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1a. C.W. Mills, an American sociologist, presented a version of the Elite theory. He analyzed the American society in 1950s. Unlike the earlier elite theorists, he did not believe that elite rule is inevitable. In fact, he saw that development in USA as fairly recent and condemned it.

He rejected that the members of elite have superior capabilities or psychological characteristics which distinguish them from others. Instead, he argued that the structure of the institutions is such that those at top of power in the hierarchy usually monopolized power. He said that certain institutions occupy 'pivotal positions' in society (such as major corporations, military and federal government) and those who elite who held 'command positions' in them became the elites.

In practice, he said that the activities...
and interests of these elites resemble that of a "single ruling minority", which he termed as "The Power Elite". This power elite involves the coincidence of economic, military and political power.

The cohesiveness and unity of the members of this elite is strengthened by their common backgrounds. Mills said that they usually are Protestant, native born Americans coming from East with similar educational background and upper social status. Within the power elite, there seems to be frequent change of personnel. E.g.: The director of a corporation may become a politician and vice versa. He argued that the American society is ruled by this power elite with unprecedented power and accountability, citing that the dropping of nuclear bomb was a decision of such power elite with no reference to the people.
Mills' theory of power elite was criticised by Robert A. Dahl as circumstantial. Dahl claimed that by omitting to investigate where key ranges of decisions like expenditure, taxation, subsidies, etc., Mills failed to establish where actual control lies. Weber's theory on the power of unorganised masses and pluralists' theory of power are opposed to the view of Mills.

However, Floyd Hunter, who studied community power structure in states of USA and R.K. Merton supports Mills' view that the concepts based on comparative study of elites in Britain, Canada, Australia, etc. Raymond Aron and Bolland have said that power in communist USSR best illustrated the "power elite", where they had absolute and unbound power. M. Djilas too argued that ruling minority...
in communist societies employ power for self-enrichment rather than benefitting the society.

David Lane, however, argued that the principal aim of Soviet elite has been industrialization and economic development of masses (as tried in Kruschev's era where scientists, industrial managers influenced policies).

Whatever the discussions, the elite theorists agree that power is always concentrated in the hands of a self-conscious cohesive minority over a majority. Their domination may include one or all of the following attributes: monopoly over means of violence (police), means of subsistence, or hegemony over formation of social values (religion). Control over middle men and command positions in key areas.

This theory seems true in present society where various scams have shown the intricate link of politics.
business; media as in the case of 2G Scam, the Murdoch Case etc.

1b. Animism refers to the belief that there is no separation between the physical (material) and spiritual worlds and that souls or spirits exist not only in humans but also in plants, animals and rocks and natural phenomena like thunder, rain and geographic features like rivers, mountains. Animism.

Animism is particularly practised as a form of religion by many indigenous people (tribes). Also some part of it exists in modern religions of Christianity, Hinduism, Buddhism etc.

The term “animism” was given in its present form by anthropologist Sir Edward Tylor in his book “Primitive Culture.” He defined it as a
general doctrine of souls and other spiritual beings in general. Taylor saw all forms of religions, modern and primitive as some form of animism.

Animism is often described as a primitive religion, but since it does not imply some form of emotion often attached with religion, it is not considered so too. It is taken more as a philosophy by some.

Two animistic theories of religion have been forwarded. The one associated with Herbert Spencer is called "Ghost Theory" and other put forward by Taylor.

The "ghost theory" refers to the happening beginning of religion to the cult of dead human beings. The theory of E.B. Taylor is that
early humans, through observation alone, recognised what might be called life force, soul or spirit or breath within themselves, that which was present in body in life and absent in death.

They equated these souls and spirits with images appearing in their dreams and visions. Then the early human cultures interpreted these spirits to be present in animals, the living plants and even in natural objects, this was Animism. They believed that the spirits were interested in human life and performed rituals to please them. E.g. Offering prayers and calling upon the four winds by Aztecs, associating human beings with spirit of things/animals, naming them so as in Inuits etc.

These rituals and beliefs evolved over time into a vast array of "developed" religions.
Taylor believed that more a society is scientifically advanced, less does it believe in Animism.

The world view of Animism is that human beings are part of the environment and not superior to them. So rituals to appease the environment, where spirits reside, are considered essential to obtain food, shelter, fertility, etc., as in Shintoism.

