

## NAS PUBLIC WELFARE MEDAL ACCEPTANCE SPEECH

Norman P. Neureiter

Washington, D.C.

April 27, 2008

Thank you Dr. Brauman. It is truly humbling to be recognized in this way by the Academy and to have one's name added to that illustrious Pantheon of earlier awardees. I am greatly honored and deeply appreciative. Who knows, it may even help me to get more respect from my grandchildren—and three of them are here today—just for that reason.

But today you have done much more than confer a medal. You have confirmed again the National Academies' vigorous support for international scientific and technical cooperation as a vital element in the formulation and execution of American foreign policy. It is essential to keep repeating that message and reminding the policymakers of this critical link between science and international relations. In the cacophonous world of policymaking, without a constant reminder, that capricious razor in the foreign affairs area--called "responsible budgeting"--can so easily fall again on science as it often has in the past. In 1999, with science at one of its lowest points in the State Department, it was the excellent report of the NAS/NRC on the role of science, technology and health in foreign policy, plus a lot of pushing from the science community, that persuaded Secretary of State Albright to lay out a plan for greatly strengthening science at State and hiring a Science and Technology Adviser to drive the process. I was lucky enough to get that fascinating job in September 2000. I just loved it.

As I signed on, Secretary Albright's chief of staff, thinking of the coming election, muttered, "Don't sell your house in Dallas; you could be gone in three months." Well, fortunately I was not gone; I survived the transition and spent the rest of my three-year assignment under Colin Powell. One of the really high points was exactly six years ago at the NAS annual meeting when Secretary Powell stood at this podium and spoke of the National Academies as State's great partner in foreign policy. Some of you were probably here for that talk. He also praised the AAAS diplomacy fellows program that brings Ph.D. scientists each year into State and helps build S&T literacy and capacity. It was a great talk—and when he finished he got a standing ovation from the packed auditorium.

Just a word about how I got here: After my third year of graduate school I had a year at the University of Munich, Germany as a Fulbright scholar. It was 1955, with the formal end of the occupation and Germany's emergence as two separate countries. Munich was still partly in ruins; the university chemistry labs had just been rebuilt; all my fellow students had been through the war and had their stories; I saw the horror of Dachau: and in a divided Berlin, one could feel the rising tensions of the Cold War. I also often thought about something my Austrian-born father said: In the US, election debates are always about domestic issues, but those things which have the greatest impact on the country usually begin abroad.

That year in Munich changed my life. The idea of war—which, sadly, may indeed be the natural condition of mankind—seemed so abhorrent and with today's destructive capacity ultimately so pointless, that from then on, I was inexorably pulled toward an international job—where I could contribute to trying to find peaceful solutions to international problems.

Furthermore, over the following years—some in NSF, some in the foreign service as a science attaché abroad, some in the White House Office of Science and Technology, and some with Texas Instruments in Europe and Japan, I began to see science and technology as a new kind of international currency—a basis for a common language among people of many countries.

Now, combining those thoughts into operational terms for today's complex world, my personal equation comes out something like this. International scientific and technical cooperation can be one of America's most powerful and effective soft-power instruments of a constructive foreign policy. Dialog among scientists can often contribute to the resolution of issues that elude politicians.

Of course, this thought is not new. Some of this cooperation is going on today. But as an active instrument of foreign policy, it is under-utilized, under-funded and too often treated as only an afterthought in the national diplomatic toolbox. We need alternatives to a foreign policy which one cartoonist depicted as three pit bulls, lunging forward with jaws wide and incisors bared, restrained only by a thin leash in the hands of the US president.

I don't have to remind this Academy audience of the great contributions of the US-Soviet scientist dialogs that began at a place in Nova Scotia called

Pugwash and eventually led to the nuclear test ban treaties, the arms limitation talks, etc. I still remember standing on the edge of a diplomatic reception at Spaso House in Moscow together with former NAS president Phil Handler and talking quietly with Andrei Sacharov--the developer of the Soviet hydrogen bomb, who also became the Soviets' most famous dissident. And the Academies' CISAC committee continues its superb work of engagement today with countries where there remain threats of conflict or misunderstanding. I have also been able to participate in several Academy activities in Iran, where Glenn Schweitzer has built a remarkable level of personal and professional relationships and exchanges over the past eight years—despite the atmosphere of sanctions, restrictions and extreme, official hostility between the US and Iran.

