SCIENTIFIC CULTURE
www.sci-cult.com

SCIENTIFIC CULTURE, Vol. 12, No. 2.1, (2026), pp. 4234-4248
Open Access. Online & Print

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo. 18936669

GROUND-UP AI JUSTICE: THAILAND'S PATH THROUGH TAO ETHICS AND MILL'S UTILITARIAN LENS

Pattamawadee Sankheangaew[1], Mom Anchalee Yugala Na Avudhya[2], Sorawit Wongsaard[3], Phrajarcenphong Dammatepo (Vichai)[3], Phrakru Baidika Theerayut Chantupamo[4]

[1,3],3,4 Buddhapanya Sri Thawarawadee Buddhist College, Mahachulalongkornrajavidyalaya University, Thailand
[2]Faculty of Buddhism, Mahachulalongkornrajavidyalaya University, Thailand

Received: 01/01/2026
Accepted: 02/03/2026

Corresponding Author: Pattamawadee Sankheangaew (Patthamawadee.san@mcu.ac.th)

ABSTRACT

The research entitled "Ground-Up AI Justice: Thailand's Path through TAO Ethics and Mill's Utilitarian Lens" aimed to show that AI social justice in Thailand must incorporate philosophical ideas that harmonize with Thai cultural values. Therefore, integrating Tao ethics and Mill's utilitarianism is a practical way to rethink social justice regarding AI development in Thailand. The objectives were to study Mill's Utilitarianism and Tao ethics of social justice; to demonstrate through Tao ethics and Mill's Utilitarianism argumentation that Tao ethics of Wu Wei, natural harmony, and organic order provide superior theoretical foundations for understanding social justice for AI in Thailand; and to synthesize Taoist-Buddhist authentic concepts of social justice that are philosophically more coherent and practical for AI in Thailand. This documentary research employed Philosophical Analysis, Comparative Analysis, and Hermeneutics Analysis. The research finds that Taoist philosophy presents distinct perspectives on social justice. These ways are based on natural harmony, balance, and social order, prioritizing the well-being of all and sustainability over individual achievement. The Tao Te Ching's idea of Wu Wei, or non-action, is about skillful action, not just doing nothing, but not doing anything against nature or the way of the universe. Tao's philosophy of harmony, nature, and universal order should be good for Thailand's AI ethical system because it aligns with Thai cultural values. Taoist ideas support flexible approaches and balance instead of focusing on getting the most out of things. By synchronizing Taoist and Thai cultural values influenced mainly by Buddhism, we can create frameworks that value well-being, compassion, and interconnectedness. These frameworks could be practical and culturally relevant. The study proposes an integrative implementation model that balances empirical outcome measures with ethical, cultural, and systemic considerations. It offers a pathway for Thailand to achieve AI justice development from the grassroots, composed of indigenous wisdom and cultural values. It provides a pathway for culturally sensitive, sustainable development in Thailand and other communities with similar values. This comprehensive analysis significantly contributes to AI Ethics, Social Justice, Sustainable Development, Human Rights, and Global AI Ethics.

KEYWORDS: Artificial Intelligence, Social Justice, Tao Ethics, Mill's Utilitarianism, Thai Cultural Value, Sustainable Development.

Copyright: © 2026. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License. (https://cre-ativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

1. INTRODUCTION

The Philosophical Crisis of AI Social Justice in Thailand caused by the sudden rise of artificial intelligence (AI) technologies in the past few years has shown Thailand a philosophical crisis like never before, seeking solutions on how social justice should adapt to the undermining of the assumed foundation of social justice and technology that engulfs moral agency on cultural authenticity. As Thailand is shifting toward the digital era, initiated by such initiatives as Thailand 4. O and the National Digital Economy and Society Development Plan, the insertion of AI systems into key social institutions such as healthcare, education, finance, and government, and that of the legal, has laid open profound theoretical deficits in existing philosophical frameworks for any just analysis in technology-mediated societies (Digital Economy Promotion Agency, 2019, pp. 15-32). The crisis is not simply one of policy but of a clash between Western liberal-utilitarian ethics as developed in the systematic moral philosophy of John Stuart Mill, and Eastern wisdom traditions based in Taoist notions of natural harmony, which have historically influenced Thai cultural values and social structures. The philosophical significance of this crisis lies in the light it casts on what Castro-Gomez (2008) calls "the hubris of the zero point": the fantasy that these supposedly "universal" ethical frameworks are "views from nowhere" rather than culturally-inflected visions of human nature, social life, and technological progress (pp. 283-322). Current discussions about AI and ethics, heavily influenced by Western theories, appear to be culturally agnostic and universally applicable, however this veneer of universality belies the fact that not just any ethical frameworks may be appropriate in the specific case of Thai culture that is based on a Buddhist Taoist synthesis which prioritizes relational ethics and natural patterned harmony to the detriment of western assumptions of individual autonomy, rational calculus, and technological progress. Thailand's distinctive status as a society that has preserved cultural independence while embracing technological progress offers a prosperous site to explore these philosophical fault lines. Unlike several Southeast Asian countries, which underwent only direct European colonization, Thailand's retention of political sovereignty has made possible the survival of native epistemological traditions, which pose serious challenges to Western styles of social order and technical fit (Thongchai 1994, pp.4578). This focus on kreng jai (reserve), sanook (enjoyable togetherness) and keeping face in Thai culture can be 'read' as a relational personhood which can be informed by Mulder (2000) who argues that people in Asia have a relational understanding of self whereby social affiliations and social advancement are more important than individualistic achievement and rational optimization (pp. 34-67). Conventional theories of social justice, stemming from Western philosophical traditions, consider moral communities their basic normative unit, consisting of only human actors exercising rational reflection and grounds for moral liability. Justice is a virtue of allocating resources and duties between rational agents. The most basic and enduring articulation of justice as a virtue has its origin in Aristotle's account in the Nicomachean Ethics, which sees justice referring to the proper distribution of goods and burdens among individuals, especially to proportional equality, and to the mean between opposites (Aristotle 1999, Books V-VI). Rawls' influential development of this framework in A Theory of Justice puts forward principles of justice that rational choosers would agree to under the veil of ignorance with respect to their own situation, on the assumption of deliberative agents with the capacity to reason about fairness from the point of view of a neutral observer (Rawls, 1971, pp. 11-22). Nonetheless, these conventional models face deep problems when applied to AI systems. An Unprecedented Philosophical Crisis of AI Social Justice Emergence of artificial intelligence (AI) technologies in Thailand has raised a new philosophical crisis that questions the underlying principles of social justice, moral agency, and cultural authenticity in technology governance. While Thailand is transitioning into ramified digital societies with the adoption of the Thai 4.0 and the National Digital Economy and Society Development Plan which are fundamentally involving AI system into the core social frame from medical, education, financial and politic regulation, the shallowness of contemporary theory of justice alongside emerging digital societies is increasingly revealing profound theoretical flaws of existing philosophical approaches towards justice in digital society (Digital Economy Promotion Agency, 2019, pp. 15-32). This crisis is not simply a matter of policy. However, it is symptomatic of deeper tensions between Western utilitarianism in AI ethics, epitomized by John Stuart Mill's systematic moral philosophy, and Eastern Taoist traditions of cosmological harmony that have historically shaped Thai cultural mores and social structures. The philosophical import of this crisis is that it unveils what Castro-Gomez (2008) calls "the hubris of the zero point," the arrogant belief that so-called

