

An Appraisal of Hard Power in Contemporary Practice of Diplomacy

Nyam Elisha Yakubu

Department of International Relations, Skyline University Nigeria, Kano, Nigeria

Abstract- While power is an ever-present part of international relations; state's success in achieving its interest in the anarchical and self-help international system is a function of the available power in her possession. Before now, states are regarded as the sole most significant actors in international system, and brute force otherwise known as hard power - where military might is used to achieve a particular objective – rules the day, the situation has changed. The end of cold war in the 1990s saw many changes in international system where globalization is rapidly bringing states closer than ever before which resulted in interdependence on each other. Therefore, the use of hard power in diplomatic practice has to be scrutinized to determine its efficacy. The purpose of the study was to analyze the effectiveness and or the utility of hard power in the conduct of diplomacy in contemporary international relations. The study was hinged on the theory of Complex Interdependence. To guide the study, three research questions were raised. Content analysis was the method adopted where secondary data from research findings, articles in journals, textbooks etc. were consulted and mixed with the writer's observation in drawing conclusions. The study revealed that globalization today has increased the interdependence of nations in so many ways such that applying hard power by one state, comes with lots of consequences. Evidence is seen in United States' (U.S.) usage of hard power in Iraq, Kosovo, Somalia and Libya and how it negatively affected its other interests in the international system. The study concluded that soft power, though regarded as the newest and alternative form of power to be used in international relations, is also limited in its effectiveness. To balance the inadequacies of hard and soft powers, smart power is recommended where components of hard and soft powers are combined.

Keywords: Power, Hard power, contemporary diplomacy, globalization and complex interdependence

I. INTRODUCTION

The relationship of states across border is not only important but necessary because no state can exist in isolation, not even the most developed state like the United States of America. The nature of the relationship may take many forms including diplomatic, economic, trade, educational, cultural, technical, military and political. Inter-state relations are akin to symbiotic relations in animal environment where the benefits of relating with one another could be for both states, or sometimes one state benefit at the other's expense, and in other cases neither states benefits. Mutualism is when both states benefit in the relationship; best described as a win-win relationship. Parasitism refers to the kind of relationship when one state benefits, the other is harmed; a win-lose relationship. A relationship could also be

commensalism when one state benefits, the other is not harmed nor gained. When a relationship is competitive, neither state is benefiting, but strives to have edge-outs or counter one other. Neutralism is a form of relationship when both states relate for no just specific purpose of themselves but for possibly others.

Since it is necessary for states to relate with each other worldwide, it is imperative for nation-states to consciously formulate policies that would guide their actions and inactions in the international system in order to maximize their gains. Foreign policy is defined by Jean-Frédéric and Jonathan (2018) as a set of actions or rules governing the actions of an independent political authority deployed in the international environment. Thus, "foreign policy is aimed at determining and identifying the decisions, strategies, and ends of interaction of a state with another" (Bojang, 2018). In effect, no nation can meaningfully conduct its external relations without articulating ambitious foreign policy. Also, the manner of a state's behavior in the international arena is a function of its foreign policy style. Foreign policies are tailored and crafted towards achieving national interest.

National interest and foreign policy are inseparable, they are reinforcing to each other. A state's foreign policy cannot operate in a vacuum; it has to be guided by national interest. States employ various methods and means to project and achieve their interests. Such methods include diplomacy, propaganda, economic, alliance, treaties, and coercion. Scholars are divided in their view on the nature and character of international system. The realists see international system as anarchical, with no world government that can make and enforce rules. They believe that national interest of states seeks to primarily acquire and maintain power in a self-help fashion. They see man by default as selfish and egoistic thereby making cooperation difficult. The idealists on the other hand believe in international institutions to provide leadership and guide the actions and inactions of nations in the international system. They also assume that cooperation is possible because behaviors of men can be transformed through education and good democratic governance. National interest in realist perspective is in terms of power, which they believe is a means as well as an end. Wilson (2008) sees power in international politics as the ability of states to influence another to act in ways in which that entity would not have otherwise acted. Nye (1990) outlines three ways power can affect the behavior of others—they can "coerce them with

threats,” “induce them with payments,” or “attract and co-opt them”. He categorizes power into two forms—hard and soft, and later added smart power. Power is hard when someone does something he would otherwise not do but for force or inducement. Soft power is “getting others to want the outcomes you want” through co-option rather than coercion. Smart power is the blend of hard and soft power. These forms of power represent the mechanisms or tools used by states in implementing their foreign policies; that is, states could deploy hard, soft or smart power to achieve a set of objectives.

Just as the debate between realists and the idealists, divergent views exist among scholars on the best form of power – hard or soft, to be the most effective tool for nations in achieving their interest. But it must be noted that the prevailing reality of the character of international system would determine which form of power could be deployed to achieve an objective. Gorodnia (2018) noted some major features of 21st century international system to include: transformation of the system from unipolar to multipolar; diffusion of power among state and non-state actors, including multinational companies, transnational crime organizations, terrorist groups, hackers-individuals, increasing importance of regional integration; a changing global balance of power; a relative weakening of established Western nations and emerging of new centers of power; more independent developing nations’ position in international affairs; significant increase of China’s impact on regional and global economy and politics; and a return of great powers’ geopolitical competition. The role of financial and economic components of power in the post-Cold War strategic environment has sufficiently increased, as well as non-traditional threats to security. The scholar posits that most of the developments were caused by acceleration of globalization as a process of growing interconnections, interactions and interdependence among nations and individuals across the globe. With such gigantic changes in the character of international system, the nature of the relationship, the mechanism and strategies for implementing foreign policy or the conduct of diplomacy must also change. Hard power was essentially used by states to project and pursue their interest before the 21st century, and relative power of a state was measured in terms of military might and capability. The passed era saw arm race among nations where nations strived to catchup or outrun one another militarily as military capability is regarded as the most portent instrument of foreign policy. The colonization of Africa and Asia was only possible because hard power was applied to subdue and compel compliance. Hitler’s madness was also contained through the use of hard power. Nayef Al-Rodhan (2018) believes that given increased interdependence, states can engage in symbiotic relations, that is, they can take part in a relationship of mutual dependence that allows one state to gain more than another without deleterious effects. Where hard power is used by a state to implement a foreign policy agenda against another state, it would most likely be difficult for the parties to mutually benefit from such form of hostile

engagement given by the current realities of the 21st century international system.

