The Pursuit of Philosophical Efficacy: A Data-Driven Analysis of Modern Statecraft

I. Introduction: The Philosophical Foundations of Modern Statecraft

The challenges of contemporary governance—from global pandemics and climate change to profound economic inequality and social fragmentation—have intensified the search for more effective models of statecraft. Traditional analyses, often focused on parliamentary versus presidential systems or market-based versus state-led economies, have largely failed to explain why some nations consistently exhibit superior performance in delivering public goods and maintaining societal cohesion. This report posits that the answer lies in a deeper, more enduring dimension of governance: its underlying philosophical principles.

The report explores the concept of "Philosophical Efficacy," which is the measurable success and efficiency of a government in achieving its stated aims, as a direct consequence of its foundational philosophical tenets. The central hypothesis of this work is that states embodying a long-term, collective-oriented philosophy—often cited as the bedrock of successful East Asian statecraft—demonstrate superior efficacy across a range of measurable policy outcomes. These philosophies, which draw from sources such as the Confucian and Bushido concepts of duty, long-term vision, and the collective good, provide a powerful framework for a highly cohesive and strategically-minded government.[1] For instance, the Bushido code emphasizes loyalty, a long-term view that transcends individual mortality, and the pursuit of virtues such as righteousness and courage, which can be seen as guiding principles for state actors and citizens alike.[2]

This report will test this hypothesis through a multi-faceted analysis. It begins with an in-depth case study of Singapore, a state that has explicitly engineered its governance model around these principles. This will be followed by a comparative analysis with Switzerland, a model of decentralized, consensus-driven democracy. The inquiry will then broaden to examine the efficacy of multilateralism in an age of resurgent nationalism and the measurable impact of non-coercive power. Finally, the report will delve into the often-overlooked dimensions of integrity and psychological well-being, exploring how these internal elements of

a political system contribute to its external effectiveness. This analysis will rely on a range of quantitative metrics and case studies, while also articulating the inherent limitations of the available data, such as the self-selection bias that complicates some empirical findings and the past controversies surrounding certain indices.[3]

II. The Case for Centralized Efficacy: The Singapore Model

Singapore serves as a primary case study for a government that has operationalized a long-term, collective-oriented statecraft with notable success. Its governance model, which has been in place since its independence in 1965 under the ruling People's Action Party (PAP), is characterized by a high degree of state intervention and a strategic, technocratic approach to problem-solving.[5] The government's dominance in land ownership and housing provision is a prime example of this model, demonstrating a direct, hands-on approach to solving fundamental societal challenges.

Metrics of Domestic Efficacy

The success of this centralized model can be substantiated by specific, measurable data in key policy areas. In housing, Singapore's Housing & Development Board (HDB) has built three-quarters of the country's housing stock, financing homeownership through Central Provident Fund (CPF) savings.[5] This systematic approach has resulted in a homeownership rate of 90%, one of the highest among market economies.[5] The HDB-CPF system, an integrated land-housing supply and financing framework, was a multi-decade solution to a severe housing shortage in the 1960s.[6] This framework has continued to evolve, addressing more recent challenges like income inequality and an aging population through targeted housing grants and schemes for monetizing housing equity.[6] The government's ability to implement such a comprehensive and evolving policy is a direct manifestation of its long-term strategic planning.

Similarly, in water management, Singapore has demonstrated exceptional resource resilience through a multi-pronged strategy. The government has focused on both supply-side innovation, such as the creation of NEWater (high-grade reclaimed water), and demand-side conservation efforts.[7] The efficacy of these efforts is evident in the data on household water consumption, which dropped steadily from 165 liters per capita per day (LPCD) in 2003 to 141 LPCD in 2019.[7] While consumption temporarily increased during the COVID-19 pandemic to 158 LPCD in 2021, it returned to the pre-pandemic level of 141 LPCD in 2023, underscoring the

success of these long-term conservation policies.[7] The government's ability to maintain a sound pricing policy that reflects the scarcity and true cost of water is a key component of this success, enabled by a high degree of social buy-in.[7]