"universal" ethical theories are perspectives from nowhere rather than situated cultural perspectives that require assumptions about human nature, social organization, and technological transformation (pp. 283-322). The Anglosphere-oriented discourse around AI ethics appears to be culturally neutral and universally applicable, but instead of being under those labels, Western civilization's assumption of egoistic individualism, rational calculation, and progress of technology may be ill-suited to the social and cultural conditions of Thailand, framed by Buddhist-Taoist hybridization of relational ethics and natural order. Thailand's society is still in the process of coming to terms with the paradox between cultural independence and technological development, and it also offers a particularly fertile field to consider these philosophical questions. Unlike those Southeast Asian countries that the West directly colonized, Thailand has preserved its political independence, and thus, its indigenous philosophical traditions, offering something in the way of an authentic alternative to Western practices of social organization and technological rationality (Thongchai, 1994, pp. 45-78). Its kreng jai (considerate concern for others), sanook (social enjoyment), and sutthi (harmony maintenance) traits are manifestations of a relational personhood orientation in which personal relationships and collective welfare overshadow individual success and rational choice (Mulder, 2000, pp. 34-67). Traditional theories of social justice developed in the Western traditions of philosophy have assumed, as their most common point of reference, that the moral community consists exclusively of human beings—beings who are rational deliberators, who are capable of assuming moral responsibility for their actions. Aristotle's influential treatment in Nicomachean Ethics found justice to be a virtue in distributing goods and burdens between rational agents, paying special attention to proportional equality and the mean (Aristotle, 1999, Books V-VI). Rawls's (1971, pp. 11-22) influential generalization of this approach in A Theory of Justice suggests principles of justice that reasonable parties would endorse under ignorance about their particular situation, provided deliberative agents can think about fairness from an impersonal point of view. Unfortunately, classical models have trouble when faced with artificially intelligent agents that display symptoms of moral agency while appearing not to have full-blown morally responsible status, namely what I call "moral entities but not moral agents" (Johnson 2006: 195-204). Nonetheless, the theory of distributive justice via public goods that mode of distribution has been prevalent in wallops. Its impartial nature certainly comes at least partly from its concentration on the ends, not the means, but, as Mill himself admits in Utilitarianism, utilitarian calculation relies on prior definitions of what counts as "welfare" or "happiness" that may not have clear connotations across cultural traditions (Mill 1 969: 210-2 15). The qualitative hedonism of Mill, in specification of higher and lower pleasures by reference to the preferences of those who are acquainted with both, rests upon conceptions of human excellence that are culturally constituted, not on culturally-independent truths about human nature and perfection. There are many promising counterexamples to Western models of AI ethics. Thailand is a philosophical counter-example due to the fundamentally different concepts of social justice, individual autonomy, and technological development from those of the West, which are shaped by Western cultural values and philosophies. In contrast to individual achievement, the Thai cultural value of harmony in interpersonal relationships seems to represent an alternative modernity that adapts to technological change, but does not capitulate to cultural authenticity. More tangibly, for example, King Bhumibol's philosophy of a "Sufficiency Economy" - which calls for moderation and resilience rather than maximizing and maximizing and maximizing -- this is a concrete illustration of how cultural values in Thailand are working themselves out in alternative approaches to technological developments in which sustainability and social cohesion trump efficiency and growth. Sufficiency Economy (SE), as Piboolsravut (2004) describes, is the principle of balance for economic development, which balances between personal affluence, community cohesion, and environmental security, and is said to be a balance between blind belief in technology and reactionary technology rejection (pp. 127-134). Translated into AI governance, the Sufficiency Economy approach would value technological decisions that improve social harmony and community resilience rather than those that maximize individual utility or economic efficiency, thereby contesting utilitarian optimisation, the mainstream approach in Western AI ethics discussion. The Thai concept of nam jai (literally "water heart"), which encourages the gentle heart that enables social cooperation, is a cultural alternative to Western notions of rational self-interest upon which utilitarian approaches to AI ethics are based. As Komin (1990) shows in her detailed mapping of Thai psychology, nam jai indexically conjures a uniquely Thai comprehension of human motivation that privileges unproblematic interest in

the welfare of others, rather than the strategic weighing-up of their utility or benefit to the self (pp. 149-168). AI built according to the nam jai model would put maintaining social harmony and the welfare of the collective above any calculus of optimal individual gain, provoking a profound re-evaluation of what Western societies assume to be the good grounds for developing technology and what human beings understand to be rational behaviour. 2 Research Objective We have three objectives for this research, which are to help address both the theoretical and practical challenges of AI social justice in cultural context of Thailand.

2. OBJECTIVE

1. To explore Mill's Utilitarianism and Tao Philosophical Theory of social justice.
2. To display Tao Philosophy of Wu-Wei and Mill's Utilitarianism argumentation related to the Philosophy of human nature, harmony, and nature, in order to offer better theoretical grounds for Thailand's Al Justice
3. To theoretically reconstruct from the ground up to produce Taoist-Buddhist compelling and philosophically interesting theories that are analytical, coherent, and practical for Thailand Al Justice

3. RESEARCH QUESTION

1. How do Tao Philosophy and Mill's Utilitarianism differ on the notion of social justice
2. In what ways can Tao Philosophy and Mill's Utilitarianism challenge these foundations to grasp social justice regarding AI in Thailand?
3. How does harmonizing Taoist-Buddhist with Thai cultural values for AI social justice, coherent and practical?

4. LITERATURE REVIEW

4.1 Philosophical Foundations of Social Justice

4.1.1. Historical Development of Social Justice Theory

The concept of social justice has evolved significantly from its classical origins to contemporary formulations that address technological challenges. Rawls (1971) fundamentally transformed social justice theory with his "Theory of Justice," proposing that a just society is one that rational individuals would choose from behind a "veil of ignorance," not knowing their position in society. This approach emphasizes fairness as the fundamental principle of social institutions and provides a framework for evaluating how AI systems should distribute benefits and burdens across society.

Miller (2017) traces the evolution of social justice concepts from Aristotelian distributive justice through modern theories that emphasize equality, need, desert, and contribution as competing principles for resource allocation. Each principle offers different perspectives on how AI systems should be designed and implemented. Equality-based approaches might emphasize universal access to AI benefits, while need-based approaches prioritize AI resources for the most disadvantaged populations. Desert-based theories would tie AI benefits to individual merit or contribution, while contribution-based approaches would distribute benefits according to social productivity.

