

---

## A REFLECTION ON THE FOUR BIASES (AKKHAṬI 4) IN THE DHAMMASATTHA AND BUDDHISM WITHIN THE THAI JUDICIARY: FROM PAST TO PRESENT

Boonchanadtha Sooksmaer

Student of Doctor of Law in Faculty of Law, Chiang Mai University

E-mail: Boonchanadtha\_sook@cmu.ac.th

### Abstract

This research examines the influence of the Four Biases—Chanda (desire), Dosa (anger), Moha (delusion), and Bhaya (fear)—as ethical concepts rooted in Buddhism and the Dharmashastrascripts on the Thai judicial system from the Sukhothai period to the present. These biases have shaped judicial perspectives and practices, serving as a foundational framework guiding judges' conduct in case adjudication, judicial training, and legal interpretation. The study reveals that these principles have persisted and adapted through historical developments, including Western legal modernization, becoming embedded in judicial codes and professional ethics. This enduring influence reflects a fusion of religious, customary, and modern legal thought that underpins the organizational culture and operational norms of Thailand's judiciary across time.

**Keywords:** Four Biases, Thai Judiciary, Judicial Ethics

### Introduction

This research article is a part of the doctoral dissertation titled "The Influence of Buddhism on the Thai Judiciary," which is submitted for the Doctor of Laws program at the Faculty of Law, Chiang Mai University. The purpose of this article is to explain and analyze the important role of the Four Biases principle, which is a doctrine rooted in the Dhammasattha texts and Buddhist teachings. The Four Biases consist of chanda-agati (bias from desire), dosa-agati (bias from anger), moha-agati (bias from delusion), and bhaya-agati (bias from fear). These mean partiality caused by affection, anger, ignorance, and fear. This principle has been used as a main guideline in the operations of the Thai judiciary from the past up to the present.

In the past, the Thai judiciary was deeply influenced by Buddhism and the Dhammasattha texts, especially during the Sukhothai period. The Four Biases principle was included in the Tripitaka and the Dhammasattha, to be used as a guideline for fair judgment. It was meant to prevent judges or those with decision-making power from letting emotions or personal feelings influence their decisions. This principle also reflects the effort of Thai society to create a justice system that is transparent and impartial.

As time has passed, the Four Biases principle still plays an important role in the Thai justice process, whether in interpreting laws, considering cases, or even in drafting new laws. In each era, judges and those involved in the justice process have realized the importance of avoiding all four kinds of bias, in order to achieve the highest justice for the parties and for society as a whole.

In the present era, even though Thai society has changed rapidly in terms of economy, society, and technology, the Four Biases principle is still used in the training and development of ethics for judges and officials in the justice process. This principle is also included in the education curriculum for judges, to remind everyone of the dangers of bias and the importance of impartiality in decision-making. Furthermore, it still influences the drafting and

interpretation of modern laws. Legal scholars and academics give importance to reducing bias in every step of the justice process, from lawmaking and law enforcement to court proceedings, in order to build public trust in the Thai judiciary.

Therefore, this research article shows the continuity and importance of the Four Biases principle from the Dhammasattha and Buddhist teachings, which has been applied in the Thai judiciary from the past until now. This principle not only has historical significance but also continues to play a role in the Thai justice system today.

### **Research Objectives**

This study deepens understanding of the cultural and legal foundations of the Thai judiciary by tracing how the Four Biases from the Dhammasattha and Buddhism have been passed down and adapted over time. It explores the blend of traditional customs with modern law, reveals the unique traits of Thai judges, and aims to support the development of a justice system that better fits Thailand's social context, with the following objectives.

1. To study the historical emergence of the Four Biases principle (Akkhati 4).
2. To analyze the dynamics of the Four Biases principle as it has been transmitted into law and the justice process, especially within the modern judiciary.

### **Scope of the Research**

1. Study and collect information on the Four Biases principle from the Dhammasattha texts and Buddhist scriptures.
2. Analyze the development and role of the Four Biases principle in the Thai justice system from the Sukhothai period to the present.
3. Analyze the role of the Four Biases principle as it appears in judicial proceedings, legal interpretation, lawmaking, and its influence on the Thai judiciary.