Public Service and Public Trust

A critical enabler of this centralized efficacy is the country's public service model. The Singaporean civil service recruits a small number of elite Public Service Commission (PSC) scholars who are mandated to work for the government for several years after graduation.[8] Many of these scholars eventually rise to senior leadership positions, and the practice of rotating permanent secretaries every few years ensures that top officials gain broad experience across ministries, preventing stagnation and promoting a holistic view of governance.[8] This highly-paid, meritocratic system is intended to attract and retain top talent.[8]

The efficacy of this model is reinforced by public trust metrics. The 2023 Edelman Trust Barometer report shows that trust in the Singaporean government reached a record high of 76%, a figure that ranks among the highest globally.[10] This high level of public confidence is not merely a passive outcome but an active resource that enables the government to pursue complex, multi-decade projects. The public's willingness to endure short-term costs and inconveniences, such as water price increases or mandatory CPF contributions, for a long-term collective benefit is a direct result of this trust. It is the belief that the government is competent and ethical, a sentiment that allows for ambitious, large-scale policy implementation that would be politically untenable in many other systems.[12]

However, this model is not without its challenges. The Edelman report also reveals a significant trust gap in Singapore, with an 18-point difference between high- and low-income earners, the seventh-largest gap among all surveyed countries.[11] This finding suggests a potential paradox. While the system is philosophically grounded in meritocracy and purports to serve the collective good, its reliance on an elite, highly-paid civil service may be inadvertently creating the very inequality it seeks to solve.[8] The perception that advancement is sometimes tied more to seniority and loyalty than to pure performance and that leaders can be out of touch with the pace of change, risks eroding the public's confidence over the long term.[14]

III. Comparative Analysis: Centralized vs. Decentralized Models of Efficacy

To provide a nuanced understanding of governance efficacy, this report now turns to Switzerland, a country with a governance model that is philosophically and structurally diametrically opposed to Singapore's. Switzerland is a decentralized, power-sharing consociational democracy with strong neo-corporatist features, where significant authority is vested in its cantons.[15]

Efficacy in Crisis Response

The Swiss response to the COVID-19 pandemic serves as a crucial case study in the dynamics of decentralized efficacy. The government was reportedly slow to introduce responsive measures in January and February 2020, despite receiving detailed information about the virus early on.[16] This initial lag can be attributed to the need for a broad consensus among a multitude of cantonal governments and economic interest groups.[16] However, once a state of emergency was declared, the Federal Council acted decisively, implementing firm measures to flatten the infection curve and protect at-risk populations.[16]

This situation reveals a fundamental trade-off. While a highly centralized state can mobilize quickly and decisively in a crisis, a decentralized, consensus-driven system may be slower to react initially. The long process of consultation and power-sharing is an institutional feature that can impede speed. However, once a decision is made and a unified strategy is adopted, the buy-in from various stakeholders and a greater public sense of ownership can lead to a more resilient and sustained response. This contrasts with more fragmented presidential systems, where checks and balances can lead to gridlock and indecision.[17]

Efficacy in Environmental Policy

Switzerland's efficacy in environmental policy provides a further example of a decentralized model achieving strong outcomes. Despite its fragmented governance, Switzerland has successfully decoupled economic growth from energy use, and its overall national energy efficiency improved by 1.8% per annum from 2000 to 2022.[19] The country's commitment to environmental goals is evidenced by its adoption of a new Climate Protection Act in 2023, which establishes a net-zero target for 2050 and sets sector-specific goals.[19]

While the outcomes are impressive, the administrative and legal challenges inherent in a decentralized system are acknowledged. The International Energy Agency (IEA) has noted the

need to shorten the "complex and extended administrative and legal permitting process" for energy projects and has recommended that the country work collaboratively with its cantons to accelerate project approval.[20] This reinforces the idea that while effective policy can be achieved in a decentralized system, it often comes with structural inefficiencies that can impact speed and administrative agility.

Structural Correlates of Efficacy

A key finding from the comparison between Singapore and Switzerland is the commonality in their institutional quality despite their vastly different governance structures. According to the Worldwide Governance Indicators, both countries rank exceptionally high in Regulatory Quality, with Switzerland scoring 1.73 points and Singapore scoring 2.31 points in 2023.[21] This index measures the perceived ability of a government to formulate and implement sound policies that promote private sector development.[23]

This data suggests that governmental efficacy, as measured by the quality of regulation, is not exclusively tied to a centralized or decentralized structure. Instead, it is dependent on a deeper, shared characteristic: a commitment to robust, transparent, and rules-based governance. Both states have cultivated institutional environments that foster predictability and efficiency, regardless of whether power is concentrated at the center or dispersed among constituent parts. The quality of a nation's institutions, and the public's confidence in them, may be more determinant of its success than the specific distribution of power.

