

Theatrical Nationalism: Exposing the “Obscene Superego” of the System

Steve Wilmer

Nationalism has been an important facet of theatrical expression since the Greeks. The earliest extant Greek play, *The Persians* by Aeschylus, reveals the ingenious tactics of the Greeks in defeating the Persians in the battle of Salamis, and much of Greek tragedy emphasizes the superiority of the Athenian city-state to other polities. Cultural nationalism flourished particularly in the nineteenth century, following the American and French revolutions, the partition of Poland, and the Napoleonic invasion of much of Europe. Nationalist movements developed in the many nations of Europe, in some cases calling for independence from a foreign oppressor. Theatre was recognized as a useful means for formulating and solidifying notions of national identity. National theatres, especially in countries that were not yet nation-states, were established to further the aims of nationalists. In the twenty-first century, national theatres continue to play an important role in conserving national cultures, especially in Europe, and cultural nationalism remains a recurrent motif. I will discuss some of the earlier features of nationalism in the theatre and show how they have been retained in theatrical expression today, especially in the National Theatre of Scotland. I will also demonstrate how certain theatre artists, such as Christoph Schlingensiefel in Austria and Janez Janša in Slovenia, who employ a mode of “subversive affirmation,” have turned the tables on cultural nationalism at local, national, and transnational levels, ironizing it and rendering it obscene. According to Inke Arns and Sylvia Sasse,

Subversive affirmation is an artistic/political tactic that allows artists/activists to take part in certain social, political, or economic discourses and to affirm, appropriate, or consume them while simultaneously undermining them. It is characterised precisely by the fact that with affirmation there simultaneously occurs a distancing from, or revelation of, what is being affirmed.

Steve Wilmer is Associate Professor of Drama at Trinity College Dublin and author of *Theatre, Society and the Nation: Staging American Identities* (2002) and (with Pirkko Koski) *The Dynamic World of Finnish Theatre* (2006). Other publications include (with Anna McMullan) *Reflections on Beckett: A Centennial Celebration* (2009); *National Theatres in a Changing Europe* (2008); *Writing and Rewriting National Theatre Histories* (2004); (with John Dillon) *Rebel Women: Staging Ancient Greek Drama Today* (2005). He is also a playwright, a member of the executive committee of the International Federation for Theatre Research, a convenor of the National Identities/National Cultures research group of the American Society for Theatre Research, and former Director of the Samuel Beckett Centre at Trinity College Dublin.

In subversive affirmation there is always a surplus which destabilises affirmation and turns it into its opposite.¹

Nations and nation-states are somewhat arbitrary constructions that result from wars, invasions, and other historical events. The geographical and cultural contours of these entities have changed over time but have been legitimated through nationalist discourse in the theatre, emphasizing their homogeneity and distinctiveness and disguising their disharmonies. One of the main proponents of cultural nationalism was Johann von Herder, who rejected the dominance of French culture in German-speaking lands and urged his compatriots to acknowledge the German poets of the past. He developed a theory of the organic growth of the nation, its language and *Volksgeist* (national spirit), as distinct and unique, placing his faith in cultural rather than political unity. He encouraged research into German folklore, myths, legends, and local history and argued that German culture would never come into its own unless it was based solely on traditional popular German culture. To this end he encouraged Germans to make a “complete critical study of the chronicles and legends of the Middle Ages.”² As a result of his endeavors, Herder fostered a new respect for the German folk traditions and so promoted a notion of national cultural unity. At the same time, he encouraged other nations to do the same, arguing that each nation was organic and distinct and needed to develop its own national spirit. Cultural nationalists in many countries in Europe read his works avidly and adopted his methods and attitudes.

Nationalists essentialized national characteristics, legitimized its boundaries, and emphasized the borders between those to be included or privileged and those to be excluded or underprivileged. For those who were privileged according to these distinctions, it provided a sense of belonging and identity. For those who were underprivileged, however, it necessitated their marginalization or disenfranchisement on the basis of such differences as gender, class, ethnicity, language, and religion. Thus cultural nationalism is a Janus-headed ideology with positive and negative effects: on the one hand, promoting a sense of self-worth for the individual who can successfully identify with the nation and galvanizing movements for autonomy and self-government, but, on the other hand, ostracizing or excluding others.

