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Abstract

This research takes into consideration a specific part of Günther Anders thought, ‘The obsolescence of Evil’, in particular: ‘The Sorcerer’s Apprentice metamorphosed’. In ‘The Obsolescence of man, vol. II’, the destruction of human life is perpetrated by the man transformed in a ‘Sorcerer’, without a master of the atomic arrangement. In the industrial revolution era, this is a negative result for excellence, the maximum point of ‘Promethean gap’. The objective of this research is to move the reflection from Anders philosophical view to a law philosophical perception, searching for legal responses to the postmodern ‘logos’ that seem to have removed the central position of human nature; the logos is now free of the nomos. Is it possible an hermeneutic way, searching human nature over its obsolescence due to the modern power of products and machines? Over the ‘Promethean gap’, thanks to law and philosophy?
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Fig. 1. Antonio Di Marco, Chernobyl, Sculpture, private collection, Italy
1. NEGATIVE THEOLOGY: THE MAN FROM THE BIBLICAL ADAM BECOMES ‘SORcerer’ OF NUCLEAR ARTS: LOGOS WITHOUT NOMOS IN HUMAN NATURE

Who is the ‘Sorcerer’s Apprentice’? He is the man who, from Adam’s biblical concept is then transformed into a postmodern lord of magic arts. Through the language he communicates and manipulates, through the techniques, the languages of the world in the postmodern (Portinaro 2002, 158), characterize by the industrial revolution that has dictated new laws by modifying the logos: existence, world and cosmic order, in pre-Socratic Greek philosophy (Eraclito 1983, 179-221) where it seems no longer reside the ontology of being. “The second volume of the obsolescence of Man is like the first volume, a philosophy of technology. [...] By ‘technocracy’ I am not referring to the supremacy of the technocrats (as if they were a group of specialists who dominated contemporary politics), but to the fact that the world in which we live and which surrounds us is a technological world” (Anders 2003a, 4). In this way we have: the obsolescence of the individual, the obsolescence of the Society, the obsolescence of the Language (logos). “Anders, as we shall see, always thinks one thing, and that is the problem of man’s anthropological inadequacy (in his own language, the obsolescence) versus objects and automated structures of its production techniques” (Preve 2003, 11). In human nature, now, logos is without nomos (justice). “Hot out of the oven” (Anders 2003a, 40), are now the sons of this unstoppable industrial revolution. Which are the products? From the invasive media up to nuclear weapons: everything is an industrial product and everything must be consumed. If however the media consumption is able to cancel the human rights to self-determination in an aggressive market (Nencioni 2010, 10-16), equal to the unrestrained consumption of each single product, different thing is the matter of the atomic bomb technology. In this way, perhaps, philosophy is not enough, philosophy living obsolescence without the law. At the same time, the jurisprudential discipline, for atomic and like situations, is obsolescence if remains confined in formalism without hermeneutic construction.

