

Question 1

From agora movie, I will explain the difference of 4 paradigm through the main characters in the movie. First, our main actress – Hypatia – who is the astronomy teacher that thought the other main actors in the movie. She doesn't believe in any god and She is also the good example of positivism paradigm because she will not believe in anything that can't prove it's true or exist. She has to prove everything and believe that social should be studied empirically and scientifically. For example, she tries to prove that why there are winter and summer if the sun can change its size or else; if the sun is the center of solar system or not; if the world is moving but we don't realize it yet or not. She is guided by the principles of objectivity, knowability and deductive logic and also believe in epistemology. Second, Orestes is the one who is the example of the postmodernism paradigm. He usually questions about how you knew that its true. Davus is also has a part of postmodernism because he is a Christian that believe in Jesus but also question about his existence. Third, Ammonius, Synesius and Cyril are the example of critical paradigm. They are Christians that believe in Jesus without any curiosity about HIM and his doctrine. They have ontology in their mind what ideal society should look like and believe in god even if it's no proves. In addition, I think almost everyone in movie are critical paradigm and believe in ontology except Hypatia.

In the movie, there are many different paradigms in society so it would cause a conflict between each other's such as Christians vs Pagans. However, most people in 2 groups are critical and social constructionism paradigm who believe in their religion without any prove that god is really exist and have been shaped their mind by the society. Christians in the movie also believe anything that Cyril said by claiming the Jesus without analyzes it.

Question 2

There are many different meanings of development in these days. Each of country have their own discourse of development in their mind. Most of the country in Europe are viewing the development as social welfare. For example, at France and Italy, they take good care of their people; the government provide free health care, good education, paid sick or maternity leave, paid vacation and also provide a good and nutritious lunch for kids at school. In addition, Finland and Slovenia also provide free and good education for their people. Finland provides an equal standard of education in each of every school in the country. There is no private school in Finland because if you open a school and collect the payment from students, it would be illegal so the rich and the poor students will go to the same school which is nearby their house. Therefore, parents of the rich students will push the quality of the school for their kids too. Moreover, the rich and the poor kids will become friends so in the future when the rich kids are grown up, they would think twice before they take advantage of a poor people. In Slovenia, the government doesn't collect the university tuition fee because they have a concept in their mind that education is a common benefit of the society. Meanwhile, there is also another different discourse of development among other country in the movie. I think; Germany, Portuguese, Norway, Tunisia and Iceland are viewing the development as modernization. In Germany, they respect the labor voice and provide the power that they should have to bargain with the employer. Portuguese, Norway, Tunisia and Iceland they have common standpoint about every human are equal no matter who you are or what your gender. In Norway, they treat prisoners as a human too. They think that they should take care and rehabilitate the prisoners and help them get back to the society. Even if they killed people but we have no rights to kill them too. There is no one have the rights to killed anybody. There should not be a violent punishment. The prisoners in Norway also have the rights to vote in the election so the politicians have to listen to their voice too. Furthermore, in Tunisia and Iceland, they believe in the concept that men and women are equal. They believe that women should have more position and role in the society. Lastly,I think the common definition of development in my own interpretation is it should make all people have a good living standard no matter who they are, they are also humans too. Everyone has their own rights. The development should not just focus on economic and wealthy.

I think sustainable development could explain the determinant of development level in each society. Sustainable development is development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. Sustainability

level will classify the level of development in each society. This will link to the idea that development isn't conceivable without economic growth. People will not interest in anything else if their stomach are not full yet. Economic growth provides the resources which can be invested in development: better education, better health, reduction of poverty, reduced inequality and environmental sustainability. Growth can transformed into the socio-economic outcomes.

Question 3

In my opinion, Adam Smith is an example of capitalist and Karl Marx is an example of communist. In the movie, there was a conflict between American worker and Chinese employers and also Chinese employees too. First, Fuyao – the Chinese glass company – doesn't want to have a labor union in their factory at America. They don't want the American worker to have a power to bargain with them. The Chinese chairman doesn't want the worker to have a say on the production process. He wants the worker to do what he wants and see that it's the most benefit to company. The Chairman believe that the workers make his production process inefficient and it's just bleeding his money. This kind of belief is quite against the idea of Karl Marx that worker have the rights to have a say on what they have to produce. The capitalist builds up their wealth through the labor of their workers. They become wealthy by keeping for themselves a certain amount of the value their workers produce. American workers thought that management, company and rich people pick and choose what will happen to you; what you get and what you don't get. Capital is nothing else but accumulated labor. The worker's labor increases the employer's capital which are used to build bigger factory and buy more machines. This increases the division of labor and puts more self-employed workers out of business, and they must sell their labor on the market. This intensifies the competition among workers trying to get the job and lower wages. In Fuyao, American worker receive the lower wages than they have received from the GM factory and also lower welfare too. By the way, in the movie there was once that the Chinese employer has increased the wage with a few dollars per hour to stimulate the workers, but this was against Marx's idea. Marx rejects the idea that anything would be achieved by an enforced wage rise. With higher wages, Marx describes as nothing but a better slave. It would not restore significance or dignity to workers or their labor. In addition, in the movie, Chinese workers have to move from their home country to America to work for their company and some of them can't go well with the American worker. A consequence of this alienation of humans from their own nature is that they are also alienated from each other. Productive activity becomes an activity under the domination, coercion and yoke of another man. This other man becomes an alien, hostile being. Instead of humans relating to each other co-operatively, they relate competitively. Love and trust are replaced by bargain and exchange. In the end of the movie, Fuyao has decreased the human labor and use the machine instead. They claim that they do this because they want to improve for a better production standard and American workers are slow so they can't reach the goal number of products.

Question 4

From Marx's theory of history, it divided into many era and each of era have their own conflict between group of people. I will skip era of primitive communism since it was way too long back then. First, era of slavery, there was conflict between empire and barbarians which in the context of Thailand; it would be in the fifth king of Thailand era that slavery has been abolished. Second, era of Feudalism, there was conflict between landed Aristocracy and bourgeoisie which in the context of Thailand; it would be the era before we have changed the regime from absolute monarchy to democracy in 1932. There was a conflict that people want to have their own freedom to own the land or have their own property and to have the government that represent their voice not the aristocrat. They have been pressed by the aristocrat for a long time. Third, era of capitalism, there is also a conflict between bourgeoisie and proletariat. In this era, class struggle happens when the bourgeoisie pay the proletariat to make things for them to sell. The bourgeoisie controls the capital and means of production. They own the machines and let the worker use it to make things for them to sell in the market. The workers have no opinion in their pay or what things they make since they can't live without pay. The rich become richer while the worker hauled and lifted and did all the hard stuff that no one want to do. In the context of Thailand, this would be the era after we have changed the regime to the democracy until these days.