

INTERNATIONAL ADVOCATE FOR PEACE
AWARD ACCEPTANCE SPEECH
PRESIDENT JIMMY CARTER

On April 10, 2013, the *Cardozo Journal of Conflict Resolution* presented its annual International Advocate for Peace Award to Jimmy Carter, 39th President of the United States. What follows is a transcription of his public address at the Law School, entitled “America as Global Mediator.”

DEAN MATTHEW DILLER: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen, and good afternoon, President Carter. I want to welcome you all to the 13th annual International Advocate for Peace Award ceremony of the *Cardozo Journal of Conflict Resolution*. Today, the students of the *Journal* will present the International Advocate for Peace Award to President Jimmy Carter. [Applause]. I understand that you were just back from a trip back from Myanmar, and I am impressed that you were just on the other side of the world on Sunday and have chosen to come up from Atlanta to receive this award today. [Applause]. I would also like to acknowledge and welcome Mr. Leon Charney and his wife, Tzili Charney. Mr. Charney is a member of the Cardozo Board of Overseers, and played an important role in the Camp David Accords as an adviser to President Carter. [Applause]. In a moment, I will turn the podium over to the students who edit the *Journal of Conflict Resolution* and to Professor Lela Love, who is the Director of the Kukin Program for Conflict Resolution. The students will make their presentation of the Award, and then President Carter will make remarks. And my understanding is that the editors have selected questions from the students in our audience, and President Carter has agreed to answer them. I know that a number of President Carter’s views are extremely controversial and that some may have strong disagreements with the President. In the tradition of Cardozo Law and of all great universities, we expect that President Carter will be received respectfully and listened to carefully. As future lawyers, we believe in discourse, civility, discussion, and freedom of expression. The *Journal of Conflict Resolution* has a long tradition in this area, and I know that its leadership has already reached out to those who have expressed concerns about the event today, and has already initiated conversation and dialogue. In that spirit, there will be another forum at the School in the spring that will provide another perspective on President Carter’s conflict resolution work. I

have invited Professor Alan Dershowitz of Harvard Law School to participate, and he has accepted.

That said, the Dispute Resolution Program is one of this school's flagship programs. It engages lawyers and law students in problem-solving and mediation techniques that can lead to the resolution of disputes in non-zero-sum ways. You guys probably have a better way of explaining that. In addition, our conflict resolution *Journal* is one of the leaders in this important field. And Cardozo offers numerous classes and clinics in arbitration, negotiation, and mediation, as well as a Certificate Program and Masters in the field. Professor Lela Love, who is an internationally known leader in dispute resolution, directs the program. This January, Professor Love, along with Professor Leslie Salzman, led a group of 18 students to South Africa to study conflict resolution. And Professor Love and Professor Salzman have led similar trips around the world in the past. Last year, Professor Love won the International Academy of Mediators Lifetime Achievement Award and has won numerous other awards for her pioneering work in the field. And at this point, I'd like to introduce Professor Love.

PROFESSOR LELA LOVE: Thank you so much to our Dean, who is a wonderful supporter of all our programs, and has been just great throughout this event. What a privilege to be here with President Carter and to welcome not only *Journal* students but our friends, alumni, and supporters of our Dispute Resolution Program to the event. I wanted to very briefly take a trip back in the history of this Award, because I think some of the people who began the Award are here. This Award was started by students in the year 2000, when the first IAP was awarded to Richard Holbrooke. That was followed the next year with the presentation of the Award to President Bill Clinton. This was then followed in 2002 by Senator George Mitchell and Seeds for Peace. The point I'd like to make is that, since the very start, the awardees have been phenomenal. And we only need to look at the leader in the conflict resolution world sitting to my right. Our Program, as Dean Diller said, has gotten a fair amount of recognition. It's fair to say that our students who started this Award, our students who started the *Journal*, our students who have pressured me and the school to enter into international competitions are the reason our school has been recognized. And it is the leadership of now not only students but also alumni that keeps us out front. We're lucky to have Lester Levy here with us today, an alum of Cardozo and one of the foun-

ders of JAMS. For those of you who don't know what JAMS is, they're probably the leading provider of ADR services.

