In the simplest form, power can be defined as ability or right to control people. This ability can be done in two ways: soft power and hard power. Hard power includes threats and payments whereas soft power includes attraction. There are various opinions about which power one should use to make his country powerful in world politics. Some people supporting hard power over soft power. They believe that everything can be achieved by using hard power. However, this common belief is majorly wrong. In this age countries are reduntant to send troops in battlefield or to see warfare in their lands. By using soft power, these incidents are very unlikely to happen. Moreover, people fear from strong. As a country become powerful via using hard power, it may lose its allies and be alone. Its opinions will not be listened in world politics. However, by using soft power, there is no threats. Countries may become allies because their goals are alike and their word will be listened. This having soft power is more curicial than having hard power to wield true power in world politics.

Some may argue that having hard power is more important. Supporters of hardpower claim that it is tangible. They believe that its results occur in short duration and the time that requires to do action is shorter than soft power, Although they are right to some extent, they forgot the fact that peace by hard power is short. As soon as hard power is withdrawn, people start to behave the way that they used to. Also hard power forces people to choose the opposite side because they fear. Proponents of hard power may also assert that countries that have large army or nuclear weapon wield more power inc world politics. These countries could intimidate other countries to do their own wisher because they have military. However, this approach would seem to be somewhat mistaken. A well known political scientist Joseph Nye raised an issue about the effectivenes of soft and hard power in his article Hard and Soft Power in a Global Information Age. He asserts that Soviet Union’s soft power has decreased after Soviet Union attacked his neighbours. He continues that even after the attack their military power kept growing but these offensive strategies blocked its soft power. One can see Soviet Union lost its political position in world. The conclusion needs to be drawn from these is that having hard power is not beneficial as it is thought.

Firstly, using soft power is beneficial for both countries. Both countries benefit in different ways. Firstly the country that uses soft power make demans to the other country in exchange of money. Attractiveness of money leads this country to do host country’s demans and host country benefits this because their demands are done. It promotes their relationship. Secondly, some unions needs member to become powerful, like Europe Union. Countries offering a seat at Europe Union, where the decisions are made. By doing so, these countries have more friends and more power in world politics because they have word to say whenever a decision made. Lastly, the country which used soft power has more money left because having an army is costly. In his article named Soft power: What It Is, Why It’s Important and the Conditions Under Which It Can Be Effectively Used, Gulio M. Gallerotti(2011, p.34), who is professor at Wesleyan University, said that “The cost of using or even threatening force of nuclear powers have skyrocketed.” Contrary to hard power, soft power costs less because it is about demands and decisions not about invading other countries and spending much on military investments. By using soft power, countries could save on “carrots and sticks” and benefit from this money. Hence, soft power makes both countries powerful and prosperous.

Secondly, having an army or having hard power is not a necessity for being powerful. It is known that Scandinavian countries has powerful positions in international politics. Nye said that Scandinavian countries, The Netherlands and Canada have much soft power than hard power. Their political influence is greater than their military power. That is because these countries have peaceful strategies and they provide economic aids. Nye (2004) continues that size does not matter for a country to become powerful. He examplifies his assertion with Norway. Norway is a small country that has 5 million resident neither has transnational culture nor international language and does not have a aseat at Europe Union. Still it developed diplomatic power through actions and it shows that the ability to reach soft power resources made this country powerful. The US is also using soft power even they have one of the biggest military. They use Hollywood to influence the audience. They use ad. Placements to effect the viewers. By doing so, people are buying this brands and US gets money. Also they influence viewers by speaking English, making English worldwide. It is not only the Hollywood that influenced audience, articles written by individuals are also affected people. Hence, any country can use soft power.

All in all, hard power makes people to choose other side whereas soft power changes other country’s behaviour in a different way with attraction. Soft power is beneficial for both countries. There is no need to military expanses for a country that use soft power. Furthermore, the country on which soft power is applied can gain money through demands of other country. Finally, having a military is not a necessity for a country to be powerful. Scandinavian countries are example to that. Therefore, having soft power is more crucial than having hard power to wield treu power in world politics.
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