

Foreword: The Limits of Globalization?

JOHN B. ATTANASIO AND DON S. DEAMICIS*

The collapse of the World Trade Center on September 11 resembles a demented allegory too terrible to imagine. On “9–11,” two American planes brought crashing down the enormous towers of the World Trade Center.¹ Sardonicly, the terrorists turned globalization against itself: the wings of globalization, jet airliners, wreaked havoc in the Wall Street area, a cradle of globalization. In another bitter irony, the terrorists used computer and communication technologies to plot their dastardly surprise attacks. Paradoxically, then, the key transportation, information, and communication technologies driving globalization were used against it.

The events of September 11 and subsequent terrorist attacks in other parts of the world broke with terrorist assaults of the past. Indeed, they were not really terrorist attacks at all. After all, terrorist attacks leverage fear. Terrorism is an emotional act. Because the terrorist lacks sufficient military resources to inflict significant injury on his adversary, the terrorist assaults the mind rather than the body. He seeks to instill fear in those who survive his slaughtered prey; the terrorist attacks the few in sudden and brutal ways, hoping that the many will dread a similar fate.

Fear was well understood by those who launched the attacks of September 11. However, their focus was not fear. Instead, their operations much more closely resembled a military attack, seeking to physically degrade the enemy itself by inflicting a large loss of life, and by attacking key resources, notably, our symbolic and effective centers of economic and military power. Osama bin Laden himself openly boasted that he designed the attacks to bring down the economy of the United States.²

*John B. Attanasio, Dean and William Hawley Atwell Professor of Law, Dedman School of Law at Southern Methodist University; LL.M., Yale Law School; Dipl. in Law, University of Oxford; J.D., New York University School of Law; B.A., University of Virginia. Don S. DeAmicis, Partner, Ropes & Gray. Mr. DeAmicis is chair of the Section of International Law and Practice of the American Bar Association. We would like to thank Kathleen Spartana and Dean Attanasio's research assistant, Jason Cross, for their assistance with this essay.

1. American Airlines Flight 11, from Boston, Massachusetts to Los Angeles, California, crashed into the North Tower of the World Trade Center with ninety-two people on board. United Airlines Flight 175, from Boston, Massachusetts to Los Angeles, California, was the second hijacked plane to strike the World Trade Center, plowing into the South Tower. Two pilots, seven flight attendants, and fifty-six passengers were on board. Available at <http://www.cnn.com/SPECIALS/2001/trade.center/victims/AA11.victims.html>; <http://www.cnn.com/SPECIALS/2001/trade.center/victims/ua175.victims.html>.

2. See Todd Zeranski, *Bin Laden Calls for Strikes Against U.S. Economy*, BLOOMBERG NEWS, Dec. 27, 2001 (Osama bin Laden called on his followers to “concentrate on hitting the U.S. economy”); see also Seth Bor-

The destruction of these pre-eminent symbols of international commerce threatened the very system undergirding globalization. After all, what is globalization but the free movement of people, capital, goods, and information? The attacks of September 11 threatened every one of these. Moving people, capital, goods, and information are all more dangerous because these drivers of globalization had now suddenly been turned against globalization. Brought to their logical conclusions, such attacks could end globalization by prompting nation-states to make their borders far less permeable. Even in a best case scenario, these military incursions will increase the cost of globalization and reduce its benefits, thereby slowing its pace in the short run, and possibly in the long run.

The events of September 11 impacted people in various parts of the globe in different ways. Some delighted in this tragedy; however, most people did not. Our own interactions with people around the world since September 11 suggest that most recoiled at these events, irrespective of whether they live in the first, second, or third world. In a way, reactions to these events divided the world.

