Universiteit Leiden
The Netherlands

MSc Cultural Anthropology and Development Sociology

Master Thesis:

"When Heritage and Kinship meet at Home:

French Migrants in Luxembourg"

Name:	Lara Persin Rexer
Student number:	s2747162
Course:	MSc Cultural Anthropology and Development Sociology
Supervisor:	Peter Pels
Assignment:	Master Thesis
Date:	30th of June 2025
Word count:	27'022
Pages:	60

Acknowledgments

I want to thank my supervisor, Peter Pels, for his continued support throughout this thesis, and the *At Home Otherwise* Research Project for inspiring this research in the first place.

Words cannot express how grateful I am to everyone who has participated in my research during my fieldwork. This thesis would not have been possible without any of my participants. I want to thank everyone who has taken the time out of their day to support this endeavor and share their experiences with me. I am extremely grateful to the "Communauté des Français au Luxembourg", especially Christophe Biraud, for allowing me to join them and get to know everyone within the community.

I want to extend special thanks to my mom, for having supported me during my whole research, and for always believing in me regardless of the stage that I was at. I could not have undertaken this journey without her, my family and my friends, for their presence and support encouraged me to continue even when things got tough.

Abstract

This research examines how French migrants integrate in Luxembourg through an exploration of their understandings of home, heritage and kinship ties. With French migrants being part of one of the bigger communities of migrants within Luxembourg, they offer an example of how European migrants integrate in another European country.

Through fieldwork in the South of Luxembourg with French migrants of different regional backgrounds, this research aims to show how home is an essential space for connecting both kinship ties and heritage together. Home is influenced by inside and outside factors, which then affects how well a community integrates. French migrants, for the most part, are not affected by racial discriminations, which this research highlights by the absence of such themes when discussing the subject of home, relationships and heritage.

Keywords: French migration, patrimoine, heritage, home, kinship ties, Luxembourg

TABLE OF CONTENT

Introduction

The motivation behind this thesis started with my parents. They moved away from their family in France into Luxembourg over 30 years ago, leaving behind family, friends, neighbors and coworkers. My mother, a traveler by heart, had moved for an interim position (usually offered during the summer) at a hospital in Ettelbrück, in the Northern part of Luxembourg. She described her stay in Luxembourg as magical. She connected so much with Luxembourg, that she knew was meant to return to the country when she wanted to settle down. My father moved a few years after her and started working at a hospital in the south of Luxembourg. One stayed for the country, the other stayed for the financial stability and benefits that the wages had to offer. Both have spent most of their life in the country after settling down. One learned the language fully, even adopting the Luxembourgish nationality, while the other learned the basics, but kept his French nationality. Communication was done in any language that they knew, no matter how fragmented. French here, Luxembourgish there, some English in one case and some Spanish in another, there was bound to be a language that could be understood by both parties. Throughout the years, this diversity in languages will be further supported when putting their children in the Luxembourgish schooling system.

Friends were made and lost, roads were taken to visit family back in France. Big holidays for family, other celebrations for friends. The longer they were in Luxembourg, the more they settled in a routine, learning and adapting their lives in this country at the border of France. Family remained close, yet so far. Home was made with what you could find and with the values that they had brought along: safety, financial stability, hope and dreams for a future for themselves and their children where they would want for nothing. After a difficult separation between my parents, both rebuilt their own homes again, but this time without needing to negotiate with a partner what it would mean, what it would hold and entail. The small country became her place, her safety net, while he found his back in France, his childhood house renovated to be his new home.

This difference between the two highlights two ways of settling and integrating into a new county, which I have also encountered with my other interlocutors. Settling in Luxembourg, for French migrants, can be far from home or not far enough. For some the distance to family is nothing new, to others, the distance is killing them.

This thesis will aim to look at this search for a place to call home, and what French migrants seek when moving to a country a border away. I focus on the French migrant community residing in Luxembourg, which is currently the second biggest community of migrants in the country. This research attempts to look at how French migrants settle and integrate. This is also where its relevance lies.