### **Literature Review**

The Four Biases (Akkhati 4) are a conceptual principle that appears in the Dhammathat texts, which synthesize ideas from Brahmanical-Hinduism and Buddhism. It is evident that definitions or explanations of bias are found in the scriptures of both religions. According to the Dictionary of Buddhist Terms: Collected Dhamma Edition by Somdet Phra Buddhaghosacariya (P.A. Payutto) (2021, p. 149), the term "Four Biases" appears in the Sutta Pitaka, which is part of the Buddhist Tripitaka. However, the Four Biases also appear in the Dhammathat under the name "Indabhasa Principle," which serves as a doctrine and reminder for judges and judicial officers, emphasizing justice and impartiality in adjudication. This principle is regarded as "the declaration of Indra," the supreme deity in Brahmanical-Hinduism, who is honored as the guardian of heavenly justice (Trongjai Huthangkool, 2023). The Indabhasa Principle and the Four Biases originate from the Dhammathat, which is the ancient law of Southeast Asia, especially in Thailand, Myanmar, and the Mon tradition, influenced by both Buddhism and Brahmanical-Hinduism.

The Four Biases (Chaturakkhati) are an important doctrine in Buddhism and the Dhammathat, referring to four causes of partiality that result in unjust decisions or judgments. This principle has been applied in the justice process and administration to prevent injustice (Kanokwan Thongtako, 2010). The Four Biases consist of

1. Chanda-agati (Bias from desire or affection) Partiality arising from personal preference, love, or attachment, such as ruling in favor of someone one likes, even if unjust.

2. Dosa-agati (Bias from anger) Partiality caused by anger, dislike, or hatred, leading to unfair decisions against those one dislikes.

3. Moha-agati (Bias from delusion) Partiality due to ignorance, misunderstanding, or confusion, such as making errors in judgment because of misinformation or lack of knowledge.

4. Bhaya-agati (Bias from fear): Partiality resulting from fear, such as ruling in favor of the powerful or those who intimidate, regardless of justice.

In Buddhism and the Dhammathat, the Four Biases are identified as a major cause of the decline in the duties and reputation of rulers or judges. If they are avoided, it leads to prosperity and credibility. This principle is mentioned in the Suttas, the Anguttara Nikaya, and the Vinaya Pitaka. In the Dhammathat, which is the ancient law of Southeast Asia influenced by Buddhism, the Four Biases are used as a guideline for adjudication and governance, emphasizing that judges and rulers must be free from bias (British Library, 2021).

The role of the Four Biases from the Dhammathat and Buddhist scriptures has influenced the judicial process in ancient times, focusing on careful, thorough, and just case consideration, with specific procedures and essential qualities (Trongjai Huthangkool, 2023). For example, in the fact-finding stage, the process begins by comparing the plaintiff's accusation with the defendant's testimony to distinguish between facts and doubts. If the facts remain unclear, evidence from both sides is considered. If a decision still cannot be made, ordeal methods such as submersion in water or walking through fire are used to prove innocence or guilt. The structure of a case is compared to the parts of a tree, illustrating the relationship and importance of each element in the justice process.

Furthermore, the qualities and attributes of judges are highlighted: they must be meticulous and not overlook suspicious points; judges must investigate and examine cases thoroughly, not make careless decisions, and must scrutinize suspicions closely. When a suspicious point is found, it must be further investigated until the wrongdoer is brought to justice, likened to a hunter who must track down the prey, not stopping at mere traces. Judges must also be sharp and precise, using wisdom to see the facts clearly. When making a decision, it must be decisive and correct, like a hawk swiftly and accurately catching its prey. Above all, judges must have courage in passing judgment and punishing wrongdoers, maintaining their own honor and dignity, and not fearing influence or pressure, like a lion that always succeeds in hunting and never fails.