There are common patterns of nationalist cultural expression observable in the artistic work of the nineteenth century that continue into the twentieth and even the twenty-first centuries. Historical plays in the vernacular language portraying heroic national characters from the past or images from national folklore or rural life asserted the uniqueness of their culture and in some cases challenged the dominant discourse of imperial rule. For example, Schiller’s *The Maid of Orleans* and *William Tell* depict “nationalist” heroes striving to free the nation from oppression and were written during a period when there was not yet a German nation-state. German-speaking lands were fragmented amongst many principalities, dukedoms, and free

cities, which were, for a while, subject to Napoleonic rule. In most cases, such plays would focus on male heroes fighting for the author's native land and perhaps dying for it. In the case of *The Maid of Orleans* there are a few unusual features: Joan of Arc is a female warrior, and the play is about a country other than that of the author's. Nevertheless, one can see the typical nationalist rhetoric emerging in the play as the English soldiers are vilified as oppressors and the French are rallied to regain what rightfully belongs to them. The traditional symbols of national flags and Christian icons have a potent effect, as does the image of the heroine dying for her country. Because of her international fame, Joan of Arc has been used as a cross-cultural archetype to serve nationalist purposes not only in her home country but also as a metaphor for such struggles in other countries, especially the righteous battle against a foreign oppressor. Although anomalous in being a woman soldier, the figure of Joan of Arc also feeds into normative iconography that depicts women representing the nation. Such mythical characters as Britannia, Germania, and Marianne in France have often been represented in monuments and paintings as militant figures (echoing classical images of Artemis, Athena, and Penthesilea), though more passive virginal or motherly depictions of the nation are more common.

The founders of the Irish Literary Theatre (the precursor of the Irish National Theatre) asserted that the new theatre would no longer demean the Irish people in the way that the British theatre had done in the past. Irish nationalist theatre at the beginning of the twentieth century employed historic struggles, folklore myths, and stories of idyllic rural life as a means of showing the distinctiveness of Irish (as opposed to English) culture. W.B. Yeats's *Cathleen Ni Houlihan* managed to combine all three of these features, showing the mythical figure of Cathleen Ni Houlihan calling out young Irish peasants to fight in the 1798 uprising against British rule.

In nationalist discourse, rural characters are often depicted as pure and wholesome, unsullied by the grime, squalor, and malevolent influences of the city. J.M. Synge, however, was not a writer to conform to nationalist rhetoric and frequently depicted the ugly sides of rural life. When *The Playboy of the Western World* was staged by the Irish National Theatre Society at the Abbey Theatre, the portrayal of Christie, who is celebrated by the young women of Mayo as a hero for allegedly killing his father, was regarded as unacceptable and caused riots in the theatre. The audience rejected the implication that the loose values of the village women in the play conveyed either an accurate or a welcome depiction of Ireland at a time when they were attempting to assert the superiority of their culture to that of England. Having been depicted by English dramatists as wild men and figures of fun for years, Irish nationalists regarded *Playboy* to be even worse, especially as it was the Irish National Theatre Society that was now presenting this travesty. The director of the theatre, W.B. Yeats, defended the right of the Society to present such a play and insisted that it should be performed for the rest of the week (with the aid

of a police presence) while the audience continued to riot. However, in subsequent years the play became canonized as one of the most often performed plays in the Irish repertory, thereby querying the relationship between nationalist rhetoric and national culture. As is manifest in the *Playboy* riots, theatre has equally been a site for disrupting nationalist discourse and challenging essentialist stereotypes. Ibsen's *Peer Gynt* also depicted a rogue figure and criticized the nationalist movement's language reform in the middle of the nineteenth century. Nevertheless, despite Ibsen's critique of nationalism and an initially hostile reaction, the play rapidly became canonized, especially as a result of Grieg's beautiful music that was written subsequently to accompany it in performance.

In the twenty-first century there are obvious echoes of the cultural nationalist movements of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. For example, the creation of the National Theatre of Scotland (NTS) heralds a Romantic nationalist spirit at a time when the possibility of political independence has appeared on the horizon. In the Scottish Parliament in 2003, Frank McAveety, the Minister for Tourism, Culture and Sport, revealed the important implications of establishing the new theatre by asserting that it was "emblematic of much of the debate about Scotland's identity and cultural future." The nationalist impulse behind the enterprise became clear when the NTS explained its intended goals in its newsletter later in the same year: "The National Theatre of Scotland will develop a quality repertoire originating in Scotland. This will include new work, existing work, and the drama of other countries and cultures to which a range of Scottish insights, language, and sensibility can be applied."³

