

Chapter 7
Alexei Penzin
Philosopher

I would like to outline the problem of sleep in a theoretical framework, sort of from ground zero. So we can ask a question: what actually is sleep? Not in terms of medicine or in terms of biology, but in terms of its belonging to our human existence. The answer is not so obvious, because animals also sleep. But in the case of humans (a very specific, anomalous animal), sleep is transformed. And this is not just an elementary biological fact; both sleep and wakefulness have cultural, social, philosophical and political dimensions, in my view.

My research poses a question about sleep problematization (using a term coined by Michel Foucault). In these terms, problematization is not just putting something into question, but considering something as a difficulty or urgency which needs to be solved. So it's both theoretical and practical. When sleep is questioned both theoretically and practically, we can see how humans reorganize their lives, their social existence, to try to solve the "problem" of sleep. For example, the modification of sleep which happens when people are sleeping longer or are sleeping quickly, or they try to hibernate, or there is a laboratory condition when people can sleep more than usual. Or there's a whole sci-fi narrative about how long hibernation will save some time for people who are traveling between stars. At the same time, there is a conscious deprivation of sleep, a specific practice of vigilance, which is a part of many rituals of power, like a night watch, which was introduced in early modernity just for policing city life, controlling night spaces, and so on. So that would be just a couple of examples of these practices of problematization of sleep and wakeful-

ness, and deprivation of sleep.

And also, in the theoretical aspect, there is a whole line of thinking about sleep, since the philosophers of antiquity. We see how most of Western philosophy says that sleep somehow contradicts all values of reason, rationality, conscious dialogue, or ethical commitment. To stress this marginalization of sleep I coined the term “wake-up-ism”. In my view, “wake-up-ism” is embedded into philosophy, and also in Christian theology, for example. “Wake-up-ism” is an attitude of negation of sleep as insignificant, as just a meaningless interruption of our activity, of our mind, of our consciousness. It could be also embedded, not only in theoretical discourse, but also in the practice of economy and politics, especially in capitalist political economy. So we can say that both theoretically and practically, classical and modern philosophy is based on awake, or non-sleeping subjects. Consciousness is represented as something uninterrupted, as something sleepless. To just put it in a very simple way: our thinking is supposed to be continuous. And it’s not just idealist philosophy, but it’s quite widespread in contemporary philosophy, which claims to be materialist or realist philosophy. At this point, I also would claim that it’s largely overlooked in contemporary radical attempts to rethink various philosophical legacies.

Even more, by wake-up-ism, philosophy fulfills its specific function, which is about waking people up, raising consciousness. Socrates, for example, referred to himself as a gadfly, a specific insect which bites people in order to wake them up. And we can trace this waking function of philosophical discourse until recent modern or contemporary philosophy. I recently found a very interesting Hegel aphorism, written when he was young; he says, I quote, “*don’t be a sleeper.*” He uses the word *schlafmütze* in German; it means “sleepyhead.” Don’t be a sleepyhead; be wakeful, says Hegel. “If you are a sleeper or a sleepyhead, you are blind and mute. While waking, you can see and define the proper

essence or meaning of everything,” says Hegel. And he adds, “this is reason,” and even more, “this is power over the world.” So in these three sentences, I think, all the wake-up-ism of philosophy is exposed. When you don’t sleep, you are practicing your ability of reason, and you also enjoy power over the world. If you take such an important contemporary philosopher as Alain Badiou, he actually reiterates this metaphor of hidden wake-up-ism. He writes that a philosopher is a guardian of truth who keeps vigilance even during the night. “So when the night falls, we do not sleep, because we must endure our thoughts all night. We philosophers are not allowed to sleep,” he says. We still have this blind spot related to the question of vigilance and wakefulness and negation of sleep. Deleuze and Guattari also mention this problem in *Anti-Oedipus*. They say that the problem is not the sleep of reason, but its incessant vigilance, wakefulness, which becomes an obsessive phenomenon, and this continuous vigilance, not the “sleep of reason,” produces monsters. So in this respect, mine is the study of these monsters which are produced by both philosophical reason and by economical-political reason of capitalism. I study these strange monsters of vigilance, monsters of sleep deprivation, or monsters of negation of sleep, both in theory and in practice.