IV. Efficacy Beyond the State: Global and Social Policy

The scope of this analysis extends beyond national borders to explore the efficacy of philosophical principles in international relations and social policy. This section examines whether the principles that underpin effective national governance translate to effective global and societal outcomes.

Multilateralism in an Age of Nationalism

Multilateralism, a cornerstone of international cooperation, is philosophically predicated on the idea of collective action for the global good. However, its efficacy is often challenged by

the hard power interests of individual states. The empirical evidence on the effectiveness of foreign aid channels—multilateral versus bilateral—is mixed and inconclusive.[25] While proponents argue that multilateral aid is less politicized, more expert-driven, and better positioned to provide global public goods like pandemic control, a comparable number of studies find no significant difference in effectiveness between the two types of aid.[26] The World Bank's own research finds that financial aid has little impact in countries that lack sound policies and institutions, and its effectiveness is contingent on the recipient's institutional environment.[25]

The COVAX initiative, a historic multilateral effort to ensure equitable access to COVID-19 vaccines, serves as a powerful illustration of the chasm between multilateral aims and state interests.[29] While its philosophical goal was to allocate vaccines based on need, the empirical reality was a geopolitical struggle where "vaccine nationalism" led high-income countries to secure large quantities of doses for themselves.[31] As a result, many countries missed the World Health Organization's targets of vaccinating 40% of their population by the end of 2021 and 70% by mid-2022.[31] The data shows that by September 2022, only 22.3% of people in low-income countries had received a first dose.[31] While COVAX delivered nearly 2 billion doses and is estimated to have averted 2.7 million deaths in lower-income economies, its ambitious global targets were largely undermined by the self-interested behavior of member states.[30] This reveals a fundamental weakness in the efficacy model of multilateralism: its success is often contingent on the political will of its members rather than its own inherent structure or philosophical appeal.

The Power of Attraction

An alternative model of influence in international relations is soft power, defined as the ability to persuade others through attraction rather than coercion or payment.[33] This is in stark contrast to hard power, which relies on military and economic might.[33] The efficacy of a state in a multipolar world may be increasingly dependent on its ability to project its values, policies, and culture.[35]

The empirical evidence supports this view. A study of a multidimensional global soft power index found that soft power has a significant positive influence on long-term growth performance, while military spending appears to be insignificant and negatively correlated with growth.[36] This finding challenges traditional deterrence theory, which holds that threats of force prevent undesirable actions.[37] Instead, it suggests that a state's values and culture are increasingly valuable foreign policy assets, leading to more durable and less costly influence than military might.[33] The ability to combine both hard and soft power into a "smart power" strategy is posited as the most effective approach in modern international relations.[33]

The data indicates that a state's philosophical efficacy in foreign relations is not about its capacity to compel, but about its ability to generate goodwill and stability, which in turn correlates with long-term peace and prosperity.[36]

V. Integrity, Accountability, and Psychological Efficacy

Efficacy in governance is not only a matter of institutional design and foreign policy; it is also a function of a system's ability to maintain integrity and its impact on the psychological well-being of individuals.

The Mechanics of Accountability

The UK's parliamentary system provides a valuable case study in the mechanics of political integrity and accountability. The July 2022 government crisis, which saw an unprecedented 62 ministers resign in two days, culminated in the resignation of Prime Minister Boris Johnson.[40] The stated cause of these resignations was a lack of honesty and integrity on the part of the Prime Minister.[41] This event underscores a key feature of the parliamentary model: ministerial resignations are a relatively common and accepted mechanism for holding the government to account.[42] This is in contrast to many presidential systems, where executive power is more fragmented and less susceptible to such rapid and collective internal pressures.[17] The data on political resignations in Germany, for example, suggests that the likelihood of resignation increases by 22.3 percentage points with a one standard deviation increase in media coverage, highlighting the role of external pressure in driving accountability.[44]

This suggests that different governance structures handle breaches of integrity with varying levels of speed and consequence. While a parliamentary system may be more sensitive to public and internal pressures, leading to swift changes in leadership, a more fragmented presidential system may be more resolute and resistant to change.[18] The efficacy of these mechanisms depends on the specific context and the desired outcome—whether it is stability or a rapid, decisive response to a loss of public confidence.

