

**EE466 ( Quiz No. 1)**

**1.1 A) Explain the difference in paradigms according to the movie and its impacts on society.**

**B) Analyze the phenomena in the movie with some paradigms frameworks in social science**

A) : The movie took place in an unfamiliar world of early Christianity invasion to the city of non-Christianised Alexandria. The film depicts a slowly shifting beliefs of Alexandria's pagan towards a more Christianised state; a state enriched with issues of division and conflict. Speaking of division, pagans and Christians wage war against each other in the very first section of the movie. Spurring into conflict, Christians set ablaze pagan's gods and the, homogeneously dissimilar, two groups of believers stepped into battle. Depicted as an antagonist, the Christians found themselves superior in number, thanks to Jesus Christ, and eventually besieged the library where flocks of pagans and several main characters, Orestes and Hypatia, took refuge in. The inevitable result of wars is death for both partakers. Paradigm here is defined as beliefs one holds and according to when they live through one's life. It can be onerous to understand one's paradigmatic assumptions. However, with the portrayal of religion, Paradigmatic clashes between the two groups of people, holding totally different views and beliefs, can be grasped quite easily. One group holds their traditional belief, whilst other "newcomers" forcefully embedded their belief into the incumbent with force and violence. The society bears the death tolls and lives loss, once the war is over. Not only the lives that the Christians took, but also the mountainous scrolls of knowledge sat in a library. Presumably, once the war eventuated, the society will be stunted from their inability to learn progressively.

B) Hypatia, a scholar who was originally responsible for teaching the students of Alexandria, saw her dream of seeking the truth of the universe burned down, literally. In the social science view of positivism, the seeking of truth, Hypatia was the perfect character to display such "truth exploration." As the city spirals downward, Hypatia rose upwards urging to solve the unbeknown truth of astronomy. She seemed not complacent with the existing and ill explained truth, that is the Sun, the Moon, and the Wanderers circulate around our planet, Earth. Despite her eventual successful exploration, the Christian ridicules her concept of earth being round, arguing that if the earth were to be round, why doesn't people down under wouldn't fall off the Earth. The movie displays the dichotomy between knowledge and religion consistently throughout the movie. While Hypatia can be viewed in the lens of social science as "positivist", the Christians are seen as "social constructionists"; Christians are seemed to held the same perspective of their "flat earth theory", disbelieving the science.

Furthermore, there is a recurring nuance portrayed in the movie of the normalcy of possessing slaves. Davus, Hypatia's slave, is considered one of Hypatia's companions, yet she failed to take him as a fellow human being. This can be seen in social science

paradigms as a critical paradigm. It is definitely socially unjust for human beings to beslave their fellow humans. Despite her own words to bridge the conflicts between her pagans and christians students, saying “ If two things are equal to a third thing, they are equal to each other.” It can only seem that in the narrative of this movie that conflict between believers and nonbelievers posted more problematic than a class divide

**1.2 A) Explain how the discourse of ‘development’ had been constructed differently in different societies and what the common definition of ‘development’ (in your own interpretation) should be.**

**B) Explain which hypothesis [from the class] could explain best the determinant of development level in each society.**

**C) Discuss do you believe that development is conceivable without economic growth?**

A) : Development has always been the forefront when discussing the world's economy. The term development more specifically has been coined with the economic prosperity of that country. Despite the difference in hegemony of dissimilar eras, economic indicators such as GNP and GDP are most frequently used to gauge “development” of that country. Through different periods of humanity, distinct development paradigms had taken the reign and dictated the ways our development policies improved the society. Historically, the approach to development has continuously evolved to accommodate different societies. To illustrate, in the economic growth and modernisation era, Robert Malthus perceived that humanity’s ability to reproduce too rapidly could potentially doom society. The unthinkable amount of population would exceed the diminishing food production. At times, if humanity fails to implement check and balance on its population growth, calamities will then be inevitable. Development in modernisation revolved around the effort to limit population through preventive actions, in order for the state to remain prosperous. The idea of Malthus’ basic theory slowly perished as scientific and agricultural development enhanced exponentially, exceeding its population growth counterpart. Especially, in Asia and African continent, the growth rate could easily exceed the already troublesome subsistence produce to satisfy its large population. Despite that, Malthus’s basic theory could not be applied to advanced economies like the United States of America or the majority countries of Europe, where agricultural development is readily developed to serve its major population. It can be seen, as stated, that development is construct differ from society to society. One set of ideas could not be applicable to another society without the understanding of its geographical, technological, demographical, and structural structure. For instance, from the book Gun, Germs and Steel (Jared Diamond, 1997) showcased the importance of geographical factors as an indicator for the country’s success economically. To illustrate, the northern hemisphere might face a colder climate, encouraging its population to stay inside: Hence, more time to develop tools to tackle resource issues, resulting from uncompromising cold year round. In contrast, the southern hemisphere did not experience coldness and yield its produce year round. Consequently, its population did not have the incentive to be as innovative, compared to its northern hemisphere counterpart. Thus, there are certainly blueprints that allowed many so-called “First World

