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"Hard power and Soft Power"

Leading to the undisputed overall prowess and military capabilities of the United States, the current phase of international association is also known as the global hegemony era (Aviel, 17). This paper examines the most influential U.S. power and how it influences foreign policy objectives. I believe that its current application of hard power has harmed the United States' overall impact as a diplomatic policy tool in Western America. The paper investigates the impacts of two historical examples, one of which demonstrates soft power tactics. The second demonstrates hard power attributes on gaining better comprehension of American influence.

What's the difference between hard and soft power? According to Cooper (6), hard power is reflected when power is used to coerce or encourage the behavior. Hard power is also linked with a rationalist approach to international associations theory, which argues that authority is primarily derived from economic and military means. Hard power strategies, in other definitions, are the capability to monetarily impose financial allowances on a country or arbitrarily attack a neighboring nation with one's troops to control its conduct. As a result, hard power is described as the power to compel one's desired outcomes.

On the contrary, soft power talks of the strategies imposed to attract others. Stakeholders voluntarily go along with the wishes of another state rather than being threatened with a specific result. In contrast, "soft power depends on the opportunity to influence the preferences of others" (Nye 5). In the course of the Cold War, for example, freedom of American pop culture and political speech made the Russians envious of what the U.S. had. At the exact moment, while soft power drew Russians to the free market system, hard power, in the form of America's nuclear arsenal, posed a threat to the Soviets, preventing them from encroaching too far into the American territory of dominance. To summarize, soft power is associated with the "co-option end of the action continuum, while hard-power tools are typically associated with command behavior," as Nye puts it (Nye 7).

**Examples on Which Power Has Been More Effective In Achieving U.S. Foreign Policy Goals**

The examples I will use to illustrate hard power and soft power strategies are the contra war in Nicaragua and Franklin Roosevelt's Good Neighbor strategy, which occurred during Reagan's presidency. By comparing and contrasting these two examples, one can determine which form of power strategy leads to a more significant impact in achieving U.S. foreign policy objectives. Power effectiveness is crucial because it connects to achieving American goals. Franklin's foreign policy approach against Western America during his presidency is known as the "Good Neighbor Policy." Due to the focus on non-intervention and the role of public foreign policy, which is an unmistakable feature of the soft power strategy, it is a remarkable era in inter-American alliances (Cooper 8).

Foreign policy strategies used prior to and during the *Good Neighbor* period differ significantly from scenarios that happened in the course of Roosevelt's reign, making the *Good Neighbor policy* an excellent example to study while comparing power strategies. Since it represents hard power approaches such as economic threats and army interference, the contra warfare in Nicaragua is as well a valuable example for the analysis (Aviel, 4). Furthermore, the Reagan Administration's systematic use of coercive foreign policy and unilateral intervention contradicts aspects of the soft power definition. Furthermore, since the affair is a recent occurrence in hemispheric associations, stakeholders in the period will provide current commentary on the affair's effectiveness on U.S. power today.

Soft power, which is based on the appeal of ideals, has also been shown to be efficient. Furthermore, while increased soft power can assist a nation in gaining an effective impact on the international phase, a decline in soft power may experience negative consequences. This can be seen through the coalitions formed by former President George W. Bush and President Bush Sr. in both of their American-led seizure of Iraq. It was truly respecting multilateral institutions and seeking advice from international heads of state that the first President Bush was able to form an alliance that failed to place as much strain on the U.S. military as his son's (Cooper 10). As a result, soft power plays an important obligation in international dominance and the United States' performance in achieving foreign policy goals, as shown by the Cold War,  Gulf, Mexican-American, and Chinese Wars.'

**What Does This Say about the Motives behind the United States Foreign Policy Goals?**

Soft power can be used to preserve power by spreading culture and philosophy. Motives behind U.S. foreign policy priorities are critical for spreading superpower values and messages in this regard (Aviel 6). Furthermore, America, the new global superpower, employs soft power to retain world dominance through 'Americanisation' and pursue foreign policy objectives such as ensuring the country's national security, promoting global peace and environmental security, as well as maintaining a power balance among nations.
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