The International Journal of Ethical Leadership

Volume 8 Article 15

2021

Conversations on JUSTICE with Inamori Ethics Prize Winners

Silvia Fernández de Gurmendi

LeVar Burton

Farouk El-Baz

Marian Wright Edelman

Conversations on JUSTICE with Inamori Ethics Prize Winners

October 23, 2020

Shannon E. French
Inamori Professor in Ethics and Director of the Inamori Center for Ethics and Excellence
Silvia Alejandra Fernández de Gurmendi
leading figure in international justice, humanitarian law, and human rights, the first woman to serve as the president of the International Criminal Court (ICC), and recipient of the 2020 Inamori Ethics Prize
LeVar Burton
renowned actor-producer-writer-director, literacy and AIDS research advocate, recipient of the 2019 Inamori Ethics Prize, and first recipient honored for ethical leadership in the Arts
Farouk El-Baz
famed NASA scientist and geologist, clear water advocate, advisor to African leaders on decreasing dependence on strained water sources and finding hidden ones, and recipient of the 2018 Inamori Ethics Prize
and
Marian Wright Edelman
revered civil rights leader, the first black woman ever admitted into the Mississippi Bar, founder and president of the Children's Defense Fund, and recipient of the 2017 Inamori Ethics Prize

---

FRENCH: Welcome everyone, virtually, to the Inamori International Center for Ethics and Excellence at Case Western Reserve University in Cleveland, Ohio, USA. We're so delighted to have you with us here today for this momentous occasion where we have the opportunity to discuss justice with four of our Inamori Ethics Prize Recipients. The Inamori Ethics Prize winners were honored, each of them, for being outstanding global ethical leaders in their fields, and so we have brought the most recent four winners together today to talk about this very important, very timely, topic of justice.

I'm going to introduce them very briefly and myself. I am Shannon French, the director of the Center, and I'm here with our associate director, Beth Trecasa. We're going to take in the questions that you all send and make sure that they get as many as possible to our panelists, and then we will keep the conversation going until about 2:15, our time here on the East Coast. With that in mind let me very briefly introduce these wonderful individuals to you, but I would also direct you to our website for the Inamori Center for much more information on each of them and where you can also find their videos of their actual speeches that they gave when they received the award.

First our 2020 winner, who has unfortunately had to have her ceremony postponed due to the global pandemic, but she is with us here today virtually, and that is Silvia Alejandra Fernández de Gurmendi, and she is joining us all the way from Argentina. For those of you who are not familiar with her incredible history, she is a leading figure in international justice, humanitarian law, and human rights, and she was the first woman to serve as the president of the International Criminal Court, or ICC. She's worked tirelessly throughout her career to see that those who commit war crimes and crimes against humanity are held accountable for their actions. Our 2019 winner is with us here as well, and that is none other than renowned actor, producer, writer, and director, LeVar Burton. LeVar Burton, in addition to his work in the arts, has been an absolutely passionate advocate for literacy, both for children and adults, and has also worked to raise money for AIDS research. He was also our first prize winner to ever be honored for ethical leadership in the Arts. We are also joined by our 2018 recipient, Farouk El-Baz. Farouk El-Baz is a famed NASA scientist. He was the one who actually taught the Apollo astronauts what to expect when they landed on the moon and later, after he left NASA, he turned the very technology and science that he had practiced—focused towards space—and refocused it towards the Earth. Using techniques like remote sensing to look for hidden water sources in places where humans are suffering, like war-torn Darfur, and he joins us today from Boston. By the way, I didn't mention LeVar is joining us from New Orleans, which when I used to live in Texas we called N'awlins, and he will have to depart after a little while, but we're glad he could join us. Last, but certainly not least, we have another icon with us today of course, Marian Wright Edelman. She is a revered civil rights leader, the first black woman ever admitted into the Mississippi Bar. She founded the Children's Defense Fund, which is the nation's leading advocacy organization for children and families, which

champions policies to lift children from poverty, protect them from abuse and neglect, and ensure their access to healthcare and quality education. These are the four amazing people that I brought together for you here today, and we're going to start by asking some questions that we already have. This is very exciting.

LeVar, I'm going to open with you if I may. LeVar, from your portrayal of Kunta Kinte in *Roots* to your work with literacy in *Reading Rainbow*, to your current podcast *LeVar Burton Reads*, and your upcoming directing of the documentary *Two-Front War*, you've advocated for the importance of sharing stories and the lived experience of Black Americans. President Trump recently issued an order to establish "patriotic education"—that's the expression he's using—to defend American history. What concerns do you have about that?

BURTON: Wow. What a great question Shannon, and first I'd just like to say I sometimes just have to pinch myself. How a storyteller wound up in the company of these world changers, I don't know, but I'm happy to just be in the same space with these people, with Silvia and Farouk and Marian. As a storyteller, here's my point of view on what Mr. Trump is suggesting. America has never told itself the true story of who we are and how we got here, and it sounds to me like Mr. Trump in addition, along with his idea of "making American great again," wants to return to a time that really never existed. The myth of American exceptionalism, in my view, is just that. It is simply a myth. The story of the founding of America is one where we came to this nation and stole the land from the people who were on it and killed anyone who resisted, and we just don't teach that to our children. We have a tendency to gloss over our history and reinvent the past in order to serve our egos. The idea of educating, creating content, and curriculum that perpetuates these myths about America is as bad an idea as I can possibly think of. However, and I will be quite honest and candid, I think this administration is full of bad ideas, and I cannot wait for it to be gone.

FRENCH: Thank you for sharing your thoughts on that, and while I've got you thinking in this vein, one of your iconic characters that so many people know you from was the engineer Geordi La Forge on *Star Trek: The Next Generation,* and as that character you were part of an optimistic view of the future. We've just talked the past and history, and *Star Trek* is that forward-looking vision. It certainly looked, to me anyway, as a more just and equitable world than the one we're currently living in, and so I'm wondering, do you still have hope that that kind of future is possible, and why or why not?

BURTON: I am always hopeful. I'm betting on the human beings. Gene Roddenberry's vision for the future was one that always appealed to me as a young black kid growing up in Sacramento, California. As a science-fiction fan, Gene's vision was one that included me, so as a storyteller he was saying, "When the future comes there is a place for you." Gene's vision for humanity was that we would indeed resolve all issues of race and class and sex and economy and live in a more egalitarian society. I still believe in our potential to get there because I believe in human beings and our ability to rise to our highest level of expression while working out all of the darker aspects of our nature. I genuinely believe, Shannon, that this current generation will get us ever closer to that ideal of living in a world that is just and equitable for all. The passion that they have shown on the streets of the world this past summer encourages me in the belief that, as Kendrick Lamar would say, "We gon' be alright."

FRENCH: I love that you have hope, and I have to say hearing that gives me more hope, so thank you very much. I have a related question that came in for Silvia, and I think it's so closely related that Silvia, I'd like to throw this one to you, if I may. In trying war criminals you've obviously had to confront some of the worst that humans are capable of doing to one another. Do you still have hope that humans, despite our differences, can learn to treat each other justly and fairly, with dignity and respect?