Of course, the general framework for this is the Marxist theory and critique of capitalist modernity, and also the historical, philosophical genealogy of these present conditions, when these monsters of vigilance and sleep deprivation are so obvious, but we still don’t know how they emerged in our contemporary situation. And also, as I said, it’s important to study this human problematization of sleep, which relates to this more general framework of philosophical discourse about human capacities or faculties. So the question here is how people use this capacity for sleep and wakefulness, how they transform these capacities, and so on. Finally, a very important context is not just the critique or deconstruction of philosophical legacies related to this question

of sleep, but also this theological thinking. And more particularly, these interconnections of theological and political thinking, because there is the whole idea of political theology, relating religious models and political models.

After introducing my central problems. I would just like to state my hypotheses about sleep as a specific, crucial experience of passivity, isolation, non-thinking, non-communication, and also non-productivity. The first one is more historical, and it's related to what you can call capitalist modernity, the whole grand transformation of society since the 16th, 17th century, the transition to capitalist modes of production and all its consequences for social life, cultural life, politics, and so on. My point is that in this context of the great transformation of modernity, sleep started to be controlled and regulated. But at the same time, the deprivation of sleep or control over sleep became a model for the operating of modernity itself. The second point is that the formation of the theoretical discourse on sleep is usually about excluding sleep. And the last point is the problem of the relation between sleep and subjectivity. When we fall asleep, our subjectivity somehow disappears, or it is deactivated. There is no ego in the state of sleep. At the same time, paradoxically, sleep could be considered as a ground for subjectivation, so a support of subjectivity.

Concerning sleep and capitalist modernity, first of all, of course sleep is a natural obstacle for the pragmatic values that have been established in modern capitalist society over the course of several centuries – these principles of productivity, efficiency, rationality, and so on. But, in light of these principles, the only alibi or excuse for sleep is that it provides creation or reproduction of the labor force. Another side of modernity is so-called secularization. The religious ideology that guaranteed an endless existence, even after death, for the human soul, somehow disappears and leaves humans with this idea of their finitude, their limited existence. You can find it in many sources that sleep “takes one third

of our life,” etc. So our life is already finite, but sleep makes it even shorter. It's reproduction of the labor force, but if we could find another way to reproduce our bodies and minds, after fatigue and tiredness from work, we could find, maybe, less time-consuming methods. Sleep is too luxurious, for just being eight hours of reproducing our body and mind and putting us outside of any social life, interaction, productivity. So there is already a tension inherent in this obvious reproductive function of sleep in social and cultural logic, but also the economic pressures of capitalist political economy, which are quite sensible for everybody living in these conditions of modernity. In *Kapital*, Marx says, “capitalist production drives, by its inherent nature, towards the appropriation of labor throughout the whole 24 hours in a day.” So the continuity of production is a central point of this economic system. Capitalist production is the employment of all human temporality to produce surplus value, because structurally, it is based on this principle of maximization of profit. If you don't use your machines or your material assets for your factories, this means that you ruined the value you can produce using these means. So this logic of machinery provides the logic of continuous exploitation of the labor force. And there are very few references to this point from *Kapital*, which I think is important to stress.

My second hypothesis concerns this question of sleep and its exclusion from philosophical and political discourse. My favorite example comes from very ancient times, from a late Plato text called *Nomoi* in Greek – it means “laws.” So the text is about laws for this imagined society which Plato suggested. It contains a section that gives various regulations for social life. And one of the sections of this text concerns sleep and night life. He says that the ideal citizens of this state should not sleep! That's of course a radical and paradoxical statement, which goes against all empirical evidence of our need to sleep, to restore, to reproduce our forces, and so on. But what's more interesting is Plato's argument: he says that when we are falling asleep, we are losing

connections with external, broader society, with language, with communication, with rationality, and finally, with government and power. So when they sleep, man and woman are useless, uncontrollable, and outside of any rational condition. He even says that the sleeping person is no better than a dead person. This is a paradigmatic model, which you can trace in many other philosophical, theological, or utopian texts. For example, in the 19th century, you can find statements indicating an ideal society where people should not sleep. You can find it in Fourier, when he talks about these future communities, which he called *phalanstères*. So people should reduce sleep to minimum in these utopian communities. And also, there was a stage of this argument that sleep is alien to thinking, rationality, or political government. So it's probably not even a human state. And that's why we should exclude sleep, both theoretically and practically, as much as possible. Because sleep suspends all important social ties, bonds, connections, communications, and administrative chains.

