

# **Slovenian Migrants in Transnational Social Spaces: Exploring Multilayered Identifications and Ambivalent Belongings**

**Tea Golob**

Independent researcher, tea.golob@gmail.com

## **ABSTRACT**

The paper explores the complexity of identifications among Slovenian migrants coming from Argentina. The focus is on migrants who had emigrated from Slovenia and have now returned or who were born in Slovenian communities abroad and recently came to live in Slovenia. The primary aim is to shed light on the complexity of their feelings of belonging that emerged as a result of contemporary migration processes. The perspective that attempts to reveal the variety of their identifications presents a concept of home, yet this may denote a house, a family, a locus of belonging or imagined community. Considering migrants as a part of transnational diaspora stretched between Slovenia and Argentina, the intention is to represent the understandings of belongings that reflect the experience of having lived in social worlds that span two distant countries and how de-centred and multiple attachments and feelings of belonging to more than one place developed.

**KEYWORDS:** Slovenian transnational migrants, ambivalent feelings of belonging, multilayered identifications, concept of home

## **Introduction**

We live in an age in which transnational migration, border crossings and global media are proliferating at an increasing rate. The social, economic and cultural connectivity of the world is becoming an inevitable fact, and the regular movement of a people, goods, and ideas is certainly a part of everyday reality. Mixing languages and blending cultures, all this movement challenges the intrinsic connection between people and their place. The deterritorialization caused by intensive migration has created many diasporic people who have become physically disconnected from their homelands as they have settled in different countries. Nonetheless, the desire and need for belonging to a certain place are still strongly present among them; and the homeland as a physical and imagined territory remains an important element in their attachments and belongings.

Relying on those presumptions, this paper explores the relationship between migration processes and identifications among Slovenian migrants coming from Argentina. The focus is on migrants who either emigrated from Slovenia in the course of their life or then returned, or on their descendants who were born and grew up in a Slovenian community abroad but decided to migrate to Slovenia. They participate in transnational social fields stretched between their homeland and the diasporic communities established in Argentina. They can be best understood as transmigrants 'whose daily lives depend on multiple and constant interconnections across international borders and whose public identities are configured in a relationship to more than one nation-state' (Glick-Schiller and Basch 1995: 48). Accordingly, the aim herein is to shed light on the complexity of their feelings of belonging emerging as a result of contemporary migration processes. In this context, it is important to understand that migration constitutes a complex socio-cultural phenomenon, not solely because it entails geographical mobility. It produces a whole range of personal and social transformations, even though it is delimited by diverse internal and external cultural, economical and socio-political factors. Therefore, this paper considers migration within the framework of a transnationalism that contemplates processes, activities, individuals and their identifications across national borders and connects them within a broader space, both physical and cognitive. The perspective lens that attempts to reveal the variety of their identifications presents a concept of home, yet it may denote a house, a family, a locus of belonging and imagined community (Basu 2004).

This paper ensues from the supposition that *home* and *homeland* remain one of the most powerful unifying symbols for mobile and displaced individuals, although the relation to both may be very differently constructed in different settings (see Gupta and Ferguson 1997: 39). The underlying thought of this paper, which has served as a frame of the research, is that the concept of home occupies an important position in contemporary anthropological ideas referring to transnationality, hybridity and creolisation. Transnational migration and territorial dispersion have shed a new light on migrants and their spatial belongings. Although mass migration is hardly a new feature of human history, one can notice that the influence of the rapid flow of mass-mediated images, scripts and sensations has brought about 'a new order of instability in the production of modern subjectivities' (Appadurai 1996: 6). Alongside the growing awareness that transnational processes have changed ideas about migration and belongings, new conceptual ideas concerned with home have come to the fore.

