

Manuscript version: Author's Accepted Manuscript

The version presented in WRAP is the author's accepted manuscript and may differ from the published version or Version of Record.

Persistent WRAP URL:

<http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/126998>

How to cite:

Please refer to published version for the most recent bibliographic citation information. If a published version is known of, the repository item page linked to above, will contain details on accessing it.

Copyright and reuse:

The Warwick Research Archive Portal (WRAP) makes this work by researchers of the University of Warwick available open access under the following conditions.

Copyright © and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable the material made available in WRAP has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

Publisher's statement:

Please refer to the repository item page, publisher's statement section, for further information.

For more information, please contact the WRAP Team at: wrap@warwick.ac.uk.

Designing the Pentagon Memorial: Gendered Statecraft, Heroic Victimhood and Site Authenticity in War on Terror Commemoration¹

Charlotte Heath-Kelly, PAIS, University of Warwick

Abstract: How does a memorial curate an image of conflict when it is dwarfed by 6.5million square feet of the Department of Defense, when it is tasked with commemorating simultaneous military and civilian deaths, and when its public access consists of a sliver cut through one of the most secure sites on earth? Given the uniquely inconvenient siting of the Pentagon Memorial, this article argues that the Pentagon Memorial was itself curated by two memorial grammars: contemporary expectations that disaster sites resonate with 'authenticity'; and that civilians are incorporated into commemorative rhetoric of heroic victimhood, during the War on Terror. These memorial grammars constitute the Pentagon Memorial through gendered logics of statecraft. The memorial is crafted as a response to the sudden violation of the domestic realm on 9/11, as well as the violent entangling of civilian and military victims at the crash site. Its design encircles this moment of violation, where the bodies of 'protectors' were entangled with those of the 'protected'. The memorial freezes time a moment prior to impact – so that the masculine, militarised agents of state defence might once again be distinguished from civilians, and the distinction of inside/outside re-established. The Pentagon Memorial encircles the disruption of gendered logics of statecraft on 9/11, and their restitution.

"Tuesday, September 11, 2001 was a pivotal day for America and the world. We ask that you search your souls and envision a memorial that inspires visitors to contemplate what the attack means to them personally, to us as family members, to the community, to the country, and to the world. Visitors should comprehend that our loved ones were murdered simply because they were living and working in, and enjoying the benefits of, a free society. The memorial should instil the ideas that patriotism is a moral duty, that freedom comes at a price, and that the victims of this attack have paid the ultimate price. We challenge you to create a memorial that translates this terrible tragedy into a place of solace, peace, and healing." (Pentagon Memorial Family Steering Committee, 2002)

Introduction

Producing a national memorial to the victims of terrorism involves many considerations. When commissioned, stakeholders and steering committees first identify a location for the memorial – calculating its accessibility to the public, the challenges posed by its terrain, and the potential for visitor revenue (or situation upon national parkland managed by the state) to compensate for ongoing maintenance costs. Following these considerations, managing bodies are then tasked with obtaining that land from private owners – or enacting procedures for the appropriation of publicly

¹ The author is grateful for the comments made by the two anonymous peer-reviewers and the audience of the LSE's IR Theory Research Seminar series, from whom this paper received very useful feedback. The paper is significantly stronger, thanks to the input of you all.

owned land (Flight 93 Memorial Task Force 2004; Lower Manhattan Development Corporation 2003a; Sagalyn 2016). If all goes well, a site plan is then negotiated (zoned according to the types of usage planned for the land) before an international design competition is run to solicit artistic and architectural visions for the memorial component (Lower Manhattan Development Corporation 2003b). Finally, memorial steering committees then co-opt artistic consultants to sit alongside family representatives and civil servants, to choose the design which will best cater to the diverse needs of families, survivors, politicians, and the general public (Young 2016: 19-77).

A vast amount of labour and planning occurs, before a memorial design is selected to publicly curate a terrorist event. In the minutes of the various planning committees who organised national 9/11 memorials in the United States, discussions of site selection and financial longevity are often more prevalent than considerations of aesthetic impact or curation². The logistics and business case for memorials to terrorism in the United States (they must not become a financial burden to cities) can precede symbolic consideration. With this in mind, the article explores the National 9/11 Pentagon Memorial – the first of the three national 9/11 memorials to be constructed, opening on 11 September 2008.

Why this memorial? The Pentagon memorial is an outlier in terms of memorial conventions relating to site selection, public accessibility and the designated military *or* civilian referent of other such sites.³ Its idiosyncratic siting, and dual audience, help us to reflect upon the existence of those otherwise hidden grammars of commemoration practice. The memorial is located on one of the world's most securitized sites, the Pentagon Reservation, and rather than curating the events of 9/11 in the traditional museum style of storyboarding or providing artefacts (as its sister museum – the National September 11 Memorial and Museum – does), the memorial uses a geometric design to code Washington's victims of 9/11 as Department of Defense (DoD) employees or passengers aboard the hijacked airlines.

Through interviews with key protagonists and a site visit, the paper argues that the idiosyncratic Pentagon 9/11 Memorial enables us to see two powerful memorial grammars of the War on Terror: the drive to derive 'authenticity' and exceptionalise the site of terrorist attacks, and the incorporation of civilians into narratives of heroic sacrifice during acts of war (replete with many resulting tensions) (Swain & Tweedie 2011). The War on Terror is the context in which both grammars of commemoration have come to the fore (Heath-Kelly 2016), adapted from practices of genocide memorialisation (Young 2016). Importantly, both conventions *expose the gendered nature of commemoration at the Pentagon site*. Memorialisation is complicated at the Pentagon site as the victims were both military personnel and civilians. The design cannot exclusively utilise aesthetics of military sacrifice or the non-figurative architecture now common in commemorations of civilian massacre. Instead it orients individual markers to the deceased in different directions depending on their military/defence employment (or lack thereof). Using feminist research on the gendered

² The minutes of the Lower Manhattan Development Corporation board and advisory council meetings, regarding the World Trade Center site reconstruction, are available from:

<http://www.renewnyc.com/AboutUs/BoardMeetingsArch.aspx> &
<http://www.renewnyc.com/AboutUs/AdvisoryMeetings.aspx>.

