

INTERPRETING THE CONCEPT OF POLITICS IN TERMS OF PREFIXATION

Irina Zhurbina

Udmurt State University
Universitetskaya str., 1/4, Russia, Izhevsk
e-mail: soloveyIV1@mail.ru

Abstract:

The article analyzes the revision of the concept of politics caused by the exhaustion of the ideological paradigm. In modern philosophy politics acquires new meanings through prefixing, resulting in the emergence of such concepts as archi-politics, para-politics, ultra-politics, trans-politics, or bio-politics. These new concepts close the philosophical source of politics laid by the Greek tradition. The departure from philosophy as the source of politics is completed with the idea of police, in which prefixing as a way of conceptualizing politics reaches the linguistic limit. However, modern philosophy encompasses a more positive attitude, which is linked to the hermeneutic tradition of philosophizing of Heidegger and Gadamer that focuses on the preservation of thought and language in the source of political existence.

Key words: Archipolitics, Parapolitics, Ultra-politics, Transpolitics, Biopolitics, Metapolitics.

In the post-modern era, the existence of the world as a whole is most fully expressed in the concept of globalization. Global processes are changing the essence of the social world, which is losing its structure, stability, and guaranteed order. We come across the effect of 'escaping' social reality, when it becomes impossible to state anything about the social world using the terminology of traditional discourses. The era of global change allows us to speak about 'the end of the world as we know it' (Wallerstein, 1999). There is a widespread belief that in an era of global transformations, no idea that claims to be the dominant ideology can any longer perform the function of a political strategy governing society. All ideologies that were more or less important – communism, liberalism, conservatism – have reached their limits and have become unsustainable.

The world is entering an 'after liberalism' era, which will inevitably change the general paradigm of politics (Wallerstein, 1995).

In philosophical discourse, to overcome the ideological paradigm in politics one has to re-think the source of politics set by Greek philosophy. The sources inevitably refer to the Greek concept of ἀρχή, which has two meanings. It means both 'beginning' and 'command, rule', which indicates that the source is always the dominant principle (Agamben, 2013). Since the source of politics is Greek philosophy, referring to the source involves further interpretation of the word πολιτικά. Noteworthy is the fact that new meanings behind the concept of politics evolve out of prefixing as a linguistic way of conceptualizing. Currently, the most important concepts are biopolitics (Foucault, 2008), transpolitics (Baudrillard, 1983), metapolitics (Badiou, 2005), parapolitics, archipolitics (Rancière, 1999), and post-politics and ultra-politics (Žižek, 2009), which do not form either a conceptual unity or a holistic view. Instead, they show different modes of politics' existence. The increasing number of prefixes indicates that in the socio-philosophical discourse, the concept of politics begins to live its own life as a linguistic construct. It should be noted that the concept of politics is fleshed out with content only when it has a prefix. In prefixal interpretation, politics becomes a homonymous notion with a formal structure. The word politics, pronounced and written in the same way, is each time re-read by researchers through a lens established by the prefix with which the word starts.

Prefixing is done by adding to the root word of 'politics' a Greek or Latin prefix bio-, archi-, ultra-,

trans-, para-, meta-, or post- through which the word takes on an additional meaning, which is not so much the emergence of a new one as the revision of the old one. There is a steady trend of using only those prefixes which expand the meaning of the word 'politics'. Prefixing constrains the formation of new concepts by transforming the old ones. The general meaning of prefixes is determined by semantics, according to which the use of such prefixes as super-, post-, neo-, hyper-, meta-, or archi- makes it possible to go beyond the traditional meaning of the word. Prefixing violates the tradition of using the concept of politics that exists in the language of philosophy. The meaning of politics is expanded so as to acquire a variety of meanings, i.e. lose the terminological stability of a category. One can clearly see how prefixes that are synonymous in terms of their form (archi-, ultra-, trans-, meta-, post-, para-) with a similar meaning of 'going beyond' begin to differ conceptually. Having explored the prefixes, we can distinguish their temporal meanings through which it is possible to see the concept of politics in perspective – the beginning (archi-), the middle or process (bio-), and the end (post-). While archi- returns us to the revision of the past tradition existing in permanence, the prefix post- seems to turn us to the future of politics, which can be defined and redefined endlessly because of its uncertainty. An attempt to revise the past tradition gives rise to various ideas of the beginning of politics, and an appeal to the future returns it to the present in the 'end of politics' concepts. Between the beginning and the end, as the past and the future, unfolding is the space of the politics of life determined by the concept of biopolitics.

