

Center for Strategic and International Studies

**Bob Schieffer's "About the News" with H. Andrew Schwartz
Podcast**

Subject: "Journalism is Disappearing from War Zones"

**Speaker:
Yves Daccord,
Director-General,
International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC)**

**Hosts:
H. Andrew Schwartz,
Senior Vice President for External Relations,
CSIS**

**Bob Schieffer,
CBS Political News Contributor;
Former Host, "Face the Nation," CBS News**

Date: Wednesday December 7, 2016

*Transcript By
Superior Transcriptions LLC
www.superiortranscriptions.com*

(Music plays.)

BOB SCHIEFFER: I'm Bob Schieffer.

H. ANDREW SCHWARTZ: And I'm Andrew Schwartz.

MR. SCHIEFFER: And these are conversations about the news. We are in the midst of a communications revolution. We have access to more information than any people in history. But are we more informed, or just overwhelmed by so much information we can't process it?

MR. SCHWARTZ: These conversations are a year-long collaboration of the Bob Schieffer College of Communication at Texas Christian University and the Center for Strategic and International Studies in Washington.

(Music plays.)

MR. SCHIEFFER: Our guest today is Yves Daccord, director-general of the International Committee of the Red Cross, a post he has held since 2010. He grew up in Switzerland, is now based in Geneva. He was a TV reporter in Switzerland, covering sports and politics, before coming to the Red Cross in 1992. Prior to being named director in 2010, he served in various posts in Israel and the occupied territories, in the Sudan, and Yemen, the Northern Caucasus and Georgia.

We've asked him to talk to us today about a survey the organization took between June and September among 17,000 people in 16 countries, some of whom have experienced war in recent years and some, such as the United States, who have not. It caught our interest because it has some key insights into the effect that social media and the 24-hour news cycle is having on our attitudes towards war and its impact.

Thanks for joining us, Yves. And why did you decide to conduct this survey?

YVES DACCORD: I think I think as the Red Cross we are – we are working in very close proximity with people affected by war everywhere. So my colleagues today will be in Aleppo, so not just in Damascus, or they will be in Afghanistan, in Yemen, in South Sudan, in Ukraine, in Iraq. And I think we are daily basis seeing that the war is changing, that the way people are fighting, the way people sort of relate to each other, the way they communicate is changing. And for us, it was useful not to operate, but also to take one step back and maybe to challenge our own assumptions about what is happening right now in the world, and to ask the opinion of the people. And in that sense, it's very interesting.

MR. SCHIEFFER: So I guess it's no surprise, but the survey shows that people living in countries affected by war or living near countries affected by war responded in a different way to the questions, compared to people living in countries such as the United States, United Kingdom, China, Russia, and France. So talk a little bit about that, just to start us off. Why do you think – obviously we know the basic reason, because they've experienced war. But what – the

differences in their attitudes are striking, aren't they?

MR. DACCORD: I must say, the first thing is, I was a little bit surprised because I was expecting – we did a survey in '99, the same survey, 17,000 people. So we checked the same questions 15 years later, right? And what is extremely interesting is that you feel still – in country affected by war, people still feel very deeply that the law of war should be applied, that limits at war are central. They think deeply that civilians should not be attacked under any circumstances. They are very clear about health care – very clear. Hospital can't be attacked. And by the way, they are joined on that one by the people of the P5 countries, very strong. So you can still see there are some taboos. Hospital, health care worker, everybody in the world across culture thinks you should not attack them.

But it's still a bit of a surprise for me that people in Yemen and Iraq and Syria still feel that, yes, law of war matters. And in that sense, I think it's reassuring. Now the question we should ask ourselves, what happens with a P5 country? So the P5 country – or the public opinion of the P5 country, you see a shift in attitude.

MR. SCHIEFFER: Tell us what the P5 countries are.

MR. DACCORD: So the – we are talking about Russia, we are talking about China, we're talking about U.S., U.K., and France, right? And we're polling the public opinion in this country. And what is interesting is the shift of attitude is mainly related to a growing acceptance of civilian casualties in war. You can see that very clearly, right? Whereas people in affected countries say, no, there is absolutely no way that civilian casualties can be – can be accepted.

People including in this country, in U.S., would say, you know, in special situation like – and we ask a question: Can we attack any combatant in populated area, knowing that it will kill many civilians? And then 78 percent of people affected – or country affected by war, they will say no. But only 40 percent of P5 opinion public will say no. So you start to see a bit of differences. Same about humanitarian. We ask if – is it normal or wrong that humanitarian are sometimes killed when they do their missions in war? Forty percent of people in P5 country, in Security Council country, will think, yes, it's normal.

