of Maine that they preferred to keep natural. Second, the preceding narrative about hunting season was that locals already knew the rules of hunting and newcomers did not. Locals knew that

32

during hunting season one was to not go outside in a wooded area without an orange vest. The first and second narratives almost went hand in hand, as locals knew the rules and the infringing newcomers did not. Therefore, Wood, a newcomer, did not know the rules of Maine, and so the two preceding narratives weigh heavily against her own narrative from the start. In contrast Rogerson, a Maine local who was not only beloved by his community but also a seasoned hunter, had the two preceding narratives supporting him. After the death of Wood, post narratives emerged. One narrative supported Wood, focusing on her as being all-American, a housewife with two small children. The other narrative supported Rogerson, focusing on him as a beloved hunter who made a mistake because of the denseness of the wooded area. Eventually Rogerson's narrative proved victorious because he not only had the present narrative, but also the preceding two narratives supporting him. All the narratives appeared to carry some feasibility and probability in their own context. However, it is apparent that preceding narratives commonly dictate which future narrative will dominate.

The Narrative Paradigm as Part of Memory and Memorial

There are many rhetorical implications of memory and memorializing (Burke, 1969; Hasian, 2004; Kitch, 2002). One of these implications is the need for memorializing is always brought by death. For Burke (1966) death is not just loss of a body but also loss of rhetorical meaning. In short a deceased individual cannot continue to create their own meaning, leaving their family and friends to justify and relay that meaning. Fisher (1984) believed that the creation and continuation of meaning was dealt with through stories. Kitch (2002) and Hasian (2004) echoed Fisher's belief when they explored the continuation of stories in a memorial setting.

The U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum

Hasian (2004) argued that the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum (USHMM) contained the narrative "Americanize the Holocaust" (p. 64). Hasian believed that the meaning of the Holocaust was somewhat lost amongst the telling of stories that linked America and the Holocaust. In addition, the author believed that the narrative of the museum combined past and present politics, something often found with structures representing historical events. Hasian stated "the selective nature of all forms of Holocaust memory-work means that critics will have to pay attention to more than just an accurate retrieval of past events" (p. 66). Thus, the museum has been the target of controversy because of its placement, its representation, and its meaning.

Hasian argues that the "curators, planners, and fund raisers" are the narrators causing the Americanization of the museum. He also notes that there are conflicting narratives between those who believe the USHMM should be in the United States and those who believe it should be placed elsewhere. In essence, America's involvement in World War II brings question to whether there is a political overcompensation to make up for America's guilt about the war in general. Others feared that the USHMM would become too commercialized if it was built in America, taking away from the essential purpose of the museum. Hasian found that despite the controversy over how the Holocaust was represented, ultimately the museum could only create stories for certain aspects of the Holocaust. Hasian's article is important because, while it does not use Fisher's methodology, it brings to light several critical aspects of a narrative. First, Hasian discusses the important influence of the narrator. Second, Hasian considers how a narrative can affect the reception of a museum that memorializes. Both of these concepts

relate directly to Fisher's idea of conflicting narratives. According to Fisher, narratives can influence opinions. Thus, when narratives are in conflict, the situation of which narrative to believe arises.

Journalism and the Narrative of the Kennedy's

Kitch (2002) discussed the narrative created by the Kennedy family. In particular, Kitch considered how the Kennedy's became a narrative that represented the country's essential values. She examined the media's coverage of the mourning of John F. Kennedy Jr. and how it continued this narrative. Two different aspects of Kitch's study made it especially relevant to not only Fisher's methodology, but also the study at hand. First, Kitch studied the use of narrative combined with myths and values. Fisher carefully considered how particular myths and values could influence individuals. Fisher stated "it is only when communication is considered seriously in regard to its advice or fostering of a particular belief, attitude, or action that the narrative paradigm becomes relevant" (1989, p. 57). Second, Kitch looked at the role of the media in creating the narrative. Kitch states "journalism is at the center of the process of creating and conveying mythic narratives to the public" (2002, p. 296). Overall, Kitch established a link between journalism and story-telling that can be extended beyond her article.

While Kitch (2002) and Hasian (2004) both looked at the narrative of particular memorial processes, neither used Fisher's narrative paradigm for their studies. Thus, applying Fisher's narrative paradigm to the rhetorical debate surrounding the World Trade Center site not only uses past articles, but it also presents a new context for applying the methodology.

Opposition to Fisher's Narrative Paradigm

While Fisher's narrative paradigm proves valuable to the study of communication, it is still critiqued as a viable tool in its pure form. Rowland (1987) authored a scathing article that claimed the narrative paradigm was too wide-ranging. Rowland argued that the narrative paradigm could not viably be applied to any and all discourse. In addition, Rowland believed that if the paradigm was applicable to all discourse, then it would lose essential fidelity because, in his opinion, a paradigm must have a narrow enough scope to be a critical tool. I think Rowland is mistaken because the author distinctly overlooks the fact that the rational-world paradigm could be seen as applying to all communication through the lens of debate. If the rational-world paradigm can use this particular lens, then the narrative paradigm should be able to use the lens of story to look at communication.

Rowland (1987) also debates the idea that if a story contains narrative probability and narrative fidelity then it is true for its audience. I concede to the fact that a narrative can contain probability and fidelity but still not tell a true story. However, as Fisher (1989) stated in his reply to Rowland, "if I were to respond to Professor Rowland's essay in the usual way, I would argue that he does not test the narrative paradigm, he tests his understanding of it, and it is his understanding that fails" (p. 55). Fisher (1984) did not state that the story must be actual reality; instead Fisher argued that the story must just present a reality that is true for its particular audience.

The debate about the broadness and lens of the narrative paradigm are two of the most basic critiques of the paradigm. Currently, some researchers have attempted to change the narrative paradigm to modernize it. Roberts (2004) proposed the creation of a

performance paradigm, in which the narrative paradigm could expand to include folklore. The inclusion of folklore, Roberts believed, would focus on some central features of the narrative that Fisher did not specifically detail. However, for the purpose of my study Fisher's basic narrative paradigm provides a useful tool. The paradigm provides a useful tool through its use of the story to explicate communication. When Fisher (1989) discussed the connection between the paradigm and communication the author states "the narrative paradigm is a philosophical statement that is meant to offer an approach to the assessment and interpretation of human communication" (p. 57). Thus, the paradigm's thoughtful approach to assessing and interpreting communication, such as conflict, makes it a useful application to the narrative of the rebuilding of the World Trade Center site.

<center>The Narrative Paradigm as a Rhetorical Tool</center>

In Fisher's (1984) view, a paradigm was "a representation design to formalize the structure of a component of experience and to direct understanding and inquiry into the nature and functions of that experience--in this instance, the experience of human communication" (p. 2). Basically, Fisher thought a paradigm was a tool categorizing communication in an organized way thereby creating a basis for others to analyze this communication. Fisher applied this belief about paradigms to narrative criticism. This move of correlating narrative criticism and paradigm connected two elements of rhetoric: "the argumentative, persuasive theme and the literary, aesthetic theme" (Fisher, 1984, p. 2). In short, Fisher (1984) took the idea of debate from the rational-world paradigm and considered it as a creative, ever-changing form. For this study, I will also consider the concepts of persuasion and argumentation as they are within the overall concept of debate or discussion. While Fisher's narrative paradigm has been used within the realm of

political debate (Smith, 1989; Smith & Smith, 2000), for the purposes of this study I consider the concept of debate as it relates to the discussion of the rebuilding of the World Trade Center site.

According to Foss (1996) using the narrative paradigm to analyze an artifact includes two steps: "(1) a comprehensive examination of the narrative; and (2) selection of elements on which to focus" (p. 402). Following these two steps proves beneficial because it first provides the reader with a complete analysis of the narrative, which then lays the groundwork to show the researcher's decisions in analysis of the material. In order for a researcher to provide a complete analysis of the narrative, she or he should answer a set of questions involving different elements of the narrative. These questions address the setting, characters, narrator, events, temporal relations, causal relations, audience, and theme of the narrative (p. 402-405).

Basically the researcher gives an overview of the most distinguishing qualities of the narrative. After the researcher provides this overview he or she should then select the elements they will focus on in their analysis (p. 405). This can be problematic as critics might question why certain elements are more important than other elements, claiming the researcher is choosing elements simply based upon her or his own biases. However, as rhetorical critic, the researcher must make particular choices in order to carefully examine the narrative. The task of selecting to address every possible element proves not only cumbersome, but also diverting from the nature of rhetorical critique. Foss argues that the selection of elements should be those that most fully encompass the purpose of the study. Foss states "these features [selected elements] are those that provide the clearest, most coherent, and most insightful answer to the research question" (p. 405).

38

Each element of Foss' critical examination of the narrative plays a vital role in defining the narrative of the World Trade Center site. Discussing each element lays the groundwork to display the continual debate about rebuilding and renewing at the site. Fisher (1987) discussed how the narrative paradigm turns on the situational elements of the narrative. In other words, one can only judge the fidelity and probability of a narrative if they have a clear understanding of the complete narrative. Thus, Foss' critical examination of the narrative creates the framework to aptly apply Fisher's narrative paradigm to the text.

Narrative Criticism and the Controversy over Rebuilding the World Trade Center

For the purposes of this study, narrative criticism and Fisher's narrative paradigm will be used in their most basic forms to look at the controversy over rebuilding the World Trade Center site. I will first give a comprehensive examination of the complete narrative to create a basis for the rest of my analysis of the articles. This comprehensive examination will show why I chose to look at two particular groups for my analysis: those with an economic interest in the memorial and those with a personal interest in the memorial. I will then apply Fisher's principles of narrative fidelity and narrative probability to each group's narrative. Lastly, I will discuss Fisher's principle of competing narratives and draw conclusions as to why one narrative proves more prominent than the other for the future of the World Trade Center site.

CHAPTER IV: ANALYSIS

September 11, 2001, is considered one of the most infamously memorable days in United States history. The television coverage of the attacks placed unimaginable and despairing visions in Americans' minds (James, 2001). Consequently, the nation needed a way to quickly recover from the attacks to prove to other nations that the United States would not crumble in the face of adversity. Larry Silverstein, the lease holder of the World Trade Center, stated of rebuilding "to do anything less. . .would be to simply give an incredible victory to those who sought to destroy our way of life" (Pristin, 2001, p. B8). The need for recovery and renewal became emblazoned in memorabilia across the country (Holloway, 2001). New York government officials began creating a commission to oversee the recovery and rebuilding of the area just six days after the attacks (Perez-Pena, 2001). They took an affirmative step in a quick recovery process by clearing the debris ridden area of Ground Zero in exactly nine months, three months before schedule ("Turning," 2002). This quick recovery process provided hope that the rebuilding process would follow the same timely schedule. An article in *The New York Times* states "it is now time to apply the same energy and dedication [as applied to clearing the debris] to determining what sort of memorial and urban world should be created there [Ground Zero]" ("Turning," 2002).

However, as design plans for rebuilding the site began to flow in (some coming weeks after the attacks) the quick pace turned to a slow crawl. A variety of groups spoke

out about the rebuilding process, determined to make their story heard (Wyatt, 2002c). Thus, the narrative aspect of the rebuilding process is of particular relevance to this study.

This chapter contains an analysis of articles printed in *The New York Times* for the months of September from 2001 to 2005. These articles were selected because they specifically relayed the rebuilding process narrative. Using this material to form a narrative analysis, this chapter will address the fundamental question regarding rebuilding presented in Chapter I: How does one create a framework for evaluating conflicting narratives in order to more fully explain why the rebuilding process is taking so long?

This study is an exercise in rhetorical criticism, not a chronological recap of events. Its purpose is to interpret the narrative found in a collection of rhetorical artifacts from a particular era. Therefore, it cannot encapsulate every argument or conflict regarding the memorial. Instead it relies on the most public arguments and those that attend to the core of the rebuilding processes' stagnation.

In staying with the thesis stated in the beginning of my study, I argue that the conflict of interests between the families of the victims and those who have an economic interest in the area are the cause of the sluggishness of the reconstruction process. Like the Karen Woods tragedy, or the penicillin discovery conundrum, the conflicting narratives of the family and economic groups caused numerous delays in the reconstruction of the World Trade Center site.

Application of the Critical Method

As expressed in Chapter I, the critical method used in this study is an examination of a narrative, with emphasis on Fisher's narrative paradigm. There are three steps that

comprise the analysis with the critical method. The critic must first do a comprehensive examination of the narrative to give the reader an appropriate understanding of the narrative. Second, the rhetorical critic employs Fisher's paradigm by looking at the narratives' fidelity and probability. Third, the rhetorical critic explains the conflicting narratives and establishes the foundation for the discussion of why the rebuilding process was preempted.

<div align="center">Comprehensive Examination of the Narrative</div>

Foss (1996) stated that a comprehensive examination of the narrative was essential to prepare the research to analyze the narrative. Fisher (1987) believed that "the quality of rhetoric is inevitably influenced situationally" (p. 124). Moreover, the narrative situation determines how one can evaluate the merit of the narrative. The following presents a collective examination of the 56 various articles from *The New York Times* that focused on the controversy of the September 11th World Trade Center site during the September months of 2001 to 2005.