A. *Aim and Objectives of the Study*

The aim of the research is to use palpable qualitative data to add in the body of literature of the utility of hard power in the international system. The work aspires to be rigor in collecting unbiased pool of data for the research where the conclusion and the recommendation of the work would be from the outcome of the findings. The objective of the work is to ascertain the effectiveness or otherwise of the use of hard power as a foreign policy tool by U. S. in contemporary diplomatic practice. Specific objectives of the work are as follows:

- i. To better understand what hard power is and how it is used as a foreign policy tool
- ii. To understand the character of 21st century international system and see if hard power could be used as foreign policy tool.
- iii. To proffer alternative foreign policy tools in the 21st century international system

B. *Research Questions*

To achieve the above objectives, questions framed to be answered and to guide the work are:

- i. What is hard power and how is it exercised in international relations?
- ii. What are the characteristics of contemporary international system and how effective is the use of hard power in contemporary diplomatic practice?
- iii. What are the alternatives to hard power in the contemporary international system?

Propositions

This work is on the premise that the contemporary character of interconnected and interdependent international system may not be compatible with the use of hard power as a tool of foreign policy.

C. *Methodology*

The methodology adopted for the work is content analysis. Content analysis according to Singleton and Straits (2010) is a set of methods for analyzing the symbolic content of any communication. It involves the systematic description of the contents of either verbal or non-verbal materials. Because content or document analysis is adopted, no questionnaire or interview is used to collect primary data to answer the research questions. To this end, the findings of this study are solely based on previous research findings and the analytical skills of the author.

D. *Conceptual Clarification*

Power: The concept is used to describe the capacity of state and non-state actors to direct or influence and alter the decisions, actions and inactions of others.

Hard power: Nye, defines it as "the ability to use the carrots and sticks of economic and military might to make others follow your will" (2003). "Carrots" stand for inducements such as the reduction of trade barriers, the offer of an alliance or the promise of military protection. While "sticks" stand for threats such as the use of coercive diplomacy, the threat of military intervention, or the implementation of economic sanctions. Hard power is the use of military and economic means to influence the behavior or interests of other political bodies.

Diplomacy: This can be understood to be the practice of influencing the decisions and conduct of foreign governments or intergovernmental organizations through dialogue, negotiation, and other nonviolent means

Globalization: Simply refers to the process of interaction and integration among people, companies, and governments worldwide.

E. Theoretical Perspectives

The Theory of Complex Interdependence

The concept of power and its application in international relations is most associated with realism. Realists have a strong conviction of the anarchical nature of international system, where states are believed to rely on self-help in pursuing and protecting their interest in such a violence prone community. The self-help in an anarchical system made acquisition and use of power essentially necessary for states. Just a passive observation of contemporary international system would indicate that lots of transformation have taken place, notably, an increased interdependence of states on one another. The interdependence means a state might not be able to achieve its exclusive interest without relying on other states in some ways.

Keohane and Nye (1987) identified three main assumptions of realists as first, states as coherent units are the dominant actors in world politics; states are predominant and they act as coherent units. Second force is a usable and effective instrument of foreign policy. Other instruments may also be employed, but using or threatening force is the most effective means of wielding power. Third, partly because of the second assumption, realists assume a hierarchy of issues in world politics, headed by questions of military security: the "high politics" of military security dominates the "low politics" of economic and social affairs. Keohane and Nye (1987) asserts that if the three identified assumptions are challenged simultaneously, it will reveal a world in which actors other than states participate directly in world politics; where there is no clear hierarchy of issues, and in which force is an ineffective instrument of policy. They called the condition as having the characteristics of *complex interdependence*.

Complex interdependence of Keohane and Nye is the theory adopted for this work which is used as a stand point in

viewing and analysing the utility of hard power in contemporary international relations. Keohane and Nye aimed to develop a coherent theoretical framework that could explain the continuity and change in world politics in order to demonstrate the reality of interdependence in contemporary world politics (Işiksal, 2004). Basically, Keohane and Nye defined complex interdependence according to three characteristics:

1. The actors are states and non-state actors with multiple channels of communication; interstate, trans-governmental and transnational.
2. The agenda of interstate relationships consists of multiple issues that are not arranged in a clear or consistent hierarchy. In other words, there are multiple issues with no hierarchy; military security does not consistently dominate the agenda.
3. Military force that plays a relatively minor role in international relations mainly because "it is not used by governments toward other governments within the region, or on the issues, when complex interdependence prevails

It is pertinent to point out just as Işiksal (2004) noted, Keohane and Nye do not claim that military power is insignificant but costlier, and these costs have increased for a number of reasons. For instance, nuclear weapons increase the costs associated with conflict. In addition, using force on one issue could have negative effects on other economic goals. Thus, relative to cost, there is no guarantee that military means will be more effective to achieve a certain goal. Keohane and Nye explained such a cost with four main explanations: There is a risk of nuclear escalation, negative effects on achievement of economic goals, domestic opposition to the human costs in the case of war and peoples' resistance in weak countries. Complex interdependence is a situation in the world politics where all the actors including states as well as non-state actors, are dependent upon one another. Dependence means a state of being determined or significantly affected by external forces. Interdependence, most simply defined, means mutual dependence, a situations characterized by reciprocal effects among countries or among actors in different countries (Keohane & Nye, 1977).

