

1. A) According to the movie, first let take a look at the word paradigm. Paradigm is the term that shows the way we know and framing, what we know and how do we know it. In the movie, there are some difference in paradigm for example for the first one there is one character named Hypatia which she perceive or had the ontology believe that only thing that can be prove for example in the movie she has the doubt on the motion of the star such as the sun, earth and etc. which she has the doubt on the way its rotates or orbits. At first, the Christianity believe that earth is the center of the universe but Hypatia does not actually believe it so she tries to find the way to prove it as in the ontology that mention before. So, she try to find the answer by experiment by herself and study more on other related research as for the epistemology she would question in the way that how do you know that the earth is the center of the universe so she try to prove it and finally she found the important fact that against the Christianity believes that earth is not the center of the universe but the sun is and not rotate in the circle form but in the ellipse form. So, the impact on the society is that after she found the truth but it is against the Christianity paradigm so Christianity people took her into the punishment and blame her that she is not believe in their god and killed her.

Another paradigm is that in the movie there was a conflict between roman people and Christ people which these group of people have believe in god and the ontology could be in the way that there are some thing exist or not but this existence is dynamic and it depend on the difference group of people and also the culture and in the movie they both believe that the god exist but their perception on god is much different so with the different perception in god it create the impact in the society in the way that many people fight each other and many people died from this consequence.

B) According to the paradigm framework in social science that could related to these are positivism and social constructionism. For the social constructionism, this framework show that people believe in something which they perceive as a truth but the truth is varies or we can say that there is no existing truth like everyone perceive god in the difference aspect and dynamic understanding toward the same concept which is god for example difference group of people who believe in god may have different perception toward god like the phenomena in the movie that Roman and Christian had the conflict about their god for the Roman they believe in pagan gods while Christian

believe in Jesus with these different kind of perception it result in conflict and create the battle in the city which many of people died in this battle.

For the positivism, this framework shows the believe that there should be something objective something that objective can explain everything and everyone can prove it. So , as in the movie the phenomena that is related to this framework is that Hypatia has the doubt on the mechanism of the star how it rotate which is related to the positivism in the way that she find the way to prove it and she really find the answer that earth is not the center of the universe but the sun is and not rotate in the circle motion and also earth is not stay still but it always move like in the situation in the movie that when she is on the boat and drop the bag from the top of the boat to the bottom so due to this phenomena it means that when she believe in something that thing can be prove like in positivism.

For the postmodernism, we could say in the way that there is no objective truth and this paradigm will always ask the question like how can you know that it is true which it also related to the phenomena that explain the postmodernism that when Hypatia talks to her student Synesius which is the priest “you don't question what you believe, or cannot. I must” in 1:49:31 in the movie this dialogue could be view in the two-paradigm framework for the first one it could be view as the Postmodernism in the way that the dialogue show that Hypatia is the person who always ask the question on her believes while the priest is social constructionism he just believe in god believe only in the bible said.

For the critical paradigm, this paradigm shows that there are something that is true but we cannot prove that is true. According to the movie, the situation that could related to this paradigm is that when Ammonius who believes in Jesus walks across the fire and did not burn and he claims that Jesus is with him because of this we could view this as a critical paradigm in the way that the truth is that He is a Christian who believes in Jesus and Jesus would talk to him and lead him the way Jesus want which he also have the goal in his mind like to promote his believes to other people but in this movie we cannot prove that there is a real God.

