**Documentary film analysis of “Capital in the Twenty-First Century".**

"Capital in the Twenty-First Century" is a documentary genre created by Justin Pemberton, based on the best-selling book by French economist Thomas Piketty. With a length of 103 minutes and being released in 2020, the film offers a perspective on capital accumulation that goes hand in hand with social progress. Capital accumulation increases, inequality worsens. The film collects popular cultural references and time travel to effectively reach audiences and reputable professionals. This analysis focuses on three main aspects: authorship - audience, messages - meaning, and representations - reality.

***In terms of authorship and audience***, Justin Pemberton, a New Zealander, is a documentary filmmaker across many disciplines (*NZ on screen, 2020*). Justin Pemberton made this movie because of the book's selling speed and became the best-selling book listed on the New York Times (*NZ Entertainment Podcast, 2019*). Also, the author has worked on several projects on inequality in New Zealand Television and Nigel Latta (*NZ Entertainment Podcast, 2019*). Although it is an academic economic book, the author has adapted it into a captivating documentary film. In an interview with entertainment weekly, he admitted he is interested in a long look at Thomas Piketty's history (*Christian Holub, 2020*). Thomas Piketty talks about Pride & Prejudice, The Grape of Wrath, and things like in the book. As a result, it’s the starting point where the author used pop culture to tell us stories of wealth and inequality for hundreds of years. That's why Justin Pemberton got excited about it and adapted it. In the film, there is the participation of academics such as Kate Williams of the University of Reading in England; Suresh Naidu, an economic historian at Columbia University - get prime screen time, with Piketty, who appears as a talking head, often playing a supporting role in his narrative. The target audience for this film is primarily documentary lovers, who prefer writing adapted into movies with pictures. Surprisingly, the audience may not be economics students because Piketty often quotes Austen or Balzac's novels to illustrate the points he's making, which excites audiences (*Christian Holub, 2020)*. Furthermore, the messages might benefit policymakers, governments in every country. There must be an adequate and effective intervention to prevent this. Also, it is a tacit accusation for illegal profiteers. The filmmaker wants the audience to perceive it as a historical film in general and social issues in particular. By presenting images of economic stagnation, or great crises, people are brought out clearly through the added movie scenes, death in the street from unemployment, because of hunger, because there is no money to repay the loan, etc. To prove this statement, the author lists over time stages of inequality: the industrial revolution with "Les Miserables", the Great Depression with "The Grapes of Wrath" and in the late '70s, early' 80s with Dolly Parton's "9 to 5".

***In terms of messages and meaning***, the film is interpreted chronologically: from before World War I, with the 18th century with the industrial revolution, then by the 19th century with globalization, and finally the current state of affairs and predictions for the future. The economic documentary covers over 400 years of "Capital" history. The film uses silhouettes, graphics, and news footage to better reach audiences and film critics. ***In the 18th century***, the capital was concentrated in the form of inherited land. The more land a man holds, the more powerful he is. 1% of the population accounts for 70% of social wealth. As a result, the gap between rich and poor is widening. People born with poverty will carry the death sentence for life. However, from today's economic views, inequality is a driving force for innovation and process because inequality causes competition that makes people work harder to have a good life. . But if it were extreme inequality, it would put great pressure on the economy, politics, and society. Taking references from the United States and England, typically through the two films "Pride and Prejudice" (2005) and "Les Misérables" (2012). Clips from movies above are deployed liberally, visually echoing the book’s use of historical novels to illustrate the earlier periods. The growth of the capitalist system expanded through the ***industrial revolution***. Explained by creating more wealth and profits through replacing human power with machines, the business monopolists continue to reuse capital and profits expand. Besides, the workers are mostly slaves, who have no property and are bought through slave markets in New Orleans. Not only that, until the 19th century, when society appeared the distribution of labor, inequality, and power spread throughout the world through invasions of lands and other national sovereignty. The film gives examples of the expansion of two camps: capitalist and socialist, especially Germany. To give viewers a better overview of the devastating levels of war and the development of world power. Editing the movie following a composition from past to present and future respectively. From the rudimentary development, not enough shape to the process of expanding and spreading rapidly through globalization. ***Globalization*** has brought world markets together, making inequality worse and worse because the share of all the money which is made in the economy is going less and less to the workers. As a consequence, the wage share is declining. The film's highest-rated scene is one from a psychology experiment at the University of California at Irvine. Two strangers fighting in a Monopoly game. In a coin toss, one player is given twice as much money as the other to get started. At the same time, that player can also use two dice 1 more than the other. So, double the amount for each turn passing Go. The experiment observes the victor's attitude and words towards the disadvantaged. The results indicated that not a single winner in the entire study thought their straight victory was due to initial unfair advantage. They think they win because they're better. This scene made me constantly think, wondering if it affects our national psychology or not. Persistent ones need to believe that any luck comes at a price, admitting that it all might be by nature like a coin toss. "Capital in the twenty-first century" offers an aspect of artificial intelligence, automation, and environmental issues to account for defining the future of the world economy. ***In the future***, capitalism is no longer about labor. The technology gradually came to life and changed the way society operates. Robots do basic human functions such as driving, assembling, operating. The film offers a metaphor for the comparison of horses and humans. The horse once brought the backward economy into industrialization and gradually replaced by machines, and it was no exception for humans. Looking back on the problem, minimizing inequality is the key issue for humanity to survive. As a result, The film offers some solutions such as need a progressive tax on capital and ownership right can't be eternal.

The film is conducted through the narrative voices of Francis Fukuyama, Joseph Stiglitz, and Thomas Piketty. At the same time, interweaving news, images about financial markets, stocks, film clips to reach the audience more effectively. Not only is it concise, but also informative. Narrators who are knowledgeable academics, draw reliable conclusions, and convey it to the audience. The reason for the success of the film is not only in the content but also in how to render and match the music accordingly. Information is given in a brief, full of images. At the same time, it is ordered in chronological order, and after each period, the information is reflected in its present state. Because of the reflective and controversial issues of many tides, the audience easily approaches many different directions and has different perspectives from others. The film has a knack for making tricky economic concepts accessible to all. The technique the filmmaker constructed depicts capitalism as a self-sustaining beast with a natural tendency to enrich and starve the poor to an increasingly, unsustainable rate. Unless there's a progressive tax to reallocate wealth in society from the start.

***In terms of representations and reality***, the film has been taken to film festivals such as Sydney Film Festival, New Zealand International Film Festival, Melbourne International Film Festival, but has not had the chance to receive an award. Admittedly, the film still brings historical and cognitive value to the hearts of audiences. However, in addition to the values it brings, the film also receives many criticisms from scholars, political economists. The shortcoming when the author thinks that inequality is getting worse, worse at the stage of globalization. But the author does not exploit the aspect, the life of the poor has also been significantly improved through tax money of the rich and subsidies (*Potter, Michael J, 2014*). Furthermore, the author asserts that increasing inequality leads to a division of labor capital. But, in the first data, the inequality in the distribution of labor income accounts for a large proportion of the increase in overall income inequality (*Marshall Steinbaum, 2017*).

At the end of the film, the audience can make their conclusions because the author has made the arguments, evidence, through images, sounds, and effects in the film including the author's point of view. In my view, some lessons can be drawn from the film, generally, it's not a political movement, and that's the problem. For a more equal society, people moved old Europe to new democracies. Therefore, a political organization is key to preventing this situation.
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