Under this mutual dependence which interdependence entails, the relationship between and among states as well as other non-states actors, is characterized by both cooperation and competition. Interdependence means there are costly reciprocal effects of transaction among the actors (Işiksal, 2004). The policies and actions of one actor have profound impact on the policies and actions of the other actors and vice versa. Rana (2015) also noted that complex Interdependence stresses the complex ways in which as a result of growing ties, the transnational actors become mutually dependent, vulnerable to each other's actions and sensitive to each other's needs.

F. Power and the Components of Hard Power

Niccolò Machiavelli, David Hume, E. H. Carr and Hans Morgenthau all identified power as an important variable in international political theorizing. It is defined as the ability to get another person to do what it would not otherwise have done (Goldstein & Pevehouse, 2007). In other words, power refers to the ability of one person or group to make another person or group conform to a particular pattern of action. It entails some form of control over the actions of other state by means of effective sanctions and rewards. State cannot just exercise control over the behavioral preferences of others unless it is powerful (Omede & Aremu, 2013). Elements of power in international relations may be tangible or intangible. Tangible elements of power may include Economy (GDP), Population, Geography, Territory, and natural resources. Intangible elements of power include political culture, patriotism/nationalism, education of the population etc. Foreign policy depends on both tangible and intangible power to achieve national interest.

The global positioning and influence of a state in international system is a function of its relative power. United States of America is considered powerful today because it can alter a cause of action or preference of many nations in the world today. Nigeria can be said to be relatively more powerful than many countries in the sub-Saharan Africa. Beckley (2018) posits that wealth is an important component of power enables a country to buy influence through aid, loans, investment, and bribes. It can also fund global propaganda campaigns, building huge skyscrapers, and hosting international expositions and sporting events. Military resources (e.g., troops and weapons), on the other hand, enable a country to destroy enemies; attract allies; and extract concessions and kickbacks from weaker countries by issuing threats of violence and offers of protection.

Joseph Nye is credited for splitting the concept of power into two forms: hard and soft. Hard power is the oldest form of power which is connected to the idea of an anarchic international system, where countries do not recognize any superior authority and thus have to focus on power politics. Hard power is defined as the application of military power to meet national ends—that is, the deployment of ground troops, naval assets, and precision munitions to secure a vital national objective (Campbell & O’Hanlon, 2006). Hard power is defined as the capacity to get what you want through the use of economic power or through the use of military force, by threatening others that you will use against their economic superiority or your coercive capabilities. Wilson (2008) further expounds that hard power strategy has to do with coercing or threatening other entities into compliance. These measures might include the use of “sticks,” such as the threat of military assault or the implementation of an economic embargo; they might also include the use of “carrots,” such as the promise of military protection or the reduction of trade barriers. Hard power focuses on military intervention, coercive diplomacy, and economic sanctions to enforce national interests. Its resources include aircraft carriers,

bombers, tank divisions as well as the economic might to crush another’s economy or control its markets. It could also come from economic resources that translate into military might (Wilson, 2008). Thus, hard power would be said to be used when a state uses military force or other coercive measures against another with the objective of compelling and goading her to act in certain manner.

G. *Characteristics of Contemporary International Relations*

The end of Cold War was marked by the acceleration and progression of globalization, which remains the defining historical phenomenon of the contemporary era. Laurence-Camille, (2011) asserts that the process of globalization is driven primarily by economic forces and new communication technologies, leads to a deeper interdependence between countries, not only in the economic sphere but also in an expansive array of human activities. Raymond Cohen in Laurence-Camille, (2011) noted that globalization has led to the breakdown of national barriers to the world-wide spread of trade, investment, travel and information of all kinds, brings societies and civilizations into contact as never before. To him, globalization and its many corollaries are having significant impact on the conduct of international relations.

First, careful observation would reveal that the technological advancement in virtually all sectors is unprecedented. Revolution in communication and transportation system contributed to the development and promotion of faster movement of goods, capitals, people and ideas across borders. The development brought nations of the world closer, increasingly causing national borders to be irrelevant. Insecurity and other forms of challenges faced by one country would have ripple effect on the international system as a whole. Evidence is the case of the outbreak of the deadly corona virus from Wuhan in China which turns out to affect the whole world, the impact is still felt and could endure for a long time to come. A case at hand is also the Boko haram activities that started in Nigeria and has now spread to Cameroon, Niger and Chad republic. United state action against the Libyan Authority have many fallouts (Sawani, 2014). Such fallouts are felt even in Nigeria through the influx of Small arms and light weapons in the country that exacerbate terrorism, banditry, kidnapping, communal and other forms of conflict in the country. (Yakubu, 2018).