Efficacy in Social Policy: Restorative Justice

In social policy, restorative justice offers a philosophical model that fundamentally redefines efficacy in the criminal justice system. Unlike the traditional, punitive model that views crime as a violation of the law and focuses on punishment, restorative justice views crime as a violation of people and relationships, with the goal of repairing the harm caused.[45] This approach seeks to reestablish balance by involving victims, offenders, and the community in a dialogue to determine what can be done to make things right.[47]

The efficacy of this model is substantiated by quantitative metrics that challenge the traditional focus on incarceration. Research has shown that offenders who participate in restorative justice programs are less likely to re-offend.[49] One study found that the recidivism rate for restorative justice participants was 20%, compared to 48% for those who refused participation and 35% for the comparison group.[3] Furthermore, studies indicate that restorative justice programs can reduce recidivism rates by as much as 10% to 25% compared to conventional methods.[49] While this data is often complicated by self-selection bias—where individuals who choose to participate may be inherently less likely to re-offend—randomized controlled trials (RCTs) have provided more robust evidence.[3] One such RCT on a program targeting high-risk youth found that assignment to the restorative justice program reduced the probability of rearrest within six months by 19 percentage points and that this reduction persisted for up to four years.[50] This supports the claim that the philosophical shift from punishment to healing produces a more effective and durable outcome.

In addition to reduced recidivism, restorative justice is also demonstrably more effective in terms of victim satisfaction.[3] The focus on empowering victims and giving them an active role in the process has been shown to reduce post-traumatic stress symptoms and give them a greater sense of control and closure.[45] This demonstrates that the efficacy of a justice system should be measured not just by its ability to punish, but by its capacity to heal and rebuild social relationships.

The Mind of the Leader

Finally, the report examines an emerging area of research that links a leader's psychological state to their efficacy. The philosophical concept of leadership as a form of self-cultivation—the idea that a leader must first govern themselves to govern others—is now being supported by empirical evidence.

The practice of mindfulness, defined as a moment-by-moment awareness of one's internal and external environment, is being studied as a tool for improving leadership effectiveness.[52] Research has shown a correlation between a leader's mindfulness and lower levels of the stress hormone cortisol, suggesting that this practice can have a direct physiological impact

on stress reduction.[54]

Beyond stress, mindfulness training has been linked to improved cognitive function and decision-making. Empirical studies, including those using fMRI, indicate that mindfulness can lead to a reduced cognitive bias and a greater ability to regulate emotions, which are crucial for making sound judgments in high-pressure environments.[56] One study found a positive relationship between a leader's self-reported mindfulness and their followers' satisfaction, a relationship that was fully explained by the leader's "mindfulness in communication".[58] This suggests that a leader's internal state can manifest in observable behaviors, such as listening and non-impulsive responses, that directly impact their effectiveness and the well-being of their team.[52] This line of inquiry proposes a new metric for evaluating governmental efficacy: the psychological well-being and self-regulation of its leaders, an essential and previously unexplored aspect of effective statecraft.

VI. Conclusion: A Synthesis of Statecraft and Efficacy

This report has sought to ground the philosophical claims of Eastern statecraft in empirical evidence, moving beyond abstract concepts to quantifiable metrics of governmental efficacy. The analysis reveals a complex and nuanced picture, where success is not determined by a single factor but by the interplay of philosophical principles, institutional design, and the psychological state of a system's leaders.

The primary finding is that a government's philosophical foundation can be a powerful determinant of its effectiveness. The Singaporean model, with its long-term, collective orientation, demonstrates remarkable efficacy in targeted policy areas such as housing and water management, largely enabled by a high degree of public trust and a meritocratic bureaucracy. The comparative case study of Switzerland shows that a decentralized model can also achieve strong outcomes, particularly in areas like energy efficiency, provided it is underpinned by high-quality, transparent institutions. This suggests that the locus of power—whether centralized or decentralized—is less important than the quality of the institutional processes themselves.

