

The regulation of the Thai government against the Coronavirus, including intervening the market, forcing citizens to wear the facemask in the public place, spending the money to help the sufferer and forcing people who arrive from the foreign countries to stay in the state quarantine, is appropriate or not.

The Thai government regulation is appropriate or not. This topic is very debatable in society. Some people believe in the government regulation against the virus, while some people argue that it is not appropriate. This essay will cover the paradigms, the role of governments, institutional framework, and the ethical aspects of public policy in term of Thai context and some international opinions to support. (It is about the opinion in the freedom to choose that is very popular in America) This topic has the wide scope of content, so some aspects from each thinker may be in both sides.

Begin with the linkage between the Coronavirus and the four of the most common social scientific paradigms. In the positivism aspect, they may think about the measurement of the Coronavirus. These people may believe in the statistic of the death rate and the patient rate to make the measurement of the dangerous of the virus. The Coronavirus can be checked and measured in its DNA structure about its evolution and development. Move to the social constructionism, some people who live in the infected countries may believe in the dangerous of the virus, while some people who live in the countries that far away from the infected area may think that this virus is ridiculous. However, Thai people believes in the impact of this virus because many Thai people are infected from this virus. This paradigm believes that the point of view of each people in different countries on the virus is totally different. Different societies develop different cognitive and belief on the virus. Move to the critical paradigm, the Coronavirus is created to boost the sales of the vaccine. It is not the things that we should concern about. We should focus on the goal of the society such as the social discrimination from misunderstanding with the virus. The racist in the society is the thing that we should concern. We should believe in nothing about the Coronavirus. The protection guideline from the virus, the evolution of the virus, and others are biased. We can really know the truth of the virus because we study from the other truths or researches, so it is biased.

There are many people who support the government regulation against the Coronavirus. The Thai government regulation creates the safeness to their citizens and makes Thailand to be one of the top countries that has the low infected rate. Begin with the linkage between the role of the government from difference thinkers and the government regulation. Begin with classical liberalism, Adam Smith and Ricardo, the government has the duty to maintain the justice and the rule of the law, provide the resource for the national defense army, and maintain the public works and public institution. The government should build the factory of the face mask to produce the mask to protect the citizens from the virus. Also, the government should build the hospital to cure the patients. In Thailand, the government provides the place for people who likely to be infected to quarantine. Friedrich Hayek, one of the famous liberalisms, believes that the government must provide the safety to the citizens, including some minimum of food, shelter and clothing and sufficient to preserve health. As I mention before, the government provides the place for people who have state quarantine. Also, it provides the free payment of the Covid-19 treatment to all citizens which represents to the safety net from Hayek.

(Source: <https://www.hfocus.org/content/2020/04/18945>)

Move to the Keynesianism aspect, Keynes believes that the government should spend their money on public works because it will produce a cumulative wave of prosperity. To compare with Thailand, the government does not spend their money directly to public works, but the government provides money to aid citizens who are sufferers from the pandemic situation. Some of Thai citizens take that money to create their jobs such as opening the restaurant. Move to the Schumpeter's aspect, he does not believe in the free market because the market will be failed, and it will lead to the socialism later. The government should have the duty to intervene the market and do not let the market to be free much. In Thailand, with the capitalism, there are many firms and sellers raise the price of the face mask very high, so the government has intervened the market by setting the law to control the face mask price against arbitrage. Next is the linkage between the institutional economics and the government intervention. This topic will mainly focus on the institutional economics with 3 dilemmas. According to the emergency degree of Thailand, people who do not wear the face mask will have the guilty under the Communicable Disease Act 2015, Section 34,51, on leaving the dwelling without wearing a mask or mask, a fine of 2,000 baht. (Source: <https://www.thailandstack.com/post-2364-ศาลสั่งปรับ-นาย-ประยุทธ์-ฝ่าฝืนกฎหมาย-ไม่สวมหน้ากากอนามัย-เดินตลาด/>) This law is one of the formal constraints (written law) that is one of the type of institution. The effectiveness and the result of this law will be presented by the 3 dilemmas, price mechanism, transaction cost, and rule of the game. Begin with the third dilemmas, rule of the game, it provides two choices which are going out from the living place with the face mask and going out without the facemask. This dilemma will link to the second dilemmas, transaction cost. For those who do not wear the face mask will face with the guilty under Communicable Disease and face with the infection (Covid-19), so the transaction cost of this choice is very high. While those who go out with the face mask will only be violated their freedom to choose and face with difficulty breathing, but the transaction cost is low compared to the others choice. People will choose the choice that has low transaction cost. The second dilemmas will link with the first dilemmas, the rule of the game. People will choose to be going out with the face mask, so the institution works. These dilemmas are compared with the pandemic situation in Thailand. The citizens fear to get infected with the Covid-19 and also do not want to pay the fine from breaking the disease law, so they will choose to wear masks when they go outside their place. Also, the government also orders the shops and restaurant to check the temperature and check the face mask of their customers every time when they enter to the shops. This kind of regulation forces citizens to wear the face mask, but it works for them because Thailand has 0 infected in the country very long time. Next is the linkage between the government regulation and the ethical aspects in public policy. Start with Utilitarianism aspect, they believe in the greatest happiness for the greatest number of people or the voice of the majorities. Any think that care for the majorities will be acceptable. In this case (pandemic in Thailand), forcing people to stay state quarantine is acceptable for the benefits of the whole nation. If we let the infected come in the country without quarantine, we will face with the high number of infected for sure. Also, forcing the citizens to wear the mask is also acceptable because it reduces the risk of the infected for the majorities. Move to Kantian's aspect, it provides the first categorical imperative which is universalize your maxim. It implies that when you accept for one thing, you have to accept for all. In Thailand, the government regulation orders the firms or employees to have all temperature checking for all citizens, so firms or employees check the temperature every single person who pass to

