



I-CAST Episode 1: Stéphane Dujarric on the Role of the U.N. Today

Guest: Stéphane Dujarric, Spokesperson for the United Nations Secretary-General António Guterres

In the inaugural episode of the I-CAST podcast, Stéphane Dujarric and Kyle Cleveland discuss how the U.N. is able to project its values in consideration of diverse political interests in the midst of the global pandemic.

Stéphane Dujarric is the Spokesman for the United Nations Secretary-General Mr. António Guterres, and previously served as Spokesman for United Nations Secretary-General Kofi Annan from 2005 to 2006 and then Deputy Communications Director for Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon from 2006 to 2007. For the U.N. he served as Director of News and Media for the United Nations Department of Global Communications, and as Director of Communications for the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). Prior to joining the United Nations, Dujarric worked for ABC News television for close to ten years in various capacities in the network's New York City, London and Paris news bureaus. He is a graduate of Georgetown University's School of Foreign Service and an alumnus of the CPD Summer Institute in Public Diplomacy (class of 2009).

Key ideas from the conversation:

- [The role of the UN Security Council in the COVID-19 crisis](#)
- [The politicization of global health issues](#)
- [UN communications in the current news media environment](#)

Related Links:

- [Stephane Dujarric on Twitter](#)
- [UN Audiovisual Library of briefings](#)

Episode link: <https://soundcloud.com/icas-temple/i-cast-episode-1-stephane-dujarric>

This transcript was lightly edited for clarity.

Kyle Cleveland: This is Kyle Cleveland with the Institute of Contemporary Asian Studies at Temple University Japan's ICAS. I'm talking today with Stephen Dujarric, who is the spokesman for the Secretary-General of the United Nations. Steph, you're in New York. Thank you for taking the time to talk today.

Stéphane Dujarric: My pleasure, Kyle. It's a pleasure to be here.

Cleveland: Steph, I know of you through your brother Robert Dujarric, who for a number of years has been the Director of Temple University's Institute here. If you could speak a little bit about your history with the United Nations and how you became involved in this role.

Dujarric: Sure. I've been at the United Nations for about 20 years now, serving solely in communications capacities. I came to the UN in a roundabout way. After finishing my university degree in the U.S., I returned to France. I tried to get into journalism and wound up working for ABC News, the U.S. television network. I worked for them for about 9 years— 2 years in Paris, 3 years in London, and then 4 years in New York. Throughout that time I did a lot of traveling, covering some of the major stories that broke in the 1990's, whether it was the war in eastern Congo, Somalia, the former Yugoslavia. I always had come across UN staffers and UN people and I was attracted to what they were doing, but never really pursued it actively.

In late 1999, a colleague of mine at ABC said, "You know, there's a job opening at the UN for assistant spokesperson. You should apply." I applied on a whim, and was fortunate enough to get the job. I joined the UN in May of 2000 working for Fred Eckhart, who was the then-spokesman for the late Secretary-General Kofi Annan. Fred retired in 2005, this was at some of the nadir of the UN's reputation and relations with the U.S. It was after the Iraq war; a number of accusations were being made about corruption against the UN. I think they couldn't find anyone with a reputation to take the job.

Cleveland: [Laughs]

Dujarric: I was fortunate enough to take the risk, I had nothing to lose. From there I served Kofi Annan for 2 years, until he left office. It was an amazing time, an amazing opportunity. Ban Ki-moon came in, in early 2007, the 7th Secretary-General from the Republic of Korea, as you know well. I was asked to find another post at that time, because understandably he came in with another team. I went to the UN development program, and then I went back to the Secretariat and headed up the UN's television and internet services.

In 2014, Ban Ki-moon's spokesman said he wanted to leave, and my boss at the time said, "Do you know anyone who could replace him?" I gave him a few names, and I went home that evening and I told my wife what had happened. She hit me over the head with a newspaper, I think more figuratively than literally, and she said, "Why didn't you give him your name?" I went back the next day and did just that. I said, "You know, I could walk into the job. I know the press corps." So Ban Ki-moon hired me. I finished out his term through the end of 2016.

I did not expect to stay, but when Antonio Gutierrez came in as the 8th Secretary-General, he decided to keep me on, and I've been here ever since. It's been an immense privilege to do this job. I think privilege is the word that I keep using because it truly is a privilege to be able to serve the United Nations, and to serve three Secretary-Generals who were all very unique and very powerful in their own ways.

