

ASPECTS OF THE CONSCIOUSNESS OF WORDS

words die unnoticed

turn on the radio
turn on the radio
turn on the radio

it tends to induce various

words

i'm talking to you
i'm talking to you

don't treat me like a-

this excerpt was written while listening to Wax Tailor (Hope&-Sorrow LP).

so what we're really talking about here is the two aspects of the consciousness of words [sample: Alice (dir. Woody Allen, 1990)] -

I. waking up with an ill-bone//

i woke up like this. trying to get my back as straight as possible until i let out a « putain » that i often use when something seriously starts to bother me so much i lose my capacities of control over my decency/ which follows that of word-control.

however, no matter how uncontrollable my emotional reactivity has become at this second it is then that i feel conscious of

my words - finally. because sometimes i do not want to use words that follow the lead of my societal brain filtering every sentence that comes up so as to be as conventional as possible, i do not want to care neither do i want to think about anything but the impulsive-instinctive reaction that wishes to burst out of my body//or my mind depending on the situation and its consequences.

i woke up in my bed feeling that my back was seriously fucked up and i needed to call a doctor and explain what exactly was happening until i turned off my phone because the idea of having to build up understandable sentences to explain a physical pain that could've been explained with an « AAH », was -

II. *streams of consciousness*//

the idea of a « stream of consciousness » in literature (also known as interior monologue) is a « literary technique that presents the thoughts and feelings of a character as they occur ». [the Free Dictionary]

in psychology, it is « the conscious experience of an individual regarded as a continuous, flowing series of images and ideas running through the mind ». [the Free Dictionary]

the first definition follows the second; however they have to be defined separately because one can never perfectly transpose the uncontrollable, uncontrolled and unpredictable flow of ideas one has in his mind, in literature. literature implies control over words; the psychological interior monologue has none.

i tried it some times last year; just taking out a random notebook and trying to write every single arbitrary word that

passes through my mind - without any selection, without any edition etc. it is an endless cause; the mind is too quick. and at a certain points, things get scary. however i realized there are so many of our thoughts that we leave behind, or that die unnoticed. in between lets say, the « big important thoughts » run the absurd, which from « oo a black cat » to « this chocolate cake was really sticky » create « oo a sticky chocolate cat black cake ». which is somehow close to reading Beckett.

the stream of consciousness is the least organized mental instant-recorder we have. the stream of consciousness may be a base to which are added many filters and defensive mechanism that either block, annihilate or exhibit the thoughts.

III. *the day i realized everybody wants to die//*

lets take one event that people commonly experience. waiting for the train, feet grounded to the platform. one random unstopping train passes by at an extreme speed, you see it coming from far away, the noise gets louder, you see the wheels now, oh it's going quick, a guy says « STEP BACK » to his kid, for one minute you wonder

what would it be like to jump.

you take a step back.

there are at least 95% chances, taking into consideration that you are a mentally healthy human being, that you won't be

thinking about this event not even five minutes after it has happened. sometimes not even one. life goes on. the mind too.

words die unnoticed.

this ephemeral and sudden wish of death will die unnoticed; and with its death no words will be said at this point. the sentence was created, perpetrated, heard by and into the mind. at this point, one is barely conscious he has for one second imagined and wished for his own death.

the words weren't spoken, however they were stated by this instant flowing of the mind that although silent is interiorly speaking in words.

how conscious are these words?

IV. *impulse vs. disinhibition*//

i'm fascinated by impulse. it is the behavior closest to that of one's mind; and there I mean emotionally because a structured, over-controlled speech can also be very close to one's mind - only not based on the same criterions. the emotional self seems to come out in physical moves, spasms, OCDs somehow (even those so barely inconvenient that they are not considered as OCDs); and sometimes in language, mostly when one experiences a very intense emotion. (if your phone falls off the staircase you will probably impulsively say « oh shit »).

some mental illnesses can create what's called a « disinhibition » which is a complete lack of control over what one can show, talk about, which words will come out of one's mouth,

etc; those affected by these illnesses often seem to be making a show out of themselves as they will interpret everything they feel - from sexual desire to speaking aloud their interior monologue - which is precisely the interesting part of it.

they are also the patients that you will always hear talking to themselves, which is also an effect you can get with alcohol as it is a disinhibiting drug. but they are not talking to themselves any more than anyone is - they are only lacking a series of filters that we use everyday to control our speech and the amount of words that come out of our mouth; lets say in a way that they are completely honest and transparent - their interior monologue is set free.