Today, we're here to honor Jimmy Carter to receive the International Advocate for Peace Award. I wanted just to read you why the people who award the Nobel Peace Prize honored him. It was for his "decades of untiring effort to find peaceful solutions to international conflict, to advance democracy and human rights, and to promote economic and social development." As you'll hear in a moment, the students on our *Journal* were similarly inspired to recognize a lifetime of work to promote negotiated and peaceful resolution of conflict. I have a personal thank-you, though, as an educator. As an educator, one frequently finds oneself having to explain mediation or the difference between mediation and arbitration, and there's nothing better than an example that everybody can immediately understand and relate to. And the Camp David Accords, Jimmy Carter's work there, obviously challenging work of facing and then resolving what was then seen as an intractable conflict, is a most moving example for folks about what mediation involves. So I thank you not only for the example, but for the unbelievable work that it took to produce that example. We have here Leon Charney, a member of our Board of Overseers. Earlier today we saw a documentary he was featured in, *Backdoor Channels*, which shows his work in helping to facilitate the Camp David Accords. One of the things Leon Charney did in the back channels was to show what an important role lawyers have as visionaries, as creative articles—as I believe you put it Mr. Charney—in helping along the resolution of disputes.

So, I'm not going to say more, because Brian Farkas is going to introduce President Carter. I would however like to introduce Brian Farkas. [Laughter.] It's been a challenging job to be Editor-in-Chief this year, with the IAP Award of course, but with other endeavors as well. Brian did way more than the usual. He did two symposia, not one. Instead of having two issues of the *Journal* this year, he had three. He reconstructed our website. And he moved the *Journal* up in the rankings! This is important for an academic endeavor. Maybe equally important to all that, Brian is a student in the Mediation Clinic. He has, as you'll see in a moment, a beautiful ready smile, a way with people. We were recently in Chicago together at the American Bar Association Dispute Resolution Section Annual Conference with a group—not only Brian but a group of students from the *Journal*; I cannot tell you how many people came up to me and said, "How do you do it at Cardozo? Your

students are so amazing.” So, with that, I’d like to give the podium to Brian Farkas.

BRIAN FARKAS: So, my mother is here in the audience, and I think you made one Jewish mother incredibly happy just now. [Laughter.] Thank you all for coming here today, on behalf of the entire staff of the *Journal of Conflict Resolution*—the Editorial Board, the Symposium team who worked so hard to make today’s event happen, I really appreciate it. I know the Security can be tiring, but we’re in for a really big treat today.

So, first a word about who we are. The *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, as Lela said, is part of this phenomenal Conflict Resolution Program that she has sort of pioneered and invented here at Cardozo. The *Journal* publishes on what you might actually consider to be kind of non-legal topics. For example, most law reviews will publish on areas like appellate review of particular statutes, courtroom advocacy, and constitutional litigation. We don’t publish on any of that, really. We don’t focus on anything that happens in a courtroom. Recent articles have included the impact of gender on negotiation performance, and another focused on setting up school-based mediation programs for bullying in high schools. And you might think to yourself, “What is that doing in a law school? That has nothing to do with the law.” But as I think today’s honoree very gracefully reminds us, the most interesting, the most intractable human conflicts don’t really happen where we are right now—a moot court room. They don’t happen in front of a judge or a jury. The most interesting and intractable and really fascinating problems to study are the ones that start with difficult conversations—really difficult conversations. Often really long, really difficult conversations. Often really long, really difficult conversations with really difficult people. This is what we learn here at Cardozo through Lela’s work and through the Kukin Program.