This research is part of a bigger discussion on the integration of migrants. The focus of such research on integration is usually targeted towards the so-called ‘problem communities’ in different countries (Schinkel, 2018). My research focuses on a group of migrants who usually do not have to face the

question of integration, or at the very least, can think about integration differently than other communities. For one, my participants are all white French migrants, which means that a very important dimension of integration – namely the dimension of ethnicity and race – will be mostly, if not fully absent from this research.

Since this research focuses on a more privileged community of migrants, it can offer a useful comparison to other research of this kind with a focus on less privileged and minority migrant communities. While it is true that there are French migrants who have migrated to Luxembourg and end up struggling both financially and socially, a good part of French migrants are able to settle at the very least financially. This migration from a community of a Western country into another Western country can offer an interesting comparison within migration studies, where the focus is usually on the issues of integration that less privileged communities of migrants' face when moving to another country. (Schinkel, 2018) As Schinkel (2018) points out in his article criticizing the notion of integration, it is not about the different degrees of integration, but about who must worry about integration and who does not.

Take the Muslim community in the Netherlands for example. From discrimination (both because of their religion and ethnicity) to political opposition, the Muslim community in the Netherlands faces all kinds of challenges upon their arrival in the country. On the other hand, French migrants face significantly less trouble when moving to Luxembourg. When arriving in the country, they do not have to worry about language. Most people in Luxembourg speak some level of French. This leads to most of them not feeling the need or the pressure to learn Luxemburgish to communicate with the rest of the population. This, of course, creates its own issue, where Luxembourgish citizens tend to be more closed off to French-speaking individuals, especially if those migrants make it clear that they do not wish to learn Luxembourgish. Additionally, they do not face much if any political pressure when coming to the country, unlike communities such as the Muslim community, which faces political pressure and islamophobia in numerous Western countries such as the Netherlands and France. I will explore the socio-economic situation of Luxembourg in further details within the communicative contexts.

On the one hand, it offers insight into how more privileged communities settle in a new country where they are not faced with constant obstacles. On the other hand, it offers more comparative insight on how the treatment of migrants impacts how they can integrate in the country. In cases of both privileged migrant communities, such as the French community in Luxembourg, and less privileged and discriminated against communities, like the Muslim community in the Netherlands, their integration and attempts at settling in another country are affected by how a country treats them, both as an individual and as a community.

The chapter after the introduction will focus on the communicative contexts that I have encountered during my fieldwork. The key aspects that will be mentioned are the following: who I have done research with, what I have researched and how I have done so. I will end with an exploration of the socio-

economic situation of Luxembourg. The chapter will offer further insight into my position and how I have gained access to my interlocutors.

The next chapter is divided into four parts: the conceptual framework, and three discussions focusing on the notions of kinship, heritage and home as understood by French migrants. In these discussions, I will explore conversations and experiences I had with my interlocutors. I explore these conversations in hopes of showing how French migrants understand and apply these notions in their daily lives. I want to stress at this point (and I will repeatedly mention it throughout this research) that, while I divide the notions, it is impossible to fully separate them into neat categories. The three notions are closely interconnected with one another. I separate them to make the analysis of the subject easier to follow and understand.

I have divided them into three in hopes of answering the three sub questions of my research question. The three sub questions are as follows:

What kind of connections did French migrants seek to establish and maintain?

Did French migrants' understanding of heritage accommodate their past and present experiences?

What kinds of developments did they seek to accomplish by making a home?

I end with this research question:

Do French migrants make a home in Luxembourg by employing French heritage or other memories of their French past, and do kinship relations, whether national, fictive or based on biogenetic metaphors, play a role in this?

Homemaking and heritage are connected to integration through the attempts of migrants to settle in a new country. By making a home, migrants can settle, which then allows them to focus on how to integrate in the public sphere. Heritage influences the values and beliefs that migrants have, which are often questioned during discussions of integration. I will start by answering the sub questions to lay down the groundwork to answer the research question in the third chapter.

