Synthesis of Eros and Hypnos.
Eternal Sleep as Aesthetical Metanarration of Cyberculture

Summary. The intention of this article is to present the thesis that the mode of being proper to users of cyberculture is eternal sleep. This thesis is based on an interpretation of Gilles Deleuze's *Difference and Repetition*. It is shown that cyberculture as technical culture is anesthetizing user experience by indicating them the world of sleep. It is correlated with the synthesis of time, which is the synthesis of Eros and Hypnos. Here Hypnos functions as the ruler of aesthetic. So Deleuze's theory of the three syntheses of time is extended but not in the form of an interpretation of Deleuze's words but directly through technical mediation. Eternal sleep refers to the state which technically mediated Eros puts them in, giving them dreamlike aesthetic objects. At the end of this article it is shown how dreams are related to human spiritual experience and how this kind of experience could lead to waking up from the aesthetic metanarration of cyberculture imposed by the technically mediated synthesis of Eros and Hypnos.
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Cyberculture provides a new model of aesthetic metanarration. Every human activity becomes to some extent sensual, so contradictory data can be shown as belonging to one fable. Cyberculture cannot be understood solely through the prism of aesthetic experience, because it is the most basic effect of every techno-
logical mediation. It is important to say that cyberculture is treated here as cybernetic culture, not as a form of popular culture, although its technological layer is the most external one. The main reason for this is due to the interiorization of cyberculture into ordinary consciousness. So there is no external metanarration of cyberculture other than cyberculture itself, because aesthetic mediation is always present in the mediation of human experience via technology. Cybercultures users do not form metanarration consciously – it is an effect of the subsumed technological and aesthetical mediations of their everyday experiences.

So the basic structure of cyberculture is imprinted in human subjectivity and by that I mean mainly the essential mechanisms of memory. The aesthetization of experience by cyberculture means that this anesthetization is recorded in some form of memory: either purely biological memory or biotechnological memory of cyberculture. Therefore, such metanarration is inscribed directly into human memory, which cannot be viewed as something external to cyberculture. We may now sum up the effect of cyberculture on human memory: "every aesthetically mediated experience is technologically inscribed into human memory, so in the course of the constant inscription of cyberculture the structure of memory changes into sleeping memory." Therefore, the main effect of cyberculture is to shut down every aspect of human mental faculties with aesthetic experience. Where faculties controlling conscious actions are absent, the subject (cybercultures user) is sleeping. This sleep substitutes aesthetical memory for reason. When mind, reason, and soul are sleeping, aesthetic judgment is turned off by the power of desire. Desire is the force of Eros, and sleep becomes identified with Hypnos. The synthesis of Eros and Hypnos is essential for understanding this metanarration.

The synthesis of Eros and Hypnos will be expounded as an extension of Gilles Deleuze’s theory of memory which was introduced in *Difference and Repetition*. Here Eros alludes to the motor force of any activity or desire, and Hypnos produces simulacras; illusions which are objects delivered by Mnemosyne (the Bergsonian “world memory” – the place in which everything is written). Hypnos is a purely technological function of memory that allows individual memory to participate in
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1 According to Marc Dery, pop culture is a part of cyberculture. But nowadays, most presentations use the terms “cyberculture” and “pop culture” interchangeably. That is a mistake if we want to investigate the philosophical dimension of cyberculture. By accepting this starting point of analysis we can trace how cyberculture becomes “ordinary” culture without eliminating its metaphysical phenomena to the attentional forms produced by pop culture. Attentional forms (Bernard Stiegler’s term) produced by cybernetic culture are different because they are not interpreted from the perspective of a given medium. That enables us to inquiry about the interiorization of cyberculture.

eternal sleep – an aesthetic metanarration proper to cyberculture. Users of cyber-
culture are constantly being bored and stimulated by aesthetical objects. Owing to
this process, they cannot be fully active nor passive, they fall into programs of pure
interactivity instead.

This presentation will be followed by specific examples associated with the dis-
cussed phenomena, focusing on the possibility of a different synthesis which would
allow users of cyberculture to “wake up” from the eternal sleep of pure interactivity.