FERNÁNDEZ DE GURMENDI: Let me say that I'm also very very hopeful, I'm also a very optimistic person. Indeed, we have seen at the court real—you see real evil. Now, are we going to learn? I have to say that I don't know if everybody will ever learn, not everybody, but I do believe that we can, and we should make it more difficult for those who do not learn. They can do so—if they do not learn how to not do harm—we need to make it more difficult for them and we need to make national societies more resilient. Now I think prevention is key. Of course I'm going to be talking about justice, and justice is very important as a prevention tool, but certainly not the only one. They are—you know we have learned about past atrocities. We know they do not happen overnight. We know that they are processes, that they require planning and preparation, that they are warning signs and common risk factors that can lead to enable the commission of violence, of crimes. Racism, xenophobia, antisemitism, and other forms of discrimination, intolerance, and exclusion are well-known precursors of violence. Now, unfortunately, we know they are on the rise. In many of the situations at the

court when—when you read the context of the crimes that were committed, you can see easily that there was a disaster in the making not for months, for years, for decades. So there is a need to address these precursors of violence early on, before they explode, and you need to have standards, you need to have policies and appropriate mechanisms permanently enshrined in the national policies, and it has been mentioned here about education. Yes, education is one of the keys in prevention. Education, sorry, not "patriotic education," but education for inclusion, education to learn tolerance, to learn how to include the others. This is extremely important. We need education, we need appropriate, permanent policies and specific initiatives to address precursors of violence, and I think we can. With that we can make societies more resilient against those who do not learn. I think we have learned that no society is new, in whatever continent, so there is a lot that can and should be done in every region and every country, but I'm very hopeful that we have learned a lot to know how to address some of these.

FRENCH: I'm grateful again for your optimism, but also for those important warnings in a way about what needs to be done in order to keep things moving in the right direction, and to note when the warning signs are there, and also the sense that no country is immune, as you just said, and that we all need to be part of trying to build cultures and communities of justice. LeVar, actually a related question that came in. I'm going to just throw back to you because it follows off nicely from what Silvia was just saying. A question about representation in the arts, again, but specifically asking why—if you could put into words—why does it matter to have in a culture like the US or anywhere—why does it matter to have people be able to recognize themselves in the arts particularly?

BURTON: Wow. What a wonderful question, Shannon. Absent healthy self-images in popular culture and media, a child grows up with a very dangerous message. A message that says, "You do not matter. You are not a part of this thing called culture." The idea of representation in the media is so critical in terms of the mental health of a society because a society that is not receiving contributions from all of its component parts is a society that's not fully expressing itself. It's not expressing itself to its highest potential, so representation is critically important in order for everyone in the society to feel valued and included in our efforts.

FRENCH: Thank you so much, and with that point I think I will turn now to our expert on the rights of children in particular. Marian, if I may

ask you, when we talk about these efforts, whether it's representation, or it's Silvia's point around building a more just society and making sure that people are held accountable, I'd like to ask you—Does it make sense to start addressing inequities that specifically affect children? What is the role of justice towards children in trying to make a society better?

EDELMAN: Well in our future and investing in children preventively and equitably is going to benefit everybody. It is a disgrace in the United States of America that children are among the poorest of our age groups, and it's costly, and they are the future in so many ways. I grew up in a small segregated town in South Carolina, Bennettsville, which I love dearly, but with great parents and community co-parents who've made it very clear that though we have the external world saying we're not as valuable as white children, we knew that wasn't true because we believe that God did not make two classes of children, and that every child was sacred, and that each of us had to struggle to make a difference and to give back in service to others. I'm so grateful for the community parents and co-parents and my own parents that taught us that if you don't like the way the world is, you change it, so I've been a rebel since I was a few years old. I would wander in and switch the black and white water fountain signs that said black and white. I would—I just—I loved growing up protesting, from the time I was four or five, but I think we need to change the perception that God made two classes of children. I'm a person of faith and our church, my father and my grandfather, Baptist preachers, all made it clear that God did not make two classes of children, that every child was sacred, and that each of us had entitlement from God to realize our full-fledged potential. I've been driven by that message of my faith. The message of the examples of my family and co-parents in one community, and I love the fact that they thought the service was about each of our space for living. You see a problem you don't just say, "Why doesn't somebody something?" Here. Why don't you do something? I always felt valued as a child and always felt that I would be empowered to change the world if I didn't like the way it was.

FRENCH: I love that and the idea that we can all change everything around us, even if it's in small parts. I love the expression that never let the idea that you can't do enough stop you from doing something. We have to keep, keep moving forward. You know I want to turn now to Farouk, if I may. I was—it was occurring to me that as someone who came to America from Egypt as an immigrant and then was pulled into doing this exciting, really

cutting-edge science at NASA and yet, at the same time, you were aware of the tremendous inequities that were going on in that organization. Although you've said you've even become aware of more of them as time went on, like you didn't know everything until the story of *Hidden Figures* came out, for example, but as an Egyptian immigrant, you were able to play that key role. How do you see the struggle going forward evolving to increase diversity and speak perhaps particularly to STEM fields?

EL-BAZ: I think it's so important that we—I think it's very important that we consider the fact that we are all human beings and the opportunities, as Marian just said, the opportunities should be available to all, and the people that do better can certainly be better respected and better promoted and so on. In every field, there is no question about the fact that we need more brains for better humanity in the future. We need better brains for the economic success in the future. There is no question about the fact that we need all of our intellect and our intelligence and our knowledge and our institutional—our intuitive activities to take humanity to where we think we should go, so we cannot work only on one part of our mind or our intellect. We should work on all our intellect and ability to succeed and produce human efforts that are capable to make everybody feel happy and live a beautiful life.

FRENCH: You know I love the reminder that for the size of the problems that we face as humans right now, as all of humanity, as the human race, we really can't afford to not get everyone working on them. The idea of diversity here as a strength because we need every smart person, we need every genius, we need every talent, we need every bit of creativity, we need all of that, and we're not gonna find those people if we're forcing some of them to be pushed in a corner and not have a voice, so the best of us would otherwise be hidden if we don't include them. I was thinking, too, Farouk, that one of the things that you've done, as I mentioned in your introduction—is you've asked how we can turn science towards helping the present-day problems of the world. I think that's a very hopeful move as well, and I think it makes us—it reminds us that there is something to work towards if we do all work together, if we work on the level of the kind of passion we saw in getting humans to the moon. I'm wondering, so with your work about finding untapped water sources in Darfur, where the lack of fresh water was actually a root of conflict and death in that region, do you see overall an important role for scientists in addressing injustices that do arise from practical problems?

EL-BAZ: Absolutely, there is no question about that indeed. We went to the moon based on the interpretation of satellite images of the moon, and we selected sites for the astronauts to land based on our ability to interpret photographs of the moon before they went, and we planned their excursions on the lunar surface and where to go and what kinds of materials to pick. All of that was done interpreting photographs, so as soon as the program ended we thought, "Okay, we need to look at the Earth and figure out exactly the same kind of thing. Let's look at space photographs and figure out what is it that we need to—we can learn—and what is it that we need to learn?" We did that, and the first thing that we found out was the fact that the deserts of the world are beautifully exposed, not much cloud, and therefore we can photograph them any time and we can photograph them with all kinds of equipment, including radar, and we—when we used radar, actually the radar waves penetrated through the sand and gave us a view of the solid rock layer beneath the sand. For the first time, we were able to see the surface of the desert before the sand covered it up, and that actually told us a great deal, including about the way the water used to move around these places before they dried up and the sand took over. We found out that, my God, if water was here maybe there is leftover, some of that water might be left over in the layers beneath. We tried in Egypt, and indeed there was a great deal of water beneath the channels of former rivers and where the former rivers used to lead to and my God—there was a great deal of water, and today there are thousands of acres of land being planted constantly and regularly in this location in southern Egypt based on the images of radar, so we began to say "My God, we can do this same thing everywhere else where it's in—where it is badly needed."