Without a theatre building but with a six million euro subsidy from the Scottish parliament, the National Theatre of Scotland in 2006 launched a series of events in ten venues around the country under the title "Home." This turned into an opportunity in specific instances for nostalgic reminiscence and for identifying what was culturally distinct about particular areas of Scotland. One of the pieces, *Home Shetland*, was a multi-media event aboard a ship that travels between Shetland and the mainland, and featured Scottish music and local stories about Shetland Islanders. According to one of the reviews,

It was therefore a perfect choice for the "launch" of the National Theatre of Scotland in Shetland, and the performance transported the small audience groups on a stunning and very personal emotional journey. . . . Personal headsets guided the visitors (a more appropriate word than audience) around the boat, the public areas, private cabins and a spectacular ending on the cavernous car deck.⁴

According to Robert Leach, the National Theatre reflected "a new Scottish

consciousness [that] had emerged. Scots began to re-examine their past, and to seek alternative historical narratives, different from those that had been accepted for so long.⁵

Following the series of events on the theme of “home,” the NTS produced over twenty productions in their first year, often with national historical themes about Scotland such as Schiller’s *Mary Stuart* in a version by the Scottish playwright David Harrower, and *Project Macbeth*, a devised piece with “the real Macbeth at war with Shakespeare’s myth in a battle to redefine his twenty-first century identity.”⁶ Perhaps the most notable production was *Black Watch*, a new play commissioned by the NTS from Scottish playwright Gregory Burke, about a Scottish regiment that was being amalgamated with other regiments after three hundred years of distinguished service. Besides being a well-choreographed and dynamic piece of theatre, it was also an exercise in nostalgia and national pride, recounting the history of the Black Watch regiment as well as its final deployment in Iraq. Owen Humphrys commented in a review for the Royal United Services Institute journal,

Running as a “red thread of courage” through the play is the Black Watch’s ever-famous and exclusive red hackle. The Watch’s pipe-tunes and their songs are used, and adapted, from the “Black Bear” to “[en]list bonnie laddie and come away’ wi’ me.” And in one five-minute scene, three centuries of Black Watch history are played out on a red carpet that is rolled out down the drill hall. One soldier is kitted out successively in the garb of 1739, the uniform of Waterloo and the kilt apron of the trenches in 1915. It is a magical moment.⁷

Scottish iconography abounds on stage, with flags, kilts, bagpipes, and songs, not to mention the accents and speech patterns of the soldiers, providing a strong visual and aural Scottish presence that contrasts strikingly with the documentary video footage of their military deployment in the Middle East projected on large screens. Behind the individual experiences of the soldiers lies a tension between Scottish and British identities. This comes to the fore when two of the actors, impersonating Alex Salmond, head of the Scottish National Party, and Geoffrey Hoon, the British Defence Secretary, trade insults over the redeployment of the Black Watch regiment from Basra to Falluja, to relieve the American troops. Salmond opposes this redeployment, which results in the deaths of three soldiers, arguing that the Black Watch has been given “an impossible job”—having to replace a much larger force of American soldiers who are better equipped and have greater backup. He accuses the British government of putting the Scottish soldiers at risk in order to cater to the needs of the Americans, and specifically to aid President George W. Bush’s campaign for reelection in 2004: “I think it will give way to a wave of anger

as Scotland and the Black Watch families compare and contrast the bravery of our Scottish soldiers with the duplicity and chicanery of the politicians who sent them into this deployment.”⁸ The redeployment leads to the most horrific sequence in the play, during which three Scottish soldiers are blown sky-high by a suicide bomber.

The play conveys considerable resentment towards the British government for this redeployment as well as the controversial decision to amalgamate the Black Watch with five other Scottish regiments, thereby undermining its local and distinctive identity. Ian Jack commented on this amalgamation in *The Guardian*: “Given what the British government was asking the Black Watch to do in the desert of Iraq, the decision was seen as a betrayal, a poor piece of bureaucratic judgment that would damage the Black Watch’s already sinking morale.” A soldier exclaims in the play: “It takes three hundred years to build an army that’s admired and respected around the world. But it only takes three years pissing about in the desert in the biggest Western foreign policy disaster ever to fuck it up completely.”⁹ This expression of resentment is significant and comes close to subversion in challenging British policy during an ongoing war. It sets out a distinctive Scottish agenda in opposition to British military policy, although this is complicated by the Scots being part of the British army. According to Joyce McMillan, the production of *Black Watch* reveals the “National Theatre as a force that can reassert a strong grass-roots Scottish perspective on parts of our story which, until now, have been filtered mainly through institutions of the British state.”¹⁰