Fisher (1989) posited that the situation affected the narrative. Similarly, Foss' (1996) believed that one must do a comprehensive examination of a narrative in order to discover the most pertinent aspects of the narrative. Therefore, the next section will complete the task of fully examining the narrative by looking at eight different aspects of the narrative: setting, characters, narrator, events, temporal relations, causal relations, audience, and theme.

Elements of Foss' Narrative

This section provides a full examination of the narrative under analysis. Foss (1996) believed that narratives "allow us to interpret reality because they help us decide

<div align="center">42</div>

what a particular experience 'is about' and how the various elements of our experience are connected" (p. 399). Therefore, relying on Foss' notion of the narrative, in order to understand how different pieces of a narrative come together, one must obtain a full understanding of the narrative. Thus, this section uses Foss' eight narrative characteristics to examine the narrative of the World Trade Center site.

Setting. Foss (1996) believed that the discovery of the setting included analyzing how the setting was created, the changes the setting incurred over time, and its relation to the overall plot (p. 402). The setting of the articles takes place at the World Trade Center site, or "Ground Zero." In 2001, after the September 11th attacks, media, locals, and the government appropriately labeled the demolished buildings and the area surrounding it Ground Zero. Ground Zero includes the footprints of the two towers and a parameter of 16 acres reaching out around the footprints (Iovine, 2001). The setting is integral because it influences the conflicting narratives of this study. There are two reasons the setting is under dispute.

First, there are other areas within close proximity to Ground Zero that influence the setting. These areas are part of the rebuilding process and also part of the controversy. These areas are controversial because the parameters of what is "sacred ground" are not properly defined (Purnick, 2002; Wyatt, 2002c). Some denote the complete area as sacred ground, while others dismiss this claim. Wyatt stated "there is the question of what, exactly, should be considered hallowed ground" (2002c). The problem of discovering the boundary of sacred ground is a result of a memorial and commercial businesses being built in the same vicinity (Holusha, 2001). Accordingly, the World Trade Center

43

Memorial will be placed at Ground Zero. However, in order to rebuild the economy of the area, Ground Zero must include multiple commercial buildings.

The second reason the setting is so highly disputed relates to the setting's creation. The September 11th attacks created Ground Zero. Therefore, the setting encounters controversy because people died at the site, so people want the ground to be sacred (Bagli, 2002; Dunlap, 2005a; Dunlap, 2005b; Dunlap, 2005d; Montebello, 2001; Purnick, 2002; Wyatt, 2002c). However, the setting also has to be rebuilt in order to reclaim any economic value back to the land (Dunlap, 2005a; Holusha, 2001; Martel, 2003; Ouroussof, 2005; Pogrebin, 2005; Purnick, 2001). *The New York Times* articles spend a great deal of time describing the setting, an empty desolate space (Lewis, 2001; Montebello 2001). The articles also emphasize the description of what the setting will eventually become (Cheatham, 2001; Iovine, 2001; Johnson & Bagli, 2002; Kirke, 2001; Leone, 2001; Lunke, 2001; Nagourney 2001). People were so eager to discuss the setting after September 11th that architects and designers requested fervent parties use some restraint. For example, Municipal Art Society executive director, Frank Sanchis, stated on September 27th, 2001, sixteen days after the attacks, "we feel things are moving too fast. We're put off and frightened by all the announcements of commissions and building the towers back up. It just hasn't sunk in" (Iovine, 2001).

Characters. Foss (1996) believed that one should discover the main characters of the narrative and their distinguishable traits. These distinguishable traits include the characters' amount of predictability in their choices and their likeliness to change over time (p. 402). Many important characters interact within the narrative. However, the main characters can be divided into three groups: the economic characters, the family

characters, and the political characters. The economic group basically consists of four

main groups: The Port Authority, Larry Silverstein, The Lower Manhattan Development

Corporation, and Daniel Libeskind. *The New York Times* describes the economic group as

ambitious visionaries looking to unify the area commercially (Leone, 2001).

The Port Authority specifically commissioned the creation of the twin towers in

the 1960s and, until the destruction of the towers, controlled the transportation aspects of

the area (Wyatt, 2002c). Overall, the opinions of the Port Authority are seen as

reasonable and required. Port Authority representatives mainly discuss the infrastructure

of the site, and the elements they seek to include are viewed as necessary and inevitable.

For instance, family members protested plans for the new PATH station to run under the

footprints of the two towers because they believed this area to be sacred ground.

However, Joseph J. Seymour, executive director of the Port Authority, stated "I think

you're going to find that the PATH station is going to stay where it is" (Wyatt, 2002b, p.

31). Seymour continued, claiming that although there had been several ideas about

moving the station, the only reasonable place to have the station was under the footprints

of the towers in its original location.

Larry Silverstein holds the most pivotal position in determining the rebuilding of

Ground Zero. Silverstein is the leaseholder of the World Trade Center, giving him access

to all of the insurance money from the twin towers (Traub, 2003). Silverstein is shown as

a monetary provider for the rebuilding process (Bagli, 2003a; Bagli, 2003b). *The Times*

contains several articles that discuss Silverstein's battle to gain control of the insurance

money from the site. Silverstein presents his request for the insurance money as

reasonable (Bagli, 2003b). However, insurance companies and the second-circuit court in

New York see his request as overzealous. Overall, the discussion of funds divulges the knowledge that Silverstein will ultimately hold control over billions of dollars that will go towards rebuilding the site. In addition to the financial control, government support provided Silverstein even more control over the rebuilding of the new site. *The Times* reporter, James Traub, states "Larry Silverstein. . .has become, with the clear support of Gov. George Pataki, the lead player in the rebuilding process" (2003, p. (6)17).

The Lower Manhattan Development Corporation (LMDC) is "the state agency created to supervise the rebuilding of ground zero and the financial district" (Muschamp, 2002, p. (6)46). The LMDC held the design competition for the site and the memorial. The LMDC are seen as the moderators of the economic group. They deal with the public the most often, answering complaints and attempting to prevent future complaints about the design of the site and the design of the memorial. For instance, Roland Betts, a director of the LMDC, stated about the design competition

> Without being naive about the complexity -- political and from an engineering
>
> and technological standpoint -- of the problem in front of us, Mr. Betts said, I
>
> think all of us are extremely optimistic that the step [selection of teams for the
>
> design competition] taken today is going to yield a solution (Wyatt, 2002d, p. B1)

Thus, the LMDC plays the role of a moderator, admitting the difficulties of the plan, but also showing that rebuilding progress is being made.

Daniel Libeskind is the designer of the World Trade Center site. Selected by Larry Silverstein and the LMDC, Libeskind won the design competition giving him the artistic control over the new site. Libeskind is one of the most prominent promoters of a futuristic renewal of Ground Zero. He is shown as ambitious and imaginative, if not

overzealous (Martel, 2003). *The Times* reporter, Ned Martel, states that "whether talking

to developers or high-school students, this odd visionary [Libeskind] peaks the language

of a conceptual artist with a carnival barker's fluid delivery" (2003, p. B14). Despite

Libeskind's passionate belief in his design, he does not wield the same control over the

design as Silverstein and the LMDC. As the contention for retail and memorial space

grows, Libeskind is required to change and even move elements of his design in order to

accommodate requests (Wyatt, 2003b). However, Libeskind's willingness to change and

alter the design made him the clear winner of the design competition. Thus, Libeskind is

a character portrayed as not only ambitious, but also flexible (Wyatt, 2003a). As stated by

Port Authority official, Joseph Seymour, "The genius of Daniel Libeskind. . .is that he

worked hard with us to understand all the engineering and transportation elements on the

site. He showed his flexibility" (Wyatt, 2003a, p. B1).

The economic group spends most of their time coming up with different plans,

designs, and visions for the site (Wyatt, 2002a; Wyatt, 2002b; Wyatt, 2003a). After their

2002 unveiling of a "master plan," the economic groups declared that the plan may

endure some changes, but would maintain its original concept and purpose. They also

hoped to keep their stringent timeline that conceived some retail stores opening as early

as 2009 (Dunlap, 2005f). The economic group continually stands behind its master plan,

despite several revisions. For example, when the master plan was revised in 2003, the

economic group stated that despite revisions it was still "superior to that of the World

Trade Center design of the 1970s" (Wyatt, 2003, p. B1). In addition, when civic groups

claimed that the design lacked organization, the economic supporters defended the master

plan (Dunlap, 2004b). Kevin Rampe, development corporation president, stated that they

were working on re-organizing the design to fit the area, but "the master plan was not being diluted in any way" (Dunlap, 2004b, p. B4).

The family group consists of a myriad of characters who have anointed themselves representatives of the victims of the September 11th attacks. As stated in the introduction, the family members include specific vocal individuals and those in support of the "Take Back the Memorial" campaign. *The New York Times* describes the group as unsatisfied mourners who are looking to make the entire area sacred (Barron & Connelly, 2004). Family members spend a large amount of their time disputing the economic groups "master plan" for its inclusion of items the families do not want near the memorial (Wyatt, 2002c). The family group starts out playing on the offensive, claiming that they want only particular things included near the memorial. However over the course of four years the family moves to the defensive, simply awaiting each new plan or design to be unveiled (Dunlap, 2005c). After a new plan or design is unveiled the family members immediately dispute it (Dunlap, 2005c).

The political characters consist of two main characters: George Pataki, current governor of New York, and Michael Bloomberg, current mayor of New York City. *The New York Times* posits that Governor Pataki contradicts his own opinions about culture and freedom (Dunlap, 2005f). For example, the article "Pataki Solution Flies in the Face of Planning" presents a timeline that shows how Governor Pataki drastically changed his opinions of the Freedom Center over time. The article discusses that in 2002 Governor Pataki fully supported designs for downtown that included a culturally driven museum. In 2003 he also supported cultural proposals that would be included in the area. In 2004 Governor Pataki supported the building of the Freedom Center stating that "the Freedom

Center has formed a committee of outstanding individuals to create vibrant content on the global quest for what our own Declaration of Independence deems the inalienable rights of humanity" (Dunlap, 2005g, p. B8). Thus, it was not until 2005 when complaints about the Freedom Center grew more boisterous, that Pataki decided the Freedom Center did not fit with the WTC area. Another excerpt from the article states "Mr. Pataki's decision to evict the Freedom Center flies in the face of a long planning process" (Dunlap, 2005g, p. B8).

The Times describes Mayor Bloomberg as a silent push-over, who sides with the cultural and economic parties, yet is always silenced by Governor Pataki's demands (Dunlap, 2005e). Despite the fact that Mayor Bloomberg relinquished the control over the site to Governor Pataki, Mayor Bloomberg is seen by citizens as a supporter of the arts and culture. Thus, even though Mayor Bloomberg has no control over the site, reporters, such as Dunlap and Pogrebin, take issue with his reluctance to stop Governor Pataki's removal of the cultural building. Pogrebin (2005) states that Mayor Bloomberg's failure to more publicly protest the removal is "a noticeable absence given his widely known commitment to culture" (p. E33). Dunlap (2005e) noted that while Mayor Bloomberg voices significant disappointment with the decision, he also conceded to the removal of the center by stating that he understood Governor Pataki's motive. Thus, even if Mayor Bloomberg is a partisan of the cultural needs of the site, he certainly does not take a stand against any of the choices that are made.

Overall, The Times claims that Governor Pataki was once a supporter of the economic rebuilding and proposed instatement of cultural buildings in the area (Pogrebin, 2005). However, when Governor Pataki moves closer to re-election time, he switches his

support to the family members and denounces much of the cultural and commercial rebuilding proposals (Pogrebin, 2005; Dunlap, 2005e; Dunlap, 2005f). Mayor Bloomberg is a consistent party, while being mindful of the family member's desires; he always sides with the need to rebuild both commercially and culturally as soon as possible (Dunlap, 2005g). However, Governor Pataki is shown to consistently outrank Mayor Bloomberg (Pogrebin, 2005). For example, journalist Robin Pogrebin notes that Mayor Bloomberg relinquished much control over the memorial to Governor Pataki in exchange for control over other projects. Pogrebin (2005) states "the mayor long ago made a bargain with Mr. Pataki to let the governor take the lead at Ground Zero in exchange for a free hand in planning the future of the Far West Side" (p. E33). Thus, *The New York Times* displays Governor Pataki outweighing Mayor Bloomberg's opinions in the controversy.

Overall, many of the characters appear to be one-dimensional. After the first year following the attacks one can predict that if a rebuilding decision is made by the economic groups then the family members will dispute it. After the second year following the attacks one can predict that if the family members dispute the economic plans Governor Pataki will get involved. The economic characters are more multi-dimensional as they eventually change plans and visions in order to appease the family members.

