universität wien

MASTERARBEIT / MASTER'S THESIS

Titel der Masterarbeit / Title of the Master's Thesis

"Naši" ("Our" people) in Vienna: Beyond a "Yugoslav" diaspora"

verfasst von / submitted by

Mag. Jelena Mihajlović Ignjatović

angestrebter akademischer Grad / in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts (MA)

Studienkennzahl lt. Studienblatt / degree programme code as it appears on the student record sheet:	***A 066 656***
Studienrichtung lt. Studienblatt / degree programme as it appears on the student record sheet:	***Master studies CREOLE-Cultural Differences and Transnational Processes***
Betreut von / Supervisor:	***Univ.-Prof. Dr. Jelena Tosić***
Mitbetreut von / Co-Supervisor:	***Dr. Ivan Rajković***

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First of all, I would like to express my gratitude to all my interlocutors who were willing to share their thoughts and experiences with me, to “our” people who live, work or socialise at Märzstraße or anywhere in Vienna. A special thank you goes to my first interviewee, Goran, who introduced me to many other interlocutors and “opened many doors” to “our” people, and of course to the Sofra restaurant team, who made it possible to experience personally and fully what it is like to be a part of the community that I researched.

I would also like to express my deepest gratitude to my professors; Professor Ayşe Çağlar and Professor Monika Palmberger, who lead me through this process from the beginning and contributed with many ideas and initial inputs that greatly shaped my work; Professor Jelena Tošić and Professor Ivan Rajković, whose support, wealth of suggestions and dedication made it possible for me to complete this process and to raise this thesis even to a higher level, by giving it more of my own voice.
I would also like to thank Professor Jaka Repič for providing the additional literature within diaspora studies and my colleague Ana Čuković, for sharing her MA thesis - both were very beneficial for my own work.
Special thank you goes to the whole department of Cultural and Social Anthropology of University of Vienna and to all my professors who brought back my belief in higher education, taught me what it means to love the science that you are studying, and helped me realise who I actually am, professionally.

The biggest and warmest *Thank you* is for my family and friends, for all their love and support.
I could never express how grateful I am to my parents, Ljubica and Dragan Mihajlović, whose love and believing in me provided me with a secure base from which I could further self-develop. I am also grateful to my brother, Vladimir Mihajlović, a sociology student and a history fan, for history-related consultations, and to my first cousin, Aleksandar Saša Gavrilović, MD and a member of this community, with whom I exchanged many ideas.
I am thankful to my colleague and friend, Jovana Čanji Arandjelović, English teacher and MA of Human rights, who found a way for my writing to be even more “in the spirit” of the English language. I am especially grateful to yet another Vladimir Mihajlović, one of my best friends, Assoc. Prof. of Archaeology at the Department of History, University of Novi Sad, for his support, advice and provided literature.
Thank you from all my heart goes to my husband - sociologist, Darko Ignjatović, who ensured daily support in this process, starting with taking care of our daughter so I could research and write, for his patience and encouragement in difficult moments and also for constant brainstorming, exchange of ideas and help in developing this master thesis as it is today.

This year marks 30 years since the breakup of Yugoslavia. On that note, I would like to dedicate this master thesis to a confused child in me, as well as to millions of other people, post-Yugoslavs, who grew up in the time of the breakup of Yugoslavia, and to the others, older and younger, who never stopped wondering, whether, under some different conditions, some other reality would be possible.

I am also dedicating this thesis to my daughter Una, with words:

"*My dear Una, never forget that everything is possible"*

(even to "find" a part of a "Yugoslav" space in a "foreign" land in other time, when and where you would have never expected)

TABLE OF CONTENT

Introduction - The land out of its time and space?

I remember my first day when I moved to Vienna. A relative took me to a small cafe, near the Vienna University Campus - Cafe Zeit in 8th district, a place for students owned by a man from Bosnia. This cafe is not considered to be a place where many former Yugoslav usually go. Still, I met a few people from Serbia, two from Bosnia[1] and a girl from Croatia - in Vienna, the capital of Austria, where one can presume that he or she will firstly meet the Austrians. And that was just the first day. In the next few days in Vienna I met more people from Croatia and Bosnia than I did in my whole life.

Another thing that surprised me, apart from a great number of former Yugoslavs in this city, was that all of them were socialising together wherever I went, and especially the way people have been calling each other. I had just recently come from Serbia and for me it was unusual that here, in Vienna, former Yugoslavs, regardless of their ethnicity or land of origin, are called "naši" (our people), among each other. And it stayed unusual. For a day, or two. And then, I just realised that all former Yugoslavs also have become "our people" for me. And the Serbian language also has become "our language", just like that, over the night. This was the most noticeable in the situations where someone "new" would move from Serbia to Vienna - at the beginning, this other person would call the language Serbian, and I would call it "ours". But already the next time we would meet, we would both call it "ours".

All of this led to an impression, that I have been having since - that former Yugoslavs, in Vienna, still considered themselves as one community, or maybe even as one nation. I was wondering if this is just my impression or if the other former Yugoslavs experience this belonging in a similar way. As Povrzanović Frykman says, "it does not really make sense to presume that people perceive themselves as part of a community, or even of a group - the existence of this relationship with a certain group should not be presumed, but rather observed in the process of research" (Povrzanović Frykman, 2004, 87). If these people also see themselves as part of one community, how this all came to be and what is the "bond" that keeps them together? Could this community be called diasporic, or it extends beyond the definition of diaspora?

This is how I decided to try to explore this complex topic and to see what I will discover during the field research. Historian Ivanović (2012) says that motivation for researching never comes just for the urge to discover the reality, but also so we could explain that reality to ourselves. It is certain that I also needed to explain to myself how it is possible that in the capital city of Austria, 30 years after the breakup of Yugoslavia (thus in different time and space), there is a group of former Yugoslavs, where people still feel as one community.

Many people from Yugoslavia migrated to Vienna, while the former country still existed. They left one country, and while being physically absent that country disappeared. In a way, they were

[1] Even Though the full name of the state is Bosnia and Herzegovina, I would be using just shorter name "Bosnia" in this thesis

left without a homeland. They found themselves in an uncomfortable position as citizens of a nation that no longer existed (Mazzucchelli, 2012). How did this affect their image of the former Yugoslav community in Vienna and relations to its other members? Did ethnic belonging become more relevant than “being” (feeling like) a Yugoslav?

I have been living in Vienna for almost 6 years now and during this period I got in contact with many former Yugoslavian migrants, who are of different age, profile, background, and have migrated to Vienna in different periods of time. At first, I assumed that people who had migrated to Vienna before the breakup of Yugoslavia still experienced this country as existing and all the former Yugoslav nations as one community, or maybe even one nation. Accordingly, they call all social groups that lived in former Yugoslavia “our people” (what could be considered unusual in former Yugoslav republics). Opposite to the Yugoslav idea, what once brought different nations together and was the basis for the shared identity, the nationalist discourse in newly formed states, former Yugolsav republics, tried to minimise the similarities between the different nations, as the chance for their further together living (Srebotnjak, 2016). My first thoughts were that it could be possible that people who left Yugoslavia before 1990s and were physically absent during its break up, were not influenced by the political tension, the war or this strong nationalistic propaganda in everyday life and on daily bases (at least not so intensively as people still living in the former Yugoslav Republics at that time), so they could preserve the image and the brotherhood and unity of the old Yugoslavia and continue to keep and develop this image within the community in Vienna (For a moment it looked like Yugoslavia continued to live on in Vienna, like “the land out of its space and time”). I wondered whether these people still feel like Yugoslavs and do they maybe even experience Yugonostalgia.

Mette Berg (2011) writes that the answer to the question why people from diaspora remember their homeland differently lies in the time period when they left it, with historically embedded experiences that it carries and shapes the modes of remembering and relating to home, but also away. Accordingly, it is possible that one generation interprets events in a different way, or even does not recognize the experiences of the other. But, then I realised this is not the case just with people who migrated before the 1990s, but also the students I met, as well as other people who came from former Yugoslav republics after the 1990s - we call all former Yugoslavs “our people”. Could this kind of atmosphere be somehow presented to the “new” migrants? How do they understand it, and do they accept it, while becoming a part of this community? Could their image of this community even be connected with “Yugoslav” identity?

While thinking about the former Yugoslav community in Vienna, and doing the preliminary research, another question had to be raised. While on one side, we have people from former Yugoslav republics socialising and being connected in practice, on the other, if we look at the organisations related to the people from former Yugoslavian republics in Vienna, they are strictly separated by ethnicities, and it is even often emphasised in their name (like

Serbian/Croatian/Bosniak Association/Club/Organisation/Society). Fischer (2003) writes that after the 1990s the Yugoslav organisations in Vienna started declaring themselves Serbian, Croatian, etc., since then have been trying to nationalise “their" migrants. By Mijić (2019) no Yugoslav association or cultural club survived the Yugoslavian disintegration. If we look at the time of their establishment, we will see that the majority of them were created after the 1990s, after the breakup of Yugoslavia. What does this mean? Is this maybe just a question of funding (for example if they get the most of their funds from the mother states) or this could actually indicate the separation of ethnic/national identities, in opposition to a common, former Yugoslav identity, even though people socialise in practice?

My thesis focuses on the multifaceted nature of the connections between people of the former Yugoslav community in Vienna. The aim was to answer the following research questions: What kind of connections are maintained between former Yugoslavs in Vienna? What holds these people together, even though their mother lands are different (now)? What are the belonging modes of former Yugoslavs in Vienna? (Are they Yugoslavs, former Yugoslavs, “Serbs”, “Croats”, “Bosnians”, “Bosniaks”, “our people”, or something else?) Were the belonging modes deconstructed (and then again reconstructed), after the break up in Yugoslavia, and in what way? Furthermore, how does this community fit into the definition of diaspora?

In order to grasp this phenomenon I had been researching the former Yugoslav community in Vienna for two years, starting December 2019 until December 2021. During my field research I tried to concentrate on Mäzstraße, a street in 15th district that has been considered “a former Yugoslav street”. My main research method was participant observation. Additionally to visiting former Yugoslav places, I have been working in one of the bakeries/restaurants on Märzstraße, for six months, in order to enjoy the method of participant observation in its full sense. During this period I was in contact with this community almost on a daily basis, and I (informally) talked with the owners, other workers, customers, neighbours, etc. With the aim to gain even a better insight, I also conducted 10 interviews with various former Yugoslavs, who are of different gender, age, time of migration (or been born in Vienna), ethnicity, professional, social and educational background, etc. Finally, in order to acquire the broader picture, I was using digital ethnography as an additional research tool, especially at the beginning of the research and during the COVID 19 lockdowns in Vienna, when it was not possible to be physically present on the field sites, such as cafes or restaurants.

Here I will briefly present the structure of the thesis. After the Introduction, in order to contextualise the population that I have been researching, it is important to briefly present its (historical) background. This is the topic that I will be dealing with in the first chapter - “Word or two about the former Yugoslavs in Vienna”. In the second chapter I will present the Theoretical background of my research (“Diaspora and nostalgia”), which will be followed by the

explanation how I did my research - in the third, Methodological story. In the fourth chapter, before the Conclusion, I will present and discuss the findings of my research (Empirical story).

However, before we continue, a few explanations have to be made. Firstly, I will be using terms ethnicity and nation equally, and sometimes as synonyms, but this does not mean that I am equating these two notions. This is due the complexity of the situation, where the topic includes different territories and time periods; Yugoslavia (past), Vienna (present) (where different social groups are considered ethnicities), and former Yugoslav republics (present) (where some of these ethnicities have become nations).
Secondly, when I write “different former Yugoslav ethnicities" in Vienna, I will be mostly writing about “Serbs”, “Croats” and “Bosniaks”, since they are the three largest groups of former Yugoslavs in Vienna. Bosniak (Bošnjak) is a term officially used for all the Muslims that live in former Yugoslavs Republics, but most often it refers to Muslims from Bosnia (and this is how I will be using it in this thesis). Bosnian (Bosanac) is a term for all people from Bosnia and Herzegovina, regardless of their ethnicity or religious background (“Serbs”, “Croats” and “Bosniaks”, or Orthodox Christians, Catholics and Muslims).
And finally, when I write about the language(s) of these groups, I will be using both language and/or dialect, since languages are politically separated in the former Yugoslav republics, after the breakup of Yugoslavia, but on the other hand, are usually considered as one language by linguists, as well as the Austrian government (what I will elaborate later).

The contribution of this thesis could be multiple. It is often heard that nationalist tendencies in diasporas can be strengthened even more than in homeland. In spite of that, it seems that former Yugoslavs in Vienna are creating forms of bonds that are in opposition to the newly nationalis tendencies. Within the thesis I will try to explore if this is the case that contradicts such common thinking. Here I will also deal with some of the topics that did not receive much attention so far. For example, there is a lot of literature that deals with emergence of new ethnic/ national identities after the breakup of Yugoslavia in the new formed republics, but not so much the ones exploring what happened to these identities, social networks or social spaces of former Yugoslavs in the lands of immigration. Similarly, there is a lot of literature that deals with nostalgia in relation to diaspora, and on the other side, we can read a lot about Yugonostalgia, but we cannot read almost anything about Yugonostalgia in diaspora. Diaspora is strongly related with the concepts of memory and nostalgia, nevertheless, the concepts of diaspora and memory are rarely combined in the research process (Palmberger, Tosić, 2016); (Lacroix, Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, 2013). In this master thesis all these concepts - diaspora, memory, nostalgia and Yugonostalgia have been taken into consideration, as the relations between them. Finally, with the example of former Yugoslavs in Vienna, in this thesis I am challenging the most common definition of diaspora, in which diaspora is strongly connected with the national component, and where home (homeland) automatically equals motherland in the sense of nation-state.

A Word or two about the former Yugoslavs in Vienna

In this chapter I will be dealing with the background of the former Yugoslavs in Vienna. In order to get a better insight into this group, I will briefly describe the former Yugoslavs in Vienna (first subchapter), while in the second subchapter I will be dealing with Yugoslav past, legacies and its possible influence on former Yugoslavs living in Vienna.

Who are the former Yugoslavs in Vienna?

Vienna is the city with the largest former Yugoslav population in Europe, outside the former boundaries of Yugoslavia, and also, former Yugoslavs are the most numerous group of people with migrant background in Vienna (Fischer, 2003, 2). It is hard to find the exact number of former Yugoslavs living in the capital of Austria – according to different sources this number goes from 167.000 people to 10% of the Vienna's population, what would be around 186.000 (and this numbers includes only people who still hold citizenship of their country of origin). The editor of the KOSMO magazine, in the interview within this research, said that, according to their unofficial research, the number of former Yugoslavs in Vienna, counting also people who acquired Austrian citizenship and their children and grandchildren born in Vienna, could even reach around 25 percent of Vienna's population. Gebesmair, Brunner and Sperlich (2014) also mention that according to Statistics Austria almost 450,000 people from the successor states of Yugoslavia lived in Austria in 2010 (which makes more than five percent of the Austrian population), while the second and third generation who were born here and/or people who have Austrian citizenship, are not yet taken into account. Who are these people, why, how and when have they come here?

The migration of foreign workers from the territory of the future Yugoslavia to Vienna (Austria) started already at the end of the 19th century (Ivanović, 2012). The most prominent Serbian, Croatian and Bosnian intellectuals from that time period also usually came to Vienna for schooling. At the time Croatia was part of Austria-Hungary, while Bosnia-Herzegovina was placed under Austro-Hungarian military occupation at the 1878 Congress of Berlin (although formally under the administration of the Ottomans. Serbia has been independent since 1830, even though this independence was internationally recognized in 1878. The Habsburg recognized the independence of Serbia, but relations between the two countries had been tense (Austria had long seen Serbia as a threat to the stability of its multi-ethnic empire). When the influence of the Ottoman Empire decreased, Austria-Hungary and Russia started to compete for the Balkan areas. Serbia came more under the influence of the Habsburg sphere, and was forced to accept unfavourable trade agreements (Calic, 2019, 26). The tension burst in an economic conflict known as the Pig (Customs) war, 1906-1908 (where the Habsburgs unsuccessfully imposed a

customs blockade on Serbian pork, its major export), followed by the diplomatic and military crisis over the Austrian surprise annexation of Bosnia in 1908, that made South Slavs, inside and outside of Bosnia and Herzegovina extremely bitter and it took months to pacify the country. On the other hand, a young independent Serbian state had the lack of well-trained and qualified people and had to carry out many reforms and a provide a constitutional government and civil rights, encourage the development of trade and commerce, increase literacy and improve the general educational level of the population and similar (Krestić, 2010). At the beginning Serbian government counted on educated people with Serbian origin living in Austria, thus it made a request to the Austrian government to accept their employment in Serbia. Later, more and more people from Serbia started going to Austria (mostly Vienna) for schooling. Austrian authorities mostly allowed that kind of appeals, in order to affect the politics of Serbia in accordance with its own interests (Krestić, 2010). Mishkova (2006) notes that "the intellectual and political leadership in Serbia, which was educated mostly in Austro-Hungary (and sometimes Russia), constituted the main supplier of „Western knowledge" throughout the 19th and early 20th centuries" (Mishkova, 2006, 37). For some time in the beginning the state of Serbia relied mostly on Austrian-Hungary educated Serbs, since "the first generation of „proper" Serb intellectuals having graduated from Western universities did not appear until the late 1850s" (Mishkova, 2006, 38). The university study of Serbs continued to take place primarily in the Habsburg monarchy until WW1.

First migration of Yugoslav workers started in 1921 and until 1941 already around 30.000 workers were employed in Austria (Ivanović, 2012). In the 1960s Europe encountered a different type of migration - temporal working migration (where this temporality was clearly emphasised by the employing states), thus the workers went with the intention to go back to Yugoslavia one day. In the 1960s Austria made an open call for "guest workers" ("Gastarbeiters"[2]) and the Agreement on Labour Recruitment with the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia was signed in 1965 (Bakondy, 2017; Ivanović, 2012). Despite the Austrian government's expectation for guest workers to go back to their homelands, many of them decided to stay in Austria (Mijić, 2019). The majority of people who emigrated from the former Yugoslavia in the 1960s and the 1970s settled in Vienna, and their number began to increase slowly each year. In the 1970s, 80% of foreign workers in Austria were Yugoslavs (Ivanović, 2012; Bakondy, 2017)[3], and because of

[2] Primarily, the name for the employees from the other countries was "Fremdarbieter" (foreign worker), which was replaced with "Gastarbeiter" (guest worker) at the beginning of 1970s. Later the term "Ausländische Arbeitnehmer" (foreign worker) was used, while today we have "die Leute mit dem Migrationshintergrund" (the people with a migration background). In Yugoslavia the term "Gastarbajter" became common (Ivanović, 2012). "The official definition of the worker abroad was "radnik na privremenom radu u inostranstvu" (worker temporarily employed abroad). The Serbo-Croatian spelling of the German "Gastarbeiter" (guest worker(s) in English) is Gastarbajteri. The term Gastarbajteri is commonly used, even today to define economic migrants of rural origin and low qualifications" (Bernard, 2012, 3-4), people who left during the 60s and 70s with the aim to earn as much as possible, and not to "integrate" in the employing countries, since they were planning to return to their homeland. However, Ivanović (2012) writes that their children, grandchildren or people who emigrated in the 80s, 90s or later cannot be considered "gastarbajteri".

[3] Mijić (2019) writes that compared to 4565 Yugoslav citizens in Austria in 1961, the number reached 93.337 in 1971.

that growing number. already in 1973 the government of Austria attempted to un-invite the guest workers. The Recruitment stop ("Anwerbstopp") from 1973 had an aim to stop the employment of foreigner workers in Austria[4] (Ivanović, 2012). This policy did not succeed entirely - even though the average number of Yugoslavs was reduced, the stable permanent core-population was already developed (Fischer, 2004). Also, in the late '80s, due to the economic and political crisis in Yugoslavia, the number of Yugoslav migrants began to increase again.[5] Yugoslav wars in the 1990s also "pushed out" a large number of people to move, and many of them settled in Austria (one of the countries which accepted the largest number of Bosnian refugees - around 90.000, from which 60.000 stayed in Austria (Emirhafizović, 2013).

The results were a rapid growth of the "Yugoslav Diaspora" (Fischer, 2004), which is, in spite of the strict visa procedures, still growing, since, in the recent years, thousands of young people from former Yugoslavian countries have come to Vienna for bachelor, master or PhD studies, and many of them continue to live here after finishing the faculty. The most numerous group of foreign students in Vienna are Germans, Italians, Turks and former Yugoslavs[6]. Emirhafizović (2013) says that "Austria is highly rated as one of the most attractive destinations for workers and students from Bosnia and Herzegovina, both in peacetime and in the post-war period" Emirhafizović (2013, 11), but I would add that it is also the case with Serbia.

Based on the previous data, I would say that there have been three big phases of migrations from Yugoslavia and former Yugoslavia to Austria (especially Vienna): first one was in the 1960s and the 1970s - "economic" migration, which continued during the 1980s; then, during the Yugoslav war and breakup of Yugoslavia (in the 1990s) - "refugee" migration; and in recent years (after 2000) - "educational" (student) migration. If we look at the former Yugoslav diaspora in Vienna, and want to position it on Cohen's typology of Diasporas, I would define it as the combination of Labour Diaspora (a community developed and created due to a search for work), Victim (traumatic event as the primary catalyst of dispersion, such as the Yugoslav civil war of the 1990s) and Deterritorialized Diaspora (asynchronous pattern which includes studying in a different land than the land of origin). While, for example, Čuković (2013) sees Yugoslavian Diaspora in Detroit primarily as Victim diaspora, that may overlap with Labour Diaspora, I would say that the former Yugoslav Diaspora in Vienna is primarily Labour diaspora (since its base are guest workers from 1960s, 1970s, even in the 1980s, and also many students who tend to stay and start to work in Vienna after finishing their studies), and then Victim Diaspora (people who came in the '90s, during the Yugoslav wars). However, the Yugoslav Diaspora in

[4] This migration policy was also emphasised in the new law concerning foreigners from 1976, which has been one of the most repressive laws of that type in Europe (among others it defined that Austrians have the absolute advantage in the labour market, what has been the trait of Austrian migration politics until today) (Ivanović, 2012).

[5] In the period of 1987-1994 again, the number of foreign workers in Austria rapidly grew, which led to even more strict regulations (from 1995 there is a limited number of visas that can be issued annually, and the employing positions are almost exclusively for high qualified workers (Ivanović, 2012).

[6] *Studiranje u Beču,* Stadt Wien, accessed on 30.1.2021, https://www.wien.gv.at/bh-hr-sr/obrazovanje/studiranje.htm

Vienna cannot be clearly defined as one type of Cohen's typology, as the mentioned migration phases cannot be seen as completely separate, since they are the part of the same continuity of the bigger migration process. For example, Kurtović (2021) sees the recent phase of emigration from Bosnia as the consequence of the both post war and post-socialist transition factors, like political and economic instability, or ethnic separation. Even the students who nowadays leave Bosnia (or other former Yugoslav Republics) can take that action in the search of a better, or even "normal" life conditions (and such a state is, among other factors, the result of the 1990s Yugoslav war after-effects). For people of former Yugoslav countries (especially Bosnia and Serbia, who are not in the EU) Austria often represents a "typical Western country", more developed than the one of their origin, a symbol of wealth and better life conditions (similar as Germany, US, Australia, Canada or Scandinavian countries). This can also be seen in the work of Johnson (2019), who explores the migration of highly educated people from Serbia to the Western countries, where they are seen as synonym for "normal life", with many opportunities and possibilities ("perspektiva"), where their talents, diplomas and knowledge will be recognised and appreciated, and hard work rewarded (while they do not see Serbia as such place). She even gives an example of one of her interlocutors who has been a PHD student in Serbia, but, since she did not see any opportunities for herself there, she planned to enrol in a new PHD studies in Austria.

Despite often being generalised as the former Yugoslav community, this population is not a homogeneous group. While guest workers that came in the 1960s and 1970s were mostly uneducated and came from rural areas, migrants who have been coming since the 1980s also had different educational backgrounds and came from urban areas (Mijić, 2019). Mijić (2019), as well as Fischer (2003) consider that these people are separated in cultural niches (Fischer, 2003), regarding their lifestyle, interests, taste of music and similar, where mostly people who came later than 80s emphasise that they have different tastes than the guest workers from the 1960s and 1970s.[7]

"The Yugoslav past"

Even though in this thesis I do not deal with Yugoslavia and its breakup per se, in order to provide a broader context it is necessary to present a short historical background, regarding the "Yugoslav past" (factors in relatively recent history of Yugoslavia that could have affected the life of former Yugoslavs in Vienna today).

[7] I would like to mention that I did not find this kind of symbolic boundaries in the field. However, this was not the topic of my research, since I was interested in potential symbolic boundaries through ethnic lines. (Few of my interlocutors mentioned that guest workers have a lower educational level than migrants that have been coming after. One of my interviewees mentioned that the Bosniak group has the highest educational level from all former Yugoslavs in Vienna).

Yugoslavia was known for its complex ethno religious diversity. The SFRY (SFRJ) or The Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia was a multinational federation of six republics and two autonomous provinces, and had five constitutive nations (Slovenes, Croats, Serbs, Montenegrins, Macedonians (later the Muslims were also acknowledged as the 6th). On religious grounds, the population was divided into three confessions: Roman-Catholics, Orthodox Christians and Muslims (Tomić, 2014). People of different nations ("narodi"- members of a titular nation of each republic) and nationalities ("narodnosti"- members of non-titular Yugoslav nations) distincted themselves regarding language, religion and different belongings. However the state was built on the equality of different nations and nationalities, under the slogan of "brotherhood and unity" ("bratstvo – jedinstvo"), and was recognised as the most economically successful socialist state (Haydn, 2012).

The president Josif Broz Tito died in 1980, for what is believed that, among many other factors, has shaken Yugoslavia. It is often considered that his death produced a political vacuum, rise of the new political elites and a huge economic crisis (Srebotnjak, 2016). Some republics wanted their independence, Slovenia and Croatia declared theirs in 1991, and as a response JNA - Yugoslavian national army, reacted with force. The situation was the most complicated in multinational Bosnia, where ethnic Serbs proclaimed their own separate Serb Republic - Republic of Srpska in 1992 (in Croatia there was also a proclaimed Serbian state in 1991 - The Republic of Serbian Krajina). All of this resulted in a series of horrible wars in Croatia, and Bosnia and Herzegovina in the period of 1991-1995, where about 140.000 people lost their lives, and around 4 million have been displaced (Limantzakis, 2014).

In January 1992, with the international recognition of several of Yugoslav republics as sovereign states, the SFRY formally stopped to exist (Dragović-Soso, 2007). Different scholars and analysts (from the former Yugoslav countries, but also from "Western" academia) have been having various theories regarding the reasons for the breakup of Yugoslavia, spreading from the alleged "ancient hatreds" of its nations, historical legacies (of the Balkans, 19th century South Slavic national ideologies and first Yugoslavia (between WW1 and WW2)), through causes related with Yugoslavia itself (constitution, federal structure, ideologies, economy, etc.), to the crises in the 1980s, or influences of political figures and external factors (for more, look Dragović-Soso, 2007; or Limantzakis, 2014). Some authors strongly emphasise the mixture of different factors as the cause of the breakup of Yugoslavia. Woodward (1995) connects the Yugoslav crisis with the crisis that developed among major powers over the war in Bosnia and the worldwide situation that was created by the end of the cold war. She criticises the widely accepted theory of "ethnic Balkan hatreds", writing that the Yugoslav crisis and the war were the result of a complex and long process, connected with dissolution of governmental authority, politics of transforming a socialist society to a market economy and democracy, an attempt to resolve a foreign debt crisis, unpreparedness of the new political powers for rapid changes and their inability to manage to provide stability and protect civil order (for more, see Woodward, 1995). There are also authors who underline the economic factors, such as Musić (2021) who

writes that in the 1980s the Yugoslav authorities were hardly managing to keep the social peace in the economic crises conditions, thus the worker´s crisis and economic struggles turned to be nationalised, and the top-down nationalistic mobilisation prepared a violent break up of the country. He also underlines that the scholars of Yugoslavia were under pressure to put ethnicity, religion and conflict between republican leaders in the foreground as the possible reasons for the breakup of the country, while class, social inequalities, workers protest, economic crisis, labour and worker´s self-management were pushed in the background (for more, see Musić, 2021). In her book "Thinking about Yugoslavia", Ramet (2005) presents various scholarly theories that deal with the breakup of Yugoslavia, where she especially criticises the theories about patient hatred, saying that they distract the readers from the relevant evidence which may lead to more useful conclusions. She says that, even though the literature produced a mass of theories about the Yugoslav war, certainly the roots were diverse and that there is no need to reduce this complexity to one supposed factor. "On the contrary, economics, demographics, programmatic choices, institutional structures, religious cultures, elite dynamics, and deficiencies in system legitimacy all played a role in pushing the country towards violent breakup" (Ramet (2005, 55). Various authors have presented different factors as the main explanation of the breakup of Yugoslavia, but in the book it is suggested that the whole complex group of factors has to be considered, rather than just one (for more, see Ramet, 2005).

Principle on which Yugoslavia was based was *Unity in diversity* (Pavlović, 2000). McDonald (2009) writes that Yugoslavia was known for its cooperation and tolerance, where discrimination on the basis of ethnic belonging was very rare. Many people who lived in Yugoslavia saw themselves as Yugoslavs, and other citizens of the country as the same nation (Haydn, 2012), while "being a Yugoslav" did not exclude other identities, that often coexisted with each other (Dragović-Soso, 2007). For many people Yugoslav identity was one more of the many national categories and/or it overcame all the national categories. Jansen (2005) writes that Tito's regime did not have the intention for Yugoslav identity to replace all the other national identities, thus the citizens did not have the impression that these identities were mutually exclusive. They just felt that Yugoslavhood is part of their everyday life, together with the spectrum of other possibilities. One could feel as a Yugoslav, Dalmatian, Croat and Partisan all at once and exactly in that hybridity lied the power of Yugoslav identity. But during the war this supposed "old hatred" was again reopened as a topic and old national stereotypes (as Serbs-Chetniks and Croats-Ustashas) were used again in opposition to Yugoslawhood, until the other Yugoslavs became just "Others" (Haydn, 2012). The denial of identity as both; "Yugoslavs", as well as Croats, Serbs, Slovenes, Muslims, Macedonians and others was the way to transform brotherhood and unity to war (Haydn, 2012). Palmberger (2016) also writes that "it is widely believed that the breakup of Yugoslavia was not so much the process from below, but something that was launched from above, since the old collectivism of communism had to be quickly replaced with a new form of collectivism, and that was national homogenisation" (Palmberger, 2016, 70). Thus, during the wars in former Yugoslavia, ethnic belonging became extremely

important, and “this reduction of one’s own individual identity to ethnicity is still symptomatic for the whole region” (Mijić, 2019, 9).
The strong nationalistic media propaganda had the aim to present the differences among ethnicities of Yugoslavia as non-negotiable and to deconstruct the similarities, thus leading to the conclusion that physical separation is necessary (McDonald, 2009). In this intensive media war the targets were not opponent governments but entire populations, and “traditional and historical differences", such as religion, script or language (dialect) were emphasised to underline the distinctiveness of the ethnic nations. “The political struggle was presented as a “cultural” struggle and the message in the media was not that “we cannot live with them because they do not share our ideas about the political and economic organisation of our society” but, rather, that “we cannot live with them because they are culturally, religiously and historically different or inferior to us”” (Malešević, 2000, 158).

How did this affect the Yugoslav living in Vienna? It is highly presumed that the war and breakup of Yugoslavia also affected Yugoslavs living in Vienna. Mijić (2019) writes that this nationalistic media propaganda that was present in the republics found its way to Vienna. Even though they were not physically present there (on Yugolsav soil), this triggered cultural, political and socio-economic changes of what people had experienced and remembered as their homeland (Bernard, 2018). First, their legal status changed, some became displaced persons, asylum seekers or refugees, others got citizenship of their new nation states (Bernard, 2018). The trauma of losing the Yugoslav identity (Bernard, 2018) was also present, where self-identified Yugoslavs struggled in the war and post-war reality (Srebotnjak, 2016). Fischer (2003) writes that after the break-up of their country of origin, the Yugoslavs were basically left without a name and they lost the “comfortable” Yugoslav identity (the one including the answer “I am a Yugoslav”, without further explaining are you a Croat, Bosniak, Serb, Macedonian and similar). Mijić (2019) and Fischer (2003) write that processes of nationalisation and ethnicization have divided the multi-ethnic structure of the “Yugoslav diaspora” – the formal ones (associations), as well as the informal. During the 1990s the Yugoslav organisations in Vienna started declaring themselves Serbian, Croatian and similar (Fischer, 2003), and today they are usually organised along ethnic lines (Mijić, 2019). But does this correspond to the everyday practice and socialities of former Yugoslavs in Vienna?
This topic will be further analysed and discussed, together with findings of this research, in the Fourth Chapter of this thesis.

Diaspora and Nostalgia

Diaspora

Thinking about the former Yugoslavs in Vienna, and wondering if this community could be a diasporic one, I had to take a step back and think about what diaspora actually is. The literature concerning the topic is broad, and, to say the least, confusing. Different authors emphasise different characteristics, even to the point that almost any group today can be considered diaspora. The term being so wide in its meaning, why wouldn't the former Yugoslav community in Vienna be considered diaspora? Let's "dive" into theory and see.

In search of defining Diaspora

The meaning of the term "diaspora" has been broadly interpreted, and, as Brubaker (2005) says, it has been stretched to different directions. Some authors consider the concept of diaspora to be relatively new in social sciences (Vesković Anđelković, 2019); (Glamotchak, 2013), with its popularity growing since the 1960s, and especially increasing after the 1990s. Originated from Greek "dia sperio", meaning to sow over, diaspora covers all people and social groups, who have left their country of origin, willingly or by force, but still nurture the culture of the motherland (Vesković Anđelković, 2019). The term was firstly used by Greeks, to describe their citizens who left to make colonies in Egypt and Syria, while later it was utilised for Jews who lived out of Israel (Vesković Anđelković, 2019). Safran (1991) explains this lack of attention toward the concept of diaspora until the 1990s, through the fact that the term referred only to the displacement of Jewish people from their historic homeland. Tölölyan (2012) mentions something similar, saying that the term was utilised only for Jews, Armenians and Greeks. While in ancient Greece the term was related with migration and colonisation, today the concept has been used for different types of displacement or modes of hybridity (Povrzanović Frykman, 2004). Clifford (1994) and Glamotchak (2013) suggest that it is not possible to define diaspora sharply, while Brubaker (2005) even suggests that the definition of diaspora at one point (by including every group that is dispersed in space) stretches to the point of uselessness. He writes that if everyone is diaspora, then no one is not a diaspora, thus the universalisation of diaspora actually leads to the disappearance of diaspora (Brubaker, 2005, 3).

Indeed, even after extensive theoretical research, my conclusion is that it cannot be clearly said what exactly diaspora is, it is only possible to set some determinants.

Safran (1991) writes that diaspora (and diaspora community) has been used for several groups of people, as the persons who live out of their native country (willingly or forced), refugees, immigrants, alien residents and minorities. He starts with a broad working definition in which diaspora equals people living outside of their homeland and widens it, by adding the main features of diaspora: a history of dispersal from their homeland, myths/memories of the original homeland (its location, history and achievements), the belief of not being fully accepted in the

host country (followed by a feeling of alienation), desire for eventual return (and regarding the ancestral home as a true home), ongoing support to the homeland (believing that they should be devoted to the preservation of its safety and prosperity), and a collective identity importantly defined by this relationship, as the group consciousness and solidarity. This definition is widely used by many others (as Clifford (1994), Povrzanović Frykman (2004), Cohen (2008) and Repič (2016)), at least as a starting point for further elaboration. The main common ground for everyone (what is also a basis of my understanding of what diaspora should be) is that diaspora is a community dispersed from its country of origin. Every author builds on this definition, by adding other characteristics (like Brubaker (2005) - boundary making, Tölölyan (2012) - time passage or Cohen (2008) - "co-responsibility"), while some specifically emphasise some of already given traits, as orientation to homeland (Repič (2016); Povrzanović Frykman (2004); Glamotchak (2013) or self-awareness and mobilisation of a common identity (Cohen (2008), even as a visible political expression (Povrzanović Frykman (2004)). While I agree with all of them that some kind of relation (and I would not necessarily call it orientation, since for me, it is a strong word that carries a meaning of complete directedness towards something) with the homeland is important part of the diaspora essence (and because of its importance I will revisit this topic again later and discuss it more thoroughly), I do not see why does it have to be specified in what form this relation must be present in order to call something a diaspora. Of course, it is desirable to list as many examples of these possible manifestation forms as possible, but I do not recognise the need for the diasporic community to be, for example, obligatory visibly politically organised, neither in the homeland, nor in the country of current residence, to earn that name. It is similar with the time component, since there are authors that consider the passage of time as an important dimension in the process of diaspora-defining.

Cohen (2008) writes that certain amount of time has to pass before it can be said for any community that it is really a diaspora, since diasporic consciousness has to appear from strong renewed ties to the past and repeatable unwillingness to assimilate, while Tölölyan (2012) emphasises the time dimension in a sense that group of migrants becomes a diaspora only when its members distance themselves from their nation, but continue to care deeply about it, what usually requires a few generations. He explains that the recent immigrants still feel most at home and most accepted in a transnational social space of the diasporic community. This can happen to the first, and sometimes even the second generation of migrants. Opposed to that, after a few generations, it is not anymore about not being integrated or not feeling at home, since they already have a comfortable bicultural, or hybrid identity, but it is about a decision to continue to remain diasporic, to care about the others in diaspora with whom one shares ethno-diasporic origin, and about the well-being of homeland of the ancestors (Tölölyan, 2012). Even though this is a very interesting explanation where (some) logic can be seen, it also reminds a little bit of the principle from romantic movies where sentiment must endure the test of time to prove its true existence. Considering that I have been knowing people who came to Vienna very recently and already chose not to be diasporic (feeling more related to Austria than to the country of their

origin, even though they are not “integrated” or have a safe, comfortable position here), and in the same time, people who do not have a “healthy” hybrid identity, but are “too diasporic” even if they are the 3rd generation born out of the country of origin of their ancestors), I cannot say that I see time as a key factor in determining if some community could go under the name of diaspora.

Personally, I agree the most with the broadest possible definition of diaspora from the beginning - all people and all social groups, who have left their place of origin (does not have to be a country necessarily), for any reason, but still feel some kind of relation with that place, actual or imagined, legal or emotional (even in the sense that anything related to this country/place means something to them, it does not necessary have to be history, or myths, or memories of the “homeland”). Time component, the belief of not being fully accepted in the host country, the desire for eventual return and ongoing support to the homeland, in my opinion, can be part of the diaspora definition, but are not crucial, as collective identity, group consciousness and solidarity are (what can also be seen in the case of former Yugoslav community in Vienna). While I consider self-awareness of the group identity (and in relation, boundary making process, in which the members of the group define who is and who is not the part of this community) as very important, solidarity towards other members of the group is what I find particularly interesting. Povrzanović Frykman (2004), Cohen (2008) and Glamotchak (2013) write about the connection between co-ethnic members in “host” country (and even other countries), calling it solidarity, or in Cohen´s case - “co-responsibility”. This is the concept that I will widen through this thesis, as the important characteristics of the former Yugoslav community that I found during my field research (see Fourth Chapter).

While trying to define the diaspora, we also have to “touch” the related term of transnational community. In his book “Transnationalism” Vertovec (2009) writes about the complexity of both terms. Transnationalism refers to multiple ties and interactions linking people and institutions across borders of nation-states, while diaspora is an “imagined” connection between a post-migration population and a place of their origin and with people of similar origins now living elsewhere in the world (a group based on a certain national, linguistic or other awareness of a relationship with a group elsewhere). Even though by imagined he does not mean that these connections are not real, but he emphasises that they are full of strong sentiments, narratives, and memories according to which members of diasporas organise themselves, while by transnationalism he refers to the actual, ongoing exchanges of information, money and resources – as well as regular travel and communication – that members of a diaspora may or may not practice. “Diasporas arise from some form of migration, but not all migration involves diasporic consciousness; all transnational communities comprise diasporas, but not all diasporas develop transnationalism” (Vertovec, 2009, 137).

In order not to get lost in this search of trying to define diaspora, at the end, I will form my own determination (that consists of some parts of earlier mentioned various definitions of other authors, while it rejects some) what diaspora is. People who left (or whose ancestors once left) a place that they still feel connected to, even though they live elsewhere, and based on that connection they develop the feeling of a group identity and solidarity with others in similar situation or position, would be considered as diaspora in this thesis. A feeling that you are still somehow connected to the place where you no longer live, but also to the others with whom you share the current country of residence and might have the "same destiny" (since they also feel this connection with this "place of home"), that you all are the same community and that you should help and support each other. A feeling that can be "caught" within the former Yugoslav community in Vienna.

Connection with the motherland and nation-based identity of the diaspora?

Let's go back to the connection with the motherland, emphasised so many times from various authors as a crucial diaspora trait. "The dominant theories do claim an orientation towards the homeland as an essential feature of diasporic identity" (Tölölyan, 2012, 9). If we look at the list of features of Safrans definition of the diaspora from 1991, four of the six of them are regarding the relation towards homeland/motherland, land of origin (or the land of origin of the ancestors) (Cohen, 2008), what clearly emphasises the importance of this feature. If we accept that the bond with motherland is a crucial part of diaspora definition, what does it imply about the relations of diaspora and the national component? Is motherland always a synonym for a one nation-state? And related, does diaspora have to include a national category?

Even though the definition of diaspora is so broad and elusive, in the humanities and social sciences, it is mostly used to describe attempts to reconstitute ethnicity-based communities outside the natal or imagined natal territory **(**Povrzanović Frykman, 2004). This is what Brubakers calls "classical" diasporas, meaning ethnocultural[8] or country-defined (Brubaker, 2005, 2 - 3). Vertovec (2009) also writes that once the religious character of diaspora is now marginalised in favour of ethnicity and nationality. Glamotchak (2013) says that, even though it is not logical that diaspora is formed as a national community in the territory that is neither its national, nor linguistic, nor cultural territory, the dimension of the nation still cannot be escaped in relation to diaspora (since other dimension related to national, as ethnicity, national memory and belonging involved), what agrees with Clifford (1994) who writes that even though diaspora goes outside the territory and temporality of the nation state, that does not mean that there is no national component involved, and even adds that nationalistic tendencies can be not just present, but sometimes even more strengthened in diaspora than in homeland. Vesković Anđelković (2019) goes so far to even claim that the feature that differentiates the diaspora from other

[8] "The word 'ethnic' as defined by Fredrik Barth refers to "groups of people who are considered to have a shared identity, a common history and a traditional cultural heritage." (Barth, 1969, 5). Wimmer (2013, 7) defines ethnicity as "a subjective feeling of belonging to the group that is distinguished by a shared culture and by a common ancestry").

similar terms is recognising the motherland (nation-state) as a basis for a common (national) identity, the togetherness of the diaspora members and imagining their community as a relatively closed group.
As entrenched as these theories and opinions are, I cannot find a way to agree with them. Even though the relation with "homeland" (or, as I would rather call it "place of home") may be inseparable from diaspora, I do not hold that homeland has to be equalised with nation-state (or this is why I rather define it as a place than a land/country). Rather, my affiliation lies with the approaches that go beyond the national scale. For example, Caglar (2017) writes that "migrants are usually approached through methodological nationalism, which equates society and culture with the nation-state and takes the nation-state as the unit of analysis" Caglar (2017, 26). In this perspective (through the lens of nation-states), the differences in national origin are treated as the most significant cultural divide - it is automatically presumed that people who originated from the territory of one nation-state have a common culture, thus the one who migrated from one national territory in another state is also supposed to have a shared common identity and values. In other words, they are identified by the nationality of their homeland. The methodological nationalism (and the related ethnic lens) in migration scholarship has been widely criticised, and is seen as a product of nation-state building processes of the twentieth century, in which the individual has only one country and one identity. The assumption that nationality based identities are central to the life of the people who migrated in another countries denies the significance of the variety of other factors that can influence the life of migrants in their place of settlement, like other belonging modes, or the divisions based on class, religion, politics and similar (among the people who are seen as one group) (Caglar, 2016, 953)[9].

