Konstantina Georgelou

Janez Janša:

Acts of Politicisation By Means of Art

We are constantly reminded that we live in a time of crisis, be it environmental, financial or political. In effect, crisis has become a somewhat stable state. It impacts many facets of our lives and affects core aspects of political thought and action, such as practices of resistance and ideologies of change. Due to a perpetuated state of precarity, anxiety and hopelessness with regard to the present and future, it is often difficult to imagine or decide how to (re)act and resist, how to generate social and political change and in which direction.[1]

In 2013, Giorgio Agamben gave a talk in Athens about the destiny of democracy, in which he referred to the problematic use of the term 'crisis', while unpacking and reflecting upon the political conditions we are in (2014). As he explained, the concept of crisis derives from the Greek verb *crino*, meaning to take a critical judgement or decision that is connected with a certain moment in time. For instance, in medicine this verb is used when the doctor has to judge and decide if the patient will survive or die. Hence, a crisis has a specific temporality, carrying the possibility of producing critical change in the train of events. In its present manifestation, however, 'crisis' has been split from its temporal index and become a normative state that cannot generate any decisive change: 'the crisis coincides with normality', Agamben claimed. He further stated that crisis has become a tool of governmentality for installing mechanisms of management and control, by removing the moment of judgement, and of political activity in general, since 'the continuous decision-making process decides nothing'. Consequently, we are experiencing a process of 'increasing de-politicization', in which the political life of the citizen is rendered inactive and 'has now become a purely passive juridical status' (2014).

Drawing on Agamben's concerns, I will explore the question of politicisation in the context of a society that emphasises—perhaps above all else—individuality. I will analyse the ongoing work of the three Slovenian artists Janez Janša, Janez Janša and Janez Janša, who, in 2007, changed their names from Emil Hrvatin, Davide Grassi and Žiga Kariž to the name of the then Slovenian Prime Minister and leader of the right-wing democratic SDS party: Janez Janša. Through a reading of Agamben's considerations of crisis and decision-making, I suggest that the artists' works— especially the *Troika* and *Credits* series (2013)—mark a process of politicisation by means of art. More precisely, I argue that their projects actively intervene in and engage with the political and artistic domains through a display of *crises*. 'Crisis' pertains here to artistic, financial, legal and political infrastructures suddenly being exposed as functioning in ways that are incoherent or paradoxical. Rather than taking the proclaimed state of crisis for granted, these three artists interrogate and seek to locate where and how it takes place, while making it visible.

Theatre scholars Bojana Cvejić, Ana Vujanović and Sigrix Merx have all discussed the position and function of the arts in the current neoliberal context. Cvejić and Vujanović (2012) specifically assert that the artist is often conflated with the artwork, whereas Merx (2012) argues that the political domain tends to show indifference towards both the artists and their artworks unless these are participating in community projects for social integration, playing a role in cultural diplomacy and tourism, or making considerable profits for the market. The work of the three Janšas is worth examining in this context, as it emerges from a decision to deliberately blur the boundaries between themselves as artists and their artworks. In this process, they implicate each other as well as the political, financial, legal and artistic sectors.

Other essays have conceptualised the three artists' work along similar lines, such as in terms of over-identification (Milohnić, 2008), de-subjectification (Lukan, 2008) and intervention (Bleeker, 2013). Following on from these essays I suggest here that this way of working (deliberately blurring identities and subjectivities) over a sustained period of time is an act of politicisation because it decisively transcends private and atomised opinions and generates connections between the artists/artworks and different infrastructures that do not usually collaborate with art. In the long course of their projects, the artists—as well as the art institutions they work with, politicians, the media, banks, the legal system and political ministries—are confronted with the exposure of problems and with paradoxical situations in which critical decisions and (joint) actions need to be made. As this discussion of the art projects will show, the concern is not to manage these critical situations but rather to highlight and expose them, a process that can lead to inter-sectorial collaborations. Consequently, they reveal as well as *shake up* usual artistic trends and institutional procedures, social standards, political agendas and financial processes. Continuing to work in this way can in this sense be understood primarily as a political activity.

