The Quiet Diplomats: How Science is Building Bridges in a Broken World

Hind Mouslim

PH-D student at Faculty of Law, Economics and Social Sciences Cadi Ayyad, Marrakech, Morocco.

DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.908000110

Received: 21 July 2025; Accepted: 29 July 2025; Published: 30 August 2025

ABSTRACT

In an era defined by a polycrisis of interconnected challenges—from the escalating climate crisis and global health emergencies to deepening geopolitical fissures—traditional diplomatic tools are often insufficient. This article posits that science diplomacy is increasingly recognized not merely as a niche area of foreign policy but as a critical instrument for navigating complexity and fostering global cooperation. It provides a comprehensive analysis of the field, tracing its evolution and dissecting its core conceptual frameworks, notably the tripartite model of 'science in diplomacy,' 'diplomacy for science,' and 'science for diplomacy,' while also engaging with critical theories that illuminate the structural inequalities embedded within these dynamics. The paper examines the operational dynamics through which it functions, from formal intergovernmental agreements and large-scale research infrastructures to the resilient informal networks of scientists that often persist despite political tensions. Through a detailed analysis of illustrative case studies—including CERN as a model for post-conflict reconciliation, the SESAME light source as a beacon of cooperation in the Middle East, the dual-edged lessons of the COVID-19 pandemic, and Morocco's strategic use of science for regional leadership—the article explores both the potential and the limitations of these approaches in practice. The central thesis argues that while science diplomacy is not a panacea, it offers a vital pathway for building transnational networks grounded in trust and evidence, thereby contributing to more effective global governance. However, its success is continually challenged by the inherent tension between the universalist ethos of science and the competitive realities of national interests, as well as by the often-unseen power asymmetries inherent in global scientific collaboration. The article concludes that building greater capacity, consciously addressing these power dynamics, and navigating this 'interest paradox' are essential for leveraging science diplomacy to address the defining global challenges of the 21st century.

Keywords: Science Diplomacy, Global Governance, International Relations, Geopolitics.

INTRODUCTION

In a world grappling with a convergence of unprecedented challenges—from the escalating climate crisis and the persistent threat of pandemics to deepening geopolitical fissures and the rapid, unregulated advance of new technologies—the need for innovative and collaborative solutions has never been more urgent. Against this backdrop of global turbulence, science diplomacy is increasingly recognized not merely as a niche area of foreign policy but as a critical instrument for navigating complexity, fostering mutual understanding, and building a more resilient and equitable global order. By harnessing the universal language of scientific inquiry and the collaborative spirit of research, science diplomacy offers a powerful means to bridge political divides, address shared vulnerabilities, and forge transnational networks dedicated to the common good.

This article provides an in-depth exploration of science diplomacy, expanding significantly on its conceptual foundations, operational dynamics, and real-world impact. It will delve into the historical evolution of the concept, from its early manifestations in Cold War rivalries to its contemporary role in an increasingly multipolar and interconnected world. The analysis will dissect the key mechanisms that enable scientific collaboration to transcend entrenched geopolitical barriers, examine the formidable challenges that threaten to

undermine these efforts, and assess the growing influence of science diplomacy on the architecture of global governance. Through a series of detailed case studies—including an extensive look at the European Organization for Nuclear Research (CERN), the SESAME light source in the Middle East, the global response to the COVID-19 pandemic, and Morocco's strategic use of science for regional cooperation—this article will illustrate the diverse ways in which collaborative innovation is being mobilized to confront the defining challenges of our time.

The 21st century is characterized by a landscape of complex, interconnected global challenges that defy simple, unilateral solutions. The relentless progression of climate change, with its cascading impacts on ecosystems, economies, and human societies, represents an existential threat that necessitates a globally coordinated response grounded in scientific evidence. The COVID-19 pandemic served as a stark and devastating reminder of our shared vulnerability to infectious diseases, highlighting the indispensable role of international scientific collaboration in everything from viral sequencing to vaccine development and distribution. Beyond these immediate crises, a host of other issues—including biodiversity loss, food and water insecurity, the responsible governance of artificial intelligence, and nuclear proliferation—demand a level of sustained international cooperation that often seems at odds with the prevailing geopolitical climate.

This era of "polycrisis" is further complicated by a fracturing of the post-Cold War international order. Rising nationalism, great power competition, and a general trend toward political polarization are creating an environment of distrust and rivalry that can impede collaborative efforts. It is precisely within this challenging context that science diplomacy emerges as a vital, and often underutilized, tool. By providing a neutral and objective platform for engagement, science can create channels for communication and cooperation even when formal diplomatic relations are strained or severed.

