

1)

There are two extreme paradigms that are in the movie are positivism and critical paradigm. The Christians in the movie challenge themselves against positivism, or any truth other than the one from the bible, hence being the ones who practice the critical paradigms. They object against heliocentrism even though there has been scientific proof that the earth is not in the center of the universe, but the sun is. On the other hand, the jews, the pagans, or anyone who finds evidence to challenge the “truth” in the bible are the ones with the positivist mindset. They believe that in order for a fact to be true, there must be something to prove it. With the knowledge of math from the Greeks, they believe that Earth isn’t flat nor is it at the center of the universe, and that earth, the moon and the “wanderers” (mercury, venus, mars, jupiter) all orbit around the sun and at the same time rotate on its axis.

The difference in paradigms in the movie can be clearly seen when the christians only rely on the bible and their religious “truth” which claims that the earth is flat and is at the center of the galaxy, not scientific facts that the mathematicians have prior to this period has discovered. The Christian think that if the earth was a sphere like what the mathematicians said, then people in the north would fall down to the bottom. They reject any beliefs that prevent people from accessing those facts by burning down scrolls in the library and only allowing christians to enter them. The Christians are afraid that when people read those proven facts that they will deter away from Christianity once and for all.

The two sides, christian and the jews, firmly believe in their truth, shaped the society significantly. Since Christianity was the dominant religion in Alexandria, Egypt during that time, it was considered to be the norm of the society to believe everything the bible says. Anyone who challenges it will be considered evil and will most likely be stoned to death or exiled. Many parts of society are impacted. The first part is human knowledge. When Christianity forbids all new information and discoveries that do not coincide with the bible, it pauses the improvement in human knowledge and learning. People, like Hypatia, won’t be able to experiment or teach what is true freely. They have tested their theories in secret, and even if their ideas are mathematically proven, they aren’t able to share it to the rest of society. Being this way, the society will continue to believe in false “truths” that the Christians preach to them. Another aspect that is affected is the unification of people. Instead of living in harmony, and being able to share their opinions on things, being able to agree to disagree, the city falls in chaos and is divided into two groups. Those who go against the majority, in this case anyone who isn’t christian or who abide with the beliefs of the christian, is despised and even killed. As seen in the movie, most of the time the ones in the black robes are always either causing violence to the ones in the white robes or sermonizing that scientific proofs are absurd. Lastly, the conflict between these two groups affects the environment in which the society lives in. Blood is shed constantly and as a result of the fight, buildings are destroyed. Not only are the relationships between mankind broken but the tangible part is as well.

B)

An phenomenon that occurred in the movie that depicts the social paradigms is when Hypatia tried to prove that the earth may not be orbiting in a circle like what the greek mathematician prior to her believed. She does not base her beliefs on religion or any one else's opinion. In order to believe in some fact, she must be able to back it up with logic, reason, laws, and mechanism. Hence, why Hypatia spent most of her time trying to prove her theories. There were two events that showed her positivist mind clearly. The first was the scene on the ship. She wanted to prove that she was not insane for thinking that the earth was rotating on its axis, so she told Aspasius to climb to the top of the ship and drop the sack down to where she was standing. The outcome due to the normal logic at that time was the sack will end up a little bit behind from where it was dropped because the ship is moving forward. However, when it did drop, it landed parallel to the pint Aspasius let go. She claims that it is the "definitive" proof that the sack acts as if the boat was stationary, which could prove that the earth is moving around the sun without humans feeling that movement. Hypatia does not jump to conclusions that she is correct, but instead says that she is not sure and goes back to her place to try to prove her thoughts. She not only questions herself but also the theories of other philosophers. For instance, he does believe that the earth revolves around the sun but not in a circular motion like other mathematicians. She