One needs to take into account that *home* has always been a concern of scholars exploring various issues relating the ideas of intimacy, family, kinship, gender, ethnicity, relations of production and consumption and many more (see Mallet 2004: 84). Regarding the fact the notion of home comprises various aspects of people's lives, it is not surprising how many different ways in exploring it have emerged in disciplines concerned with people, societies and places. Nevertheless, traditional anthropological conceptualizations considered the notion of home mostly as a synonym for a house or a household (Rapport and Overing 2003: 157). *Home* referred to a physical shelter, territorially bounded in a certain location, where daily routines and family relations are embedded in a fixed enviro-

ment. Furthermore, considering home as a physical place, it could also denote a country, nation-state or homeland, yet such a conceptualisation of home was explicitly territorially based and predicated upon the nation-state acting as the primary container for people's lives (Lukas and Purkayastha 2007: 244).

In contemporary anthropological perspectives, home can still mean a house or a nation-state; however, the view of the notion has changed. Challenging the growth of global communications, media, consumerism and popular culture, which has greatly affected the contemporary global situation, new issues have emerged and new conceptual lenses have been used in approaching the concept of home. Revaluated ideas about home reflect the changing relation between individuals and perceptions of place. It has been argued that since places are more a result of imagination than being just a static entity, the symbolic geography and meanings attached can be as real as the actual territory. Although the imagined places are experienced only through social memories, they can be as real as actual, experienced places (see Repič 2009: 183). Accordingly, the notion of home has taken an important position in anthropological debates regarding the role of transnationality in contemporary migration processes. Traditional understandings of home as a fixed and territorially based entity became anachronistic, and provide little conceptual stability on a world of contemporary movement. New ideas about home have been postulated insinuating on perspectives, which are concerned less with the routinization of space and time and more with their fluidity and with individuals' continuous movement through them (Rapport and Dawson 1998; Ahmed 1999; Rapport and Overing 2003; Mallet 2004; Lukas and Purkayastha 2007). It is argued that presently a concept of home should consider 'various modalities, as for instance memory and longing; the conventional and the creative; the ideational, the affective and the physical; the spatial and the temporal; the local and the global; both positive evaluations and negative' (Rapport and Overing 2003: 157). Home has thus become mobile, multidimensional and in a way deterritorialized.

Therefore, it is becoming increasingly important to distinguish between a homeland (a place of origin to which one feels emotionally attached) and a home (a stable place of residence that feels secure, comfortable, and familiar). Seeing that transnational migration not only introduces a disjuncture between peoples and their homeland, but also between their homeland and their homes, migrants may create more than one home, not necessarily attached to a homeland (see Tsuda 2004: 125). Accordingly, the challenge herein is to capture the connections between imagining and constructing a home (or homes) and defining a self, while considering this disjuncture.

## **Slovenian migrants within transnational social spaces**

My interest in the connections between migration, dislocation, belongings and identifications started rather accidentally after I met some students who came from Argentina, but claiming Slovenian nationality. As an anthropologist, I could not restrain my curiosity as to why they actually live there, what their everyday life looks like, and how do they feel when they are in Slovenia? While looking for potential interlocutors, I made connections with students who have lived together in a Student Home in the centre of Ljubljana. Even

at the first visit, I noticed many interesting object. The rooms of the students were decorated with various pictures of Argentina; on the shelves there were Argentinean books and special metal straws – *bombillas* – for serving a tea. Some of students also had an Argentinean flag on the wall; all of them made a particular note of the place. Furthermore, at the beginning of our conversations, I noticed that sometimes they spoke of themselves as being Argentines and sometimes as being Slovenians. This duality has led me to the central part of my study – their identifications.

Accordingly, the purpose herein is to represent the ways in which transnational practices of exchange, communication and frequent travel impact daily experiences of migrants and their perceptions of home, based on twenty-five stories of Slovenian transnational migrants. Nevertheless, in effort to understand the contemporary transnational connections and activities between Argentina and Slovenia, the basis for migration to and from Argentina needs to be explained.

