

paying an ever higher price in order to defeat the terrorists by refusing to respond in the way they want us to?"⁷²

Maintaining world trade is a more important than ever, cite some. The argument follows that if we are to fight terrorism, we have to fight by maintaining economic growth and by not sacrificing the value of an orderly, open economic society for a closed order.

This argument—let's preserve our values so as not to let the terrorists "win"—was taken up by Richard Zoellick, U.S. Trade Representative in a much-talked about editorial appearing in the *Washington Post*. Titled "Countering Terror With Trade," the article postulated that America and its allies should defiantly defend the values "at the heart of this protracted struggle." Zoellick felt that trade is about "more than economic efficiency." Trade, he wrote, fits into a larger framework of values that "define us against our adversary: openness, peaceful exchange, democracy, the rule of law, compassion and tolerance."⁷³

Even as the nation mourned, the U.S. Trade Representative pleaded for a message to be sent out to the world that economic growth would not be impeded and that hope for the future had not been extinguished. Zoellick urged the administration of which he was a part to "shape history by raising the flag of American economic leadership," just as Franklin D. Roosevelt had done to roll back protectionism during the Great Depression.⁷⁴

Extra resonance for this argument is drawn from the fact that the September 11th attacks were, quite literally and startlingly, an attack on trade (and finance) itself. The World Trade Centre (WTC) housed brokers, insurance companies, retailers, bankers, lawyers, agents, and many who provided essential

⁷² David Fromkin, "The Strategy of Terrorism," *Foreign Affairs* 53, No. 3 (April 1975): 697-698.

⁷³ Robert B. Zoellick, "Countering Terror with Trade," *Washington Post* (September 20, 2001): pg A35.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*