In the tenth chapter of Plato’s *Republic*, there is a discussion about mimesis. For example, a carpenter has produced a chair according to an idea of a chair but when you sit on it you realize that there is something wrong with the chair. In this case, you take the chair to the carpenter, and tell him your complaints, and the carpenter reworks the chair to get it closer to its ideal form, that is, to produce a perfect resemblance between the chair and its ideal form. What is important here is to create a one-to-one mimetic equivalence between the model and the copy. Things get complicated when we consider the artist who makes a painting of the chair, because now we are in a situation where we cannot use and tell whether the copied chair is useful or not. According to the argument, since artistic representation does not allow us to test the usefulness of the produced copy, and since it tells us lies, the arts should be expelled from the *Republic*. Now, if we look at the logic of the coup d’état from this angle, has this incident put forward something which cannot be verified on the basis of a perfect correspondence between the thing and its idea, the failure of which cannot be reported to the interested authorities, such as a carpenter? Or rather, do we overlook the proliferation of various possible meanings since we already have the tendency of overriding artistic representation? Without doubt, we need a bit of the notion of *quod libet* so as to save these choices from the straightjacket of the useful. It is only thus we can prefer not to prefer, like Bartleby. A situation where non-representability is preferred. Meta-democracy?