September 11 deeply affected all who witnessed it. Many of us were horrified, and wanted to do something, if for no other reason than to combat feelings of helplessness and despair. As a global law school, the Dedman School of Law has tried to partner with others to discuss this profound evil. Specifically, we organized a series of three conferences to address the policy concerns emanating out of the tragic events of September 11, 2001.³

On February 7, 2002, the Dedman School of Law hosted the second in this series of three conferences. This conference, entitled "Terrorism's Burdens on Globalization," posits that terrorism poses a systemic threat to globalization. As previously suggested, globalization involves the free movement of people, goods, information, and capital. Terrorism challenges every aspect of globalization. This conference attempts to address the systematic dangers that September 11 poses for globalization. To address these issues the American Bar Association Section of International Law and Practice and the Dedman School of Law at Southern Methodist University have collaborated to bring together anti-terrorism experts with private businesspersons, doctors, engineers, and lawyers. Private business people and professionals seldom interact with anti-terrorism experts as, until September 11, their paths rarely crossed.

To turn back the military campaign initiated on September 11, however, these groups will have to seek out each other's counsel and wisdom. They will have to learn how each other thinks, how to work together, and how to trust each other. For example, international bankers and financiers will have to adapt their work to the new transparency required by intrusive regulations designed to curb money laundering. Those who deliver gasoline and other combustible energy will have to prevent their wares from becoming weapons of mass destruction. Anti-terrorism experts will have to help in their endeavors by not imposing

enstein & Jodi Enda, *War Will Go on after Me: Bin Laden*, *TORONTO STAR*, Dec. 28, 2001 ("It is important to concentrate on the destruction of the American economy so the United States will be too busy to bother with Islamic fighters," bin Laden said in the 33-minute video, aired on the Qatar-based television station Al-Jazeera. "It is important to hit the economy (of the United States), which is the base of its military power . . . if the economy is hit they will become pre-occupied.").

3. Sponsored by the *JOURNAL OF AIR LAW AND COMMERCE*, "Freedom versus Fear: The Future of Air Travel" was held on October 29, 2001 and October 30, 2001. Co-sponsored by the Section of International Law and Practice of the American Bar Association and The International Law Review Association of SMU, "Terrorism's Burdens on Globalization" was held on February 7, 2002. "Responding to Global Threats: the Cases for Unilateralism and Multilateralism" was held on April 4-5, 2002.

unjustified costs on private concerns, which would force some out of business. After all, pushing them out of business would advance some of the ultimate economic/military objectives of these new combatants.⁴

Owing to the hectic schedules of our extremely prominent participants, the organizers compressed what should have been a two-day conference into one day. The expanse of expertise presented by the speakers was necessitated by the concomitant expanse of dangers posed by these technology-empowered, new style warriors. Even with the expertise assembled in this conference, we can only hope to begin to identify some of the issues posed by these new threats.

Because of the timeliness of these issues we have endeavored to publish these papers quickly in hopes that they may shed some light on the policy debate of these momentous times. As President Bush stated, the response of the national and international communities of nations and peoples must be holistic.⁵ The private sector must join with security and military forces just as they do in traditional wars. Such a coordinated, holistic effort will be expensive and will inevitably require considerable sacrifice.

Because this new context differs from traditionally understood war in so many ways, inspiring a societal response commensurate with wartime will be difficult. Moreover, the intermittent, random “pattern” of these attacks makes it easy for the enemy to lure the rest of the world to sleep, unwilling to continue the profound, and sustained sacrifice that a successful effort will almost certainly entail.⁶ We can already witness the difficulty of sustaining a war level response in the current recriminations regarding the intelligence community’s level of knowledge that might have averted the horrors of September 11.⁷ Irrespective of fault, intense public scrutiny would entail just the kind of revelation of internal security and intelligence operations about which wartime enemies usually can only dream. Of course, some press accounts following September 11 claimed that Osama bin Laden has grown used to the United States doing much of that.⁸

4. See Borenstein & Enda, *supra* note 2.

5. President George W. Bush, *No Nation Can Be Neutral in This Conflict*, Remarks by the President to the Warsaw Conference on Combating Terrorism (“The defeat of terror requires an international coalition of unprecedented scope and cooperation. It demands the sincere, sustained actions of many nations against the network of terrorist cells and bases and funding.”), at <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/11/20011106-2.html>.

