

THE ANTAGONISM OF CAPITALIST CRITIQUE AND HUMAN NATURE: A CRITICAL  
DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF THE PLATFORM (2019)

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi M. Talha ALTINKAYA\*

DOI: [10.47107/inifedergi.1608852](https://doi.org/10.47107/inifedergi.1608852)

Araştırma Makalesi

Başvuru Tarihi: 28.12.2024

Kabul Tarihi: 07.04.2025

---

**Atıf Bilgisi:** Altinkaya, T. M. (2025). The Antagonism of Capitalist Critique and Human Nature: A Critical Discourse Analysis of the Platform (2019). *İNİF E- Dergi*, 10(1), 315-329.

**Abstract**

The primary aim of this research is to analyze *The Platform* (2019) as an allegorical critique of capitalism and human nature, using critical discourse analysis (CDA) as the methodological framework. This study employs Van Dijk's framework of macro and microstructures to analyze how the film portrays systemic inequalities rooted in capitalist societies. Additionally, it investigates the moral dilemmas individuals navigate within these systems. At the macro level, the film's critique centers on class inequalities, symbolized by the vertical prison structure, where food distribution mirrors capitalist hierarchies. At the micro level, the characters' behavior, which ranges from selfishness to solidarity, highlights the complexity of human nature when confronted with scarcity and competition. In this context, the article argues that *The Platform* critiques both the capitalist system, which sustains inequality, and human nature, which aggravates these inequalities through individualistic tendencies. However, the film fails to address capitalism's role in fostering these behaviors. The findings indicate that while the film emphasizes human nature as the root cause of scarcity and inequality, it overlooks how the platform (as an allegorical representation of capitalism) shapes and amplifies these behaviors. The article engages with contemporary debates on capitalism, drawing on the work of scholars such as Piketty and Fraser. It assesses *The Platform* as a production that reflects ongoing ideological discussions about social justice, inequality, and human behavior in capitalist societies. However, it argues that the film overlooks a critical analysis of capitalism as the root cause of conflict within its narrative and in the broader capitalist system. In this framework, the tension between capitalism's impact on human nature and individual responsibility is essential to understanding the ideological aspects of the film.

**Keywords:** *The Platform, capitalism, human nature, social inequality, class struggle, critical discourse analysis*

---

\*Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, Güzel Sanatlar Fakültesi, Kurgu, Ses ve Görüntü Yönetimi Bölümü, E-mail: [talhaaltinkaya@gmail.com](mailto:talhaaltinkaya@gmail.com), ORCID: 0000-0003-2872-5532

## KAPİTALİZM VE İNSAN DOĞASININ UZLAŞMAZ ÇELİŞKİSİ: THE PLATFORM (2019) FİLMİ ÜZERİNE ELEŞTİREL SÖYLEM ANALİZİ

### Öz

Bu araştırmanın temel amacı, *The Platform* (2019) filmini, kapitalizm ve insan doğasının alegorik bir eleştirisi olarak analiz etmektir. Bu analizde metodolojik çerçeve olarak eleştirel söylem çözümlemesi (CDA) kullanılacaktır. Van Dijk'ın makro ve mikro yapılarına dayanarak, bu çalışma, filmin kapitalist toplumlarda var olan sistemsel eşitsizlikleri ve bu sistemler içindeki bireylerin karşılaştığı ahlaki ikilemleri nasıl yansıttığını keşfetmeyi amaçlamaktadır. Makro düzeyde, filmin eleştirisi, yiyecek dağıtımının kapitalist hiyerarşileri simgelediği dikey hapisane yapısı üzerinden sınıf eşitsizliklerine odaklanmaktadır. Bu yapı, kapitalizmin sınıf ayrımlarını ve kaynakların adaletsiz dağılımını gözler önüne serer. Mikro düzeyde ise, bencillikten dayanışmaya kadar değişen karakter davranışları, kıtlık ve rekabetle karşılaştığında insan doğasının karmaşıklığını vurgular. Bu bağlamda, makale, *The Platform*'un yalnızca eşitsizliği sürdüren kapitalist sistemi değil, aynı zamanda bu eşitsizlikleri bireyselci eğilimlerle daha da kötüleştiren insan doğasını da eleştirdiğini savunmaktadır. Ancak film, bu davranışların oluşmasında kapitalizmin rolünü ele almaktan kaçınmaktadır. Bulgular, filmde kıtlık ve eşitsizliğin temel nedeni olarak insan doğasının vurgulansa da, platformun (kapitalizmin alegorik bir temsili olarak) bu davranışları nasıl şekillendirip büyüttüğüne dair göz ardı edilen bir nokta olduğunu göstermektedir. Piketty ve Fraser gibi çağdaş kapitalizm tartışmalarından faydalanarak, makale, *The Platform* filmini, kapitalist toplumlarda sosyal adalet, eşitsizlik ve insan davranışı üzerine devam eden ideolojik tartışmaları yansıtan bir yapım olarak değerlendirirken, filmde ve kapitalizmde çatışmanın kökeni olarak kapitalist sistemin eleştirisini göz ardı ettiğini ileri sürer. Bu çerçevede, kapitalizmin insan doğası üzerindeki etkisi ile bireysel sorumluluk arasındaki gerilim, filmin ideolojik yönlerini anlamada önemli bir yer tutmaktadır. Film, kapitalizmin nasıl bireysel çıkarları yücelttiğini ve toplumsal dayanışmayı nasıl erozyona uğrattığını gözler önüne sererken, bu yapının insanları nasıl yozlaştırıp, toplumsal eşitsizlikleri derinleştirdiğini vurgular.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** *The Platform*, kapitalizm, insan doğası, sosyal eşitsizlik, sınıf mücadelesi, eleştirel söylem analizi

### Introduction

The primary aim of this research is to examine the complex relationship between capitalism and human nature, as depicted in *The Platform* (2019). This study uses critical discourse analysis to reveal how the film critiques capitalist social structures and the behavior of individuals within this system. By analyzing the film's narrative, visual elements, and character interactions through Van Dijk's discourse analysis, this research aims to highlight the dual critique present in the film: systemic inequality and the underlying motivations that drive human behavior. As societies confront growing inequalities in wealth and opportunity, films such as *The Platform* serve as essential cultural texts that reflect and challenge contemporary social norms. Understanding these dynamics is key to uncovering the film's discourse. This analysis advances broader debates on social justice, ethical responsibilities, and how individual choices confront systemic oppression. Furthermore, the film frames human nature itself as the root cause of such inequalities. By analyzing the film from a critical perspective, this research seeks to explore how individuals navigate the complexities of morality and survival within an imperfect system and to unpack the discourses presented by the film. Furthermore, this study aims to provide a deeper understanding of how cinematic narratives reflect societal values and shape audience perceptions and responses to pressing social issues that remain relevant today. This research analyzes *The Platform*'s dual critique of human nature and capitalism, providing key insights for filmmakers, critics, and scholars exploring ideology in cinema and interdisciplinary discourse.