³ However, the Pentagon Memorial does conform to other memorial conventions – such as the placement of names within commemorative architecture, the architectural object standing in for the human, and the erasure of the enemy from representation. My thanks to reviewer one for emphasising this point.

dynamics of statecraft, the article shows that the memorial encircles the binary distinction between military and civilian bodies, gesturing towards disentangling them and reinstating gendered norms of inside and outside in statecraft.

Feminist literature within International Politics explores how binary gendered archetypes structure statecraft: while the external realm is the domain of conflict and masculine protection, civilians fit within the narrative of the 'beautiful souls' who require the protection of that 'Just Warrior' (Elshtain 1982). Here the peaceful domestic realm is feminised, underpinning the construction of war-like realm beyond which militarised masculinities are dispatched to suppress. But the 9/11 attacks disrupted this rhetorical inside/outside distinction, with visceral horrors enacted upon the bodies of beautiful souls and defence employees employed at home.

To be clear, the designer and the manager of the Pentagon Memorial Fund both articulated no intention that military sacrifice can be distinguished from civilian tragedy in the representation of 9/11. In conversations with the author, their stated intentions were quite the opposite. And yet, by demarcating the victims according to employment in the defence sector, the memorial reproduces the gendered logics of statehood concerning who is expected to die violently and who is to be protected (Basham 2013; Elshtain 1982; Enloe 2007; Young 2003), and the seeming upturning of this assumption for a (white) U.S. audience on 9/11.

The disruption of the homeland as a place of safety and domesticity is strongly invoked in the Pentagon Memorial Family Steering Committee statement, which structured the memorial competition. Victims were rendered as military targets, despite their domesticity, and the breach of this gendered binary is used to reassert militarised patriotism:

Visitors should comprehend that our loved ones were murdered simply because they were living and working in, and enjoying the benefits of, a free society. The memorial should instil the ideas that patriotism is a moral duty, that freedom comes at a price, and that the victims of this attack have paid the ultimate price. (Pentagon Memorial Family Steering Committee, 2002, emphasis added)

The Steering Committee named the tension which resulted from the incursion of militarised violence into the domestic realm, then presented it to competition entrants as a problematic memory to be solved with design. As a result, the Pentagon memorial design incorporates and encircles this binary between (feminine) civilians and heroic (masculine) protectors in its architecture; although awkwardly, given that a significant number of Pentagon employees are civilian contractors.

The Logistics of Commemoration: Car Parking, Photography and Flight-Paths

The commemorative grammars which shape the Pentagon memorial become visible, given the outlier status of the site. How did it become possible to build a national, public memorial to the dead of 9/11 upon the Pentagon reservation - Department of Defense land? At face value, this location was an odd choice for a national memorial. High levels of visitation and the intense security arrangements which surround the United States' military headquarters combine to produce a unique situation whereby the tourist attraction cannot provide parking, refreshments or commercial facilities for its visitors. The site caters to 225,000 – 250,000 visitors per year, but cannot provide

parking facilities. These are reserved for 'AUTHORIZED PERSONNEL ONLY'.⁴ Drivers must pass through checkpoints on the Pentagon Reservation but then unload their passengers at designated drop-off points. Visitors are instead advised to use the subway system to reach the Pentagon and then walk several kilometres around the enormous structure to reach the memorial. In the United States, this kind of incompatibility between the site and the motor vehicle is exceptional.

The militarised space of the reservation renders access to the memorial difficult, but also restricts the potential for photography and the aesthetic qualities of the site. The memorial is positioned between two interstate freeways, I-395 and I-66, the asphalt stretch of the Pentagon's South Parking Lot, and the enormous concrete structure of the Department of Defense itself. Given this enclosure within military and state infrastructure, one cannot walk onto, or out from, the site. While photography is permitted within the memorial, it is strictly prohibited on all other parts of the reservation. It is almost impossible to photograph the memorial from any angle without capturing the Pentagon, the freeway, or the parking lot in one's image. There is constant auditory and visual disruption when attempting to frame the memorial within a photograph or video recording. Again, setting the memorial on this unforgiving terrain is exceptional.

In this concrete enclosure, one further discomfort interferes with the memorial's aesthetic. The Pentagon Memorial sits directly underneath the flight path for nearby Reagan International airport. During the author's visit, contemplation of the memorial was disrupted regularly by commercial aircraft taking off and passing directly overhead. When contemplating the horror of civilian aircraft being utilised as weapons against buildings, this regular disturbance by jets runs contrary to the memorial competition brief which invited designers to "create a Memorial that translates this terrible tragedy into a place of solace, peace, and healing".⁵ Instead one is repeatedly addressed by the noise of the aircrafts flying overhead and directs one's thoughts towards their passengers. Here the noisy continuation of work patterns and their related transport infrastructure impedes attempts to construct an atmosphere of reflective contemplation, creating tension between everyday banality and the aesthetic rendering of exceptional, sacred space.⁶

Such a site is not traditional fare for a monument or memorial. Given the problems with accessibility, photography, enclosure by freeways, and auditory disturbance by overhead flight paths, others sites offer a more forgiving and pleasant landscape for contemplation and remembrance. Arlington National Cemetery, for example, is sited only hundreds of metres away and could have alleviated many of the strains upon the memorial.

How, then, can we understand the site selection which underwrites this commemorative effort? This article uses interviews with the memorial's designers and the chair of the Pentagon Memorial Fund to ascertain why this particular location and design won the international design competition. The article identifies expectations that a contemporary post-terrorist memorial reconstruct affect *upon the site* of violence (Connor 2017; see also Foote 1997), reifying and reflecting the United States' militarised discourse about the exceptional status of the 9/11 attacks and the necessity of an

⁴ The National 9/11 Pentagon Memorial Website (undated): <https://pentagonmemorial.org/plan/frequently-asked-questions/where-can-visitors-park> (last accessed 30 April 2018). Capitalisation in original.

⁵ 'Families Statement' (undated), available at: <https://pentagonmemorial.org/explore/biographies/memorial-construction-timeline>, last accessed 30 April 2018.