But why are diaspora and nation-state often put in a relationship? Glamothcak (2013) explains that in the processes of a globalisation the premises of one territory equals one state, one nation and one culture, was shaken, and the social phenomenon of diaspora was in direct contradiction with the logic of national institutions. Diaspora is separated from everything on which the nation-state rests (the borders of the country of origin, its economy, regulations, etc.). Since the influence of the state, as a nation state, is limited in the case where the groups do not live on the state territory, the political community has to be created (the one based on non-territorial and transnational nationalism). Therefore, the diaspora is an attempt of a state to "spill over its borders" in order to connect the national interest with the group living outside the national territory. She calls this process the "nationalisation" of the diaspora, meaning the creation of the "ethno-national diaspora" (providing a context of ethnic identification), thus the using diaspora as an "expansion of the policy of the native country". The state establishes relations with diasporas through policies, voting, language, via establishment of Ministries of the Diaspora and

[9] In order to grasp the social practices and agencies of migrants, beyond the national component, a group of authors propose the "city as context" approach. Here, historical context, urban spaces, institutional structure, opportunities available to the migrants (access to rights, benefits and services) and similar related to city context are taken as an entry point unit of analyses rather than ethnic group or nation-states (Caglar, 2016).

Migrations, or investments into the Diaspora Associations. The diaspora can be seen as valuable for the motherland. Functionaries of homeland governments have been persuaded of the importance of reclaiming their diasporas are busily creating ministries and bureaus of diaspora in host countries (Tölölyan, 2012), and from the point of view of the homeland, emigrant groups are seen as diaspora, even when they are assimilated (Brubaker, 2005, 3). Tölölyan (2012, 11) also remarks that 'the nation has outgrown the state because of its diasporic tentacles' and migrants who established diasporas attribute to that diaspora the status of a fragment or an extension of the nation. But we have to wonder what happens with diaspora, when a country that was their motherland stops existing, like in the case of Yugoslavia? The enormous number of people from Yugoslavia who migrated in Vienna over the years, lost their motherland overnight. What happened to these people? Did they become parts of other diasporas? Since there was no more official country of Yugoslavia, legally there could not be a Yugoslav diaspora anymore, but Serbian, Croatian, Bosnian…Slovenian, Macedonian. The big diaspora broke into smaller pieces, turning to their new formed countries and embassies for official matters. But this does not necessarily define how people feel or where they belong. If we clearly recognise the difference between nationality in our passport and, let's call it - our "ethnicity" (to which social group we feel or choose to belong), how can we then automatically assign a national character to diaspora? I would argue that diaspora and national components are as separable and different as what is written in our passports and what is our personal feeling of belonging. Like the Yugoslav identity (or feeling of togetherness between former Yugoslavs) could not be changed just like that in newly formed states, but needed a lot of work from the governments (like extremely strong nationalistic propaganda inserted in all state systems, from media to schooling), it could not just stopped existing all of a sudden in Vienna as well. Certainly, there were attempts of the new republics to "nationalise" their migrants in diaspora, through television and institutions, political separation of languages, and opening different Serbian, Bosnian, Croatian organisations, but it does not seem that in Vienna they have succeed in their intention (or at least, not entirely).

And what happens with complex social groups, where ethnicity and nationality do not always coincide, like for example with ethnic Serbs or Croats from Bosnia? For example, people living in Vienna who declare themselves Croats and originate from Bosnia, and after the breakup of Yugoslavia, they took both citizenships. If the diaspora is nation-based, then whose diaspora are they - Croatian or Bosnian? If people in diaspora are seen as a resource from the point of view of the motherland, I can just imagine "the race" between Serbia and Bosnia after the breakup of Yugoslavia who will "nationalise" people living in diaspora first. Again, whose diaspora are they - Serbian or Bosnian? If the diaspora is strictly nation-based this should be clear. But it doesn't seem to be. There are also some organisations of former Yugoslavs in Vienna that are present on both lists - of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Serbia, and of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Even the President of the organisation "Prosvjeta" (see the Fourth Chapter or/and Appendix), during the interview says "motherlands" (not one, but more), meaning Serbia and Bosnia, at the same time. There is an overlap, there is more than one motherland? How can this be, if diaspora is strictly connected with one state, and one nation-based identity?

In his book Antinationalism, Jansen (2005) writes about the danger of taking a national belonging as an unchanging quality, especially related to former Yugoslavs. If we automatically assume that someone is a Serb, or Croat, or Bosnian, we turn them into representatives of the nation, even though maybe they do not feel this way at all, or maybe there are much more important belonging modes for them than national or ethnic. Speaking of "Serbs" or "Croats" we take away a mass of people, who maybe do not nurture the feeling of belonging to these categories, a possibility to an alternative point of view, and we seal the allegeable logic of national belonging as a main factor of explaining the reality. If we came so far as to realise that nationality (in the sense of belonging) is a social construct, which is at the same time relational, situational, changeable, "switchable" and nonetheless "imagined", why we cannot make one step further and allow for diaspora to finally break up with its supposable national character? Who can impose on a Yugoslav diaspora in Vienna to be Serbian, Croatian or Bosnian, if it is not such a case in practice?

Vertovec (2009) writes that this rise of the complex global networks are questioning the traditional definition of the state, and that in this way the old diasporas have become today's transnational communities (who do not have to be related with one motherland). He writes that diaspora has arisen as a postmodern project of resisting the nation-state, and is associated with hybridity and multiple identities outside of the nation-state, and I agree with him, as I agree with Povrzanović Frykman (2004) who says that "it makes more sense to talk about diasporic communities instead of ethnic communities - rather than being viewed as an ethnicity, diaspora may be alternatively considered as a framework for the study of a specific process of community formation" (Povrzanović Frykman, 2004, 90).

The concept of home

Since the orientation towards homeland is an important dimension of the definition of diaspora, the concept of home also needs to be approached here. What is home, and what is homeland? Do motherland and homeland have to be the same?

Many authors warn us (as Tölölyan, 2012) that there is a danger of locating the (diasporic) home simply in the motherland/ancestral homeland, even though this often happens in diasporic studies. For some people their land of current residence, or other "host" land can seem more like a home than a country of origin. I have a friend who always says that her homeland is Austria, even though she moved there from Serbia a few years ago, and now she even lives in the Netherlands. The concept of home is relative and individual, and does not even have to be set in one place, or a place at all. Some authors, actually (and I stand by them) separate the concept of home from the actual location or even a physical place (Repič, 2016) and connect it more with a feeling (Boym, 2011), set of meanings, narratives, imaginaries and memories (Repič, 2016) or security, community and familiarity (Jansen and Löfving, 2007).

"To feel at home is to know that things are in their places and so are you; it is a state of mind that doesn't depend on an actual location. The object of longing, then, is not really a place called home but this sense of intimacy with the world; it is not the past in general, but that imaginary moment when we had time and didn't know the temptation of nostalgia". (Boym, 2001, 254).

Jansen and Löfving (2007), suggest that the concept of home needs to be problematized and that a more accurate notion will be "myth of home". Home is often seen as an "timeless entity in an unchanging context of origin", where the important temporal dimension is neglected. The home has not just simply been left in another place, but also in another time, irreversibly lost both spatially and temporally. Repič (2016) also sees home as a mythical place located in narratives, imaginaries and memories, or even a different time.

Myth of home often goes together with "the myth of the return". It includes maintaining a collective memory or myth about the homeland and perception of ancestral homeland as the true, ideal home and as the place to which one should return once (Brubaker, 2005). It is widely presumed that the desire of returning home is universal, but Povrzanović Frykman (2004) emphasises that the idea of return may not be relevant for all diasporic groups. Even if people on the move express nostalgia that does not necessarily represent their desire to return. Jansen and Löfving (2007) also critique that kind of premise, saying that this desire for return varies related to individual and collective experiences as well as social, political, and economic contexts. For example, Safran (1991) writes about the Turks in Germany, where the myth of returning to Turkey with a large number of people, could actually be the result of German non accepting policy and atmosphere. Sometimes there is no homeland to which diaspora members can return, it is not a welcoming place, or they cannot identify with it anymore (For example, some of my interlocutors from today´s Bosnia said that, after the breakup of Yugoslavia, they could never again relate with the newly formed state of Bosnia. Their homeland was Yugoslavia, and since it did not exist anymore, Vienna slowly became their home), or it even does not exist (as in the case of Yugoslavia). The "myth of return" does not have to be related with the people's desire to actually come back, but it is important in what way and how much this orientation towards home influences their lives (Jansen, Löfving, 2007). "The "return" of most diasporas can thus be seen as being used to make life more tolerable by holding out a utopia that stands in contrast to the perceived dystopia in which actual life is lived" (Safran, 1991, 94).
Imagined or not, connected with return or not, the concept of home can have a great impact on people who live out of the land of their origin. In diasporic contexts, images of home can be especially pervasive, since displacement intensifies our investments in memory, and memory preserves and establishes new forms of social relations (Palmberger and Tošić, 2016). Brubaker (2005) and Repič (2016) point out that the orientation to a real or imagined homeland represents an authoritative source of value and is essential in maintaining group identity and solidarity. Also, home can be built, "carved out" into the host country. Jansen and Löfving (2007) mention

the Hage´s expansion of the concept of home, which adds a "sense of possibility" to security, community and familiarity. The passive concept of home is here challenged, by adding to it the opportunities to change, improvement, dreaming and imagining. Through nostalgia people on the move build a new home, an ideal home in a new context, where they feel secure, familiar (familiarity is here defined as a space where one possesses a maximal spatial knowledge), where they are part of the community (meaning a space where one possesses a maximal communicative power) and are able to make plans for the future (Jansen, 2009). There is a very interesting example that Dzenovska (2018) presents with Latvian field workers who migrate to the UK, in search for very similar way of life and working conditions that they once had in Latvia. In a way, they are moving in search of "future pasts" and they actually "leave to stay" (for more see Dzenovska, 2018).

As we can see, home does not always have to be identified as a land of origin, or motherland. The concept of home goes beyond the homeland/motherland (and especially far beyond the nation-state), since it is more related with the feeling and meaning, or feeling of security, than actual place or even time period. This could mean that a home can be built even in the "host state", or that even the state that does not exist anymore, as Yugoslavia, can be still felt as a homeland. Homeland can be imagined, as any other imagined community (Anderson, 1991).

Between the social spaces

"Diaspora communities are often (even though not always) considered as an example of culture transformation - once people leave their country of origin, they on the one hand take with them an image of their "own culture"[10] and on the other hand, they are influenced by a "host culture"...which then leads to the creation of a hybrid culture" (Remiddi, Alibašić, Kapetanović, Davidović, Zejnilović, 2019, 19). On the other hand, diaspora is often caught in, as Glamotchak (2013) says, dual and paradoxical logic - from one side there is the struggle for equality within the new community (host country) and - the affirmation of the collective national identity of the land of origin.
It is often considered that migrants live **s**imultaneously between the two social spaces[11] - the "country of origin" and the "host" country (Glamotchak, 2013). Clifford (1994) writes that "diasporas have a sense of being people with historical roots and destinies outside the time and

[10] When I use the term culture I am referring to the various values and beliefs that are the basis for behavioural patterns, customs and relations within one social group. Frederik Barth (1969, 9) writes that people who essentially share a common culture also share interconnected differences that distinguish each such discrete culture from all others, which is the ground for boundary making between different cultures.

[11] When I use the term social space, I am writing about the set of relations and connections, based on Bourdieu's use of the term - the set of all possible positions and the whole network of relations. Povrzanović Frykman (2004) also defines social spaces as "social and symbolic ties between places and people, established and sustained by the set of practices, connected to cultural politics and representation, political attitudes and engagements, economic, social and emotional links and exchanges" (Povrzanović Frykman, 2004, 80).

space of the host society"(Clifford, 1994, 311). Since they are "not here to stay" diaspora cultures mediate, in a lived tension, the experiences of separation and entanglement, of living here and remembering and desiring another place. Povrzanović Frykman (2004), on the other hand, propose that "diaspora members may be fully rooted and feel fully accepted in the country of residence while maintaining multiple links to their country of origin - they link their country of settlement and country of origin into a single social field"[12] (Povrzanović Frykman, 2004, 83). Vertovec (2009) also mentioned "diaspora consciousness" that is marked by dual or multiple identifications, awareness and attachments of being simultaneously home and away from home. While some people identify more with one society than the other, many seem to maintain several identities that link them simultaneously to more than one nation. It is the connection elsewhere that makes a difference here, residence here assumes a solidarity and connection there and the multilocality stimulates the desire to connect oneself with others who share same routes and roots here and there. This is what Vertovec calls "the paradox of diaspora - just as an individual can be bilingual, it can also be multicultural and have a competence to switch between cultural codes as needed" (Vertovec, 2009, 73). Diasporic groups are being shaped simultaneously by living in a host country and through contact with the other social groups there. It is not just the point of origin that creates the diaspora's sense of distinctiveness, but also the whole journey of migration and experiences that people had through their way and life in another land (Lacroix, Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, 2013). As Čuković (2013) writes, the birth of diasporic communities starts in their homelands, and has been modified in response to the hostland's values and limitations. "Every diaspora generates a memory of its own, based on the human, economic or political experiences it produces and through its diverse experiences of interacting with new societies, including the receiving society… the diaspora is then, distinctive toward both - sending and host society" (Lacroix, Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, 2013, 688). The very contact with these two worlds creates the third world. In the case of the former Yugoslav diaspora in Vienna, the specific experience of living in Yugoslavia (or former Yugoslav republics), together with experience of living in the capital of Austria, experience that is shared with other former Yugoslavs, could have created the former Yugoslav community in Vienna ("our people"). I would also dare to argue that the members of this community live not just between two, but three social spaces; not just country of origin and host country, but also the community of "our people" (what I will discuss further in the fourth subchapter).

For the end of this subchapter dedicated to diaspora I will agree with Vertovec (2009, 141-142) who says: "Identities are not fixed, and tend to change in order to define and position groups and individuals in light of surrounding contexts. Moreover, diasporic identification involves complexities and permutations: some people continue to regard their land of birth as 'home',

[12] This is why Povrzanović Frykman (2004) rather than the noun diaspora proposes using the adjective diasporic, which better depicts the process of identity formation than referring to a (already created) social formation. "This reminds the researcher, who deals with this topic, that this is still ongoing process, and points him or her to a wide range of experiences within the living away from home, as having yet another home(land) – whether actual, remembered, or imagined – as a potential or actual frame of emotional, social or political reference" (Povrzanovic Frykman, 2004, 85). These experiences can significantly influence the lives of some people, while for others they may remain totally marginal (Povrzanovic Frykman, 2004).

while others come to identify primarily with their land of settlement. Others may feel at home in neither place... And – perhaps in most cases – there may also be multiple, co-existing identities" (Vertovec, 2009, 141-142). If diaspora is inseparable from the "homeland" (or rather "place of home"), that does not mean that it is inseparable from the nation-state. Since home can be more related to feelings, memories and images, rather than an actual physical place, the diaspora can be more related to feelings, belongings and solidarity. If the diaspora is identity-based, that group identity does not have to be nation-based. All the more, diasporic identity, as any other, can be hybrid and consist of many different identities that coexist, and easily shift, depending on the context. If the diaspora is the attempt of every nation-state to "spill over its geographic" borders, that attempt does not have to be necessarily successful.

Nostalgia

Nostalgia…Yugonostalgia…Titostalgia

"Nostalgia (from nostos - return home, and algia - longing) is a longing for a home that no longer exists or has never existed. Nostalgia is a sentiment of loss and displacement, but it is also a romance with one's own fantasy. Nostalgic love can only survive in a long-distance relationship. A cinematic image of nostalgia is a double exposure, or a superimposition of two images-----of home and abroad, past and present, dream and everyday life. The moment we try to force it into a single image, it breaks the frame or burns the surface… " (Boym, 2011, 11)

When I decided to leave Serbia and move to Vienna, I was just over 30, got married, spent a lot of time with my family and friends and I worked in a very active NGO for youth, what was a dream come true for me (and also gave me an opportunity to stay out of the political and other state systems I did not like). This picture of pure happiness and a complete fulfilment is how I remember my home. Even though I am aware that many things have changed over the years (my former workplace, living conditions in the state and the dynamics of my friend group), for me this image has stubbornly resisted change over the years. Or maybe even got more emotionally coloured, as an answer to the life I am living here and now (at the end of my 30s, professionally unfulfilled, concentrated on parenthood, in a different country, far away from my family and friends). Many of my friends who still live in Serbia tell me that this image would be easily broken if I was living there all these years, and this is why Boym says that nostalgic love can survive just as a long distant relationship; just when we are away, we can save these images of our home intact. My home probably does not exist in the way it once did, but being aware of that does not stop this "perfect snapshot" of the past there, of my youth in my "homeland", of

different time and different place, to make me feel nostalgic every day. My nostalgia is, as Pita says (2020) centred around the idea of a lost past in the face of an uncertain present and future.

I am not alone in this “romance with my fantasy”, many people on the move often feel nostalgia. Even the term (nostos - return (home) and algia (longing, pain) -. Greek origin) was coined by the Swiss doctor, Johannes Hofer, in 1688 in order to depict the condition that some displaced people had - the sad mood originating from the desire for return to one's native land. (Boym, 2001); (Petrović, 2010). Nostalgia is still considered to be a typical characteristic sentiment of the diaspora (Mazuchelli, 2012). It is a “safe zone” in the time of change that mediates between the present and the past. Even though often assumed as a relation towards the past, nostalgia is also related both with the present and the future. This is why nostalgia tells us more about the present and the yearnings for the future than about the past itself. Angé and Berliner, (2015, 2) write that nostalgia is longing for what is lacking in a changed present; it can involve critique of the present times, but also an alternative to deal with social changes, and this is why these two authors emphasise its potent, empowering agency. Aspects of nostalgia are an important factor during migration and they influence the way people apply memory (Čuković, 2013); (Petrović, 2010) and play a crucial role in “constructing, maintaining, and reconstructing our identities” (Angé and Berliner, 2015, 5). Boym (2011, 356) writes that nostalgia is not just retrospective but also can be prospective and that these reconstructions are based on mimicry; the past is remade in the image of the present or a desired future. In this process, through nostalgia people on the move built a new home, an ideal home in a new context (“a desire of being there here”), where they feel secure, familiar, are part of the community and are able to make plans for the future (Jansen, 2009), what can also be seen on the example of the former Yugoslavs in Vienna. From that perspective, the visions of the lost homelands are also visions of homelands yet to be realised (Angé and Berliner, 2015).

The specific type of nostalgia, related to people who have some kind of connection with former Yugoslav republics (or had/ still have with Yugoslavia) is Yugonostalgia, a social phenomenon that has become very popular in the “ex Yu” states. Mazzucchelli (2012, 7) writes about it as a “fashion trend” with a great reappearance of Yugoslavia and its symbols in popular culture. It can be seen in the revival of the movies or music from the time of Yugoslavia, or commercial products from the past, but also in the revival of old socialist symbols, renovation of monuments, collecting and exchanging souvenirs from everyday life in Yugoslavia or simply travelling throughout the area (Mazzucchelli, 2012). It has to be said that this is a relatively recent phenomenon, since immediately after the Yugoslav war, when everything was coloured with nationalistic discours the term yugonostalgic (“jugonostalgičar”) was practically an insult as the “traitors to country” and the “suspected communists” (Mazzucchelli, 2012); “lost in the past, opposed to progressive nationalist” (Srebotnjak, 2016). “In post socialism, nostalgia for the socialist past can often be seen as a weakness that causes feelings of shame and guilt or a strategy for “losers" that allows them to survive in the unpleasant present by looking at a

harmonious, selectively remembered, and idealised past" (Velikonja 2004, 40 in Petrović, 2010, 127). Sentiments of nostalgia for socialist "yesterday" are recognised in many post-socialistic surroundings, as the figures who are seen as a symbol of that past times and can represent an overpass to the present period of transition[13] (Angé and Berliner, 2015; Palmberger, 2016; Petrović, 2010). Ostalgie in former East Germany (Boyer, 2006), "red" nostalgia in some other post-socialist states or Yugonostalgia in former Yugoslav states, are all complex psychological and sociocultural phenomena whose basis is seeing the past in a better light (Petrović, 2010, 128).

Like any other nostalgia, Yugonostalgia is more than remembering good old times (Tomić, 2014), but also longing for its security and prosperity (Mazzucchelli, 2012) and values that people see as neglected today, as social justice, morality, solidarity and connectedness of the people (Spasić, 2012). During focus groups that she conducted in Serbia, Spasić (2012) found that Yugoslavia is still seen as a place of high ethics, norms of humanity and dignity. It is, of course, debatable if this, or any other similar image of Yugoslavia correspondents to the actual situation, but it is certain that it is very powerful and that it affects people's lives today, since they still use it as a comparison with the present and a reference for a desirable way of living. Or, as Petrović (2016, 505) says - the fact that these stories about Yugoslavia may not be completely true does not make them any less real. Either way, Yugoslavia was often considered as a very successful state; tolerant, with its "brotherhood and unity", free, with its leadership role in the nonalignment movement, and prosperous, with the country's unique socialist self-management economic system (McDonald, 2009). Since it was based on an idea for creating a federation state of many nations, with common cultural, geopolitical and economic space, some people dare to compare Yugoslavia to the first European Union (Jagiełło-Szostak, 2013). If we examine the position in which former Yugoslav Republics are today, it can be understandable how some people long for Yugoslav experience and admire its one time economic and political security, remembering the past through Yugonostalgia (Čuković, 2013). The positive qualities in previous (Yugoslav) everyday life, in contrast with the present situation, where people just strive for "normal life"[14], are the basis for this kind of nostalgia. "By "normal lives" in Yugoslavia people usually mean living standards, order, social welfare, but also the dignity of having 'a place in the world' vs. becoming the EU's "immediate outside"" (Jansen, 2009, 827), what happened after the breakup of Yugoslavia. "In this kind of nostalgic discourse Yugoslavia is often remembered as an ideal home, a lost home that can never be regained" (Palmberger 2008, 193). "The Yugoslav identity offered a wider range of possibilities in people's everyday life which resulted in more positive self-perception" (Petrović, 2010, 141). Spasić (2012, 587) writes that the fact that the progress of SFRY was ideologically projected more than real is not crucial for the

[13] Palmberger (2016) writes that if these regimes do not change peacefully, what often happens there is even a greater chance for stronger feelings of loss and insecurity which activate longing for the past, as in the case of Yugonostalgia.

[14] Like a normality in the sense of mobility in the time of (late) Yugoslavia in opposition to the until recent "entrapment" (too complicated and even humiliating required visa regimes for citizens of Serbia and Bosnia in the period of 1996 until 2008) (Jansen, 2009)

Yugonostalgia, what matters is the opposition in relation to a present without perspective for the better future. Life in SFRY, on the contrary, promised always moving to a more advanced future. It does not matter that the faith of that time was naive, and that nostalgia romanticised the past that was not always so nice, because the sense of loss is today very real and influences collective identities and understanding of social realities in new states. Then "Yugonostalgia is not so much the longing for some real past, but more for the desires and fantasies that were possible once ("lost imagined future")" (Spasić, 2012, 589).

Specific type of Yugonostalgia is the Titostalgia - nostalgia for the SFRY´s President Josip Broz Tito. As the figure who personified Yugoslav socialism, the role of Tito is often interpreted through the lens of the cult of personality (Pita, 2020). For some Tito was a dictator, who repressed individual freedoms and for others he also has been the symbol of a "golden era", a visionary who preached 'brotherhood and unity' over differences of religion or ethnicity. People have been connecting the figure of Tito with different concepts from the time of Yugoslavia, as the advancement of women's rights, the increased standard of living and the promotion of values of inter-ethnic solidarity, or a hybrid socialist system that afforded its citizens a degree of freedom denied to those behind the Iron Curtain, while the Yugoslav passport opened doors East and West (Balunović, 2020) ("The (famous) red passport" had allowed visa-free travel to almost anywhere (there are even stories that it was the most frequently stolen and falsified passport in the world, and the most expensive one on the black market (Jansen, 2009, 822)). Sometimes even portrayed as a 'creator and saviour', a 'peacemaker' and a 'defender of truth' (Palmberger, 2016, 562) he became the central figure of the SFRY and established a cult around himself that would persist for years after his death, even today. (This is why in the former Yugoslav republics there is a saying "And after the Tito, Tito" (Pita, 2020; Calic, 2019). Pita (2020) writes that in most of the societies of the former Yugoslavia, which today are characterised by increasing unemployment and instability Tito remains a symbol of a better and safer life (or as another saying goes -"After the Tito, Titanic".
Personally, I have never heard about any of these sayings. As I would emphasise later, I grew up in Serbia receiving different messages about Yugoslavia, and from time to time someone would express some kind of Yugonostalgia, but I hardly remember that I have ever met someone who was Titostalgic until I came to Vienna (where many people expressed Yugonostalgia, but again, just a few of them in a form of Titostalgia). While I was growing up (1990s-2000s), Tito was strongly criticised by most, starting from people from my surroundings to the school system. Sometime around 1997, I remember seeing a framed photograph of Tito in my grandmother's house in Slovenia[15], which was very strange to me, and I asked why that photo was still there. Her husband told me that Tito was a great man, whom he will always admire and he will never take that photo off the wall (it still stands there until this day). Even if this was beyond my

[15] This experience of mine is in accordance with what Petrovic (2010, 132) says and that Slovens nurture Yugonostalgia the most. She explains that due to their economic and political success, Slovenes feel freer than others to display their nostalgia. Slovenes are privileged to be nostalgic for the cultural space of socialist Yugoslavia. This kind of nostalgia offers a warm and pleasant symbolic playground of the past, unburdened by any ideological pretext.

comprehension, it cannot be denied that the image of Tito which symbolises better times survived even today. Jansen (2005) writes that in all of the former Yugoslav states, Tito´s system of socialist self-management was replaced with some kind of capitalism, and many people saw this transition as a decrease of living standards. Less purchasing power, increasing unemployment and abolition of the social system benefits led people to a conclusion that they have lived better before, regardless of the fact that the last years of Yugoslavia were also marked with crisis. Titostalgia, as Yugonostalgia can be seen as the longing for a certain standard of living or security, but sometimes the concepts intermingle and the name of Tito is related to other concepts, as antifascism, social solidarity or good neighbourhood ("komšiluk"). The association between Tito and the project of socialist Yugoslavia was such that in the end they were inseparable for many (often when talking about Tito, people in the former Yugoslavia ascribe the whole action to him personally: "Tito built roads, gave work to everyone, made hospitals…") (Pita, 2020; Petrović, 2010). What is often missing in this picture is a reflection on Tito's period of rule in a somewhat balanced way ("critical nostalgia", as Pita (2020) calls it), that "also takes into consideration the various errors of Tito's Yugoslavia[16]. There are also interpretations of this system as "a totalitarian one that invaded all spheres of public and private life, and did not leave any possibility for citizen agency" (Petrović, 2016, 506). Finally, there is also the commercial aspect or Titostalgia, materialised as key rings, lighters, fridge magnets, T-shirts and caps with the image of Tito and similar, even though, as we have seen, it is based on a much complex mixture of feelings and meanings. This can especially be seen in the cafe/club "SFRJ" in Vienna (which I will talk about later, see chapter four), where almost everything is related to Tito, and the famous Yugoslav president (photo shopped) is even present on almost every announcement of their events on Facebook.

Yugonostalgia as present and future oriented?

Yugonostalgia is often seen as a paralysing phenomenon (or even "social anaesthesia", a post-socialist characteristics that stops people from facing the real social anxieties and problems in their current surroundings (Petrović, 2016)), retaining people in a state where they just mourn the lost past. I have to admit that, before this research (theoretical and in the field) this is also the way I usually thought about it. For me, Yugonostalgia was mostly "kind of silly" or sometimes "cute" (like when I saw some of it´s materialised forms, like bar "Tito" in Sarajevo, Bosnia, in 2010, or Hostel "Republika" in Užice, Serbia, in 2014). I have also heard from some of my interlocutors that they do not consider themselves Yugonostalgists since they are not oriented towards the past but towards the change. However, if we see Yugonostalgia as other nostalgias, and we already said that nostalgia often goes beyond "nice images of the past", as well as being a response to a present situation, then Yugonostalgia is not just a "silly" or "cute" phenomenon that

[16] In Yugoslav case, nationalist propaganda prevailed in the immediate Yugoslav post-socialist years instead of a critical debate and to this day such a critical engagement has not yet been initiated since the crimes committed during the Yugoslav wars in the 1990s overshadow the crimes committed during socialist Yugoslavia (Palmberger, 2016, 60)

relives the past, but it is also a way to express that we think this present moment could be better. It is not just "a speech about the past, but also a critique of the present" (Spasić, 2012, 586), mostly critique of the ongoing nationalism or capitalism, or both (Pita, 2020),"creating the "counter-narrative" in opposition to the new narrative" (Balunović (2020). "Yugonostalgia isn't just about how they or their families once lived, but about the life they want to live now" (Balunović, 2020). Jansen (2005) writes that Yugonostalgia appears as a desperate dissatisfaction with the pathology of everyday life during the nineties. He warns us that Yugonostalgia does not mean the recreation of a common state, or loyalty to Yugoslavhood, but a set of memories unrelated to geopolitics, or declaration of identity. It is a memory of what people once felt as "home", but can sometimes also represent an antinationalistic tendency. When the official politics in the former Yugoslav states (Jansen writes about Croatia and Serbia) was the politics of forgetting of the Yugoslav past that regime imposed, Yugonostalgia served as a basis of remembering and resistance to forget for many people. This is why Yugonostalgia is not longing for going back to something, but it sheds light to an actual situation. Petrović (2010, 141) writes about workers in cable factory of Jagodina, Serbia, who feel humiliated and trapped in an uncertain moment, which triggers nostalgia for the past, a past that always stays perceived as better, not just in material terms, but also in the sense of dignity that they enjoyed under socialism. For them nostalgia is a necessary tool to make sense not of their past, but present. Nostalgia is positioning what once was into relation to now, what creates a frame of meaning. "…Living in an insecure present, the workers need for their past to be remembered, since it gives them a right to request a better future" (Petrović, 2010, 138-139). Thus "nostalgia, similar to other forms of remembering, is about the production of the present rather than reproduction of the past" (Berdahl, 1999, 202 in Petrović, 2010, 149). The memories about Yugoslavia are not just memories, but always position the speaker in relation to what is happening now - whether or not one wishes to make a political statement, the way one positions oneself towards Yugoslavia always refers to the state of the present situation (Palmberger, 2016, 131). "Any positive reference to Tito, Yugoslavia, the partisan resistance, the socialist system or the culture of those times is - whether one is aware of it or not - to a certain degree political, because they represent a world different from the current one, they show that an alternative was, is and will always be possible" (Pita, 2020).

The more I started to think about Yugonostalgia in this way, the more sense it started to get for me. It became less and less "cute" and more and more strong expressive critical power, or even a mobilising force for change. Jansen (2005) writes that, even though Yugonostalgia mostly has been interpreted as an escapist strategy which helps people manage to forget the reality around them and construct some kind of ideological past, and that there are similar passive and pessimistic views about nostalgia in other post socialistic countries, there is a possibility that Yugonostalgia has a strong active component. Based on the argument that nostalgia is not actually oriented to the past, but to the present, and above all it´s critique, there are authors who see in Yugonostalgia a potential for changes, social and political (Tomić, 2014). For example Palmberger (2016) writes that "in some cases Yugonostalgia expressed among people in Bosnia

is actually a tool for overcoming the troubled relationship between “Bosniaks”, “Croats” and “Serbs” and in these cases the memories of Yugoslavia and the good coexistence is used as an example, as a “guiding star” for the future” Palmberger (2016, 222), what could also be the possible case within the community of former Yugoslavs in Vienna (if we assume that their relations were/are troubled to begin with). Angé and Berliner (2015) do write that “recent anthropological literature has confirmed that nostalgia (as affect, discourse and practice) mediate collective identities, whether they are social, ethnic or national, thus nostalgia constitutes a fascinating angle to explore the creative persistence and the disappearance of cultural forms for the anthropologists” (Angé and Berliner, 2015, 5). What kind of power does Yugonostalgia carry? What can it do? Čuković (2013) writes about a continuation of Yugoslav imagined community in Diaspora circles in Detroit, USA, that has persisted despite a traumatic event (breakup of the country, Yugoslav wars) in the form of certain socialised manners and rituals that are demonstrated through Yugonostalgia. She recognises creation of community and its characteristics that were carried to the hostland (social gatherings, foods and speciality stores) continued through the collective memory and affirmed the imagined community, while being materialised in a form of Yugonostalgia. Can Yugonostalgia do all that? Can it really be more than a “safe space” for cognitive dissonance, ambivalent emotions and (un)successful attempts to understand everything that happened to us: personally, socially and politically (Balunović (2020)? Can it really contribute in rebuilding a new “home” in the host land, or in “overcoming” the differences between different ethnicities (that were proclaimed to be so huge during the Yugoslav wars in the newly formed states), or to even in maintaining the image of Yugoslavia, the country that officially does not exist for 30 years, as a “real” homeland?

Young Yugonostalgic people?

But could those who grew up and formed themselves after Yugoslavia, be considered Yugonostalgic? Farkas (2014) states that young people cannot be Yugonostalgic, since they have never lived in Yugoslavia, so their nostalgia is actually a fantasy related to a country in the past, that, as they have heard, was better than the present. One of my interlocutors also mentioned that young people cannot be Yugonostalgic in the same way as the people who once actually lived in Yugoslavia. On the other hand, other authors, with whom I tend to agree more, are allowing that kind of possibility. Spasić (2012) writes that opinion about the life in SFRJ can be positive without any difference between the ones who experienced it and the ones who just have heard about it from stories of older generations, emphasising that this is the one of the paradoxes of Yugonostalgia, and even maybe it is differentia specifica. Jansen (2005) writes that even for people who have just hazy memories about their childhood in Yugoslavia, Yugonostalgia can serve as an imagined frame of reference. Petrović (2010) also writes about Yugonostalgia among young people, saying that “it is not necessarily a generationally bound experience that keeps Yugoslavia still alive, cause even for some who hardly have any experience of living there, Yugoslavia is “right here and right now” - an actual reality” (Petrović, 2010, 515).

Nostalgia among younger people who did not grow up in Yugoslavia can be considered as "armchair nostalgia", as Boym (2011) calls it, meaning nostalgia without lived experience. Čuković (2013) writes that yearning for the past shows a collective reformation of memory throughout generations. She sees the manifestation of Yugonostalgia within Yugoslav diaspora in Detroit, USA, as a combination of armchair nostalgia, imagined community and transmission of the past through continuation of time. The children of Yugoslav parents may have never even visited Yugoslavia, or they just have occasional visits to the former Yugoslav republics, but the stories are passed down by their parents, stories that are opened for their interpretation and reconstruction. "Self-identifying of these children as partly Yugoslavs can contribute to the continuation of Yugonostalgia in Diaspora communities and survival of this nation beyond its times and generations" (Čuković, 2013, 34). Same, I have heard about Yugonostalgia and saw it in Vienna, not just among people who once lived in Yugoslavia, but also among "younger" ones: children and grandchildren of Yugoslavs, born in Vienna, or students who just recently moved from any of former Yugoslav states. Indeed, the sentiment was usually much stronger among "older" (Yugoslav) generations, but that does not exclude the existence of any kind of Yugonostalgia among "younger" generations. Sometimes, it even seems like some young people who were not Yugonostalgists became one when they came to Vienna (since recently there is an appearance of Yugonostalgic places and they were somehow "swallowed up by that atmosphere"). However, related, it has to be mentioned that there is also a form of materialised Yugonostalgia in Vienna (as probably in other places) that does not have to be related to a real sentiment. Spasić (2012) also mentioned that this motive of "lost future" can be connected with current commercialisation of Yugonostalgia. What capitalism lacks and socialism has is utopia, collective desire for a better future. "The post socialist capitalist market through sentimentalisation of potentially dangerous memories, tends to remove the political edge from them and turns them in one more type of product on which one can make a good profit" (Spasić, 2012, 587). This is also what some of my interlocutors had a problem with - when someone "sells this idea" and "uses the emotions of a real Yugonostalgist to make money". Petrović (2016, 510) also writes that reduction of Yugonostalgia to consumerism and consumption is clearly problematic and if it is reduced only to those most accessible, visible, banal and kitschy aspects of Yugoslav cultural production, then it can be seen even as a negative phenomenon. (Boyer (2006, 372) also mentioned similar "kitchines" of Ostalgie, saying that consumerism around GDR-era commodities (as T-shirts "I was born in GDR - German Democratic Republic (East Germany)) have little to do with actual nostalgia and are usually manufactured by Western Germans firms). But it has to be admitted that the whole process would not be so successful, if it did not have a foundation in real need (Spasić, 2012), and that it shows there are many people (in this case, former Yugoslavs in Vienna) to whom Yugonostalgia means something.

This discussion opens the topic of diaspora once again, now in relation to memory. How is it possible that Yugonostalgia has a meaning for someone who was born in Vienna, for example? Did they hear about Yugoslavia from their parents, or other "older" generations? Palmberger (2016) writes that anthropologists have paid special attention to the phenomenon of the

transmission of memories downwards through generations, saying that it is the way how collective identities are maintained, but she also emphasises that memories are not directly transmitted to younger generations but are rather re-narrated, often contextualised and selectively adopted. What stays unclear is - when and why do individuals of different generations decide to pass on their memories and to whom; and again, whose narratives are perceived as trustworthy? Can I end up being a Yugonostalgist, if I hardly heard anything good about Yugoslavia while I was growing up? Whose memories did I finally accept? Of former Yugoslavs in Vienna? Can a collective identity do that? Some authors say that it can. Shared memory, of the point of origin, is an important diasporic trait. Collective memories are social constructs in the basis of the formation of the imagined communities, and as such appear to be important for the process of identity formation in host countries. Collective memories are narratives that merge the actual and mythical and their understanding influences the sense of belonging to a certain community, and the process of making boundaries between sameness and otherness (Lacroix, Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, 2013, 685), as can be seen in the example of the former Yugoslav community in Vienna. What is extremely interesting, and represents a different question that will be discussed throughout this thesis, is why former Yugoslavs in Vienna continue to maintain the common collective identity, rather than separate "national" ones. After all, maybe it is like Petrović (2010) says - "all former Yugoslavs are, nevertheless, nostalgic about their common past" (Petrović, 2010, 132).

"Komšiluk" (Good neighbourliness)

"Komšiluk is a way to express what was and what no longer is, and to emphasise today's corrupt relations between Bosniaks, Croats and Serbs. Pre-war komšiluk is narrated as the art of being neighbourly regardless of national affiliation, meaning neighbours who help each other out (for example, during illness) but who also celebrate festivities together and share daily practises, such as drinking coffee with one another". (Palmberger, 2016, 66)

Here "komšiluk" is defined as the idea of brotherhood in the neighbourhood beyond ethnic differences, but the concept cannot be reduced just to cross-ethno-national relations. Sorabji (2008) also writes about the trend in social sciences to treat *komšiluk* as a social mechanism that regulates relations between different ethno-national groups, often Bosniaks, Bosnian Serbs and Croats (in Bosnia), what she calls its metaphorical meaning. She says that *komšiluk* should be returned to its primar, common sense meaning, where it stands for the relations between people who live in proximity to each other and can, but do not have to be of different ethno/national belonging. As someone who grew up in Serbia, as one of the former Yugoslav Republics, and has experienced this concept personally (even though it is even more practised among the generations of our parents) I have to agree with her and widen the concept a little bit. "Komšiluk" represents a strong relation between "komšije" (neighbours), a bond that is almost family-like. This bond refers to the people who live nearby, in the same building or the area of your house, regardless of their educational, social or other background, including

ethnicity/nationality. Since Bosnia is more multinational, the concept is probably often recognised as related to closeness between neighbours of different ethnicities than, for example in Serbia, which is more homogeneous regarding the ethnic/national belonging. But the concept is all the same: people who live near you will be there for you in different situations. Here, your neighbours are like your family, especially if your family does not live near. You can count on them for almost everything, from borrowing sugar or something else for your home, over buying groceries (also for you when they go to do that for themselves), to even leaving your children with them. It is not just that neighbours drink coffee together, but often eat together or share meals, communicate on a daily basis, share personal feelings, and support each other. Simple, you can rely on them to be there for you and help you when you have problems. Of course, this concept works the same in multiethnic environments, as in Bosnia, or (as we would see in the Fourth chapter) between former Yugoslavs in Vienna, where there is a "clear obligation of reciprocity" between people of different nations/ethnicities living in close proximity, as in definition of Haydn that Sorabji writes about (2008).

In "A History of Yugoslavia" Calic (2019) writes about the mutual respect and good neighbourly relations that were part of village life between different people (from different social groups) in the territories that would later become Yugoslavia even in the 19th century, where people supported each other beyond regional borders through neighbourly help, and also socialising together. This spatial sociality can also be connected to Ottoman heritage (as Prof. Jelena Tošić pointed to me during our personal mentor-student communication), also Sorabji (2008) and (Živković, 2011) say that even the word *komšiluk* has Turkish origin. However, I have heard many times that people consider this concept as one of the legacies of (Tito´s) socialism and they connect good neighbourly relations with the time of Yugoslavia. Palmbergers (2016) interlocutors in Bosnia consider that the relationship with their neighbours has become superficial and is reduced to simply exchanging greetings after the breakup of Yugoslavia, while Spasić (2012) focus groups members in Serbia said that the old days (Yugoslav times) were much warmer, full closeness, friendship and togetherness. In my experience, komšiluk is still a very important concept in everyday life of people in Serbia, although it is possible that it carries more significance in smaller towns and means more to the generations that grew up in Yugoslav times. For example, my mother has been very close to her neighbours to the point where she pounds to the radiators pipes in order to see if some of her neighbours are awake, so she could come for a coffee, or on some days she would make the agreements with one of her neighbours, and one of them would prepare soup, while the other would be in charge of the main meal and then they join food and eat together. Furthermore, she has always criticised my generation for "not even knowing who lives in the apartment next door", for being very alienated from each other (which can also be related with the time of Yugoslavia and the time after the breakup). I am not sure if "komšiluk" can be considered as Yugoslav heritage, but somehow it did find it´s way to Vienna, through the the community of "our" people that will be presented and discussed in the upcoming pages, together with all other mentioned theoretical concepts, which will be thoroughly discussed in relation to the findings of my research, in the following (fourth) chapter.

Methodological story

When I realised that I want to explore the connections between former Yugoslavs in Vienna, the next question that rose in my head was: how? What would be the best possible way to “catch” the essence of this community? Where should I go, and what should I look for? Should I go to people's homes, or should I search for places where people socialise the most? What should I ask people and which people? This journey of understanding and grasping the former Yugoslav community in Vienna was a long, interesting and not an easy one, and in the next chapter I will try to present to you how it looked like.

Explaining my positionality and motivation

Researchers' subjectivity and position necessarily play an important role in the construction of ethnographic knowledge. In order to gain more objective knowledge, they have to be accepted, analysed and interpreted together with other data gained in the field (Ardévol, Gómez-Cruz, 2012). This is why it is crucial for me, as a researcher, to reflect on my positionality, especially because I also am part of the population that I have been researching - the former Yugoslavian community in Vienna.

Even though I was formally born in Yugoslavia (1984), I have never felt like I was, since I was young when the breakup happened (1992). As far as I remember, if I considered myself something in the sense of ethnicity/nationality, it was Serbian (never Yugoslav). (Of course, this could be a false product of my memory from this, present moment, since I was, as the majority people from Serbia and other former Yugoslav Republics, influenced by the political propaganda and extremely strong presentation of a new (in my case, Serbian) national identity through media, schooling and other systems). I grew up listening to different stories related to Yugoslavia and relations between different ethnicities, starting from my family. My father, who always felt like a Serb, claimed that all the ethnicities from Yugoslavia never felt like they should have lived in one country and that Yugoslavia was an artificial construct that just waited to burst. In opposition, my mother (who lived in Slovenia for a part of her life and participated in Yugoslav youth work actions) was always saying that it did not matter who came from which part of Yugoslavia, ensuring me that brotherhood and unity between different ethnicities was real.