6. At approximately 12:00 P.M. on February 26, 1993, a massive explosion rocked the World Trade Center in New York City, causing millions of dollars in damage. The terrorists who bombed the World Trade Center murdered six innocent people, and injured over 1,000 others. On August 7, 1998, 224 innocent civilians were killed by terrorist bombs when they exploded at the U.S. embassies in Nairobi, Kenya and Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. On October 12, 2000, a terrorist in a boat attacked the USS Cole in the harbor at Aden, Yemen. This attack killed seventeen sailors and wounded over thirty others. During the morning of September 11, 2001, two hijacked commercial airliners were used to attack the World Trade Center in New York City. Another hijacked airliner was used to attack the Pentagon. A fourth plane was hijacked but crashed before reaching its target. Available at <http://www.dssrewards.net/english/wldtrade.html>; <http://www.dssrewards.net/english/kenya.html>; <http://www.dssrewards.net/english/usscole.html>.

7. Michael Elliott, *How the U.S. Missed the Clues*, TIME, May 27, 2002, Vol. 159, No. 21 (“The nation has gone through a period of painful second-guessing, asking whether Sept. 11 could have been prevented.”).

8. See Alison Mitchell, *Traces of Terror: The Hearings; Investigators in Congress Want Inquiry Of Themselves*, N.Y. TIMES, June 21, 2002 (“The President does have very deep concerns about anything that would be inappropriately leaked that could in any way endanger America’s ability to gather intelligence information,” Mr. Fleischer said. He said that in 1998, an unauthorized disclosure of intelligence information led Osama bin Laden to stop using a satellite phone that the United States had been able to monitor. “We never again heard

This recent turn of events may be a barometer indicating that we are approaching this entire issue as though September 11 were an isolated incident, or one event in a series of terrorist acts, rather than part of a fairly traditional military campaign that simply employed new weaponry, more or less in the same way that the Palestinian suicide bombers are using a new style of weaponry.⁹ The American and Israeli militaries obviously view these as military attacks as each has responded to them in military terms.

Several factors thwart convincing the American public (although not the Israeli public) to treat the attacks as part of a war. Besides the intermittent nature of these attacks, September 11 could easily be mistaken for a terrorist act rather than an attack on the American economic and political infrastructure. After all, what are a few guys with box cutters against the might of the American military—at least if you can find them?

As we have seen repeatedly on the news, however, weapons of mass destruction, coupled with advanced forms of transportation and communication, transform the terrorist—particularly the one who is willing to die for the cause—into an effective military threat. This threat represents the dark side of globalization and advanced technology. As globalization intensifies and interdependencies increase, the ability to inflict damage will only grow more formidable. One disturbing fact brought to light by the demonic events of September 11 is that many dangerous weapons are lying around the world. Some comprise the seemingly endless remains of the Cold War, but others are peaceful instrumentalities, like airliners, which demented individuals can metastasize into weapons of mass destruction.¹⁰

One might try to comfort oneself with the hope that technology will also supply the means of detecting those who pursue these new means of war. Unfortunately, however, our technology has failed to track down many of the key al Qaeda leaders to this point.¹¹

