

TIMES & SPACES



The World and the Cave

Imagination, Public
Space and Politics
with Hannah Arendt
and José Saramago

Hans Teerds

1.

A characteristic of human action is that it always begins something new, and this does not mean that it is ever permitted to start '*ab ovo*', to create '*ex nihilo*'. In order to make room for one's own action, something that was there before must be removed or destroyed, and things as they were before are changed. Such change would be impossible if we could not mentally remove ourselves from where we physically are located and '*imagine*' that things might as well be different from what they actually are.¹

Imagination is the very root of political action, German-American philosopher Hannah Arendt states in this quote. The ability to act depends on the human capacity to imagine how things can be different. The quote is taken from a text in which Arendt also addresses less heroic virtues, like the 'ability to lie', or the 'deliberate denial of factual truth' and even the 'capacity to change facts', which also depend on the capacity of imagination.² Even though the reflections on these latter human capacities, as part and parcel of the realm of politics, can be understood as topical for the current circumstances in Western political practices,³ we leave them aside. Instead, this text proposes an attempt to dwell on an exemplary reading beyond the borders of the architectural profession by means of a comparative reading of Hannah Arendt's 1958 *The Human Condition* and the 2000 novel by Portuguese writer Jose Saramago. While this article, of course, can only offer a brief and initial reading of the two texts, it will nevertheless explore perspectives of public space, mass consumption and production, and craftsmanship that, I believe, highlight political aspects of architecture. Such a comparative reading of texts from outside the field of architecture, in which the fragments are brought together and understood against the background of buildings, constructions, spaces and cities, is a matter of imagination as well. Neither the fields of philosophy, sociology, anthropology, cultural theory and theology, nor the fields of the arts offer immediate directions for design with regard to concept, type, form, structure and material. What these fields do offer is a challenge to think from different positions, which is, according to Arendt, necessary 'to understand what we are doing'.⁴ Only if we are able to inhabit different perspectives, will we be able to understand the meaning of what we do.

Arendt's writings are well suited for such an undertaking, and make it possible to highlight the political aspects of architecture. She even presents her reflections in remarkable spatial and architectural terms. Even though these terms should be understood as mainly metaphorical, Arendt was well aware of the importance of such a spatiality in her writing. To think spa-

tially, she once wrote, is to think politically, since it is bound to the *world* and its inhabitants. It's 'deepest aim', she stated, 'is "to create a space" in which the *humanitas* of man can appear pure and luminous.'⁵ Other artistic fields – such as, for instance, literature – are very capable of making such reflections even more tangible and can present them more incisively. Artists have the capacity to explore what developments in society, culture, economy, science and technology might mean for the future of the earth, life and society, by embodying them in images, stories and characters.

2.

Note how Arendt presents the faculty of imagination, in literally spatial terms, as the mental capacity to 'remove ourselves from where we are physically located'. The human capacity of displacement is also at the root of her own writings. Although Arendt has regularly been presented as a political philosopher, she rejected this term. Politics deal with the actualities of the world, with the hustle and bustle of the people that inhabit it. Philosophy, on the other hand, withdraws from these actualities and the world, in order to contemplate life and its structural questions. Instead of a strict philosophical approach, Arendt admired the writings of Walter Benjamin, whom she met in Paris when both were on the run from the Nazis in Germany, and whose writings she described as 'thinking poetically', his method as 'pearl-diving':

... we are dealing here with something which may not be unique but is certainly extremely rare: the gift of 'thinking poetically'. And this thinking, fed by the present, works with the 'thought fragments' it can wrest from the past and gather about itself. Like a pearl diver who descends to the bottom of the sea, not to excavate the bottom and bring it to light but to pry loose the rich and the strange, the pearls and the coral in the depths and to carry them to the surface, this thinking delves into the depths of the past – but not in order to resuscitate it the way it was and to contribute to the renewal of extinct ages.⁶

Again, this 'method' is presented in remarkably spatial verbs, along the lines of imagination. The description imagines movement and replacement, change and removal: diving, wrestling, gathering, prying loose, carrying, delving.

Such a method seems to be productive in the field of architecture, too. Precedent analysis is part and parcel of the education of architects. It requires imagination to pick the right pearls, and to really understand what is valuable. More often, however, such undertakings end in rather formal, stylistic agendas for current practices.

3.

