Urbanism, Nationalism and the Politics of Place: Commemoration and Collective Memory

James Mellon

Introduction

One obstacle in the way of clarifying the relationship between nationalism and urbanism is a lack of clarity about what nationalism implies, and about what urbanism implies. Too often, reference is made to nationalism as if it was a simple notion, and the only relevant issue was its strength or weakness in a given context. Nationalism relates to the assertion of a pride in identity, and as long as notions of identity may contend in a given context, nationalism itself will be a complex matter. Nationalism may take the form of civic nationalism or of an ethnic nationalism, sometimes associated with intolerance for those who are perceived as being outside the nation. Urbanism is not a straightforward concept, either. Some relationship presumably exists between urbanization, which has been a trend from the Industrial Revolution on, and urbanism. Urbanization tends to undermine the affective bonds of clan and locality, and to encourage a sense of nationalism, in part to provide some sense of belonging to a larger whole in the absence of the support systems traditionally provided by clan and locality. Urbanism refers not simply to a certain population density but to certain sorts of relationships between a city and hinterland. Tuan observes that population density does not necessarily produce urbanism.[1] Urbanism, he suggests, entails certain relations between city and hinterland. Rae refers to an "old urbanism" in which cities were characterized by five elements --- "industrial convergence", "a dense fabric of enterprise", "a centralized clustering of housing", "a dense civic fauna of organizations", and a "pattern of political integration" --- and to the possibility of a future "new urbanism".[2] Scobey observes that "Unlike the more technical 'planning', 'urbanism' seems to me to convey the cultural stakes of urban reconstruction, denoting both a program of physical interventions and the ideological and aesthetic discourses that inform them."[3] Nor is urbanism necessarily good or bad in itself. Both the refined ambience of the sidewalk café and the soul-numbing blocks of slum tenements are aspects of urban life. For many in all historical periods, urbanism has reflected less a conscious choice than an outcome of either necessity, accident of birth or choice of occupation or spouse.

There has long existed a strand within the literature reflecting the aspiration that cities may somehow transcend differences. Mumford, for example, writes that "Today the physical dimensions and the human scope of the city have changed; and most of the city's internal functions and structures must be recast to promote effectively the larger purposes that shall be served: the unification of man's inner and outer life, and the progressive unification of mankind itself."[4] On the other hand, because of urbanization's association with globalization, it may reduce the distinctiveness of the local in favour of a certain homogeneity across borders. Of course, some, like Mumford, do not have such a concern. Indeed, Mumford followed his reference to "the progressive unification of mankind itself" with a sentence suggesting that "The city's active role in future is to bring to the highest pitch of development the variety and individuality of regions, cultures, personalities."[5] He goes on to assert that "These are complementary purposes: their alternative is the current mechanical grinding down of both the landscape and the human personality."[6] In any case, what can be said about the implications for urbanism?

The political philosopher Alan Ryan points out that there are two distinct issues raised. One is a normative issue raised as an outcome of the premise that ". . . the city <u>should</u> display a physical order that will reflect the commitments of, and have a moral effect on, the inhabitants of an area".[7] The other Ryan refers to as a "diagnostic" issue, and this arises as a consequence of the premise that ". . . we can as a matter of fact read the commitments of a given society in its city planning."[8] To some degree, the peace and prosperity of certain cities reflects the outcome of chance or historical accident; to some degree, conscious decisions and effective implementation of sound plans can be seen to improve the urban situation, while division or irrationality can be seen to have culminated in adverse consequences.

Perhaps the most well-known book on this subject is Christine Boyer's <u>The City of Collective Memory</u>.[9] Boyer suggests that two hundred years ago the prevailing sense of the city was what she calls "the city as a work of art" which was characterized by the effort on the part of monarchs or other public authorities to use public space and architecture to seek to impress viewers with the majesty and legitimacy of sovereignty. This was superseded, she tells us, by a sense of "the city as panorama" which viewed the

city as a whole emphasizing movement. The currently prevailing sense, in Boyer's view, is "the city as spectacle" in which the line between public and private is blurred, and the viewer is faced with a random pattern of images promoting a brand whether of tooth-paste, fast-food, housing subdivision or city. Boyer worries that, in such a prevailing climate, any higher aspiration for the city than the market-place tends to be denigrated. Boyer's critique is not of the notion of urban planning and heritage preservation but of their too common actual practice. Boyer worries that this practice too readily glosses over the sometimes problematic character of the past and the actual melange of disparate elements that constitute the urban environment, and focuses only on its most congenial elements, thereby limiting the reliability of that environment as a repository of, and prompt for collective memory. Boyer also expresses concern that this practice as it has evolved has lost a sense of vision of the possibility of addressing social and ecological problems in innovative ways.