⁶ Thank you to reviewer #1 for this point.

exceptional response. The Pentagon Memorial is also a useful counterpoint to James Young's reading of the arc of memorialisation, whereby memorials (which originated to honour military sacrifice) have increasingly adopted civilian subjects (Young 2016). The Pentagon Memorial is oddly situated in Young's arc, given that the co-mingling of military and civilian remains is reflected, problematized and resolved in the design.

The moment which violently brought together the 184 flight crew, passengers and DoD staff is immortalised in the memorial design, which demarcates the victims according to their military or civilian association. The memorial sorts the victims by means of a geometric design. It dedicates one memorial bench to each victim, which is located in the memorial field according to the age of the deceased. If the victim died inside the Pentagon (either as military personnel or a civilian contractor) their memorial bench points outwards towards the incoming plane; but if the victim was on-board the hijacked airliner, their bench points towards the Pentagon itself. The design attempts to resolve the entanglement of military and civilian bodies at the site, by articulating the memorial benches differently according to employment inside or outside the Pentagon. As such, the inconvenient location of the memorial (in traditional terms) did not prevent the siting of the memorial on DoD land.



Figures 1 & 2: author's collection, photos of The National 9/11 Memorial at the Pentagon. The benches arching away from the Pentagon represent those killed inside the buildings, looking out. The units arching towards the Pentagon represent the civilians on-board the hijacked airliner.

Methodological Note

To explore the grammars of memorialisation which influenced the Pentagon Memorial, this article relies upon two expert interviews as well as research familiarity with other sites of 9/11 commemoration⁷. James Laychak's brother was a civilian contractor to the DoD, killed by the plane-strike on 9/11. Mr Laychak attended the military briefings for families of the missing before becoming a member of the Pentagon Memorial Family Steering Committee, and eventually became a jury member on the design selection team. My Laychak has since headed the Pentagon Memorial Fund, playing a leading role in obtaining corporate and individual donations to support the

⁷ This research was conducted as part of a comparative study of War on Terror memorialisation, funded by the UK's Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC): ES/N002407/1

construction of both the memorial and the planned Visitor Education Center. The article also relies upon an interview with Julie Beckmann who won the design competition for the Pentagon Memorial with Keith Kaseman.

Both interviews were semi-structured around questions relating to site selection, design history and memorialisation process. No further attempt was made to contact family members of the deceased or survivors of the Pentagon plane-strike. While it is possible that other potential interviewees could have added details to the study, their privacy must be respected as a priority. The two experts interviewed for this paper were considered to possess such high levels of expertise that sourcing other interviewees was not likely to produce results that outweighed any potential intrusion into their lives. Furthermore, a number of other public figures associated with this project have since died natural deaths.

However, the reader will note that the reflections of the architect on the memorial's design are not taken at face value in this paper. The discussion situates these expert interviews within the context of the 'Death of the Author' - first identified by Roland Barthes in 1967; an insight which has been influential across post-structuralist philosophy. Here, the intentions of the author (or designer) are distanced from the meaning of their text (Barthes 1967). After Barthes, the author can no longer be treated as the authoritative source of the meanings found within the text. Rather, the meanings of texts and architectural designs are the product of the context in which they are read and understood by an audience. For Barthes, the reader is the one who brings meaning to the text and who is the site of discourse:

The reader is the space on which all the quotations which make up a writing are inscribed without any of them being lost; a text's unity lies not in its origin but in its destination. Yet this destination cannot any longer be personal [...] he is simply that someone who holds together in a single field all the traces by which the written text is constituted (Barthes 1967: 142-9, sexism in original).

In Foucauldian thought, the poststructuralist decentring of the author was read to reflect the structuring role of discourse. Here structures of language 'write' the author, determining what it is possible to say, and hear (Foucault 1979). It is not the writer of the reader who bring meaning to the text – but structures of discourse which constitute some meanings as perceivable and others silent.

If authors, or memorial designers, are not the creators of meanings, then how should we understand their works? To explore memorialisation at the Pentagon, this article refers to the grammatical rules (Wittgenstein 1958; Pin-Fat 2010) which structure commemorative design in a particular era and context. Key figures in the Pentagon Memorial Family Steering Committee and design team are interviewed not as 'authors' with creative control, then, but as expert witnesses to the many factors which steered the memorial towards its final form.

Narrating Washington D.C. – Bringing 'Authenticity of Place' to a Settler-Colonial Showpiece

Of course, before this article deconstructs this particular memorial it must also address its siting within the context of Washington D.C. America's capital indirectly contributes to the visual and

cultural identity of the memorial, even if the Mall was not deemed appropriate for siting the 9/11 memorial - given the particular memorial vernaculars of the War on Terror.

The landscape of Washington D.C. has been conscripted to tell stories about conflict. The Washington Mall – a short distance across the Potomac River from the Pentagon reservation - is the visual centrepiece within the official narrative of American identity, as configured by settler-colonialism. A grander landscape of memorial tributes and monuments is hard to imagine, nor one more intertwined with the ghosts of military battles and global ambition. Within one grand public space the Mall hosts monuments to the legacies of General Washington, wartime President Abraham Lincoln, Civil War General Ulysses Grant, World War Two, the Vietnam War, and the Korean War. The Mall also hosts a memorial to the Swedish engineer John Ericsson whose invention of the screw propeller revolutionised naval design, enabling Union naval supremacy in the Civil War with the design of the USS Monitor and the CSS Virginia (Haru Fisher: undated). Indeed, while considering their task, the Pentagon Memorial Family Steering Committee were taken on site visits which included the Lincoln memorial, the Vietnam Veterans Memorial and the Women in Military History Memorial (Interview with James Laychak 2017).

Like many enlisted men, the Mall has been conscripted – perhaps against its will – to participate in retelling military glory. Kirk Savage's *Monument Wars* describes the cultural and material landscaping processes which produced Washington's monumental architecture (Savage 2009). Savage carefully notes how the landscape of Washington has been curated over centuries to serve the function of 'telling'; not until the mid-1930's were the trees and flower gardens cleared, and the road structure built, to create the current appearance of a grand, civic stage. Strikingly, the site of the Lincoln memorial did not even exist during Lincoln's lifetime. It has since been created by mud dredged from the Potomac River by the Army Corps of Engineers (Ibid: 5).