*The Platform* (2019) is a Spanish science fiction-horror film directed by Galder Gaztelu-Urrutia and released in 2019. Set in a dystopian vertical prison, the film follows the protagonist Goreng's ambiguous journey through the events of a facility known as 'The Pit.' In this prison, food is delivered to individuals via a platform that descends through various levels. While the platform provides sustenance to those at the top, progressively fewer portions remain as one descends. This unique structure serves as a powerful metaphor for the inequalities present in capitalist societies, where access to resources is determined by one's position within a hierarchical system. Throughout the film, Goreng's experiences on the platform reflect his struggle for survival amidst the brutal dynamics of competition and cooperation. As the narrative unfolds, the film becomes a microcosm of society in which characters react in various ways to the challenges posed by the system. Some resort to selfishness and brutality, while others strive for solidarity and altruism. This striking contrast raises fundamental questions about human nature when faced with famine and the ethical dilemmas that arise in such threatening circumstances.

*The Platform* (2019) encourages viewers to critically engage with the nature of humanity, morality, and the social structures that govern our lives. The film presents a gripping story and a thought-provoking commentary on contemporary issues such as class struggle, resource distribution, and the psychological effects of incarceration.

In this article, the discourse analysis will focus on how the film uses its narrative and visual elements to explore the complex interplay between capitalism and human behavior. Furthermore, the paper uses critical discourse analysis (CDA) as the methodological framework to explore this intricate interaction between capitalism and human nature. CDA suggests that language and visual representation reflect reality and actively shape perceptions and power dynamics within society. In this analysis, Van Dijk's (Dijk, 2001) framework of macro- and microstructures will examine the film's narrative and visual components. The theme developed by Ayvaz and Livberber (2019), inspired by Dijk's work, will guide the study's methodology. It encompasses macrostructures, general themes such as class struggle and resource distribution, narrative progression, and character development. These elements collectively highlight the film's critique of capitalist society. At the micro level, the analysis will focus on specific linguistic features, camera techniques, and visual symbolism. This detailed approach will reveal how these elements contribute to the ideological messages of the film and reflect the complexities of human behavior within a capitalist framework.

### **1. Capitalism and Social Structure: Allegorical Reading of Capitalism in the Film**

This chapter moves beyond conventional discussions of class dynamics to offer a fresh critique of capitalism and social structures. Rather than rehashing familiar narratives, it engages with contemporary socio-economic debates, focusing on present-day challenges and their impact on individuals navigating these systems. As Marx, the source of almost all discussions of capitalism today, states in his theory, "the history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles" (Karl Marx, 2008, p. 33). For Marx, history has always been defined in terms of power relations, although not in terms of capital accumulation as we understand it today. These power relations, referred to as class theory or the history of class struggles in Marxist studies, form the foundation of Marx's early and later writings. From his 1848 work on class struggles during the French Revolution (Marx, 2001) to *The 18th Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* (Marx, 1972), the class theory remains central to his work. One of the pillars of this theory is the concept of labor. With the concept of labor, humans transform both themselves and nature. "He sets in motion the natural forces which belong to his own body, his arms, legs, head and hands, in order to appropriate the materials of nature in a form adapted to his own needs. Through this movement he acts upon external nature and changes it, and in this way he simultaneously changes his own nature" (Marx, 1990, p. 283).

This process, in which human beings transform both themselves and nature, is, in fact, a process that creates inequality. For Marxism, capitalism is a system of exploitation in which the owner of capital shapes class dynamics and power relations through the surplus value they obtain. This system is fundamentally a social system characterized by private ownership of the means of production, unlimited market competition, and the desire for infinite profit. For Marxism, the problem lies in economic interactions based on exploitation and the fact that this system determines social hierarchies. These hierarchies, i.e., class consciousness in Marx's sense, evolve into a system that dictates the roles of individuals, how they experience life, and even their entire subjectivity.

Indeed, this system and the critique of it persist in contemporary class debates. For example, Bourdieu emphasizes that class debates are shaped not only by economic factors but also by cultural and social relations. The relationship of individuals to capital and money affects both their cultural capital and their social capital, which determines how social classes have or do not have access to social resources (and, therefore, to all possible opportunities) (Bourdieu, 1984). Therefore, as Marx considered, capital does not consist solely of economic capital. In addition to economic capital, other forms of capital, such as cultural capital and social capital, are accumulated through labor (Bourdieu P., 1986, pp. 241-242).

Similarly, in his study focusing on capitalism's social structure, Weber interprets capitalism's development in terms of whether classes possess a universal morality and links the rise of capitalism to Protestant morality. According to him, capitalism developed through disciplining individuals by Protestantism and establishing a rational work ethic. This morality focuses on profit maximization, valuing personal gain, and supporting entrepreneurship—what Weber describes as a morality of aspiration, emerging to achieve higher (if we read the film allegorically) social statuses (Weber, 1992). For Weber, social class is inseparable from status and is always linked to status. In his work outlining this relationship, Weber categorizes these two

concepts under three categories: *Status Groups and Classes* (Weber, 1978, p. 302). According to Weber; “the most elemental economic fact that the way in which the disposition over material property is distributed among a plurality of people, meeting competitively in the market for the purpose of exchange, in itself creates specific life chances.” (Weber, Gerth, & Mills, 1946, p. 181)

Contrary to liberal theory, Marxist studies, both today and in the early 1900s, emphasize the impossibility of an equal distribution of opportunity. Marxist theory maintains that transforming this relationship - and its inherent element of chance - requires fundamentally restructuring production relations and redistributing ownership of the means of production. As Marx and later Marxist thinkers have emphasized, such transformation becomes achievable only through the development of working-class consciousness. According to Lukács (1972), class consciousness emerges when workers recognize their position in the capitalist system, and the only way they can escape from this process is by realizing their alienation and objectification, particularly in the production process. The worker's labor is abstracted and commodified, becoming an object of which they are not even aware. This makes it difficult to attain class consciousness. As Lukács states:

For the worker, the reified character of the immediate manifestations of capitalist society receives the most extreme definition possible. It is true: for the capitalist also there is the same doubling of personality, the same splitting up of man into an element of the movement of commodities and an (objective and impotent) observer of that movement. But for his consciousness it necessarily appears as an activity (albeit this activity is objectively an illusion), in which effects emanate from himself. This illusion blinds him to the true state of affairs, whereas the worker, who is denied the scope for such illusory activity, perceives the split in his being preserved in the brutal form of what is in its whole tendency a slavery without limits. (Lukács, 1972, p. 166)

Similar studies can be found in contemporary Marxist class debates. In his article discussing current approaches, Wright evaluates the concept of class at both the macro and micro levels, and these evaluations reflect traces of past Marxist work. At the macro level, class analysis examines how policy and social changes, such as capital and labor relations, are influenced, while at the micro level, it looks at how class affects individuals' life chances and opportunities. Although Wright's theoretical foundations are rooted in Marx and Weber, he critiques the reduction of class analysis to purely economic categories. According to Wright, what is needed for contemporary capitalism is a comprehensive analysis of the social context (Wright, 2005). In the same study, Breen (2005) critiques the simplistic use of Weber's schema with a neo-Weberian approach and investigates the effects of contemporary capitalism's structure and the working conditions it creates on individuals' lives. According to Breen, at the current stage of capitalism, working conditions still profoundly impact workers' life chances. Breen argues that Goldthorpe's class schema is a significant tool for this analysis and that it is essential to empirically test the relationship between life chances and class (Breen, 2005). Similarly, Weininger (2005) continues Bourdieu's perspective and argues that class today is shaped not only by economic factors but also by cultural and symbolic power.