The play might be regarded as celebrating local history and culture as well as a military way of life (although the play contains numerous anti-militarist touches). However, *Black Watch* mourns the passing of an important aspect of Scottish society, like the clothing, mining, shipbuilding, and fishing industries that have virtually disappeared. Once again the Scots have become the victims of British political decisions. Thus the play can be read as a nationalist performance, expressing pride in a distinctive aspect of Scottish history and culture, and attacking the British government for neglecting Scottish cultural traditions and ignoring the welfare of brave young Scotsmen. It is not surprising that Alex Salmond, who is steering the Scottish people towards a referendum on political independence within the next two years, takes great pride in the production and told me in an interview that he would like to send *Black Watch* “around the world.”¹¹ He has used the play “not once but three times to celebrate the opening of the Scottish Parliament and the Scottish National Party’s first crack at government.”¹² Thus, the National Theatre of Scotland, through such plays as *Home Shetland* and *Black Watch*, which are situated in local geographical environments and feature local characters, stories, imagery, and language, is effectively aiding the cause of Scottish political and cultural autonomy. We can see echoes of the past in this, with the National Theatre of Scotland replaying the role of the national theatres in emerging nations in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, presenting plays to stress

the distinctiveness of national identity and supporting the case for independence.

By contrast with the role of the National Theatre of Scotland, many theatre artists have ironized and critiqued nationalistic expression. For example, in Germany, Bertolt Brecht and Rolf Hochhuth overtly criticized the virulent nationalism of the Third Reich by showing its evil effects in such plays as Brecht's *Fear and Misery in the Third Reich* and Hochhuth's *The Representative*. There is a long tradition of comedians throughout the world, from sketches in the Royal Variety Show to Charlie Chaplin in *The Great Dictator*, impersonating and parodying political leaders. Another tactic, which I want to consider in some depth, is that of subversion through over-identification with nationalism, which features in the work of Christoph Schlingensiefel and Janez Janša. These artists, operating on the former border between western and eastern Europe, have devised performances to call nationalist expression into question by imitating and exaggerating it, and yet evoking a serious rather than a comic response.

In 2000 Christoph Schlingensiefel created an event in a main square outside the opera house called *Bitte liebt Österreich (Please Love Austria)* for the Vienna Festival to focus attention on Austrian attitudes about immigration. Staged shortly after the election of a coalition government that included the right-wing party of Jörg Haider (and caused the European Union to impose diplomatic sanctions against a member country for the first time), Schlingensiefel placed twelve immigrants in an industrial container and asked the public to decide which of them should be deported and who should be allowed to win prize money, marry an Austrian, and gain the right to remain in the country. Slogans associated with Haider's party were affixed to the outside of the container such as "*Ausländer raus*" ("foreigners out") and the Nazi motto "*Unsere Ehre heißt Treue*" (Our pride is loyalty), while the activities inside the container were transmitted via the internet, which participants could watch live via video streaming. The event was modeled on the popular *Big Brother* reality TV show, during which contestants lived with each other in a confined environment called "the container." The TV show emphasized that the public could interact with the program by voting on whether the contestants should leave or remain in the container, and the independent news programs announced every night who was allowed to remain in the show. In the case of the Vienna performance event, Schlingensiefel raised the stakes by using contestants who were (or claimed to be) highly qualified political exiles from various parts of the world (such as China, Iraq, Iran, Kosovo, Sri Lanka, Kurdistan, and Nigeria) and who supposedly faced danger if they returned to their home country. Of course the audience could not be sure whether the contestants were real exiles or simply actors playing such characters, especially because the public could see the refugees inside the container only via the media, except when the unlucky contestants were being escorted to official-looking cars ostensibly on their way to deportation. Schlingensiefel claimed that the program was extremely popular and that over 70,000 people contacted the

website, which frequently crashed due to the level of interest both locally in Vienna and nationally as well as internationally. The event caused a heated discussion in the press, as it raised uncomfortable associations with Austrian support for Hitler during the Third Reich as well as with the recent success of Haider's far-right party. Schlingensief himself stood on top of the container with a loud hailer claiming to represent Haider's party and spouting his party's ultra nationalist slogans. After several days, the container was assailed by a crowd of left-wing protestors, who objected to Schlingensief's performance and tried to liberate the remaining refugees and dismantle the offensive signs.