Cleveland: It seems like a job that's so complex. The United Nations is so multifaceted. How are you able to manage this kind of workload where you're representing the institutional interests of the UN, but you're dealing with all these various member-states and the issues that they're facing at a given time?

Dujarric: It's a very good question. My job is to speak for just one slice of the UN, right? The Secretary-General, who represents the Secretariat. I don't speak for the Security Council, the general assembly.

I don't speak for UNICEF [United Nations Children's Fund], the World Health Organization. That being said, the UN's communications challenge is very great. That's because we have, on one hand, the world's most recognizable logo. You can go just about anywhere and you show them the logo, and people would say "Oh, that's the UN." But we have no brand management. If you take Sony, Panasonic, or McDonald's, it's always very clear who gets to speak for that brand.

For the UN by design, many, many people get to speak on behalf of the UN. Whether it's the president of the Security Council, a special rapporteur on human rights, the president of the general assembly, the head of UNICEF, they are always tied to the UN. Yet the person that embodies the UN—and that's the Secretary-General—is often held responsible for many of the actions of people over which he has no authority.

The result is that all too often, the negative narrative about the UN is very simple. To turn that narrative around to a positive one, or to even a neutral one, takes some extra time and unpacking and explaining to people what the UN is, and often more importantly, what the UN is not.

Cleveland: If the negative narrative on the United Nations is simplistic, what is it? What is the reduction there?

Dujarric: On one hand, people who see the UN as an all-powerful world government, which it's not. You have to realize the Secretary-General, if you look at the charter, has basically no authority. He is the head of the Secretariat, but it's an organization of sovereign member-states. And so, the negative narrative is when the nations that make up the UN are disunited, right?

Let's take Syria for example. People say, "Well, the UN has failed the people of Syria." The way I have to answer the question is to ask a question in return. "What UN are you talking about?" If you're talking about the Security Council, it's clear that the Security Council has lacked any sort of real unity on pushing Syria towards peace. If you are talking about the Secretary-General, I would argue, no.

Let me put it this way. Even though there has been no political unity in the Security Council, it has not stopped the UN's humanitarian workers from being there on the front lines, never abandoning the people of Syria. It has not stopped the UN's political envoy for Syria from continuing to put all his efforts into reaching a peace deal. But we all know that a real deal on Syria, or on Libya, or on Yemen will require strong unity from the Security Council, and the most powerful members of the Security Council. Unfortunately, the UN—or fortunately, you could say—the UN is a reflection of the world that we live in. We are in a world where great power relations are not in a good place, to put it mildly. That impacts how they behave and how they vote, within the UN and especially within the Security Council.

Cleveland: It seems the UN is inherently political, and I don't know how to talk about politics except in a somewhat critical way. How are you able to speak to these issues without resorting to platitudes or vagueries that don't really address those critiques? How are you able to take on this criticism that may be coming in on an array of various issues?

Dujarric: We take it on by showing what the UN is doing. When the UN is doing airdrops in eastern Syria in Deir ez-Zor because the parties can't agree to a ceasefire, that's the UN working. That's the UN under the authority of the Secretary-General working. It's the World Health Organization and UNICEF staffers doing measles vaccinations in the middle of warzones. It's peacekeeping troops, trying to keep the peace in some of the most dangerous areas in the world, whether it's in Mali or in the Central African Republic. It's the UN that's on the ground and serving people. It's the UNHCR [United

Nations Human Rights Council], you know, the UN refugee agency providing shelter and food for millions of refugees around the world who otherwise would be abandoned. That's the UN that works.

The UN is also inherently political, but there's a whole normative side of the UN as well. Whether it's on the human rights side or whether it's in more specialized areas like world health, telecommunications, civil aviation travel, or maritime travel, there's a whole business part of the UN that enables the global economic machine to work. For a Japanese plane to be able to land safely in Kinshasa, there has to be a common language for civil aviation. Where was that language elaborated? At the International Civil Aviation Organization. Same thing for letters. If you mail a letter in Yokohama and send it to your family in the U.S., it's because there were treaties negotiated under the International Postal Union. It's not the sexy part of the UN, but it's a part of the UN that's indispensable in a globalized world.

Cleveland: You've been with the UN long enough that you've been able to live through some very historic events. The nature of the world these days is, it seems like every few years there is a singularly historic event, starting back with the Gulf War at about the time that you first came in. How have you seen the United Nations' mission or its actions evolving over time in response to these various historic crises?