The subchapter after the conceptual framework will focus on the first sub question concerning the connections that French migrants establish. The next subchapter will focus on heritage and French migrants' understanding of heritage as influenced by past and present experiences. I will use the last subchapter to focus on home, and what kinds of developments French migrants hoped to achieve and have achieved after moving to Luxembourg.

I will be using the third and last chapter before the conclusion to highlight how these notions of home, heritage and kinship are interconnected, especially in the case of French migrants in Luxembourg. I will start by exploring how home and kinship are interconnected, through both literature and my own experiences with my interlocutors. In the next section, I will focus on how home and heritage are connected, with the added complexity of the French language when translating heritage. I will end this

chapter with a section exploring how home connects both family and *patrimoine*, in hopes of becoming a space of safety and comfort, of teaching and learning.

I will end this thesis with the conclusion that French migrant use and understand home as connecting both heritage and kinship, becoming an ever evolving and multi-sited place intended to house them and keep them safe. Unlike other migrant communities, external political pressure and discrimination is non-existent in Luxembourg, which makes it easier to settle in the country. They do not have to worry about racial discrimination the way, for example, the Arab Muslim community must.

Communicative Contexts, Methodology and Ethics

This section of my report will focus on the four key aspects of my research: whom I did research with, what I have researched, where I did research and how fieldwork proceeded. I will start with an exploration of my own position, before introducing my participants and my connection with them. This will also include a short discussion on how my previous relationship and position have influenced who I had access to and what I have been told. Afterwards, I will explore what I have researched with my informants, and what kinds of methods of communication I have used. I will end this chapter with a more in-depth exploration of the socio-economic situation of Luxembourg. I have also faced some ethical challenges throughout my fieldwork, which I will also explore throughout this chapter as they appear to be relevant.

As the child of two French migrants who have settled in Luxembourg over 30 years ago, I have been able to gain access more easily to the French community residing in my native country. I was born and grew up in Luxembourg, surrounded primarily by French-speaking individuals throughout my childhood. Unless I was at school, where the primary spoken language was Luxembourgish, I spoke French. This means that I was already familiar with the location that I was doing my research in. I knew the culture, the people, their traditions and the languages that they spoke, I was familiar with public transport, and I was able to reside in my mother's (C's[1]) apartment.

My identity as a child of two French migrants allowed me to get better access to French migrants across the country, but it also has influenced how my informants saw and understood me. The research was about an aspect of myself, a community to which I belong to through my parents. This allowed me to relate to my informants and has allowed me to frame my research as an attempt to learn more about a community I otherwise knew little about. This framing allowed me to gain access to French migrants, especially when I contacted organizations which focused on helping French migrants integrate into the country. My identity most likely explains part of my interlocutors' willingness to talk to me and answer my questions. This willingness can also be explained both by their intrigue and their desire to help a student with their research. French migrants are rarely approached by researchers, especially in a context where they are the migrants in another country. This means that my participants did not have their lives disrupted much by researchers and the likelihood of them feeling research fatigue was slim. Clark (2008) describes research fatigue as occurring within communities who have gotten tired of engaging with researchers, which often leads to feeling over-researched.

The community of people I decided to focus on is the French migrant community in Luxembourg, specifically those who were both working and living in Luxembourg. Some informants, such as my

[1] I use pseudonyms for most of my interlocutors mentioned in this research, all of which I have agreed upon with my interlocutors. I use either initials, a string of letters or nicknames, depending on their preferences. The only exception will be Biraud, as I am referencing him directly through his blog.

mother, have also taken up the Luxembourgish nationality. Other informants have started working in Luxembourg as cross-border workers before deciding to settle in the country later. One of them did the opposite and was living in France and working in Luxembourg before her retirement.

The French community can be broadly divided into two halves between French migrants who both live and work in Luxembourg, and those who work in Luxembourg as cross-border workers from France. This research focuses on those who have decided to stay in Luxembourg and who reside in the South of the country. That is where the community of French migrants primarily resides. I have gained access to them through my parents and two organizations focusing on connecting French migrants in Luxembourg.