“What Goethe has treated in his famous ballad Der Zauberlehrling (the Sorcerer’s Apprentice), I would not even need to remind this here. A Famulus steals to his master the magic formula that can transform an inanimate broom handle in a servant who works alone. Without worrying about the consequences of what he made, he enjoys the power and the immediate utilization of what he has transformed, not to the remapping of the formulas- Famulus utters the magic word and sort to the tool, which is now at his disposal as a robot, fill a bath with water. And the transformed tool obeys and completes independently the assigned job, indeed it obeys too well, at the end it obeys terribly well: in fact, even if it can perform alone its new task it is not enough independent to renounce to its autonomy” (Anders 2003a, 370). From Goethe to the technological analysis and hermeneutic of postmodern the ballad: thus terminates the imposing Ander’s opera on the obsolescence of man, vol. II. This reinterpreted ballad shows with poetic words the ‘Sorcerer’s Apprentice’ language (Zagari 1993, 7) that communicates with the instruments and crushes ontologically: living for himself, then the Promethean gap, “that is, the gap that exist between the maximum that humanity can produce and the maximum ‘shamefully small’ that humanity can imagine. It is also the evident gap between what we produce and what we can concretely use [...] it consists in anomalia indigentia, (as if to inamolable industry’s politic) we can need not enough necessity to consume” (Anders 2003a, 12-13). The analysis of the poetic text shows the peculiarities of Goethe’s masterpiece in particular how the ‘poetry language’ expresses the nomos, in this new analysis using law, to have stronger and concrete response, like G. Anders was usually try: the paths of true ontological, announcing the necessary research of a ‘legal brake’ to the decline of the logos that you believe the Almighty and his doing this it makes ‘ontologically emptied’. “This thought brings us suddenly at the main theme of our inquiry [...] The theme of language” (Anders 2002, 102). The analysis of the atomic bomb are perfected in the unfinished third’s volume on the human’s obsolescence around the theme of language: silences and silent languages before the Apocalypse. Anders analyzing Goethe, now we are searching with a new analysis the means of the atomic technique, uncontrollable: using law’s interpretation, over the ‘Promethean gap’. The language at the time of the ‘the third industrial revolution’, that perfects in fatal sense, Ander’s ‘second industrial revolution’, is interrupted ontologically in different ‘issues’, the most terrible is that the ‘atomic product’ able to destroy not only more existentially, but now also ‘materially’ man. The poem as a search for the true in the journey toward the language because the
maximum expression of language revealed (Heidegger 2002, 200-241) is in Goethe’s ballad, the manifesto of dangerous delusions of man’s omnipotence ‘now I forget the revelation of Being’: the law is called to stop, to ‘resize’ the languages of the modern Sorcerer’s Apprentice who have mastered the atomic. The magic formulas of the Apprentice opened to the lack of control which only ‘the old master’ remedied: and if the object handled was not a broom but an atomic bomb? As ‘ex post’ belatedly? How to communicate the interruption of a destructive task got out of scientists hands? “In brief: the reverse path the broom knows him just as his master, the Apprentice who put it in motion. Automatically, blindly and without even caring about the effects of what it does, the broom rushes towards the fountain to fill its dried, then back to pour, forwards and backwards, without end. If the water jets swell up to become a cascade, threatening to engulf the house and the road, this for him is the same, it will never even realize it. Unlike his so-called master, the Sorcerer’s Apprentice, that now begins to get an idea of what has set in motion: evoke a spirit without knowing how, even if he can get back to get rid of it” (Anders 2003a, 370). The same action performed by the modern man that, as in Goethe’s ballad, learned the rudiments of technological witchcraft believes to be able to master the communication and interaction with the object without the need to impose truly rigorous legal limits to his work (Anders 2002, 108 ss.): the product ‘Product’, this time is not a product of any kind, but the expression itself and deeper of legal nihilism of technique: “Our existence under the sign of the bomb” (Anders 2003b, 247). The second volume on obsolescence, that states the conclusion with the ‘languages and the metamorphosis’ of man become a Sorcerer without legal and ideological limit, it is linked to the less fragmented investigations of the first volume. The ‘legal discipline’ on nuclear disarmament exist, but according to Anders, is not sufficient: the danger of weapons of mass destruction is the most nihilistic and obscure product of the ‘industrial revolutions’ (Anders 1962, 1 ss.). What does the Sorcerer’s Apprentice in the poetic ballad? He recognizes the danger triggered, now over his hands, that the word is no longer able to defuse, already that same language compound of magical words now ‘interrupts its communication’- is ineffective. The Apprentice does not know the ‘correct rule’, yet the mechanism is now triggered, “but this belated recognition and panic in which he falls, are now useless, make things worse: in fact, when he throws on his servant so terribly active for stopping, Alas! It is too late; and when attempting to disarm it by cutting it in two halves, only achieved the opposite result: instead of putting an end to the disaster, they doubled. In fact immediately each half of the servant is transformed into a whole servant and, instead of one, now are two servants activated to cause the flooding. Next to drown and now completely desperate, the Apprentice called shouting the master” (Anders 2003a, 370-371). Eraclito’s logos and nomos (Punzi 2007, 164-166) are broken in ‘Sorcerer’s Apprentice’ at the time of crisis, in Goethe’s poem: “Oh my master and teacher, my cry unto thee not worth? He back at last: «Oh Master, helps you! The Spirits called, now resolve I do not know more!»” (Croce 1993, 78). The knowledge of the Sorcerer’s Apprentice for purposes of reflection in the course sees the use of poetic language ‘to evoke the dark forces of magic’ and then ‘for blocking the action’. The language of the Apprentice put into poetic verses is first safe and immodest to then become totally out of control and ‘incisive capacity’. The Apprentice is presumptuous: he believes that having simply heard the magic words allows to master, allows to check the spirits. This magician plays dangerously with the snakes in his tabernacle. It is a clear link with Heidegger, which brings a Trakl’s toward: “In his grave the white magician plays with his snakes” (1982, 173). The foreigner is who you adventure in the revelation of the Being, who seeks the circle where touch the law (Heidegger 2002, 207), but certainly not this reckless Anders Sorcerer who pretends to communicate with deadly tools-mortal, with the new atomic snakes. “He lives in his chamber, so quietly and lost in thought that he plays with his snakes. They cannot harm him. They have not been strangled, but their malice has been transformed” (ID. 1982, 173). From Heidegger to Anders: the modern Sorcerer’s Apprentice of science believes it has trapped ‘the snakes’ in its home, but in reality he is reckless master unable to communicate with the objects, such as in Goethe’s ballad. The snakes are not cramped and they do not obey certainly at this reckless ‘Apprentice’, but the laws of ‘late modernity‘. “The order of modernity, the function-purpose of authentic existence of law, the unity and strength of social morality is lost in the labyrinth of mega machine [...] The essential question, already anticipated, remains the following: Why the law in modernity is so?” (Argiroff 2007, 262). Oblivion of sense and legal removal in the logos of this Sorcerer: unwary or criminal? It’s not casual, the Anders philosophy was born on Heidegger’s
ideas: I think that Anders was the real ‘and new’ Heidegger’s heir, in a different way obviously: the atomic idea is the evolution of technical dictator by Heidegger. The language and its effects: here the communication between subject and object through the word shows all the symptoms of the *Promethean gap, in modernity post-human art*. In Goethe’s ballad, however there was a magic formula of the remapping, communicating with the object was allowed to make cease effects and more importantly, there was a teacher at which ask for help and teaching: “kBrooms, at the corner! In a moment! Recessed or boundaries, or you, spirits! The master only calls you for its purposes” (Croce 1993, 78). Poetry’s language, as Heidegger taught in his second period. And then, the language as poetry can allow you access the knowledge and the truth: in this sense we can trace in *Justice* ‘the land on which rests this research’. A natural law certainly (Preve 2003, 25); yet Anders has trained to reflection on our anthologies first, has taught us that it does not make much sense philosophizing for the sake of doing so and that if a philosophy exists, today must look to the salvation of man in the search never tamed of being, this is perhaps his *dwelling place* where the *Sorcerer’s Apprentice*, without presumption does not attempt to dominate occult powers: where the ‘Apprentice’ does not decide carelessly train and ‘attempt to communicate’ with snakes in freedom *in his tabernacle, whose language allows the positive metamorphosis of these, of new human*. What kind of law we research in Anders philosophy? A new Natural law, in the modern state of necessity: in the atomic time (Anders 1987, 3). The poetic language of the ballad and the language of the *Sorcerer’s Apprentice*, today. Has become a matter of communication with the technique from the ‘unnatural’ effects and toward ‘these effects’, the reflection of the jurist must aim to ‘placement of prognostic banks’ against the disappointment of modern atomic Apocalypse. Today, the whole humanity in contact with the technique is transformed into an army of *Sorcerer’s Apprentices* and the world is full of art spirits. Today we are *Sorcerer’s Apprentices*, not only we know that we do not have the magic formula of the remapping, we are aware of our powers of *Sorcerer’s Apprentices*: while manipulating the appliances we are fused with the spirits with which we believe we are communicating. We are missing a teacher able to revoke the *words* that have communicated with the spirits, we do not know who has this master (Anders 2003a, 371). The ‘question of rules and the laws of nature to administer’ is also already explained in Goethe’s text: “Whilst in order the old magician is once removed! And I want to control my spirits, now is given! His sayings and gestures now I noticed, and each rite: the wonders will follow to the strength of the invitation” (Croce 1993, 75).