Now, just a quick anecdote on why our honoree really represents that value in particular. The editors were talking yesterday to a lovely woman named Beth who works at the Carter Center. She was helping us to coordinate the logistics of this event. And you all might have seen that there was a little bit of publicity about today’s event—I think it’s been mentioned a couple times in the media. So, we mentioned to her, “Beth, we’re really excited about tomorrow. The students, almost everyone, are really excited for it. We just want to warn you that you might see some fliers, or maybe some protesters outside. We just wanted to give you a heads-up.” So, Beth said, “Oh don’t worry about it—it’s going to be fine; he’s

used to much more than that. *He's really excited to talk with them.*" And that statement sort of struck me as I was sitting in the room on speakerphone, as we were all thinking she's going to say, "All right, never mind, we're out! Forget it. We're taking him back to Atlanta, taking him back to Myanmar!" But, that statement. Imagine yourself, in a position where you're invited here to speak and you hear that there's this reaction. And someone who works closely with you says, "No he's not put off by that, he's excited to engage." I can't think of any more fitting example of what we try to teach here in the Dispute Resolution Program. If you want to even try to resolve a dispute, it starts with that engagement.

I don't want to bore you with President Carter's biography, but I'll just give you the highlights. And there are many. Before becoming the 39th President of the United States, he served as a U.S. Naval officer, was a peanut farmer, served two terms as a Georgia State Senator and one as Governor of Georgia. During his time in office, he oversaw a number of significant foreign policy agreements. These include the Panama Canal Treaties, the Camp David Accords between Egypt and Israel, the SALT II Treaty with the Soviet Union, and—I was a history major, and this was something that has been discussed a lot—he established U.S. diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China. All of that is amazing. What is even more amazing is that that is only the beginning of his work.

When he left Office in 1982, he founded the Carter Center in partnership with Emory University. The Carter Center's mission is to "advance human rights and alleviate human suffering around the world." That's a pretty bold statement, and they do it incredibly well. Their work often comes in the form of direct intervention into some of the most challenging conflicts on earth. Just to give you a small sampling of their work: the Center has engaged in conflict mediation in Ethiopia, Bosnia, the Great Lakes region of Africa, Sudan and Uganda, and most recently Ecuador in 2008. The Carter Center also works to ensure reliability of democratic decision-making through its election monitoring programs. Those programs have overseen 94 elections in 37 countries. We always talk in mediation courses about how important it is for there to be confidence in democratic decision-making, and that's such a big part of what the Carter Center has done in regions around the world.

His other humanitarian achievements include pioneering new public health approaches to controlling devastating diseases in Africa and Latin America. Last night on *the Daily Show with Jon*

Stewart, he spoke about his work on eradicating instances of the Guinea worm disease. President Carter's post-presidential efforts were recognized in 2002 when he was awarded the Nobel Prize.

Now, it's worth noting that many of President Carter's positions have been controversial. We the students take no particular views on his specific positions; he will speak more to that. Over his career, like many politicians, he has received a great deal of criticism and generated a great deal of controversy in the media. And I have to say, after the last few days, I empathize with you. I really do. [Laughter.]

There's a quote that hangs upstairs in the Dispute Resolution office upstairs from another American President, Abraham Lincoln, who wrote in 1850 when giving a lecture at a law school: "Discourage litigation. Persuade your neighbors to compromise whenever you can. As a peacemaker, the lawyer has a superior opportunity of being a good man."

The idea behind his words is that the best lawyers—I think the best people—are the ones who look for compromise, who look for creative collaboration *wherever* and *whenever* possible. Please join me in congratulating President Carter on receiving the *Journal's* 13th annual International Advocate for Peace Award.

PRESIDENT JIMMY CARTER: Well, when anybody asked me why I came here, my first thought was, "Former Presidents don't get much publicity, and it's been a long time since I've had several articles in the *New York Times*," and so forth, so thank you for that, first of all. Secondly, when somebody asks me how to summarize my present position, I remind them of a cartoon in a *New Yorker* magazine last year, as a matter of fact: this little boy is looking up at his father and he says, "Daddy, when I grow up, I want to be a former President." If you think about it for a minute, you see why I'm so proud to be here: former Presidents have no responsibility to the government, but a great deal of freedom and access to go anywhere we want to in the world.