Another event that occurred in the movie, this time depicting critical paradigm, was when the Chritian leader preaches to the followers that it is God's will for them to kill the jews, that it is claimed in the bible that the earth is in the center of the universe, and that Hypatia, a firm believer in philosophy is a liar, a sinner, and a threat that should be stopped and stoned to death. The christians based their beliefs on nothing but the bible, and the leader of the cult. It's as if the Christian leader puts society, or anyone who listens under the spell of his own beliefs. When the leader tells the town to kneel before the bible, they do, except the apprentices of Hypatia, who , as a result, are beaten up. They have no scientific evidence that God said this himself and that the theories in the bible are true. They purely believe in the idea of religion and not the definitive logic like Hypatia does. Whatever they cannot prove, or whatever isn't said in the bible they use the reason that " only God knows" and whoever acts like they know the answer to that something is lying and sinful.

2)

A)

Different societies view development differently. Some countries see it as expanding on freedom and capability. They don't see income as the main factor of development but instead the people's welfare as a priority. An example of a country that practices this approach given in the movie "Where to invade next " is Italy. Micheal interviewed a couple who are in the working class about their benefits and pay. It came to his surprise that they get 8 weeks of paid vacation, a paid honeymoon, 13 month worth of salary each year for the 12 months that they work, and a 5 months paid maternity leave. In addition to that, they get a 2 hour lunch break, which is the time where they can go home, eat home-cooked meals , and spend time with their loved ones. In Italy,

they see vacation and rests as stress-relievers for their employees. They don't see it as a waste of company profit or inefficiency. In fact, when asked about the paid benefits the CEO sees it as something that will increase his employee's productivity. They work better with a relaxed state of mind and a healthy body. He believes that stress causes sickness and those illnesses result in employee leave and when this happens often, it slows production down. He sees that in the long term, making sure that people's wellbeing is taken care of is much more beneficial for the whole than just looking at the profits. "The welfare of the people and the profit of the company do not clash", said the CEO of Ducati. As for countries like the US, with the profit-driven attitude, they believe that in order for their firm and the economy as a whole to grow, they have to extract as much surplus from the workers as possible, simultaneously paying them as low as possible to obtain the highest profit they could possibly grasp.

Moving on to the societies of Finland, France, and Norway, who also have the type of development mindset Italy has. In Finland, they barely have any homework, because they believe that homework is the origin of stress in children and believe that children should have the freedom to be kids, to spend time running around with their friends, and spend time with family. In Finland, they only have 20 hours of schools per week, and the students perform better than anywhere else around the world that spends twice as much in school. The teachers believe that in order for children to develop, they must be free to seek knowledge on their own and have time to do extra-curricular activities. When they don't spend hours and hours doing "homework" or studying for "tests", their mind is able to work more efficiently, allowing them to obtain more information. In France, they educate their students about sex like it's not something to be condemned or feared. Instead, they teach the students their first time making love is something special, something one must consider carefully before doing it, and don't preach the idea of abstinence to the teens. They don't make it seem like it's something that is forbidden unlike in the US. Some highschools avoid even having sex education or teaching students that sex is something teenagers should be avoid at all costs. As a result, students violate what they are taught in school and hence, US. is the country with the most teen pregnancy, compared to other countries like France, whose teen pregnancy rate is relatively low. As for Norway, Micheal went to see how the prisoners are treated, and once again, fell in awe. The prisoners in Norway weren't put behind bars like animals, instead, they are put into homes, with space to go for a walk, a tan, or even a bike ride. They are as free as us citizens who are not criminals. How did this strategy come to be? Well, they believe that everyone should be treated with care and love, even the worst of us should be treated as normal people to teach them how to be good people, so that when they are released they are able to treat their neighbors with love, instead of the same hatred they had prior to going into jail. The norwegian believes that the prison is a place of rehabilitation not revenge. That the freedom and the care that the prisoners receive in the years serve in jail will allow them to be able to go out and live a normal decent life that everyone deserves. On the flip side, the US. believes that bad people should be punished and that it is okay for police officers to commit violence to the criminals because they deserve it. Some critics

believe that this kind of mindset comes from the hidden agenda the US people have to obtain power over the weak. That is why they feel like they have the right to be violent towards the prisoners, like the clip that is shown in the movie. They drag, hit , and kick people as if they aren't humans, put the people in a small enclosed cell, and feed them with food that isn't even "real".