The beginning of politics opens with Plato's theory of state, politics, and laws. The modern concept of archipolitics, according to Rancière, returns us to Plato's "political idyll of achieving the common good by an enlightened government of elites buoyed by the confidence of the masses" (Rancière, 1999, p. 93). The prefix archi-, meaning, firstly, precedence, rule, and, secondly, a high degree of anything, indicates that politics is subject to a higher principle. In the teachings of Plato, the source of politics, its ἀρχή, is knowledge understood as λογος. Knowledge is the highest Good, i.e. the principle without which natural life (physis) exists in its incompleteness and randomness as a chaotic multiplicity of individuals deprived of their unity. Philosophy, which is the highest degree of manifestation of knowledge in general, transforms politics into art,

which fully presents itself in the implementation of the law (nomos) of Good, Kindness, and Justice in state government. State organization depends on how good the politicians' knowledge of the highest ideas of Good, Kindness, and Justice is.

The concept of archipolitics departs from the philosophical source of politics. Knowing loses the meaning of logos (λογος), which leads to the ultimate rationalization of not only thinking, but also the entire sphere of knowledge. Rationalization becomes a way of organizing the social world, in which science and technology gradually begin to dominate. Knowledge in politics is necessary to the extent to which it contributes to rationalization and optimization of the governance of the social world. With regard to modern conditions, archipolitics is a concept justifying the power of science and expert management of the state. This situation occurs when the general understanding of political power changes. It is as if archipolitics demonstrates the transfer of power from politicians to 'experts'—bearers of scientific knowledge. In the context of this general transformation of ideas about political power a special form of government – epistemocracy – appears. Epistemocracy is a result of the development of management techniques, demonstrating the level of human knowledge. Rationality becomes the basic principle of state governance. It establishes a connection between politics as practice and politics as knowledge, with science being its supreme incarnation. Epistemocracy changes the relationship between science and politics. Within epistemocracy as a special form of government, an intellectual generalist independent of the state is replaced by an intellectual specialist, who is politicized and partisan, and involved in the state management process (Foucault, 1980, p. 129). Specialists get involved in the vicissitudes of political life, where they play the role of experts, allowing them not only to legitimize their own scientific knowledge, but also to use the state to fulfil their own power ambitions.

The power of scientific knowledge divides society into two non-uniform parts: those knowing and not-knowing. Citizens take on an obligation to be controlled, i.e. agree to be not-knowing and act as objects of control. The not-knowing part of society, due to their incompetence, i.e. lack of expertise, are, in fact, removed from discussion and decision-making that affect the development and well-being of society. The knowing part is represented by experts. The role of the expert is determined by the presence of specialized knowledge sufficient for

decision-making in the field of economics, law, education, medicine, science, information technology, etc. The level of professional qualifications or expert competence determines the significance of the issues discussed with the expert. Expert systems are developed by means of specialising in certain areas of management, resulting in narrowly specialized expert groups dealing with specific issues of ecology, chemical and biotechnological production, nuclear energy, genetics, etc. There is a peculiar pattern: the narrower the specialization becomes, the more limited the scope of the expert knowledge is and the bigger the number of experts becomes.

Expertocracy can be regarded as one of the ways epistemocracy manifests itself. It is believed that an expert opinion should increase the predictability and controllability of natural, technological, and social processes. However, no expert opinion can either give a definite answer to the question about the long-term effects of any event that has occurred as the result of a natural or man-made disaster, or predict the ways in which human behavior may engender or contribute to a potential accident. Therefore, any expert solution increases the degree of uncertainty and creates unforeseen and unintended consequences. There is always a chance that something which experts believed to be impossible will happen. Expertise includes risk assessment. Unintended consequences are no longer an exception, but an inevitable rule of the system of government. Rationalization of the expert government system reaches its peak in situations where it changes its priorities and strategies—where, for instance, the government transitions from ensuring peace, security, and stability to focusing on reducing the likelihood of damage and environmental, chemical, nuclear, genetic, or other threats. Risk management is intended to include risk experts for whom risk assessment itself is a very risky activity. Risk record, forecast, and assessment by experts removes any responsibility from the experts themselves. Thus, the knowledge that underlies the source (*ἀρχή*) of politics is classified by the possibility of its use in management practice, which significantly narrows the scope of knowledge by reducing it to expertise. As knowledge can give impetus to opposite-direction actions, it reduces the level of rationalization of management. Expert management is limited by unintended consequences, which are seen as inevitable limitations of the system of control. This means that decision-making is no longer a solution to the problem. Since actions of experts increase uncertainty,

the rejection of the decision becomes a marginal administrative action that can be accepted in the conditions of a growing danger.