'Pearl diving' is an important characteristic of Arendt's writings too. In her work she does not present fixed theories with static concepts. Evoked by the present, she aims to think through (political) actualities, and revisit certain (ancient) concepts in the light of current developments.⁷ Her work aims to understand, rather than grasp 'eternal truths'. For Arendt, this 'working-method' is a fundamental response to the experience of modernity. In her introduction to Benjamin's essays she writes:

Any period to which its own past has become as questionable as it has to us must eventually come up with the phenomenon of language, for in it the past is contained ineradicably, thwarting all attempts to get rid of it once and for all. The Greek polis will continue to exist at the bottom of our political existence – that is, at the bottom of the sea – for as long as we use the word 'politics'.⁸

It is of course not without reason that Arendt takes the term *polis* as an example: her own writings encircle politics, evoked by a sincere concern about the world and its inhabitants. Arendt's writings are therefore not just spatial in a metaphorical sense: she indeed goes back to the Greek *polis* in a very concrete way, and rereads this first origin of democratic organiza-

tion particularly through the lens of Aristotle. There is thus also a literal and concrete spatiality in her writings: it is rooted in cities, and is larded with spatial and architectural references, metaphors and concepts, such as 'public space', 'the space of appearance', 'the wall'.⁹ These architectural terms can be seen as 'pearls', brought to the light of the present, to help us understand what has been lost over time, but is nevertheless still present in our language and still influences our ideas and ideals.

4.

Whereas Arendt's aim is 'to understand', it requires another step and another position to mirror her findings in concrete images and future scenarios. Architects, as well as other artistic practitioners, have the instruments to do so. As a mirror to Arendt's book *The Human Condition*, I will use the novel *The Cave*, written by Portuguese novelist José Saramago. Even though their respective biographies are quite different, their ideas seem to intertwine. While Arendt distances herself from the field of philosophy, she of course has been immersed in this field: she studied philosophy with Martin Heidegger and Karl Jaspers in Germany in the years before the Second World War. It is due to the experience of being excluded from public life (and excluded from university life) as a Jew in Germany in that period that she quit philosophy in favour of politics and public matter. It is through this active participation in public debates (for which she needed to learn to speak and write English quickly), through her thoughtful analyses of what had happened in Europe, and her stubborn reflections upon political actualities, that she became well-known. Saramago's biography represents what Arendt celebrated as the *vita activa*. He started his working life as a car mechanic, and worked as a civil servant before becoming an independent writer. As a writer, though, he did not live the *vita contemplativa*, but was actively engaged in the world as a public intellectual, political activist (as a member of the illegal Portuguese Communist Party) and editor of a newspaper.

5.

Like other novels in Saramago's oeuvre, *The Cave* is a political novel. In his stunning style without punctuation, he draws the end of the working life of potter Cipriano Algor against the background of what he regularly calls 'The Centre' – a huge building located in a city and increasingly absorbing that city in its interior.¹⁰ The Centre is a shopping mall as well as an apartment building, both an office centre and a leisure dome. A new city within the city, where most visitors also work and live in this huge building. With the work of his hands, the potter cannot fulfil the requirements of the Centre (of predictability and interchangeability), while the Centre also forbids him to sell his product to other parties. He thus is forced to stop his pottery. Moreover, he is forced to move to the Centre too, to live there with his daughter and son-in-law.¹¹ This story is understood as a critical retelling of the famous Platonic parable of the cave, in which the philosopher is able to escape from the shadowy realm of the cave (the natural circumstances of life), live in the 'open air of ideas' (the good life of the *vita contemplativa*) and is hardly understood by his fellows when he returns and reveals the 'reality' out there. Arendt was very critical of this Platonic idea, which is at the root of the idea that withdrawal and contemplation is the highest form of the good life. *The Human Condition* is meant to propel the *vita activa*, the active engagement with the things of the world, as equally important.¹² Saramago's political critique reflects upon this active life too – and in line with Arendt, he addresses such topics as vanishing craftsmanship, comprehensive mass consumption and production, increasing bureaucratic organization and the loss of public space. As such, it contrasts craftsmanship with labour in environments of mass production and bureaucratic organization. In Arendt's famous terms, the distinction between 'labour' and 'work', the first being repetitive and cyclical, corresponding to the biological circumstances of life, the second producing an artificial world that lasts, which requires craftsmanship and responsibility.¹³ *The Cave* offers a literary narrative that enlarges and magnifies Arendt's concerns about the loss of public space, and the loss of 'things' that mediate between people. Through its narra-

tive, *The Cave* offers a literary image that is positioned between Arendt's architectural metaphors on the one hand, and architecture's materialities, typologies, structures and formalities on the other.