Countries” to develop in their ways; These blueprints don't possess a magical “copy-paste” to lift the Third World Countries out of economic difficulties, without understanding the existing struggle that these countries experienced. It's

In my opinion development has a usual connotation with economic prosperity being a central force. Poverty and malnourishment are pivotal borderline between developed and developing or underdeveloped countries. Having drastically excess monetary, the citizens of underdeveloped countries could be uplifted. Subsequently, without worrying where to make ends meet, they could pursue their personal goals. Despite this, others non-monetary development indicators cannot be dismissed. Yearning towards betterment, the idea of development should measures the overall welfare, including education, freedom, equality, and most importantly happiness. In spite of the subjective manner of happiness, I maintained that happiness could be the pivotal concept to lean on developing such a country. Collective happiness could be achieved through non-monetary means aforementioned. Therefore, development, in my opinion, stems from monetary and non-monetary factors (monetary being a primary factor) working conjointly towards the homogeneous gola, bettering the welfare of the citizens.

- B) : The hypothesis proposed in class, in my belief, that could measure the level of development is the sustainable development goal (SDGs). Sustainable development is an excellent development plan to gauge different pillars of a country's development, including poverty level, nutrition, education, equality, economic growth, innovation, inequality, environment and freedom. The concept measures and encourages the present generation to function well without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. Sustainable development is not necessarily focused on preserving environmental preservation, but rather profusely underlying economic and social development as well. Showcasing a difference in how development needn't be coined with land invasion or economics prosperity; the movie Where to Invade Next is a great example. For instance, In Finland, the schools are craftly designed for children to explore their own liking through excessive free-time during school. Unlike the United States schooling system, Finnish school system encourages their students to prosper in their individualistic ways, understanding that standardised tests could not gauge different individuals. In SDGs, development aspects are divided into different categories to understand varying aspects of that specific country, allowing them to blossom in their own ways. Socio-Economic Development (Szirmai) displayed how different countries possess similarities and differences, when discussing development. For the developing countries, dimensions like levels of per capita income, demographic characteristics, natural resources and geography, structure of production, economic regime etc are the determinants between rich and poor countries. I wholeheartedly agreed on the stated aspects that it certainly played roles in shaping a country. However, without a clear road map on how a country to develop, development in such a country could potentially experience a development stagnation. SDGs provide such fundamental frameworks, allowing socio-economists to track different aspects of well-being in such a country, and rank them accordingly.
- C) : Development alleviates the people from hardships and low-standard of living with proper jobs and welfare. While, economics growth mostly aims toward bettering in production, illustrated by Production Possibility Curve, or more generally a growing GDP.

If we observe closely, there is a blurring borderline between development and economic growth. For example, to promote employment in rural areas, the government is inclined to provide better education— which can be seen as development. Once the region became educated, this, eventually, attracted more investment and the likeliness of these people getting hired drastically rises. Collectively, purchasing power rises, hence a flooding of consumers products and services. Eventually, the region filled with businesses and opportunities sparked through the means of education, initially. Employment, opportunities, businesses can be seen as economic growth. Once the collective becomes more “developed” the consequence of economic growth is inevitable. The context given here does not take into consideration the time taken for the region to become developed, demographic and geographic difficulties, fundamental welfare, but the context can be seen as achievable at certain periods of time. It could be seen that development and economic growth are communally working together to flourish in the current capitalism context. Development, in the aspect of government entities, is accrued in order to pursue a country's economic growth, but the citizens acquiring a social welfare betterment along the way. Despite that, without economic prosperity, development might not occur in the very first place. Development and economic growth rely heavily upon one another, hoping that each other will cherish, just like marriage. Therefore, in my humble opinion, development is not conceivable without economic growth, especially in our capitalism dominated society.

**1.3 Watch the documentary film, ‘American Factory’ (2019). Explain the debates between Adam Smith and Karl Marx portrayed in the movie regarding these concepts of 1) division of labors 2) labor union and 3) technological development.**

As a principle of organisation, division of labour has always played a major role in building up capitalism society. Through specialisation, Smith maintained that workers who expertise granted him to work his craft on one particular skill can, in turn, generate enormous increment in output. Division of labour itself granted the intricacy of industrial processes, an integral for the later Industrial Revolution. Smith firmly believed that by encouraging cooperation of many specialists, certain output that formerly unattainable by the mass can then be accessible. Thus, whilst extolling the impacts that the division of labour has on productivity, Smith failed to take into account the immense psychological effects that took a toll on the labours, who initially used to be assigned to crafting each pin individually, now became a mere pawn in an elaborate chess game. Marx , on the other hand, elaborate on the issue— underlying that the division of labour emphasised the class division issue. He opposed the idea that men, through enforced division of labour, became alienated from their work.

In the documentary, It can be seen through many scenes, showcasing different labours assigned to sell their labour for tedious repetitive works in exchange for a minute hourly wage. Despite the already implemented delegation of works, American workers face an allegation of lacking in discipline and laziness attributing to the low-productivity, compared to the hardworking Chinese: The chinese, in my opinion, are imbedded with the idea of hard-working and easily exploitable traits— showcasing by the lack of weekend, strenuous work shift, and harsh working conditions.