Modern revision of the beginning of politics demonstrates the uncertainty of political power. The existence of parallel processes in the modern management system fully reflects the concept of parapolitics, which is based on Aristotle's doctrine of the principles of separation of power and redistribution. Rancière writes:

“Parapolitics is, first, this centering of political thought on the place and mode of allocation of the *arkhai* by which a regime defines itself in exercising a certain *kurion*” (Rancière, 1999, p. 72).

Aristotle's source of politics no longer opens with philosophical knowledge. The source of politics is power that determines the essence of the politics. In this case, the concept of *ἀρχή* means ‘command, order’ and refers to dominance. However, Aristotle's works discuss the modes of existence of public power, the essence of which is manifested in the process of communication.

In the concept of parapolitics, the Greek prefix *para-*, meaning, firstly, a retreat, a deviation, and secondly, rework, change, indicates there are parallel processes in the structures of power. The public form of power is only a facade, behind which there is an invisible, half-shadow power focused on the redistribution of resources and based on unwritten rules and regulations, rather than law. Public and half-shadow actions of those in power lead in opposite directions. Noteworthy is the fact that synonymous with the prefix *para-* are such prefixes as *trans-*, *in-*, *against-*, and *out-*. The source of such politics is completely non-transparent, invisible to society. Half-shadow power follows the principle of one hand washing the other, being a closed circle where there is nepotism, cronyism, protectionism, favoritism, etc. Solovyev writes:

“While in the public sphere the main players are important government officials, political leaders, public opinion leaders, public administrators (of parties and NGOs), political journalists, in half-shadow power their places are occupied by apparatus ‘figures of influence’ and informal, reference (kinship, family, friendship, community, and so on) coalitions and groupings” (Solovyev, 2011, p. 80).

Reduction of public politics and constant expansion of half-shadow power are accompanied by a shift of boundaries between legal and illegal activities of those in power. Increased illegality reveals itself in the emergence of corruption schemes in

public management practices (bribes, kickbacks). All that was illegal acquired the status of unwritten norms and rules typical of shadow forms of management, including splitting the pot, administrative raiding, illegal channelling of public funds offshore, etc.

It is as if parapolitics demonstrates that the principles and priorities that are proclaimed by those in power can be completely opposite of the policy conducted by the state. The existence of shadow and half-shadow power increases the uncertainty of governance or management, where there is no connection between the words and actions of those who govern and who power belongs to. Discussing any social problems in the framework of public politics turns out to be demagogic ‘idle talk’, or ‘talking shop’, which is not supported by any further action. Following its unwritten norms and rules, the government may say one thing and do the opposite, and vice versa, may speak without doing, or do something without speaking.

Closing – in the literal sense of the word – the source of politics allows the non-transparent and uncertain government to act without any explanation or justification of the reasons for its action. The source of such power is determined at the time of an emergency situation. The concept of ultrapolitics is based on K. Schmitt’s theory, according to which politics is defined in the ‘case of emergency’ (*extremus necessitatis casus*) (Žižek, 2009). In this case, the prefix *ultra-* indicates the highest characteristic of politics, the function of which ‘the state of emergency’ performs. To declare ‘the state of emergency’ is the prerogative of the sovereign, who is not distinguished in a normal condition of peace, safety, and order, but arises in the exceptional case of urgency, when someone with ambitions to assume unlimited power attempts to stand out (Schmitt, 2005). The sovereign creates and guarantees the way in which situation as a whole transpires in its totality, that is, the sovereign confers on himself a higher right—that is independent of the law and does not derive from anything but itself—to make the final decision, which stands apart from the rule of law and proves that the sovereign, in order to create this privileged right for himself, does not need to have the right or precedent to justify it. Deciding, as specifically the legal action of the sovereign, is outside the law, and is therefore unrestricted in legal terms, i.e. becomes absolute. This shows that when the source of politics is closed, the sovereign decision is the only form of public presentation of power.