Slovenians started to immigrate to Argentina during the last quarter of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. A large wave of emigrants occurred between 1923 and 1929. Migrants predominantly were from the Slovenian border region called Primorska and proclaimed themselves as sympathizers of socialism and communism after the Second World War. They advocated the formation of the new Yugoslavia and defended the annexation of Primorska to Yugoslavia (Žigon 1998: 42). The majority settled in Buenos Aires, where they established closely linked communities. Immediately upon arrival, they started to organize themselves into societies. The political and social situation in Argentina was characterized by a multiculturalism that encouraged immigration and supported immigrant activities. Accordingly, Slovenians established special meeting points called Slovenian Houses, organized the first Slovenian primary schools in Argentina, where children could learn Slovenian language, and published Slovenian magazines (Repič 2006: 132). The social and political activities of Slovenian immigrants significantly changed after the Second World War. The Argentinean government prohibited many Slovenian associations in 1949 because of their political and ideological perspectives. The political situation of Slovenian migrants proved to become even more complex when Argentina was confronted with a new wave of immigrants. Considering migration to or from Argentina, the political context has played an important role, whereas the majority of returned migrants and their descendants coming to Slovenia lived in communities characterized by the political situation emerging after Second World War. Those Slovenian were predominantly political refugees opposed to the communist regime. Many of them left their homes and relatives due to force, and many others experienced a well-founded fear of violence. Memories of the post-war situation and the circumstances forcing them to leave home remain vivid among migrants; they have been consciously preserving those memories in order to legitimize and substantiate their diasporic identity. They organized their life separately from the communities established by immigrants prior to the Second World War. They created their own Slovenian associations under the patronage of the Catholic Church and had almost now relations with the older Slovenian communities. Nevertheless, being a special social, ethnic-linguistic and cultural group, they had a strong interest in establishing and maintaining relations with its original nation. Due

to the political situation, they established Slovenian communities where they have often made conscious efforts to preserve Slovenian identity, cultural heritage and memories of the homeland and tried to transfer the accumulation of these efforts onto their descendants.

Therefore, comprehending and imagining Slovenia as a homeland and a strong consciousness of Slovenian origin has been one of the reasons leading migrants to come from Argentina to Slovenia, especially for those who came to Slovenia before the Slovenian independence or immediately after it. Slovenian independence held a meaningful shift for the Slovenian community in Argentina. Many of them came back because they wanted to fulfil their dreams or dreams of their parents and thus partly fulfil a myth of return. As one of the migrants from the second generation living there explained: ‘Many Slovenians came to Argentina believing to come back in few years and that marked us – their children. They always wanted to come back and so did we. . . I came to Slovenia convinced that I am exclusively Slovenian’.

Nevertheless, the majority of them came after 2001, led not only by personal reasons but also because of the economic situation in Argentine. It is often impossible to separate the social or cultural factors from the economic, as the social context within which economic factors arise contributes to their importance. It is worth mentioning that as early as in the 1980s, and even before that, a rhetoric of national revival emerged as a consequence of the military dictatorship, seeing that many people tried to leave the country as politic refugees (see Repič 2006: 125–126). A few decades later, due to an economic crisis, migration from Argentina started again. Accordingly, many Argentines intensively began to search for their origin and tried to find the ways of legitimization of their origin through the rhetoric of the national rebirth, especially after 2001 (Repič 2006: 166). Therefore, Slovenian roots have led many individuals living in Slovenian community to come to Slovenia, while the whole migration process, including the decision for migration, has been facilitated by transnational connections between both states. As one of the migrants said:

We have Slovenian blood and we lived in the Slovenian community; therefore, when we came to Slovenia everything was familiar, I had a feeling that I had been here before, and besides, a lot of my friends and relatives came here before me, so it was actually easy for me to start a new life.

Almost immediately upon arrival, they connected in associations in a similar way as their parents or grandparents did in Argentina. Beside formal organizations, they formed networks of informal connections mostly with friends they know from Argentina. In Argentina, they tried to preserve the Slovenian language but attempted to speak Spanish as well. They regularly attend an Argentinean mass in Šentjakob, where they also play football and other games and organize festivities as they did in Argentina. The priest of that parish explained to me:

For years, we have held masses in the church of Saint Jacob in the Spanish language every month. We are preserving the Argentinean atmosphere; we are playing football and organizing other activities as well. The fact is that have a double culture here, we are conscious of both of them and we are trying to preserve them.