I'm going to repeat in my comments some of what has already been said by Brian and others. I really started out my career as a naval officer. I was in the navy for twelve years, and the last portion of my navy term was in submarines. And I went through the Korean War and the last part of the Second World War. And then when I saw the wars over, I was a First Officer in charge of the first submarine, the first navy vessel that was built by the U.S. Navy, and it was called the USS K-1, and the 'k' stood for 'killer,' and what we were supposed to kill was Soviet submarines. And my

submarine was designed in a special way: extremely quiet to go deep and listen without being detected. And if and when the United States and the Soviet Union went to war and changed the Cold War into a hot war, we were designed to kill Soviet submarines before they knew we were there. Later, I wrote a book of poems, and one of the poems I wrote was about how we and the Soviet submarine crew listened to the same whale song—that's the name of my poem.

When I got to be President, I was faced with a different proposition, because the Cold War had basically heated up. And there were 30,000 or more nuclear weapons on both sides focused on each other. We had about 15,000 and the Soviets had a few more than that. And my primary goal as President was to protect my own country's interests, of course, but to avoid war with the Soviet Union. And so I determined that we would not go to war and that I would do anything I could to prevent conflict—not only with the Soviet Union, but with others. And there were a lot of challenges while I was in office—most of you are too young to even remember those days. I finally negotiated with the Soviet Union with President Brezhnev an agreement to reduce the nuclear arsenals, the SALT II Treaty. And I used to get ready for that and make sure I understood the paranoid aspect in the Soviet Kremlin by sitting in the Oval Office with a big globe, and I would turn that globe around to Moscow and I would try to imagine myself being the president of the Soviet Union, and how they looked on activities and statements coming out of Washington that might convince them to launch a nuclear missile to defend themselves that would have brought a worldwide holocaust. And so I negotiated with them as hard as I could and we concluded that treaty.

Well, we also determined—I did—that we would bring peace to others. At that time, many of the countries in Latin America had broken diplomatic relations with us, including Panama, in an argument over the Panama Canal Treaties. And the most difficult political challenge I ever had was to get 67 senators to vote for the Panama Canal Treaties to give away the canal that President Reagan was pointing out regularly, "We built it, we paid for, it's ours, we're not going to give it to a bunch of drug-runners and incompetent people." But we finally got that it was more difficult for me to get that treaty ratified than it was to be elected President in the first place. So, that was a very great challenge on how to negotiate a sensitive treaty—actually, two treaties, one before and after the year 2000—but we did it. We also decided—I did—after 35 years

of estrangement with China, to normalize diplomatic relations with China. So, the negotiations that I had with Deng Xiaoping, who was the Vice Premier and a leader of China, was done in complete secrecy—we never sent a message from the State Department to China. We sent messages only from the White House to China. And eventually we concluded an agreement in 1978, which was announced on the 15th of December and went into effect on the 1st of January, 1979, and which has brought about a transformation not only between us and China, but also within the internal affairs of China. Because that was when, three days later, Deng Xiaoping announced openness and reform, which brought about a new era in China. At that time, for instance, there was no possibility of having a Bible into China, and worship was illegal. Now, after the reforms in China, China is the fastest-growing Christian nation and more Bibles are published in China than in any other country; and of course you know what has happened in China's relationships with other countries in the world, which had been stalemated before that. And China has one of the most vibrant, dynamic, and competitive economic systems in the world.

And I saw, then, that the biggest challenge to the United States-Soviet peace was the possible conflict duration in the Middle East. Because prior to that, when Richard Nixon was in office, we almost went to a nuclear war. That was the first time when the United States had ever been on all-time alert with all of our nuclear forces, when the Israelis were invaded across the Suez Canal heading toward Cairo, Egypt, and the Soviets threatened to go in and stop that advance. And so I could see that the deterioration in the Middle East peace with Israel might be the launching pad for the nuclear war that I wanted to avoid. So, I decided early in my term, and worked for two solid years on, the main goal that I've had in my diplomatic life then and now to bring peace to Israel. When I became President, there had been four wars in the Middle East between the Arab countries and Israel, and the only Arab country that could challenge Israel militarily was Egypt. And I had a good relationship with Sadat and with Menachem Begin—in fact, I've known every Israeli Prime Minister since Golda Meir, whom I met when I was Governor. So, I began to negotiate between the two men. They despised each other. But eventually, I got them to come to Camp David, as some of you may already know, and we negotiated there for thirteen days with the doors locked, and everybody swore that they would not reveal our negotiating position to the outside media. And after three days, I decided that Begin

