

CONSCIENCE IN FRAGMENTS

© Attila Horváth H.
(Pannon University, Veszprém, Hungary)

hha@almos.vein.hu

What does conscience mean to the present-day individual whose life is fragmented, in what form does it manifest itself to him/her and how does he/she interpret it? The study - based on Zygmunt Bauman's typology - draws the typological features of the Tourist, the Player, the Vagabond and the Stroller showing the chaos and incoherence of today, as well as the fact that the present-day individual cannot be described by a single metaphor. These four types do not cover the whole personality but we deal with them because they used to be on the periphery of society and they have got into the main stream today. None of the types can rely on identity-building strategies; they rather strive for avoiding stability. The study analyzes how these types appear in Babel directed by Iñárritu, and proves that although conscience can be neglected for a certain period of time, none of the types manages to eliminate it for good, however the fragmentation of conscience has already begun.

Keywords: conscience, Player, Tourist, Vagabond, Stroller, fragmentation, game

Introduction

The individual's existence and activities is fragmentation today. The great narratives are gone and replaced by the puny games of personal survival. We and the individual alike see him/her as if s/he (from here on "he" is used in these cases but it stands for "she" as well) were constantly in disco lights; he appears only for a flash, which means the breaking of his movements into small fragments. The same fragmentation characterizes his identity. No matter what combination is seen in the flashing lights, there is always something missing from the wholeness, it remains mosaic-like.

The man of previous ages could enjoy the belief in constant values; i.e. everything that represents values today will remain valuable tomorrow, too. In such situations saving for the future and identity building are beneficial strategies, during which overcoming the difficulties is a good step towards the right way. In this world the most dominant value is the coherent, continuously improving personality with self identity.

Based on Bauman's idea (2002), the most important characteristic feature of the post-modern man is not "identity building but the avoidance of stability". The man of today marks four types: the *Stroller*, the *Vagabond*, the *Tourist* and the *Player*. Marginally located though, the four lifestyles mentioned above were already present in the social structure before. They got into the mainstream only in the post-modern era.

The *Stroller* feels best in shopping malls, in a “world tailored to his own size and style by designers”. Although he is the most devoted follower of instructions coming from outside (via the media), he may think in this world that he is the one who governs his own life.

The *Vagabond* is best characterized as being unsettled. Wherever he is, the vagabond is unable to settle down and find permanence. Despite all his efforts, the locals will always consider him as a stranger. For him the most valuable strategy is to foster the feeling of “not belonging to the community”. (In the post-modern era the continuous changes undermine the life of the ones who have settled. Everything becomes insecure: “safe social networks dissolve and become useless junk”.)

The *Tourist's* way of life significantly differs from that of the *Vagabond's*. He enjoys the “I am a visitor here but my home is there” attitude. He is driven to experience new adventures by the stability of his home. He is eager to explore the world outside his home. The tourist's world is safe, he gets what he has paid for, otherwise he has his solicitor file a lawsuit. The rough reality of the *Vagabond's* everyday life does not fit in *Tourist's* experience.

The *Player's* motto is to “be alert”. He must always be prepared to recognize, avoid and dodge his rival's steps. “The goal of the game-like fights is to win at all costs, there is no room for regret, pity, sympathy and cooperation”. However, the situation is not so perilous because the participants know that it is just a game. Therefore it should have a well distinguishable start and end so that its “game-like property” will be apparent, it should not cause permanent damage of any kind, let alone mental damage.

Bauman convincingly argues that the four types are really typical of our age and therefore we may get a better understanding of the postmodern individual. (It must be noted that though the whole individual can not be described with these types but whether the individual can be described at all still remains a question.)

A logical deduction in Bauman's reasoning is that conscience becomes missing from the *Player's* games. He does not mention the question of conscience in connection with the other types but according to the text the above statement is valid for them, too. What also confirms our assumption is that the author mentions the whole identity of the individual in connection with an earlier age. A full personal involvement in the events is needed for the individual to be morally present in the events (Pokol, 2005). Fragmented lives do not allow a personal completeness so conscience can not fulfil its function, it loses its integrating function and it works incidentally or not at all.

Aim

Our approach examines if Bauman's philosophical thought is valid for a case when our world is depicted from an artistic aspect. Inarritu's film, entitled *Babel*, shows today's person in whom a basic thing, communication, which expresses humanity and social life characteristically, becomes a problem. This paper's aim is to find Bauman's types in Inarritu's film and analyze if the act of conscience can be found in each type. Where, when, why does an individual get into a situation where conscience becomes prominent?

Method

Turning the philosophical chain of thought into an analytical framework: 1) by describing the centralized peripheral types (the Player, the Tourist, the Stroller and the Vagabond) 2) clarifying the relation of the four types to conscience. Analysis of the film with the help of this framework:

- showing the presence of the four types;
- comparing the type characteristics and the showed characters;
- analysis of the manifestation of conscience.