Identity, Place and Meaning

The potential for conflict over such issues is noted in some of the recent literature. In his recent book on the past, present and future of cities, Rykwert stresses the relevance of the notion of "place" with all its implicit specificity and concreteness in contrast to the more abstract notion of "space".[10] Agnew suggests that the notion of place entails three elements --- locale, location and sense of place.[11] Jacobson reflects that "Place locates individuals and societies of people in a point in time and space and in doing so resolves ---potentially --- the (infinite) stream of space and time, by orienting human beings in a given society, culture, or civilization, placing them in the cosmos."[12] He discusses how landmarks may be viewed differently from different perspectives and at different points in time. To illustrate this, he looks at different interpretations of the Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument, in which case changes in presentation and even in the monument's name were made in an effort to be more sensitive to the concerns of aboriginal Americans; the Vietnam War Memorial, in which case critics of the original design felt that it under-emphasized the recognition of the patriotism of those who served; and the United States National Holocaust Memorial Museum, in which case some wondered whether it was appropriate to dedicate a national museum in the United States in commemoration of a tragic event that occurred in another continent. Shackel cites the differing responses to the Robert Gould Shaw Memorial in Boston.[13] Some have seen this memorial to the commanding officer of the Fifty-Fourth Massachusetts Infantry, one of the first African-American regiments in the Civil War, as rising above racial and racist stereotypes; others have objected that its focus on Shaw reinforces racist stereotypes. With changes in society, the memorial itself is now viewed, as reflected by a change in the name of the monument, as a tribute not to an individual alone but to the Fifty-Fourth. Observing that ". . . saving a public past for any city or town is a political as well as historical and cultural process."[14], Hayden points out that changes in the attention to issues of gender are reflected in the decision of the United States National Park Service to develop a Women's Rights National Historic Park in Seneca Falls, New York.[15] This subjective element entailed in concepts like "place" and "community" is also noted by Zukin in a discussion of American city life. She observes that "Cities have also shifted from a population historically recognized as homogeneous, after the great immigration waves of the late 19th and early 20th century ended, to a population of far greater ethnic and social diversity. This change in the public has had a great impact on public culture. . . . How the great public spaces of modernity absorb and reflect the tensions, and create a more inclusive vision of separate identities, is part of the visible struggle to enter the 21st century."[16]

The urban landscape is to a substantial degree a product of forces beyond the control of any city or its people. Not only are there, of course, the same impersonal economic, political and strategic forces that impinge on states, but the subordinate and non-sovereign character of city government imposes limits, as well. The result has been that the focus of urban politics literature, whether in the traditional emphasis on the legal and constitutional aspects of local government or in the modern emphasis on socio-economic challenges, has concentrated on the limits of urban politics. Discussion of urban politics, as a result, tends to shift quickly to discussions of delivery of urban public services and away from the more overtly political aspects of urban government. While it can reasonably be stated that cities are vulnerable to a greater degree than may be the case with national or provincial/state governments to the effects of external social and economic forces, nevertheless, there persists a degree to which cities, for better or for worse, are capable of shaping their own environment. Rykwert emphasizes the necessity to view the city ". . . as a concatenation of man-made, willed things --- things that add up to a texture of places. Places in turn are

composed of buildings and streets and parks, which are ordered and decided upon by more or less empowered individuals for varying, often incompatible reasons."[17] Sometimes the issues raised are ones over which differing viewpoints exist. For present purposes, some of the instances in which the character of the urban landscape became a conscious issue and one related to nationalism should be noted.