Since the Four Biases are a key doctrine explaining the roots of partiality in adjudication and the exercise of judicial power, this principle appears in the "Indabhasa Principle," where Indra instructs judges to uphold justice and not fall under the influence of the Four Biases. This teaching explains the consequences and karmic results for biased judges. In ancient society, biased judges were considered "useless men," not only failing in their duties but also causing harm to others. The Indabhasa Principle states that adjudicating with the Four Biases is a grave offense, with severe consequences in this life and the next. If a judge maintains justice and impartiality, their life will prosper like the full moon; if they act with bias, they will fall into darkness like a new moon, and after death, they will descend into a woeful state. No matter how many good deeds they perform, they cannot erase the bad karma from biased adjudication. Bias due to the Four Biases is considered more severe than any other offense, such as killing animals or people, because it distorts justice, which is the foundation of society (Trongjai Huthangkool, 2023).

## Research Methodology

### 1. Research Methodology

This study adopts a qualitative approach, primarily utilizing documentary research to examine the meaning, role, and development of the Four Biases (Akati 4) from Dhammasattha scriptures and Buddhist teachings as they relate to the Thai judiciary. Qualitative research enables in-depth analysis of concepts, principles, and interpretations found in legal and historical documents across different eras.

### 2. Research Steps

**Data Collection:** Systematically gather primary sources (Dhammasattha scriptures, Tripitaka, legal texts) and secondary sources (research papers, articles, books) relevant to the Four Biases and the Thai judiciary.

**Reliability Measures:** Cross-reference data from multiple sources to ensure consistency and confirm authenticity. Keep a detailed record of sources for verification and transparency.

### 3. Data Collection

Compile and digitize all relevant primary documents and key secondary literature.

Employ purposive sampling to focus on authoritative, widely recognized, and peer-reviewed materials to enhance source credibility.

Document each step of the data collection process to allow for peer review and replication.

### 4. Data Analysis

**Descriptive and Thematic Analysis:** Organize and code collected data by concepts, time periods, and applications of the Four Biases.

**Content Analysis** Compare interpretations found in different documents and historical contexts.

**Triangulation:** Validate findings by comparing results from various document types and perspectives—legal, historical, and academic.

Clearly discuss potential limitations and address possible sources of error or subjectivity for transparency.

## Research Results

The research findings, the dynamics and influence of the Four Biases can be considered as follows:

### 1. Dynamics before the Reform of Law and Judiciary in Thailand

The Four Biases first appeared during the Sukhothai, Ayutthaya, Thonburi, and Rattanakosin periods, before the legal and judicial reforms under King Rama V. The Four Biases entered Thailand through the influence of the Indian Dhammasattha scriptures, which were integrated with laws and customs, especially during the period when Dhammasattha texts from Mon and Hindu traditions were adopted as the legal foundation of the Thai state. The arrival of Indian civilization in Southeast Asia is explained by three main hypotheses: The first hypothesis is that kings and warriors were the leaders of civilization. It is believed that the spread of Indian civilization began with the migration of Indian kings and warriors. The Kalinga people, who were defeated by Emperor Ashoka, migrated and settled in Southeast Asia, and the invasion of the Kushan tribe, which moved from China to occupy India, led some Indian warriors to migrate to this region. These warriors married local people, resulting in the integration of Indian civilization with local cultures. The second hypothesis is through trade and settlement by merchants. The travels of Indian merchants were another important channel

for bringing civilization into Southeast Asia. These merchants married locals and settled in the area, leading to the transmission of Indian culture and traditions. The main reason for India's contact with this region was the desire for gold, which is reflected in the name "Suvarnabhumi" or "Suvarnadvipa" as mentioned in the Ramayana epic. The third hypothesis is the influence of religion and priests. The travels of both Buddhist and Brahman priests were another significant factor in bringing Indian civilization into this region. Linguistic evidence, such as the use of classical Sanskrit in inscriptions and ancient documents, confirms the transmission of knowledge and religious ideas. Present-day religious sites such as temples and stupas are material evidence of the arrival of priests and the influence of Indian religion (Siwaporn Chaiprasitkul, 2000, pp. 30-31).