While the practice of using science to build bridges between nations has a long history—from scientific exchanges during the Cold War to the great voyages of exploration—the term "science diplomacy" gained significant currency in the early 2000s. A landmark 2010 report by the Royal Society and the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) provided a foundational framework that has shaped the field ever since. This report, and the subsequent body of scholarship it inspired, has cemented the idea that science, technology, and innovation are no longer peripheral to foreign policy but are, in fact, central to it.

The relevance of science diplomacy today is underscored by the simple fact that the world's most pressing problems are increasingly scientific in nature. Whether it is negotiating climate treaties, managing global health crises, or setting standards for emerging technologies, effective diplomacy requires a deep and nuanced understanding of the underlying science. Moreover, in an age of rampant misinformation and disinformation, the commitment of the scientific community to evidence, transparency, and peer review provides a valuable anchor for international dialogue.

While the literature on science diplomacy has grown considerably over the past decade, several gaps remain. Much of the early work in the field was descriptive and focused on defining the concept and its various dimensions. While this foundational work was essential, there is a need for more analytical research that critically examines the mechanisms, effectiveness, and limitations of science diplomacy in practice. Furthermore, while many studies have focused on the role of science diplomacy in the context of great power relations, less attention has been paid to its application in other regions and by a wider range of actors, including smaller states and non-state organizations. A significant portion of the literature also tends to present a narrative of cooperation from a Global North-centric lens, often inadvertently obscuring the power dynamics and structural inequities that can condition such international collaborations.

This article seeks to address these gaps by providing a comprehensive and in-depth analysis of science diplomacy that integrates theory with practice. By moving beyond a purely descriptive approach, it aims to offer a more critical and nuanced understanding of how science diplomacy works, where it has been successful, and what challenges it faces. The inclusion of a diverse set of case studies, including a specific focus on Morocco, is intended to broaden the geographical and thematic scope of the discussion and to highlight the

varied ways in which science diplomacy is being deployed around the world, including from a Global South perspective.

This article is guided by the following central research questions: How has the concept and practice of science diplomacy evolved to meet the challenges of a rapidly changing global landscape? What are the key mechanisms and dynamics through which science diplomacy operates, and how do they contribute to addressing global challenges and shaping global governance? And finally, what are the primary obstacles and limitations to the effective use of science diplomacy, particularly in an era of heightened geopolitical competition and persistent structural inequalities?

The main thesis of this article is that while science diplomacy is not a panacea for the world's problems, it represents an increasingly indispensable tool for navigating global challenges. By fostering transnational networks built on the principles of trust, evidence, and mutual interest, science diplomacy can create unique pathways for collaboration, de-escalate tensions, and contribute to the development of more effective and equitable forms of global governance. However, its success is contingent on a clear-eyed understanding of its limitations and the inherent tensions between the collaborative ethos of science and the competitive realities of international politics.

This article employs a qualitative, multi-method approach, drawing on a comprehensive review of the academic and policy literature on science diplomacy, as well as an in-depth analysis of specific case studies. To ensure transparency and analytical rigor, the case studies were selected based on a clear set of criteria. These criteria included: (1) geographical and geopolitical diversity (spanning Europe, the Middle East, and a global crisis, with a specific focus on an African nation) to counteract a purely Western-centric view; (2) thematic variety (fundamental physics, public health, and sustainable development); and (3) historical and contemporary significance, offering lessons from both long-standing institutions and recent events. The evaluation of their success is not based on a single metric but on a holistic assessment of their demonstrated ability to foster sustained dialogue, build local and regional scientific capacity, tangibly influence policy, and contribute to de-escalating political tensions. The analysis will proceed in four main parts. Section 2 will provide a detailed conceptualization of science diplomacy, tracing the evolution of the concept and exploring the key theoretical frameworks that can be used to understand it. Section 3 will examine the mechanisms and dynamics of science diplomacy in action, looking at both formal and informal modes of collaboration and the challenges they face. Section 4 will present a series of detailed case studies, providing a rich empirical basis for the article's arguments. Finally, Section 5 will offer a concluding assessment of the role and future of science diplomacy in the 21st century.