2. A.) According to the movie, many countries had their own interpretation on the construct of development which is not the same as other countries for example in Italy, they focus on welfare of the employee, Germany focus on teaching the future generation about their history and responsible for what they have done, Finland is the world best education around the world, and etc. the reason that these country focus and value on these thing as development would be related to the past the history or what they have faced before like what German doing in world war 2. German people try to learn what they did in the past and use that history to remind them and be responsible for that and don't make it happen in the future again unlike in some country like USA they did not value that much in the movie it shows that in USA there is not much of the study on the past that what American people do to form an America like they try colonies the indigenous people of the Americas and also this could related to Thailand that the Government try to cover what they did in the 14 October 1973 the less of study in the past would lead to the less development because we will not know what should be fix. Moreover, in Italy in the past the employees had been exploited so that Italy government set up the law to protect their employee and give them more wage with many free time on vacation due to this it may generate the happiness of labor with a lot of welfare this could make them happy to work for the company unlike Thailand which may not focus on the labor or employee that much like the minimum wage that Thai people can get is very low which is around 300 baht per day. For the Finland, in the past, the education of USA and Finland is nearly the same which is quite low so Finland try to develop the education by reduce the Homework and focus more on the activity more than the lesson this could make student know what they like when they were young unlike Thailand which main focus on the lesson and always study for 8 hour a day this could make student in Thailand unhappy and feel stressful. In conclusion, the way that other country has their own interpretation on the development could be related to the history background like what they have faced like in Germany in second world war, Italy had the problem with the employee before or even in Tunisia which they focus on the right of women which in the past women has less of right so history of other countries could be the key that shape different concept of development in different ways. And for the development in my own definition development is the way we lift up our well-being not even in the economic growth but also in them of equality, society, health, education, literacy rates, a decline in poverty levels, environment, and etc. which these term have to be develop along together for example if the economics growth of this country is very strong but this country lack of equality for me this country is not developed or on the other hand, if these country is equality but the economic growth is very low this is also not developed. If we achieve all these term for me we can call this country or society that is developed.

B). According to my opinion, the hypothesis that could best explain which countries or societies to become developed or developing is the sustainable development. This sustainable development is a new concept of development which aims to focus not only economic growth and equality but they also care about the environment problem. This development concept would be against some theory like in neoclassical theory like free trade which can use unlimited resource because in long term the resource is limited so we cannot provide the economic as we want as unlimited growth. This hypothesis also shows more on the balance between three aspects which are economy, environment, and social community which these three aspects have to go together and these lead to the key development that you can consume in the present and you also let the future generation have the resource to consume as well. And how to say that sustainable development can be the best factor to determine the development level. To answer this question the sustainable development goals could be the point to determine the development level for example the 8th goal is good jobs and economic growth this goal tries to make less in unemployment level by offering the opportunity for everyone to get work. If there is a lot of unemployment how could that country generate the economic? And for the environment aspect let look at the 13th goal which is protect the planet. The term of global warming is common known nowadays and it leads to climate change and this change in climate could lead to natural disaster "it is disrupting national economies and affecting lives and livelihoods, especially for the most vulnerable". For the social community, let look at the 4th goal which is quality education. This goal tries to give the quality education to the one who really needed. This matter because education can reduce the poverty by improving the socioeconomic mobility. If we can develop these three aspects the sustainability development could be the best determinant level of development.

C.) To answer this question, let see the definition of economic growth first, economic growth is focusing on the country output which are goods and services that had been produced by every sector of the economy and could be explained in the term of GNP Gross National Product or extend of urbanization also with the degree of industrialization. Economic growth does not care about the amount of natural resource used which this could lead to pollution, Disease and also congestion. And economic growth does not care about the informal sector on the economy. So, the answer to this question would be disagree because if the country does not have money how could that country use the money to develop their well-being of people for example like in Europe country such as France, this country focus on the well-being of the children lunch but how could they achieve that they achieve that by collecting tax which generate the revenue for the government to develop the children lunch which also related to the Environmental Kuznets curve in the way that in the period of pre-industrial economic the environmental degradation is very low this because no resource use that

much but during the Industrial economies people tend to use the resource more in production which could lead income to people which generate the economic growth first then when the time passed by the level of environmental degradation is getting higher due to the use of resources and it create pollution un until it reaches the turning point which when economic growth get higher but environmental degradation is getting lower like U shape for which people will have the consciousness on the environmental problem which they want to develop and investment on the technology to protect their health or their environment. Due to Kuznets Curve, we would say that first we need to focus on the economic growth then we will focus on the development but I would not say that development is not important but it has to go together with the economic growth but first we have to focus on the economic growth in the way to have money first to develop other factors like equality, society, health, education, literacy rates, a decline in poverty levels, and environment. To say that development is possible without economic growth due to the reason above this statement is not quite true in my point of view.