Narrator. Foss (1996) states that one should discover not only who the narrator is, but how the audience views the narrator. The narrative of the conflict is told by many journalists in *The New York Times*. While each of these journalists has different opinions about the attacks, their coverage and analysis of the characters is surprisingly consistent over four years. One can sense the presence of a narrator simply by the knowledge that

these are newspaper articles. Despite this fact, it is also easy to sense the presence of a narrator based upon the subtle commentary that underlies each of the articles. Foss (1996) states one should analyze if the narrator "evaluates, criticizes, or preaches" (p. 403).One can see the narrator using this subtle commentary to evaluate and criticize different elements of the conflict. For example, journalist David Dunlap (2004b) wrote an article about Governor Pataki's decision to support Libeskind's master plan. Specifically, Dunlap discussed Frederic Schwartz, who was a close contender to Libeskind in the master plan design competition. Dunlap discusses Schwartz's disappointment with his loss to Libeskind. Although Schwartz insists that he has moved on since losing the competition, Dunlap infers differently. He writes that Schwartz's discussion of moving on is "perhaps a bit too adamantly [stated] to be entirely convincing" (p. 4B). In addition, when writing of the announcement of the decision Dunlap (2004b) states "the rest is history. Tortuous history" (p. 4B).

While Dunlap does not specifically state that Schwartz would have been a better candidate to create the master plan for the World Trade Center site, he notes that Schwartz's plans are beloved by the public. Dunlap (2004b) refers to Schwartz in the title of his article as "for two 9/11 memorials, a man who listened" (p. 4B). Although this is in reference to memorials other than the World Trade Center memorial, it is easy to see that Dunlap conjectures that where Schwartz listened others have not. Dunlap also notes that Schwartz credits his designs with "having listened to the needs and aspirations of the victims' relatives, friends and co-workers -- and having not arrived with a preconceived aesthetic approach" (p. 4B).

Another aspect of the narrator the critic should analyze is the narrator's attendance to upholding reality (Foss, 1996, p. 403). As a journalist of *The New York Times*, one of the most widely read papers in the nation, the narrator wields a great amount of influence upon the readers. The narrator is able to choose which events to describe, which family members to interview, and what economic plans to discuss. However, the narrator appears to give a comprehensive view of the discussion. This is notable from the knowledge that the analysis covers only 56 of a possible 922 articles discussing the World Trade Center controversy. Thus, if the narrator gives a detailed insight from only 56 articles, having a pool of 922 more that could be referenced shows they use some equality in their discussion of the controversy. In addition to the preceding fact, many of the articles rely on testimony through paraphrased information and quotes from the family group, economic group, and political group. Therefore, the reader can gain knowledge of the controversy based on more than an article summary. Overall, *The New York Times* is not only one of the most widely distributed newspapers, but also one of the most respected (Schwartz, 2006). This respect is shown by *The Times* being awarded 94 Pulitzer Prizes, exceeding any other newspaper (Schwartz, 2006). Hence, the newspaper's coverage of the conflict is an appropriate reflection of the actual conflict in reality.

Events. Foss (1996) believed that one should analyze the major and minor events that influence the narrative. In addition the major events should comprise the most important essence of the narrative. Basically if the major events were taken out, the narrative would be drastically changed. There are many events that encompass the conflict over the rebuilding of the World Trade Center site. However, four events remain

the most distinctive in their influence on the conflict and the affect on the outcome of the site design. The first event that shaped the conflict was the attack on September 11th 2001. While this may appear an obvious construction, the uniqueness of the attacks makes it quite distinct. The attacks on September 11th killed more than 3000 people, while simultaneously demolishing an economic pillar. Thus, a place to memorialize the victims and a place to economically rebuild are located within the same area (Ouroussoff, 2005). The World Trade Center Memorial will be built directly on top of the footprints of the towers, where numerous family members' bodies were never found (Wyatt, 2002b). The area became a mass graveyard (Bumiller, 2003; Murphy, 2001). Consequently, family members feel very strongly about what is built around the memorial. However, there are still economic groups that have a stake in the land and are rightful owners of the property (Leone, 2001). Thus, it is an unequivocal tug-of-war between the two groups over how the area should be rebuilt.

The second event that affected the conflict was the announcement of the master plan. In 2002 the Port Authority and Lower Manhattan Development Corporation announced a "master plan" for the site (Wyatt, 2003a). The Port Authority immediately encountered debate about the master plan and subsequently revised the plan to fix some of the reported issues. For example, even though Libeskind won the competition to be designer of the master plan, other economic groups still wanted a say in the design. Wyatt (2003a) reports "After Mr. Libeskind was selected, Mr. Silverstein continued to push for his own priorities" (p. B1). In fact Silverstein claimed that none of the final designs fulfilled his conditions.

Thus, the master plan endured several major changes days after its announcement. These changes included shrinking much of the open space because of transportation issues and raising the memorial floor 40 feet to accommodate concourses and train stations that would reside below it (Wyatt, 2003a). The revised plan also included adding 170,000 square feet of retail space in an attempt to entice potential tenants (Wyatt, 2003b). Although there were several revisions to the plan, the Port Authority and Daniel Libeskind remained committed to their vision. They proclaimed the changes made the plan better and more feasible. For example, Libeskind believed "the changes improved the buildings 'in every sense'" (Wyatt, 2003b, p. B1).

The third event that affected the conflict was the announcement of the selected design for the memorial. The selection of a design began the conflict over the narrative of the story of September 11th. Young (2004) stated that "the memorial is animated and sustained by the public give and take, the debates, the constant working through" (p. (14)13). Family members pondered how the memorial would appropriately tell the story of September 11th (Dunlap, 2005d). The debate over the memorial correlated with a discussion over the entire memorial area. The memorial area encompasses a 6.5 acre quadrant that family members denote as hallowed ground. Supporters of the hallowed ground believed that culture does not have a place at the site. President of the Uniformed Firefighters Association, Steve Cassidy, stated "we believe that public cultural art, dance, music and theater institutions are needed, but not on this sacred, hallowed ground" (Dunlap, 2005a, p. B4). Family members readily stated that the entire area surrounding the memorial should represent the proper story of September 11th. However, many feel that the current memorial design and area does not aptly support the story. Debra

Burlingame, who lost her brother in the attacks, stated "there is so much wrong with this memorial" (p. B4). The need for the memorial to justly tell the story of September 11th led to the removal of the International Freedom Center and Design Center, the fourth event that affected the conflict.

As previously stated, when Governor Pataki announced the International Freedom Center and Design Center were being permanently removed from the site, this encompassed the fourth major event affecting the memorial. Family members took the removal as a victory step in keeping unwanted visions out of the area (Dunlap, 2005e). These critics "contended that the center would take away space that could be used for a museum devoted solely to 9/11 and that it would detract from the solemnity of the memorial by focusing on geopolitics and on national and international social history" (Dunlap, 2005g, p. B8).

However, others, including the *Times* and Freedom Center board members, saw it as an overt attempt by Governor Pataki to appease an overly demanding group. For instance, President of the Lower Manhattan Cultural Council, Tom Healy, stated of the decision to remove the Freedom Center "when they [culture advocates and political figures] got in trouble, no one was willing to stick their neck out against the families" (Pogrebin, 2005, p. E33). In addition, a late edition editorial of the *Times* made several openly critical assertions about Governor Pataki's decision stating that Pataki "killed" many chances to have an open discussion about the Freedom Center, and ignored cultural plans that had changed little since their induction with the master plan in 2002. In addition the *Times* made this last appeal about Governor Pataki's decision:

nor does it seem to have mattered that the protest against the Freedom Center --

or, more truthfully, against any cultural presence at the World Trade Center site --

was based on false information and a profound fear of free speech" ("Leveling,"

2005, p. A30).

This presented the culmination of an opposing story of September 11th from a

personal and economic standpoint (Dunlap, 2005e). The family members believed that

they held the right to confer what should be placed at the memorial site. Family member,

Charles Wolf, stated "the fact of the matter is that families have a right to deal with the

memorial quadrant and its environs" (Dunlap, 2005f, p. B1). However, economic and

political groups posited that there had to be rebuilding to rejuvenate the area. John P.

Cahill, chief of staff for Governor Pataki, stated "I have met with many business and

community leaders, and they have told me firsthand about the need to expeditiously

restore retail at the World Trade Center site. I could not agree more" (Dunlap, 2005g, p.

B1). Family members again took a stand against retail plans near the memorial,

unsatisfied with just the removal of cultural buildings. Family member, Charles Wolf,

questioned "how hypocritical will it be for us to have a totally 9/11-related memorial

quadrant and directly across Greenwich Street you have shops facing it which, overtly by

their signage, are inappropriate?" (Dunlap, 2005f, p.B1) Thus the controversy over the

placement of the two centers expressed two conflicting narratives over the story of

September 11th.

Foss (1996) believed that minor events functioned to more fully elaborate the

major events. If they were deleted from the narrative it would not drastically change the

story's structure, yet they provided additional insight and commentary on the tone of the

narrative (Foss, 1996, p. 404). Many minor events potentially shaped the major events, however, three prove the most prominent: the re-election of Governor Pataki, the debate over reason, and the debate over the characteristics of a hero. First, the re-election of Governor Pataki provides the turning point in Governor Pataki's opinions about the design and rebuilding of the site. If the information of Governor Pataki's re-election was eliminated, the reader would still receive the narrative about his changed opinion of the site. However, with the re-election knowledge placed within the articles, it provides a political spin to any decisions Governor Pataki makes about the site. For example, Wyatt (2003a) discusses Pataki's approval of the newly revised plan for the placement and monetary funds of the memorial. Wyatt (2003a) makes a point to state that Pataki's proposal coincides with "muting any significant controversy over the Ground Zero project that could disrupt Mr. Pataki's re-election campaign" (p. 1B). This political spin ultimately questions Governor Pataki's credibility and validity to make decisions about the rebuilding of the site.

Second, the debate over reason is subtly seen in different articles. Through a series of letters to the editor, different people ponder if it is reasonable to re-build so soon, if the families' influence on the site is reasonable, and if the economic visions considering the site are reasonable. For example, Chris Burke, a member of the Freedom Center advisory group, uses reason to guide his opinion about the debate over the major event of the removal of the Freedom Center (Dunlap, 2005d). Burke (2005 September 23) states "I'm not coming out in favor of the center. I'm not coming out against it. I'm in favor of reason" (p. 3B). Ultimately, this debate places the questions of a few into the minds of many. The growing question about the sagacity of rebuilding creates a problem

57

for the economic group. The economic group then finds themselves having to place more support behind their "master plan" and their narrative about rebuilding.

Third, the debate over what makes a hero is shown through different references to heroes throughout the articles. While some reference all of the victims as heroes, others state that only some of the victims are heroes, and others believe none were heroes because of the event. For example, Mayor Bloomberg states "all Americans, but particularly organized labor, were heros[sic] on 9/11" (Greenhouse, 2002 p. 3B). This contrasts with others' view that an attack of this kind does not denote heroes (Purnick, 2002, p. B1). Garry Willis, a historian, counters Mayor Bloomberg's statement that Americans were heroes on September 11th. Willis states that "we honor soldiers not because they were killed, but because they risked being killed. They go into battle, go into that situation. They deserve a special kind of honor" (Purnick, 2002, p. B1). Basically, Willis contends that people do not become heroes simply by being the victim of a terrorist attack. In addition, Willis believes that Ground Zero is neither a burial ground nor hallowed ground because of the circumstances surrounding the attacks and the meaning of the World Trade Center site. Thus, the debate provides some important background on the impending debate over the memorial at the World Trade Center site. Thus, the discussion over heroes in 2002 provides a significant link to later conflicts about the rebuilding of the site and the building of the memorial.

Temporal Relations. Foss (1996) believed that exploring the temporal relations of the narrative provides insight into how the stories correlate within time and how they change over a period of time. This is particularly important given that this text spans four years. The articles create a time-line from September 2001 to September 2005 for the

58

discussion of the conflict over rebuilding of the World Trade Center site. The most integral elements of the narrative, rebuilding and memoriam, are discussed within two days of the attacks and continue to be debated for the next four years. For example, the discussion of rebuilding and the memorial began just two days after the attacks. Mayor Giuliani gave a speech to the public two days after the attacks, promising citizens that New York City would be rebuilt for the better. Giuliani stated "we're going to rebuild. . .we're going to come out of this stronger than we were before. Emotionally stronger, politically stronger, economically stronger" (Purnick, 2001, p. A6). In response to Mayor Guiliani's announcement, Steven Van Leeuwan, a New York citizen, wrote a letter to the editor expressing the need for a memorial before rebuilding. Leeuwan stated:

> While the confidence expressed in Mayor Rudolph W. Giuliani's commitment to rebuilding the attack site heartens all New Yorkers, would it not be much more meaningful. . .to commemorate the loss of so many with a permanent memorial like that of the U.S.S. Arizona at Pearl Harbor? (Leeuwan, 2001, p. A26)

While some of the events build over this four year period, others occur within the last year of the study. For example, culture is readily discussed over the four year period as an integral part of the memorial quadrant and WTC site. For example, in 2002 the LMDC proposed the creation of "a new museum dedicated to American freedom, tolerance and the values that the World Trade Center represented" (Dunlap, 2005g, p. B8). The LMDC's plan in 2002 was not only approved by Governor Pataki, the governor readily discussed and supported the plan in 2003 and 2004. Governor Pataki states that "the Freedom Center [will] create vibrant content on the global quest for what our own Declaration of Independence deems the inalienable rights of humanity" (Dunlap, 2005g,

p. B8). It was not until 2005 that family and political figures began debating about the removal of culture completely at the World Trade Center site. Family members, such as Debra Burlingame, stated that the Freedom Center was a "multi-million-dollar insult" (Pogrebin, 2005, p. E33). Consequently, Governor Pataki decided to remove the International Freedom Center in September 2005.

