

WHY SCIENCE IS YET ANOTHER CASUALTY OF WAR:

SCIENTIFIC COOPERATION IN A GEOPOLITIC ERA

UAB

Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona

ANNA ROSSELL NAVARRO

TUTORED BY DR. ORIOL COSTA



INTRODUCTION

Science diplomacy

/ˈsaɪəns dɪˈpləʊməsi/ · noun

Science is more than a global good: it can also be a powerful tool to build peace and trust between confronted nations through cooperation.

Science diplomacy was very successful during the **Cold War**. Many research projects and exchange agreements were started and later survived serious episodes of diplomatic crisis.

Today, it is different.

Chinese scientists were expelled from American universities and research facilities after in 2018 the FBI claimed some were spies.

In 2022, the **invasion of Ukraine** has led to termination of most academic and scientific cooperation agreements with Russia.

METHODOLOGY

We start with an anomaly: scientific cooperation is expected to resist diplomatic crisis, but in reality it has not. It makes sense to use a **backward-looking design**: we start by looking at the evidence and then theorize to find our variables.



What has changed?

The key hypothesis is that we are more keen to implement sanctions on those who attack us or our ideals today than we were half a century ago.

Which factors influence the resilience of scientific cooperation?

About bilateral relations

- **Economic competition**
If there is notable economic competition, we are less likely to cooperate.
- **Historical relationship**
It can entail a positive or negative bias.
- **Type of technology developed**
Data collection is a security concern.
- **Interdependence**
How much would we suffer from retaliation?

About the conflict

- **Severity of the aggression**
A military invasion is worse than spies.
- **Visibility of the conflict**
If the population is aware of the reality of the conflict, they will be more eager to act.
- **Proximity to the conflict**
Not only in geographical terms, but also culturally and even racially.

A state may decide it's best to suspend scientific cooperation with another state

TOP-DOWN
SANCTIONS

If the scientific community cares enough about a conflict, scientists and institutions will want to stop cooperation themselves

BOTTOM-UP
SANCTIONS

Since last century there has been a normative evolution which affects how we see conflict and cooperation.

- There is a social obligation to act against injustice.
- Not speaking up is the same as siding with the aggressor.

Today, there are...

- ✓ More fields of action
- ✓ More targets sanctioned
- ✓ More actors sanctioning

Speaking out against injustice is good, but in the name of ethics other norms suffer.

In an era where many global threats require international scientific cooperation (like climate change or pandemics) this poses a moral dilemma.

What is more important:
advancing science
or standing up for
human rights?

Among great powers, **science drives diplomacy**, not the other way around. It was **scientists** and **engineers** who pushed for international collaboration. As long as there's a wish and a will from the scientific community to keep working together, cooperation can survive.

Science is yet another casualty of war because our opposition to war is an opposition to all ties with the aggressor. Scientific cooperation hasn't inherently changed; we just choose not to engage as a way of **sanctioning** the opponent.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Dolan, B. M. (2012). Science and Technology Agreements as Tools for Science Diplomacy: A US Case Study. *Science & Diplomacy*, 1(4).
- Richmond, Y. (2003). Cultural Exchange and the Cold War: Raising the Iron Curtain. *Penn State University Press*.
- Schweitzer, G. (2004). Scientists, Engineers, and Track-Two Diplomacy: A Half-Century of US-Russian Cooperation. *National Academies Press*.
- Jin, X. (2020). The Challenge and Necessity of US-China Technology Cooperation. *Columbia University Journal of International Affairs*.