Definition of conscience

The word *conscience* derives from the concept of the Greek vernacular *syneidesis* which was translated as *conscientia* by the Latin stoicists. The original meaning of the word referred to some shared knowledge of a certain secret; the public knows about one of its member's misdemeanour as a result of which, the guilty has bad feelings and is ashamed before the others. Following Fromm's theory, we consider conscience as a complicated *psychic formation* deriving from different sources, which develops through interactions with several other psychic structures. Fromm claims that only one side of conscience is formed by adhering to norms imposed by the expectations of authorities. The other side of conscience is innate which builds on the non-conscious perception of our own human nature and the experience of our own fate and mission (Fromm, 1947). According to our viewpoint, conscience is an inner signalling and complex operating system of the individual, which directs his morality reflecting upon it at the same time, whose manifestations are present in the individual's actions and moral judgement.

Types and conscience

The Player

How to interpret the paradigm of not having to feel remorse as a participant of the game? Either by believing that whatever I do is consistent with my conscious or my actions are inconsistent with my moral values, therefore the latter ones are excluded from the very situation following the principle that everything is permitted in love and war. Since the game requires ruthlessness, it does not give way to regret, sympathy or cooperation therefore I either follow these aspects of the game or I must eliminate my negative attitude towards them. It may not be so difficult to accomplish these expectations during the period of the game even if I ensure everybody including myself that it is just a game. These games meeting the requirements are independent entities, start and end make them clearly separated, and due to their nature they do not leave imprints. However, there is a problem triggered by the infinite nature of the games. Although each game is independent of the other, one follows the next so fast in time that despite the fact that they do not exert demonstrable influence on one another, each game is to be considered as a transitional stage, during which our moral sense is suspended.

What is more, the problem seems unsolvable because the games are embedded in the strategies of the post-modern consumer. S/he has the interest in breaking his life-games (Bauman, 2002). Thus s/he has the

possibility to win the game amid constantly changing rules with the least loss.

In this state of fragmentary and momentary transition, play-games and life-games can easily overlap thus becoming inseparable and uninterpretable. The player gets void of not only remorse but apparently also conscience.

In parallel with the fragmentation of the game, the player breaks his identity into small parts, which is only valid from the start to the end of the game. S/he can give a fresh start to his identity at each beginning of the game. For the player the valid imperative of "Be alert" cannot be changed for any other like: "Know Yourself" because there is no time to contemplate before and after the game, as it is a must to outwit the others. The only afterthought and assessment of the game are devoted to developing better practical strategies of how to become smarter and more beneficial than are rivals at the period of the next game.

There is no point in pondering and reflecting upon moral values as everything is permitted during the course of the game and it does not involve dire consequences.

Conscience gains importance for the player again if s/he gets out of the framework of the game as a result of some unexpected situation. The games may lack in conscience, still it is the games themselves that provide the player with the feeling of security.

The Tourist

The tourist takes pleasure in encountering the pleasantly commercial and safe outer world where s/he pays a temporary visit by being present in a tourist's disguise rather than showing his own self. Since this role is not his own, it is possible and acceptable that s/he should adjust to different moral values. The moral value is of secondary importance in this situation even if temporarily. There are moral values and rules (as well as moral emotions and regulatory functions) for the tourist to accept, s/he has conscience but it only relates to his home. As visits are becoming more and more frequent, due to the pleasant and carefree atmosphere they tempt with, the importance of being HERE wields more time and space, as a result of which THERE (home) and conscience become smaller and less significant in their character. HERE and THERE gradually become mixed and interchanged in the constant present. But it is not the rules accepted and applied THERE (home) that appear in the changing scenes of HERE gaining dominance, on the contrary, the temporary and occasional preferences of HERE overshadow and diminish the moral values, emotions and responsibilities of THERE (home).

The tourist to whom moralising would make sense only THERE (home) is in eternal transit. He fulfils all the moral requirements of the real world of his home burdened with real problems. No wonder he is attracted by the vivid, colourful and tempting HERE which offers only the best things of life pre-packed and gift-wrapped. THERE (home) serves as a reference point from where and referring to which he can temporarily move to the always existing and more exciting HERE. Why should the tourist pose moral questions in HERE if in this state his only concern is whether he is satisfied with the services he receives or not? Thus social problems and personal relations are irrelevant to him/her.

The Vagabond

Although the vagabond is more affected by the everyday problems than the tourist, he cannot complain if something is not as attractive as he /she has expected because he has not been promised anything and he has not paid for anything, either. He /she enjoys much more freedom than the tourist, he can leave the place any time it turns out to be the wrong choice. His interest is to seek and find the best possible place of living where he would like to settle down. However, he /she cannot do so as he would deny him/herself by achieving his goal. As a vagabond, he has the attributes of temporariness and not belonging to anywhere therefore his relationships, which are less refined than that of the tourist's, are significantly determined by temporariness. He can break up with the others anytime, otherwise he could not move on, his freedom would be restricted thus he would get closer to settling down because his strangeness would be forgotten. Due to his circumstances and relationships, small games with minor risks are suitable for the vagabond.