The ambivalence of the stories that I have heard while I grew up continued, so eventually I did not have a clear picture about relations between people of Yugoslavia. I have never dealt with the topic professionally, even though I always thought that it would be extremely interesting for researching, especially in the field. During my psychology studies in Serbia, this topic was not addressed in any way. During my 6 years of NGO work in Serbia I did not deal with the topic per se, but I did engage in various projects, programs and workshops related to intercultural acceptance and understanding, coexistence and reconciliation, where the relation between the

former Yugoslav was discussed many times. I once (2013) even was the workshop leader in Sarajevo, Bosnia, where young Bosniaks and Serbs from Bosnia were participating together, not just without any problems, but in a complete friendly atmosphere (followed with socialising, making friends, getting together, having crushes on each other, and everything that regularly happens during the youth trainings and exchanges).
When I came to Vienna, in 2016, I was immediately introduced to this community of “our people” (by some relatives and acquaintances, also members of the community of “our” people), and what surprised me is that people, when saying “our people”, did not mean just “Serbs”, or “Croats”, or “Bosniaks”, but all the people from former Yugoslav Republics. In the first few days in Vienna I met more people from Bosnia and Croatia than I did in my whole life. All the places I visited had all former Yugoslav ethnicities as guests, socialising and spending time together, many being friends, many in mixed relationships. I was (as many people I talked to about this topic) easily “caught” in this atmosphere and I didn't even realise when and how I started calling the language that I speak “our language” and all the former Yugoslavs “our people”, but I know that it happened very fast. I have never been longing for anything related to Yugoslavia (if I have been, I am not aware of that), but I have to admit that I have been very (positively) surprised by such atmosphere and I have been under the impression that these people really lived as one community and still considered themselves as such. A million questions rose in my head, especially if this is just my impression, or others experience this belonging in a similar way. I also have been wondering how this all came to be, what kind of relations these people maintain, if there is a community, what is the “bond” that keeps them together. This is why I decided to research this complex topic and to see what I will discover in the field.
It is certain that I also needed to explain to myself the multifaceted nature of connections between the people of the former Yugoslavian community in Vienna and to discover what is a unifier that keeps these people together. I was also wondering about their belonging modes, did the breakup of Yugoslavia have an impact on them and in what way. Finally, I asked myself if this community could be considered diaspora.

Within the diaspora studies, it is usually considered that nationalist tendencies in diasporas can be strengthened more than in homeland (Clifford, 1994) while within the former Yugoslav community in Vienna it seems not to be the case. This could be the example that does not fit into this common consideration.
The breakup of Yugoslavia resulted in the emergence of new national and ethnic identities that were the topic of various research in former Yugoslav Republics, but not so often in the host countries of the former Yugoslavs on the move. Social sciences neglected the social networks between migrants from former Yugoslavia, as their social spaces in their countries of immigration (Božić, Kuti, 2016). The research related to this thesis could contribute to better understanding of this overlooked social phenomenon.
Diaspora is strongly related with the concepts of memory and nostalgia. “A shared memory of the point of origin is generally acknowledged as a defining trait of any diaspora, since memory in

a diasporic context embodies a range of specificities, occurring not only across generations but also across borders, and simultaneously in different socio-political contexts" (Lacroix, Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, 2013, 685). Nevertheless, the concepts of diaspora and memory are rarely combined in the research process (Palmberger, Tosić, 2016); (Lacroix, Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, 2013). Even though there are a lot of authors that deal with the topic of relation of diaspora and nostalgia, and there is also a lot of literature regarding Yugonostalgia per se, there is almost no literature that deals with Yugonostalgia in diaspora[17] (Čuković, 2013). In this master thesis all these concepts - diaspora, memory, nostalgia and Yugonostalgia have been taken into consideration, as well as the relations between them.

Here it has to be mentioned that not many authors researched specifically the group of the former Yugoslav community in Vienna. To the best of my knowledge, the authors that dealt with this topic are: lingvist and historian Wladimir Fischer (2003, 2004), historian Vladimir Ivanović (2012) and sociologist Ana Mijić (2019). All of them have been a significant source of information for my own research (especially Mijić (2019), as we did not have just the same research group, but also some of our research goals were similar[18]).
There is a very interesting term "Yugosphere", coined by the British journalist Tim Judah (for the magazine The Economist, in 2009 (Jagiełło-Szostak, 2013) and a follow up study published by the London School of Economics), which usually refers to an area of the former Yugoslavia, but it can also be referred to as the sphere (region or zone) of Yugoslav culture and influence. The term is used for connection among people from the former Yugoslav republics, that were made after Yugoslavia broke apart, in most cases - connections in the area of economy, but in a broader meaning Yugosphere can also be used for any kind of bond between former Yugoslavs. In this paper the term will be used in its wider sense, and not just related to people living in former Yugoslav Republics, but also in diaspora, since "the extension of the Yugosphere exceeds the geographic borders of former Yugoslavia, due to the waves of migration and the "members of Yugosphere" that are spread all over the world" (Mazzucchelli, 2012, 6). The Yugosphere can be seen not just as an economic process, but also a social phenomenon, as a process of making, preserving, or renewing ties and connections that have been cut off after the collapse of the former states of Yugoslavia (Judah, 2011). Judah also believes that this process is in a greater sense reinforced by the similarity of the language, as well as of the shared culture and history. "The Yugosphere is also made of shared experiences and memories, expectations and life-styles, a cultural universe, where all the parts of culture, while interacting produce a new meaning" (Mazzucchelli, 2012, 6). Mazzucchelli (2012) wonders if it is possible to belong to a Yugosphere and at the same time, to the national spheres. I would argue that the Yugosphere in Vienna still exists, sometimes overlapping with "new" national spheres (social spaces of being a Serb, Croat, Bosnian).

[17] Čuković (2013) researched Yugonostalgia within the Yugoslav diaspora in Detroit, USA
[18] Needless to say, I was not familiar with her research when I started my own

Judah (2009) says that the emergence of a Yugosphere (connecting between former Yugoslavs) is rarely talked about or even acknowledged since it opposes everything that was believed in the 1990s. The paradox between decades of peaceful coexistence between different ethnicities in Yugoslavia and the sudden eruption of violence during the war is hard to understand, thus many consider this earlier together living to be fake (Palmberger, 2006), and that Serbs, Croats and Bosniaks were never able to leave in peace, nor they will ever be (Palmberger, 2008). The research of the former Yugoslavs living together in Vienna could open some new perspectives about this topic.
Finally, the contribution of this research would be, if I could show based on this example that this community could actually be considered a diaspora, even though it does not have one motherland or nationally-based identity. If the former Yugoslav community in Vienna is actually a Yugoslav diaspora, "a diaspora beyond diaspora", could this mean that I might challenge the most common definition of diaspora, in which diaspora is strongly connected with the motherland and national component?

Being in the field (Access and Methods)

Since the contemporary ethnography does not consider ethnographic field as just as a place, but rather as a set of relations and connections between different locations where actors engage in activity (Ardévol, Gómez-Cruz, 2012), in case of this field research it could be seen as the social space of the former Yugoslav community in Vienna and the set of connections between its members. My field sites were certain places in Vienna, where these connections could be observed, but mostly former Yugolsavs bakeries/restaurants and cafes/clubs at Märzstraße (15th district), that is considered as "our" (former Yugoslav) street (from numbers 1 until 60, 900 metres in total, there are 17 former Yugoslav bakeries/restaurants and cafes/clubs), and especially the bakery/restaurant "Sofra", where I have worked for 6 months, using the method of participant observation.
Furthermore, as the online presentation and communication of the organisations that I followed are considered as a virtual part of the research field, then I should also mention official web and Facebook pages of some organisations related to the former Yugoslavian community in Vienna, that I included in the research.

The original plan for my research was to last 6 months (from December 2019 until May 2020), but some modifications had to be made due to the situation related to the COVID-19 pandemic, in which all outdoor activities, such as social gatherings had to be stopped for a certain time period. Due to the three COVID-19 lockdowns in Austria, my research lasted a lot longer - 2 years in total (from December 2019 until December 2021).
The field research with interviews was conducted in the period of December 2019 until March 2020, and then continued from April 2021 (interviews), May 2021 (field research and

interviews) until December 2021. Meanwhile the online research was done, starting as an additional method, in December 2019, but then, in lockdown, continued as a main (only possible) method, lasting until December 2020.

The methods I have been using are: observation and participant observation, informal conversation and interviews (semi structured, sometimes with elements of narrative, and sometimes the elements of an expert interview). Some elements of online ethnography have also been used, as an additional method.

My plan was to visit the events or cafes where people from former Yugoslavian countries meet and socialise, observe them socialising and talk to them (what went according to the plan, except during the COVID 19 lockdowns). Luckily, I also had a chance to take a job in one of the former Yugoslav bakeries/restaurants, where I worked for 6 months, and where I really enjoyed the participant observation in its true meaning.

I also planned to conduct many informal conversations and around 10-15 semi structured interviews, ideally with persons originated from or related to different parts of former Yugoslavia (Serbia, Bosnia, Croatia), bar owners or employees (as waiters or musicians), guests or any people that are part of this community. Eventually, I did 10 interviews, with various members of the former Yugoslav community, with different ethnic and educational background, age, gender, different time of migration in Vienna (one of them even born here), some of them being my acquaintances, some I met on the events or in cafes/restaurants, some are representatives of the organisations, some are restaurant owners and some I even found online. Additionally, I had numerous informal conversations with acquaintances, people that I met on Märzstraße, on events, customers and colleagues in the bakery/restaurant where I worked, etc.

On the other hand, my plan was to map the organisations that are related to people from former Yugoslavia, follow their online representation, visit some of their events, observe and talk to people, get in contact with their representatives (presidents, founders, directors, employers), and try to get an interview with some of them. As planned, I found the former Yugoslav organisations in Vienna, and followed some of them for a certain time period. I visited the office of one of them at the event they organised and I had an interview with their president. I also visited the office of one media organisation and conducted two interviews there. Originally, I was aiming for more events and office visits, and more interviews with organisation representatives, but the circumstances did not allow for it, since due to the COVID19 pandemic there were almost no events organised. I tried to compensate for this potential shortcoming with online observation of the organisations.

In general, there were not many alterations to the original research plan, except that the COVID19 pandemic caused a much longer research period, as well as the lack of the events that could be observed. This was overcome with the online observation. I also did not originally plan to work in one of the former Yugoslav bakeries/restaurants or cafes, especially not for 6 months, but this was just an enormous plus and very significant opportunity, that allowed me to apply the method of participant observation on a much higher quality level than with just visiting the coffees, restaurants and events.

The research was conducted responsibly and in accordance with ethical codes. All my interviewees and most of my interlocutors (with whom I engaged more than a few sentences via informal conversation) were aware of my role as a researcher. The topic of the research was thoroughly presented to all of my interviewees, who accepted willingly to participate and agreed that the information they gave me could be used in my research and later published. All my interlocutors were provided with anonymity, except when they wanted for their real names to stay as they are. I would ask each of my interviewees if they would like to have their name changed, but some of them wanted me to keep their real name. Those who did want to change it, I would ask them to give themselves a different name they wanted. All the data that I collected have been used exclusively for the purpose of this research and for no other purpose.

Online research

In December 2019, my research started online. Digital ethnography is an approach that is currently growing and online observation can be seen as a methodological response to the challenges of the virtual world (Ardévol, Gómez-Cruz, 2012). It is almost no longer imaginable to conduct ethnography without considering online spaces (Airoldi, 2018). Contemporary social relations are becoming increasingly mediated by digital technologies thus observing the participants of the research, as talking to them face to face, can be supported by observing via online platforms (Beneito-Montagut, Begueria, Cassián, 2017). The Internet can represent a field site, but also can be used as a research tool, mainly for data collection.For this kind of ethnography that is connected with the internet, but not completely, Pink (2012) recommends the term “internet-related ethnography”. In that sense, I was using online ethnography as an additional research tool in order to get a more complete perspective, thus I was combining online and offline ethnography. Group of authors (Pink, Horst, Hjort, Lewis, Tacchi, 2016) tried to explain what it means to be digitally engaged, writing that many ethnographic activities are “transferable” to a “digital ethnography”. For example, in digital ethnography, we are often in mediated contact rather than in direct presence with the participants, watching them means digitally tracking them, while listening may rather involve reading, and ethnographic writing can be replaced by video or photography. This kind of research can combine off and online situations, face-to-face interviews, but also following posts on web sites or social media, or for example, following the announcement for an event, visiting that event in person, and then again, following comments related to the same event online. Related, online data could be online posts, links, information or photos from web sites, which are then combined with “offline data”, as field visits or interviews in person (Pink, Horst, Hjort, Lewis, Tacchi, 2016). Ideally, the research should combine both online and offline data. One does not explain the other, rather, the aim should be to look at the ways in which each configures the other - the online data serves to contextualise the offline data and vice versa (Orgad, 2009).

My research started online. In the beginning I started searching for organisations related to former Yugoslavs in Vienna. This was a first step, finding and mapping them. Then I continued to look at some of their websites to see where they are located, what kind of programs they have, what their target groups are, when they were established and similar. I also followed their official Facebook pages with a double aim - one was to observe their work through their online presentation, and the other was to see if some of them will announce some events that I could attend. Therefore, the online research was, in a way, an entry point, a first step, but not just that. Since the research field is seen as a set of connections and relations between people, they can be observed not just offline, but also online. This is why I also continued to follow posts and articles of the organisation that I already visited in the field, including the comments and reactions. Finally, online observation has been the only possible research technique during the special situation of the COVID 19 pandemic. New approach to ethnography, called "patchwork" ethnography (Günel, Varma, Watanabe, 2020) recognises that combination of "home" and "field" have become necessary, especially in the face of the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic. While keeping the characteristics of "traditional" fieldwork, such as committedness, language skills or contextual knowledge, patchwork ethnography expands the list of what are considered to be acceptable materials, tools and objects of analysis, while participating in the way how changing living conditions are changing knowledge production.

Apart from official websites, I also followed the organisations online via Facebook. On Facebook, users can communicate through posts, comments and 'likes', with messages, or social interactions take place in public, for example on Facebook pages (Airoldi, 2018). "The research of a social media ethnographer involves spending a lot of time on the Internet, keeping up-to-date with and participating and collaborating in social media discussions" (Postill, Pink, 2012, 8). The fact that the ethnographer is not physically close with his research subjects makes the participant observation on facebook a bit problematic, and the starting point is having a profile (Dalsgaard, 2016). Since I had a profile on Facebook for 14 years and have been using it daily, it was a good starter for my online research. After visiting and copying all the relevant information from the official websites of the organisations, I would observe their Facebook page (if they have them) and follow their posts, photos, shares or comments. It was useful for getting to know something about them, obtaining preliminary data, announcements of the events, but I could also see comments of the people from the former Yugoslav community related to their Facebook activity. (Dalsgaard, 2016) explains how Facebook helped him to stay informed when he could not be physically present on the field, what was also very important in the case of my research, since Facebook provided me a way to observe, at least partly, former Yugoslav community and the activity of the organisations that I was interested in, since the COVID 19 crisis left me without a possibility to go to the field (offline) research for more than a year. Additionally, I had access to some comments and thoughts that were publicly shared on facebook, which I probably couldn´t observe in some other way.

"Practice as a social media researcher consisted of: catching up, sharing, exploring, interacting, archiving, and interacting with research participants even just the occasional "Like"" (Postill,

Pink, 2012, 8). Markham (2013) writes that the researcher is often tempted to archive all the information that he or she finds online, just to be sure, and I agree. Digital platforms and tools are also important in the ethnographic research process since they are able to deliver digital footprints of social interactions which can be incorporated with other forms of data (Beneito-Montagut, Begueria, Cassián, 2017). During my research I often used digital media to generate data; phone to make photos and audio records, as screenshots of posts and comments on Facebook pages, and laptop to write my field diary, transcribe my interviews, to have one online interview (via messenger), as for my notes regarding websites, Facebook pages, to follow comments, etc., what all can be considered as digital ethnography (Ardévol, Gómez-Cruz, 2012).

Observation and participant observation

What followed were observation and participant observation. In ethnographic research observation and participation are interwoven with other procedures and it usually involves the ethnographer participating in people's daily lives for an extended period of time, collecting every available data related to the research topic, listening, observing everything and asking questions. Flick (2009) also mentions that sometimes, and in some phases, the ethnographer just observes people, without them even being aware that they are observed (like people who drink coffee in the cafes, as I did, in the beginning). Additionally, participant observation is "an immersion to a culture", and the participant observer comes into a social situation with an aim to engage himself or herself into situation activities and to observe these activities, people and physical aspects related (Fine, 2005). The aim of participant observation is to understand cultural formations, so the researcher has to attend to what people say or do, and observe and comprehend how people build meaning in relation to their experiences and actions. It is a way to gain access to people's ways of life, not only by observing behaviour but also by sharing their daily life routines and social meaning (Ardévol, Gómez-Cruz, 2012).

Time is a very important component of the participant observation, since the researcher should be on the field usually for a year, or even longer. The certain knowledge of the language that the research group uses is also very significant, because it is fruitful when the researcher can also understand what people are speaking among themselves. In this case the researcher is not just an observer, an "outsider" who stands near the group and writes his/her notes, but someone who joins the group and engages in their activities (Miller, Costa, Haynes, McDonald, Nicolescu, Sinanan, Spyer, Venkatraman, Wang, 2016).

Spradley (1980) emphasises that the participant observer has a complicated position where he or she has to be the insider and the outsider, at the same time. He also underlines that introspection is very important, even though it may not seem objective, it is a tool the participant observer has to use to understand the new situations and to acquire skills needed for following the cultural rules. "Participant observer has to learn to use oneself as a research instrument, and to increase his/her introspectiveness and after participating in some activity to try to find out how did this experiences felt like" (Spradley, 1980, 57)

The first question related to this method is always field access. Access to the field and the group that I was about to research was one of the crucial motives for choosing this research topic. In many ways, I am a part of this community, since I live in Vienna, and I come from one of the former Yugoslav republics. Furthermore, I know many people who originate from the former Yugoslav republics and live in Vienna. I also have visited many bars, cafes, and have met many people, bar owners, musicians, waiters, etc. In the particular case of the KOSMO magazine, I had easy access, since I volunteered there a few years ago. Very important was the fact that the language that this community uses is my mother tongue, so I could observe and participate without any difficulties, and conduct the interviews better, since people could express themselves easier, and would be more open and relaxed or even trust me more. All of this contributed to gaining access to my main research site, one of a former Yugoslav bakery/mini restaurant (Sofra, at Märzstraße), where I managed to get a job at the cash register, and engage in participant observation in its full sense for a half a year.

After having (gaining) the access to the field, the questions of field sites rose. Field site is a stage where social processes under study are happening. For ethnographers defining this space is an important activity that also involves identifying where the researchers should be located as a participant observer (Burrel, 2009). It was not easy to identify what would be the best field sites in case of this research, and to define what physical spaces reflect the social space of the former Yugoslav community in Vienna the best. Cafes and events are always a good place not just for observation, but also meeting people, informal conversations or even getting some chances for interviews. Between December 2019 and March 2020 I have been visiting the events or cafes/clubs where people from former Yugoslavian countries meet, where I observed the dynamics and happenings, talked and socialised with people that are part of this community. I always talked with people in Serbian/Croatian/Bosnian. After visits, I wrote field notes to describe what I have seen, but also to note my thoughts. Between the two lockdowns, in the period from May until December 2021, I continued my observation and participant observation at Märzstraße, especially in the Sofra bakery/mini restaurant, where I went for 6 months from Monday to Friday, at least a few hours a day, talked to customers, other workers, owners, neighbours, observed socialising and relation of the former Yugoslavs, and also gained insight from my own perspective as a community member and a job holder in such a place.
My field notes were originally in Serbian/Bosnian/Croatian, and then later, translated into English. Sometimes I would write them in my notebook (for example, while working in Sofra, my pencil and notebook, ethnographic diary was always near me) and then I would later type them on my laptop, while sometimes I would come home and then type them directly.
Furthermore, in the beginning I also went to the field in the 2nd, 3rd and 8th district. I strived to focus on Märzstraße in the 15th district, since I previously knew that this street is packed with former Yugoslav bakeries, cafes, restaurants, etc. (There are 17 of them within 900m). As Mijić (2019) writes, in order to analyse the process of social boundaries making, it is important to

focus on a specific neighbourhood with a high number of people from former Yugoslavia. Mijić (2019) also writes that the first migrants (meaning the ones that came in 60s and 70s) were "mostly the working class, uneducated and from rural areas, thus having below-average incomes and ethnic discrimination in the housing market resulted in their concentration in urban neighbourhoods, like Vienna's sixteenth district, Ottakring" (Mijić (2019, 5). I would definitely add the fifteenth district, Fünfhaus, since these two districts (15th and 16th) are familiar as "Yugoslav" districts in Vienna. While Mijić focuses on, as she writes, one of the most well-known former Yugoslav streets in Vienna, Ottakringerstrasse, unofficially familiar as the "Balkanmeile" or "Balkanstraße" (Mijić, 2019), my field research was concentrated on the, as some of my interlocutors called it "New Ottakringerstraße" - Märzstraße, in the 15th district (For more related to urban context and migration see the Fourth chapter).

The first place that I visited and where I have started my field research was, at that time, recently opened cafe/club "SFRJ" (Socialistic Federative Republic of Yugoslavia), clearly Yugonostalgia referencing place in Märzstrasse, 15th district, Vienna. During the informal conversations in SFRJ I have heard that the whole street Märzstraße is full with cafes and clubs that are owned and visited by the people from former Yugoslavia (Earlier I knew about some, but not that there are so many of them). This was one of the reasons why I chose to stay in the area of this street, to follow the leads that I was getting from the people I talked with. Also, one of the people whom I talked to told me that Märzstraße is more for older generation, comparing to famous "Balkanstraße" (Ottakringerstraße in the 16th district), also full with similar clubs, but more for very young people, like high school or early 20s, thus in order to providing more appropriate field site for participant observation, considering me being 35, at the time (37 at the end of research). Here, I have to briefly reflect on my positionality and motivation again, since there was one motive more for staying (more) in the area of Märzstraße and that is a musical taste/preference. Ottakringerstraße is related almost exclusively with Turbofolk music, while the cafes and clubs in Märzstraße are related more with rock or pop music from former Yugoslavia. I am aware that visiting Ottakringerstraße could maybe show different findings (as for example, conflicts during the football games between the former Yugoslav republics, mentioned by Mijic (2019), or some of my interviewees and interlocutors), but I still have chosen not to go in the field there. I always tend to enjoy my field visits, believing that this also contributes to the higher quality of the method of observations and participant observation, thus the quality of a complete research.

I also visited a few places outside of the street (for example when I visited the event that Prosvjeta was organising in the 3rd district, as well as the office of this organisation and the office of the magazine in the 2nd district) but I tried to stay in the area of the Märzstraße. Intentionally I was looking for a way to practice a participant observation, and found it via working (from May 2021 until December 2021) in a newly opened bakery/small restaurant "Sofra", exactly at Märzstraße and also with a clear reference to Yugonostalgia. There I had a

chance to observe and to daily interact with the community I have been researching, and to conduct one interview and many informal conversations in that time period.

Interviews

One of the limitations of observation is that some phenomena cannot be observed in situations, for example some biographical processes. This problem is usually solved with additional interviews that allow the reconstruction of these processes, thus the researchers' knowledge in participant observation is only partly based on observation of the actions, while the large part is grounded on participants' verbal statements about certain relations (Flick, 2009). Since I was also interested in the people's memory of the past and parts of their biographies, in a way (story of how they came and have been living in Vienna), the conversations with people, sometimes in the form of an informal conversation and sometimes - interviews, were necessary.
The people I have been researching were members of the former Yugoslavian community in Vienna in the broadest possible way, of both genders, different age, ethnicities and time of migration period. My plan was to conduct many informal conversations and around 10-15 semi-structured interviews, ideally with different former Yugoslav ethnicities (Serbs, Bosniaks, Croats), bar owners or employees (as waiters or musicians), guests or any people that are part of this community. Eventually, I did 10 interviews, with various members of the former Yugoslav community, with different ethnic and educational background, age, gender, different time of migration in Vienna (one of them even born here), some of them being my acquaintances, some I met on the events or in cafes/restaurants, some are representatives of the organisations, some are restaurant owners, some I found online.
Additionally, I had numerous informal conversations with acquaintances, people that I met on Märzstraße, on events, customers and colleagues in the bakery/restaurant where I worked, etc.
The informal conversations that I often used in order to get to know people to some extent, present them shortly with the topic of my research, to see whether they have some opinion about the subject or some experiences and thoughts they would like to share, or to find out if they would be willing to give an interview, etc. This kind of conversation can be done without any scheduling time or structured form, so they are an ideal additional method while being in the field, doing observation or participant observation. Also respondents are usually more relaxed, since they see it as a regular conversation (Cohen, Crabtree, 2006). For example, I went to one acquaintance (a cafe/bar owner from Bosnia, whom I considered very important since his student cafe (near the Uni campus, in 8th district) was the first one where I entered, on my first day of living in Vienna, and he gave me a lot pieces of advice related to my future living here and the former Yugoslav community), with the aim of getting an interview, assuming that there would not be any problems, since he is very talkative and open for conversations and discussions of any kind. However, he was not feeling comfortable talking while I was recording the conversation, so we ended up having an informal conversation, where I also found out a lot related to my research topic. Finally, informal conversations can provide the foundation for the developing and

conducting more structured interview (Cohen, Crabtree, 2006), as in the case of my research, where 5 informal conversations lead to an interview or to the agreement that the interview will be done later.
The interviews took place between December 2019 and December 2020 and lasted between half an hour and 2 hours (with the shortest being 29 minutes and the longest 1 hour and 54 minutes). All interviews were conducted in Serbian/Bosnian/Croatian, as the mother tongue of the researcher and the participants. It is suggested that researchers should create the balance between formality and informality so the participants could openly contribute and express their opinions freely, but also not to let the interviewees wonder too much with anecdotes or freely chatting, unrelated with the topic (Farkas, 2014). The interview style was mixed, but more informal, allowing the conversation to create its own direction, while remaining within the research topic, or related topics. The interviews were recorded with the smartphone (audio recorder) and later transcribed in original language, with further translation into English. Depending on the interviewees choice, the interviews were conducted in people's homes, or cafes, restaurants, etc. In one specific case an interview was done online, during the COVID-19 lockdown in December 2021, via Facebook messenger (also regularly recorded, then transcribed and translated).

The interview goal is to reveal existing knowledge in a way that can be expressed in the form of answers that can become available for interpretation (Flick, 2009). Ethnographic research is often combined with semi-structured interviews, usually “involving a mildly formal setting where the interviewer and interviewee sit down together in one place and attempt to work their way through a specific list of questions brought by the interviewer. Here the interviewee is given the opportunity to shape his or her own responses and there is a good chance for developing a conversation along one or more lines without most of the usual “chatter”” (Fine, 2005, 94-95).
All my interviews were semi structured, with the elements of a narrative interview, and expert interview, in some cases. When interviewing the members of the community, I combined elements of narrative and semi structured interview, since I was focusing on two crucial points - the story of coming and living in Vienna and the former Yugoslav community in Vienna. In the interviews I have been focusing on the life of people in Vienna, not in Yugoslavia (or former Yugoslavian republics).
First part of the interview was more like a narrative interview, where the initial topic was their moving and life in Vienna. I have usually started with asking about the story of how and when they came to Vienna, followed by additional questions like - why did they choose Vienna, what do they remember about the first days here, who did they meet and to which places did they go, and why? This would be continued with the story of their life in Vienna. This could be considered as a narrative interview, where the person is asked to “present the history of an area of interest, in which he or she participated, in a consistent story, with all relevant events from the beginning until the end” (Hermanns, 1995, 183 in Flick, 2009, 177). “The narrative question serves not only to encourage the creation of a narrative, but also to focus the narrative on the topic and the period of biography of interest for the research” (Flick, 2009, 183). These stories

often lasted long, which I encouraged by not interrupting them or asking additional questions until it was necessary. All the people were gladly telling their stories about the beginning of their life in Vienna, remembering anecdotes, situations and details. I choose this technique since it can provide data that cannot be produced in other forms of interviewing, since people know and are able to tell more about their lives than the researcher can remember to ask, and also the retrospective narrative of experiences or events in life history are presented in the way they were experienced by the narrator as actor (Flick, 2009). Also, it seemed convenient for the people that I did not know before, so I could find out more about them, and, on the other hand, that they could relax more and feel more comfortable. However, this was not always a full success. For example, the first person I interviewed was a person I knew, and he, knowing about the topic of my research, started spontaneously to talk about "our" cafes, even before I started to record and told him an initial question, so I had to ask different questions from time to time, what turned out to be semi-structured interview. There was also another minor issue and that was the often tendency of some of my interviewees to talk a lot about their career path in Austria, sometimes not so much related to the topic of the former Yugoslav community, so I had to direct them back to the research topic.

Second part of the interviews were semi structured, where I asked about the former Yugoslav community in Vienna, starting with describing this community, followed by additional questions such as: who is the part of this community, where people meet and socialise, are they part of this community, what bounds them together, etc. I also focused on the relations between people (with different ethnicities), asking about their experiences and perceptions (through private everyday life or their work), regarding whether ethnicity/nationality is important and on what occasions, were the relations between people once different, in what way and in which time periods, etc. Finally I asked them about the Yugonostalgia - are they personally a Yugonostalgist, but also about their opinion - is there some kind of Yugonostalgia among the people of this community? What does Yugonostalgia mean to them, whether they are nostalgic? Of course, the type of questions, as the style of leading the interview, varied from case to case and depended on the story of the person that was interviewed, age, the fact do we know each other already and finally, the interviewees preferences.

When interviewing a representative of an organisation (NGO or media), as well as the restaurant co-founder, the structure of the interview was slightly different, since I was also using elements of the expert interview. The expert interview is a specific form of semi-structured interview, where their capacities as experts for a certain field of activity are in focus, often staff members of organisations with a specific professional experience and knowledge about the target group (Flick, 2009). They are usually used to complement other methods. In contrast to narrative interviews, here the interviewer is less interested in a whole person than the capacities of that person as an expert for a certain field of activity (Flick, 2009), and this is why I used only the elements of expert interview, since I was interested in the professional views and experience of the person interviewed, but also including some personal impressions. This interview started the same with a shorter and more direct question: when did you come to Vienna (not with "Tell me a

story about your coming and living in Vienna"), with the additional-How did you decide specifically for Vienna? Then I would ask about the organisation itself (aims, programs, target groups, funding, how is their work important for this community, reactions of the community related to their work, etc.). In the second part of the interview, I asked them about the former Yugoslav community in Vienna, relations between its members and Yugonostalgia, where they could choose if they wanted to give their professional observation or personal opinion. People gladly talked about their organisations, and they approached the topic of the Yugosphere in Vienna, usually through their work, but sometimes also combined with personal impressions. Organising these interviews required more effort than the others, since these interviews had to be more structurally planned and be more time scheduled. In the preparatory phase, I had to prepare myself, reading on websites and Facebook pages about the organisations, their posts and articles. Also, reaching the experts was not easy, since it was difficult for them to find time for an interview, thus the arranged interview date was postponed minimum twice in every case (with the exception of the interview with one of the leaders of the Choir "29. November", since it was done via Facebook messenger (audio call)). The issue of limited time of experts also came up (half of one interview I even conducted in the metro, while the interviewed journalist had to go to the field, due to the interview related to the magazine). This is why, due to the time pressure and the narrow focus, the interview guide here has been having a much stronger directive function and also had to ensure that interview does not get lost in the topics related to the organisation, but not related with the topic of research (Flick, 2009), what was not always easy to handle, since the interviewees sometimes tend to speak about overall organisation programs or problems and current issues, that are in their focus, but not in the focus of the interview topic.

Here I will briefly present my interviewees and present my motivation for talking with them. While some interviewees allowed for their real names to be published, others preferred for their identity to stay private.

When I started thinking about my field research, I immediately knew that I would like to interview Goran, since when I think of the community of the former Yugoslavs in Vienna, he is my first association. He is a Serb (from Serbia), in his 50s, who also still feels like Yugoslav, since he came to Vienna after finishing high school, in the '80s, while Yugoslavia still existed, with his cousin, who was already living here, in order to find a job. Since then, he has been a part of this community on an everyday basis, on a private and professional level. He worked as a drink delivery man to former Yugoslav cafes/clubs for more than 20 years, and he has been organising different events, like wine tastings or concerts with performers from former Yugoslav republics. Additionally, almost every day he drinks coffee in "our" cafes, socialising with "our" people. When I moved to Vienna, he took me to many places related to former Yugoslav people, and introduced me to many of them, since he thought that this could be very useful. Also, whenever he meets someone who came from former Yugoslav republics recently, he immediately does the same - over the years he brought many students and young people to our apartment, so

my husband and I could share our experience with them, since he considers contacts with “our” people in Vienna as very important and useful. I thought that his perspective would be a good starting point, and that his position and network of contacts could also open the way to many “our” places and people.

Aida and Biljana I met (separately) during one of my field visits, at the opera concert on Serbian New Year’s Eve, and they were interested in sharing their stories and experiences with me.
Aida is a journalist, in her 60s, who came from Sarajevo, Bosnia. She came to Vienna to stay with her brother, who was already living here, in the 90s, just before the war started. She comes from a Muslim family, but she said that she is a Bosnian, not Bosniak, since she is not religious (adding that when someone says that he or she is a Bosnian, it means that this person is oriented towards Yugoslavia). She is a strong Yugonostalgist, as, as she says, many people in Vienna are. She says that she was part of the both communities, “our", as Austrian, and that one does not exclude the other. Over the years she socialised with many of “our" people, even though she admits that for some time during and after the war Serbs and Bosniaks did not like each other very much.
Biljana (around 50 years old) came from Serbia to Austria 20 years ago (and lived first in some other city in Austria, for a few years), and then came to Vienna, since she had an aunt here. Compared to this previous town where foreigners were strictly socially separated from the Austrians, in Vienna this was not the case, so she got into the Austrians circles immediately, finding a job on her own, an Austrian partner and friends, so she did not have any contact with “our” community. She didn't even know that she lived in the close neighbourhood of the street and area full with our cafes, in the 15th district. Few years ago, she met a Croat, who became her partner and then she realised how much she actually misses “our” people, so she returned to “our” community. To meet them better and communicate with them, she even worked in one of our cafes in the 15th district on weekends (even though she already had a regular job, as she works in the area of interior design and furniture selling). She studied Chemistry in Serbia.

Mika is a woman in her 80s, and she came from Serbia to Vienna in the 70s, to stay with her husband, who was already working here. She can be considered as a First generation migrant, and this is why I considered her perspective as important and interesting. She worked for 30 years as a nurse, she even gained Austrian citizenship. She is retired and lives in 15th district, and part of the year she also spends in Serbia. Until today, she always says “I am going back to Yugoslavia” and she calls all “our” people - “Jugovići” (Yugos). During her life in Vienna she has been having many former Yugoslav friends, of all ethnicities, and she strongly emphasises that in Vienna “our” people never changed their relation, even during the Yugoslav war or after the breakup of Yugoslavia.

Duče is a family friend, a Muslim from Bosnia, who still feels like Yugoslav. He came to Vienna, together with his wife, in 1992, when the war started, to stay with his father, who was already

living and working here for a while. Now he is in his 60s, and he works in the Art and History museum. He says that our people here get along much better than in the former Yugoslav republics, but also that he is under the impression that they do not mix a lot (that they are separated by ethnic lines). However, he underlines that he has friends of all former Yugoslav ethnicities. He studied Agriculture in Sarajevo.

In the case of experts, I would send an email to an organisation, writing that I would like to make an interview with someone from the management or employees. Then they would answer back and say who is willing to talk to me. (With exception of the Choir “29. November”, where I directly found one of the leaders via Facebook and contacted her in a private message via messenger). In the case of Sofra´s co-founder there was no need for an email, since I worked there and we agreed in person, but also communicated via whats up.

I met Srđan also at the event I visited which was organised by Prosvjeta. (Having in mind I have visited the opera concert for which I saw the announcement on Facebook, and Prosvjeta was mapped as “our” organisation in Vienna, I decided to include him in my research) Furthermore, as previously announced, I sent him an email and we agreed on the interview. Srđan, the co-founder and president of Prosvjeta, is a professor of language and literature (Yugoslavian literature with general language theory), who came to Vienna in the 90s, just before the war, since his wife had a friend who already lived here. He is a Serb (but he felt like a Yugoslav once, since he was brought up in that way).

I know Dragomir and Dušica from my previous volunteering (in 2017) in KOSMO magazine (a magazine for former Yugoslavs in Vienna). KOSMO was interesting for my research, since they are media for all “our" people.
Dragomir is a co-publisher and main editor, in his 40s, and he says that he is from everywhere (he comes from mixed Serbian/Croat marriage, born in Serbia (Vojvodina), schooled mostly in Croatia). He came to Vienna to stay with his family, who was already living here, during the 90s. Dragomir has the impression, privately and professionally, that “our” people like to stick together, and the basis he sees in the origin from the same region.
Dušica, is a KOSMO journalist in her 30s (currently on the master of Translation studies-German language). She came to Vienna around 10 years ago to study Transcultural Communication, saying that Vienna attracts Serbs because of the energy of the previous generations that participated in building this city, so, even the ones who do not have a relative here, like she does not, come for this energy. She is from Belgrade, Serbia, and sees herself, primarily, as someone from the Balkans. Dušica thinks that nationalism among our people is still expressed in Vienna, which she mostly sees through her work. She also sees the inexplicable ambivalence, as if “our” people, at the same time, want and do not want to stick together.

Jana, one of the leaders of the Choir “29. November” came from Zagreb, Croatia, 9 years ago, to study in Vienna. She chose Vienna because of her academic aspirations, but also for practical reasons, since she had an uncle living here. Now she has a PhD in Theatre studies and works at the Faculty. I found and contacted her via Facebook. Jana has a big group of former Yugoslav friends in Vienna, and she says that it is too easy to be caught in this community. She considers Vienna not to be a fertile ground for nationalism between our people at all. She says that the Choir that she leads gives the opportunity to the people to live the Yugoslav values now, but not to be stuck in Yugonostalgia.

Edo is a co-founder of the “Sofra” restaurant, a young businessman in his 30s. His career is mostly related to gastronomy. He was born in Vienna, he grew up here, but he feels the former Yugoslav heritage as a part of his identity. He sees himself a Muslim from Vienna, but also former Yugoslavia (his parents have Macedonian, and also Sandžak (South West Serbian origin)). Edo grew up just with Austrians, but at some moment (beginning of high school) he realised that “our” community fits him even better. He says that ethnicity does not matter when hiring someone, socialising, there are even mixed relationships, but it matters when it comes to marriage or having children. Also it seems to him that there are ethnic separations between “our” people in Vienna, at least in the area of business.

In order to even more complement my own research, I also supported it with secondary sources - interviews that other authors have done with the same research group, like: Mijić (2019), who interviewed and talked informally with many former Yugoslavs in Vienna; Ivanović (2012), who did interviews with 3 guest workers who came in Vienna from Yugoslavia (Bosnia, Serbia, Croatia) in the 60s and 70s; and Bernard (2018) who made 2 interviews with a married couple who came to Vienna in the 1970s (man from Bosnia, woman from Serbia).

Discussion of the research findings

In this chapter I will discuss the findings of my research, including findings of participant observation, as online observation, the interviews and informal conversations. In the first subchapter (Places and events) I will describe some places and events that I visited during my field research. In the second subchapter (The Former Yugoslav community - "Our" people) I will describe the community and present the dimensions that keep its members together (based on my research findings), as the possible factors that could have influenced its forming in Vienna. In the end, I will discuss more thoroughly the relations among "our" people (former Yugoslavs in Vienna). In the third subchapter, I will present the organisations of former Yugoslavs in Vienna, in the fourth - manifestations and possible meanings of Yugonostalgia in the capital of Austria, and in the fifth subchapter I will write about the organisations in Vienna that are related to former Yugoslavs, while the sixth subchapter ("All roads lead to "our" people) would be reserved for Concluding discussions.

Places and events

SFRJ - Vienna

My first choice for field visit was "SFRJ" (at that time recently opened cafe/club called Socialistic Federative Republic of Yugoslavia in Märzstrasse 27, 15th district, near to the U3 station Schweglerstraße, or exactly at the tram 9 and 49 station Beingasse). "SFRJ" is a place where everythings is made with a purpose of strong reference to Yugoslavia (starting with foundation date, 29. November - the Day of the Republic of Yugoslavia (online observation). On its Facebook page the first thing to notice is "You will feel the smell and the spirit of old "Yuga" (a shorter name and a dear nickname for Yugoslavia), since our every corner is honoured with the memories of the past times…" (online observation). On the entrance there is a big map of Yugoslavia, visible from the far, so it was not difficult to guess which cafe is "SFRJ", when I first came. The entrance board is in the shape of Yugoslavia, where it is written "SFRJ Vienna". Maps of Yugoslavia are present everywhere inside, on the menus, napkins, sugar packs, and on some there is also a face of Tito. The waitress wears a red scarf and navy blue hat with a red star (this was the uniform of Tito's pioneers, and the hat was even called "Titovka" (Tito's)) and she addresses people immediately in Serbian/Croatian/Bosnian language. The music choice is Ex Yu Rock (rock music from the time of Yugoslavia), and on the walls different elements of the Yugoslavian culture are framed, as from the most famous Yugoslavian movies (National Class Category Up to 785 cm, Valter defends Sarajevo), albums of old records of Yugoslavian singers or bands (some of them even having the name Yugoslavia included in the name of the album or similar, like Silvana Armenulić "Jugo moja Jugo, kad se vratim u zavičaj" (My Yuga, when I go

back to my homeland), or “Yu Group”, or the framed article about the Olympics in Sarajevo in 1984, and finally very big frame with the Pledge of the Tito’s pioneers. On some tables there are wooden boxes with the inscription “Made in YU (Yugoslavia)". The whole interior reminds of old socialistic offices from the 70s and 80s, that still can be found in the government institutions of the former Yugoslav republics, there are also tables with big armchairs. People who come use different dialects/languages, so you can see that they are from different former Yugoslavian republics.
SFRJ club works very successfully, which could indicate that many people from this community like the idea of having a place related to Yugoslavia. As I have heard in informal conversations, the place is seen as “fancy” and “cool” by the younger generation (20-30 years). My interlocutors also think that people from Bosnia come the most often, since they are the biggest Yugonostalgists (something that I have also heard many times during the interviews and informal conversations from different people). During later informal conversations, on other field sites, I have heard that some people are glad that this kind of place opened, since they like everything that is related to Yugoslavia and that joins “our” people. During the online observation, following their Facebook page, I also noticed that every post or announcement is related to Yugoslavia, and that they put everything in Yugoslav context (for example, they take the photo of the band that is going to play and photoshop them in Tito's uniforms in editing program, or put also Tito somewhere in the photo). It is more than clear that everything in this cafe/club needs to recall the Yugonostalgia.

San Marco -”a Croatian place”?

I also visited cafe “San Marco”, one of the first of former Yugoslav cafes in the Märzstraße, starting from Gürtel (Märzstraße 2). The place was announced to me as a “Croatian” cafe (in some informal conversations and by the person that I interviewed there, a Serb, who also chose the place as a meeting point for the interview), but I could not see any reference to Croatia. Interior was neutral, musical choice was Dino Merlin, a Yugoslav pop singer from Sarajevo (Bosniak), the waitresses were neutrally dressed, speaking Serbian language/dialect, while guests spoke different dialects/languages from former Yugoslavia. When I asked what it meant “a Croatian place”, people were not sure how to explain what they had in mind. I asked if it means that Serbs or Bosniaks do not come here, and they answered - “By all means no”, adding that it never means something like that in Vienna, since all “our” people come to all “our” places. It turned out that they meant it has a Croatian owner and manager, and that a lot of Croats come there, especially after the Sunday mass, or to watch football games when Croatia plays. Some of my interlocutors said that when Croatia plays, there are Croatian flags everywhere and they do not feel as comfortable going there on that occasion (Bosniaks, Serbs). Later, during the informal conversation with the manager, he said that the cafe is meant for everyone, our people, Austrians, tourists and other international guests. He also said that everyone goes to every cafe/club (within the group of “our” people), and when I commented that waitresses are Serbs, he was confused

and said - “Why wouldn’t they be?”. When I asked the manager if they intentionally picked this street, he said - “No, the location was good”. From later informal conversation I found out that San Marco, together with the (Bosniak) restaurant “Galaxia” right across the street (Märzstraße 1), were the first “our” places at Märzstraße (in the period after of 2000-2010), and then our people just started coming after that, and opening “our” cafes/clubs/restaurants, until it slowly became “our” (former Yugoslav) street.

Prosvjeta´s Serbian New Year's Eve?