That immediately showed the problem of radar ability in Darfur because Darfur was a situation where the government and the local people were fighting over land and the use of water resources. We thought, "My God, let's look at the land in northwest Sudan and see what can we see," and indeed we saw an ancient lake, much like the case in Egypt, and lots of rivers that led to it, so I started talking about that. The United Nations heard about it, Ban Ki-moon, the Secretary General of the United Nations, heard about it and called me in. I explained it to him, and he said, "Maybe you can go and explain this to the locals." They said great, and he actually assigned a helicopter for me, from the UN for me. I went to Sudan, and the first thing that I did was go to the president of Sudan, who was kind of a religious nut, he was a member of the Muslim Brotherhood. So I sat with him, and the minute we started talking,

I started talking about what water meant in Islam. I told him, in the Quran, that from water we invented or presented all kinds of things, all living things came originally from water, and God did that. So he said yes, and therefore nobody should hold water from anybody else, otherwise it would be non-Islamic, nonreligious to hold water over anybody. He said yeah, so I thought that I'm going to take a—give a lecture at the university this afternoon and he said, "No, don't give it at the university, you do it right here at the Ministry of Foreign Interior. I will come. I have somebody from Germany coming, but I want to come and listen anyway." It really happened, and I went to Darfur and talked to the people and told them where is more potential for water, and it worked out very nicely based solely on the fact that we applied knowledge from science to these kinds of problems. The most important thing, as far as I'm concerned, with the whole story is the fact that I lectured a lot, just being at BU I lectured in Boston a lot, at Harvard, MIT, and Boston University many times. The BU students started an organization, a student organization, they called it "Wells for Darfur," so they collected money, a dollar at a time. One would drop a dollar at a time for a well in Darfur, and they collected over two and a half years, consistently working at it, and they collected ten thousand dollars, meaning ten thousand students participated in the collection of one dollar to make a well in Darfur. That, to me, was the most beautiful illustration of the whole spirit, of the human spirit, of that thing.

FRENCH: I love the fact that you were able to change minds by just coming at them from where they were, you know saying, " Here's what you believe, and I will show you how what we're trying to do fits with you, what you believe." Marian, if I could draw you in on that point as well. Hearing Farouk describe that persuasion that he had to go through and bringing people around to the notion that this is something that is in everyone's interest, and you must have done so much of that in your work to try to get things changed. Marian, can you tell us anything about your efforts to try to change minds, open minds, get people how—what are some tricks or stratagems that you found actually work to get people to care about the welfare of someone who isn't exactly like them?

EDELMAN: Well, growing up with Baptist parents and a mother who ran the community and was a church organist and the church fundraiser, and the father who's a Baptist minister, and I'm grateful for my childhood because I grew up with people who believed in children, who believed in faith and believed that God did not make two classes of children, and who always made

it clear from the youngest times that we were sacred and were equal to any other human being and that we, those of us who had gifts, were obligated to give back to the community in service, which is the rent we each pay for living. I feel privileged to be born where I was with who I was with the community and community of parents that I had, and one of the basic things is that services are rent to pay for living, but second, if you don't like the way the world is, you go out and you figure out a way to change it. You try to do it nonviolently, but you don't complain, you see what you can do to make it better. I had those wonderful role models and examples as I grew up, so I do what my parents did, I do what my community co-parents did. When I went to historically black college and I had Dr. King and Dr. Benjamin Mays, his model and mentor and all of our mentor, that message was reinforced that we each and to make a difference, don't complain, act, serve, make the world better, don't—it's just that's what we were put on this Earth for, just to leave it better than we found it. The fact that we have millions of children who are poor is a disgrace in the richest nation on Earth. Almost 12.3 million children who are poor and many of them living in extreme poverties. It's a disgrace. It's costly. We'd rather imprison them. What kind of values is that? Rather than give them food and give them decent housing and give them a decent education and cost-effective early childhood education. That's insane. We've made some progress, and we're trying to talk about preventive investment and putting into place a more high-quality childcare system. Still have a long way to go. Preschool education, we've made great strides in giving children healthcare, but it's hard to get all these things done when it should be just a given in a nation that says it wants to provide an equal opportunity for everybody. I think that the fact that we let our children still be the poorest group of Americans, and it hurts us all, it flies in the face of what we profess to be. I think that the key goals of our nation, to the goals of children's benefit, is to end child poverty, and you can't help children without helping their parents make sure that every child gets a high-quality early childhood education, that every child gets healthcare, that every child is safe after school, and every child gets an equal education to succeed and contribute and give back, because God did not make two classes of children. I think we've been plugging along, and there are many laws in the books, but we've got to enforce them and hold on to them when people try to cut the budget. This country's weakest point is its failure to invest in its young and to live up to its values and making sure that every child feels valued and has healthcare and has a fair chance to get a good education, to give back to this country, and I think that is our Achilles heel.

FRENCH: I appreciate that so much because as someone with a young daughter at home, thinking about what world she's going into and thinking about all of her peers, and sometimes it is hard to keep that hope, foremost about the future, but if there is to be any, it is going to come from the way that we take care of our children and lift them up and move them towards a brighter tomorrow. I'm sorry, Farouk, our guest LeVar is going to have to step away; I wanted to give him a chance to say final commentary on anything with what we've been discussing here today about the importance of justice in this world.

BURTON: My final thought is this. In a world where competition has become the norm, in fact it is the way we communicate with one another more than any other modality, we communicate through our competitive nature. I think going forward, if we are going to be successful at really realizing our most full potential as a species of human beings, we need to focus our energy and attention on cooperation more than competition. The kind of just society that can come out of a society that cooperates more than it competes bodes very well, I think, for our ability to really get the job done here on Earth as we do in the heavens, as is evidenced by the work of the geniuses like Farouk.

FRENCH: Thank you so much LeVar, and good luck with your upcoming projects, and we will all anticipate them and keep up with your contributions to the arts. Thank you so much.

BURTON: It's a blessing, Shannon, and to everybody in the office, in the audience. Have a great day and a wonderful weekend.

FRENCH: Thank you so much. Bye. Farouk, you had some thoughts to jump in on following on the previous comments from Marian.