In my opinion, the common meaning of development should be what the Europeans are practicing. The balance between the welfare of the people and the profit of the company. The businesses should be able to set rules and regulations that will allow them to profit while at the same time making sure that the people in the society are happy, content, and have the best quality of life possible. Development should prioritize people not profits. It should first look at the quality of people's lives, and how to improve in areas that are lacking. Once the productive forces are able to work more efficiently, economic development will come as a by-product automatically.

B)

Amartya Sen hypothesis best explains why a society is at a certain level of development. He claims that the amount of people who are under the poverty line is what measures whether or not society is developed. He then goes on to say that poverty limits people from being able to have the power to choose what they want to do or what they have to do to be successful, which is true, for example, education is one of the keys to success as we know it and if a child's family isn't able to afford it, then it's one of the factors that takes away their freedom to do things to help to achieve in life. Social factors and the actions of the government are what determines whether the citizens in the country will have those freedoms. In a more developed country, social services are more emphasized, people have better facilities, healthcare, and education, hence greater welfare of those in developing countries. If the society and the environment is able to be of better assistance to the ones in need or that lack opportunities, then the country may have an increase in development, despite the increase in GDP. The difference in the level of freedom in a developed and a developing country can be seen evidently. To give an example, a developing country would be Thailand, where there is a huge gap between the rich and the poor, and the poor's capability to have the same freedom of choice to do things as the rich is out of reach. However, in European countries, even though one is a working class level, they get the same benefits as the upper level ( CEO). They are treated with fairness. In their society, they give the same right to freedom even though that individual is not at the top of the social status. With the given freedom, people work more efficiently and productively than most societies that don't , have happier lives, get sick less, and a higher life expectancy rate. This shows that his hypothesis that development can be measured by freedom is pretty accurate.

C)

Yes, I do. There is no absolute determination to development, of course. Everything is connected, may it be directly or subtly. People's welfare depends on economic growth and vice versa. However, I believe that development is obtainable without economic growth. The latter is just an assisting factor to development. Sometimes an economy may be very prosperous and have a very high income and yet the people in the country aren't happy. The educational standard level, quality of life, income per capita, and life expectancy may remain the same pre and post economic growth. The country may produce more things, hire more workers, have better technology, but those things may only benefit the rich entrepreneurs, and as for the poor, they will continue to be stuck in poverty. Economy may grow, but if there is no increase in freedom, opportunities, and quality of life for the poor, then no matter how much income an economy is making, the human capital in that country will be trapped in the same state. Yes, it is true that without economic growth education, health institutions, and infrastructure won't be funded properly hence, low quality of life. When this occurs, people have no incentive to develop or even have the opportunity to better themselves since the choices are so limited. The poor in the society may want to live a better life, to find a better job, to be more educated but if the environment isn't able to provide anything for them due to a poor economy, then development in this case won't be feasible. However, I believe that people's welfare and human capital is the priority when it comes to measuring economic development. Not, the money, the income, the tax, or the profit, but whether each individual in the society is able to practice their rights freely, to live in an environment that is not polluted or hazardous to their health, and to have achieve happiness through the tangible (luxury goods, personal wants) and intangible things (relationships, love, community, social circle, knowledge). It doesn't really matter if the country is obtaining so much income from their production but the people in the society are in conflict. People will be stuck trying to debate over a never ending issue that may not even be a big problem to begin with if only they were well informed through education of what is right and what is wrong.

Development may occur with just a shift in the strategies the government is implementing with the same budget and the same income. It doesn't necessarily have to happen only when the country gets richer. The country may not be developing because of the way the state is working. The right education and the right beliefs can prevent corruption from happening and can prevent the government from making unnecessary expenditures, which can enhance the wealth of the economy.