In an emergency situation the sovereign decision defines friend and enemy. The existential meaning of friend and enemy is always that the enemy is a stranger on the current existential level (Schmitt, 2007, p. 27). Ultrapolitics is an armed struggle against the enemy, the ultimate expression of which is war. Schmitt writes:

“The friend, enemy, and combat concepts receive their real meaning precisely because they refer to the real possibility of physical killing. War follows from enmity. War is the existential negation of the enemy” (Schmitt, 2007, p. 33).

War becomes the only possible action of the government conducting the policy of ‘the state of emergency’. The concept of ultrapolitics fulfils the right to engage in war, which is no longer a protection or resistance practice, but is rather a preventive action of the government, justifying their existence through the declaration of ‘the state of emergency’. The action of the government toward any citizen, including killing, becomes a preventive measure and remains unpunished.

Thus, it is now possible to observe the transformation of the Greek interpretation of the source of politics. Moving away from knowledge turns the source of politics into a non-transparent source of power, when those who have it begin to act as if they know nothing about the consequences of their actions. This creates an impression that the source of politics is fragmented, anonymous forces represented by countless expert communities, expanding the matrix of bureaucracy, managers, and government administrators. Anonymity de-humanizes (or de-personalizes) power and generates a general feeling of spontaneity of all that is happening with no one in charge. The only action, publicly demonstrating the authority in power and representing the beginning of politics, is ‘the emergency situation’ caused by social unrest and a threat to society.

Another mode of the beginning of politics is archipolitics, which shows that rejection of knowledge (*λογος*) as the source (*ἀρχή*) of politics, returns us to the archaic heritage of the past. The existence of the past in the politics of the present is most fully expressed in Eco’s metaphor that the ‘Middle Ages have already begun’. More recently, U. Eco argues, our era has been spoken about as the new Middle Ages. The beginning of the new Middle Ages is reflected in the disappearance of state power, decay of states, growing tribal, ethnic, and religious conflicts, the emergence of international criminal mafias, the increasing number of refugees, and the un-

limited proliferation of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction. Following the medieval model means the onset of political crisis in the future. The state will break into several autonomous subsystems that will be independent of the central government, with hired troops and autonomous courts. Overcoming the crisis will be easier for inhabitants of undeveloped areas, prepared for life and competition in primitive conditions; there will be mass migrations that will lead to the merging and mixing of races and the emergence and dissemination of new ideologies. When the power of law is no longer recognized, and all documents are destroyed, property will be based only on 'the right of custom'. On the other hand, as a result of the imminent decline, cities will consist of both debris and homes suitable for living, where those who will be able to assert (and defend) a claim over them will dwell, and small-scale local authorities will be able to save at least some power only by building fortress walls and fortifications. Then we will find ourselves in a completely feudal system; alliances between local authorities will be based on compromise rather than law; relationships between individuals will be based on aggression and unions built on friendship or common interests; primitive traditions of hospitality will revive (Eco, 1989). The beginning of politics turns out to be its end, but at the end of politics there is nothing but the word or language, able to stop an act of direct action, that will have potential. It is language alone that allows us to avoid such drastic actions as war, which force humanity to face the problem of survival.

The concept of *transpolitics* contains an attempt to overcome the non-transparency of the source of politics. The emergence of the concept is due to the transition of social reality to a new state, when the decisive role is played by the media, the development of which suggests the appearance of an information society (Baudrillard, 1983). If we look at the etymology of the word *transpolitics*, we will see that its meaning is determined by the Latin prefix *trans-*, which is used in compound words, and at the same time means over/through/on the other side/behind. In this case, going beyond means the transition of politics into the sphere of information production. Distribution of objective, reliable, and unbiased information is believed to guarantee that the source of politics will be open and understandable.

However, we observe an opposite effect. In *transpolitics*, the only entity power belongs to is the media, which monopolize the right to represent politics. Politics is gradually absorbed by something that

produces it, i.e. the media. *Transpolitics* removes the difference between reality 'as it really is' and the media's production of political reality. Producing information becomes an autonomous process determined solely by the internal needs of the media system. As a result, a new form of power emerges, the essence of which is expressed in the concept of 'mediacracy'. In *mediacracy*, power is all that is said in the media, and all that is said should be perceived as something that 'really is'. The media create a stable belief that everyone knows what is happening, but no one acts or wants to do anything.