from that satellite phone,' Mr. Fleisher said. Mr. Fleisher said he was confident the disclosures had not come from the administration.'") See also Thomas L. Friedman, *Foreign Affairs; World War III*, N.Y. TIMES, Sept. 13, 2001 ("What makes them super-empowered, though, is their genius at using the networked world, the Internet and the very high technology they hate, to attack us."); Seth Borenstein, *Al-Qaeda Cell May Be Using Internet to Plan Attacks on U.S. Targets*, KNIGHT RIDDER WASHINGTON BUREAU, Jan. 18, 2002 ("Officials fear that al-Qaeda members may be using government Web sites to help them develop future attacks. The transportation advisory reported that terrorists 'may be using U.S. municipal and state Web sites to obtain information on local energy infrastructures, water reservoirs, dams, highly enriched uranium storage sites, nuclear and gas facilities and emergency fire and rescue response procedures.' 'We've known for a long time, and certainly since Sept. 11, that if you want to find out about a potential target, you could look it up on the Internet'" said Shane Ham); Josh Meyer & Jube Shiver Jr., *U.S. Strikes Back; Securing the Home Front; U.S. to Intensify Effort Against Threat of Computer Terrorism; Security: Web-based Attacks Could Cause Mass Confusion and Death, Officials Say. Advisors to Assess Vulnerabilities*, L.A. TIMES, Oct. 9, 2001, at A4 (Authorities are also investigating whether another suspected terrorist detained in Minnesota, Habib Zacarias Moussaoui, downloaded information from the Internet about crop dusting as part of a conspiracy to spray biological or chemical poisons on communities).

9. See *Human Bombs*, WASH. POST, Apr. 4, 2002, Thursday, Final Edition ("Israelis are facing a terrible new weapon: the Palestinian suicide bomber. Suicide bombers are terrorists who wrap explosives around their bodies, go someplace where there are many people and set off the bomb—killing themselves and anyone unlucky enough to be nearby. Palestinian leader Yasser Arafat and some other Arabs refuse to call the bombers terrorists, saying they are like soldiers, fighting to help their people.").

10. See Patrick E. Tyler, *Nuclear Arms Treaty: News Analysis; Pulling Russia Closer*, N.Y. TIMES, May 14, 2002 ("The nuclear legacies of Russia and the United States remain a huge threat if they are allowed to despoil the environment or, worse, fall into the wrong hands. The biggest threat mankind faces is the legacy of nuclear material and the cold war and the whole question of dealing with catastrophic terrorism.").

11. See Frank Rich, *Thanks for the Heads-up*, N.Y. TIMES, May 25, 2002 ("Nearly nine months have passed since the day that was supposed to change everything, and Osama bin Laden and most of his top associates, Mullah Omar included, have not been found.").

The third Dedman School of Law symposium on “Responding to Global Threats: The Cases for Unilateralism and Multilateralism” discussed the fact that some four billion people, or over half of the world’s six billion population, live on less than \$3 per day.¹² Some of these people inhabit “failed states,”¹³ which not only are devoid of hope, but also lack the sophisticated infrastructure that technological countermeasures often demand.¹⁴

In addition to poverty, failed states, sophisticated communication and transportation technologies, and available weaponry, another unfortunate factor further elevates the probabilities and scope of future attacks—specifically, spreading ideologies that “justify” such attacks. We have in mind more than the radical brand of Islam that drove the attacks of September 11, although that is one apt example.¹⁵

If the foregoing analysis is correct, the conclusions are sobering. If we are essentially in a war in which the probabilities and scope of additional attacks will actually increase over time, then we must have a concerted military/civilian response, just as we do in “real war.” At some level, this conference discusses certain aspects of what coordination between governmental and civilian authorities might be appropriate in response to this military threat. Any assessment of an appropriate response to this military threat must be commensurate with the probability and scope of the attack.¹⁶

This written symposium organizes the papers in *The International Lawyer* along the same lines that the presentations were organized at the conference.¹⁷ The conference spans many of the multifaceted burdens that terrorism imposes on globalization. The principal areas that the conference did not treat were insurance markets¹⁸ and airline security. The first in the series of three conferences, however, discusses airline security.¹⁹ While not all of the conference presentations appear in this written symposium, many do.²⁰ We begin with

12. See Videotape: 2002 Carrington Lecture, “Responding to Global Threats: The Cases for Unilateralism and Multilateralism,” held by the Dedman School of Law at Southern Methodist University (April 5, 2002); see also *The World Can’t Survive Poverty Gap*, THE TORONTO STAR, Sept. 24, 2000, Sunday, Edition 1 (nearly half the world’s population of 6 billion people, live on less than \$3 a day).