These meetings are of great importance, especially when a person has first arrived, because they facilitate first days or months in a new country. Gradually, they participate in the meetings less frequently depending upon how successfully they integrate into Slovenian society. Migrants from Argentina cooperate with each other and with formal organizations that help new arrivals with bureaucracy and other proceedings. These kinds of contacts are of great importance, especially in first years in new environment, because establishing immigrants' social networks and organisations is an important part of the integration strategies of immigrants who connect themselves to communities on the basis of similar experiences. It is argued that 'the necessity for keeping company with each other is not present only within older generation but also in younger where many of them identify themselves with immigration and not with remigration' (Lukšič-Hacin 2004:29).

Furthermore, the transnational connections also play an important role in migrants' life after the arrival to Slovenia. Although they do not often visit their relatives in Argentina because of the distance and expensive of flying there, the links among them still remain strong. As one of the migrants said: 'We keep regular connections with Argentina because it became much easier now. You can just talk through the computer for free or for low cost. That is why I talk with my parents and friends several times a week'. Therefore, their everyday life activities extend the borders of their communities and state of resident and link them with their homeland or with other communities in different states. They create a dense social network based on their migration strategies, everyday actions and regular routines that expend borders of one country. While living in Argentina, they organize not just nostalgic imaginings of the homeland but active relationships with it on a daily level. They have become firmly rooted in their new country, but they have maintained multiple linkages with the other. Moreover, they not only live their lives across the borders of two or more nation-states, participating in the daily life of various states, but also bring to bear citizenship in these states, whether on the basis of legal rights or being substantively members of those states (Glick-Schiller 2005b). Within the field of transnationality, they can be denoted as a part of Slovenian diaspora, which has gained the adjective *global*. It is important to take into account that regular connections between immigrant communities and the homeland were established almost immediately upon the emigration and were relatively strong. Nevertheless, at the time when Slovenia was becoming independent, those links significantly strengthened, and the discourse of Slovenian diaspora entered the political field as a political discourse and a construct as a result of the active participation of Slovenian migrants in the process of independence (Skrbiš 2003: 13).

The presence of the diaspora in political discussions gave rise to new perspectives on Slovenianess, while establishing more global ideas about the Slovenian nation and enabling the discourse of Slovenian global diaspora (see Skrbiš 2003: 14–15). In the light of this context, the diaspora has acquired a new and theoretically challenging position. In terms of transnationality, the diaspora has become closely related to the increasing relevance of representations of identity and culture in international politics, and has accordingly become an element of self-reference and political identification. It has been argued that by access to new channels of communication, by economic exchange and facilitated physical

mobility, extraterritorial groups or organizations could seek political influence in their homelands or other communities of the same perceived origin, or vice versa (Kokot et. al 2004: 1–2). Nevertheless, the role of the homeland in its political aspirations is often even more important. The political activity of the Slovenian diaspora is a complex phenomenon seeing that particular political institutions and parties in Slovenia have played an important role in its political mobilization in order to serve as a support to certain ideological and political perspectives opposed to the communist past. In accordance, although it has become recognizable that the diaspora plays an important role in transnational stage, one needs to consider that migrants remain dependent on states and their institutions. In an effort to elucidate the intrinsic ambiguity in migrants' attachments to their homeland and to the diaspora, the concept of home offers an invaluable analytical tool. Therefore, it is crucial to consider that the social constructions of home, place and belonging simultaneously depend on ethnicity and ties to an imagined homeland, whereas they depend upon a legal and social status and economic and political relations in both locations (Ahmed et. al. 2003: 8). That implication insinuates on contested homes, and ambivalent, multilayered identifications among migrants.