6.

In both philosophy and architectural theory, Arendt is particularly known as being the first to propel the question of public space within the context of modernity.¹⁴ Her term 'the space of appearance' has gained some attention in the field of architecture as well, for instance by architect and critic George Baird and architectural historian Kenneth Frampton.¹⁵ For Arendt, appearance is the most crucial aspect of public space: public space offers the opportunity to appear among others. Through appearances, moreover, differences become visible, as they are revealed through 'words and deeds'. No one acts or speaks the same. Therefore, plurality is the condition of public space.¹⁶

Arendt, traces the idea of public space back to its classical origins: the agora in the Greek *polis* where 'free citizens' gathered as peers, in order to discuss actualities and the future of the city.¹⁷ This view has raised critical responses, which I will not address here. An important aspect of public space is that it creates a common context for appearance, and as such is constitutive with regard to the realm of politics. For Arendt, appearance is also an important aspect of 'being human'.

*In ancient feeling the privative trait of privacy, indicated in the word itself, was all important; it mean literally a state of being deprived of something, and even of the highest and most human of man's capacities. A man who lived only a private life . . . was not fully human.*¹⁸

We can only understand this last remark if we see that a lack of public appearance not only meant to be deprived from the capacity to act and speak publicly, but it also meant a lack of seeing and hearing others, as well

as of being heard and being seen by others. One appears in the world, in a particular position. But it is through the mutual perspectives that are developed through 'the presence of others who see that we see and hear what we hear' that we can be assured 'of the reality of the world and ourselves'.¹⁹ This concern with 'reality' is not simply a philosophical quest, but it also affirms one's own position in a world-in-common. From an architectural perspective, the idea that the world can be understood through the juxtaposition of numerous perspectives is obviously important. Moreover, it is important to see how Arendt intertwines the human experience of appearance with this assurance of 'reality'. This is not another metaphorical spatial term, but it embodies concrete and tangible experiences, wherein all five bodily senses are involved.

*In a world of appearances . . . reality is guaranteed by this three-fold commonness: the five senses utterly different from each other, have the same object in common; members of the same species have the same context in common that endows every single object with its particular meaning; and all other sense-endowed beings, though perceiving this object from utterly different perspectives, agree on its identity.*²⁰

Note that appearance itself is not a static fact but a movement – a moment of transition from the private realm into the public eye. It is through this movement that the senses are addressed, that others and otherness, as well as the world-in-common is perceived.

Arendt evokes the image of appearance against the background of modernity, wherein a political community is replaced by a society of consumers, being engaged in the world by striving for leisure and entertainment.²¹ It is this latter development that is prominent in *The Centre* too: the interior offers a variety of attractive, commercial leisure spaces, which absorb public life:

The lift travelled slowly past the different floors, revealing a succession of arcades, shops, fancy staircases, escalators, meeting points, cafés, restaurants, terraces with tables and chairs, cinemas and theatres, discotheques, enormous television screens, endless numbers of ornaments, electronic games, balloons, fountains and other water features, platforms, hanging gardens, posters, pennants, advertising hoardings, mannequins, changing rooms, the façade of a church, the entrance to the beach, a bingo hall, a casino, a tennis court, a gymnasium, a roller coaster, a zoo, a racing track for electric cars, a cyclorama, a cascade, all waiting, all in silence, and more shops and more arcades and more mannequins and more hanging gardens and things for which people probably didn't even know the names, as if they were ascending into paradise. And is this speed only used so that people can enjoy the view, asked Cipriano Algor, No, at this speed the lifts are used as an extra security aid, said Marçal, Isn't there enough security what with the guards, the detectors, the video cameras, and all the other snooping devices, Cipriano Algor asked again, Tens of thousands of people pass through here every day, it's important to maintain security, replied Marçal.²²