Politic(ian)s, Artists and Artworks

Cvejić and Vujanović (2012) have convincingly argued that we live in 'the Century of the Self'. In a century that celebrates the individual, artists' subjectivities, private feelings, self-determination and self-expression are produced and promoted by means of images and trends, as if they were the artworks. Cvejić and Vujanović write:

> in the art field, the artistic aura has shifted from artworks—which since then have been produced both as unique objects and reproduced copies—toward artists themselves, who are assigned the social role of being authentic, different, outstanding, and above all, non-conformist personalities. (2012: 138)

In light of this claim, it can be argued that in certain cases an artist's personality can have more of an impact in the capitalist economy than their artwork, a condition that has serious implications for the relationship between life and work. Maaike Bleeker's essay 'Being Janez Janša' (2013), where she discusses the artists' name change as a tactical interventionist art project, elaborates on the conflation of public and private life, moving the argument about the artist's personality in contrast to his artwork into a larger political perspective. Referring to Richard Sennett, Bleeker shows that private and public life are confused, and because of this the private determines our evaluation of politics and politicians. As she writes, '[i]n this situation, public expression becomes personal representation while political representation is authenticated by means of reference to private feelings and convictions' (2013: 138). Agamben echoes this point when discussing the current process of de-politicisation, saying that 'action and inaction, the private and the public are progressively blurred and become indistinguishable' (2014).

In order to further unpack the implications of fusing life and work, it is useful to take into account the wider neoliberal milieu of immaterial labour. According to the philosophical reflection of the Italian post-Operaists, due to post-Fordist forms of immaterial labour, we are in a phase of cognitive capitalism and experience economy. This means that the production of wealth is increasingly dependent on the immaterial labour of human beings, that is, their linguistic, intellectual, affective, cognitive and communicative capacities. Information, experience, emotions and knowledge are appropriated by the capital, which is to say that they function both as human properties and as commodities. Shannon Jackson writes that the world of labour organises emotions in order to produce immaterial experiences, and acknowledges that

> Lazzarato's definition of immaterial labor was able to capture not only the fleeting nature of the service experience, but also the wider emphases of a so-called 'knowledge economy,' in which immaterial products circulated as information, software, and other forms of 'cognitive' innovation. (2012: 13)

Against this backdrop, in many situations there no longer exists a differentiation between private and public or work and leisure. Wealth equals life, and the neoliberal subject is constantly available for work; their work is their life and they can best be 'themselves' through their work. As Nicholas Ridout and Rebecca Schneider point out, 'Life and work, and their dependence upon one another, are often imagined as increasingly precarious, their futures shadowed by pervasive terror as well as anxieties about work' (2012: 5).[2]

At the same time, the demands of the economy and capital require that concerns for audience numbers and budgets outweigh the focus on artists' conditions of work or their artworks. Merx (2012) discusses the troublesome state of art's autonomy in the Netherlands, illustrating a situation current in many other neoliberal countries. According to Merx, the value of the art is not entirely denied, but it is expressed in economic terms and is therefore subjected to the reality of the market. She points out that

> Artists and cultural institutions are addressed as cultural entrepreneurs. In order to qualify for money they have to demonstrate their shrewdness in exploring new financial sources and strategic partners as well as ability to attract large and broad audiences and generate, at least partly, their own funding. The legitimacy of art is understood purely in neoliberal terms. Whoever is able to create or find their market has a right to exist. (2012: 26)[3]

In the same article, Merx highlights that the Dutch government primarily supports creative industries and cultural institutions that are either able to represent the Dutch national culture in regard to tourism and cultural diplomacy, or to foster social integration.

Thus, it can be asserted that the relationship between artists, artworks, politics and politicians is a highly problematic one. The equating of the artwork with the artist, politics with the politicians, the private with the public and work with life is accompanied by mistrust in the values of art and politics in general, unless they serve economic or governmental interests.

Fig 1. Janez Janša, Janez Janša, Janez Janša, *Masterpiece on MasterCard, Credits* series, 2013. Image courtesy of Aksioma.