3)

Adam Smith believes that division of labor is what creates economic efficiency and increases productivity.. People should only focus on what they do best and import what they don't produce from another party. This is depicted in the documentary. First, looking on the macro scale, the Fuyao glass company specializes in building glass for several car companies like Toyota and Honda. Those car companies can use their time to design models and engines instead of worrying about how to produce durable glass for the cars. When they decide to use Fuyao's glass, they are able to produce more cars with the same amount of time and work. Fuyao gets money from big firms and the big firms get more output; it's basically a win-win situation. Looking at the micro scale, in a company, each person has one main job, whether it's to take care of the furnace, or to make sure that the glass passes the QC. No one is doing everything. This system of labor goes hand in hand with Smith's idea of how the stages of production should be. He believes that when an individual specializes in a task and invests their time to it, they are able to discover new labor-saving technology or ways to minimize the input while simultaneously maximizing the output. To Smith, specialization stimulates money, money generates wealth, wealth gives surplus, and those surpluses are what expands the market. In his kind of Utopia, there should be no market intervention and people will figure out a way to come back to equilibrium on their own.

Marx, on the other hand, does not see eye to eye with Smith's philosophy at all. Adam Smith believes that we should work for money because that is what gives us welfare, but Marx sees money as something that devalues human essence. The desire to accumulate more capital, profit, and wealth is what dehumanizes us. Humans will no longer empathize with each other. Capitalism allows the rich to be the ones with power automatically and the working class to abide by whatever they say because their life depends on it. This can be seen clearly in film. In the beginning, the American workers are so happy that Fuyao gave them a job so they can pay their bills and live life freely. However, as working conditions and treatment aren't favorable, the workers started to become aware of what is happening. Marx predicted that this would happen for all societies that are based on capitalism. Capitalism does not survive in the long run. In the film, an interviewee said that "rich people get to choose what happens to you, what you get or don't get", and one of the quotes from the unionization speech was "we have the right and the obligation to say no, making profit, having a fair pay, and safe working conditions can exist together". This is the realization that the ones in control are taking their rights and freedom away, that they have the right to have a voice to go against the orders of the "rich". Class struggle is depicted in the scenes where there was an uprising of unionization.

The goal of the capitalist is to extract as much surplus from labor as possible, while paying them as little as possible to maximize profit. The founder of Fuyao is an example of a capitalist. He tries to silence the Union by paying them to vote No, or to threaten to take their job away from them if they join because he knows that if the union wins, his costs will increase, and that is not a desirable outcome for an entrepreneur. It does not bother him at all whether his employees are

safe, cared for under hazardous conditions, or even complimented when they do something well. The CEO forgets how to be humane ever since he started his company; money was always the priority.

Adam Smith believes that what the Fuyao is doing is efficient and all the conflicts will be resolved in the long run, but Marx sees it as a road to disaster in humanity.

On to technological changes. As mentioned above, Adam Smith says that specialization allows people to find ways to better their skills and invent new technology to save labour. Hence, the ending of the documentary where the employees show Cao that in the near future they are going to replace all of the workers with machines since it gets the job done way faster. We can predict that many of the workers will end up unemployed because of technology. Smith sees technological development as something positive. He thinks that with these equipment wealth expands and when wealth expands, the whole country becomes richer. Thus, both the poor and the rich will gain from this. For Karl Marx, accumulation of new capital is just a way for the ruling class to have more power in the society since they are making more money. He thinks that when an individual becomes more productive, the firm will try to extract more benefits from the laborers even more. In the end, the firm will thrive but doesn't return its surplus to the productive class.