Across the Potomac River from the grand civic stage of the Mall, Arlington mirrors the Mall's landscaping and curation of American memory. Arlington National Cemetery consists of 624 acres of military burial ground, interring casualties from the Civil War right up until those of the present day. Arlington is central to American necro-geography and identity. As Robert Poole points out, American practices of military burial and topography began with Arlington. Before the national cemetery was established in 1864, bodies were left strewn around the battlefields of the Civil War (Poole 2009: 2). In Arlington, the ritualised performance of a military funeral places the dead soldier within a heroic, sacred and idealised legacy of sacrifice and honour. It is the focal point of a topography of memory, whereby combat is inscribed into the landscape of the capital and the American imaginary. Almost 4 million people visit Arlington every year, in devotional pilgrimage (Ibid: 5).

Arlington and The Mall become important for this article because they are positioned adjacent to the world's largest office building: the Pentagon. While the Mall and Arlington National Cemetery have been developed as repositories and topographies of memory in the American psyche, they were not chosen as locations for the memorial labour associated with the 9/11 attacks. The Steering Committee were presented with ten potential sites for the National 9/11 Memorial in Washington, some in Arlington, and some next to the Pentagon, but they unanimously chose the Pentagon location:

To a person, we all said, “no, this is the site. It’s where it happened, it’s hallowed ground, because that plane came through and that’s where our loved ones died. It was that western side of the building” (Interview with James Laychak 2017).

This resolute and unanimous feeling that the memorial had to occupy the site of the disaster reflects a contemporary memorial vernacular. For example, the 1996 Oklahoma City bombing of a federal building was commemorated on-site and not in a military cemetery (Linenthal 2001), as was the 1993 bombing of the World Trade Center in Manhattan. 1993 was also the year of the Warrington bombing in the United Kingdom, which led to the first physical memorial to terrorism victims in Britain. We are accustomed, especially in the twenty first century, to the creation of architectural symbols on the sites of civilian catastrophes.

But the memorialisation of civilian deaths in terrorist attacks is a new cultural practice (Heath-Kelly 2016). Its roots are still profoundly tied to the military culture from which memorialisation emerged. Indeed the first U.S. memorial to terrorism upon civilians was built in Arlington Military Cemetery in 1995; it was sited in military necrogeography. Arlington hosts a memorial cairn for the victims of the Pan-Am bombing of 1988 which claimed 270 lives over Lockerbie, Scotland (Doss 2010: 117). Uniquely for its time, the Lockerbie bombing was interpreted as a relevant subject for memorialisation in Arlington’s military cemetery – as the civilian victims fit the narrative of having been killed in an act of war, by a foreign state (Libya). It can be suggested that geopolitical context of these American and Scottish deaths enabled their commemoration in a military cemetery, as opposed to other terrorist attacks which took American lives.

Indeed Senator Edward Kennedy proposed Arlington as a ‘fitting and appropriate place’ to remember the Pan-Am victims to Congress, to obtain a Joint Resolution (#129) in favour of hosting a cairn within Arlington Military Cemetery (U.S. Congress 1993). This motion was *heard before the Veterans Affairs Committee*, despite the airliner having been a civilian vessel. The context of Libyan state responsibility for the ‘act of war’, and the military service (previous and current) of 25 American victims, was also used to negotiate the cairn’s entry into Arlington. The deaths could be incorporated into a militarised frame. It also potentially helped that the cairn was proposed for a section of Arlington National Cemetery which was ‘unsuitable’ for hosting military remains, according to the Congressional Resolution, and could thus serve to commemorate non-military personnel. The cairn is somewhat liminal between military and civilian space.

Yet, its existence shows us that it has been historically possible to memorialise terrorist attacks on civilians within Arlington. One would assume, given the increased number of military dead in the Pentagon attack, that Arlington might have been selected for this purpose once again – especially given its next-door location. But the attacks of 9/11 were memorialised on Department of Defense land at the Pentagon. This becomes particularly surprising when we note the inaccessibility of the Pentagon reservation to the general public and visitors, compared to the National Cemetery next-door, which has been accustomed to hosting solemn visitations with the dead since 1864.

Why choose such a complicated location for a national memorial? We must note that the USS Arizona memorial to victims of the Pearl Harbor bombing is also situated on a military base (with all the complications that brings for steering visitors through restricted terrain). But the case of Pearl Harbor is significantly determined by the thousand plus military bodies entombed on their sunken ships below the memorial. Unlike the Pentagon attack, the naval dead of Pearl Harbor remain

entangled with the wreckage of their ships. The USS Arizona Memorial partially functions as a shrine to those trapped below (White 2004), and is situated accordingly. The dead of the Pentagon, however, were removed and interred within Arlington National Cemetery – yet the choice was still made to site the memorial on near-inaccessible DoD land. Why?

Rather than take a place within the memory fields of the Mall and Arlington, the National 9/11 Memorial was placed outside the existing topography and tapestry of national narration. Its idiosyncratic site-selection reflects several consolidating vernaculars in memorialisation – firstly that memorials should occupy sites of disaster to make use of the ‘authenticity of the site’ in their curation of events for visitors. In this regard, contemporary post-terrorist memorials do not simply integrate the dead of 9/11 into existing topographies of memory, wherever those topographies are located (i.e. The Mall). They also function to reconstruct the affective relationship between the site and its before-and-after temporalities (Connor 2017). Post-terrorist memorials, in particular, are built upon the location of violent deaths – functioning to alleviate the resonant mortality anxiety which lingers after disaster events, by remaking the site as an image of societal resilience and recovery (Heath-Kelly 2016; 2018; 2019). And in this way, expectations of ‘site authenticity’ reflect the centrality of image warfare to the War on Terror. As W.T.J. Mitchell has argued, the televised destruction of 9/11 sparked a ‘war of images’ where the U.S. embarked upon shock-and-awe bombing to retaliate in the global aesthetic imaginary, as well as on the ground (Mitchell 2011: 3). The excessive mediation of the 9/11 attacks (and as Simpson points out, their replication of the 1993 spectacle) caused dislocation between the events and perceptions of their reality, and fed into techniques to re-presence and re-ground American power – both through site-specific memorialisation and warfare (Simpson 2006).

