***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.

**Intertwined** = closely and intricately woven or connected.

Immediacy refers to the quality of being instantaneous or occurring without delay.

**Yarn**: Spun threads of natural or synthetic fibers used for knitting, weaving, or sewing.   
**Veracity** refers to the truthfulness or accuracy of something, reflecting its conformity to facts or reality.

**Courtesy** is the display of politeness, respect, and consideration towards others.

A **proxy** is an intermediary server that acts on behalf of clients, facilitating communication with other servers or resources.

**Denigrates** means to criticize or belittle someone or something unfairly, often with the intention of damaging their reputation.

***Paragraph -2***

Over the past few decades, electronic computer technology has made enormous **strides**. Moreover, there can be little doubt that in the decades to follow, there will be further great advances in speed, capacity and logical design….Already computers are able to perform numerous tasks that had previously been the exclusive province of human thinking, with a speed and accuracy which far outstrip anything that a human being can achieve. We have long been **accustomed** to machinery which easily out-performs us in *physical* ways. *That* causes us no distress. . . We are even more delighted to have machines that can enable us physically to do things we have never been able to do before: they can lift us into the sky and deposit us at the other side of an ocean in a matter of hours. These achievements do not worry our pride. But to be able to *think* – that has been a very human **prerogative** . . . If machines can one day excel us in that one important quality in which we have believed ourselves to be superior, shall we not then have surrendered that unique superiority to our creations?

[Source: Roger Penrose, *The Emperor’s New Mind: Concerning Computers, Minds and the Laws of Physics*, Oxford University Press, 1999, pages 3-4.]

Strides refer to long, decisive steps or significant progress made in a particular direction or endeavor.

Accustomed means familiar or accustomed to a particular situation, experience, or environment.

Prerogative refers to an exclusive right or privilege inherent to a particular individual or group.

***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)