and Sadat were so incompatible and began to abuse each other every time they were together that I kept them apart. So, the last ten days of the thirteen days, they never saw each other. I went back and forth between Begin and Sadat, and while one of them was sleeping, I was negotiating with the other one. And toward the end of the thirteen days, we had narrowed it down so the Palestinians had rights; the Israelis agreed to withdraw their military and political forces from the occupied territories to honor UN Security Council Resolution 242, and also to withdraw from the Sinai region, which was Egypt. So, we decided to go from that to a treaty between Israel and Egypt, which took six more months to negotiate. And, finally, in 1979 in the springtime, we had a treaty between Israel and Egypt. Not a single word has ever been violated by either side. And I think that both sides, and the people who live in Israel and Egypt, are still grateful that we were able to bring those two very strong, dynamic, aggressive, and determined men to an agreement. And I used the techniques that you're teaching here and that you're honoring in your periodical.

I left the White House after four years, involuntarily retired by the 1980 election results. [Laughter.] And there was not much attention given to carrying out all the detailed terms of the treaty and negotiations between Israel and its neighbors. But that's another story. Well, when I went home, I decided to establish the Carter Center. The Carter Center was designed in the beginning just for conflict resolution. And I decided to set it up in Atlanta, associated at Emory University, where I'm still a professor, to let people who had an ongoing or potential conflict to come to me, and I would, in effect, make the Carter Center a miniature Camp David. And I would negotiate with them in Atlanta or go to their country if they decide, and try to bring peace between two warring parties. We still do that. I just returned, as has been pointed out, from Nepal and from Myanmar, formerly Burma, trying to bring about democracy to replace a military dictatorship in one instance, and a very abusive monarchy in the other. This is what the Carter Center has done in the last few years. We have a major emphasis on election monitoring, a process that the Carter Center initiated, because I found quite early in my negotiating between two Generals, for instance, who were fighting each other in a civil war, that I could go to them and say, "Why don't you let me come in with the Carter Center and we'll monitor an honest and fair election and I'm sure that the people of your country will choose the best leader to be their president." And because of the baseline for politics—that is,

self-delusion—every candidate thinks he’s going to win, both sides will say, “Why don’t you come in and do an election.” And it’s just been pointed out, we’ve finished our 94th election last month, in Kenya. And a lot of it has been to use election processes as a way to resolve disputes. That is another very important part of our administration effort.

I’ve just made a list of the ones in which we’ve been directly involved. We negotiated between Ethiopia and Eritrea, which was a long time more—it even took place when I was President—and Eritrea had become a new nation in Africa. I’ve been to North Korea three times. In 1994 I went there and negotiated with Kim Il Sung and got a complete agreement with North Korea that would do away with that nuclear program that international atomic energy inspectors come in permanently; they would have a peace agreement with South Korea; they would sign a peace treaty with the United States, which they had never had since the Korean War was just ended a cease-fire; and they would let us go into North Korea to find human remains of American people killed in the Korean War. All of those things were worked out and approved by President Clinton, who was in office then. But unfortunately, when President Clinton’s successor came in office, he threw that agreement in the wastebasket, declared that North Korea was a member of the Axis of Evil, and the North Koreans went back to their nuclear programs. Now you see that that’s one of the main frontline headlines today, is what’s happening with North Korea. We have negotiated peace agreements in Liberia. In Haiti, I went there again in 1994. We were prepared to invade Haiti with 34,000 troops to replace a president who had been removed. I went into Haiti with Colin Powell and Sam Nunn and negotiated a peace agreement with them. We went into Bosnia and Herzegovina and negotiated a four-month peace treaty. North and South Sudan were still involved there in active negotiation almost every day now, and we’ve been partially responsible for South Sudan becoming a country as well. We’ve negotiated a peace treaty between Uganda and North Sudan; between Venezuela and Ecuador; in Nepal—I just came back from Nepal—and Colombia, and the Middle East. We are still involved very deeply in the Middle East. We have a full-time office in Israel, a full-time office in Ramallah, and a full-time office in Gaza. And we meet with everybody involved in a potential peace agreement with Israel that will talk to us. And we make some departures from the policy of the US government, because our government is very reluctant, particularly today, to