EVOLUTION OF THE CONCEPT

The idea that scientific collaboration can serve diplomatic ends is not new. The Pugwash Conferences on Science and World Affairs, which began in 1957, brought together scientists from both sides of the Iron Curtain to discuss the dangers of nuclear weapons and advocate for arms control. This early example of "track-two diplomacy" demonstrated the potential of the scientific community to maintain lines of communication and build trust even in the most hostile of political climates. Similarly, the establishment of the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA) in 1972 was a joint US-Soviet initiative aimed at using systems analysis to address shared problems such as pollution and resource scarcity.

However, it was not until the post-Cold War era that the concept of science diplomacy began to be systematically theorized and promoted. In the United States, the late 1990s saw a growing recognition of the need to integrate science and technology more fully into foreign policy. In a 2009 speech in Cairo, President Barack Obama explicitly called for a "new beginning" in relations between the United States and the Muslim world, with a significant emphasis on scientific and technological cooperation as a means of fostering partnership and opportunity. This period also saw the establishment of the AAAS Center for Science Diplomacy in 2008, which has played a key role in advancing the field through its publications, training programs, and advocacy efforts.

The landmark 2010 report by the Royal Society and AAAS, "New Frontiers in Science Diplomacy," provided the conceptual scaffolding that has supported the field ever since. The report's enduring influence lies in its clear and concise articulation of the three core dimensions of science diplomacy, which have provided a common language for scholars and practitioners alike.

Key Dimensions and Their Interactions

The Royal Society/AAAS framework divides science diplomacy into three distinct, yet often overlapping, dimensions:

Science in Diplomacy: This dimension refers to the use of scientific knowledge and advice to inform and support foreign policy objectives. This can take many forms, from the provision of expert analysis on climate change to inform negotiations on international environmental agreements, to the use of technical expertise in arms control verification. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) is a prime example of "science in diplomacy" in action. By synthesizing and assessing the vast body of scientific literature on climate change, the IPCC provides the authoritative evidence base upon which international climate policy is built.

Diplomacy for Science: This dimension encompasses the use of diplomatic action to facilitate and enhance international scientific collaboration. This can involve negotiating bilateral or multilateral agreements on scientific cooperation, creating legal frameworks for the sharing of data and materials, and establishing and funding international research infrastructures. The Agreement on Enhancing International Arctic Scientific Cooperation, signed in 2017 by the eight Arctic states, is a clear example of "diplomacy for science," as it aims to reduce the legal and logistical barriers to collaborative research in this critical and rapidly changing region.

Science for Diplomacy: This is perhaps the most widely recognized dimension of science diplomacy, referring to the use of scientific cooperation to build bridges and improve relations between nations, particularly those with a history of conflict or strained relations. Large-scale, international scientific projects, often referred to as "megascience" initiatives, are powerful exemplars of "science for diplomacy." These projects, which are often too expensive and complex for any single nation to undertake alone, can serve as powerful symbols of shared human endeavor and can foster a sense of common identity and purpose among participating scientists and nations.

It is important to note that these three dimensions are not mutually exclusive and often interact in complex and dynamic ways. The SESAME project, for example, is a clear case of "science for diplomacy," as one of its primary goals is to foster cooperation and understanding among its diverse membership, which includes Iran, Israel, and Palestine. However, its creation also required a significant amount of "diplomacy for science" in the form of decades of negotiations and fundraising. And as SESAME begins to produce cutting-edge scientific research, it will increasingly contribute to "science in diplomacy" by providing new knowledge and expertise that can be used to address regional and global challenges.

Relevant Theoretical Frameworks

The practice of science diplomacy can be analyzed through a variety of theoretical lenses from the field of international relations. Each of these theories offers a different perspective on the motivations, dynamics, and potential outcomes of scientific cooperation.

Liberalism: From a liberal perspective, science diplomacy is a quintessential example of how international cooperation can foster interdependence and peace. Liberals would argue that by creating transnational networks of scientists who share common norms, values, and a commitment to rational inquiry, science diplomacy can help to break down national stereotypes and build trust. This, in turn, can spill over into other areas of international relations, creating a more peaceful and cooperative world order.

Constructivism: A constructivist approach would focus on the ways in which science diplomacy can shape the identities and interests of states. Constructivists would argue that shared scientific endeavors can help to create a sense of common identity and purpose, leading nations to define their interests in more cooperative and less conflictual terms. The idea of "the international scientific community" is itself a social construct, and the norms and values of this community— such as openness, transparency, and peer review—can have a powerful influence on the behavior of states.