News production, according to Baudrillard, turns politics into a simulacrum, i.e. an illusion of objective reality. In the media, it can be clearly seen how politics is transforming into a performance that creates a special form of 'spectacular policy', which opens the space of visibility (Debord, 1994). In the space of visibility, the performance establishes a visual procedure that involves the public in watching media representations. The greater the viewer involvement is, the more spectacular politics becomes, following the model of entertainment talk shows, court interviews, or TV debates featuring leaders of parliamentary parties. In the information flow, politics is no longer seen as a logical and consistent process and seems an excess. Politics becomes a subject and source of information only in the case of corruption revelations, mistress scandals involving government officials, violations of legal, moral, political correctness norms, etc.

In 'spectacular politics', the word is replaced by a visual image that is mixed with other forms of representation. The image turns out to be a distorted language, altering the linguistic nature of human beings. The words of a language are re-denoted and lose traditional meanings and connotations. The media, claiming full power, generate a new language where meanings of such significant concepts as 'life' and 'death', 'war' and 'peace' are replaced with euphemisms. Contemporary wars, on the surface of meaning, manifest themselves as a movement for justice and humanism, i.e. pretend to be a kind of 'humanitarian mission' or 'pacifist humanitarian intervention' aimed at promoting peace. In this case, war is presented as 'protection of peace', where any attack is only a 'strategic alternative to defence' or a preventive action aimed at preserving security in the world. In turn, the state of the world is regarded as an endless series of 'states of emergency', gradually leading the world to a state of 'permanent war'.

The language of the media loses its main function – the ability to express thoughts. The image is always presented in only one way, i.e. the way it is presented in the media. In this sense, the image does not carry anything imaginary; it literally means ‘what is seen’. The ‘image’ no longer refers to anything else but itself as a kind of visual picture, the meaning of which is determined performatively, in the process of commenting. The comment, as an explanatory note, attaches additional meaning to the visual image, and this forms the ‘secondary system of meanings’. This ‘secondary system of meanings’ is a myth, in which the primary sign of the semiotic system is the visual image that combines the primary signifier and signified to become a signifier itself. The unity of the secondary, mythological signifier (form) and the corresponding secondary signified (concept) produces the sign of the second order – the meaning (Barthes, 1972). One can say that at the limit of linguistic expression, information is presented in the form of a myth, which unfolds in narratives/stories about events that may have occurred or may have never occurred. The media are, in essence, a means of producing political myths, which exist only in the media and are supported only by the media. Such political myths are necessary to maintain the existence of the media themselves.

Society loses the ability to distinguish between the media illusion and the political reality. The disappearance of boundaries between illusion and reality causes ‘trance’ as the limit state, which occurs when the distance between illusion and reality is reduced to ‘zero’. In transpolitics, the prefix *trans-*, which was originally interpreted as moving/transition into a different reality, acquires a different meaning, indicating the state of society which is characterized by a clouded state, similar to insanity or madness, or hypnotic trance, to which the media condemn ‘the society of the spectacle’. Being in a ‘trance’, society loses common sense. One can say that transpolitics extends the idea of the end of politics, allowing it to last endlessly in stories and narratives that are produced by the media, serving an endless source of political mythology, mainly focused on entertaining the public.

Between the indefinite beginning and the indefinite end of politics, there is an infinite space of the politics of life, or biopolitics. The etymology of the word ‘biopolitics’ is determined by the prefix *bio-*, which is used in compound words and is derived from the Greek *βίος*, denoting life, and the Latin *bios-*, corresponding to the meaning of the word

‘biological’. The prefix *bio-*, providing the basic idea of the word, is a combination of the Greek and Latin interpretations in the way that biopolitics expands the notion of social life to the biological/natural level of society’s existence. In this case, life is understood as *zoe*, which is implemented at the level of species (i.e. humankind). Modern biopolitics abolishes the semantic difference, introduced by Greek philosophy, between life as *zoe*, meaning the fact of life common to all living beings, and *βίος*, pointing to the political life of society. In Greek tradition, the political life of a polis *βίος πολιτικός* was separated from natural, or biological, existence, which focused on the household as *οικία*, where there was *βίος ἀπολαυστικός* – life for the sake of pleasure. The modern concept of biopolitics imposes a limit on the Greek understanding of politics as *βίος πολιτικός*.