The 'public spaces' of the Centre offer a variety of experiences, dispersion, exhaustion. More importantly, however, is that Saramago shows how such a leisure environment depends on prescription and control, the latter not only in the matter of safeguarding, but also as scripted experiences, perspectives, views, movements. This obviously is at odds with the plurality and freedom that Arendt draws as crucial to appearance. Control restricts the freedom to enter, and being encapsulated in a script reduces the possibility of interaction, to do things differently. As Algor experiences: '... going into the Centre just to look around is not, if you'll forgive the apparent tautology, viewed with friendly eyes, anyone caught wandering around inside empty-handed will soon become the object of special attention from the security guards.'²³

The consequences of the loss of freedom is quite dramatically imagined by Saramago in the final chapters of the book, wherein a cave is found under the huge building. Indeed: *the cave of Plato*. It would not have been the Center, if they had not immediately seen a *business model* in it: 'Coming soon. Public opening of Plato's Cave, an exclusive attraction, unique in the world, Buy your ticket now.'²⁴

As made explicit in the discovery of the cave, the reduction of life to scripts, commercial services and similarities leads to the loss of 'reality'. Things only can be seen from a single perspective. Even though this might create 'shared' experiences, these experiences are not plural, but repetitive. This creates a singular perspective rather than a common world wherein one can appear from a particular position. Public life in the Centre, despite its sensational and adventurous character, is in the end, imprisonment.

7.

With her reflections, Arendt offers an *understanding* of what the importance of public life might be. She does not, however, offer a formal or typological perspective for the design of public spaces. If her reflections were to be understood as directive to a particular architectural 'model', it would overestimate architecture as an instrument of political and public organization and arrangement, while architecture, at its best, can only offer (or disturb) the conditions under which public life can take place. Nevertheless, there is another entry into the field of architecture in *The Human Condition*, namely the argument that a 'world' is needed in order to enable and sustain the 'space of appearance'. Arendt attributes a specific meaning to the term 'world', distinguishing it from the word 'earth'. Earth stands for the natural circumstances of the globe, depicted by the cycle of nature. Even though the globe is the natural habitat, human beings cannot survive but by intervention in the earth through the construction of artefacts (houses, furniture, infrastructure) and by establishing institutions (for the human community). By doing so, they establish the 'world'.²⁵ For Arendt, therefore, 'artefacts'

are not just objects, they are politically relevant: they establish the artificial 'world', which enables human life as well as the life of the community. 'To live in the world,' Arendt writes in a famous quote, 'means essentially that a world of things is between those who have it in common, as a table is located between those who sit around it; the world, like every in-between, relates and separates men at the same time.'²⁶ Artefacts, in other words, offer an in-between that is held in common. Moreover, we not only have it in common with our contemporaries, but we also share the world among generations. 'If the world is to contain a public space,' Arendt writes, 'it cannot be erected for one generation and planned for the living only; it must transcend the lifespan of mortal men.'²⁷ The importance of the permanence of the world partly relates to the fact that 'things of the world' are not neutral atoms in space and time, but have a particular shape, history, materiality, tactility, or in short (again): appearance. It is through their particular appearances that they have the capacity to reify stories and (communal) narratives, to memorize actions of the past, and to make history present today – all to be valued from a political perspective.²⁸ Arendt stresses these aspects against the background of the increasing influence of mass production and mass consumption and their negative effect on the lifecycle of artefacts at the end of the 1950s.²⁹ Moreover, mass production and mass consumption wipe out the artefacts' particular forms, the traces, and signs of handwork and craftsmanship. They disperse the relationship between maker and product, and deprive the labourer of responsibility by dividing the production process into small and repetitive activities. In *The Cave*, the potter, of course, stands for this close relationship between the maker and the work, and the wider scope of craftsmanship in local traditions.

He rolled the block of clay backwards and forwards, pressing it and stretching it out with the heels of his hands, then he slapped it down hard on the table, squashing and squeezing, then started all over, repeating the whole operation, again and again and again, Why do you do that, his daughter asked him, So that

there aren't any lumps or air bubbles left inside, that would be bad for the work.³⁰

The Centre, on the contrary, is the commercial power that sweeps away traditional and personal craftsmanship and relationships in bureaucratic ways. The potter is one of the suppliers of the Centre – but not for long.

They only took half of the shipment today, they say that fewer people are buying earthenware crockery, that some new imitation plastic stuff has come onto the market and that the customers prefer it. ... earthenware cracks and chips, it breaks easily, whereas plastic is more resistant, more resilient, The difference is that earthenware is like people, it needs to be well treated.³¹

His practice cannot fulfil the requirements of the Center – or the requirements of the modern age.