Warsaw was occupied by German forces during World War II, and the urban landscape was a matter of profound symbolic political importance for both Poles and Germans in this period. Tung observes that "German architects carefully identified the historic monuments of the city: the most beautifully proportioned buildings, the buildings designed by distinguished architects, the buildings where famous Varsovians had lived, the places where important historic events had taken place, the buildings with gracious sculptural decoration, the buildings of symbolic importance, the best examples of different architectural styles, the most meaningful buildings of various periods, the proudest churches, the richest palaces, the most beautiful homes, and the neighbourhoods where the architecture of Warsaw was knit into an artistic whole --- the panoply of Warsaw's pride built across seven hundred years of history."[18] The purpose of such study, however, was to obliterate effectively the built expressions of Polish pride and culture as a means of undermining resistance to occupation. But in the face of such an effort, underground organizations of Polish architects and planners both developed meticulous documentation of structures from pre-war Warsaw, and worked on plans for post-war reconstruction at great peril. Tung notes that "In the reconstruction, the Varsovians have edited the unvarnished truth --- and some of its occasional ugliness, stupidity, and imperfection --- out of the cityscape. Perhaps they understood the ultimate futility of trying to put all such idiosyncrasies back. Historic Warsaw, the achievement of a more recent generation, is an evocation of selected parts of the past. The particular character of six hundred years of evolution has been stolen away forever. The Warsaw of today is a new tale."[19] The point is that for residents of Warsaw (or Varsovians) the effort to preserve the specific quality of urban landscape and life was an integral part of Polish nationalist resistance, and that this experience has conditioned attitudes to heritage preservation in Poland ever since.

A recurring theme in the discussions included in the recent collection edited by Czaplicka and Ruble[20] is the determination of ideologically-driven authoritarian regimes to attempt to eradicate the distinctively local elements of a cityscape in favour of an imposed style reflecting the ideology of the regime. Buildings and monuments commemorating the national and pre-Communist character of societies in Eastern Europe were viewed as anachronistic, and either neglected or demolished during the Cold War. Sezneva points out how this effort to erase a city's past led to frustrations among residents of Kaliningrad in the Soviet Union (formerly Konigsberg in Germany) in the post-World War II period even though, with population shifts in the aftermath of war, few of the post-war residents of Kaliningrad had, in fact, resided there prior to the war. She remarks that "Kaliningrad provides a particularly interesting case. It presents a conflict between representations of place as new and 'cleansed' from memories and its creatively revived past. The relationships between ideological historical rewriting and the material culture of the city became problematic."[21] Hrytsak and Susak observe that "Creating a new Soviet image had some success in different regions of the Ukraine, but it proved to be a total failure in the case of L'viv."[22] They note that, with the dissolution of the Soviet Union, the new government in L'viv set out to make L'viv a Ukrainian city. This entailed, they suggest, not only an effort ". . . to create a Ukrainian image of the city but to promote a national version of Ukrainian historical memory as well."[23] Sparitis chronicles the campaign in the independent post-Soviet Riga in Latvia that culminated in the reconstruction of the historic city core with the Town Hall and the House of the Black Heads. He comments that "During the period of perestroika no voice was raised against the proposed reconstruction of a German symbol, for everyone felt the necessity of renewing areas such as Town Hall Square that had been marred by a clumsy, megalithic architecture, and brutal aesthetics characteristic of the architecture spawned by communist ideology."[24] Sparitis observes that "A politically independent society desired to shape a capital of its own, to shape its own country, and to recall the ideals of the first independent Latvian Republic of the 1920s and 1930s as the new millenium approached."[25] The emergence of new states with the end of the Cold War revived diverse nationalisms. While this did not necessarily lead to the sort of violence characteristic, for example, of the break-up of Yugoslavia, these changes continue to raise issues in many places about the place for Russians and other nationalities throughout the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe.

Such issues have emerged elsewhere, as well. Under the Franco regime, the identities and languages associated with regions within Spain were suppressed. Among these was the Catalan identity and language, and consequently Barcelona, the major city within that region, suffered from neglect. Since the restoration of democracy under the monarchy, there has been a dramatic shift in the attitude of the national

government towards the expression of regional identities. One consequence has been a deliberate policy on the part of local authorities in Barcelona to exploit cultural monuments and international events like the Olympics to revive a city and turn it into a model for other urban centres. Rykwert notes that "Barcelona had been scarred by the Civil War and was regarded with disfavor by the Franquist regime as a center of separatism. In the new democratic-federal Spain, the capital of the Catalan region now sees itself as an independent metropolis, and even before bagging the Olympic Games, embarked on a policy that the Catalan architect and politician Oriol Bohigas, who is most responsible for the transformation, has described as one of 'monumentalizing the suburbs and sanitizing the center,' an invocation of and an improvement on Soria y Mata's catchword --- that he wanted 'to urbanize the country and ruralize the town.'"[26] Subiros observes that:

> . . . by the mid-1970s Barcelona faced much more than the conventional urban problems. The city as center and driving force behind the 'Catalan factor' aspired to more than a mere rationalization of its infrastructure and services. Since the early 1960s and particularly when Franco died in 1975, Barcelona saw the development of significant sociopolitical movements in a range of areas: first, in the fight for democratic rights and social justice, not just for Catalonia but for Spain as a whole; second, for Catalonia's autonomy and for the recovery of self-government and its related institutions; and third, for the defense and reconstruction of Catalonia's cultural and linguistic heritage.[27]

Barcelona's strategy of cultivating cultural institutions included not only the Olympics but such institutions as the Catalan Art Museum, the Contemporary Art Museum, the Barcelona Center of Contemporary Culture, the Municipal Auditorium and the National Theater of Catalonia. This strategy in Barcelona has come to be viewed internationally as having been remarkably successful not only in developing a noteworthy cityscape but in strengthening democracy itself in the region.