The historical development reveals persistent tensions between individual rights and collective welfare that become particularly acute in AI contexts. Young (2011) argues that traditional distributive approaches to justice prove inadequate for addressing structural inequalities and systemic oppression. Her structural approach to justice emphasizes the importance of social processes, institutional arrangements, and power relationships rather than merely end-state distributions. This perspective proves particularly relevant for AI systems that embed decision-

making processes with long-term social consequences.

4.1.2. Contemporary Debates in Social Justice Theory

Contemporary social justice theory grapples with recognition, redistribution, and representation questions directly impacting AI development and deployment.

Fraser (2003) identifies three dimensions of justice: Economic redistribution, cultural recognition, and political representation. AI systems affect all three dimensions by altering economic opportunities, reinforcing or challenging cultural norms, and shaping political participation through information filtering and access mechanisms. The capabilities approach, developed by Sen (1999) and refined by Nussbaum (2000), offers another framework for evaluating Al's social impact. This approach focuses on what people can do and be, emphasizing human capabilities rather than resource distributions or welfare maximization. AI systems should be evaluated based on whether they expand or constrain human capabilities, including practical reason, affiliation, play, and environmental control.

This framework proves particularly relevant for assessing Al's impact on human agency and autonomy. Sandel (2020) raises fundamental questions about meritocracy and desert that apply directly to AI systems designed to reward achievement or allocate opportunities. His critique of meritocratic assumptions challenges the notion that individuals deserve their social positions based solely on talent and effort, highlighting how social advantages and disadvantages compound over time. AI systems that rely on historical data to make predictions may perpetuate these compound advantages and disadvantages unless explicitly designed to promote justice.

4.2. Artificial Intelligence and Social Justice

4.2.1. AI's Impact on Social Justice

Artificial intelligence systems increasingly shape social opportunities, economic distributions, and political participation in ways that directly impact social justice. Eubanks (2018) documents how automated decision-making systems in welfare, housing, and criminal justice disproportionately affect poor and marginalized communities, often exacerbating existing inequalities rather than promoting fairness. These systems embed particular assumptions about risk, desert, and social value that may conflict with justice principles. The scale and scope of AI systems amplify their justice implications beyond traditional technological interventions. O'Neil (2016) demonstrates how "weapons of math destruction" operate across multiple social domains simultaneously, creating compound effects that disadvantage particular groups while concentrating advantages among others. The feedback loops inherent in machine learning systems can perpetuate and amplify these disparate impacts over time, making initial biases increasingly difficult to correct. Noble (2018) reveals how seemingly neutral technologies like internet search engines embed racist and sexist assumptions that shape information access and social opportunities. Her analysis of "algorithms of oppression" demonstrates how technical design choices become sites of social and political contestation with significant implications for marginalized communities. This research highlights the need for explicit attention to justice considerations in AI development rather than assuming technical neutrality.

4.2.2. Algorithmic Bias and Discrimination

The problem of algorithmic bias represents one of the most extensively researched aspects of AI social justice. Barocas and Selbst (2016) comprehensively analyse how discrimination can emerge in data mining and machine learning applications through biased training data, problematic feature selection, and inappropriate proxy variables. Their framework identifies multiple points in the machine learning pipeline where discriminatory outcomes can emerge without discriminatory intent.

Chouldechova (2017) demonstrates mathematical tensions between different fairness criteria, showing that it may be impossible to simultaneously satisfy multiple algorithmic fairness definitions. The choice between individual, group, and counterfactual fairness involves moral and political judgments that extend beyond technical optimization.

Kleinberg et al. (2016) explore the inherent limitations of observational fairness criteria in contexts where structural inequalities shape both outcomes and the data used to predict those outcomes. Their analysis reveals how attempts to achieve statistical parity may conflict with other fairness intuitions and may fail to address the underlying causes of inequality. This research suggests the need for approaches that address structural conditions rather than merely equalizing statistical measures.

4.2.3. UNESCO 2022: Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence

The values and principles included below should be respected by all actors in the AI system life cycle, in the first place, and, where needed and appropriate, be promoted through amendments to the existing and elaboration of new legislation, regulations, and business guidelines. This must comply with international law, including the United Nations Charter and Member States' human rights obligations, and should align with internationally agreed social, political, environmental, educational, scientific, and economic sustainability objectives, such as the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

4.2.3.1. Values

Respect, protection, and promotion of human rights, fundamental freedoms, and human dignity. The flourishing of the environment and ecosystem should be recognized, protected, and promoted through the life cycle of AI systems. Furthermore, the environment and ecosystems are the existential necessity for humanity and other living beings to enjoy the benefits of advances in AI. To ensure diversity and inclusiveness, stakeholders should respect, protect, and promote diversity and inclusiveness throughout the life cycle of AI systems,

consistent with international law, including human rights law.

4.2.3.2. Principles

Proportionality and Do No Harm It should be recognized that AI technologies ensure that humans, the environment, and the ecosystem flourish. In the event of the possible occurrence of any harm to human beings, human rights and fundamental freedoms, communities and society at large, or the environment and ecosystems, the implementation of procedures for risk assessment and the adoption of measures to preclude the occurrence of such harm should be ensured

Safety and Security Unwanted harms and vulnerabilities to attack (security risks) should be avoided. They should be addressed, prevented, and eliminated throughout the life cycle of AI systems to ensure human, environmental, and ecosystem safety and security.

Justice (Fairness) and non-discrimination AI actors should promote social justice and safeguard fairness and non-discrimination in compliance with international law. At the national level, Member States should encourage equity between rural and urban areas, and among all persons regardless of race, colour, descent, gender, age, language, religion, political opinion, national origin, ethnic origin, social origin, economic or social condition of birth, or disability and any other grounds, in terms of access to and participation in the AI system life cycle. At the international level, the most technologically advanced countries have a responsibility of solidarity with the least advanced to ensure that the benefits of AI technologies are shared such that access to and participation in the AI system life cycle for the latter contribute to a fairer world order about information, communication, culture, education, research, and socio-economic and political stability.

Sustainability Sustainable societies' development relies on achieving complex human, social, cultural, economic, and environmental objectives. The advent of AI technologies can either benefit sustainability objectives or hinder their realization, depending on how they are applied across countries with varying levels of development. AI technologies for sustainability are a set of constantly evolving goals across a range of dimensions, such as those currently identified in the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) of the United Nations.

Right to Privacy and Data Protection Privacy, a right essential to protecting human dignity, human autonomy, and human agency, must be respected, protected, and promoted throughout the life cycle of AI systems. Adequate data protection frameworks and governance mechanisms should be established in a multi-stakeholder approach at the national or international level, protected by judicial systems, and ensured throughout the life cycle of AI systems. Algorithmic systems require adequate privacy impact assessments, including societal and ethical considerations of their use, and an innovative use of the privacy by design approach.

Human oversight and determination Member States should ensure that ethical and legal responsibility is always assigned for any stage of an AI system's life cycle. Sometimes, humans choose to rely on AI systems for efficacy reasons. Still, the decision to cede control in limited contexts remains that of humans. Humans can resort to AI systems in decision-making and acting, but an AI system can never replace ultimate human responsibility and accountability.