One of my field visits was to the event of one of Serbian organisations, “Prosvjeta - Srpsko prosvjetno i kulturno društvo” (literally English translation - Education/Enlight-Serbian association for education and culture, that I will call just “Prosvjeta” hereinafter), during Serbian (Orthodox) New Year, for the concert of the most famous Serbian opera singer, Dragana del Monako. The event was announced on different Facebook pages related to former Yugoslavs, including media and organisations pages, Facebook groups, but also one Serbian vinery that is opened in Vienna. Additionally, my first interviewee also wrote to me via Facebook messenger that this event could be interesting for my field research, and that he will be there, presenting the vinary. Even though I have never before been in the building where the concert was organised (3rd district magistrate building), I could immediately assume that I was in the right place, since in front of the building were many groups of people, waiting and chatting in Serbian/Croatian/Bosnian. The hall was full with elegantly dressed guests of all generations, greeted in both Serbian/Croatian/Bosnian and in German language. The members of Serbian Orthodox Church were also there, donating publicly for the work of the organisation (Prosvjeta), for its program - school of Serbian language. The program started with a children's choir, singing mostly in Serbian/Croatian/Bosnian, but also in German. Then there were other performers from Serbia, and eventually, “Serbian pride”, the opera singer. At the end, the president of the organisation spoke to everyone just in German.
This event was not important just for observation, but also for meeting people, talking with them, and making contacts for possible interviews. This was, more than obvious, a Serbian event, but even so, I sat with two women, Bosniak and Croat, with whom I had an informal conversation. They are neighbours in the 21st district, but also good friends who share similar interests. They said that there is a “Yugo Community” here, but without an official place for gathering, even though, as one of them said, this could now be the “SFRJ” cafe. They both said that they are Yugonostalgists, and that they miss that time, when no one knew where other people come from, or what name they have, since this was not important. When I asked if this Yugo community in Vienna reminds them of that, they said it is possible it does, at least to some extent. With one of them I agreed to do the interview that I later conducted. On the exit I spoke with one woman that gave me her contact and I also interviewed her in the following month. At that event I also got in contact with the organiser (president of the organisation) and we agreed on the interview that we later conducted, while I also visited the office of the organisation “Prosvjeta” (3rd district).

Yugonostalgic “Sofra”, intentionally at Märzstraße

Most of my fieldwork was happening in one of the former Yugoslav restaurants, at Märzstraße - “Sofra”, where I have been working at least a few hours a day, from Monday to Friday, morning shift, from May until November 2021. In the beginning I wrote the fieldnotes every day (because everything was new and interesting, and there was a lot to observe), but later I started writing them every couple of days, sometimes even once a week. This continuous presence in one field site for a half a year, directly within the “former Yugoslav street”, as being a part of this community, being “in touch” with the people almost on daily basis, made it possible for me to gain the broader perspective and get a different insight into what happens there, on Märzstraße, than, if I just, for example, visited the cafes from time to time. I met many people, with whom I talked a lot and I had access to the community almost on a daily level. Also, I could form my own impressions how it has been to be a part of the community (in a way of being a worker in one of the “our” places), and the field led me in the direction of some theoretical concepts that I did not expect to find there, as “komšiluk” (good neighbourliness), and some others turned out to be much more present than I imagined, as Yugonostalgia (in different forms).

Märzstraße is a wide, crowded and noisy street. It is always full of traffic, a lot of cars are passing during the whole day, and also two trams (9 and 49) are going through it in short intervals. Since it is full with bakeries and cafes, it is also packed with people who are buying food, sitting and drinking coffee, socialising, standing and talking, or just taking a walk. Many languages can be heard here, but mostly German, Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian and Turkish (what surprised me is that I almost never heard English at Märzstraße, except when I spoke with some colleagues from the kitchen in Sofra who do not have former Yugoslav origin, like from Syria, Bangladesh and Greece). The street is not so colourful, mainly white, yellow, brownish, grey and beige buildings are there. This “greyness” is a little bit “broken” by the colourful awnings from different shops, bakeries, cafes and similar, or different shop or store windows. It can be seen that the street is full of people, except the “million” bakeries and cafes, it also has many big stores just on the surface area that is less than a kilometre, like Penny, Dm, Bipa and Spar. Besides that, and of course, many former Yugoslav bakeries, cafes and restaurants, it also has “der Mann” bakery, hair salons, newsstand/tobacconist (Tabak), few “Turkish” stores, one “Russian” store, one “Kent” restaurant, one Austrian Guesthaus and just one Austrian cafe (“Amadeus”). It is interesting to notice that there aren't any clothes stores there (just one children's store and one store that sells women's bags). Apparently, people do not come here to do the shopping, but to socialise and drink coffee, eat or buy food, what can also be sensed through smell, since, depending on which place you are passing by, you can smell different kind of coffee and food, like pies, bread, or even grill. But if I would have to decide what the dominant odour is, and it is probably because I spent so much time in Sofra, it would be the combined smell of burek and “Turkish” coffee.

“Sofra” is a small restaurant/bakery at the address Märzstraße 48, exactly on the tram station Scweglerstraße - the trams 9 and 49 (that go from the Gürtl) stop directly in front of its entrance. Across the street is the Scweglerstraße metro (U3 metro line). The whole front of the place is made of glass (big glass windows from both sides of the door), so one can see everything inside, the ambient, shop window with pies, the “Sofra wall”, and even through one more glass - the kitchen. Terrace is rather small, just with 4 small tables, with 2 chairs each. Above the entrance door it is written “Sofra” with big red letters (the background should imitate the brick wall). When a person enters, there is a stand from the left side, with the pies and cash register, right across the entrance is the kitchen (which can be seen through the glass), and there are 7 tables in total (right). Right is the yugonostalgic Sofra wall. It is dark grey, and all over it there are different photos that refer to Yugoslavia. The motives on the photos are related to places, food, music and similar: Sarajevo (four times), Olympic games in 1984 in Sarajevo (two times), “Fildžani” (traditional small coffee drinking cups, mostly used in Bosnia), Zlatan Ibraimović (worldwide famous football player of Bosnian origin), Tito and Fidel Castro, smoking cigars and talking (this is the only photo with Tito on this wall), Newspaper article about Sofra (der Standard, 24.Juli 2020, p. 10, Leben in Wien, Balkan-Ekpres), “Kiki” candy (the real ones, framed, not the photo), the poster “Forbes -Yugoslavia- among the richest nations in Europe!”, Women with headscarves (Yugoslav grandmas) seating and eating on the sofra (low wooden table), sign for TV guide (evening news) from the time of Yugoslavia, Mostar, the process of making burek, music bands such as Bijelo dugme and Dino Merlin, Knitted milieu of white thread, the movie “Valter defends Sarajevo”, the Yugo car, Ratluk (Rahatluk, Turkish delight, that is also very popular in Bosnia and Serbia), women eating in Sofra, etc.

The founder is a Muslim from Bosnia, who grew up in Vienna, and the co-founder was born in Vienna, but has Muslim Macedonian/Serbian origin, or Yugoslavian, as he sometimes says). However, when one enters, one would say that the owners are certainly from Sarajevo. The food that is served are Sarajevo´s ćevapi and burek (pies). Most of the customers are “our” people (former Yugoslavs). Many people would answer me directly in our language, even though I would greet them in German when they entered. Additionally to the photos that are in reference to Yugoslavia, and the Sarajevo food, there is also a music - almost always it is ex yu (former Yugoslav) rock or pop, or it can be something similar, something that is pleasant for our people to hear. People who come here to eat come from different parts of former Yugoslavia (I could always tell by the way they speak). It is quiet inside and it gives the impression of being a family place.

As I found out from the co-founder, Sofra is intentionally on Märzstraße, since this is “our” street. As he said, it was once Ottakringerstraße, but Märzstraße slowly, but certainly becomes the new Ottakringerstraße, just a little bit “nicer”. Maybe it has to do more with food and daily cafes, while Ottakringerstraße is more for night clubs, he said. He also said that there are a lot of “our” places (cafes, bakeries, restaurants) along this street, and that they are opened now here intentionally. I also talked with a colleague from Sofra, how it was to live on Märzstraße and she said that it was great for a while - “as we did not even left Serbia” - she said - “you are here,

somehow among yours, and you do not even need German". At some moment, when she lived on Märzstraße, she had the feeling that her whole home town from Serbia moved here. I asked if mostly Serbs live here, she said no, it is totally mixed. I asked her if she witnessed some conflict on national bases, she said: "no, everyone gets along here", and then she added - "you can see it in Sofra, they are Muslims, we are not, it does not matter*."*[19]
The perception of the street is similar from outside and the inside. One of my colleagues from Sofra, who lives here, told me once, as a joke "I wonder if "our" people would leave Vienna, who will stay?"[20], meaning that only former Yugoslavs lived here. This is a great representation of his image of Vienna, from the perspective of someone who lives at Märzstraße, where he is surrounded just with "our" people. And one of the customers, from Spain, once told me that this street is full with former Yugoslav bakeries and restaurants and that it is "like a small Yugoslavia".[21]

My typical working day looked like this: I would arrive in front of Sofra at 6.30 in the morning, and I would have about 30 minutes to prepare everything, before I open the doors at 7. The pie master, who works there during the night, would unlock the door for me and I would enter. I would sweep the street in front of the restaurant, then carry out the furniture outside. Around 6.40 I would put the pies in the oven (different kinds), so they will be ready, fresh and hot around 7, when I open the door for the customers. While the pies were in the oven, I would prepare everything else, such as the warmers for the pies, for the shop window, clean the tables inside, and the glass stands. I would select the music, usually "ex yu" rock or pop. When the pies are baked, I would turn the lights on, and line up the different sorts of pies in the shop window. In the meantime, I would talk to the pie master, or other colleagues. At 7 o'clock I would prepare the cash register and open the bakery. People would come, I would sell them pies, bake new ones. I would talk a lot, being friendly, nice and informative, explaining about the food and orders, but I would be also talking with "our" people, about where I come from, or what I do in Vienna, and they would also tell me about their life.

At the end, I will try to position myself in relation to my interlocutors and broader setting in Sofra. My role as a researcher was familiar from the beginning to the founders, but for them, this was not as important as doing my job as any other worker. I was not privileged in any way, I was one of the workers, I was registered, I was paid, I was given negative feedback when I made mistakes. It is not that I did not feel privileged, but actually it was quite the opposite - since all people around me came from gastronomy, I had to learn everything related to the food, serving, cash register, I had to clean and do everything that other workers did. I had a feeling that I was respected, in a way, from the co-founder, because of my position as a researcher (but that did not make me spared from my workers duties). Many times, especially in the beginning, I would try to talk to the co-founder regarding my topic, and he participated gladly, whenever he had time. It

[19] (fieldnotes, 1.7.2021)
[20] (fieldnotes, 20.10.2021)
[21] (fieldnotes, 4.11.2021)

seemed like it was interesting for him, and even, when some highly educated guest (former Yugoslav), an acquaintance of his, would come to Sofra, he would introduce me and explain what I was writing about. This would be a good starter for me to continue to talk to people further about my topic. Not all the people knew that I am also a researcher, especially the customers. For many of them I was just a person behind the cash register. Of course, there was no time or need for me to impose to every guest what I was writing about, but if I would spontaneously get into conversation with some of them, I would introduce my research. Some of my colleagues did know - it depended on the level of closeness that I developed with them, and of course the time we spent together working, especially talking. I did not want to start every work relation with "I am here as a researcher", rather I would wait to engage in some conversation and then to announce my main purpose there. In my experience, emphasising my role as a researcher right away could have been counterproductive and could have made a barrier at the very beginning (especially since I was already kind of "outsider", being the only one that does not come from the area of gastronomy and being the only student in the team (what is actually unusual, since restaurants and cafes in Vienna are often full with students employees). The women who worked at the cash register are all former Yugoslavs (or have some related origin), since the knowledge of Bosnian/ Croatian/Serbian language was the obligatory factor for getting that job (even more important than speaking German well). The people from the kitchen were younger people, not necessarily with former Yugoslav origin. I was in good relations with everyone, but the closest relation I established with the "pie master" (a man from Macedonia who still thinks of himself as a Yugoslav), since we were always together in the early shift and we talked on daily basis about many interesting thing, often related to Yugoslavia, Tito, today´s politics in former Yugoslav republics, but also about the life in Vienna. He, as other people that I spoke with in Sofra or in area near by gave a great contribution to my research, since they "opened the door" of Märzstraße from inside to me, and gave me the perspective of how it is to work and live for years in this former Yugoslav street, the perspective that I probably couldn't have gained otherwise (at least not at such a high quality).

The Former Yugoslav community in Vienna - *Naši (ljudi)* ("Our" people)

Based on the research done for the purpose of this thesis it can be said that there is a community of formerly Yugoslavs in Vienna, a community called "our" people ("naši ljudi"), or just "ours" ("naši").

All of the people that I talked to, informally or during the interview, call people from the former Yugoslav Republic *naši*. People who were born here, people who came a long time ago, or very recently - situation is the same, they all say "our people". Some people also call this groups "Yugoslavs" and some "Jugovići" (Yugos, Yugoslavs with "ić" at the end (how would a typical yugoslav surname end)), but, at least once in every conversation that I had during these two years

of the research, the name "our" people came up. If one would look at my field notes, almost all of them have this observation written (that someone from former Yugoslavs, who lives in Vienna, used the word "our/s" to describe this group of people). In Sofra, where I worked, all the colleagues, founders and the people who came there used "our" people and "our" language. When someone from *naši* would ask me where exactly do I come from, then they would always add something like: "It does not matter, we are all ours"[22] or "We are all ours, it was always like that and it will always be"[23].

Some of my interlocutors think that this community does not exist formally (like a registered group with a formal gathering place), but it does exist in practice, since people are connected, for different reasons. Former Yugoslavs in Vienna, from wherever they are, socialise without any problems (observation from almost all my fieldnotes), there are mixed relationships, there are mixed business partnerships (when I say mixed, I mean between different former Yugoslavs ethnicities). When there are concerts organised, from whatever former Yugoslav country the performer comes, all our people come (participant observation, informal conversations, interviews). It does not matter what former Yugoslav ethnicity the owner or manager of the restaurant is, all "our" people would come as guests, or could be hired as workers, regardless of the ethnicity (participant observation, informal conversations, interviews). Even when the cafe would be announced to me as an ethnicity specific (as San Marco - Croatian), I would find all former Yugoslavs there, as guests and workers.

What I wanted to discuss here is that when I write about "our" people, I usually mean all former Yugoslavs, and I always mean people who have Serbian, Croatian or Bosnian origin, and this is for a few reasons. Firstly, they are the most numerous in Vienna (since there are not many people from Macedonia and Slovenia); secondly, because they are the speakers of a common language (Bosnian/ Croatian/ Serbian) and thirdly, because it is often assumed that relations between them are the most troubled (since the three "nations" were directly confronted in Yugoslav wars and the alleged "old hatred" between them is often considered as one of the reasons why Yugoslavia broke apart). But this does not mean that "our" people does not usually refer to all former Yugoslavs in Vienna, since it is mostly the case. When "our" people in Vienna call someone *naš* it usually means all former Yugoslavs, but it always means "Serbs", "Croats" and "Bosnians". The boundary making of this community in most cases coincides with former Yugoslavia, but sometimes is reduced just to speakers of "our" language ("our" people speak "our" language). If the language is the common identifier for this community one must wonder what is with Macedonian, Slovenian, Albanian and Romani speakers.

While thinking about this I remember my volunteering in KOSMO magazine, when I wanted to write about one photographer from Macedonia, who lives in Vienna, the whole editorial office agreed, while there was one journalist that had a comment that the "real" *naši* are actually just people from Serbia (and Montenegro), Bosnia and Croatia. Personally, and also, during my research, I have never had an impression that Roma people with former Yugoslav origin are not a

[22] (fieldnotes, 18.6.2021)
[23] (fieldnotes, 29.9.2021)

part of "our" community (but again, they do also speak "our" language), while I am not sure what to say about Albanian speakers. One of my interviewees mentioned that "our" community is language based and that this is the reason why Kosovo Albanians are not part of it - practically, because of the communication and not because they do not have "similar mentality", since she considers that they do. There was a neighbour that lived near Sofra, with Albanian/Macedonian origin, who stopped by several times a day, sometimes just to talk and for him I did have an impression that he is *naš,* and part of the *komšiluk* (where we would help him and he will help us)*,* but again he spoke "our" language. Also, I once talked (in German) with a delivery boy who worked in Sofra, from Pristina, Kosovo, who has been living here in Vienna for a decade, but he still puts in opposition "them" (Austrians) to "us", as he said. I was wondering, who are "we" for him - former Yugoslavs, people from the Balkans? Who are "we" and where are the borders?

Other kind of example is when I was exchanging messages with one girl from Slovenia via Facebook messenger (in English) in order to connect her to the Sofra founders, since she was considering to get a job there, and she wrote to me -"they, people from the Balkan", and in that way put the "Slovenes" in opposition to them. For her, the perception that Slovenia is Europe in opposition to other former Yugoslavs, who are the Balkans, is stronger than the one that all former Yugoslavs are one community (as Patterson (2003) writes most Slovenes think that their "culture" belongs to Europe, and almost never to the Balkans - they even often taught how the borders of the Balkans actually were within the Yugoslav state, since their country is seen as a non-Balkan part of Yugoslavia, "Europe in not-Europe" and he even writes that Austrian perception of the Slovenes agrees with their owns). This is of course the bigger question of where the Balkans (as a "European Other" (Todorova, 2009); (Živković, 2011) begins in whose perspective[24], but it also demonstrates how the borders making process can differ also in diaspora. My impression is still that "our" people in Vienna mean all former Yugoslavs when they say *naši,* and even if this community is language based, "our" language is understandable even to people from Slovenia to a certain degree (as Serbo-Croatian once was in Yugoslavia), and fully to people from Macedonia.

Almost no one of my interlocutors has ever experienced some ethnicity/nationality based conflict among former Yugoslavs in Vienna. Dušica said that different ethnicities from former Yugoslavia can get into a negative discussion via online comments (below the KOSMO online articles), and Duče mentioned that the women of different ethnicities could have said something bad to one another in Vienna parks, during the Yugoslav war. Few people did mention that all former Yugoslavs have their own communities. Srđan and Duče have the impression that these communities - Bosniaks, Croats and Serbs, actually keep themselves separate from each other, and that everything beyond that is based on individual friendships, while Edo has the impression

[24] Živković (2011) writes about the "gradient of depreciation", where the borders of the Balkans are not seen differently just by different actors outside of it, as Central or Eastern Europe, but also in different time periods, and even differ within the Balkan countries themselves, where they try to pass this "intra-Balkan differentiation" to neighbours who are supposedly "more Balkan than themselves". He gives an example of Croats, who are to the west and north of Serbia and often pass this "Balkaness" to the Serbs (down the southeastern gradient of depreciation) (for more, see Živković, 2011).

that in the business world the ethnic communities have the tendency to be kept separate (even though he has had business partners of different former Yugoslav ethnicities). Dušica sometimes has the impression that "our" people are more separated by the ethnic lines, than being part of one community.

On the other hand, there is the common impression that everything that is former Yugoslav in this city is mixed to the extent that it cannot even be untangled. Everything is just "ours", Yugoslavian, as the Macedonian making Bosnian pies, or the Bosnian who owns the restaurant "Niški merak" (traditional South Serbian food), or all former Yugoslav ethnicities being at Serbian New Years Eve or at a "Croatian place". Jana said that all "our" people in this town are mixed and bonded, that they cannot unravel, even if they wanted to. She says that even on the events that Croatian Embassy in Vienna organises there can be other former Yugoslavs present. *"*There is, for example, the Croatian ball, but it is not that just exclusively Croats go there. I think that in Vienna we are all so mixed, that there is no nationalism or separation, I think even not in the high consular parts of society, that someone could say - hey, I am just going to the programs when the Croatian community invites me, it is not separated like that…I am sure that these communities exist nominal, but that they also keep the exclusivity in practice - I am not sure that would be even possible in Vienna*"* (Jana).

The usage of the word "our/s" is very interesting. It is a neutral word that does not imply any specific ethnicity, but belonging to a wider group - former Yugoslavs. (Once[25] a young man asked me if we speak the same language. The "same" is an equally neutral word as "ours"). For example, many of my interlocutors would consider someone who referred to the language as Serbian, Bosnian or Croatian, to be nationalistically oriented. Could this name, "our" people, also be an attitude, or a statement that former Yugoslavs in Vienna do not want to be separated through ethnic lines?

What is interesting is that, during my theoretical research, I noticed that the usage of the term "our" people is not new, and that it goes before the breakup of Yugoslavia (maybe even before the time of Yugoslavia, since Calic (2019) writes that, in the lack of a common name for a language that South Slavs were speaking the name "naški" was used even in the 19th century). In the quotation that Ivanović (2012) presents in his book, from an interview from 2009, with a woman who came to Vienna in the 70s, he writes: "Woman who rented us sheds was "ours" (naša)". It is possible that she adapted the usage of the word "ours" after the breakup of Yugoslavia, since the interview was done in 2009, and she describes this woman as "ours" in the past, but from the present point of view. Presumably, they started to use the word "ours" after the breakup of Yugoslavia (since it would be plausible to assume that during the time of Yugoslavia, people called themselves Yugoslavs, and after the breakup, when they were left without this common identifier, they started to use the word "ours"). However, in Ivanović´s book I found another interesting example that leads to the conclusion that the term was also used earlier, apparently side by side, with Yugoslavs. There was a magazine "Naš list" ("Our magazine"),

[25] Fieldnotes, 20.7.2021

published in 1970 in Austria, with an aim to inform Yugoslavs about the happenings in Yugoslavia and Austria, about the laws and regulations, presents stories of successful Yugoslavs, and finally to connect all the Yugoslavs in Austria (Ivanović, 2012). There is also a possibility that both terms were used, and then the term "our" people stayed and intensified in usage after the 1990s. After the breakup of Yugoslavia people could not be called Yugoslavs any more, but the other term, "our" people still stayed appropriate, for the ones who did not want to emphasise their (new) national identities.
Tomić (2014), in the fact that many former Yugoslavs on the move, call the language they use "our" languages, and not Serbian, Croatian or Bosnian, finds a proof that traces of Yugoslav identity still exist, a form of post Yugoslav identity among the hundreds of thousands of people who left Yugoslavia and created networks or communities based on a transnational cultural intimacy[26] (Herzfeld, 2016). But is there still identification with Yugoslavhood, within this community in Vienna?

My grandmother, who came to Vienna in the 1970s, until today, says "I am going back to Yugoslavia", and she calls all former Yugoslavs "Jugovići" ("Yugos"). This is not strange since she migrated while the country of Yugoslavia still existed, but, for example, I also witnessed the scene from the store in my neighbourhood, in 18th district, where the seller (who comes from Czech Republic) asked the man who entered: "Where do you come from?", and he just answered "Yuga". What does this Yuga category mean to people, and who goes by that name? Do former Yugoslavs even identify with Yuga, or anything related to Yugoslavia?

As Fischer (2003) notes, after the break-up of their country of origin, Yugoslavs were basically left without a name, explaining that before the 1990s one could simply say that he or she is Yugoslavian, without further explanation, even if a person felt like a Croat, Muslim, Serbian or Macedonian. He explains that using a different name would mean losing a social space that the migrant had kept under the term Yugoslav. Fischer (2003) even writes that there was a belief of Austrians that all Yugoslavs speak Yugoslavian language[27], even though it was never it´s name. But if the former Yugoslavs are still referred to as Yugos, do they identify with this name or the others see them like that?
Bauman (2012) writes that migrants from former Yugoslav countries are still referred to as "Yugos" in Vienna and this term is generally not perceived negatively among them. Even the

[26] Cultural intimacy is a concept developed by Herzfeld (2016, 2), meaning presentations of individual selves within the intimacy of the national space (which differ from presentation of the national culture to others, or what nationalist discourses personalise as "national character"). He sees cultural intimacy as "the recognition of those aspects of an officially shared identity that are considered a source of external embarrassment but that nevertheless provide insiders with their assurance of common sociality, the self-stereotypes that insiders express at their own collective expense" (Herzfeld, 2016, 7). I will be using cultural intimacy not just as a set of introjected and collectively adopted stereotypes, but more as a set of various traits and values that one social group recognizes as common for most of its members, and on the basis of it, people from that group presume that there will be a special kind of understanding between all its members. This special intimacy and implied similarity overcomes the other differences. The social group does not have to be nation, ethnicity or any other category related, and it also plays a great role in group forming and maintaining/ boundary making.

[27] "'Do you speak Turkish or Yugoslavian" used to be a frequent question to migrant children at the time" (Fischer, 2003, 7)

second and third generation migrants are called this way. But from the point of view of my interlocutors, the identification with Yugoslavhood is rare, even though it is not non-existent. Few of the people I talked to informally did say that they are Yugoslavs and this is how they introduced themselves to me.

He is from Macedonia, but when I asked him where he is from, he said - I am Yugoslavian (I did not ask him anything related to Yugoslavia, he said that himself). He says "I am Yugoslavian, one cannot change that just like that. I went to "radne akcije" (Youth work actions/reconstruction movements/working projects in Yugoslavia) and different kinds of socialising events all over Yugoslavia and one cannot forget that so easily, forget Yugoslavia and that wonderful time" (fieldnotes, 19.5.2021)).

One of my interviewees (Duče) also introduced himself as Yugoslav (saying that he is Yugoslav more than anything else, since he came to Vienna while Yugoslavia still existed and that later he could not identify with anything else, not Bosnian, and certainly not Bosniak ("This is how I was born and raised, I am Yugoslav, that is simply it. I do not have that kind of feeling for Bosnia, that it is my homeland*",* he said), while three of them emphasised that being a Yugoslav is, still, the strong part of their identity (Goran, who said: "For me, it was better to stay Yugoslavian, I felt better as Yugoslavian, but I had to become a Serb, I cannot be a Yugoslavian since Yugoslavia does not exist anymore"), Aida (who said that she is now a Bosnian, what actually means Yugoslav oriented) and Mika (who said - we are all still "Jugovići"). All four of them left Yugoslavia while it still existed.

Some of the people with whom I spoke have the impression that the name Yugo or Yugoslavs is more used by Austrians than by other people (Dragomir). Duče and Mika both said that Austrians always called them "Jugovići" (Yugos), but also other foreigners, as they did among themselves. Edo (who was born in Vienna, a Muslim with former Yugoslav origin, as he says) said that he would definitely have to use the name Yugoslav or Yugoslavia when he would have to explain his origin to other foreigners, and even to Austrians. ("To Austrians I also say just Yugoslavia and it is enough. Just with "our" people that name is not enough, the next question that follows is - where are you from exactly. For "our" people - Yugoslavia or former Yugoslavia does not mean anything as an explanation" - he said).

During my fieldwork I was asked a few times also by the Austrians, and other nationalities, to explain in more details about whose the bakery is. It rarely happened, because they were usually quite satisfied with the answer - (former) Yugoslav, but sometimes, they wanted to position me, or the bakery more precisely within that category. Once a young Austrian, who bought burek, was interested in where exactly these pies come from, and where are the owners from. He says he knows that it is a Balkan store, but he would like to know more precisely. The first thing that I answered was former Yugoslavia. But he says - yes, but what country specifically, there are more of them. Then I started to explain to him, how the owners are from Serbia, Macedonia, Bosnia, burek master and grill master from Macedonia, I am from Serbia, and the burek is actually Bosnian recipe, not Serbian or Macedonian, they are slightly different. In that moment I realised that identification with Yugoslavia, or more precisely, to introduce yourself or something as

Yugoslav, actually shortens the way during the communication and explanation. If he had accepted this answer - (former) Yugoslavia, I would not have to explain to him more thoroughly and longer who and what comes precisely from which former Yugoslav republic. And I, behind the cash register, really do not have time to explain something long, when many people are waiting to buy something (as people in general do not have much time for long explanations). It is easier and shorter to put it all under one name - Yugoslavia. In Serbia that would not make sense at all, but here, it certainly does, especially when you are explaining something to an Austrian or some other foreigner[28]. This agrees with the Fischers note from earlier that former Yugoslavs in Vienna kept the usage of this name, so they could just say Yugoslav, without further explanation. Among themselves, however, former Yugoslavs rarely refer as Yugoslavs, but, as already emphasised, "our" people. So it could be said that the former Yugoslav community is called Yugoslav outside and "our" people from the inside (even though it is officially called BKS community in Austria, on which I will elaborate later).

What holds "our" people together?

After discussing the existence of the community of "our" people, I will present the dimensions that I have found, on the field and in the interviews, which could represent some of the unifying factors that keep its members together. People experience this community, as the reasons for its existence, differently.

Practical reasons

Part of the interviewees and people I talked informally to said that being a part of this community is a "stepping stone" (Goran), a "necessity" (informal conversation with a bar owner) at least for a few years, since it is practical to develop as many contacts within it (what can be useful for getting advices and recommendation, finding jobs[29], apartments and similar). Some people see this community not as a togetherness created as a result of mutual affection, but as a purely practical necessity, the first step that everyone needs to take on the road towards "integration into Austrian society", since, for example, all "our" people have a relative who is a former Yugoslav, not an Austrian (informal conversation with a bar owner). Here I have to mention that almost all my interviewees, and people with whom I talked informally, came to Vienna to live with a relative or a friend who was already living there, at least in the beginning (except Edo, who was born in Vienna, and Dušica, who came as a student, and within the recent student migration of young people from former Yugoslav republics, this does not have to be a

[28] Fieldnotes, 20.5.2021

[29] Goran spoke about the very clear split of job areas between the former Yugoslav community in Vienna (where for example people from South Serbia work as construction workers, people from East Serbia and Vlachs work as janitors, people from Sandzak (Southwest Serbia) in restaurants (kafanas) or own them, Roma and Vlachs as bus drivers...this origins from the time when Austria wanted a lot of guestworkers and everyone were massively bringing people from their own regions. Goran says that this still functions in this way even today, thus recommendation or having someone "yours" to help you find a job is extremely important.

typical way of coming to Vienna anymore, because nowadays one can apply online for a student residence, or find an apartment via internet and move directly to Vienna, without the help of someone who lives there)). Emirhafizović (2013) writes that today, students migration from Bosnia to Austria assumed the characteristics of chain migration as the relatives, friends, and acquaintances mediate in the process of admission to Austrian universities, providing not only the essential information, but often broader logistical support (submitting enrolment documentation, providing accommodation, and other forms of concrete assistance). "These social connections resulted in the establishment of a migration scheme, which has proved to be quite effective in the process of Bosnian citizens coming to study in Austria" (Emirhafizović, 2013, 21).

The recommendation and having someone "yours" to help you find a job proved to be very important, as some of the people that I talked with did say. In Sofra, almost everyone had someone who brought them there (even I), or who asked for them to get a job, someone who already worked there or who knows the owners, and similar. Dušica also mentioned that one of her colleagues from the faculty, "our" girl, recommended her for a position in KOSMO magazine. Many people also told me that this functions in the same way at many other places - someone belonging to "our" group of people gets a job somewhere, and then he or she brings other "our" people. This does not happen just in former Yugoslav places, but also in Austrians firms, and even some state institutions, such as the facility for elderly people, for example.[30]
This probably has its roots from the time of the 60s and 70s, when one family member would come to Vienna, and would slowly "pull" the whole family, helping them find an apartment and a job, as Mika mentioned. Mika also said in the interview that the workforce was so much needed, that she did not just help all the relatives to find a job in the hospital where she worked, but sometimes her superiors would even send her to a train station to bring more Yugoslavs to work there, people that she had never seen before.

For some, being a part of this community is simply the easiest way, so there are a number of people who stay there their whole life (mentioned by Goran, Biljana, Jana, and also in some informal conversations), especially the ones who do not speak German well. "It is a very important factor why people stay together, it is the advantage and disadvantage at the same time, since by talking just with "our" people, you are not able to learn German, logically…and then, how can you spend time with the Austrians, if you do not speak German?" (Biljana).
While being in the field, I met a few people who do not speak almost any German, but they manage to function, because they live and work at Märzstraße, or in the area. I will illustrate this with a few examples from my field notes, where I write about the people I met in Sofra.
He came to Vienna 4 years ago, and he almost speaks no German, and he manages to function anyway, since he lives here, at Märzstraße, almost across the street from Sofra, and here, as he says, just former Yugoslavs live. He says "I have never heard any other language in this city of

[30] fieldnotes, 20.7.2021

Vienna, except Turkish and "our" language, and he laughs, since it is partly a joke, and partly it is not…He is always surrounded with our people, he speaks with them, he meets them, he works with them. Since he does not know German, he enters the store (some of the groceries stores at Märzstraße) and asks loudly at the entrance: "Ex Yu?". And immediately at least one of the workers answers, often a few of them, and sometimes all of them are "ours". This is the way he functions here. (Fieldnotes, 19.5.2021)
He says that he has no impressions about Austrians, he could not even form them, since, as he says, he has never met an Austrian (it is a joke, but it is almost true). (Fieldnotes, 17.6.2021)
Earlier they had a bakery in Hungary, and they had to learn the language, they had to communicate…And now, she has been here for 6 years already, and she thinks that she knows only around 100 words in German. She says that it is a shame, she knows, but she really does not need to know it, there is no need at all, since she works only with "our" people, only "our" people are here…(Fieldnotes, 29.6.2021)
This leads us to the language barrier and the importance of the language, the topic that will be approached in more details later in this subchapter.

There is also one sub dimension (that is also related to the next dimension of similarity) that I would call "the ease". People are part of this community because it is easy, or as Jana said in the interview - too easy, since so many "our" people live in Vienna, that one can find so many of them who really suit him or her.
"*I immediately became a part of that Yugo team, and this is so easy, too easy even, because, I do not know, you put yourself in situation not to say a word in German for a week, which is actually a curse, you live in a foreign land, and you do not actually live in it…you actually live in the post Yugoslavs bubble…On the other hand, you love all these people, it's not like you are friends with them because you do not have other friends, it is because they are all super interesting people that I adore spending time with…Many of my friends from Zagreb, from Belgrade, they definitely sometimes close themselves in this community, they are here more than 10 years, they speak German badly, they do not have Austrian friends…This bothers me, I really do not want to close myself in just in these drawers, I want to be active in Austrian society and understand it, the political struggles, the positions and everything, so I really try to have more Austrian friends, I struggle to take myself out of this Yugoslav bubble, but it is a hard struggle" (laughing)* (Jana).
During my field work I called this sub dimension "An ease of communication and action", meaning that among "our" people you communicate and organise the working tasks more easily and quickly, which positively influences the team working performance. This is why I wrote the following in my field notes (7.6.2021); *The language is an enormous practicality, and not just in a sense of a deep understanding between people, because there is no time…it shortens time when everybody understands everybody, not just linguistically, but in every way, everybody supports everybody, it is easy to make arrangements, people complement each other easily.*

People also stay part of this community because of the feeling of self-worth;

*Some things, that are not appreciated in Austria and do not mean a lot, are appreciated here, and what would be a minus for getting a job, here is a plus, and is almost mandatory for a job, as speaking our language, any of our languages, being familiar with our food, our customs, geography, because people often like to talk who is exactly from where, all in all it is extremely interestin*g*…you have the feeling of self-worth, that something you know or can do is valuable, at least your mother tongue and knowing the culture from which you came from, what can easily be forgotten in Austria, in foreign land…here, inside of this circle, you are "worth more", all your qualities, related to a cultural milieu are appreciated, and are a plus, while, in the broader surroundings, in an outside circle, in Vienna, they can be a minus…*(Fieldnotes, 7.6.2021).

At the end, "our" people more easily turn to other "our" people in need, when they have to do some home reparation, or they have to ask something in some state institution, former Yugoslavs will most often search for someone of "our" people, even though they do not know that person. As Jana said in her interview - "And you know, you always have someone in some position, if you are going to ask someone for something, for a plumber, or to help you move, you always have our people, you always have a pool from which you can choose…"

Similarity and Otherness

There are also people who became part of this community for different reasons than practical. For example, one of my interviewees, Biljana, is a woman who socialised and worked just with "Austrians" for around 15 years and then she also returned to "our people", because of better understanding with them, (meaning also shared experiences in the past) but also, again mentioned, linguistically, even though she speaks German almost as a native speaker. The other of my interviewees, Aida, has been a part of this community since her first days in Vienna, even though she, as well as Biljana, got a job in an Austrian company quite fast, so she did not have any practical agenda.

Here comes a dimension of "the sameness", similarity and/or same or similar shared experience, that many of my interlocutors mentioned or even emphasised ("We are the same nation, I do not see any special difference between Serb, Croatian and Bosnian" (Goran); "We are from the same country, that is a big thing" (Aida); "It is not possible not to merge….If you speak the same language, have similar culture, if you are crazy in a specific way" (Srđan); "We grew up in Yugoslavia, watching the same cartoons and children's programs…until our studies, it was the same country…He was my mirror" (Biljana); "We have the common topics, same interests, reference, when you tell a joke people get it" (Jana)). Duče and Mika also mentioned the similarity. ("Our people are just like that, our mentality is like that. They like to be together, sit together and drink" (Mika)).

Dragomir, Goran, Aida and Biljana mentioned shared experience as an important dimension, but not just growing up in the same country of Yugoslavia, or similarity of the mentality or culture of former Yugoslav nations, but also specific experience of leaving their country of origin and being

a foreigner from the same country/region in Vienna. (“All of us from the former Yugoslavia, had the same trouble - we were trying to survive and make a living in a foreign country” (Aida); “We have a lot in common… we have the same story” (Biljana); “Through my work I have seen that people have a strong desire to stick together, and to help each other...In the comments you can read: We are all together, joined, we are the same, we are all “ours” ...People are somehow connected, since they are foreigners from the same region, and they have the same destiny here” (Dragomir)). This agrees with the theoretical statements that people in diaspora experience specific types of problems and difficulties, from being a foreigner in that specific host surroundings, from visa procedures, over learning a new language, to trying to get a job. Having a similar experience with someone can indicate that there will also be a better understanding. In the interview for KOSMO (issue February 2020, page 14) the Justice Minister Alma Zadić, also told that she was feeling like a stranger when she came in Vienna, being 10 years old, and war refugee from Tuzla, she felt like an outsider, especially in the school in 3rd district, but the feeling changed when she started the school in 15th district, where she felt like “među svojima” (“among her own”), the children that also needed German classes, so they could learn the language of the new environment.

The “similar mentality” or “cultural similarity” is often narrated as a unifier. One of my interlocutors, Edo, was born in Vienna, also emphasised this dimension,, during one of our informal conversations.

I asked him if he is a part of the community of “our” people, since he was born here, and he said to me that this just happened, simply - it finds you, or you find it. His parents did socialise just with our people, but that was not the reason. He grew up in 23rd District, where he was the only “Yugoslav” in school, he just had Austrian friends while he was growing up, maybe there were a few other foreigners. He speaks our language very well, but he thinks about German as his native language. But at some point, at the beginning of high school, being around 16, when he started going out, he began to feel more comfortable with “our” people, “mentality” was more similar…I asked him if someone really can feel that much of a difference, and he said - absolutely. For example, he said, we (“our” people) make plans much more spontaneously, and it is not as with the Austrians, where every person pays for his own drink, and similar. He also says that he is a part of the Austrian community, he belongs in both of them equally. But regarding our community, one cannot miss it, it simply feels good, first of all because of the communication, and he does not mean just the language, but also the way people communicate (Fieldnotes, 7.4.2021).

This tendency of our people not to pay the bill separately, I have noticed many times in Sofra (and I am, of course, familiar with it from before).

Two man, it looks like they are friends, they sit at the table, eat, at the end they cannot agree on who will pay for the meal, they are arguing, they cannot decide, they are both giving me the money, at the end I have to decide, that is something very specific for our culture, it's a shame

not to offer to pay, and that people who are close, friends, relatives or something, to pay something separately, no way (Fieldnotes, 18.6.2021).
Mijić (2019) also mentioned the same language and similar mentality as critical connecting elements of former Yugoslavs in Vienna.

This dimension of "sameness" of culture/mentality with "our" people is sometimes present together with the dimension of "difference" in relation to the Austrians, who, as people say, have different mentality and cultural background (Biljana, Goran, Edo, informal conversations). Mijić (2019) also mentioned that, in a certain way, former Yugoslavs in Vienna are "othered" in relation to the majority population (Austrains).
Ivanović (2012) writes that, in the 60s and 70s, both Yugoslavs and Austrians had formed images of each other. He writes that for the average Austrian the image of a Yugoslav was something as a necessary evil. There was a name "Tschusch", a derogatory name for a man from the Balkans, skinny and hungry, dark hair man, who speaks loudly and explains mostly with his hands and does not understand the highly developed country in which he came (Ivanović, 2012, 299). This name was also common in the Austrian newspaper, which contributed to the image among the Austrian citizens.[31] Both Ivanović (2012) and Fischer (2003) write about the Kolarić campaign[32], with the aim to replace the name used for Yugoslavs and to increase the tolerance towards them. Duče also mentioned that Austrians called Yugoslavs "Tschusch" (and he said that that comes from "Ču(je)š?" ("Do you hear?" in Serbian/Bosnian/Croatian).
By Ivanović sources (2012) Yugoslav workers did not have the impression that they were discriminated against, they thought that Austrians see them as honest and diligent workers. This is in accordance with what Duče said during the interview, that the Austrians have accepted Yugoslavs, since they proved to be very hardworking people from the beginning. Mika also did not have the impression that she was not accepted by Austrians. She said that she was not sure what they thought of them ("Yugos"), but they did not feel any open rejection.
There are also different opinions. During one of my informal conversations with the Bosnian bar owner, he told me that the first generation, the first gastarbeiters that came in the 60s and 70s were the most uneducated people of Yugoslavia and they made an image of Yugoslavs in Austria that could not be broken for a long time, and even today it is just slowly changing, especially with the student migration. Fischer also (2003) writes that this otherness of many migrants from the countries of the former Yugoslavia is still visible in every-day encounters, and that the crude stereotype of "dark-haired" persons speaking "broken German" has survived (Fischer, 2003, 8).
Srđan also talked a lot about how the children with (former) Yugoslav background (together with children from migrant families from Turkey) are not seen as equal partners here, but are more as second-class citizens, because of what they have difficulties to reach certain social status that

[31] By the research from 1971, done by Institute for Sociology and Social researchers from Vienna, for example, only 2% of the Austrian citizens answered that they would not mind having a gastarbeiter as a neighbour, and half of the Viennese people were for total segregation of the foreign workers in the special areas in the city (Tschuschenviertel) (Ivanović, 2012).
[32] In 1972, there was a campaign for more tolerant relations towards foreign workers, the Kolarić campaign (with posters of a man and a child, speaking: "My name is Kolarić, your name is Kolarić. Why do they call you Tschusch?" (Ivanović, 2012)

they normally could. He said that pejorative relation towards people with Yugoslav origin goes way back, maybe starting with guest workers, maybe even before that. Mijić (2019) writes that differences between the former Yugoslav community and the Austrian majority persist, and that compared to the Austrian population without migration backgrounds, people of former Yugoslavian origin have significantly lower educational qualifications, even the second-generation is underrepresented both in higher educational institutions, politics, journalism, and similar. She also writes that all this may contribute to maintaining the abyss between Austrian majority and former Yugoslav community, leading to an even greater feeling of Otherness of the former Yugoslavs, who then tend to hold even tighter together. Dragomir and Biljana also mentioned that "our" people are on the dimension of "Us" and "Them" ("We are ours and they are theirs…They do not like us since we are foreigners, so we should stick together then" (Dragomir); "There is a difference in mentality, cultural difference, we are "Slovens", they are "Germans"…They never wanted to accept my cultural background and they expected from me to become a complete Austrian…I mean, I cannot just graft on some Austrian and start to grow as Austrian…I am really integrated, but as I have seen that it will never be enough…Then I realised, if I want to feel more at home, I have to change the focus, I have to turn towards our people…Our people, in opposition, are completely open, generous…They have accepted me for who I am…(Biljana).

However, this polarisation goes in both ways, and it also goes way back. Ivanović (2012) writes that the knowledge of the Yugoslavs guest workers about Germany or Austria was after all based on the post-WWII school books, movies, stories, and that was an image of an enemy. Back then, Yugoslavs called Austrians (and Germans) "Švabo" (still a colloquial word that serves to put the Austrians in opposition (in the sense of mentality) to former Yugoslavs. The word "Švaba", originally referring to Swab settlers in the region, came to be used for any person of German origin. Both terms could be used as neutral or derogatory, depending on the context (Krestić, 2010). It can be related with specific stereotypes such as liking order and being punctual (Mijic, 2019), but often it can also have pejorative meaning.