When Indian beliefs and religions entered Southeast Asia, they naturally influenced law, politics, and governance, especially the concept of the Four Biases. Duangchit Kamprasert (1999, p. 28) explains that it appeared in the stone inscription of King Ramkhamhaeng regarding the justice process and trial proceedings. An interesting observation is that in Sukhothai, there is no evidence of court buildings, but the king was the source of the judicial process and provider of justice. However, the cases the king would adjudicate were likely those that occurred within Sukhothai city, while in provincial towns, governors or nobles appointed by the king would act as judges. Those who judged cases had to be honest, conduct thorough investigations, and be free from desire-based bias, association with wrongdoers, greed for others' property, or personal craving. The king's authority, influenced by Buddhism, had a structural impact on the legal and judicial system. In the Sukhothai era (1350–1438), governance followed the "father governs children" model, with the king acting as a father caring for his people through Dharma, or Dhammaraja, based on Theravāda Buddhism of the Lanka tradition (Phramaha Nantakorn Piyabhani, 2016, pp. 123–132). The king held judicial authority, as evidenced in the Traiphum Phra Ruang. The king's judicial power is explained as follows: "When the world was destroyed by fire and then extinguished by rain, Brahmas ate earth-matter, developed defilements, lost their powers, and turned into humans. They consumed naturally growing, huskless rice. Later, due to greed, people hoarded rice within their homes, so rice developed husks and had to be cultivated for consumption. Then people quarreled over land and rice, so they agreed to find a wise and just mediator to resolve disputes. Eventually, a Bodhisattva was chosen to perform this role and determine land ownership, thus becoming the King. His lineage continued, and judicial power was established" (Samiannari, 2023). This implies a comparison of the king as a meritorious being like a Bodhisattva, possessing wisdom to judge and resolve disputes, reflecting Buddhist ideas about the origin of judicial power of the king—namely, that the source of judicial power arises from a social contract according to the Mahāsammata principle in Buddhist scriptures. The people selected a just and virtuous person, in the form of a Bodhisattva, to adjudicate disputes instead of resolving them through force. This aligns with the Dhammaraja principle, where the king's moral virtue is the foundation of power, not coercive force. As for the qualifications of a judge, they must be wise and just, free from the Four Biases (desire, anger, fear, delusion) according to Buddhist principles that emphasize using wisdom to resolve conflict rather than arbitrary power. It reflects that the initial role of judicial power was to determine land and property ownership to end economic conflict.

Moreover, in terms of trial procedures, there is a passage in the first stone inscription stating: "Commoners and nobles alike, if any die or disappear from their ancestral homes, their elephants, wives, and rice fields shall be returned to their children. All people, if there is a dispute, it shall be judged fairly, without siding with thieves or hiding wrongdoers, not coveting

others' rice or property" (Princess Maha Chakri Sirindhorn Anthropology Centre, n.d.). This passage reflects the role of adjudication and trial procedures, where judges between commoners and nobles emphasized impartiality, treating both groups equally, based on the Four Biases principle.

Later, in the Ayutthaya and Thonburi periods, much of the legal evidence was lost due to the second loss of independence to the Burmese, during which legal records and documents were destroyed. However, the outline of the law can still be seen from the Three Seals Law, which King Rama I revised. The Three Seals Law was a revision and compilation of old Ayutthaya laws. The Three Seals Law was compiled in the reign of King Rama I of Rattanakosin, with the objective to revise, check, and collect old laws used since the Ayutthaya and early Rattanakosin periods, to ensure correctness, fairness, and suitability for the society at that time. The laws compiled in the Three Seals Law were mostly those actually enforced in the Ayutthaya period, whether Dhammasattha, Royal Law, or Royal Jurisprudence (Sumet Jeerachaisiri, 2020). Furthermore, the structure and content of the Three Seals Law reflect Ayutthaya society, including its social structure, sakdina system, customs, traditions, and the ruling class's way of thinking. Many parts maintain the original forms and concepts of Ayutthaya law, such as class division, the determination of rights and duties of commoners, slaves, and masters, as well as the justice process (Manop Thavornwatsakul, 2000). In the Ayutthaya era, society was clearly more complex than in Sukhothai, resulting in the establishment of a more detailed and meticulous court system to address the rapidly growing and changing society's problems and conflicts. King Ramathibodi I (King Uthong), the first king of Ayutthaya, assigned Brahmin priests, experts in governance and royal court traditions, to lay the foundation and determine legal provisions as guidelines for establishing justice in society. The Brahmin priests used Dhammasattha as a model for drafting laws, which later appeared in the Three Seals Law, such as the Law of Evidence, the Law of Accepting Complaints, the Law of Ordeal by Water and Fire, and the Law of Judges, etc. (The Subcommittee for the 100th Anniversary Book of the Ministry of Justice, 1992, pp. 3-9).