Due to his attributes, the vagabond cannot be committed. He does not pay attention to the others and he does not shoulder any responsibility for the others and very often for him/herself, either. The vagabond is very sensitive to social injustice and discrimination but this sensibility does not derive from solidarity or commitment to moral convictions and values but from the self-reference of the things and happenings and from his own self-esteem. As a result of determinism, the vagabond is rather incapable of creating values or performing artistic work, he cannot build and maintain relationships with the others, therefore his pride (thymos) – always in the foreground – dominates his personality. Driven by his excessive self-esteem, the vagabond not having any other property expects the others to acknowledge his dignity.

The Stroller

The Stroller's interest is restricted to colourful, attractive and varied scenes which he can survey and alter to his taste. He does not seek and build his identity because he does not need to do so as he can always furnish the scene with the people present to his liking. He does not have a profound relationship with anybody, he is the director of the play so he can label the participants freely with different identities without anybody questioning his own identity.

Unlike the tourist, the vagabond does not move places and as opposed to the vagabond he does not want to settle down. He is at home, yet the vagabond remains an outsider. He does not intend to analyze, interpret or find a deeper meaning; he always seeks pleasure. At a party, it does not make any difference whether old or new friends keep him/her company as long as they adjust to the scene.

The Stroller does not feel or shoulder responsibility for his mates because they are not real friends only different colours on the artist's palette. The Stroller is the artist; he mixes and applies the colours on the topical scene according to his preference. Although the Stroller considers himself as the director of the play, his connection with the players is nowhere near the real director-actor relationship. Why should he bother about showing any remorse for his mates if the situation can any time be rewritten with new players on the scene?

The four types in the Iñarritu movie Babel

Let us see an example for the description of the post-modern man: the movie entitled *Babel* by Alejandro Gonzalez Iñarritu, was nominated for the director prize of the Cannes Festival in 2006. The film shows a tough picture of our days, and as it describes this world in a very complex way, all the four types of the Bauman characters can be recognized in it. The seemingly independent episodes taking place in four countries of the three continents are linked to each other at several points and give a global segment about our life. (The basic problem of the film is the difficulty in communication – in broader meaning human relations – which refers to the Biblical example, the punishment of the man aiming for the role of God.) Here and now I do not want to analyze the work of art, but I would like to give a picture of the four types.

The tourist: Susan and Richard

From the four main characters the American couple fits into this group. Susan and Richard take part in a journey in Morocco. Two of their children are being looked after by their housekeeper during this travel. They travel in a bus with several of their tourist mates. They stop for a rest and sit down to have lunch by the tables protected by parasols in a well-equipped oasis of the desert. Susan is enquiring from the waiter about the available fat free dishes. They both order Coke to the lunch; the woman asks Diet-Coke. When the waiter says there is no Diet-Coke Susan understands it, she does not make a fuss, and accepts the traditional Coke.

The outlined situation is the typical picture of a tourist. She evidently orders Diet-Coke in the middle of the desert and asks for food which suits her present diet. This natural behaviour is connected to the fact that the tourist's needs have to be served in any case: when she longs for getting to the desert in an air-conditioned bus; when she wishes to feel the hot sand but after a few steps she expects a sheltered table or when she desires to sit on a camel but for just one or two photos, and then quickly rushes back to the cool bus. Susan's fair hair and white skin can even highlight the contrast.

The excellent director's absolute sensitivity to the human problems is shown when after exposing the typical situation of the tourist he draws up the opposite of this in the following dialogue:

Susan: – Richard, why did we come here?

Richard: – What do you mean, why?

Susan: – Really, why are we here?

Richard: – You know. To be alone.

Susan: – Alone? (She looks around: her mates are talking cheerfully and having lunch.)

Susan: – Throw out the ice.

Richard: – The Coke's hot.

Susan: – Yeah, but you don't know what kind of water is in there.

(When her husband pours some Coke onto the ice in the glass the woman pours out the whole one with a quick move.)

Richard: – Jesus Christ!! Why can't you just relax? Why are you so stressed?

Susan: – You are the reason I'm stressed. You are the reason why I can't relax.

Richard: – You could if you tried.

Susan: – You don't think I tried?

Richard: – You're never gonna forgive me, are you?

Susan: – You know what I’ m talking about.

Richard: – Hey. I’ m not gonna argue.

Susan: – Okay. Just let me know when you are ready to argue. If you’re not gonna run away again. (Iñarritu, 2006, 00:12:32 - 00:14:27)

During the dialogue the pictures make us feel the difficulty of the communication: that it is difficult to say things; that we should say a lot of things at once; that a lot of things have already been said; and it seems that in vain. At this point of the film it is not clear what causes the tension between them. This tension, however, tips them over the situation of being a tourist and to be able to return to the question of Coke and ice again in the next moment.

There is a deep problem attached to the couple’s HOME life and it disturbs their being here. Richard would rather be far away from this problem, his answer may refer to this in this question: “Why are we here?” The “to be alone” answer could have meant that they wanted to be away from the children and from everything that reminds them of that particular problem. He could trust that the new situation can offer new opportunities and new rules with which the old sins associated with HOME will become smaller and can dim and become insignificant. The woman, however, does not let her husband shift off the problems so easily. She signals that she has not forgiven him therefore we can conclude from this that the man had left his family. We do not know why and how long but it is indicated that he has chosen to be a tourist for a while: to be as far away from home as possible (with the thought of getting home eventually). So not only the habit and boredom of being at home drive the tourist to new adventures but also the escape from the problems and the burden of the accepted but not obeyed morals too.

