

## Question 1

In our world, there are many people in different areas. They grow up with different family, religion, culture, and belief. Therefore, it is not surprise that they perceive the world in different way and have various believe system which we have known as a paradigm. Sometimes, we can compromise with each other and still live in peace but in some cases, they can't. Take the movie called *Agora* as an example, this movie shows that there are people who have different thought trying to prove that they are right and try to get rid of people who have different belief.

In the movie, I clearly saw each group of people has various belief which makes them to have the different paradigm. Begin with Hypathia, a mathematician, philosopher, and astronomer, she has a clearly character which was a person who had to prove everything that she had not known yet. She always observed something around her and then questioned it and tried to find the answer by scientific method. She did not believe in what people said if it cannot proof. From the character of Hypathia, this refers to paradigm which called positivism. Positivism is a paradigm which guided by the principles of objectivity, knowability, and deductive logic. Take the scene on the boat as an example, Hypathia tried to find an answer when the boat was moving, why a sack on the boat drop exactly on the place that a sack should drop when the boat stay still. In my own opinion, I think people who believe in this paradigm will only believe in what they can proof by themselves. For example, there is a scene that even Hypathia will be killed if she did not change her mind to believe in Christian's god, she still did not change her mind because god is something she cannot proof that he existed.

In addition, there are also people who strongly believe in something even it cannot prove. Most of those people are the person who believe because they saw other people believe. I think those people had not have logic and tend to do something because other people also do, regardless of what should do or what should not. In the *Agora*, there are two group of people who have this kind of paradigm. One is the Christian and the other is Jewish. They really believe in their god even they cannot proof his existence. They had never seen him and some of them even never experienced the miracle that they thought god will give to them. However, they were still strongly believed in god and did everything that they thought it will please him. As shown in the scene that a Christian risk himself walking on the fire to prove and show other people including the traditional Roman that Christian's god existed, I think this scene tried to show that those people really believed in god and they even willing to

sacrifice themselves to the god in their beliefs. The other scene that clearly referred to people who have this kind of paradigm is when the Jewish attacked the Christian just because the Christian had the carnival instead of attend the celebration of the Jewish's god. Last but not least, along the movie, I saw people tried to hurt each other just because they had different belief. These referred to the thought that insanely believe and violate the right of other people.

However, the movie also showed that paradigm is not something that last forever. People can change their mind. For example, the scene that Davus, Hypathia's student who had a good logic and always tried to find the answer of science mystery, he changed his mind after he pray for the god and his wish came true. Even there is no proof that his wish came true because of the god but eventually, he became a Christian.

In my own opinion, I think people can have different paradigm since we grew up and experienced in different surrounding. However, we should respect other people's right or at least we should not hurt each other just because we did not believe in same thing. I think in each paradigm, there is something that shape people to believe in those things and even we do not agree with them but there always be something good in every paradigm. For example, paradigm called positivism makes people trying to find the exact answer of science and it makes our world develop. If there is only people who only believe in god and think that god create everything so we do not need to question anything, maybe in these day, we still can not find the truth that our world has a sphere shape. On the other hand, if there is no people who believe in god and faith, maybe, we will still attack each other everyday because we do not believe in moral and the good thing.

## Question 2

According to the movie called where to invade next, I saw each country has different purposes that they fight for. Begin with Italy, labor in Italy have very good quality of welfare since the entrepreneurs give them a lot of holidays to spend for relaxing after the work and also give them a lot of salary compare to other countries. Since the labors have very good welfare, they have quite a higher average life span because they have not much stress. The entrepreneurs are also happy even they pay a lot of money to labor because when the labors are happy, they do good job and the entrepreneur benefit from this point. In France, people in France pay highly attention to the food that children have. Lunch in school contains sufficient nutrition and it looks very delicious. All of the children in France have to spend one hour for their lunch and it is like they do not just have lunch, but they study it. The benefit of France to do so is everyone healthy in the long term because they know what should eat and what should not. France also take care everyone well for the education and public health. In Finland, there is the best education system here. Actually, at first, Finland has quite bad education system but they try to find new ways to improve. The secrets for their success are children here have a lot of free time to find things that they want to do, every school in Finland have the same quality so the rich have to push the government to control the quality of school, and every children in Finland are very happy. In Slovenia, all the education fee is free. Everyone can access to the education because the government here believe that education is benefit public. In Germany, they treat the employees very well. They care about the welfare of the employees. Employees here have a lot of free time after work so they can enjoy life and the entrepreneurs have to listen to their employees. In Portugal, people who use drugs do not be judge as criminal so they do not have to go to jail and this makes the number of people who use drugs and criminal dramatically decrease. In Tunisia, people really care about woman's right. Here, woman can legally have an abortion. As you can see, each country has different point that they want to fix. They fight for different purposes but the only reason that they do so is to improve their society and quality of life. Therefore, in my own understanding, the common definition of the word "development" is to do something that help people in society having a better life. Even there are many approaches, there is no exact way that fit exact country because in each country, it has different problem to solve. For example, in country that have severe problem of widespread poverty, hunger, and misery, they may have to solve the problem immediately by any approach that provide people some food and habitat which can only help in short term. However, in some country that most people have sufficient things that they need but may not

catch up with the other countries, they may need the long-term approach like changing in pattern of policy or focus on long-term growth.