And here I would like to talk about the concept of *Rex Exsominis*. In Latin, it means non-sleeping or vigilant king – *exsominis* means being outside of sleep. This king must not sleep, otherwise the operation of power will cease and social order will fall apart. So while Plato has attributed this strange exaggerated figure of non-sleep or vigilance to all citizens of this ideal state, in medieval theology, at least one single figure should not sleep. And this is a king, the sovereign, who concentrates in himself all power, all social order, and is a very important symbolic figure. Because in feudal or medieval societies, pre-modern societies, the social order was quite fragile. According to well-known idea of Ernst Kantorowicz, the sovereign has two bodies. One is a physical body, his mortal body which can be weak, sick, tired, and finally dead. And there is a second body, which functions as a center of power and maintains the continuity of power. It's over-invested with this symbolism, with his crown, with his throne, with all his genealogies and relations of kinship. It's a big problem because

sleep means interruption of a monarch's conscious life. And a monarch, when he is sleeping, is also not exercising his power. The death of a monarch is a big problem, because that moment was very dangerous for the medieval social order; all forces of chaos, competition, struggle and conspiracy can intervene in this gap between the old monarch who died and the new one. So if the death of a monarch is a huge problem, sleep is also a big problem for this political, theological thinking. And that's why there is a whole body of quotes which prescribe vigilance to a monarch, at least symbolically.



We can trace the same logic in the foundational political texts of modernity in the 17th century, which actually laid the ground for the modern understanding of what is power, the state, politics, and so on. For example, this foundational figure of Thomas Hobbes, in his famous early treatise called *De Cive* (On Citizens), discusses this big problem of a sleeping monarch, because in medieval thought, they can just say that their king never sleeps (and nobody can check this, because the king was very much alienated from everyday life). But in early modernity, this is very difficult to use as an attractive image. That's why Hobbes tried to solve this problem, introducing the concept of delegation of power. He actually acknowledges that a monarch can sleep, but when a monarch or king is going to bed, he delegates his power to his representative or deputy. So the problem of sleep is solved through the idea of representation, which is one of the key modern ideas about politics – representative democracy. Representation is interestingly linked to the problem of sleep. If sleep is a dangerous interruption of power, this problem can be solved through the mechanism of representation or delegation of power.

And actually, you can find this in many cultures, not just in Europe; for example, in the medieval codex of Chinese or Japanese emperors, there are specific rules that a model ruler or sovereign is also someone who is permanently awake at night. He spends his nights in meditation about the welfare of his citizens, or improving his governance. Of course, it was sheer ideology, but it was still part of this discourse. But there's another very interesting point in Hobbes, which was rather absent in the medieval political-theological discourse on power: that sleep plays not only on the side of the monarch, but also on the side of the people. Sleep is not just an interruption of the powerful life of a monarch, it's also the point of extreme vulnerability for those who are already weak and need protection. For citizens, night and time of sleep is the most vulnerable time, when they are exposed to violence, theft, crime, whatever. And he argues that that's the main reason why people should unite into the state and delegate their power to a monarch or supreme ruler, or in more recent times a government or parliament. Within the big narrative about the transition from the natural order to social order, and establishing the state, sleep plays a very important role. Because the state is created for the protection of citizens during night time and sleep.

The idea that the state is basically a night watchman, which protects the lives of citizens during the nighttime, was used during contemporary neoliberal time to argue against the welfare state, saying that the state should reduce its function to pure protection of property and citizens' lives. You can find this key metaphor in Hegel; in *Philosophy of Right*, he says, arguing with anarchists: okay, you claim that the state is useless. You claim that the state is just an oppressive bureaucratic apparatus. But look, when you are going through the town during the night, you are not aware of the state, which actually protects you at that moment.