Inspired by the Frankfurt School's critique of instrumental reason, Benhabib argues that this is the infiltration of instrumental reason into relations of production and all aspects of life. This infiltration is an ideological process that facilitates the internal manipulation of individuals: “The efficiency and predictability of these new organizational techniques are made possible by the application of science and technology, not only to the domination of external nature but to the control of interpersonal relations and the manipulation of internal nature as well” (Benhabib, 1994, p. 74).

Capitalism doesn't merely create inequality—it weaponizes human nature itself to sustain oppressive structures. This system generates unavoidable alienation while ideologically reducing systemic violence to mere wealth disparities, obscuring the true relations of exploitation. As Piketty (2017) states in his detailed analysis of contemporary capitalism, the root of the structural inequalities created by capitalism lies in the concentration of capital and wealth in the hands of one class. This tendency will have irreversible socio-economic effects if not addressed. These effects are also noted by Fraser, who offers a similar critique of capitalism:

The fact is, our social system is sapping energies needed to tend to families, maintain households, sustain communities, nourish friendships, build political networks, and forge solidarities. Often referred to as carework, these activities are indispensable to society: they replenish human beings, both daily and generationally, while also maintaining social bonds. In capitalist societies,

moreover, they assure the supply of commodified labor power from which capital sucks surplus value. (Fraser, 2022, p. 53)

As contemporary studies demonstrate, capitalism exploits the worker's labor and systematically devalues and consumes the social and emotional labor that binds individuals and communities together. This consumption is central to *The Platform*, the subject of this study, as the referenced studies earlier in the article and the film emphasize how the system (the capitalist structure or platform) 'cannibalizes' the social bonds and human labor necessary for survival.

In terms of all these points, the platform that provides food to the people in the film is the most crucial tool for the allegorical reading of capitalism. The film uses the platform structure to critique the social hierarchies and systemic inequalities present in capitalist systems. The film constructs its narrative around a vertically structured prison, where food is distributed via a descending platform. This spatial arrangement serves as a metaphor for capitalist economies, in which individuals' access to resources is determined by their position within a hierarchical system.

At the very beginning of the film, we meet the protagonist, Goreng, who voluntarily enters the prison system. His journey through the various platform levels is a microcosm of society, illustrating the harsh realities of class struggle. Goreng's descent to the lower levels as the film progresses and the rigid contrast between the top and those at the bottom powerfully underscores the inequalities in power and privilege. While individuals living at higher levels enjoy an abundance of food and comfort, the poorer inmates at the lower levels are forced to fight for scraps, revealing the exploitation and systemic oppression characteristic of capitalist systems.

To achieve this, the film relies on the fact that resources are limited, just as they are in the real world. Capitalism's structural logic necessitates competition for survival, directly mirroring and reinforcing the system's core ethos. This competitive framework systematically prioritizes individual advantage over collective welfare, naturalizing the very inequalities it produces.

This ethos is undoubtedly rooted in Hobbes' pessimistic perspective, encapsulated in his assertion that "homo homini lupus," as illustrated through his concept of the state of nature. According to Hobbes, human beings act solely in self-interest and exist in a perpetual state of conflict. In the state of nature, where there is no sovereign or absolute authority (Leviathan), individuals prioritize their survival over the well-being of others. Therefore, absolute authority becomes necessary to ensure individuals' safety and establish a functioning society (Hobbes, 2023). Akmeşe's (2021) critique of the film, grounded in Hobbes' philosophy of human nature, aligns with this interpretation. The world of the film is, first and foremost, constructed as a table of wolves. According to Akmeşe, the narrative is "woven with a pessimistic approach to human nature, similar to Hobbes' state of nature" (Akmeşe, 2021, p. 226). This pessimism is embodied in characters such as Trimagasi, whose actions reflect Hobbesian self-interest and survival instinct.

Nevertheless, the film also suggests an alternative reading of human nature through the character of Goreng, who embodies an inherent optimism. Contrary to Hobbes' bleak view, Adam Smith evaluates moral sentiments and the social existence of human beings through concepts such as empathy, virtue, and justice (Smith, 2018). Smith famously asserts, "No matter how selfish man is thought to be, there are some principles that he has by nature" (Smith, 2018, p. 13). While human beings may instinctively evaluate situations from their perspective, they are also capable of empathy—of imaginatively placing themselves in the position of others. According to Smith, for moral sentiments to manifest, individuals must engage in appropriate actions and possess "good and respectable virtues" (Smith, 2018, p. 35–39). In this framework, Trimagasi embodies Hobbes's vision of humanity in the state of nature—a conception Adam Smith notably critiqued as reductive. Goreng, by contrast, personifies Smith's ideal of the impartial spectator: a morally attuned individual who recognizes others' suffering and chooses ethically grounded action over raw self-interest. Goreng's moral transformation throughout the narrative parallels what Smith frames as the development of moral conscience and virtue.

Fromm, however, argues that the destructive tendencies of human beings predate capitalism and stem from a more primal motivation: the drive to sustain biological life. He suggests that the root of human conflict and destructiveness lies in defensive aggression—a survival mechanism rather than inherent malevolence. Contrary to popular belief, defensive aggression is less prevalent under primitive conditions, where people do not perceive one another as existential threats. The Cartesian conception of the subject, which underpins modernity's belief that individuals and societies do not inherently threaten one another, was fundamentally challenged by the economic, political, and cultural upheavals of the early 20th century (Fromm, 2024).



From a philosophical-anthropological perspective, the film's characters—particularly Goreng—embody fundamental tensions in human nature when confronting extreme circumstances. Their divergent responses map a behavioral spectrum from Hobbesian self-preservation to Smithian sympathy, revealing the perpetual struggle between base instincts and ethical potentiality. The moral dilemma presented by the film highlights the complexities of human nature in the face of systemic oppression. This ideological closure, referred to in Marxist terminology as alienation, is also visible in the psychology of other characters in the film.

The struggle for food on the platform creates an atmosphere of despair that fosters a sense of competition among the inmates. This, in turn, perpetuates the capitalist ideal of 'survival of the fittest,' where individuals are encouraged to prioritize their interests above all else. Instead of fostering solidarity, this cinematic atmosphere reinforces social divisions, spreading distrust and hostility. This depiction of the film also reveals class relations and differences.

As mentioned earlier, the platform serves as a powerful metaphor for capitalist society, representing both the means of survival and the mechanism of oppression. In this world, where wealth and resources are distributed according to hierarchical organization, higher-level people receive plenty of food. At the same time, those at the bottom only have access to crumbs, mirroring real-life class divisions. This inequality of sharing also makes the platform an important tool for determining power dynamics. Those in control of the platform (symbolically the authorities) dictate the conditions of survival, ensuring that the lives of prisoners on lower floors are more destructive. This dynamic embodies capitalist structures, where power is concentrated in the hands of a few, and the many are subjugated by a system designed to maintain their oppression.

As the film's narrative progresses, the interactions between characters involved with the platform offer deeper insights into class relations. Some inmates attempt to redistribute food, advocating for a more egalitarian system. However, individuals prioritizing their survival over collective well-being often resist their efforts. The film demonstrates the difficulties of promoting solidarity within a competitive framework while critiquing capitalist structures perpetuating inequality and social fragmentation. This point invites viewers to reflect on class relations in contemporary societies through the platform's life/death opposition. It is precisely through these scenes that the film poses important questions to the viewer.

What moral responsibilities do we have towards each other in a system where we often oppose each other to survive? Is it feasible to achieve equality within a fundamentally flawed system? How can social justice be achieved, and what price must be paid for it?