Realism: Realists, on the other hand, would be more skeptical of the transformative potential of science diplomacy. From a realist perspective, the international system is fundamentally anarchic and competitive, and states will always prioritize their own national interests and security. Realists would view science diplomacy as just another tool in the state's toolkit, to be used to enhance its power and influence. They would point to the fact that scientific knowledge can have military applications (dual-use technologies) and that international scientific competition is often a proxy for geopolitical rivalry. The ongoing "tech war" between the United States and China, with its focus on competition in areas like artificial intelligence and quantum computing, would be seen by realists as evidence of the enduring power of national interest in the scientific realm.

To deepen the analysis, it is crucial to integrate critical and postcolonial theories of international relations. These perspectives challenge the often-optimistic narratives of traditional frameworks by foregrounding issues of power, hierarchy, and historical injustice. A critical lens reveals that science diplomacy does not occur on a level playing field. It argues that global scientific structures are often dominated by institutions and funding from the Global North, which can lead to neocolonial dynamics. This can manifest as knowledge extraction, where data and resources flow from South to North, and research agendas are set by wealthier nations, potentially marginalizing the needs and priorities of developing countries. Postcolonial theory further contends that the very notion of "universal science" can be problematic, as it has historically been used to devalue or erase indigenous and local knowledge systems. Therefore, science diplomacy, if not approached with critical self-awareness, risks reinforcing existing global inequalities rather than alleviating them.

This inherent tension between the collaborative ideals of science and the competitive realities of international politics is what some have called the "interest paradox" of science diplomacy. When viewed through a critical lens, this paradox is deepened by issues of power and equity. Acknowledging and navigating this complex interplay of interests and structural power is essential for a realistic and effective approach to the field.

The Role of Trust and Evidence

At the heart of any successful science diplomacy endeavor are the twin pillars of trust and evidence. Trust is the essential glue that holds transnational scientific collaborations together. It must exist at multiple levels: between individual scientists, between scientific institutions, and between governments. This trust is not an abstract ideal; it is built and maintained over time through concrete actions such as repeated positive interactions, shared experiences in joint projects, the establishment of transparent data-sharing protocols, and a mutual commitment to the integrity of the scientific process.

Evidence, in turn, is the currency of science. The ability of science to inform diplomacy is entirely dependent on the credibility and reliability of the scientific evidence being presented. This requires robust systems of quality control, such as peer review, and a commitment to transparency and openness in the sharing of data and methods. In an era of rampant disinformation, the ability of the scientific community to speak with a clear and unified voice on the basis of solid evidence is more important than ever. However, it is also crucial to acknowledge that scientific evidence is often uncertain and contested, and that scientific advice must be communicated in a way that is sensitive to the political and cultural context in which it is being received. Moreover, the operationalization of "evidence" must be inclusive, creating space for diverse knowledge systems to contribute, thereby building broader trust and legitimacy.

ISSN No. 2454-6186 | DOI: 10.47772/IJRISS | Volume IX Issue VIII August 2025

SCIENCE DIPLOMACY IN ACTION: MECHANISMS AND DYNAMICS

The practice of science diplomacy is carried out through a diverse array of mechanisms, involving a wide range of actors. These can be broadly categorized into formal and informal channels of collaboration. Formal Mechanisms:

Bilateral and Multilateral Agreements: These are the most traditional instruments of science diplomacy, providing a legal and political framework for cooperation between nations. These agreements can cover a wide range of activities, from joint research projects and researcher exchanges to the establishment of shared scientific facilities.

International Research Infrastructures: As noted earlier, large-scale research infrastructures like CERN, ITER, and SESAME are powerful engines of science diplomacy. They require a high degree of formal international agreement and long-term financial commitment, and they provide a physical space for scientists from different countries to work together on a daily basis.

International Governmental Organizations (IGOs): Organizations like UNESCO and the World Health Organization (WHO) play a crucial role in facilitating science diplomacy on a global scale. They provide a platform for multilateral dialogue, set international norms and standards, and coordinate global responses to shared challenges.

Joint Funding Programs: A growing number of countries are pooling their research funding to support international collaborative projects. The European Union's Horizon Europe program, for example, is the world's largest multinational research and innovation program, and it actively promotes collaboration with researchers from around the globe.

Informal Mechanisms: Scientist-to-Scientist Networks: Perhaps the most fundamental mechanism of science diplomacy is the web of personal relationships and informal networks that connects scientists across borders. These networks are often forged through academic conferences, workshops, and graduate and postdoctoral training. They provide a channel for the rapid exchange of ideas and information and can be remarkably resilient even in times of political tension.

