

**HIGH COURT OF TRIPURA  
AGARTALA**

**Examination for Direct Recruitment  
to Grade-III of Tripura Judicial Service**

**ENGLISH**

**100 Marks**

**[Time Allowed: Three Hours]**

**Please read each of the following instructions carefully before attempting questions:**

All questions are to be attempted.

The number of marks carried by a question/part is indicated against it.

Answers must be written in **ENGLISH** only.

Word limit in questions, wherever specified, should be adhered to.

Any page or portion of the page left blank in the Answer Booklet must be clearly struck off.

**Q.1. Write an essay in about 1000 words on any *one* of the following topics:**

**30**

[a] Sustainable development for a greener future.

[b] Legislation reflects the Parliament's collective wisdom for greater public good.

[c] Directive principles of the State Policy: Can the state depart from those principles?

**Q.2. Write a précis of the following passage in your own words in about one-third of the original length:**

**20**

Let us begin with the question: what is science? Karl Popper, an influential 20<sup>th</sup>-century philosopher of science, thought that the fundamental feature of a scientific theory is that it should be falsifiable. To call a theory falsifiable is not to say that it is false. Rather, it means that the theory makes some definite predictions that are capable of being tested against experience.

If these predictions turn out to be wrong, then the theory has been falsified, or disproved. So a falsifiable theory is one that we might discover to be false – it is not compatible with every possible course of experience. Popper thought that some supposedly scientific theories did not satisfy this condition and thus did not deserve to be called science at all: rather they were merely pseudo-science.

Freud's psychoanalytic theory was one of Popper's favourite examples of pseudo-science. According to Popper, Freud's theory could be reconciled with any empirical findings whatsoever. Whatever a patient's behaviour, Freudians could find an explanation of it in terms of their theory – they would never admit that their theory was wrong. Popper illustrated his point with the following example. Imagine a man who pushes a child into a river with the intention of murdering him, and another man who sacrifices his life in order to save the child. Freudians can explain both men's behaviour with equal ease: the first was repressed, and the second had achieved sublimation. Popper argued that through the use of such concepts as repression, sublimation, and unconscious desires, Freud's theory could be rendered compatible with any clinical data whatever; it was thus unfalsifiable.

The same was true of Marx's theory of history, Popper maintained. Marx claimed that in industrialized societies around the world, capitalism would give way to socialism and ultimately to communism. But when this didn't happen, instead of admitting that Marx's theory was wrong, Marxists would invent an *ad hoc* explanation for why what happened was actually perfectly consistent with their theory. For example, they might say that the inevitable progress to communism had been temporarily slowed by the rise of the welfare state, which 'softened' the proletariat and weakened their revolutionary zeal. In this short of way, Marx's theory could be made compatible with any possible course of events, just like Freud's. Therefore, neither theory qualifies as genuinely scientific, according to Popper's criterion.

Popper contrasted Freud's and Marx's theories with Einstein's theory of gravitation, also known as general relativity. Unlike Freud's and Marx's theories, Einstein's theory made a very definite predication: that light rays from distant stars would be deflected by the gravitational field of the sun. Normally, this effect would be impossible to observe – except during a solar eclipse. In 1919, the English astrophysicist, Sir Arthur Eddington organized two expeditions to observe the solar eclipse of that year, one to Brazil and one to the island of Principe off the Atlantic coast of Africa, with the aim of testing Einstein's prediction. The expeditions found that starlight was indeed

deflected by the sun, by almost exactly the amount Einstein had predicted. Popper was very impressed by this. Einstein's theory had made a definite, precise prediction, which was confirmed by observations. Had it turned out that starlight was not deflected by the sun, this would have showed that Einstein was wrong. So Einstein's theory satisfies the criterion of falsifiability.