Biopolitics begins when political life (*βίος*) is interpreted simply as natural/biological life (*zoe*), which implicates life itself within the sphere of government control and supervision. Biopolitics involves the generic principle of life, which is included in politics in the state of ‘bare life’ (Agamben, 1998). All biopolitics is presented as a way to control the processes of life and expressed in supporting the existence of society. The practice of managing the life of society develops in two main directions – regulation of population life and continuation of individual life (Foucault, 2013). Organization of life is centred around the human race, which serves as the basis for control of the biological processes of reproduction, birth, and mortality, health status, life expectancy and longevity. Regulatory methods of control over the human race are realized through population biopolitics. In this case, decreasing child mortality and increasing life expectancy become an indicator of care taken by the government of the population. The government is responsible for the survival and growth of the population as a kind of biomass. The government takes care of the population only to maintain itself as a kind of biopower, regulating the life of the social body from inside.

The life of an individual is controlled by the anatomo-politics of the human body, including the individual as one of the species of living beings that functions primarily as a kind of a living/biological body. Anatomo-politics of the human body, according to M. Foucault, is focused on disciplinary control over the life of the individual’s body. Disciplinary techniques of control and persuasion develop

the life of the individual's body in accordance with the automatism of habit. The requirement of disciplinary power to live in a certain way reaches the unconscious/non-conscious level of the individual's life as the level of ultimate subjectivity. The more obedient the body becomes, the more effective the life of the individual is and the more useful such a body is for the government. The obedient body of the individual allows the government to act through itself and in itself. The individual's body is marked with the social content that the government assigns it. Any claim of individuals to their bodies leads to a change in government strategies. In biopolitics, disciplinary strategies of suppressing the individual's body are replaced by the strategies of stimulating the life of the body.

The individual becomes her own investor who assumes the costs of improving the life of the body. The strategy of stimulating the body's life does not require any additional investments from the government. The social efficiency of the individual begins to be measured through both innate and acquired abilities. Innate abilities are expressed through the natural abilities and inclinations of the individual, which are developed by improving both the external physical parameters of the body (gymnastics, muscle development) and the internal ones, thus changing the genetic inheritance of a population over time. The strategies of the control-stimulation of the individual's body are directed toward the very core of life, i.e. they infiltrate the life process reaching up to its elementary component - the human genome. Modern bio-genetic experiments in the form of genetic engineering, the use of GMOs, cloning, transplanting and growing artificial organs, and artificial immortality are aimed at improving the individual's physical and mental abilities. Biogenetics seeks to free life from biological limitations, which would drastically increase life expectancy, and the bio-genetic makeup of human beings ceases to be regarded as a result of natural evolution.

Natural biological process management is embedded in the natural order of life as its necessary component, the existence of which is determined by the processes of life itself. In biopolitics, the administrative apparatus is a de-politicized element of life. One can say that biopolitics diffuses throughout the technology of life and reaches its limit in the everyday politics of individuals who are concerned with increasing life-supporting resources. At the level of life technology, each individual turns out to be one's own manager, a rational automatic machine that

regulates the processes of one's own life. The emergence of 'everyday politics' indicates the absence of a grand 'Politics' (starting with the capital letter) (Bauman, 2001). Management of life, deprived of the political beginning, is the essence of post-politics, where the prefix post- indicates the overcoming of ideological interpretations of politics and the transition to a politics of expert management and administration (Žižek, 2009).

Noteworthy is the fact that in socio-philosophical discourse the concept of "politics" is gradually pushed out and replaced with police, representing a version of the interpretation of management practices and its technological components. Etymologically, the word police – polizei – is as close as possible to 'policy'. Currently, the negative meaning, which the concept of police as a punitive supervisory authority of coercion and direct suppression traditionally had, is disappearing. In the past, police powers were mostly limited to the apprehension of offenders and supervision of public order, while now the term 'police' is becoming synonymous with the overall governance and control over society. This suggests a return to the original, positive meaning of police (as relating to policy), indicating a change in political practice that entails the need to identify new meanings of the words used to describe reality itself.

The positive meaning of 'police' is restored through reference to the original meaning of the word. Exploring the origins of police M. Foucault points out that, firstly, "police" was used to refer to a community that was governed by public authority, secondly, it was used to denote a set of acts relating to the management of this community, and thirdly, in the 17th century, the word 'police' began to be understood as a set of tools to facilitate the growth of the state's forces. Foucault writes:

"The objective of police is therefore control of and responsibility for men's activity insofar as this activity constitutes a differential element in the development of the state's forces" (Foucault, 2007, p. 417).