Transparency and explainability Transparency is necessary for the relevant national and international liability regimes to work effectively. A lack of transparency could also undermine the possibility of effectively challenging decisions based on outcomes produced by AI systems. It may thereby infringe the right to a fair trial and effective remedy, and limit the areas in which these systems can be legally used. Explainability refers to making intelligible and providing insight into the outcome of A system. The explainability of AI systems also refers to the understandability of the input, output, and the functioning of each algorithmic building block, as well as how they contribute to the outcome of the systems. Thus, explainability is closely related to transparency, as outcomes and sub-processes leading to outcomes should aim to be understandable and traceable, appropriate to the context. Transparency and explainability relate closely to adequate responsibility and accountability measures and to the trustworthiness of AI systems. They are synchronized with Tao Te Ching Chapter 17: Leadership Through Non-Interference. The best leaders are those whose existence the people are barely aware of. The following is a leader who is loved and praised. Next comes the one who is feared. The worst one is the leader who is despised. If you do not trust the people, they will become untrustworthy. The best leaders value their words and use them sparingly. When their work is done and their aim is fulfilled, the people will say, "We did it ourselves." According to chapter 17, the principle that "if you do not trust the people, they will become untrustworthy" has particular relevance for AI social justice in Thailand's democratic context.

Responsibility and accountability AI actors and Member States should respect, protect, and promote human rights and fundamental freedoms. However, promotion to safeguard the environment and ecosystems, assuming their respective moral and legal responsibility, in accordance with national and international law, in particular Member States' human rights obligations, and ethical guidance throughout the life cycle of AI ethical systems, including with respect to AI actors within their effective territory control. The moral responsibility and liability for the decisions and their impact on human rights and access to rights.

Awareness and literacy Public awareness and understanding of AI technologies and the value of data should be promoted through open and accessible education, civic engagement, digital skills and AI ethics training, media and information literacy and training led jointly by governments, intergovernmental organizations, civil society, academia, the media, community leaders and the private sector, and considering the existing linguistic, social and cultural diversity, to ensure effective public participation so that all as well as on the environment and ecosystems.

Multi-stakeholder, adaptive governance, and collaboration International law and national sovereignty must be respected when using data. That means that States, complying with international law, can regulate the data generated within or passing through. Their territories, and take measures towards effective data regulation, including data protection, based on respect for the right to privacy in accordance with international law and other human rights norms and standards. Stakeholders include but are not limited to governments, intergovernmental organizations, the technical community, civil society, researchers and academia, media, education, policy-makers, private sector companies, human rights institutions and equality bodies, anti-discrimination monitoring bodies, and groups for youth and children. Chapter 64 emphasizes the wisdom of prevention and early intervention, essential for establishing social justice in AI development before systemic problems become entrenched. The opening principles about addressing issues while they are "at rest" and "not yet manifest" speak directly to Thailand's opportunity to build ethical AI frameworks proactively rather than reactively responding to algorithmic bias, digital inequality, or technological disruption after they have caused social harm. The principle of dealing with problems "before they exist" suggests that Thai AI governance should anticipate potential social justice issues and build preventive measures to design and deploy AI systems from the beginning. This includes conducting community impact assessments, ensuring diverse representation in AI development teams, and establishing ongoing monitoring systems for bias and discrimination before AI systems are widely deployed (Lee & Park, 2022). The metaphor of the great tree growing from a tiny sprout illustrates how small decisions in early AI development can have enormous consequences for social justice outcomes. Initial choices about data collection, algorithm design, stakeholder engagement, and cultural sensitivity will shape the entire trajectory of AI impact in Thai society. Therefore, particular attention must be paid to foundational decisions about AI development priorities, ethical guidelines, and community participation structures. The warning that "whoever acts defeats their own purpose" and "whoever grasps loses" addresses the counterproductive nature of forced or controlling approaches to Al governance. Heavy-handed regulatory interventions or attempts to control AI development through rigid restrictions may actually undermine social justice goals by driving innovation underground, creating adversarial relationships between regulators and developers, or stifling beneficial applications along with harmful ones. The Master's approach of not acting and therefore not failing represents skilful AI governance that creates conditions for beneficial outcomes rather than trying to control specific results. Thai AI policy should focus on establishing ethical principles, incentive structures, and community engagement processes that guide development in positive directions while allowing for innovation and adaptation within those frameworks. The final observation about people failing "when they are on the verge of success" warns against the tendency to relax vigilance or compromise principles when AI projects appear to succeed. Thai AI governance must maintain consistent attention to social justice concerns throughout the entire lifecycle of AI development, from initial research through deployment and long-term operation.

5. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This documentary research uses primary sources, both Thai and English versions. The AI scope encompasses artificial intelligence technologies and applications most relevant to social justice concerns in Thailand, including automated decision-making systems, algorithmic bias and discrimination, AI governance and regulation, and community impacts of AI implementation. The research analysis was done using three analyses, as follows.

5.1. Philosophical Analysis

This research in philosophy involves, as the key component of the methodological process, the systematic analysis of concepts within and across philosophical traditions and the analysis of arguments or principles. The conceptual analysis addresses some concepts most significant to the research inquiry, which are: Social justice; Artificial Intelligence; Natural harmony (Tao); Virtuous action (Te); Non-interference or natural order (Wu Wei); Utility; Liberty and Harm. This analysis explores the definitions articulated here and those that emerge indirectly through use and application. The systematic philosophical analysis considering the interrelations and tensions of different philosophies might inform what policies should be adopted or how to practice AI.

5.2. Comparative Philosophy

It is inherent for comparative philosophy when leveraging methodological approaches from many different philosophies and adjusting them to accommodate the specific obstacles of probing AI ethics through Eastern and Western philosophical traditions connected with Thai cultural values. The comparative approach uses multiple comparison methods relevant to different dimensions of the philosophical search. It does this by investigating how these models present their arguments, examining the overarching conceptual frameworks underpinning them, and comparing methodological strategies in greater depth.

5.3. Hermeneutics Analysis

The hermeneutical analysis is concluded with a series of practice applications describing how philosophical understanding can and should be applied directly to policy and practice today. These applications are notable for translating philosophical concepts into practicable recommendations that still respect the philosophical foundations. To their credit, a hermeneutical approach understands that translation is already an act of interpretation that must be adjusted according to the context, purpose, and audience.