I have heard this name from so many young people here (even from students who came here a few years ago), and during my fieldwork, it also happened many times. One woman called, she ordered something for food delivery, she spoke in German, and he asked me if she was "ours" or "Švabica"?. It is interesting to me how she put that, like there are just these two categories - "We" and "Švabe". "Even that Švabe, when I hear it from someone who came in the 60s or 70s, maybe I can understand, but from younger people, I do not know from where they get that…Probably that dichotomy was made from the beginning, and as the child grows, it stays…He moved here with his family, when he was a child, he grew up here, so he is partly Austrian, in a way, but still, these categories seem to be clearly set in him (Fieldnotes, 17.6.2021).

So, even the people who were born here, or grow up here, and feel like Austrians, at least partly, express this dichotomy.

The most interesting usage of this word I heard from Edo, the co-founder of Sofra, during the interview. While explaining to me how he and his sisters could not always fit in, when they were in Macedonia during the holidays (since they grew up in Vienna), he said, *"We, Švabčad"* (Švabe children). He said that he is a foreigner everywhere, down there (Macedonia and other former Yugoslav countries) and here (Vienna), even though this is his city and it is where he feels at home. (Vertovec (2009) calls this "the risk of transnational childhood"- being caught between two nations and feeling marginal at both places). He was born and schooled here and speaks German perfectly, but at the end he is still, as he says, a "Auslander" (foreigner). But nevertheless, calling himself "Švabo" means that this name is an actual synonym for the "opposition to "our" people". When he could not fit into this category of "our people" completely, he proclaimed himself "Švabo" in order to emphasise that he also has "Austrianess" in his identity.

The "otherness" to Austrians can be expressed in many ways. Once, in Sofra, I asked two (our) young men if they wanted to pay separately and they said - No, this is done just by the Austrians, not us.[33] I also witnessed a lot of these preconceptions, negative, neutral or positive, but always meaning that they (Austrians) are extremely different from us (former Yugoslavs). I have to admit that it even happened to me.

I asked Edo why we do not have the tables outside anymore, and he said that the summer season is over and that we do not have so many customers who will sit outside, and I answered him with a following message: Yes, we are not so much Austrian restaurant, where people sit during the whole winter outside, wrapped in jackets and blankets (what was strange for me when I first came to Austria, to see people sitting outside even during the winter)…Later, when I thought about it, I realised that, with this statement, I also drew a line between Us and Them, Our people and the Austrians. …Related, a few days ago, the pie master had an issue with a new guy that delivers bread to us. He needs a few minutes to unlock the door, since he has to wash his hands from the oil, and we all wait for him a few minutes to come to the door. The new guy did not wait, he just left the bread in front of the door, outside. He was mad, and I wanted to explain something to him, since he does not have many contacts with the Austrians. I told him that so far the people who delivered bread were Bosnians, Serbs, Macedonians, Bulgarians, and we all wait, since with us things function a little bit more relaxed and flexible. This is the first time that we have an Austrian, and he probably does not want to wait even a minute, since they really appreciate their time and effort. I know that from earlier experience (and other restaurants), and I think that this is something we should learn from them. Even though this was not something negative, I still, again, drew a clear line between Us[34] and Them. And if even I do it (and becoming immediately aware what I did), who knows how many our people do that on a daily

[33] Fieldnotes, 29.7.2021

[34] Apparently this time, I even included "Bulgarians" in "our" people (maybe I meant people from the Balkans, or all South Slavs).

basis, not being aware of it, but it becomes an attitude, preference, action, for example - from now on I will cooperate just with our people…(Fieldnotes, 17.11.2021).

The dimension of being othered in relation to an Austrian could have influence on the type of connections that are developed within the former Yugoslavs community. Mijić (2019) also writes that it could be assumed that connectedness of the former Yugoslav can be the reaction to the reality of being Othered, and I agree that it could have contributed to the togetherness of former Yugoslavs in Vienna (what I will discuss more later). The way people pay for their check, the underlining how "our" people do it always for the whole group of friends and the "Austrians" everyone for themselves, as similar traits, are used to make a distinction between "us" and "them", what can result in the differences between "our" people appearing smaller (what I have observed many times in the field and also some of my interlocutos mentioned it, as well as Jana who said that seeing the Austrians as more different makes "our" people to have a feeling that they understand each other even better). This economic transaction is idealised as a "cultural" category and then used to emphasise identity borders between "our" people and "the others" (in this case the majority population - the "Austrians").

In the end, the possibility should also be considered that not all former Yugoslavs are othered in the same way (or have a feeling of being othered), in relation to various dimensions, as educational level, citizenship, ethnicity or religion (for example Chatolic and EU citizenship Croats could be feeling as less different from the Austrians (and could be seen by the Austrians as less different), than Non EU Orthodox Serbs or Muslim Bosnians. Mijić (2019) also mentioned that the Austrian population with a Bosniak/Muslim background is affected by the country's general Islamophobic atmosphere, while Srđan mentioned in his interview that the Austrians are more open towards Croats.

Language

Three dimension of language will be discussed in the following sub-chapter; language as a basis for unification of former Yugoslavs, language as "our" language, and language as BKS ("Bosnisch/Kroatisch/Serbisch" (in German) - Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian, as the official language of these three groups in Austria).

The people I talked to mentioned language as something that unites all "our" people, starting with language as practicality to a language as a way to deeper levels of expression and understanding with someone. Many of my interlocutors mentioned that it is much more practical to use your mother tongue when speaking to someone, and I also experienced how easier and faster the communication flows during my field research. During my work in Sofra, I realised that the language is an enormous practicality, and not just in a sense of a deep understanding between people (because there is no time for that during the working shift), but because it saves

time, since we, "our" people could explain everything to each other in a "blink of an eye". The dimension I found in the field and called the "Ease of communication and action" is greatly based (even though not only) on using the same mother tongue. Also, while working in Sofra, I was under the impression that many former Yugoslavs have been coming there not just to eat "our" food, but also (or sometimes even only) to speak *naš jezik*. Some of my interlocutors also mentioned that this could be the reason why people stick together, which leads to not having the opportunity or need to learn German. During my fieldwork I meet some people who really function like that (I already described a few cases, when I was writing about Practical reasons as a unifying force of this community). People that I talked to also mentioned that using the same mother tongue contributes to understanding certain references, jokes, cultural patterns, and interest. "Even though we both speak German very well, communication in our mother tongue is something else, because we can completely understand each other*",* said Biljana. Calic (2019) writes that even in 19th century South Slavs felt related, despite their religious, historical and other differences, and she emphasises that the reason for that was because they could communicate freely with each other. Farkas (2014) also emphasises that the language is what unites the imagined community of Yugosphere (in case of his research, in former Yugoslavian republics), and when people speak of it, they actually mean linguistic community (community based on the sense of linguistic unity). All of this almost made me thinking once that language may even be the most important unifier of "our" people in Vienna, but then I thought about the "Second" and "Third generation" (children of the migrants that were born and schooled in Vienna), who prefer to speak German among themselves (or some kind of mixture of languages, where German is dominant), but still are a part of this community of "our" people. But even though maybe not being the most important unifier, speaking the same native language is a very important component of the former Yugoslav community.

Furthermore, my next focus will be on the name of the language and what it represents. The official language of Yugoslavia was Serbo-Croatian, which entailed several dialects and the use of two alphabets, Latin and Cyrillic (The other official languages were Slovenian and Macedonian). With the dissolution of the former Yugoslavia, the recognition of the new official languages was used to achieve political independence (Remiddi, Alibašić, Kapetanović, Davidović, Zejnilović, 2019). "Nationalists of all sides in the Yugoslav conflict claimed that the common state as well as the common language were an artificial construct, so there was an overall effort of every newly formed former Yugoslav state to speak its own language…The citizens of the newly-created states of former Yugoslavia have been wonder-struck: they speak a "dead" language and have become polyglots. They can communicate simply and easily in four languages: Serbian, Croatian, Bosnian and Montenegrin" (Babić, 2010, 7-9).
"Despite evidence by many linguists that the differences between these languages are actually dialect differences[35], the leadership of former Yugoslav states disregards these facts and promotes

[35] Jansen (2005) also writes that some linguists say that these languages are in same relation as English and American, for example, nor that he had a feeling that he had learned different languages in Croatia, Serbia or Bosnia (different dialects, yes, but differences were, as he says, regional, not national)

the specificities of their national language, since language is used as a mean of attaining nationhood" (Remiddi, Alibašić, Kapetanović, Davidović, Zejnilović, 2019, 20). But in Vienna, it seems that the situation is different. Almost always this language is called "our" language by the people who speak or better to say, use it, and it seems to be a very important dimension of the "Yugosphere". ("We always call it "our" language, we do not want to make any difference" (Dragomir); "When someone asks me which is your mother tongue, I usually say Serbo-Croatian. I am really careful there. In the Choir we also translate the programs in Serbo-Croatian, or "our" language. In the Choir there isn't any kind of divide between Croatian or Serbian, so there is this Yugosphere, in my practice, it is in the language. Identification is mostly in the language, I definitely do not see any difference there and I would never ever say that I speak Croatian. I would say Serbo-Croatian, or Croato-Serbian, or "our" language (Jana)).
Even though two of my interlocutors (Serbs) did mention that this language is called "our" language mostly by Serbs (because they were targeted as the aggressor during the war and now they are careful not to offend someone), I did not confirm that in the field. In fact, I can literally count on one hand the times that some former Yugoslav, living in Vienna, did not call it "our" language. Few times I have heard Serbo-Croatian (what was the official name of the language in Yugoslavia), one time I even heard Yugoslav language (what was never its name, but it is clear what was meant by it) and one time one young man asked me if we speak "the same" language. "The same" is as equally neutral word as "ours", revealing the tendency that former Yugoslavs in Vienna chose the neutral words (almost always word "our"), maybe in order not to offend someone, but also to show that they do not want to separate people by ethnic lines. As Dušica said: "Language is important for expressing our national identity - in Vienna language shows if the national identity is important to someone and how much. If someone calls it "our language", for me, this means that for this person nationality is not a big issue, and that he or she sees all of us as one nation". This kind of usages for the name "our" language is not new, nor specific just for Vienna; as mentioned, Calic (2019) writes that even in the 19th century people used that name with the same intention. On the territories that would later become Yugoslavia, areas where the common language was used did not correspond with ethno/"national" boundaries. People could understand each other, but there was no name for that language, so, for lack of a better nomen, people called it *naš (jezik)* or *našk*i. It seems that this language always has been missing the common collective term[36]. Jansen (2005) also writes that the majority of his interlocutors in

[36] It is interesting to mention that this language got it´s official name here in Vienna. The nineteenth-century language reformers selected the dialect that most South Slavic people spoke in 1850 in the Vienna (Literary) Agreement to serve as the basis of a standardised SerboCroatian language. "Most Croats and all Serbs, Montenegrins, and Bosnians have been speaking the same dialect, known as Štokavian (after the interrogative pronoun "što" for "what"). The idioms of the Slovenes and the Macedonians were distinctly different and would later develop into their own literary languages" (Calic, 2019, 8)

Serbia and Croatia during 2000s used the terms "Serbian" or "Croatian" language, but there were also some people who would still call the language "Serbo-Croatian or Croato-Serbian", in order to resist to the nationalistic discourse, or if they would want to avoid any name at all (since the double name could be related to Yugoslavia, or even to the certain nation, depending on which one would be put first in the name (Serbian or Croatian), they would intentionally use *naš (jezik)* or *našk*i. Today, it seems that calling this language "our" language in Vienna serves the same purpose - to express that people do not want to emphasise "the national" in language, or even that they do not want to be separated through ethnic lines.

There is another debate regarding the language name that should also be mentioned. Even though the last official language of Yugoslavia was Serbo-Croatian, and today languages are politically, and officially separated to Bosnian, Croatian and Serbian in the former Yugoslav republics, official name for it, coming from the Austrian government since 1992 is BKS (Bosnisch/Kroatisch/Serbisch)[37]. The reactions of people regarding this name go from being confused to a strong negative reaction.

"*BKS is a language without a name, since we all argue about the name and whose is it, even though lingvist confirm that this is one pluricentric language, with a Serbian, Croatian and Bosnian centre. Language is a victim of politics, for political reasons we had to split the language and to declare these centres as only valid standards, thus giving the argument why the language is separated in the first place. But if they are separated, at least politically, then every person can say I speak Serbian, not Croatian, for example. I would be most happy when this language would get some neutral name, like language Y, spoken in Bosnia, Serbia, Croatia, that would be the most fair"* (Dušica).

"*I mean, what exactly is BKS? When I asked the authorities why this BKS and what it suppose to mean, the only answer I got from the authorities is that they do not have any intention to write everything in three languages, that this is one language and so they could save some cost they put everything under BKS and this is one language for all"* (Dragomir).

One BKS teacher, whom I spoke with informally, also said that it would be much more expensive for the Austrian state if the language would be separated into three official languages (like for example is Bosnia and Herzegovina, where all administrative and legislative matters have to be "translated" into three official languages: Bosnian, Croatian and Serbian (Remiddi, Alibašić, Kapetanović, Davidović, Zejnilović, 2019))[38]. The BKS teacher said that he does not

[37]Arandjelović (2011) writes that in 2009 the US State Department issued a document, stating that Croatian, Serbian and Bosnian language are different dialects of the same language, and that they should be treated as such (especially in the Office of the State Department, since that would lower the cost of documents' translation, but also at all major American universities). As we can see, Austria is actually not a unique case, but the difference is that Austria started treating this languague/s as one - BKS immediately after the breakup of Yugoslavia, in 1992.

[38] It is interesting to mention that there were initiatives of reclaiming the common language beyond the political language reforms during and after the wars. There is even a Declaration on Common Language, the initiative that problematise the existence of four 'political' languages in Bosnia, Montenegro, Croatia and Serbia. "The Declaration advocates polycentric standardisation that does not bring into question the individual right to express affiliation to different peoples, regions or states; each state, nation, ethno-national or regional community can freely and independently codify its variant of common language; and also the freedom of 'mixing', mutual openness, and the permeation of different forms and expressions of common language

mind that there is one language (even though he does not think that it is one language, but it is manageable to teach it like this, he said). He explained that one must adapt, to explain "their own" to everyone - cyrilic, latin, whatever is needed. At the end he said: "Love what is yours, respect what is other´s"[39].

However, there are also very negative reactions to this language name.
"*BKS is a political construction, made up, "newspeak", artificial creation, forced from the Austrian government, as they see it... Imagine that there is a DÖSCH, "Deutsch/Österreichische/Schweiz" (German/Austrian/Swiss), created by some French officials in Belgium, and then some Austrian who lives in Brussels, sends a child to learn German in school, and the child comes home and speaks a mixture of Swiss, Austrian and German language, with a French accent - this is how the BKS looks like"* (Srđan).
The organisation Prosvjeta even made an initiative towards the Austrian government for getting the official right to call their mother language Serbian, to learn and inform themselves in their mother tongue, while in the meantime one of their main programs is a school of Serbian language (interview, fieldnotes, online observation). One of the Croatian organisations - Croatian home, also made an initiative towards the government for separation of Croatian language from BKS, writing that Croatian language in Austrian schools is not offered as an "only possible independent language, but just as constantly imposed non-existent BKS" (online observation).

We can see that there are also different examples, and some of them could be seen as an act of separation, oriented towards the national motherland´s languages. On the other hand, there is also the possibility that organisations have the problem with the name BKS itself, since it is an official name of the language just in Austria, proclaimed by the Austrian government. In practice former Yugoslavs absolutely do not call their language BKS, leading to the conclusion that the situation is the similar as with the name of the community itself - from outside of the community the language is called BKS (at least officially), while inside the community the language is called "our" language. This can be seen, for example in KOSMO articles, where they have the same text in "our" language, saying "our" community, and the same text in German, where they write "BKS community" (online observation).

"Yugoslavhood top-down" (BKS community)

While discussing the topic of BKS language, I also have to mention something that I like to call "Yugoslavhood top-down". Srđan has a slightly different view regarding the motivation of "our" people to stick together, saying that this feeling of being one community between former Yugoslavs comes also from above, from the Austrian government itself. He says that Prosvjeta

to the universal benefit of all its speakers. Since 2016 (until 2019) there has been more than 9 000 signatories, ⅙ are supporters from former Yugoslav Diasporas". (Remiddi, Alibašić, Kapetanović, Davidović, Zejnilović, 2019, 20).

[39] Field notes, 4.5.2021

does not get almost any funding from the local or state government because they are promoting something that is Serbian, and not BKS (and that was even suggested to him informally - that he will get the funding for certain events if he organises them as "BKS" events). He said: "Austria is trying to sell us Yugoslavhood, since they want to keep the people calm...but this cannot be called Yugocommunity, this means creating a new group, while not letting it be what it actually is, but making it something that it is not".

This is, as he emphasises, most visible through language.
"This kind of conditioning is like that - if you want to work, and it is hard to find a job, you will get into a circle with BKS, and this is the official politics…I understand Austria, why would she be dealing with Serbs, Croats and Muslims…when we all have the same language, same mentality and similar, let's throw all under the same hat and to create one new caste, that is not what it is, but something else… De facto it is one balloon that is blown by official politics, but I could not call it a Yugosphere… The state of Austria now wants to sell us Yugoslavhood, because it is OK for them" (Srđan).

Some of my interlocutors did mention that from the beginning their superiors told them that they will never tolerate any kind of ethnic separation or similar (related to former Yugoslav nationalities, ethnicities and potential conflicts), and if someone expresses something similar, he or she would get fired (Aida, Duče, the BKS teacher, with whom I spoke informally). ("People worked together, but everyone knew that they had to keep their job, so they did not dare…one would immediately get fired, and everybody needed a job…" (Duče); "How can nationalism be developed here? You had to put bread on the table. And you are in foreign country. Then try, if you dare. If you…then you lose your job, and then you think about it - or you will be quiet and work and not be talking with someone from another state, with whom you disagree, or you will lose your job. That is the motive." (Aida)).
Even though we should not, as Palmberger (2016) says, assume that people automatically accept everything that comes in a top-down political process, this factor still should be considered as something that could have contributed to former Yugoslavs keeping themselves together, since the official political discourse of Austria after the breakup of Yugoslavia was unifying (in opposition to, for example, separating and nationalistic official discourse that has been present in former Yugoslav Republics since they were formed). It is possible that the concept of BKS community and language has been forced upon as brotherhood and unity was the concept chosen to prevent conflict in Yugoslavia once (Palmberger, 2016). Wimmer (2013) writes that the majority population may try to reduce the number of categories of the migrant minorities (fuission) or incorporate the smaller minority groups into larger categories easier to administer (ethnogenesis). Over time these reduced categories may, from administrative routines of the state, become adopted by the minority individuals, which also can decrease the importance of ethnicity as a principle of categorization and social organisation.

Feeling secure and “at home”, “komšiluk” and “implied solidarity”

“*This opened my eyes, that, if I ever want to feel at home, I should move my focus more towards “our” people.*” (Biljana)

While being in the field, working in Sofra, I realised that “our” people needed to see this place as something where they can feel at home, home that they miss and where they feel secure and pleasant. Accordingly, they expected to be welcomed in their mother tongue. When I started working in Sofra I would always greet people who enter in German, but 90% of them would immediately start speaking our language. (*The man enters, I greet him in German and he waves his hand away and says “Please, don´t” (in “our” language) and starts speaking “our language”. Some of “our” people like to feel the atmosphere of their homeland when they enter, including the language. Small world in a foreign land.* (Fieldnotes, 26.5.2021)). I was also under the impression that many times people come just to talk in our language, many times even not buying anything. It is not just about using someone's mother tongue, it is also about communicating in a certain way. For example, “our” people ask other “our” people very direct questions about their personal life, that it can be considered almost rude, and they also have the need to tell others about their life.

Additionally to the language, the whole ambient in Sofra was designed in a way that could provoke the feeling that replicates the emotions of being at home. And people react to it.

All these things on the wall, they create some emotions in people, some kind of a feeling, nostalgia, not necessarily towards Yugoslavia, but for home…because many “our” people are away from their homes (Fieldnotes, 18.6.2021);

A woman enters to buy burek, then she sees “fildžan”, and she says “oh, fildžani, wonderful, oh, my Sarajevo, my dear”…she smiles…and she goes away..” (Fieldnotes, 22.6.2021);

A man sits down, he eats burek, the Bijelo dugme is on, and he is delighted - “Oh, when you welcome me here with this food, with this music…”, he says (Fieldnotes, 23.9.2021).

Ivanović (2012) writes that guest workers were not gladly accepted in Austrian cafes, in some even entrance was strictly forbidden to them, so in the 70s, when the law allowed it, Yugoslavs started to open their own places. Going to Yugoslav restaurants/cafes/kafanas had a special social component for Yugoslavs - they could eat food from Yugoslavia there, talk about their difficulties in a foreign land, listen to Yugoslav music, make friends or meet partners, play chess or cards. Yugoslav stores or taverns were near the places in Vienna where Yugsolav lived or near the train stations and markets. To me it seems that not much has changed today. “Our” people come to “our” places because they want to feel at home, or closer to home, to talk with “our” people, eat “our” food and socialise with “our” people. Someone in Sofra even told me that when you live in the area surrounded by “our” people, and you have contact mostly with them, then you somehow lose the feeling that you are in a foreign land.[40] This all helps people feel more secure and more at home.

[40] Fieldnotes, 1.6.2021

This feeling of security is also something that I described in my field notes.
Somehow the homely atmosphere is present there, one feels like he is surrounded by his family, not literally, but somehow "homely". People help each other, workers are coming even when they are not working, sitting there, eating, somehow one feels as surrounded by his own…safe, or at least safer…I think maybe this is the base for the whole community, maybe I am thinking this because I am also a psychologist, but the feeling of security, which is the part of every collective identity, that one has because he belongs somewhere, to some group, or community…belongs somewhere, and it is, without any doubt, necessary when one is in a foreign land for a long time, far away from friends and family, and the surroundings where his or hers culture is implied, where everything is easy to read, culturally… To have this feeling after 5 years, it means a lot…especially since I was not in Serbia for 2 years, because of the covid situation…it is nice, it is easy… (Fieldnotes, 7.6.2021).
"Our" people belong to this community as it represents safety, pleasantness, a piece of home in a foreign land. This dimension goes in accordance with the theoretical explanation that people on the move built a new home (through nostalgia), an ideal home in a new context, where they feel secure, familiar, where they are part of the community (meaning a space where one possesses a maximal communicative power) and are able to make plans for the future (Jansen, 2009).

The feeling of security is related to the concept of "komšiluk" (good neighbourliness), which I also found in the field, and the dimension of "Implied solidarity", as I call it. I will illustrate what I mean by that with a few examples from my field notes.
He, the neighbour from the apartment above, does not speak German well, he is bringing me again the letter from some institution, in German, to interpret, he does that from time to time…he drops by almost every day, sometimes he drinks coffee, sometimes he just wants to talk…sometimes he bring us something, chocolate, tee… (field notes, 22.6.2021);
After some time, a woman comes, she carries many full (shopping) bags and she speaks to me directly in "our" language, in order to ask me if she can leave her things here, because she has to go and take the shopping cart, her shopping bag is torn apart. She either heard me speaking "our" language once before, or she presumed that I do, either way, she assumed that I would help her. She also mentioned that she comes here with her daughter to eat pie. But to me it is fascinating how people presume that someone from "our" people will help them automatically, which is probably often the case in practice. She did not enter some other restaurant or cafe, she came intentionally to Sofra to ask me, even though she does not know me, or the owners personally… And she knew that I would meet her needs. There is some strange solidarity between our people in this city, I do not know if it is so in other cities...I guess that it is implied that we will be there for each other, when we are in a foreign land. I don´t know…(Fieldnotes, 1.6.2021.);

Last week a young man came to leave a key for his friend who lives in the neighbourhood. He said "Milan leaves the key for Enis". No one of us from Sofra knew who either Milan or Enis

was, but they knew that they can leave their apartment key here, to someone belonging to "our" people, when they do not have the other way, again presuming that some of us will help them...all of this is very interesting, that implied solidarity… (fieldnotes, 1.6.2021).
Palmberger (2016) also mentioned the concept of "komšiluk" in Bosnia, good neighbourliness, the concept that was very much present during the time of Yugoslavia, and still is in former Yugoslav republics.

This concept surely exists at places such as Sofra, where some people can be there for you if needed, to help…where burek master comes so the owners could help him apply for a vaccine, since he does not speak German well…And this concept of good neighbourliness is very pleasant and gives the feeling of security and cosiness, and this is really necessary in one big city, far away from your homeland, friends and family…Like some legacy that was brought to Vienna and transferred on…Yugolavs just brought komšiluk (good neighbourliness) and it stayed there, and it sustains, and we all become part of it when we come here…Komšiluk swallows us, because it is pleasant, and safe, because it accepts us, and allows us to be equally worth in Vienna, what we hardly can feel outside of it...Komšiluk is our community, here everyone is on their own (ground), "svoj na svome", and this is why it sustains…in addition to language, the concept of komšiluk is something that all former Yugoslavs, from every part of former Yugoslavia, can understand and what connect us… komšiluk speaks louder than ethnicity, even louder than language...that implied solidarity ("podrazumevana solidarnost"), readiness to help each other, where everyone can help and also hope that that he or she will be helped…nice place, isn't it? (Fieldnotes, 7.6.2021).

In Sofra I found the "komšiluk" meaning that "our" people who live in the area would gladly help each other, but the concept of "implied solidarity" between "our" people goes beyond the "komšiluk", since it expands to all "our" people, regardless if they live in the neighbourhood. It happened to me many times (during the field research and in private life) that someone from "our" people, when we first meet, has the need, even feels some kind of obligation to help me.
It is not like the "Komšiluk" can be seen just in Sofra. Duče also mentioned that he took the child from his neighbour (Croat) to the kindergarten, when he could not do that by himself and how his neighbour (Roma from Serbia) took his mother to the hospital all the time. Mika also said that she sometimes took care of the girl next door (Croat family). Regarding "implied solidarity" many of my interlocutors mentioned that they helped many "our" people, even if they did not know them, or that some unfamiliar "our" people helped them. Mika, Goran and Duče said that they helped many "our" people to find a job, and Biljana mentioned that some "our" people she just met are helping her in renovating her apartment.

The feeling of security, feeling at home, good neighbourliness and implied solidarity (that is reciprocal) are all intertwined and related concepts. As seen, many authors wrote that solidarity between its members is an important trait of diasporas (Safran, 1991; Cohen, 2008; Glamotchak,

2013). Cohen (2008) even writes about solidarity between co-ethnic members in the host country, what he calls "co-responsibility", which could be very similar to the dimension that I call "implied solidarity" between members of the former Yugoslav community. Wimmer (2013) writes that "Barth in 1696 suggested the concept of ethnicity related to social and symbolic boundaries - they emerge when actors distinguish between different ethnic categories and when they treat members of these categories differently - each identification implies a categorical boundary that leads to an action and he gives an example of someone who is Swiss helping another Swiss to find an apartment in the US, and not helping someone who is not Swiss" (Wimmer, 2013, 5). This is very similar to "implied solidarity" between "our" people in Vienna, as they have assumable common understanding with other "our" people, they also have the responsibility to help someone just because he or she is "ours". However, "our" people is the group that consists of more ethnicities, not just one ("Serbs", "Croats", "Bosnians", "Bosnikas", "Macedonians"…). If the boundary making that leads to action actually defines how one experiences his/hers ethnicity, could it be that "our" people in Vienna function similar as one (ethnic) group? It would be in accordance with what Wimmer (2013, 5) writes, being that ethnicity provides personal security and psychological stability granted on a sense of belonging to the community where you feel "culturally at home". Or maybe this responsibility for automatically helping someone just because he/she is from your community extends to "co-ethnic" groups in this case? Focusing on social and categorical boundaries gives us the chance to research formation and dissolution of ethnic groups more precisely (Wimmer, 2013).

There are different dimensions that appear as a possible "bond" of this community, as practical reasons (network of connections and contacts useful in various situations as finding a job or apartment, or staying in the community as being an easier way to manage in the foreign land), dimension of similarity (as similar mentality and/or shared experiences) and "otherness" towards the majority population in Austria, same language ("ease of communication and action"), a dimension that comes from the above, from the Austrian government - avoiding possible conflict between different former Yugoslav ethnicities through "Yugoslavhood-top down" (the official discourse in Austria that recognises all former Yugoslavs as one group - BKS community with one language - BKS language) and at the end, the need to belong somewhere and/or feel more like at home and secure), together with good neighbourliness and "implied solidarity" between the community members. The dimensions that I found while analysing the interviews match the ones that I found in the field, except that in the field I also found good neighbourliness. While being in the field, and practising the participant observation, I also "forged" the two above-mentioned terms - "ease of communication and action" and "implied solidarity".

Possible factors that could influence the forming of the community of "our" people in Vienna

"We fight each other just when we are down there (former Yugoslavia), but here, everything has always been great between us". Mika

After discussing the potential unifying dimensions of the community of "our" people in Vienna, I also feel the need to examine what could have been the factors, specific for Vienna that could contribute to forming the community of "our" people.

I will start with the, so called, first migration phase (the guest workers). Since I had a lack of interlocutors that came in the 1960s and 1970s, I have been supporting my research with the secondary sources, research done by the other authors, as Ivanović (2012), who also researched this group (through interviews, but also the analysis of documents and newspaper articles). The connections that people had to make from the beginning had to be strong, so they could manage in a new foreign city. It would function in the way that one member of the family would come, and then, when (usually) he or she would settle in Vienna, and would slowly bring the rest of the family, sometimes even other relatives, neighbours and similar. Mika told me that her husband brought all of his relatives to Vienna, and then he would help them find a job, as she would too. The job demands/opportunities at the time were so big, that the superiors in Mika´s hospital would send her to wait for Yugoslav people at Hauptbahnhof, offer them a job when they get out of the train, and bring them directly to the hospital (Mika, interview). Ivanović (2012) also mentioned that Yugoslav workers sometimes got the jobs directly at the train station, immediately when they arrived. He also writes that the train stations were important spots of connections and communication among Yugoslavs in Vienna. Train stations were a source of information, "taverns", where friends meet to talk about the problems they encountered in a foreign city, waiting for fellow Yugoslavs who carried food from their homeland, and information from family and friends from there. Letters and money were also sent "through" people, via informal channels, that was the fastest and the safest way (Ivanović, 2012).

Keeping the connections was important not just with the aim of getting information about your family in your homeland, it was also practical for living in Vienna. About 90% of Yugoslav workers in Austria lived out of the collective worker homes, meaning that Yugoslavs had to organise their accommodation by themselves, which was not easy, especially considering the fact that they did not speak the language[41]. In the interview of Ivanović (2012, 230) with a Yugoslav worker who came to Vienna in the 60s he says:

"I did not know any German. I came to Zidbanhof (Südbahnhof) and I saw a blackhaired man, and I assumed that he was our man, Yugoslav, and he helped me, that man. I told him that I have no job, nothing, and he said he will help me. He took me to the 16th district, in a small room, to spend a night there. Tomorrow I have found one of my acquaintances and he found me a job in an electro firm, but I still did not have a place to stay. In 7 days I found a collective apartment, held by some Croat, 18 guys in one room, 25m squared, 18 beds. I started working and living there, with colleagues from former Yugoslavia, all mixed, Bosnians, Serbs, Croats, Albanians, Muslims from Bosnia. We were all mixed. We were recognised workers, we had the will to work. In 3 months I got the papers for myself. The firm boss filled some forms for me and I went to

[41] Around 47% Yugoslavs in Vienna lived in janitors (hausmajstorski) apartments (Ivanovic, 2012)

some bureau of employment, I gave all that, waited a few weeks and I got it immediately. Working and residence permit, we got this in duration for one year, and then we would extend it. With that, after 3 months, I managed financially, and I brought my sister and my brother in law here, so the three of us found a place together."

From this example from Ivanović´s resources (2012) we can see how the man approached another man for which he assumed that it was "our" man for help, how he manage to find a job and an apartment through the connections he made with our people, and how he later continued to bring other people in Vienna.

Bernard (2018) also mentioned that her interviewees came because they had a relative already working in Vienna. They recalled difficulties in Vienna, especially in the beginning and early period, struggling with language barriers and new surroundings. The woman eventually found a job in the family firm of people from Yugoslavia, since there was no language problem, especially since all the workers were from Yugoslavia as well (Bernard, 2018).

In an interview done by Ivanović ((2012, 23.), his interlocutor says: "Woman who rented us sheds was "our"...The other accommodation we could not find, we did not know the language".

In data that Ivanović and Bernard presented, one can also see that many people had similar experience - they came to Vienna, since they already had a relative here, and they stayed in connection with the Yugoslav community, among other, for practical reasons, as language barriers, or related, finding a job or apartment. Many of my interlocutors said that it is still like this, and for almost all of them this was the way they got to Vienna in the first place (almost all of them had a relative here, including myself).

Free time of the guest workers from the 60s and 70s was not organised, they came to temporary employment without language skills, without families, unaccustomed to the new environment, and in small, shared apartments they did not have any space for themselves, so spending time and socialising outside was a necessity for many of them. In the 1970s they started to organise Yugoslav clubs. The biggest club in Vienna "Jedinstvo" was open with the help of the Austrian workers union and workers chamber, but Clubs had to self finance through selling food, organising concerts, movie nights, dancing or with members fees. From the three Yugoslav clubs that were opened in Vienna, one was closed shortly after, while the other merged with Jedinstvo. (Ivanović, 2012). Through Yugoslav Clubs the sociability and solidarity among the Yugoslavs were fostered (Bernard, 2012). Ivanović (2012) also says that in Germany there were social workers from Yugoslavia, who advised the Yugoslavs about different legal issues in their mother tongue, while in Vienna that was not the case. This means that people were left to trust each other, and that informal circles of communication among "our" people were the main source of information for them. Since most of the people that came from Yugoslavia in the period of 1960s and 1970s did not know any German, it is likely that the people needed each other, so they could spread the information among themselves, help each other, with the paperwork and practicalities, finding a job, apartment and similar. Additional to practical reasons, they all came from the country where "brotherhood and unity" was the dominant feeling/atmosphere, and all former Yugoslav ethnicities were "fellow countrymen/women". The combination of different factors, as

the ones that were “brought” from motherland (togetherness of people as a dominant atmosphere in Yugoslavia), as the ones that were further developed in the “host land” (togetherness as a result of various, even practical reasons that helped them function in a foreign land) could have resulted in strengthening the relations between “our” people (at that time, Yugoslavs) in Vienna.

It is clear how the connections between our people were created and maintained while Yugoslavia still existed, but what happened after the breakup of the county?
When thinking about “our” people, I was also thinking how all this was possible and how could this community survive the war and the separation that followed. My first presumption was that people living here were, even though influenced by the media, physically separated from the war and strong nationalistic propaganda in the former Yugoslav republics. Malešević (2000) writes that in a situation of political uncertainty, economic hardship and state collapse, intensive attachment to ethnic groups and consequently animosity towards other ethnic groups became the only source of security and certainty. We may assume that people who were already living in Vienna did not experience the state collapse in the same way as the people who were in Yugoslavia at the time, and presumably being in Vienna meant that they were not experiencing economic uncertainty. Many of my interlocutors have mentioned financial security, together with the orientation towards ensuring that security, as the factor that could contribute to the former Yugoslav´s staying in good relations, even during the war and after the breakup of Yugoslavia. People were concentrated on achieving the status that would enable them stay in Austria, keeping their jobs and obtaining financial security. In order to keep their jobs and permit residence, people had to “be calm”, they were not allowed to provoke any kind of troubled relationship. It is also possible that they had different priorities, that they were concentrated towards this. (“When someone is economically secure, he thinks about other stuff. He just thinks about where he is going to travel, or what new car he should buy, new furniture, and then he does not have the time to hate someone. And when you do not have, even for bread, for anything, you sit at home, and for you, that is everybody's fault. You are angry at yourself and then to the whole world” (Duče)).
Many people mentioned that Austria simply has that kind of system that does not support separation between the former Yugoslavs (Srđan, Aida, Duče, Jana, informal conversations). Srđan even mentioned that the city itself never wanted to finance something that is just related to Serbia, but it was suggested to him in some informal conversations that it would be financed if the programs were BKS related. Let’s not forget, of course, the name that Austria legally has given to this community - BKS and to its language, and by doing that, expressed it´s position about seeing former Yugoslavs (and at least these 3 ethnicities) as one social group. This certainly had influence, since the official state discourse of Austria was unifying (for former Yugoslavs), in opposition to the one in former Yugoslavs republics, which was nationalistic. While in the Yugoslav successor states nationalistic tendencies were not just allowed, but often welcomed, in Austria that kind of climate was not nurtured/appreciated/allowed.

”*Vienna is not a fertile ground for that. I think that even when the hardest nationalist comes to Vienna and realises, when he sits with everyone, Serb, Croat, Bosnian, that, here, this does not work. When you do something like this in Croatia, the whole system supports it, and here the system is not like that”* (Jana).

I would also dare to say that the specificity of this town is that it has such a large number of former Yugoslavs (let’s not forget, some informal researchers estimate that it could even be almost 1/4 of the city). There are parts of Vienna where you rarely hear German, just “our” language, especially in 15th and 16th district (for example in the tram 46). Jana sees, as the main reason for our people to stick together, first of all - statistics, meaning that in Vienna there are so many of “our” people that you cannot avoid getting to know many of them that actually suit you.

What can also be considered as town related specificity is that former Yugoslav did settle mostly in 15th and 16th district, but without any physical separation through the ethnic lines. There has never been the Croatian part of town, or Serbian, or Bosnian, just “Yugoslav” parts of town. Since the former Yugoslavs in Vienna never stopped being physically close and have been in contact with other former Yugoslav ethnicities on a daily basis, there wasn't much space for the influence of the negative propaganda, since the people could see, in direct contact, that the things did not change. (“There is no nationalism, as I can see. In mother lands - yes, because the governments are using nationalism to distract the attention of people from the real problems, but this is not transferred to people in Vienna” (Biljana); “I saw it, young people down there…they hate each other so much…because they did not have a chance to live together. We can live together when we come here, but down there (Former Yugoslavia) - we cannot.” (Duče)). MCDonald (2009) also suggests that keeping friendly relations with other ethnicities as making the opportunity for “not dehumanising” them represent very important factors for keeping the good relations. In the newly formed former Yugoslav states the dominant negative national narratives demonised “the enemies” (MCDonald (2009), while in Vienna these images could be challenged by the continued living together and positive experiences. He proposes that narrative of cooperation and tolerance that emphasises the commonalities, not the differences of people during the existence of the former Yugoslavia and their shared experiences of hardship during and after the war and breakup of the country, cuts across ethnic and religious divisions (MCDonald, 2009, 396). He also mentioned collective mourning, and shared traumatic experiences as an important element for keeping good relations with other former Yugoslav ethnicities. Aida mentioned in her interview how all of them who moved from Sarajevo to Vienna were gathering to mourn and share their sorrow, during the war, even though she also said that Serbs and Bosniaks did not like each other for a while, she said that they would still gather together, adding that it was not the fault of other Serbs, who also ran away from that situation, they were in the same position and trouble.

Fischer (2003) also mentioned that people who migrated before and after the 90s, also merged in one community, since, "despite having had widely different experiences, Yugoslavs who had settled in Vienna before 1991 were still also affected by problems similar to those of the "new migrants", such as the loss of a "comfortable[42]" identity arrangement of Yugoslavism" (Fischer, 2003, 9).

While people continued to stick together, within the huge community of now, former Yugoslavs, that provided large number of opportunities within it (starting from practical, like finding a job, recommendation, apartment and similar, to satisfying emotional and social needs, like finding a partner, friend, sense of acceptance, security, appreciation), the former Yugoslavs have also been excluded from the Austrian society (already discussed in the previous chapter "Othered"). "In the recent "migrant integration policy index" (Huddleston, Niessen, Ni Chaoimh, White, 2011) it was not simply Austria as a country, which scored poorly (24 out of 33 countries), but Vienna as a city also had problems in such rankings, related to: lack of an open policy towards immigrants and their exclusion; the difficulties of third-generation immigrants finding their place in the knowledge sectors of the city's economy; and the impact of national political hostility" (Sievers, 2014, 3 in Caglar, 2016, 963). Not being fully socially accepted (even the third generation) in Vienna could even more straighten the relations between former Yugoslavs.

Duče once mentioned that this atmosphere is here because of the people who came here, actually. He says that people who fled Bosnia during the war were the ones who did not want to get into conflict with other Yugoslavs. If they did not want the conflict then and there, they certainly do not want it here and now. If we look at things like this, and we remember the three bigger migration waves from Yugoslav soil, the people who came in the 60s and 70s were already Yugoslavs, the people who fled from war were presumably (although not necessarily) against the fighting, and the students that are coming now have the war 30 years behind them, and also, probably do not like the political situation in their countries of origin, or even the nationalist discourse (this is why they are searching for a better conditions in the host land). Balunović (2020) writes in his article that one of his interlocutors said that it is easier to embrace this "new old" identity in Vienna than in Belgrade or Zagreb, quoting: "An open-minded person finds it easier to approach other people here then for a person who lives in Serbia, Bosnia or Croatia, where the nationalist currents are blatantly repressive" (Balunović, 2020).

As seen, people had to make connections with "our" people in the beginning for practical reasons (a practice that has persisted to this day). The "human" basis of this community are the guest workers from the 60s and 70s, who already came as Yugoslavs, while the others who migrated

[42] When Fischer talks about the comfortable Yugoslav identity he means the one that "saves the time" in explaining where you come from exactly and how you declare yourself within the former Yugoslav ethnicities/nationalities (instead of just saying - Yugoslav). This is something that still happens in Vienna, as some of my interlocutors said - they still use Yugoslavia to explain their origin since this is the shortest and easiest way. However, here it has to be said that it is considered that the Yugoslav identity was never just comfortable, but it just appeared in that way - by some, it was also ideologically fixed, flexible in usage and full of tensions.

after were the people who ran from the conflict and/or presumably did not agree with it, so this atmosphere of not separating could have been further nurtured and maintained. At the same time, "our" people were not fully accepted in Vienna, while being very numerous, and what is also important, they were not physically separated, since they have been inhabiting the same parts of the city which gave them the opportunity to always live together. Economic factors should also not be forgotten - people, presumably, were not economically endangered, so the ethnic differences had a lesser chance to become important. They were concentrated to provide for their existence in Vienna and the official discourse in Austria also has been propagated that all former Yugoslavs are still one group (BKS). All of this could have contributed to Vienna not becoming "a fertile ground", as Jana said, for separation and nationalism and to keep "our" people together all these years. It may appear that this togetherness of former Yugoslavs in Vienna is just a "transferred" atmosphere from the "old motherland", whose disappearing "our" people in Vienna refuse to acknowledge, but, in my opinion, it has been only the basis. The "brotherhood and unity" that people presumably brought transnationally from the "old motherland" were further nurtured in the non separational atmosphere in the "host" country, maintained in the living conditions in the state of Austria and the city of Vienna that enabled for them to be kept (as physical closeness of all former Yugoslavs in the same parts of the town and the official political discourse of the state that enabled them continue to officially be "one community" - BKS), and maybe even strengthened in the circumstances which required it (like being together in the "same troubles", or not being fully accepted by the "Austrians" and had to make for a living in a foreign land). If (some) former Yugoslavs are staying loyal to an "old motherland" of Yugoslavia, togetherness of "our" people in Vienna cannot be reduced just to that relation.