We have seen the very traditional way the clay is kneaded . . . we have seen that the kiln outside shows traces of an antiquity unforgiveable in this modern age, which for all its scandalous defects and prejudices, has had the goodness to allow a pottery like this to coexist with the Centre like that, at least up until now.³²

Indeed, not for any longer: his deliveries will be replaced by mass products, made in the Industrial Belt.

The ominous sight of those chimneys vomiting out columns of smoke made him wonder which one of those hideous factories would be producing those hideous plastic lies, cunningly fashioned to look like earthenware, Its just not possible, he murmured, you can't copy the sound of it or the weight, and then there is the relationship between sight and touch which I read about somewhere or other, something about eyes being able to see through

*the fingers touching the clay, about fingers being able to feel what the eyes are seeing without the fingers actually touching it.*³³

8.

Arendt's understanding of the 'world of things' offers a political understanding of what architecture *does*: it is to be understood as 'world-construction', which not only entails establishing the world, but also maintaining it. The patina of time and the traces of life enrich buildings and (public) spaces, and transform factual, material constructions into meaningful artefacts, to which the people that inhabit the world attach. On the one hand, this understanding offers an argument for a careful renovation, restoration and refurbishment of existing buildings, urban structures and cultural landscapes.³⁴ But on the other, it also draws a perspective on the architectural intervention: new buildings, too, in their very appearance, embody narratives, even before the patina of time enables attachment to them. Architecture is not just construction, but also has the capacity to bear narratives, memories, remembrances for both individuals and communities. Design requires the faculty of imagination, not simply to invent something new, but also to understand what this 'new' has to offer the world. From a political perspective, this particularly challenges the design of public buildings. With their presence and shape, public buildings embody ideas about the organization of the human community and thus expose what has been considered important for this community. As political philosopher Bonnie Honig argues: 'Public things are the infrastructure of democratic life, and they underwrite the signs and symbols of democratic unity, that, for the moment, still survive.'³⁵ But this conviction is not limited to public buildings. All interventions in the world do, in turn, shape that world-in-common. In *The Cave*, the building of the Centre in itself tells the story of the absorbing power of bureaucratic organization and the destructive power of aggregated commerce, security and entertainment on the city, landscapes, public life and local businesses. Introducing the Centre, Saramago stresses the 'extremely high wall, much higher than the highest of the buildings on either side of the

avenue' that seems to block the road, but that turns out to be the 'gigantic quadrangular edifice, with no windows on its smooth, featureless façade'.³⁶ The façade is not articulated in an architectural sense, and that is telling:

*With the exception of doors that open onto the outside, there are no openings to be seen, just impenetrable stretches of wall, and it is not the vast hoardings promising security that are to blame for shutting out the light or stealing the air from those living inside.*³⁷

The exception is the apartment façade: 'this side of the building is peppered with windows, hundreds and hundreds of windows, thousands of windows, all of them closed because of the air conditioning inside.'³⁸ In an episode in which Algor drives around a construction site, where existing buildings are torn down to make room for the extension of The Centre, Saramago lets the potter reflect on this expansion. In an again powerful passage, Saramago notes how differences, remembrances and memory are impossible when the urban environment changes quickly, moreover, through such a blunt architecture:

*When he comes . . . in ten days' time, there will be no trace left of these buildings. . . . They will erect the three walls . . . and, after a matter of days, not even the most keen-eyed observer, viewing it from the outside, still less from the inside, will be able to distinguish between the new and old.*³⁹

9.

At the very core of the profession or architecture there is always the inclination for intervention – what else is design than to imagine how 'things might as well be different from what they actually are'? Architecture, in other words, depends upon the same human faculty as political action: imagination. It embodies the freedom 'to change the world and to start something new in it'.⁴⁰ The application of this freedom, is not neutral – it stresses the political and ethical dimension of architecture. Buildings and spaces appear

in the world itself, as particular ‘objects’ with a particular shape, embodying narratives that, in turn, shape the world-in-common by directing and orienting the inhabitants. Architecture draws the outline of public spaces. It can do that in various ways: by offering a space that is strictly controlled and pre-scripted towards a strict and particular end, or by drawing the outlines of spaces that offer the freedom to appear, to appropriate and to occupy. It is in these latter ‘spaces of appearance’ that eventually ‘the *humanitas* of man can appear pure and luminous’.