their working place. This situation also similar in the case of the face mask. The government has to check face mark for all citizens. Citizens who do not has the face mask have to pay the fine. Lastly, Rawlsian believes in the mutual respect as human being. To compared with Thai situation, the government let the Thai people who worked in the infected countries to fly back to Thailand with state quarantine for 14 days. It concerns about a veil of ignorance. Every people were born in Thailand with or without infection are Thai, so it is the duty of the government to take care those people. Also, Rawlsian believes in the benefit of the least advantaged members of society. The government also provides the government spending to aid people who suffer from the pandemic with the condition. Those people are the poor who are the least advantaged member of society. This is the end for those who agree with the government regulation.

On the contrary, there are some people who disagree with the government regulation against the virus. The government regulation violates the human freedom, destroys the economy and the free market mechanism. Begin with the linkage between the role of the government from difference thinkers and the government regulation. Begin with classical liberalism, Adam Smith and Ricardo believe that the government should not intervene the market price of the face mask because it violates the freedom of their citizens. In the same way, people who are neoliberalism also disagree with this regulation. Hayek does not believe in the government spending. The spending from Thai government to aid their citizens will work only in short-term. In the long term, the government will have lower money to manage the society. Thatcher, the former UK president, also believes that the fiscal policy is inefficient. Neoliberalism also believes in the freedom of free market and individual. They do not believe in the government intervention; however, the government should intervene when it is necessary. In Thailand, the government provides the law to control the price of the face mask, but it also sells their face mask with the price that higher than the market price. Next is the linkage between the government regulation and the institutional economics. The emergency degree that Thai government announced is still be extended from month to month, so many citizens are not very satisfied about this extension. Many citizens decide to protest against this emergency degree in order to abolish this degree. The number of infected in the country is zero, so it does not need the degree. (Source: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lqOZAGMzX-E>) They demand for the institutional changes. I will explain by using the ball and cup resilience compared with the Thai context. Thai citizens come to protest against the government regulation about the emergency degree. They try to push the change to reach the level of threshold. However, it does not work because the government still enforce the degree. The change does not occur because some citizens still agree with the government side, so the number of protestors is not enough to change the institution. However, if the protestors still protest and promote their ideas about the change, the number of protestors may be increased to reach the level of threshold which leads to the change in institution. (cancel the emergency degree) Move to the linkage between government regulation and the ethical aspect in public policy. Libertarians oppose government regulation in the name of human freedom. They believe that the government violates their freedom through enforcing the regulation. The libertarian rejects the policy about no paternalism. This policy is mostly about forcing to wear the safety equipment for their safeness. In Thailand, the government enforces the law to force people to wear the face mask when they go out from their living place. This kind of regulation violates the human freedom because the state has no right to dictate what risks

they may have. This topic is also very debatable in America. Many protestors protest about the right of the citizens against the government regulation. People have the rights to choose to wear or not to wear the mask. People were not born with the face mask.

(Source: <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-53477121>) This is the end for the disagreement on the government regulation.

In my opinion, I tend to agree with the government regulation side in some part. First, the government with the doctors and nurse can control the infected rate and the death rate to be due to their emergency degree. It shows that the regulation works. Second, we should concern about our safeness before we concern about our rights. We can see that the countries that concern about human rights or freedom over the safeness, such as America, face with the high death rate and infected rate, while Thailand which concerns about the safeness over the rights has lower amount of the infected. However, when the government can control the infected in the country to be zero, it should abolish the emergency degree to stabilize the economy again. Thailand faces with the big economic crisis during the pandemic (accumulated from many years), the government should concern about this crisis as well instead of controlling the rate to be zero all the time. People with bad economic still have bad living standard same as people who got infected the virus.

In conclusion, the Thai government regulation is acceptable in the aspect of safeness. However, the regulation can be seen as unacceptable in the aspect of violating the right and freedom as well. With the case study from many countries that have difference aspect on the regulation, countries with the regulation about safeness seem to have better living standard and the higher satisfaction of the safeness from the virus than the countries with no regulation to handle this virus because of the human rights and freedom. The advantages from the regulation seem to be higher than the advantages from without the regulation. Overall, Thai government regulation against the Corona virus is appropriate. (Source: <https://travel.trueid.net/detail/EpwDxDy0Jd17>)