6. RESULTS

Philosophical Analysis of AI Social Justice in Thailand

6.1. Argumentative Analysis: Integrating Taoist and Utilitarian Frameworks for AI Social Justice in Thailand

Thesis: Taoist Harmony as Foundation for Holistic AI Ethics

Integrating Taoist ethics and Mill's utilitarianism presents a compelling framework for understanding social justice in AI development within Thailand's unique cultural context. Drawing from the Tao Te Ching, Chapter 37, the "unnamed simplicity of not-wanting" principle suggests that sustainable AI development should emphasize sufficiency rather than maximization. This approach aligns with Thailand's cultural values of balance and environmental sustainability, prioritizing quality of life over technological supremacy. The Taoist concept of Wu Wei (non-action) offers crucial insights for AI governance in Thailand. Rather than imposing disruptive technological solutions, principles advocate for AI systems that support and enhance existing community structures and local wisdom (Si Sutthitham & Thaotharanin, 2021). As Lai (2017) explains, "harmonious interaction is realized when human beings respond to the natural course of events without tampering or interference" (p. 137). This suggests that Thai AI development should build upon the nation's strengths in communal cooperation, Buddhist ethics, and sustainable development rather than blindly following Western tech models (Sivaraksa, 2023). The Tao Te Ching's teaching that "being and non-being generate each other" provides valuable guidance for Al governance policy. This principle suggests that AI policy in Thailand should seek dynamic equilibrium rather than static optimization, acknowledging that effective governance emerges from creative tension between opposing forces: openness and regulation, global integration and local preservation, efficiency and equity. This dynamic balance approach aligns with Thai societal values of relational harmony and supports the creation of societal equilibrium (Wong, 2020, p. 168).

Antithesis: Utilitarian Optimization for Social Welfare Mill's utilitarian framework provides a systematic approach to AI policy evaluation based on measurable outcomes for social welfare. Mill (1863) argues that "the happiness of all concerned is the only right end of human action" (p. 15), providing clear guidance for AI applications in public health, education, and social services. The utilitarian perspective's strength lies in its practical applicability and its use of measurable metrics for policy analysis, making it valuable for Thai AI initiatives seeking to enhance overall societal well-being (Kumar & Lee, 2021, p. 215). However, pure utilitarian approaches may create ethical dilemmas when individual rights conflict with collective welfare. Mill's definition of the ultimate end as "an existence as free as possible from pain, and as rich as possible in enjoyments" (1863, p. 8) raises questions about balancing individual autonomy with community needs in Thai cultural contexts.

Synthesis: Toward an Integrated Framework

The challenge lies in harmonizing Taoist balance with utilitarian efficiency while respecting Thai cultural specificity. Pure utilitarianism may overlook Thai society's cultural and relational dimensions, while an exclusive focus on harmony might neglect individual rights and broader social structures (Cheng, 2018, p. 157). An integrated approach from both philosophies can facilitate socially just AI development that honours cultural values while promoting measurable social welfare outcomes.

6.2 Comparative Philosophical Analysis: Core Principles and Cultural Adaptations

Individualism versus Relativism Western Utilitarian Perspective: Mill's utilitarianism emphasizes maximizing happiness for the most significant number, treating individual welfare aggregation as the primary measure of social justice (Mill, 1863, p. 20). This approach suggests that AI systems should optimize individual outcomes in aggregate, with happiness as the fundamental welfare metric.

Table 1: Synthesis considering Ethical Priority of AI Justice for Thailand by Integrating TAO Harmony and Mill's Welfare.

Ethical Priority	Concrete Action	Taoist + Millian Rationale	Accountability & Safeguards
Participation & Local Voice	Establish community co-design labs (pilot provinces) with mandated representation (elders, youth, marginalized groups, developers)	Tao: center local harmony, communal wisdom, relational legitimacy. Mill: gather data on stakeholder welfare to inform benefit maximization.	Quotas for marginalized groups; rotating seats; public minutes; independent facilitator accreditation.
Harm & Benefit Assessment	Require AI Impact Assessments (AIIA): mixed-methods (welfare metrics, ethnography, and Cultural Impact Statement) for public AI projects.	Mill: quantify net wellbeing gains/losses; Tao: surface cultural/harmony impacts that metrics miss.	Standardized AIIA protocol; independent audit; mandatory longitudinal follow-ups; public disclosure.
Fit to Human Context (Wu-Wei)	Mandate iterative user-centered design & staged rollouts tuned to local rhythms (adaptive UI, consent norms)	Tao: Wu-Wei — technologies should fit human practices, not force changes; Mill: iterative testing ensures net welfare improvements before scale.	Preset go/no-go gates; community validation checkpoints; adaptive monitoring reports.
Cultural Integrity & Respect	Require localization standards and Cultural Impact Statements (UX, consent language, data use norms reflecting Thai values such as thongyim)	Tao: preserve cultural harmony and dignity; Mill: avoid welfare loss from cultural alienation.	Inclusive cultural review panels; iterative testing across subcultures; public reports.
Equity & Recognition of Local Knowledge	Create RPL pathways to recognize mentor/community expertise and fund labs in underserved areas.	Tao: value local relational expertise and elders; Mill: incorporate local knowledge to improve welfare outcomes and reduce inequality.	Transparent rubrics; peer review; appeal mechanisms; targeted grant allocations.
Monitoring — Welfare + Harmony	Build a national dashboard combining welfare KPIs (health, employment), trust/cohesion indices, bias incidents, and cultural flags	Mill: track measurable welfare impacts; Tao: monitor social harmony/trust as key outcome	Independent data steward; open methodology; prioritized KPIs; public access.
Redress & Restorative Remedies	Create accessible complaint channels, mediation, compensation mechanisms, and community remediation processes.	Tao: restorative approaches rebuild social harmony; Mill: remedies restore welfare and reduce net harm	Independent ombudsman; clear timelines; public anonymized case outcomes; enforceable remedies.
Incentives & Funding for Justice	Create a blended justice fund (public + private + donor) prioritizing equity, community labs, and longitudinal evaluation.	Tao: invest in community cohesion and cultural resilience; Mill: invest where welfare returns are demonstrable	Transparent grant criteria; independent grant review panels; co-funding requirements for sustainability.

Taoist Relational Perspective: Taoist ethics prioritizes relational harmony and social equilibrium, emphasizing balance between complementary forces rather than quantifiable individual utility (Lai, 2017, p. 139). From this perspective, justice emerges from relationships and

natural order rather than numerical calculations. As Sangowawa (2020) argues, "Western democracy and utilitarianism recognize the individual as an end in himself/herself and tend toward egocentrism, which is incompatible with Chinese society as opposed to the Taoist emphasis on social harmony" (p. 89)

Cultural Contextualization of Ethical Frameworks Thai conceptions of social justice are deeply influenced by relational norms, including Kreng Jai (consideration for others) and respect for hierarchical relationships, extending justice principles beyond individual utility calculations (Tamonwan & Phongphan, 2019). These cultural values create layered ethical frameworks where justice must be interpreted through local norms and social expectations.

Thai values integrate Chinese concepts of honour (renqin) with community obligations while maintaining attention to individual karmic responsibilities. This complexity means that AI deployment in healthcare or governance must consider relational obligations, social hierarchy, and community cohesion alongside individual outcomes. As Tamonwan and Phongphan (2019) observe, "Thai social justice is informed by relational obligations including Kreng Jai that complicate pure utilitarian calculations" (p. 112).

Synthesis: Hybrid Ethical Framework

The tension between individualist utilitarianism and relational Taoist ethics can be resolved through dialogical integration that respects contextual harmony and individual welfare. This synthesis suggests that AI for social justice in Thailand must balance individual needs within broader social relationships and cultural expectations, creating systems that simultaneously support social coherence and personal well-being.