13. See Joseph Kahn & Tim Weiner, *World Leaders Rethinking Strategy on Aid to Poor*, N.Y. TIMES, Mar. 18, 2002.

14. Of course, certain technology-based countermeasures—such as satellites—do not require much infrastructure; however, our recent apparent inability to use them to catch the leadership of al Qaeda may reveal distinct limitations on their utility. See *supra* note 11.

15. Another wholly unrelated ideology is that which drove the Oklahoma City bombers, for example. See Ed Timms, *A Deadly Breed Apart; Lone-wolf Style like McVeigh’s Is New Terror Fear*, THE DALLAS MORNING NEWS, June 9, 2001.

16. I take this wisdom not from military theory, but from the great torts strategist Judge Learned Hand and his famous *Carroll Towing* test, which forms the basis of modern American tort law. Of course Hand’s test was fashioned to deal with negligent threats, whereas the threats that we are discussing are intentional. Nevertheless, the epistemology of the *Carroll Towing* test strikes me as at least somewhat useful in assessing the appropriate response to the current military threats. See *United States v. Carroll Towing Co.*, 159 F.2d 169 (2d Cir. 1947).

17. The conference schedule included noted speakers addressing such issues as bioterrorism, nuclear terrorism, cyber-terrorism, counter-terrorism, issues regarding the financial system, and matters pertaining to trade and transportation.

18. We endeavored unsuccessfully to secure someone in the insurance area; the conference was planned on short notice.

19. For further reading, see JOURNAL OF AIR LAW AND COMMERCE, Vol. 6, No. 1, Winter 2002.

20. Those not represented in the written symposium include: Philip J. Wise, CEO InfoMART; Erle Nye, Chairman and CEO, TXU; Albert V. Casey, former U.S. Postmaster General, former Chairman and CEO, AMR Corporation/American Airlines, Inc.; Dr. Francois Gianviti, General Counsel and Director of the Legal Department, IMF (Washington D.C.); Marshall P. Cloyd, Chairman, InterMarine, Inc. (Houston); Daniel L.

threats posed by biological and chemical weapons and possible responses. Dr. Paul Pepe is Professor of Medicine, Surgery, Public Health and Chair, Emergency Medicine at the UT-Southwestern Medical Center and the Parkland Health and Hospital System. Dr. Pepe is also the Medical Director for the Dallas Metropolitan Response System (MMRS) for Anti-Terrorism and the Dallas Metropolitan BioTel (EMS) System. He co-authored his article entitled "Bioterrorism and Medical Risk Management" with Dr. Kathy Rinnert, the Associate Medical Director and Physician Team Leader for the Dallas MMRS for Anti-Terrorism and the Dallas Metropolitan BioTel (EMS) system. The authors posit that while the risk of bioterrorism "can be dramatically decreased," it cannot be entirely eliminated. Risk management of bioterrorism must be dealt with in both medical and political terms. As a result of bioterrorism, there may be "less international collaboration on research" and reallocation of money from health care needs to military and law enforcement needs. The authors stress the importance of maintaining "authoritative and appropriate communications" with the public through the media to "diminish the risks of misinformation dissemination" at the time of a public health emergency.

Dr. Kathleen Delaney is Professor of Internal Medicine and Surgery at the UT-Southwestern Medical School, and a Medical Director at Parkland Memorial Hospital, Emergency Department, in Dallas, Texas. Dr. Delaney asserts in her article entitled "Impact of the Threat of Biological and Chemical Terrorism on Public Safety-Net Hospitals" that the biggest challenge for the medical community in the face of a bioterrorism attack would be its ability to care for a large number of exposed or sick people. She argues that health care providers and the public need to be educated in advance about the procedures that should be followed in the event of bioterrorism. Dr. Delaney encourages local and national governments to develop preparation plans now for a potential bioterrorism attack.