3. To be able to explain this, first let take a look at concept of Adam smith. The concept of Adam smith shows that the wealth of nation should be related to the trading activity not accumulation asset (Mercantilism) He also believes in self-interest which his idea is that when a person act to their self-interest this could lead to the best in economic growth. Talking about the production, he believes that division of labor could lead to most efficient in production like you should specialization in some production not every production you can specialize. With this he believes that it will benefit even for the poorest class level of people because they can consume the product in the in a cheaper price because you can produce a lot of amount due to your specialization. Also, in free market Adam smith see competition as a good thing to people bring their best in competition. With these self-interest and competition would lead to the term invisible hand which he believe that the market or economic will adjust itself without the intervention.

For the Karl Marx concept, he did not agree in term of division of labor. He said that division of labor could lead to alienation which the society spit ourselves like employer and employee or even in capitalism there is also social structural. His idea is like why we need to spend our life helping the company to sell product in order to maximize profit even we do not know who will buy our product. And he also said that when labor specialize in something and doing it for a long time eventually that labor will no longer feel associated with the company like abstract labor just only follow the order but not work for their specific purpose.

According in the movie, for Adam Smith view in labor division, In Fuyao Glass Company, there are many step-in making glasses and this movie show what there is the division of labor in the way that American people focus on the operator and Chinese people is doing their job in supervisor. Moreover, in China, the Fuyao company shows the clearly picture of the concept of Adam Smith in the way that there is labor specialization which can product the huge amount of glasses than Fuyao in America. And also in Smith concept people are rational they response to incentive which incentive is money and labor in China work very hard to earn money to help their family. In addition, in the middle of the movie, it mention about the competitive of the labor which is related to the concept of smith in the ways that if there is competitive in the market it will create the efficiency in the market like Fuyao in America they fired labor that cannot use the computer and etc. so they can hire the one with more specialize. For the Marx view, if Marx is watching this movie he would against the way that Fuyao company works because he thinks that the division of labor could lead to an alienation like in the movie most of the Chinese people are supervisor while American people are only the operator which there wage is not the same as the supervisor. Due to this it also related to the Marx concept in the way that he think that money is a mean that we use to fulfilled our life but it is a kind of alienate people from each other. Like in the case of Fuyao company in America the

American labor need to obey in the capitalism system who have money to pay them which the labor cannot argue why they have to do this task which is like the abstract labor which employer doesn't care much about your well-being but care only the production like in the movie they fire the labor that has been injured. Moreover, in the movie which Bobby (furnance off-laoder) said that "the condition are not favorable. Doing the same thing over and over again that bear your body, mind. Some tine you think why am I doing this. You think about whether you have stamina and the will to do this types of job" this dialogue is related in the concept of Marx in the way that when labor specialize in something and doing it for a long time eventually that labor will no longer feel associated with the company.

For the labor union, in Adam Smith view, if he watch this movie he might not agree with this statement because Smith believe that any type of intervention will distort the incentive of people and in the movie labor union could be view as intervention which the employer in Fuyao think that if there is labor union the production the labor can produce will be less which they do not want labor union to happen so they tell their employee to vote no for labor union. For the Marx view, Marx could view labor union as good thing to help labor in Fuyao factory which these labor could be view as proletariat. This labor union could reduce the gap between alienation of employer and employee but they have to accept that there is an exist in the class struggle for which in the movie if the labor union happen the employee may not have to obey the employer to do the task that they do not want to do or do not have knowledge on which they could work for their own purpose and could be more happy on their life.

For the technology development, in Adam smith view, he would agree with technology development because he believe in the division of labor would lead to specialization as in the movie the machine can even be more specialization than the labor force and also product the product even more. And Smith also believe that competitive could lead to the market efficiency for which in this case the labor have to invest themselves to be more skilled in order to complete with each other and could get the job. As the Marx view, Marx could see this as the problem in the way that technological development would lead to the excess supply of labor in the market which is over demand and it will create an unemployment this will lower the market wage so that mean when capitalism reinvest in technology. These technology could even replace the demand for labor and finally it will create the wage drop down and if the wage drop there will be the many cheap labor in society which they cannot do anything else because no one will want to hire them so there will be cheap labor with cheap wage in the society and there will be a lot of unemployment due to technology development.