When they are sitting on the bus again – after a long silence – Susan leaning her head towards the window squeezes Richard’s hand for a moment, which can mean either their unity despite all their problems or the release of the tension and the acceptance of being a tourist. Richard is turning towards the woman but the woman still does not communicate with her face just looking out of the window. Susan makes gestures: the spilt Coke and the squeezing hand can all mean that her husband is important to her but what had happened might have been so serious that it is not easy to give forgive. The presence of the problem brought from HOME is enough for them to out-balance them from the situation of being a tourist. The moments filled with tension and problems are the negation of the tourist state because at this time they are at HOME, that is, at the scene of the problems. That is why they cannot take part in the tourist activities (like taking photos, riding a camel, buying souvenirs), and they cannot really turn to each other to clarify the problems inside. Although the state of the tourist makes silence easy but the problem itself makes being a tourist or belonging to a tourist group more difficult.

Then comes the tragedy. Susan is shot through the window and is wounded in the neck. Richard makes a quick decision in this difficult situation and accepts the local guide’s, Anwar’s, advice to go to his town because it is the closest to the scene, and there is a doctor there (it turns out later that the doctor is a vet). Solidarity works in the tourist group and they agree to change their route because of the wounded woman. When Richard leaves his wife in the local guide’s house and rushes to phone, the travellers begin to worry about the length of their stay at an extra place not included in the program.

1st man: – How's your wife?
Richard: – It's bad. I can't stop the bleeding.
2nd man: – Get her out of there and let's go.
Richard: – Where? Where do I take her?
2nd man: – In Egypt in a town like this they slit 30 German tourists' throats. They might do the same to us
Local guide: – No, Sir, not here, not here.
2nd man: –. What do you know? We've got to get out of here as soon as possible.
Woman: – It's unbearably hot on the bus. We have to get back for our children.
Richard: – Look, you can't leave us here.
3rd man: – What is the point in our staying?
Richard: – In case we need the bus.
3rd man: – He can drop us off and come back for you
Richard: – No, no.
1st man: – I'll stay with you if you need me.
Richard: – Please just wait.
2nd man: – We're not gonna risk our lives, so hurry.
(Iñarritu, 2006, 00:37:26 - 00:37:48)

However hard Richard may try to hurry to get his wife some help, he phones and urges everything and everyone, but it is in vain. It is not him, who controls the events. His wife's wound has become media news and part of a political game because her tragedy was thought to be a terrorist attack by the US government. From this moment it was the diplomacy and not the distance that hindered the arrival of the ambulance. When the local police inform Richard that the ambulance will not come but an American helicopter will arrive instead, the man totally breaks down. He cannot communicate well with his tourist mates. He starts a fight with one of the tourists and threatens him that he will kill him if they dare to leave. But the bus sets off.

The American couple – because of the misfortune – becomes part of the Moroccan family's life: they live with them, which is not similar to living in a hotel; they eat their food and drink their water without questioning “we don't know what kind of water is here”. Richard has enjoyed Anwar and his family's hospitality so far but as their mates left them here they even turn to the local people. He can see the host praying to muezzin, they speak about family and customs. He gets a deep insight in the local people's life. The communication is still shallow. Some stereotypes disappear but beyond the words you can feel something encouraging. Tarazin will not occur to his mind as a small town at the foot of Mount Atlas any more but it will remind him of Anwar's hospitality; the first-aid given to his wife and the fact that he can thank her life to this town. It is true that if Richard had known in advance that a vet would sew Susan's neck with a needle sterilized with the flame of a cigarette lighter, he would surely have not turned to him. In spite of this, he trusted Anwar. When the problem occurred in the physical reality of their state of being a tourist, Richard did everything for his wife and in this situation they could clarify their previous problem. In Tarazin, the unity of place and time, the **HERE** and **THERE** have become one and they managed to find and obey the values and rules of **HOME**. It may not be accidental that they had to step a century back or place the present in another dimension.

If we consider the question from another point of view: this seemingly under-developed settlement – with its low-comfort houses, services and infrastructure – means for Anwar his five children, the family in a broader

meaning and the acquaintances; the place where he can find his way, where he can manage the most difficult problems. He can accept the home together with all its backwardness, poverty and constraints. His and his family's helpfulness, selflessness and solidarity can save lives. And this is a natural human gesture, which also means that Anwar does not accept money for his act. It is also understandable that Richard would give all his money to that person who had helped his wife. The tourist cannot forget that he has to pay for all the services. Richard intended to help Anwar in his own way.

The Player: Ahmed and Jusseff

The two boys live together with their parents and sister in the mountains. They graze the goats day after day. Their father buys a rifle from a neighbour to save the herd from jackals. They test the rifle, and Ahmed, the elder brother misses the target. For this reason, he is being laughed at. In spite of his young age, his younger brother, Jusseff is much better at shooting than his brother, Ahmed. When the herd is taken out to grass, the rifle is carried by the elder brother, Ahmed. As usual, the brothers play games on the pasture; they throw gravels into a tin.