I agree with the concept of Amartya Sen that see development as freedom. I really agree with his argument about the word poverty that poverty is not just people who have a few money but it is also the lack of ability to do things that they want. Amartya Sen studied the famines in various part of the world and found that they occurred even there was no decline in food output and they tended to occurred because of they could no longer afford for the food. Some people have income exceed the poverty line but they still face social problems which make them living as if they have insufficient income. In my opinion, this is the serious problem that we can use to measure the level of development in each country. Development in my opinion should not measured by the amount of money they have but it should be seen as a process of expanding the freedoms that people enjoy. However, there is no social system that can occur simultaneously. We have to choose only two things between freedom, capability, and economic efficiency.

In my own opinion, there is no development without the economic growth. However, it is also no economic growth without development. These two words need to stick with each other but it does not mean that development need only the economic growth only. It depends on many factors. The reason that economic growth is essential for development is to improve something in the society, apart from the policies, budget is the very necessary. And the budget mainly comes from the national income which related to economic growth. Take America as an example, because of highly economic growth, the U.S. government can spend budget to develop their country. On the other hand, the country that has very poor economic growth like Zimbabwe, they merely develop their country at all. However, economic growth is not the only factor that make country to be developed. Take Kuwait as an example, Kuwait is a country that exporting oil so its economic growth is quite high. But Kuwait still considered to be developing country because of its economic structure which is extremely one-sided. In conclusion, I believe that economic growth is very essential for development but it is not the only factor at all.

### Question 3

First of all, I am going to summarize the idea of Adam Smith and Karl Marx. These two concepts extremely contradict with each other. The idea of Adam Smith is about free market. Adam Smith argued about the division of labor. He said that labors should work in something that they specialize because it can increase huge amount of output. He also believed in mutual gains from exchange that everyone only works for their self-interest and at the end, this benefit is mutual. In the free market concept, if left alone, markets will produce the most efficient and just outcome. However, this will make enormous inequality in the society. Therefore, Karl Marx came up with the idea of communism. He believed that firm should not look labors as input but they should treat them as human being. He saw the division of labor as a way of devaluation of human being. Eventually, he came up with the idea of labor union.

The movie is about the Fuyao, glass company, owned by the Chinese investor who took over the General Motor company. In that time, General Motor company had to shut down because of the economic crisis. Since it was a big company, many people were laid off and they were unemployed. However, Fuyao company decided to employed a lot of old employees from GM company with a condition of decrease more than fifty percent of their salary. Those employees have no choice so they accept the condition and work in the Fuyao company.

Chinese and American have a very different cultures and believe system. In China, people work very hard like machines and workers have no right to disagree with their employers. On the other hand, there is a lot of freedom for American citizens. In America, workers should work only in office hour and they have the right to discuss or argue with their employers. Therefore, when American people combine with the Chinese people, there are huge conflict. On the grand opening day of the company, one of the members in the company said that American workers need the labor union. This made the chairman of Fuyao very angry and fired him. I think this situation can refers to the two different idea of Adam Smith and Karl Marx as I mentioned above. For the Chinese chairman, he might agree with the concept of Adam Smith which should let the market freely so everyone can act for their self-interest. However, the American workers may agree with the concept of the labor union from Karl Marx because it is not fair for them to be treated very poor and have no right to argue in things that they want. Therefore, they need labor union for the power to negotiate and to protect them from the labor abusive.

After the conflict, the chairman still did not believe in the labor union because he thought that it will take the power of controlling the company from him. American worker's life became harder and harder. They were more report of injured and unfair treat for the American workers. They were also oppressive by the Chinese leaders. Therefore, the American employees began to protest for their right of the labor union. However, instead of construct the labor union, the Chinese chairman fired all of the people who joined the protest. Finally, he got rid of people until it was too low so he found a new way to continue the firm. His solution was using the new technologies to work instead of workers. This made the had more power to negotiate with the workers because they can use machines instead of workers. In my opinion, this is the big progress of technological development.

#### Question 4

First of all, in my understanding, the idea of 'Marxist historical development' is about cancelling the class. He believed that there should not be the class that rule others and the class that be ruled. Everyone should be equal. This means that there should be no property right. Government should allocate resources so everyone will be equal. This idea can refer to the word communist.

The idea of communist spread over various part of the world. Thailand is one of the countries that govern by the communist. In the past, before Thailand governed by democratic system, we governed by the absolute monarchy system which all the power belonged to only the king. However, when our country is bigger and people have more knowledge, the system began to changed. The big point that can change the system was when Pridi Banomyong, Thai student who went to studied abroad, adapted the knowledge that he learnt from the foreign country and tried to use it in Thailand.

Eventually, the king rama VII was seized his power. And Thai people have the right to have their own power. However, it was not democracy at all because in that time, Thai people still did not have enough knowledge and understanding about the democracy. Therefore, the country was governed by Pridi Banomyong.

In 2501, Sarit Thanarat changed our governing system to be the communist. Thai people lived in the silence in many years. They have no right to argue anything. In the end, Thai people cannot bear that situation anymore. The university student started to fight for our rights and there was a revolution since then.

I believe that in the Marxist idea, there still be some good point. For example, equality can make everyone live in peace. They do not need to fight for the self-interest because of the management of government. However, I still believe in the democratic government since I think that we should have our right to choose the best thing to ourselves.