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**Q1. Explain caste system and how it functioned in Rampura village.**

The concept of dominant caste has been used for the first time in sociological literature by an eminent sociologist. Srinivas says that the existence of the dominant caste is not particular to Rampura village only. It is also found in other villages of the country.

According to him, A caste may be said to be dominant when it dominates numerically over other castes and when it also wields greater economic and political power. A large and powerful caste group can be more easily dominant if its position in the local caste hierarchy is not too low. For a caste to be dominant, it should own a sizable amount of the land locally available, have the strength of numbers and occupy a high place in the local hierarchy. When a caste has all the attributes of dominance, it may be said to enjoy a decisive dominance.

The Hindu caste system is divided into Brahmins, Kshatriyas, Vaishyas, Shudras, and Dalits in the decreasing order of superiority. The study of the caste system in Rampura Village shows a different cast structure than this. Srinivas came up with the term "Dominant caste". This dominance can be a result of numerical strength economic and political power, ritual status, or western education. When caste enjoys all or most of the elements of dominance; it has decisive dominance. But this form of dominance is not common. in Rampura Village, the Peasant caste enjoyed decisive dominance.

Another important study in the cast structure is discrimination and group mobility. This determines how easy it is for a particular caste to move up the social ladder. if a caste enjoys one form of dominance, it can easily go up the ritual hierarchy by sanskritizing its way of life. the problem is with the untouchable caste. The dominant caste was reluctant to allow the untouchables caste to improve their social status.

The caste system in various regions has one common aspect, its effect on those placed at the bottom, i.e., economic deprivation, discrimination, and a life full of humiliation.

**Short Answers**

1. **Scope of sociology should not be generalised**

The scope of sociology should not be generalized without a demarcated boundary, systematic study of sociology is difficult. The formal school of thought made a more constrained view of sociology because it believed that human science cannot study social life as an entire, and it ought to be considered as a pure and independent science. The most center of the formal school was in social relationship viewpoints like participation and sub-ordination. The synthetic school of thought is that as it may give a more extensive scope to human science and considers it as common science. According to me, the issue with a bigger scope is that the quality and center of the subject diminishes.

1. **Any one form of suicide described by Durkheim.**

Agreeing to Emile Durkheim, this frame of suicide is found when a person isn't well coordinating into society, collectives, or groups. When social streams are weak, individuals easily surmount the collective conscience and do as they wish. This result in declining social and familial bond. The need for integration leads to a sense of loneliness among the individuals. Societies that have a collective conscience, envelops social streams likely to prevent the occurrence of egoistic suicides.

1. **Alienation**

According to Karl Marx, the term Alienation means the process whereby the worker is made to feel foreign to the products of his/her own labor. The creation of commodities need not lead to alienation and can, indeed, be highly satisfying. One pours one's subjectivity into an object and one can even gain enjoyment from the fact that another, in turn, gains enjoyment from our craft. In capitalism, the worker is exploited insofar as he does not work to create a product that he then sells to a real person; instead, the proletariat works in order to live, in order to obtain the very means of life, which he can only achieve by selling his labor to a capitalist for a wage.