By claiming to speak on behalf of Haider's party, Schlingensief was using a subversive strategy of over-identification with the opposition in order to expose and render them powerless.¹³ According to Slavoj Žižek, "By bringing to light the obscene superego underside of the system, over-identification suspends its efficiency."¹⁴ The Austrian government seemed uncertain of whether to shut down the event and risk accusations of censorship or to allow it to continue despite all the attendant bad publicity for its coalition partners. In the end, it ran for the week of the festival, attracting considerable newspaper and television coverage, not only locally in Vienna, but also nationally and internationally.

Using a similar strategy of over-identification with nationalist expression, three Slovenian artists decided that they would all change their own names and adopt the name of the right-wing prime minister of Slovenia, Janez Janša. Slovenia forms the eastern border of the European Union, with its neighbor Croatia outside the Union. The Prime Minister, Janez Janša, had received criticism from the left for promoting national cultural traditions rather than contemporary art and for stigmatizing immigrants and minority groups. Although Blaž Lucan wrote that "the three Slovenian artists who have decided to change their names to Janez Janša have remained silent regarding their decisions and . . . have stated that this was an intimate, personal decision," he went on to explain,

The three artists did not pick just any name; they chose Janez Janša—the name of the Slovenian Prime Minister, the president of the centre-right SDS party (Slovenian democratic party/Slovenska demokratska stranka), the front man of the right wing in the Slovenian political arena. No doubt, the choice of name indicates a certain agenda.¹⁵

By adopting Janša's name and becoming members of his political party, the three artists over-identified with him and at times caused confusion about his identity, thereby undermining his authority. For example, Janez Janša (formerly Emil Hrvatin), a theatre director, performed in a dance festival in Germany resulting in the ironic newspaper headline "Janša dances in Berlin."¹⁶ For a photograph taken on

top of the Triglav (the three-peaked mountain in Slovenia that serves as a national symbol on the Slovenian flag), the three Janez Janšas dressed themselves in a black cloth with their three heads peering out the top to represent the Triglav on top of the Triglav mountain in a comic doubling of the iconic image, presenting it as a “multiple (state-forming) jubilee.”¹⁷ The categorization of artistic work as “state forming” is a quality that Rok Vevar says “has lately become a kind of unwritten prerequisite for artistic events in our country to gain any public relevancy.” Critiquing nationalist cultural policies in Slovenia, Vevar writes, “More than 15 years after the creation of the Slovenian state[, the society] still conceives art as state-forming, because the official (cultural) policy conceives the state as a kind of reserve for the endangered Slovenian ethnic group.”¹⁸ By reconstructing the national symbol with their own bodies, the artists were making a seemingly nationalist gesture that at the same time looked ridiculous and thereby deconstructed nationalist iconography and queered nationalist cultural practices.

The theatre director Janez Janša (Hrvatín) also directed a play in 2007 entitled the *National Theatre of Slovenia* (ironically copying the name of the main theatre in Ljubljana) which recalled Slovenians shouting abuse at a Romany family named Stroján and erecting barricades to prevent them from living in their midst, behavior that was encouraged by the policies of Prime Minister Janša’s government. The incident had been sparked in 2006 when a neighbor was severely injured by a Slovene who was living amongst the Stroján family. The neighborhood overreacted, assuming wrongly that the Slovene was Romany, and three hundred armed residents surrounded the Stroján family and threatened to kill them if they did not leave. Rather than simply arresting the wrongdoer, the government complied with the community’s wishes and removed the family from their legally owned homes and placed them in emergency accommodation for asylum-seekers while attempting to relocate them. After a year they still had not succeeded in providing them with a home.

Four actors, using headphones, repeated verbatim television and radio footage of Slovenes shouting abuse at the Stroján family while erecting barricades to prevent them from living in their midst. The actors reproduced for the theatre audience the “extremely vulgar and aggressive language, used by the angry mob”¹⁹ as well as statements by politicians, with the director Janša (Hrvatín) himself pacing back and forth across the stage for an hour and a half muttering “Gypsies, gypsies.” The piece reached a high point when the family tried to come back to their home for Christmas and the government brought in bulldozers to destroy it, leaving them out in the cold. The President of Slovenia, who disagreed with the Prime Minister’s policies, attempted to intervene by delivering two mobile homes for the family, but he encountered the same mob reaction. According to Blaž Lukan,

This scene is reconstructed on stage with shivering precision

and intensity. However, when one adds the content of what is actually being said by people who are the real (live) protagonists among us, the hate-speech of the mob and the fact that this kind of language—legitimized by the Ambrus case—became the language of the political “elite”, [it] represents a complete break down of state institutions, which are supposed to guarantee and protect the very fundamental law of “all being equal under the law.” . . . This sad story without a doubt stands for one of the most shameful and tainted moments in Slovenian history since Slovenia became independent.²⁰

As Wolfgang Heuer argues, within the nation-state, there is always “the danger of the nation overtaking the state as *volonte general*, as democratic populism or as a folkish, current ethnic movement,”²¹ and in this case the government followed the general will.

