

Overview of the book's main themes

The present work, developed between the year two thousand and six and the year two thousand and thirteen – with long intermediate pauses – and circulating in various forms from the year two thousand and ten, is divided into three major sections composed from a total of four parts. The first section, Nemo, includes the first two parts.

The word “nemo” has been chosen for its original Greek meaning: to distribute, to graze, to dwell and rule, to estimate.

Each of these meanings is none other than a face of a rather complicated conceptual polyhedron. It is a polyhedron whose nuclear meaning is “to distribute”, in other words to share something – perhaps in terms of components or perhaps for the benefit of a group or perhaps both simultaneously.

It is akin to a grazing herd, and therefore to a pastoral subsistence economy. This also concerns living in a place and governing it, probably in the place itself. Finally, it involves the meaning of “considering”, both in the sense of estimation and esteem, of looking at someone or something in a certain way.

“Nemo” is the action of nomos, the law.

The word “nomos” means use, habit, custom, but also chanting, melody, musical way or coin (nummos).

Therefore, considering this multitude of meanings, the law carries many hidden implications with itself. The first one concerns the concept of law basing itself on the economy: given the nomadic habit – due to the easily changeable political system - of recognizing and governing lands on the base of herds grazing in that territory, the idea of pasture as economical subsistence is naturally connected to the one of law. This is, hence, what completes the chain: subsistence, economy, private property, law.

Thus, no wonder “nummos” is linked to the law.

But compared to nomos, the Greek word nemo has the suggestion of the Latin “nemo”, which means “No one”.

If the law – the use, the chant – is ownership of livelihood, it would be easier now to realize what other books have already explained: the word itself is law as such, but this law is not based on *ideal principles* – as we may expect, but on the possession of territory (it would not be necessary to bother Aristotle for the differences about the etymologies of “ethics”).

In this sense the image of God allowing Adam to give animals a name seems to be almost scientific. It is also consequent at the invitation of God to dominate and subjugate animal species and lands.

Basically, it is through naming that God gives men the true power over things – this is the only power he gives.

The Latin shade of “No one” which the law seems to convey is perhaps the most fascinating contribution to a discussion about power. Not because the law does not appear as enacted by *someone* – even if the specters of Heidegger’s “Man” and cruel Superego always seem to raise –, but because no one concretely endorses the social convention in order of which a law should be respected. This convention is a deal, an agreement, often only tacit, implicit, even not said or – because not said – not even known.

To sum up, the first section addresses to this brink underlying the so-called net of words. Time, Logos and Space are handrails of a reality we experience as human beings. The reality beneath our words is almost all unknown.

If words get empty, becoming consumed coins of poor value, the human being ends up committing suicide (considering that it is suggested a detailed reading of Heidegger’s *The Principle of Reason*, especially for the concept of the generalization of being allowing the application of will: without any even supposed certainties, planning is catatonic). That is what makes the second section of this work, transposed to the here and now and focused on the movie *La Grande Bouffe*.

The second section is called Cut. If the reality that we see and experience and think exists in virtue of words which order psychological shades as names order wavelengths, we must speculate about reality as a page of a book.

Thus, it is not our present to deconstruct reality: it is reality that, being composed of punctuations and changeable words, is suitable for being mounted and unmounted as in bricolage manufacturing.

It follows that the pivotal of our dimension does not consist on the singular meaningful lego we use to substantiate the sense, but it is based on the way they join and interact arriving to a certain sense.

Here the final Bricolage of the last forth part comes into play, whose aim is to provide an overview – inevitably partial – of how, in the United States of America, it may be noticed an exponentiation of the *principle of bricolage* onto reality, in spite of an Europe seen as “open text”.

Just a few words about the methodological approach. Each phenomenon, concept, data, etc. used in this work is analyzed as a text. Related and interpreted as relations and interpretations of texts.

Contextualized as texts. If, like some argue, everything is a text, then the entry of something into perception is just a passage of the same text from a semiotic shape into another one, and the passage is an interpretation that should pick the hard-core of reality or existence which someone hypostatized.

It has been preferred to define more times and to recall concepts in order to avoid any obscurity – this work being an introduction – then to prevent any leap of logic, trying to keep a consistency during the exposition.

It is recommended to tridimensionalize this lecture, in the sense of crossing the mentioned books with the context in which they appear and, not to leave any fragments of path, to imagine what is written even from the last expressed concept toward the first one.