This shift towards ‘authenticity of place’ has occurred alongside a shift in the memorial’s subject. Memorials originated as commemorative devices to honour war dead and to cast foundational societal moments from their slaughter, via the attribution of sacred honourable sacrificial status to the dead (Edkins 2003; Rowlands 1996). Civilian death does not traditionally lend itself to inclusion in sacrificial narratives of heroism because the liberal state traditionally justifies its existence upon the protection of such bodies (Elshtain 1982). These are the gendered logics of statecraft, impacting once again on commemorative practice. So how have the civilian victims of terrorism been incorporated into commemorative architecture, when so many previous atrocities have been left unmemorialised? As James Young argues, the process by which memorialisation opened-up to civilian referents has unexpected roots in genocide commemoration, Jewish commemorative architecture and the pivotal intervention of Maya Lin in the memorialisation of a failed war (Young 2016). These developments displaced tropes of heroic sacrifice in favour of resilience in the face of irreconcilable loss.

Holocaust memorialisation developed a minimalist aesthetic which has come to dominate European and North American memorials to the ‘unheroic’ dead – those feminised subjects who weren’t expected to die for the country as part of their role. These are the tragic dead who the state failed to protect, or itself slaughtered. James Young traces an arc in memorial design, exploring the Jewish aesthetic influence which permeates through questions of marking irreconcilable loss (Young 2016). Berlin’s Denkmal, Libeskind’s Jewish Museum, Maya Lin’s Vietnam Veterans Memorial and Michael Arad’s Reflecting Absence in Manhattan are linked by an arc of design which uses non-figurative, non-linear and often bleak design to place civilian deaths within national monumental landscapes.

Abstract and non-figurative design incorporated the civilian into memorialisation as the victim of violence (Doss 2010: 117-85), but Maya Lin's intervention into twentieth century memorialisation also radically queered⁸ the military sacrifice trope by inverting expectations of 'heroism' as the irreconcilable loss of conscripted young men. In the vast militarised, monumental landscape of the United States' capital, Maya Lin subverted the neoclassical militarised memorial aesthetic of the Washington Mall. Her Vietnam Veterans Memorial cuts a black marble scar into the earth to mark the tragic absence of generations of (non-Vietnamese) men, reclaiming their civilian identities from the war which swallowed them (see Sylvester: this issue). Even though her memorial addresses a military subject, the design marked the ascendance of non-figurative memorial art in the West – and marked the shift away from tropes of military heroism.

Indeed, denied the established sacrificial narrative, the memorial has become more reliant on siting for its aesthetic and affective power. Kirk Savage writes that Maya Lin's design also brought home the spatial turn in memorialisation, where the site rather than the design undertook a large proportion of the symbolic work associated with monumentality (Savage 2009: 21). Other 9/11 National Memorial designers have also been explicit about deploying 'authenticity of place' as an aesthetic and affective technique, intended to engage the full faculties of visitors through the visceral authority of death on public space (Heath-Kelly 2016).

In this context, the Pentagon Memorial Family Steering Committee were acutely aware of the importance of their site. Despite the enormous challenges posed by locating their memorial on the Pentagon Reservation, they were resolute and unanimous in their conviction that it *must* be placed *there* – reflecting the enormity of that day, where logics of statecraft were upturned. As James Laychak remembers, despite being shown ten potential locations across Arlington and Washington D.C. by the DoD team, the Steering Committee were unmoveable on site selection:

The biggest challenge in creating any kind of memorial is figuring out the space, what land are you going to do it on. And we decided that up front [...] This is the site. It's where it happened, it's hallowed ground, because that plane came through and that's where our loved ones died. It was that western side of the building (Interview with James Laychak 2016).

Given the shift in memorial practices over the twentieth century, the site was understood to resonate with the memory of the disaster. It made no sense to the bereaved families to so locate the memorial elsewhere. Here we can identify the memorial grammar which has emerged alongside the transition of memorialisation from military to civilian contexts: site specific authenticity. Memorials to military dead often commemorate those lost overseas and thus occupy unrelated sites in public parks or urban space. But the transition of memorialisation into the context of terrorism has involved a recognition that violent death *came into* the homeland; it breached the discursive barrier established in statist rhetoric about the safe, protected and feminine domestic positioned against the external realm of war and struggle (Basham 2013; Enloe 2007; Weber 2016; Young 2003; see also Hobbes 2008 [1651] & Walker 1993).

⁸ I am using the verb 'to queer' to signify the disruption of binary, gendered memorial grammars. War memorials performatively reproduce (Butler 1990) statist assumptions about the domesticated inside versus the anarchic external domain of war (Basham 2013; Elshain 1982; Enloe 2007; Weber 2016; Young 2003). Queer interventions replace the heteronormative 'grammar' of 'either/or' with 'and/or' (Weber 2016) – although it must be noted that I am using the term more broadly than Weber does, by stretching it to signify architectural disruptions of militarism.

The significance of this transgression convinced Donald Rumsfeld, Secretary of Defense at the time, that the Pentagon Reservation should allocate land to the memorial. Such was the affective impact of 9/11 as an event which shattered assumptions in the United States about inside/outside, and domestic/international realms, the site was interpreted as being of great importance to American history and identity. The site is sacred ground where statist and gendered assumptions about a domesticated internal space broke down. So, when memorials are constructed *on sites of terrorism* they are intended to reconstruct affective relationships between the place and society, 'before' and 'after' the disaster (Connor 2017). Kenneth Foote has also written about historical commemorations of mass violence adopting a 'sacralising' function, when they are constructed on-site (Foote 1997).