talk to anyone with whom we have a serious disagreement, and we jump to declare that they're terrorists and refuse to meet with them. Before I became President, as you know, in South America we declared people Communists and refused to meet with them. And when I became President, almost every country in South America was a military dictatorship. I think our human rights program helped to bring democracy to every country in South America—in fact, every country in this hemisphere, except Cuba. So, that's what we have done. And let me close my comments by saying, before we answer questions, that we have a long way to go in this country. When I was in the White House, we also had a very serious challenge from Iran, as you know, they captured our hostages and kept them for 444 days; all my advisors told me that the best thing to do politically and otherwise was to attack Iran, and I could have wiped Iran off the face of the earth. But it would have resulted in unpredictable casualties. So, I decided to be patient, and every hostage came home safe and free.

So, we have tried to remain peaceful. While I was in office, we never dropped a bomb, we never launched a missile, we never fired a bullet. But since World War II, the United States has been in military conflict in Korea, Vietnam, Cambodia, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Lebanon, in Grenada, Panama, Somalia, Haiti, Bosnia, Herzegovina, Libya, Iraq, Afghanistan, and many more. So, the concept, the principle, the commitment to resolving disputes peacefully is certainly an extremely worthy subject of study. I teach in the law school at Emory; my main assignment in the last 31 years has been to teach conflict resolution. And I am just delighted and especially honored to receive this award from this great law school for conflict resolution. I think one of the hallmarks of a super power is to be a champion of peace and human rights and environmental protection and the alleviation of suffering. My hope is that we can institute a commitment in our nation to make every effort to resolve conflicts peacefully. Thank you very much.

BRIAN FARKAS: Thank you so much, President Carter. The President has graciously agreed to answer questions pre-submitted by our students; I'm hoping we have time to get to as many as possible. To ask our questions, we have Torrie Pagos and Karina DuQuesne. I could not imagine being surrounded by a stronger team this year, especially in these past few days. I don't want to pull a Lela and say a lot of nice things, but the two of these girls—and Morgan Molinoff, Shawna Benston, Sam Markowitz, Matt Maggiacomo, Kelley Chubb, Simeng Han—we've been surrounded

by this incredible team of dedicated students, and these are two of them. So, please join me in welcoming them to the stage.

TORRIE PAGOS: I'll start with the first student question. You've been credited with inventing the so-called "post-presidency." In an increasingly polarized political climate, what should be the role of a former President after his or her term in office?

PRESIDENT CARTER: I think that every President who leaves the White House is completely different from all the others, first of all. Just like five people on the street would be different from one another. So, I think we have to find out what our main interests were in the White House, whether we have any unfulfilled commitments we'd like to make. And also how much time we have. I was one of the younger survivors of the White House. I had a lot of years to go—I had a 25-year life expectancy, and I've already exceeded that, by the way. Some of the Presidents have been devoted to making a lot of money, because a lot of the people who have served as President didn't have much money. Their ultimate goal had been to receive the salary of Congressman or U.S. Senator. I never decided to go on the lecture circuit or go on corporate boards. I just decided to do what I could. And one thing I realized was that a President has not only the distinction of having led the greatest nation in the world, but also potential access to anyone on earth—scientists, educators, thinkers, politicians, and so forth. So, that's what I have done. Other people have done other things. Harry Truman, who was my favorite President, just stayed in his presidential library and took care of his affairs there. He decided not to make any money, and so forth. Others have done different things. Lyndon Johnson was quite different from them. George W. Bush, so far, has decided not to get involved in public affairs at all. I'll be going to the dedication of his Presidential Library later on this month; as a matter of fact, I'll be making a speech there. Bill Clinton has raised a lot of money around this world, and he does some very fine things. So, I think the answer to your question is, each President has to do whatever he or she feels is most compatible with his or her ability to use his or her talents naturally with his or her prestige in having been President in the most effective way. It just varies with the differences among the Presidents.