While overt political theatre that tries to undermine the excesses of cultural nationalism by showing their “obscene” nature can be criticized for attracting an audience of like-minded individuals (“preaching to the converted”), the advantage of the tactics of over-identification in performances is that they can arguably attract and engage the opposition as an audience. The disadvantage of this type of work is, of course, that it gives a voice to ideologies that one is trying to subvert, and may help to sustain them rather than undermine them.

In conclusion, expressions of nationalism continue to appear in theatre today, just as the theories of such philosophers as Johann von Herder continue to affect the formulation of nationalist discourse. At the same time theatre artists who frequently use theatre to subvert the “obscene” excesses of nationalist discourse, either by directly critiquing it by means of the internet, or through such novel tactics as over-identification, can impact not only local and national, but also transnational and global audiences.

Notes

1. Inke Arns and Sylvia Sasse, “Subversive Affirmation: On Mimesis as a Strategy of Resistance.” *Maska*, 21 3-4 (Spring 2006): 5.
15 October 2008, 5.
2. Johann von Herder, “Ueber die Legende,” *Sämmtliche Werke*, ed. Suphan Bernhard, Vol. 16 (Berlin: Weidmansche Buchlung, 1877-) 389.
3. Robert Leach, “The short astonishing history of the National Theatre of Scotland.” *New Theatre Quarterly*, XXIII, part 2 (May 2007): 172, 174.
4. John Haswell, “Home Scotland,” 2006 The British Theatre Guide. 27 December 2007.
<<http://www.britishtheatreguide.info/reviews/homeshetland-rev.htm/>>.
5. Leach 172.
6. “Project Macbeth,” 2006. National Theatre of Scotland. 27 December 2007.
<http://www.nationaltheatrescotland.com/content/default.asp?page=home_Project%20Macbeth>.

7. Owen Humphrys. "Theatre Review: *Black Watch*," 25 October 2006. *RUSI* 13 February 2008. <<http://www.rusi.org/publication/defencesystems/>>.
8. Gregory Burke, *Black Watch* (London: Faber and Faber, 2007) 9, 8.
9. 71.
10. Joyce McMillan, "*Black Watch*." *The Scotsman*, 7 August 2006. Quoted in Zoltán Imre, "Staging the Nation: Changing Concepts of a National Theatre in Europe," *New Theatre Quarterly*, 24 (2008): 93, n. 105.
11. Interview with Alex Salmond, Trinity College Dublin, 13 February 2008.
12. Ian Jack, "It's in the Blood." *Guardian*, 14 June 2008.
13. See Arns and Sasse, "Subversive Affirmation," 5-21.
14. Slavoj Žižek, *The Universal Exception* (London: Continuum, 2006) 65.
15. Blaž Lukan, "The Janez Janša Project," *Askioma* 15 October 2008 <<http://www.askioma.org/sec/reference.html>>.
16. Blaž Lukan, "The Janez Janša Project."
17. This act reconstructed an earlier performance in the 1980s by a group of politically radical artists called the Neue Slowenische Kunst that appropriated nationalist images for subversive purposes.
18. Rok Vevar, "The More of Us We Are, the Faster We'll Reach Our Goal." *Askioma* 15 October 2008 <<http://www.aksioma.org/sec/reference.html>>.
19. Blaž Lukan, "Janša in Ambrus (Slovene National Theatre by Janez Janša, 2007)," *Maska* 15 October 2008 <http://www.maska.si/en/productions/performing_arts/slovene_national_theatre/381/reviews.html>.
20. Blaž Lukan, "Janša in Ambrus."
21. Wolfgang Heuer, "Europe and its Refugees: Arendt on the Politicization of Minorities." *BNET Social Research* 2007: 3. 15 October 2008 <http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m2267/is_4_74/ai_n24377475/print?tag=artBody;coll>.