Despite the fact that some events build and others occur within a short time period, *The New York Times* creates a seamless connection to weave the narrative together. Through flashbacks and backgrounders, each new event is constructed within the past events that served to create it. For example in 2005 when Governor Pataki removed the Freedom Center, reporter Dunlap wrote an article that displayed how Governor Pataki had previously supported the center and then changed his mind within the last year (Dunlap, 2005g, p. B8). In 2002, Wyatt wrote an article covering the differing visions of the memorial. Wyatt spent over half the article discussing the different memorial ideas people discussed within the last year (Wyatt, 2002a). Thus, looking at just one September month of any of the four years provides a good insight of what has happened before and after that month.

However, studying all five months shows the differences in which particular events are narrated. Some events such as the master plan are discussed at length and then only shortly referenced later. For example, in September 2003, there is a great deal of discussion of the unveiling of the master plan and the revisions of the master plan (Wyatt, 2003a; Wyatt, 2003b; Muschamp, 2003). In 2003 three separate articles are dedicated to the discussion of the master plan. However, in 2005 when the master plan is drastically changed by the removal of the Freedom Center only two lines are given to the master

60

plan. *Times* journalist Pogrebin (2005) states "Daniel Libeskind's master plan for the former World Trade Center site called for life-affirming, forward-looking cultural activities that would coexist with a memorial's somber acknowledgment of lives lost" (p. E33). The main elements of the narrative, the right to renew and the right to mourn, are discussed and detailed at length continually over the four year period. Journalists David Dunlap and Edward Wyatt penned articles from 2001 to 2005 covering these two elements (Dunlap, 2001; Dunlap, 2004a; Dunlap, 2004b; Dunlap, 2005a; Dunlap, 2005b; Dunlap, 2005c; Dunlap, 2005d; Dunlap, 2005e; Dunlap, 2005f; Dunlap, 2005g; Wyatt, 2002a; Wyatt, 2002b; Wyatt, 2002c; Wyatt, 2002d; Wyatt, 2003a; Wyatt; 2003b). Their articles covered topics such as Governor Pataki's decision to remove the Freedom Center, opinions about the memorial design, and conflict over rebuilding. Overall, the chronological creation of the events reflects the building of the conflicting narratives over time.

Causal Relations. Foss (1996) believed that one should discover how the cause and effect relationships are established in the narrative. These causal relations relate to how the major events of the narrative are established. Foss believed one should also analyze what element is most commonly emphasized: the cause or the effect. All of the major events driving the narrative are displayed as causes. There is then a preceding discussion of the effect of each of the major events. For example, the attacks of September 11th are the cause and the subsequent effect is the discussion of whether to rebuild after the attacks. This is one of the main causes of the confliction between mourning and renewing (Young, 2004).

The announcement of the master plan causes a preceding discussion about revisions that need to be made. Third, the announcement of the design of the memorial caused the preceding conflict over the look of the memorial and the elements that should be included within it. Similarly, the design of the memorial met with dismay because of its ordinary characteristics, causing several changes being made to the memorial. Both the announcement of the master plan and the design plan caused the discussion that any rebuilding would be a long process. World Trade Center Memorial design juror, James Young, stated "the memorialization of the 9/11 attacks and their victims must be seen as a process, a process that is in many ways the life-blood of memory itself" (2004, p. 14WC17).

Finally, the removal of the International Freedom Center caused some family members to be satisfied, while also outraging some cultural supporters. For example, in response to the removal of the International Freedom Center, some family members stated their satisfaction as the memorial did not hold a place for stories other than the story of September 11th. In contrast, journalists such as Nicolai Ouroussoff, spoke out about the removal of culture. Ouroussoff (2005) stated that the "rebuilding effort . . . has long since turned into a hallucinogenic nightmare: a roller coaster ride of grief, naivete, recriminations, political jockeying and paranoia" (p. B9).

Audience. Foss (1996) believed that one should analyze not only the characteristics of the audience, but also their role within the narrative. In the World Trade Center site narrative the audience plays an integral part. As stated previously *The New York Times* is one of the most widely distributed newspapers in the nation. Thus, the audience includes local New Yorkers and the nation at large. Despite this rather large

audience, they are still active participants in the narrative. Through quotes, paraphrased information, commentary, and letters to the editor the narrator invites its audience to literally become a part of the narrative. The letters to the editor features citizens from as close as New York City to as far as Georgia (Kenney, 2002; Lunke, 2001). Their testimony provides representation of conflicts discussed inside and outside the articles. For example, just two days after September 11, 2001 citizens write letters to the editor discussing rebuilding and the memorial. Even in this short period one can see the conflict among the audience between the need to renew and the need to mourn. Karyn Kirke, citizen of Massachusetts, states "Instead of rebuilding the World Trade Center, we should build a memorial on the site commemorating all who died. The businesses will be relocated anyway, and this is something that our country should never forget" (2001, p. (4)10). In contrast, Larry Dunn (2001) states "a major part of the American response has to be rebuilding the magnificent World Trade Center as soon as possible" (p. A26).

In addition the narrators' relinquishment of their power to allow audience insight expresses the knowledgeableness of the audience. In other words, *The New York Times* must feel that the audience can provide some valuable input to speak about the conflicts. *The New York Times* sees its audience as informed about the events of September 11th and the resulting conflict over rebuilding the World Trade Center site. This is further supported by the fact that several of the letters to the editor are written by artists and commissioners of the Port Authority who worked on the World Trade Center. For instance, Ronald Mallory, who created a painting that was featured in the WTC, discussed the resolve to move on after the conflict. Mallory (2001) stated "With the tragedy of Sept. 11, I was faced with the question, Why make art?" (p. (2)4). Mallory

then warrants the need for renewal. Richard C. Leone, President of the Century Foundation, received a large amount of space to comment on the World Trade Center. Leone, past chairman of the Port Authority, places the need for renewal above a memorial. Leone (2001) states "someday . . . there will be some kind of a plaque or park. But that won't be the true memorial to those who built the place or to those who worked and died there. It will be in whatever we build and do to keep the city and country great" (p. A23). Thus, the narrators' inclusion of the audiences' voice, the audience plays an integral role in the discussion of the conflict over the World Trade Center site and memorial. Overall, the narrative is expanded and changed as a result of its audience.

Theme. The overall theme is recovery through rebuilding. However, the conflicting narratives led to conflicting themes within the entire narrative. The family groups promote the theme of memorializing the story of September 11th. The story of September 11th theme is implicitly and explicitly woven throughout the narrative by the family group. The family usually references the theme when they are discussing if something fits or does not fit with the story of September 11th. They will explicitly reference the fit of something to "the story of September 11th" (Dunlap, 2005e). For example, Debra Burlingame, who vocally opposed the Freedom Center, stated that anyone who visits the memorial should hear "the story of 9/11 and that story only" (Dunlap, 2005e, p. 1A). However, other times they will implicitly reference if something fits by arguing about the design of the memorial or the design elements of other items being built around the memorial. Burlingame's preceding argument fits, because the argument explicitly references the story of 9/11, and debates the Freedom Center, the cultural center designed near the memorial.

64

In contrast to the family group theme, the economic group promotes the theme of renewal through rebuilding. They implicitly promote their theme. The economic group discusses the impending need for rebuilding the area within the first months of the attacks. They support their theme by being zealous supporters of rebuilding as quickly as possible (Ouroussoff, 2005, p.B9). The economic group supports rebuilding quickly by emphasizing the importance in showing the world that New York City will regain its economic might. For example Richard C. Leone, who worked with the Port Authority, discussed how the city's rebuilding was the overall most important process of recovery (Leone, 2001, p. 23A). Leone stated:

> Someday, where the trade center stood, there will be some kind of a plaque or park. But that won't be the true memorial to those who built the place or to those who worked and died there. It will be in whatever we build and do to keep the city and country great (p. 23A).

Overall, these two main themes guide the conflict between the two groups. Perhaps Mayor Bloomberg, in his characteristically neutral tone, stated it best when he said "this city has to do two things: memorialize, but also build for the future" (Steinhauer, 2002, p. 1A). This appears to be an obvious notion. However, the feat that New York City must accomplish is the reason for a four year conflict causing a stalemate in both memorializing and rebuilding.

Conflicting Narratives: Probability and Fidelity

Fisher (1987) argued that narrative probability and narrative fidelity were the two central elements for the narrative paradigm. As previously stated in Chapter III, narrative probability considers whether a story proves realistic to its reader. In other words, "does

the story make sense?" (Eaves & Savoie, 2005, p. 93). Narrative fidelity considers

whether a story proves relatable to its reader. In other words, the story "adapts or relates

to the audience's beliefs, values, or experiences" (Eaves & Savoie, 2005, p. 94). Fisher

(1987) did not define narrative probability and fidelity as absolutes. Rather, Fisher

believed that narrative probability and fidelity ran on a continuum. In other words, the

critic can consider the extent to which a story has narrative probability and fidelity, not

just if it has one or the other or doesn't (Fisher, 1987, p. 124). The following analysis will

consider the narrative probability and fidelity of the two main narratives: the narrative of

the families' right to mourn, and the narrative of the economic interest's right to build.

The Right to Mourn

     The New York Times journalists establish the families' unstable narrative

coherence by stringing together different quotes and paraphrases that contradict and

collide with each other. First, the narrative essentially lacks "sense" by showing the

families' refusal to consider what *The New York Times* emphasizes as reasonable

alternatives. For example, in an article entitled "Varying Boundaries of Hallowed

Ground" journalist David Dunlap (2005a) reports on the controversy of what is sacred

and not sacred ground at the World Trade Center site. Dunlap (2005a) discusses the

families' issues with cultural buildings being placed near the memorial. However, then

Dunlap argues that while the families have vehemently rejected the cultural buildings

they have been less inclined to debate the commercial buildings, such as Border's

bookstore, placed near the site. Dunlap (2005a) questions the families' logic by stating "if

certain cultural uses denigrate hallowed ground, why would a shopping arcade be more

appropriate?" (p. 4B). Another example that displays the families' reluctance to consider

reasonable alternatives is shown as the families' decrease of attuning to reason over time. In 2002, when considering where to put the PATH terminal in proximity to the memorial Louis R. Tomson, the president of the Lower Manhattan Development Corporation, stated "my experience with the families is that when you explain the issues they generally are very reasonable (Wyatt, 2002b, p. 31). However, in 2005, Chris Burke, a member of the Freedom Center's family advisory group, argued that the opponents of the cultural center were clearly not displaying reason in their arguments. Referencing the Freedom Center's written report of their mission, Burke stated, "the Freedom Center portrayed by opponents as a partisan, political, rationalizing, blame-America institution 'clearly, to any reasonable man or woman, doesn't exist in these pages" (Dunlap, 2005d, p. B3).

Second, the narrative is not placed within a context of stability. The narrative contradicts other narratives considering the memorial and the correct way to mourn September 11th. For example, the families' narrative about culture and the memorial changes over time. This is seen through the families' repudiation from their mission statement. In 2002 the families' advisory council's mission statement declared their "resolve to preserve an open, free and democratic society…to end hatred, ignorance, intolerance and strife, and promote peace" (Wyatt, 2002c, p. B1). However, the families are portrayed to be largely dismissive of this mission statement. The following statements were made by the [some] families in consideration of the memorial [design]: "I don't want to have to go outside the United States to get designs [for the memorial]" (Wyatt, 2002c, p. B1); "I don't care about their [street vendors selling September 11th memorabilia] rights and civil liberties and all that" (Wyatt, 2002c, p. B1); and "A multi-

million-dollar insult [the freedom center to be placed near the memorial]" (Pogrebin, 2005 9/30, E33).

As seen by the preceding statements, when it comes to the consideration of the memorial, the families have largely refused to adhere to freedom or cultural rights. Thus, their narrative of only wanting to tell the story of September 11th shows an internal inconsistency. Many of the family members believe that because of the nature of the terrorist attacks on September 11th the story does include showing cultural freedom (Dunlap, 2005e). Therefore, the families' narrative is not essentially to tell the story of the September 11th known by the world at large, but their narrative is to tell their deceased family member's story of September 11th.

While the narrative does not establish sense or stability, it does essentially make a connection with the reader. This connection is evident in the considerable coverage of the families' opinions and the reporting of numerous changes made for the families. For example, many of the articles are "letters to the editor" designed to let people weigh in their opinions (Cheatham, 2001 9/19, p. A26; Kenney, 2002 9/19, p.A34; Kirke, 2001 9/14, p. (4)10; Leeuwan, 2001 9/13, p. A26; Lunke, 2001 9/17; p.A26; Mallory, 2001 9/30, p.(2)4; Szlos, 2003 9/14, p.(2)4). These letters to the editor contain suggestions for memorial designs and comments about the current memorial controversy. For example, Lunke (2001) states "Now would be the time to change the 1960's citadel approach to urban planning by re-establishing the pre-World Trade Center street layout" (p. A26). Kenney (2002) writes a proposal for a memorial stating:

> out of shattered glass and twisted girders transfigured by an artist's inspiration, a
> monumental tree, rooted in memories of loss, could rise up with limbs draped in

3,000 prisms of light that would become sweet whispers of sound when buoyed

by the wind" (p. A34).