EL-BAZ: I just wanted Marian to know something that her words affected. At the time she started the Children Defense Fund, I think it was in the '70s, early '70s or something like that, and that was the time when I had just left NASA and joined the Smithsonian Institution. There was the National Air and Space Museum, and I was directing a Center for Research there, and then I was responsible for some of the exhibits, and one of the exhibits that I was personally responsible for was a place to touch the moon. We'd have to go to my buddies at NASA to convince them that we can take a piece of the moon rock and actually put it in the museum and for people to touch it, and I succeeded after a year and a half or something, and then we started designing

that to be in the first hall where you center the museum so everybody can see it. At the time Michael Collins, Apollo 11 astronaut, was the head of the National Air and Space Museum, and he and I went down to the guys fixing up the exhibits to see it before its final formation. We went down and we—at the time I had heard about her work and about the Children's Fund and she was on my mind all the time for a few days because I had four daughters myself, at that time, and then when we went down to the exhibit, the design of the exhibit, I found out there was a column, a long column, like this [*gestures vertically*], and there is a place where people can put their finger on to actually touch the moon rock, so the exhibit was called "Touch the Moon." I saw it, and it's at a very high level, and then I said, "How about the children? You can't do that! You have to put that way two feet down, further below, because the kids are the ones that will be more affected than adults by touching the moon. So no, no, no, has to be lower." Michael Collins agreed with me and went down so anybody who will go to the moon, if you want to touch the moon, you have to bend a little to touch it because the children will touch it.

FRENCH: Yay, I love that! Marian, did you know about that?

EDELMAN: No, that's wonderful!

FRENCH: What a wonderful connection between our perspectives. I love when those come up. I also thought it was cute that *Star Trek: The Next Generation*, that LeVar starred on, had a space shuttle that was named *Farouk*, it was "The El-Baz," so these worlds colliding.

EL-BAZ: I have something for LeVar, I'm sorry that he left, but I will say it, and then you can tell him about it.

FRENCH: Wonderful. Well, what I wanted to bring out—I also have a question that relates to Silvia and your work internationally. Folks who are coming in are asking about various aspects of justice, and while they clearly want to be optimistic, there's some concerns being raised about different concepts of justice around the world, but the work you've done for the International Criminal Court does depend on the idea that right and wrong are not entirely, culturally dependent, that some things really are crimes against all of humanity. Wherever they occur. Whenever they occur. Have you seen progress in your lifetime of people around the world accepting the concept of universal human rights like that?

FERNÁNDEZ DE GURMENDI: Well, I have to say yes, what I have seen in my lifetime is a meteoric rise, since the last decade of the twentieth

century, of the acceptance of the concept of justice for certain category of crimes or for certain category of atrocities, mainly genocide, crimes against humanity, and war crimes. And not just divine justice or moral justice or different types of justice. Very concrete criminal justice for the perpetrators of the worst crimes, and I was privileged to see the rights, and I was also privileged to see this in functioning. Actually I cannot say now, but I remember the first case that we had at the International Criminal Court was a case for crimes committed against children, not child soldiers recruiting forcibly, children to be used in hostilities. This was a major breakthrough in the '90s, it was like a dream. It was fifty years after the Nuremberg Tribunals that we all studied in school, in the second World War, and then there were five decades where nothing like that could be accomplished again. Then in the '90s, for various reasons that we will not discuss now, you see that there was this acceptance first as a recognition of certain standards or prohibitions, again the prohibition of certain category of crimes that I have mentioned, and then most importantly, the acceptance that these types of crimes are an affront to mankind as a whole, and that you cannot leave the response to national states, but that you do also need an international response when there is no national response.

I was privileged to see these achievements that included the creation of an International Criminal Court. And you said, "Well are these universal? How universal are they, these standards and these concepts? Most importantly, are we going—are they going to survive our lifetime?" Well I have to say that the court and the recognition of these standards was created in a process that was open-ended to all states in the world, all regions of the world, and through multilateral diplomacy they came to this treaty—[*bad connection*]—with global participation in it yet only two thirds, I say only but it's quite significant, two thirds of the world is there, but most importantly even now where we are seeing a fractured world where certain pushback against internationalism—[*bad connection*]—towards national principles of noninterference going back to your frontiers, we can still see that this request for justice is still there, and it is really, there is a huge demand for justice for these types of crimes. First of all, no one really is questioning the prohibitions. No one is saying that the genocide or crimes against humanity is a legitimate response to conflict. They may try to hide the facts, they might try to deny them, put them under the rack, deny responsibility for them, but they are not denying the concept. There you have common values, and then well the ICC, the International Criminal Court, is now under attack,

not everywhere, but you see a proliferation of proceedings for these type of crimes in other tribunals at the national level where there is no agreement in who is going to be prosecuting. You create mechanisms to safeguard the evidence for the future. This is happening. They created two international mechanisms for Myanmar and Syria to safeguard the evidence that is being collected, and many times collected due to science and science to digital technology, so this is being collected for future prosecutions, and actually next week there are some proceedings that are resuming in Germany, in Koblenz, against two of the Syrian officers in national proceedings for international crimes, so I'm very optimistic that even in the current environment that is very difficult and very different from the '90s, I still see that there is a lot going on and that there are indeed certain common values that remain, and I think they're here to stay.

FRENCH: I am glad to hear that, and I like hearing the history and seeing the changes and again the ways that you had to persuade or bring people along, but your point is also extremely well made that it wasn't that hard to get people to agree that certain things are wrong. People may try to get away with not calling something for example, in the case you gave calling—not calling something genocide and so forth, but you're at least able to say there isn't anyone saying, "Oh genocide is fine," so you know this is moral progress because certainly we can go further back in history where there would have been people saying that is fine, so let us see that as a move of the needle in the right direction and going towards. One of the—speaking of children, who keep coming up in our conversation, one of our younger audience members from Shaker Heights High School nearby us actually wanted a follow-up question to you, Silvia, wondering if having seen the progress that you've seen in that area, in criminal prosecutions of war criminals, do you also, just personally, think that we could see in our lifetimes ethical agreements internationally around other issues like environment, economy, and health? These kids have easy questions, obviously.

FERNÁNDEZ DE GURMENDI: This is an extremely relevant question and extremely important. I think you have all seen that I'm part of the optimistic type of individuals, so I do think that we can and should reach agreements in these areas as well. Actually, we have some agreements in issues of environment, and on other issues we really need to tackle inequality because this, together with conflict, together with climate change, is creating a crisis of huge proportions. I do think that we can do this, but

of course, it requires, and I think some—I think LeVar mentioned this already, we need a lot of cooperation. We need a coordinated approach. We need multilateralism, multilateral institutions, international institutions where we can discuss, reflect, and have agreements. It's not going to be easy because, as I said, we are in a world with that you have different tendencies, and right now you have this tendency that countries think that in order to save yourself from global responses then you go back to your frontiers. I think we need to do opposite; I think we need to cooperate. This needs a huge amount of cooperation between not only states, I think we can all help. It is a dialogue and an engagement that needs to—you need to have all actors included, you need to have states, you have to have civil society, academia, students, or you know. Look at the students, look at the young people. They are all pushing out for the importance to protect their environment. There you see that you don't need only adults or superpowers. Children, students, young students are doing a huge amount to promote these agreements. Yes, with this type of young people and these activities, of course I'm very optimistic that we can do better than we are doing now.

FRENCH: Thank you so much, and another question came in for Farouk relating to your story, which people seem to be loving, about making sure the children could touch the moon. I do love that as an image, and they wanted to ask you if you have suggestions for making sure that people can think beyond the present moment? I think what they're getting at is that things like a journey to the moon or any of those projects are often very long in scale and time scale, and it can be hard to get people excited to take on something that may take years and years to come to fruition, and they were wondering if you could talk about how do you help people as a teacher, as a mentor, to maintain that kind excitement so that they're always reaching for the moon, as it were?