Michel Foucault described this regime of modern power as different from the regime of sovereign power. For Foucault, the function of deprivation of sleep or nonsleeping is at the center of a displacement of the whole apparatus of sovereignty. So the king became a decorative figure which rather hides than reveals the real biopolitical mechanisms of power. His idea of the discipline of bodies, the policing of the social body, as well as the idea of biopolitics, were connected to the emergence of capitalism and the growing demands for a disciplinary labor force. And for Foucault, interestingly, the whole idea of this new sort of power was not just discipline, but it was also what he called *surveillance*, or observation, or what he called also a panopticon — this ideal architecture for observation or monitoring individuals. Even though the sovereign as a central figure of organization of power disappears in modernity, his non-sleeping function persists, and even became more important in modernity.

We can see this continuous deployment of the idea of non-sleeping and vigilance, which is overarching from late or classical antiquity to modern and contemporary power apparatus, both philosophical and theological, and post-theological discourses on power. You can also find this in Deleuze, in his idea that control devices are continuously operating. So even if this non-sleeping king dies, his function persists, because contemporary society is based on permanent observation, control, and monitoring of individuals. This genealogy of connections between philosophical and theological discourse on sleep, its power, and also the economic operation of sleep and vigilance, are very important for my research.

It's also very important to stress is that the picture is not so hopeless. You can also find different marginal thinking about sleep,

through subjectivity and life forces. For example, in Aristotle's work on sleep and wakefulness, he claims that sleep is related to faculties and their exercise. When we are sleeping, Aristotle says, we possess a faculty or capacity or potentiality, but we don't use it. And this non-use of potentiality somehow saves it or gives it some rest. Sleep is included here, not in relation with rationality or reason or power, but rather in the process of life and the economy of life energies. You can also find a more dialectical, ambivalent account of sleep in Hegel. In his anthropology section of *Encyclopedia of the Philosophical Sciences*, he discusses sleep as a very ambivalent state. On the one hand, it's true that sleep means our full detachment from logos or rationality; we are just in our inner night, in this black hole of sleep. But on the other hand, sleep means a return of the subject to its own interiority and, as Hegel says, to its absolute power or potency (*absolute Macht* in German). So when we fall asleep, we are not just detached from the external world, but we also return to ourselves. We are returning to our subjective core, because during our daily life, our subjectivity is dispersed. We are bombarded by various impressions, sensations, sensory data. We are also attacked by various events of daily life, which somehow provokes our emotions, our interests, our curiosity. And finally, we are exhausted. Each day starts from this situation when you just wake up and your subjective experience is fresh and new. But then, during the day, this experience is overwhelmed, so you need to return to yourself. And this is possible only in this isolated state of sleep. It's like returning to a specific room, wherein you can finally be detached from all these distractions. This could also be related to contemporary questions of when a subject is installed in the huge social communication provided by the internet, by various mobile forms of communication, when he is bombarded by these distractions. Sleep gives us the only exit from this reality which bombards us with various messages, symbols, stimuli, and so on. Basically, sleep is the only way out of this oppressive continuity of modern everyday life. And then you have some expansion on these

thoughts about sleep as an escape from oppressive and alienated social life and modernity in Emmanuel Lévinas, who wrote a small book called *From Existence to Existents* where he considers sleep a ground for subjectivity. It's not just that it saves us from being bombarded by the demands of the external world in this modern society, accelerated by capitalist production and saturated with all this communication; Lévinas claims that ontologically, being itself is constructed exactly like this. It's permanently demanding from us to be awake; he says that being is an insomnia, or vigilance. Being, as a philosophical concept that he borrows from Heidegger and all this tradition, means permanent, oppressive continuity. And the only way to escape from this capture of being is sleep. Lévinas made this radical statement about sleep as an exodus from being itself, which creates a ground for the emergence of subjectivity. So sleep is part of our process of subjectivation. Using this Lévinas logic, sleep is the last resort or escape from this oppressive reality, especially of late capitalism or contemporary hyper-capitalism.

To summarize again, the ultimate goal of my research as I see it is not just to explore political and cultural meanings of sleep, but also to produce another theoretical, philosophical meaning of modernity. In fact, this binary position between sleep and vigilance is very important in its construction of capitalist modernity. Research in sleep and wakefulness in modernity gives us a different perspective on modernity. It gives us a new reading of modernity. And also, an even more general task is to provide another reading of philosophical legacy, because we can imagine a different form of philosophical thinking, which would not be based on the premise of wakeful subjects.