So there is a bit of a shift, clearly. And I think we need to reflect, why? Is it because they don't experience war, as you mentioned? Is it because since '99 a lot of things happened – 9/11, the fact that people maybe feel more insecure, including in this country. Maybe there is also a different relationship to who is the other. This country – if you look at the U.S. – but U.K. is a good example. The experience of war goes very different maybe 20 or 30, 40 years ago. You have much more people who did war at the time, right, through the draft, I think, the numbers of soldier. So the society felt maybe much more connected to the experience of war than today, in reality. So I think there is something around that we need to think about.

MR. SCHIEFFER: Well, let me ask you this, do you believe that social media has made people closer to one another across the globe? Or do you think it has made it all too easy to scroll past the suffering of others. In other words, when we see and hear in social media about these horrible things, do we have a tendency to kind of get used to those pictures, or does it make

us more aware of the suffering?

MR. DACCORD: I think social media is changing the attitude of everybody, that's very clear. And not only in the U.S. or in Europe. I see that everywhere. I see that in Somalia. I see that in Ukraine, in Syria. People have phone. Mobile phone is everywhere. So the way people relate to each other, the way they will explore that, the way they will look at that is very different.

Can I give you one anecdote? Something interesting happened in Somalia. Somalia is really a very poor country, 35 years of war. Three years ago you had a typhoon in Somalia, a very serious typhoon. It hit one community 200 kilometers from Mogadishu, the main city. Our team was in Mogadishu. It took them four days to deploy – four days – because Somalia is a very difficult country. You have to negotiate with every clan when you go through – four days.

They arrive after four days to, in fact, the communities, and they're received by the head of community, a woman, Somali woman. And she look at my team. She doesn't smile. She just say: You are late. Late? Four days crossing? She takes her phone and she says, I've seen there was a typhoon in Philippines two days ago. It took you 24 hours to respond. And here, four days? And by the way, this little hospital you're bringing, it's much smaller than the one you're bringing in the Philippines. You don't like us?

So I'm just telling you this is three years in Philippines. It is changing the attitude. It's changing the way you relate to each other, and not just here, also in country affected by war. People will not just look at you anymore as just the Red Cross, but they will look at you also as service provider. So no surprise that somewhat when we look at the result of the survey – if we come back to the survey – that, yes, possibly the way we relate to each other, the way we relate to the other is something which is shifting. There is no doubt on that point.

And last by not least, if you look in terms of information, what I was so surprised is also to see how information now is used to in fact control the propaganda, control the image. I'm amazed by – if I look at the famous Islamic State group, look in terms of communication and social media. This is 21st century. There is not one image – one image – about them, about their soldier, about their fighter, which is not provided by them. Kind of interesting, no? All the image is controlled by them. So 21st century social media, at the same time, I mean, you can see the control. You can see how much it's changed the landscape in which we operate.

MR. SCHIEFFER: You know, hearing you say that, it reminds me, I mean, that social media, for want of a better word, sort of creates this sense of entitlement to certain things. They expected you to be there. What took you so long to get here? We're now seeing in social media, people want the news for free. We're seeing in music, people expect to get the music for free. They don't expect for there to be any cost. It's somehow, well, it's always been this way. Well, of course, it hasn't always been that way. But somehow, I think we're seeing that, and not just in these countries you're talking about but in the United States, for example.

MR. DACCORD: Absolutely.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Yves, you know, as we're talking about social media and as we're talking about perceptions to other countries, in this country we're facing right now something of a fake news crisis. That's been going on around the world for a long time as well. How do you think fake news is impacting the way people view war? Are people using fake news to affect public opinion in the countries that you're working?

MR. DACCORD: I think what I found difficult for fake news is somewhat – it creates a distance between fact and people, right? And people find more and more difficult to being able to look at what is right or what is wrong or what is really real or not. I see that at the political level, but also, of course, when it comes to military. And I think – look at Aleppo. If you want to be aware of what is happening on Aleppo, you can go – it would take you one good hour, but on internet, on social media, you have very good information. But I would really challenge you to be able to find who is doing what exactly, how, who is the good, who is the bad.

