

1.A. The movie “Agora” represents different paradigms via different type of people or group such as religion or politicians. First of all, most parts of the movie based on religions and beliefs. So, “social constructionism” is shown due to this reason. One scene that made watchers realize that it is social constructionism is when the leader of people who believe in Greek God and the leader of Christian have an argument on whose God is truth or real. The leader of people who believe in Greek God just think that Christian God cannot protect Christian from getting killed from a lion. While Christian leader thinks their god protect them when he was trying to walk crossing the fire and said that Greek God is non-sense as Greek God has flowers on his head. They both create reality themselves. Therefore, the belief that is difference can lead to an argument not only in the past, but at the present as well. People who believe in different still fight with other who do not believe the same thing as they do.

Next, the situation above leads to conflicts and the war began from the different point of views. There is not such the real truth because the truth that is each leader said is from the same people that are from the same group, so this is likely to be “postmodernism”. The truth that Greek and Christian believe are different because they learn about the truth from different sources which are from others’ bias.

For “positivism”, it is clearly that Hypatia is the only one who is positivism. She believes in the things that can be proved. It is kind of new in that time because most people believe in god but not science. Philosophy is what she strongly believes in, one scene that the leader of Christian tries to force her to believe in Christian god, but she refused and said that philosophy is her belief. Her confidence on philosophy and science leads her to discover the new knowledge about the earth and sun. However, her belief also kills her because it’s against Christian and the authority in the movie. The natural law that drives the society helped improving the society and make our world go further as today. Therefore, we learn many paradigm in just one scene of the movie, so it is better to not use one’s judgement to tell what is right or wrong, but use each’s belief to help improving the society and live peacefully with others.

Critical paradigm is a bit difficult to understand in this movie because it based on the past that people do not realize that women can be equal to men. Hypatia tries to make her voice loud enough to change things in society. However, people at that time, for example, her father does not even listen to her suggestion. Also, the rule of Christian does not allow her to teach students about science. The reasons may be most women are not strong and smart as men at that time and

men would not accept in women. So, this paradigm, in my opinion, shows me in the movie that what cannot be proved at a period of time, may be proved in the future that is true. Like in the present, women have ability to be equal as men, women can take important role in the world such as president.

1.B The phenomena in the movie that impresses me is when the leader of Christian tries to cross the fire to show how Christian god can save him from danger. This phenomena can be analyzed in some paradigms in social science. For example, this challenge happens because the leader of Christian wants to show that there is a miracle of God but it cannot be proved. This is critical paradigm, it is something that is they believe is true but can't be proved yet, but the leader tries to prove that. Another is when both Christian and Greek leaders have an argument about the real god. This shows the differences in believe because they hear different thing from different sources. This happens in the present too, but it has to come out with social agreement to make people live together, however, it does not happen in the movie. Next, in this argument, there may be nothing true or false because the truth is made out of one's opinion. Both god may exist or may not. This implicitly shows that postmodernism is applied in the movie. The last one is positivism, there is no positivism in this scene, but watchers can be positivism. We can think that the Christian leader is not burnt because he has scientific techniques when he crosses the fire or he has special cloth that Greek leader does not.

2.A. According to dictionary, the word "development" means the process of developing or being developed. However, in political term, the definition of development can be varied. Some countries may define development as power and money such as the United States of America. From the movie, the United States have been spending their national budget on military and war to win the war and become strong country. There are benefits of doing that such as when they are strong, they may have more power to negotiate with other countries which would benefit them and have advantages in economic growth. However, living standard of their citizens may not be as good as they should be. For example, American citizens do not get vacations with wages while Italians do. Italians can have 8 weeks vacations with income, and they also get more vacations if they are pregnant or getting married. The reason is the authority in Italy believe that vacation is nothing if you can't afford to go travel. Another example is about education, the most

powerful country, USA, college students have to borrow money to pay for their tuitions about 10,000dollars/year. Until a student graduate, they may owe bank or university a lot of money. It takes a long time until these students are free and can make money for themselves not just paying the debt. On the other hand, in Slovenia, college students both Slovenian and foreign students do not have to pay the tuitions. The result is some American students choose to come to Slovenia for college.

The examples above, from *Where to Invade Next*, show us that the definition of development in USA and some other countries are quite different. Some countries may focus on different points. Finland may focus on education, Norway focuses on rehabilitating the prisoners to be back in the society, Iran tries to make equality for both male and female or France focuses on small thing like students' foods. The differences depend on which direction the government or organization in each country want the country to go.

For my point of view, development of each country may be varied. However, the common property that every country should have is the development that the authority tries to develop should make citizens' living standard better. A great example from the movie, German workers finish the work at 2 P.M. and get a lot of break during working hour. This shows us that the law that allow workers to do this aims to care about workers' health, both physical and mental. Workers are more productive because they say how can workers do their best if the body and brain are so tired. Also, they can do what they like after work freely because it's illegal for the boss to Email workers after work. So German citizens can both work and find the value of themselves at the same time. While the workers are productive, this helps the growth of country's economy. So, living standard and economy's growth can go the same direction. In conclusion, the basic needs of human, food, education, health or equality, should be provided to people first and that will pay the country back what the country needs.

