***Paragraph -1***

Because we, human beings, have language, we cannot but be aware that all living creatures are mortal, and so too each one of us; we (more to the point: I) will die, as sooner or later will all other humans we know or know of, all those men and women with whose lives our lives are intertwined. Yet by the same reason none of us is tied to the immediate reality of experience. Language may inform us how things are, but language is also a knife that cuts us, the word-makers, word-users and words’ creatures, free from things as they are and from the immediacy of their presence. Using words as yarn, we can weave canvases that do not picture any ‘reality’ that we (or for that matter any other language users) have experienced. The veracity and trustworthiness of such ‘nonrepresentational’ canvases do not differ markedly from those of the rest. And so, courtesy of language, we can ‘experience’ by proxy a world from which we, whose world it is, have been removed: a world that does not contain us, the world as it might be when we are no more. Such a world is frightening; it dwarfs and denigrates whatever we do or may do while we are still part of it.

***Reference:***

Bauman, Zygmunt. *Wasted Lives: Modernity and its Outcasts.* Polity Press, 2004.

***Paragraph -2***

Eternity has been one of culture’s few genuine universals. To the sober, logically trained mind this may seem strange, at first glance at least; indeed, it takes a lot of imagination even to conceive of ‘eternal duration’, while visualizing it defies the power of human senses. In no form can ‘eternity’ be gleaned from the ‘inside’ of human experience. It cannot be seen, touched, heard, sniffed or savoured. And yet one would search in vain for a human population that did not consider eternity anything but self-evident. Awareness of eternity (should we rather say, belief in eternity) can indeed be taken as one of the defining traits of humanity.

***Reference:***

Bauman, Zygmunt. *Wasted Lives: Modernity and its Outcasts*. Polity Press, 2004.

***Paragraph-3***

Philosophers of science have repeatedly demonstrated that more than one theoretical construction can always be placed upon a given collection of data. History of science indicates that, particularly in the early developmental stages of a new paradigm, it is not even very difficult to invent such alternates. But that invention of alternates is just what scientists seldom undertake except during the pre-paradigm stage of their science’s development and at very special occasions during its subsequent evolution. So long as the tools a paradigm supplies continue to prove capable of solving the problems it defines, science moves fastest and penetrates most deeply through confident employment of those tools. The reason is clear. As in manufacture so in science—retooling is an extravagance to be reserved for the occasion that demands it. The significance of crises is the indication they provide that an occasion for retooling has arrived.

**Reference-**

Kuhn, Thomas S. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions.* Chicago:The University of Chicago Press, 2012.

***Paragraph 4***

We have so far focused mainly on the significance of research in producing new knowledge. However, in the contemporary scenario, where environmental, political and social crises have become extremely prominent, we need to concentrate on the role of research in finding ways to ensure and promote universal well-being. How can we ensure the well-being of the individual without compromising that of the community? How can we, on the other hand, make possible the well-being of the community without compromising the stability and well-being of the individual? These are the pressing issues on which we should concentrate. Research, thus, needs to be oriented towards – not knowledge for knowledge’s sake - but knowledge for the sake of human well-being.

(Source: Simon Matthews, *Research and Good Life*, Cansiterra University Press, 2022, pages 56-57)

***Paragraph 5***

Science has opened up new horizons before us, but we need to democratize those horizons so as to ensure that the fruits of scientific research are made available to all – even to the human being who is in the most unprivileged condition now. Science should be used to lessen, and not to deepen, social inequality. Scientific development should be seen as a way to improve the condition of *everyone*, not just that of the few. It is true that scientific experiments require a lot of financial investment: a laboratory can be set up only when you have the financial resources to do so. However, the outcome of scientific investigation should not be kept outside the ambit of distributive justice.

(Source: Natalie Horkpreer, *Science and Justice: New Openings*, Damsrock Academic Press, 2021, page no. 480)