- 1 Hannah Arendt, ‘Lying in Politics’, in: Hannah Arendt, *Crisis of the Republic* (San Diego/New York/London: Harcourt Brace & Company, 1969), 5.
- 2 *Ibid.*, 5.
- 3 Cf. Richard J. Bernstein, *Why Read Hannah Arendt Now* (Cambridge: Polity, 2018), 3.
- 4 Hannah Arendt, *The Human Condition* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998 [1958]), 5.
- 5 Hannah Arendt, ‘Karl Jaspers, A Laudatio’, in: Hannah Arendt, *Men in Dark Times* (San Diego/New York/London: Harcourt Brace & Company, 1995 [1968]), 79.
- 6 Hannah Arendt, ‘Walter Benjamin. 1892-1940’, in: *Ibid.*, 205.
- 7 Cf. Hannah Arendt, *The Life of the Mind* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1978), 3; Hannah Arendt, “‘What Remains? The Language Remains.’” A Conversation with Günter Gaus’, in: Hannah Arendt, *Essays in Understanding, 1930-1954, Formation, Exile, and Totalitarianism* (New York: Schocken Books, 1994), 12.
- 8 Arendt, ‘Walter Benjamin’, *op. cit.* (note 6), 204.
- 9 These notions particularly are used in *The Human Condition*.
- 10 José Saramago, *The Cave* (London: Vintage, 2018 [2002]); José Saramago, *A Caverna* (Lisbon: Caminho, 2000).
- 11 Saramago, *The Cave*, *op. cit.* (note 10), 277-282.
- 12 Arendt, *The Human Condition*, *op. cit.* (note 4), 14-15, 226.
- 13 *Ibid.*, 7.

- 14 Cf. Bernstein, *Why Read Hannah Arendt Now*, op. cit. (note 3), 89.
- 15 George Baird, *The Space of Appearance* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1995); Kenneth Frampton, 'The Status of Man and the Status of his Objects: A Reading of *The Human Condition*', in: Melvyn A. Hill (ed.), *Hannah Arendt: The Recovery of the Public World* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1979).
- 16 Arendt, *The Human Condition*, op. cit. (note 4), 7-8, 220; Arendt's perspective, with plurality as its characteristic, is often described as agonistic. German philosopher Jürgen Habermas has developed a slightly different view, called the discursive model. In this model conflict is not central, but the idea that consensus can be reached through a rational conversation and exchange of ideas. Cf. Seyla Benhabib, 'Models of Public Space: Hannah Arendt, the Liberal Tradition, and Jürgen Habermas', in: Craig Calhoun (ed.), *Habermas and the Public Sphere* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1992), 87.
- 17 Arendt, *The Human Condition*, op. cit. (note 4), 28.
- 18 Ibid., 38.
- 19 Ibid., 50.
- 20 Ibid., 57.
- 21 Arendt, *The Human Condition*, op. cit. (note 4), 6, 131.
- 22 Saramago, *The Cave*, op. cit. (note 10), 231.
- 23 Ibid., 80.
- 24 Ibid., 294
- 25 Arendt, *The Human Condition*, op. cit. (note 4), 2.
- 26 Ibid., 52.
- 27 Ibid., 55.
- 28 Ibid., 95.
- 29 Cf. Kenneth Frampton, who at the end of the 1970s already discussed this perspective with regard to the field of architecture. Frampton, 'The Status of Man and the Status of His Objects', op. cit. (note 15).
- 30 Saramago, *The Cave*, op. cit. (note 10), 21.
- 31 Ibid., 21.
- 32 Ibid., 120.
- 33 Ibid., 16.
- 34 Hannah Arendt, 'The Crisis in Culture: Its Social and Its Political Significance', in: Hannah Arendt, *Between Past and Future: Eight Exercises in Political Thought* (New York: Penguin Classics, 2006 [1961]), 208-210.
- 35 Bonnie Honig, *Public Things, Democracy in Disrepair* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2017), 17.

- 36 Saramago, *The Cave*, op. cit. (note 10), 6.
- 37 Ibid., 81.
- 38 Ibid.
- 39 Ibid., 8.
- 40 Arendt, 'Lying in Politics', op. cit. (note 1), 5.