Janez Janša: Conflicts and Complicities

In the summer of 2007 the three artists mentioned at the outset, who were living in Ljubljana, Slovenia, changed their names to that of the politician Janez Janša. Why would these artists—already well established in their careers in contemporary performing arts and whose overall work suggests that they ideologically position themselves to the Left—go to the trouble of becoming members of the Slovenian right-wing democratic party and eventually change their names to the then Prime Minister's, following a thorough legal procedure? The reply of the artists to this question is that it was a personal decision that was made after careful consideration and on the basis that there are no boundaries between their works and their private lives. Bleeker rightly remarks that 'the tripling of their gesture highlights that what in fact is given is no explanation at all' (2013: 139). As they wrote in the letter to the politician Janez Janša, informing him of their name change:

> For us, there are no boundaries between our work, our art, and our lives, and, in this respect, we believe we are no different from you. We live for what we create and, with your permission, we would like to quote here the words from the letter you sent us when we joined SDS: 'The more we are, the faster we will reach the goal!' (Lukan, 2008: 9)

Several publications, performances, films and exhibitions have taken place since 2007 that are sometimes critical of the political party and its ideology, but not directly of the politician whose name the artists share.[4] Here, an overview of this series of works can illuminate the diverse formats and paths this life-long project has been taking. The first public appearance of the three Janšas in an artistic context was the exhibition *Mount Triglav* (2007), which was a re-enactment of a performance by the Slovenian avant-garde movement *OHO* in 1968. A publication, an exhibition and a lecture-performance titled *NAME Readymade* followed, together with a glossy biography of

the artists Janez Janša. *NAME Readymade* is comprised of material that shows impressions, reactions and the collateral consequences of the name change with regard to their lives and work. Each of the elements in the project presented a different aspect. The biography was written as if there were only one Janez Janša, born as Janez Janša.

In 2008 they created the work *Signature, Event, Context*, which they performed at the Holocaust Memorial in Berlin.[5] This was one work in a series of signatures in public spaces that culminated in the exhibition *Signature* (2010), in which another artist was commissioned to paint the three artists' signatures in twenty-seven paintings. The paintings were, however, signed by the Janšas, who used their old and new signatures in different combinations. Since 2010 they have been presenting the documentary performance *The More of Us There Are, the Faster We Will Reach Our Goal*, which explores name changing, name branding and identity, and consists of interviews with people on the street and with experts in the fields of law, art and theory. The documentary film *My Name is Janez Janša* (2012) explores the role of one's name in private and public life, as well as issues of homonymy and name change. More recently they have been displaying personal documentation (identity cards, SDS membership cards) and valid customised bankcards as artworks, in the *Troika* and *Credits* series (2013).

Fig. 2. Janez Janša, Janez Janša, Janez Janša, *Masterpiece on MasterCard, Credits* series, 2013. Image courtesy of Aksioma

Their themes, concepts and objects arise from this 'intimate' decision of the name change. Blurring the boundaries between their lives and work can be understood as 'a continuum that exists because their name is Janez Janša' (Quaranta, 2013: 74). Not exactly an art project but neither a private life decision (these artists were already and still are well-known public figures in their field), the name change has provoked a series of events and generated various artworks that create bafflement as to how one should read and understand them.[6] Without directly attacking or creating propaganda against 'real' Slovenian politic(ian)s, the three Janšas seem to be engaged in an ongoing critique of political and institutional mechanisms, which has moved beyond their

national borders. They do this by means of a continual tracing and display of different stages and occurrences in their lives as artists and as citizens that pertain to crises, that is, the paradoxes, incoherence and irrationalities of artistic, legal, administrative, ideological and economic circumstances.[7]

Their story could also be told this way: three members of SDS decide to follow the party motto ('the more of us there are, the faster we will reach our goal') literally, which brings them to the point of changing their names into that of the party's leader. These three citizens are professional artists who use life experience to make art. And in this case, quite literally so. The legal procedure of that name change provides them with a series of new documents and bankcards that end up featuring in publications and being exhibited as artworks in galleries and museums.[8] Having new names, the artists need to create new signatures, which they transform into a series of performative acts and an exhibition. Along the way, they also get curious about other cases of people who have changed their names in later life, or who share the same name, and the artists decide to make a documentary performance and a film about that. And the story continues.

This brief narrative reveals that when one tries to conform as literally as possible to slogans, laws, bureaucratic procedures and artistic prerogatives, one starts enacting the absurdity that is inherent but often invisible within them. What may give the impression of a joke or blasphemy in fact looks like a collective and committed effort to re-enter society with a new name, by submitting to regulations and procedures as strictly as possible. One of the Janez Janšas explains, 'I am not trying to work between the law, to find holes in the law. No. I'm working with the law'.[9] The artists, unaware where each step will lead them next, take decisions and actions upon tensions and changes that happen over the course of time. Thus, performative acts and artistic projects emerge along the way. According to the three artists, many of these actions are merely produced by the system in which they exist, and they call this '"collateral art" because these traces are produced by the media or the political, economic or legal systems as a response to, and a side effect of the name change' (Quaranta, 2013: 42). Nevertheless, I would argue that the artists still decide how to react and what to make public in this process. At the same time, Bleeker considers their project radically relational, that is, it is actively intrinsic to the contexts in and with which it operates. Their project, she writes, demonstrates