Scientific Diasporas: Scientists who live and work outside their home countries can play a unique role as "science diplomats," bridging the scientific communities of their home and host countries. They often have deep personal and professional connections in both, and they can facilitate collaboration and knowledge transfer in ways that formal diplomatic channels cannot.

Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) and Academic Institutions: NGOs and universities are increasingly active players in the science diplomacy landscape. They can act as "track-two" diplomats, convening dialogues and fostering collaboration outside of formal government channels. They also play a critical role in training the next generation of science diplomats.

NAVIGATING GEOPOLITICAL CHALLENGES

Despite the power of these mechanisms, science diplomacy does not operate in a vacuum. It is constantly shaped, and often constrained, by the geopolitical realities of the day. The recent war in Ukraine, for example, led to the widespread suspension of scientific collaboration with Russia, severing long-standing ties and raising difficult questions about the limits of scientific universalism. The growing strategic competition between the United States and China has also cast a chill over scientific cooperation, with rising concerns about research security, intellectual property theft, and the potential for dual-use technologies to be used for military purposes.

These challenges have led to a renewed debate about the balance between openness and security in international scientific collaboration. While the principle of open science—the free and open sharing of data, methods, and results—is a core value of the scientific community, governments are increasingly concerned about the potential risks of this openness. This has led to the implementation of new export controls, visa restrictions, and research security protocols in many countries, which can have a chilling effect on international collaboration.

Navigating this complex and often fraught landscape requires a high degree of political and scientific acumen. It requires scientists to be more aware of the geopolitical context in which they are working, and it requires diplomats to have a better understanding of the nature and value of scientific collaboration. It also requires a commitment to finding creative solutions that can balance the legitimate security concerns of states with the imperative of international scientific cooperation to address shared global challenges.

Impact on Global Governance

Despite the challenges, science diplomacy is having a growing impact on the theory and practice of global governance. By providing a basis for evidence-informed policymaking, fostering transnational networks, and creating new channels of influence, science diplomacy is contributing to a more networked and multi-stakeholder model of global governance.

One of the most significant impacts of science diplomacy is its contribution to what has been termed "evidence-informed diplomacy." In an increasingly complex and technical world, effective diplomacy requires a deep understanding of the scientific dimensions of global issues. Science diplomacy helps to provide this understanding by building bridges between the scientific and diplomatic communities and ensuring that policymakers have access to the best available scientific evidence.

Furthermore, the transnational networks created through science diplomacy are themselves a form of global governance. These networks of scientists, institutions, and organizations can often mobilize more quickly and effectively than formal intergovernmental bodies, as was seen in the early days of the COVID-19 pandemic when scientists around the world rapidly shared data and collaborated on research.

Finally, science diplomacy can create new channels of influence that can complement and sometimes even bypass traditional diplomatic structures. By fostering "track-two" and "track-three" dialogues, science diplomacy can create space for creative problem-solving and can help to build the political will for action on difficult issues. While the influence of these informal channels can be difficult to measure, they are an increasingly important feature of the global governance landscape.

CASE STUDY / ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLES

To move from the abstract to the concrete, it is essential to examine specific examples of science diplomacy in action. The four case studies presented below have not been chosen at random; their selection is deliberate and designed to offer a comprehensive, multi-dimensional analysis that directly addresses the questions raised by both traditional and critical theoretical frameworks. Each case was chosen to illustrate a distinct and complementary facet of the phenomenon:

- CERN is selected as the foundational archetype, the historical benchmark for "science for diplomacy" in a post-war European context. It serves as a reference point for understanding the origins and potential of large-scale collaborative infrastructures.
- SESAME is included to analyze the adaptation and transfer of this model into a radically different and vastly more complex geopolitical landscape: the Middle East. It allows for the study of the challenges and successes of science diplomacy in an active conflict zone.
- The COVID-19 pandemic was chosen as a global, contemporary case study. It is crucial because it dramatically highlights the tensions between ideal scientific collaboration and fierce geopolitical

ISSN No. 2454-6186 | DOI: 10.47772/IJRISS | Volume IX Issue VIII August 2025

competition, while also exposing the structural inequalities (notably "vaccine nationalism") that run through global health.

- Finally, Morocco provides an indispensable Global South perspective, specifically chosen to counterbalance the often Eurocentric or great-power-focused narrative. This case demonstrates how a middle-income country can strategically use science diplomacy as a lever for development and regional leadership, offering an essential counter-narrative.