Police as a management practice includes both public and private mechanisms to ensure public tranquillity and the security of the state. Police practice becomes an immanent principle of society's organization, applicable to all levels of the population's existence: health, education, work, etc.

Erasing the semantic differences between 'policy', performing positive tasks, and 'polizei', performing negative tasks, leads back to the phenome-

non of opposites changing places and ‘overturning’ one another. As a result, ‘police’ gets a positive meaning of practical activity while ‘politics’ acquires a purely negative one. ‘Policeman’ became a common name for all who are involved in the normal practice of supporting the life of society: a government member, an expert, a lawyer, a doctor, a teacher, a sociologist, because public opinion polls have become a form of police control. In police regimes, such actions as protests, strikes, and demonstrations are opposition actions that disrupt public tranquillity and the security of the state since they introduce confusion and disorder. These actions are classified as legal issues, and therefore, must be suppressed. In a police regime, politics has no source, i.e. is anarchic in nature (Rancière, 1999). In the state of anarchy, politics can be implemented anytime and anywhere, but its origin is connected to the violation of the established social order. There is complete nihilisation of politics, which is set to the ‘zero’ level of existence, where there is a kind of politics because the state continues to operate, the government does something, and people live, yet at the same time, there is no politics.

In the structures of social and philosophical discourse prefixing in conceptualizing politics reaches the limit of linguistic possibilities. The limit can be regarded as a ‘turning point’ where the state of *post*-politics acquires the meaning of *meta*-. *Meta*- is one of the most productive prefixes in conceptualizing politics because it creates the possibility of transitioning to the metaphysical foundations of politics. The concept of ‘metaphysics’ derived from the Greek ‘*μετα τα φυσικα*’ refers to the way in which a study carries political ‘meta’ issues beyond questions of power and ideology. The plurality of meanings of the language prefix *meta*- are reduced to two meanings – ‘after, behind’ and ‘among, together, accompanied by’. The first meaning of *meta*- refers to a situation of transition, which is denoted by the Latin prefix ‘*post*-’. However, the idea of movement is found in the Greek word *μεταβολή*, denoting turnover, transformation. The second meaning of ‘*meta*’ is communicated with the Latin prefix ‘*trans*-’. Heidegger writes:

“The meaning of changeover, of ‘turning away from one matter toward another’, of ‘going from one over to another’, came out of a purely positional meaning” (Heidegger, 1995, p. 39).

Going beyond (*post*-) the prefixal ways of interpreting the noun ‘politics’, which has completely exhausted itself, turns (*trans*-) to the ontological

foundation of political life as a system of philosophical knowledge.

Appeal to ontological grounds returns philosophy to itself as a source of apolitical existence. In this case, *a*- is a negative prefix indicating the absence of the characteristic or property expressed by the main part of the word. The prefix *a*- is productive only to form adjectives and absolutely unproductive to form nouns. While literally or grammatically the prefix *a*- refers to negation, semantically it makes a distinction between what is called the reality of politics and political reality, i.e. between the being of politics related to power and ideology, and political existence. As much as the difference between the reality of politics and political reality reveals itself through the negative prefix *a*-, such a distinction is, in fact, an ontological way of distinguishing between being and existence.

In this case, Badiou’s concept of metapolitics is becoming especially important (Badiou, 2005). However, Badiou uses the prefix *meta*- to denote the transition to a higher level of understanding, which he associates with the logical analysis of politics, opening the level of meta-philosophical reflection. Philosophical meta-reflection is understood as part of politics since it undermines ‘the established intellectual order’ as a certain regime of truths accepted in political philosophy, legitimizing a certain type of politics.

In turn, the ontological ‘turn’ takes us to the metaphysical grounds of political reality. In this case, the prefix *meta*- means the transition from the noun ‘politics’ to the adjective ‘political’, which is denoted by the Greek word *πολιτεια*, returning us to the philosophical roots of political life as a knowledge system based on the original identity of being and thinking. In philosophical discourse oriented at the study of political systems of knowledge, the grammatical structure is changing. There prefixing as a way of interpreting is replaced with suffixing, with suffixes being used to form vague adjectives that denote only a sign, a property, or a quality of reality.