Dujarric: Whatever happens, the UN winds up at the center of things. In terms of preventing conflicts, sometimes it works, sometimes it doesn't work. I mean, the UN architecture, the Security Council, did not prevent conflict during the Iraq war, right? Other places, conflicts were either prevented or minimized.

During each one of these crises, it is a reminder of why the UN exists. Even if you were going to strip away all the humanitarian work, all the normative work, you will always need a place, a convening place, where nations can come and talk. It sounds idealistic and basic, but it is a fact. You will always need that table around which 193 countries can come and talk. I mean, you look at the current pandemic we're in, you look at issues of climate change. You need this place. You need a table that's already existing. When you talk about the UN, you're not going to need talks about talks. You're not going to have to negotiate the size of the table, the shape of the table. It's there. That remains the unique and central role of the United Nations, even if you were going to strip everything else.

Cleveland: With the current COVID crisis, which seems to be so profoundly influential on every nation, are there any analogies to this? Or do you see this as a singular event? I think the only thing that would seem to be comparable would be a major World War.

Dujarric: Yeah, it's a singular event. It's a singular event because it's a war without bloodshed. But it's a war that while no blood is being spilled— I mean, people are dying, but no blood is being spilled— it has a devastating economic impact. No bombs are falling, but economies are being destroyed. What it shows you is that you need this place like the World Health Assembly, where people can get honest advice and clear scientific advice from the World Health Organization. I think unfortunately— and this goes back to what I was saying earlier about the UN not being isolated, and a reflection of the world we live in— we are seeing a politicization of global health policy. That is a reflection of the state of play of relations between the U.S. and China and others, and that's too bad.

Cleveland: We have been through this before, somewhat, through SARS and H1N1, the swine flu. This is obviously at a much larger scale. Were those issues politicized in this way?

Dujarric: Not that I recall, and they were not as global. This is unprecedented because layered on top of a global health crisis, you have a crisis of relations between some of the world's largest powers, and you have a level of instability and unpredictability that we have not seen for a long time.

Cleveland: Can you speak a little bit more to that? Because obviously, in the second invasion of the Iraq war, throughout the UN's history, there have been these moments in time in which there's so much conflict and strife between the various member-states. But it does seem that there is a different dynamic in play now that you have very conservative governments around the world. Not only in the U.S. with the Trump administration, but with Brexit, various countries have nationalist leaders coming into power. How have those political dynamics that have been changing in recent years, affecting the UN mission?

Dujarric: The problem is the unpredictability and the shifting alliances, the lack of clear lines of alliances. In the run-up to the Iraq war, it was very clear. You had the U.S. and U.K. and a couple of other countries on one side, and you had the rest of the world on the other. It was very clear. Here, the lines of alliances are not that clear. I would let analysts speak to the reason for it, but it is this uncertainty that makes it much more difficult to manage a global crisis. As the Secretary-General likes to say, we went from a bipolar world with the U.S. and the Soviet Union to, for a period of time, a unipolar world with the U.S. Now we're sort of a multipolar world that is still evolving and has yet to settle. I think that's where we see danger.

Cleveland: The Security Council seems to have been sidelined initially with COVID. In more recent weeks, they've seemed to be getting some traction and are starting to meet and discuss this. Why have they been relatively marginalized at the beginning of this crisis?

Dujarric: It's not that the Security Council is sidelined, it's that the Security Council has yet to coalesce, right? The most powerful countries in the world are sitting on the Security Council. It's not as if the council is a separate entity that's been sidelined. They have been now— and this is clear from the press reports— they've been negotiating a resolution on having to do with COVID, and are having a lot of problems agreeing on language.

Cleveland: Well, where do they gain traction? What is their role in this crisis?

Dujarric: They had a role in the Ebola crisis. Through Security Council resolutions, the UN set up a mission to deal with Ebola. There was strong messaging on Ebola. On HIV/AIDS, they had a role. HIV/AIDS language was included in all the peacekeeping mandates. They have a role because they have a unique position in the global management of peace and security.

I think it would be a very strong positive sign if the Security Council could speak with one voice. The Secretary-General has used this crisis, this COVID crisis, to call for a global ceasefire. His message is simple: we can't fight wars on two fronts. Whether it's conflicts in Yemen, Libya, Syria, Colombia, Philippines, Myanmar, if humans keep killing other humans, the virus wins. So for us to have a strong message of backing from the Security Council backing this call for a global ceasefire, would be a great help to the Secretary-General's efforts.