KARINA DUQUESNE: Throughout your career as a statesman, you have been required to take stances on certain matters. You have simultaneously functioned as a mediator of international con-

flict. How do you reconcile these roles and maintain your neutrality as a mediator?

PRESIDENT CARTER: Well, you have to be neutral to be a mediator. I wrote a book about this, by the way, a textbook. I describe the causes of conflict and some techniques in solving them. The cause of a conflict between nations is the same as it is between a husband and wife, or between a father and a recalcitrant son, or between two students on a college campus. It's a difference of opinion and an inability to communicate with each other adequately. And so, when two people are heading an army and having a real war, they are quite often so filled with animosity towards each other, that they look on the other person as almost sub-human. And so, a mediator, if one is available, has to be trusted by both sides in a conflict. I could not go into a conflict as a mediator if only one side wanted me to come in. And I would say, as another requirement, that the mediator has to be knowledgeable about the subject. When I went to negotiate between Egypt and Israel, I knew every detail of the geography of the occupied territories. I had psychological analyses of Begin and Sadat since the time they were born. I knew what their background was, who their parents were, what their philosophies were, who their friends were, what their obligations were, what they had said publicly, how they responded under pressure. By the way, Begin responded with minutia when he got under pressure. He would start talking about, how do you diagram sentences, that sort of thing. And Sadat would go into broad-based analyses of what goes on in the entire world. So, I knew all about them. And what I have done is use what's called a single-document method. Some mediators like Kissinger, for instance, would tell every side what they wanted to know. It was completely different what he told one side compared to what he told the other. But I decided to use a single document. I would write out, after studying the issue, what I thought the final solution should be. And I put tremendous pressure on them by making them agree ahead of time, when the negotiation is over, I reserve the right to reveal to the public my last proposal, and also reveal who accepted it and who didn't. And so, that puts great pressure on them not to be the one to reject the proposal, particularly if the proposal is attractive to their own people. I think a single-document method is good. But the main thing is you have to be trusted by both sides all through the negotiation and you have to work for what's known as a win-win so that both sides feel that

they came out on top. And I think in the case of Egypt and Israel, both sides felt then and still feel that they won the negotiation.

TORRIE PAGOS: In 1978, you helped broker the peace treaty between Egypt and Israel. With the Arab Spring and the fall of Mubarak, many have questioned whether the treaty will last. Can you comment on this?

PRESIDENT CARTER: Yes, I know Mohammed Morsi quite well. He's the president of Egypt. When I knew him first, he was the dean of an engineering university in Cairo. And he's a graduate of Southern Cal—he has a Ph.D. in engineering, and I happen to be an engineer, so I had a natural friendship with him. So, the first question I asked him when he was chosen to be a candidate and before he was elected president was, "Will you honor all the terms of the peace agreement I reached with Menachem Begin and Anwar El Sadat?" And he said, "Yes, Mr. President, I will do that." And he said, "If there are any changes made, I will not make any unilateral changes in the treaty, nor will I violate the terms of it." So that's a commitment he made to me, and since then, he has reconfirmed that commitment to other leaders who have met with him. Now, I think there are some changes that ought to be made, for example, concerning where Egyptian troops can go in the Sinai Region. But anyway, I have absolute confidence that Egypt will not break the terms of the treaty that I negotiated. And I think another thing about that is, if he did do that, it would be a devastating blow to his own country, which could not possibly match Israel now in military capability. So, the Egyptians know they got a good deal, and I hope the Israelis do, too.