Jusseff catches a glimpse of a jackal. Ahmed picks up the rifle immediately and aims at the intruder but the rifle goes off earlier so he misses the animal. The elder brother is scolded off by the younger one. Although the age difference is very little: one or two years between the two children, they are anxious to outdo each other. Ahmed claims a better position for himself because of his age, but Jusseff's brightness and cleverness are also appreciated in the family thus he has an advantage over his elder brother. Testing the rifle gives a proof of this rivalry. First, Jusseff, the most favoured son is called by his father to shoot. But Ahmed, the elder boy insists on shooting first. Finally, the shepherd gives his consent, but Ahmed unfortunately does not hit the target. The shepherd gives a sarcastic smile to his elder son and praises the younger one, who proved to be more skilful than his brother. From this moment on, Ahmed wants to prove his talent and skills much harder than ever before. There is another strain between the boys, namely their sister, Zahra. Jusseff watches his sister getting dressed secretly several times. Ahmed catches him doing so, and tells him off in an unfriendly way and threatens Jusseff to inform their father about it. He is not worried about Zahra's reputation so much, but rather jealous of his younger brother's position. The situation is very special, because besides their mother and sister they have never met any other women. So the rivalry extends to which position they could get to show off in front of the opposite sex.

Ahmed would like to make up for the mistake he made and tries to hit further targets. If it turns out that the rifle does not have a three kilometre range, it will prove the elder brother's fiasco, as well. It will prove that missing the target is not his mistake, because there is something wrong with the rifle. The two boys take turns at shooting. If Jusseff hits the target, then Ahmed looks for another target further away to shoot at. They aim at a moving car, then a coach, but it moves on and Jusseff acknowledges that the rifle has gone wrong. Then suddenly the bus stops. The boys realize what has happened and flee the scene.

The boys are competing continuously. After having lost several games, Ahmed would like to challenge his brother but it turns out that he cannot outdo his brother at shooting. In cases like this the loser is trying to prove that it is the instrument to be blamed (e.g. racket, goal, boat, rifle) because of

its defect. Looking for errors is a hidden competition. This is the last chance for the loser to retrieve his honour if the instrument is proven to be faulty. If the instrument is proved to hit targets from long distances, then it is another victory for the winner. When the boys want to figure out if the bullets can really go as long distances as it was told so during the purchase, rules are set up again and they take turns at shooting, similarly as they did when they threw gravels into tins. So the game goes on, and winning is the most important thing. No matter how it is achieved, with gravels or bullets, but the main thing is victory.

The rifle was given to them for shooting jackals, not for playing with it. But they are just children, and children because of their age always want to play, and seek anything to play with. During pasturing they kill the time with playing games. The competition between the two boys turns everything into games. They take games very seriously as long as the game is over. They do not want to defeat each other for good, for the simple reason that they are brothers. Their situation does not really depict the post- modern age. Children of their age also compete with each other on the other parts of the world. They also use weapons but not real ones, either virtual ones or toy ones. These 'gadgets' are perfect to play with, but not the rifle because it involves the chance of irreversibility, thus it denies the essence of games. Ahmed and Jusseff get a rifle and not an electric toy gadget because the jackal's attack threatens the family's possessions. They are treated as adults due to the circumstances they live in. The goat herder, living in the Atlas Mountains, seems to come from a scene of the Bible; he doesn't look like the man of our age at all. The bullet coming from the old Winchester was flying through time and space breaking and hurting the globalization, bringing up the spectre of terrorism and fears of it. Since 11th, September 2001, terrorist attacks have been suspected behind the scenes of every tragic incident so the brothers' foolish game is said to be a terrorist attack, furthermore it is claimed to be an attack against democracy and freedom. Thus their fate has been sealed. The kids flee the scene when the bus comes to a stop because they do not know exactly what has happened but they have a bad feeling that something terrible could have happened and it is they who caused the trouble. Although the kids do not have to fear of being noticed, they have fled because they would like to be as far as they can from the scene, they would like to finish the game as they did earlier, and start a new one. According to the rules of the games nobody must be injured or hurt. But in this case the game seems to be irreversible and this incident does not fit into the kids' experience they have gained so far, that is why they try to act as if nothing had happened. The boys think if they leave the scene and hide the rifle they can consider the incident cancelled. The kids feel guilty. First they would like to know if the victim is dead or alive. They realize the enormity of what they have done when they see the policemen who are looking for their father. The kids give the policemen the wrong direction and run home in order to admit everything to the parents. The father slaps the children's face then packs his things, grabs the rifle and with his two sons they start to find a hiding place. The policemen see them fleeing from their house and without any notice they open fire. One of the bullets hits Ahmed in the leg. Seeing that his brother is bleeding, Jusseff returns the fire and injures one of the policemen. The police continue shooting and Ahmed is shot in the back, being fatally injured. Jusseff breaks the Winchester in despair and walks towards the police officers with his hands raised. He begs them not to hurt his brother as everything is his fault. Knowing that they are looking for terrorists, the policemen act without thinking and it is out of question for them that children might be involved in the incident. It is not surprising

these days that kids can be found among terrorists. The game has become not only the family's problem, but it has got international significance. The film illustrates well how a thoughtless act committed by children can emerge into an international conflict in this globalized world. Due to the fast pace of life, the rapid processes, the uncertainty and prejudices, political declarations and media sensations, there is no time to analyse, understand and interpret things according to their values and handle them in their proper places. Anything can become absolutely important and anything can become insignificant on the spur of the moment