Cleveland: You had mentioned that the World Health Organization is not exactly at the center— it's on the periphery, it's connected to the United Nations. In recent months, they've come under fire of being politically collusive with China and there's something of a scandal, or at least an accusation of that. How are you managing that? Or is that something that's not really part of your—

Dujarric: Well, it's part of our world, right? The World Health Organization is a specialized agency of the UN which has its own general assembly, for lack of a better word. There, the World Health Assembly elects the head of the World Health Organization, so the Secretary-General has no legal authority, or any way to influence exactly what happens in the WHO. That being said, for us, the WHO should be at the center of the scientific and public health response to this crisis.

There will be a time where we will need to look back on how institutions, member-states, and other entities dealt with the outbreak of this virus. How we saw things. How we interpreted. There will be a time for a "lessons learned" exercise. We do not think that now is that time, when we are in the middle of the battle. We think this is the time to support the World Health Organization, to enable it to lead on public health issues and medical issues, in giving advice to people, to member-states. Thousands of WHO staff are on the front lines, delivering medical supplies and equipment to developing countries. So there will be a time for lessons learned, we just don't think this is the time.

Cleveland: When you step back from this and look at the trajectory over the last 15 or 20 years, in the time that you've been involved with the UN, what's your analysis of why some of these issues that have previously not really been necessarily politicized [are now politicized]?

I mean, in the case of HIV/AIDS in the United States, Act-Up and various activist organizations very much became politicized, but then-president George W. Bush had been very active in trying to develop international policy particularly in Africa with HIV/AIDS. That was not politicized in any way, and to the extent to which the current COVID crisis is being politicized. What is your analysis or explanation for why issues are becoming politicized now in the last dozen years or so?

Dujarric: Part of it is that these issues are not political in themselves, but they are used as wedge issues. They are used as hammer issues for one country to go after another. I think we are still living through the aftermath of the destruction of the Cold War system. That is one way to look at it. The end of that system has enabled democracy to flourish in so many places and has brought freedom to so many people, but it has also unsettled things. We have seen the growth of middle powers which are trying to assert themselves, regional powers which are trying to assert themselves in a way that they would not have 10, 15, 20 years ago.

Cleveland: Do you have any particular nations in mind when you talk about middle powers and regional powers?

Dujarric: If you look at Saudi Arabia, India, Pakistan, Brazil, Korea, or South Africa, Nigeria, Egypt. This is not a list of countries that have meddled in a negative way. It's just countries that have grown in stature. They have made themselves heard, as countries should, but we are still, I think, in an unsettled period.

Cleveland: Well, COVID is certainly right now the issue, the intersection to which all roads seem to be leading. Can you discuss the way in which the United Nations has been responding to this crisis?

Dujarric: You have different parts of the UN reacting in different ways. In terms of WHO, they have, since the beginning, been in the lead on public health and that's where they belong. For the Secretary-General, as I said, he has tried to use this opportunity to push for ceasefires in different parts, to redouble our efforts. We have also—in terms of the immediate reaction—we have activated the UN's global supply chain in support of developing countries. Delivering equipment, delivering supplies, delivering humanitarian workers. Our peacekeeping missions are mobilized in an effort to help prevent the spread of the virus in the countries in which they are operating.

We are also putting out policy advice and policy papers on issues such as the economic recovery, to make sure that the recovery is not only equitable for people but is also green. We should not waste this opportunity and not fight harder for climate change. We've highlighted issues such as the threat to human rights in the COVID response. We've seen civil liberty issues; we've seen issues related to freedom of the press. We've seen a tremendous spike in gender-based violence, where the lockdowns have often forced women and girls to be locked into small spaces with people who are their abusers. So these are issues that we are putting in the forefront for policymakers. We're involved in all sorts of ways. I think the UN's system as a whole has really come together and focused— with everyone in their own department, whether it's human rights, whether it's children, whether it's health— to address the current crisis.

Cleveland: These are state-level responses that work through institutions. The WHO has referred to COVID as an infodemic. The saturation of media, including social media, is really unique and unbalancing the way in which people are able to process the information related to this. How has the changing media climate affected the way you do business?