As mentioned before, I started doing my research with my parents, my mother, C, and my father, Tck. Both had migrated to Luxembourg over 30 years ago when looking for work in a new country. I then branched out to family friends with whom I had regular contact with.

Given my personal relationship with them, I needed to be careful with how I would approach this new relationship as informant-researcher. First, I had to be careful not to take their answers for granted and to question them critically. Our relation outside of that of a researcher and an interlocutor would make things harder for both of us. I had to be careful not to be too familiar or uncritical with what I was told, and they had to be mindful about deciding what they could tell me as a researcher and as someone that they knew previously.

To establish some boundaries, both for myself and them, I used an informed consent form, both in English and in French, where I aimed to be as transparent as possible. By starting most discussions with this consent form, I was able to set the tone for our interactions during our interviews. I have also added to it that I would like to visit physical homes, but I have not had the opportunity to do so with most of my informants. I was only able to see my parents' apartments, and the living spaces of close family friends.

Since I was living at my mother's place during my fieldwork, I made sure that I would only ask questions for my research during clearly designated timeslots, avoiding, as much as possible, the bleeding of one role into the other. This meant that I tried not to take advantage of my mother's constant presence and take it as a given that I had her consent to record our interactions. I always made sure to ask for each of the interviews, whether it was alright to audio record our discussion and take notes. When encountering such ethical dilemmas, I principally followed the AAA Statement on Ethics (The American Anthropological Association, 2025) as well as the Ethical Guidelines put forward by the Dutch Anthropological Association (Abv).

During our discussions, it was impossible to separate our parent-child relationship from our informant-researcher relationship. I tried my best to distance both during discussions, both unconsciously and consciously, through either acting a certain way, such as focusing on what my parents are saying rather

than sharing my opinion or through having a notebook in front of me, clearly indicating my intention to write notes and my role as a listener.

For the duration of my fieldwork, I lived with C in her apartment near Luxembourg city. As such, especially at the beginning, C was my primary informant. Both because of the proximity and our parent-child relationship, I sometimes relied on her feedback to see how to adapt some of the questions, especially in their wording since I was using French to communicate with my interlocutors. I had been living in the Netherlands for nearly five years at this point where I spoke only English, so I relied on her help to double check my grammar and wording. Beyond that, I also let her know where I was at all times, for both my own safety and our shared peace of mind.

I tried to avoid discussing other informants with her, especially those she did not know before. This was harder to achieve at the beginning, as I had to really separate what I could tell her about my experience as her child and what I could not tell her as a researcher concerning a fellow informant. It took me a while, but after some time, I was able to determine that I could tell her about how I felt about the experience but that I must avoid telling her the personal details of the participants she had no prior contact with.

Other informants I was able to access are both family friends and my parents' coworkers. I reached out to them through C, who had asked them for their participation before I contacted them. Most of the coworkers I was only vaguely familiar with, but they all expressed their willingness in helping me, which was also influenced by their connection to my mother. C is a well-regarded senior worker at her workplace, and this view of her has allowed me to gain access more easily to her coworkers.

The other part of my informants I have gained access through two organizations: "Communauté des Français du Luxembourg" (CFL) and "Amicale des Français à Luxembourg" (AFL). One of the two founders of the CFL, Biraud, provided access to French migrants I had no previous contact with. Thanks to his post (Biraud, 2025a) about me seeking French migrants to interview, I have been able to reach French migrants with a variety of backgrounds and age. I was able to expand the kind of people I interacted with to beyond the people I had immediate access to. Biraud (2025b) also expressed his desire to share the whole thesis with the rest of the community after he interviewed me for his blog.

I ended up interviewing 15 informants in one-on-one discussions and talking with about 20 more during group meetings organized by the CFL and AFL.

I have used a variety of research methods during my fieldwork. I started all my encounters with my interlocutors with a semi-structured interview, where I used a topic list to guide our discussions (Bryman, 2016). This kind of interviewing method has allowed for the interviews to feel more like discussions rather than formal interviews. It provided me with the opportunity to encourage my interlocutors to answer with more than just one word or short sentences.