EL-BAZ: Indeed, it's an excellent question and indeed, it might be—it might look as if it is difficult or long-term, and maybe we should not start it now because we will not end it, but that is not at all the situation. I really think that people have thought about flying, and they did it, and in less than one hundred years we've been with you to the moon, in less than one hundred years from learning how to fly. That there is—all kinds of things that develop swiftly, even though it looks as if it is, not now or not in the near future, but indeed, it's okay. Think about it now, think about what to do, because during the 1960s we had the Apollo astronauts. They were all military guys and

the guys, because there were no military women at the time and these—in the Air Force and the Navy and so on, they were all men. Now there are all kinds of women flying into space and younger people and people that were not part of the flying scheme, and in the future there will be others, and there will be many more varieties of people flying and going to Mars or going to other planetary bodies. There is no question about the fact that the more we dream, the more we expect things to happen, the more we will get there. Don't think that this is since it's one hundred years off today that it might be so difficult, and let's not do it. Absolutely not. Think about it now, and think that you are going to do it, girl or boy, that doesn't matter. You are going to do it and you are going to do well, and you're going to do something nobody else has done. Why not? It will happen. I think you need to think positive and do whatever you can. Dream as much as you can, and continue to dream because you will get there, no question about it.

FRENCH: Thank you so much, and I noticed that our questions are converging in interesting ways that we're getting in from folks. This one is directed at Marian, but it's a wonderful follow-up on what Farouk just said. Marian, and I like the language here, someone would like to know, How do you motivate yourself to keep going when some fights seem never-ending, and you feel small?

EDELMAN: You never let yourself feel small. You're never too small to make a difference, you can always make a difference. My parents in my small, segregated town made it very clear that they believed that every child was sacred and, even though it was a segregated world, that we could change it. Well I was a rebel, from the time I was four when I would switch the white and black water signs on the public department stores, but I think that we can make a difference and we've seen extraordinary change, but God did not make two classes of children. All great faiths affirm the sacredness of children, and I think we should just hold that in mind. Secondly, if you see a problem, don't just say, "Why doesn't somebody do something?" What can you do? I think each of us can do that, and I think that we've been able to see an awful lot of people come together over the last decade since Children's Defense Fund began to pass many laws that have helped millions of children escape poverty. Millions of children, they have healthcare. Millions of children get better chances to succeed in life because of a better child welfare system. Millions of children got in childcare. You do what needs to be done. Don't let anybody tell you can't change things, and that change is hard, but you got

to keep at it. You're going to have to take two steps backwards, but you just have to keep moving forward. I'm really very pleased that there are many laws on the books now that have given many, many millions of children, tens of millions of children, healthcare and mental healthcare, a chance to go and get preschool education, to get a head start, to get better quality child care, but we've got much more to do. This is a very rich nation, but still twelve and a half million children live in poverty. It's disgraceful, it's costly, and we must change it, but we just must absolutely never give up advocating for preventive investment, saving money by investing in children who will become productive citizens, rather than prisons, but we're more willing to pay three times more for prisoners than for public school kids, and that's something wrong with the values of the system. I think that children deserve to have first place at the table of hope and of the future, and they are the future, and I think that while I'm proud that many, many laws are in the books, I am not proud still at the wild distribution of wealth between those at the top, and the top one and two percent, and the millions of those who are still suffering and languishing without adequate housing and adequate food and adequate hope and adequate education, that each of us feel more privileged and want for our own children. I think that the mistreatment, the failure to invest in all of our children, to live up to our values, that everybody is equal, and we should have a chance to achieve a level of equality in our society, is going to be our undoing and we are still more willing to pay three times more for prison than for public school. People, there's something really wrong with that, and I think that, you know, we must end child poverty. We must make sure that every child gets what each parent wants with their own children: decent healthcare, safety, decent place to live, housing, disability. And that should be a "duh" in this wealthy, boastfully wealthy, nation. We can continue to send people off to prison, we can continue to let millions grow up without the education they need to give back to the rest of us, but it's a spiritual poverty that must be addressed, it's a practical poverty that must be addressed. What is it about us that is more willing to put three times more to send a child off to juvenile penitention or to adult prison than to give them a good preschool education and give them healthcare, the basic things that each parent wants for their own child—

FRENCH: I'm so sorry to interrupt, I just got excited. I just wanted to jump in on—I was just moved by your point around the money that's going in the wrong direction. The money that's going to prisons and so forth, and I just wanted to push, I agree with you that it seems like it should be a

"duh," that this is not right, but I'm just going to ask it straight out. Why isn't it? Who, what is the pushback? Is it—what do people think? Why are they putting the money in the wrong place? Is it that they fundamentally misunderstand what is best for children, or is there something financial behind it, that they're trying to make money? What do you think it is really? Because otherwise it just seems like insanity—

EDELMAN: We have a great pandemic here in this country. For those who are at the top and the few, we need a concept of enough. I wouldn't deprive anybody of their first million or two million or ten million or two billion, if we had no hungry children, okay? If we had no uneducated children, if we had no children that didn't get an early education that those of us were more privileged can get. This whole concept of "enough" and wanting for your own children what you want for other people's children, and that's the only way we're going to all have a safe environment in order to grow up. It defies any sense of core values and about respect for all human beings that we will let twelve and a half million children go in poverty. We're a little more willing to pay three times more to put them in prison than give them a good preschool education. What is it about us in America? We need to come to grips with our spiritual poverty. We need to come together about practical poverty. I mean but there's nobody super, but we're more willing to wait until somebody gets into trouble, and two, three times more often you imprison them than if you give them a preschool education. What is our value gap here that we need to address in the faith community, and how do we get to live up to all these things of life and liberty and justice for everybody? We need to stop this hypocrisy.

FRENCH: Farouk, I'm going to put you on the spot, too because we're talking about, what we certainly want to talk about the hope and the optimism, and I think that's vital because we all, all of us, need to keep working, and we need that spirit to do so, but I do think that we have to also ask what's gone wrong? What is going the wrong direction, and I wonder if you could talk at all from your experience, Farouk, if you see some of these same strange choices, and whether that's specifically in your work or just in society, but where it doesn't make sense to you that the direction the money is flowing? Like, why aren't we finding water for people who need it? Why aren't we? Do you have any thoughts around that?

EL-BAZ: To me, there is an objection to "the other." The ones that look different, the ones that speak different, and the ones that behave differently

in any way, or dress differently or whatever, so the fear of "the other" can hold human beings further away, like the ones that have the money, the ones that have the cars and this and that, cannot perceive what is the person that walks all the time, and this and that and doesn't even have money to go into a bus or something like that. There is a vast difference between these two, and the rich and the well-to-do stay away from it all. They don't really like to see these people that don't have it, and there is an objection to their state, but there is a rejection of them. That's why we have kind of a standoffish attitude because the people that have it don't really like to consider the ones that don't have it and their problems and their life. The only thing that can get us all together is that the spiritual effect that people speak about, like Marian speaks about her church, that keeps it this and that yes, indeed the churches can do this. They, the religious people, can do that. The ones that have the potential of speaking anywhere. Writers, the movies, the television—all of these things can improve the situation a little bit by getting two parties to a little better, a little closer, a little more understanding of each other.