The film attempts to answer these questions through characters who strive for justice and equality, attempting to redistribute resources fairly and equitably among the inmates on each floor. However, their efforts often fail, and they are forced to contend with the limitations imposed by the structure in which they live. This struggle for social justice leads to a broader social questioning of whether true equality can be achieved within a capitalist framework that inherently favors competition and self-interest. The film suggests that systemic change requires more than individual acts of kindness; it requires fundamentally restructuring social norms and values.

Moreover, the film's narrative raises critical questions about the role of leadership and authority in promoting social equality. Trimagasi's cynical compliance—his reduction of existence to mere survival—epitomizes the fatalistic resignation that perpetuates oppressive systems. This passive acceptance functions as a pointed critique of societal complacency, revealing how perceived powerlessness reinforces the status quo. Goreng, however, resists this nihilism, embodying the radical possibility of ethical agency even within structural constraints. His persistence becomes a testament to the transformative potential of hope in the face of systemic brutality.

The film's allegorical reading of capitalism and social structure reinforces the idea that social justice is an ongoing struggle. When Goreng realizes the futility of his efforts within the existing order, he understands that real change requires collective action and a willingness to confront the system. While this message may resonate as a call to struggle for viewers who face similar difficulties in their lives in defense of social justice, Goreng's struggle is embodied in the intolerant self. Although Goreng appears to struggle against the system through the platform metaphor, the fundamental principle that undermines equality is the individual who does not obey the system's rules that allocate equal amounts of food for everyone. In this context, while the film critiques the distorted structure of the system on one level, it simultaneously emphasizes the insatiable and maladaptive nature of human beings on the other, rendering the criticism of the system both meaningless and dysfunctional. Does people's inability to live equally stem from the platform or their insatiable nature?

## 2. Human Nature-Behavior and Its Ideological Impact in *The Platform*

First, it should be noted that “cinema in general, and every commercial/popular film in particular, produces the opposite/false consciousness; on the one hand, it defends and conveys the worldview of a class; on the other hand, it forms the values that hold society/culture together (...) and functions as a social plaster” (Yılmaz, 2008, p. 63). Similarly, in one of the most fundamental reference texts on this subject, Kellner states that films are intensely ideological and political, and that viewers must read films politically to understand how power and domination relations are coded in them (Kellner, 2014, p. 55). In a similar vein, Kolker in his recent work discusses the effectiveness of political cinema from the early years of cinema to the present day. In his analysis, the issue addresses political themes, how a film can be political within its structural system, and how it can politicize audiences (Kolker, 2018). As Franklin asserts, cinema, specifically American films, operates through a system of American political ideology that permeates the films, with classical liberalism being the most dominant example and principle of this culture of influence (Franklin, 2016). In this world, which Carl Boggs refers to as the globalized stage of post-Fordist development, postmodern cinema, in his words, “more than anything else encourages a flight from politics—a cynical, detached, disempowering attitude toward the entire public sphere—typical of an increasingly depoliticized society” (Boggs, 2001).

As Althusser argues, capitalism builds its structure first and foremost on "reproduction." This reproduction is not only of the commodities produced in the factory but also the reproduction of individuals, their ways of thinking, and their ways of living. For this reason, the number of factory workers never decreases, and the system is never interrupted. The system reproduces the workers who will sell their labor to produce surplus value and the consciousness it addresses to them. This production also reproduces the ideological system that ideological apparatuses address Althusser claims. Without this ideological production, neither the ideological apparatuses of the state nor the apparatuses of repression can fully function (Althusser, 2014). In this sense, Althusser's work on ideology has directly contributed to film ideology. As Diken and Laustsen note in their book *Cinematic Apparatus*, inspired by Althusser: “Films do not, in this context, necessarily legitimize the dominant ideologies; rather, they serve as an outlet, making sure that the subjects do not challenge the system. As such, the actual content of the ideological images matters less” (Diken & Laustsen, 2007).

In this sense, *The Platform* offers a profound allegory of capitalism, as argued in the previous section, and an in-depth examination of human behavior and its complex relationship with systemic structures such as power and inequality. The film illustrates how individuals cope with the harsh realities of life in a vertically structured prison, where their choices and actions significantly impact both their survival and the well-being of others. However, at the narrative level and through the characters' actions, this impact shifts from resisting the system to opposing individuals who succumb to their desires. This shift is where the film deviates ideologically—both in its discourse and the platform's operational logic.

The struggle of Goreng and his allies reproduces the system if it is not directly targeted at the platform itself. Instead, it focuses on the equal distribution of food to everyone. From the film's opening scenes, the system itself appears flawless. Food is meticulously prepared, served, and placed at the Platform with great care. On one occasion, when a single hair is found in a dish, the person responsible is sternly reprimanded for their mistake.

Moreover, the food provided is chosen by the inmates themselves. Thus, the platform does not compel anyone to consume something they did not select. Within this framework, the struggle of Goreng and his allies aligns with the reproduction stage, which Mephram describes as the reproduction of discursive practices. Within the same ideological system, data derived from the same ideological presentation perpetuates the same ideological world morally and philosophically. Mephram divides this reproduction into four distinct phases, emphasizing the complexity of ideological systems (Mephram, 1994, p. 230). In line with Mephram's interpretation of ideology, the actions of Goreng and his allies must transcend the act of consuming the food provided and evolve into a systemic struggle. Otherwise, their efforts will merely reinforce the existing system.

Goreng's journey begins as a personal quest for moral integrity, yet the platform's brutal hierarchy forces him to confront an existential dilemma: can individual idealism survive in a system engineered to crush solidarity? Each descent strips away layers of his initial naivete, exposing the raw tension between ethical principles and survival imperatives. The inmates' escalating ruthlessness—mirrored in Goreng's own shifting compromises—serves as a dark testament to capitalism's corrosive effect on communal bonds. When starvation becomes the great equalizer, the film suggests, even the most virtuous must choose between martyrdom and moral erosion.

The film effectively highlights this conflict through various character developments. For instance, Trimagasi, an inmate on the lower floors, initially adopts a cynical outlook, believing that ruthless competition is the only means of survival. His worldview reflects a learned behavior shaped by the oppressive environment of the prison, suggesting that human nature can be influenced and even corrupted by systemic conditions. In contrast, characters like Mihar, who attempts to rescue her child from the depths of the prison, represent an oppositional response, symbolizing compassion and resistance to the dehumanizing effects of their environment.

This contrasting depiction of human behavior is rooted in the concept of moral agency. *The Platform* invites viewers to consider the extent to which individuals bear responsibility for their actions within a system that systematically devalues human life. As the narrative unfolds, the film underscores that human behavior has tangible consequences on the social structure of the prison. Inmates' decisions to share or hoard food significantly affect the social dynamics within the facility. While this reflects a broader ideological discourse on capitalism, suggesting that the competitive spirit fostered by the system erodes solidarity and mutual aid, it also implicates the insatiable nature of humanity itself. This portrayal of struggle, embodied in the character of Goreng, underscores the need for a critical examination of human nature about the structures that govern our lives.