Especially with informants who did not know me beforehand, this allowed for some reciprocity between us. Many felt comfortable to not just answer my questions, but to ask me questions back, making their own curiosity about me, my research and my own life shine in our discussions. Of course, this was not the focus of the interview, and I made sure that they are always the ones who talked the most. But this has permitted me to create some rapport with my other informants, even if our relationship remained primarily that of a researcher and informant.

Typically, I met each of my informants three times. During those interviews, I asked them questions about their lives, their journey to Luxembourg, their hobbies and interests. The three meetings were usually set up as follows: we would start with an introductory meeting, where I would first offer the informed consent form which contained information about my research, research methods and what I intended to do with the information that they shared with me. After, I would ask them general questions about how they got to Luxembourg, what their first impressions were and if they had expectations for the future when they arrived.

The second and third meeting would focus on what they have told me, especially in relation to home, family and integration. Since the aim of my fieldwork was to uncover how they understood the notions of home, family and friendships, and heritage, I attempted to focus the two other meetings on those subjects. In some cases, I was able to organize an outing for the third meeting. In the case of C, that outing involved traveling by car through the country and retracing her first steps and experiences when arriving in Luxembourg. It started with visiting her old working place and ended with her driving me to a castle that her colleagues had shown her to be an integral part of Luxembourgish culture. Another outing was with Biraud, where we visited a military museum and an art gallery in a shopping mall. He described the outing as perfectly reuniting his two passions in life: the military (as he's a veteran) and his passion for art.

For other informants, the third interview was used to do some creative activities together. One such activity, which I had first done with C, was where I gave them a list of words which I then asked them to link with one another. I ended up adapting the words (by taking some out and adding others) after noticing that they struggled to place those words anywhere. One such word was 'community', where some informants explained that community left a bad taste in their mouth, feeling like it encouraged division instead of supporting one another regardless of who they are.

I had organized this activity under the assumption that some people have an easier time showing the interconnection between notions such as home and family through drawing rather than through words. I was reminded of this presumption when talking with C about her opinion on the difference between *héritage* and *patrimoine* (two translations of heritage in French). I remember noticing that she was struggling with finding the right words to describe what the difference is, and that I was struggling to understand what she was saying. On a whim, remembering that we share a love for crafts and creative

exercises, I had offered a piece of paper and a pencil. Through this piece of paper, C was able to explain to me what she meant by saying one notion is horizontal while the other is vertical. I will explore this explanation within the relevant discussion. I can pinpoint now, in hindsight, that this was the moment that gave me confidence in using, at times, a more creative approach to explore the interconnection between different notions in their lives.

However, this method has not always succeeded. There were several instances where some of my informants froze after I had introduced the activity, showing obvious discomfort at the thought of having to do it. In cases like these, I decided to simply adapt the activity to simulate an interview instead. Instead of having them link the notions on paper, I decided to let them explain what the words meant to them with their words. Some felt restricted by simply using words to explain themselves, others felt that the activity gave them too much freedom, creating a sense of paralysis. In a rare few cases, due to time constraints during the interview, I had decided to switch the activity of linking words to asking them about the notions instead.

While I never put time aside for solely this activity and always mixed it with an interview-style discussion, I noticed that the two methods were helpful to gain different perspectives on how my interlocutors think about certain notions. The activity was especially helpful to see how those notions interact with one another according to my informants. I also organized group discussions, where I invited several of my informants to C's apartment with her permission to discuss the different notions of my research.

In four cases, I was also able to visit my informants' homes. I saw an apartment because I was living with my mother (C) throughout the entirety of my fieldwork. The other three instances happened when I visited my father and two close family friends. I was not able to organize an actual tour of the apartments and houses, but I noticed that during out interviews, especially when talking about what they needed to feel at home, they would point out some objects within the rooms that we were staying in. All the other informants, especially those I had no prior contact with, I met either at cafés or through a phone call. This was done both for my own safety, but also because I wanted to meet at a somewhat neutral place, easily accessible to my informants and myself. Although I had written in my informed consent form that I would like to visit their homes, unless I knew them beforehand, I did not have the opportunity to do so. Regardless, I wanted to be transparent with my intentions, as a home visit was one of the methods that I wanted to use during my fieldwork.

