

What One Believes

Let us first approach the statement “every action is caused by a motivation” in a logical sense. If we think closely, the statement is circular because a motivation must have its motivation that caused the motivation and the motivation of a motivation must have its motivation that caused the motivation of motivation, and so on and so forth into the depths of infinity – we are only left with the baggage of motivations that never get to the action, which eventually too turns into a motivation that causes another action, and...

Here we investigate a similar circular ladder: “who is your father, and his father, and his father’s father, and his father’s father’s father,.....?”. Our logical approach in this paper thus justifies that logic fails whenever we try to investigate the cause of any cause. As a result, any question regarding why (i.e. that begs for the reason of cause) naturally justifies itself as *pretentious*. People struggle because they ask why and, subsequently dramatize their struggle for asking why. Most children and Hollywood films are thus pretentious.

Now we can see that the only justifiable and true motivation behind any of our action is our individual *belief*. Religion is the easiest example of among all. Many people *believe* that God (or Gods) is the ultimate origin of everything; what they *believe* is the source of the chain of every motivation. *Belief* is where any motivation begins and it is where the investigation of any motivation comes to an anticlimactical end. Many people are lost because “they don’t know what they want in life,” but they should really be asking themselves “what do I *believe* in life”. Having a belief tranquilizes one from doubts.

In a film titled “Stalker” (1979) directed by Andrei Tarkovski, the character known as Starker (played by Aleksandr Kaydanovskiy) guides two other characters into an area called the Zone in which any innermost desired wishes can be granted. But ‘why’ does Stalker guide them? He doesn’t even get paid, he himself has never entered the Zone that he guides other people into, he does not do it for the benefit of his family (as he ruthlessly leaves his family to guide those two men), and he certainly has no philosophical desire to know and understand (as he expresses throughout the film). Towards the end of the film, however, Stalker reveals to his wife that he wanted to guide those men to the Zone because he *believes* in humanity. And that’s all. Stalker is motivated only by his *belief* – the source of all of his causes and actions. Throughout the film, the two other characters who are guided by Stalker ceaselessly bring out the questions of why and those regarding the purpose of life. Their motivations are clearly defined, but as a result, they fail to enter the Zone because, as Stalker says, “they could not *believe* in themselves”. They acted according to their motivations, but theirs were all acts of reason but never those of *belief*.

Further, the film ends with the Stalker’s child mundanely sitting and moving a glass of water along the table with her telekinetic power for no apparent reason of motivation. How does the scene make sense? ‘Why?’ Here, the child’s telekinesis is hardly a supernatural power. The scene simply shows that *believing translates into action, and that actions do not arise from motivation*. The film proves that Tarkovsky was one of the most important artists of all time, and certainly the most important filmmaker ever lived, for he was able to capture nothing but the essence of life and what it is to live – not by motivative reasons, but by the singular source of love and sacrifice called *belief*.

In terms of filmmaking, filming by analyzing the characters’ motivation behind their actions is nothing but a psychological procedure that dramatizes the images in the screenplay, which are utmost important in cinema. Such procedure severely dumbs down cinema as language. If actors and/or cinematographer “cannot film” because of the “lack of motivation in the script,” then they are simply missing the point of art making. To make art is to *do* what one *believes*. *Belief* is neither psychological nor reasonable. To *believe* is to act according to what one deems as *truth*.

Alexander Kang
2016/02/02
Shanghai, China