Formulas and rules that then are expressed in the *communication* with the ‘servant’ subject: here is the relationship between *logos* and *nomos* as communication. In Anders, replaces the technique in all its complex languages and *industrial productions*: the *Sorcerer* multiply as the *servants* now able to subdue the masters with ‘apocalyptic’ effects. “Let us be clear. What Goethe has put in poetry as something that causes terror, as an event of the exception, worthy of a ballad adventure, this something to us happen uninterruptedly, it happens without respite. [Is mutated] the rule; that *I broom handles* become autonomous, the apparatuses (both in administrative sense that in a physical sense-technical), such as power stations, the atomic missiles, space appliances and major industrial installations necessary for their production, they form together our *everyday world*. Millions of people think that the production of these devices has become autonomous; the economy of entire continents would collapse if their manufacture suddenly ceases: all these things are today no exceptions nor sensations that you can sing to mode of ballad, as the sensation sung by Goethe” (Anders 2003a, 374). Through the words of the magic formula we produce these ‘modern spirits’ convinced to be able to master them through a *communication* with them: and yet our *laws* do not apply to objects animated by the spirit of the art. Our laws may not put a limit to the atomic processes and in general to the technological processes once started: behold the ‘promethean gap’ throughout its strength. The only laws that we can impose to child objects of the industrial revolutions are those of the *protocols required*, to govern the procedures put in place from time to time, in controlling the use or by imposing constraints well precise *Apprentice’s Sorcerer*, that through the magic formulas *communicate* life to technological objects in question. “And in the same way as part of the rules of everyday life that we do not think even rebelling against what our «Spirits» do and expect from us. On the contrary we see in the autonomous, automatic effectiveness of what we produced- that in the eyes of Goethe seemed still something terrifying- something normal, indeed, even something that
we welcome: that is the guarantee that our existence will continue to operate the plane” (Ibidem, 374-375).

2. CHERNOBYL IS THE NEW HIROSHIMA. THE NEW ‘SORCERER'S APPRENTICE’ WITHOUT NOMOS AND LOGOS. THE EVIL’S EVOLUTION

Sorcerer’s languages-formulas express the apocalyptic communication with objects. The men remain in his obsolescence, without legal protection. For Anders these spirits become increasingly independent with respect to words that have animated them, while men, as creators, become increasingly objects servants renouncing to their ontological plane: this is the communication at the time of the technique that involves in fact or in law, emptying of the issues of the now be deprived of its languages and therefore of its dwellings; objects have the power, we give power without knowing it. In this sense, how can we fail to think of the terrible effects of Chernobyl? The explosion of the nuclear power plant in 1986 was caused by serious failings from ‘the staff’ in terms of compliance with the security protocols and by the problems arising the plant itself: the incident was classified as Level 7 on scale INES, equaled only by the accident of Fukushima in 2011. Yet the Anders volumes were published respectively in 1956 and 1980: obviously the cry of this ‘not Sorcerer’s Apprentice’ was not ‘translated in terms of protection and legal discipline’, behold the delirium of the Sorcerers who in their total superficiality: scientific and administrative have allowed the human extermination. On Chernobyl Anders highlights the problem of the prior art that is slave of the economy, has totally entitled Atomic practices able to contaminate the Humanity, depraving of the right to exist. The moral law, our existential law must overcome the simply legality of the atomic bomb and energy, and their derivatives (Anders, 1987, 2-10). Hiroshima is like Chernobyl, which as shows, after Hiroshima, that humanity must be the servant of postmodern languages. (Anders 1986a, 65-66). Law to emphasize the needed emotional recovery in the postmodern age, against the misleading use of atomic energy of Chernobyl which is one of the perverse products (Ibidem, 65); that of Anders is a public complaint ‘communicating’ crimes to allow a return to the level of justice tragically violated. The thesis 4 (of article) is that Chernobyl is Hiroshima in substance that the atomic energy is destructive independently from its specific use. Chernobyl is the funeral oration where it is consumed the poem of human death (Fig. 1). Guilty Sorcerer’s Apprentice who demanded to check the monstrous. “The distinction between the use of war and pacific atomic energy community is neutral and misleading. Today, after Chernobyl, nobody can ignore this situation; supporters of atomic energy have become aware criminals” (Ibidem). Hiroshima and Chernobyl are the postmodern ballads of the Sorcerer’s Apprentices who have been victims of the objects to which they have donated carelessly life in pretense, ‘Almighty’, they teach and adjust with a language not suitable to govern “the language in the atomic era” (Anders 2002, 109). The third unfinished Anders volume speaking about the language of the atomic energy, shows the legal innocence that we have in fact attributed to these instruments of genocide. “Atomic weapons are considered innocent and blameless because they are objects of property [...] as they belong to someone, seem to have a right to exist, thus acquiring the positive quality of «legitimacy». In fact, the owners (but also us, the public) are in general unable not to see in these objects of property” (Ibidem, 112). The language of the complaint supports this: atomic weapons were legalized and this sophistry of legal form has removed ‘appearance’ attribute of monstrosity. “In fact, nothing has been able to delete so effectively the enormity of atomic weapons, «decriminalizing them», they are born as objects of property and come to us interpreted as such” (Ibidem). This is the unsound idea of modern Sorcerer’s Apprentices pupils of technocracy: one thing exists in nature if it is owned and used. The ontological existence of something is subject to the judgment of the usefulness. Something ‘exists’ if it is exploitable and it is right that everything has a master that exploits it in accordance with modern laws of technocracy (Ibidem, 112-113). Anders analyses and digs further into obsolescence’s of man through language, clarifying the centrality and the function ‘complaint’, communicating all the uneasiness of the postmodern age in an ever more explicit way and asking safeguards and concrete answers, ‘legal’. The language is the instrument for the ontological recovery of antiquated man. Surprised and not a little in the third unfinished volume from one side the radicalization of thought, especially on the atomic (and this is a very relative surprise), but above all an unusual closeness in the terms of ‘being ontological’ and with the master-enemy Heidegger. They both
admit the philosophical centrality of language: a privileged instrument of man and the place where these livings to exist possibly ‘in a dwelling’, the world, which is not destroyed by the Technique. For Anders, Goethe’s time was happy because he could use the poetry to share his ballad which remained a great story: a time from idealists; “happy times in which there ‘You could allow, without risking to be scorned as naive and unrealistic, creating the figure of a master, a man who having the antidote and to which it was enough to open his lips to make it even possible the happy ending’” (Anders 2003a, 375). Us ‘Sorcerer’s Apprentice’ of postmodernism we do not have a teacher to show us how to ‘moderate’ communication with the creation of objects. Continues Anders: “Happy Times really! Compared to us, the men of today, even the Sorcerer’s Apprentice, despite the desperate situation where it was, and despite the acute despair with which cries out aid, is still an enviable figure [...] he is enviable because, unlike today’s men, he perceives with his own eyes the danger evoked; because still understands that there is a reason to despair; and because, for that reason, it is still attempted to stop what has caused or is on the point of cause” (Ibidem, 375-376). In a certain sense, the Apprentice that has overestimated its powers has dared to ‘say formulas’ and ‘using magical rules’ which transcend his education. Yet this unwary Sorcerer knew to be such, a Sorcerer full of proud, precisely and therefore ‘still ontologically’ able to ask for help through language, the cry of despair, in search of a logos that can ‘Return to the laws of nature’ to their normal: the Sorcerer’s Apprentice search in the word, the law (nomos) stating the order where now chaos reigns. “But what is this? Ahy, what disgrace!... The word most do not know! The word that returns everything as first...” (Croce 1993, 76). The postmodern Sorcerer’s Apprentice instead communicates with modern broom handles in the art that other are not, if not atomic bombs and similar derivatives. These technological tools that often, in their turn, speak the ‘language of fragmentation’, are the full expression of the nihilism because legally do not have limits and, where these exist, appear as embankments too weak relative to their overflowing rivers, potentially destroyed. We are ‘Sorcerer’s Apprentice’ unwitting, which is worse than being an aware ‘Sorcerer’s Apprentice’. We are ignorant because we have never had a teacher able to explain the languages and the rules of the postmodern technology: we do not have a master with who communicat and to whom explain the negative effects of technologies broom handles. If this was true at a certain time, today we know ‘the perverse effects of our broom handles’ with which it is not possible to communicate: Hiroshima, Chernobyl are striking examples. Chernobyl and the guilt, back to what has been said before in the article by Anders. Thesis 4. Today we are criminal witnesses aware in the use of atomic energy. “The crime is not called only genocide but ‘globe destruction’, globe assassination. Who is in favor of the nuclear power plants? Still worse, who is favorable to regenerated plants and the breeder reactors to fast neutrons? It is certainly not better of what President Truman did when he bombarded Hiroshima. Indeed it is even worst because today we know much more than Truman could know. We know what we are doing, while Truman did not know what would have caused” (Anders 2002, 65). After Chernobyl, and now after Fukushima, we impose a new legal duty to protect that human logos that it appears today, still not protected. The atomic, like other types of industrialization have placed in serious danger humanity. Our ontological plane is in fact inclined. The Sorcerer’s Apprentice is a modern God. The power that derives from the mastery of the technology makes it almighty; power lies precisely in his capacity for self-destruction of the nihilistic omnipotence. How? Through the broom handles, namely appliances evoked and with which we communicate without ‘opening the ontological question’: beholding the distorted use of ‘broom handles’ to Hiroshima. Yet to this omnipotence corresponds ‘impotence’ in not being men, able to give the legal meaning to the laws of nature that are provided for our survival (Anders 1986b, 14-17). It is already the mere possibility of the annihilation of humanity the legal failure of our era. We are messengers incapable of ‘protecting us before the atomic threat’ (Ibidem, 376-377). It perfecf the industrial revolution which we are incapable of putting a brake: Hiroshima the case of cases, then Chernobyl, Fukushima. The Apocalypse of postmodern, the language of the Sorcerer’s Apprentice got out of hand, is no longer a question of dictatorship of the media and of consumption, now there is talk of ‘surviving physics of man’ before the atomic bomb: these are the mortal snakes escaped to the command of the magician. It is the failure of the naive idea of being able to communicate and to master the danger without the need
of imposing legal and ethical limits. In this way for a complaint of the language of the Apocalypse and a reversal of legal logic in order to protect ourselves: (Anders 2002, 108 ss.).