In accordance to the memorial controversy Szlos (2003) writes in "we debate who is a

survivor or what a memorial should look like" (p. (2)4). Szlos continues stating that the

memorial should at least include a list of names because "names indicate that someone

lived" (p. (2)4). The letters to the editor are a way to hear the audience's voice in the

narrative. They show that the reader feels a considerable stake in the memorial's design.

Thus, they feel a connection to the families' disagreement over the memorial's design.

However, this connection is established more through its ability to "ring true" than its

ability to "hang together" (Fisher, 1987).

The *Times* establishes a strong narrative fidelity for the families' narrative of the

right to mourn and memorialize. For example, the economic groups constantly discuss

how they are trying to appease family members' desires for the memorial. Consequently,

Joseph Seymour, executive director of the Port Authority in New York and New Jersey,

stated that "I don't think the families want a commercial element through those

footprints" (Wyatt, 2002b, p. (1)31). Similarly, nationally and internationally there is a

known tradition of the right to mourn. Within the United States there are numerous

monuments, memorials, and museums dedicated to memorialize and mourn those lost in

times of war, tragedy, and terrorism. Therefore the narrative of the right to mourn

certainly rings true with a multitude of readers.

The Right to Renew

The New York Times journalists establish a strong narrative coherence with its

readers by displaying the economic interests' seemingly stable "master plan." First, the

narrative appears to make sense as each plan of the economic group is carefully explained in full detail, usually accompanied by a timeline for the plan (Dunlap, 2005a; Dunlap, 2005 b; Dunlap, 2005c). Second, the narrative is consistently stable. For example, the *Times* reporter, James Young, states that "the Lower Manhattan Development Corporation has wisely taken a long and capacious view of its mission, which might be summarized in its motto, 'remember, rebuild, renew'" (p.(14)13). Even the families agree that rebuilding and renewing must be done in the area. Thus, the economic interest group is seen to have an ongoing narrative of stability. Third, the narrative makes a connection with the reader. It establishes the view of the need for renewal in order to recreate the strong-hold of New York City and the United States. For example, Rudolph Guiliani, mayor of New York City during September 11th 2001, stated two days after the attacks "we're going to rebuild…we're going to come out of this stronger than we were before. Emotionally stronger, politically stronger, economically stronger" (Purnick, 2001 9/13, p. A6). Mayor Guiliani was seen as one of the pivotal leaders during September 11th. Mayor Guiliani created a sense of stability during the September 11th attacks and connected with an international audience. One can infer that because the reader already feels a connection with Mayor Guiliani then they can also understand and find his narrative about the rebuilding of New York City both valid and feasible. Thus, the narrative does not only "hang together" it also "rings true" for the reader.

The *Times* establishes a strong narrative fidelity for the reader. The United States is known for its promises of quick renewal. Whenever national disasters happen, government officials are quick to propose plans of renewal and recovery. In a situation like the World Trade Center attacks, the government proved no different, as they quickly

sprang to action proposing methods of recovery and then renewal. These plans came

within a few days after the attacks. As previously discussed, just two days after the

attacks Mayor Guiliani announced that New York City would rebuild and this rebuilding

would make the city greater than it was before (Purnick, 2001). Tierney (2001) also

alludes to New York City and the nation's history of rebuilding. Tierney (2001) states

"Newer, bigger, better: that was spirit when the city's symbol was built on 34th Street,

and that was the spirit when the twin towers rose even higher. That was how the skyline

was built, and maybe that's the way to rebuild it" (p. A11). Therefore, the right to renew

rings true for a multitude of readers. For example, the *Times* journalist, Martel (2003)

states "The World Trade Center landlord, Larry A. Silverstein, is the embodiment of the

will to build bigger and better on a site that New York has for decades seen as a symbol

of the city's renewal" (p. 14B).

Conflicting Narratives: Mournful Us versus Economic Them

Many researchers devoted a significant amount of their studies to the analysis of

conflicting and competing narratives (Atkinson, 2003; Brinson & Brown, 1997; Flores,

2003; Jorgensen-Earp & Jorgensen, 2002; Tonn, Endress, & Diamond, 1993). Fisher

(1987) posited that in order for a story to have narrative fidelity it must be logical to its

audience (p. 88). Thus, in order for the audience to determine if the story is logical they

must compare the narrative to other previous narratives they already know. Overall, this

relays that narratives are not judged just on their own merit, but against other narratives.

Fisher went on to state that the audience played an integral role in deciding if a narrative

proved the most persuasive (p. 131). Thus this next section will look at how the

narratives of the right to renew and the right to mourn conflict and which one proves the most dominant.

Mournful Us

As previously stated, within the main narrative of rebuilding there is the narrative of the right to mourn and the right to renew. One narrative is driven by the surviving families of victims of September 11th and political figures that include Governor Pataki and Mayor Guiliani. This narrative supports the idea of the right to mourn and tell the story of September 11th at any cost. This cost includes the removal of all cultural buildings and attempting to remove commercial and retail buildings near the memorial quadrant. It is common to place messages of memoriam with messages of tolerance, such as the Oklahoma City Memorial and Memorial Institute for the Prevention of Terrorism. However, the narrative of the right to mourn believes that the story of September 11th should be the only story present at the memorial quadrant. New York Republican representative Peter King stated about the memorial "I don't think it has to be amplified. It doesn't have to be put into greater context" (Dunlap, 2005d, p. B3).

Economic Them

The second narrative is driven by the economic groups who have an investment in rebuilding the World Trade Center site. This narrative supports the idea that renewal and recovery will come through the rebuilding of the site. It is important to note that in the beginning these two narratives followed a similar path. The economic groups spoke out about the importance of the families' insights into the planning of the site. For example, Larry Silverstein, the leaseholder of the WTC, sent a letter to the editor of *The New York Times* stating:

All those who were affected by the tragedy, as well as the broader planning,

architectural and artistic communities, should be involved in fashioning a

dignified memorial as an essential element of the new World Trade Center and

downtown New York. At the same time, it is imperative for our city, state and

country that rebuilding go forward. (Silverstein, 2001, p. A22)

Silverstein, a major economic supporter, makes it clear that the right to mourn is an

integral part in the creation of the memorial and the rebuilding effort. In addition many

family members believed that the economic groups had a reasonable vision and families

also expressed the importance of culture at the site. As previously discussed the families'

original mission statement denoted the need for a cultural influence to put the message of

September 11th within a broader context (Wyatt, 2002c, p. B1). It was only after the

recovery process was finished and plans for the site began to develop further that the real

conflict began. Hinging on the history of other memorials, such as the Vietnam Veterans

Memorial, the Crispus Attucks Memorial, or the Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial,

controversy over a memorial is not a new concept. The *Times* journalist, Wyatt (2002c)

stated "no one could expect the memorialization of the murder of more than 3,000 people

to proceed without controversy" (p. B1). However, the continual conflict of the right to

renew versus the right to mourn, places the World Trade Center site and memorial within

its own historical position. Part of the conflict is driven by the differing political voices

that purport the narratives.

The Political Element

A significant amount of the conflict is fueled by the political support obtained by

the family and economic groups. The family groups have found significant support in

Governor Pataki, while the economic groups have found significant support in Mayor

Bloomberg. While Governor Pataki and Mayor Bloomberg believe they are trying to help

the rebuilding effort, the conflict between the two political leaders has further fueled the

conflict between the two groups. For example, Pataki first supported the creation of the

International Freedom Center stating that it would show terrorists that Americans would

still maintain their freedoms and way of life despite the terrorist attacks (Pogrebin, 2005).

However, after intense pressure from some of The World Trade Center Memorial

Foundation board members and other family members, Pataki agreed to have the center

removed (Dunlap, 2005e). Governor Pataki also supported a quick and expansive

rebuilding of the site. However, Governor Pataki fell again to the whims of the family

members by supporting many of their objections which included not only the removal of

the Freedom Center but also the Drawing Center. Governor Pataki also supported the

movement of buildings that were designed within close proximity to the memorial, and

called for numerous redesigns of the selected memorial design (Wyatt, 2003a).

Mayor Bloomberg disagreed with many of Governor Pataki's decisions. From the

beginning Mayor Bloomberg supported rebuilding the site culturally and economically as

quickly as possible. Mayor Bloomberg and Tom Bernstein, the cofounder and chairman

of the Freedom Center, readily criticized Pataki's decision to pull the Freedom Center

from its planned site (Dunlap, 2005e). When asked about the removal of the Freedom

Center, Mayor Bloomberg stated "I am disappointed that we were not able to find a way

to reconcile the freedoms we hold so dear with the sanctity of the site" (Dunlap, 2005e, p.

A1). Despite Mayor Bloomberg's disappointment with the cultural upheaval, he remained

reluctant to stop Governor Pataki from removing the buildings.

Overall, Governor Pataki and Mayor Bloomberg played significant roles in the conflicting narratives between the family and economic groups. As seen in the previous example, the narratives of Governor Pataki and Mayor Bloomberg align with the narratives of the family and economic groups. Like the families, Governor Pataki's narrative first supported the placement of culture at the site, but changed when the buildings threatened to reveal not only the story of September 11th. Like the economic group, Mayor Bloomberg's narrative has remained relatively stable. Mayor Bloomberg has shown constant support for rebuilding of the site both economically and culturally.

The Effect of Politics and Economics

Fisher (1987) believed that all stories must be placed against their particular historical situation, as well as other stories. Both the right to mourn and right to renew narratives fit well with their historical situation. Thus, both stories have strong narrative fidelity. However, it is when one considers their narrative probability that the two stories differ. The right to renew narrative appears to carry more sensibility than the right to mourn. The economic groups carry their narrative with more stability and consistency than the family groups. In addition, the fact that Mayor Bloomberg is a consistent voice and consistent support of the economic groups furthers the stability of the narrative. While Mayor Bloomberg usually succumbs to the demands of Governor Pataki culturally, economically there is more support for the right to renew. In contrast, the right to mourn changed drastically over time. In the beginning the families seem to wield a considerable amount of control over the design and placement of the memorial. However, the multiplicity of desires for the memorial design and placement prove problematic in maintaining that control.

Thus, the right to renew outweighs the right to mourn because of its stable voice and its backing with the facts. New York City must renew and rebuild the area of the demolished World Trade Center. The memorial is appropriate and needed, however, citizens of New York City remain cautious of allowing the memorial to take over the economic area. Although Governor Pataki removes the cultural buildings from the site, this does not prove in favor of the memorial's narrative. Instead it makes the families appear unreasonable in their desires for the memorial. The families are shown as wanting a story of September 11th that eliminates the actual story of September 11th. Overall, while the two narratives each carry a strong message, the economic group consistently proves a more feasible and plausible narrative over time.

Conclusion

The narrative of the World Trade Center site proves complex and diverse. The conflict over the rebuilding process was encompassed by two distinct narratives of the right to mourn and the right to renew. The creation of a narrative is a long and painstaking process. The *Times* creates its narrative of the rebuilding conflict over a period of four years. Each of the elements of the narrative is influential as an individual considers the narrative fidelity and narrative probability of the two stories. Through considering these different elements I found that each was essential to create a basis for the validity of the narrative fidelity and narrative probability of each story. In addition, the history of the World Trade Center is immensely influential in the narrative fidelity of each story. As discussed in the literature review, the World Trade Center had a history of being an economic strong-hold. Thus, the World Trade Center's historically linked economic basis created a great push for the economic groups in creating and maintaining

a dominant narrative. However, the economic narrative is never explicitly shown as dominant within the articles. There is much consideration for the desires of the family members, which lends more credibility to the right to renew narrative. The final chapter will further discuss the study's conclusions and provide implications of the text.

CHAPTER V: IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSION

Four sections compose the final chapter of this study. The first section summarizes the current study. The second section discusses the conclusions of the study. Within this section, the future of the methodology will be explored along with the advantages and disadvantages of the methodology and text. The third section discusses the implications of the analysis. The fourth section explores the implications of why the rebuilding process was extended. Lastly, the chapter will end with some closing remarks.

Summary of the Current Study

Within my study I used *The New York Times* articles from the months of September from the years 2001 to 2005, to focus on the creation of the absent narrative framework by evaluating the conflicting narratives of the families and economic groups to explain why the rebuilding process has taken so long. Within each of my chapters I discussed narrative and its inclusion in different facets of rhetoric and rhetorical debate. I found that the effect of the story can determine the outcome of different controversies and provide insight into why those controversies occurred.

