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## Arendt

Hannah Arendt’s philosophy seems inconsistent with how I see life now. I understand that Arendt grew up under the Nazis and thus saw little hope in the future of humanity, namely that the Nazis had ripped a hole in Western history which could never be repaired. However, it seems that we’ve been able to recover quite well since then. Today we consider Nazism a detour in history; a mistake.

We’ve also come a long ways in terms of equality. Arendt does point out the Greek slaves whose lives consistent solely of labor. Yes some Greeks could now participate in *polis* but this is only a small fraction of people at the time period. I believe that modern times have created the technology which has greatly reduced the amount of labor to keep people alive. Just look at farm productivity.

Furthermore, what was so sacred about what was talked in the *polis* during Greek societies that we no longer talk about? I feel that American politics is mostly about how we can increase the standards of living for the most people possible. Is that not noble? If not, what is?

## Sacks

I’m wondering why we read this book? While it was interesting to learn about the struggle of the deaf to be recognized as valid members of the community, this book seemed outside of the realm of the other books which we’ve read.

I don’t understand why the board of Gallaudet University chose Dr. Zinser where there was such an outcry for a deaf president. The proper leader of an organization depends a great deal on the current environment. It is often not the smartest or best position person, but the one that is right at that time period. The Board should have recognized this earlier.