Death is believed to occur to the body while spirit remains and is often reborn in another form. Also, spirits must travel to the spirit world and must not get lost, else they become ghosts and they may usually obtain revenge. Practices like burying corpses of dead animals, putting coins in mouth etc. are done to ensure this doesn’t happen.
Taylors theory was a radical one at the time of its publication. Animism tried to prove for that non-Western (or heathens) non-Christian people do have religion and so faced heavy criticism. Some claimed that people from various regions who have never communicated cannot be lumped together in one form of religion. Others like Durkheims argued religious beliefs are more emotional and social than intellectual. Finally, some called it ethnocentric. Though all the points mentioned above whatever the arguments, some part of Animism, either in totality or parts exists in all religions for every religion has words like spirit and some like re-birth still associated and practiced in direct and indirect forms.
Education, according to Ruskin, consists in making people believe in what they ought to be. Education teaches man to use various capabilities, abilities to give to him by nature. It teaches him the art of adaptation and survival. Education is seen as an important means of bringing about social change. By effecting changes involving values, norms, and structures, one can undergo socio-cultural transformation. Education enables it.

Traditional societies have orientation towards traditions of religious nature, outdated views on politics and economy. Education, which is secular and scientific, only can impart modern ideas like modern nation state, universal franchise (Political); adherence to nationalistic ideology, egalitarianism, freedom, humanism, rational outlook (Cultural); industrialization, modernization.
improved technology (economical) etc.
Most importantly social change involving
acceptance of universal values,
achievement motivation, literacy,
urbanisation etc could only be brought
about through modern education.

The above is clearly seen in
Indian context where the 2nd half of
19th century with increased education,
people formed reform movements to
bring about socio-cultural changes,
with diffusion of humanism and values
of equality and freedom, greater political
change was possible through freedom
struggle. All modern and developed
societies have witnessed greater
social change through education,
especially Scandinavian countries.

But this view of education
as an important agent of social
change is disputed. Education as
a means of cultural reproduction,
and perpetuation of social stratification, is the view held by Marxist scholars. Prominent among them being Pierre Bourdieu, Louis Althusser.

Another scholar (non-Marxist) Illid regarded education as repressive and it teaches students to accept the power of powerful.

But most of these scholars who have criticized and opposed as education being positively co-related with social change have done so because of their dissatisfaction with the educational system and methods more than education itself. Education taken is a complete sense, where it imparts independence of mind and clear thinking. Educational" above criticisms.
Social movement essentially involves sustained collective mobilisation through either informal or formal organisation. Social movements are outcomes of social disorganisation and the strain caused by it and hence most are oriented towards bringing about change, either partial or total. Presence of ideology plays an important movement. e.g. Dravidian movement praised the virtues of Dravidian culture against Aryas. Marxism is followed by the ideology of Naxalite movements.

Social movements have been classified on the basis of change orientations by M.S.A. Rao into 3 types.

1. Reforms movement
2. Transformative movement
3. Revolutionary movement

Reform movements: They attempt partial transformation in the value systems without trying to change the society as whole. Often reforms are associated
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with belief systems, world views, rituals etc. eg: Bhakti movement in medieval India, Arya Samaj, Brahmo Samaj during British India.

2) Revolu Transformative movement: These type of movements try to bring changes in the traditional distribution of power. They try to change the differential allocation of resources, rights, privileges by attacking traditions like religion, caste et al which have monopolized the system. They have sharper focus than reform movements eg: SAIM movement in Kerala, Marat movement in Maharashtra.

3) Revolutionary Movement: They try to bring about radical changes that transforms the cultural and social systems. Often such changes are brought about by violence. They are mostly ideology based political parties like the communist party of Russia & China.
Apart from the types mentioned, J.H. Turner had given 2 more:

They are:

Reactionary movement or protest movement which is similar to transformative movement for they try to block a new or existing system/change.

Expressive movement: In this the individual try to come to terms with unpleasant external reality by modifying their reactions to it. eg: Hippie movement.

The sociologist H. Blalmer has also distinguished General Social movement, Specific Social movement, and expressive social movement.

Whatever the types of social movement, one important component of these apart from their beliefs and outlook are strong leadership and organization.
Family is a universally present irrespective of tribal, advanced or village societies. Earlier families were large with more than two generations of people co-habiting. They were needed for taking care of the land, educating children, taking care of infirm and elderly, recreation etc.