There is a lot of empirical, historical research about this transition to capitalism and how it changes sleep patterns (for example, how the modern standard of eight hours sleep was established). You can find all this in published historical research; for example, in the “The Sleep We Have Lost” by Roger Ekirch. You can even find this in the famous work of Max Weber about the Protestant ethos of capitalism, when he studies various Protestant rules and how they influence this emergence of the entrepreneurial spirit at the center of capitalism. But he also discusses all these Protestant codes or regulations over sleep, because sleeping too much was connected to the sin of laziness, indolence, and so on. He has a couple of very interesting pages analyzing Calvin’s followers’ various regulations of sleep. Of course, long sleep would be considered as strictly prohibited in this Protestant ethos of capitalism. Marx’s chapter of *Kapital* on the working day also talks a lot about sleep, about the problem of over-working, about the limit of the working day, which in the 19th century was 16 hours long or even more, and the problem of drowsiness of workers and the horrible conditions they were finding themselves in.

But more theoretically, I would just stress this point: is sleep a last barrier to capitalism’s penetration into all pores of society, into our everyday life, into our consciousness, and so on? Of course, it’s a bit of a paranoid picture of capitalism; maybe it is too radical to think of capitalism in your bedroom, capitalism in the smallest secret parts of your life. But I would just refer here to a recent work by Jonathan Crary, titled *24/7: Late Capitalism and the Ends of Sleep*. It is important research that stresses how late capitalism attempts to capture our attention, gaze, motility, even our entire wakeful brain’s functioning into its valorization mechanisms. It takes into account the expansion of social media in the last ten or fifteen years, and the expansion of mobile technologies, which provide permanent access to the internet wherever you are — on the street or in your private room or in a public space. For Crary, sleep looks like the last natural barrier for capitalist expansion,

because when we sleep (at least now!), we cannot say that there is any technology to penetrate into this time. Sleep functions like the last obstacle before the advance of this sort of capitalist apocalypse; in my view, sleep functions like the theological concept of *katechon*, which is the last barrier before the coming of the antichrist. What I’m missing in Crary’s account of sleep is exactly this last point, which reveals a more constitutive and productive meaning of sleep, relating to its resistance to power, to the ability of this subjectivity to escape from the greed of power, and to the ability of sleep itself to be a central point in the constitution of our subjectivity. For Crary, sleep is something like a pure interruption, a pure barrier for this penetration of capitalism into our everyday life. I believe we should trace different valences: the relation of sleep into the whole long story of political and theological discourse, the contribution of sleep to establishing our subjectivity. So I don’t think sleep can be just reduced to this function of interruption of the capitalist flow of communications, signs, activities, and so on.

And actually, in his early drafts for *Kapital*, Marx described quite a complicated picture of this last barrier for capitalist expansion. A natural barrier is something that prevents the function of capital, be it a spatial distance or geographical difficulties; establish a new factory or a new communication point and the problem is sorted. But Marx gives it a more dialectical twist, because he says that ultimately, capital is able to overcome any sort of natural barrier and swallow everything which looked like something potentially resisting capital one hour ago. It’s an amazing force of assimilation or penetration or colonization, which we can observe in recent capitalist development. But for Marx, there is a dialectical twist: he says that the only barrier to capital is capital itself. Capital is structurally limited; it is limited by its internal loss of rate of profit, by its internal capacity to extract surplus value, and so on. So it can overcome all natural barriers, but is still limited by its own internal limits. Productivity, for example, or some side ef-

fects of its expansion — like we now see with the enormous ecological problem of climate change, which is a byproduct of capitalist development and which can finally ruin capitalism itself. So for me, it's more important to think about sleep not as a natural barrier, but as something more ambivalent. Capitalism is trying to exclude sleep, to reduce our time to productive time, but sleep is not a mere simple barrier for this. It's a more complex and sophisticated reality, way more ambivalent. For example, there is a contemporary discussion about cognitive capitalism or post-Fordist capital, when we cannot find a borderline or barrier between work time and leisure time. This distinction between leisure time and work time is part of an old problem, which Marx was calling “real subsumptions”; he envisions a state of society when capital was not just changing some small sectors of society, like transforming human bodies into workers' bodies in the factory space, but transforming the whole structure of society. So he called real subsumption this state when there is no space outside of capital. I would call this continuous capitalism exactly the definition of contemporary capitalism, when its main function consists of maintaining these continuities of production, consumption and communication. I would call this not real subsumption, but rather continuous capitalism.