Back ‘circularly’ to the first volume of the antiquated man. Of the bomb and the roots. Our blindness to the Apocalypse. Ultimately, it is not a coincidence that we do not understand this evidence: we do not know that we have, in fact ‘the powers of a Sorcerer’ thanks to the technique, therefore, we do not know how to read the language of modernity and without this ontological understanding the legal instruments in place, are inadequate or otherwise unable to respond to the needs of modernity, in its complexity. “Given that the bomb is not suspended on our universities, but on the head of all of us, it would not be appropriate to philosophize on possible revelation in a specialized language to the intention of a group specializing” (Anders 2003b, 249). For Anders, the Atomic question cannot remain a theoretical issue confined in universities. “You should find a language that is not understood only in certain buildings: universities” (Ibidem). Anders’ man is incapable of questioning, answering these questions because incapable of saying the truth to himself: beholding nihilism at the time of the Atomic Apocalypse ‘Titans and Sorcerer’s Apprentices’: these are the men of Anders ‘ontologically in silence’. We are currently analyzing their language and also the languages of the world, from the perspective of the Apocalypse: We are still searching the master, who increasingly looks like the strong legal protection that can allow man’s survival, no more ‘Be but unconscious Sorcerer’, with the atomic arrangement. The Atomic, products of wars other are not be if not products, effects of the industrial revolution: everything can be marketed by the media to the weapons of destruction, globally also. If Hiroshima and Nagasaki were possible, due to ignorance and evil, Chernobyl and Fukushima are unacceptable. These are legal decline of the civilization, the logos disastrous of ‘Sorcerer’s Apprentice’ that have transferred the man to the laws of the industrial revolution. From philosophy to law, in searching of the international protection, in searching of the new man’s ontology. Talking about Chernobyl, which is most juridical dangerous than Hiroshima, because happening 40 years later, Anders wants the way to nuclear ‘global disarmament’. Us temporal heirs our despite of that epoch, although probably we do not want to use the atomic bomb and the other weapons genocides, creating a permanent danger, however we leave humanity in a constant danger because the ‘simple threat’ permanent, represents in itself a condemnation. “These men the permanent blackmailers should not be sought between us. The atomic terror began on August 6, 1945, and those that I take the aims are also the nihilists today, because what is at stake is the annihilation, the annihilation of the world. The decision to take action has already been taken once, in the war of Vietnam, with the aid of a computer. And if the exclusion of man from the decisions that affect the fate of humanity is not nihilism, then I do not understand the meaning of this concept” (1986a, 65).