But in modern societies, especially urban societies, the above functions except a few specifics are largely taken care by external systems like industry, government etc. The 20th emergence of industrialism, which required occupational mobility wage-based livelihood, modern education and individualistic ideologies, there emerged a high degree of need for structural and functional specifics which the older family system was not able to provide.
The nuclear family, which is a relatively smaller group consisting of upmost two generations was able to provide this high degree of specialisation. The nuclear family is characterized by high emotional bonds (conjugal, filial, sibling) with openly manifested interpersonal interaction (i.e., showing of affection). Authority. Authority is exercised more by persuasion and a greater equality between sexes (i.e., spouses) exists. This can be seen in joint decision-making, parents tending to be more friends than authoritative masters over their children.

The nuclear family unlike the extended family centres around the "individual", whose well-being is given primacy. High division of labour in the areas of parenthood, maintenance of household etc. are no longer based on gender.
op: Women becoming joint bread winners, PTA taking part of in household work. Thus nuclear family is more Egalitarian.

Even if it has been redefined of some traditional functions, the (nuclear) family according to T. Parsons still performs the irreducible function of primary socialization and stabilization of adult personality (besides sexual gratification and legitimation reproducity). Warmth and affective affectivity in interpersonal relations are essential for the development of stable human personality and family alone can provide it.

The nuclear family is however not without any faults. Some sociologists claim that these types of families result in emotionally disturbed children (Vogel and Bell), due to the parents using children.
as emotional scape-goat to relieve their tensions... Edmund Leech believes that nuclear family isolates the children from their kins and external world, thereby robbing them of the moral buffer and support that were present in earlier families and increasing their loneliness and causing them to become rebels.

Some sociologists argue that family does ideological conditioning of children and teaches them how to submit to society for survival, robbing them of their individuality.

The nuclear family in modern times though far suited for the modern politico-economic scenario is proving ill-suited for socio-cultural stability. With increasing divorce rates, suicides, old age homes, children becoming engaged in deviant activities (drugs, gangs, peer groups etc) are proofs to this.
5c. Development means a gradual unfolding or a fuller working out of the details of anything or growth of what is present in the germ (more of biological evolution). e.g.: Development of a child.

Development in Politics, economics, culture all are intricately connected to the development of society or social development. But social development cannot be clearly distinguished nor can any social phenomena can be clearly linked with development and decay. The perspective that certain changes lead to development or decay have varied with times and persons.

The concept of "social development" was first given by Hobhouse who gave "scale, efficiency, freedom and mutuality" as criteria for developments. In recent times, the term development is used to differentiate two broad types of society.
the prosperous industrial society and societies which are rural, agricultural and poor.

6. to describe the process of industrialisation and modernisation.

Various sociologists have tried to identify the indicators of the growth in which signifies social development. Some of these indicators are:

1. High urbanisation
2. Industrialisation
3. High literacy and skill training
4. Political democracy
5. High levels of social mobility
6. High newspaper circulation
7. Nuclear family pattern
8. Independent judiciary
9. Strong sense of nationality
10. Secularisation of society
11. Values of individualism

etc.
The above model and indicators are perceived by some as highly biased in favour of Western societies. It is not an universal model.

Development in recent times as measured by Human development index, Human Happiness Index have incorporated such indicators with high economic indicators. These indicators try to balance the Western social indicators with indicators perceived by traditional societies in developing world (especially HHI).

Value change: The difference between social change and development is that development is generally a "positive social change", but what constitutes "positive" is a continuing debate.
Various sociologists have defined the concept of power, its nature, and distribution in industrial societies. Among the most prominent of these perspectives are Functionalist, Weberian, Marxist, and Parsonsian. Power, Elite, and Pluralist perspectives.

Weber defines power as "the chance of a man or number of men to realize their own will in a communal action even against the resistance of others who are participating in it." He says that individuals do not own power in isolation, but in relation to others. This is also called "constant sum power," as it views power as a fixed amount. Since power is held only by some while others lack it, Weber's definition seems to suggest that power could be used by those who hold it to satisfy sectional interests and exploit and oppress others.
Arguing from the functionalist perspective, Talcott Parsons rejected the constant-sum power. He regarded power as something possessed by society as a whole. He defined power as "a generalized facility or resources of a society as a whole." He said the amount of power in a society is measured by the degree of its success in the attainment of collective goals. Parsons said that political power is similar to money in a bank. The elected people, similar to bankers, the people have deposited power in them, which they can revoke when they feel so. And they can reap the interests in the form of benefits for further collective goals.