The film refrains from taking sides in this examination. One of the central themes of the narrative is the scarcity of food, which functions both as a systemic issue and a reflection of human nature. The platform that delivers food to the prisoners operates on a diminishing scale, offering abundance to those at the top while depriving those at the bottom. However, the problem does not lie with the platform itself. The platform allows inmates to request their desired meals in their preferred quantities before they enter, ensuring that everyone's needs can theoretically be met. The issue arises when individuals consume more than necessary. At times, the film hints that this insatiability stems from the unequal structure of the platform. However, it does not definitively address whether the platform or human nature is the root cause of the scarcity. Instead, through its characters, it reinforces the notion that the primary source of the problem is human behavior.

At first glance, food scarcity appears to be a direct consequence of the prison's structure—a designed mechanism ensuring inequality. This perspective critiques the capitalist system, where resources are distributed unequally, often favoring the wealthy while excluding the poor. The platform's functioning mirrors the real-world dynamics of capitalism, where access to resources is determined by one's position within a hierarchical framework.

However, the film also delves into the psychological dimensions of food scarcity, exploring how it influences human behavior and interactions. The desperation of hunger compels prisoners to act in ways that conflict with their moral values. The survival instinct often leads to ruthless competition, driving individuals to violence and betrayal to secure their needs. This element of the film implies that human nature, driven by primitive instincts, can sometimes override ethical considerations. Yet, in doing so, the narrative downplays the impact and responsibility of the prison's design. Why is the system designed vertically, and why does it force individuals to eat?

The film's ideological limits become apparent in its displacement of systemic critique onto individual moral dilemmas. By foregrounding questions of personal responsibility within an artificially scarce system—rather than interrogating the mechanisms producing that scarcity—it remains trapped in the very neoliberal logic it ostensibly critiques. The platform's allegorical power is ultimately constrained by this ideological short-circuit: It gestures toward systemic change (through Goreng's idealism) while naturalizing the conditions that make collective action impossible. What emerges is less a discursive analysis of capitalism than a dramatization of its most corrosive false binary: the supposed inevitability of choosing between survival and solidarity.

The film depicts various responses to the conflict among characters. For instance, some prisoners adopt selfish behaviors, while others strive to promote collective well-being, often at significant personal risk. The character of Trimagasi exemplifies a normalized acceptance of the system, viewing individual interests as the sole means of survival. Trimagasi's hardened worldview functions as a damning indictment of systemic moral corrosion—his survivalist ethos demonstrating how structural oppression perverts ethical reasoning into zero-sum calculations. Goreng's transformative arc, conversely, maps the precarious emergence of political consciousness under duress. Where the system seeks to reduce humans to atomized consumers of scraps, his insistence on equitable distribution—even amid escalating brutality—performs the radical possibility of sustaining solidarity in the face of engineered scarcity. In this sense, the film culminates in Goreng's realization



that real change requires collective action and a commitment to social justice. This realization underscores the importance of solidarity and empathy within a competitive environment.

Ultimately, *The Platform* critically examines human nature and ideological discourse, exploring the complex relationships between behavior, scarcity, and social responsibility from an ideological perspective. Through its depiction of the prison environment, the film encourages viewers to reflect on their moral choices and the systemic structures that shape these decisions. However, the questions it raises focus less on why the system is designed in such a way—why the platform is organized vertically or why it offers only the desired food—and more on the nature and actions of human beings within this system.

### 3. Macro and Micro Structures and Ideological Discourse in *The Platform*

In their study on automobile advertisements, Ayvaz and Livberber propose Van Dijk's systematic approach to discourse analysis as a model for evaluating films by separating the components that form a film from a general discourse analysis critique. This approach, in which Dijk decomposes news texts to reveal their ideological content, breaks down the elements that constitute the content and can be applied to other forms of media (Ayvaz & Livberber, 2019, pp. 1146-1147). Following this framework, Van Dijk's macro and microstructures, as developed by Ayvaz and Livberber, will be applied to analyze the narrative and visual components of the film and provide a comprehensive examination of its ideological foundations. The film's evaluation through this framework consists of the following elements:

*Macrostructures* encompass "narrative, themes, atmosphere, characters, and social context." *Microstructures* include "dialogue, camera techniques, soundtrack, visual elements, and symbolism." As a medium, the film allows for a detailed examination of how language, visual representation, and narrative structure interact to convey ideological messages. By employing this dual-structure approach, the analysis aims to highlight how the film critiques and, at times, overlooks specific critiques of capitalist society and human behavior through both broad thematic elements and specific linguistic and visual details.

#### Macro Structures: Narrative, Themes, Atmosphere, Characters, and Social Context

The film employs a rich narrative structure on multiple levels, integrating various themes and social contexts to critique capitalism and human behavior effectively. The story follows Goreng entering a vertical prison called "the Pit." This setting serves as a metaphor for social hierarchies and resource distribution, illustrating the harsh realities of class struggle. The narrative unfolds linearly, emphasizing Goreng's descent to the lower levels of the prison.

The film's vertical staging of deprivation performs capitalism's brutal geography—each level's material conditions producing distinct moral ecosystems. Yet this brilliant allegorical device is ultimately undermined by the narrative's ideological pivot: where early scenes indict the platform's engineered scarcity, the climax redirects blame toward individual moral failures. By framing bullying and violence as innate human responses rather than systemic byproducts, the film replicates neoliberalism's favorite sleight-of-hand—converting structural critique into morality play. As Goreng encounters characters who respond differently to the prison's hardships, the film examines moral dilemmas through the lens of human behavior and the human condition. Themes such as capitalism, social justice, and the duality of human nature are central to the narrative. This allegorical representation of capitalism is most evident in how the platform operates: those at the top enjoy abundance, while those at the bottom are left with little or nothing. This platform's dynamic raises critical questions about inequality and the social structures that perpetuate it; however, these questions are primarily directed toward critiquing human nature rather than capitalism, both at the macro and micro levels.

The film's atmosphere is dominated by a bleak and claustrophobic vertical prison design, pivotal in reinforcing its themes. With its harsh, industrial aesthetic, the prison's design creates an oppressive atmosphere that mirrors the dehumanizing effects of the capitalist system. The descending platform serves as a physical representation of social stratification and a constant reminder of the hierarchical nature of resource distribution. Like real-world systems, resources are distributed hierarchically. This atmosphere not only shapes the characters' behavior but also serves as a microcosm of society.

The characters in the film are carefully crafted to represent a spectrum of human behavior. Goreng embodies the struggle for moral integrity amidst the chaos, while characters such as Trimagasi and Miharü reflect varying degrees of cynicism, selfishness, and compassion. This diversity of character reactions underscores the film's exploration of human nature and individuals' choices when faced with adversity while

emphasizing social diversity. This richness in characterization is reflected in the film's broader social context. In its internal narrative and release timing, the film resonates with audiences grappling with similar challenges in a real-world marked by rising economic inequality and social unrest. The film invites viewers to critically engage with the social structures shaping their lives by portraying a critique of capitalism as a reflection of real-world struggles. The film's layered narrative operates on dual discursive planes: at the macro level, it delivers a searing indictment of capitalist structures through its allegorical platform, while at the micro level, it stages intimate moral dramas that probe the limits of human nature under duress. This dialectical approach enables the work to simultaneously critique systemic violence and interrogate individual agency—though its ultimate ideological tension lies in whether it blames the system, or the subjects trapped within it.