Three syntheses of time in *Difference and Repetition*

I will briefly summarize the three syntheses of time from Gilles Deleuze’s *Difference
and repetition*. They will be presented in a simplified way, not by reduction but by
deterritorialization from Deleuze’s discourse on difference and metanarration to the
aesthetical effect of cyberculture. First is the synthesis of Habitus and Mnemosyne –
memory here serves as a solid state for repetition; Memory is considered a foundation
for habit. The time corresponding to the habit is the present. The second synthesis
of time is that of Eros and Mnemosyne. It can be considered as the relation of Eros
to Mnemosyne – Eros is the driving force of desire that “tears virtual objects out of
the pure past and gives them to us in order that they may be lived.”

Here time functions in the form of the past. The third and last synthesis introduced by Deleuze is
that of Eros and Thanatos. There is a relation of disjunction between Eros and Thanatos,
namely Eros is desexualized. Thanatos is the pure form of time – the future. The
first synthesis is responsible for grounding memory in repeatable forms of actions
(habits), the function of the second one is remembering (the erotic correlation be-
between Eros and Mnemosyne) and the third synthesis of time leads to the faculty of
thinking. The functioning of cyberculture introduces the fourth synthesis of time.

The fourth synthesis of time: Eros and Hypnos

Eros becomes the helper of Hypnos. Lacking reason and other human faculties
which lead to the creation of principles of judgment, Eros is the force of desire that
lacks autonomy. He cannot take memories from Mnemosyne and move them to the
time of eternal sleep, in other words, infinity. At the same time, Hypnos makes eve-
ry experience in cyberculture dreamlike, while Eros, his helper, puts those dreams
right into memory. Memory is unable to distinguish which dreams are real and
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3 Ibidem, pp. 102-103.
which are artificial – i.e. created by technological devices. In both kinds of dream they are given as disguises\(^4\) which refer to the process of bare repetition\(^5\). We can only distinguish dreams from reality because we practice this distinction by repetition. The aesthetic mediation of cyberculture unifies artificial dreams, replacing them with reality. Now, the whole of reality can be grasped only as a disguise. As Deleuze states, dreams are also related to dramatization\(^6\) – being someone else or being in another kind of a dream means that one should always disguise oneself or be disguised. This could be interpreted as the consistency of a dream. Hypnos is the ruler of sleep – we can dream because we are asleep. Eros then, is the desire to dream. Hypnos gives the dream its substance – cyberculture in the form of a dream. As long as cyberculture is given in images, content or interactive connections, there is no place for conscious thought because Hypnos takes the place of his brother Thanatos and instead of an empty form of time we experience the form of time that is filled with the dreamlike substance of cyberculture.

Not only memory is shaped by dreams, but thought is also related to a dream. Users disconnected from cyberculture know only vaguely what they did while they were in front of the screen or another interface that enables them to connect to cyberculture. They remember their experiences as dreams through using their second synthesis of time to recollect what they did, yet Eros, sent to trace memories, finds nothing but dreams. This leads to the destruction of habit – the main reason for acknowledging this destruction is that the dream substance of the content of cyberculture is ephemeral and temporary. So only habit refers to the ability to sleep, whereby users learn that they are able to sleep without ever waking up. Hypnos fights with Thanatos and wins – Thanatos is not extirpated but is converted into a servant of Hypnos. He becomes the negative aspect of Hypnos because he informs users they are awake. Meanwhile, Eros finds another dream, desires new content derived not from memory of the present but from the dream substance: the substance of disguises, masks that dramatize users’ experience.