Barry Kellman is Professor of Law at DePaul University College of Law and the Co-Director of the International Criminal Justice and Weapons Control Center for the DePaul International Human Rights Law Institute. In his article "State Responsibility for Preventing Bioterrorism," Professor Kellman posits that the threat of biological terrorism "exposes the limitations of received doctrines of international law." He argues that because of the severe consequences of biological agents, states must move toward a new priority of "prevention and interdictum." Stressing the importance of international cooperation, he criticizes the United States for resisting prospective efforts to strengthen the Biological Weapons Convention (BWC) of 1972 at the Fifth Review Conference held in December 2001.

Turning to technology terrorism, Peter Lichtenbaum, a partner at Steptoe & Johnson, writes on "The Response to Cyberattacks: Balancing Security and Cost" with his associate Melanie Schneck. The authors argue that while the response to the threat of a cyberattack

Rikard, Vice-President, General Counsel and Secretary, Cendian Corp. (Atlanta); Rona R. Mears, Haynes and Boone, LLP, Past Chair, ABA Section of International Law and Practice; Robert S. Rendall, Patton and Boggs, LLP, Past Chair, ABA Section of International Law and Practice; Peter Winship, James Cleo Thompson, Sr. Trustee Professor of Law, SMU Dedman School of Law, and Reid Witcliff, Division Chief, Texas Internet Bureau, Office of the Attorney General. Moderators of the event included: Thomas W. Mayo, Professor of Law, SMU Dedman School of Law; Matthew E. Yarbrough, Fish & Richardson P.C., Adjunct Professor of Law, SMU Dedman School of Law; Ndiva Kofele-Kale, Professor of Law, SMU Dedman School of Law; Don DeAmicis; and Christopher Hanna, Professor of Law, SMU Dedman School of Law.

must be forceful, it should not unduly burden the very systems they seek to protect by increasing the costs (both financial and otherwise) of doing business.

Jay Vogelson, Past Chair of the ABA Section of International Law and Practice posits in his article "Multinational Approaches to Eradicating International Terrorism" that September 11 "exposed the inadequacy of past policies and practices in dealing with terrorists." He acknowledges the difficulty of determining the "right mix of unilateral and multilateral action."

John Murphy, Professor of Law at Villanova University School of Law addresses "The Impact of Terrorism on Globalization and Vice-Versa." He suggests that we need to make greater efforts to distinguish between beneficial and harmful dimensions of globalization and combat "the forces of poverty and hopelessness on which international terrorism feeds."

In "The Wake-up Call of Terrorism," Craig Hall, Chairman and Founder of Hall Financial Group, advocates the use of preventative aid to combat the causes of terrorism. He calls on the United States to support education and literacy programs, provide economic help in various parts of the world, facilitate regional cooperation, and consider further debt relief to third world countries.

In "The Diligence Due in the Era of Globalized Terror," co-authors Judge Joe Kendall, Mark Allenbaugh, and Pamela Barron argue that future terrorist activities will be prevented by increased due diligence and cooperation of the private sector. Judge Kendall serves as commissioner for the U.S. Sentencing Commission; Mr. Allenbaugh served as a Staff Attorney in the Office of General Counsel for the U.S. Sentencing Commission, and Ms. Barron is Deputy General Counsel of the U.S. Sentencing Commission.

Arthur Helton and his co-author Dessie Zagorcheva address the issue of immigration in light of the events of September 11. They argue that action taken to increase U.S. security "should not infringe unnecessarily on the civil liberties and human rights of migrants, asylum seekers, and refugees." Mr. Helton is Senior Fellow for Refugee Studies and Preventive Action at the Council on Foreign Relations and Ms. Zagorcheva is a Doctoral Candidate in International Relations at Columbia University.

Professor Marc Steinberg explains how the actions taken by the SEC in cooperation with market participants and the securities industry significantly minimized the potential enormous damage that could have been inflicted on the U.S. securities markets in the aftermath of September 11. He posits that in such times of great stress, government and industry must work together to resolve the crisis. Professor Steinberg is the Rupert and Lillian Radford Professor of Law and Senior Associate Dean for Academics at the Dedman School of Law.