2.B. Amartya Sen's "Development as Freedom" influence readers that the determinant of development is the degree of poverty of people. He mentioned that famines can occur even in the country without lack of food production or when the real income of people decrease (price of food increases), those people may face poverty. Poverty in this book can be mentioned as freedom. The example that show how lack of freedom can lead to famines, if there is a merchant who sells food, and the law of that country is that merchant can trade with the government only

and get paid just a small amount. This shows that the merchant has minimum freedom so the chance that the merchant would upgrade his status is less than if he has more freedom. If the merchant has more freedom, he would be able to trade with the buyers who pay him the most, and the income would be used to upgrade his store and also help the country's economy due to higher amount of tax. As a result, development would be made if the people have opportunity to improve themselves. But freedom depends on other determinants such as education, health facilities, civil rights. Therefore, if freedom, principal means and social and economic arrangement get together, development would be able made effectively.

2.C. I do agree that development is conceivable without economic growth but in only short term and specific development. The development that can be made without economic growth is basic civil right such as the equality between male and female. For example (from Where to Invade Next), in Iceland, manager of bank who is female, the gender that is not always given a chance to do important job, lead the bank to get through financial crisis. This development is made without economic growth (it is during financial crisis). However, for long term development, it is different. According to Myrdal and Seers, that development is unavoidably a normative concept involving very basis choices and values. This implies that development of developing countries may follow the modernization ideals or developed countries. Western countries become the model for developing countries nowadays or it's called "Westernisation". These Westernisation also use economic growth to help on their development, for example, famous company like Adidas, when they sell their clothes around the world, however, they pay tax to the country that they are in, Germany. The country uses the tax to make a development further. Most of countries also use GNP as the indicator to indicate the growth and development of nation. On the other hand, people should think carefully that GNP cannot summarize that country with higher GNP is more developing than another with lower GNP because of some reasons such as GNP calculates the income but not the consumption, GNP does not account the cost of the disposal of waste. So, the country with high GNP may have higher gap between rich and poor people, also have more health issues of citizens.

In conclusion, long term development should come with economic growth. The development would be made better if the economy of the country grow and the government spend the money to help to improve living standard of their citizens.

3. American Factory documentary takes place in the United States of America. It is about a car glass factory which is owned by Chinese firm, Fu Yao, they started to invest in 2010. The CEO's name is Mr. Cao. Before Fu Yao started to invest in 2010, this place used to be owned by General Motor(GM), a car building company. However, GM had to close down due to financial crisis in 2008, it became bankruptcy. After 2010, Fu Yao started the factory in USA, they have the way to work by hiring both Chinese workers from China who are specialists in each process because they used to work for Fu Yao in China. Also, they hired American workers which some of them are local people and some of them used to work for General Motor. However, Chinese workers are in charge so American workers have to follow Chinese's instruction because some of American have less experience. Briefly, there are Chinese who have specialization in every sector of this factory who will control American workers to complete each stage to have the quality as high as there is in China. "Specialization" is in a concept of division of labors as Adam Smith who mentioned that each of labor must have the job to do and when they keep doing that job they will become more specialized which make the labor more productive. In contrast, if there is no division of labors concept and each labor has to do everything by themselves, it will cost a lot of opportunity cost because the less specialize in their job the less productive it is. So Mr. Cao let Chinese workers teach American workers to do what Chinese workers have been doing is help American workers to be more specialized and that is good for Fu Yao because the company would be more productive. However, the concept of division of labors is quite contrast from Karl Marx's point of view. Karl Marx explained that division of labors would make alienation. It is contrary to man's real essence because this concept would alienate one man from another. Differences between employers and employees, boss and subordinate make the difference in value of each one's life. From the documentary, Mr. Cao is the CEO of Fu Yao and we can say that he is capitalist or elite who aims for profit and cash flow for the company only without caring about his employees. One example is that when a worker said when she worked for General Motor she got about 28 dollars/ hour, but she gets about 14 dollars/ hour now. This example shows the alienation that Mr. Cao sees the workers as a factor of production that makes profit for the company even their real essences can be more than that, they can be very good guitarist, football player, chef, but they do not have a chance to do what they like because of capitalism that money is everything. In perspective of socialism, people have to worship money because it is important for everyone's daily life. Money also separates people. The way of