Sociologists generally categorize power into two types: authority and coercion. Parsons's power refers to the legitimate authoritative power.
The Marxian analysis of power is radically opposite to Parsons's approach. It rejects the view that power is a societal resource held in trust and directed by authority for benefit of all. Instead, it views power as a coercive force, which is used by one group (bourgeoisie) to illegitimately subjugate the others (working class). Illegitimate as it is, it is perpetuated by spreading false class consciousness.

The Elite theory of power opposes Marxian view. The Classical elite theory by Pareto and Mosco gives a psychological dimension to power. They say that there are two “laws” and “forces” in men: lions rule by their ability to direct decision action and by force. Foxes rule by cunning and guile: diplomacy, wheeler-and-dealer. They said that the rule of minority is inevitable. By other, domination, so-called, majority.

This theory of Elite coas taken further.
by C.W. Mills and Hunt, who called them small group of elites who dominate key positions in society, industry, military and government as "power elites." They said these elites come from similar social background and are a cohesive group and that there is frequent interchange of personnel among themselves. Concept was developed on Max Weber.

This was strongly criticized by Robert A. Dahl. He claimed it is not a single group that dominates decision making. He argued that there are multiple centres of power, which influence decision making. This perspective is called the Pluralist's perspective.

Each of the above perspectives have been given at different time periods during modern industrial society and each of them are heavily influenced by the times.
The theory of Weber and Marx are similar: where they said a group has absolute power, while others do not have. But Marx also talked about the power of common masses which could overthrow the power of a few.

Marxian theory of power is supported by Ralph Miliband who says how the subject class are made to accept their status quo with the process of legitimation involving massive indoctrination through influence in all forms of life (religion, culture, economy etc). Eg: Advertisement by major companies and conglomerates like Uniliver etc who project that material possession is the means to happiness.

Critics to the theory say this doesn't hold true in modern society where it's managers, not owners, who are key decision makers. But marxists say that managers usually are shareholders thus their separation is not absolute.
The view of Talcott Parsons was considered naive to accept power as positive. But it cannot be totally rejected as power is needed at certain level for directing operations.

The Elite theories were criticized for their feudalatory beliefs. They were termed as products of those societies where democracy was least developed. But some supported it as being relevant as seen in USSR and communist nations where the ruling elite held true control.

Pluralism was criticized for it claimed that all major interest of society are represented. However in a society which is largely unequal, the interests of the privileged class is likely to be served by various groups than underprivileged eg: Ancient India where they were several groups of upper castes, while the
lowest class was completely ignored.

All these theories hold true in some societies while do not fit in other conditions. While Marxian perspective was a social reality in the pre-communist era, the elite theory was true to an extent at times of monarchy and aristocracy in ancient Rome. e.g. Alexander the Great, Charakya etc.

The "power elite" theory holds some truth in modern times where the nexus between important systems like democracy, media and business houses are emerging for public scrutiny. It was a social reality in earlier times too. e.g.: the genealogical proof that has been revealed, which proves that many people in key positions are closely linked.
However, the theory of Pettit's Pluralism seems to be much closer to current society and hence must be termed as a can. Social reality fitting to modern industrial society. In modern societies various groups like trade unions, intellectuals, civil societies, caste organisations, terrorist groups, rebels, political parties, civil servants, etc. form various power groups. They can be both legitimate and illegitimate, formal and informal, authoritative or coercive, but they shape in some way the other group in making their decisions and performing their actions. E.g.: The civil society trying to influence politics through "Jan lokpal". Movements like "Green Peace" and "Amnesty" influencing industrial and government policies etc.
Various feminist sociologists have given diverse perspectives on the sexual division of labour in family and labour market and how it is a reflection of patriarchal values.

Patriarchy is a system of domination of men over women. It is an ideology which is a socio-cultural construct.

Various sociologists like Nimet Agy and Fox and G.P. Murdock saw that biological differences as the basis of sexual division of labour and T. Parsons and John Bordo have supported similar arguments. Sexual division is thus natural and inevitable.

Am Oakley, the British sociologist, strongly opposed this view saying sexual division of labour is not universal and biological. This she emphasized by citing the example of Mbuti Pygmies.
Ernestine Fiord provided an explanation for the sexual division of labor and domestic tasks based on the values and beliefs of the family and the traditional gender roles. She observed that men were assigned to certain tasks such as growing crops, hunting, and childrearing, while women were responsible for domestic duties like cooking and cleaning. This division of labor was explained as a way to balance the needs of the family and society.