Dujarric: On one hand, it's increased the threats to journalists, and we're concerned about press freedom. On the other hand, it's increased, as you say, disinformation and the dangers of disinformation. We have been working with social media companies like WhatsApp to help spread correct information about the pandemic. This crisis came at a time where there are so many social media platforms. There's so many ways for people to spread information and to spread misinformation and disinformation. That's a threat and that's something we are focusing on.

Cleveland: I had seen this during the Fukushima crisis in Japan, the nuclear crisis where social media started to gain attraction. That was the first major nuclear event in which the internet and social media changed the way in which governments dealt with this, so this is something that's been coming for a while. Can you talk a little bit more personally about how the changing media has affected the way in which you do your job?

Dujarric: It's interesting, because what I have seen over the last 20 years that I've been doing communications from this end is an increasing speed at which information travels. The news cycle goes faster and faster and faster, right? It's no longer 24-hour news cycles. It could be an hour news cycle, or less.

So you have on one hand, this engine that is spinning at faster and faster speeds all the time. And I connect that engine to the engine of diplomacy, which moves at a much slower, and deliberate pace. It moves faster than it used to, but still at a deliberate pace, for very good reasons. It takes more time. I sometimes feel like I have smoke coming out of my eyes, because I am the transformer that converts the voltage of diplomacy with the hyper voltage of the news cycle.

Cleveland: [Laughs] How do you manage the workflow? What's a day in the life of Stéphane Dujarric?

Dujarric: We'll start by saying it's 10 pm and I'm doing an interview, and I still have a night's worth of work.

Cleveland: [Laughs] I appreciate you indulging this response. I know you're very busy.

Dujarric: Always happy. I start my day usually around 5:30 in the morning. I start to work on a morning headlines document for the Secretary-General, about 10 pages of top-level headlines from around

the world. That is done by myself and my colleagues. I edit the final version around 7:30. It goes out to the Secretary-General and about 3,000 other people within the UN system.

I then brief him every morning— himself, the deputy, the chief of staff, and the senior staff in his personal office, not the heads of the dept. It's a chance for me to talk to him directly, and see what he's thinking and doing. I'm not going to ask him what the UN is doing in the Congo at that time, but I will ask him what kind of phone calls he's making. He gets briefed by others during this meeting.

Then we put together and do a daily press briefing for the journalists that are here at the UN. We put it together a bit like a newscast, we have an editorial meeting. We have one at 9 o'clock and we have one at 10:30, and we go around the table and see what stories we have for that day. We put together that newscast by my staff preparing notes for me to read out. [We also prepare] a pile of political, what we call "if asked language," questions [to which] we have answers, if they are raised, but we don't want to be proactive on those.

Then I do my press briefing at 12. I say what I want to say, and it's a chance for the journalists to ask questions. We very strongly believe in the need for this organization to be as transparent as possible. We are a publicly funded institution. We need to be held accountable. One way to do that is to ask questions from the press.

Then in the afternoon it's— I mean, when we're in the building obviously— to basically do a lot of bilateral work with the journalists, to answer their questions. They will come into my office to talk about stories they're working on that they don't want their competitors to know about. I do a lot of off-the-record work with them.

The relationship I have with the UN press corps is one that I like to refer to as "mutually assured destruction." Meaning that I have to trust them completely, that if I tell them things off the record, they won't quote me. And they have to trust me completely, that if they tell me information, I will not share it with their competitors. If that trust is willfully broken, it can't be repaired. Obviously, mistakes happen and whatever.

Then we do a lot of work preparing the travels of the Secretary-General. Either myself or one of my colleagues will travel with him. We do preparation for the trips, interviews, Q&A's, talking points. Right now, this minute, Secretary-General is very likely to do a press event later this week, so I'm working on his talking points. I get input from all sorts of people and I'm working on putting them together. Then I end my day. I try to be asleep by midnight, and then I start over again. I do have a wonderful wife, 3 children, and an amazing dog, so that also takes up a bit of time.

Cleveland: [Laughs] That's amazing. How do you stay on top of all this information flow? And be able to assimilate it and then convert that into something in a coherent way where it can be politically actionable?

Dujarric: Part of it is being able to interpret the diplomatic language to press language. The key part for me is to know a little about a lot of issues. I like to be able to answer two or three questions on just about everything that comes up at the UN, but I don't want to waste my limited memory space with diving too deep into any issue. Because there are questions that I can pawn off onto someone else, but I need to be able to handle the first round of questions on just about everything. Now of course after 20 years here, there's an accumulated level of knowledge, that you kind of know how to answer questions. It's an amazing job. I love it.