Together, these examples do not merely illustrate science diplomacy; they were selected to put theories into tension, reveal paradoxes, and offer a broad, critical view of its practical applications across diverse historical, political, and economic contexts. They highlight the diverse forms that science diplomacy can take and the tangible impacts it can have.

CERN:

The European Organization for Nuclear Research, better known as CERN, is arguably the most iconic example of "science for diplomacy." Founded in 1954, in the ashes of World War II, CERN's primary mission was to provide a world-class facility for fundamental physics research. However, it had an equally important, if less explicit, mission: to rebuild the shattered scientific community of Europe and to foster reconciliation and cooperation between nations that had recently been at war.

CERN's success in this regard has been remarkable. For over six decades, it has been a place where scientists from across Europe and around the world, regardless of their nationality or political persuasion, have worked together in pursuit of a common goal: to understand the fundamental building blocks of the universe. The collaborative culture of CERN, built on principles of openness, meritocracy, and shared scientific curiosity, has helped to break down national barriers and build a sense of common European identity. CERN's model of governance, in which member states contribute to a common budget and decisions are made by a council of representatives, has also been a powerful example of successful multilateralism. It is important to note, however, that while CERN is a celebrated model, it originated in a specific Western context with significant funding from economically advanced nations, a fact which must be considered when assessing its replicability in other parts of the world with different historical and economic realities.

SESAME:

Inspired by the success of CERN, the Synchrotron-light for Experimental Science and Applications in the Middle East (SESAME) is a bold and ambitious exercise in "science for diplomacy" in one of the world's most conflict-prone regions. Located in Jordan, SESAME is a third-generation synchrotron light source—a powerful tool for research in fields ranging from materials science and biology to archaeology and environmental science. What makes SESAME truly remarkable, however, is its membership. The project brings together scientists and governments from Cyprus, Egypt, Iran, Israel, Jordan, Pakistan, the Palestinian Authority, and Turkey.

The very existence of SESAME is a testament to the power of science to transcend even the most deeply entrenched political divides. The project was conceived in the late 1990s and has been painstakingly brought to fruition through decades of quiet, patient diplomacy, much of it led by scientists themselves. The challenges have been immense, from securing funding and navigating complex political sensitivities to overcoming technical hurdles. However, the project's supporters have been driven by a shared conviction that science can provide a common ground for dialogue and cooperation in a region where such opportunities are scarce.

SESAME is now a fully operational scientific facility, and it is already beginning to fulfill its dual mission: to produce world-class science and to build bridges between people and nations. It is providing a new generation of scientists in the Middle East with access to cutting-edge research tools, helping to reverse the region's "brain drain" and build a more knowledge-based economy. And by bringing together researchers from across the region to work on common projects, it is fostering a new culture of collaboration and mutual understanding.

ISSN No. 2454-6186 | DOI: 10.47772/IJRISS | Volume IX Issue VIII August 2025

COVID-19 AND THE GEOPOLITICS OF GLOBAL HEALTH

The COVID-19 pandemic offered a stark and complex illustration of the promise and peril of science diplomacy in the face of a global crisis. On the one hand, the pandemic sparked an unprecedented wave of international scientific collaboration. Scientists around the world shared data and viral samples at lightning speed, and researchers in academic labs, government agencies, and private companies worked together to develop new diagnostics, treatments, and vaccines in record time. This rapid and open exchange of scientific information was a testament to the power of the global scientific community to mobilize in the face of a common threat.

On the other hand, the pandemic also exposed and exacerbated the geopolitical fault lines that run through the international system. The initial response to the outbreak was marred by a lack of transparency and a failure of international cooperation. The rise of "vaccine nationalism," in which wealthy countries hoarded vaccine supplies for their own populations, undermined efforts to ensure equitable global access to these life-saving tools. This behavior was a clear manifestation of the structural inequities highlighted by postcolonial critiques, revealing how quickly the rhetoric of global solidarity could be abandoned in favor of national self-interest, largely along Global North-South divides. The pandemic also became a new front in the great power competition between the United States and China, with both countries engaging in a war of words over the origins of the virus and the effectiveness of their respective responses.