The penalty for violating the Four Biases in the Ayutthaya period was severe. The Four Biases were fundamental to justice in court proceedings. Judges who decided cases with bias were regarded by society as "mokhaburut," meaning useless, worthless, and lacking credibility. Such actions were considered a serious dereliction of duty and a grave undermining of justice, resulting not only in a loss of credibility (mokhaburut) but also in both worldly punishment (loss of rank, dismissal) and spiritual punishment (serious sin, falling into hell), reflecting the utmost importance of impartiality in the ancient Thai justice system.

In the early Rattanakosin period (King Rama I to King Rama V, before legal and judicial reform), after King Rama I revised and promulgated the Three Seals Law, it included the principle of Indhapasa, an important teaching on the morality and ethics of judges, rooted in the Dhammasattha scriptures. The Indhapasa principle was the teaching of Indra for those responsible for adjudicating disputes in society, to ensure that judgments were just and free from all bias, serving as a main guideline in court proceedings to prevent partiality and foster faith in the judicial system (The Teachers' Council Publishing Organization, 1962).

## **2. In the period after the legal and judicial reform during the reign of His Majesty King Chulalongkorn (King Rama V) until the present**

This was a significant transformation that occurred in the Thai legal and judicial system, arising from several important factors that affected Siam in the late 19th century. One of the main driving forces was the confrontation with the threat of colonialism from Western nations, especially Britain and France, which pressured Siam to modernize its legal

and judicial system in order to preserve national independence and sovereignty. The backwardness and complexity of the Thai legal system at that time, which still relied on customary law and unorganized provisions, caused foreigners to distrust it and demand legal privileges (extraterritoriality), so that their citizens would be tried in their own courts instead of Thai courts. Moreover, economic, social, and administrative changes that became more complex caused the old court system to be unable to effectively meet the needs of the state and the people. Therefore, Siam urgently needed to reform its legal and judicial system to meet international standards, in order to build trust among both the people and foreign nations. This legal and judicial reform approach was influenced by both Western countries and Japan, by studying examples from countries that were able to maintain their independence amid pressure from Western powers.

King Rama V thus began by establishing the Ministry of Justice in 1892 to centralize the power of the courts and organize all courts in the country under one administration. Then, the first court of justice was established and the court network expanded to various regions. At the same time, the court structure was improved to be divided by types of cases, such as civil courts, criminal courts, and other courts following the Western model. Ancient methods of trial were abolished, such as trial by water, walking through fire, or swearing oaths. The process of drafting new laws began, with a law-drafting committee composed of both Thai and foreign legal experts, to draft the Criminal Code and the Civil and Commercial Code to meet international standards. A law school was established to produce personnel with knowledge and morality to enter the judicial system, with Prince Rapee Pattanasak as the one who laid the important foundation. The major achievement of the legal and judicial reform in the reign of King Rama V was the creation of a legal and court system that met international standards and was accepted by many countries, resulting in Siam being able to abolish the legal privileges of foreigners (extraterritoriality) and preserve national independence. The Thai court system had a clear structure, separating courts by types of cases, with a transparent appeal system and adherence to the rule of law in the Western model. The enactment of written laws helped reduce ambiguity and uncertainty in the justice process. At the same time, the establishment of law schools and the training of judges that emphasized ethics and morality made the Thai judiciary strong and trusted by both the people and foreigners (Nut Keawngam, 2020).

However, although there was a strong influence from the West during the reform era, the principle of Indhapasa or the Four Biases did not disappear from the Thai legal system. Rather, the Indhapasa principle continued to be enacted and inherited in Thai law and transformed into the ethical guidelines of judges and the judiciary. It was also integrated with international concepts in terms of impartiality and equity in the modern court system, as seen in regulations, codes of conduct, and laws related to judges in later periods (Ackaratorn Chularat, 2009). There are even comparisons that show its similarity to international ethical principles, such as the Bangalore Principles of Judicial Conduct, which emphasize impartiality, integrity, and the absence of bias in judges. These principles are cited as important guidelines in evaluating the qualifications and behavior of judges, both in terms of ethics and professional conduct, and are used alongside international ethical standards so that Thai judges can perform their duties professionally and be accepted internationally (Sarawut Benjakul, 2012).