Relations among "our" people in Vienna

There are also different opinions regarding the relations among the people of different ethnicities. All interviewed people who came before the breakup of Yugoslavia said that they were brought up as Yugoslavs and that they felt as Yugoslavs (once or still do), meaning also that for them there wasn't any kind of difference between various ethnicities that lived in Yugoslavia, and that in Vienna it was the same. Mika came to Vienna during the 70s and she claims that all Yugoslavs here were like brothers. Goran came in the 80s, he said that that kind of atmosphere existed also in Vienna ("Before there was no difference at all, you just hear the language and start talking" (Goran)), while Aida, Duče and Srđan came just before the war started, so they cannot speak for certain how it was before. Aida heard from her brother and sister in law that it was the same as in Yugoslavia, everybody lived in harmony with each other. ("It was the real Yugoslavia, here as down there, without any difference" (Aida)). Duče also heard from his father, who lived in Vienna from the 60s, that Yugoslavs were getting along without any problems or separations. Ivanović (2012) writes that in the 70s, when Yugoslavs started opening their own places in Vienna, they gathered all the Yugoslav workers. "There is no difference, we are all one and equal, Croat, Macedonian or Serbs, we are all Yugoslavs…" (Ivanović (2012, 237, quoting the article *Subota na banhofu*, Politika, from 11. 11. 1971). Mijić (2019) also depicts the

situation before the 90s with the story of one of her interviewee, the son of a (Croatian) guest worker family who was born in Vienna: “Until the age of 14 or 15, I actually did not know who was Croatian, Serbian, or Bosnian. We had always been together. We were Yugoslavs. We had a red passport and we knew about Tito. That’s it. That’s what we knew about down there. And then the war came and everything, even here in Vienna, fell apart….” Mijić (2019, 10)

What happened to former Yugoslavs in Vienna during the war and the breakup of the country?
Mika underlines that in Vienna there weren't any problems between (former) Yugoslavs ever, even during the war (she mentioned the few neighbours, Croats, who welcomed them into building and socialised with them normally even during the war, as nothing was happening, bringing them food every day while they were renovating the apartment, and later, when they moved in, one of the Croat neighbours would leave a little girl, their daughter, in Mika´s apartment, so she would take care of her). “It doesn't matter at all. We fight each other just when we are down there (former Yugoslavia), but here, everything has always been great between us. Like nothing ever happened, now, then and always, here… Slovenian, Croat, it never mattered, there was not any difference, never…I think that it is still like this. We were all Yugos (Jugovići) and that was it”, said Mika.
Duče says something very similar, that Yugoslavs in Vienna were always getting along, (mentioning that the first neighbours of his parents, from Serbia, were like a family to his parents, before, during and after the war, bringing them to the hospital and helping them with everything they needed). When he came, in 1992, there wasn't any atmosphere of separation between our people in Vienna. He said: “I was also surprised, not to hear that someone somewhere got into a fight. But this did not happen here, even though it was war down there….I saw it, young people down there (Bosnia)… they hate each other so much…because they did not have a chance to live together. We can live together when we come here, but down there - we can’t”. Duče says that people can get along here since all the people who came, at least from Bosnia, during the war, ran away since they did not support the separation and especially conflict with other former Yugoslavs. So there was not a “human basis” for the conflict - people who left Yugoslavia during the breakup didn't want the ethnic conflict there (where it was already happening), it is logical to assume that they certainly did not want it here (in Austria).

However, few of the interviewees say that after the war for some time (around a decade), some kind of separation and tension was present between people in general. People still socialised, but less, and the real friendships survived (all interviewed people who came before the breakup of Yugoslavia said that). Aida also said that people still socialised in Vienna, even though Bosniaks and Serbs didn’t like each other for some time.
“*When the war in Bosnia started, then we, from desperation, from a terrible shock, people started coming, they run away, they were saving their children, I mean, this was terrible, then we...we met in groups, we the Bosnians, we from Sarajevo, we those, we these, and we did not like the Serbs very much, what was probably normal in that moment, but there were also people*

from Sarajevo, from mixed marriages, so we had to be careful about some things, because they were not guilty, they also run away. From a side, you get a totally different picture, regardless of whether you are desperate and that your mother, sister stayed there, and that your friends are killed, that is terrible...but you cannot hate this man, because he has Serbian name and last name, my best friend is that, it is totally irrelevant, I never knew in my life the difference between orthodox and catholic name, it did not matter, we called each other by nicknames and celebrated everything…Then the war in Bosnia started, yes, I can say then there were separations here. But listen, everyone was desperate in their own way…But later it all levelled up…Then that spirit of Yugoslavism started to slowly return, slowly, slowly, we became a little bit closer again, started socialising more, going to the same theatre Akzent, going on concerts…" (Aida).

Goran also mentioned that separations through the ethnic lines were present during the war, and that it took around 10 years for the situation to "cool down" and for people to start socialising again normally (but still, as he emphasises, not as before the war).
Mijić (2019) also writes that symbolic ethnic boundaries within the former Yugoslav community in Vienna were reconstructed and reinforced during the Yugoslav wars. During her field research, she also found that the separation took place until sometime after the war, and then, all at once, all of this vanished and the people continued to socialise (she mentions the year of 1998). She presents the example of her interlocutors; one of them saying that a (former) Yugoslav in Vienna decided not to pay attention to what was going on down there; and the other, a Bosniak woman (a 1992 refugee, who started a faculty in 1994), saying that there were plenty former Yugoslavs in that time here, sticking together, and that they have been a microcosmos of Yugoslavia even during the war.

Few people mentioned the importance of the media, such as Aida, Duče and Goran, who even said that the media made the biggest separation between the Yugoslav people. Mijić (2019) also mentioned that one of the findings of her research was that during the war people of different ethnicities in Vienna, even though far away from their homelands, were watching media from their own countries and getting different kinds of information. She gives an example from one of her interviews, where it was said that people with different ethnic belonging were working together in Vienna during the Yugoslav war, and while they worked during the day or socialised after work everything was all right. But the moment they went home, where everyone was watching the news from their own country, everything changed, because they "get sucked in all this hatred", and the broader conflicts of Serbs and Croats in Yugoslavia (Mijić, 2019, 12).

Now we come to the question - what is the situation in Vienna today, 30 years after the breakup of Yugoslavia? Goran says: "The situation today is much better than immediately after the war, after around 10 years it gradually became better, everything calmed down to a certain level, but still is not completely calm, and maybe never will be as it once was, since people are strongly connected to their motherlands". Still, Goran says that ethnicity is not important almost on any

level (everyone visit every “our” caffe/club/restaurant, and it is not important who is the owner (he mentioned the club “Cream” in Märzstraße as an example, as he worked there for years, where the owner was “Croat”, then “Serb”, then “Austrian”, then “Turk”, but the same people always came - all former Yugoslavs and Turks). People socialise with other former Yugoslav ethnicities, hire them, recommend them if needed, see them as the same social group, have friends and partners, marry each other. Also, when I commented that Croat and Bosniak women were sitting with me during the Serbian event, Srđan got confused (as Goran and the manager of San Manco cafe/club when I was commenting that the Serbian waitress works in a “Croatian” place), adding - “Of course, why not?” People see socialising and mixing the former Yugoslav ethnicities as a rather regular phenomenon. Almost no one of my interviews said that they have experienced any kind of nation-related conflict between the former Yugoslavs. (Duče did mention that, during the war, women of different former Yugoslav ethnicities could sometimes say something bad to each other in the parks, and Dušica spoke about the negative and nationalist comments that people leave below KOSMO online articles).

Many of the people I spoke with mentioned that the more educated people are, the ethnicity is less of an issue (Goran, Aida, Biljana, Dragomir, Duče). People have different opinions concerning nationalism within this community. Biljana says that it is not an issue, since everyone socialises with everyone, there are mixed relationships, and everyone goes into each other's cafes. Aida says that nationalistic or similar ideas could not be developed in Vienna, since all the people from former Yugoslavia had the same trouble - to put a bread on their table. People were preoccupied with finding a job, learning the language and managing themselves in the foreign county, and no one had time to think about nationalistic ideas. Duče mentioned something similar: “Later I realised that most of the people did not socialise, so they couldn't get in conflict, because there were no “kafanas” (taverns) where everybody would sit together…cafes were then separated, Croats had their own places, Serbs also, Bosnian also, but I went to all…People worked together, but everyone knew that they have to keep their job, so they did not dare…one would immediately get fired, and everybody needed a job”. Jana said that she never experienced any kind of nationalism or separation and that Vienan simply is not the fertile ground for that, and that even if some nationalist would come here, he would be changed.
On the other hand, Kopanja (2012) says that the division exists in the sense that there are cafés preferred by Serbs and others preferred by Croats, for example. Goran told me during the interview that there are some preferences in the sense that Croats like to go more to this place than the other, or Serbs, or Bosniaks, but it does not mean that the place is exclusive (as it can be seen with the example of San Marco cafe, which was announced to me as Croatian, but in practice turn out not to be). Duče also mentioned that people do get along, but he is under the impression that they also keep themselves separate by the ethnic lines, since the TV and media from motherlands still provoke the separation. All the people have been watching media from their countries, and this is, as he says, like “fighting against the witches that you cannot see” (Duče). Edo too told me in his interview that sometimes he has the impression that people keep

themself separated, but this impression comes from looking through the “business lenses”. For socialising it is a different story, people socialise without any difference, but when some kind of serious business cooperation is in question, it is not so much the Yugo community, but rather every community for itself (Edo says that his impression is that especially Croats keep themselves separated in business circles).

There is also a story of Dušica, who says that nationalism is present within this community, what she can see in her private life -“Many of my friends, as well as myself realised that in Vienna it is very important to say who you are - a Serb, a Croat or a Bosniak...Separation does exist, there is almost no mixing in partnership, people socialise, but when you are in a bigger group, you can always feel the distance between ethnicities" (Dušica), but also through her job (through public online comments and reaction of the readers below the KOSMO articles). She said: “Our people are arguing on national bases among each other in the comments or they direct comment to us that we spread nationalism according to their opinion...why do we write this, we spread hatred, we want people here to get in conflict...and we are just reporting regularly about the things happening that other media also write about, like Heute, for example”. Dragomir also mentioned this: “Our approach is like this - when we think that something is not ok, we criticise it by writing about it, since we think that if we write about it, we can raise awareness that this is not OK. But people do not want to confront themselves with certain topics and say - yes, this is really not ok, so we are then the anti-serbian, then anti-croatian, anti-bosniak sometimes...”

Some of my interlocutors think that these nationalistic ideas come mostly from very young people and teenagers (Goran, Dušica, Dragomir, Duče, informal conversations) who were born here and are “poisoned” by some older family members. Kopanja (2012) also mentioned that there are occasional fights along ethnic lines between younger people, writing that sometimes, the second generation clings onto nationalist ideas they do not fully understand. This can have as a result negative online comments related to some KOSMO articles (Dušica, Dragomir, online observation), but also some conflicts on Ottakringerstraße, especially when Serbia and Croatia are playing a football game (Goran, Biljana, Dušica, Jana, also mentioned by Mijić (2019)).

“*...People say that it is still a short period of time, maybe it needs to pass more time after the war, but still…And these are usually young people, who were not even born during the war, they are nationally poisoned”....On Ottakringerstraße, there can be chaotic, but this is the district where all of them live and for something like this to happen, this is just sad for me…Older people are more calm regarding these questions, at least they will not express it openly, they will not get into conflicts directly. But I consider them responsible for the behaviour of the younger people, because those young people, they had to hear that from someone…Nevertheless, their decision, even like this, is somehow more valid for me, since it is based on personal experience, then with the young people who act nationalistic just based on someone´s stories or something that is imaginary for them…”* (Dušica).

While researching the relations among the former Yugoslavs in Vienna, just as the researcher before me (Mijić, 2019)[43], I also found certain ambivalence within this community[44]. Dušica also mentioned, after the negative examples, the people who stayed pure Yugoslavs in their soul, even today, and that they have just a great sorrow because of all that happened, and then said: "*People stick together, but at the same time they do not, I am not sure how to explain it…*" (Dušica). Srđan says that this community looks nice on the outside, but when you look under the surface, the situation is different and that before the war it could be called Yugoslavhood ("Jugoslovenstvo"), but now there are just some remains, traces left. Even though people from former Yugoslavia do not have conflicts in Vienna (especially older ones that grew up in Yugoslavia), for him, the strong ambivalence is noticeable. From one side there is a positive mainstream, such as openness and human contacts, and on the other there is pretending and even hypocrisy. Srđan calls this a "cheap Yugosphere" and says that it is even better to separate than to pretend that we are the same. "*There is also a Serbian community, as a Bosniak and a Croatian community, they do not mix much, they live next to each other, and socialise, but the stories from motherlands affect diaspora as well. Even though contact between people exists, this Yugosphere is not real, it exists, rudimentary, as a soap bubble... that will perish eventually, I am afraid…* (Srđan).

Duče also mentioned that he is under the impression that these three communities (Bosnians, Serbs, Croats) exist separately and that they do not mix much, and this is why there are no conflicts. But then, he also says, in his interview, that "we" are all basically Yugoslavs and that we have been all getting along. Edo told me, during the informal conversations, that there is a great community of "our" people and that people stick together, while in the interview he told me that communities are mostly separated (later he explained that he meant separated in business, not in everyday life). Goran also said that people socialise without any differences, but that still some separation exists, since people are sensitive to what comes from motherlands.

Opposite to that, Dragomir thinks that when people in Vienna hear about what is happening in motherlands, how people get in conflicts and politics separates them, there is even a stronger motivation for them to stick together here in Vienna. Jana has a strong impression that, as much as someone tries to keep people separated, it just cannot be done, because simply this town is not a right place for nationalistic happenings. "I sincerely think that it is like that, there should be some separation that has to be maintained officially, but on the terrain, no one really sticks to this or practises it, because really Vienna is not a fertile ground for that. I think that even when the hardest nationalist comes to Vienna and realises that he sits with everyone, the Serbs, Croats, Bosnian, here this does not work. When you do something like this in Croatia, the whole system supports it, and here the system is not like that"- she said.

I would also like to point out that all the people I talked to either in the interviews or informally, have close friends of all former Yugoslav ethnicities, and almost all of them mentioned they have been in the relationship with a different ethnicity from former Yugoslavia, some of them even

[43] Since Miji ć´s paper had the same research group and she conducted her field research recently (2019), while presenting my own findings, I will be referring to her findings as well, drawing a parallel, but also discussing the differences in findings

[44] As Palmberger (2016) also did in Bosnia

during the war in the 1990s, while some of them adding that this cannot even be considered as an intercultural relationship/marriage since they actually come from the “same culture” - (former) Yugoslav.
Mijić (2019) writes that even though former Yugoslavs of different ethnicities “socialise with each other, there seem to be clear boundaries regarding the intimacy of the relationships” (Mijić, 2019, 11). She writes that their narratives, where ethnicity is not important, are different then the practises, where her interviewees are, as she says, typically married to, or are in a relationship with the members of the same ethnic background. She even claims that interethnic marriages between Bosniaks, Serbs and Croats seem to be non-existent. I would say that this is a very daring claim. It can be said that there are different levels of “ethnic importance” among former Yugoslavs. For example it is not a matter of significance on the levels of socialising, making friends, hiring someone, helping someone or similar, but it becomes more important with regard to romantic relationships and really important with regard to marriage. People I spoke with, who mentioned something similar, said that they would maybe be afraid some differences might appear later in marriage, mostly related to raising children (and let's not forget, the ethnic boundaries between these three ethnicities correspond with religious boundaries). Still, one cannot exclusively claim that there are no mixed marriages within the community. One of my interlocutors is in a mixed marriage (two different former Yugoslav ethnicities), I know personally some people who are in mixed marriages and the people I talked to told me that there are a lot of mixed marriages. Mijić (2019) gives the example of a Bosniak woman that she interviewed, who explained that having a partner with the same ethnic background and the same experiences makes everything so much easier, since she does not have to discuss her values and explain her perspective. Some of my interlocutors mentioned something similar, but for all “our” people, not just their ethnicity. For example, Biljana, a Serb, who said something very similar for a Croat, emphasising the growing up in the same country (Yugoslavia) and then living abroad for some time (shared experience in both senses), also underlined that she has more in common with a Croat who has been living in Vienna for a long time than with a Serb who lives in Serbia.
Finally, I would like to mention one anegdote from the life of one interviewee, an example where a Serbian girl had a Croatian boyfriend (both living in Vienna), who once, during their date, played a Croatian nationalistic song. She did not know what to think, especially because she was informed that his parents are not fond of Serbs. She ended the relationship after a while as she couldn't always wonder whether this was going to be a problem. Eventually, a few years later, he married a Serbian girl. The very presumption that there is going to be a national/ethnic problem seems to have made the problem after all.

The issue of relations among the different former Yugoslav ethnicities in Vienna is a complex one, and as we can see, there are different opinions and experiences. People mostly expressed that they all lived as the same, Yugoslavs, and during the war, some said that it did not influence the people in Vienna, while the other said that I did, and that former Yugoslavs were separated through ethnic lines for a while. Some say that they still are, while the majority says that it is not

the case. Some see nationalism among "our" people, some absolutely don´t. Ethnicity matters differently on different levels, starting with not being important at all for helping someone, socialising and friendships to being very important with regard to being married to someone. Mijić (2019) had similar research findings regarding this multifaceted community - we both found some ambivalence in people´s stories. This ambivalence is, as one of my interlocutors said, inexplicable - no one can explain how people, at the same time, stick together and do not, how ethnicity sometimes matters and sometimes it is irrelevant. This is why I argue that "our" people in Vienna are constantly shifting between not just two, but three social spaces - "Austrian/Viennese, their ethnicity/nationality and belonging to "our" people. The "host" home of Austria, and the city of Vienna, with all its specificities, have transformed people who once were Yugoslavs (or younger ones who were former Yugoslavs) into *naši* while, at the same time, the political separation of the former Yugoslav states (with all its tensions, conflicts and nationalistic propaganda) made them also "Serbs", "Croats" and "Bosnians"/"Bosniaks", at least to a certain extent. The "overall" identity of "our" people does not exclude for someone to also identify with their nationality/ethnicity, nor it "forbids" that this category can be important in certain situations, but it does give the opportunity for the people to avoid national/ethnic separation in their everyday life, and this is why they gladly accept it.

Organisations

Another puzzle/contradiction concerns the organisations related to former Yugoslavs in Vienna. While people socialise and stick together as one community of "our" people, the organisations are strictly separated. This caught my attention and I wanted to research this further. Were they all created after the 1990s, when Yugoslavia was breaking up and its former republics just started to establish? Fischer (2003) writes that after the 1990s the Yugoslav organisations in Vienna started declaring themselves Serbian, Croatian, etc., since then have been trying to nationalise "their" migrants. By Mijić (2019) no Yugoslavian association or cultural club survived the Yugoslavian disintegration (which agrees with the fact that none could be found online[45], and also some of my interlocutors mentioned that). Could this be a question of funding (if they are perhaps founded by motherlands)? Or this could indicate that there is a separation among "our" people in Vienna?

When I started searching for organisations online, it was the easiest to find a list of Serbian organisations (at the official website of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of

[45]There is one organization "Jedinstvo" (Unity) that dates from the time of Yugoslavia, but it is officially on the list of organisations of diaspora on the website of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Serbia. It is not clear at what point a Yugoslav organisation became a Serbian organisation.

Serbia[46], as on the official website of the Embassy of the Republic of Serbia in Austria[47]), than the list of Bosnian organisations (at the official website of Embassy of Bosnia and Herzegovina in Austria[48], as well as in the Addressbook of organisations and clubs in Bosnia and emigration ("A D R E S A R organizacija, udruženja i klubova u BiH iseljeništvu")[49], while I was not able to find the list of Croatian organisations anywhere (neither on the website of the Croatian Embassy of Austria, nor The Ministry of Foreign and European Affairs of the Republic of Croatia). While the list of Serbian organisations is easily accessible and long (25 organisations in Vienna), it is not updated, since the majority of organisations (18 of them) do not have any possibility for online observation, many of them do not have websites (or the web site are not functional, or the links that should lead to the organisation's website are actually linked to something else). The list of the Bosnian organisations (16 in total) is more updated (not only that all web sites function, but also, for example, the club "Jedinstvo" is on both lists, with having a functional website on the Bosnian list but not on Serbian).
After noticing how much effort each of the former Yugoslav states (concerning Serbia, Bosnia and Croatia) puts into building the image of its diaspora, I noticed how much the "national" is emphasised in their name. The name "Serbia/Serbian" is present in the names of 11 organisations from the Serbian list, and 3 from the Bosnian list; the word "Bosnia/Bosnian" is emphasised in 7 organisation from the Bosnian list, just one organisation on the Bosnian list has the word "Croatian" included, while the two Croatian organisation I have found online (via regular google search, not within any list), both have "Croatian" in their name. The term "Bosniak" is not used in any name. What is interesting is that there are 4 organisations that are present on both lists (Serbian and Bosnian, as "Prosvjeta" or "Jedinstvo"). This sets me back to the question that I raised in the theoretical part of the thesis - whose diaspora they belong to, then? Serbian or Bosnian? It is not clear even legally, and I can just imagine how interesting it would be to ask these people whose diaspora they belong to. If the diaspora would have an obligatory national character, the answer to this question would be easy. But apparently, the situation with the "national" in diaspora is not that simple.

Finally, I decided to observe 10 organisations online, with different target groups (all former Yugoslavs, just "Serbs", just "Croats", "Bosnians, etc.): KOSMO (magazine, related to all former Yugoslavs); Prosvjeta (found on the list of Serbian and Bosnian organisations); Jedinstvo (related to Yugoslavia, but also found on the list of Serbian and Bosnian organisations); Srpski centar (Serbian organisation); Srpski kulturni forum (Serbian organisation); Dijaspora TV (Serbian organisation); Mostovi (Bosnian organisation); Hrvatsko kulturno društvo Napredak (Croatian organisation, found on the list of Bosnian organisations); Hrvatski centar (Croatian organisation) and Hrvatski dom (Croatian organisation). I also have to mention Choir 29. November, for which

[46] http://www.mfa.gov.rs/sr/index.php/konzularni-poslovi/dijaspora/klubovi-iz-dijaspore/101-dijaspora-klubovi/10658-austrija-dis?lang=lat
[47] http://www.vienna.mfa.gov.rs/lat/dijasporatext.php?subaction=showfull&id=1348056781&ucat=127&template=MeniENG&
[48] www.bh-botschaft.at/Diaspora
[49] http://www.mhrr.gov.ba/iseljenistvo/Publikacije/Adresar%20organizacija%20dijaspore6.pdf, published in Sarajevo, September 2013, publisher: Ministarstvo za ljudska prava i izbjeglice BiH

during my theoretical research, after reading about it in one Serbian newspaper article, I found the Facebook page of the Choir. This was all almost at the end of my research, unfortunately, so I did not observe any of their events, but I contacted one of the leaders via Facebook and we did an interview. The Choir 29. November (This date was the official state day of the SFRJ) was an informal group, and subsequently registered as an organisation.
Here I will briefly discuss the most interesting and important findings (while more information about the organisation related to former Yugoslavs in Vienna, including the whole list of them, can be found in Appendix).

Magazine *KOSMO* was created in 2008, with the idea of being the media for "our" people (all people from former Yugoslav republics, or related with them) so the important topics from Austria, such as politics, could be available to "our" people in "our" language. The aim of the magazine has been to connect these two "cultures" - former Yugoslav and Austrian, to duly inform "our" people and help them integrate better. Printing issues were until recently always in "our" language, as they also call it (a mixed language, but not in a sense of official BKS, but if the journalist comes from Bosnia, he or she will actually write in Bosnian, from Serbia - in Serbian, from Croatia - in Croatian). Financing is exclusively through selling advertisements. KOSMO being the only media organisation for all former Yugoslavs in Vienna could represent the social space of "our" people in a certain way. They are also emphasising the word "our" community/language and they use "the mixed language", their team is mixed (all former Yugoslav nationalities), they write about all former Yugoslavs. They chose their own topics, since they are not financially dependent on some specific donors. However, they still encounter "nationalism" through the online comments of their readers. Seems like the situation is ambivalent, as everywhere in this Viennese "Yugosphere".

Prosvjeta (its Austrian branch) was established in 2011, with the aim of promoting Serbian culture (beyond the most famous national costumes, folklore dance and food, as Srđan emphasises) and preserving the Serbian language. Its funding comes mostly from private donations, something from Serbian Orthodox Church in Vienna, partially through project financing from motherlands (Serbia and Republic of Srpska). Almost no funding comes from the local governments, since, as Srđan says, they are not interested in the promotion of something that is Serbian, and not BKS, as mentioned above. In this case it is not just that funding does not influence the programs, but it seems that programs are actually created and maintained despite the lack of funds. Prosvjeta really intends to promote the culture of one former Yugoslav ethnicity - Serbian. On the other hand, Prosvjeta's programs are open for everyone (as the president told me, and I have seen while visiting one of theirs events), regardless of the ethnicity/nationality, and the organisation itself is also ready for cooperation with anyone (for example they cooperate with a Croatian organisation in Vienna). Ambivalence again.

Jedinstvo was established in 1970 - it is the oldest "our" club in Vienna which helped the workers who came here in 1960s and 1970s in the process of preserving and nurturing tradition

and culture. This organisation seems to be significant and interesting for further research, since it acts even from the time of Yugoslavia, but unfortunately, I could not get in contact with any of their representatives. There is nothing related to the breakup of the country on the website (nothing between 1990 and 2000), and today it is on two lists of organisations - Serbian and Bosnian (also two motherlands, as in the case of Prosvjeta). They write about Serbian folklore, in their news on the web site one can read about humanitarian aid for "Serbia and Srpska", and that "members or activists of Jedinstvo have helped the citizens of Serbia, whenever there was a need for it." One must wonder at what moment and how did a "Yugoslav club" become a "Serbian" organisation? Did this happen during this process of an attempt of newly formed (former Yu) states to "nationalise" their migrants, to become "new motherlands" for people who once were Yugoslav diaspora? Probably. But, they also write "our" citizens in Austria, on their website. Jedinstvo may be the example of how this road from Yu to "our" people looked like - first, in the time of Yugoslavia they were a Yugoslav club, then, with political separation of the motherlands, they became "Serbian", but also stayed *naši.*

Srpski centar (Serbian Centre), was established in 1995 (thus right after the Yugoslav war, and interestingly, *Hrvatski centar* - Croatian centre was founded in 1994), with support of the Embassy of the Republic of that time Yugoslavia (the federation of Serbia and Montenegro). The aim of the organisation is the promotion of Serbian cultural creation that comes from mother states (again, two mother states) and from Austria. They have been organising "The Serbian ball" since 1998, but interesting posts could be observed on their Facebook page, like when they were calling people to donate for help for the people of Croatia, affected by the earthquake (where we can see the solidarity between "our" people, regardless of the ethnicity/nationality); or when they congratulated everyone that celebrates Christmas by the Gregorian calendar, or Bajram. The most interesting post is from 29 November 2020, which was the official day of the republic of Yugoslavia, and it is just a photo of the hands holding together, without any text, that clearly points out to the connectedness of the former Yugoslavs. But they also have a post with photos about the Serbian refugees who had to leave Croatia, during the war. What I consider the most interesting, is the fact that they have opened the library even during the Covid19 pandemic. Following the other organisation - Croatian Home on Facebook I saw that its team was also preparing to open a library at the time. To me it seems like it was the race - who will open the library first - Serbian or Croatian organisation.

Srpski kulturni forum (Serbian culture forum) - was founded in 2006 with the aim of preserving, developing and promoting the culture and art and Serbian national identity. Even though they emphasise that they are promoting "Serbian national identity", it is also written on their website that their aim is to cooperate with similar institutions from Austria or the motherland (just one this time), and they also write they are open for everyone who "carries in them the spirit of the Balkans". Also they often criticise nationalism harshly in their Facebook posts.

Dijaspora TV - an association for intercultural communication and integration in the form of a communication platform, created in 2013. In their description on the web site they use neutral words such as: intercultural, diversity, immigrants, lands of their origin, "our" people and similar, but news are almost always related to Serbia and citizens of Serbian origin, so the impression can be made that diaspora here means just Serbian diaspora, what is again interesting, since it leads to conclusion that this term can also be "stretchable" and that sometimes it can represent just one nation's (Sebian, in this case) diaspora and sometimes "the Yugoslav" diaspora. There is an interesting description in the section "about us" on the Facebook page: "themes and cultural events of the diaspora of people from former Yugoslav republics, the biggest migrant society in Austria". Even though their main topics are related to the Serbs, in the description they are presenting themselves as former Yugoslavs, maybe so they could seem more numerous, because then we are "the biggest migrant society in Austria", as they said. And when one googles them and they appear in German language it says "Dijaspora.tv - Das bekannteste Medium der Balkan - Diaspora (the most famous media of the Balkans). AS KOSMO uses the BKS community as the name for "our" people in German language, the Diajspora.tv uses the term - Balkan community.

Hrvatski dom (Croatian home) was established just recently, in September 2020. It can be read on their website and Facebook page that they have directed the initiative towards all relevant institutions in Austria for recognising Croatian language as a separate language from BKS in Austria (same as Prosvjeta with Serbian language). On their page everything is clearly "Croatian" (workshops of Croatian language and culture or humanitarian aid for the people affected by the earthquakes in Croatia, Catholic church masses, etc.) like opening of the Croatian library (mostly at the end of 2020 and the beginning of the 2021, at the same time when Serbian centre opened a library, as previously mentioned).

The Choir 29. November was established in 2009. Jana says that it all started as an artistic action, since they actually wanted to celebrate 40 years anniversary of the establishment of the Yugoslav club "Mladi radnik" (Young worker), since they wanted to point to this Yugoslav heritage that has been lost after the war (since all these Yugoslav workers' clubs became national, as we also saw the case was with Jedinstvo). Later the Choir was officially registered as an organisation, financed through projects, usually by the City of Vienna. Everyone can join the Choir, regardless of the musical talent, or ethnicity (people do not even have to be former Yugoslav), as long as this person relates with its political values, such as antifascism, multinational identity, workers, women and minorities rights and similar ones, that were found in Yugoslavian heritage, but are still actual worldwide. They also do spontaneous public performances, when they go to the train stations where migrants usually come, like Erdberg and Pretarestern, or sing in demonstrations. These are clearly organisations for all "our" people, all former Yugoslavs and all people who recognise these values as important and turn them into activism.

When we look at the lists of organisations related to former Yugoslavs in Vienna, the first impression is that they are very numerous, but apparently just "on paper". Many of them seem not to be active, and even the ones that allegedly should be are inaccessible for research. The second impression is that "new motherlands" really "did their job well" and have nationalised "their" (former Yugoslav) migrants in Vienna successfully. Except the Club Jedinstvo (that is inaccessible for research and now is "Serbian"), none of the Yugoslav organisations really survived the breakup of Yugoslavia and the organisations are, nominally, strictly separated as Serbian, Bosnian, Croatian. But again, the first impression may be deceptive, since no such separation can be found in practice. Programs of every organisation are open for everyone, thus if we have something called the "Croatian ball" or "Serbian New Year's Eve", that actually does not imply that these events would be organised just for one ethnicity/nationality, but that probably all "our" people would be there.

These organisations should represent the institutionalised part of their motherlands, one of the diaspora´s formal bonds with their land of origin, the way how the states "spill over their borders" and reach people on the move with their politics and separations, and influence their lives and behaviours. But do they? One must rethink how much importance and influence these organisations really have on the everyday life of "our" people in Vienna. With a few exceptions, to me (as someone who worked for years in a very active NGO which has daily programs and some even during the weekends), they do not seem as very active in their engagement. It is possible that I made the wrong impression due to the COVID 19 pandemic, since many activities had to be cancelled. But still, I would dare to argue that this separation by means of ethnic/national lines which present on the list of organisations actually does not reflect the situation in practice. Firstly, this may be due to the official separation "in the name" (since all their events and programs are not meant just for one ethnicity/nationality, but for all "our" people or even wider target groups), and secondly, because most of the organisation do not seem to really have an impact on the former Yugoslavs in Vienna - they (usually) do not organise people in some particular way and they are not significantly present in their everyday life. As far as I'm concerned, most of them look like a "charade" of the Ministries of the Foreign Affairs of the motherlands - Serbia, Bosnia and Croatia (especially Serbia, with its longest, but totally un-updated list).[50] This "at first sight" discrepancy between how organisations are officially divided and how people socialise did not turn out to be such a huge puzzle, as it seemed in the beginning, but still, some important findings came out from this research. First, we saw that separation presented through the list of organisations does not reflect the actual state between "our" people, which actually takes us away from concluding that former Yugoslavs in Vienna were successfully nationalised by their new motherlands and leads us into direction that this is one different diaspora. This diaspora is not "answering" to the call of its separate motherlands through institutions and organisations, or even politically separated languages, but overcomes its

[50] However, it has to be taken into consideration that my impression may be wrong, and that the findings of the research would be different in some other time period (not during COVID 19 crisis). This topic, of course, requires more thorough research.

national component by organising itself not as Serbs, Croats or Bosnians, but as "our" people. Additionally, by observing organisations, even just online, I could also see some traits of this community that corresponded to one that I found by observing and participating in the everyday lives of these people, as ambivalence, switching between different identities (ethnic/national and "our" people), but also solidarity and connectedness between different former Yugoslav ethnicities in Vienna.
Needless to say, the Choir 29. November (about which I will talk more in the next subchapter) is not on any list, and how could it be? It does not "belong" to one state, as after all, neither do "our" people in Vienna.

Yugonostalgia in Vienna

When I started planning both my theoretical and field research I did not intend to work with the concept of Yugonostalgia to such an extent, but the field led me towards it, since it turned out to be much more present than I thought. Yugonostalgia in Vienna appears through three forms: Yugonostalgia as remembering the "good times" (mostly in narratives), "Yugonostalgia as business" (mostly in a material form) and "Yugonostalgia as an actuality" ("set of values, statements and actions through which people still "live as if they were in Yugoslavia").

Some of my interlocutors did say that Yugonostalgia is present (Aida, Duče, informal conversations), but nobody emphasised this to be a primary reason why people socialise and make and maintain different connections. Duče said that there are a lot of Yugonostalgists in Vienna, while Aida said: "All of us are Yugonostalgists. We all miss those times, our home, that we left, that we had to leave". Some people mentioned that in most cases Bosnians are the strongest Yugonostalgists, since they always were and still are, "the biggest Yugoslavs" (Goran, Dragomir, Aida), but this does not mean that Yugonostalgia is absent from the Serbs or Croats (informal conversations, interview with Aida, Goran), or Macedonians (participant observation, informal conversation)[51].

Often in the field, Yugonostalgia appeared in the narratives of the people I met. A colleague from Sofra once told me: "Then (in the time of Yugoslavia), God was walking on the Earth ("tada i Bog šetaše po zemlja"). This is the Macedonain saying meaning that the welfare and prosperity were unbelievable. When I asked him if that was really possible, he answered: "Oooo, everything that you have heard - is not enough to depict how wonderful it was…". While we were talking, the woman who always brings us bread came and he asked her immediately: "Did you cry when Tito died?" And then, she immediately started to talk about the topic. She was usually in a great hurry, but now she was standing with us, and told us: "Of course I did, we were children, all lined up, we all cried…For days our black and white TV showed just Tito's funeral,

[51] For example, as I have heard (unfortunately, I did not have the chance to speak with any of them) "SFRJ" cafe concept is designed by Serbian owners and the manager (for sure, that does not have to imply they are indeed Yugonostalgists).

for days everyone in our house cried, young and old, everyone"... Then he asks her: "Do you still remember Tito´s pioneer pledge? " - and she says yes. They continued to talk about how they could never forget it, and then they both could say it in the middle of the night[52]. Many people told me about the time of Yugoslavia, how they went to school there, or about their youth, and I wrote down once how it is amazing how easy they start talking about this, and how their eyes are just sparkling when they start to talk about Yugoslavia[53].

Dragomir mentioned in his interview that these positive memories are told by parents to their children. "*These young people, they do not have a bond with Yugoslavia, and usually do not have the clue, someone who was born in the 1990s now has 20, 30 years, and they do not know what Yugoslavia was, but their parents, or at least a great part of them, speak positively about it - we could sleep in the car, with the unlock doors, we sticked together, and then the parents are transferring that nice image of Yugoslavia.*" I also observed several times as people of older age point to some of the photos and explain something from the Yugonostalgic Sofra wall, the situations that could have been that parents talk to their children, or someone older to someone younger, what Yugoslavia was and how was to live then and there.

The opening of the place called SFRJ, that works very successfully (with not just a name, but the whole ambient inside, related to Yugoslavia), the Yugonostalgic photos on the Sofra wall, or the bakery called "Vučko 84" (the mascot of the Sarajevo 1984 Olympics) clearly indicate the presence of the materialised Yugosnostalgia at Märzstraße. I am aware that in this way Yugonostalgia does not have to represent more than a good profit-making product, but the whole process would not be so successful if it did not have a foundation in real need. This could be telling us that there is a Yugonostalgia, at least in one part of this community. Duče says for himself that he is a Yugonostalgist, and also says that it makes sense that these places, like SFRJ or Sofra rose due to the fact there are a lot of Yugonostalgists in Vienna. Aida also mentioned something similar, even though at the time we did an interview she had not visited SFRJ cafe yet (but since we became friends on Facebook, I saw that a few months later she was there. She posted photos and commented with a heart emoticon, and said that she liked it (online observation)).

There are different reactions as well. Goran and Srđan mentioned there is no real Yugonostalgia there, that these are just profit-making taverns, while Jana had a stronger reaction. "*That SFRJ…the waitresses dressed as partisans, very young girls, probably not knowing anything about it…this is some kind of capitalisation of that feeling - Oh, it was beautiful when we were all together, and then, we all come and sit together - Bosnians, Serbs and Croats, and then this is the place where we can all be together, and this is great, but there is a profit, and that is a problem for me, someone is making money based on that feeling, and when that Yugonostalgia is used in the purposes of capitalism, then it is really problematic for me*", she said.

[52] Fieldnotes, 29.6.2021

[53] Fieldnotes, 23.9.2021.

Clearly, the Sofra wall is also Yugonostalgic, as well as SFRJ cafe/club. I spent 6 months looking at that Sofra wall, looking at the photos and wondering who designed the Wall, and how did they choose the photos, since the both founders are "too young for Yugoslavia" and on top of that, also grew up in Vienna. Did they ask their parents, did they assemble the group of older people and brainstorm the ideas, or is there some kind of marketing expert that can design the Yugonostalgic wall? In the end, I finally got the answer in an interview with Edo, the co-founder, who said that he did it all by himself, both the idea and the design. When I asked him how he chose the photos he replied that he googled them. He just googled "Retro photos, Ex Yugoslavia". And that was it. He said that it is just business, not something that is personally important to him. But it does not mean that it is not important to the people who come, quite the opposite. This is why the music also had to be "ex-Yu" rock/pop, and why we have products like Cockta (Yugoslavian copy of Coca-Cola), because the whole setting should provoke the certain feelings within the visitors, to produce the emotional reaction for former Yugoslavs who come and evoke some memories.

People who come are looking at the motifs from Yugoslavia framed on the Sofra wall (not all the people, but many of them), and they are glad, they smile… One man says to Edo and me - "This one is my favourite", I ask him which one, and he says: "Sarajevo 84", and then he remembers the Olympics, and how his father took him there, when he was little...then he continues to talk about that memory for some time...Edo sells emotion here, I do not know if he is aware of that, or maybe he is quite aware, and that was the goal…(Fieldnotes, 28.4.2021).

I witnessed this and similar reactions of people regarding the Sofra wall almost daily. Since I was not present at SFRJ cafe regularly, I cannot be fully certain, but I can presume the similarity. During an informal conversation I asked a woman if she was glad a place called SFRJ was opened, and she confirmed, she likes everything that reminds her of Yugoslavia, everything that connects "our" people. She likes the atmosphere, that there are different groups of people, and she likes that interior is arranged so that everything reminds of Yugoslavia, as she misses those times very much, when it wasn't important how one person was called or where they were from[54].

As it can be seen, there is also a commercialisation of Yugonostalgia, where this feeling is made into profit-making products. Edo openly says that this is pure business, and assumes, even though he cannot claim, that it is similar in SFRJ, Vučko 84, etc. This is Yugonostalgia without any meaning or identification, it is just "selling the idea, the feeling". But, still, many people react to this commercialisation as it doesn't matter, since it represents something else for them. Even though they are often aware that this is just some merchandise, what is important is the underlying meaning and what it provokes - a feeling, a memory, a safe place, a home.

Finally, there is a Yugonostalgia which is more than just remembering good times, or making profit, and that is Yugostalgia as an "actuality" ("set of values, statements and actions through which people still "live as if they would in Yugoslavia". I will present my standpoint with one

[54] Fieldnotes, 13.1.2020

part of Balunović´s article, where she quotes Jana, one of the leaders of the Choir 29. November (that I also interviewed): "Established in 2010…the Choir through its songs and performances "lives Yugoslavia,"... "They started to give life to that heritage, which gave them a political identity or substance that had been missing for them until that point…They realised that this heritage can, even today, become an active element. The choir's participants – replete with the red star of Yugoslavia on their shirts – share the values of anti-fascism, solidarity and internationalism that were central to socialist Yugoslavia…The members are playing Partisan-inspired movies, attend conferences and discuss how to continue "living" the Yugoslav heritage, through song and activism, they are 'living' their ideal manifestation of Yugoslavia." (Balunović, 2020). During the interview, Jana also talked about this.

"*For me, Yugonostalgia is some kind of retroactive point of view on that, and what we want is that some ideas of Yugoslav supranational project live even today, or that there is a plan for the future, simply we are not oriented towards this - oh, how good it was, first because many people are not from Yugoslavia, or are, but they do not identify with that, or they are born here, or they were kids when they came, or whatever, they cannot be Yugonostalgists in that sense - how before it was better, so we are really careful not to fall into this trap…we try to find the current in that heritage…it is very important that we separate this - that is some part of the past and now put it in the box and that was Yugoslavia, no, Yugoslavia was so much more, and still can be much more, active process, that can encourage new fights, new reflections, that is how we look on it…and I am not sure about the audience, maybe they are just Yugonostalgists… We are the group where everyone is welcome, regardless of musical talent or language knowledge, it is only important that someone recognise him/herself there politically, since it is one antifascist project that gathers all the fights, not just from Yugoslavia, but all the similar fights in the world…we promote the idea of Yugoslavia as an emancipatory project…we are not Yugonostalgists in that way…we are very critical…we do not have songs about Tito, we do not have that idea that the system was perfect then, and that Tito, as a represent was without a mistake…but the idea of Yugoslavia as a multinational identity, where the workers, women and minorities were emancipated and there were some high achievements that are very important and for which we should still fight. This is the idea on which the Choir is based" …."We want some ideas of Yugoslav national project to live on even today, or that it will become the plan for the future… We try to find the actuality in that heritage…we are connecting it with what is happening today, with refugees, with Kurdish fight for freedom, and similar…Yugoslavia is not just remembering, it is much more and can be much more, it is an active process that can enforce new fights"* (Jana).

Boym (2001) writes about the two aspects of nostalgia: *restorative*, that puts emphasis on rebuilding the lost home and fill in the memory gaps, manifested often in reconstruction of monuments and other artefacts of the past or reinstituting tradition and *reflective* that is a deep mourning for the past that actually points us to the future. Without the intention of restoring the original, reflective nostalgia calls for freedom and creativity, exploration of various planes of

consciousness. The members of the Choir 29. November are not longing for an idealised past, but, while being critical to some aspects of it, they recognise the other values of one´s Yugoslavia (like antifascism, workers' rights, living together) and incorporate them into their today´s activism. Petrović (2016) writes about seeing Yugonostalgia as a negative phenomenon when it just "revitalises only those aspects of Yugoslav culture that were the most accessible, visible, banal and kitschy. In opposition, there is a longing for Yugoslavia and its real, productive and still important achievements, some of which are directly inscribed in the present world crisis, such as equality, right to work, health insurance or gender equality" Petrović (2016, 510). This is exactly the kind of Yugonostalgia that is present (or better to say practised) among the members of the Choir 29. November - returning to the Yugoslav past not to try to restore it, but to find something new there, something that could be "used" for both the present and the future. For activists in the Choir 29. November Yugonostalgia goes beyond just remembering good times. It represents living the Yugoslav values, transferring memories and feelings in an active process that can give a life to Yugoslav heritage, and can even inspire further activism. Here Yugonostalgia is clearly not just past related, but also present and future oriented. But what does Yugonostalgia mean to ordinary former Yugoslavs in Vienna? Is it a dear memory, or a "safe" space where people stayed to get away from the chaos in which they found themselves after losing the Yugoslav identity? For some it is even a good way to make profit. What does it mean for us, "younger" ones, students, people who did not "feel" Yugoslavia, as the people who lived there and then? Is it a pleasant social space in a foreign land where we feel at least partly at "home"? Or is it more?