## **Contested homes and ambivalent identities among Slovenian transnational migrants**

Perspectives of transnationality have implied a radical change in the conceptualization between movement and home. Increasingly, individuals are seen as moving between multiple present homes. Taking into account the ideas signifying the changing perspectives on home within a frame of transnationality, one can notice a move away from the notion of bounded socio-cultural units of analysis in favour of an appreciation of individuals who move cognitively and physically through their lives: who throughout their lives move shorter and greater distances across the globe, and who imagine communities of belonging (and invent their traditions) on their way (cf. Anderson 1983, Hobsbawm and Ranger 1983, Mallet 2004).

Seeing that growth of global communications, media, consumerism and popular culture has greatly affected present society, one can see that migrants negotiate traditions, memories, and feelings of belonging in never-ending struggles to form and re-form new ambivalent identities. In order to understand the connection between diaspora and homeland and to illustrate the ambiguity of their identification, the notion of home seems to be invaluable. Cultural studies and anthropological literature detailing the experience of migrants and refugees as well as sociological and psychological empirical research on family formation and home leaving claim that ideas about staying, leaving and journeying are integrally associated with notions of home. As such, home, be it defined as a dwelling, a homeland, or even a constellation of relationships, is represented as a spatial and relational realm from which people venture into the world and generally hope to return. It is a place of origin (however recent or relative), as well as a point of destination. Accordingly, the conditions under which people leave their homelands, their journey beyond and away from home and their destination are all said to impact their identity and understanding

of home (see Mallet 2004). Therefore, the journey of migration involves the splitting of home as a place of origin and a place of residence, or everyday experiences. Migrants' descriptions of home show a broad set of transnational experiences instigating from the day reality of living in social world 'that span more than one place' (Vertovec 2001: 575). They represent migrants' identities and self-positioning in societies both *here* and *there*. However, not only transnational practices but also particular living conditions before and after migration in the countries of origin and residence affect migrants' articulations of home. Homes are gendered spaces, inhabited by people of various social classes, different generations and political orientations with diverse experiences of movements between their multiple homes. Therefore, migrants' relation to the notion of home could reveal a great deal about the process of imagining their identity.

Focusing on the first generation of immigrants in Argentina, one can notice that although migrants were territorially detached from their homelands before the return, they grew accustomed to a life in their host countries, and well-situated and comfortable living in self-contained immigrant communities with their families and acquaintances. Accordingly, they were able to create a *home* away from their homeland. The same process is also well evident while viewing the arrival of emigrants' descendants to Slovenia. Once again, it is important to consider that a home not necessarily an adequate homeland.

Slovenians who lived abroad for many years consequently formulated a mythologized homeland that became an important component of their identity. I argue that migration to Slovenia presented a meaningful shift in their imagining and perceiving of homeland and accordingly of home. When they returned to their former place of living, or established home in a new place, their home in Argentina turned out to be an important component of their identity. They are connected with both homes, although they actually live only in one of them. The way in which they imagine both of them depends on the relation between them.

It has been argued that distant locations to which individuals feel attached to are not only linked but are dependent upon each other for their meaning. It is the connection between the two places – *here* and *there* or *home* and *away* – that is of paramount importance (Clifford 1997). Consequently, migrants negotiate traditions, memories, and feelings of belonging in never-ending struggles to form and re-form new ambivalent identities. Often, migrants struggle to define where their home is. This very question can sometimes evoke discomfort. Their relation to home emphasizes a complexity of self-identification and attachment to more than one place, which is quite evident in comparing different generations of migrants living abroad. For instance, the first generation of immigrants consciously and intentionally retained only one ethnic identity, which is not the case among their descendants. Notwithstanding, they were physically and emotionally attached to more places, which is reflected through their relation to home. Home presents a multi-layered notion, although they perceived only Slovenia as their true homeland. Slovenia was thus a homeland for them, but not the only home. They had more than just one home, but they imagined their homes in different ways and attributed different connotations and features to them. They transferred this highly symbolized connection between home and homeland onto their children, while raising them in a strong Slovenian identity.