> how their new identity is not merely a matter of the three artists named Janez Janša designing themselves and tactically using media opportunities to expose themselves to others, but also of them being designed by the media, by all kind of legal and other practices, and by the gaze of others perceiving them. (2013: 152)

In their letter to Janez Janša, the politician, the artists pronounce the decision of changing their names an 'intimate' one and explain that like him, they have no boundaries between their lives and their work. This statement, however, highlights the difficulty of discerning between 'intimacy' and 'being in public'. Bleeker's account—that this is a tactical interventionist act—is crucial to consider here, as it points to a practice in the public space that disrupts and destabilises what is taken for granted (2013). Each artist continues with his own work and life under a different name, without seeking to become or to pretend to be the politician or the other two artists in any way. Nonetheless, each artist's public actions and decisions inevitably implicate one another, as well as the homonymous politician. In 'the Century of the Self' where the artist and the artwork, life and work coincide, it could be argued that the three artists announce their decision to actually submit to this expectation of equating their work with their lives. At the same time, they recognise, or perhaps attribute, the same feature to the political persona of the SDS party. It is thus implicit that politicians and artists have in common their public appearance and that their private conditions

and public function have been fused. This statement is crucial in pointing to the fact that nowadays artworks and political deeds cannot be separated from the artists' and politicians' 'selves', which are frequently considered in terms of aura, charisma and talent. Artists and politicians experience a similar condition, although the former are often less visible and the latter more powerful.

In their recent exhibition series *Troika* and *Credits* (2013)—where valid identity cards and credit and debit bankcards are exhibited—the three artists engage more directly with the tensions between artworks, artists and infrastructures. More specifically, in *Troika,* they display official documents from the SDS party (membership cards), their identity cards and three Mastercards (customised with images from the artists' public act *Mount Triglav*), which represent the political alignment, legal status and financial means of the artists. In *Credits*, debit and credit cards are presented in triptychs: *Mount Triglav on Golden MasterCard*, *Golden Triglav on Golden Maestro* and *Signatures on Maestro*. The front sides of the cards have the artists' signatures as background images.

Fig 3. Janez Janša, Janez Janša, Janez Janša, *Masterpiece on MasterCard, Credits* series, 2013. Image courtesy of Aksioma.

These are documents that administratively certify the synchronous legal, political and economic existence of three people with the same name, and that inevitably allude to a fourth one. The multiplication of a name in authorised official documents, such as the SDS membership cards with the artists' photos and their earlier names, evoke a sense of paranoia when displayed inside an art gallery because of the various contradictory significations. The gallery is suddenly transformed into a place in which a perplexing and diffused notion of the 'self' is constructed and evidenced through issued and legal documentation. In this way, straightforward distinctions between 'self' and 'other' are disrupted and the logic of artistic individualism is undermined.

The principal function of such documents is to validate and codify the existence and state of a citizen, to index them biopolitically.[10] Following Michel Foucault, Agamben has written extensively on the study of biopolitics, which marks the 'growing inclusion of man's [sic] natural life in the mechanisms and calculations of power' (1998: 119). For Foucault, the inquiry of biopolitics was mainly situated in hospitals and prisons. For Agamben, the inquiry focuses on the analysis of concentration camps and biometric technologies (i.e. fingerprints, identity cards photographs, optical scanners, etc.). As he explains, in the previous century biometric technologies were meant for specific groups (such as animals, Jews, criminals) and today are applied to all citizens under the guise of security apparatuses. In this sense, according to Agamben, biopower plays a major role in increasing the State's control over the people, while substituting political and social identity with the biological one. Due to the blurring between biological and political life, the very existence of political practice is called into question.[11] Agamben claims that

> This transformation is so extreme, that we can legitimately ask not only if the society in which we live is still a democratic one, but also if this society can still be considered *political*. (2014; emphasis added)