As seen in the theoretical chapter, many authors that deal with this topic never considered Yugonostalgia as just memories and longing for the past, but positioning one person towards present and usually it means criticism of the present (Palmberger, 2016); (Spasić, 2012); (Pita, 2020); (Balunović, 2020); Jansen (2005). Whether or not one is aware that he or she gives a statement, or wishes to make one. Is it possible that Yugonostalgia among "our" people in Vienna also represents a statement, and if yes, what kind? Yugonostalgia in former Yugoslav republics is often considered to be a critique regarding the present nationalism and economic uncertainty. But if we presume that in Vienna people are usually economically ensured, that leaves the critique of nationalism. Jansen (2005) also mentioned that sometimes Yugonostalgia can represent an antionationalistic tendency. Does it mean that "our" people who feel and express Yugonostalgia actually say, again, that they do not want to be separated by ethnic lines?

Various former Yugoslavs find different values in Yugonostalgia; while some recognise the opportunity to make profit, other treasure good memories of the past, some are hiding in that comfortable position, others are just overwhelmed by it and wonder what it represents, some find the current values in it, others are turning it into a proactive force. But probably for all of us, in a way, it is a vision for a better future, and it certainly contributed to the process of maintaining, or maybe even creating some kind of a common identity between former Yugoslavs in Vienna.

Discussion - All roads lead to “our” people

Community has been defined as a type of relationship or as a sense of identity, based on a feeling of commonality, regarding for example, the shared language or the migration experience. What people of one community have in common distinguishes them in a significant way from other groups or categories (Povrzanović Frykman, 2004). Former Yugoslavs in Vienna can be seen as one community, a community of “our” people. If we dare to presume that belonging to this community is expressed by calling all former Yugoslavs “our” people, then I have never met any former Yugoslav in Vienna who does not.

Within this multifaceted community **various kinds of connections** are maintained. People help each other, socialise, they are in neighbourly, professional and romantic relations. Some people mention that separation through ethnic lines exists within the community of former Yugoslavs in Vienna, but during my field research this separation could not be found in practice. Ethnicity among “our” people becomes more important with regard to relationships and especially marriage. On other levels, it does not seem to have significance, in narratives or in people's everyday life.

There are **different dimensions that appear as a possible “bond”** for this community, as practical reasons (network of connections and contacts useful in various situations, as finding a job or an apartment, or staying in the community as it is an easier way to manage in the foreign land), dimension of similarity (similar mentality and/or shared experiences) and “otherness” towards the majority population in Austria, same language (“ease of communication and action”), a dimension that comes from the Austrian government - avoiding possible conflict between different former Yugoslav ethnicities through “Yugoslavhood-top-down” (the official discourse in Austria that recognises all former Yugoslavs as one group - BKS community with one language - BKS language) and at the end, the need to belong somewhere and/or feel more like at home and/or secure), together with good neighbourliness and “implied solidarity” between the community members.

With regard to the **modes of belonging**, former Yugoslavs in Vienna sometimes see themselves as Yugoslavs, Balkans, Serbs, Bosnians, Muslims, Bosniaks, Croats, Macedonians, but above all, as *naši* (“our” people), for which I would dare to argue that it represents the dominant belonging mode.

It can be said that the **belonging modes were deconstructed after the breakup of Yugoslavia, and then again reconstructed.** It seems, based on my research and personal experience, that people who once were living here as Yugoslavs, or did immediately transfer to “our” people (Yugoslavs became “our” people), or were separated through ethnic/national lines for some time, and then became “our” people (Yugoslavs became Serbs/Croats/Bosnians/Bosniaks, who all,

again, became “our” people after some time). As for us, students and other “younger” people who came to Vienna from former Yugoslavs Republics, we probably arrived as Croats/Bosnians/Bosniaks/Serbs, and became “our” people here (Croats/Bosnians/Bosniaks/ Serbs became “our” people). For Former Yugoslavs in Vienna, all roads lead to “our” people.

This, of course, does not mean that “our” people do not feel at all, or have never felt, in accordance with their ethnicity. Diaspora discourse merges both roots and routes to construct alternate public spheres, forms of community consciousness and solidarity that maintain identifications outside the national time space in order to live inside (Clifford, 1994), a new home, a third social sphere. Povrzanović Frykman (2004) proposes that diaspora members link their country of settlement and country of origin into a single social field, a third “world”, while Vertovec (2009, 63) writes that there is no radical divide or “clash of social worlds”, but more a fluid continuum. Diasporic groups are being shaped simultaneously by living in a host country and contact with the other social groups there. The very contact between experiences from Yugoslavia and/or former republics, together with specifics of living in a foreign country of Austria, or the city of Vienna, could have shaped the community of “our” people. Mijić (2019) also mentioned that former Yugoslavs live their lives, often simultaneously, in two, or more intersecting cultural spheres or in between those spheres, or in between the two social spaces - the country of origin and the host country (Glamotchak, 2013), but in this case, it seems to be yet another social space, and that is the community of “our” people. This is the specificity of the former Yugoslav diaspora in Vienna - its members live and shift between three social spheres, since the Yugoslavia is also involved, (or if not Yugoslavism per se, than the togetherness of former Yugoslavs). Former Yugoslavs in Vienna shift between being a Serb/Croat/Bosnian/Bosniak, being someone who lives in the country of Austria/the city of Vienna, and being a member of the community of “our” people. When you come from Serbia (where you, let's assume, feel like a “Serb”) to Vienna, a city with so many former Yugoslavs, somehow you are not a “Serb” so much anymore, and neither are you a Yugoslav. You are something else - naš (“ours”). When you are coming to Vienna as a former Yugoslav, regardless of your ethnicity/nationality, it is like you are entering the social space of “our” people, which represent a kind of supra (ethnic) identity, that unites all former Yugoslavs in Vienna, regardless where and when they came. Srebotnjak (2016) writes about the concept of dual consciousness during the time of Yugoslavia (where Yugoslav was either assumed to be an ethnic/national category by itself or acknowledged as a supranational category), that allowed for both - ethnic consciousness and a Yugoslav consciousness to simultaneously co-exist. Palmberger (2016) and Jasnsen (2005) mentioned something similar, explaining that the complexity of everyday identification is very difficult to be determined, especially if group identities are seen as situational and context-based. Palmberger (2016) gives an example of a “Herzegovinian woman with a Bosniak background from Yugoslavia”, who could emphasised different identity, depending on the surroundings; Muslim, Herzegovinian in Bosnia, Bosnian in different Yugoslav republics or Yugoslav - outside of Yugoslavia, because “these identities did not exclude one

another" (Palmberger, 2016, 65). I see the belonging modes within the former Yugoslav community in Vienna in a similar way, just in this case the ethnic belonging (Serb/Croat/Bosnian/Bosniak) coexist with belonging to "our" people, and are also situational and context-based. Former Yugoslavs in Vienna have been constantly switching between their ethnicity/nationality, between being a citizen of Vienna and between being *naš* ("ours").

The last research question - "does this community fit into the definition of diaspora?" seems to be the most complicated one. It certainly fits into "my" definition of diaspora (my seeing what it represents) - people who left (or whose ancestors once left) a place that they still feel connected to, even though they live elsewhere, and based on that connection they develop the feeling of a group identity and solidarity with others in similar situation/ position. But what about all the other authors?

Čuković (2013), was also wondering how Yugoslav diaspora in Detroit can be classified as a diaspora, not just because of the non-existing homeland of Yugoslavia and nation of Yugoslavs, but also because of the time passing component, since some authors emphasised that certain amount of time has to pass before it can be said that one community is a diaspora (Tölölyan, 2012); Cohen (2008). Since (former) Yugoslavs in Vienna started coming already in the 1960s, this community has existed for around 60 years now, meaning that there are already 3rd and maybe even 4th generation of Viennese with former Yugoslav origin, thus it can be said that the time trait of diaspora is met.

The community of "our" people has many other traits of diaspora, such as group consciousness, sense of belonging to a same group based on similarities and shared experiences, and (implied) solidarity between its members. However, it does not have the national based identity (since it is not related to just one nation and one state-motherland). What is also missing is the component of orientations towards homeland (since there are multiple homelands), and, as seen, the dominant theories claim an orientation towards the homeland to be an essential feature of diasporic identity. We cannot deny the diaspora connection with a "homeland" (or, as I would rather call it "place of home"), but I do not see any reason why homeland, or just home, would have to automatically mean nation-state, thus there is no way to attribute the diaspora an obligatory national based identity. If the definition of diaspora is so broad and dilatable (that at some moment it even stretches to the point of universality), then the compulsory connection with the national becomes overrun. What stops us then to go beyond national, and relate the concept of diaspora more with its other dimensions, such as solidarity, group membership, belonging, a feeling?

Safran (1991) writes that "the problem of diaspora/host country/homeland relationships, as the very definition of diaspora, goes beyond the purely ethnic/national, analysed on the examples of Devout Roman Catholics who live in largely Protestant countries, who may see themselves as living in a religious diaspora and look to Rome as their spiritual homeland, or German-speaking Swiss, who may locate the Germanic cultural centre somewhere in Germany, while for French Stalinists, the homeland could have been Moscow, and they may have seen themselves as living

in an ideological diaspora" (Safran, 1991, 94). If we can allow for diasporas to be religious, spiritual, ideological (all without the national component), why wouldn't we allow the Yugoslav diaspora in Vienna to be a diaspora? The diaspora that is not based on a national identity of one motherland, but overcomes all the nation identities of more motherlands in favour of feeling of connectedness and intimacy (even though with certain ambivalences and tensions), with the people with whom they now share the imagined (officially not existing any more) homeland. If we consider Yugoslavia as a possible imagined homeland for former Yugoslavs in Vienna, then it can be said that the people who migrated maintain social memory and myths of homeland, which brings this community closer to fitting into the "classical" definition of diaspora. Čuković (2013) gives us that kind of solution and at the end concludes that concerning the connections between the people, one can allude to the actual existence of Yugoslav Diaspora which comprises the nationalities of its previous republics, and yet established imagined community through Yugonostalgia. Mazzucchelli (2012) relates the "lost civilization syndrome[55]" to Yugoslavia, writing that the sudden and violent breakup of Yugoslavia led to the breakup of the "Yugoslav community" into other spaces. Mazzucchelli (2012) refers to Cohen's definition of diaspora which considers diasporas as all the communities that left their homeland, yet continued to recognise themselves as a common group, and he says that it is impossible to deny the existence of a community that continues to identify themselves with a no longer existing nation. This is one interesting solution, but somehow it does not fully convince me, and it even feels like we are trying to "squeeze" the community of "our" people into the "Yugoslav diaspora" (which simply refuses to cut the bonds with "old motherland" of Yugoslavia)just so it could fit into the "classical" definition of diaspora. Yes, it is certain that there are many former Yugoslavs in Vienna who do still think of Yugoslavia as their homeland, but it is also certain that it is not the case with all of them. Some of them recognise their "new" motherlands, but still belong to "our" people. Some are "too young" for Yugoslavia, they do not remember it, or they were not even born while it existed, but still, they are "our" people. Maybe to some of them the stories about "brotherhood and unity" were transferred from older generations, yet it is questionable to how many of them, and then again how many of them accepted the concept and in what way. We cannot simply attribute Yugoslavia as a "motherland" to all "our" people, especially to the youth, students, people in their 20s and even 30s, who nevertheless belong to the social space of "our" people in Vienna. The most we can do is to recognise that bond with Yugoslavia as an "old motherland" may be a possible ground, a starting point from which the further processes that shaped the today´s community of "our" people in Vienna once started. But as a snowball rolling down the snowy hill, this set of connections has undergone changes. It is not like the relations between people stayed exactly the same from the time of Yugoslavia until now (what would be expected if the former Yugoslavs simply stayed loyal to Yugoslavia as a motherland and to its values, as brotherhood and unity), on the contrary, they have been changing through time. They

[55] "In this community, a sort of an "extinct civilization syndrome" is present and kept together fundamentally by two "binding forces": the collective trauma of the war and a feeling of "collective nostalgia" for the past life in former Yugoslavia and their common cultural heritage strengthened in that period" (Mazzucchelli, 2012, 7).

changed after the breakup of the country, during the Yugoslav war and after, when people were more separated and then they changed again sometime around 2000s, when people merged again, now not as Yugoslavs, but as "our" people, with the addition of some kind of national identities that arose in the meantime and the other additions that this snowball picked up along its way through Austria and Vienna. "Our" people are not simply "Yugoslavs", they are something else now, somebody new. The creation and endurance of this community cannot be explained just with Yugoslav heritage, but rather with a complex mixture of factors where the state of Austria, the city of Vienna, or even newly formed states could have equally important roles, each in its own specific way. Finally, as we have seen, the former Yugoslav social space in Vienna does not always coincide with the one of "our" people. The community of "our" people in Vienna goes even beyond the "Yugoslav" diaspora.

If we do not necessarily put homeland into the motherland, a "place of home" into the country (nation-state), or nation into diaspora; if we go beyond the nation as a "natural" unit in analysis; if we realise that diaspora is just an attempt of the nation-states to spill over its borders (a try, not necessarily a success); if we escape the scale of national (and it is about time), we can call this group a diaspora. And if the former Yugoslav community in Vienna can be considered as a Yugoslav diaspora, "a diaspora beyond diaspora" (diaspora that extends beyond the borders of its most common determination), then this mean that I could challenge the usual definition of diaspora, in which diaspora is strongly connected with the motherland and has a national component. If diaspora is an "expansion of the policy of the native country" (Glamotchak, 2013) (and this is why state establishes relations with diasporas[56] through policies, voting, language, via establishment of Ministries of the Diaspora and Migrations, or investments into the Diaspora Associations), what is with "Yugoslav diaspora"? Since the breakup of Yugoslavia, within the community of former Yugoslavs in Vienna, the divide through ethnic/national lines has been organised by the states behind them (the motherlands of Serbia, Croatia and Bosnia). But what are people seeking in practice? Former Yugoslavs in Vienna are officially organised (on the level of institutions of the motherlands and diaspora organisations) as "Serbs", "Croats" and "Bosnians", but in practice they are "our" people. People seem to be ignoring this official divide, first on the level of their narratives (using the term "our" people for all former Yugoslavs and "our" language for all three politically separated languages in the motherlands) and then on the level of everyday life, in practice, in doing, in their actions. If "our" people, by calling themselves like that, are giving the statement that they do not want to divide, and then they also do not want to imply this separation in everyday life, then this separation remains at the very point of the attempt of the Yugoslav successor states to "nationalise" their migrants. These connections in narratives and practice goes against the separation of the motherlands.

[56] For example, Bernard (2018) writes how the issue of migration acquired new visibility in the Serbian institutional space with the creation of the Ministry of Diaspora in 2004, the institution that promoted various activities, strengthening cultural bonds with Serbian citizens living abroad, especially by addressing the second and third generations through offering various courses in Serbian as well as scholarships for study in Serbia. In 2014 this institution was incorporated into the Ministry for Foreign Affairs as a bureau for cooperation with the diaspora and Serbian citizens living in neighbouring countries, and efforts were made to promote the participation of Serbian nationals living abroad in the economic and political life of the country (Bernard, 2018).

Yugonostalgia is present within the community of “our” people in Vienna: on the level of being a commercialised product “for sale”; on the level of good memories of the past and on a level that is more connected with the present and the future, as living Yugoslav values and people's statement that they do not want to be separated. If we understand the former Yugoslavs calling themselves “ours” as an attitude that people do not want to be separated through ethnic lines, than we have a double statement - expression of the attitude of not wanted to be separated that is expressed through the name “ours” and through Yugonostalgia (However, it has to be mentioned that Yugonostalgia is not present within the whole community, and also it does not have a form of a statement for the people for which it represents “pure business”). But, on the other hand, everyone calls all former Yugoslavs “ours”/”our” people. I would never say that I am “ours” in Serbia, that would not have any meaning, but in Vienna, I would always say it, since here it means a lot - it expresses an attitude that “all former Yugoslavs are the same community, regardless of what happened in the past - here we are all the same, we are all “ours”. The narratives correspond to what is happening in social practice - the separation in everyday life could not be seen during the research. These people act as they speak. “Our” people in Vienna simply do not want to be separated through ethnic lines.

Jansen (2005) writes that the main goal of the nationalistic discourses in the newly formed states after the breakup of Yugoslavia was to abolish every indeterminacy or ambiguity in the sense of belonging, so the antinationalists (in former Yugoslav republics) put a lot of energy into saving that indeterminacy, by claming that they are Yugoslavs. I believe that something similar happened with former Yugoslavs in Vienna - by staying or becoming “our” people they managed to save that indeterminacy, even though their newly formed “motherlands” tried to nationalise them. Jansen says that people in former Yugoslav republics remember that comfort within the common cultural space of once Yugoslavia that in some cases could be opposed to national belonging, and sometimes did not exclude them. People remembered this Yugoslav cultural space as “home” where they felt free to choose their identity, or many of them. This heterogeneousness and hybridity is also something that Calic (2019) writes about in her book “A History of Yugoslavia”, saying that people were not faced with the decision of identifying, they could be a members of certain ethnicity, inhabitants of some of the republics, or Yugoslavs. She even says that federalism “institutionalised” multiple identities since every person was the citizen of a republic and at the same time a Yugoslav citizen. This legacy of hybridity could have found its way to Vienna, where the identities of former Yugoslavs are various, but coexist with one “more inclusive broader” identity of “our” people (as I also believe it possible that the heritage of “brotherhood and unity”, the highest patriotic values of Yugoslavia (Calic, 2019), in the sense of solidarity among different ethnicities, could also be found in today´s Vienna).
Jansen showed that even the 1990s people in former Yugoslav Republics underlined their Yugoslav identity as a way of belonging to a different imagined community in opposition to what was around them, an alternative “state-making” through nostalgia, what could also be possible in

the case of former Yugoslavs in Vienna, who can represent one different diaspora, a diaspora without a "classical" motherland, or maybe even, at least partly, with an imagined (or made via Yugonostalgia), homeland of what once was one country.

On the example of "our" people in Vienna we can see processes that participate in creating the community from above and from below. "Yugoslavhood" appears to be both top-down and "bottom-up"; on one hand, people connect on practical and sentimental reasons to one another; but Austrian state also tends to keep them together and continue treating them as one "nation" after the war (for various reasons). There could be a parallel between how Yugoslavism was promoted once by the state institutions in Yugoslavia and how the Austrian institutions are trying to make an integral Yugoslav diaspora. This does not mean, of course, that the togetherness of "our" people is only a result of these institutional effects, but it is certain that the Austrian state has a significant role in the process of creating and maintaining this community. Another important question is related to the position of the former Yugoslavs in Austrian society. Besides all other similarities that they share, it is possible that "our" people also see themselves as sharing the same structural position in systems such as education, housing and labour market, like they are being common in "class". This belonging mode could even be stronger than national and "cut" through ethnic differences, and could influence the togetherness of "our" people who share the same "destiny" in Austria (as some of my interlocutors mentioned). Srđan mentioned in his interview that the broader context for fulfilment of the children with (former) Yugoslav origin is "not so friendly", which results in them having difficulties to reach the social status that they otherwise could. In that way the whole setting in Austria is "making" a "class" of former Yugoslavs (and, in his opinion, many other foreigners).

Let me put it in short - Austria is one nice country, who has a relation towards foreigners, that is conditioned by its long history, and also by the fact that many Austrians are actually with foreign background, in 3rd and 4th generations, and then they have one, I will say it a little bit diplomatic, one conservative and pragmatic position towards it, it does not have to mean anything bad, but the consequences that I mentioned, make one, maybe not visible, but present, caste society, or class society, apparently that is ok, but in practice the caste of foreigners is not treated in the same way. I use two terms, for domestic I use "Eingeborene", native, and for the rest "Zugraste", that is a dialect form "Zugereiste", arrivers, the ones who came. Natives and Arrivers. I use these two terms intentionally, because they are the closest to that. (Srđan)

If ethnic/national identities are always relational, and we have to have a relation, the "other" for making one group identity, then it is clearer why this identity has been developing differently in Vienna after the break of Yugoslavia. While to people in former republics their neighbours from newly formed "ex Yu" states were presented as "other", in Vienna, the ones who always stayed "others" were "Austrians". This is why in Vienna "Croats" never became "others" to "Serbs", or "Bosniaks" to "Croats" and similar - because for all of them, the ones who always were "the Others" are actually Austrians (the ones that are not just "too different", but that also do not fully "accept them in their society").

At the end I would like to mention one more observation. Jansen (2005) reminds us that sometimes we even have to criticise practices that we are researching, and be aware of the less attractive features of our research groups, since in this way we are also showing them respect, and not just idealising them. Writing about "our" people in Vienna I did not want to "fall into a trap" of romanticising them or their relations. Here I would like to say that I was not "caught" in the pleasantness of being "among my own" in every moment, I also experienced some things that I didn´t like so much (which also reminded me what I did not like in Serbia), as occasional conservative mindsets, sometimes more rigid attitudes towards some social groups (like people of different sexual orientation, or refugees from West/Central Asia or Africa) than the ones that can usually be heard in Vienna out of this community, or this imaginarium where masculinity is connected with meat eating (since it happened from time to time that some of "our" men would be almost ashamed to order something vegetarian or vegan, what is very interesting, although totally different subject[57]). But I guess that the feelings of safety, belonging, acceptance and even self-worth that being the part of this community constantly provokes had eventually "swallowed" those less charming traits of "our" people. I also wrote about separations, conflicts, relations that have been changing through time, tensions during and immediately after the Yugoslav war, the ambivalence and how people "somehow stick together and do not, at the same time", and also how the practical reasons, as the relation of the Austrian state and its citizens towards this community plays an important role in this togetherness. However, the dominant impression that always stayed and rose above everything else was that former Yugoslavs in Vienna are "our" people, before everything else and that their togetherness is strong and real.

[57] Gender (and related topics, as for example here mentioned gender roles within the community of "our" people) as a belonging mode, is not a dimension that I approached in my analysis. Even though entangled in the "whole story", as other belonging modes that are not related with ethnicity, it would require a specially designed approach and findings that were not the focus of this thesis. Unfortunately, the limit on one's research and asked questions must be put at some point, and although I consider gender to be a very interesting and important topic, I think it requires fully different research of its own.

Conclusion

This master thesis focuses on the multifaceted nature of the connections between people of the former Yugoslavian community in Vienna. I aimed to answer the following research questions: What kind of connections are maintained between former Yugoslavs in Vienna? What holds these people together, even though their motherlands are different (now)? What are the belonging modes of former Yugoslavs in Vienna? Were the belonging modes deconstructed (and then again reconstructed), after the break up in Yugoslavia, and in what way? Furthermore, how does this community fit into the definition of diaspora?

In order to grasp this phenomenon I have been researching the former Yugoslav community in Vienna for two years, starting from December 2019 until December 2021. During my field research I tried to concentrate on Märzstraße, a street in 15th district that has been considered "a former Yugoslav street". My main research method was participant observation. Additionally to visiting former Yugoslav places, I have been working in one of the bakeries/restaurants on Märzstraße, for six months, in order to enjoy the method of participant observation in its full sense. For a half a year I was in contact with this community almost on a daily basis, and I (informally) talked with the owners, other workers, customers, neighbours, etc. With the aim to gain even a better insight, I also conducted 10 interviews with various former Yugoslavs, who are of different gender, age, time of migration (or been born in Vienna), ethnicity, professional/social/educational background, etc. Finally, in order to acquire the broader picture, I was using online anthropology, as an additional research tool, especially at the beginning of the research, and during the COVID 19 lockdowns in Vienna, when it was not possible to be physically present on the field sites, such as cafes or restaurants.

In the first chapter I tried to contextualise my research group, in the second chapter I gave a Theoretical background of my research, and in the Third chapter (Methodological story) I described the process of my research, my positionality and motivation, access and methods used. In the fourth chapter (Empirical story), I thoroughly presented and discussed the findings of my research, in relation to the theoretical concepts that I have presented in the second chapter.

Based on the research done for the purpose of this thesis it can be said that there is a community of formerly Yugoslavs in Vienna, a community called "our" people ("naši ljudi"), or just "ours" ("naši"). They also call the languague/s that they speak "our" language ("naš"). In practice, people socialise everywhere, at different events, caffes, restaurants, clubs, everywhere you can hear all three "languages"/dialects. Some sources say that division exists, but this does not mean that in places that are considered, for example, "Croatian", you will not find all people from former Yugoslavia. These people maintain various types of connections, from just helping a fellow "ours" ("implied solidarity" among "our" people), over socialising, being neighbours, co-workers, friends, to being in a romantic relationship.

There are different dimensions that appear as a possible “bond” of this community, as practical reasons (network of connections and contacts useful for various situations, as finding a job or apartment, or staying in the community as being an easier way to manage in the foreign land), dimension of similarity (as similar mentality and/or shared experiences) and “otherness” towards the majority population in Austria, same language (“ease of communication and action”), a dimension that comes above, from the Austrian government - avoiding possible conflict between different former Yugoslav ethnicities through “Yugoslavhood-top down” (the official discourse in Austria that recognises all former Yugoslavs as one group - BKS community with one language - BKS language) and at the end, the need to belong somewhere and/or feel more like at home and/or secure).

The question of relations among the different former Yugoslav ethnicities in Vienna is a complex one, and just like the researchers before me, I also found ambivalence. People who came to Vienna while Yugoslavia still existed say that the breakup of the country and the war has shaken this community and that around ten years it was relevant whether you were a Croat, Serb or Bosniak, while today again it is not so much (even though, as they say, it still is not as irrelevant as before the 1990s, when it really did not matter and they all were Yugoslavs). Some people think that there is nationalism present, while others do not see it. Related, some have an opinion that ethnicity matters and that separation exists, while others do not. Ethnicity matters differently on different levels, starting with not being important at all for socialising and friendships to being the most important with regard to being married to someone.

The contradiction concerns the organisations related to former Yugoslavs in Vienna that looked as a puzzle in the beginning, actually turned out not to be one. Organisations related to former Yugoslavs in Vienna are numerous, but apparently just “on paper”. Many of them seem not to be active, and even the ones that allegedly should be, are inaccessible for research. The organisations are, nominally, strictly separated as Serbian, Bosnian, Croatian and they should represent the institutionalised part of their motherlands, but it again seems that in practice this separation is not present. Programs of every organisation are open for everyone, and at the event of the Serbian organisation I have visited all former Yugoslav ethnicities were present. I would dare to argue that this separation through ethnic/national lines that is present on the list of organisations does not reflect the situation in practice, firstly because it is only the official separation “in name”, and secondly, because the organisation do not seem to have a great impact on the everyday life of former Yugoslav in Vienna, what contributes to the argument that this is one different diaspora, that is not organised by “classical principle” (where one state- motherland organise its migrants’ identity on national basis).

The connection with Yugoslavia (even as a homeland) can be recognised as the basis for the togetherness of “our” people in Vienna, but it certainly cannot be reduced to just that, since there

are also many other factors involved. Additionally to the specificities of living in the "host" country and the city of Vienna, there are also complex processes that participate in creating and maintaining this community; top-down, as the ones coming from the Austrian state (treating "our" people as one group, as BKS community and their languages as one language - BKS language, what is in contradiction to the top-down processes coming from the official states (motherlands), former Yugoslav republics, where the separation based on nationality is pushed through politically separated languages and organisations. The impulse from the Austrian state actually corresponds with how people act in their everyday practice - bottom-up they also see themselves as one community, just not BKS, but a community of "our" people (in opposition to what comes from their official motherlands).

Regarding belonging modes, Former Yugoslavs in Vienna sometimes see themselves as Yugoslavs, Balkans, Serbs, Bosnians, Muslims, Bosniaks, Croats, Macedonians, but above all, as "our" people, for which I would dare to argue that represents the dominant belonging mode of former Yugoslavs in Vienna. It can be said that the belonging modes were deconstructed after the breakup of Yugoslavia and then again reconstructed. After the breakup of Yugoslavia in the former republics the strong nationalistic discourse was developed, that prevented the feeling of closeness and similarity between different ethnicities and disabled the option of both belongings - being a Yugoslav and in the same time being a Serb, Croat or Bosnian/k (Srebotnjak, 2016). Even though this discourse was transnationally brought to Vienna and had shaken the former Yugoslav community, with some people being divided according to their ethnicities, I would still argue, based on observation through almost 6 years long personal experience and 2 years long research (theoretical, online, field research and interviews) that the process of identity reforming did not exclude the identification with the former Yugoslav group, even though it is not called like that anymore. People in Vienna did become Serbs, Croats or Bosnians, Bosniaks, but at the same time they also remained (or have become) "our" people. Today, 30 years after the breakup of Yugoslavia, they still are one community - they are not Yugoslavs anymore, but they are *naši*. These belonging modes within the former Yugoslav community in Vienna seem to function in a similar way as once hybrid identity in Yugoslavia, just in this case the ethnic belonging (Serb/ Croat/Bosnian/Bosniak) coexist with belonging to "our" people, and are also situational and context-based. Former Yugoslavs in Vienna have been constantly switching between their ethnicity/ nationality, between being a citizen of Vienna and between being *naš* ("ours").

If we go back to what is considered diaspora in this thesis, in its most flexible definition, where diaspora is a feeling that you are still somehow connected to place where you do not live anymore, and with others with whom you share the country of residence but also the "same destiny" (they also feel this connection with this "place of home"), feeling that you all are the same community and that you should help and support each other, that is a feeling that can be "caught" within the former Yugoslav community in Vienna. Also, the community of "our" people has many traits of diaspora given by other authors, such as group consciousness, sense of belonging to a same group based on similarities and shared experiences, and (implied) solidarity

between its members. However, it does not have the national based identity (since it is not related to just one nation and just one motherland), and also the component of orientations towards homeland is missing (since there are more homelands than one). If we consider Yugoslavia as a possible imagined homeland, then it can be said that the people who migrated maintain social memory and myths of homeland, which brings the community of “our” people in Vienna closer to fitting into the classic definition of diaspora. However, the trait of having a nationally based identity cannot be met in this case. I wrote a lot about leaving “the national” as a compulsory trait of the diaspora, and I stand by it. Jansen (2005) writes that we cannot simply assume that national identity is always and for everyone of equal importance, and even less we can presume that it is something that is fixed and unchangeable. The division of people according to national basis as completely separate groups (as “Croats" and “Serbs”, for example) was a very powerful tool in post-yugoslav nationalistic discourses, and if we want to resist the nationalism as a repressive discourse, we have to first show how meaningless its system of categorisation is, and how it ignores other criteria of distinction. He writes that post-yugoslav antinationalism (in the former Yugoslav republics) shows us that we have to overcome the idiom of national, so we could understand all the inexhaustible variety of human experience. I would also say that the example of the former Yugoslavs in Vienna can contribute to this process, since it shows us how “national” can be overcome in favour of togetherness of “our” people.
If the definition of diaspora is so broad, what stops us then to go beyond national and relate the concept of diaspora more with its other dimensions, such as solidarity, group membership, belonging, a feeling? Why wouldn't we allow the Yugoslav diaspora in Vienna to be a diaspora? The diaspora that is not based on a national identity of one motherland, but overcomes all the nation identities of more motherlands in favour of feeling of connectedness and intimacy with the people with whom they now possibly, at least partly, share the imagined homeland. And if the former Yugoslav community in Vienna can be considered a Yugoslav diaspora, “a diaspora beyond diaspora” (diaspora that extends beyond the borders of its most common determination), then this mean I could challenge the usual definition of diaspora, in which diaspora is strongly connected with the motherland and national component.

Former Yugoslavs in Vienna are officially organised (on the level of institutions of the motherlands and diaspora organisations) as Serbs, Croats and Bosnians, but in practice they are “our” people. People seem to be ignoring this official divide, first on the level of their narratives (using the term “our” people for all former Yugoslavs and “our” language for all three politically separated languages in the motherlands) and then on the level of everyday life, in their social practise. If “our” people, by calling themselves so, are giving the statement that they do not want to divide and then that they also do not want to imply this separation in everyday life, then this separation remains at the very point of the attempt of the Yugoslav successor states to “nationalise” their migrants. These connections in narratives and practice goes against the state separation. “Our” people are “invited” by their motherlands to be separated, but they do not respond, rather they respond to intimacy that they feel among each other. Srebotnjak (2016,

based on Barth, 1969) writes that “the constructed boundary of the group must be perpetually sustained”. But in Vienna it did not happen that way, since people stayed close and continued to stick together. By being “our” people, speaking “our” language, in narratives and in practice, former Yugoslavs in Vienna state that they do not want to stand by the divide that has been made in former Yugoslav Republics. By accepting the name “ours” instead of Serbian, Croatian and Bosnian they reject to support the separation by ethnic lines, by saying “we are all ours” they overcome the differences that were inflated during the war and the breakup of Yugoslavia. It is a statement, that they are still one group, one community, that there is a greater togetherness, based on many factors, but most of all, intimacy. Maybe they are not Yugoslavs any more, maybe the younger ones never were, but they are definitely “our” people. As Čuković (2013, 51) writes: “...regardless of their past or ethnicity – what was left, was the memory that once, they were all together in their Yugoslavia.”

In the end, I just want to look back once more on my positionality. When I started planning both my theoretical and field research I did not intend to work with the concept of Yugonostalgia to such an extent, but the field led me towards it, since it turned out to be much more present than I thought. Yugonostalgia among “our” people in Vienna can be seen as the statement that they do not want to be separated through ethnic lines. But, while thinking about the Yugonostalgia in Vienna many things crossed my mind. For some time I considered the possibility that Yugonostalgia is just a current trend that also came from the motherlands (since Yugonostalgia is a relatively recent phenomenon also in the former Yugoslav republics). Did this trend travel from the motherlands over the borders and came to Vienna just now? Can it be a coincidence that these Yugonostalgic places started rising now and not in the 1990s, for example? In the 90s the ethnically separated - Bosnian, Serbian and Croatian organisations were rising in Vienna, and now, around the 2020s, we have a wave of Yugonostalgia? Or maybe the time was needed for the right conditions to be made. Maybe Yugoslavs made a new home in Vienna through nostalgia, a new home where they have been feeling safe. There is no Yugoslavia anymore, there is no homeland where they can return, there is no home for them there anymore. They can travel to the place/s where Yugoslavia once was, but they cannot travel back to its time. They cannot go home so they create a new home for themselves in Vienna where the relations between people stayed practically the same. And what is with us, the “younger” ones, us who “cannot” be Yugonoslagic in that, “real” sense? Do we all who came to Vienna from the former Yugoslav republics have some hidden Yugonostalgia in us, which we are unaware of? Do we all long to experience a piece of this Yugoslavia that earlier generations have been talking about? Or do we, simply, like more the situation that we find here - the community of “our” people, the togetherness of former Yugoslavs than the separation with which we were growing up in former Yugoslav republics?
When Professor Monika Palmberger once asked me if I was sure that I maybe do not long for Yugoslavia, I said no, and I was honest. I did not live in Yugoslavia, I do not remember it, I heard different stories about it, I am not sure if it really existed as in people´s stories or it is completely imagined. But maybe I was longing for home. For a new home in a foreign land, where I would

feel safe, maybe even better than one from which I came, since in this new home there is no (or less) nationalism. “I have written about nostalgia by being busy to avoid nostalgia”, as Boym (2011, 357) said.
Nostalgia is a longing for a different time and place and different circumstances, regardless if the place was once real in the past or did not even exist. When we are in the new country we are rebuilding our home as a secure place, with the help of nostalgia. Maybe I just needed a home in Vienna, where I projected some image of old Yugoslavia as an intercultural place, where all former Yugoslavs live as one community. And I created it, through nostalgia. Maybe the other (former) Yugoslavs did it too. Maybe this is how the community of “our” people was created in the first place. Maybe we are the ones creating this Yugosphere in Vienna, by subconsciously yearning for Yugoslavia, even us, the “younger” ones, for pieces of someone else's past, for which we have once heard that was better and it stayed somewhere in our memories, hoping that it can be our present and our future? I can never be sure, but I can be sure of one - here, we all became “our” people, all of us from former Yugoslavia merged again, but now not as simply Yugoslavs, but something new, with various additions and changes that came as a result of the different processes that we experienced in the last 30 years (in “origin”, as in “residence” land). Therefore, the community of “our” people in Vienna is not just a “rewritten Yugoslav diaspora”, it is more than that - it is a new “identity” that enables all people who live in this city and are related in some way to former Yugoslavia, however they feel and whatever they have become over time (Serbs, Bosnians, Croats, Bosniaks, Macedonians…those who still feel like Yugoslavs and those who never did...those who lived in Yugoslavia and the others who were born after its time...those who are nationally very determined and those who are not at all…), after all relation changing and separations that they have been through, to belong to the same group where they can escape from the national/ethnic divide.

Mc Donald (2009) sees, in the images of living together and examples of cooperation across ethnic lines, the potential for a new solidarity and healing beyond the boundaries of the newly formed states. Yugonostalgia, hand by hand with together living, could even influence social and political changes (Tomić, 2014), or it may actually present a vision of a better tomorrow (Palmberger, 2008), since it shows that an alternative was, is and will always be possible” (Pita, 2020). Maybe this example of former Yugoslavs living in Vienna as one community could be a part of that process. I am not sure if it can show that an alternative way has been possible, but I sincerely hope that it could have a meaning for at least someone´s better tomorrow. In the words of Srđan:

“*Politics was as it was, so let the people then separate themselves, so they could once again meet...When the time passes and if a hatred is not nurtured, people will merge again*”.

Literature

Airoldi, M. Eduardo. 2018. *Ethnography and the digital fields of social media*. International Journal of Social Research Methodology Vol. 21, issue 6, pp. 661-673.

Anderson, Benedict. 1991. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism*. London, Verso.

Angé, Olivia; Berliner, David. 2015. *Anthropology and Nostalgia*. Berghahn Books, New York, Oxford.

Arandjelović, Jovana. 2011. *MY MOTHER TONGUE IS SERBIAN BUT MY GRANDMOTHER TONGUE WAS SERBO-CROATIAN*: *The role of language used by young people in peace building, tolerance and reconciliation in the former Serbo-Croatian language community.* MASTER THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE EUROPEAN REGIONAL MASTER'S DEGREE IN DEMOCRACY AND HUMAN RIGHTS IN SOUTH-EAST EUROPE. Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Ardévol, Elisenda; Gómez-Cruz, Edgar. 2012. *Digital ethnography and media practices.* The international encyclopedia of media studies.

Babić, Marko. 2010. *Language and political disintegration: the case of Yugoslavia*, in Intercultural Europe: Arenas of Difference, Communication and Mediation" (Cinteues: Fulda University of Applied Sciences; An Interdisciplinary Series of the Centre for Intercultural and European Studies, Vol. 7), ibidem-Verlag, Stuttgart 2010 pp. 234-248, Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk Barbara, Pułaczewska, Hanna.

Bakondy, Vida. 2017. "*Austria Attractive for Guest Workers?" Recruitment of Immigrant Labor in Austria in the 1960s and 1970s,* Migrant in Austria. New Orleans: Contemporary Austrian Studies, Vol. 26, 2017.

Barth, Fredrik. 1969. *Ethnic groups and boundaries: the social organisation of culture difference*. Boston: Little, Brown and Co.

Berg, Mette, Louise. 2012. *Diasporic Generations. Memory, Politics and Nation among Cubans in Spain,* Oxford: Berghahn Book.

Bernard, Sara. 2012. *Developing the Yugoslav Gastarbeiter Reintegration Policy. Political and Economic Aspects (1969-1974)*. Centre for Southeast European studies

Bernard, Sara. 2018. *Times of Hope and Despair: Return migration to socialist Serbia and the impact of the 1990s conflicts on returnees*. Remigration to Post-Socialist Europe, Hopes and Realities of Return, LIT Verlag. Vienna, ERSTE Foundation Series, Vol. 3, ISBN: 978-3-643-91025-7.

Boym, Svetlana. 2011. *The Future of Nostalgia,* New York: Basic Book.

Boyer, Dominic. 2006. *Ostalgie and the Politics of the Future in Eastern Germany*. Public Culture (2006) 18 (2): 361–381. https://doi.org/10.1215/08992363-2006-008

Božić, Saša; Kuti, Simona. 2016. *New international borders – old social spaces: Transnational migrant networks beyond post-socialist Croatia.* Österreichische Zeitschrift für Soziologie, 2016, 41(4): 409-426. https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007%2Fs11614016-0246-2.pdf.

Brubaker, Rogers. 2005. *The 'diaspora' diaspora*. Ethnic and Racial Studies Vol. 28 No. 1 January 2005 pp. 1 19.

Beneito-Montagut, Roser; Begueria, Arantza' Cassián, Nizaiá. 2017. *Doing digital team ethnography: being there together and digital social data*, Qualitative Research.

Burrell, Jenna. 2009. *The field site as a network: A strategy for locating ethnographic research.* Field Methods.

Caglar, Ayse. 2016. *Still "migrants" after all those years: Foundational mobilities, temporal politics and emplacement as an analytical tactic*. Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies. Vol 42. No 6. 952-969. (http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/1369183X.2015.1126085)

Caglar, Ayse. 2017. *Locating Migrant Hometown Ties in Time and Space. Locality as a blind spot of migration scholarship*. In: Seiser, Gertraud, ed. Ökonomische Anthropologie. Einführung und Fallbeispiele. Wien: Facultas, 298-318. Reprint with permission from Böhlau Verlag.

Calic, Marie-Janine. 2019. *A History of Yugoslavia*. Purdue University. United States of America

Cohen, Deborah; Crabtree, Benjamin. 2006. *Qualitative Research Guidelines Project.* Princeton.

Cohen, Robin. 2008. *Global Diasporas,* An Introduction. Second edition. New York, Routledge.

Čuković, Ana. 2013. *Yugonostalgia, Memory, and Ethnic Reconciliation: Study of Remnants of the Former Yugoslavia in Metropolitan Detroit.* Master thesis, The American University of Paris Master of Arts in International Affairs,Conflict resolution and Civil society development, Paris.

Clifford, James. 1994. *Diasporas*. Cultural Anthropology, Vol. 9, No. 3. Toward Ethnographies of the Future. (Aug., 1994), pp. 302-338. http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0886-7356%28199408%299%3A3%3C302%3AD%3E2.0.CO%3B2-O

Dragović-Soso, Jasna. 2007. *Why Did Yugoslavia Disintegrate*? An Overview of Contending Explanations. In: Lenard J. Cohen and Jasna Dragovic-Soso, eds. *State Collapse in South-Eastern Europe: New Perspectives on Yugoslavia's Disintegration.* Purdue University Press, pp. 1-39. ISBN 1557534608.

Dalsgaard, Steffen. 2016. *The Ethnographic Use of Facebook in Everyday Life*. Anthropological Forum, 26:1, 96-114, DOI: 10.1080/00664677.2016.1148011.

Dzenovska, Dace. 2018. *Emptiness and its futures: Staying and leaving as tactics of life in Latvia*. Focaal—Journal of Global and Historical Anthropology 80 (2018): 16–29. Stichting Focaal and Berghahn Books doi:10.3167/fcl.2018.800102.

Emirhafizović, Mirza. 2013. *Demographic and Socio-Economic Characteristics of Migrants from Bosnia and Herzegovina in Austria,* Migration from Bosnia and Herzegovina. Institute for Social Science Research at Faculty of Political Sciences, University of Sarajevo and Department for Diaspora, Ministry for Human Rights and Refugees.

Farkas, Eniko. 2014, *Yes for Yugosphere, No for Yugoslavia, A Case study of domestic music and identity in Serbia and Croatia.* Master thesis, Nationalist Studies Program. Budapest: Central European University.

Fine, Wayne. 2005. *Doing Fieldwork: Ethnographic Methods for Research in Developing Countries and Beyond.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Fischer, Wladimir. 2004. *Migrant Voices in Vienna's contemporary history.* Vienna: Urban History Conference.

Fischer, Wladimir. 2003. *Prominently absent, Problems of "Ex-Yugoslav" Migrants' representations in Vienna.* Vienna: 8th International Metropolis conference.

Fischer, Wladimir. 2003, *Travelling Tunes: Pumping up the Volume of ex-Yugoslav Pop Music in the Viannnese Diaspora.* Frankfurt: Central European and North American Culture/s in Motion, 221-47.

Flick, Uwe. *2009. An Introduction to Qualitative Research*. London: SAGE Publication Ltd.

Gebesmair, Andreas; Brunner, Anja; Sperlich, Regina. 2014. *Balkanboom! Eine Geschichte der Balkan Musik in Österreich"*. PL Academic Research. Peter Lang Gmbh, Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften, Frankfurt.