### **Micro Structures: Dialogue, Camera Techniques, Soundtrack, Visual Elements, and Symbolism**

The film's microstructures delve into specific linguistic and visual elements that enhance the audience's understanding of its narrative and its ideological messages. The film's dialogues are designed to reveal character motivations and power dynamics. Conversations among prisoners frequently reflect their desperation, self-interest, and moral dilemmas. For instance, Goreng's discussions with Trimagasi highlight their conflicting perspectives on survival and morality, while other dialogues focus on the dire conditions of the prison and the choices prisoners face. These dialogues critique and reinforce the theme of individual choices rather than providing a comprehensive critique of social structures or capitalism at the macro level. The dialogues need more in-depth discussions questioning the platform (i.e., the capitalist system), its design, or its mechanisms. Scenes where the platform is critiqued often conclude with an emphasis on individuals making poor or insatiable choices.

Goreng offers a focal point for deeper analysis. When he decides to descend on the platform to promote equality, his and his companion Spice's primary motivation is to ensure that food is distributed equally to everyone. On the first day of this attempt, Goreng argues with those above him, insisting that the people below should eat first, with the upper levels eating later, and resorts to violence against those who resist. However, neither Goreng nor Spice questions why the system is designed how it is, whether it is fair, or how it might be changed. They focus on addressing the insatiable behavior of those at the top and enforcing justice at the individual level.

In this context, the ideological critique of the platform (as an allegory for capitalism) does not emerge through the main characters. However, instead, through the "wise man" they encounter on their journey. The wise man reveals the futility of their actions and how their efforts inadvertently reproduce the system, even as they strive to bring food to all levels. He advises them that the management is unscrupulous, and that real change can only occur if a message is sent to those overseeing the system. This message takes the form of an untouched dessert, the "panna cotta," symbolizing resistance and hope for systemic change. Until this moment, no character in the film engages in discourse about the existence of the system, its design, or the possibilities for altering it.

Similarly, camera techniques play a crucial role in conveying the film's emotional weight and thematic depth. Close-ups capture characters' expressions of fear, helplessness, and determination, creating a psychological tension that affects not only the characters' relationship with the platform but also the audience's engagement with the screen. Wide shots emphasize the vastness of the prison and the isolating nature of the platform, while visual choices highlight the contrasts between individual experiences and the overarching system of oppression. This approach steers the film to critique human nature rather than capitalism. For instance, the scenes introducing the platform depict it as flawless. The workers preparing the food exhibit meticulous care, allowing no defects. A single hair in the food prompts an exaggerated reaction, with all kitchen staff addressing the issue. This scene underscores the perfectionism of the platform's operation.

Similarly, the first depiction of floor zero, where food is prepared, shows workers carefully cooking and presenting dishes with precision, such as the snail delicately arranged with tweezers. However, as the platform descends, close-up shots reveal hands tearing apart the food, destroying it amidst chaotic sounds of screaming. The focus is not on the platform but on the people who insatiably ravage the food carefully prepared for everyone. In this sense, the visual framing and its narrative impact emphasize human behavior over the platform.

Likewise, the soundtrack and music contribute significantly to the film's atmosphere. Characterized by a chilling and tense quality, the sound design underscores the emotional turmoil and dissatisfaction

experienced by the characters. By accentuating moments of despair and pain, the film draws the audience into the dramatic aspects of the narrative rather than prompting them to question the system itself. The interplay between the soundtrack and the visuals transforms the film into a visceral depiction of human pain, endurance, and insatiability in the face of systemic challenges rather than a critique of the system. Visual elements such as color palettes and lighting further enhance these themes. The dark, muted colors of the prison evoke a sense of hopelessness and despair, while strategic lighting contrasts emphasize the differences between levels. The upper levels are always brightly lit, whereas the environment becomes progressively darker as one descends to the lower levels. This descending darkness, symbolizing starvation and cannibalism, is mirrored in the behavior of the inhabitants on these floors. These visual techniques effectively represent the narrative's social hierarchies and the impact of capitalism on individual lives.

Symbolism permeates the film, with the characters and the platform's design serving as metaphors for broader social issues. The platform symbolizes the capitalist structure, determining resource distribution and illustrating systemic inequalities. Food symbolizes subsistence and survival and becomes the focal point for the characters' moral decisions. Sharing or hoarding food reflects more profound ideological debates about individualism and collectivism, yet this is where the film reveals its complex ideological messages.

The dissonance between macro- and micro-structures illustrates a tension within the film. While the macro-structure allows for deeper engagement with a critique of capitalism, the micro-structures—such as character motivations, visual choices, dialogue, camera movements, and symbolism—suggest that the critique shifts focus from systemic issues to human nature. The film presents uncomfortable truths about humanity's roles within a capitalist framework but avoids questioning why the system exists in its current form. It does not interrogate the vertical design of the platform, or the selection criteria used for resource allocation. Instead, it focuses on the perceived insatiability of human beings, emphasizing that the problem lies not with the system but with individuals who fail to be content with their share. The film's formal and narrative elements support this discourse, reinforcing the idea that the focus on human behavior overshadows systemic critique.

The discourse analysis presented in the findings also resonates with recent studies on the film. Akmeşe (2021, p. 229), in his analysis of the movie through Hobbesian philosophy, argues that “the message of the movie is that people generally have a malevolent nature.” According to Akmeşe, “Goreng and Baharat, who are exceptionally positive characters in the film, also kill many people due to the conditions they are in, and they even resort to cannibalism under extreme starvation” (Akmeşe, 2021, p. 229).

Similarly, Köse and Bingöl (2021, p. 28) highlight that the film critiques the inequality inherent in today's neoliberal order by portraying individuals' perceptions of moral values and ideology. In this new neoliberal paradigm—reminiscent of Hobbes' conception of the state of nature—the film's dystopian design exposes the problematic circumstances in which individuals, deprived of freedom, are compelled to take morally questionable actions merely to survive within a rigid and surveilled system.

In conclusion, analyzing macro and microstructures in *The Platform* reveals the intricate connections between narrative, character, and ideology. The film critiques capitalist structures through compelling storytelling and powerful visual language while prompting viewers to discuss social justice, human behavior, and the potential for change. While the film appears to critique capitalism, it simultaneously offers a deeper reflection on human nature. It illustrates a system in which resource access is determined not by merit but by one's position within a rigid hierarchy. In doing so, the film highlights the struggles those at the lower levels of the socioeconomic order face. However, this critique is complicated by its tendency to attribute systemic failure to individual behavior. By implying that inequality persists because individuals consume more than their share, the narrative shifts responsibility from structural conditions to personal morality. As a result, the film's critique of capitalism is diluted, framing inequality as a consequence of human nature rather than systemic design.

### Conclusion and Discussion

This study uses critical discourse analysis (CDA) as a methodological framework to examine the intricate relationship between capitalism and human nature, as presented in *The Platform* (2019). Through its powerful visual language and narrative, the film critiques the systemic inequalities embedded within capitalist structures while exploring the moral dilemmas that arise within such frameworks. Through the framework of critical discourse analysis (CDA), particularly Van Dijk's macro- and microstructures, *The Platform* critiques not only capitalist hierarchies and resource distribution but also raises more profound, often uncomfortable questions about human nature and ethical responsibility within a fragmented system.

A macro-level analysis of the film's narrative, themes, and spatial design reveals an explicit allegorical critique of capitalist societies. The vertical prison structure in *The Platform* serves as a metaphor for the hierarchical nature of capitalist economies, where access to resources—symbolized by food—is determined by one's position within the social hierarchy. The stark contrast between the experiences of those at the top, who enjoy abundant resources, and those at the bottom, who struggle for mere crumbs, powerfully reflects the systemic inequalities inherent in capitalist structures. The film critiques how these systems perpetuate social stratification and deepen inequality while questioning individuals' roles in challenging these structures.