Throughout *Difference and repetition* Deleuze reiterates that philosophers dream of something – their goals and purposes are dreams. It is not only a style or a metaphor, but a reference to the genesis of thought that is beyond representation. So we may say that the model of the subject introduced by Deleuze is a larval subject that is a dreaming subject. A larva is both a being and a mode of connection – larvae suck on the dream substance – that is a mode of acquiring ideas proper to their being. Philosophers are different to other people since they are dreamers who
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\(^4\) This is the idea of Gilles Deleuze. See: G. Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition*, s. 16.
\(^5\) Ibidem.
\(^6\) Ibidem, p. 218.
mastered the science of sleep. Such an extension of Deleuze’s concepts may lead to acknowledging the fact that philosophers are lucid dreamers who disguise their dreams in concepts and represents them in language. This is an example of distinguished subjects filled with concepts – they can only dream philosophically. But when we refer to “ordinary” users of cyberculture we can observe how dreams are dissolving themselves and then combining back together.\footnote{There is no such thing as a normal user – this form of subjectivity is used here only to show that a dreaming subject does not suck from the dream substance but from everything.} In that case, the dream-in-itself is not an aesthetic phenomenon, but how the dream dreams itself for the user. Philosophers dream about ideas in their life – they are the larvae of Mnemosyne. Users that are submerged in cyberculture absorb everything from the dream substance without any selection. The force of selection laid in the third synthesis of time – Thanatos was responsible for selecting experiences when Eros was desexualized, that is, deprived of his ability to take memories in the form of virtual objects from Mnemosyne. Now Hypnos is selecting the dream. When new objects appear in cyberculture they are not thought about but dreamt about. Every dream is necessarily aesthetic: it is true for objects such as videos, images or games. Users dream because their existence in cyberculture is dreamlike – this is no aesthetic metaphor but the factual state of matter. When users open a few online communication programs e.g. Facebook, electronic mail, image browser, word application and so on, they are switching between them at the highest possible rate, so Eros becomes light-headed and disoriented. The only way to orientate Eros, that is, to direct desire, is to find an object corresponding to that desire – a dream object made of a dream substance. When such an object is found, desire adapts to it. Subsequently, the whole of memory is conditioned by the correlation of Eros and dream objects. Users are attracted by those objects because they are aesthetic. Then the mode of attraction changes – users sleep and the only legitimization of the aesthetic dramatization of their experience is found in the reality of a dream. Hence, users do not need the dream substance of anything else anymore, because they have aesthetically fallen asleep.

“Everything changes when the dynamisms are posited no longer as schemata of concepts but as dramas of Ideas. For if the dynamism is external to concepts – and, as such, a schema – it is internal to Ideas – and, as such, a drama or dream.”\footnote{G. Deleuze, \textit{Difference and Repetition}, p. 218.}
ate. Eros delivers ready-made dreams from cyberculture (the reign of Hypnos) but during this process, dramatization that leads to the loss of identity occurs:

Dramatization takes place under the critical eye of the savant as much as it does in the head of the dreamer. It acts below the sphere of concepts and the representations subsumed by them. There is nothing which does not lose its identity as this is constituted by concepts, and its similarity as this is constituted in representation, when the dynamic space and time of its actual constitution is discovered.9

Only this loss could lead to what is now cyberculture – a powerful dreamscape that dramatizes users. This is a reversal of the situation described by Deleuze. Now the aesthetic realm of Hypnos forces users to become a part of the eternal sleep of the cyberculture. The main effect of Hypnos is purely negative – he would fail if users woke up. That does not mean that cyberculture will be perceived as something ugly or terrifying, but rather it would allow Thanatos to be a master of thought. The main difference between the correlation of Eros with Mnemosyne, and Eros with Hypnos, is that memory ends – there is an end to a specific kind of memory (remembering is related to time elapsing) between Eros and Mnemosyne – but the relation between Eros and Hypnos is potentially endless. There is no discrepancy between new and old content – it does not even matter if it has aesthetic qualities. The very process of sleeping becomes the source of the aesthetic experience of cyberculture users. Everything is subsumed by the dream, so that the users:

[... ] know nothing of the domain of the possible, being close to the virtual, the first actualizations of which they bear as though they had chosen them. Such is the intimacy of the Leech and the Higher Man: they are at once dream and science, object of dreams and object of science, bite and knowledge, mouth and brain10.

The dream could be understood on the same level as the simulacrum11 – alas, the dream reality that is simultaneously a dream and science can endure because numerous users are sleeping at any given moment. Although their sleep is aesthetic – they use avatars and other representations of themselves which serve as aesthetic masks applied to their sleeping larval body.

It was God and angels who placed dreams within sleeping souls. Nowadays, cyberculture makes a fourth synthesis of time – a synthesis aesthetical in itself. It does not require any grounding other than that of cyberculture. Eros is sleeping, he can no longer choose any fragment of Mnemosyne in which all memories and dreams

9 Ibidem, p. 218.
11 Ibidem, p. 68.
are located. This dream is not spiritual – the aesthetic experience of eternal sleep excludes any spiritual content, that is, content that transcends Hypnos. Hypnos engages Thanatos, who now serves as his other servant – his being is brought to the same level as that of Eros. Now “larval consciousness [...] moves endlessly from science to dream and back again”\(^{12}\) because users simultaneously perceive an aesthetic dream object as science and a dream substance. Therefore, the eternal sleep of cyberculture, as an endless work of Eros and Hypnos to preserve a dream, is the effect of the synthesis discussed above. Every dream object is a start of individuation:

Dreams are our eggs, our larvae and our properly psychic individuals. The vital egg is nevertheless already a field of individuation, and the embryo is a pure individual, and the one in the other testifies to the primacy of individuation over actualization – in other words, over both organization and the determination of species.\(^ {13}\)

In cyberculture, users become their own dreams. It is not merely a question of identity but a question of individuation – users cannot individuate properly because one dream is followed by another. As a form of compensation they get aesthetic objects and aesthetic consciousness given in the arrangement of aesthetic time. As was mentioned earlier – the difference between science and a dream lies in the degree, not in quality:

[...] bare repetition must be understood as the external envelope of the clothed: that is, the repetition of successive instants must be understood as the most relaxed of the coexistent levels, matter as a dream.\(^ {14}\)

The user is relaxed or behaves compulsively due to the fact that the lack of dream (dreamless sleep) is replaced by a desire to get specific dreams. Eros is then treated as a passive force that searches for desired dreams. However, the user obtains a dream irrespective of the results at the end of this pursuit – even the sheer quest for a dream is a dream. In this perspective, dreamless sleep is the most horrifying thing for users, as there are no aesthetic effects, no aesthetic narration of their telepresent behaviour:

A nightmare is perhaps a psychic dynamism that could be sustained neither awake nor even in dreams, but only in profound sleep, in a dreamless sleep. In this sense, it is not even clear that thought, in so far as it constitutes the dynamism peculiar to philosophical systems, may be related to a substantial, completed and well-consti-
tuted subject, such as the Cartesian Cogito: thought is, rather, one of those terrible movements which can be sustained only under the conditions of a larval subject.¹⁵

The dream substance is a substance of pure interactivity within the fourth synthesis of time. When we are sleeping, a dream relates to what we have experienced. When we dream audiovisually, then in cyberculture our dreams are lucid – our dreams as dream objects are externalized to audiovisual objects that are technological. So we are dreaming constantly. During the day we are dreaming a narration from our aesthetical consciousness, during the night – about a different materiality and making a remix of a remix, that is, a dream of a second degree. What we have dreamt of in our waking state now becomes the content of biological dreams. The artificial dreams of cyberculture are dreamt while we are asleep, in the biological sense of the state. When we turn our computer or some other interface off and go to sleep we may dream about monsters that we have not killed in a computer game or about emails that we have to send. We predominantly dream about what we have dreamt in cyberculture – biological dream is anesthetized by dream objects coming from cyberculture. There is no other time than dreamtime, which is measured with the processes of creating and dissolving dreams. Eros is the designer of the dream space, filling it with objects that constitute cyberculture. Hypnos is the guardian of One Sleep in cyberculture, he coordinates the work of Eros. So eternal sleep becomes the metanarration of cyberculture. Thanatos is no longer needed – the aesthetic argument against death is simple: Thanatos becomes interiorized into a multiplicity of dream objects becoming a dream that is never dreamt – the only possible death is the death of the dream itself which, in turn, is the lowest class of Thanatos’ commission, his metaphysical degradation. The users of cyberculture do not fear death, a biological phenomenon, as now the dreamless sleep has become the most frightful state – a state in which they cannot dream within cyberculture.

There eternal sleep works parallel to the eternal return (the aesthetic units of cyberculture are not memes, information or even programs alone, but all of these mixed together and appearing in the form of memory-dreams). Nonetheless, eternal sleep is not death – it is rather a space without any physical constraints or transcendence (except when switching from one dream object to another). Eternal sleep denotes the domesticated simulacrum of quasi-death that is available to all users of cyberculture in their everyday interactive activity. Falling asleep makes Hypnos enter, sleeping creates Hypnos, who is partly human and partly techno-

¹⁵ Ibidem, p. 118.
logical. A dream equals aesthetics, dreaming means anesthetizing experience. That is the genesis of Hypnos. Marshall McLuhan said that we sleep in front of our television. Currently we are sleeping in front of electronic interfaces that are enabling us to connect with cyberculture. Eternal sleep is the process of everlasting distribution of seeped data; we do not think of data, we do not experience it sensually, we mainly perceive data from the dream substance by sleeping. Cyberculture is a culture of sleep. Our desires are directed by Eros to the servants of Hypnos. Even Mnemosyne is a mere servant of Hypnos. Habitus becomes dream-matter. There is no external aesthetic of dreams – we are sleeping. We share our sleep – the aesthetic worlds of communication and games are those of sleep. The fourth synthesis is the synthesis of the distribution of dreams. Lucid dreaming is the interactivity of dream substance. When we are searching for the deepest level of a dream we find that it is related to spiritual phenomena and the soul, which is their sensor.