The COVID-19 pandemic thus serves as a powerful reminder that while science diplomacy can be a powerful force for good, it is not immune to the pressures of geopolitics. The crisis highlighted the urgent need for stronger international institutions and a more robust framework for global health governance, one that is better equipped to balance the competing demands of national interest and global solidarity, and one that actively works to dismantle the structural inequalities that led to inequitable vaccine distribution. It also underscored the critical importance of building trust—between scientists, between governments, and between governments and their citizens—as a prerequisite for any effective response to future pandemics.

Morocco: As Regional Leader in Science Diplomacy

Morocco provides a compelling and more recent example of how a middle-income country can strategically leverage science diplomacy to advance its national interests and promote regional cooperation, offering an important counterpoint to the more commonly cited Western-led examples. In recent years, Morocco has made significant investments in science, technology, and innovation, with a particular focus on renewable energy, sustainable agriculture, and water management. These investments are not only aimed at driving the country's own economic development but are also designed to position Morocco as a leader in these fields within Africa and the broader Mediterranean region.

Morocco's science diplomacy strategy is multifaceted. It involves actively participating in and shaping regional and international scientific networks, such as the MedECC (Mediterranean Experts on Climate and Environmental Change) initiative, which brings together scientists from across the Mediterranean basin to assess the impacts of climate change and develop policy recommendations. The country has also launched its own initiatives, such as the Moroccan Science Leadership Program, which aims to train the next generation of scientific leaders from across North Africa and the Sahel.

In the field of renewable energy, Morocco has become a global leader in the development of concentrated solar power, and it is actively sharing its expertise with other African nations through joint ventures and training programs. This "green diplomacy" is not only helping to address the shared challenge of climate change but is also enhancing Morocco's soft power and strengthening its economic and political ties across the continent. Morocco's approach to science diplomacy demonstrates that this is not a game reserved only for the great powers. By strategically investing in its scientific capacity and actively engaging in regional and international networks, Morocco is showing how science can be a powerful tool for sustainable development, regional integration, and smart foreign policy, representing a model of South-South cooperation.

CONCLUSION

In an increasingly complex and turbulent world, the need for effective and innovative forms of diplomacy has never been greater. This article has argued that science diplomacy, by harnessing the universal language of science and the collaborative spirit of research, represents a vital and often underutilized tool for addressing the multifaceted global challenges of the 21st century.

From its early origins in the Cold War to its contemporary application in fields as diverse as climate change, global health, and sustainable development, science diplomacy has demonstrated its ability to build bridges, foster trust, and find common ground even in the most challenging of political circumstances. The three-dimensional framework of "science in diplomacy," "diplomacy for science," and "science for diplomacy" provides a useful, if sometimes overlapping, typology for understanding the various ways in which science and diplomacy can interact.

The mechanisms of science diplomacy are as diverse as the actors who practice it, ranging from formal intergovernmental agreements and large-scale international research infrastructures to informal networks of scientists and the "track-two" efforts of universities and NGOs. Together, these formal and informal channels are creating a more networked and multi-stakeholder model of global governance, one in which evidence and expertise can play a more central role in policymaking.

However, as this article has also shown, science diplomacy is not a panacea. It is constantly buffeted by the winds of geopolitics, and its noble aspirations can be easily undermined by the competing demands of national interest and security. The "interest paradox"—the inherent tension between the collaborative ethos of science and the competitive nature of international politics—is a constant challenge. This paradox is deepened by the structural power asymmetries, highlighted by critical and postcolonial theories, which must be consciously acknowledged and addressed. The challenge must be carefully and creatively navigated.

The case studies presented in this article—from the post-conflict reconciliation of CERN and the bold vision of SESAME to the complex and often contradictory lessons of the COVID-19 pandemic and the strategic smarts of Morocco's regional diplomacy—illustrate both the immense potential and the formidable challenges of science diplomacy in practice. They show that when it is pursued with patience, persistence, and a clear sense of purpose, science diplomacy can achieve remarkable things.

Looking to the future, the role of science diplomacy is almost certain to grow in importance. The world's most pressing problems will continue to demand scientifically-informed solutions and international cooperation. To meet this demand, it will be essential to continue to build capacity in science diplomacy, both by training a new generation of scientists and diplomats who can work effectively at the intersection of these two worlds, and by strengthening the institutions that support their work. It will also be necessary to have a more open and honest conversation about the challenges and limitations of science diplomacy, particularly regarding the power imbalances that can undermine trust and equity. We must develop new strategies for navigating the complex terrain of 21st-century geopolitics that are sensitive to these dynamics. In the final analysis, the pursuit of a more peaceful, prosperous, and sustainable world will depend, in no small part, on our ability to build and sustain the transnational networks of collaboration and trust that are the hallmark of science diplomacy at its best.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS). (n.d.). *Science & Diplomacy*. Retrieved from https://www.sciencediplomacy.org/
2. Berkman, P. A. (2019). Evolution of science diplomacy and its container for international relations. *Global Policy, 10*(S1), 6-12. https://doi.org/10.1111/1758-5899.12595
3. Carayannis, E. G., & Campbell, D. F. J. (2012). *Mode 3 knowledge production in quadruple helix innovation systems*.