FRENCH: Thank you, and I think the work that LeVar was describing fits into that as well. The idea that as long as we don't have enough representations of different kinds of people then again, we won't be treating everyone the same or making people feel like they're part of the same endeavor. That cooperation that we all keep talking about won't be there. Silvia I feel—I'm gonna continue—this is a somewhat negative thread, but I do think it's important that we be addressing it. You mentioned earlier that the ICC has been under some attack, and that's certainly the case, that there has been fierce criticism, and particularly from the United States towards the International Criminal Court, and I wonder if you could say for us your thoughts on why you think there's an uptick in that? Where is that hostility coming from, and what's driving it, and any thoughts you have around why that's happening right now?

FERNÁNDEZ DE GURMENDI: Well, creating a court of the general character like the ICC was considered to be a revolution—[*bad connection*]—to be restrained, refrained by the rule of law and to accept that someone else is going to step in if you don't do what is necessary to address certain facts. So already to have states accepting this was a huge thing, and the second huge matter is that in accepting this international response, the international community accepted also to create a court where the court itself can decide where to look and where to step in. So it is not a surprise that this court was

not created by superpowers, it was not created by huge powerful countries. They were created by those who most need the law, which is midsize and small countries; in a way the law is an equalizer, but that is not easy to accept for those who do not need the protection of the law. Every time the court has selected a situation to investigate and prosecute, that has created a lot of problems because as I said there is a general recognition of standards, but there is more difficult acceptance of having this address to you or to your friends, so that has created problems, every time the court has selected a situation it has created huge problems, and one of the situations that was starting to be investigated by the court was Darfur. Farouk was talking about Darfur and the conflicts of water, and this was a situation where everybody agreed that there were huge atrocities being committed there, and the situation was brought by the court, actually by the Security Council of the United Nations, and you would think that everybody would accept this, and at the time Sudan didn't accept it; of course now they do because they have changed, but every situation, even the most obvious ones for people, create a lot of problems. The court has moved from situations in Africa and that was criticized because they were saying, "Well the court is focusing too much on Africa, why don't they go elsewhere?" The court also started to investigate in other regions of the world, in Georgia, in Afghanistan, where other countries have also an interest, and they are following these situations. That was not very well received by other states, and it was not received, as you mentioned, by the United States, so there is an issue there of maybe protecting self-interest, and also there is another issue, which I always said and I always said it when I was at the court, that the court has some problems with its own performance. It was too slow, it was considered not to be sufficiently efficient, so there has been a big push to reform, to accelerate proceedings, to expedite, to make the selection of situations more transparent. That is being done. Actually they are under this process of reform right now, and it has started already, and I did my small contribution to this in the past. We need to improve the quality of justice that is delivered in order to obtain more cooperation, but we also have to accept that when you go into global, general standards, sometimes you are affecting interest of specific countries and specific regions, and the court will need to live with this, and I hope that it will be receiving sufficient protection and cooperation from other regions of the world as well because that is what will allow it to survive.

FRENCH: Thank you. I appreciate again the history is helpful and also the specific examples and again connecting up to Farouk's work with Darfur,

but showing how these struggles are ongoing, this is the current state of what we are trying to achieve, and it brought out another question, Marian, that someone brought in based on what Silvia was describing with the International Criminal Court. What was asking about—for Marian to comment on specifically systemic racism, institutional racism in the United States, and how it has come into things like police behavior and the court system, and how you see changes that need to be made in that particular area to combat that problem? How do you see justice as almost an institution? It looks like the question is around justice as an institution, whether that's the law side or the order side, how does that need to confront systemic racism going forward?

EDELMAN: It has to. We have an unjust criminal justice system in so many ways. I'm just very pleased with what young people have been doing and Black Lives Matter and calling into question the way in which law enforcement treats disproportionately people of color differently and then unfairly than people who are not of color. We have, we in the United States, we have a legacy of slavery that has never really gone away and been eradicated, and we've made strides forward and different movements before the Civil War. We had a reconstruction period, another post-reconstruction period. Change is never permanent. We're back in another period of demand for equal access to justice and to the richness of this nation for all of us, but we've got a long way to go. When we look at the prison population, it's disproportionately poorer minorities. When we look at unequal education, it is still too much true for many of our children of color in our inner cities, in rural areas. We still have structural problems that come from our legacy of slavery and from segregation and from apartheid. When we look at the income, the distribution of income in this country would be the Forbes 100, yeah they're great, they may look great as what the top one percent is, one tenth of one percent yet, we have twelve and a half million children living in poverty. There's something wrong and unjust in that picture. We've got to create a concept of "enough." I don't begrudge their first, their second, or ten, or fifteen million or even their billion or their second billion, if we have not got twelve and a half million poor children, many of them living in extreme poverty, if we do not have children who don't still get adequate healthcare, or who are being put out in the child welfare system without adequate chances to grow up into a successful adulthood. There's something wrong with twelve and a half million poor children, many millions of them in extreme poverty, in an economy like the United States of America. We need to come to come to grips and just to make sure

there's a concept of "enough for all" and that every child has a fair chance to get educated, to have healthcare, to be able to realize their God-given potential, and that still does not exist in the United States of America, and we must correct it. There should be no poor children in the United States of America. We can't afford not to do it. There should not be billionaires and billionaires with trillions when we've got twelve and a half million poor children. Something is wrong in that system. We need to change it.

FRENCH: Thank you, and I think the person who asked the question will appreciate that you went into some depth on the point that this is not really and should not be seen as completely unsolvable. There are solutions, we're aware of some of the solutions, but what we need is the will. I think that's a really important point to bring in there, that this is not like some of the mysteries of the world where we really haven't figured it out yet. We know how we could solve some of these, but we need the political will behind it. Farouk, I'm going to blend a few questions because they're directed at you, around the fact that you are an educator, that you've been an educator your whole life. Someone references having seen the episode of *From the Earth to the Moon* where you were portrayed as educating the Apollo scientists, but their question is—they're wondering, I'm guessing they're an educator too, I don't know at what level—but they're asking, Do you think there are helpful ways to think about and incorporate some of the topics we've talked about here today as an educator in whatever you're teaching, for example, so that you don't have to be specifically teaching a course on justice to bring up some of these points, or do you think that doesn't make sense, and you should just stick to science if you're doing science and not touch on any social issues? That was the question around, or I'm blending a couple, but they want to know about learning about justice and blending into your process as an educator.

EL-BAZ: There is no question in my mind at all that as you educate, you can blend in all kinds of things with it because you don't need to educate something about science and skip everything else about the fact that—What does science do? Science helps people. Well, helps people do what? Well, better lives. Better lives, meaning where? I know all of that, it really is if you can educate, you can educate in all kinds of fields and really blend them together, and if you are a good teacher then you can look at the environment of the students themselves. See where they came from. What is the problem when they leave school? Where they go to go home, what is that place where they live in, and how can you discuss things in a way for them

to take it better, to appreciate it a bit more, and to ask more questions, to actually revel, to enjoy being taught? Good teachers are like that, they can see what their students are and see what they ask about, and they can sense what they are after, and they respond with them. They give them the basic stuff that they have to teach in a way that they, the students, can absorb it, they can appreciate it, can simmer, have it in their thoughts and delight them while they are learning, and make them happy while they are learning. The answer is absolutely, yes, you can blend these things together.