The analysis of global and social policy further reinforces this conclusion. The COVAX case study illustrates the limits of multilateralism in the face of national self-interest, while the data on soft power indicates a compelling correlation between a state's ability to attract and influence and its long-term peace and prosperity. This suggests that a state's efficacy in foreign relations is increasingly a function of its values and culture rather than its capacity for coercion. Similarly, the efficacy of restorative justice demonstrates that a philosophical shift from a punitive to a healing-oriented approach can yield superior social outcomes, such as

reduced recidivism and increased victim satisfaction.

Finally, the report has introduced the idea of the psychological dimension of efficacy, where a leader's internal state can be a measurable factor in their external performance. The findings on mindfulness and leadership suggest that practices that reduce stress and cognitive bias can directly contribute to a leader's ability to govern effectively. This adds a new and critical metric to the evaluation of governance—one that focuses on the quality of the mind of the leader.

Based on these findings, the report offers the following recommendations for policymakers and future research:

1. **Embrace a Hybrid Model of Governance:** States should seek to balance the decisiveness of centralized authority with the institutional resilience and public buy-in of a decentralized, consensus-driven model.
2. **Invest in Non-Coercive Power:** Policymakers should allocate resources to soft power initiatives, such as cultural exchange and foreign aid that is decoupled from political interests, as these correlate with long-term peace and economic growth.
3. **Incorporate Psychological Training in Public Service:** Governmental and corporate leaders should receive training in practices such as mindfulness to enhance decision-making, manage stress, and build trust within their organizations.
4. **Strengthen Accountability Mechanisms:** Governments, particularly those with fragmented power structures, should seek to cultivate a political culture where integrity breaches are met with swift and consistent consequences, as is observed in certain parliamentary systems.
5. **Conduct Further Empirical Research:** To refine these findings, future research should focus on developing a cross-country comparative database on political resignations and conducting more randomized controlled trials on the long-term effects of restorative justice, particularly on victim healing and well-being. This will allow for a more robust analysis of the complex relationships between governance, philosophy, and efficacy.

Works cited

1. Samurai and Bushido - Code, Japan & Meaning | HISTORY, accessed September 26, 2025, https://www.history.com/articles/samurai-and-bushido
2. What is BUSHIDO? Loyalty, Honor, Respect, Courage, Honesty, Righteousness, accessed September 26, 2025, https://mai-ko.com/travel/japanese-history/samurai/bushido-the-code-of-samurai/
3. Discussion - The Effectiveness of Restorative Justice Practices: A ..., accessed September 26, 2025, https://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/rp-pr/csj-sjc/jsp-sjp/rp01_1-dr01_1/p5.html
4. Ease of doing business index - Wikipedia, accessed September 26, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ease_of_doing_business_index
5. Housing Policies in Singapore - InK@SMU.edu.sg, accessed September 26, 2025,

https://ink.library.smu.edu.sg/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2801&context=soe_research

6. Housing Policies in Singapore | Asian Development Bank, accessed September 26, 2025, https://www.adb.org/publications/housing-policies-singapore

7. Water | Ministry of Sustainability and the Environment, accessed September 26, 2025, https://www.mse.gov.sg/policies/water

8. Singapore Civil Service - Wikipedia, accessed September 26, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Singapore_Civil_Service

9. Consultancy Service for an Analytical Study on the Latest Developments in Civil Service Pay Administration in Other Countries, accessed September 26, 2025, https://www.jsscs.gov.hk/en/publications/pwc/appendix_d.htm

10. 2023 Edelman Trust Barometer_Singapore Report, accessed September 26, 2025, https://www.edelman.com/sites/g/files/aatuss191/files/2023-03/2023%20Edelman%20Trust%20Barometer_Singapore%20Report.pdf?utm_source=chatgpt.com

11. Trust in Singapore Govt rises in 2023 Edelman Trust Barometer report - The Online Citizen, accessed September 26, 2025, https://www.theonlinecitizen.com/2023/03/15/trust-in-singapore-govt-rises-in-2023-edelman-trust-barometer-report/

12. Top 10 takeaways from the 2023 Edelman Trust Barometer - LRN Corporation, accessed September 26, 2025, https://lrn.com/blog/top-10-takeaways-from-the-2023-edelman-trust-barometer

13. Study: Economic fears leading to grievance in Singaporeans - Marketing-Interactive, accessed September 26, 2025, https://www.marketing-interactive.com/study-economic-fears-leading-to-grievance-in-singaporeans