4.) The concept of Marx's Theory of History is related to the dialectical process which are the process of through which the way to create the knowledge or any is contradict between mind and something else or even ourselves and something else. When there is a contradict we could called these contradict as a fist existing or original substance which we called this thesis and what had challenge the existence or original thing which we called the antithesis and when we have the thesis and antithesis which both are contradict it will created the reformation of the system and this will change and transform into the new form which we called synthesis (can refer to knowledge) which it lead to reconstruction of the system. Moreover, Marx coming up with the question that how can the society evolve? His idea shows that social revolution are the result of class struggle for example like conflict between the ruling class and the productive class which all the struggle can be explain in the ruling class and the productive class. And ruling class will work as thesis because they have power to rule the economic power but when the productive class which work as antithesis have the consciousness enough this will create the class struggle and will lead to the conflict between both classes and that come to the synthesis which we could view this as a result.

According to the history of Thailand, p.s. in the book and in the movie there is a lot of character and many context which is very confuse so I will try my best to explain only some of the event that could be related to the Marx theory, for the first timeline that Marx theory can explain is that in 2475 B.E. at that time there was the great depression a lot of people suffer in that period so there was some group of people in Paris that have the consciousness enough and would like to change the dominance which are Pridi and Phibun with some military in Thailand. These group of people form themselves as a Khana Ratsadon or people party which they want to have the revolution. As we use the Marx theory we will see that in this timeline the ruling class or thesis would be the king and the royalist which they control the superstructure like politics, religion, and etc. and for the productive class or antithesis would be the people such as Khana Ratsadon and also the military so these two class had the conflict with each other with these conflict it will create the class struggle which was the issue that lead to revolution and the result or synthesis is that there is the social revolution in the way that absolute monarchy had been changed to democracy with constitutional monarchy for which the productive class win and become in the ruling class which also destruction of the old superstructure.

The next timeline is that in 2516 B.E. for which before that there was a dictatorship which is military polity which at that time there was a lot of corruption, many illegally acquired assets which these behavior of this ruling caste was echoed through the society which military rule reproduced the

strongmen at other level of the class. Due to this, it created the unsatisfaction to the lower class like in student, proletariat class and also for the communist party at that time and then when it is accumulated in one level this will cause the conflict the lower class fight for their constitutional and the result is that lower class win and get their democracy back. In Marx concept, the military could be view as the ruling class and the productive class could be view as the student communist or even proletariat and both class had the conflict and it creates class struggle and the result which can be view as synthesis is the productive class win and become the democracy which is the ruling class instead.

In the middle of 2500 B.E., there is the conflict between the resource due to the booming urban economy which there are a lot of competitor on land, water, and forest for example dam building also deprived the villager of the land, forest and fishing right for which the capitalism who own more power and want more resource and fight against the villager or rural group which has less opportunity in money power and also less in government support. Which in 2535 B.E., there was a protest of agriculture innovation project (๑๑๓) which had left them with large debt between ruling class and productive class which ruling class is the government and the productive class is villager or rural group. As a result, the project had been denied and productive class win there is social revolution from this synthesis in the way that the villager or rural groups were able to exploit new political space and have more power to negotiate with the government.

Moreover, the Marx concept could not be suit for Thai history in the way that Marx say that social revolution are the concept of class struggle which there is conflict between thesis and antithesis and could lead to the synthesis with is destruction of old superstructure like the system of culture of relationship and etc. are the thing that remain and educate everyone in the society that these are the different between ruling class and production class. And when the synthesis come Marx said that there will be the new class like production class will be in the ruling class instead and lift up the society in the next level like empire to landed Aristocracy and to Bourgeois democracy which is called social revolution but in case of Thailand there is the shift back and forth of the class struggle or even social revolution throughout every period of the Thai history for example there are a lot of coup de ta in Thailand which shift back and forth of dictatorship ruined by military and democracy also class struggle once become the ruling class and then also be the productive class and in some period of time these military come back and become in the ruling class again. According to my understand, this is not related to the Marx theory.