But as we have seen, this veneration of the Pentagon site's affective authenticity – and necessity of reconstructing the state's image upon the disaster site - then posed overwhelming design challenges for entrants to the international design competition. Designer Julie Beckmann eventually won the competition with Keith Kaseman. She reflected that on the significant logistical challenges of the site, which render the memorial utterly idiosyncratic in terms of location:

Just how are people going to get here? From what direction will they be coming? What is the first thing they're going to encounter when they get there? How do we transition from, you know, a massive south parking lot with, you know, 25,000 parking spaces to what is supposed to be this intimate place? We were right next to a major highway. We're right under the flight path of planes coming and going from Reagan. And we're next to this building that has 25,000 people working in it, you know? So that was more of the context that we were dealing with, and trying to come up with a place that spoke to all of those audiences, you know? Somebody who lost their colleague, and is still coming to work at the Pentagon, what kind of place would they want to go to during their lunch hour to remember their friend? Where would the mom and two kids who lost their dad on the airplane want to come for two minutes or two hours, you know? And how do we reach the cars driving at 70 miles an hour on 395? (Interview with Julie Beckmann 2016)

In this context, the designers created a 'field of markers' (Interview with James Laychak 2016) which triumphed over the other 1100 submissions – but the success of which is perpetually challenged by the affective volume of the Pentagon, its security architecture, and the infrastructural density of freeways, car parks and flight-paths on the Arlington side of the Potomac river.

Disentangling military and civilian lives?

The second memorial grammar exposed by the Pentagon Memorial is the transition of memorialisation's subject from military to civilian lives – but where these civilian lives are allocated aspects of heroic status, given their deaths in terrorist events (Edkins 2003). The military/civilian divide is blurred by terrorist attacks. As described above, commemorative architecture has historically taken a military subject – inscribing lives lost overseas onto the national topography and enacting the blood sacrifice ritual upon which nationalism has traditionally depended (Marvin & Ingle 1999). Yet the twentieth century has seen a shift in memorial vernacular whereby civilians slaughtered in genocide and terrorism are now commemorated (Doss 2010: 117-85). These monuments do not take the form of military-sacrifice totem, but rely upon the abstracted, non-figurative architecture of the 'counter-memorial'. Counter-memorials (so called because they up-end

the blood-sacrifice function of the military memorial) can function as acts of resistance to hegemonic narratives and silences, as was the case with Hamburg's disappearing monument to the Jews of Europe (Young 1992) and Latin American memorials to the disappeared (Hite 2012). Maya Lin's Vietnam Veterans Memorial also deploys a counter-memorial aesthetic by refusing to heroicize or sacralise the deaths of conscripted men. Instead, it queers the military memorial by applying the non-figurative style of counter-monuments to military loss.

In the twenty-first century, these counter-memorial vernaculars have had an unexpected effect on national commemoration. Despite their critical intent, they have provided a cultural resource for states faced with challenges to traditional sources of authority under conditions of globalisation. European and North American states have appropriated the aesthetics of these counter-memorials in commemorations of terrorism victims, thereby rearticulating a global threat (terrorism) to replace the Cold War frame. The terrorism memorial underscores the heinous crime committed when an international enemy defiles its domestic realm, affirming militarism as a response to intrusion upon the feminised, social realm (Basham 2018). The Pentagon Memorial Steering Committee – and designers – were thrown into this changed context, and expected to bring the military and civilian dead together in one design and process. How would they bring together the contrasting commemorative styles associated with military and civilian remembrance?

The memorial process imbued civilian victims of the 9/11 attacks with an aura of heroism, where military aesthetics of sacrifice were afforded to them and their families. James Laychak reflected on the military processes afforded to families in the aftermath of the Pentagon attack. Each family, whether civilian or military, received a casualty assistance officer to steer them through the administrative processes associated with sudden bereavement (Interview with James Laychak 2016). He also spoke of the comfort it brought him that a three-star general led the twice-daily briefings for families of the missing. The nearby Sheridan Hotel hosted the Family Information Center run by the DoD, where General John Van Alstyne briefed families on the rescue operations every day at 10am and 4pm. No separation was imposed between military and civilian families, and everyone was treated equally.

Similarly, the efforts to build a Steering Committee also reflected a strong drive towards inclusivity. Mr Laychak described how the DoD led these efforts via its Family Liaison Officer Meg Falk, and that equal representation was obtained between families of civilians inside Pentagon, families of serving military staff inside the Pentagon, and those on the flight (Interview with James Laychak 2016). At all times, the stakeholders and process managers demonstrated firm commitments to equal representation between the affected constituencies.

This commitment also underwrote the 'design intent' for the winning design. In the words of Pentagon Memorial designer Julie Beckmann:

The concept of military versus civilian never really came up in, at least the conversation between Keith and myself. Mainly because the fundamental underpinning of everything related to 9/11 in our minds were these 189 people that were going to work, and were going on trips and were living their lives, their probably rather ordinary lives, and are now encapsulated in this extraordinary event, you know? And they're encapsulated together. So this guy going on a business trip to California is now forever remembered against this guy, who worked in the Pentagon. Never would the two have met before, but now they're remembered in this place. And so it really was about the people, whether they were military or not. But we did have to contend with the backdrop of our site being this

massive, you know, one of the five sides, you know? [...] These were not soldiers, you know? These were just regular people. So I think where they worked and what they did got stripped away. And it was more about them as human beings (Interview with Julie Beckmann 2016).

The design intent was never to mark some deaths as military and others as civilian. Instead the 'magnitude of the event' (Interview with Julie Beckmann 2016) was represented through a field of markers, spread across the site to emphasise the individuality of each victim. Julie pointed to the design as being oriented around 'age lines', which arrange the victims geometrically according to their year of birth to tell the story of their (irreconcilably lost) individuality and difference. The gaps between benches are intended to impress upon the audience the disparate age ranges of the victims – from children on the plane, to senior staffers inside the Pentagon.

Simultaneously, the design orients the benches to reflect the victim's position in the plane or the Pentagon building. Julie explained that this demarcation was intended, again, to capture something of the heterotopia of the lives ended on that day, and the eternal togetherness which now unites the dead:

To distinguish between the individuals on the plane versus the building, they're [the benches] just simply oriented in two different ways [...] When you read the name of the individual and the building is in the background of your view, they worked in the building. And then, conversely, if you read the name and the sky is in the background, then they were on the plane. And so that's another moment where you'd be standing amongst all these units and realise, "Wow, this one's facing this way. And the one right next to it is facing the other way." They were very close in age, but doing very different things that day. But they're forever adjacent to each other now (Interview with Julie Beckmann 2016).