A variety of scholarly information exists about memorials and museums. In my literature review I discussed how the narrative surrounding a site, memorial, or museum correlated with the future interpretation of the site. Consequently, I found that the history of a person, building, or event, such as a war, greatly affected the amount of controversy over the structure. For example, I found that some memorials and museums, such as the

Crispus Attucks Memorial or the Beit Hashoah Museum of Tolerance, encountered significant controversy over their design and placement. Many rhetorical critics either expressed their own dissatisfaction or carefully followed the dissatisfaction that these memorials and museums encountered. In contrast, some memorials, such as the Oklahoma City Memorial, were widely accepted from the beginning. I found that this acceptance was a result of an inclusion of pertinent parties in the design process. In correlation to my text I discussed not only the history of the World Trade Center and the controversy it encountered, but also the controversy over the current memorial design. The narrative over the current memorial design parallels some of the controversy encountered by the Vietnam Veterans Memorial. I discussed these two controversies to appropriately compare their similarities and differences. I found that their major difference was the location.

Thus, I laid the groundwork to discuss how the controversy of my current study was not only relating to the memorial, but the entire World Trade Center site. Because the controversy of the World Trade Center site included such a large number of individuals, I recognized the importance of looking at the confliction of narratives and their influence on rhetorical debate. I looked at two articles that discussed the use of conflicting narratives. From these articles, I found that when narratives conflict, one narrative tends to dominate the other narrative. This provided an excellent end to my review of memorials, museums, sites, and controversy. It also opened the door to a discussion of Fisher's narrative paradigm and my methodology.

Rhetoric is a malleable concept. Two critics may select the same methodology to study the same artifact and reach distinctly different conclusions. As a result, the rhetor

must provide appropriate reasoning not only for the methodology and selection of artifact, but for the conclusions achieved. The narrative paradigm, like rhetorical criticism, is also a malleable art. Different critics applied Fisher's narrative paradigm to a variety of text subjects including, folklore, campaigns, and party platforms (Brinson & Brown, 1998; Smith, 1989). In addition to their diverse text subjects, critics have also chosen to look at different narratives within these subjects. For example, some critics chose to look at one coherent narrative, while others weaved together a series of fragmented phrases to create a coherent narrative for use in their analysis. Furthermore, critics not only chose many different ways to create their analysis, they also made scholarly choices on what to include with the narrative paradigm. Some critics created categories that specifically related to their study, such as Eaves and Savoie's (2005) use of narrative framing and narrative voyeurism in their analysis of the reality television show *Big Brother*. Other critics looked at narratives that competed with the narrative under analysis, such as Brinson and Brown's (1998) analysis of narratives that competed with the PSA's campaign about safe sex. Overall, the critic made particular choices in order to suitably analyze the chosen text.

In my study, I also made particular choices for the proper analysis of the narratives of the World Trade Center site (WTC site). Like some critics I chose to weave together a series of fragmented articles in order to create my text. In addition I also looked at competing narratives. However, I chose to look at two conflicting narratives that actually fell under the complete narrative of my text. I also chose to provide a comprehensive analysis of my text in order to supply further insight into the structure of the narrative and give support to the conclusions that I infer from the narrative. From my

80

analysis I found that the narratives were influenced by a multitude of elements. As I

addressed each element of Foss' examination of the narrative, I found that each element

impacted the two narratives. Consequently, this examination laid the foundation to look

at Fisher's narrative paradigm. Using Fisher's narrative paradigm I found that the

stability over time of the right to renew narrative gave it a great amount of narrative

probability. In contrast, the constant fluctuations of the right to mourn narrative lessened

the narrative probability it could obtain. Despite the weak narrative probability of the

right to mourn, both narratives contained narrative fidelity that was situated in past

American history. However, when placed in confliction the narrative of the right to renew

proved to be more stable, reasonable, and foreseeable than the right to mourn narrative.

Overall, this analysis provided some imperative conclusions of my text. However, I

ended my analysis noting that the conclusions and implications would provide the insight

to my thesis question. Thus, I now turn to my next section that will look at the

conclusions of my study and the implications of the analysis.

<div align="center">Conclusions of the Study</div>

When doing a rhetorical analysis the critic must make certain decisions to select

her or his method and text. The critic must decide what lens is the most appropriate from

which to view the text, and what text is appropriate to analyze. In correlation with these

selections, the critic must set up guidelines and follow particular rules that bring

objectivity to the study. These selections create both advantages and disadvantages for

the study.

Advantages and Disadvantages of the Study

The following considers three different aspects of the study. First, it discusses the future of the methodology and the various advantages and disadvantages of the methodology. Second, it discusses the advantages and disadvantages of the text. Third, I will discuss the contribution that this study makes to the future of the methodology.

Future of the Methodology

One of the most important tasks of the rhetorical critic is to select a suitable critical method. The critical method should assist the critic in her or his explanation of the text under analysis. This current study based its methodology on Fisher's (1987) idea that a narrative did not need to be one study. Rather, like other researchers, the study weaved together different pieces of an overarching narrative. The study looked for clues within the different articles from *The New York Times* to explain how the overarching narrative of rebuilding was accomplished, as well as the subsequent narratives of the right to mourn and the right to renew. The critical method applied in this study, as described in preceding chapters, is an application of Fisher's narrative paradigm with consideration of Foss' creation of the narrative. One must now consider the following questions: (1) Did the employment of the critical method assist in examining the narratives of the right to mourn and right to renew?; (2) Were there any limitations of the method?

Assistance in examination of the narrative. Being the critic who selected the method, it would be easy to make the subjective leap into professing the advantages of using the methodology in examining the narrative. As previously discussed, I focused on examining the controversy surrounding the rebuilding of the WTC site. Thus, the method had to be able to weave together a series of discussions that had been continuing for over

four years. In addition, this study approached the rebuilding discussion as a telling of stories, so it seemed only appropriate to use a method that specifically defined stories.

Despite my natural bias to the method, I believe that the methodology appropriately assisted in the examination of my text. The most useful characteristic of Fisher's narrative paradigm is its flexibility. Fisher (1989) stated "the narrative paradigm is the foundation on which a complete rhetoric needs to be built" (p. 56). Accordingly, Fisher proposed that the method could be combined with other aspects of narrative in order to gain a complete understanding of the text. In this study, it was advantageous to not only look at the narrative probability and fidelity of the stories, but the confliction of the narratives as well. Overall, once the series of stories were weaved together Fisher's narrative provided a distinguished lens to view the resulting narratives.

Limitations of the method. Fisher's narrative paradigm is just that: a paradigm. Fisher (1989) did not presume that the narrative paradigm can fully encompass every aspect of a narrative. In the same sense Fisher (1989) admitted that a paradigm, like art, changes over time. Therefore, as the narrative paradigm changes, the rhetorical critic must make the choice to stay with the classic paradigm, or create other correlations. As always this choice comes with a set of limitations. As Fisher (1989) stated "the narrative paradigm is the foundation on which a complete rhetoric needs to be built" (p. 56). Thus, in order to provide appropriate implications of the analysis, one cannot reside on the narrative paradigm alone. Consequently, it was essential to include other factors in order to give the analysis more substance. Fisher (1987) denoted the importance of factors such as the audience, narrator, event, and characters. However, Fisher did not supply a way to analyze these elements and their affect on the narrative. Applying Foss' comprehensive

83

examination of the narrative gave insight into all the various elements of a narrative. However, connecting together two different rhetoricians without their knowledge can cause problems in the correct interpretation of the methodology. Nevertheless, taking the chance that there may be some confliction in how the two rhetoricians viewed these various elements was minor in comparison to how combining the two methodologies created a more full analysis of the text.

The Contribution of the Study to the Methodology

The combination of Foss' and Fisher's methodologies contributes to Fisher's narrative paradigm. Performing a comprehensive examination of the narrative creates a substantial foundation for the reader and the analysis of the text. Looking at the conflicting narratives expands Fisher's (1987) definition of narrative probability and narrative fidelity. In addition one of the major contributions to the methodology is the text to which it is applied. Fisher's narrative paradigm has been applied to a variety of texts. In this case the text involved a controversy that was built upon one of the most infamous events in the history of the United States. It was also used in the unique circumstance that a completed structure, or a completed controversy for that matter, was not available. Thus, the methodology is the part of an evolving narrative that over time may become much different than the narrative it is now. This makes the methodology a unique application to an innovative text. Despite this text's innovativeness it came with its own set of advantages and disadvantages.

The Advantages and Limitations of the Text

The possibility of text choices for the narrative of the WTC site was numerous. The economic groups have websites dedicated to their vision of the right to renew.

84

Likewise, family members have a variety of diverse websites that discuss the right to mourn. Over 922 articles by *The New York Times* alone were written to discuss the WTC Site and the WTC memorial. The critic must select a way to pick a text that appropriately defines the subject interest, but also is objectively chosen.

Limitations of the text. As stated previously, there is a variety of articles that discuss the WTC site controversy, and so the possibilities of a text for the rhetorical critic are endless. In addition, the articles only covered the months of September for each of the four years under analysis. Consequently, some events were not covered in this four year time. The announcement of the design of the memorial came in January of 2004, so all of the articles discussing the announcement of the design were written in retrospect. In addition, the complexity of the controversy and the depth of the debate make the critic's job quite difficult. Multiple smaller narratives reside in the articles, so just picking the two most prominent narratives proved demanding. Another issue I faced was that most rhetorical critics studying a site or memorial look at the site or memorial after its completion. Most of the previous literature I analyzed discussed finished museums, sites, and memorials. Creating a basis to look at a controversy over just rebuilding took tedious piecing together of literature to provide the proper support. Thus, to look at only the discussion of the many design possibilities not only causes difficulties in analyzing the text, but also in creating concrete implications. Despite these disadvantages, overall the uniqueness of the text created a significant amount of advantages for the critic.

Advantages of the text. While a multitude of texts may exist discussing the WTC site, *The New York Times* provides the most advantageous dialogue. As discussed earlier in the text, the *Times* is a nationally renowned newspaper that is recognized not only for

its large distribution area, but also its award winning articles. In addition, the *Times* has been featured in another previous study discussing September 11th, which is Dickinson's (2005) analysis of the post-September 11th advertisements. Though my analysis only used articles from the month of September, I found that these articles provided complete and quality discussions of the WTC site controversy. In addition, though I did not analyze the 922 articles that discuss the WTC site controversy, I read a great number of them finding that much of the discussion was repetition of the September month coverage. For this reason, I conclude that studying the month of September proved an appropriate text to analyze.

While I mulled significantly over the idea that my critique would be of a discussion rather than a structure, I found that this brought a particular uniqueness to the analysis. While several memorials have encountered controversy over their design, none has been so widespread and so detrimental to the rebuilding of an entire economic area. Therefore a unique situation, in my opinion, deserves a unique analysis. The controversy over the rebuilding of the WTC site and the building of the memorial was immediate and long lasting. The text of *The New York Times* articles provided a detailed and thorough coverage of each year of the controversy.

<div align="center">Implications of the Analysis</div>

Using the narrative paradigm as my rhetorical tool I found several implications of my analysis. First, I will discuss the implications of the narrative probability and narrative fidelity of the two narratives. Second, I will examine the implications of the two conflicting narratives. Lastly, I will consider how the conflicting narratives are affecting the building process of the WTC site.

The Implications of Narrative Probability and Fidelity

In my analysis I found that two narratives differentiated on their strength in narrative probability and fidelity. The right to mourn narrative contained a strong narrative fidelity because of the national need for mourning loss. However, the right to mourn narrative fluctuated in its narrative probability because of the tendency of the families to change their desires and expectations. Dissimilarly, the right to renew narrative contained not only a strong narrative probability, but had a strong narrative fidelity backing it as well. The strength of the narrative probability of the right to renew resided essentially in the narrative's continuity over time. The strength of the narrative fidelity of the right to renew comes from the national need of rebuilding as a way of recovery.

The implications of the narrative probability of the two stories express the bias of the narrator and the bias of the audience. In the analysis, I established that the narrator has a great deal of influence over the narrative. In addition the narrative consists of commentary and opinion pieces that provide conclusions and implications of the controversy in their own right. Thus, it is evident that the narrator believes the right to mourn narrative lacks significant factors in its probability. Overall, the families are shown to lack continuity in their desires. This is seen by their constant contradictions of what they want in the memorial, and what kind of story they want the memorial to tell. Seemingly, based on its narrative probability, the families' narrative should not be persuasive to the audience of the narrative. In contrast the strong narrative probability of the right to renew should provide a persuasive argument for the audience.

The strongest element of the right to renew is its continuity. While the economic groups make adjustments and some design changes to their plans, their overall narrative is created quickly after the September 11th attack and remains stable over the four year period. In addition the economic groups are very careful that their narrative is balanced from the beginning, so that the need for renewal does not appear to dominate the need to mourn. Thus, the narrative's proposal that healing can come through renewal provides the economic group with reasoning for the different choices they make. Fisher (1987) argued that good narrative probability helps the audience comprehend the choices made in the narrative. Fisher (1987) stated "narrative rationality . . . offers an account, an understanding, of any instance of human choice and action" (p. 66).

When examining my text I established that the two stories each contained a significant amount of narrative fidelity. However, I found that while the right to mourn narrative rang true nationally, the right to renew narrative rang true both nationally and locally. The right to renew narrative related with the history of the United States and more importantly the history of New York City. As stated in the literature review, the World Trade Center was built as a way to recover from an economic slump. Therefore, the original World Trade Center was a rebuilding process to help rejuvenate a city that was in despair.

