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Name: Lecturer: Course: Date: Journal Question 1 I agree with the statement concerning the survival inability of a capitalistic world-economy since majorities of economies are facing real historical alternatives. An economy being a social system, notes continual modifications in accordance to societal changes and therefore most processes are being outdated, evidencing inabilities to continue in normal, regular as well as slow upward pushes. A present capitalistic economy will obviously fluctuate uncontrollably leading to a chaotic divergence, where a steady equilibrium cannot be maintained. The underlying objective of a capitalist economy is the continuous accretion of capital and such accumulation requires fraud surplus value thus contributing to economic problems. Therefore, a capitalist economy cannot survive because it will lead to political problems and inequalities among different classes of people in the present globalization setting. Another reason why the same cannot survive is that a capitalist world economy involves interstate systems. In such a setting, all states are theoretically autonomous yet constrained by interstate system processes.

Thus, with such an arrangement it is tough for a capitalist economy to survive because some states would be viewed as stronger as opposed to others, thus bearing a level of control on the weak ones. This is unachievable in the present equitable global setting. Note that, in a capitalistic economy, there are long cycles in which a particular state within a multiple state system manages to have hegemonic power over others, permitting monopoly activities on resource proprietors.

This system is presently considered as an outdated historical social system since it may favor capital accumulation to enterprises located within a specific boarder. Additionally, a capital economy cannot survive because achieving the hegemonic powers is not easy in the current trading environment. Question 2 There are varied primary weaknesses of feminist approaches concerning the IR theory.

First, Keohane fails to notice the consequences of observation on the study object, together with the instability of the contextual concepts and approaches that can accommodate the unstable IR factors. Thus, the IR theory needs to accord more observations on gender centrality, towards acquiring an elevated understanding on the social construct of gender in order to avoid subject biasness. Another weakness is that the feminist approaches to IR theory have misunderstandings as well as uninformed rationales for research and scientific theories. Feminists draw on diverse philosophical literatures and political science within which many IR scholars are trained in the process of acquiring authentic knowledge towards obtaining an enhanced understanding of IR issues. However, the critical approaches used for understanding social construction extend the level of misunderstanding due to negative stereotyping from all sides of epistemological perspectives.

A proponent of the feminist IR theory would review Keohane’s views in several ways. First, by focusing on the traditional roles of women, a critique would hold that feminist IR approaches should eliminate women participations in politics as diplomats since they are manly issues. The critique would only favor men and take women as inferior. The perspective would hold the argument as a political realism because of its competitiveness and conflicting ideas. A second way would be the use of realism assumptions like the democratic peace theory of realism that advocates that IR should not be applied in a democratic state. Such realism would target a tangible form of feminist criticism by supporting a male dominated theory in aggressive states.