Until the present day, in legal education in Thailand, the concept of the Four Biases has clearly appeared in the content of the legal profession course (Sawang Boonchaloemwiphas, 2024). It is a fundamental course in the law curriculum of various universities, aiming to instill ethics, impartiality, and freedom from bias in judicial decision-

making. Even though the course structure or the course title may not directly mention the Four Biases, the course content refers to this principle as the foundation of judicial and legal ethics. The table presents the dynamics of the Four Biases.

Historical Period	Main Context and Sources	Core Concept of the Four Biases and Role in Judiciary
Sukhothai - Ayutthaya - Early Rattanakosin (Pre-Reform)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Influenced by Indian Dhammasattha and Buddhism</li> <li>- Blend of customary law and traditional norms</li> <li>- Monarchy and Brahmins played key roles</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Four Biases guided judges to avoid desire, anger, delusion, and fear</li> <li>- Emphasized judicial ethics, fairness, and judge qualifications</li> <li>- Severe penalties for biased judges</li> </ul>
King Rama V to Present (Post-Reform)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Legal and judicial reforms influenced by Western and Japanese models</li> <li>- Centralization of judiciary and Ministry of Justice setup</li> <li>- Establishment of law schools and codification of law</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Indhapasa (Four Biases) principle integrated in judicial ethics</li> <li>- Combined with Western concepts of impartiality and fairness</li> <li>- Legal education fosters ethics and unbiased judgment</li> </ul>

### Discussion

The research findings indicate that the "Four Biases" (Akati 4) were transmitted into Thai society since the Sukhothai period through the influence of the Indian Dhammasattha scriptures, which were directly integrated with Thai laws and customs. The Four Biases—Chandāgati (bias from affection), Dosāgati (bias from anger), Bhayāgati (bias from fear), and Mohāgati (bias from delusion)—were adopted as key concepts in defining the qualifications of judges in the ancient Thai legal system. This process resulted from the spread of Indian civilization by groups of kings, warriors, merchants, and priests, all of whom played roles in introducing religious and legal ideas into Southeast Asia. Historical evidence, such as the King Ramkhamhaeng Inscription, reflects that those who judged cases must be free from bias, not favoring social status or personal interests. Judicial power in the Sukhothai era, therefore, was not based on coercive authority but on virtue and justice, following the concepts of Dhammaraja and Buddhist principles.

The development and inheritance of the Four Biases continued through the Ayutthaya, Thonburi, and early Rattanakosin periods, especially in the Three Seals Law, where the Indhapasa principle was clearly codified. This principle became the ethical guideline for judges and the judiciary in the Thai justice system. Those who violated the Four Biases were condemned by society as "mokhaburut" or useless persons and could receive both worldly and spiritual punishments, reflecting the utmost importance of impartiality in the Thai court system. Even during the legal and judicial reforms of King Rama V, which were influenced by Western law and modernized the court structure, the Four Biases continued to be inherited and applied in the form of codes of conduct and judicial ethics. They were integrated with international concepts of impartiality and equity to establish moral standards in the Thai judiciary. The influence of the Four Biases on the Thai legal and judicial system remains evident today.

Although the term "Four Biases" is not explicitly listed as a specific course in law curricula, the content of legal ethics and professional conduct courses continues to emphasize this concept as the foundation of judicial impartiality and justice. Thus, the Four Biases have evolved from religious and customary concepts to international ethical standards in the modern court system, which explains their continued influence.

The influence of the Four Biases on the judiciary, judges, and legal professionals is a fundamental basis confirming that the operations of the judiciary must be just and free from bias—whether affection, anger, fear, or delusion. This principle is established in the laws and ethics of the courts to maintain impartiality and build trust in the Thai justice process. For judges, the Four Biases remain the basis for performing their duties in considering and deciding cases, ensuring that judgments are straightforward and impartial. Additionally, this principle is used as a standard for evaluating the qualifications and ethics of judges in the processes of selection, appointment, and promotion, to prevent damage to public confidence. If judges are biased, their decisions will lack credibility and negatively affect the image of the judiciary. For legal professionals, the Four Biases serve as a guideline to elevate professional ethics, requiring lawyers to be careful not to let personal feelings or interests interfere with their duties. It is also a tool for self-regulation to prevent unconscious bias.