4)

The marxist idea was that when a society falls into capitalism, everyone is alienated from each other and themselves. People see money as a priority and without it, life is meaningless. Marx believed that it is capitalism and the control of the powerful class that forces us to abide by the rules of the people with money because without them, who would pay us? This is very applicable to the history of Thailand beginning from the year 1944, where there is a contradiction between the Seri Thais and the Thai government. At that time, there were tensions between the militarist, royalist, and pro-Prudi liberals, and that caused the salaries of the officials weren't stable or very low which led to many to fall into corruption and crime. The Seri Thai, who were an educated group of people rose up against the government by having protests and unionization, but Thailand ended up in a coup instead. In 1947, after the coup, the democrat party dominated the cabinet, but in 1951 another coup pushed them aside. During the same year, president Truman spoke in his speech about his meaning of development and Sarit took it, adapted it into his own version and applied it to Thailand, which wasn't accurate. He practiced the idea "Work is money. Money is work. This brings happiness". When the leader of the country has this type of mindset, it builds up into people's minds. As Marx said, money causes us to devalue ourselves as human beings and causes us to be blind to our actual purpose in life. All we do is work days on end, and we don't even care about what the other human is feeling or experiencing. The "upper" class isn't interested in anything but how much money they can get from your hours of work. Capitalism, in Thailand though, isn't all evil like how Marx sees it. During the 1950s, it

brought entrepreneurship to the Thais for instance, the Chirathiwat family who owns the Central Department store. With increase of investments and partnership within the country and cross-country, Thailand 's economy was growing rapidly. When the Entrepreneur families became the ones who had the majority of the money, subtly making them the “powerful” class of society, they began to grab the opportunities that were available after the fall of the old colonial economy during the war, and decided to enhance money flow, promote ideological commitment to the Thai society. The powerful made the powerless( or the poor) feel like they were obliged to serve and that their life depended on how well they did their job for the rich. The growth of the economy came from the capitalists exploiting the natural resources and the people. Farmers were tied to the market and weren't able to have freedom in their work life.

With development, comes improvement in technology, and that was when the Green Revolution occurred in the 1960s. There was a rise in the rice technology; fertilizers and pesticides were discovered. Without a doubt, the rice exports increased and people profited. Some even grew out of poverty. However, a lot of money also comes with a lot of changes in the mindset of people. According to Marx, he believes that having social class is the dissatisfaction of our lives. When we obtain something, we want more and more of it. We won't ever feel content with what we have. He says that even though we have such a big house already, but the houses surrounding us are bigger than us, then our house will be considered tiny relative to our neighbors, and that makes us want to find even more money to build an even bigger house. Applying to the case of the green revolution, when the farmers use pesticides and fertilizers, they can supply more to the market, hence more income. With more income, farmers are able to own more land, live in better condition, and have the chance to do what they desire. BUT, “wealth depends relatively on other people”, and if the farmer next door has more land and a bigger house, then this farmer will have the mindset that he isn't working hard enough and he needs to work more. Instead of enjoying farming as their occupation, their mental state will be money-focused. They will only think about how they will supply more rice without thinking about the quality of the rice sold.

Marx claimed that class struggle happens when the working class or the proletariat becomes educated and aware of the unfairness in society, realizes that they are being exploited. Once that awareness reaches a threshold, comes the uprising against the ones in control, which is exactly what happened in Oct 1973, where students in Thammasat university were more educated about the leftist ideas of justice and democratic liberalism, they protested against the government, which resulted in a massacre of students. According to Marx's theory of History, there are three main points of the first marxism. Thesis, which is the current system, the antithesis, the people who disagree with the thesis, and the synthesis, which is the resolution from the change in the system. Applying to Thailand's case, the thesis is the Thai government, the antithesis is the uprising students and citizens, and the synthesis is the final resolution from the blood shedded. As mentioned above, when students started to become more educated and were able to translate the left ideology of the West, they became more aware of what the

government is doing to them and wanted change ( aka class struggle). The students then formed a union and started protesting. At first the result may be a huge massacre, however, according to Marx, the productive class, or antithesis, is larger than the ruling class which, in Marx's theory, the productive class will end up taking over the ruling class as a result. And that is exactly what happened in October 1976. The government gave up their old system and adopted the new one (synthesis).