Anders certainly, but also McLuhan spoke about the modern technological sorcery: “you see something that looks like a witch? […] The front part of the machine with its flamboyant cascade of lights, is like the phosphorescent mask of tribal wizard” (McLuhan 1984, 173). The theme of consumption, addressed by McLuhan, ends up by even touching the product ‘of war’ in this sense approaching to the Anders research, grouped together under the label of the Industrial Revolution (Anders 1986b, 14 ss.): the Philosopher and Sociologist have ‘clear lines of contact’. In the post-war period does not escape to the latter the effects of war, understood as the product between the products: here is the mask worn by the Sorcerer which is nothing more than the instrument, Goethe’s broom become tribal mask through which the modern communications. “Modern war is another advantage which allows the observer to note as merely the logistics of the war machine causes the propagation of the technological education and specialist. In the same order of cause and effect, the mechanized war or integral fosters the prosperity and economic well-being that is in itself an immediate denunciation of a situation in which we tend to have lost control and the vision of our purposes. As a creator of wealth and opportunities for all, the war has done to deface the peace in our time. The war has caused more education and a higher consumption standard for more people than peace has ever done. […] This is simply a way to indicate once again the reality that is at the center of the world. Accelerated
changes and a scheduled obsolescence constitute the primary principle of an economy based on industrial power built on the applied sciences. And is the production for use? Yes, but for the shortest possible us timeframe, in accordance with the manipulation of the market for the increasing pyramidal profits” (Ibidem, 248-249). Law seems still before this power of the market and of the art. The postmodern law seems to be the son of a minor god, concerned to answer this invisible to the dictatorships of the art. The language as communication in the postmodern lives the cleavage between subjects emptied ontologically and subjects became lords of the Apocalypse. The most important product of the industrial revolution, for Anders, is the bomb handled by the ‘Sorcerer’s Apprentice without teacher’. This instrument of global destruction to which the law must give a ‘full cut’, also from the point of view of the trials, stands at the postmodern as the Book of Revelation to the ancient language. At the bottom of modernity in the rules and places not ago that interpreting ancient knowledge. As in the Apocalypse of John (Giovanni), that of Anders is the prophecy on the fate of humanity in the moment in which we do not put a legal limit the definitive atomic question. “Against the «conspiracy of silence», contrived around the existence scandalous of the bomb, never tried to raise his voice, whereas the philosopher priority task is to unmask the reality of the terrible threat, bypassing language - for which he considered it indispensable to the appeal to the anger of Noah: «The shouted truth is more true of the truth that does not arrive at destination» - can be synthesized with a single abutment: make «lords of the Apocalypse» «enemies of the Apocalypse»” (Portinaro 1986, 49-50).

The new messengers of the apocalypse respond to “theology of atomic situation” (Anders 2003a, 376): the man believes to control the object by giving his order, in reality the technological object lives independently from the Creator. “The alleged emancipation of man (supposing it has never occurred in reality somewhere) is now followed by the undeniable emancipation of objects: «broom handles». Fall victim of which is not tragic - and I say this not really for cynicism - but something much more terrible: is stupid” (Ibidem, 378). The Anders theology is that it is not for nothing that religion, recovering elements of the biblical tradition, is stretched through the atomic prophecy, the survival of man even before the ontological recovery of the same: communicate the attempt of salvation in the time of technological religion, before the consumption of every kind of course, but even more, before the power of mass destruction tools, devastating tools, expression of postmodern cyclopean power able to annihilate the man with their whistling. We give the mythological example of Polyphemus, the Cyclops of the classical tradition. From the ancient Greek Πολύφημος ‘that speaks very, mouthy’. These modern technology means have the same destructive force of titans or of the Cyclopes and the same communicative absence with the man in their mortal’s word. From Odyssey: “Foreigners, who are you? Where do you come from? From the land? Or from the sea? […] a fool you’re, or foreigners, or you have come from far away, thou that I urge to fear the gods or to avoid the wrath. The Cyclops will not damage the thought of Zeus nor of the Gods Blessed: we are much stronger. Neither I […] save yourself or your teammates, if my mind requires it” (Omero, 2010, 519-521). It is not possible to establish a dialog between men and Cyclops, as well as the same communication was impossible between Sorcerer’s Apprentice and his broom. “So I said, and what immediately answered me with ruthless heart” (Ibidem, 521). The nature of destructive war instruments, bestial children of the industrial revolution, is dictated by their absence of meaning, from their non-existent ontological plane and exclusively machine, in which they can finally compel man that has completely dispersed the revelation of the ‘Be and hermeneutic’ in Heidegger. Only the law can respond by providing the appropriate legal means to confine and indeed to extinguish, the mortal dimension objects that haven’t ontological logos and therefore devoid of communicative capacity. These tools, to equal Cyclopes jurisprudential, live in total absence of laws, in which man is in danger of compromising himself losing control on the technique, which in nuclear weapons, see living modern Cyclopes that speak a lot, but are devoid of laws and empathetic aspects. Their logos does not communicate because devoid of nomos. “The land of the Cyclopes haughty, devoid of laws, we got […] have not assemblies to deliberate or laws. But inhabit the tops of high mountains in recessed caverns; and each submits his law” (Ibidem, 507). The aspect that most grieves is our alleged ‘legal innocence’ before the postmodern transformations (Portinaro 2002, 158). “On the other hand, the terror that I admit here is not identical to the negative classic religious, to original sin.