4. CERN. (1953). *Convention for the establishment of a European Organization for Nuclear Research*. https://cds.cern.ch/record/109477/files/CERN-Convention-en.pdf
5. Colglazier, E. W. (2020). The role of science and technology in the new era of great power competition. *Science & Diplomacy*, *9*(1).
6. Fedoroff, N. V. (2009). Science diplomacy in the 21st century. *Cell*, *136*(1), 9-11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2008.12.030
7. Flink, T. (2020). *The interest paradox: The power of national interests in global science diplomacy*. De Gruyter.
8. Flink, T., & Schreiterer, U. (2010). Science diplomacy at the intersection of S&T policies and foreign affairs: toward a typology of national approaches. *Science and Public Policy*, *37*(9), 665–677. https://doi.org/10.3152/030234210X12778118264534
9. Gluckman, P. D., Turekian, V. C., Grimes, R. W., & Kishi, T. (2017). Science diplomacy: A pragmatic perspective from the inside. *Science & Diplomacy*, *6*(4).
10. Gluckman, P. D., Goldson, D., & Turekian, V. C. (2021). The fragility of science and the case for its careful protection from politicization. *The Lancet*, *397*(10287), 1799-1801.
11. Hotez, P. J. (2021). *Preventing the next pandemic: Vaccine diplomacy in a time of anti-science*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
12. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). (2023). *AR6 Synthesis Report: Climate Change 2023*. IPCC. https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/syr/
13. Kickbusch, I., & Kökény, M. (Eds.). (2013). *Global health diplomacy: Concepts, issues, actors, instruments, fora and cases*.
14. Krige, J. (2006). *American hegemony and the postwar reconstruction of science in Europe*. MIT Press.
15. Lander, E. S. (2021). The fabric of science diplomacy. *Science & Diplomacy*, *10*(1).
16. Lord, K. M., & Turekian, V. C. (2007). Time for a new era of science diplomacy. *Science*, *315*(5813), 769-770. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1139857
17. Mauduit, J. C., & Gualsolino, M. (2020). Mediterranean experts on climate and environmental change (MedECC): A new science-policy interface. *Science & Diplomacy*, *9*(3).
18. Moomaw, W. R., & Berkman, P. A. (2019). The Arctic science agreement: A new framework for science diplomacy. *Science & Diplomacy*, *8*(1).
19. Ruffini, P. A. (2017). The "inter-scientific" dimension of science diplomacy. *Global Policy*, *8*(S4), 67-74. https://doi.org/10.1111/1758-5899.12458
20. Ruffini, P. A. (2020). *Science and diplomacy: A new dimension of international relations*.
21. Schoo, E. (2019). Diaspora networks in science diplomacy: Bridging the gap. *Science & Diplomacy*, *8*(2).
22. The Royal Society & The American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS). (2010). *New frontiers in science diplomacy: Navigating the changing balance of power*. The Royal Society.
23. Tooze, A. (2022). Welcome to the world of the polycrisis. *Financial Times*.
24. Turekian, V. C. (2018). The evolution of science diplomacy. In *The Oxford Handbook of Modern Diplomacy*. Oxford University Press.
25. Turekian, V. C., & Neureiter, N. P. (2012). Science and diplomacy: The past as prologue. *Science & Diplomacy*, *1*(1).
26. Van Langenhove, L. (2017). *Tools for an EU science diplomacy*. European Commission. https://doi.org/10.2777/38964
27. Wilsdon, J., & Doubleday, R. (2015). Future directions for science advice in Whitehall. *Alliance for Useful Evidence*.
28. Winick, H. (Ed.). (2017). *SESAME: A story of collaboration, science and peace*. World Scientific Publishing.
29. World Health Organization (WHO). (2021). *Global health and peace initiative*. Retrieved from https://www.who.int/initiatives/global-health-and-peace-initiative
30. Zelenika, I. (2017). Track II diplomacy. In *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Political Behavior*. SAGE Publications.