When moved into an art space, these documents create incoherency, which on the one hand concerns their reception (aesthetic and conceptual) and on the other, the institutional conditions for their function and display. As it is rightly argued in the book *Troika* (Quaranta, 2013) these works are beyond 'readymades'. They have not lost their function as objects, at least not until they expire or are revoked, and, contrary to 'readymades', which are usually mass produced, they are unique: 'an ID card cannot be replicated without breaking the law, and the artwork *Troika* cannot be converted into an art edition' (Quaranta, 2013: 40). Moreover, valid debit and credit bankcards are not just unique documents but are also connected to bank accounts through the digits inscribed on them, which means that the artists and the public and private institutions involved may risk theft when these are displayed. What is more, when one of the banks advertised the possibility of customising their clients' cards—a sign of the uniqueness of the object and of the cardholder—the artists seized this opportunity. Hence, some of the exhibited cards are personalised with pictures, pointing to and appropriating strategies of individualism and promotion of the 'self'.

At the same time, these bankcards create connecting lines between art galleries, where they are exhibited, and banks. According to the artists' statement, these are lines of 'trust' that ensure the safety of the products (money or artworks):

> Two institutions of trust are thus put on the same level: the banks create the conditions for production, produce debit and credit cards and look after the money deposited in the accounts associated with these cards, while the museum ensures that the public has access to these objects and, at the same time, that these objects remain safe and intact. The artwork consists not in the bank cards as such, but rather in the parallelism of double trust. (Quaranta, 2013: 59)

Since these objects occupy two positions simultaneously, that of an artwork and that of a functional object of documentation and capital, the artists, the relevant public institutions, the specific banks and the art institution are equally involved. The tension of this collaboration is evident, for instance, when the artists had to negotiate with the banks and other institutional partners for the triptych *Signatures on Maestro*, because signatures have the function of identification on bankcards and not of illustration. The tension is even more apparent in the legal

appeal to the Ministry of Culture on behalf of the Museum of Modern Art in Ljubljana, which began in 2013. The museum asked the Ministry to intervene in the process of permitting the purchase of the identity cards of the three artists, in order to include them in the permanent collection. At the same time, though, the museum and the bank were accomplices in order to allow the artists' bankcards to be exhibited safely while still being active and in light of duplicate cards being issued for the artists' personal use. It thus appears that different institutions are acting on behalf of others and, perhaps, not only for themselves. Currently, the artists are planning the project *Masterpiece on MasterCard*, where they will insert their identity cards as background images on their bankcards. This is a sensitive issue because it requires an official document to be printed on another official document. Although MasterCard headquarters have been supportive, the procedure is undergoing further investigation (Quaranta, 2013: 58).

An odd decision that was taken a few years ago, a particular process of name changing, has provoked a series of circumstances and events in the three artists' lives. Complicities and mistrust between artists, artworks and governmental infrastructures are at work during this time. This ongoing process locates and discloses the incoherency of administrative, financial and legal systems that are usually pronounced as consistent, just and efficient. Due to the specific function and 'problematic' nature of the artworks in question, the right conditions for art and politics to be involved in a mutual undertaking and to confront each other are created. More importantly, this project sets the scene for the artistic and political domains to be in relation to each other, which basically suggests that substantial disagreement and mistrust, but also complicities, can occur and be made visible. In this way, crisis is not necessarily being managed. Rather, it is decisively specified and rendered visible. At the same time, art *matters* differently in the larger political landscape. It is not there just as a social service or as a commodity. Instead, it operates as an activity that articulates problems, reveals inconsistencies and creates affinities. Antagonism and complicities between artists, politicians, institutions, banks, documents, artworks and politics are brought into the public space, and require the practice of judgement.

Politicisation of Citizenship

Janez Janšas' work would perhaps not be as politically relevant if it were not for its temporal dimension. The name change has produced critical circumstances and events that the artists anticipate, judge and decide to display, emphasise, exploit or continue over time. This demonstrates a practice of decision-making, by means of art and of a *pluralised* form of life, which happens at the time of the crisis: zooming in, reflecting, deciding and acting upon the present critical event while implicating others who co-exist in the same context. By revealing the inconsistency and irrationality of the system, they judge and act upon it in a manner that triggers inter-sectorial involvement and public activity. Against the current state of proclaimed crisis and indecisiveness, their artistic practice shows a type of continuous and collective engagement that determinedly acts upon critical moments by exposing them.