The Vagabond: Amelia and Santiago

Amelia came to America from Mexico to make a better living. She managed to find a job as a housekeeper with an American family. She looked after the children. The family liked and respected her. One day the parents took a trip to Morocco. Amelia's son's wedding day was due while the parents were away in Morocco. Then a disaster happened. Susan was shot on the bus. Richard tried to keep his promise and find someone to take care of the children so that Amelia would be able to travel to her son's wedding. As he was not able to find a substitute for the children he asked Amelia to put the wedding off and offered to pay for another wedding.

Richard tries to solve the problem with money, handling the whole thing as a question of money. The characteristics of the tourist can be recognized in his personality. It is vital for the tourist to have to pay for everything, meaning that everything is available for him if he pays for it. On the contrary, the most important values for the vagabond are his freedom and self-esteem, yet he is helpless because of his immigrant status. His pride is hurt if he is taken for a beggar and offered alms. The 'sense of not belonging' makes him feel more sensitive because it is clear for him that it does not matter whether he does any good or bad, he will always be a foreigner in this new place. As he is not able to find the right place for himself to settle down, and going back to his home country is impossible (on one hand he left his country because of the hard living circumstances, on the other hand he would be treated as a stranger if he went back) he has to live the life of a vagabond, whether he likes it or not.

Amelia has not thought about Richard's offer at all, she just wanted to find someone who would be able to look after the children while she was staying in Mexico. Unable to find any help to care for the kids she decided to take them to her son's wedding. (This decision will lead to fatal complications, she will be charged with kidnapping.) But rather than staying the night in Mexico, she drives back to the U.S. But Amelia should attend the wedding by any means.

Although, Santiago is anxious for the kids, he promises to take them to Mexico. Crossing the border is uneventful for them and the children are surprised how soon they find themselves in Mexico.

The little boy says that Mexico is a dangerous place according to her mum. Santiago is pulling his legs and says that it is true because it is full of Mexicans. We can draw the conclusion from the boy's remark that prejudice is part of the tourist's characteristic features. No matter how much he travels, his way of thinking will not really change. Instead of lessening the stereotypes, the prepared and arranged relations intensify them. The remark is interesting because we learn from it that the parents have never been to Mexico, yet they feel strongly about it. Psychological and sociological evidence can be concluded from this remark, as we can see that a child adopts his parents values and views, taking them for granted, if the child is

about the same age as the one in the film. This is the way he adopts prejudices without sound foundations. This adoption is more intensified in the case of a child. The vagabond has the intention to change his attitude and approach things without prejudices but it is not easy for him because he is prejudiced and he has also a prejudice against the local people. In this catch 22 situation it is not easy to find a solution.

Although the most important wedding ceremonies have finished, the revelry of the wedding is going on and Amelia is about to go back home. Her son wanted her to stay because he knew that Santiago had drunk too much and he had had problems with the police before. Santiago claimed he was all right and they set out. During the journey Santiago almost fell asleep which made their trip more excited but finally they arrived at the border.

Entering the U.S. is not as easy as going to Mexico. Although they all have passports the children do not have a letter of consent from their parents allowing them to leave the country. On top of all that Santiago feels offended because of the border patrol officer's bureaucratic procedures and made a provocative remark.

Becoming suspicious of Santiago's behaviour, the border guards want him to pull over with his car. Instead of doing so, he speeds up and drives through the border. They are being chased as illegal intruders from this point on. Santiago drives off the road and drops off Amelia and the children in a deserted place and drives away to lead off the police. Amelia wanders for hours with the children then leaves them in the shade to get help. Finally she finds a border patrol, who puts her under arrest immediately. She manages to persuade the officer to go back for the children but they are not there. (Later we learn that the children have been found.) Amelia will be deported from the US as an illegal immigrant.

Amelia, who had been living in the States for years, was really happy that she had a job and a better living in the U.S. than in her home country. Living in the U.S. gave her a chance to support her children financially or help them to come to live in California. Amelia had found a good family but her real home was in Mexico.

However much she would like to settle down in the U.S., she will always be a foreigner there. Her mistakes will always be taken more seriously than those of the locals. No matter how much convenient her life may be in this new country, she will be taken for a vagabond. Although she is taken in by the American family, they consider Mexico as a dangerous place, moreover she is offered money to put her son's wedding off. Despite the fact that they live together and she looks after their children, they have a prejudice against each other, and they do not seem to accept and understand each other's values and culture.