If we want to wake up from eternal sleep, then it would be legitimate to place a soul in cyberculture – conjointly with the dream substance.

Otto Rank states that psychoanalysis disconnected the dream from the soul, in favor of this former. We are in a similar situation to the one described by Rank, showing how dreams determine actions in reality. Still an important difference remains – One-Dream of cyberculture is disconnected from the soul. Eternal sleep is lacking its spiritual dimension. The soul is the missing interface, being without cyberculture belongs to the reality of pure dreams. The synthesis of Eros and Hypnos needs to be overwritten by the soul – it is possible to wake up by plugging a soul into users of cyberculture. By plugging a soul into them, I mean reminding users that they have a soul. It is crucial because:

“The dream-work” does not think, calculate or judge in any way at all; it restricts itself to giving things a new form [...]. This dream work is not interpretation (production of discourse) but transformation.

It is the dream-work that is interpreted as interactive operations on “desire itself that disguises itself” – so Eros disguises desires as basic needs that must be fulfilled by cyberculture. The main exigency becomes an aesthetic one. But these dream objects are interpretable because they belong to figural, not to purely visible, phenomena:

18 Ibidem, p. 240.
There are ready-made symbols in the depths of the dream, material designed to lead censorship astray, because it already contains elements of the unreadable and the figural.\textsuperscript{19}

Here, dreams are ready-made, they are dream-objects, partial objects of dreaming, not partial objects that are defined by lack. A dream-object’s purpose is not to be interpreted – it is to be judged by emotions, but in the most elementary manner, as it was made for being dreamt.

As Lyotard argues, the fulfillment of desire lies “entirely in the imaginary activity itself”\textsuperscript{20}. Here, narration created by day-dream activity (Freud), which is conscious or unconscious,\textsuperscript{21} forces the narration to become a sequence of dream objects dreamt in eternal sleep by the users of cyberculture. Aesthetic metanarration is the reign of Hypnos. He is the principle of organizing dream-objects retrieved by Eros – Eros is only a worker (not a messenger), he loses his erotic force of connection and becomes a force of downloading dream objects into the larval subject that dreams them. Their narration is understood in the following manner: all larval subjects describe themselves by the dream-objects that they are currently dreaming or have dreamt in the past. Their history is the writing of their past dreams, their hopes – desire for future dreams.

Dream-objects are physical – cyberculture becomes materialized in dream-objects – the dream substance is not only the essence of a dream; there are also interfaces which enable the user to be connected to cyberculture – computers, iPads, tablets etc. They are the devices of sleep. Hypnos represents the solidification of dreams into dream-objects and is responsible for the standardization of dreams that users can share, making aesthetic experiences of sleeping their own sharable substance. Hypnos becomes the producer of sleep by providing dream-objects.

Larval subjects dream of objects. It is not some mythological intervention in scientific time but Hypnos, the initiator of the fourth synthesis of time (dream-time), governs cyberculture to assure himself that every user is sleeping. Eros does not possess any duties regarding dream-objects apart from searching for them and placing them in users’ memory.

Dream is figural\textsuperscript{22} – infographics, images, films, interactive presentations are the dream effect of this. The presentation of knowledge is figural in cyberculture – these figures are dream-objects – although we cannot trace their precise origin and

\textsuperscript{19} Ibidem, p. 240.
\textsuperscript{20} Ibidem, p. 241.
\textsuperscript{21} Ibidem, p. 258.
\textsuperscript{22} Ibidem, p. 261.
creators, there are a lot of virtual archeologists that look for the first dream-objects. Internet sites are designed to perfectly fit the reign of Hypnos – larval subjects not only use Eros but they are Eros (the power of selecting and downloading dream-objects), that is, they easily download additional dreams. Afterwards, they send those dream-objects even further, modified by their desire, hence another user can get a second-hand dream and alter it afresh. Constant sending and receiving engenders the absence of “unity of meaning”23 in a dream because of the “dream’s preference for visual images.”24 Freud advises us to “not treat the content [of dream – R.I] as test, but as an object.”25 It is not an object of external reference but an autonomous dream-object.