In his talk in Greece, Agamben referred to Christian Meier's take on the 'politisation [sic] of citizenship' in classical Athens, where citizenship became a form of life in the city (*polis*) distinct from the private life at home (*oikos*). 'The citizens of a democracy considered themselves as members of the *polis*, only in so far as they devoted themselves to a political life' (Agamben, 2014). In other words, social identity was dependent on citizenship, and politics was practised in the public space. However, today, according to Agamben, citizens are bereft of their social and political identity due to the rising control of the State by means of biopower. Rather, the focus is on bodily identity 'in order to produce healthy, well-ordered and manageable bodies' (2014). In this context, Agamben justly announces the disappearance of political life—the process of 'de-

politisation', as he calls it—in contemporary Western democracy, in favour of a state of policing and control.

The artistic work of the three Janšas is situated and intervenes in this very context and can therefore be understood as enacting the 'politisation' of citizenship. Particularly in the case of the recent exhibitions of legal identification documents and bankcards under the same name, it becomes apparent that governmental mechanisms and strategies—in other words, the State's performance—are being played out in public.[12] Rather than directly attacking or merely ignoring legal and administrative procedures and infrastructures and their sociopolitical implications in this process, the artists' work *enters* into this logic, captures its inconsistency and moves it off its axis.

Notes

1. Judith Butler wrote about the notion of 'precarity' in her book *Precarious Life* (2004), referring to terror, dependency and the vulnerability of life vis-à-vis US politics and the Israel-Palestine conflict. This concept was later developed in performance theory, especially with the *TDR* issue titled 'Precarity and Performance' (2012), edited by Nicholas Ridout and Rebecca Schneider, which posed the question 'How do we pay attention to precarity—economic precarity and the sheer vulnerability of a body in tenuous relation to modernity's "human rights"—through a consideration of the performing body, in all of its multitude?' (7). In the same issue, Shannon Jackson's article situates precarity precisely in the neoliberal context. She explains that labourers are thought to be 'free' to change jobs and avoid situations that provide employment regulation and security. In her words, '[t]he paradoxical advancement of a kind of "institutional individualism" celebrated privatized models of creativity and life management, so that "risk" could become synonymous with thrill and creative speculation rather than with precarity and insecurity' (22).

2. Pascal Gielen and Paul de Bruyne (2009) even suggest that the artist is the model employee of the post-Fordist world, since s/he is an ideal creative worker whose professional skills are dependent on his/her assets of imagination and skills of socialisation.

3. For instance, Dutch right-wing politician Geert Wilders famously announced in his election program that 'Art is a left-wing hobby'. For more information see: http://www.groene.nl/artikel/dag-linkse-hobby-s.

4. Interestingly, after the three artists changed their name, it was discovered that the real name of the politician was Ivan Janša. He started using the name Janez when he entered politics because it sounded more Slovene. On 5 June 2013, Janez Janša was sentenced to two years in prison for corruption.

5. *Signature, Event, Context* started with the artists signing their name with stones in a mountain. This is a common tradition in Slovenia but if one writes it on a large scale, as they did, it is associated with Tito's name written in this way in the former Yugoslavia.

6. It should be noted that one of the three artists, Žiga Kariž, decided after a while to return to his initial name. He is currently using the name Janez Janša as a pseudonym.

7. *NSK – Neue Slowenische Kunst* can be considered as a precedent to Janšas' work with legal documents. *NSK*, which is a political art collective, was formed in Slovenia (former Yugoslavia) in 1984. They created diplomatic embassies, issued their own passports and held congresses of their citizens. Moreover, they would not sign their artistic work as individuals, undermining the author's individuality, and would make use of opposing ideologies (e.g. leftist and totalitarian ones). On that basis, it could be argued that both *NSK*'s and Janšas' works seek to destabilise policies of citizenship and identity.

8. Blaž Lukan rightly remarks about the name change that '[it] is not only an intimate performance, it is also a peculiar social spectacle. The name – even though it is originally assigned to one arbitrarily, at birth, at

christening, or when the newborn is registered in the records – signifies one's legal, administrative, identity as well as one's intimate self becomes merely representation through this name change; the change legalizes, or rather, reveals precisely the original randomness of the name' (2008: 19). This type of spectacle also had financial value: in 2010 a valid passport was sold at auction for € 1,900 as an artwork by Janez Janša, Janez Janša and Janez Janša.