FRENCH: I like that, and it makes me want to take a class from you. I think that would be marvelous. Silvia, we have another question that's come in for you around the issue of deterrents, and the question has to do with the fact that so much work happens after crimes have been committed, obviously, in terms of things like the sorts of crimes that end up before the ICC. Do you have any thoughts about how the international community can do more around deterrence, and I think you mentioned some of this in one of your earlier answers, but they were intrigued and would like to hear more on your thoughts of what might work for building a more just world when it comes to deterrence?

FERNÁNDEZ DE GURMENDI: Well first of all, justice is supposed to act as a deterrent. When you talk about deterrence, deterrence means a little bit of a threat, in a way. You say, "Well if you do this you will end up in front of justice." That of course, it's a very narrow understanding of prevention, but it is an aspect of it. One problem with that deterrent effect of justice and all these tribunals have been created on the understanding that justice can prevent future crimes actually. If you go into the wrong treaty, the wrong statutes that created the court, it says that. We do—that we have seen a lot of atrocities, and with this we hope to prevent future crimes. Now, one problem that we have there is, again, the fact that justice, even if it is a far wider demand for justice and much more is being done than it was done, I would say three decades ago nothing was done. I would say that we come—the entire twentieth century, from Nuremberg to the end, was basically an age of impunity. It was easier to go to prison if you stole a car than if you committed genocide because normally, if you committed genocide there will be a solution, there will be an agreement, there will be impunity, and then you will go to some villa in the south of some country to relax until the end of your life. We have gone from that to justice efforts, but it is still very little. There is no pattern of accountability. We need, first of all we need more

justice; we need really more proceedings, more ratifications of the ICC, less attacks from the ICC, and more justice in general, nationally and internationally. But that is one aspect you need to do a lot around, and it has been said here, you need to invest in prevention, you have to invest in inequality, you have to invest in things that make a lot of sense. Now the problem is that I think most politicians, in every country, will go for short-term approaches to things. You say you need to invest in education in order to teach more about inclusion, nondiscrimination, nonracism, but those are long-term efforts, so most politicians want short-term efforts, not long-term efforts, but actually that's what we need because it makes a lot of sense. Marian was mentioning about a spirituality gap or a value gap; well we do have that, of course, but we also have a lack of understanding in self-interest because it is in self-interest to invest in early warnings against violence, to invest in health, to invest in education, to invest in initiatives against discrimination. Again, what we need to do is to push our governments, to push our politicians to invest in these long-term projects that will diminish the sources of violence. The justice comes because you have not addressed the sources. Of course you can help that, that will prevent the future, but actually if you need to go and do justice against the perpetrator of genocide you can say, well already you have failed, because you failed to prevent what should have never happened. So what would work? Again, there is no simple magic solution. There is a concerted effort and coordinated efforts of all of us, including at the national level, to push our governments to do the right thing. Don't let them go away without investing in what is right to prevent violence and improve the world.

FRENCH: Thank you, and Marian, I'm wondering if you might want to jump in here because I could see you reacting with agreement to some of the things Silvia was saying, and I am wondering about this idea. I assume from some of your work, Marian, that you have seen the literal playing out of what she was describing. That when resources are given to people in the front end, as it were, given to people preventatively, then you don't see the same kinds of problems later on, that there is actual proof of this process, is that correct?

EDELMAN: Preventative investment works. Investing in children early on to give them their basic healthcare, their basic nutrition—what we want for our own children, okay—and basic safe housing, and basic early childhood education, all these are doable, and we can still have lots of room for billionaires to be billionaires. They don't need to have a hundred billion

or a trillion, but there could be a concept of "enough for all" at the bottom so that every child would have a chance to succeed and perhaps one of these days become a millionaire, billionaire if that's what they want to be. But this is not rocket science; we just have a degree of injustice in the distribution of resources and access to the resources that has to be corrected at some point. We just don't—you know I don't begrudge anybody their first, second, and third billion, if we didn't have all these poor millions of children and extremely poor children in our own rich nation and around the world. We can do better than that. We could end child poverty in our nation and still have lots of millionaires and billionaires around. You know we can do better than this. It needs to be a concept of enough for every human being. God did not make two classes of children, I don't believe, and we should not continue to do that by the way in which our systems have been designed to create those systems.

FRENCH: Thank you very much. Now the next question is technically directed to all of you because they want to hear your perspectives, each of you on this. I'm going to start with you, Farouk, if I may? The question is that each of you is renowned in your own field, and you have the opportunity, either directly or indirectly, to speak to diverse audiences around the world. They want to know, How has your public profile become part of your identity, and in what ways have you been able to use that profile as a way to enact or encourage change? And they were asking for even some specifics as well as generalized, so things like, Do you use social media? How do you get your voice out there? How do you use your profile and the status that you have earned to try to enact or encourage change in the world?

EL-BAZ: This is an excellent question because that is really the basis or the reason for being able to make change, and I definitely am open to all kinds of social media. I have accounts everywhere, and I use them all the time, and I respond particularly to youth in Arab worlds in general. I get more comments and more attention and more requests from youth, from teenagers and people in their twenties and up to their thirties, from all kinds of Arab countries everywhere constantly about their jobs, about their ideas, about latitude, about what should they do with the government, about what should they study and how could they study and what is best for them, and you name it. That is, as far as I'm concerned, the place where we can be most effective, because we speak directly to these people that we do not have anything to gain from talking one way or the other.

They know they are not paying us to do it so there is no benefit either from me or them and therefore my advice to them will be directed at basically their benefit, and there is nothing else that I can do except for that, and therefore I open myself constantly. Even now with the coronavirus I'm online constantly with the students in university in Alexandria, in Cairo, everywhere in universities and groups and people in the UAE and Saudi Arabia and Qatar, in Kuwait, everywhere where people speak Arabic, and they know of me. They communicate, and I respond, and it is a wonderful thing because I think we can certainly make a change ourselves.

FRENCH: And I have to say, your Twitter profile is excellent. I follow you on Twitter myself, so I encourage others to do the same. Marian, same question to you, and if you have any specifics? I know you have recently, if I'm correct, you have stepped down from running the Children's Defense Fund, but you obviously still have a platform and a voice. How do you get that voice out there in a variety of ways?

EDELMAN: The ways in which I've been doing the last fifty years. I try to stay out in community, I try to knock on doors and be in direct contact with the poor. Social media has its role, television has its role, but there is no substitute for knocking on doors and talking to people and sitting with people and praying with people, and I'm still for grassroots organizing, and I'm for creating models that implement change in local communities that empower people, empower young people. I'm very proud of the new generation and what I call servant leaders that are developing out of our Freedom Schools Programs. Our children who we've been celebrating, who've been beating the odds, who can show other young people that you can make it no matter what. If your dad is in prison or your mother's in prison, or you saw somebody shot, or you know you were shot, you can make it. We just need to build on the strength and the resiliency of many of those left behind and to create grassroots movements at the local level. I'm very proud of our Freedom Schools. I'm very proud of the servant leaders that are coming out of our Beat the Odds kids, who've got in prison fathers and mothers, but they have somehow—if one person reaches out to them and says, "You can make it, you know you can do this," but we've just got to forage change at the bottom that builds up. I believe my theory of change is the parable of the sower: you've got to plant a lot of seeds from the bottom up, and the sun's going to burn up a lot of those seeds and pour all kinds of stuff on a lot of those seeds, but when you plant enough of them. I've watched

our seeds and the Children's Defense Fund grow and I'm so proud of our young people who have beat the odds, whose parents are in prison, but somehow they're able to get away from that as the future because there's somebody in that community who made a difference. I'm more proud of our freedom schools in many ways because they're learning that they can learn how to read and catch up. We just need to do what we've got to do at the grassroots level and to make sure that policy reflects the needs of people in their communities day to day, and I think that making sure that young people are engaged at every level, we don't have any right to give up on a child, and that we just need to build that movement, but it has to come from the bottom up and not just from the top down.