So I think social media just accelerate also the fact it's difficult to have a clear view when you look at facts. So what does that mean? It just also accelerate a very opinionated relationship to information. And that worries me. I see that in war. I see people will then not take the time to try to distinguish. They found difficult to go to a platform where you have really all the information put together. So what they will do? They will go to the people who somewhat – who will resonate their own opinion. I see that very, very strongly in country at war.

MR. SCHWARTZ: That's interesting, because we're seeing in the United States, in terms of media, people self-selecting their news based on what they like. Are you seeing – there's always been propaganda in war. There's always been propaganda in countries that are war-torn, countries that have authoritarian governments, countries that are, you know, coming apart at the seams. Do you see more fake news now than you did a year ago? Or do you see about the same, less?

MR. DACCORD: It's difficult to say. What I see as a fact is you do have less independent reporting, that's very clear. I think we don't speak so much about that, but one thing which has disappeared are journalists. I don't see journalists anymore in places where we operate. There is none, right? Remember 10 years, you would still feel, you know, important journalists be on the ground, being able to be there. Ten years ago you would have journalists reporting about Islamic State group, about Syria, from Aleppo, from al-Raqqa, from Mosul today.

What are the information we get from Mosul which are independent, somebody that we know, we will value? Today we have somewhat – we're not sure. There's a lot of information coming out, but we're not sure about the quality of the people who are giving the information. What social media do is it helps everybody to produce his own information very quickly.

So I'm really seen – and I think we underestimate the fact that journalists have disappeared somewhat of – and they don't provide us anymore the ability to somewhat put issues in perspective. And in war, the fact that journalists disappeared was clearly strategic intentions from the warring party, very clear. I've seen that the last 10 years, targeting information, targeting the people who can give objective information.

MR. SCHWARTZ: One of the things we're trying to determine in this podcast are, are people overwhelmed with information? Are they desensitized by it? Are they overwhelmed with what they're seeing in media?

MR. DACCORD: I'm not sure that they're overwhelmed, to be honest. (To be maybe reflected ?), I see that's true. There is a lot of information. I think there is maybe also – speed and information makes it difficult. But what seems to be complex – take Aleppo, which is so much at the core of our news, at least globally, right? Almost on a daily basis. I think rarely see one city being with us almost since a year and a half. So we feel they are almost – we are with them. But then, reflect, what is the level of information you receive? Who is able to give you information about Aleppo, right?

So and we all know that The Washington Post or The New York Times, they don't have really better information than I do, right, because they won't be able to have their own journalists staying in Aleppo, making a difference. I won't be able, myself, to relate with one or two person or one or two institution who really are in Aleppo, and can give me the complexity, explain to me the gray dimensions of what's happening, the dynamic.

And so we lacking the ability to capture the dynamic. We're lacking the ability to capture what is really happening, in a world where, of course, when we have so many information, what we would like is to classify this information – good and bad, right or wrong. And it's difficult. It's really difficult, especially when it comes to the environments at war, or the places which are very challenging. So no surprise that people somewhat will then go where it's easier for them to go, which is to go where their instincts will tell them to go, right?

So if it's Aleppo, I don't know where to go, so I don't go. I'm not interested, because it's too complex. And then I will go maybe to follow something which is more easy for me to understand.

MR. SCHWARTZ: This is a critical thing we're dealing with in the news media is the United States, is shrinking news rooms, less reporters, less reporters in newsrooms in America and our major outlets means there's going to be less reporters covering things internationally.

MR. DACCORD: Absolutely. And I think it also create less accountability, you know? Bob, I – first time I'm meeting you, but I'm pleased to meet you, but I knew you too. So in a way, my relationship as a citizen to you was a clear one, right? So I could somewhat follow you. I know what you will see. Bob will tell me: This is what's happening in Mosul. And I mean – Mosul I'm talking to – somewhat I will believe you. Maybe I will challenge you, but I know it's you, Bob. Today about Mosul, I have a lot of information but I have no clue who gives me this information, right? It makes a hell of a difference and it creates a different relationship with information, but also with the people who provide the information.

And by the way, this has also changed the relationship people have with my own organization, the International Committee of the Red Cross, because in this very complex environment, when we as an organization start to say – and we're very careful about

communication. But when we say this is dramatic, or this is really problematic, then people will very carefully listen to us because they want to relate to organization or people that they can trust.

MR. SCHIEFFER: That's very, very interesting. I want to go back to what impact – and does it help or hurt when we show the horrors of war. There have been several photos. I remember the photo of the tiny baby that was being carried.

MR. DACCORD: Yes, yes.