In Greek philosophy, an apolitical source of political life as a system of knowledge was thinking (*λογος*) and action (*πραξις*). Thinking is action since ‘the thought thinks’. As much as thinking thinks, the activity of thinking is aimed at making activity products, i.e. is the action of producing, within which the thought is thought through thinking. The product of the activity of thinking is the idea, the essence or the meaning of which is expressed by

language. Thinking that exists in the identity with language is a productive action (Heidegger, 1968). In turn, action as *πρᾶξις* is realized through the word, which loses the linguistic meaning *λέξις* and is understood as *λογος*, i.e. it represents a conscious linguistic activity that exists in the identity of language and thought. The notion that any idea asserts a justified claim to the status of dominant ideology is dismissed with philosophical reflection, which, on the one hand, helps to illuminate the degree of the presence and intervention of the ideology in social life, and on the other hand, preserves thinking and language as the source of political existence..

So, to summarize, it can be stated that the trend of prefixing reflects the desire of researchers to break the traditional link between politics and ideology and to justify a concept of politics that would be more in line with the realities of the management state. As a result, researchers revise the basic concepts of the beginning, the end, and the process of political life. Moving away from philosophy as a necessary source of politics is one of the ways to overcome ideology in politics. Post-ideological politics gives form to the idea of police and police management, and this idea is more total(izing) than any previous ideology, since it diffuses throughout the technology of life and permeates all levels of social existence, including the natural/biological one, which has never before been infiltrated by politics. The idea of police management is implemented under the banner of concern for the safety of life, which is possible only if social life as a whole and the life of each individual is absolutely transparent and controllable. The transparent society susceptible to absolute control becomes the only idea to be implemented—not in the future, but in the present. We believe that the ontological ‘turn’ returns us to the philosophical source of politics. Philosophy demonstrates the conventionality of the beginning of politics and the absoluteness of thinking of *λογος* as the beginning of politics, restoring the original value of action *πρᾶξις*.

References

- Agamben G (1998) *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*, trans. Daniel Heller-Roazen. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Agamben G (2013) *Qu'est-ce que le commandement?*, traduit de l'italien par Joël Gayraud. Bibliothèque Rivages.
- Badiou A (2005) *Metapolitics*, trans. Jason Barker. New York: Verso.
- Barthes R (1972) *Mythologies*, trans. Annette Lavers. New York: The Noonday Press.
- Baudrillard J (1983) *In the Shadow of the Silent Majorities or, The End of the Social and Other Essays*, trans. Paul Foss, Paul Patton and John Johnston. New York: Semiotext(e).
- Bauman Z (2001) *The Individualized Society*. Cambridge UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Debord G (1994) *The Society of the Spectacle*, trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith. New York: Zone Books.
- Eco U (1989) *The Middle Ages of James Joyce: The Aesthetics of Chaosmos*, trans. Ellen Esrock. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University of Chicago Press.
- Foucault M (1980) *Truth and Power // Foucault M. Power/Knowledge. Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972–1977*, ed Colin Gordon and trans. Colin Gordon, Leo Marshall, John Mepham, Kate Soper. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault M (2007) *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1977–78*, ed. Michel Senellart, trans. Graham Burchell. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Foucault M (2013) *Lectures on the Will to Know: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1970–1971*, and *Oedipal Knowledge*, trans. Graham Burchell, ed. Daniel Defert. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Foucault M (2008) *The Birth of Bio-Politics: Lecture at the College de France 1978–79*, trans. Graham Burchell, ed. Arnold I. Davidson. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Heidegger M (1995) *The Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics: World, Finitude, Solitude*, ed. John Sallis, trans. William McNeill and Nicholas Walker. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press.
- Heidegger M (1968) *What is Called Thinking?*, trans. J. Gray. New York: Harper & Row.
- Rancière J (1999) *Disagreement and Philosophy Politics*, trans. Julie Rose. Minneapolis – London: The University of Minnesota.
- Schmitt C (2005) *Political Theology: Four Chapters on the Concept of Sovereignty*, trans. George Schwab. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Schmitt C (2007) *The Concept of the Political. Expanded Edition (1932)*, trans. George Schwab. Chicago – London: University of Chicago Press.

Soloviev Alexander (2011) Latent structure of governance, or the play of shadows on the face of authorities. *Polis. Political studies* 5: 70–98.

Wallerstein I M (1995) *After Liberalism*. New York: New Press.

Wallerstein I M (1999) *The End of the World As*

We Know It: Social Science for the Twenty-first Century. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Žižek S (2009) *The Ticklish Subject: the Absent Centre of Political Ontology*. London-New York: Verso.