Politics, Identity and Memory

It will not come as a surprise to students of nationalism that people can identify strongly with a particular collectivity known as a nation, which may or may not correspond with one or more states. People may also identify with a local community or city, which may be populated primarily by members of a given nation or by persons identifying with a number of nations. This is sometimes further complicated by the fact that individuals identifying with the same nation may nevertheless hold differing senses about what that national identity signifies. People who identify with a given community look around them to find expressions of their national and civic identities in that community, and generations do, both consciously and unconsciously, express their identities in the material culture of brick and stone, marble and concrete, just as they do in literature and art. Mumford observes that ". . . the historic city retains, by reason of its amplitude and its long past, a larger and more various collection of cultural specimens than can be found elsewhere."[28] Harvey remarks that "A city center, it has been said, is a great book of time and history."[29] Different identities and contending conceptions of the same identity hold different narratives, and look to discern and to promote recognition of those narratives in the cityscape around them. For Varsovians, a particular architecture reflected their sense of their distinct history as Poles. It becomes more complicated in a case like Barcelona where some residents see themselves as simply Spanish and others see themselves and their city as specifically Catalan. In cities that have experienced rule by different powers and flows of migration, this may be immensely complicated. For residents of Riga, the reconstruction of the House of the Black Heads represented an affirmation of the city's Latvian and German heritages arguably at the expense of its Russian and specifically Soviet heritages. This is even clearer in L'viv where renaming streets after Ukrainian heroes may mean replacing a name honouring a Russian hero.

It is inevitable that people will look around themselves for recognition of who they are and who they aspire to be as a collectivity in the physical environment. It is also inevitable that changes in the social, political and economic orders will inspire efforts to transform that physical environment to maintain an element of congruence with senses of identity and aspiration. What is not inevitable, however, is that such efforts will necessarily be sensitive or inclusive. It need not necessarily be the case that the sense of identity reflected in art and architecture will genuinely capture an historically accurate rendering of a

community's past in its various facets, especially when elements of that past may be embarrassing or ignoble. Tung cites a number of examples where issues of this sort arose.

Among them is the issue of how Berlin should memorialize the historical experience of the 1933-45 period. Also, Berlin has had to confront how to mark the divisions defined both by a confrontation between democracy and totalitarianism, and by the Berlin Wall, a physical structure that served both as a means of enforcing repression on one side of the Wall, and as a symbol of the ideological and strategic confrontation. Since reunification following the fall of the Berlin Wall, Berlin has gone some distance towards dealing with the issues raised. One hundred eighty-nine roads that had previously linked East and West Berlin were reconnected, and seven major crossings of the Spree River were either re-opened or constructed.[30] Reader observes that reunification ". . . presented Berlin with visions and opportunities such as no city in history had seen --- a city reborn, a new capital in the vanguard of a new world order. But making a reality of the vision presented challenges of huge and hitherto unencountered proportions."[31] Tung observes that "Many old wounds are being healed; others are being exposed to the light. Berlin's central Holocaust monument and its many self-critical markers will color the very visage of the city in perpetuity, conveying regret and responsibility for terrible deeds that Germans have resolved will not be dissociated from their capital, as if the cityscape is a reflection of its conscience."[32] With the fall of the Berlin Wall, some once central sites that were essentially on the outskirts of either East or West Berlin where once major thoroughfares for thirty years ended at the Wall suddenly became central once more. One thinks of the Brandenburg Gate and the Potsdamer Platz, for example. Once the Potsdamer Platz was the centre of the central business district before a wall cut it off from one Berlin and left it at the edge, rather than the centre of the other. With re-unification, Potsdamer Platz is once more an attractive and a high-profile site. As in other cities, there is a concern about heritage preservation, and in some cases, restoration. In Berlin, however, this is complicated. There is concern that the past not be forgotten but there is also anxiety that restoration may entail celebration of a past that includes Naziism. In Berlin, even to a greater degree than in most cities, it becomes a matter of controversy what is preserved and restored. The vestiges of the Nazi era have to be preserved but this is complicated by issues of who qualifies as either complicit or as victim. The effort to come to terms with this was reflected in the Topography of Terror exhibit on the grounds where the former Gestapo headquarters once stood and where, with the demolition of the Wall, below-ground bunkers have been found. The persistence of the dilemma was reflected in the difficulty over twelve years in selecting an appropriate site and design for a permanent Holocaust memorial. West Berliners have little sympathy for the preservation of monuments in East Berlin from the GDR era, and in some cases whatever people think about Communism, it disturbs some East Berliners when a structure like the Palace of the Republic is threatened by the campaign to restore the old royal palace on its former site. In 1993 and 1994, the façade of the old royal palace was displayed on canvas scaffolding at its former site. In 1995, the artist Christo wrapped the Reichstag, a building that had housed the German parliament and been the scene of an historic fire that unleashed atrocities, and with the reunification of Germany and the relocation of government offices from Bonn, would be restored to house a German parliament once more. Pressure to replace East Berlin street names encountered the problem that, in some cases, restoring earlier names to some streets would mean replacing names honouring communist heroes with names that honoured figures associated with Germany's past militarism. Huyssen writes that "There is perhaps no other major Western city that bears the marks of twentieth-century history as intensely and self-consciously as Berlin. This city text has been written, erased, and rewritten throughout that violent century, and its legibility relies as much on visible markers of built space as on images and memories repressed and ruptured by traumatic events."[33] Ladd observes that "All cities' buildings display their cultural traditions, but the sandy soil of the German capital conceals the traces of a history so fiercely contested that no site, however vacant, is safe from controversy. Each proposal for construction, demolition, preservation, or renovation ignites a battle over symbols of Berlin and of Germany."[34]