And much less, since the atrocities of the situation today, is not, however, our fault. We are not even more guilty, and we must not become even more guilty. All this is rather the effect of our human history, that passes over our heads” (Anders 2003a, 379). The ‘Promethean gap’ between humanity and industrial products is bigger. “Time after time Anders had recognized that the gap between the inutility of appeals to reason and to the responsibility and probity of the disaster was not that grow, ending to give ever more to its morals of the character of the surrogate negative of practice. From here the upsurge of the tone of the last writings, the impatience felt of controversy, the closure in a solitude no longer willing to reasons of dialog. Objects do not speak, and if the man takes the word, makes only more as the spokesman of things” (Portinaro 1986, 51). We are legally innocent or at least we think so before the language of art. There is a theology symbolized by analyzing the Sorcerer’s Apprentice from the implications of postmodern hermeneutic evidence: it is in the absence of control, in the communicative impossibility that exists between subject and technological instrument, the materialization of human decline possible with the absence of legal technique limitations. As repeated often, the ontological absence of languages leads to a symbolic dimension, where aw become icon private instrument of the dimension of the human being incapable of revealing the true in discernment; this takes place in the market of art: between the media and the tools of war of the Apocalypse, everything is produced, everything must be consumed. The end of the world feared by Christianity, described by John has already widely seen his first existence to Hiroshima: these are the technological horsemen of the apocalypse that descend from heaven to procure the destruction of their own creators in industrial forms, apocalyptic translation of ‘Promethean gap’, the reversal of values between man and machine (the atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki): Little Boy and fat man capable of killing approximately 246,000 people with only two ‘horsemen of the Apocalypse’. In that sense the language and law are manifested as communicative incapacity as well as between individuals, between man and technology? “In other words: today the danger of apocalypse is, despite that it does not present almost never with the solemn garments of a religious language, incomparably more serious than what we have never been the previous dangers of apocalypse [...] the temptation to commit to play such a «crime» (but the word is not sufficient) could certainly become irresistible [...] to the desire of aggression and destruction dominant today” (Anders 2003a, 380-381). However, as is evident, the use of these tools of destruction, sons of communicative interruption between subject and object, communication that it must be said, has never existed, puts humanity in front of a constant and uncontrollable danger and to which only the most stringent forms of legal protection can ask a concrete brake. It is not enough to denounce these phenomena, lawyers are called to understand fully the risks and to operate accordingly to the necessary search for ‘man’s protection’. In this sense, the technique, traced back to its function of inanimate broom, can really become an excellent instrument and servant of the real lord: man. To report, as, in this sense, in the direction of a useful communication ‘for the ontology of the Be’ is the International Week of disarmament, commissioned by the United Nations and aimed to ‘draw attention’ to the dangers in the arms race. It is in the global disarmament as requested specific legal and legitimating, the tool needed for the construction of a common language of peace. If in the seventies, the nuclear non-proliferation Treaty -what to think- if the danger is still not sufficiently concrete, of North Korea that in blatant violation of the ‘United Nations resolution’ has made four nuclear experiments: 2006, 2009, 2013 and 2016, communicating through the media the event that speaks the language of the apocalypsis? What to say about this as other nations who possess nuclear weapons and do not respond to international laws? If on the other hand, the United States, often considered as an example of democracy, have used in war these terrible horsemen of the Apocalypse, what would prevent other nations deemed to come ‘not democratic and legally dictatorial’ to operate in this sense, if you were in conditions even only distantly like United States in 1945? the North Koreans test speaks the technology language of atomic machines, that through the modern medias communicate messages of global danger in which we find ourselves: the law exists but in fact suffers the Promethean gap toward technology, too, incapable of being always and globally embankment and discipline; already in the Eighties he noted Anders as “these culprits (which is no doubt) know yet what they would do if (which also is no doubt) were still subject agents and not only beings who are blindly drag from automatic proliferate for their appliances. Even if this was the case, is a non-sufficient justification. However, it could still identify and stop individuals or groups while the high technical reality, which lies at the base of the current
period, is not identifiable and cannot be fought nor stopped” (Ibidem, 381). If the year zero was the birth of Christ, thus, for Anders, the new year zero was ‘the bomb of Hiroshima’ which has demonstrated that man might be able to destroy the whole humanity (Ibidem, 400), then himself through the language of the atomic bomb does not find legal limitations to its use. The technological Apocalypse, precisely: John communicates a message of salvation, of disclosure. “‘Apocalypse’ detection means. [...] The roots of this tradition are found in the Old Testament prophets [...] The characteristics more showy this type of tradition, [...] are the language highly imaginative and symbolic, often encrypted, and constant use of great visions and the scenography” (Galbiati 1979, 385). John’s analysis announces, with a symbolic language, the destinies of the world: “I had a vision: a door was opened in heaven. The voice that before I had heard talk like a trumpet said: salts here, I will shew thee things which must happen later” (Giovanni 1979, 401); the gate, precisely. That the Lord (Sorcerer’s Apprentice) passage could symbolize the transit as forgetfulness, opening or turning off of the logos. Who is, however, at the time of the technological revolution, the lamb for sacrifice? The man who from shepherd of being is transformed ontologically and has become feeble in voice, incapable of ‘match the strength of its industrial products’, only able to activate through sorcery imprimis apocalyptic language of art through its hermeneutics’ absent. On the other hand, the apocalypse is characterized by symbols and icons and shows the remoteness from that ontology of being emptied now the direction; if there is an apocalypse: religious or technology there is a description of an ontological decline of Be. The time of the theological Apocalypse, that of John. “Good Times were those when the evil manifested still in evil or in malignant and when he could hope to be able to fight the evil fighting against evil. [...] Today we threaten the survival of the world because we had become sinners by nature or by a «fall»; but because we are the Sorcerer’s Apprentice, because, even with the best conscience, we do not know what we do when we produce our products; because there is no clear that what they want these products when they are slipped out of our hands [...] be Sorcerer’s Apprentice means: not knowing what they were doing, not knowing what produce means act, and not imagine or fear, or not knowing how to repent it in a second time, what could cause through what is produced or occurred” (Anders 2003a, 381-382). The habit of modern wizards is no longer that of black capes but has now many garments: all those who favor the ascent of the art from the moment our formulas stringent in respect of the ontology of man shepherd of being are no longer able to govern, through sound communication between various organs and structures, languages of postmodern. The legal nihilism of the Sorcerer’s Apprentice is manifested when the right shows itself incapable of setting the logos in the right direction ontological, in function of the man only true lord of globalization. International protocols and legally inviolable rules equipped with ‘Practice’ are the teacher able to save us, but in which we pour all our ontological sense: Hiroshima has shown the effects of this late understanding. Chernobyl also with the greater guilt of ‘recidivism’, recently Fukushima. To inhabit this dwelling place of language man must be the guardian, must become a patron of himself.