The first science program undertaken for purely diplomatic political reasons was the NSF's US-Japan program initiated by President Kennedy and Prime Minister Ikeda as part of an effort to repair the "broken dialog" between the intellectual communities of the two countries. Running that program was my first job at NSF and I could see how working together on common scientific problems did bring people together. That program worked out very well.

A barrier to using science cooperation in foreign policy today is that there is no science agency that can readily fund science for foreign policy reasons—the projects have to be justified in terms of their benefit to US science. In principle, money could be given to State, but their committees on the Hill don't think of funding science through the State Department, though there are some examples such as the cooperative threat reduction activities. But more typically, new international science cooperation agreements—even those initiated as a presidential deliverable on a state visit, often languish for lack of sustainable funding after a flurry of forced activity at the start. What I am saying is that we are depriving ourselves of one of our potentially most effective instruments of engagement, and we ought not to do that. Even Secretary of Defense Gates is asking the Congress for more support for the soft-power instruments of global diplomacy. He understands that we need something other than bombs, bullets and boots on the ground to stabilize a complex world.

And, by the way, we must also reopen the doors to America. Every week I hear another horror story of a failed visa application; of a meeting missed; of scientists who don't want to hold their meetings in the US any more; of

foreigners who say they would rather just not come—it is too much of a hassle; of companies that cannot easily train their foreign employees here; of exporters, who can't get their customers in to see their products; of leading scientists who are excluded or who will not submit to the indignities of the visa process. We must do better. Remember President Reagan's famous remark in Berlin: "Tear down this wall." Not bad advice, was it?

One of our greatest challenges is in the Moslem world. While our US policies and life style rank very low in public polls in the Moslem world, those same polls rank US science and technology very high. It seems almost like an invitation to constructive engagement.

I feel very strongly that we have to seize such opportunities. At present I am running a Center on Science, Technology and Security Policy at AAAS. And as one contribution to greater US security, I have set one more major goal—one more big to-do. I want to find a mechanism, an institutional base and some significant funding for a serious experiment in employing science cooperation as an instrument of a global engagement policy. I want to see if the potential I know is there can be effectively realized. Some of us are already talking with both congressional and possible private funding sources in support of this goal. I am certain it can have a great impact.

Finally, permit me a few words of thanks. First to Ralph Cicerone and the National Academies for their strong sustaining role in international science--and also to Bruce Alberts, who supported me so strongly when I started at State. Paula Dobriansky, Undersecretary of State for Global Affairs, very much deserves our thanks for assuring that the position of S&T Adviser has continued—now for almost eight years. And in addition to Secretaries Albright and Powell, I want to thank Secretary Rice, who appointed Nina Fedoroff as her present Adviser and later endorsed Nina's also becoming the S&T Adviser to USAID; and furthermore, she personally spoke at Nina's swearing-in ceremony with all the strong words of support and encouragement that the position deserves. Nina is off to a great start.

There is one more person to whom I am particularly indebted. For the first time in many years he is not here today. Bill Golden died on October 7th last year at the age of 97. He personally funded the Academy's study of science at State that led to the creation of the Adviser's position. And from the day I took office he was a constant and unflagging supporter. He was not a scientist, but he loved science and he spent much of his life in linking

science to the service of humankind. His secretary recently sent me a copy of a letter he had written in 1950 during the Truman Administration. It was about getting a science advisor at the State Department. Bill had worked on this issue for 50 years. He received the NAS Public Welfare Medal in 1996 and there is perhaps no more appropriate thing to do today than to remember Bill Golden and his deep and lifelong dedication to science in the service of a better world and to commit ourselves to try to follow in his imposing footsteps.

Thank you.