Second, the growing influence of China in the international system has drastically affected the global position of U. S and its influence. China’s economy witnessed tremendous growth at a time the U.S. is grappling with the challenges of economic or financial crisis of 2008; terrorism in its territory as well as its involvement in wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, which essentially drained its resources and affected its standing in the international system. Odgaard (2013), stated that Beijing is emerging as a maker rather than a taker of international order. This assumption is based on China’s success in reinterpreting the United Nation Charter’s provision by opposing the Western approach of the use of

force; to that of peaceful coexistence and commitment to mutual non-aggression and non-interference in the internal affairs of others. Concurring to this assertion, Ding (2008), identified China's foreign policy to include four main pillars: a commitment to multilateralism underpinned by the central role of the UN as the guarantor of global security; a commitment to consultation and dialogue rather than force as a means of settling disputes; a commitment to global economic development with the developed world taking a greater share of the responsibility for promoting growth elsewhere; and a spirit of inclusiveness for all societies and cultures to coexist as equal stakeholders in the global order. To this, China values a more democratic international order rather than the unipolar hegemony, and has utmost respect for state sovereignty rather than imposing values and policies on other countries.

Third, more states are acquiring Nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction in spite of the global outrage against it. Beside the five states of U.S.A., Russia, United Kingdom, France, China, other nations including India, Pakistan, North Korea and Israel are believed to be in possession of the banned weapons. Kenneth Waltz asserts that Nuclear weapons have been the second force working for peace in the post-war world. They make the cost of war seem frighteningly high and thus discourage states from starting any wars that might lead to the use of such weapons. (Waltz, 1981). We are aware of the tension that ensued between Donald Trump and Kim Jong-un, despite the military threat and economic sanctions imposed on North Korea by the U.S. and its allies, Pyongyang was unperturbed.

Fourth, the influence of non-state actors in the international system is increasing exponentially. Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) and Multinational Corporations (MNCs) keeps waxing stronger by the day. The power possessed by many NGOs and MNCs surpasses many states. Today, nation-states are no longer able to solve their problems only by themselves. They cannot deal with problems such as acid rain, nuclear contamination of the atmosphere, climatological changes, and shortage of food, poverty, overpopulation, and insufficient natural resources (Ataman, 2003).

Fifth, globalization has also increased the Socio-cultural interdependence of states. International trade, global communication, the increased speed of transactions, travel, political change, resource depletion, social mobilization and impacts of increased cultural exchange has undoubtedly increased the level of global interdependence. As noted by Paehlke (2009) global cultural integration is accentuated by American Hollywood, music and commercial advertising. For example, many of the Ghanaian and Nigerian films are carved around American movies. This is no different from South Africa where seven out of ten popular television programs have U.S origin (Paehlke, 2009: 5). Barber (1996: 62) in support of this argues that films now accrue greater export

revenue for the US economy far more than automobiles companies.

H. Utility of Hard Power in Contemporary International Relations

For most of history, hard power was the standard in practice, especially until the early Cold War era (Karki & Dhungana, 2020). But the reality of the changes in the world, the utility of hard power in international relations today is increasingly becoming more and more difficult to exercise. Nye (1990) exposed five trends that have diffused power resources and made them "less fungible." His position is still very relevant today. In fact, his preposition is more validated with the ongoing happenings in the world.

1. Nye first identified economic interdependence of states that made it harder to use force because it jeopardizes economic growth and financial interests.
2. Transnational actors—multinational corporations, non- and inter-governmental organizations, and even terrorist groups—are able to exercise power that was once the preserve of only states.
3. Resurgent nationalism made it tougher to use military power. Example is the small military outposts that was able to manage the British Empire, but the United States found it difficult to subdue Somalia's clans with much greater force.
4. The spread of technology, especially nuclear weapons and weapons applied to asymmetrical tactics, has equalized parts of the battlefield.
5. Changing political issues made force less applicable for solving today's dilemmas. Having the strongest army will not solve world poverty, pollution, and pandemics! As Nye observes, "While military force remains the ultimate form of power in a self-help system, the use of force has become costlier for modern powers than it was in earlier centuries.

Interdependence of states on each other today is best to imagine. Asare (2011) opined that when nations lack needed commodities, technology or skilled labor, raw material for their industries, they look elsewhere. That economic interdependence is made possible with the increased gospel of free market economy or trade liberalization that has become the common feature in the world today. Most developing countries whose technology is low and industrialisation is at the lowest ebb, relies on developed countries. On the other hand, the developed economies rely on developing nations for market of their surplus products as well as for supply of raw materials and other natural resources that are most found in the developing countries.

Cases abound, illustrating the impracticality of hard power as a tool of achieving state's national interest in 21st century. Some of the cases are discussed below:

- 1) U. S. invasion of Iraq

Hinnebusch (2007) observed that U. S National Security Strategy was sort of overhauled in 2002 in response to the 9/11 attacks. The strategy shifted from traditional international policy of containment to "preventive wars" utilising her exceptional military capabilities to achieve self-interest. To legitimise her interest in preventive war in Iraq, Bush administration had claimed that Saddam Hussein was allegedly linked to al-Qaida and was actively developing weapons of mass destruction which he might turn over to terrorists or use on their behalf, and hence that Iraq represented an imminent threat to the US (Hinnebusch, 2007). Butt (2019) discredited the claim that WMD, oil, Israel, or spreading democracy in the Middle East – drove the decision to fight Saddam Hussein but that war was more of a concern with status, reputation, and hegemony. That having experienced status-loss as a result of 9/11, the U.S. was compelled to burnish its reputation for toughness and establish a generalized deterrence against challenges to its hegemony. Consequently, she had to fight and win a war in order to assert hegemony and demonstrate strength to a global audience.

The cause or justification for the war argument is not our concern, we are aware that U. S. fought that war for an interest she considered vital. The argument is that, whatever the interest, the best way to achieve it was not war since the threats the US claimed to have faced were neither so immanent that it had to act immediately nor immune to solutions that stopped far short of an invasion of Iraq. Hinnebusch (2007) argued that a different administration would arguably not have gone to war with Iraq and would have pursued other less risky ways of addressing US dilemmas-such as re-starting the peace process and adjusting dual containment.