9. Personal conversation with Janez Janša (previously known as Emil Hrvatin) during the research residency of the Working Group on Art of Lawlessness at Het Veem Theater in Amsterdam, 17/12/2013. See: http://hetveemtheater.nl/en/agenda/2013/12/09/working-group-on-art-of-lawlessness-2/

10. 'The work *Troika* deals with three pillars of contemporary biopolitics: politics, law and economy' (from a description of the project at http://www.aksioma.org/troika/).

11. Reading Aristotle, Agamben has distinguished between two terms that mean 'life' in Greek: *zoē*, which expresses the mere fact of life, common to all living beings, and *bios,* which refers to a way of living that is particular to an individual or a group. Agamben acknowledges that Hannah Arendt was the first to detect how biological life (*zoē*) has been rendered primary to political action. Later on Foucault, without reference to Arendt's work, showed that natural life has been included in the modern State's calculations and mechanisms, transforming politics into *biopolitics*. Agamben (1998) has shown that the concentration camp is the exemplary case of modern biopolitics. The politicisation of life as such is what has caused the concealment of political thought and action.

12. In a similar tone, Agamben has suggested that today true anomy and anarchy exists within governmental structures, where the State's power is gathered. Therefore, it is not possible to imagine anarchy differently today. According to Agamben, the exercise of power cannot change by inflicting anarchy at the outside, but from exposing the anomy that already exists inside power: to destitute rather than constitute power (February, 2014).

Works Cited

Agamben, Giorgio. *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*, trans. Daniel Heller-Roazen (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998; 1995).

Agamben, Giorgio. 'From the State of Control to a Praxis of Destituent Power', transcript of a public lecture given on 16 November 2013 in Athens (4 February 2014), http://www.chronosmag.eu/index.php/g-agamben-for-a-theory-of-destituent-power.html

Bleeker, Maaike. 'Being Janez Janša', in Matthew Causey and Fintan Walsh (eds.) *Performance, Identity, and the Neo-Political Subject* (London: Routledge, 2013), 138–153.

Butler, Judith. *Precarious Life: The Powers of Mourning and Violence* (New York: Verso, 2004).

Cvejić, Bojana and Vujanović, Ana. *Public Sphere by Performance* (Berlin: b_books, in co-operation with co-publisher Les Laboratoires d'Aubervilliers, 2012). Available at http://issuu.com/katalogija/docs/_____public_sphere_web-single

Gielen, Pascal and De Bruyne, Paul (eds.). *Being an Artist in Post-Fordist Times* (Rotterdam: NAi Publishers, 2009).

Jackson, Shannon. 'Just-in-Time: Performance and the Aesthetics of Precarity', *TDR: The Drama Review* 56.4 (2012): 10–31.

Lukan, Blaž. 'The Janez Janša Project', trans. Petek Polona et al. in *NAME: Readymade*, ed. Janez Janša, Janez Janša, Janez Janša (Ljubljana: Moderna galerija, 2008), 9-30. Available at http://www.aksioma.org/name_book/name_readymade.pdf

Merx, Sigrid. 'The Argument of Autonomy: The Missing Link in the Discursive Arena', *The Walking Theory* 20, special issue 'Art and the Public Good' (2012): 23–29.

Milohnić, Aldo. 'Ready-Name (Over-identification through Over-multiplication)', trans. Petek Polona et al. in *NAME: Readymade*, ed. Janez Janša, Janez, Janša, Janez Janša (Ljubljana: Moderna galerija, 2008), 121–132. Available at http://www.aksioma.org/name_book/name_readymade.pdf

Quaranta, Domenico. (ed.). *Troika* (Brescia: Link Editions, in co-operation with Ljubljana: Aksioma – Institute for Contemporary Art, 2013). Available at http://issuu.com/linkeditions/docs/domenico_quaranta_troika_link_editi/76

Ridout, Nicholas, and Rebecca Schneider. 'Precarity and Performance: An Introduction', *TDR: The Drama Review* 56.4 (2012): 5–9.

KONSTANTINA GEORGELOU (K.G.Georgelou@uu.nl; constantinageor@gmail.com) *works as a performing arts theorist, dramaturge and researcher. She is currently a lecturer and research advisor at Utrecht University, ArtEZ Master of Choreography, DasArts and SNDO. In 2011 she co-curated the PSi Regional Research Cluster in Athens. She publishes articles internationally (*Performance Research*, Maska*, On Air, TeaK-Kinesis*, ArtEZ Press*). Her research interests concern modes of working together, dramaturgy and the intersection between performing arts and science.*