6.3 Hermeneutical Interpretation and Analysis: Cultural Translation of Philosophical Concepts

6.3.1. Taoist Philosophy in the Thai Cultural Context

Taoist texts like the Tao Te Ching require cultural interpretation within Thai society's historical and social context. Wu Wei is understood not merely as non-action but as "perfectly aligned action" that harmonizes with Thai social values such as Kreng Jai and respect for natural wisdom (Wong, 2020, p. 174). Contemporary Thai interpretations of Taoism transform abstract philosophical concepts into practical principles for AI governance that balance technological progress with cultural preservation. This hermeneutical approach reveals that Taoist ethical function, as "lived realities that inform societal expectations and moral judgments in Thai society," rather than merely philosophical abstractions.

6.3.2. Mill's Utilitarianism in the Thai Cultural Context

Mill's utilitarian framework requires reinterpretation in light of Thailand's emphasis on community welfare, social hierarchy, and relational harmony. In Thai contexts, happiness is understood collectively rather than individually, emphasizing family well-being, social order, and respect for authority (Sangowawa, 2020). Therefore, AI systems implementing utilitarian principles must account for these cultural dimensions of welfare and social justice.

6.3.3. Toward Cultural Authenticity in AI Ethics

The hermeneutical analysis suggests that practical AI ethics in Thailand require dialogue between universal philosophical principles and local cultural interpretations. This approach avoids uncritical adoption of Western frameworks and rejection of useful analytical tools, instead creating space for culturally authentic applications of diverse philosophical wisdom

7. CONCLUSION

7.1. Harmony Balance in AI Development: The Ideas of Taoism

In a Taoist sense, justice is also about balancing technological innovation with social harmony in AI. To achieve this balance, AI development should be multi-stakeholder, including ethicists, community members, local leaders in outreach efforts, and end-users from different cultures. “Together, these will help us build AI products that reflect the collective wisdom of our community and ensure inclusivity and fairness in everything we share.” Moreover, Taoism also emphasizes Wu-Wei, or "non-action," suggesting that the best results come when we act in concert with life's natural course. In the context of AI design, this can mean that systems should fit like a glove to human needs rather than trying to shoehorn rigid sets on end users. This approach respects individuals' autonomy and enables them to have a better experience, leading to fairer outcomes. In conclusion, integrating Taoist tenets with discussions of AI and justice offers a way to develop technology that is not only radical but also deeply sensitive to balance, harmony, and interconnectedness. Valuing these points of view, we can shape the AI future in line with Thai cultural values, ensuring equality and justice for everyone.

7.2. Assessing AI Outcomes in Light of Mill's Principles

In the case of AI ethics, when utilitarianism is adopted from Mill's perspective, we need to consider stakeholders involved in future consequences. It becomes important to judge the effects of AI technologies on different actors. This is based on assessing the extent to which AI contributes or detracts from individual and collective happiness. For example, AI-driven healthcare technologies that increase patient outcomes and accessibility can be viewed as morally welfare-improving under the utilitarian theory because they maximize net well-being. Conversely, AI that reinforces biases or invades privacy, though not fulfilling this role, could also cause large amounts of unhappiness and social contention, leading to a failure in the utilitarian test. Furthermore, we need to consider Mill's conception of qualitative distinctions in pleasures in assessing AI systems. There is more to happiness than simply getting as much of it as possible; the emphasis should be on high-quality experiences and results that contribute in some way towards a whole life rather than just sweating profit ratios. While not the focus of this, a qualitative angle only underscores the importance of developing AI in line with ethical values and promoting positive societal impacts.

7.3. Difficulties in Applying Utilitarianism to AI Domains

While appealing, applying utilitarianism to AI is problematic. One primary concern is to foresee which specific long-term consequences AI technologies might lead us. Because it is hard to predict how AI decisions interact with human society and individuals, it is difficult to determine their long-term effects on happiness. There are also moral implications to utilitarianism, because, in theory, the rights or lives of a minority could be sacrificed to achieve the greater good. This concerns fairness and justice, especially in different cultural contexts such as Thailand, where collective values and individual rights may clash. Moreover, there is the challenge of quantifying happiness and well-being. What are the metrics to judge how an AI system affects various emotional and psychological states? Depending solely on quantitative measures, one might miss the quality dimensions indispensable to exploring human experience. Consequently, though utilitarianism again serves a modest role as the gold standard by which we evaluate AI ethics problems or solutions, it must be administered with some cultural wokeness and recognition of human flourishing in general. In conclusion, Mill's utilitarianism provides valuable tools for considering the ethical implications of AI technologies. We then aim for greater fairness and a just approach to AI rather than the immediate release of poor or dangerous implementations (which degrade happiness). However, it is important to negotiate the problems in this conceptualization so that pursuing the common good does not compromise individual rights and cultural norms.

Table 2: Comparative Overview of Justice in TAO Ethics and Mill's Utilitarianism.

Dimension	Taoism	John Stuart Mill (Utilitarianism)
Core conception of justice	Harmony with the Way; balance among people, society, nature; relational and contextual	Maximizing overall welfare (greatest happiness); consequences determine justice; qualitative distinctions in pleasures.
Decision method	Situational, context-sensitive, guided by sages and moral exemplars; Wu-Wei (non-coercive action)	Consequence calculation (aggregate utility); cost–benefit reasoning; protection of individual liberty as instrumentally valuable
Strengths	Preserves social cohesion; long-term relational well-being; respects local norms and cultural practices	Clear evaluative metric for policy; focuses on welfare and freedom; useful for comparative policy analysis.
Limits	Can entrench hierarchies; vague for policy quantification; risk of coercive "harmony."	Predictive uncertainty about long-term effects; risk of sacrificing minority rights; may undervalue non-quantifiable cultural goods

7.4. Major Insights from Taoism and Utilitarianism

Taoism itself is a philosophy of harmony and balance, which suggests we consider the interconnectedness of our world when developing technology. This view emphasizes the deployment of AI that generates societal good instead of systems that drive a wedge between humans. By contrast, Mill's greatest good utilitarianism enables AI systems to be measured by their consequences (on the criterion that happiness should be maximized and suffering minimized). This approach requires a robust evaluation of AI's consequences to ensure

technological advances are for the good.

Table 3: AI Justice for Thailand in Policy/Action: Grounded Up by Integrating Taoist Ethics and Mill Utilitarian Lens.