Hudson, on the other hand, argued that the division of labor was not based on sex but on the needs of the community and the value of the work. He believed that both men and women should be involved in all aspects of domestic life and that the traditional roles were not natural but were constructed by society.

These views were often driven by cultural and religious beliefs. In many societies, the division of labor was seen as a way to ensure the survival of the family and the community, with men providing the means of production and women ensuring the reproduction of the species.
such as hunting, taken over by men. She sees this as a reflection of male dominance. Friedel also says that tasks such as cultivation are allocated to women, while deforestation and clearing lands, exchange of goods are taken by men because the former involves danger. While the loss of men can ensure that the population survives, while the loss of women cannot be adequately compensated. Her arguments reveal the importance of culture in the sexual division of labour in family and labour.

Others tried to explain the subordinate status of women in family and external sphere. She says women are perceived closer to nature because their bodies and physiological functions are more concerned with the natural process of reproduction of species—like birth, menstruation, pregnancy, lactation et al.
Since a mother role is linked to family, the family itself is considered closer to nature compared to activities and institutions outside the family (religion, politics, etc.). These outside tasks are considered superior as they are away from nature and thus, as the province of men.

Sylvia Breiby's "Theorising Patriarchy" talks about cultural conditions of patriarchy that influence sexual division like economic dependence (where women are last to be hired and first to be fired), patriarchal relations in family (respectability, avoidance of poverty, etc.), culture (women are brought up as daughters, wife, mother, sister of men, always dependent), control of female sexuality, male violence in family, state politics, etc.
8. Kulasekhar Firestone in "The Dialectic of Sex" says that child-bearing and family make women dependent on men for survival and hence unequal power relations. This he termed as "Power Psychology," an inherent desire to dominate others which is practised by men on women. He calls this the basic model of domination.

The cultural values which are predominantly male-dominated assign positions for women in the labour market. It could be seen that women in most developing countries are assigned major bulk of the unorganised sector which is lowly paid with inadequate facilities, e.g., construction, agriculture, etc. While women in developed nations are preferred for low-level blue-collar jobs such as secretarial jobs, nursing, primary school teaching etc.
The same feminist sociologists call these jobs as natural extensions of work of women in family like caring, nurturing, organizing, etc. Men are reluctant to hire women in larger decision making roles largely citing their familial responsibilities as greater hindrance, e.g., Child birth.

In current society, women are placed in jobs where men want them to be such as positions in communication, marketing, media relations, etc. These jobs are now referred to as “Pink Collar Jobs”. Even when these are few women who reach the top positions in power, industry, etc., they are few and isolated and are mostly single women.

This trend is however slowly
getting altered through women slowly but surely breaking the invisible glass ceiling in many areas. But still it's a long and tricky path.

Women's liberators claim that women can break this patriarchally created sexual division of labour only if they can conquer biology or their self and shun family. This may however be a radical view which may not be necessary.

Weber said that all human actions are guided by meanings and in order to explain any action, the meaning and motives that lie behind must be observed. He gave 3 types of action: "affective action" (emotions like verbal and physical abuse), "traditional action", (e.g. ingrained habits, respect to elders etc) and finally "rational action".

Rational action involves a systematic assessment of various means to attain goals.
Since capitalist society has fixed goals he says it is guided by rational action. In a modern capitalist society rational action is expressed in a wide variety of areas like administration of state, education, science and even in Western classical music. This process he called as rationalisation and cited bureaucracy as the prime example of this process.

A bureaucratic organisation has clearly defined goals and it involves precise calculation of means to attain them and the systematic elimination of all obstacles. Bureaucracy being a system of control is inevitable in large industrial societies which have large organisations with hierarchy.

Bureaucracy is a rational-legal authority which is based on the acceptance of set of impersonal rules. Thus those who possess authority are able to issue commands and have them obeyed by others in the legal framework.
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As tax authorities, military command for the proper functioning of an industrial this becomes inevitable and people cannot escape bureaucracy for all organizations are guided by it.

Weber further emphasis on the inevitability and inescapability of bureaucracy in modern societies by specifying the features of it.

(a) The regular activities required for the organisation are distributed in a fixed manner as official duties. Each administrative area has clearly defined responsibility. Complex tasks are divided into manageable parts, leading to attainment of specialization in particular areas, e.g., division of departments in state administration – military, education.