The design intent of the author was, very clearly, to map the heterotopia of the lives ended on September 11th at the Pentagon site. However this article reflects on the Pentagon Memorial from an understanding which decentres the author and treats unfolding historical and discursive structures of legibility as producers. How was it that a design which demarcates the victims according to their military/defence employment won the design competition?⁹

To manifest this heterotopia, the design freezes the events of 9/11 seconds before the hijacked plane was rammed into the Pentagon. But, why seconds before? What does freezing the events seconds before the crash tell us? The design could equally have reflected that all the victims' lives ended inside the building, and thus they are indistinguishable. This would also fit with the U.S. security discourse after 9/11 which radically reimagined all civilians as vulnerable to military style violence in the homeland.

Julie and Keith's design won because it solved a problem between contrasting memorial aesthetics and referent communities. Disentangling the deaths enables the memorial to respectfully commemorate all the lives lost at the Pentagon, without 'feminizing' the military dead as tragic victims, nor totally integrating the airline passengers into a militarised blood-sacrifice mythology. It resolved the problem of how to memorialise contemporaneous military and civilian deaths, when both have been afforded such different commemorative aesthetics across the twentieth century. By

⁹ In a parallel example of military/civilian distinctions being made in death, the commemorative landscape of Pearl Harbor was eventually extended beyond the USS Arizona Memorial – with the addition of a plaque to the 48 civilians killed, located away from the sacred sites at the visitor centre (White 2004).

rewinding time to seconds before the impact of the hijacked airliner, the Pentagon Memorial encircles the rhetorical exceptionalism of the attack upon America and the violation of its borders, and the entangled military and civilian dead. It imagines a time mere moments before those assumptions about a peaceful domestic sphere were exposed as assumptions, perpetually imagining the collision of worlds and attempting the disentanglement of protectors and the protected.

When we consider this ideological work undertaken within the design, implicitly, we understand why it triumphed over the other shortlisted contenders. Of the 1100 submissions to the Pentagon Memorial design competition, six were shortlisted. Apart from Julie Beckmann and Keith Kaseman's winning design, the shortlist included five other non-figurative entries which were described to me by James Laychak:

- An earth mound which viewers would encircle and climb, viewing storyboarded profiles of the victims throughout their journey. At the top of the mound, visitors are provided with a perfect view onto the impact site upon the Pentagon, from an angle similar to that taken by the hijacked plane;
- A large table design, sunken into the earth of the site, with 189 empty chairs for the victims;
- 189 black boxes buried in the site, each containing an item treasured by the victim and provided by their family, with markers identifying the location of each buried box;
- 189 plexi-glass windows which would attract condensation overnight, enabling visitors to write messages and tributes which would then vanish 24 hours later. The tactility and engagement dimensions mirror the practices of visitors to individual names upon the Vietnam Veterans Memorial;
- 189 pieces of stone placed around the site, all cut from one original block (Interview with James Laychak 2016).

These other shortlisted designs are legible products of the transition of memorialisation into the civilian realm, which appropriately replicate non-figurative, abstract designs common to that field. But they contain no comment on the military identity of the site, nor on the loss of military personnel. The attempt to disentangle military and civilian lives in the Beckmann/Kaseman design demonstrates a far more insightful take on the complexities of the site, and of the split vernaculars in twenty and twenty-first century memorialisation. The Beckmann/Kaseman design solves a problem in contemporary memorialisation by disentangling the bodies which gendered statecraft cannot yet afford to see tangled.

Conclusion

This paper has argued that the contemporary grammars of commemoration have designed the Pentagon Memorial in particular ways. This article has pointed to the salience of contemporary commemorative conventions regarding site-authenticity as well as the incorporation of civilian subjects within memorialisation. These cultural vernaculars, and their complex situation within the gendered imaginary of statecraft (Walker 1993; Weber 2016), have curated the Pentagon Memorial – overpowering concerns about the complex and inaccessible site. The article has offered a gendered reading of the memorialisation process, highlighting how the Beckmann/Kaseman design – as well as the use of the crash site – encircles the breach of statist assumptions about the peaceful

domestic realm, and the war-like international domain. In perpetuity, the Pentagon memorial records the moment where the inside/outside distinction was breached (through its location on the site of the crash), but simultaneously rewinds time to a second before impact, where one's position inside or outside the Pentagon could still be identified. The entanglement and disentanglement of military and civilian realms plays out in the memorial, with significant implications for how we might think of memorials as gendered and gendering objects.

However the curation of the memorial by these global forces has not produced a perfect object. While the Pentagon Memorial may resolve the question of how to simultaneously memorialise military and civilian deaths, and blur their respective commemorative aesthetics, it is now found lacking by the association of family members who lobbied for its funding (the 'Pentagon Memorial Fund'). They are now raising funds for a Visitor Education Center adjacent to the memorial because the memorial's subtle geometric design does not instruct visitors on the details of 9/11. It doesn't narrate or storyboard 9/11. As James Laychak explained to me, the design isn't exploiting a teachable moment for those with no direct memory of the events (Interview with James Laychak 2016). He recalled how visiting schoolchildren once had no conception of the plane strike, but thought the Pentagon attack was the result of bombs. In Mr Laychak's opinion, a visitor education centre would complement the memorial by creating a site of direct historical instruction.

In the mission to obtain such a centre, we can read that the 'authenticity of the site' is not doing the work expected of it. The expectation that the site itself would help to affectively communicate the power of the 9/11 attacks has been found lacking, and the non-figurative design – which perpetually reifies and encircles the military/civilian entanglement at the Pentagon – does not convey a linear narrative of the day.

But was the monument ever intended to provide a teachable moment, or to storyboard the events of that day for visitors? As this article has argued, its aesthetic and function are more closely related to marking the exceptional space where gendered logics of statecraft broke down, and resolving that moment through disentangling the bodies.

References

Barthes, Roland (1967) *Image, Music, Text* (London: Fontana).

Basham, Victoria (2013) *War, Identity and the Liberal State: Everyday Experiences of the Geopolitical in the Armed Forces* (Abingdon: Routledge).