KARINA DUQUESNE: You recently travelled to Cuba and, similar to Bill Clinton's efforts in North Korea, you met with government officials and with Alan Gross, who was detained in 2009 for distributing computers and satellite equipment to the Jewish community in Cuba. What are certain obstacles that you faced regarding his release, and what do you think the role of a former President should be in situations like these?

PRESIDENT CARTER: Yes, I met with Alan Gross, and I met with leaders in North Korea to get them to release the prisoners they were holding there. What the leaders want more than anything is to have good relationships with the United States. You have to remember that in the cases of Cuba and North Korea, the United States has had a very restrictive and damaging embargo

against them for 60 years. It happens in both cases. And they would like to have normal relations with the United States. I would say at least in the case of North Korea, they're paranoid. They're afraid we're going to attack them. And Cuba has five prisoners who were arrested and tried and convicted in Miami. The Cubans thought they were innocent; other people and the jury thought they were guilty. And so, if the United States were flexible enough to have direct talks with Raul Castro, I think that would mean that we could release the five prisoners in Miami whose terms have almost been completed anyway, and Alan Gross would come home. That's the message I have derived from Raul Castro, with whom I discussed this after I met with Alan Gross. And it's the same way in North Korea. What North Korea wants is direct talks with the United States, which we refuse to do. They want to have a peace treaty with the United States to replace the temporary cease-fire, which we've now disavowed. And they want to have the assurance that the United States is not going to attack them, and they want to have lifted the economic embargo, which has done everything possible for 60 years to destroy their economy. That's been aided greatly by the despotic military regime in North Korea. So, Cuba and North Korea both have problems within their own countries, but we have exacerbated those problems and extended them by not talking to them, by not negotiating with them, by not making it possible to have a mediator come in and help. That's a statement that you won't hear from anybody else in the United States probably. But it's true. I've spent dozens and dozens of hours in Pyongyang, talking to the North Koreans about what they would and would not do with their nuclear program, and so forth. And they want a peace agreement with the United States.

TORRIE PAGOS: Our last question: who have been your role models in developing your style of conflict resolution?

PRESIDENT CARTER: Well, I would say that Henry Kissinger was one of the very consummate mediators and negotiators in my lifetime. I didn't really follow in his footsteps, because I didn't really agree with his negotiating technique, which was quite successful on occasion, but I really just resorted back to my own concept of what is fair and honest. It puts me in a position of bragging, which I'm reluctant to do with so many witnesses. [Laughter.] But I couldn't bring myself to tell Sadat one thing and tell Begin a different thing. That seemed to me to be lying. I thought the best thing to do would be to have one document to let Begin read, and

make him a Xerox copy of it for Sadat, and we identified all the remaining differences between them, and I could eventually get both of them to agree. So, eventually, they agreed on every word in the Camp David Accords, and later they agreed on everything in the peace treaty. And we did the same thing with Panama, we did the same thing with China, we did the same thing with the Soviet Union, and we've done the same thing since I've left the White House. But I think that's not a very good answer for you, but there really haven't been many good cases of negotiating away conflict until after one side defeated the other one ignominiously and imposed its will on the defeated side. That happened in the Second World War; that happened in the First World War as well. And one unfortunate example of it not happening is when we couldn't win over North Korea and we just had a cease-fire. And that cease-fire involved us, North Korea, and China, but did not involve South Korea. So, I would say that a successful negotiation has to result in the conclusion of a conflict and not just for one side to defeat another. So, I'm really grateful for a chance to answer your good questions, they've been very nice questions by the way. [Laughter.] And I hope that this session will inspire everybody to do two things. One is to try to encourage our own country to be a champion of peace and to understand the negotiating or mediating techniques that you teach here at Cardozo School of Law. The second is, when you have a difference with someone, whether it be your wife or husband or father or mother or business partner or whatever, just find some way to communicate, maybe through a mediator, preferably one trained at Cardozo. Thank you very much. [Applause.]