However, in terms of values, the Four Biases have influenced the conduct and self-discipline of legal professionals, not only creating the image of a legal professional but also fostering social responsibility. This arises from the roles and expectations that society has for those involved in making important decisions about people's lives, such as rights, freedoms, and property. Legal professionals are therefore expected to have higher ethical standards than ordinary people or professions not directly involved in dispensing justice. This distinction does not mean that legal professionals have greater "human value" than others, but rather that it is a matter of the roles and trust that society bestows. Legal professionals do not have more rights or dignity than others as human beings, but they stand out in terms of ethics and social responsibility according to the duties entrusted to them.

## References

- Ackaratorn, C. (2009). *The role of court in the development of the rule of law in Thailand*. from <http://www.public-law.net/publaw/view.aspx?id=1415>.
- Benjakul, S. (2012). *Judicial ethics*. from <https://isranews.org/content-page/item/53350-%E0%B8%88%E0%B8%A3%E0%B8%B4%E0%B8%A2%E0%B8%98%E0%B8%A3%E0%B8%A1%E0%B8%82%E0%B8%AD%E0%B8%87%E0%B8%95%E0%B8%B8%E0%B8%A5%E0%B8%B2%E0%B8%81%E0%B8%B2%E0%B8%A3.html>.
- Boonchalermwiphas, S. (2024). *Collection of lectures on the legal profession* (12th ed.). Winyuchon.
- British Library. (2021). *Transcribed from the boundary wall of the universe: Early Dhammasattha manuscripts in the Burmese collection of the British Library*. from <https://blogs.bl.uk/asian-and-african/2021/11/transcribed-from-the-boundary-wall-of-the-universe-early-dhammasattha-manuscripts-in-the-burmese-col.html>.
- Chaiprasitkul, S. (2000). *A brief history of Southeast Asia*. Ramkhamhaeng University.
- Jirachaisiri, S. (2020). *Three seals law*. from <https://parliamentmuseum.go.th/ar63-Law-enact.html>.
- Kamprasert, D. (1999). *History of law*. Ramkhamhaeng University.

- Keawngam, N. (2020). The legal reform of Thailand in the reign of King Chulalongkorn (Rama V). *Journal of Social Science for Local Rajabhat Maharakham University*, 4(4), 207–213.
- Kurusapha Organization. (1962). *Three seals law (volume 1)*. Educational Supply Commerce.
- Nari, S. (2022). *Disclosure of judicial power and laws in the Sukhothai period: Who judged cases then?* from [https://www.silpa-mag.com/history/article\\_79185](https://www.silpa-mag.com/history/article_79185).
- Piyabhani, P. N. (2016). Sukhothai Kingdom: The golden age of Buddhism. *Journal of International Buddhist Studies*, 7(2), 123–132.
- Princess Maha Chakri Sirindhorn Anthropology Centre. (n.d.). *Glossary of inscriptions*. from <https://db.sac.or.th/inscriptions/glossary/detail/10268>.
- Subcommittee for the Commemorative Book on the 100th Anniversary of the Ministry of Justice (Thai edition). (1992). *100 years of the Ministry of Justice*. Bangkok: Perfect Graphic Group Printing House.
- Thaworawatthanasakul, M. (2000). Determining the age of law in the Three Seals Law: A preliminary analysis. *Journal of Arts, Silpakorn University*, 2(22).
- Thongtako, K. (2010). *Bias*. from <http://legacy.orst.go.th/?knowledges=%E0%B8%AD%E0%B8%84%E0%B8%95%E0%B8%B4-%E0%B9%92%E0%B9%99-%E0%B8%95%E0%B8%B8%E0%B8%A5%E0%B8%B2%E0%B8%A1-%E0%B9%92%E0%B9%95%2D%E0%B9%92%E0%B9%95%2D%E0%B9%AA%E0%B8%A5>.