Three syntheses of time were put to sleep by cyberculture – they are at the service of the fourth synthesis that is the synthesis of Eros and Hypnos. “The dream-work is not a language; it is the effect on language of the force exerted by the figural (as image or as form).”26 A dream-object does not need language – it needs desire. Desire, not reading or viewing of any dream content, is the most important medium. So the language of dreams is the language of sequences of dreams and their appearing – existing dream-objects force users to sleep. Eros anesthetizes perception, consciousness and all ability to select and judge – that is the hidden brutality of the dream. Eros turns off the soul in favor of the dream substance.

Dream-objects are also phantasies (I dream about what I am in cyberculture, what others are), tools (how am I using tools? – am I efficient in tool usage?), emotions (social dream-objects – we are engaged in the same case), thoughts (we think of cyberculture as the sphere of the most important existential phenomena). These dream-objects that constitute cyberculture are only borrowed. Eros is not the owner of dream-objects. “In the dream, aesthetic space does not simply apply itself onto linguistic space; rather the bodily expanse itself is stretched, so to speak, beyond the mundane dimensions it hews to while awake”27 – so there is no proper language of dreams. Therefore, we must ask what the dream objects are and determine the state of sleep through the answer. Of course, the depth of each and every sleep is distinct and different, but entering cyberculture always makes it very strenuous to resist falling asleep, that is, indulging the power of Hypnos. “One cannot afford to ignore the fact that we sleep while we dream, and thus that the connaturally between body and world is suspended by an immobility whose function is not only to
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23 Ibidem, p. 260.
24 Ibidem, p. 265.
25 Cited by: J.-F. Lytoard, Discourse, Figure, p. 266.
eliminate the world, but whose effect is to take the body as world.\footnote{Ibidem, p. 273.} In cybertecture the role of the body is paradoxical – we dream about our body being something else, but our body itself is disconnected. Contemporary interfaces are trying to put the body to sleep by feeding it with dream objects such as interactive interfaces that require the use of a body for playing sports, instruments or games. The body is active, yet it is active in the cyberticultural sphere of sleep. Hypnos cannot use dream objects alone – he also needs the dreaming body, an actual body that can sleep (a sick or a broken body cannot fully participate in the eternal dream of cybertecture).

Dream objects are not neutral, in the sense that they do not do anything and require the force of desire to animate them:

The \textit{figure-image} is that which comes into view on the oneiric or quasi-oneiric stage. What suffers abuse here are the rules regulating the formation of the perceived object. The figure-image deconstructs the percept, taking effect in a space of difference.\footnote{Ibidem, p. 274.}

This situation is inverted by the dream-object, as it is not an – using Lyotard’s concept – “object of deconstruction” but the object that deconstructs. The crucial reason for the larval subjects’ existence is constantly being deconstructed by dream-objects while sleeping. Deconstruction is not some effect (as in Lyotard) or a method (as in Derrida) but a process after the destruction of the present subject – firstly, memory is being deconstructed by dreaming and secondly, the body is being deconstructed. This implies the destruction of all the subject’s capabilities for being awake. Sleep is the destruction of reason, and dream-objects are phenomena in the reign of Hypnos which Eros downloads from cyberticultural dreamscapes. Dream-objects – software, interfaces and so forth – are the technological infrastructure of Hypnos. The desires of larval subjects are directed by Eros towards Hypnos – consequently, subjects are being “deconstructed as a result of the interference of the two others”\footnote{Ibidem, p. 276.}. Hypnos deconstructed three syntheses and put them in his reign of sleep, finally, he transforms their work into a dream-object. Our habits, remembering, and thinking are put to sleep. Our body, memory, and mind are asleep. But it is only an aesthetic sleep without regeneration, because the users of cybertecture are driven endlessly from one dream to another. This is, made possible by the abovementioned deconstructions. Hypnos is a puppet master of syntheses of time that emerge as syntheses of sleep. We live in the age of downloading aesthetic
dream objects. They are primal – not interpretations. Larval subjects are downloading them without any careful interpretation. Which is to say, they download them without reason. Due to their aesthetic appeal, dream objects are more real than present reality.