At the micro level, the analysis of dialogue, camera techniques, visual elements, and symbolism enriches the film's ideological critique, shifting the focus from systemic issues to the complexities of individual behavior. The characters' actions and interactions, particularly their moral struggles and choices regarding food distribution, emphasize the ethical dilemmas individuals face within capitalist systems. Confronted with the harsh realities of survival, the characters' responses—selfishness to solidarity—offer a critical commentary on human nature under extreme pressure. The film's intimate focus on personal struggles crystallizes its central ideological tension: even within fundamentally unjust systems, human impulses - whether self-preservation or solidarity - become active agents in perpetuating or resisting oppression. While the narrative acknowledges the necessity of structural change, its persistent return to individual moral choices reveals a deeper pessimism: that humanity's competing instincts may sabotage collective liberation before capitalism's contradictions ever do.

While the film critiques the inherent flaws of the capitalist system—particularly its exploitation and unequal resource distribution—it also emphasizes that these inequalities are perpetuated, and in some scenes entirely driven, by human nature. The desire for personal gain, competition for resources, and reluctance to share in contexts of scarcity highlight a fundamental tension in human behavior that is exacerbated, rather than alleviated, by capitalist structures. This dual critique of both the system and human nature raises difficult questions about whether true social justice can ever be achieved in a system that is not only structurally oppressive but also fosters individualistic tendencies.

The film's conclusion aligns with contemporary debates on capitalist criticism discussed in the first part of this study. Like the critical theorists examined earlier, *The Platform* argues that real change requires collective action and a fundamental shift in social values. Scholars such as Nancy Fraser (2022) and Thomas Piketty (2017) contend that capitalism is not merely an economic system but a deeply entrenched social structure that shapes individual behavior and perpetuates systemic inequality. The platform serves as a stark reminder of the need for systemic transformation alongside a reassessment of human values in addressing the social injustices capitalism perpetuates.

Considering these findings, while the film's critique of capitalism is evident, it leaves unresolved—and at times diminishes—the question of whether individual actions can genuinely overcome the systemic challenges posed by capitalist structures. The moral dilemmas faced by the characters in *The Platform* are not only about survival within a hostile environment but also about the ethical choices that define human behavior in the face of inequality. Ultimately, the film questions whether individuals entangled in the web of a fundamentally flawed system can transcend their base instincts to work collectively for the common good.

In conclusion, *The Platform* offers a poignant lens to explore the intersections of capitalism, social justice, and human behavior. Its allegorical nature, combined with its depiction of human nature under extreme duress, positions the film as an important representation of the ideological tensions shaping contemporary capitalist societies. By highlighting systemic and individual failures, the film challenges viewers to reflect on the complexities of achieving social justice in a world where capitalism and human nature present formidable obstacles.

## References

- Akmeşe, E. (2021). Thomas Hobbes'un insan felsefesi bağlamında the platform (2019) filmi üzerine bir analiz. *Atatürk Üniversitesi Güzel Sanatlar Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 221-230.
- Althusser, L. (2014). *Apparatuses, on the reproduction of capitalism: ideology and ideological state*. London and New York: Verso.
- Ayvaz, S., & Livberber, T. (2019). Reklamlarda toplumsal sınıf: otomobil reklamları üzerinden bir söylem analizi. *Erciyes İletişim Dergisi*, 1141-1163.



- Benhabib, S. (1994). The Critique of instrumental reason. In S. Z. (Ed), *Mapping ideology* (pp. 66-92). London and New York: Verso.
- Boggs, C. (2001). Postmodernism the movie. *New Political Science*, 351-370.
- Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. G. Richardson, *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education* (pp. 241-258). New York: Greenwood.
- Breen, R. (2005). Foundations of a neo-Weberian class analysis. In E. O. (Ed), *Approaches to class analysis* (pp. 31-50). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dijk, T. A. (2001). Critical discourse analysis. In D. T. Deborah Schiffrin, *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 352-371). Malden: Blackwell Publishers.
- Diken , B., & Laustsen , C. B. (2007). *Sociology through the projector*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Franklin, D. P. (2016). *Politics and film: The political culture of television and movies*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Fraser, N. (2022). *Cannibal capitalism: How our system is devouring democracy, care, and the planet - and what we can do about it*. London and New York: Verso.
- Fromm, E. (2024). *İnsandaki yıkıcılığın kökenleri*. Say Yayınları.
- Hobbes, T. (2023). *Leviathan*. Yapı Kredi Yayınları.
- Karl Marx, F. E. (2008). *The communist manifesto*. London: Pluto Press.
- Kellner, D. (2014). Film, politics, and ideology: Toward a multiperspectival film theory. In J. Combs, *Movies and politics* (pp. 55-92). London and New York: Routledge.
- Kolker, R. P. (2018). *Politics goes to the movies*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Köse, H., & Bingöl, T. (2021). Neoliberal düzende panoptik denetim tahayyülü: The Platform filmi ve düşündürdükleri. *İleti-ş-im*, 5-31.
- Lukács, G. (1972). *History and class consciousness: Studies in marxist dialectics*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.
- Marx, K. (1972). *The eighteenth brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*. Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- Marx, K. (1990). *Capital vol. 1: A critique of political economy* . London: Penguin Books.
- Marx, K. (2001). *The class struggles in france*. London: The Electric Book Company.
- Mephram, J. (1994). The theory of ideology in capital. In T. Eagleton, *Ideology* (pp. 211-237). London and New York: Longman Publishing.
- Piketty, T. (2017). *Capital in the twenty-first century*. Belknap Press.
- Smith, A. (2018). *Ahlaki duygular kuramı*. Pinhan Yayınları.
- Weber, M. (1978). *Economy and society: An outline for interpretive sociology*. Los Angeles and London: University of Calofornia Press.
- Weber, M. (1992). *The protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Weber, M., Gerth, H., & Mills, W. (1946). *From Max Weber: Essays in sociology*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Weininger, E. B. (2005). Foundations of pierre bourdieu's class analysis. In E. O. (Ed), *Approaches to class analysis* (pp. 82-118). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wright, E. O. (2005). Foundations of a neo-marxist class analysis. In E. O. (Ed), *Approaches to class analysis* (pp. 4-31). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.





Yılmaz, E. (2008). Sinema ve ideoloji ilişkileri üzerine. In B. Bakır, & Y. Ünal, *Sinema, ideoloji politika: Büyüleyen faşizm ve diğer yazılar* (pp. 63-86). Ankara: Nirengi Kitap.

**Destekleyen Kurum/Kuruluşlar:** Herhangi bir kurum/kuruluştan destek alınmamıştır.

**Çıkar Çatışması:** Herhangi bir çıkar çatışması bulunmamaktadır.

### Genişletilmiş Özet

Bu çalışma, The Platform (2019) filmini eleştirel söylem analizi (CDA) çerçevesinde inceleyerek, kapitalizm ve insan doğasının alegorik bir eleştirisini yapmaya çalışmaktadır. Eleştirel söylem analizi, filmdeki toplumsal yapılar, güç ilişkileri ve ideolojik söylemleri çözümlemek için kullanılan bir yöntem olarak, kapitalizmin ve insan doğasının filmlerdeki yansımalarını daha derinlemesine anlamamıza yardımcı olmaktadır. Bu araştırma, Van Dijk'in makro ve mikro yapıları üzerinden yaptığı sınıflandırmayı temel alarak, The Platform filminin kapitalist toplumdaki eşitsizlikleri ve bireylerin bu eşitsizliklerle nasıl başa çıktığını ele almaktadır.