Beside the component of home as homeland, my interlocutors more frequently expressed home to be a shelter, a place where one feels safe and where one's family is. Again, these homes do not refer to one place and there is ambivalence in their expressions. Some of them also feel as if they had no home at all. I found it interesting when one of my interlocutors said:

I am homeless now, because home is where father and mother live, but they died. So I have no home in Argentina. Here [in Slovenia] I am also without home. I have a house but I do not feel really attached to it. In this sense I am homeless. I feel like Slovenia is my homeland, so it is some kind of a home, but I lived thirty years in Argentina and I can not avoid that fact.

Narratives of migrants offer an interesting insight into the influence of transnational connections in perceiving and imagining multiple homes. It has been argued that transnationalism as a concept grew out of the recognition that migrants do not necessarily substitute old homes for new ones in a straightforward transfer, but often create active fields between the two (Ramji 2006: 646). In response to transnational circumstances, migrants experience home as multi-dimensional, pluri-local, and characterized by regular crossings of borders. For instance, the expressions of the migrants reveal the confusion and certain level of hesitation:

Where is my home? Hmm. I have two homelands, otherwise I don't know where I belong to. Physically I am Argentine, I have two citizenships and I do not intend to refuse one, because I was born there. Still, I am Slovenian, I have Slovenian citizenship. I often go there, but now I live here, in Slovenia.

Following the stories and narratives about homes, I argue that for migrants the transnational experiences influenced the meanings and characteristics of home. Homes in these stories are negotiated between embodied experiences, social networks, and politicised and narrated identities. Slovenia and immigrants' countries were associated with feeling of home. Therefore, home is pluri-local and incorporates the global and the local. The pluri-local nature is affirmed by simultaneous descriptions of home as a dwelling, a Slovenian community or a country of residence. Migrants also described home as a space defined very much by movement (Al-Ali and Koser 2002; Lucas and Purkayastha 2007). Therefore, Slovenia was sometimes defined as being at home, or going from Slovenia felt like going home as well.

Migrants changed their perception of home while migrating to Slovenia and simultaneously transformed their self-identifications. They have two homes now, not just a mythic home, as in the case of Slovenian emigrants living abroad. They sustain regular connections with both of them. They have multi-layered, complex, ambivalent identities relating to more than just one home in one country. Immigrants have to negotiate relationship to their new countries of settlement, but at the same time, the relationships to the past and

to the country of origin are renegotiated. Migrants, while settling in a new society, borrow new characteristics and elements from it and consequently reinvent elements of home country traditions (amongst others) thereby transforming them (Huttunen 2005). Migrants simultaneously create communities and identifications in the transnational space that is signified with pluri-locality and social and symbolic networks between different places (Repič 2006: 37–45). Their feelings of belonging indicate a certain level of ambivalence, and in relation to transnational activities they have all established multilayered, ambivalent transnational identifications. Two of the migrants explained:

When we lived in Argentina, we thought that we are more Argentines than Slovenians. However, when we came here, we noticed that we have more in common with Slovenians than we thought before. Therefore, if someone asks me what I am, I answer that I am Slovenian but I am also Argentine.

I have two homelands. I cannot erase the fact that I was born in Argentina but raised as a Slovenian. In Argentina, we maintained Slovenian identity but now we try to preserve Argentinean language and habits as well, for example, we eat asado<sup>1</sup> and drink mate.<sup>2</sup>

## **Conclusion**

There are many possible ways by which migrants can organize and construct their relationships and identities in both a new land and homeland. According to Glick-Schiller ‘even long-distance nationalists who identify with a nation-state building project in an ancestral homeland usually live within a social field that includes multiple social networks that are not ethnically based’ (Glick-Schiller 2005: 442). Moreover, it is of great importance to recognize that migrants can consciously choose and switch between multiple identities. The success of migrants involved in transnational activities does not depend so much on abandoning their culture and language in order to adapt to another society. It seems to be more important for them to preserve their original cultural endowment and simultaneously instrumentally adapt to a second one (Portes et al. 1999). Identifications could take over an instrumental value, which insinuates on the significant role of individual’s agency in migration processes.