Even in a communism regime, China allows the fundamental of free market, division of labour, to integrate in their system, generating mountainous output. Despite that, the work environment for both plants, Chinese and American, seemed inexorably

dangerous. In an Ohio plant, for example, the facility doesn't seem suitable for workers to work in a perilously boiling glass-making department. This demonstrates the concern Marx had that workers will eventually become a commodity: a mere production of which is subject to the ordinary laws of supply and demand. The capitalists does not concerned regarding their working condition of their labours, but rather their personal gains.

While the documentary truthfully illustrates certain hardship facing Fuyao workers and the formation of a worker's union. Fuyao's management team promptly opposed the unionisation, and went the distance to hire a legal personnel to interfere with the worker's union. In Smith's view, labour unions offer instant relief from employer's exploitation. The union can institute a collective voice, preventing such exploitation. In contrast Marx viewed unions as a terrible institution for the workers, claiming that the unions usually benefit a certain number of workers at the cost of others.

Lastly, in terms of technological development, the documentary shared many glimble of how the machine has played a major role in assisting human production. Smith remained that through his invention of pin-making-machine, that technological development is crucial for the society to acquire welfare, through mutual gains from exchange of better goods and services. In spite of that, Marx's perspective on technological development revolve around the idea of, still class divide. He believed that by the improvisation of technology, factories will be equipped with better tools; In which, eventually, they can create output, similar to the small business, at much more productive rate— risking small business towards obsolete. In the very last section of the film, it can be seen that automation has actually replaced human workers. Fuyao is no longer at risk of union revolt any longer. Seeing the story of how a woman can barely afford her shelter, I felt despair at how the lives of Moraine people will be without secure jobs once again.

**1.4 Read *Baker and Phongpaichit (2014)* [chapter 6-9] and watch a Thai documentary movie: '*Paradoxocracy*' (2013). Write a short synthetic essay on how applicable the framework of 'Marxist historical development' [keyword: class struggle] could be in the context of Thai modern history. Draw a conceptual timeline if necessary. (10 points)**

Thailand has long been ruled under the absolute monarchy system. By holding sole ownership of land and granting producers only usufructuary rights, the Thai absolute monarch monopolized the country's resources and state power, rendering the genesis of an independent nobility, hence the key to the development of capitalism was impossible.. Unlike the European feudal lords who had their own serfs and land, the Thai nobility was an official class in the service of the absolute monarch: the low level of class conflict and struggle was owing to the lack of power centers which could rise up to challenge total state power. The indigenuos Thai values and institutions had far been managed by the ideology put in place by these monarchs. Thai before Pridi's revolution against the monarchy, Thailand was conditioned in Sakdina society (before 1932). Men, then, were not equal, the social structure was primarily class based. Values such as face-saving, acceptance of fate, and deference to elders and seniors are unarguably Thai's values that are embedded in our subconscious mind of many Thais then. The earlier-mentioned values are initiated by those elites in the palace. Such values, in turns,

thwarted the development of skeptical inquiry and science. When Thailand became westernised, after World War II, which brought about capitalism. Capitalism highlighted human equality, science, and venturesome use of capital, something many Thais were not familiar with. The clash between ideology, traditionalist and capitalists, slowed brewing in the Thai's society. The notable dissent of Thai's working class was oppressed exerted through the administrative legal system that made the peasants too weak to challenge the monarchy.

Despite the absence of class conflict, it is notable that class conflict existed in Thai's society before World War II. Soon after Pridi's overthrow of King Rama VII, the revolution was carried out from the social discontent towards monarchy and, at the time, economic crisis. Working-class activists participated in the revolution itself. Despite their successful democratic acquisition, the proletariat unfortunately experienced the rise of the capitalist ruling class expanded their power under military bureaucracy.

In 1973, the growing economy as a result of Korean and Vietnam wars should bring about economic prosperity to the Kingdom of Thailand; However, despite a growing working class and blossoming number of factories, the minimum wage was kept unchanged (10 baht) since the early 1950s. Whilst, the working class continually growing, their children likewise became more educated. The massive uprising, on 14th October 1973 against the dictatorship regime shaken Thai ruling class to their core.

It was this historic moment where the working class (and their Children) had their first encounter with the revolution against the ruling class. Radical changes then were made, and the military dictatorship was soon perished, giving democratic freedom to the people. Not for long, the bourgeois retaliated, alleging the mass uprising as communists people threatening the livelihood of the state. Tragically, the Sanam Luang massacre happened on 6th October 1976. Dictatorship, once again, ruled over Thailand. Those who survived such unfortunate events retreated into the Communist Party of Thailand in the jungle. Thai society became unimaginably polarised, one by the ruling class and another by the working class. Class conflict, by the definition of Marxism, came into full spectrum. Misery and oppression were nurtured in many Thais working class long before the establishment of any democratic system. 2