Butler, Judith (1990) *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (Abingdon: Routledge).

Connor, Andrea (2017) *The Political Afterlife of Sites of Monumental Destruction: Reconstructing Affect in Mostar and New York* (Abingdon: Routledge).

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

Edkins, Jenny (2003) *Trauma and the Memory of Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Elshtain, Jean Bethke (1982) 'On Beautiful Souls, Just Warriors and Feminist Consciousness', *Women's Studies International Forum* 5(3-4), pp.341-348.

Enloe, Cynthia (2007) *Globalization and Militarism: Feminists Make the Link* (Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield).

Flight 93 Memorial Taskforce (2004) *Planning and Design Process (National Park Service)*, downloaded from https://www.nps.gov/flni/learn/management/upload/Attach2_advcomminutes_nov14_04.pdf (URL no longer functional, materials are available from author on request).

Foote, Kenneth E. (1997) *Shadowed Ground: America's Landscapes of Violence and Tragedy* (Austin: University of Texas Press).

Foucault, Michel (1979) 'Authorship: What is an Author?', *Screen* 20(1), pp.13-34.

Haru Fisher, Robert (undated) 'Park of the Week: John Ericsson National Memorial, Washington, D.C.', *Frommers*, available from <https://www.frommers.com/trip-ideas/outdoor-adventure/park-of-the-week-john-ericsson-national-memorial-washington-d-c> (last accessed 20 April 2018).

Heath-Kelly, Charlotte (2016) *Death and Security: Memory and Mortality at the Bombsite* (Manchester: Manchester University Press).

Heath-Kelly, Charlotte (2018) 'Survivor Trees and Memorial Groves: Vegetal Commemorations of Victims of Terrorism in Europe and the United States', *Political Geography* 64, pp.63-72.

Heath-Kelly, Charlotte (2019) 'Sacred Rituals of the Security State: Reclaiming Bodies and Making Relics from Ground Zero' in Zahra Newby & Ruth Toulson (eds.) *The Materiality of Mourning: Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives* (Abingdon: Routledge).

Hite, Katharine (2012) *Politics and the Art of Commemoration: Memorials to Struggle in Latin America and Spain* (Abingdon: Routledge).

Hobbes, Thomas (2008) [1651] *Leviathan; Or the Matter, Forme and Power of a Commonwealth Ecclesiasticall and Civil*, edited by Michael Oakeshott (New York: Touchstone).

Linenthal, Edward (2001) *The Unfinished Bombing: Oklahoma City in American Memory* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Lower Manhattan Development Corporation (2003a) *Final Scope: World Trade Center Memorial and Redevelopment Plan Generic Environmental Impact Statement* (New York: Lower Manhattan Development Corporation), available from http://www.renewnyc.com/content/pdfs/WTC_GEIS_Final_Scope.pdf (last accessed 02 May 2018).

Lower Manhattan Development Corporation (2003b) LMDC All Advisory Council Meeting on the Draft Memorial Mission Statement and Program (New York: Lower Manhattan Development Corporation), available from <http://www.renewnyc.com/content/meetings/1.15.03FinalMinutes.pdf> (last accessed 02 May 2018).

Marvin, Carolyn & David Ingle (1999) *Blood Sacrifice and the Nation: Totem Rituals and the American Flag* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Mitchell, W.T.J. (2011) *Cloning Terror: The War of Images; 9/11 to the Present* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press)

Pentagon Memorial Family Steering Committee (2002) *Pentagon Memorial Commission Mission Statement* (Washington: U.S. Department of Defense), available from <http://archive.defense.gov/news/newsarticle.aspx?id=43622> (last accessed 30 April 2018).

Pin-Fat, Veronique (2010) *Universality, Ethics and International Relations: A Grammatical Reading* (Abingdon: Routledge).

Poole, Robert (2009) *On Hallowed Ground: The Story of Arlington National Cemetery* (New York: Walker & Co.).

Rowlands, Michael (1996) 'Memory, Sacrifice and the Nation', *New Formations* 30, pp.8-17.

Sagalyn, Lynne (2016) *Power at Ground Zero: Politics, Money, and the Remaking of Lower Manhattan* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Savage, Kirk (2009) *Monument Wars: Washington D.C., The National Mall and the Transformation of the Memorial Landscape* (Berkeley: University of California Press).

Simpson, David (2006) *9/11: The Culture of Commemoration* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).

Swain, Jon & Neil Tweedie (2011) '9/11 Ten Years On: The Heroes of Ground Zero', *The Telegraph*, 9th September 2011, available from <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/september-11-attacks/8750377/911-10-years-on-the-heroes-of-ground-zero.html> (last accessed 11th March 2019)

U.S. Congress (1993) *S.J.Res.129 - A joint resolution to authorize the placement of a memorial cairn in Arlington National Cemetery, Arlington, Virginia, to honor the 270 victims of the terrorist bombing of Pan Am Flight 103*. 103rd Congress (1993-1994). Available from <https://www.congress.gov/bill/103rd-congress/senate-joint-resolution/129/text> (last accessed 12 May 2018).

Walker, R.B.J. (1993) *Inside/Outside: International Relations as Political Theory* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Weber, Cynthia (2016) *Queer International Relations: Sovereignty, Sexuality and the Will to Knowledge* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Weber, Cynthia & Mark Lacy (2011) 'Securing by Design', *Review of International Studies* 37(3), pp.1021-43.

White, Geoffrey (2004) 'National Subjects: September 11 and Pearl Harbor', *American Ethnologist* 31/3, pp.293-310.

Wittgenstein, Ludwig (1958) *Philosophical Investigations*. Translated by G. E. M. Anscombe (Oxford: Basil Blackwell).

Young, Iris Marion (2003) 'The Logic of Masculinist Protection: Reflections on the Current Security State', *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 29(1), pp.1-25.

Young, James (1992) 'The Counter-Monument: Memory against Itself in Germany Today', *Critical Inquiry* 18(2), pp.267-96.

Young, James (2016) *The Stages of Memory: Reflections on Memorial Art, Loss, and the Spaces Between* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press).