The languages of apocalyptic production require discernment and determination on the part of the man. That precisely because it does not have the ability to defuse the process, precisely for this reason must legally show rigorous in its preventive action. But if some industrial products such as the means of communication technology can be perceived as destructive because empty man of size pathos ontological, otherwise, the apocalyptic products that have seen their mortal life in Japan cut the root of the problem: eliminate man despite everything that has laboriously constructed. Is law once again the only teacher able to put a brake on this miserable decline of man incapable not only of revealing the be in language but just to survive, a master to govern with the logos, in the nomos, the postmodern innocent Sorcerer’s Apprentice. The communication that cannot assume the role of the complaint as the only possible salvation, is the fundamental starting point, the notitia criminis: “the thinking of the past decades, in this faithful expression of a society disenchanted, hungry and bored, has lost the sense of its own investigation, up to hide the laborious search for truth [...] The building planetary order imposes, therefore, choices and [...] must shrug off once and for all, fear, it too tragically twentieth-century, to speak of what you should not speak. Where is the danger, also grows what Save, you could repeat with Heidegger” (Punzi 2003, 404-405). See agree with Anders, in which
technical problem change prospective: from theory to concrete; “my reflections always relate to individual phenomena and very concrete of our life today” (Anders 2003a, 386).

4. PREDICTIVE HERMENEUTICS, ANALYZED IN PHILOSOPHY OF LAW: LOGOS AND NOMOS; OVER THE ‘PROMETHEAN GAP’

What can save us from the modern industrial apocalypse when this becomes even atomic bomb? Consider restarting from Heidegger. Something that is not entirely clear or ‘there is not entirely clear’, this is the Anders research of solution that invokes Heidegger, just for a starting point. “If the interpretation is necessary, this is already implicitly said something about what is to be interpreted on the institution: that is to say, that it does not reveal of everything that is that hides partially. This sounds is ‘Heidegger’s voice’, and the remembrance of Heidegger in this case is a must” (Ibidem, 391). Heidegger is without surprises the determinant anchor for the snapping of the Anders reflection. Perhaps more the first Heidegger that the second, one mostly taken into consideration in this work, but the thing looks unusual since Anders leads to maturation and erosion many themes of the second Heidegger, somehow ignoring the teacher for not having to pay an unfair duty: language, art and ontology are concretely redesigned in the masterpiece in two volumes of mature reflection of the Polish philosoper. For a confirmation in this sense: (Preve 2003, 14). It should also be said that judging by the parties of the unfinished The obsolescence of man, vol. III, the rapprochement with the second Heidegger and greater decision toward the dissertation on ‘legal instruments’ and ‘communication in the form of open complaint’, it is much more marked, particularly in the context of a text which acts as ‘authentic interpretation’ for the two who preceded him chronologically. In this way, I think that the incomplete vol. III, is really the ultimate Anders writing after 80’s. In this sense, I think that is clear a possible approach to philosophy of law ‘logos and nomos’ (1987, 3 ss.). Progressive, Anders ‘en plein air’ system, created a new hermeneutic way (Anders 2003a, 3-8): the prognostic system which is more concrete than Heidegger’s hermeneutic system and ‘open’ to this possible rereading in juridical prospective. And so it is that Anders analyzes the Greek’s ἀλήθεια. In the wake of the ontological Heidegger’s reflection, it is not enough to discover what is hidden but we must discover the fact itself of the hiding. The knowledge of the truth must liaise with the object and then ‘the Be’ must not hide the truth and in this sense, should not impede the ratio with the object. The man then cannot live in a world that is totally obscured: in this way we are able to read the languages of the world in relation with ‘the Be’ revealing the truth: the danger of nuclear installations; already because we seem incapable of talking hermeneutics the danger and therefore to provide the legal protocols of our salvation (Ibidem, 392-395). Yet the Go to the objects themselves seem to be the only instrument capable of ‘understanding the languages of the industrial world in nuclear danger’: the complaint as communication between beings, because living, because men ‘in languages of art’ that do not communicate with us, but expect our obedience. The truth must correspond, as the path of language to answers of legal protection precise, even stronger and binding of the current U. N. protocols. “For example, the nuclear plants (even when they are not specially subtracted from the eyes of the world) does not have any particular aspect, resemble mosques with chimneys, and not reveal minimally what effects must produce and may cause [...] Make the products thus inconspicuous that they even become invisible” (Ibidem, 394-395). The language of the atomic bomb empties the ontology of being tried by man because it responds to the dictatorship order of the industry with its law and its iconic word. Preve write: if the first volume of the human’s obsolescence focused on means of mass communication and the atomic bomb in the second twenty-eight compositions rhapsodic marks the passage to ‘the third industrial revolution’, that of irreversible production that marks the year zero with Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Between ’56 and ’80 gives a firm grounding the Anders thought (2003, 18). Media are oligarchic rights that through language as medias communication alters reality. In this sense, aligned with Anders, Fennell: he explains logos and nomos as the communication of the art in Hiroshima, the new year zero of humanity: the western world has legally acquitted Hiroshima and condemned Auschwitz. Are manifested the dilemmas in interpreting two cases legally comparable as characterized both by the massacre of the innocents. (1999, 4 ss.). The law (nomos) is a formal system to remove the sense of injustice, to clean the human’s logos, human without conscious. “The effect is simply kept silent; no,
not even this, even the word «silent» is too positive, because it does not think even more to prevent or avoid, to mention the effect. As little as in our everyday conversation there comes to mind having to explicitly remove the mention of Auschwitz. The coercion to remove is already outdated on its part is already «removed» [...] you cannot say with respect to the ideas of Auschwitz or Hiroshima. Simply «There are no», «not worth talking», and therefore are unreachable for those who speak” (Anders 2002, 117).