to talk about the consciousness of words however, we need to define what exactly is being conscious (of smthg). as states the dictionary, being conscious is « being aware of one's own existence, sensations, thoughts, surroundings etc »; « being fully aware of or sensitive to something ». A third definition could also be « having the mental faculties fully active ». taking only the first two definitions, it could be said that being completely disinhibited does not take away any form of consciousness. If to be conscious, you need to be fully sensitive to something, then maybe what comes from impulses, what comes uncontrolled but deeply felt could be the perfect example of one that is fully conscious.

if we take the last definition however, then disinhibition would be the straight opposite of what being conscious should be. If the mental faculties are fully active, the filters, defense mechanisms should be lit up.

it all depends on whether being conscious is having the capacities to take control over your mind, or if it is your mind in itself, without any add-ons. and that's a tricky subject; because you can neither define a person only by her controlled decency and thought-of acts and words, neither can you define a person that is strictly just a flow of uncontrolled interior ideas (ideals?). subconscious and conscious, whatever they are

illustrated by, work together and cannot be taken separately so as to understand one's moves and motives.

V. motives of hypocrisy// a conscious paradox

in between all that has been said, lies the capacity to consciously or unconsciously (yet again) play with words. unconsciously would be illustrated by a simple lapsus; which could be explained as the mind suddenly taking over the capacity of controlling one's words; while a conscious way to play with words would be lies, irony and hypocrisy.

1. if one lies, there is a need for word-control, as well as for controlling your physical moves. a bad liar will always be recognized for his wobbling voice, shaking feet, eyes looking down and fingers knocking on the nearest desk. this is where the mind tricks the mechanisms of control; and possibly where one realizes that filters and defenses become harder to dominate as soon as one gets too far from his « true mind/self ». a good liar may have further motivations strongly connected to the mind that let the fact of lying become a secondary issue; and as soon as it becomes secondary, the physical and psychological moves are disconnected to them// no shaking feet&wobbling voice.

2. irony and hypocrisy may be intrinsically linked. they both illustrate the paroxysm of control over words// and to anyone who believes the true self is mainly shown throughout mechanisms of control, these may be the most accurate illustrations.

one interesting fact is that both irony and hypocrisy are often objects of discomfort and disturb. if irony is a type of humor it is also humor at a degree which may sometimes be hard to understand and to depict; hypocrisy is the ability to mischievously trick the mind by letting words and emotions

come out opposite to those felt.

but if they imply much control, they likewise can manipulate the manipulator when it turns into an unwanted defensive mechanism.

indeed, what are the motives of lies, irony and hypocrisy, if it is not finding a way to fool oneself or the others- in certain situations a way of protecting oneself by tricking others into what one is not?

VI. *conscious vs. subconscious// are you conscious of your subconscious*

there is, somewhere in this excerpt, a misinterpretation of words. maybe because the human being is an uninterruptible search engine that often, as time passes, becomes more aware of what lies beneath.

we could say it started in the beginning of the 20th century, when suddenly God was dead (cf. F. Nietzsche), the human being had a subconscious and Picasso started to look for an inner-truth he couldn't be sure existed.

or maybe when someone, somewhere, decided it was time to dismantle the fear of the mind.

the consciousness of words is a chain; that begins much earlier than when a sentence is first thought of. the consciousness of words is how you hear the words you create and how you end up placing yourself in the sounds you hear. what do they mean, where do they come from, are they impulsive or defensive - and if defensive, a defense to what?

the consciousness of words may somehow be connected to existentialism. a certain lucidity to which you force yourself; which doesn't mean controlling each of your moves but being aware when things are out of control. lets say that for a liar

who is fully aware of his lie and acknowledges its consequences; who has thought the consequences of the lie would win over that of the truth...may be fully conscious of his words.

VII. woody allen

if i quoted woody allen at the beginning it does not mean that all of this is linked to his scenario. i don't know what he meant exactly by the « consciousness of words » but the term in itself hit me pretty strong. and this excerpt is not about an apology of the consciousness of words as i describe it; even though it is a mechanism i often find myself trying to follow, i do not think it is the key to anything brilliant. well, i guess it depends on how one uses it.

words can be as beautiful when they lack consciousness, and if one would wish to be conscious of his every word, it would prove a certain masochism that would contain no good.

maybe the mind is set to be free and that each of us find our way through this complete freedom that lies in our head; when a mind is taken away from outside conventions then opens up a space of a freedom so tragically pure that it may only lead to anguish and pain.