Popper's attempt to demarcate science from pseudo-science is intuitively quite plausible. There is certainly something fishy about a theory that can be made to fit any empirical data whatsoever. But some philosophers regard Popper's criterion as overly simplistic. Popper criticized Freudians and Marxists for explaining away any data that appeared to conflict with their theories, rather than accepting that the theories had been refuted. This certainly looks like a suspicious procedure. However, there is some evidence that this very procedure is routinely used by 'respectable' scientists – whom Popper would not want to accuse of engaging pseudo-science – and has led to important scientific discoveries.

**Q.3. Rewrite each of the following sentences as directed without changing the meaning:**

**1X5=5**

[i] No one dares to criticize her for what she says.

[Rewrite the sentence starting with 'No matter']

[ii] She decorated the room. The purpose was to make it look beautiful.

[Combine using 'so that']

[iii] "What a beautiful day!", said the young tourist.

[Change the narration]

[iv] My mother remarked, "what a wonderful batsman my son is!"

[Change into indirect speech]

[v] I could have finished the work. But I would have had to go out.

[Combine into one sentence beginning with 'Had']

**Q.4. Supply the missing words:**

**1X5=5**

[i] I am going away \_\_\_\_\_ the end of January.

[ii] Our flat is \_\_\_\_\_ the second floor of the building.

[iii] What time did they get \_\_\_\_\_ the hotel?

[iv] I've no idea who Tom Alter was. I've never heard \_\_\_\_\_ him.

[v] The problem is getting serious. We've to do something \_\_\_\_\_ it.

**Q.5. Use the correct forms of the verbs given in the brackets: 1X5=5**

[i] If you \_\_\_\_\_ a wallet in the street what would you do with it? [find]

[ii] We are late. The film \_\_\_\_\_ by the time we get to the cinema.  
[start]

[iii] What was wrong with you? Why \_\_\_\_\_ to the hospital? [go]

[iv] I am thinking \_\_\_\_\_ a house. [buy]

[v] She took a bottle from the bag she \_\_\_\_\_ all the way from home.  
[carry]

**Q.6. Write the antonyms of the following words: 1X5=5**

[i] Boring

[ii] Accept

[iii] Exit

[iv] Misanthropic

[v] Descent

**Q.7. Use the following words to make sentences that bring out their meaning clearly. Do not change the form of the words. [No marks will be given for vague and ambiguous sentences]: 1X10=10**

[i] Altruist

[ii] Senility

[iii] Glib

[iv] Ostensible

[v] Tortuous

[vi] Austere

[vii] Loathsome

[viii] Predicament

[ix] Supercilious

[x] Precarious

**Q.8. Choose the appropriate word[s] to fill in the blanks:**

**1X5=5**

[i] There are millions of stars in \_\_\_\_\_. [space/the space]

[ii] Keats' poetry is full of \_\_\_\_\_ imagery.  
[sensual/sensuous]

[iii] Leave aside the interest, she won't pay even the \_\_\_\_\_ amount.  
[principle/principal]

[iv] Research demands an \_\_\_\_\_ study of the subject.  
[intense/intensive]

[v] This is not an \_\_\_\_\_ list at all but shows the kind of range that is available. [exhaustive/exhausting]

**Q.9. Use the following idioms/phrases in sentences of your own to bring out their meaning clearly. Do not change the form of the words:**

**1X10=10**

[i] Cold comfort

[ii] End in smoke

[iii] Feather one's nest

[iv] Incumbent upon

[v] Laugh in one's sleeve

[vi] Burning question

[vii] At logger heads

[viii] Left in the lurch

[ix] See of

[x] Drop in

**Q.10. Correct the following sentences without changing their meaning. Please do not make unnecessary changes in the original sentences.**

**1X5=5**

[i] My neighbour, along with two friends, were pushing his car which is stalled.

[ii] Can I leave the room now, Sir?

[iii] When I was a child, I enjoyed to eat ice-cream in the bench.

[iv] Do you have an idea who is that man?

[v] When I woke up, the man already disappeared after committing murder in the running train?

---