The historical experience of Soviet totalitarianism raises such issues, as well. Colton notes that, after the fall of the Soviet Union, a number of places and structures were renamed.[35] The Lenin Hills once more are known as the Sparrow Hills. The Lenin Library was renamed the Russian State Library. Oktyabr'skaya ploshchad, in memory of the October Revolution, was retitled Kaluzhskaya ploschad (Kaluga Square). Novokirovskii prospekt, in memory of Sergei Kirov, was renamed prospekt Akademika A. D. Sakharova (Academician Sakharov Prospect). During communism's final days and subsequently many have been critical of the Soviet efforts to break with Russian traditions.[36] Popular pressure led planners in 1986-1987 to initiate a design competition for reconstruction of the Sukharev Tower,

demolished in 1934. While reconstruction did not take place, trusts were able to re-build such structures demolished during Stalin's time as the Cathedral of Christ the Redeemer, the Kazan Cathedral, and the Red Staircase of the Faceted Palace in the Kremlin. There has been some controversy about what to do with Soviet-era monuments.[37] After some uncertainty, work continued on the Victory Monument, commemorating victory in World War II, on Poklonnaya Hill. Seven of sixty-eight large statues or busts of Lenin have remained in place. Nineteen of forty-eight major statues of Soviet figures, and the statue of Marx on Teatral'naya ploschad have been retained, while some statues and monuments have either been removed or put into storage. Tung notes that "Today, while self-critical monuments of conscience are rare in Russia, nevertheless a few hard-won and modest memorials have been raised at important historic locations."[38]

Tung, as well, recounts the debates over how to proceed when excavation in anticipation of the construction of a federal government office building in lower Manhattan resulted in discovery of an African-American burial site from the days of slavery.[39] Also, Tung relates how the accidental discovery of the location of the Aztec Pyramid in Mexico City reminded residents of past mistreatment of aboriginal peoples.[40] Just as notions of identity and aspiration are never finalized but are always under review, even as they are set in stone, so the way a city views itself and expresses that view is never finalized. Because of the subjective character of such questions, many times these issues will be controversial.