In noting the consequences of U. S invasion of Iraq, Hinnebusch (2007) assert that the war was partly aimed to effect a regime change in Iraq that would presumably create a stable and legitimate government that would also be friendly to the United States. The outcome, however, appears to be a failed state plagued by prolonged insurgency. Dodge (2016) opined that the invasion aggravated the grievances that created an insurgency that would have been needless had the U. S. acted differently.

The second consequence of the invasion as enunciated by Hinnebusch (2007) is the radical empowerment the Middle East. U. S usage of hard power bolsters the Iran's cravings and possible drive for a nuclear deterrent. Middle East and Iran were all the more sceptical of the preponderance and hegemony of the U. S. The war is a proof that U.S acts whimsically self-interested in a predatory manner. Experts in anti-terrorism have demonstrated that the single most potent generator of "terrorism" is foreign occupation. That the invasion of Iraq "delivered to al-Qaida the greatest recruitment propaganda imaginable. Also, that the war in Iraq has "completed the radicalization of the Islamic world" (Hinnebusch, 2007).

Another major cost of the war pointed out by Hinnebusch is the loss of respect suffered by Washington in global public opinion. That "the global wave of sympathy that engulfed the US after 9/11 has given way to a global wave of hatred of American arrogance and militarism, there for, it effectively undermines the legitimacy of US global leadership. These unanticipated costs of the war would have been avoided had say soft power was considered. Since interstate relations rewards reciprocity, persuasion and inducements could have yielded better results. U. S could have achieved her interest by working to transform Saddam Hussein's behaviour painstakingly peaceful. This could have been achieved if U. S acted as a true leader and a big brother who is not a bully. In essence, U. S' interest could be achieved without necessarily having to injure Iran. Gianotta (2020 also concur that the cost of using hard power by U.S. against Iraq outweigh the gain). Richard Haass during an interview in 2016 also added to the dimension of negative impact of U.S. invasion of Iraq, according to him, the consequences include the following:

1. It has absorbed a tremendous amount of U.S. military capacity, the result being that the United States has far less spare or available capacity, not just to use in the active sense, but to exploit in the diplomatic sense. It has therefore weakened our position against both North Korea and Iran.
2. Economically, it has clearly exacerbated the U.S. fiscal situation, which obviously has all sorts of economic repercussions.
3. Diplomatically, the war has contributed to the world's alienation from the United States, it made it more difficult for the United States to galvanize its national interest or galvanize international partners in dealing with problems related to weapons of mass destruction.

2) *The Use of Hard Power in Libya*

The popular Arab spring of 2010s that started in Tunisia and quickly spread across Arab world in bit to protest against the oppressive regimes in their respective states. From Tunisia, the uprising reached Egypt, Libya, Yemen, Syria and Bahrain. Following the development just within one week of protests. Libya's ruler Muammar Gaddafi had sworn to hunt those who protested his rule 'inch by inch, room by room, home by home, alleyway by alleyway, person by person (Green, 2019). Gaddafi's position along with the increasing possibility of Libya erupting into a civil war, prompted the United State into asking the international community to assist. Subsequently, NATO launched Operation Unified Protector, with the aims of 'enforcing an arms embargo, maintaining a no-fly zone and protecting civilians and civilian populated areas from attack or the threat of attack. The intervention of U.S. led NATO was under the acclaimed mandate of Responsibility to protect (R2P). The 2005 United Nations World Summit meeting agreed that each individual state has the responsibility to protect its populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity.

The international community, through the United Nations, also has the responsibility to help to protect populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity (Green, 2019).

But it became difficult to identify any beneficial impact of NATO's intervention in Libya, including from Gaddafi's demise. Libya is now a failing state, in large part, due to NATO's intervention (Lynch, 2021). The NATO intervention prolonged the war, decreased the chances of a negotiated peace, and failed to properly prepare for post-conflict stabilization. It has also resulted in Libyan state instability, regional stability, and increased humanitarian crisis. The regional effect has to do with the destabilization of Mali, militarization of the Syrian conflict, and regional access to weaponry. Again, the intervention has exacerbated the humanitarian crisis that it sought to prevent through human migration, internally displaced persons, and an increased number of civilians impacted by the conflict (Green, 2019; Lynch, 2021). The 2011 Libyan intervention pitched the region into a decade of chaos and undermined U.S. confidence in the wisdom of using military force to save lives (Lynch, 2021). The use of hard power by U.S. and its allies against Libya government has left Libya worst off.

3) *Kosovo*

Formerly an autonomous province in the defunct Yugoslavia, Kosovo was inhabited by the Serbs and Albanians. There has been a long and fiercely contested borderland between Serbia and Albania, this exacerbated ethnic and political tension and resulted in conflict in 1999 (Dunn, 2009). Ibrahim Rugova, leader of the Albanians in Kosovo, sought to non-violently protest Slobodan Milosevic, the president of Serbian Republic at the time. The rise in tensions gradually between the two groups resulted in the emergence of the Kosovo Liberation Army (KLA). In 1996, two years prior to the war, KLA sporadically attacked Serbian politicians and police and the attacks gradually escalated and led to the actions of the KLA being classified as an armed uprising, resulting in the Kosovo Conflict. News of the conflict filters, resulting to United Nations Security Council to pass Resolution 1199 on September 23, demanding Milosevic to immediately "cease all action by the security forces affecting the civilian population" and threatened to act if Milosevic did not obey (Kirkpatrick, 2007 in Dunn, 2009). NATO similarly made demands the next day of ending military operations against civilians with a threat of air strikes against Milosevic (Kegley & Raymond 2003 in Dunn, 2009). Initially, European mediators of the conflict, the Contact Group, made efforts diplomatically to broker in a peace deal but failed. NATO felt it was left with no option than to intervene with hard power, justifying the campaign as a "humanitarian war". The intervention which came on the heels of the Monica Lewinsky scandal was seen as a political diversionary tactic; coverage of the bombing to directly replace coverage of the scandal in US news cycles (Dunn, 2009). Herbert Foerstel was quoted by Dunn (2009) to have assert that before the bombing, the KLA

was not engaged in a widespread war against Yugoslav forces and the death toll among all concerned (including ethnic Albanians) skyrocketed only following NATO intervention.