Cleveland: What media do you consume? What are your sources of information?

Dujarric: I will tell you, I skim and do a very quick read. In Asia, I look at the South China Morning Post, I look at the Straits Times. Then I look at the Wall Street Journal, the Washington Post, the New York Times, Politico. Both the U.S. and the European edition of the Washington Times, FOX news. New York Times, obviously. I look at The Guardian, Al-Jazeera, Al-Arabia. Then obviously we're plugged into the wires all the time. So, Reuters, AP, AFP, DPA, Kyodo. I'm on Twitter looking at it all the time as well.

Cleveland: There seems to be an iterative process between what the media's reporting, and what you're later conveying. In a manner of speaking, there's a kind of conversation that's going back and forth between media reports and the announcements that you're putting forth through the UN.

Dujarric: It's a give and take, right? There are things we want to talk about and there are things they want to talk about. Our job is to make sure that what we want to talk about is relevant to what is going on. We cannot seem to be tone-deaf. There are things we will need to talk about regardless. Let's say on COVID, we wanted to talk about issues of gender violence, on climate change, human rights. We want to feed into the news cycle as well, to make sure that people understand that the UN is relevant.

Cleveland: And you're also putting forth your ideals and your values.

Dujarric: Exactly.

Cleveland: As I talked to Robert [Dujarric], we were discussing the ways in which media has changed. Our university has students from some 65 countries, and I know a number of students who are studying journalism, but it seems that every professional journalist that I talk to says that it's a very difficult environment. The transition from print media now to the internet, and just the cacophony of all these different media sources, seems to be a tough time to be a journalist. What would you tell a student about the future of journalism as an occupation?

Dujarric: It's two different things. I think it's a tough time to be a journalist, because the pay is not good, it's dangerous, but it's a great time for journalism. There are a lot of great stories to tell. There's a lot of great investigations to be had. The question is, how do you make sure that it is a profession that you can survive in financially?

It's two different things, because the threshold for how to be a journalist is very low. 40 years ago, you needed to work for a big news organization from which you got a good salary and so on. Now, it's very easy to be a journalist and do your own investigations, because you have everything at your fingertips. You don't need to go to a library, you could post on your blog. You could do whatever you want, but it's difficult to make a living out of it.

Cleveland: What's the skillset? I mean, you didn't necessarily come out of a journalistic training background.

Dujarric: I think the skillset in this is good communication skills. You need to be able to communicate clearly, you need to be able to write clearly, and you need to be curious.

Cleveland: Your particular position seems to be unique because you've been the conduit for these various Secretary-Generals. You have to both represent your institutional interests, but you also need to be a kind of proxy voice for these authorities.

Dujarric: Right. I speak on behalf of the Secretary-General of the institution. I speak on his behalf. I've been fortunate enough that I've never felt that what I was asked to do or say was in contradiction to the ideals of the institution and my own personal ideals.

Cleveland: As a working journalist before you became involved in the UN, you had surely a different motive working. How did you acquire those skills? As you look back over your time with the UN, how would you change the way in which you do your work?

Dujarric: I think I'm much more careful. You have to understand that, when you're a journalist, if you make a mistake, it's very serious but you can always correct it in one way or another. If you speak on behalf of an institution like the UN and you make a mistake, it can have real-world consequences in terms of negotiations collapsing, people walking away, all these things. So you really have to be careful. That's why we move a little slower sometimes.

Cleveland: In addition to the COVID crisis, what issues are you working on now? What are some of the things in front of you that are priorities?

Dujarric: Trying to figure out what my kids are going to do over the summer.

Cleveland: [Laughs] You're working from home, right?

Dujarric: Yes, working from home. I go to the office once a week maybe, but I'm basically working from home. I do the press briefing from home every day.

Cleveland: That must be a challenge.

Dujarric: Yes, so everything runs through COVID right now. Because it impacts climate change, it impacts equality. It impacts the economy, it impacts travel, it impacts everything.

Cleveland: Yes, with our podcast here, we've discussed not becoming so much a prisoner of the moment that the only thing we talk about is COVID, but it seems to be the tail that's wagging every dog right now. It's difficult to talk about anything without talking about COVID.

Dujarric: Right.

Cleveland: Thank you so much for taking the time.

Dujarric: My pleasure. Good luck to you and all the best in these difficult times.