The two other methods of communication that I have used are image association and participant observation. The image association activity was an activity that I had organized where I showed a series of sixteen images to my interlocutors and let them tell me their opinion about what they saw. Some of the photos I had taken myself, but most of the pictures were stock images that I had found on Pexels, by using certain keywords, such as 'Luxembourg', 'France' and so forth. This activity, I found, was

particularly useful for those informants with particularly strong attachments to either Luxembourg or France. For example, in some cases, some informants found some pictures to be nostalgic and welcoming, and expressed their desire to live in such an area, while others had no strong reaction to the image.

The main issue I have found with this method was that it was bound to be biased to what I wanted to show. In other words, my own bias about France, Luxembourg, certain activities and habits would influence what my interlocutors would see. Additionally, it was biased towards what the website showed me among their stock pictures when I typed in certain keywords, much of it associated with stereotypes of each country and activities.

The other method I have used is participant observation; a research tool I only employed in group settings where there were several discussions happening around me. During the organizations' meetings, I tried to use this method by listening to what the people were talking about around and with me, as well as how they acted and reacted (Bryman, 2016). I also observed the environments that I had been invited to, such as familiar homes of family friends when I first came to interview two of my interlocutors.

Socio-economic and political context of Luxembourg

Before starting with the second chapter, it is important to understand the socio-economic situation of Luxembourg, especially if this research aims to be a useful comparison with other research of this kind. First, Luxembourg has three official languages – French, English and German – and a national language, Luxembourgish. The most spoken language depends on the context, but French is the most spoken language in working environments (*What Languages Do People Speak in Luxembourg?*, 2024). This has to do with the large number of cross-border workers crossing from France to Luxembourg for work.

As one of the most spoken languages, French is the language most migrants are then encouraged to learn first when arriving to Luxembourg. An example which highlights this particularly happened during the 42nd edition of the festival of Migration, Cultures and Citizenship (*42 Festival of Migration, Cultures and Citizenship 2025 @ LUXEXPO THEBOX*, 2025). I was listening to the opening speeches given by organizers, ministers and other political figures, when a sentence one of the speakers said stood out to me. It was only a throwaway sentence as she was talking about needing to offer help to migrants coming to settle in Luxembourg. She spoke of the help that the new arrivals needed to learn French when arriving in Luxembourg.

Not Luxembourgish, but French was the language connected to successful integration in Luxembourg. This could be said so because Luxembourg has seen a rise in French migration in the last fifteen years, with both a boom in French migrants settling in the country and working as cross-border workers and that French is used as the language of communication within the work force.

This was said in an opening speech at one of the biggest festivals of the country, where we celebrate the diversity of people residing in Luxembourg. It struck me, at that point, just how prevalent French is in Luxembourg, so much so that the speeches are in French and that French is considered the best language to learn to successfully integrate in Luxembourgish society.

Luxembourg, both in the present and throughout its past, is also very familiar with migration. With about half of its current population having a migrant background and around 200'000 cross-border workers crossing into the county daily, the people in the country are used to seeing people arrive, settle and then leave. However, it is only in recent years that the number of cross-border workers, especially French ones, has skyrocketed. Back when C moved to Luxembourg for the first time, she told me that even then Luxembourg had been seen as an "Eldorado" for French workers: its higher salary compared to France, its good health care and its labor market that was in constant need of workers made Luxembourg a target destination for anyone looking to make more money.