MR. SCHIEFFER: I remember a photo of this young Syrian boy covered in dust and blood in an ambulance. Those photos went viral. What do you think the effect of these so-called viral media photos have on the perception of war?

MR. DACCORD: What I've seen is not just question of the photo, it's the right timing also, right? So we know it's – it might sometimes create a very different relationship with the other, that's what I see. And it's interesting about Syria because I think everybody in Europe and the U.S., and I would say worldwide, know that what is happening in Syria is now a global crisis. It's not anymore a Syrian crisis or a domestic crisis. It has become a global crisis. Everybody knows this.

But it's difficult to relate to it. It's complicated. It's going on every day. You're not sure who is the good, the bad. I mean, frankly, who do you want to support, if you don't really know? And then suddenly, in this very complex environment, you have a moment very specific, which brings your relationship and your connections much more clear. And it happens several time when it comes to Syria, where suddenly people connected with something happening in Syria which was very clear – it was very clear. It was a children – and no surprise, a child suffering, you know. And it could be your child.

I think there is – you know, so it recreate the relationship between in fact the persons, the people, and the other. And the other become not something far away, becomes a child who could be your child. So I think your connection – and it's not new, but this connection happened. Now, it's also recognize, I don't think the human being as a collective can do that too often. It's not a surprise that in Syria if I look at Europe or the U.S. it happens only, what, once or twice a year, that suddenly you have a moment of emotion, positive emotion, and then it goes away again.

MR. SCHIEFFER: But, you know, for those of us in journalism, and this has been a problem for a long, long time – going all the way back to the earliest wars – how much of the horror do you show? Where is the line? I always think of two movies – one called “The Longest Day,” about D-Day in World War II. And everybody who saw that movie thought, my heavens, you know, I want to be a part of this. And then along comes the move, “Saving Private Ryan,” where you saw just the brutality of war. And a lot of people said, my God, thank heaven I didn't have to be a part of that. And I think it gave people much more of an appreciation of just what those people went through. But they were two entirely different movies because you didn't show the people getting shot in “The Longest Day.” You saw them getting shot in “Saving Private

Ryan.”

MR. DACCORD: I think it’s a very fair question, Bob. But my sense is it’s not just the image, it’s also how – what is the environment and how do you tell the story? And I think it will be difficult to impose people with too much violence, right? And what can they do with it? But I give you two example, which is an interesting one, which is about torture, right? I mean, you know, in the survey one of the interesting thing is you see a shift of attitudes in some country when you ask people: What do you think, can we torture an enemy combatant if we want to get more information, right?

And then you suddenly have people – a vast majority of people said, no, no, we should not torture. But then suddenly they say, yeah, maybe we can torture that. And, you know, I’m deeply convinced that torture, everybody knows, is wrong. But if you are starting to change the way you portray torture, then it creates a different type of link. And we had a long discussion yesterday with some of your colleagues about the popular culture. And somebody mentioned, he was totally right. So it was not about showing culture, but it was who was doing torture?

He said, before 9/11 in this country, and I would say in U.K. and other places, it was very clear. When you saw torture, it was always the bad people torturing the good one – very clear. You would never, ever, ever think the good guy torturing someone – never, really. And suddenly, 9/11 happens, for good reason, bad reason, you have a popular culture changing a bit, integrating that. And then suddenly, you know, you see good people – the famous Jack Bauers and all these people – torturing for the good, you know?

And it’s a very smart – so, to answer your question, so not just to expose people to violence, but it’s also – is what are you telling? What’s the story? And here you have a shift really. And I’m not surprised that the attitude then also change and follow that.

MR. SCHIEFFER: Let’s talk about the laws of war. One of the things that Donald Trump sort of shocked the American people with was when he called the Geneva Conventions the problem. What do you anticipate from this next administration, and how are you planning to operate under a Trump presidency?

MR. DACCORD: I’m confident about your country, though. I’ve seen your country fighting with sometimes war. And it’s difficult. Your country is confronted with 15 years of war. People underestimate, it’s a very, very long time. In your modern history, you’ve never been so long at war. And it’s a very strange situation, because you are war without feeling that you are at war, which is a bit complicated, right, compared to your history.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Because there are so many people who are segmented away from it. We don’t have a draft anymore. We have –

MR. DACCORD: I’m aware, yeah.

MR. SCHWARTZ: We have an all-volunteer service. Not everybody knows somebody in the United States military. Not everybody knows somebody who’s been deployed.

MR. DACCORD: That's very true.