Concrete Policy / Action	Taoist (Ethics of Harmony & Wu-Wei) Contribution	Millian (Consequentialist Welfare) Contribution
Establish local AI Co-Design Labs (pilot five provinces) with mandated representation (elders, youth, marginalized groups, developers); public co-design sprints.	Ensures designs fit local rhythms, respect cultural norms (thongyim), and build social harmony through inclusive deliberation	Supplies stakeholder welfare inputs to identify priority harms/benefits and inform resource allocation
Require Justice Impact Assessments (JIA): mixed methods—Cultural Impact Statement + ethnography + welfare metrics for all public AI procurements.	Surfaces relational and cultural harms not captured by metrics; emphasizes non-coercive, contextual evaluation	Quantifies net well-being impacts to guide go/no-go and investment decisions; enables cost-benefit trade-offs
Legislate privacy, non-discrimination, humane oversight, and enforceable remedies for AI harms	Protects human dignity and social cohesion as intrinsic values	Preserves individual liberties as necessary conditions for overall welfare; prevents destructive utility trade-offs
Require localization standards (UX, consent language, data practices) and iterative community testing.	Ensures cultural integrity, reduces alienation, and maintains communal trust	Avoids welfare losses from misfit technologies; improves adoption and effectiveness metrics
Create RPL pathways to validate community expertise and fund labs in underserved areas.	Recognizes relational expertise and elders' roles in sustaining harmony and continuity	Reduces inequality by valuing local knowledge that improves welfare outcomes and intervention fit
Create a statutory AI Justice Council with multi-stakeholder seats, regional committees, and public reporting.	Institutionalizes a deliberative, community-rooted interpretation of justice	Provides evidence-based oversight informed by welfare data and independent audits
National Justice Dashboard: wellbeing KPIs + trust/cohesion indices + bias incidents + community validation status	Tracks social harmony and trust as core outcomes; flags relational harms early	Tracks measurable welfare outcomes (health, employment) to evaluate societal benefit and trade-offs
Fund accredited programs: ethical AI, participatory facilitation, cultural impact assessment, community mediation	Builds relational competence, cultural literacy, and facilitation skills to sustain harmony	Builds capacity for rigorous welfare evaluation, impact analysis, and evidence-based scaling

7.5. The Impact of Thai Culture on Developing Ethical AI

The balanced AI landscape is also leveraged from the Thai cultural aspect of "thongyim, " representing harmony, nature respect, and community-driven values. The integration of these principles into the development of AI enables stakeholders to build systems that develop technology without neglecting the ethical and social needs of the Thai. Such a cultural perspective could help avoid some of the risks associated with AI use and ensure that technological progress benefits everyone.

8. DISCUSSION

In Thailand, the use of artificial intelligence is spreading widely. Social justice questions arise in all directions in AI, especially fairness, how to avoid cultural conflicts, and public happiness or suffering. The philosophical paradigms of Taoism, on the one hand, and Mill's utilitarianism, on the other, offer us two completely different conceptualizations of justice, differing somewhat but perhaps complementary. Taoism stresses nature and social holism, while utilitarianism emphasizes making people happy based solely on outcomes. This study examines two worldviews at the levels of ground actions and strategies in Thailand, considering practical difficulties, cultural factors, and challenges. Taoism Promoting Societal Harmony and Virtues from the Grassroots. The Taoist emphasis on harmony and mutual non-interference, like Thais's emphasis on harmony and ease, also fits well with Thai cultural norms. Not daunted by the authorities (i.e., breaking the law), people may wish to keep some signs off their land for friends or life partners. (Lai 2017: 137) Such values constitute an earthy Al atmosphere that preserves or collectively supports a mind-mass like the praise, as previously discussed, Ms. Fang Bin. Thus, AI trials I have conducted in public health or social services settings that consider these sorts of indigenous customs attract little resistance and enjoy an egalitarian distribution of benefits across different forces acting within the whole society. Moreover, by calling Father Wu Wei (non-action), you may spread the soul, which is nearly crushed, except for all excellent lamps, whether they have oil or not. Incidentally, each

faculty member has explained to AI at the start of their explanation that Tao generally does not make harsh or loud sounds. An ancient and traditional language knowledge built upon oral interpretation inevitably results in fuzzier goals and judgment when developing AI policies instead of following ethical rules. (Note that) Thus, implementing this laziness philosophy depends upon a specific situation or partition. Encourage harmony from a Taoist perspective, which implies that developers must understand local orders, engage in dialogues with communities, and design AI properly, supporting relational networks essential for social stability. However, resource constraints, urban-rural divides, and the diversity of interpretations of what is harmony all present problems for each specific case. Type a Utilitarianism. With clear criteria for measuring happiness and suffering, Utilitarianism offers practical benefits. Utilitarianism encourages social welfare at the grassroots level and appropriate goal action, so such outcomes may be counted later. However, policies that aim directly at particular outcomes frequently bring harmful side effects. They might worsen the situation for people if their own welfare is regretfully below socially maximum happiness, or else overlook cultural particularities violations from Thailand's perspective. This is another worry now that the hop distributors are out of business in Thailand. Too many such policies might infringe upon individual rights, violate privacy and security, and deepen cooperation inequalities. Moreover, you are looking for a consensus on happiness, let alone mutual happiness; different cultural norms complicate this. When we examine a utilitarian policy on the ground, it means that using information, impact assessments, and public disclosure ought to be relatively well developed. There are resource constraints, especially in rural and otherwise remote regions, where it may also be necessary to consider political factors when deciding which goals should be ranked first among competing outcomes. Moreover, “a careful balance policy" is required if broad improvements in the late rather than now benefit not only politically sensitive, this readjustment must be contingent on specific circumstances.

Acknowledgements: The author sincerely thanks the National Research Council of Thailand and AI Ethics for the Ground Up Project for research funding and valuable guidance, and the Buddhist Research Institute, Mahachulalongkornrajavidyalaya University (MCU), Thailand, for their support in contributing significantly to the successful completion of this study.

REFERENCES

Ames, R. T. (1994). *Thinking from the Han self: Truth, transcendence, and identity*. Albany: SUNY Press.

Ames, R. T. (2019). *Confucian role ethics: A vocabulary*. University of Hawaii Press.

Ames, R. T., & Rosemont, H. (2003). *Thinking from the Han self: Cognition, emotion, and the embodied person in classical Chinese philosophy*. SUNY Press.

Angwin, J., Larson, J., Mattu, S., & Kirchner, L. (2016). Machine bias. *ProPublica*, May 23, 2016.

Aristotle. (1999). *Nicomachean ethics* (T. Irwin, Trans.). Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing.

Ashrafian, H. (2015). AI for social good: Unlocking the opportunity for positive impact. *Nature Machine Intelligence, 1*(11), 493–494.

Baracas, S., & Selbst, A. D. (2016). Big data's disparate impact. *California Law Review, 104*(3), 671–732.

Barocas, S., Hardt, M., & Narayanan, A. (2019). *Fairness and machine learning*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Barendt, E. (2019). *Freedom of expression in the digital age*. Oxford University Press.

Bijker, W. E., & Law, J. (1992). *Shaping technology/building society: Studies in sociotechnical change*. MIT Press.

Brown, A., Chouldechova, A., Putnam-Hornstein, E., Tobin, A., & Vaithianathan, R. (2019). Toward algorithmic accountability in public services: A qualitative study of affected community perspectives on algorithmic decision-making in child welfare services. *CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 1–12.

Buolamwini, J., & Gebru, T. (2018). Gender shades: Intersectional accuracy disparities in commercial gender classification. *Conference on Fairness, Accountability and Transparency*, 77–91.