Santiago embodies the vagabond's self-esteem. He claims that his country is much nicer than America, but he is forced to live there because in Mexico he does not have a job and cannot make a living. He is proud of being a vagabond; what's more he often insults the authorities. His thoughtless behaviour does not really threaten his vagabond existence, but it ruins his aunt's life. There are big differences in the vagabond's lifestyle. In spite of being deported from the States, Santiago will try to go back to America, but if he fails to get back, he will not be depressed; he will try to take a chance in another country. In spite of the fact that Amelia did not manage to settle down and have a home of her own, she is in close contact with the American family, she loves their kids and insists on this virtual home, although the border guard officer said to her that she had nothing to do with the children. She was not even informed about what had happened to the kids, either.

The Stroller: Chieko and Haruki

When viewers first see Chieko the deaf and dumb Japanese girl, she is playing volleyball. She explodes with rage at the referee's bad call and is disqualified. Her team mates find Chieko's rage inexplicable, and blame her for losing the match. They jokingly attribute Chieko's sadness and her behaviour to her sexual frustration and to the fact that she is still a virgin. After the game, her father wants to take her out to lunch, but she wants to go out with her friends. Chieko boils over with rage saying that her father never listens to her, unlike her mother used to do. Her father tries to calm her down saying that he also misses Chieko's mother very much.

Chieko can unbend among her friends in the bar. Her friends are sitting in one of the corners of the bar saying that flirting is easier from there. They are showing each other giggling whose favourite a certain boy is. The bar fits into the world of shopping malls. Video games can be played and video-clips can be watched on huge screens. Teens sit here not only to have a good meal but to make friends as well. They long for light entertainment, for having a good time with the others. Chieko also has a chance. When she plays a game, one of the boys goes over to her to say hello but as soon as he realises that the girl is deaf, he turns away and tells his friends what an awkward situation he has just been in. Chieko gets upset and feels that the boys look at her as if she was a monster. Wanting revenge, she takes her panties off in the washroom and returning to their table she attracts one of the boys' interests, and exposes herself to him. When all the boys are looking at her, she stands up and leaves the bar.

Chieko is a special representative of strollers. Her position is strange due to the fact that she is deaf but her main problem is her mother's death. She can overcome the difficulties deriving from her deafness by reading people's lips and answering in a written form, as proved in her conversation with the police officers or Haruki. It is typical of her that after having met the police officers she remembers how handsome one of the officers is and does not worry why they are looking for her father. Moreover, it is also typical of her that she is prone to over-appreciate if somebody is kind to her that is why she feels so disappointed in her relations with Haruki.

Everything started well. The boy talked to her so that she could understand him and was kind to her. They played silly pranks together in the street, in the underground and at the fountain. She was in high spirits even in the disco until she realised that Haruki was kissing one of her best friends. She felt disappointed and the previously taken pill also helped her feel so.

The deaf and dumb girl is cheerful when she is among her friends, she can have a good time partying, and although she cannot hear the music, she can dance with them.

On the one hand Chieko is exactly the same teenager as all the others; on the other hand she is not exactly the same. Being together with her friends, going to parties, having relationship with the opposite sex are very important to her as well. When she lost her mother she lost love and although her father tries to do his best he cannot fill the gap. Situations like the one in the bar, when she felt being considered a monster, leave deep impressions in her. Disappointments make her do more and more desperate acts. Both the desire to prove that she is not a monster but an attractive woman, and the shortage of love stemming from her mother's loss, heightens in her the drive towards sexuality that would otherwise be vivid in her because of her age. This is well indicated in the appointment at her dentist, when she tries to kiss him,

grabs his hand and pushes it between her legs. The dentist, horrified, throws her out of his surgery before finishing the treatment.

Following an additional disappointment she throws herself at one of the policemen. Chieko gets disappointed again and again as the way how and the time when she tries to get in touch with people implies that she cannot be successful. She tries to make contacts in the world of strollers for whom the others are only puppets in their own plays meaning that strollers are not interested who the other person is, what he thinks, how he feels, but she herself endows him with features and roles. She is not interested what has happened to the other person before, what makes her laugh or sad and she is not interested whether the role she has given him suits him or not. Strollers do not care others who for some reasons lag behind. As a consequence, Chieko has no chance to find a full human relationship among the strollers.

Chieko has no chance even outside the circle of the strollers because the way she approaches them is the behaviour of an stroller meaning that she is not interested who the other person is, what has happened to him before, what he would like. She does not care what circumstances the dentist or the police officer lives in, it is enough for her if they have pleasant personalities and in this case she is ready to use them. Like a child she would like to get at once what she needs. There is no time to lose she has to catch the moment. This behaviour necessarily results in disappointment because either things do not happen the way the stroller imagined, or others turn out to be able to act on their own. The situation is made even more problematic by the fact that the girl is disabled.