In "Money Laundering Law and Terrorist Financing: Post-September 11 Responses—Let Us Step Back and Take a Deep Breath?" Professor Joseph Norton and Heba Shams address the legal measures necessary to respond to international money laundering. They advocate granting U.S. agencies extensive direct and indirect extraterritorial powers; increasing cooperation between the public and private sectors in policing international finance channels and the flow of information; and substantially decreasing the economic liberalization process. Joseph Norton is the James L. Walsh Distinguished Faculty Fellow in Financial Institutions and Professor of Law at the Dedman School of Law, and Heba Shams is a lecturer in International Economic Law at the Centre for Commercial Law Studies at Queen Mary, University of London.

This symposium is the second in a series of three conferences held at the Dedman School of Law on the events of September 11. The first conference of this series, entitled "Freedom

versus Fear: The Future of Air Travel," was sponsored by the *Journal of Air Law and Commerce*. Held at Southern Methodist University on October 29–30, 2001, it addressed both security threats to air travel and the economic threat that bankruptcy of major airlines would present on an already struggling economy. Speakers included Al Casey and Robert Crandall, both former CEOs of American Airlines; Jim Hall, former chairman of the National Transportation Safety Board; John Nance, aviation editor for ABC News; Ray Hutchinson, who has been involved with the planning of Dallas/Fort Worth International Airport from its inception; Congressman Pete Sessions and W. Michael Cox, Senior Vice President and Chief Economist of the Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas.

The third conference, the 2002 Carrington Lecture entitled "Responding to Global Threats: the Cases for Unilateralism and Multilateralism," was held on April 4 and 5, 2002. There are tensions and trade-offs between unilateral, legal and juridical issues relating to the economy, environment, military, international organizations, and human rights. The recent terrorist attacks on the United States, and the responses to them present shattering illustrations of those tensions and trade-offs. The conference used the occasion of this new and more urgent environment to provide a forum to address and debate the subject. The conference featured seventeen experts on these issues from law, diplomacy, business, and government. Participants included: Christopher Ashby, former U.S. Ambassador to Uruguay; Al Casey, former CEO of American Airlines and former U.S. Postmaster General; Rudolph Dolzer, former Director General of the Federal Chancellery of Germany and Professor of Law at Bonn University; Werner Ebke, Chair of Business and Tax Law at the University of Konstanz School of Law; Whitney Harris, former Nuremberg Prosecutor and former Professor of Law, SMU; Arthur Helton, Director, Peace and Conflict Studies, Council on Foreign Relations, and former Vice President of the Soros Foundation; Ray Hunt, CEO, Hunt Oil Company; Robert Jordan, U.S. Ambassador to Saudi Arabia; Yutaka Kawashima, former Vice Minister of Foreign Affairs in Japan and former Japanese Ambassador to Israel; Ndiva Kofele-Kale, Professor of Law at SMU; Alexander Kononov, President of the Russian Institute for Strategic Analysis; Vaughan Lowe, Chichele Professor of Public International Law & Fellow, All Souls College; W. Michael Reisman, Myres S. McDougal Professor of Law, Yale University; Lt. General James T. Scott (Ret.), Former Director of National Security Program, Harvard University, and former Special Forces Operations Officer; Gao Shangquan, Vice Finance Minister of China, and President of the China Research Society for Restructuring the Economic System; Sheila Sisulu, South African Ambassador to the United States; and John Attanasio.

These conferences commemorate the inaugural year of SMU Law School as the Dedman School of Law. We hope that they express the gratitude of the faculty, students, and staff for the very generous gift from the Dedman family. The Dedman School of Law and the Section of International Law and Practice of the ABA believe this has been a very fruitful collaboration. This conference was a Roy R. Ray conference sponsored by the Roy R. Ray lecture series, which honors the memory of the late Professor Roy R. Ray. We dedicate these conferences to the victims of the events of September 11.