The Implications of the Conflicting Narratives

Overall, there were apparent and continuous implications that the importance of rebuilding outweighed the importance of memorializing. None of the articles focused only on the memorial, in fact, every article that discussed the memorial included information within it about the current rebuilding process. One could not read an article

about the memorial without gaining information about rebuilding. While the memorial could be seen as part of the rebuilding effort, justification could also be made that it is an entirely separate process. Consequently, bringing the process of rebuilding and the building of the memorial together constantly places the narrative of the right to renew above the narrative of the right to mourn. In my formation of conclusions from the analysis I pondered about one aspect that has controlled the entire controversy: the area itself.

If this were a discussion over a memorial built in Washington D.C., it would be a drastically different argument. While this may seem obvious, it is quite worth mentioning given the situation. Controversy over a memorial may arise in Washington D.C., however, controversy over the placement of the memorial is far less troublesome. A memorial in Washington D.C., is surrounded by only other memorials. The debate of placing a 1776 foot skyscraper next to the Lincoln Memorial has never occurred, and I don't foresee that debate happening anytime soon. In the same sense, one could counter stating that memorials like the King Memorial in Atlanta or the Crispus Attucks Memorial reside in urban areas. I concede to that fact; however; none of these memorials was designed to sit over an area that was the site of the destruction of two economic pillars and the deaths of more than 3000 individuals. In essence, the area must house buildings that contain drastically different meanings. Memorials are supposed to bring a sense of solace and provide a place to grieve. However, this notion goes against the essential nature of New York City, and so the domination of the right to renew is not surprising given its centrality to the basic nature of New York City.

In the 1960s the World Trade Center was built to bring a despairing city back to economic prosperity. Thus, the World Trade Center's essential nature was based upon the idea of recovery through rebuilding. The Port Authority designed and constructed the World Trade Center with notion that it would help a city find hope and rebirth. While the World Trade Center did not provide the quick economic revival they had hoped for, over time it became the symbol they envisioned. In fact it was the symbolism of the World Trade Center that made it a target of terrorism on September 11th 2001. The right to renew has long been implanted not only in the minds of New Yorkers, but in the very meaning of the World Trade Center. New York City is built upon the notion of recovery through renewal, and renewal through rebuilding. The concept of the right to mourn essentially does not stand up against the economically based right to renew. While the right to mourn has a strong narrative fidelity, it does not have a strong basis for the World Trade Center area. There is a strong inference that *The New York Times* agrees with this idea. Most of the articles are dedicated to rebuilding and when the families become more demanding, the tone of the articles distinctly changes.

The Affect of Conflicting Narratives on Rebuilding

The clash among the two narratives of the right to renew and the right to mourn significantly impacted the building process of the World Trade Center site. As stated in the previous section, I found that the narrative of renewal significantly outweighs the narrative of mourning, both in narrative fidelity and probability. Thus one can infer that if the narrative that supports renewal is the stronger narrative, then the rebuilding process should be imminent. However the rebuilding process has been an on-going debate for the past four years and still continues to be problematic on rebuilding currently. With that in

mind, I refer back to my original research question: why is the rebuilding process taking so long?

From the conclusions of my analysis, I found that the rebuilding process is being extended by two factors: the discord of the narratives and the influence of politics on the narratives. When the two narratives began conflicting the rebuilding process was instantly stalled. This is evident by three examples. First, when the two narratives began they appeared to coincide. The economic group posited the need for mourning and the family group posited the need for rebuilding. In addition the family group's mission statement originally included the idea that culture was imperative to the new site and memorial. This correlated with the economic group's mission that cultural reflection be part of the new site. The second example relates to the announcement of the master plan. This was an evident separation of the two narratives. When the family group saw the proposed design of the site and the design of the memorial, they began denouncing the plans. The site designers and memorial designers began making revisions to their designs, slowing the rebuilding process. The third example correlates with the more apparent influence of politics. Governor Pataki becomes a prominent supporter of the right to mourn narrative, and begins making demands of further revisions of the design and the removal of different cultural buildings. At this point, the right to mourn narrative has distinctly changed from its original narrative, while the right to renew narrative remains constant.

Overall, the political influence of Governor Pataki changes both of the narratives and consequently extends the rebuilding process. The right to renew narrative may contain the most probability and fidelity, yet it becomes secondary to the right to mourn

narrative because of the influence of Governor Pataki. Therefore, as the economic groups attempt to make accommodations for the family groups and the governor, the rebuilding process is pushed back even further. In 2002 there was a plan to begin building by 2004. In June of 2006, building on the site had yet to commence.

To Conclude

The narrative of the right to renew and the right to mourn are embedded within American history. In Fisher's (1987) discussion of the narrative paradigm he found that the connection of a narrative with its history proved to be one of the most influential factors on the belief in a particular narrative. From my stance as a rhetorical critic, I see two cultures conflicting over the best way to recover from a great tragedy. The extent to which this conflict will continue to affect the rebuilding process will only be available after the completion of the site.

September 11th 2006 will mark the fifth year after the September 11th 2001 attacks. During the certain commemoration of this fifth year, building may occur at the World Trade Center site. However, this building will not occur without controversy. Despite Mayor Bloomberg's announcement in early 2006 that building on the site would commence, protest and controversy remained about Ground Zero. Monthly, even weekly, newspaper articles still run nationwide reporting on this controversy. Many of these articles ponder if the rebuilding of the site will fulfill the economic members' goal of rebuild and renew, or further separate already tired citizens of New York City. One ponders if *The New York Times* will continue to support the discussion of the narrative with such fervor. Will they ever report on the completion of the site? Will they ever see

the completion of an accepted memorial? What are the ramifications of the removal of all culture from the site?

I hesitate to state a definite prediction about what the site will look like in the future. However, I believe one can safely assume that in its completion the memorial and site will welcome an abundance of curious visitors anxious to see how America recovers from an attack on its homeland. In 2005, the Lower Manhattan Development Corporation was "projecting a peak demand of up to 6.6 million visitors annually in the first three years of operation" (Dunlap, 2005c, p. B8). These visitors may come to the memorial out of curiosity alone. However, I will go to see what narrative finally won.

REFERENCES

Arad, M., & Walker, P. (2004). WTC memorial team statement for winning design.
    Lower Manhattan Development Corporation, Retrieved February 2, 2005, from
    http://www.renewnyc.com/plan_des_dev/wtc_site/new_design_plans/memorial/m
    emorial_statement.asp

Artefaqs Corporation. (2006). *The World Trade Center*. Retrieved April 11, 2006, from
    http://www.glasssteelandstone.com/US/NY/NewYorkWorldTradeCenterp2.html

Associated Press. (2000). Emotional dedication of Oklahoma City Memorial offers time
    to grieve. *CNN*. Retrieved April 11, 2006, from http://www.cnn.com

Associated Press. (2001). Documents cover trade center debris. *The Huntsville Times*, p.
    A12.

Associated Press. (2004). Final World Trade Center Memorial selected. *CBS*. Retrieved
    April 20, 2006, from
    http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2004/01/14/national/main59312.html

Atkinson, J. (2003). Thumbing their noses at 'the man': An analysis of resistance
    narratives about multinational corporations. *Popular Communication*, *1*, 163-180.

Bagli, C. V. (2002). Transit links called vital to a revival of downtown. *The New
    York Times*, p. B3, Retrieved April 20, 2006, from http://web.lexis-nexis.com

Bagli, C. V. (2003a). Time granted in dispute over insurance for 9/11 site. *The New York
    Times*, p. A1, Retrieved May 31, 2006, from http://web.lexis-nexis.com

Bagli, C. V. (2003b). Developer loses ruling in trade center insurance dispute. *The New York Times*, p. B1, Retrieved May 31, 2006, from http://web.lexis-nexis.com

Barron, J., & Connelly, M. (2004). A universe of loss and recovery for 9/11 families, survey shows. *The New York Times*, p. B1, Retrieved April 20, 2006, from http://web.lexis-nexis.com

Barry, D. (2001). A nation challenged: Messages; from a world lost, ephemeral notes bear witness to the unspeakable. *The New York Times*, p. B9, Retrieved April 20, 2006, from http://web.lexis-nexis.com

Barry, D. (2002). A year of grief; death as a constant companion. *The New York Times*, p. G37, Retrieved April 20, 2006, from http://web.lexis-nexis.com

Belkin, L. (2002). Life's work; in a season of memorials, living life. *The New York Times*, p. (10)1, Retrieved April 20, 2006, from http://web.lexis-nexis.com

Blair, C., Jeppeson, M. S., & Pucci, E. (1991). Public me memorializing in postmodernity: The Vietnam Veterans Memorial as a prototype. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, *77*, 263-288.

Brinson, S. L., & Brown, M. H. (1997). The AIDS risk narrative in the 1994 CDC campaign. *Journal of Health Communication*, *2*, 101-112.

Browne, S. H. (1999). Remembering Crispus Attucks: Race, rhetoric, and the politics of commemoration. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, *85*, 169-188.

Bumiller, E. (2003). The world: Who won?; 9/11/03. *The New York Times*, p. (4)1, Retrieved April 20, 2006, from http://web.lexis-nexis.com

Burke, K. (1969a). *A grammar of motives*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Burke, K. (1969b). *A rhetoric of motives*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Carlson, A. C., & Hocking, J. E. (1988). Strategies of redemption at the Vietnam

    Veterans Memorial. *Western Journal of Speech Communication*, *52*, 203-215.

Carpenter, R. H. (1986). Admiral Mahan, "narrative fidelity," and the Japanese attack on

    Pearl Harbor. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, *72*, 290-305.

Cheatham, E. W. (2001). Fighting back, while preserving our values; in memoriam

    [Letter to the editor]. *The New York Times*, p. A26. Retrieved April 20, 2006,

    from http://web.lexis-nexis.com

Chernick, H. (2005). *Resilient city: The economic impact of 9/11*. New York: Russell

    Sage Foundation.

CoStar Group, Inc. (2001). List of world trade center tenants. *CNN*. Retrieved May 22,

    2006, from http://www.cnn.com/SPECIALS/2001/trade.center/tenants1.html

DeRose, J., & Haskins, E. (2003). *Making collective memory visible in public space:*

    Reflections on the commemoration of 9/11 in New York City. Paper presented at

    the International Communication Association Annual Meeting, San Diego, CA.

Design and meaning of the Oklahoma City Memorial (2000). *CNN*. Retrieved May 22,

    2006, from http://archives.cnn.com/2000/US/04/19/okla.city.details/index.html

Dickinson, G. (2005). Selling democracy: Consumer culture and citizenship in the wake

    of September 11. *Southern Communication Journal*, *70*, 271-284.

Dunlap, D. W. (2001). Seeking trees, and healing, for ground zero. *The New York*

    Times, p. B4, Retrieved April 20, 2006, from http://web.lexis-nexis.com

Dunlap, D. W. (2004a). For two 9/11 memorials, a man who listened. *The New York*

    Times, p. B4, Retrieved April 20, 2006, from http://web.lexis-nexis.com

Dunlap, D. W. (2004b). Visitor center planned opposite ground zero. *The New York*

Times, p. B4, Retrieved April 20, 2006, from http://web.lexis-nexis.com

Dunlap, D. W. (2005a). Varying boundaries of hallowed ground. *The New York*

Times, p. B4, Retrieved April 20, 2006, from http://web.lexis-nexis.com

Dunlap, D. W. (2005b). Venting ideas, then hiding them, turns out to be a tall order.

The New York Times, p. B4, Retrieved April 20, 2006, from http://web.lexis-

nexis.com

Dunlap, D. W. (2005c). Matters of how many and how much at the Sept. 11

memorial. *The New York Times*, p. B8, Retrieved April 20, 2006, from

http://web.lexis-nexis.com

Dunlap, D. W. (2005d). Blurred line for the ground zero museum. *The New York*

Times, p. B3, Retrieved April 20, 2006, from http://web.lexis-nexis.com

Dunlap, D. W. (2005e). Governor bars freedom center at ground zero. *The New*

York Times, p. A1, Retrieved April 20, 2006, from http://web.lexis-nexis.com

Dunlap, D. W. (2005f). Focus shifts to retail plans at ground zero. *The New York*

Times, p. B1, Retrieved April 20, 2006, from http://web.lexis-nexis.com

Dunlap, D. W. (2005g). Pataki solution on museum flies in the face of planning. *The New*

York Times, p. B8, Retrieved April 20, 2006 from http://web.lexis-nexis.com

Dunn, L. (2001). Dispatches from a day of terror and shock; Let us rebuild [Letter to the

editor]. *The New York Times*, p. A26, Retrieved April 20, 2006 from

http://web.lexis-nexis.com

Dwyer, J., & Flynn, K. (2005). *102 minutes: The untold story of the fight to survive inside*

the Twin Towers. New York: Times Books.

Eaves, M. H., & Savoie, M. (2005). Big brother: Merging reality and fiction: An

application of the narrative paradigm. *Texas Speech Communication Journal, 29,* 91-97.