It is precisely through an oracular language that the technique imposes its apocalyptic drawing with the bomb. “To prevent the extreme danger of a call-out of conscience there is constructed of beings to whom you can put the blame, machines-oracles therefore, robots of electronic consciousness- why else are not machines cyber calculators that now, quintessence of Science (and with this progress, and with this, in all respects, of moral), have in this storm, responsibility, while the man is considered apart and, for half grateful for half triumphant, washes its hands. For someone who operates the appliance, the question if the object is inserted in the circuit as a game of levers is justifiable, even if it is simply makes sense, no longer has any importance, as is natural, [...] with this transfer of responsibility to the object (considered «objective») and with the replacement of the «responsibility» with a «response» Mechanical he has transformed the «due» in a «right» from chess game, but this transformation inspires terror” (Anders 2003a, 256-257). Hiroshima and Nagasaki, between: logos and nomos. “The problem of imputation is confused. The blame lies not just in the past but also in the present and in the future: culprits are the assassins who use the atomic bomb but also the victims who will die and those they have accepted implicitly his existence (Ibidem, 266). Anders wants to indicate a duty more binding of simple abstention, of non expedit. “No, our duties are more serious. In fact, we must hinder and effectively bond the hands to those who, obtuse and omnipotent, have the right to decide the ‘Be or not Be’ of humanity. Orders as those imparted forty years ago - annihilate Hiroshima and Nagasaki-must no longer be imparted in the interest of humanity present and future” (1986a, 66). This sense of consciousness is the return to Greek’s logos in search of the nomos to protect humanities, in the ‘necessity state’ (Anders 1987, 5). Without the centrality of being as a speech last: switching off of the right in the word is not oriented to a constructive understanding. “Similar commands and the like masters must not exist more. Those who deny the duty to oppose resistance becomes an accomplice. And who even fights the resistance as happened for example in Wakkendorf, you naturally render even more accomplice” (Anders 1986a, 66). The relationship between logos and nomos becomes complex and is the only way to salvation. “The Atomic is a total weapon which already use the minutes constitutes a legal guilt: the mere possibility of use responds to an ultimatum for humanity, a permanent ultimatum. This is the permanent blackmail to which we submit as humanity that has a global reach. To speak of the atomic wars means to speak of our end as humanity. The right is unusable before the prospect of annihilation operated by means of atomic technology” (Anders 2003b, 268-273). The ability to understand and moving ‘predictive’ is the only possible salvation. Yet this salvation requires the human’s sensation different with respect to that of the known: requires the feel, as the word of the soul. Reply to industrial product of the atomic bomb with the poetic feel of Rilke (Ibidem, 278-282). Mutatis mutandis perhaps even against the Anders wishes, resurfaces that language as ‘Opening poetic’ which in the second Heidegger had the fundamental role (1990, 1 ss.). Already it seems that against the languages of the apocalypse (industrial and the atomic, and its derivatives) the only way both the return of the right way. I through the rediscovery of the meaning: the dwelling of ‘the Be’ seeking its protection and its adjustment through the nomos. The sense of Hermes needs in the postmodern its protection, the right message through a legal direction that face precisely the logos as deep knowledge, from Heidegger to Anders, the new predictive hermeneutics way, witch transformed in language and ontology Heidegger. The atomic is the element for a change, for an evolution and restyling. In fact, today of the necessary exercise for the ‘Sorcerers’ in the possession of the atomic bomb; “an appeal, but not an appeal heard directly, as the voice of conscience, but an appeal that we launch ourselves: why the launch beyond the fracture created by the difference in height, as if the faculty remained on the other side were people; and they are, the imagination and the feelings that must hear or to whom we wish first of all «teach you hear». And this is really all that you can say in a few words. Because nothing can be communicated what happens after this time: from the true awakening of the faculty, of their uncertain attempts to come out of themselves, their efforts to adapt...
to the objects that make up the task assigned to them: in short; expansion itself” (Ibidem, 284). Also Heidegger research for the language of postmodern the law’s hermeneutic key, the rules (1982, 57 ss.). This awareness, this interior reading as answer in ‘natural law’ for the salvation from the industrial revolution irreversible, aimed ‘to limit the nihilism of art’ sees an encounter with the reflection of the second volume, on realism as fantastic-surrealist concealment of being. After a dialog in which Anders communicates with ‘an expert of art’. They talked of surrealist languages and the Impressionists; it shows ‘all the load iconic’ that comes to light, and not only. As long as the subject of the painting and argue is the modern atomic bomb: behold the over sensible appear as the only imaginable dimension but not understanding in disclosure. It is a top us, we can only daydream and symbolize the Genocide (Ibidem, 298-309). The atomic bomb shows the over sensitive. We are not able to communicate it ontologically because above us for power: “Our sensitivity in conceiving makes a step ontologically too short because the paint it leads to ‘reduce’ in images that hide its destructive value” (Ibidem, 298-300). The language of Apocalypse it’s the same of Sorcerer’s Apprentice: dumb languages of the Apocalypse (Anders 2002, 108). “We are beyond and the surreal is transformed into real: man is able to wipe because he lost his sensible dimension, logos without nomos. The deception to which underlies the modern man lies precisely in this difficulty to recognize real and fantastic in the language dictatorship imposed by the technology tools: the language and the necessary ontological rediscovery as key to ‘communicate’ legal protection in response to industrial hazards apocalyptic. “But if the ghosts make the effect to be empirical, and if the empirical appears ‘great’, then the aut-aut of perception and imagination is ‘really canceled’; we do not recognize our world […] because he believes precisely, rightly, that the normal appearance of the world is a deception” (Anders 2003a, 309). Anders precisely in communicative request of a law of nature, invokes ‘request of salvation’: “law without legislator […] »law of nature«” (2003b, 306). This law of nature has found the answer in the languages of existentialism, beyond the positive regulation in search of a theorization of being in the law. In this sense, the philosophy of the German’s law was influenced by Heidegger searches in the existential prospective. (Di Robilant 1956, 18-23).

How can then, the ‘Sorcerer’s Apprentice’ who unknowingly has worn clothes and made the rites, do now, Kafk-esque Metamorphosis on the contrary, once again becoming ‘rights’? Rediscovering the word, the formulas of sense ontologically oriented in the hermeneutics of postmodern? Through the “predictive hermeneutics” (Anders 2003a, 396) the call forward, in the attempt to understand and regulate the technologic languages in which humanity ontologically crash: the right appears to be the only instrument capable of reading this hermeneutic of the ‘ontological remapping’. Understand belatedly and ex post there is no longer possible at the time of the danger of the atomic bomb: here is the ‘day of ever’ to which no master ex post can be remedied by imposing to the object the formula for the cessation of the monstrous effects. It serves a legal response to ‘preventive’, used in the techniques of complaint to respond to the crisis of post-modernity, a nomos to educate the logos. “Anders came asking his reflection also toward the research and the proposal of practical forms of technological obstruction […] among other things has assumed the introduction of a «Hippocratic Oath» in all professions of an industrial society advanced, with the intent to declare immoral every work that directly or indirectly contribute to the production of means of destruction” (Portinaro 1986, 50). In this way, talking about the atomic language, using Punzi’s juridical analyses, it’s necessary searching the right way for human’s existence between Eraclito’s logos and nomos. The real logos you take over the deception. It is the true law-principle of the world wich may be of a few only, beyond simple appearances why ‘true wisdom’ (2007, 165). Going beyond the ‘Promethean gap’ of the obsolescence, there are logos and nomos.

There is no coincidence that the first volume ends on the plasticity of feelings. In this idea on the anthropology of man stretched to be as a response to the atomic nihilism, emerges throughout the need to return to the conscience and the ontological evocation, like the past. From the arts to the word ‘man tries retransforming’ clashing with precisely the language that is often, like Severino’s analysis: essence of nihilism (1982, 145-193). Studying history we learn that the word does not ontologically directed to true and righteous can make law by opening the doors of the oblivion of the nomos: “nationalism came to power […] the door word of nihilism is not restricted to be a door word, but as head, put in place the equivalence of law and force, then, imitating natural forces, liquid actually the
weakest. Plug and its movement almost exclusively of words belonging to the terminology of nature [...] The «nature», a time banner of movements of freedom, became then, [...] The preferred word of terror” (Anders 2003b, 326).

In conclusion, perhaps not by chance, in describing the relationship of language and law (logos and nomos) as ‘protection of man’, against the apocalyptic of atomic, Anders in the first volume, uses a ‘tale didactic’ thus recalling in ways and then in the alternation of light and darkness, those Kafka’s scenarios (1970, 153-199) where this metamorphosis 'now positive' toward the rediscovery of ‘the Be’ must occur: from postmodern icons return to the ontology of the logos. “You question: ‘These rules are binding’?” (Anders 2003b, 328). The logos with a new ontology in the nomos must strive therefore to that existential reclaimed of the ontological languages that through the legal protection, can ‘win nihilism’ of emptying the sense in which through the technique was precipitated the man became his despite, perhaps, Sorcerer’s Apprentice incapable of governing languages and rules of the objects with which he believed and still believe to be able to communicate, but from which it may instead be annihilated, forever.
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