capitalists uses to treat their workers is that worker is only capitalists' asset. Workers are important only when they make profit for capitalists. Even workers work hard, they still get low income only to keep them living, but capitalists, who do not have to work hard, get a lot of money and being obeyed by workers who work hard for them. Briefly, capitalism uses money to estimate value of human not the real value that every person has. As American workers are under controlled by Fu Yao, they want the company to join labor union because there may be more fairness for them. Due to Marx's philosophy, labors should have power to bargain with the company and when they form labor union they will have the power to ask for the fairness. However, Mr. Cao does not want labor union in his company because he believes that labor union would intervene his company and affect the financial of Fu Yao. American workers try to ask for joining labor union but Mr. Cao refused the request. Mr. Cao thinks that capitalism relies on free market. There should be no organization to make an intervention in his company. Fu Yao would lose a lot of money if the whole company joins labor union because workers are likely to ask for more wages. The solutions that Mr. Cao make is quite ruthless because he hired more Chinese labors. The reason is Chinese labors have the mindset that they work for Fu Yao because of the company is like their family and it's their jobs to work here and not ask for more wage. In contrast, American labors are seen as less incentive workers by Chinese even American only asks for more justice. Also, Mr. Cao sent American labors to China to learn how Fu Yao runs in China and see their culture which may change American labor's minds. The most ruthless solution is that Mr. Cao fired American workers who protested and invite other workers to vote to join union labor and replaced them with young workers who are scared to fight for fairness. This is contrary to Marx's point of view, labors in Fu Yao do not have power to fight for their own justice. Finally, Fu Yao still does not join labor union and the number of American workers become lesser, and the profit that the company made were put into technological development such as machines. The number of machines increases but the number of American labors decreases. The workers who still work for Fu Yao are all afraid of fighting for justice because they do not want to be fired. In 2018, Fu Yao makes a lot of profit, but the wage of employees increases by 2 dollars/ hour only. It seems that employees are hopeless to ask for what they deserve to have.

4. According to Marx's class theory, there are two classes of people one is bourgeoisie, rich people who own private property, and another is proletariat, which is worker who work for bourgeoisie and get low wage which is not enough to own the property. For Thailand, Marx's theory of class can be applied in the context of system of regime. Class plays an important role in Thai modern history.

In 1932, significant change happened when People's party, which was a combination of a few civilians and military led by Pridi and Plaek, overthrew the government of Rama VII. One of the reason is that many countries had changed the system of government to democracy before that time. Fascism became more popular at that time, people focus more on the government not only just a person like the king. So, some of Thais realized that absolute monarchy may not be the system that push the country forward because the dynasty used property of the country a lot, money and property were used without awareness. This shows that people notice that the elite people like the dynasty was unfair. Applied to Marx's theory, capitalist build up their wealth through the labors, but the proletariat has to work hard to earn low wage and that makes their boss richer. The value of the labors is just a factor of production. However, as Marx said this class system does not point out the true value of human which they can be a good artist, musicians but this system cuts their opportunity off. As same as in Thailand during that time, the dynasty was being valued higher than ordinary people, there was an alienation between elite people and citizens so this change was made through "dialectical progress" which Marx used in "Dialectical Materialism": Marx's Theory of History. Absolute monarchy is the thesis at that time while democracy is the antithesis, this contradiction finally become synthesis in Siamese revolution is 1932.

After the revolution is 1932, Thai democracy had not been going smoothly, there are coups 13 times since 1933 to 2014. Most of the coups are headed by soldiers. This illustrates that the class still affects Thai history. When there is a coup, dictator will take over the country, and dictation take away the freedom of people. That alienated the people from dictator. Dictator has full power to punish people without justice, for example, section 17 was used by Thanom to punish many people without judicial process. People can be put to death in that dictation time.

As dictator had power to govern the country, people who could not handle it anymore started to protest for constitution. The first protest was started by university students in 14 October 1973 or เหตุการณ์ 14 ตุลา. Military used weapons to stop the protest, many people died

from this event. This clearly shows that the difference in class of citizens and dictator made a huge impact on the value of people. Dictator hurt people without mercy. They devalue the people who were not on their side even these people were the ones who pay tax and let them use the tax without ability to check how the tax was used for. After that event, Thanom resigned from prime minister and escaped to Germany.

Moreover, the protest in 6 October 1976, was due to the comeback of Thanom. The event started when two electric technicians who gave away posters against Thanom's comeback were killed and hung. Then, there was a play about these two-people's death and the newspaper published and said that the actor look like the prince. As a result, many people, such as boy scouts, got angry and killed people who protested in Thammasat University. This can be applied to Marx's theory that the dynasty (the prince) was valued higher than normal people because people like boy scout can kill other protestors just for the play that the actor looks like the prince. This shows the inequality in the class that someone is valued more than others. From the movie Paradoxocracy, S.Siwarak mentioned that after the protest ended, the leaders had to run away. Some of them went to other countries, and some had to go to the jungle with communist party. The communist party that Marx had made was quite different from Marx's ideal as S.Siwarak said many leaders left the jungle because they realized how bad the communist party was. But the movie does not go deeply into the detail.

The next period, capitalism started to have roles in Thai political. Many capitalists became politicians. That improves country's economy further. In the period of Thaksin, there were somethings that can be applied to Marx's theory but also somethings that against the theory. First, Thaksin is a capitalist who owns many companies, this is what Marx does not want. There must be labors that work for Thaksin with unfair wages. However, Thaksin's policy also aimed to help proletariat class. He helped these people to start their business, also let people do the job in their locations, not everyone had to come to Bangkok to work. It can be said that this capitalist is quite different from others who care only about themselves.

In conclusion, Marx's theory can be used in many situations of Thai modern history and it may help people to realize how the alienation made the huge impacts on our society.