Ehrenhaus, P., & Davis, D. K. (1989). The wall. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication, 6,* 94-99.

Fisher, W. R. (1984). Narration as a human communication paradigm: The case of public moral argument. *Communication Monographs, 51,* 1-22.

Fisher, W. R. (1985). The narrative paradigm: An elaboration. *Communication Monographs, 52,* 347-368.

Fisher, W. R. (1987). *Human communication as narration: Toward a philosophy of reason, value, and action.* Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press.

Fisher, W. R. (1989). Clarifying the narrative paradigm. *Communication Monographs, 56,* 55-57.

Flores, L. A. (2003). Constructing rhetorical borders: Peons, illegal aliens, and competing narratives of immigration. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication, 20,* 362-387.

Foner, N. (Ed.). (2005). *Wounded city.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Foss, S. K. (1986). Ambiguity as persuasion: The Vietnam Veterans Memorial. *Communication Quarterly, 34,* 326-340.

Foss, S. K. (1996). *Rhetorical criticism: Exploration & practice* (2nd ed.). Prospect Heights, Ill: Waveland Press, Inc.

Gallagher, V. J. (1995). Remembering together? Rhetorical integration and the case of the Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial. *Southern Communication Journal, 60,* 109-119.

Gillespie, A. K. (1999). *Twin towers: The life of New York City's World Trade Center*

[Electronic version]. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Grabe, M. E., & Zhou, S. (2003). News as Aristotelian drama: The case of 60 minutes. *Mass Communication & Society*, *6*, 313-326.

Greenhouse, S. (2002). Labor leaders hail workers for 9/11 sacrifices. *The New York Times*, p. B3, Retrieved April 20, 2006, from http://web.lexis-nexis.com

Gring-Pemble, L. M. (2001). 'Are we going to now govern by anecdote?': Rhetorical constructions of welfare recipients in congressional hearings, debates, and legislation, 1992-1996.' *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, *87*, 341-365.

Haines, H. W. (1986). "What kind of war?": An analysis of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, *3*, 1-20.

Hasian, J. M. (2004). Remembering and forgetting the "final solution": A rhetorical pilgrimage through the U.S. holocaust memorial museum. *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, *21*, 64-92.

Hollihan, T. A., & Riley, P. (1987). The rhetorical power of a compelling story: A critique of 'toughlove' parental support group. *Communication Quarterly*, *35*, 13-25.

Holloway, L. (2001). Seeing the green amid the red, white, and blue; Wholesalers, in rush to market, got Sept. 11 souvenirs on street. *The New York Times*, p. D1, Retrieved May 31, 2006, from http://web.lexis-nexis.com

Holusha, J. (2001). Commercial property; uncertainty in a landscape transformed. *The New York Times*, p. (11)1, Retrieved April 20, 2006, from http://web.lexis-nexis.com

Iovine, J. V. (2001). Designers look beyond debris. *The New York Times*, p. F1,

Retrieved April 20, 2006, from http://web.lexis-nexis.com

James, C. (2001). A day of terror: Critics notebook; Live images make viewers witnesses
to horror. *The New York Times*, p. A25, Retrieved from April 20, 2006, from
http://web.lexis-nexis.com

Johnson, K., & Bagli, C. V. (2001). A nation challenged: The site; Architects,
planners and residents wonder how to fill the hole in the city. *The New York
Times*, p. B1, Retrieved April 20, 2006, from http://web.lexis-nexis.com

Jorgensen-Earp, C. R., & Jorgensen, D. D. (2002). "Miracle from mouldy cheese":
Chronological versus thematic self-narratives in the discovery of penicillin.
Quarterly Journal of Speech, *88*, 69-90.

Kenney, B. A. (2002). A tree at ground zero [Letter to the editor]. *The New York Times*,
p. A34, Retrieved April 20, 2006, from http://web.lexis-nexis.com

Kilroy, I. (2004). Reflecting absence or celebrating defeat. *The Irish Times*, *City Edition*,
p. 56, Retrieved March 14, 2006, from http://www.lexis-nexis.com

Kirke, K. (2001). Weekend of heartache: Let us honor the dead [Letter to the editor]. *The
New York Times*, p. 4(10). Retrieved April 20, 2006,
from http://web.lexis-nexis.com

Kitch, C. (2002). "A death in the American family": Myth, memory, and national values
in the media mourning of John F. Kennedy, Jr. *Journalism & Mass
Communication Quarterly*, *79*, 294-309.

Langewiesche, W. (2002). *American ground, unbuilding the World Trade Center.* New
York: North Point Press.

Leone, R. C. (2001). The working life of two towers [Letter to the editor]. *The New York*

Times, p. A23. Retrieved April 20, 2006, from http://web.lexis-nexis.com

Lewis, M. J. (2001). Before & after; In a changing skyline, a sudden,

glaring void. *The New York Times*, pg. 4(4). Retrieved April 20, 2006, from

http://web.lexis-nexis.com

Leveling the freedom center. (2005). *The New York Times*, p. A30, Retrieved May 31,

2006, from http://web.lexis-nexis.com

Lisus, N. A., & Ericson, R. V. (1995). Misplacing memory: The effect of television

format on Holocaust remembrance. *British Journal of Sociology*, *46*, 1-19.

Lower Manhattan Development Corporation. (2002). *Memorial center advisory*

committee recommendations. Retrieved February 13, 2006, from

http://www.renewnyc.com/memorial/memorial_center_draft_rec.asp

Lunke, T. G. (2001). Fighting back, While preserving our values; In

memoriam [Letter to the editor]. *The New York Times*, p. A26. Retrieved April 20,

2006, from http://web.lexis-nexis.com

MacIntyre, A. C. (1981). *After virtue: A study in moral theory*. Notre Dame: University

of Notre Dame Press.

Mallory, R. (2001). The aftermath; why make art? [Letter to the editor]. *The New York*

Times, p. (2)4, Retrieved April 20, 2006, from http://web.lexis-nexis.com

Mandziuk, R. M. (2003). Commemorating Sojourner Truth: Negotiating spaces of public

memory. *Western Journal of Communication*, *67*, 271-291.

Martel, N. (2003). Television review; at ground zero, eyes on the future. *The New*

York Times, p. B14, Retrieved April 20, 2006, from http://web.lexis-nexis.com

McIntyre, J., & Starr, B. (2002). Project phoenix: Pentagon offices rise from the rubble.

CNN, Retrieved April 20, 2006, from http://web.lexis-nexis.com

Montebello, P. (2001). The iconic power of an artifact. *The New York Times*, p. A29,

Retrieved April 20, 2006, from http://web.lexis-nexis.com

Murphy, D. E. (2001). A nation challenged: The families; Slowly, families accepting

ruins as a burial ground. *The New York Times*, p. B1, Retrieved May 22, 2006,

from http://web.lexis-nexis.com

Muschamp, H. (2002). Don't rebuild. Reimagine. *The New York Times*, p. (6)46,

Retrieved May 31, 2006, from http://web.lexis-nexis.com

Nagourney, A. (2001). Mayoral candidates discuss plans for a transformed

city. *The New York Times*, p. A20, Retrieved April 20, 2006, from

http://web.lexis-nexis.com

National Memorial Institute for the Prevention of Terrorism. (2006). *About MIPT*.

Retrieved April 11, 2006, from http://www.mipt.org/About.asp

Ouroussoff, N. (2005). A deepening gloom about ground zero's future. *The New

York Times*, p. B9, Retrieved April 20, 2006, from http://web.lexis-nexis.com

Perez-Pena, R. (2001). After the attacks: The overview; City to create commission to

oversee reconstruction. *The New York Times*, p. A6, Retrieved May 31, 2006,

from http://web.lexis-nexis.com

Pogrebin, R. (2005). Is culture gone at ground zero? *The New York Times*, p. E33,

Retrieved April 20, 2006, from http://web.lexis-nexis.com

Pristin, T. (2001). A nation challenged: Reporter's notebook; A vow to rebuild. *The New

York Times*, p. B8, Retrieved April 20, 2006, from http://web.lexis-nexis.com

Prosise, T. O. (1998). Prejudice, historical witness, and responsible: Collective memory

and liminality in the Beit Hashoah Museum of Tolerance. *Communication Quarterly*, *51*, 351-366.

Purnick, J. (2001). Metro matters: In a crisis, The Guiliani we wanted. *The New York Times*, p. A6, Retrieved April 20, 2006 from http://web.lexis-nexis.com

Purnick, J. (2002). Metro matters; a dissent on hallowing 9/11 ground. *The New York Times*, p. B1, Retrieved April 20, 2006, from http://web.lexis-nexis.com

Roberts, K. G. (2004). Texturing the narrative paradigm: Folklore and communication. *Communication Quarterly*, *52*, 129-142.

Rothstein, E. (2004). What should a city be? Redesigning an ideal. *The New York Times*, p. B7, Retrieved May 1, 2006, from http://web.lexis-nexis.com

Rowland, R. C. (1987). Narrative: Mode of discourse or paradigm? *Communication Monographs*, *54*, 264-276.

Schwartz, P. (2006). *Our Company: Awards*. Retrieved May 31, 2006, from http://www.nytco.com/company-awards.html

Schuster, H. (2005). Know your terrorist. *CNN*, Retrieved May 22, 2006, from http://www.cnn.com/2005/US/06/15/schuster.column/index.html

Silverstein, L. (2001). At ground zero, rebuild, and honor [Letter to the editor]. *The New York Times*, p. A22, Retrieved May 1, 2005, from http://web.lexis-nexis.com

Smith, L. D. (1989). A narrative analysis of the party platforms: The Democrats and Republicans of 1984. *Communication Quarterly*, *37*, 91-99.

Smith, C. A., & Smith, K. B. (2000). A rhetorical perspective on the 1987 British party manifestos. *Political Communication*, *17*, 457-473.

Steinhauer, J. (2002). Threats and responses: Perspectives; grieve today, mayor says,

and then grasp tomorrow. *The New York Times*, p. A1, Retrieved April 20, 2006, from http://web.lexis-nexis.com

Stroud, S. R. (2002). Multivalent narratives: Extending the narrative paradigm with insights from ancient Indian philosophical texts. *Western Journal of Communication*, *66*, 369-393.

Szlos, O. (2003). The new ground zero; What's in a name [Letter to the editor]. *The New York Times*, p. (2)4, Retrieved April 20, 2006, from http://web.lexis-nexis.com

Thomas, E. (2001). A new date of infamy. *Newsweek*, *Special Edition*, 22-31.

Tierney, J. (2001). The big city; beauty from evil: Preserving felled tower façade as sculpture. *The New York Times*, p. A20, Retrieved April 20, 2006, from http://web.lexis-nexis.com

Tonn, M. B., Endress, V. A., Diamond, J. N. (1993). Hunting and heritage on trial: A dramatistic debate over tragedy, tradition, and territory. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, *79*, 165-182.

Traub, J. (2003). The way we live now: 9-7-03; Public building. *The New York Times*, Retrieved May 31, 2006, from http://web.lexis-nexis.com

Turning to renewal. (2002). *The New York Times*, p. A22, Retrieved May 31, 2006, from http://web.lexis-nexis.com

Van Leeuwan, S. (2001). Stories of a stricken city, and a grieving land; Memorial to victims [Letter to the editor]. *The New York Times*, p. A26. Retrieved April 20, 2006, from http://web.lexis-nexis.com

Westfeldt, A. (2006). WTC memorial work begins. *The Huntsville Times*, *96*, p. A5.

Wood, J. F. (2005). Living by parental narratives: A narrative criticism of Marian Wright

Edelman's the measure of success: A letter to my children and yours. *Texas*

Speech Communication Journal, *29*, 106-117.

Wyatt, E. (2002a). Ground zero: planning; Many voices, but little dialogue on memorial

for trade center site. *The New York Times*, p. B1. Retrieved January 6, 2006, from

http://www.lexis-nexis.com

Wyatt, E. (2002b). New design for concourse will avoid site of towers. *The*

New York Times, p. 31. Retrieved April 20, 2006, from http://web.lexis-nexis.com

Wyatt, E. (2002c). Many minds, each envisioning a different 9/11 memorial.

The New York Times, p. B1, Retrieved April 20, 2006, from http://web.lexis-

nexis.com

Wyatt, E. (2002d). Design teams are selected for new plans for 9/11 site. *The New York*

Times, p. B1, Retrieved May 31, 2002, from http://web.lexis-nexis.com

Wyatt, E. (2003a). Ground zero: The site; ground zero plan seems to circle

back. *The New York Times*, p. B1, Retrieved April 20, 2006, from

http://web.lexis-nexis.com

Wyatt, E. (2003b). Design team for trade center reveals a revised master

plan. *The New York Times*, p. B1, Retrieved April 20, 2006, from http://web.lexis-

nexis.com

Young, C. (2005). Contemporary Native American rhetoric: A narrative criticism of the

Cherokee rally. *Texas Speech Communication Journal*, *29*, 131-141.

Young, J. E. (2004). Memories in high relief. *The New York Times*, p. (14)13,

Retrieved April 20, 2006, from http://web.lexis-nexis.com