Few cities today are inhabited exclusively by any single ethnic, linguistic or religious group, and a history in which different groups have been in ascendancy at different times is almost certain to mean that, in the absence of a calculated effort to wipe out traces of one group, a city's landmarks will reflect the identities of more than one group. Of course, such calculated efforts have been attempted in the past by, for example, Nazi occupation forces in Warsaw, and more recently as part of ethnic cleansing campaigns in the former Yugoslavia. In the case of Bosnia, for example, Riedlmayer maintains that "This systematic assault on culture can be explained as an attempt to eliminate the material evidence --- books, documents, and works of art --- that could remind future generations that people of different ethnic and religious traditions once shared a common heritage and common space in Bosnia."[41] He observes that "These records were proof that others once lived in that place, that they had historical roots there. By burning the documents, by razing houses of worship and bulldozing graveyards, the nationalists who overran and 'cleansed' hundreds of towns and villages in Bosnia were trying to insure themselves against any possibility that the people they had expelled and dispossessed might one day return to reclaim their homes and property."[42] He suggests that Serbian forces, which would have been predominantly Serbian Orthodox, made an effort to destroy mosques and Catholic churches. Such landmarks as the National Library and the Oriental Institute, both in Sarajevo, and the Franciscan Theological Seminary in Nedzarici were destroyed.

Even among members of the same ethnic group there may be differing interpretations of the shared history. Certainly, when different groups co-exist, there will be differing interpretations, even when an outside observer may have difficulty defining differences. Ignatieff refers to "the narcissism of minor difference".[43] Another recurring theme in the contributions to Czaplicka and Ruble's recent collection is the issue of ". . . how the diverse peoples of great urban communities forge a shared and public civic identity that can sustain them and their neighbors through difficult transitionary periods."[44] This collection examines cases ". . . of both successful and incomplete transmutations from the exclusionary self-images that accompany authoritarian rule to more embracing civic identities that lend support to nascent democratic institutions."[45] Whether democracy will be more inclined or not to inclusiveness may depend on whether democracy is viewed in substantive or procedural terms. To confirm this, one need only recall the cases of jim-crow laws that effectively disenfranchised African-American voters in parts of the United States, even though elections were still held, and of apartheid in South Africa in which a white minority carried on electoral politics while excluding members of the Black majority.

A particularly striking case is that posed by the World Trade Center site in New York in the aftermath of the terrible events of September 11, 2001. Currently different stakeholders are putting forward their preferred outcomes. Whatever ultimately is done on the site will be expected to accomplish a number of ends. It will have to recognize sensitively that several thousand innocent people suddenly met their deaths at the site. Whatever happens on the site, it will be mandatory to encompass some sort of memorial. It has also been suggested that, aside from the obvious commercial market value of the site, some provision for office, commercial and residential use may represent not only practicality but also a politically symbolic defiance, persisting in the life of modernity, democratic politics and market economics that the authors of the events of September 11, 2001 saw themselves as striking a blow against. The eventual design will

encompass a number of elements, one of which will be a memorial to those innocent lives lost. The process has been complicated by the sheer number of actors involved, and by the lack of an obvious consensus. Among the actors are the New York Port Authority which owned the site, Larry Silverstein and Silverstein Properties who were the leaseholders of the site, the City of New York, the State of New York, the federal government, the survivors of those killed, the tenants, the residents of New York, especially of Manhattan, and specifically of the Tribeca and Battery Park City neighbourhoods, the community of academics, architects and activists, and the Lower Manhattan Development Corporation, set up by Governor Pataki to undertake a coordinating function.[46] These actors held quite different notions about what should be done, and understandably in some cases feelings were deeply held. When construction of the Towers was first proposed, the notion was, and continued to be controversial because it represented a mega-project that displaced a community, and for some activists and academics, the Towers symbolized a type of urban renewal and development about which they had reservations until the circumstances of their destruction endowed them with a very different and very dramatic symbolism. Some, like the groups Team Twin Towers and the World Trade Center Restoration Movement, wanted the Towers re-built essentially as they had been. Silverstein and his architects, Skidmore, Owings and Merrill, already working prior to September 11 on renovation and expansion plans, expressed concern that the lease agreements he had, on the one hand, with the Port Authority, and, on the other hand, with his tenants necessitated that he re-build, although not necessarily or even preferably to the same design, and he expected to finance construction from the insurance. For the survivors of those killed, not only the site itself but some surrounding blocks were hallowed ground as fragmentary remains were found, and maps developed identifying where remains were recovered. Many who had worked in the Towers had been commuters, and the local residents had quite different ideas from the families of those who had been killed. Emotions ran very high over the past few years as families of the killed wanted first the site and surrounding blocks where remains were found, then the site itself, and later, as support for some sort of development grew, the "footprints" of the Towers themselves preserved in memory of those they had lost, and as local residents wanted a development that would bring back stores, restaurants and coffee shops. The competition for designing the site and reconciling pressures both for re-development and for commemoration attracted most of the most celebrated names in the international architectural community, and each design for the site entailed a somewhat different approach to the reconciliation of the profane and the sacred. Skidmore, Owings and Merrill were among the losers when Governor Pataki dictated that, in spite of their reservations, the Lower Manhattan Development Corporation select Daniel Libeskind. This has been complicated by the fact that Libeskind in his site plan expressed definite ideas about what should be built but other architects with other ideas, including some like Skidmore, Owings and Merrill who had lost the competition to design the site plan had the commissions to design the actual buildings. It was also complicated by the fact that Libeskind's career had, until his design and the construction a couple of years previously of the addition, commonly referred to as the Jewish Museum, to the Berlin Museum, been almost entirely as an academic and an architectural theorist. Libeskind has never actually built anything of this scale, and this coupled with the very political style of Libeskind and his partner, Nina Libeskind, and the fact that, although Libeskind was brought up and went to school in New York, he had lived and worked in Europe for many years made his selection controversial. David Childs of Skidmore, Owings and Merrill, and Libeskind of Studio Libeskind clashed over the design of the Freedom Tower with Skidmore, Owings and Merrill's right to design the building eventually recognized. Libeskind's influence was further diminished when the jury established to adjudicate the competition for the memorial itself encouraged entrants not to feel bound by the site plan. As this is written, work on the memorial has commenced, even though some of the families of the deceased have sued to stop work because of their unhappiness with the planned memorial.