14. Singapore's Civil Service: Where Meritocracy Ends - KUANYEWISM, accessed September 26, 2025, https://kuanyewism.com/2025/07/singapores-civil-service-where-meritocracy-ends/

15. Switzerland promotes governance - admin.ch, accessed September 26, 2025, https://www.eda.admin.ch/dam/deza/en/documents/themen/anwaltschaft-regierungsfuehrung/FS-Gouvernanz_EN.pdf

16. Switzerland's COVID-19 policy response: Consociational crisis management and neo-corporatist reopening - PMC - PubMed Central, accessed September 26, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7675732/

17. Presidential Leadership and the Separation of Powers - Chicago Unbound, accessed September 26, 2025, https://chicagounbound.uchicago.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2050&context=public_law_and_legal_theory

18. Are Parliamentary Systems Better? The institutional differences between presidential and parliamentary rule are well known, yet - Boston University, accessed September 26, 2025, https://www.bu.edu/sthacker/files/2012/01/Are-Parliamentary-Systems-Better.pdf

19. Switzerland energy efficiency & Trends policies | Switzerland profile -

Odyssee-Mure, accessed September 26, 2025,
https://www.odyssee-mure.eu/publications/efficiency-trends-policies-profiles/switzerland.html

20. Switzerland - Countries & Regions - IEA, accessed September 26, 2025,
https://www.iea.org/countries/switzerland

21. Regulatory quality by country, around the world ..., accessed September 26, 2025,
https://www.theglobaleconomy.com/rankings/wb_regulatory_quality/

22. Switzerland Regulatory quality - data, chart | TheGlobalEconomy.com, accessed
September 26, 2025,
https://www.theglobaleconomy.com/Switzerland/wb_regulatory_quality/

23. Regulatory Quality Indicator - Millennium Challenge Corporation, accessed
September 26, 2025,
https://www.mcc.gov/who-we-select/indicator/regulatory-quality-indicator/

24. Switzerland | Country Governance Indicators - CEIC, accessed September 26,
2025, https://www.ceicdata.com/en/switzerland/country-governance-indicators

25. Is All Foreign Aid the Same? : An Empirical Comparison of the Effect of Multilateral
and Bilateral Aid on Growth - Digital Commons @ IWU, accessed September 26,
2025,
https://digitalcommons.iwu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1311&context=uer

26. U4 Expert Answer, accessed September 26, 2025,
https://www.u4.no/publications/bilateral-versus-multilateral-aid-and-corruption.pdf

27. The Choice among Aid Donors: The Effects of Multilateral vs. Bilateral Aid on
Recipient Behavioral Support1 - Princeton University, accessed September 26,
2025,
https://www.princeton.edu/~hmilner/working%20papers/EffectofMLvsBLAidonRecipientBehavioralSupport_2016.pdf

28. Assessing aid : what works, what doesn't, and why - World Bank Documents and
Reports, accessed September 26, 2025,
https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/612481468764422935/pdf/Assessing-aid-what-works-what-doesnt-and-why.pdf

29. COVAX - World Health Organization (WHO), accessed September 26, 2025,
https://www.who.int/initiatives/act-accelerator/covax

30. COVID-19 vaccinations shift to regular immunization as COVAX draws to a close,
accessed September 26, 2025,
https://www.who.int/news/item/19-12-2023-covid-19-vaccinations-shift-to-regular-immunization-as-covax-draws-to-a-close

31. Deployment of COVID-19 vaccines - Wikipedia, accessed September 26, 2025,
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Deployment_of_COVID-19_vaccines

32. COVAX: key learnings for future pandemic preparedness and response, accessed
September 26, 2025,
https://www.gavi.org/news-resources/knowledge-products/covax-key-learnings-future-pandemic-preparedness-and-response

33. The Utility of Both Hard and Soft Power in Modern International Relations -
ResearchGate, accessed September 26, 2025,

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/382440680_The_Utility_of_Both_Hard_and_Soft_Power_in_Modern_International_Relations

34. Soft power - Wikipedia, accessed September 26, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Soft_power

35. Soft Power – ECP Monitor and Scenarios for an Unsettled World - Hertie School, accessed September 26, 2025, https://www.hertie-school.org/en/international-security/research/soft-power