(b) Principle of hierarchy ensures that lower level officers are under command and accountable to superiors.

(c) It is governed by a set of consistent and abstract rules, therefore leaving little...
Room for personal discretion.

(5) The officials perform duties with formalistic impersonality without hatred or passion.

(6) Fifth and the most important feature is they are appointed on the basis of technical knowledge and expertise. Since promotions in the full-time appointment is based on seniority or achievement or both.

(7) It involves strict separation of private and official income.

These points of Weber are negated by some of its characteristics of bureaucracy like:

(i) Bureaucracy is rigid and adherence to rules makes them well-trained to face and make decisions in new situations. They become timid and inflexible over time for their career incentives are designed to reward conformity not innovation.
ep: Red tapism and delay involved in bureaucratic processes such as licensing existed due to adherence to rules which are outdated.

(ii) Devotion to rules may lead to displacement of goals. eg: In a flood situation, if official rules do not permit procurement from private vendors, the official may stall thus defeating the purpose and goal of quick rehabilitation.

(iii) Emphasis on impersonality may lead to friction between officials and public. Seen in various places like hospitals, government organisations were public outrage occurs in what is perceived as impersonal treatment.

The above were given by R.K. Merton.

Peter Blau and Ganshure have found that certain works performed better in informal structure of mining. In contemporary societies informal education seems to benefit better development of children.

This is "Play Schools"
Bureaucracy becomes uncontrollable at times due to its permanency. This was illustrated by the 'Cooperative Commonwealth Federation' example by Lipset and Selznick. This Canadian government became bureaucrats were efficiently able to scuttle reformist policies of the government.

Bureaucracy in contemporary times has shown their inevitability and inescapability and their dispensability too. e.g. Bureaucrats using superior knowledge and interior workings of government take to benefit personally by taking bribes and 'kickbacks', thus proving false of defining feature.

In modern times, situations change more unpredictably than before, this includes nature too. So often the change rules do not always go hand in hand with it. Thus bureaucracy based on fixed rules will become inefficient. However, it does not
mean that bureaucracy is not needed. What is needed is the change in the definition and characteristics of bureaucracy and bureaucrats to suit contemporary times. Greater accountability, reasonable control, decision making skills are some which need to be inculcated.

During early phases where science began to question the so called "word of God" preached by religions, the scientists and renaissance thinkers believed that "there would come a stage in the evolution of society, when science would completely replace religion."

Religion bounded people with a set of traditions and rules that lacked rational explanation. Especially, the early Catholic Church clearly viewed science as its enemy and prosecuted and punished.
many scientists and inventors who proved religious ideologies and beliefs as untrue of Galileo’s invention of earth revolving around sun and its round. When analyzed in the above context it is reasonable that people wanted science to replace religion.

Today people have advanced, science has grown in exponential terms, man has conquered space, has created foods in labs, produced nuclear bombs, explained the cause of earthquakes, has landed on moon, got immunized against poxes and diseases, has created life artificially in a lab. But even today religions exist; if not grown stronger.

This may seem contradictory but the increasing number of new faiths, religions, increasing cults
etc are proof that religion is still growing in modern times.

With advance in science and technology man has come to face many questions, rather than find answers. The purpose of science can be said to be to understand nature, so that its working can be controlled. But, unlike man has understood.

But, more the man discovers, the more left for him to discover. E.g. Men found that all life is created from an atom, but then others found electrons within atom and quasars. And finally recently man has gone on a quest to find an even more fundamental particle which they have ironically called as the “God Particle”.

Human beings are still not able to find answers to questions such as life, death, soul, etc.
And even today what man is not able to find solution through science, he seeks solace in religion.

Moreover, religion not only provides answers for unknown but it provides support from a community, a group of people who believe in common values and customs. Thus, it prevents depression, isolation and provides moral support.

As said by Durkheim and later hinted by various sociologists, religion more than the belief in God is a worshipping in disguise of society and this maybe the reason why religion thrives in the increasingly scientific world.

The belief that science would replace religion might be viewed as purely Western perspective. The Eastern religions especially...
Hinduism have never separated science from religion, if so viewed it because of how they were interpreted. In ancient times, the religious texts seemed to have included science, mathematics, geography, medicine etc into them. e.g. Ayurveda etc.

The other major religions of the world are slowly trying to absorb scientific changes thus are changing their values, rituals to accommodate them.

New religions like "scienology" have made scientific way of life their basis.