MR. SCHIEFFER: In fact, it's one-half of 1 percent.

MR. DACCORD: Exactly, whereas in World War II it was 20 percent of the society, which I –

MR. SCHIEFFER: Everybody had somebody.

MR. DACCORD: Exactly. Yeah. But I think I want by that – by starting by that, I'm an organization working – I'm leading an organization working in war. And we are aware when war affects a country, and that's the case, it's complex for the country. It's complex for its institution to find the right balance. And I've seen your country fighting not only with Mr. Trump, but already under Mr. Bush, right, and Mr. Obama. I mean, it was not an easy way to find the right balance of how you do war, what does that mean?

So your country is a complex country. But I have seen in fact the ability of the country to do the right check and balance and to find the right element. And here, if I may say, my experience, and positive experience, also come from, in fact, the military. Your military leadership – and I hear them again over the last few weeks – they've been very clear. They are very clear. Because, why? Because they experience war. They know exactly what is – why it's useful to respect the law of war. They don't do that for moral reasoning. I don't think so. They do that for very pragmatic element. They are aware of the benefit.

If you let things go, if you have a free-for-all war, I mean, the impact will be dramatic not only on the people that you're trying to help, or the people you occupy, but also your own army. They are perfectly aware of that. And I found it interesting to hear your military leader saying, no, no – no, Geneva Convention, very important. And we want to hold ourselves to the highest standard. We don't want to be compared to the terrorist. And I like that. I think it's an important – it's an important discussion, but it's an important one to maintain.

MR. SCHIEFFER: Well, I think it's important to underline that in World War II we didn't have to become the Nazis to defeat the Nazis. And I sometimes I think it would be good to reflect on that. We beat them with American values, not with the values that they were fighting for.

What does your survey show about how people feel about the laws of war?

MR. DACCORD: The survey shows that the people in general feel that the law of war are important. And even let's us – so 67 percent of them say they have heard of it or they know it, right? But what I found interesting is even the one who don't know about it, their instinct is the right one. They know perfectly that torture is illegal. They know perfectly that rape is illegal. They know perfectly that killing a prisoner of war is completely no possible, you know? And I like that. I found that very, very powerful.

What I found also interesting is they start to reflect – we ask them, what can influence the behavior of combatant? And what I found interesting, across culture, very clearly, more than 80 percent of the people says the military commander, the military leader. They are the one. And they say, much more than – it's interesting – national or international justice. It says something in 2016 that still military leaders are perceived by people opinion – public opinion in affected country by war, but also here in the U.S., in U.K. in Russia, in China, as possibly the critical people when it comes to influencing behavior at war. I like that.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Yves, in our country the United States military is overwhelmingly one of the popular institutions. Our leaders in government, depending on who it is at any given time, might not have a high opinion approval – high approval rating, but our military almost always has a high approval rating. Our leaders, as you point – our military leaders, as you point out, uniformly believe in the Geneva Conventions. They come out against terror. They've come out against torture. But in your survey, almost half of the American people surveyed showed that they think that torture's OK to obtain military information, and that it's just part of war. How do you think that happened?

MR. DACCORD: So if you just look at the torture, we are comparing with what people are telling us in '99. So the thing which you can compare very clearly is when you ask people is torture wrong or is part of war, still two-third of the people across the board – including in this country – are saying it's wrong, right? But what is interesting is then when you ask specific questions, if you – can you get torture an enemy combatant to get important military information, then you have very different. So in country like Afghanistan, Yemen, Iraq, you would – Ukraine – people would say, no, you can't. You have to be very careful. You have to maintain the principle. Where it's true in some country, in the U.S., in Nigeria, for example, you have a different opinion than here, you do have half, sometimes less, people saying, yes, you can't torture.

The explanation is – I think there is several explanation. One is, it's clearly related to the fact – if you look at this country – related that we're living in a different environment than in '99, clearly. Until '99 the question was not about torture. The question was you had a very clear view of who was the enemy, what was happening in the world. I think 9/11 has changed possibly or so the environment in which we all live, by the way. I think it's also the fact that we started to – as a country, the war have shifted also. It's not country against country. It's country against what we call non-state armed group, which is difficult, right?

So you have the different type of war, and a different type of enemy. And then possibly, at the time, you had also leadership, it's clear, in different country who somewhat says, yes, torture is something which can be done, right? It's part of what we should be able to do. So you had a rather change in the way people were starting to talk about it. Before it was taboo. And maybe what we have to reflect, and again the survey tells us, when you have a breakdown of a taboo then you have to be very careful, because then it starts to really, you know, lead us to difficult moments.