In a post-war report released by the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, the organization also noted "the pattern of the expulsions and the vast increase in lootings, killings, rape, kidnappings and pillage once the NATO air war began at the time of U.S. lead NATO intervention. Dempsey in Dunn (2009) also noted that the option of hard power in Kosovo did not change the status of Kosovo, as it remains unresolved. The crisis unleashed unnumbered refugees who were evicted from Kosovo. There was also damaging economic consequences to neighboring countries. Aside the loss of huge amount of money (4.2 billion USD) associated with Bosnia's and Macedonia's efforts to manage the flood of refugees from Kosovo, bulk of economic losses as a result of the war resulted from the severing of transportation routes along the Danube River, and over land through Serbia. Closure of border with Serbia also resulted in dramatic loss in Macedonia's export market. The intervention also set a dangerous international precedent. Dunn asserts that NATO's justification for its military intervention in Kosovo is remarkably similar to Hitler's justification for military intervention in Czechoslovakia. Hitler's claims against Czechoslovakia were based on alleged violations of the fundamental rights of the Sudeten Germans. His accusations of the mistreatment of the ethnic Germans were purposely exaggerated and distorted to inflame public opinion. A more lasting legacy from the Kosovo campaign according to Dunn (2009) was the division within the US armed forces. It has engendered a sharp division among the senior military officials and the failure of their initial predictions of victory to materialize had the effect of diminishing their subsequent role in further conflict.

In analyzing the fallout of humanitarian intervention in Kosovo, Godec (2010) noted that Kosovo had a non-existent sex industry prior to 1999, but since the deployment of the UN Kosovo Force (KFOR) numbered about 40,000 in July 1999, alongside hundreds of the UN Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK) and more than 250 international nongovernmental organizations, Kosovo has become a major destination country for the trafficking of women and girls into the sex industry. Therefore, the intervention caused the sudden presence of military personnel and created an immediate increase in demand for sexual services in a region with previously negligible demands. Secondly, the post-intervention militarization of Kosovo sustained this demand and fostered an environment where organized criminal networks could reap substantial profits. Thirdly, the disruption of society and the economy resulted in increased numbers of vulnerable women and girls in need of remuneration, thereby creating the supply for a burgeoning sex industry. Finally, the failure of UNMIK to adequately address the problem of trafficking allowed for a culture of impunity to prevail.

4) *U. S. and the war on Terror*

United States war on terror is considered to be the longest armed conflict in its history. Hoffman, (2021) enunciates that the war lasted longer than America's participation in both world wars and surpassed even the period that the US military was actively engaged in combat operations during the Vietnam War. It has cost the US over \$5 trillion² and claimed the lives of more than 7,000 American military personnel, yet the war on terror enters its third decade (Hoffman, 2021). The National Strategy to Combat Terrorism, declared by Bush administration in 2003 has its central objectives to stop terrorist attacks against the United States, its citizens, its interests, and its friends and allies around the world and ultimately create an international environment inhospitable to terrorists and all those who support them. The strategy has 4-D primary missions: to defeat terrorist organizations with global reach, to deny such organizations sanctuaries from which to operate and launch attacks, to diminish the conditions that give rise to the use of terrorism, and to defend the United States through "proactive" defense of the homeland (Thrall & Goepner, 2017).

The most important component of U.S. International war on terror since 2001 has been direct military intervention. Thrall and Goepner, (2017) aptly and succinctly argued that U. S. war on terror is a failure. They advanced two convincing reasons for the failure; first is the inflated assessment of the terror threat facing the United States, which led to an expansive counterterrorism campaign that did not protect Americans from terrorist attacks. The second source of failure is the adoption of an aggressive strategy of military intervention. Their argument is that military intervention cause more problems than they solve, including spawning more anti-American sentiment and creating, rather than diminishing, the conditions that lead to terrorism. Second, the terrorism threat is too small to justify more military intervention and finally, the costs of the strategy to fight terrorism are simply too high. Cordesman (2020) similarly argued that One of the most critical limits to the way both Democratic and Republican Administrations in the U. S. have fought the "war" on terrorism is the they have treated it largely as a military struggle against individual terrorist and extremist movements. His assertion is that all the terrorist movements the U.S. has targeted have survived or mutated into different organizations with different names; the group either recovers or some new form of terrorism emerges in its place. Cordesman concluded that U.S. may have helped to break up the ISIS proto-state or "caliphate" in Syria and Iraq, but it has scarcely defeated it. Moreover, even if the U.S. had succeeded in driving ISIS out of Syria and Iraq, this would scarcely have defeated terrorism if the same causes then created new movements. Moreover, the fighting to break-up the ISIS "caliphate" has opened up both countries to new forms of state terrorism from the Assad regime in Syria and Iran's authoritarian theocracy.