It is not easy to define how migrants construct their self-identification, and many distinctions additionally exist among them. The most visible differences refer to the fact that those who emigrated from Slovenia created much different identification from those who were born in Slovenian families abroad. Their self-identification is characterized by the generation of Slovenians living abroad, their sense of belonging and the role of Slovenian community where they lived. It has been recognized that transnational migrants, therefore,

---

<sup>1</sup> Asado is a traditional dish of Argentina, usually consisting of beef alongside various other meats, cooked on a grill or open fire

<sup>2</sup> Mate is a national drink in Argentina prepared by steeping dry leaves of yerba mate

as ones who maintain connections, build institutions, conduct transactions, and influence local and national events (in both the country of residence and the country from which they emigrated) construct and imagine identities that are far from being straightforward. Accordingly, there is a certain level of ambivalence within feelings of belonging or spatial attachments presented among them. Nonetheless, conceptions of home as dynamic processes, involving acts of imagining, unmaking, changing, losing and moving homes (Al-Ali and Koser 2002: 6), offer an invaluable insight into complex identifications. Regarding recent shifts in anthropological perspectives, which have moved the focus from ideas that locality and community are simply given or natural to processes of place-making (e.g. Gupta and Ferguson 1997; 2007), the concept of home nowadays presents an intricate concept embracing social praxis, norms and values, feelings of belongings and attachments. As an analytical tool, it offers an important insight into individual's identification, while revealing the connections between imaging place and defining the self.

## References

- Ahmed, Sara. 1999. Home and away: Narratives of migration and estrangement. *International Journal of Cultural Studies* 2 (3): 329–347.
- Ahmed Sara et. al. 2003. 'Introduction.' In: Sara Ahmed, Claudia Castañeda, Anne-Marie Fortier, Mimi Sheller, (eds.), *Uprooting/Regrounding: Questions of Home and Migration*. Oxford and New York: Berg. pp. 1–10.
- Al-Ali, Nadjé and Khalid Koser. 2002. 'Introduction'. In: Al-Ali, Nadjé and Khalid Koser (eds.), *New Approaches to Migration? Transnational Communities and the Transformation of Home*. London, New York : Routledge, pp. 1–15.
- Anderson, Benedict. 1983. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Appadurai, Arjun. 1996 *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Basu, Paul. 2004. My Own Island Home. The Orkney Homecoming. *Journal of Material Culture* 9: 27–42.
- Clifford, James. 1997. 'Diasporas'. In: Montserrat Guibernau in Jon Rex, (eds.), *Ethnicity Reader: Nationalism, Multiculturalism and Migration*. Cambridge, Oxford in Malden: Polity Press, pp. 283–290.
- Glick-Schiller, Nina. 2005. Transnational Social Fields and Imperialism: Bringing a Theory of Power to Transnational Studies. *Anthropological Theory* 5 (4): 439–461.
- Glick-Schiller, Nina. 2005b. Transborder citizenship: an outcome of legal pluralism within transnational social fields. In: Franz Bender Beckman and Keebit Bender Beckman (eds.), *Mobile People, Mobile Law: Expanding Legal Relations in a Contracting World*. Burlington: Ashgate, pp. 27–50.
- Glick-Schiller, Nina and Linda Basch. 1995. From Immigrant to Transmigrant: Theorizing Transnational Migration. *Anthropological Quarterly* 68 (1): 48–63.
- Gupta, Akhil and James Ferguson. 1997. *Culture, Power, Place: Explorations in Critical Anthropology*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