However, the reality in Luxembourg does not entirely reflect this ideal, and it is far more nuanced than just being able to make more money than in France. Currently, Luxembourg is facing a housing crisis, where the price of living is extraordinarily high and reflects the high wages offered in the country. In fact, the high price of living and the housing crisis are two reasons mentioned for choosing cross-border work instead of living in Luxembourg. Over time, Luxembourg became more expensive, overcrowded and busy, transforming the quieter life that my interlocutors encountered at their arrival into a busy present with people everywhere.

Politically speaking, Luxembourg is a country which prides itself on its multicultural society. Its self-image is often that of a country open and hospitable to any migrants. A mentality that I have encountered (and experienced myself) is the idea that being discriminatory is counter-productive in a country which relies so heavily on migrant workers. And while there are issues concerning racism in Luxembourg, it is far more common to hear about and/or experience class discrimination.

However, many of the issues discussed in politics usually center around the housing crisis, a widely contested rearrangement of the retirement plan and disagreements on how other countries are planning to handle their involvement in wars. Unlike other countries' political discourse, Luxembourgish politics do not put the same level of attention on immigration.

A Conceptual Framework and Exploration of Discoveries

In this chapter, I will be using the different notions of my research question – Kinship, Heritage, and Home – to present a conceptual framework and to discuss the experiences and conversations gathered during my fieldwork. Each section after the conceptual framework will focus on one of three notions, all linked to one of my three sub question. I will attempt to either answer the sub question or adapt it and then answer the newly posed question to reflect both my findings.

I will start with the three concepts of kinship, heritage and home, before exploring how French migrants understand them. I will discuss kin ties and other kinds of connections that French migrants maintain, establish and break. This is often done across time and space, both before, during and after their move to Luxembourg. The next section will focus on a discussion of heritage, specifically on the difference between *patrimoine* and *héritage*, and how the different interpretations play into what French migrants find important or decide to leave behind.

I will end this chapter with a discussion on the notion of home. This section will discuss how French migrants see home ('*chez-soi*') and how this can be situated in the larger debate concerning homemaking. By using Brun and Fábos' (2015) notion of home-Home-HOME, I want to show that this kind of distinction can also be useful for more privileged migrants who migrated not out of constraint, but their own volition.

This chapter aims to offer a comprehensive understanding of the conceptual framework surrounding the three primary notions of this research and how the data I gathered during my fieldwork works together with it to answer the three sub questions first introduced at the start of this thesis. In later sections, I will discuss additional literature on the concepts as they become relevant when I present my ethnographic findings.

Conceptual Framework: Kinship, Heritage and Home

Kinship

Kinship studies have evolved in recent years to accommodate a lot of the criticism that it had faced. David M. Schneider is one of the cultural anthropologists who extensively criticized the focus of kinship studies on blood ties and many others also criticized its taken-for-granted division between biological and social connections (Carsten, 2000). The definition of kinship had long since been connected to blood ties and centered around Western practices, understandings and ideologies of relatedness (Carsten, 2000), often forced upon different communities with different practices and understandings.

Thanks to the critique of Schneider and other researchers, kinship studies shifted from focusing solely on Western understandings of kinship, to a more diverse and complex understanding of connections between human beings. The previous definitions of kinship could not be applied to other ways of relating to people in non-Euro-American societies. In addition to being heavily criticized as patriarchal

(Weismantel, 1995), such definition does not consider other forms of kinship, influenced by the rise of reproductive technologies, the shifts in marriage and family dynamics (Levine, 2009). Marginalized communities such as the LGBTQIA+ have different ways of relating to others, attempting to redefine what family and other kinds of connections mean to them.

However, the previous definitions of kinship and its subsequent division between biological and social ties do not hold true for every society and/or community. Especially adoption has been hard to both define and situate in a narrative where kinship is defined by procreation, and where some may argue that adoption is a last resort for when procreation fails (Weismantel, 1995).

Other narratives surrounding kinship that have been developed in the last 30 years question the heteronormative dominance within kinship studies. From Kath Weston's 'Chosen Family' to the usage of reproductive technologies by queer couples, queer thinkers argue for an idea of kinship where it becomes a fluid network of connections, established, maintained and broken in accordance with one's choice and depending on the circumstances (Weston, as cited in Levine, 2009).