Look at the health care. It's a huge taboo still for people everywhere. They will say – even if they know that today in Yemen, in South Sudan, in Syria, hospital are systematically

bombed. But everybody, including, by the way, the Yemeni, the Syrian, the South Sudanese will tell you, we should protect hospitals. And they're very clear on that point. And this taboo is very central. On torture, there is a shift, absolutely.

And I think we need to be very careful, because this shift is something which I think will impact society because we all know that torture doesn't work. I think all general will tell you it doesn't provide you the information that you want.

MR. SCHWARTZ: General Mattis, our secretary of defense appointee said, you know, torture doesn't work. Give me a six-pack of beer and a couple packs of cigarettes and I'll do much better than torture, in learning information.

MR. DACCORD: And he's not the only one. You will see constantly military in every country will tell you that. They're also perfectly aware that torture has not only an impact on the people on the moment, but it has a long-lasting impact. It has an impact on the communities, on the society. Look at the Syrian society. I mean, it's a society where the social fabric is completely broken. And one of the reasons – not the only one – one of the reasons is because you have such a high level of torture right now that makes the society in a very, very difficult situation. So I would say we need to reflect a little bit of what does that mean? And I think we need to make sure that also we reflect onto what is the popular culture saying about culture? And I think there is a shift here, no doubt on that point.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Can I go back to Syria and popular culture for a second, and images. We've talked about all those things in this podcast. But one of the things that struck me is, you know, the drone video you see of Aleppo. It looks like, to many Americans, a post-apocalyptic video game. Does that kind of imagery make people more interested in trying to save Syria, less interested, indifferent? Does it desensitize them?

MR. DACCORD: My experience is that people in general, if they can relate to, they have a tendency to be generous. I don't see, contrary to what people think, that people are less generous now than they were 20 years ago. The point is, they have to relate to something. They need to be able to do something, right? When you see an image of a totally destroyed city like Aleppo, I mean, it's a shock. But it's very difficult to know what can I do? You know, if you're not a professional, if you're not humanitarian or military, you know, what can you do?

When, on the contrary, you see a small child, you know, dying or separated from his parents, your elements or your ability to somewhat do something is a much stronger element. And that's the big issues we've seen when it comes to war. For people, it's difficult to relate to it. It's complicated. It's lasting also. Who is the good, who is the bad? What can I do? So I think we have to be very careful not to criticize people. We have to understand who generates this building.

What worries me much more is the way we start to relate with the other. We have to be very careful in our society.

MR. SCHIEFFER: Yves, as we approach the new year, what do you see as your greatest

challenge?

MR. DACCORD: The greatest challenge remain to really manage close proximity, physical proximity – like we are right now in the studio – with people affected by war. We as an organization have the ambitions to maintain very, very close proximity in order to understand the needs of the people, their coping mechanism. But also in order to be able to be clear, to engage governments, non-state armed group, all the people who somewhat control affected population. And to do that, you have to be very humble. You can do that only because you are on the spot. It's much more easy to engage in Aleppo the government of Syria, through its governor, for example, or rebels through their leaders on the spot, than it Damascus or in Istanbul. It makes it very, very different.

And it's true everywhere. But I can tell you, Bob, accessing people these days is complicated. It is complicated. If I look at you, for example, if I may say, your world has shrank as an American citizen. I can't use the Red Cross delegates coming from the U.S. everywhere, right, an example. I can't use a Red Cross delegate coming from Denmark these days everywhere. So I have to rethink also, in this complex, very polarized world, our own ability to access people and to take the risk to be in close proximity with people. Because if we abandon – if we agree that there area where you don't have anymore an international humanitarian action, then I think we will lose our own ability to influence humanity.

MR. SCHIEFFER: Well, we thank you, Yves, for what you are doing. Yves Daccord, the director-general of the International Committee of the Red Cross. For Andrew Schwartz, I'm Bob Schieffer.

MR. SCHWARTZ: But that's not all, Bob. At the top of this podcast we gave you just a tease of the great music from my friend Aaron Neville's new record, Apache. Let's hear some more from Aaron Neville. I just know this record's going to win a Grammy.

(Music plays.)

If you like this podcast, leave us a review on iTunes, visit us at CSIS.org, and check out the Schieffer College of Communication at SchiefferCollege.TCU.edu.

(END)