Thus we can safely conclude that in no time science would completely replace religion in society.
6(a) Dependency theory states that the poverty of low income countries (or underdeveloped countries) stem from their exploitation by wealthy countries and the multinational corporations that are based in wealthy countries. In contrast, dependency theorists argued that with colonialism (where some countries colonized others to procure raw materials for their industry), exploitation began (Sunkel). Even though colonialism ended after World War II, the exploitative did not; transnational (MNCs) corporations continued to reap enormous profits from their branches in low-income countries. They do so by establishing factories in poor countries to use raw materials and cheap labor to maximize profits and benefits.
The dependency theorists, these multi-natinal corporations do so with the help of powerful banks and governments of rich countries. These foreign industries & corporations exploit workers, prevent local businesses that might compete to come up using force of local government and beneficaries, thus increasing the other devations economic development. Local leaders who oppose them, Unions are overthrown through military coups or jailed and killed.

They point the examples of CIA's role to overthrow governments in Granemante, Nicaragua and Chile in 1950's to 1970's. They called this as "mis-development" due to manipulation. Sociologists like Gunnar Myrdal viewed that but the theory of dependency, will become crime in a globalised world. Restow suggested that an universal growth model will emerge.
Globalization has brought about changes by increasing competitiveness, reducing corruption of public controlled (i.e., state) industries, diverted funds for social development from industries and ensured technological transfer. Thus, it has tried to make growth universal according to the supporters of globalization.

This however could not be taken to be fully relevant and is not enough to dismiss the dependency theory. For e.g.: The Human Development report data over considerable time has shown that while the rich have become richer, the poor countries have become poorer.

The world is increasingly becoming polarized, it is still the domination of rich in global forums such as World Trade Organization.
World Bank etc. The positions and decision making power in these organisations are so designed to lean towards the developed nations. These forums further propose and impose sanctions and controls over less developed or developing countries. For instance: The environmental agencies (Kyoto, Cateagena) try to impose emission restrictions in developing countries, which house the bulk of the factories and energy guzzling industries of the multinational in developed countries. eg: Electronic manufacturing units of Nokia, Philips present in Taiwan, China etc. whose headquarters is located in Europe.

The new uprisings in East Africa (Ivory Coast, Sudan etc.) and the partial support offered to some of the rebels by NATO and UN are also seen as actions affirming the
dependency theory. Earlier, multi-nationalites like De Beers and Shell have accepted their role in creating conflict in Africa to sustain their industries.

Today, global accountability has increased, isolation is not possible with increasing role of social media and communication. Awareness levels among people having increased. Yet, we cannot completely rule out the dependency theory, but we can however say that its relevance is decreasing day by day.

6(b) A pressure group can be described as an organised group that does not seek political power, but seeks to influence government policy or legislation. They are not purely pressure groups but can be also described as 'interest groups', 'lobby groups'.
or 'protest groups'. It could vary from a huge organisation like FICCI to smaller tribal rights groups.

A democracy is essentially a rule of majority with cooperation from minority. These pressure groups play an important part in ensuring that their views are considered while making a political decision. They do so by informing legislators of its preferences, providing money or time to help election campaigns, threat to vote en-block against non-cooperative politicians, may influence by providing backup data and expertise.

Thus they provide popular participation in national politics. The more democratic a country, there is more the number of pressure groups present as Britain has thousands of pressure groups compared to a few political parties.
World over pressure groups have ensured that democratic values and democracy grow by their action. eg: Black movement to abolish discrimination. Gray rights movement in USA fight to abolish discriminatory laws. Caste-based movements in India fight to influence legislation to benefit deprived caste.

The recent protests by manual scavengers and former sanitary workers to abolish manual scavenging.
PETA Organisation like PETA lobby and protest against animal dissections and testing, ensuring that dissections are banned in most countries and states.

The effectiveness of pressure groups have increased in modern times due to quick communication.
channels and greater accessibility to resources. It cannot however be said that all pressure groups are beneficial for the strengthening of democracy. e.g.: Khap communities trying to influence and change modern marriage laws to older feudal ones. Terrorist groups who threaten violence if their demands are not met like Marxists etc.

But, they at the same time are not dysfunctional, by ensuring that their views are heard, they have provided the decision makers an opportunity to consider and arrive at proper consensus. So it could be said that the interplay between pressure groups and the state has led to flourishing and strengthening of democracy in modern societies.