It's also very interesting to trace how the place of sleep and sleep disorders changed during this time. In the 19th century and later on, the key sleep disorder was insomnia. Insomnia was based on the disruption of disciplinary temporality of industrial capitalism, so you can find a lot of modernist writers or artists who were suffering from insomnia — Kafka, for instance. But now, new sleep disorders are established because this interaction between market and medical services appears, which Foucault called medicalization. So it doesn't mean that medical schools have just discovered these forms of sickness or disease, but that they co-produce these new illnesses together with forces of the market, administration and control. Exactly as the origin of insomnia was

the disruption of the whole rhythm of industrial capitalism, today, the most discussed sleep problem is so-called sleep apnea, which is actually involuntary interruptions of breathing during sleep. But if insomnia is a very explicit sleep disorder, sleep apnea is a very secret illness. It can be diagnosed only after a long and expensive laboratory study, so it's a sort of secret and very ambivalent state. In cognitive capitalism, where the border between leisure time and working time is blurred and diffuse, this condition of sleep apnea can be considered a symptom of this fear of losing any ties with the continuity of capitalism. That is simply because sleep apnea is interruption of breathing, and breathing is the only physical connection between the sleeping body and the external world. So sleep apnea reveals in a very symptomatic way this fear of losing connections with the outside world, with these incessant forms of life produced by late capitalism.

At the same time, it's very important that there is an ambivalence of sleep in this system. Because from the point of view of a contemporary culture worker or a social worker, whose life is not divided so clearly between work and leisure, sleep is the only time of full isolation from the external world, because all our daily existence in these new conditions is a sort of work or labor. So we are working officially or informally as consumers of various messages which we are receiving from the everyday space of late capitalism. And sleep is the only non-working time. These new sleep disorders, like sleep apnea, reflect perfectly these fears and anxieties related to sleep. Sleep is not a sort of protest against the disciplinary condition of industrial capitalism; you are allowed to sleep. But sleep also provokes this fear of detachment from these continuities of late capitalism; we are permanently afraid to lose these connections with the social networks, to catch up, to get in touch, to support relations, to keep conversation, and so on.



So the position of sleep is very complex in contemporary society. It's not just a barrier for expansion of capital. It has many other functions: as the only escape from work, as a grounding for our subjectivity and reinforcing, not just reproducing our mental or physical capacity but reproducing our ability to be a subject, which is more important. The same with the interesting idea about a sleeping producer or sleeping consumer. I would appreciate such an idea, because I would say that it's not about a concrete individual, which can produce a sort of value while being asleep. I think it's rather about the collective body, because of the contemporary apparatus of 24-hour continuities, media, social media, services, police, stock exchanges, economic systems which never sleep (as the bank advertisement says, "money never sleeps"). Rather than the individual worker that produces, it's the collective subject, which is made from individual bodies and technological apparatuses that produce. This collective subject is not sleeping and can produce value during its presumed sleep. For example, your Facebook account is like a small *rex ex-somnis*, a non-sleeping king. Physically, you are sleeping, but your Facebook account is non-sleeping, and it represents your personality, your identity. While you are sleeping, somebody can like your post, so it means that your Facebook account will work for you, increasing the value of your recent post, or your recent announcement of whatever. Like this medieval king, you delegate some of your power to the virtual identity of your Facebook account, which represents you. It can even work and produce value or consume some value. Society, now, can be considered as a whole apparatus of continuous 24-hour production, consumption, communication, financial speculation, and so on. Of course, this apparatus exploits individual workers, and you produce value, and there is some value extraction from your intellectual capacities, but basically, this is a sort of prosthesis of vigilance or non-

sleeping. Media, or this internet or social network, is like a prosthesis for us humans who are not able to sleep less than four or six hours.