Filmin makro yapılarında, The Platform'un kapitalist toplumdaki sınıf eşitsizliklerini nasıl ele aldığı ve bu eşitsizliklerin güç ilişkileri üzerinden nasıl pekiştirildiği tartışılmaktadır. Filmde, dikey bir hapishane yapısının içinde yiyeceklerin platform aracılığıyla dağıtılması, kapitalist toplumlarda kaynakların sınıf ilişkileri üzerinden dağıtımının bir metaforu olarak kullanılır. Üst katlarda bulunanlar, bol miktarda yiyeceğe erişim hakkına sahipken alt katlardaki mahkûmlar bu yiyeceklerin kalıntılarıyla, zaman zaman yiyecek herhangi bir şey olmadan, kimi zaman ise aynı katta kaldığı diğer insanların etini yiyerek hayatta kalmaya çalışırlar. Bu yapısal eşitsizlik, filmde kapitalizmin sınıfsal hiyerarşik yapısını ve bunun bireyler üzerindeki etkilerini simgeler. Filmin toplumsal yapıyı ve kapitalist sistemi eleştirirken kullandığı bu sembolik göstergeler, sınıf ilişkileri üzerinden kapitalizmin yapısal, yasal, sosyal vd. adaletsizliklerinin altını çizmektedir. Adaletsizliklere yapılan bu vurgu yalnızca filmin biçimsel düzenlemelerinde değil aynı zamanda filmdeki karakter aracılığıyla da pekiştirilir. Filmdeki karakterler, bu eşitsiz yapısal sistem içinde hayatta kalma mücadelesi verirken, insan doğasının bencillik, paylaşma, dayanışma gibi farklı yönlerini tercih eden davranışlar sergilerler. Bu bağlamda film kapitalizmin bireyci eğilimleri nasıl pekiştirdiğini ve toplumdaki eşitsizliklerin, özellikle de yiyecek gibi temel kaynakların paylaşımı üzerinden insan davranışlarını nasıl şekillendirdiğini eleştirel bir biçimde ele alır.

Filmin mikro yapılarında ise, karakterlerin diyalogları, görsel unsurlar, kamera teknikleri ve film müziği aracılığıyla insan doğası ve kapitalizm arasındaki ilişki daha ayrıntılı bir şekilde seyreiciye gösterilmektedir. Bireylerin, hayatta kalma mücadelesi verirken karşılaştıkları ahlaki ikilemler, diyaloglarda açıkça ortaya çıkmaktadır. Bazı karakterler, kitle içinde bile yardımlaşma yolunu tercih ederken, bazı karakterler kendi çıkarlarını ön planda tutarak birbirlerini ekarte etmeye çalışır. Bu karakterlerin davranışları, kapitalizmin bireyleri nasıl rekabetçi ve çıkarıcı bir hale getirdiğinin açık bir göstergesidir. Filmdeki görsel dil de bu ikilikleri vurgulamak için bir araç olarak kullanılır. Kamera teknikleri, özellikle dar ve geniş açıların kullanımı, karakterlerin hem fiziksel hem de psikolojik hallerini yansıtarak, hayatta kalma mücadelesinin zorluklarını ortaya koyar. Ayrıca filmdeki ışık ve renk kullanımı da mekânın karanlık yapısını ve içinde bulunan insanların ruh hallerini pekiştirir. Film müziği ise bu gerilimli atmosferi güçlendirerek, izleyiciye karakterlerin korku, öfke ve çaresizlik gibi duygularını, özdeşlik ilkesi üzerinden daha derin biçimde hissettirir. Bu mikro yapılar, tıpkı filmdeki makro yapılarda olduğu gibi filmin yalnızca toplumsal yapı eleştirisini değil, aynı zamanda insan doğasının kapitalist bir sistemde nasıl şekillendiğini ve insan davranışlarının sistem tarafından nasıl pekiştirildiğini de ortaya koymaktadır. Filmdeki hem makro hem de mikro yapılar filmin eleştiri odağına aldığı iki ana öğeyi, yani kapitalizm ve insan doğası arasındaki ilişkiyi vurgulamaktadır. Ancak film, kapitalizmin bu ikili ilişkiyi nasıl şekillendirdiğini göz ardı etmekte ve sistemsel, yapısal, sosyal ilişkilerden daha çok bireylerin bencillik ve hayatta kalma içgüdülerine odaklanmaktadır. The Platform filmi bu anlamda sistemin insanların bu davranışlarını beslemedeki rolünü yeterince ele almaz ve yaşanan eşitsizliğin sistemsel bir problemden daha çok insan doğasından kaynaklandığına vurgu yapar. Bu ideolojik söylem eksikliği, filmin kapitalizmin yapısal sorunlarını doğru bir şekilde ele almadığını ve başka bir düzlemde izleyicinin başka bir anlam çıkarmasına neden olabileceğini göstermektedir.

Makale bu eksikliğe dikkat çekerek, The Platform filminin, kapitalizmin sadece bir sistem olarak değil, aynı zamanda bireysel davranışları şekillendiren gizli bir güç olarak nasıl çalıştığını gözler önüne serdiğini savunur. Kapitalizm ve insan doğası arasındaki bu uzlaşmaz çelişki, filmdeki karakterlerin seçimleri ve sistemle olan ilişkileri üzerinden ayrıntılı bir şekilde incelenmiştir. Bu çalışmanın bir diğer bulgusu ise, The Platform filminin sosyal adalet ve bireysel sorumluluk arasındaki çatışmayı nasıl ele aldığıdır. Film kapitalist sistemin bireyleri bencillığe iten yapısal faktörlerini sorgulamak yerine, insan doğasının bu davranışları doğurduğu varsayımına dayanır. Birçok sahnede, birçok diyalogla bu varsayımın altını çizer. Bu eksiklik filmdeki kapitalizm eleştirisini daraltmakta ve filmin toplumsal adalet için önerdiği çözüm önerilerini sınırlamaktadır. Zira filmdeki en temel öneri herkesin hak ettiğini kadarını yediğinde sorunların ortadan kalkacağıdır. Makale bu sorunun, filmde ve kapitalizmdeki çatışmaların temel kaynağının kapitalist sistem olduğu vurgusuyla çözümlenmesi gerektiğini savunur.

Sonuç olarak bu çalışma, The Platform filmini kapitalizm ve insan doğasının alegorik bir eleştirisi olarak ele alırken, filmin eleştirel söylemini derinlemesine incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Film, kapitalizmin ve insan doğasının etkilerini yansıtan bir yapımla güçlü bir toplumsal mesaj verirken, aynı zamanda kapitalizm ve insan doğası ilişkisinin birbirini nasıl pekiştirdiğini göstermektedir. Gelgelelim film, kapitalizmin bireylerin davranışlarını şekillendiren ve pekiştiren rolünü göz ardı ederek, bu davranışların insan doğasından kaynaklandığını varsayar. Sonuç olarak film, izleyiciyi kapitalizmin yapısal eleştirisine dair nemli bir noktada eksik bırakmaktadır.