A Place in Time

While, as Agnew observes, the notion of place entails locale, location and sense of place, the discussion here focuses primarily, but not exclusively, on the sense of place. A critical dimension is time. In some ways, architectural heritage transcends time. Lynch observes that "After a catastrophe, the restoration of the symbolic center of community life is a matter of urgency: Saint Paul's in burned London, or the 'old city' in devastated Warsaw. Symbolic environment is used to create a sense of stability: threatened institutions celebrate their antiquity; kings proclaim their legitimate roots as well as their power."[47] In some situations, preservation and restoration are complicated by debate over which past to

preserve. In a city like Berlin, many sites have been occupied in different eras by different structures. Which era should be preserved? Should the Palace of the Republic in the former East Berlin be preserved, or should it make way for the restoration of the former royal palace from the Wilhelmine era? Time enters the picture, as well, in that our sense of the past itself evolves. For Berliners, the choice whether to preserve the medieval, imperial, republican, or Cold War landmarks involves reflection on past and present. It may have been said that "A rose by any other name would smell as sweet" but it does say something whether a city is called Saint Petersburg, Petrograd or Leningrad. As our sense of the past evolves, our sense of the memorable changes. It is a reflection of contemporary understandings in the United States of the appropriate role in society for women that it is viewed as appropriate to commemorate the work of pioneers in the campaign for the rights of women with a Women's Rights National Historic Park. It also tells us something about contemporary society when a site like that of "Custer's Last Stand" is renamed and re-interpreted, and when a site like the Robert Gould Shaw Memorial is renamed and re-interpreted to recognize not simply the remarkably advanced attitudes for his time of Shaw, who rejected not only slavery but also the condescension towards African-Americans that even many abolitionists exhibited, but the record of the Fifty-Fourth Massachusetts.

Place matters deeply to many. Recalling Ryan's reference to approaches to this issue, it may be observed that the pursuit of inclusiveness is, in general, an appropriate aspiration for cities. Examination reveals that, as a consequence of circumstance in part and deliberate planning in part, some cities have been more successful than others in this pursuit. In some of the cases cited, there has been general recognition of the aptness of the outcomes. In others, the suitability of the outcomes has inspired more debate. What is clear is that for cities facing these sorts of issues it is important that they consider carefully. The built heritage accumulated over centuries may disappear as a consequence of ill-considered development. Even when a site has been rendered vacant by destruction wrought by war, terrorism or fire, decisions need to be considered because buildings, even unattractive or out-of-scale ones, are likely to stand for some time.

---

[1] See Yi-Fu Tuan, Topophilia: A Study of Environmental Perception, Attitudes, and Values, (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1974), p. 151.

[2] See Douglas W. Rae, City: Urbanism and its End, (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2003), Chapter 1, "Creative Destruction and the Age of Urbanism".

[3] David M. Scobey, Empire City: The Making and Meaning of the New York City Landscape, (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2002), p. 9.

[4] Lewis Mumford, The City in History: Its Origins, Its Transformations and Its Prospects, (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1961), p. 570.

[5] Ibid.

[6] Ibid.

[7] Alan Ryan, "Justice and the City" in Robert Geddes, (ed.), Cities in Our Future, (Washington, D.C. and Covelo, California: Island Press, 1997), p. 15.