FRENCH: Thank you, and I love that we've now gotten two different perspectives, but they're not mutually exclusive, and that's wonderful as well. You can use the right there, face to face in the community when we can, the pandemic being in the way for some of that at the moment, and also, the media that can reach halfway across the world and bring someone close in a different sense. I'm going to turn the same question to you, Silvia, and again just to restate the core aspect of it, they want to know how your public profile, you know, you were the first woman president of the ICC, for example, How has your public profile become part of your identity, and how have you been able to use that profile, and in what specific ways have you tried to enact or encourage change?

FERNÁNDEZ DE GURMENDI: Well this is a great question, and actually in a way you also formulated that beginning as, "Well you have to become renowned in your own field," and I would say that is already a little bit of a problem because when you are renowned in your own field, you tend to stay in your own field and talk a lot with other people that are in the same field, so you end up talking to those who do not need you to talk, and sometimes you are talking among yourselves. What I'm trying to do a lot is to get a little bit out of this field. Of course I do talk a lot there, and I use my public profile to try to disseminate the idea of justice, but not just to others in the field, but those who are not in the field, those students, but also you try to go into areas of people doing things that may be related but not really so specific. You may have noticed that I've been speaking a lot on issues of prevention because, indeed, I'm involved very much in issues of education and issues of prevention beyond justice. For instance, I'm now a part of what is called Global Action Alliance Against Mass Atrocity which is a platform prevention,

and there I'm involved with people that come from various different fields including things that are nothing related to the law or justice. I'm also part of the International Alliance for the Remembrance of Holocaust, which really goes very much into training and education in order to understand from the past how to prevent for the future. I'm really trying to get out a little bit, and I'm trying to connect the dots myself, but also help others to connect. You know, putting organizations in touch with each other, they also start enhancing their coordination and cooperation around certain areas and that achieves amazing, amazing results. In order to do that I talk a lot, I write a lot. Now that we are, I have been in the lockdown for seven months now in Argentina, so that means Zooms and virtual meetings and which in a way has helped to connect with people that I may not be able to see in a normal life before the pandemic. I'm very bad in social media. I do have a Twitter account. You will see that I have never published one tweet, but I do follow others in order to be informed. I use more traditional ways of communication, and that is also very tiring and exhausting, but I also believe very much in connecting with, well real people are not real anymore in these pandemic times, but still connecting more in a one-to-one or small circles in order to go from there to larger circles, so this is a little bit of what I do.

FRENCH: Thank you so much. Now I can't believe it, and I know there's going to be a bunch of people saying, "Ah, you didn't get to my question!" and I'm so sorry, but we—are believe it or not—almost out of time; it just shows how much passion and interest people have around this topic of justice. I would like with our very few remaining minutes just to briefly give each of you a chance to say a short final word to the folks listening. Just anything else you'd like to say about working towards justice. Farouk, let's start with you again, if we may?

EL-BAZ: It's very important that each one of us would when you see something wrong, try to do something about it or try to tell others how to do about it. The way we're gonna change is by talking to each other, there's no question about it, and learning from each other, so be a little more careful of listening to others. Watch how others behave and what they say and be kind to them and help them to understand things differently and be nice and be kind and talk to them about what could be done better. It always works. I find that it is in every case that I tried, it works.

FRENCH: I have to say again all of this is giving me hope. Marian, final thoughts from you?

EDELMAN: I have two slave women who guide me and get me up when I get lazy or I think that I can't make a difference. One of them is Sojourner Truth who has a theory of—I loved one story that she was heckled by an old white man in New Orleans who said he, "Didn't care anymore about her anti-slavery talking than he did for an old flea bite," and she snapped back at him and said "That's all right the Lord willing we'll keep you scratching." Many of us like to be big dogs; we just need to be strategic fleas. Enough fleas biting strategically and persistently can move the biggest dogs and the biggest policies, and that's been our theory of the Children's Defense Fund. Get out there with your vote, be a flea. Get out there and organize with your church women, your missionary women, your mother's clubs and others and work it up from the bottom. Be a flea. Massive flea corps of people who will bite others in power who are treating children and the poor unjustly can make a difference. We've seen a lot of laws get enacted because of that. A lot of fleas voting, nagging, showing up in the most inconvenient places to make politicians uncomfortable. A lot of laws on the books as a result of those fleas out there. You don't have to be big dogs, just make sure that you see an injustice. If you see an injustice, don't just be quiet about it, speak up, and then go grab the people in your own community and your own church and your own clubs and say, "What am I going to do about it?" Don't ask the question and expect somebody else do something about it, and so I just think that the whole point is to take responsibility for being a justice flea wherever you are and whatever your institution is. Institution of faith, in your sorority, your fraternity, in your fraternal organizations whatever, but let's just make a difference in making the world fit for the next generations of children so that we leave them something better than we found.

FRENCH: I love it and I dedicate myself to being a strategic flea, that's marvelous. Silvia, from you?

FERNÁNDEZ DE GURMENDI: I would like to pick on something that was said I think by Marian, when she said, "You're never too small to make a difference," and I would like to elaborate on that. I love that phrase, and I think I would like to elaborate to say that whatever you do is never too small to make a difference because when you're dealing with mass atrocities, when you are dealing with millions of displaced people, when you are dealing with so much suffering you wonder, and I have wondered, what difference did it make to indict a few perpetrators or to send to prison one person when you see all this. What is the point of going to investigate a crime in the north

when you see all the crimes that are being committed in the south, in the east, and the west? Well it's a little bit like you say, this is just a drop in the ocean, does it make any difference? I frankly believe it does. It does make a concrete difference for concrete people, and I have seen it with my own eyes. You are not helping humanity, but you are helping part of humanity, even if it is a tiny part, and I think that makes a difference for concrete people and that I think is what we need to do. A little bit, one step at a time, but that step makes the difference. So I think it is worth pursuing even if sometimes you believe "what for?" Well, for those who really see the impact of whatever you're doing, and it makes a difference to them.

FRENCH: That's marvelous. Change one life and you change the world. I have been so inspired by all of you and by LeVar who was with us earlier. I want to thank you all so much. If we had a live audience you would hear ovation very loud and cheers because you've taken us to many important and valuable places today. I want to thank you all, and I also want to thank our campus partners, everyone who supports the Inamori Center and our work and our mission, and the wonderful audience that joined us and sent us all those great questions. I'd also like to encourage those of you who have enjoyed this conversation to please keep an eye on the Inamori Center website and look out for future events. This is part of a series of Conversations on Justice. Of course we will—we are going to believe that the pandemic is going to end, and we are going to be able to eventually bring Silvia to our campus to be properly presented with her with her Inamori Ethics Prize as well. All of those things will be upcoming as events and we'd love to bring you all back for all of those. Thank you so much, my friends. I really appreciate this, and I know that everyone listening has as well. Thank you and have a great rest of your day or evening.