- Gupta Akhil and James Ferguson. 2007. Beyond culture: Space, identity and the politics of difference. In: Jeffrey A. Sluka and Antonius C. G. M. Robben (eds.), *Ethnographic Fieldwork: An Anthropological Reader*. Malden, Oxford and Carlton: Blackwell Publishing, pp. 337–346.
- Hobsbawn, Eric and Terence Ranger. 1983. *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Huttunen, Laura 2005. “Home” and ethnicity in the context of war: Hesitant diasporas of Bosnian refugees. *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 8 (2): 177–195.
- Kokot Waltraud, Khachig Tölölyan og Carolin Alfonso. 2004. *Diaspora, Identity and Religion: New Directions in Theory and Research*. London: Routledge
- Lucas, Susan and Bandana Purkayastha. 2007. “Where is home?” Here and there: transnational experiences of home among Canadian migrants in the United States. *Geo-Journal* 68: 243–243.
- Lukšič-Hacin, Marina. 2004. Vračanje Slovencev iz Argentine. *Dve domovini* 20: 13–34.
- Mallet, Shelley 2004. Understanding home: a critical review of the literature. *The Sociological Review* 52 (1): 62–89.
- Portes, Alejandro, Guarnizo, Luis E. and Landolt, Patricia. 1999. The Study of Transnationalism: Pitfalls and Promise of an Emergent Research Field. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 22 (2): 217–237.
- Ramji, Hasmita. 2006. British Indians “Returning Home”: An Exploration of Transnational Belongings. *Sociology* 40 (4): 645–663.
- Rapport, Nigel and Andrew Dawson. 1998. *Migrants of Identity: Perception of Home in the World of Movement*. Oxford, New York: Berg
- Rapport, Nigel and Joanna Overing. 2004. *Social and cultural anthropology: The Key Concepts*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Repič, Jaka. 2006. *Po sledovih korenin*. Ljubljana: Oddelek za etnologijo in kulturno antropologijo.
- Repič, Jaka. 2009. Shifting Home and Identities: Being Slovenian in Argentina and Argentinean in Slovenia. In: Jaka Repič, Alenka Bartulović and Katarina Sajovec Altshul (eds.) *MESS, Mediterranean Ethnological Summer School, Vol. 7*. Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta, pp. 169–187.
- Skrbiš, Zlatko. 2003. Diasporično slovenstvo: politika, nacionalizem in mobilnost. *Družbene razprave* 19 (42): 9–20.
- Tsuda, Takeyuki Gaku. 2004. When Home Is Not the Homeland: The Case of Japanese Brazilian Ethnic Return Migration. In: Fran Markowitz and Anders H. Stefansson (eds.), *Homecomings: Unsettling Paths of Return*. Lanham: Lexington Books. pp. 125–146.
- Vertovec, Stephen 2001. Transnationalism and Identity. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 27 (4): 573–582.
- Žigon, Zvone. 1998. *Otroci dveh domovin: Slovenstvo v Južni Ameriki*. Ljubljana: ZRC SAZU.

## **POVZETEK**

Prispevek obravnava zapletenost identifikacije slovenskih transnacionalnih migrantov iz Argentine. Poudarek je na povratnih migrantih, ki so nekoč emigrirali iz Slovenije ter njihovih potomcih, ki so bili rojeni v slovenski skupnosti in so sedaj imigrirali nazaj v Slovenijo. Glavni namen prispevka je osvetliti zapletenost njihovih občutij pripadnosti, ki je vzniknila kot posledica sodobnih migracijskih procesov. Ta perspektiva poskuša razkriti njihove različne identifikacije in razumevanje koncepta doma, ki lahko označuje tako hišo kot družino ali pa pripadnost zamišljeni skupnosti. Z osredotočanjem na migrante, ki so del mednarodne diaspore, razpete med Slovenijo in Argentino, skuša prispevek orisati razumevanje pripadnosti, ki odraža izkustvo življenja v družbenih svetovih, ki se razprostirata po dveh različnih deželah ter razumevanje razvoja mnogoterih vezanosti in pripadnosti na več kot en prostor.

**KLJUČNE BESEDE:** slovenski transnacionalni migranti, ambivalentni občutki pripadnosti, večplastne identifikacije, koncept doma

CORRESPONDENCE: TEA GOLOB, Trubarjeva 23, 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia.  
E-mail: tea.golob@gmail.com.