The goal of military intervention has been to kill terrorists, destroy their organizations, and eliminate their ability to conduct terrorist operations. Adoption of military force is viewed as a deterrence against future terrorism and as a critical tool to prop up weak governments and to prevent terrorist groups from taking territory and staking out safe harbors in weak states (Thrall and Goepner, 2017).

The most important question is to ask whether or not the U. S. government has met the goals it set for itself using hard power. Obviously, as concurred by Thrall and Goepner (2017), although the United States has not suffered another major terrorist attack since 9/11, there is no proof that intervention abroad had anything to do with that, despite killing thousands of terrorist group members. Nor has the War on Terror made Americans appreciably safer (nor made them feel safer) than they were before 9/11. Second, the United States has not destroyed or defeated al Qaeda, the Islamic State, or any other terror groups of global reach nor, diminish the underlying conditions that give rise to terrorism. Instead, more Americans have died from terror attacks and the number of Islamist-inspired terror groups has proliferated since the War on Terror began.

As seen above, the use of hard power is a costly venture that do more harm than good in view of the changes that occurred in the international system since the end of cold war in the 1990s. The failure or ineffectiveness of hard power use in contemporary diplomatic practice is argued here to concur with Nye, (1990) and Gallarotti, (2011) to be as a result of globalization-driven economic interdependence; the rise of transnational actors; the resurgence of nationalism in weak states; the spread of military technology; the changed nature of international political problems; wide-spread access to information; and growth of democracy hinders the effectiveness of hard power. U.S. invasion of Iraq in 2003 failed due the refusal to recognize and ignore two key elements of soft power: The Bush administration firstly forgot about the USA's dependence on their allies' intelligence and policy forces and on global public support; and secondly, the question of the legitimacy of the invasion was not attributed any importance. In the short term, these mistakes led to the failure of the action. In the long term, they have caused the degradation of American soft power as "the strategy undermined the U.S. global position.

II. CONCLUSION

Hard power was no doubt an effective tool for states in pursuing their interest in other states. For instance, it was the hard power that the Europeans used in achieving their colonization agenda; without such power, Africa would have successfully resisted colonialism. Many other nations where compelled to behave in a manner that they wouldn't have through hard power. But the world has changed today, its characteristics has changed to the disfavor of hard power as a strategy for compelling other actors to behave in a certain manner. Globalization has increased the interdependence of

nations in so many ways such that applying hard power on one state, comes with lots of consequences. Evidence is seen in U.S. usage of hard power in Iraq, Kosovo, Somalia and Libya and how it negatively affected its other interests in the international system. The U.S. for example no doubt possess superiority in terms of power over many nations such that its usage of hard power can be successful and effective in achieving its set objectives, but the benefit in terms of what it intends to archive would not be commensurable to the collateral damage it will incur. When cost outweighs benefit, it's a futile venture to embark on. There are other more effective ways for states to archive their interests or compel other states to behave in a certain way without necessarily using hard power.

Since the international system is compacted in such a way that consequences of an action and inaction of a state is not only borne by her, it behoves on all states to tread with caution, especially on the choice of foreign policy instrument. That is, non-military or soft power could be adopted to achieve a desired foreign policy objective. Though it might be slow, but its effectiveness would be enduring. For instance, instead of hard power option in Iraq, Libya or Kosovo, Saddam Hussein, Muammar Gaddafi and or Slobodan Milosevic might be goaded by inducements, negotiations and persuasions. Interdependence of states means no state can afford to be an island or bear the cost of isolation. In effect, no state would allow herself to be reduced in to a pariah state. There is no evidence of any state in modern history to be completely hostile to all; without allies in the global stage, not even bellicose North Korea. As a hegemon, United State of America has the responsibility of engendering international peace at all cost, even if it means cooperating with Russia to non-violently appeal to recalcitrant states and their leaders. The non- hard power strategy as espoused by Nye is cheaper, though time wasting, but effectively endures.