Glamotchak, Marina. 2013. *Nation-State and Diaspora in the Context of Globalization,* Migration from Bosnia and Herzegovina, Institute for Social Science Research at Faculty of Political Sciences, University of Sarajevo and Department for Diaspora, Ministry for Human Rights and Refugees.

Günel, Gökçe; Varma, Saiba; Watanabe, Chika. 2020. *A Manifesto for Patchwork Ethnography*. Society for Cultural Anthropology: published on 9th June. 2020; accessed on 15th August 2022.

Haydn, Robert. 2012. *From Yugoslavia to the Western Balkans*. Studies of a European Disunion, 1991-2011. Volume:7, Balkan Studies Library.

Herzfeld, Michael. 2016. *CULTURAL INTIMACY Social Poetics and the Real Life of States, Societies, and Institutions* Third Edition. Routledge.

Huddleston, Thomas; Niessen, Jan; Ni Chaoimh, Eadaoin and White, Emilie. 2011. *Migrant Integration Policy Index III*. Brussels: British Council and Migration Policy Group.

Ivanović, Vladimir. 2012. *Geburtstag pišeš normalno: jugoslovenski gastarbajteri u SR Nemačkoj i Austriji 1965-1973.* Beograd: Biblioteka studije i monografije.

Jagiełło-Szostak, Anna. 2013. *Yugosphere: The beginning of the new integration in the Balkans?*. New Eastern Europe Issue 2 (VII) / 2013: Painful Past, Fragile Future, article published on April 18, 2013, accessed on February 14, 2020. https://nweasterneurope.eu/2013/04/18/yugosphere-the-beginning-of-the-new-integration-in-the-balkans/

Jansen, Stef. 2005. *Antinacionalizam Etnografija otpora u Beogradu i Zagrebu.* Biblioteka XX vek. Beograd.

Jansen, Stef. 2009. *After the red passport: towards an anthropology of the everyday geopolitics of entrapment in the EU's 'immediate outside'.* Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute (N.S.) 15, 815-832.

Jansen, Stef; Löfving, Staffan. 2009. *Struggles for Home: Violence, Hope and the Movement of People*, Berghahn Books.

Jansen, Stef; Löfving, Staffan. 2007. *Introduction: Movement, violence, and the making of home*. Focaal—European Journal of Anthropology 49 (2007): 3–14 doi:10.3167/foc.2007.490102

Johnson, Dana. 2019. *'If you look at the sky you step in sh*t': horizons of possibility and migration from Serbia*. European Association of Social Anthropologists.

Judah, Tim. 2009. *Yugoslavia is dead, Long live the Yugosphere.* Good news from the Western Balkans, LSEE Papers on South Eastern Europe, The London School of Economic and Political Science.

Krestić, Petar. 2010. *Political and Social Rivalries in Nineteenth-century Serbia Švabe or Nemačkari*. DOI:10.2298/BALC1041073K. Institute of History Belgrade.

Kurtović. Larisa. 2021. *When the "People" Leave: On the Limits of Nationalist (Bio) Politics in Postwar Bosnia-Herzegovina.* Nationalities Papers (2021), 49: 5, 873–892 doi:10.1017/nps.2020.42, School of Sociological and Anthropological Studies, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Canada.

Lacroix, Thomas; Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, Elena. 2013. *Refugee and Diaspora Memories: The Politics of Remembering and Forgetting*. Journal of Intercultural Studies, 34:6, 684-696, DOI: 10.1080/07256868.2013.846893, http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07256868.2013.846893.

Limantzakis, George. 2014. *Reasons for the dissolution of former Yugoslavia*. Panteio University of Social & Political Sciences.

Malešević, Siniša. 2000. *Ethnicity and Federalism in Communist Yugoslavia and Its Successor States*. Autonomy and Ethnicity, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511560088.007

Markham, Anette. N. 2013. *Fieldwork in social media: What would Malinowski do?* Qualitative Communication Research, 2(4), 434-446

Mazzucchelli, Francesco. 2012. *What remains of Yugoslavia? From the geopolitical space of Yugoslavia to the virtual space of the Web Yugosphere,* e-Diasporas Atlas, Fondation Maison des sciences de l'homme.

McDonald, David. 2009. *Living together or hating each other*. In *Confronting the Yugoslav Controversies: A Scholar's Initiative* by Charles Ingrao and Thomas Emmert. Lafayette, Purdue University Press.

Mijić, Ana. 2019. *Together divided-divide together: Intersections of symbolic boundaries in the context of ex-Yugoslavian immigrant communities in Vienna.* Ethnicities, SAGE Journal. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468796819878202.

Miller, Daniel; Costa, Elisabetta; Haynes, Nell; McDonald, Tom; Nicolescu, Razvan; Sinanan, Jolynna; Spyer, Juliano; Venkatraman, Shiram and Wang, XXinyuan. 2016. *How the world changed social media* (Vol. 1). UCL press.

Mishkova, Diana. 2006. *IN QUEST OF BALKAN OCCIDENTALISM*. Centre for Advanced Study Sofia.

Moschitz, Eva. 2021. *Der Chor HOR 29. NOVEMBAR Geschichte eines künstlerisch-politischen Kollektiv*. Diplomarbeit zur Erlangung des akademischen Grades Magistra artium an der Akademie der bildenden Künste, Wien Institut für das künstlerische Lehramt.

Musić, Goran. 2021. *Making and breaking the Yugoslav working class: the story of two self-managed factories.* Work and labor : Transdisciplinary studies for the 21st. Central European University Press, Budapest-New York

Orgad, Shani. 2009. '*How can researchers make sense of the issues involved in collecting and interpreting online and offline data?*' in Markham and Baym (eds.) Internet inquiry: conversations about method. London, UK: Sage. pp. 33-53

Palmberger, Monika. 2016. *How Generations Remember: Conflicting Histories and Shared Memories in Post-War Bosnia and Herzegovina.* London, Palgrave Macmillan.

Palmberger, Monika. 2008. *Nostalgia matters: Nostalgia for Yugoslavia as potential vision for a better future.* Max Planck Institute for the Study of Religious and Ethnic Diversity, Göttingen University of Oxford, Linacre College, Original scientific paper UDK: 316.7:323(497.1) Received 29 June 2008. DOI:10.2298/SOC0804355P.

Palmberger, Monika; Tošić, Jelena. 2016. *Memories on the Move. Migration, Diasporas and Citizenship.* Palgrave Macmillan, London.

Pavlović, Srđa. 2000. *Understanding Balkan Nationalism: The wrong people, in the wrong place, at the wrong time*. Southeast European Politics, Vol. 1, No. 2.

Patterson, Patrick Hyder. 2003. *On the Edge of Reason: The Boundaries of Balkanism in Slovenian, Austrian, and Italian Discourse.* Slavic Review, Vol. 62, No.1 (Spring 2003), pp. 110-141.

Petrović, Tanja. 2010. *"When We Were Europe": Socialist Workers in Serbia and Their Nostalgic Narratives: The Case of the Cable Factory Workers in Jagodina*. In: Remembering Communism: Genres of Representation, ed. Maria Todorova, New York: Social Science Research Council.

Petrović, Tanja. 2016. *Towards an Affective History of Yugoslavia.* FILOZOFIJA I DRUŠTVO XXVII (3), 2016. DOI: 10.2298/FID1603504P.

Pink, Sarah; Ardévol, Elisenda and Lanzeni, Débora (2016). *Digital Materialities: Design and Anthropology*. London: Bloomsbury.

Pink, Sarah; Horst, Heather; Postill, John; Hjorth, Larissa; Lewis, Tania and Tacchi, Jo. 2016. *Digital Ethnography*: Principles and Practice. London: Sage.

Postill, John and Pink, Sarah. 2012. S*ocial Media Ethnography: The Digital Researcher in a Messy Web.* Media International Australia Vol. 145, Issue 1, pp.123–134.

Povrzanović Frykman, Maja. 2004. *Transnational perspective in ethnology: from 'ethnic' to 'diasporic' communities*, TRANSNATIONAL SPACES: DISCIPLINARY PERSPECTIVES. Malmö University, Sweden by Prinfo Team Offset & Media, Malmö 2004 ISBN 91-7104-060-9.

Ramet, Sabrina. 2005. *Thinking about Yugoslavia. Scholarly Debates about the Yugoslav Breakup and the Wars in Bosnia and Kosovo*. Cambridge University Press.

Remiddi, Adriano; Alibašić, Mubina; Kapetanović, Sabiha; Davidović, Emilija; Zejnilović, Edima. 2019. *The ambivalent role of diaspora engagement for the homeland in the Balkans'*. (2019) 3 Global Campus Human Rights Journal 10-27. https://doi.org/20.500.11825/997

Repič, Jaka. 2016. *Tracing Roots: Slovenian Diaspora in Argentina and Return Mobilities.* Moving places, Relations, Return and Belonging, Hb Published.

Safran, William, 1991. *Diasporas in Modern Societies: Myths of Homeland and Return.* A Journal of Transnational Studies, Volume 1, Number 1, Published by University of Toronto Press DOI:https://doi.org/10.1353/dsp.1991.0004.

Sorabji, Cornelia. 2008. *Bosnian Neighbourhood Revisited: Tolerance, Commitment and Komšiluk in Sarajevo*. In *On the Margins of Religion*, Edited by Frances Pine and João de Pina-Cabral. 2008. Berghahn Books. Oxford, New York.

Srebotnjak, Hana. 2016. *Tracing the Decline of Yugoslav Identity: A case for 'Invisible' Ethnic Cleansing.* SPRAWY NARODOWOŚCIOWE Seria nowa /NATIONALITIES AFFAIRS, New

series, 48/2016: 65–84 DOI: 10.11649/sn.2016.005, Institute of Slavic Studies, Polish Academy of Sciences.

Spasić, Ivana. 2012. *Yugoslavia as a Place for Living a Normal Life: Memories of Ordinary People in Serbia*. Filozofski fakultet Univerzitet u Beogradu, Izvorni naučni članak UDK: 316.7:159.953.3(497.1) Primljeno: 23. 05. 2012. DOI: 10.2298/SOC1204577S

Spradley, James P. 1980. *Participant Observation*. Wadsworth, Cengage Learning Publishing.

Todorova, Maria. 2009. *Imagining the Balkans.* Oxford University Press.

Tomić, Đorđe. 2014. *From "Yugoslavism" to (Post-) Yugoslav Nationalisms: Understanding Yugoslav Identities,* European national identities. New Brunswick: Elements, Transitions, Conflicts.

Tölölyan, Khachig. 2012. *Diaspora Studies, past, present and promise*. Working Paper Series No. 55. International Migration Institute, University of Oxford.

Vesković Anđelković, Milica. 2019. *Diaspora and Contemporary World – the Need to Change Study Approach.* University of Belgrade, Faculty of Philosophy, UDK 314.743.4:323.113 321.022: 316.472.4–054.7 DOI: https://doi.org/10.2298/SOC19S1655V.

Vertovec, Steven. 2009. *Transnationalism*. Routledge. London and New York.

Wimmer, Andreas. 2013. *Ethnic Boundary Making, Institutions, Power, Networks*. Oxford University, Elementary strategies of ethnic boundary making.

Woodward, Susan. 1995. *Balkan tragedy: chaos and dissolution after the Cold War.* The Brookings Institution, Washington DC.

Živković, Marko. 2011. *Serbian Dreambook: National Imaginary in the Time of Milošević*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Other sources:

Balunović, Filip. 2020. *'Living Yugoslavia': Past Identity Becomes Present Political Statement.* BalkanInsight, BIRN, Belgrade, published on September 10, 2020, accessed on June 6, 2021, https://balkaninsight.com/2020/09/10/living-yugoslavia-past-identity-becomes-present-political-statement/

Baumann, Dorothee Maria. 2012. *Yugosla-Vienna? Rolling through Austrian capital's multifarious 'Yugosphere',* Cafebabel – 6th edition of Multiculturalism in Europe, article published on July 4, 2012, accessed on February 27, 2020, http://www.cafebabel.co.uk/society/article/yugosla-vienna-rolling-through-austrian-capitals-multifarious-yugosphere.html

Kopanja, Jelena. 2012. *The Yugosphere: Not Just Balkan Nostalgia, 'Yugo'-rooted Viennese struggle with clichés and their heritage.* The Vienna Review, published on Oct 11, 2012, accessed on February 23, 2020, https://www.theviennareview.at/archives/2012/the-yugosphere-not-just-balkan-nostalgia

Pita, Antonio. 2020. *'Goodbye, Tito': una nostalgia política que sigue viva.* Internacional, Madrid, published on May 4, 2020, accessed on June 6, 2021, *https://elpais.com/internacional/2020-05-03/goodbye-tito-una-nostalgia-politica-que-sigue-viva.html*

Studiranje u Beču, Stadt Wien, accessed on 30.1.2021, https://www.wien.gv.at/bh-hr-sr/obrazovanje/studiranje.htm

Interviews:
Interview with Goran, 29.12.2019, San Marco cafe/club, 15th district, Vienna
Interview with Aida, 23.1.2020, her apartment, 21st district, Vienna
Interview with Srdjan, 13.2.2020, office of Prosvjeta, 3rd district, Vienna
Interview with Biljana, 16.2.2020, her apartment, 15th district, Vienna
Interview with Dragomir, 26.2.2020, office of KOSMO, 2nd district, Vienna
Interview with Dragomir, 26.2.2020, office of KOSMO, 2nd district, Vienna
Interview with Mika, 27.4. 2021, her apartment, 15th district, Vienna
Interview with Jana, 10.12.2021, facebook interview
Interview with Edo, 15.12.2021, Sofra restaurant, 15th district
Interview with Duče, 25.12.2021, Cultural and historical museum, Vienna

APPENDIX

The Organisations

When I started searching for the lists of organisations online, I first came across the list of Serbian organisations on the official website of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Serbia[58], as well as on the official website of the Embassy of the Republic of Serbia in Austria[59] (both times in the section "Diaspora", then "Clubs/Associations"). The list is exactly the same. There are 25 organisations in Vienna, but 18 of them do not have the possibility for online observation (they do not have websites or Facebook pages, or they do, but they are inaccessible). From the remaining 7, 3 I did not find appropriate for further observation, regarding their research group (one deals with the whole South Eastern Europe) or accessibility (two of them have websites just in German language (one of them deals with economy, the other is Roma radio). I observed the remaining 4 online: "Prosvjeta - Srpsko kulturno i prosvjetno društvo Austrija"[60], "Dijaspora TV"[61], "Srpski kulturni forum" (Serbian culture forum)[62] and "Srpski centar" (Serbian centre)[63]. "Jedinstvo", the Yugoslav Club from the 70s, is also on the list (of Serbian organisations), but without an email or web site. Eleven of them have the word "Serbian" included in their official name. This list can be found easily (with first google search), but there are many links that are not updated and some links that should lead to a website of the certain organisation are actually linked to something else.

The list of Bosnian organisations I found first on the official website of Embassy of Bosnia and Herzegovina in Austria[64] and in the Addressbook of organisations and clubs in Bosnia and emigration ("A D R E S A R organizacija, udruženja i klubova u BiH iseljeništvu").[65] Sixteen organisations from the list are located in Vienna, from which: 6 do not have a website (or they do, but it is not functional); 4 of them are also on the list of the above mentioned (the list of Serbian organisation (as Prosvjeta and Jedinstvo, but Jedinstvo actually has a functional website on this list, what means that this list is more updated than the one of the Serbian Embassy or Serbian Ministry of Foreign Affairs); one of them is actually a restaurant; one has a very specific target group (business women from Bosnia), one of them is humanitarian and has been dealing with war refugees from Bosnia from 1993, one is specifically oriented to the folklore of Brcko district (part of Bosnia), while one has a website just in German with a minimum of information

[58] http://www.mfa.gov.rs/sr/index.php/konzularni-poslovi/dijaspora/klubovi-iz-dijaspore/101-dijaspora-klubovi/10658-austrija-dis?lang=lat

[59] http://www.vienna.mfa.gov.rs/lat/dijasporatext.php?subaction=showfull&id=1348056781&ucat=127&template=MeniENG&

[60] web site https://www.prosvjeta.at/ ; and facebook page https://www.facebook.com/SPKD.Prosvjeta.Austrija/

[61] www.dijaspora.tv

[62] www.skforum.at

[63] www.srpskicentar.at.

[64] www.bh-botschaft.at/Diaspora

[65] http://www.mhrr.gov.ba/iseljenistvo/Publikacije/Adresar%20organizacija%20dijaspore6.pdf, published in Sarajevo, September 2013, publisher: Ministarstvo za ljudska prava i izbjeglice BiH

given, while one deals with students in entire Europe. Three of them have the word "Serbian" in their name, 7 have "Bosnian" in their name, one of them is called "Bosna", and one (the restaurant) "Sarajevo", while one has the word "Croatian" in the name. The term "Bosniak" is not used in any name. The ones that I found suitable for online observation are: "Jedinstvo"[66] (Unity); "Napredak"[67] ("Progress" - Croatian organisation, already recommended by the president of Prosvjeta); and "Mostovi"[68] ("Bridges" - that deals with preserving the culture and language of Bosnia in Vienna.

Regarding Croatian organisations, I could not find any list (neither on the website of the Croatian Embassy of Austria, nor The Ministry of Foreign and European Affairs of the Republic of Croatia). The only two organisations that I could find (via regular google search) are: "Hrvatski dom"[69] ("Croatian home") and "Hrvatski centar"[70] ("Croatian centre").

Finally, I observed online: 1. KOSMO (magazine, related to all former Yugoslavs); 2. Prosvjeta (found on the list of Serbian and Bosnian organisations); 3. Jedinstvo (related to Yugoslavia, but also found on the list of Serbian and Bosnian organisations); 4. Srpski centar (Serbian organisation); 5. Srpski kulturni forum (Serbian organisation); 6. Dijaspora TV (Serbian organisation); 7. Mostovi (Bosnian organisation); 8. Hrvatsko kulturno drustvo Napredak (Croatian organisation, found on the list of Bosnian organisations); 9. Hrvatski centar (Croatian organisation) and 10. Hrvatski dom (Croatian organisation).
I also have to mention Choir 29. November, for which I found out during my theoretical research - after I read about it in an article in one Serbian newspaper, I found the Facebook page of the Choir. This was all almost at the end of my research, unfortunately, so I did not observe any of their events, but I contacted one of the leaders via Facebook and we did an interview. The Choir 29. November (This date was the official state day of the SFRJ) was an informal group, and then registered as an organisation. It would be very interesting to follow it online and to visit some of their events in person.

Magazine KOSMO was created in 2008, with the idea of being a media for "our" people (all people from former Yugoslav republics, or the ones are related with them) so the important topics from Austria, such as politics, could be available to "our" people in "our" language. The aim of the magazine has been the connecting of these two cultures - former Yugoslav and Austrian, to inform "our" people better and help them integrate better. "*It means "KO SMO" (who we are), as part of Austrian society on one hand, and as diaspora people, who also go in homelands where they do not belong anymore, people who live between two worlds, since here they are foreigners, and down there they are "gastarbeiters""*(Dragomir). Printing issues were

[66] www.jedinstvo.at
[67] web: napredak.at
[68] www.mostovi.at
[69] https://hrvatskidom.com/
[70] http://www.hrvatskicentar.at/

until recently always in "our" language (in 2020 they became bilingual - BKS/German), while online is in German, because of the younger generation and our people born and schooled here. The editorial office uses mixed language, not in a sense of official BKS, but if the journalist comes from Bosnia, he or she will actually write in Bosnian, from Serbia - in Serbian, from Croatia - in Croatian. They also call it "our" language. Financing is exclusively through selling advertisements, since, as the editor says, by the Austrian law they cannot get any funding from the city or the state since they are a free (not charging) media. They knew this from the beginning, but, as they say, it was more important to reach a large number of "our" people ("Our people, when they have to pay the bill in kafana, they will fight who will do it, but when they have to buy a newspaper, then no one has money for that" (Dragomir)). Local governments, the city of Vienna and political parties can and do buy advertisements as anyone else (therefore the funding does not influence the articles). Editor says that KOSMO is not just a media, but an important part of the public life of this community. "This community is large, and it contributes to this state..these people pay taxes, and they hire a lot of people…25% of all gastronomy in Vienna is owned by former Yugoslavs, as one gentlemen from the Chamber of Commerce recently told us…These people work very hard for this city and they are a significant factor, but they also need someone who will defend their interests*"* (Dragomir). Editor said that they organised a lot of humanitarian actions in Serbia, Bosnia and Croatia, and that they also, by writing about it, are creating the atmosphere where some things are possible in Vienna, such as for one of "our" people, Alma Zadić, to become a Minister. Dragomir and Dušica both talked about the arguing of "our" people through online comments, between them, and also oriented towards KOSMO itself. "*...Then its starts, that we are the one who spread nationalism…if we publish something that happened, related to national quarrels, in the Balkans, or in Austria, then the comments start - why we even write about it, we are spreading the hate in that way …people think that we should not deal with these topics at all…and we report regularly about the things that are also published in other media. Of course, if something happens in Austria, as it has happened recently that in 12th district the graffiti "Srbe na Vrbe"*[71] *(Hang Serbs from the willow tree), and all Austrian media wrote about it, the mayor of Vienna gave a statement about it, the Ambassador of Serbia also, but when we write about it, as Heute does, we are immediately the ones who "heat up the differences"* (Dušica).

KOSMO is the only magazine for our people in Vienna at the present time (to my knowledge, and the editor of the magazine also said that). I followed just the printed issue[72]. They write in Latin letters, in all 3 dialects/ languages - Serbian, Croatian and Bosnian. The first thing that is noticeable is that they are also always using the word "our", on every cover impressum ("naš najtiražniji list u Austriji" (our most famous, best selling magazine in Austria); ("50 ours", cover magazine from December 2019…); ("people from "our" community who made contribution to

[71] The slogan "Srbe na vrbe" meaning Hang Serbs from the willow trees is a hate speech calling for the extermination of Serbs, part of Ustasha and Croatian Neo-nazi ideology

[72] That is one of the limitations of my online research, it would be better that I also followed online articles, but due to the lack of German language skills it was not possible

Austrian society"..."Akzent Theatre, 30 years of "our" plays", etc). Instead of "our" community they sometime use "The Balkan community", and instead of the word "our people", they sometimes use the word "zemljak" (fellow countryman, compatriot). They often have the examples of people who are different ethnicities but are connected (as singers, originated from different former Yugoslav republics being together in a band, or, for example (Issue for April 2020, page 62), they write about a couple, Serbian woman and a Croat man, who were separated during the war, but now are again together after 24 years. In the issue for May 2020 we have one title "Ponos naše zajednice", meaning the pride of our community, but in German the title says "Stolz der BKS Community" (Pride of BCS community). This is very interesting, as I already mentioned, from the inside this community is called "our" community, and its official name in Austria is BKS community. There are also Yugoslavia related topics, for example, in the issue for April 2021, the cover story is "30 years from breakup of Yugoslavia".

Prosvjeta, or to be more exact, its Austrian branch was founded in 2011 (Prosvjeta in Bosnia was founded in 1902), with an aim of promoting Serbian culture (beyond the most famous national costumes, folklore dance and food, as Srđan emphasises) and preserving the Serbian language. Its funding comes mostly from private donations, something from Serbian Orthodox Church in Vienna, small amounts from time to time via project financing from motherlands (Serbia and Republic of Srpska), and almost nothing from the local governments, since, as Srđan says, they are not interested in promotion of something that is Serbian, and not BKS, as mentioned above. In this case it is not just that funding does not influence the programs, but it seems that programs are actually created and maintained despite the lack of funds. Prosvjeta really intends to promote the culture of one former Yugoslav ethnicity - Serbian. On the other hand, Prosvjeta's programs are open for everyone, regardless of ethnicity, nationality, while the organisation itself is also ready for cooperation with anyone (for example they cooperate with a Croatian organisation in Vienna).

Prosvjeta´s website is in Cyrilic (while "Srpki centar" and "Srpki kulturni forum", for example, do not have a cyrilic website), but it does have an option for Serbian language, in Latin and also the option for German language (it is probably because of the "our" people that were born and schooled here and do not read Cyrilic). The main program is the school of Serbian language. Original name is "Srpsko prosvjetno i kulturno društvo Prosvjeta" (Serbian educational and cultural association), and the aim is preserving Serbian cultural, national and spiritual identity (from the web site). The Facebook page is really active and the posts are usually in Cyrilic. For example, there is one post, the announcement of the event I was observing "This is not a ordinary concert, this a Serbian, New year's concert...so we could show that we are there, to be proud, so the Serbian community in Vienna can show itself in its true form, and celebrate its traditional holiday" (post from 11. January 2020).

On 2. February 2020, there is a Facebook post, a public reaction of Prosvjeta to KOSMO magazine: "BKS media KOSMO shared a photo of Muslim portal from Bosnia, where children

on St. Sava, in Serbian national costumes, greet with a peaceful orthodox greeting, gathered three fingers, are presented as Chetniks. It seems that Muslim portals are trying to manipulate with the public in Bosnia, and their partners KOSMO want to contribute to that in Austria, by bringing restlessness and delusion among their readers and citizens of Vienna. Even the title "Serbian children from Srebrenica pose as Chetniks in school" has the aim to present Serbian children (Serbs) as bad, by sharing untrue information and giving it non existing meaning. This is not the first time that this "BKS newsletter" shares anti Serbian propaganda, disturbs the public and that the money from taxpayers of the city of Vienna is used for manipulation of the public. It is time that numerous Serbian community, but also all other well-meaning citizens of Vienna react to this provocation, or, as said by one of our fellow Austrian citizen, this rudeness." There is also a post on Facebook from Prosvjeta (18, February 2020), where Prosvjeta blames KOSMO for the already mentioned graffiti: "After discriminative writings towards Serbian children by BKS Vienna magazine KOSMO, the chauvinist and Ustasha grafitis appeared in Vienna".

On the other hand, Facebook post from 13.March 2020 says: "What gives a special value to this event is a fact that artist come from all the countries of former Yugoslavia, and diversity in the selection of artwork enables the audience to go home spiritualized and with a full of heart". During the interview, Srđan also told me that all the events and programs are, of course, open for everyone, as I have seen, while visiting one of their events.

Jedinstvo was established in 1970 (The whole history can be seen on the web site; it was also a boxing club, a football league in 1973, then supplementary education, driving school in mother tongue, service for Yugoslavian citizens, it had bolling section, folklore section, 1986 meeting with SPÖ representatives about Yugoslav children going to special schools, organising concerts, 1989 participating in the consultations in Ministry of education, and participating on the Vienna university "Integration of foreigners in Vienna", meeting with SPÖ on the topic "Being a foreigner in Austria", 1990 getting the official permission for the work of the club until 2000 when there was a celebration of 30 year of existence, with an photo exhibit of the Club through years, but also round table "Situation in Yugoslavia". There is nothing related to the breakup of the country (nothing between 1990 and 2000), and I am also wondering how a Yugoslav Club became "a Serbian" organisation? (They write about Serbian folklore, they are on the list of the Serbian organisations, etc). They do, however, write "our" citizens in Austria, on the web site. It also says that Jedinstvo is the oldest "our" club in Vienna, that helped the workers who came here in 1960s and 1970s in the process of preserving and nurturing tradition and their culture. The Club is since 1973 at the same address, and now it has around 200 members. Their full name is "Kulturno sportsko Udruženje Jedinstvo Beč" ("Cultural and Sport Association Unity Vienna). In their news on the web site one can read about humanitarian aid for "Serbia and Srpska", and that "members or activists of Jedinstvo have helped the citizens of Serbia, whenever there was need for it." Unfortunately, I could not get in contact with any representative. Jana said that they are "half existing", and Goran that they just organise folklor from time to time. On 24.1.2020

Serbian clubs in Vienna gave plaquettes to the meritorious and the golden plaquette was awarded to Jedinstvo, which celebrated 50 years of its existence and successful work.

Srpski centar (Serbian Centre), was founded in 1995, with support of the Embassy of the Republic of that time Yugoslavia (the federation of Serbia and Montenegro). They have been organising Saint Sava ball - "The Serbian ball" from 1998. The aim of the organisation is the promotion of Serbian cultural creation that comes from mother states and from Austria. They act in area of education, humanitarian work (mostly for Kosovo), info platform, the ball and the library (from their website). First library was formed by taking over the entire literary fund of the former Yugoslav consulate in Vienna after the breakup of the state. The library was working until 2008, but with support of the Embassy of the Republic of Serbia in Austria, it was opened again in 2016, and then reopened again on 19.12.2020, inactive in the meantime. The books of the Slovenian and Croatian authors were donated to the Embassies of these countries in Austria.
They post relatively often on their Facebook page, regarding the library and humanitarian aid, mostly for Kosovo. Interesting is a post from 4th December 2020 where they are calling people to donate for help for the people of Croatia, since they were affected by the earthquake. On 24th December 2019 they congratulated everyone that celebrates Christmas by the Gregorian calendar, and in the Post from 24. May 2020, they congratulate Bajram to everyone that celebrates. There is a very interesting post from 29 November 2020, which was the official day of the republic of Yugoslavia, and it is just a photo of the hands holding together without any text. But they also have a post with photos about the Serbian refugees who had to leave Croatia during the war. What I consider the most interesting is the fact that they have opened the library even during the Covid19 pandemic. Following the other organisation - Croatian Home on Facebook, I saw that its team was also preparing to open a library at the time. To me it seems like it was the race - who will open the library first - Serbian or Croatian organisation.

Srpski kulturni forum (Serbian culture forum) - on their website we can see their partners, as the Ministry for Foreign affairs of Republic of Serbia, Theaters, Culture centres, Media and Touristic organisations from Serbia, KOSMO, Bum magazin, Dijaspora info, "Wien Kultur", "Stadt Wien", etc. They mostly organise cultural events and they had some announcements, but they all were cancelled due to Covid 19 pandemic. Their Facebook page[73] is more informative - they were established in 2006, with the aim of preserving, developing and promoting culture and art and Serbian national identity. Their aim is to cooperate with similar institutions from Austria or the motherland, but they also write that they are open for everyone who carries in them the spirit of the Balkans. Their posts are mostly thoughts of famous poets of intellectuals, not just Serbian, and they often criticise nationalism (post from 9.January 2021, "Nationalist is, as a social or a human being, equal to zero...Nationalism is a paranoia, collective as individual…" (post from 16. December 2020), or for example they promote a writer from Croatia, who writes about nationalism, xenophobia, chauvinism and similar (post from 3. December 2020).

[73] https://www.facebook.com/SKForum-159155500768268/?ref=ts

Dijaspora TV - the description from the web site says that it is an association for intercultural communication and integration in the form of a communication platform. The editorial team deals with important and useful information, everyday life, and the contribution that immigrants give in the political, economic and cultural life of Austrian society, as in the lands of their origin. It is written in their website that the internet portal Dijaspora.tv started in 2013, and very fast has become the main platform for informing "our" people in Austria, in their mother language. They use neutral words such as: intercultural, diversity, immigrants, lands of their origin, "our" people and similar, but news is most often related to Serbia and citizens of Serbian origin, so the impression can be made that diaspora here means just Serbian diaspora. Even in the drop-down menu on the website there is an option "News from Serbia and the region". In the period of online research (January 2020 - January 2021) there are Serbia and Serbs all the time in the news (The day of the Republic of Serbia, Serbian holidays, Cultural activities of Serbs in foreign countries, Serbian schools in Vienna, Prosvjeta´s school of Serbian language, Discussion on the topic "The role of Serbs in the development of European culture"; there is a link to Metropole issue about Serbian community ("Breaking the stereotypes about Serbia is our mission!" (15.12.2020))). In this time period there is just one news related to Croatia and one to Montenegro. There is also an interesting headline from 13.January 2021 - "Caritas in Serbia has collected more than 90.000 euros for victims of the earthquake in Croatia ". Facebook page[74] is not as active. There is some linked news from the website. There is an interesting description in the section "about us" on the Facebook page: "themes and cultural events of the diaspora of people from former Yugoslav republics, the biggest migrant society in Austria". Even though their main topics are related to the Serbs, in the description they are presenting themselves as former Yugoslavs, maybe so they could seem more numerous, because then we are "the biggest migrant society in Austria", as they said. And when one googles them and they appear in German language it says "Dijaspora.tv - Das bekannteste Medium der Balkan - Diaspora (the most famous media of the Balkans). AS KOSMO uses the BKS community as the name for "our" people in German language, the Diajspora.tv uses the term - Balkan community.

Mostovi - "Bosansko Hercegovački obrazovni kulturni centar" (Bridges, Bosnian educational cultural centre) is actually the school of Bosnian language and culture for children, they do not have Facebook page, and there aren't many information on the website, for example I cannot see when they were established. In one part of the website is just the logo of the Ministry for human rights and refugees of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Napredak - the organisation was recommended by Srđan from Prosvjeta, and I tried following their website and the Facebook page[75]. Croatian cultural association Napredak in Vienna is a

[74] https://www.facebook.com/TVDIJASPORA/?fref=ts

[75] https://www.napredak.at/?fbclid=IwAR0m-0r3e8b0_4qgZ5zbowB99zzb4JCy8nK2LOzihiM7oQLfvJsvvmy7yAc
https://www.facebook.com/fans.napredak.at/about/?ref=page_internal

branch of the bigger organisation that was founded in 1902 in Bosnia (similar to Prosvjeta, but Prosvjeta is Serbian while Napredak is Croatian). It could be seen at the website that aims are: preserving and nurturing of the Croatian language, culture and identity, supporting the students, and organising different informative, humanitarian and social events. Maybe due to the corona crisis, but no events were announced, except the free German online course or the summer academy program that they have every year, so I did not find interest to follow it further.

Croatian centre was established in 1994 (from two organisations which originate from the 1930s). It is an organisation for Burgerland Croats (ethnic Croats in the Austrian state of Burgerland and in Hungary and Slovakia), but it is interesting how they also added that they are also for the "doseljene Hrvate" (newcomers, new immigrants Croats). I did not find much information about them, except that they organise the Croatian ball. They have a Facebook page, but rarely post anything.

Croatian home has been just recently established, in September 2020 (even though the initiatives and online activity started a year before, in October 2019). Both website and Facebook page[76] have been very active (there were posts like "the dream has come true, dream of many generations of Croats in Austria, especially after the independence of the Republic of Croatia...after intensive requests and meetings we were given 2000 square metres in the 23rd district". Even before the official establishment, they had a post in June 2020 about difficulties that they have with recognition of Croatian language as a separate language from BKS in Austria (same as Prosvjeta with Serbian language). They formed the Working group for the Croatian language and they directed the initiatives towards the all relevant institutions in Austria, since they are "constantly imposing nonexisting BKS language". Article[77] from the website from 8. October 2020 says that BKS language "traumatises the Croats in Austria for decades".
Most of the posts are related with humanitarian aid for the people affected by the earthquakes in Croatia, Chatolic church masses, but there are also post that are announcing the opening of the Croatian library (most likely at the end of 2020 and the beginning of the 2021, at the same time when Serbian centre opened a library). They also organise workshops of Croatian language and culture, promote days of Croatian beer or days of Slavonia in Vienna.

The Choir 29. November was established in 2009 and the founders were people who came from different parts of Yugoslavia in different time periods, some in the 80s, some during the war in the 90s, and some were born in Vienna (Moschitz, 2021). Jana says that it all started as an artistic action, the initial idea was not to form the Choir. They actually wanted to celebrate 40 years anniversary of the establishment of the first Yugoslav club "Mladi radnik" (Young worker), so they went out on the street in 16th district, with a Yugoslav landmarks, as the flag, or red scarfs,

[76] https://www.facebook.com/hrvatskidombec
[77] ttps://hrvatskidom.com/austrijski-ministar-obrazovanja-u-sklopu-nastave-bosansko-hrvatsko-srpskog-jezika-poducavanje-hrvatskog-jezika/?fbclid=IwAR13bZSe9x8sK1MkV91utcKXxePOJ3yf0ZGiwT6zs3ls4VHdfnq_qi_rIsY

and started to sing partisan songs. “Our” people appeared on the windows of their apartments in the buildings nearby and started applauding and commenting how they haven't heard these songs for more than 20 years (Moschitz, 2021). Jana said how they wanted to point to this Yugoslav heritage that has been lost after the war, since all these Yugoslav workers' clubs, that were really important, became national.

“*We are the group where everyone is welcome, regardless of musical talent or language knowledge, it is only important that someone recognise him/herself there politically, since it is one antifascist project that gathers all the fights, not just from Yugoslavia, but all the similar fights in the world…we promote the idea of Yugoslavia as an emancipatory project…we are not Yugonostalgists in that way…we are very critical…we do not have songs about Tito, we do not have that idea that the system was perfect then, and that Tito, as a represent was without a mistake…but the idea of Yugoslavia as a multinational identity, where the workers, women and minorities were emancipated and there were some high achievements that are very important and for which we should still fight. This is the idea on which the Choir is based”* (Jana).

Jana also said that the Choir started as the gathering of Yugoslav diaspora, but now they are the minority, since there are many Austrians, Germans, Swedes, French and similar. The official language of the Choir is German. The repertoar deflects the members, since everyone who came brought some song from their country of origin that is related to the topics they are dealing with, so they sing at 13 languages, at the moment. “We want that some ideas of Yugoslavian national project live even today, or that it become the plan for the future… We try to find the actuality in that heritage…we are connecting it with what is happening today, with refugees, with Kurdish fight for freedom, and similar…Yugoslavia is not just remembering, it is much more and can be much more, it is an active process that can enforce new fights*”* (Jana).

Later the Choir was officially registered as an organisation (Moschitz, 2021). Jana says that the Choir is financed through projects (such as the Festival of alternative Choirs), usually by the City of Vienna. They got the award IG Kultur for the best social project in Vienna in 2019. They also make spontaneous public performances, when they go to the train stations where migrants usually come, like Erdberg and Pretarestern, or go and sing in demonstrations. “People feel empowered…someone doesn't have the right to vote in Austria but maybe he or she can participate in the political system in that way…you went outside and you told something…you have the possibility to express yourself politically…through song, what is great, since it is more massive, everyone can do it, you have a group feeling and the feeling of empowerment, that is something that we really nurture in the Choir*”* (Jana).

The list of organisations

“Serbian” organisations:

SAVEZ SRBA U AUSTRIJI
www.sgoe.or.at
(the website is unavailable)

ORGANIZACIJA „BLOCKFREI"
www.blockfrei.org
(the target group is whole SouthEast Europe)

ZAJEDNICA SRPSKIH KLUBOVA U BEČU
(no website)

DRUŠTVO „HAJDUK VELjKO"
(no website)

DRUŠTVO „BEOGRAD"
(no website)

„JEDINSTVO" BEČ
(no website)

SRPSKI KULTURNI FORUM
www.skforum.at
(active web site)

ÖSTERREICHISCH SERBISCHES WIRTSCHAFTSFORUM
www.oesw.org
(web site is only in german language)

AUSTRIJSKO SRPSKO DRUŠTVO (ASD)
ÖSTERREICH SERBISCHES GESELLSCHAFT, ÖSG
www.oesg.or.at
(the website is unavailable)

AUSTRIJSKO-SRPSKA ŽENSKA INICIJATIVA
(no web site)

SRPSKO PROSVJETNO I KULTURNO DRUŠTVO
PROSVJETA AUSTRIJA
www.prosvjeta.at
(active web site)

DIJASPORA MEDIA ASSOCIATION (DMA)
Verein für interkulturelle Kommunikation
www.dijaspora.tv
(active web site)

„KOLO" BEČ
(no web site)

SKUD „KARADjORDjE"
(no web site)

KSD "BAMBI" BEČ
(no web site)

UDRUŽENjE "REČ, BOJA, TON"
(no web site)

KUD "STEVAN MOKRANjAC"
(no web site)

SKUD "KARADjORDjE"
www.karadjordje.at
(the web site is unavailable)

KUD "BRANKO RADIČEVIĆ"
(no web site)

WUZ – WienerInnen Unternehmen Zukunft
(no web site)

SRPSKI CENTAR - UDRUŽENjE SRPSKIH KULTURNIH POSLANIKA, INTELEKTUALACA I PRIVREDNIKA U AUSTRIJI
Web: www.srpskicentar.at
(active website)

SRPSKI KULTURNO-INFORMATICNI CENTAR
(no web site)

SRBOSLOV-SRPSKE NOVINE
Web: www.srboslov.info
(the web site is unavailable)

UDRUŽENjE MEDIJA Gipsy TV
www.gipsy.tv
www.gipsy-info.org
(the website is only in german)

FK"SRBIJA 08"
(no web site)

"Bosnian" organisations:

Collegium Bosniacum
Udruženje studenata BiH u Beču
www.collegium-bosniacum.org
www.cbnetwork.at
(web site is unavailable)

Kultur Sport Verein "Brčko Distrikt"
web: kud-bh-rubina-bec.de.tl
(active website)

Serbischer Bildungs- und Kulturverein "Prosvjeta" - SPKD Prosvjeta
www.prosvjeta.at
(is on the both lists - Serbian and Bosnian list of organisations)

Kroatischer Kulturverein - HKD Napredak-Austrija
web: napredak.at
(active website)

Gemeinschaft der serbischen Vereine in Wien - Zajednica srpskih klubova u Beču
www.wien.serben.at
(is on the both lists - Serbian and Bosnian list of organisations, web site is unavailable on both lists)

Verein “Jedinstvo" - Klub “Jedinstvo"
www.jedinstvo.at
(is on the both lists - Serbian and Bosnian list of organisations, but website is just on the Bosnian list)

Serbischer Kulturverein “Branko Radičević" - SKD “Branko Radičević"
(is on the both lists - Serbian and Bosnian list of organisations, there is no web site on any list)

Kulturverein “Ljiljan", Wien - KV “Ljiljan" Wien
www.ljiljan-wien.orb
(web site is only in German)

Verein Sarajevo" -Klub “Sarajevo"
www.sarajevo.at
(web site is unavailable)

Bosnisch-Herzegowinisches Bildungs- und Kulturzentrum MOSTOVI
Web: www.mostovi.at
(active website)

STUDIRAJeu - Verein Bosnisch - herzegowinischer Studenten und Akademiker in Europa
Web: http://www.studiraj.eu
(active web site)

Srebrenica-Wien-Plattform Bosnien-Österreich
(no web site)

Bosnisch-Herzegowinischer Kulturverein. "Behar", Wien
(no web site)

Verein zur Integration der bosnischen Burger in Üsterreich "BOSNA"
(no web site)

Verein “Berufsinformations- & Kultur- und Meinungsforschungsinstitut von Bosnien und Herzegowina & EU-Staaten"
Web: http://www.austria-bosnia.at
(active website)

Business Women of Bosnia and Herzegovina
Internet: www.bhwomen.org
(active website)

"Croatian" organisations

Croatian Home - Hrvatski Dom
https://hrvatskidom.com/

Croatian Center - Hrvatski centar
http://www.hrvatskicentar.at/

APPENDIX 2

Abstract

People from the former Yugoslav territories are one of the most numerous social groups in Vienna. Since the 19th century they have been coming to the capital of Austria in different phases and for different reasons. What happened to them when the country of Yugoslavia broke apart? Have their belonging modes and the relations between them changed and in what way? Who are “our” people in Vienna, how have they become what they are today and how do they fit into the definition of diaspora? Is Yugonostalgia present among them? In this master thesis the reader is provided with the insight into all these and other related questions, while reading about interesting personal stories, events and places related to former Yugoslavs in Vienna.

Key words: Diaspora, Nostalgia, Yugoslavia, *Naši* (“Our” people), Vienna

Abstrakt

Die aus ehemals jugoslawischen Gebieten stammenden Menschen gehören zu den zahlreichsten sozialen Gruppen in Wien. Seit dem 19. Jahrhundert kamen sie in unterschiedlichen Phasen und aus unterschiedlichen Gründen in die Hauptstadt Österreichs. Was geschah mit ihnen, als das Land Jugoslawien auseinanderbrach? Auf welche Weise haben sich ihr Zugehörigkeitsgefühl oder gegenseitige Beziehungen untereinander verändert? Wer sind „Unsere" Menschen in Wien, wie sind sie zu dem geworden, was sie sind und wie passen sie in die Definition von Diaspora? Ist Jugonostalgie unter ihnen vorhanden? In dieser Masterarbeit erhält der Leser einen Einblick in all diese und weitere Fragen, während er über interessante Geschichten, Ereignisse und Orte mit Bezug zum ehemaligen Jugoslawien in Wien liest.

Stichworte: Diaspora, Nostalgie, Jugoslawien, *Naši* („Unsere" Menschen), Wien