Chieko does not feel ashamed because of being refused. Conscience was above said to be a cognitive, evaluating, emotional and regulative unit, in which moral knowledge, moral actions and getting information about our own actions form a unit. Conscience does not retain its complexity but breaks into fragments in such a way that one element of the above mentioned trinity becomes suspended. From the family background and her father's behaviour it can be concluded that the girl acquired the moral rules and values in her family. This statement can be concluded from her father's reactions when he was watching how his daughter explodes with rage at the referee's bad call in an orderly way. We suspect that the girl used to act differently, but something has changed in her. From the remarks her team mates made in the changing room we can suspect that the girl's behaviour can be explained with her intensified sexuality but by the end of the film we can be sure that there is another yet more serious reason: the loss of her mother. His father tries to fill in the gap but he is too busy to be able to do so. Because of her age she needs the company of her age group, besides, she is angry at her father about not listening to her and she intensifies her mother's positive features, and it weakens her father's personality in her mind. This is a vicious circle and the father and her daughter drift apart more and more. She rewrites the circumstances of her mother's death in her mind again and again and assigns roles as an stroller director. It is the stroller director who is standing in the middle, and does not intend to look at the things from a different aspect and does not care the reactions of her surroundings. If she has or had moral knowledge at all, she puts them in brackets. This way moral emotion do not appear and she declares in her actions that moral rules do not restrict her but it appears only in attempts extremes typical of teenagers.

She expects the boy to be kind to her, but gets offended if he acts in accordance with his own viewpoint. She tries to take drugs both to make the situation manageable and to become independent from the outer circumstances. Conscience would work if some kind of real relationship

formed between the people but roles put on the others make it impossible. So there is no real need for conscience.

The girl moves about her town and home like a stroller, an outsider. This situation is intensified both by the loss of her mother and her disability which makes normal communication impossible.

Conclusion

An extraordinary thing is needed for the tourist to overstep the relationship which is typical of his transportation with the locals. Only in this case does he show his real face, turns towards the locals with full attention and tries to get more information. It is still questionable whether such a flash is enough to demolish habits that direct how tourists and locals behave towards each other, whether it is enough to launch real communication between them in which conscience has a role. And whether both parties can forget that a tourist has to pay for every service he gets.

The player seems to be a merciless fighter in the game, but outside of it he seems to be an unprotected child as everything is allowed, since the game can be started again without any permanent consequences. There is no responsibility, he does not have to consider all aspects, solve dilemmas as the others know that this is only a game. Outside the game the main rule, that everything can be started again is no longer in force.

The question is what the player can do with the irreversibility that is outside the game, with the responsibility stemming from it, as taking the responsibility is not typical of him. He is not prepared to find directions outside the game or to make decisions taking others' points of view into consideration.

The decision making process of the tramp can be described relatively easily but it is unpredictable when and why he makes this decision and which direction he will follow as a consequence of it. This unpredictability derives from the fact that he feels the desire to settle down. At the same time he protects himself against disappointments with permanent common sense and in this duality he cannot commit himself. His strangeness that is hinted at by his surroundings moves him further and further from committing himself and settling down and the feeling of freedom moves him closer to it. As a consequence freedom becomes much liked as much liked as to settle down hindering the latter one and he does not get closer to its goal but gets further from it. His surroundings' refusal elicits an opposing reaction from the tramp and he gets prejudiced against his surroundings saying that they will never accept him. With this he hinders himself to reach his goals.

The question is whether we can leave the vicious circle so that self defence will not form a self-destroying attitude and the feeling of freedom would become independent of the pressure of moving which suggests that we mustn't commit ourselves and settle down.

The stroller watches his surroundings from his director's point of view. He may use drugs to make it more manageable for himself so that he becomes more independent from the outside world. The stroller is not interested who the other person is or what he thinks but he endows him with imaginary features and roles. He is not interested in what happened to the other person before, what makes him laugh, moreover he is not interested whether the role that was given to the other person suits him or not. The stroller does not care if the other person falls out of his range of interest, he does not look for him and does not think of him.

The question is whether the situations formed by the stroller let human relations come into being. The sense of responsibility could form if there were some kind of relationship among the individuals. Without this he would not really need conscience. He does not intend to watch things from the other person's point of view and does not care about his surroundings' reaction. If he does have or did have the moral knowledge, he puts it into brackets this way his moral emotions do not appear either and he declares in his actions that he is not restricted by moral rules.

Falling into fractions that we could observe in the case of the post-modern individual seems to be valid in the case of conscience, too. Conscience does not retain its complexity in the flashing parts but falls into fractions, too, in such a way that one of the elements of the above mentioned trinity that is the moral knowledge, the moral actions and getting information about his own actions, becomes suspended or eliminated.

References

- BAUMAN, Z. (2002). Töredezett életek, töredezett stratégiák. *Vándor*, 40-41, 1-10.
- FROMM, E. (1947): *Man for Himself: An inquiry into the psychology of ethics*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- IÑARRITU, A. G. (2006). *Babel*. Budapest: Central Films, Budapest Film Kft. [Film]
- POKOL B. (2005): Jegyzetek az erkölcs és a morál szerepéről a modern társadalmakban. *Jogelméleti Szemle*, 6 (3). Retrieved from <http://jesz.ajk.elte.hu/pokol23.html> [05.02.2012]