REFERENCES

- [1] Al-Rodhan, N.R. (2013). The Future of International Relations: Symbiotic Realism Theory. <https://www.bbvaopenmind.com/wpcontent/uploads/2013/03/BBV-A-OPenMind-The-Future-of-International-Relations-A-Symbiotic-Realism-Theory-Nayef-Al-Rodhan.pdf.pdf>
- [2] Asare, B. E. (2011). International politics: The beginner's guide. Accra: YAMENS Press Ltd.
- [3] Ataman, M. (2003). The impact of non-state actors on world politics: A challenge to nation-states. alternatives: Turkish Journal of International Relations, Vol.2, No.1, Fall 2003
- [4] Bentil, S. (2016). Globalization and international interdependence.
- [5] Bojang, A. S. (2018). The study of foreign policy in International Relations. Journal of Political Science and Public Affairs. 6 (4). DOI.10.4172/2332-0761.1000337
- [6] Bojang, A. S. (2018). The study of foreign policy in International Relations. Journal of political Science and Public Affairs. 6 (4). DOI.10.4172/2332-0761.1000337 Business School, 2 June 2004.
- [7] Campbell, K. M. & O'Hanlon, M. E. (2006). Hard power: The new politics of national security. New York: Basic Books.
- [8] Ding, S. (2008). To build a "harmonious world": China's soft power wielding in the global south. Journal of Chinese Political Science, 13(2), 193- 213.
- [9] Dunn, D. H. (2009). Innovation and precedent in the Kosovo war: The impact of Operation Allied Force on US foreign policy. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/227760362>
- [10] Gallarotti, G., 2011. Soft power: What it is, its importance, and the conditions for its effective use. Journal of Political Power, 4(1), pp. 25-47.
- [11] Gianotta, V. (2020). Soft or hard power: The cycle of US policy in the Middle East. Retrieved on June 16, 2021 from www.dailysabah.com/op-ed/2020/01/10/soft-or-hard-power-the-cycle-of-us-policy-in-the-middle-east
- [12] Goldstein, J. S. & Pevehouse J.C. (2007). International relations. Longman. Ibadan.
- [13] Gorodnia, N (2018). Major features of the 21st century international system from Ukraine's perspective. Modern Geopolitics as a Challenge for International Security, Oleksandra Kordonska, Rostyslav Romaniuk (eds.), Ivan Franko National University of Lviv, Lviv-Olsztyn 2018, 192 p. – P.13- 21.
- [14] Green, M. (2019). To What Extent Was the NATO Intervention in Libya a Humanitarian Intervention? <https://www.e-ir.info/2019/02/06/to-what-extent-was-the-nato-intervention-in-libya-a-humanitarian-intervention/>
- [15] Hass, R. N. (2006). On Balance, Iraq war's impact on U.S. foreign policy 'clearly negative'. Interview by Bernard Gwertzman, on March 14, 2006 4:57 pm (EST). Retrieved on June 18, 2021 from <https://www.cfr.org/interview/haass-balance-iraq-wars-impact-us-foreign-policy-clearly-negative>. J.B. Lippincott Company. New York
- [16] Hoffman, b. (2021). The war on terror 20 years on: Crossroads or Cul-De-Sac? <https://institute.global/policy/war-terror-20-years-crossroads-or-cul-de-sac>
- [17] Jean-Frédéric, M. & Jonathan, P. (2018). Foreign policy analysis. Palgrave Macmillan. Cham.
- [18] Joffe, J. (2006, May 14). The perils of soft power. The New York Times Magazine.
- [19] Karki, S. & Dhungana, S. (2020). Soft power in international relations: Opportunities for small states like Nepal. Journal of International Affairs, 3, 162-179. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.3126/joia.v3i1.29092>.
- [20] Keohane, R. O. & Nye, J. S. (1977). Power and interdependence: World politics in transition. Boston: Little, Brown & Co.
- [21] Keohane, R. O. & Nye, J. S. (1987). Power and Interdependence Revisited. International Organization, 41, 725-753.
- [22] Laurence-Camille, R. (2011). Diplomacy in the twenty-first century: Change and evolution. API 6999: Major Research Paper Presented To: Professor Peter Jones. University of Ottawa. https://www.google.com/url?sa=T&source=Web&Rct=j&url=https://ruor.uottawa.ca/bitstream/10393/23894/1/RICH_ARID%252C%2520LaurenceCamille%252020115.Pdf&ved=2ahu_kewjgukeahbzxahxu8uakhzmtdyqfjanegqiehac&usq=Aovvaw1qj58n2z1q4kghbitzbflh
- [23] Lynch, C. (2021). The Libya allergy. <https://foreignpolicy.com/2021/03/17/libya-conflict-10-year-anniversary/>. Retrieved on 25/6/2021.
- [24] Michael Beckley (2018) The power of nations. Michael Beckley Measuring What Matters. International Security, Vol. 43, No. 2 (Fall 2018), pp. 7-44. Retrieved on June 19, 2021 from https://doi.org/10.1162/ISEC_a_00328
- [25] Nye, J. S. (1990). Soft Power. Foreign Policy No. 80.
- [26] Nye, J. S. (n.d.). The benefits of soft power. Working Knowledge. Boston, MA: Harvard
- [27] Nye, J. S. (1990). Soft power. Foreign Policy No. 80.
- [28] Nye, J. S. (2003). Limits of American power. Political Science Quarterly 117, 4.
- [29] Nye, J. S. (2004). Soft Power: The means to success in world politics. 1st ed. New York: Public Affairs
- [30] Nye, J. S. (2008). Public diplomacy and soft power. The Annals of the American Academy 616
- [31] Odgaard, L. (2013). Peaceful coexistence strategy and China's diplomatic power. The Chinese Journal of International Politics, 6(3), pp. 233-271. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cjip/pot004>

- [32] Paehlke, R. (2009). Globalization, interdependence, and sustainability. *Introduction to Sustainable Development*, 1, 187-208.
- [33] Perez, A. M. (2015). *Coercive diplomacy in the 21st century: A New Framework for the "Carrot and Stick"*. Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) Dissertation, University of Miami
- [34] Sawani, Y. M. (2014). The United State and Libya: The contradictions of intervention and disengagement. *International Relations and Diplomacy*. 2(12).
- [35] Singleton, R. A. & Straits, B. C. (2010). *Approaches to social research* (5th edition). Oxford: Oxford University Press
- [36] Thrall, A. T & Goepner, E. (2017). Step Back: Lessons for U.S. foreign policy from the failed war on terror. *Policy Analysis* No. 814. <https://www.cato.org/policy-analysis/step-back-lessons-us-foreign-policy-failed-war-terror>
- [37] Waheeda R. (2015). Theory of complex interdependence: A comparative analysis of realist and neoliberal thoughts. *International Journal of Business and Social Science* Vol. 6, (2), 345-367
- [38] Waltz, K. (1981). The spread of nuclear weapons: More may better. *Adelphi Papers*, Number 171. London: International Institute for Strategic Studies
- [39] Weldes, J. (1996). Constructing national interests. *European Journal of International Relations*, 2 (3)
- [40] Wilson, E. J. (2008). "Hard power, soft power, smart power." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 616 (2008): 110-124. Sage Publications. L.A. Mar. 2008 <<http://ann.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/616/1/110>>.