36. The Soft Power 30: getting to grips with the measurement challenge - ResearchGate, accessed September 26, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/309545051_The_Soft_Power_30_getting_to_grips_with_the_measurement_challenge

37. Deterrence theory - Wikipedia, accessed September 26, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Deterrence_theory

38. What are the tangible benefits to US citizens of global US soft power? - Reddit, accessed September 26, 2025, https://www.reddit.com/r/NeutralPolitics/comments/1ivsv9a/what_are_the_tangible_benefits_to_us_citizens_of/

39. Positive Peace Report, accessed September 26, 2025, https://www.economicsandpeace.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/PPR-2019-web.pdf

40. Boris Johnson: the moral case for government resignations in July 2022 - PMC, accessed September 26, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9702785/

41. July 2022 United Kingdom government crisis - Wikipedia, accessed September 26, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/July_2022_United_Kingdom_government_crisis

42. Powell's Choice: The Law and Morality of Speech, Silence, and Resignation by High Government Officials, accessed September 26, 2025, https://scholarship.law.georgetown.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1095&context=fwps_papers

43. Ministerial Resignations 1945–97 | Request PDF - ResearchGate, accessed September 26, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/229665877_Ministerial_Resignations_1945-97

44. Politicians under Investigation: The News Media's Effect on the Likelihood of Resignation, accessed September 26, 2025, https://ideas.repec.org/p/zbw/vfsc16/145531.html

45. The Role of Restorative Justice in a Criminal Justice System ..., accessed September 26, 2025, https://www.waldenu.edu/online-bachelors-programs/bs-in-criminal-justice/resource/the-role-of-restorative-justice-in-a-criminal-justice-system

46. Restorative justice - Wikipedia, accessed September 26, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Restorative_justice

47. Effectiveness of Restorative Justice Principles in Juvenile Justice: A Meta-Analysis, accessed September 26, 2025,

https://www.ojp.gov/pdffiles1/ojjdp/grants/250872.pdf

48. THE EFFECTIVENESS OF RESTORATIVE JUSTICE PRACTICES: A META-ANALYSIS, accessed September 26, 2025, https://www.d.umn.edu/~jmaahs/Correctional%20Assessment/rj_meta%20analysis.pdf

49. The Role of Restorative Justice in Modern Criminal Justice Administration - Park University, accessed September 26, 2025, https://www.park.edu/blog/the-role-of-restorative-justice-in-modern-criminal-justice-administration/

50. Can Restorative Justice Conferencing Reduce Recidivism? Evidence From the Make-it-Right Program - California Policy Lab, accessed September 26, 2025, https://www.capolicylab.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/01/Can-Restorative-Justice-Conferencing-Reduce-Recidivism-Evidence-from-the-Make-it-Right-Program-1.pdf

51. The Psychological Impact of Restorative Justice Practices on Victims of Crimes—a Systematic Review - PubMed Central, accessed September 26, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10240635/

52. Mindfulness And Leadership: Enhancing Focus And Decision-Making | Kapable Blog, accessed September 26, 2025, https://kapable.club/blog/leadership/mindfulness-and-leadership-enhancing-focus-and-decision-making/

53. The Role of Mindfulness in Ethical Decision-Making - Mayfair Therapy, accessed September 26, 2025, https://www.mayfairtherapy.clinic/journal/role-mindfulness-ethical-decision-making

54. Mindfulness from meditation associated with lower stress hormone - UC Davis, accessed September 26, 2025, https://www.ucdavis.edu/news/mindfulness-meditation-associated-lower-stress-hormone

55. Cortisol as a marker for improvement in mindfulness-based stress reduction - ResearchGate, accessed September 26, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/41404357_Cortisol_as_a_marker_for_improvement_in_mindfulness-based_stress_reduction

56. Mindfulness-based intervention reduce interference of negative stimuli to working memory in individuals with subclinical depression: A randomized controlled fMRI study - PubMed, accessed September 26, 2025, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/38660392/

57. Mindfulness training increases cooperative decision making in economic exchanges: Evidence from fMRI | Request PDF - ResearchGate, accessed September 26, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/303808844_Mindfulness_training_increases_cooperative_decision_making_in_economic_exchanges_Evidence_from_fMRI

58. Mindfulness and Leadership: Communication as a Behavioral …, accessed September 26, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC6450257/