Castells, M. (2015). *The rise of the network society: The information age: Economy, society, and culture*. John Wiley & Sons.

Castro-Gómez, S. (2008). The missing chapter of empire: Postmodern reorganization of coloniality and post-Fordist capitalism. In M. Moraña et al. (Eds.), *Coloniality at large* (pp. xx–xx). Durham: Duke University Press.

Cath, C., Wachter, S., Mittelstadt, B., Taddeo, M., & Floridi, L. (2018). Artificial intelligence and the 'good society': The US, EU, and UK approach. *Science and Engineering Ethics, 24*(2), 505–528.

Chouldechova, A. (2017). Fair prediction with disparate impact: A study of bias in recidivism prediction instruments. *Big Data, 5*(2), 153–163.

Citron, D. K. (2008). Technological due process. *Washington University Law Review, 85*(6), 1249–1313.

Costanza-Chock, S. (2020). *Design justice: Community-led practices to build the worlds we need*. MIT Press.

Crisp, R. (1997). *Mill on utilitarianism*. Routledge.

Davidson, D. (1974). On the very idea of a conceptual scheme. *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association, 47*, 5–20.

Digital Economy Promotion Agency. (2019). *Thailand digital economy and society development plan*. Bangkok: DEPA.

Dwork, C., Hardt, M., Pitassi, T., Reingold, O., & Zemel, R. (2012). Fairness through awareness. *Proceedings of the 3rd Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference*, 214–226.

Eubanks, V. (2018). *Automating inequality: How high-tech tools profile, police, and punish the poor*. St. Martin's Press.

Feenberg, A. (1991). *Democratic theory of technology*. Guilford Press.

Flanagan, O. (2011). *The bodhisattva's brain: Buddhism and the science of happiness*. New York: W. W. Norton.

Flanagan, O. (2016). *The geography of morals: Varieties of moral possibility*. Oxford University Press.

Floridi, L. (2014). *The fourth revolution: How the infosphere is reshaping human reality*. Oxford University Press.

Floridi, L. (2019). *The logic of information: A theory of philosophy as conceptual design*. Oxford University Press.

Fraser, N. (2003). Social justice in the age of identity politics: Redistribution, recognition, and participation. In N. Fraser & A. Honneth (Eds.), *Redistribution or recognition? A political-philosophical exchange* (pp. 7–109). Verso.

Ganeri, J. (2001). *Philosophy in classical India*. London: Routledge.

Hardt, M., Price, E., & Srebro, N. (2016). Equality of opportunity in supervised learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 29*, 3315–3323.

Hansen, C. (1992). *A Daoist theory of Chinese thought*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Heidegger, M. (1977). The question concerning technology. In *The question concerning technology and other essays* (pp. 3–35). Harper & Row.

IEEE Standards Association. (2017). *Ethically aligned design: A vision for prioritizing human well-being with autonomous and intelligent systems* (Version 2). Piscataway: IEEE.

Introna, L. D., & Nissenbaum, H. (2000). Shaping the web: Why the politics of search engines matters. *The Information Society, 16*(3), 169–185.

Jobin, A., Ienca, M., & Vayena, E. (2019). The global landscape of AI ethics guidelines. *Nature Machine Intelligence, 1*(9), 389–399.

Johnson, D. G. (2006). Computer systems: Moral entities but not moral agents. *Ethics and Information Technology, 8*(4), 195–204.

Jullien, F. (1995). *The propensity of things: Toward a history of efficacy in China*. New York: Zone Books.

Katzenbach, C., & Ulbricht, L. (2019). Algorithmic governance. *Internet Policy Review, 8*(4), 1–18.

King, S. B. (2005). *Being benevolence: The social ethics of engaged Buddhism*. University of Hawaii Press.

Kirkland, R. (2004). *Taoism: The enduring tradition*. Routledge.

Kleinberg, J., Mullainathan, S., & Raghavan, M. (2016). Inherent trade-offs in the fair determination of risk scores. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.05807*.

Komin, S. (1990). *Psychology of the Thai people: Values and behavioral patterns*. Bangkok: NIDA.

Kusner, M. J., Loftus, J., Russell, C., & Silva, R. (2017). Counterfactual fairness. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 30*, 4066–4076.

Lambrecht, A., & Tucker, C. (2019). Algorithmic bias? An empirical study of apparent gender-based discrimination in the display of STEM career ads. *Management Science, 65*(7), 2966–2981.

Laozi. (2006). *Tao Te Ching* (S. Mitchell, Trans.). Harper Perennial. (Original work published 6th century BCE)

MacIntyre, A. (2007). *After virtue* (3rd ed.). Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

MacIntyre, A. (1988). *Whose justice? Which rationality?* Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

MacIntyre, A. (2009). *Whose justice? Which rationality?* University of Notre Dame Press.

Mill, J. S. (1859). *On liberty*. John W. Parker and Son.

Mill, J. S. (1863). *Utilitarianism*. Parker, Son, and Bourn.

Mill, J. S. (1969). *Utilitarianism*. In *The collected works of John Stuart Mill, Vol. X*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
Mill, J. S. (1977). *Considerations on representative government*. In *The collected works of John Stuart Mill, Vol. XIX*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
Miller, D. (2017). Justice. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy*. Stanford University.
Mulder, N. (2000). *Inside Thai society: Interpretations of everyday life*. Amsterdam: Pepin Press.
Mulder, N. (2000). *Inside Thai society: Religion, everyday life, change*. Silkworm Books.
Noble, S. U. (2018). *Algorithms of oppression: How search engines reinforce racism*. NYU Press.
Nussbaum, M. C. (2000). *Women and human development: The capabilities approach*. Cambridge University Press.
Panikkar, R. (1979). *Myth, faith and hermeneutics*. New York: Paulist Press.
Pasquale, F. (2015). *The black box society: The secret algorithms that control money and information*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Piboolsravut, P. (2004). Sufficiency economy. *ASEAN Economic Bulletin, 21*(1), 127–134.
Rawls, J. (1971). *A theory of justice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Rescher, N. (1977). *Dialectics: A controversy-oriented approach to the theory of knowledge*. Albany: SUNY Press.
Russell, S., & Norvig, P. (2020). *Artificial intelligence: A modern approach* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River: Pearson.
Shweder, R. A. (1991). *Thinking through cultures: Expeditions in cultural psychology*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Slingerland, E. (2003). *Effortless action: Wu-wei as conceptual metaphor and spiritual ideal in early China*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Sosa, E., & Tooley, M. (Eds.). (1993). *Causation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Taylor, C. (1994). The politics of recognition. In A. Gutmann (Ed.), *Multiculturalism: Examining the politics of recognition*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Thongchai, W. (1994). *Siam mapped: A history of the geo-body of a nation*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
Vallor, S. (2016). *Technology and the virtues: A philosophical guide to a future worth wanting*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Winner, L. (1980). Do artifacts have politics? *Daedalus, 109*(1), 121–136.