[8] Ibid.

[9] See M. Christine Boyer, The City of Collective Memory: Its Historical Imagery and Architectural Entertainments, (Cambridge, Massachusetts and London: M.I.T. Press, 1994).

[10] See Joseph Rykwert, The Seduction of Place: The History and Future of the City, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000; pbk ed., 2004).

[11] See John A. Agnew, Place and Politics: The Geographical Mediation of State and Society, (Boston: Allen and Unwin, 1987), Chapter 3, "A Theory of Place and Politics".

[12] David Jacobson, Place and Belonging in America, (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002), p. 194.

[13] See Paul A. Shackel, "The Robert Gould Shaw Memorial: Redefining the Role of the Fifty-Fourth Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry" in Paul A. Shackel, (ed.), Myth, Memory, and the Making of the American Landscape, (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2001).

[14] Dolores Hayden, The Power of Place: Urban Landscapes as Public History, (Cambridge, Massachusetts and London: M.I.T. Press, 1995), p. 13.

[15] Ibid., pp. 57-62.

[16] Sharon Zukin, The Cultures of Cities, (Cambridge, Massachusetts and Oxford: Blackwell, 1995), pp. 260-261.

[17] Rykwert, op. cit., p. 246.

[18] Anthony M. Tung, Preserving the World's Great Cities: The Destruction and Renewal of the Historic Metropolis, (New York: Three Rivers Press, 2001), p. 74.

[19] Ibid., pp. 94-95.

[20] John J. Czaplicka and Blair A. Ruble, (ed.), Composing Urban History and the Constitution of Civic Identities, (Washington, D.C.: Woodrow Wilson Center Press; and Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003).

[21] Olga Sezneva, "Dual History: The Politics of the Past in Kaliningrad, Former Konigsberg" in Czaplicka and Ruble, (ed.), op. cit., pp. 81-83.

[22] Yaroslav Hrytsak and Victor Susak, "Constructing a National City: The Case of L'viv" in Czaplicka and Ruble, (ed.), op. cit., p. 151.

[23] Ibid., p. 153.

[24] Ojars Sparitis, "The Rebirth and Restoration of Administrative, Political, and Cultural Symbols in Riga's Town Hall Square" in Czaplicka and Ruble, (ed.), p. 365.

[25] Ibid.

[26] Rykwert, op. cit., p. 238.

[27] Pep Subiros, "Barcelona: Cultural Strategies and Urban Renewal, 1979-1997" in Czaplicka and Ruble, (ed.), op. cit., p. 304.

[28] Mumford, op. cit., p. 562.

[29] David Harvey, Spaces of Capital: Towards a Critical Geography, (New York: Routledge, 2001), p. 128.

[30] See John Reader, Cities, (London: Vintage, 2004), p. 287.

[31] Ibid., p. 286.

[32] Tung, op. cit., pp. 400-401.

[33] Andreas Huyssen, Present Pasts: Urban Palimpsests and the Politics of Memory, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2003), pp. 51-52.

[34] Brian Ladd, The Ghosts of Berlin: Confronting German History in the Urban Landscape, (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1997), pp. 234-235.

[35] See Timothy J. Colton, Moscow: Governing the Socialist Metropolis, (Cambridge, Massachusetts and London: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1995), p. 734.

[36] See Ibid., pp. 730-733.

[37] See Ibid., pp. 733-734.

[38] Tung, op. cit., p. 401.

[39] Ibid., pp. 402-406.

[40] Ibid., pp. 406-411.

[41] Andras Riedlmayer, "From the Ashes: The Past and Future of Bosnia's Cultural Heritage" in Maya Shatzmiller, (ed.), Islam and Bosnia: Conflict Resolution and Foreign Policy in Multi-Ethnic States, (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2002), p. 114.

[42] Ibid.

[43] See Michael Ignatieff, Blood and Belonging: Journeys into the New Nationalism, (Toronto: Viking, 1993), pp. 14-19.

[44] Blair A. Ruble, "Living Apart Together: The City, Contested Identity, and Democratic Transitions" in Czaplicka and Ruble, (ed.), op, cit., pp. 19-20.

[45] Ibid., p. 2.

[46] See Philip Nobel, Sixteen Acres: Architecture and the Outrageous Struggle for the Future of Ground Zero, (New York: Metropolitan Books, Henry Holt, 2005).

[47] Kevin Lynch, What Time Is This Place?, (Cambridge, Massachusetts and London: M.I.T. Press, 1972), p. 40.