And a final note about this famous Melnikov project, "Sonata of Sleep." Konstantin Melnikov was definitely one of the most famous Soviet architects, and he became famous in the 1920s when he was building the Soviet pavilion at the international exhibition in Paris in 1925. He was really a visionary architect, and produced a lot of amazing projects, but many or most of them remain on paper — they were never realized. The madness of this project by Melnikov was that he tried to create an ideal environment for sleeping workers, because a worker (at least on the level of cultural or ideological representation) was a central figure in the Soviet Union. And this project was created in 1929, a very ambitious time with a lot of cultural experiments, before the arrival of Stalinism. This building was a sort of membrane, composed of a circular arrangement of rooms or cells for the sleeping workers, and it would even be able to rock like a cradle with specific relaxing music, sounds, scents, smells, or massage. So it was an ideal space for sleep. He came up with this idea as a healing force, as a response to all individual physical and social disease. Through sleep, we can solve any health problem, whatever it might be. But he also was engaged in the construction of a mausoleum in 1924, the first wooden mausoleum where Lenin's body was put. After Lenin's death, the party came to the idea that he should rest not in peace, but in public. And his body was preserved and exposed in this mausoleum. But Melnikov had to construct this mausoleum in only a few weeks, so he wasn't sleeping at all. That's why he had the specific trauma of working insomnia, and that's why he got these ideas about the magical healing powers of sleep. He was also linking Lenin's body, laying in the mausoleum, with the Russian adaptation of the Sleeping Beauty fairytale. Melnikov was thinking about Lenin's body as another version of the story, thinking that potentially it could be awakened from his

sleep.

But even more, Lenin himself considered the transition to communism also in terms of sleep. I recently discovered this in an original Russian edition of his famous book, *State and Revolution*, written exactly at the time of the October Revolution in 1917. What is the transition to communism? The destruction of the capitalist state, of course. But there is a subtle nuance in this, because there is a transitional time. So first, the proletariat should destroy the capitalist state, this apparatus of violence, police, administration, and so on. There will be some leftovers during this transition period to communism, some remnants of the state which will be necessary to provide these transitional measures. And this transitional socialist state should not be destroyed by violence, but rather wither away. But in Russian original Lenin says that this transitional state before the advance of communism is not withering away, but falling asleep. Communism means, for Lenin, the falling asleep of the state. And this, I think, is a brilliant example which reflects the whole logic of capitalist modernity. These monsters, which are produced by vigilant, non-sleeping reason, this bourgeois capitalist state, should fall asleep. Friedrich Engels also used this metaphor in his book *Anti-Dühring*; he used the German word *einschlafen*, which means for him that state intervention should stop or fall asleep under communism. So you can find it in the whole Marxist tradition, not just in Lenin. And this reflects the logic of modernity, which produced these monsters of 24-hour economy, the capitalist continuity which embraces also the state, observation, control, and so on. Communism means that all these huge monsters, the apparatus of the capitalist state and of capital power and the state in modernity, would be not destroyed but rather put to sleep. Even when it's destroyed, it could resurrect again, like in a zombie movie.

Chapter 8

Reena Patel

Feminist Scholar / Geographer

I never planned to start this research. What had happened was that I had just started my first year in my PhD program, and I got a grant to go to India and give a talk on previous research I'd done on women working as engineers in the IT sector in India. And I'll never forget this woman from New Delhi who was working for a call center, and she got up on stage and told us this story about how just that very day, New Delhi had gotten a phone call from Chennai. The employees were in a complete panic, because there was a van that had picked up the employees and was taking them to the call center, which was the norm. The van was pulled over by the police, and the women who were in the vehicle were accused of prostitution, even though they had identity cards that clearly showed they worked for this company. I'm sitting there in an audience, and I'm a geographer. I'm very interested in space and place — who belongs in places, who doesn't. And that's when I started thinking about this whole call center phenomenon, because a lot of the news reports would be about how, especially for women, this was a marker of modernization, access to better employment and more money. My perspective was that, yes, women are making money, but does that buy them the right to go out and about in these night spaces as freely as men? And if that doesn't buy them the right, what does that tell us about power and dominance in this society?



Night space is different from day space. Night space has a very