In front of the image’s powerful consistency, reality is so fragile that in the contest between the two expanses, of the artwork and of the world in which it is places, it is the first that seduces and attracts the second to it.31

Users are chasing dream-objects, they think of them in the reality outside of cyberculture. As users we desire dream-objects, we want to sleep. In sleep, activity is enshrined – we can unleash our Eros from the ordinary boundaries to the world in the form of aesthetical, cultural, financial constraints. A dream is limited, but not due to some kind of dream language, rather because dream-objects make frontiers for Eros. With every dream-object downloaded from Hypnos we are deepening our sleep. Users’ “object-seeking desires”32 are the desires for dream objects – that is the habitus of Hypnos, the habitus of downloading aesthetical dream objects. As Lyotard puts it: “Desire can find fulfillment in the imagery of dreams only because the subject is asleep.”33 Thus eternal sleep is being feedback looped with the production of dream objects. Cyberculture produces them and users are dreaming them – Hypnos can continue to be the regulating force that guards the eternal sleep of cyberculture.

“The space in which the sleeper’s desire is staged and fulfilled suffers the worst transgressions, whether in relation to the rules of language or of perception (reality).”34 Indeed, users share dreams, in which case, they are also becoming dream objects for other users (inside and outside has no significant difference – everything can be interchanged). Eros shall be understood here as a technician and a creator of users – he constructs larval subjects from dream-objects. The only construction of a user that he is accounted for, is that of endless downloading dream objects from the dream substance and placing them in users’ memory so they can stay asleep. Hypnos, on the other hand, is controlling and coordinating the technological infrastructure of dreams – he modifies the dream substance. Aesthetic metanarration is a consequence of this ontological shift. Users do not need another total aesthetic theory – what people rather seek today is a theory of dreams. Dreams explain what

31 Ibidem, p. 281.
33 Ibidem, p. 322.
34 Ibidem, p. 232.
is aesthetic; not *vice versa*. Only through them can users understand each other without the painful necessity of waking up.

Although cyberculture is a dream machine, users can wake up. Cyberculture is the eternal sleep which is timeless aesthetical time or, to put it differently, time that cannot be grasped by larval subjects, time freed from dream-objects. But being awake is possible in the course of plugging the soul into users.

### Plugging the soul into eternal sleep

“Immortal bodily soul (or dream-soul)”\(^{35}\) is the plane that Hypnos tries to erase because every kind of soul raises the possibility of waking up, which is violating the fourth synthesis of time. I shall sketch Otto Rank’s distinction briefly. Firstly, dreams were more important than reality (in archaic era), then they became patterns for reality (in the sexual era) and in the psychological era:

> The dream itself did not concern wishes that could be fulfilled, but spiritual ones that could not be fulfilled. It showed man the soul that was independent of his body, and it was the dream as such and not its particular content that did this.\(^{36}\)

Hypnos denies Thanatos – this is the mythological tale of cyberculture: “Thus dreaming itself became a denial of death, because it always proved that one still survived and had not fallen into one’s final sleep.”\(^{37}\) Dream-objects are created and destroyed but for larval subjects they are eternal (in the Whitheadian sense) since they are immersed in eternal sleep. Eternal sleep means no limits for the anesthetization of experience. So technology is not solely responsible for the anesthetization of being and of human experience but rather it is a consequence of a mythological shift which concluded with the synthesis of Eros and Hypnos.

We can clearly see that “[s]pecial form of the dream which displays the soul as independent of the body and therefore immortal, or through awakening from a threatening anxiety dream which proves the real existence of the self,”\(^{38}\) so there is spiritual transcendence in sleep. In dream-objects sleep does not serve as a platform for spiritual transcendence but it rather catches the larval self and prohibits it from transcending, that is, waking up. When the larval self sleeps then Eros impre-


\(^{36}\) Ibidem, p. 116.

\(^{37}\) Ibidem.

\(^{38}\) Ibidem, p. 141.
cates dream objects, forbidding the connection between the soul and the larval self interposed in the larval subject.

When the soul is awake in a larval subject, then it is possible to interpret what is aesthetical: “A causal explanation of the dream is not possible, principally because the dream can only be further interpreted, so that we have interpretations, supplementary interpretations, and supra-interpretations without end.”39 The soul brings the possibility of waking up, i.e. interpreting subjects’ own states beyond the aesthetical metanarration of cyberculture.
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