01

[1] Individual human beings differ from one another physically in a multitude of visible and invisible ways.

[2] If races — as most people define them — are real biological entities, then people of African ancestry would share a wide variety of traits while people of European ancestry would share a wide variety of different traits.

[3] But once we add traits that are less visible than skin coloration, hair texture, and the like, we find that the people we identify as "the same race" are less and less like one another and more and more like people we identify as "different races."

[4] Add to this point that the physical features used to identify a person as a representative of some race (e.g. skin coloration) are continuously variable, so that one cannot say where "brown skin" becomes "white skin."

[5] Although the physical differences themselves are real, the way we use physical differences to classify people into discrete races is a cultural construction.

02

[1] Around the boss, you will always find people coming across as friends, good subordinates, or even great sympathizers.

[2] But some do not truly belong.

[3] One day, an incident will blow their cover, and then you will know where they truly belong.

[4] When it is all cosy and safe, they will be there, loitering the corridors and fawning at the slightest opportunity.

[5] But as soon as difficulties arrive, they are the first to be found missing.

[6] And difficult times are the true test of loyalty.

[7] Dr. Martin Luther King said, "The ultimate test of a man is not where he stands in moments of comfort and convenience, but where he stands at times of challenge and controversy."

[8] And so be careful of friends who are always eager to take from you but reluctant to give back even in their little ways.

[9] If they lack the commitment to sail with you through difficult weather, then they are more likely to abandon your ship when it stops.

06

[1] According to many philosophers, there is a purely logical reason why science will never be able to explain everything.

[2] For in order to explain something, whatever it is, we need to invoke something else.

[3] But what explains the second thing?

[4] To illustrate, recall that Newton explained a diverse range of phenomena using his law of gravity.

[5] But what explains the law of gravity itself?

[6] If someone asks why all bodies exert a gravitational attraction on each other, what should we tell them?

[7] Newton had no answer to this question.

[8] In Newtonian science the law of gravity was a fundamental principle:

[9] it explained other things, but could not itself be explained.

[10] The moral generalizes.

[11] However much the science of the future can explain, the explanations it gives will have to make use of certain fundamental laws and principles.

[12] Since nothing can explain itself, it follows that at least some of these laws and principles will themselves remain unexplained.

04

[1] There is no doubt that the length of some literary works is overwhelming.

[2] Reading or translating a work in class, hour after hour, week after week, can be such a boring experience that many students never want to open a foreign language book again.

[3] Extracts provide one type of solution.

[4] The advantages are obvious:

[5] reading a series of passages from different works produces more variety in the classroom, so that the teacher has a greater chance of avoiding monotony, while still giving learners a taste at least of an author's special flavour.

[6] On the other hand, a student who is only exposed to 'bite-sized chunks' will never have the satisfaction of knowing the overall pattern of a book, which is after all the satisfaction most of us seek when we read something in our own language.

[7] Moreover, there are some literary features that cannot be adequately illustrated by a short excerpt:

[8] the development of plot or character, for instance, with the gradual involvement of the reader that this implies;

[9] or the unfolding of a complex theme through the juxtaposition of contrasting views.

05

[1] In the early stages of modern science, scientists communicated their creative ideas largely by publishing books.

[2] This modus operandi is illustrated not only by Newton's Principia, but also by Copernicus' On the Revolutions of the Heavenly Spheres, Kepler's The Harmonies of the World, and Galileo's Dialogues Concerning the Two New Sciences.

[3] With the advent of scientific periodicals, such as the Transactions of the Royal Society of London, books gradually yielded ground to the technical journal article as the chief form of scientific communication.

[4] Of course, books were not abandoned altogether, as Darwin's Origin of Species shows.

[5] Even so, it eventually became possible for scientists to establish a reputation for their creative contributions without publishing a single book-length treatment of their ideas.

[6] For instance, the revolutionary ideas that earned Einstein his Nobel Prize — concerning the special theory of relativity and the photoelectric effect — appeared as papers in the Annalen der Physik.

[7] His status as one of the greatest scientists of all time does not depend on the publication of a single book.

06

[1] What exactly does normal science involve?

[2] According to Thomas Kuhn it is primarily a matter of puzzle-solving.

[3] However successful a paradigm is, it will always encounter certain problems — phenomena which it cannot easily accommodate, or mismatches between the theory's predictions and the experimental facts.

[4] The job of the normal scientist is to try to eliminate these minor puzzles while making as few changes as possible to the paradigm.

[5] So normal science is a conservative activity – its practitioners are not trying to make any earth-shattering discoveries, but rather just to develop and extend the existing paradigm.

[6] In Kuhn's words, 'normal science does not aim at novelties of fact or theory, and when successful finds none'.

[7] Above all, Kuhn stressed that normal scientists are not trying to test the paradigm.

[8] On the contrary, they accept the paradigm unquestioningly, and conduct their research within the limits it sets.

[9] If a normal scientist gets an experimental result which conflicts with the paradigm, they will usually assume that their experimental technique is faulty, not that the paradigm is wrong.