



Nearly a thousand construction workers rallied on March 9<sup>th</sup> for an end to the stalemate at the WTC. If they realized that there is a far more fitting and *feasible* option to the current plan, they would see how lucky we are that the process has been so slow. Anyone who doubts that they would prefer to be building new Twin Towers instead should ask them.

The American people are at the mercy of New York's profoundly corrupt government and a sadly complicit media. But there must be someone with the character to tell it like it is...

## Reasons to build "Twin Towers II"

- Because it is what most Americans want.
- Because it is not in the American nature to be terror-ized. In Israel, effective counter-terrorism begins with erasing the evidence of terrorist gains. In America, the current dismal project would become a giant trophy in the propaganda showcase of global jihadism.
- Because new, mixed-use, Twin Towers would be far more cost-effective, time-saving, and, in the end, rewarding than the current plan. World-class Twin Towers, beside an inspiring memorial, would yield a far more valuable public asset.
- Because even after factoring in the transition costs, the current plan would cost billions of public dollars more than "Twin Towers II" and add years to the recovery – for what?
- Because Mr. Silverstein is our tenant and signed a contract on 7/24/01 promising to rebuild the Twin Towers if they were ever destroyed. He should be held to that.
- Because *it's paid for*: The money already budgeted for the "Freedom Tower" would pay for one Twin Tower and the money already budgeted for the transit "hub" would pay for the other. (And what right does a publicly-funded agency have to spend \$4 billion-plus on a PATH station?)
- Because it could be in construction within a few months and would be finished years ahead of the current schedule, due to the far greater efficiency of building one uniform tower twice.
- Because the latest Port Authority offer to Silverstein Properties would cost New York City hundreds of millions of tax dollars – for what?
- Because public servants have no authority to dismiss a plan that would save billions of dollars and years of time – especially when the result represents what the people really want.

## Reasons to build the "Twin Towers II" Memorial

- Because the "Twin Towers II" memorial is far more popular with both 9/11 Families and the public at large than "Reflecting Absence."
- Because it would cost hundreds of millions less to build and would not require \$50,000,000-plus in annual contributions to operate.
- Because it would incorporate the progress that has been made on the museum and could be built on top of the concrete that has been poured for the current memorial. And, because it faces onto West Street, it would not have to remain closed while the rest of the site is under construction.
- Because "Reflecting Absence" is the ultimate anti-memorial. The message of the thundering falls disappearing down the giant drains is apparent – we are nothing but helpless victims of overwhelming forces beyond our control. That is the opposite of what most Americans believe.

- Because it doesn't take much imagination to realize that the roar of 20,000 gallons of water an hour would be a morbid echo of the crashing towers, over which people would have to shout to be heard.
- Because the "Twin Towers II" Memorial is life-affirming. The tragic relic that stood throughout the valiant rescue and recovery efforts framed by the gleaming Twin Towers rising beyond it would be the ultimate metaphor for the triumphant human spirit.
- Because the circle of flags around the footprints, representing every nation that lost a citizen, would symbolize our unity and the deathlessness of life. And the stirring peal from the world's largest orchestral carillon of bells would be the sound that has uplifted broken hearts for centuries, in dramatic contrast to the thunderous, depressing, falls.

Some of the consequences of building "Twin Towers II" instead of the current plan:

- Greenwich Street would not cut through the World Trade Center.
- There would be no giant tombstone marring a celebrated skyline.
- The transit "hub" would have an Opera House above it, instead of a billion-dollar canopy (which could still be built elsewhere in the city – as the Silverstein towers could be – using private funds.)
- Officials would be put in their place – as our public servants.

The failure at the Trade Center is giving us the best chance we've had to get it right since the process began. It's time to put the cart behind the horse by ordering an independent analysis of what "Twin Towers II" offers, what the current plan can provide, and the cost of each. We can see where we are headed now – the facts above speak for themselves – and so will the end result.

Public officials at state, local, and national levels have no business spending the public's money to downgrade the World Trade Center – especially in spite of the evidence of a far more popular and feasible option. It's not their prerogative. It is beyond the scope of their authority.

We believe that many officials and journalists agree with this cause, but are afraid to take a stand. Perhaps the increasingly diminished nature of the site will give them courage. Maybe love of country will inspire them. Or the picture below may remind them that some people go out on a limb every day, while so many of the rest of us live behind walls of excuses and regrets.

Something has to awaken our nation to the danger. If enough money and power can defeat the will of the people at Ground Zero, of all places, then who is in control of the country? Do we actually have a government of, by, and for the American people, that operates by the consent of the governed, or don't we? The World Trade Center is going to answer that question – whether we like it or not.