Despite many authors arguing for the diversification of the definition of kinship and getting rid of the biological/social binary within kinship studies, there remains an emphasis on biological ties, especially in the Western context (Levine, 2009). It remains so both legally and emotionally, to the point that even gay and lesbian couples seek out ways to legitimize their relationship with their children through the usage of blood connection (Carsten, 2000; Levine, 2009).

Leyton (2018) points out that beyond the kinship ties through blood, there are also discussions about fictive and ritual kinships. These kinds of kinship ties are connections such as godparenthood, blood brotherhood and milk kinship, all connecting people through something else than blood (Leyton, 2018). He argues that there remains an epistemological issue when trying to differentiate between 'real' kinship (referring to blood ties) from fictive kinship ties, reinforced through a lack of research in anthropology.

Despite many of the authors argue for a more complex understanding of kinship relations outside of blood connections, French migrants still prioritize blood ties over other kinds of connections. Throughout this chapter and the rest of this thesis, I will be using the word 'connection' when broadly talking about different kinds of kinship ties. This is done to reflect how French migrants are connected to all kinds of people through all kinds of connection. From being connected through blood, to being connected through friendship or work, to even being connected through living in the same neighborhood, all of these connections are important aspects of social ties that French migrants (among others) put importance on. In French, when talking about different kinship ties, my interlocutors called it '*lien*', which can be translated into connection in English. From '*liens du coeur*' (heart connections) to '*liens du sang*' (blood connections), French migrants use the word 'connection' when talking broadly about kinship ties, usually separated through the biological and social divide mentioned at the start.

Heritage

Before exploring how French migrants understand and talk about heritage, it is necessary to understand the theoretical discourse surrounding the notion. Heritage discourse is a huge field spanning across a variety of disciplines, and each theory in the field has different aims that they seek to fulfill. There are theories *in* heritage, where the primary focus is how heritage is managed, in instances of tourism, for example (Waterton & Watson, 2013). Then, there are theories *of* heritage, where the purpose of the theories is to understand what heritage is, both as a "system of production" and a "method of display" (Watson & Waterton, 2013). The last theories are *for* heritage, and they aim to question and understand how heritage makes people feel, act and react (Waterton & Watson, 2013). In short, they focus on the affective side of heritage. This division offered by Waterton and Watson clarifies the kind of theories used in the following debates.

One major debate within heritage studies concerns the question about what could be considered heritage. On an international scale and in institutions such as UNESCO, heritage is usually defined as either tangible or intangible heritage (Smith, 2006). Tangible, or material heritage was first defined within "authorized heritage discourse" (AHD) (Smith, 2006), where the importance is put on sites such as castles, on monuments, and other kinds of objects (such as many found in museums) and their maintenance so that they can be passed down to future generations (Smith, 2006). Within UNESCO, intangible heritage was only added to the definition of World Heritage at a later date. These discussions about the intangibility of heritage expanded the discussion of heritage to smaller-scale phenomena, such as collective memory as explored by Sharon Macdonald. The World Heritage discourse as offered by UNESCO is what Smith (2006) describes as authorized heritage discourse (AHD) and is concerned with what nation-states deem as heritage.

On such an international scale, heritage is usually defined as both a tool used to govern, and a term used within a variety of analyses (Geismar, 2015). Similarly to AHD, this definition of heritage primarily focuses on heritage as something that can be used to manage populations, especially through the material sites, objects and monuments. In such instances, heritage becomes a tool of the nation. Many of the sites added to UNESCO's World Heritage List are often added due to political and national interest (Gentry & Smith, 2019). In other words, what is chosen and nominated as heritage is often also used as a tool for further economic and political growth within the country who has nominated it. Heritage is then a way to further encourage the tourism sector to grow, for example, by advertising and monetizing the heritage site.

However, Smith (2006) argues that material heritage has an intangible aspect as well. She argues that heritage is an action where a place or a site is transformed into heritage through an act of remembering. I will add that intangible heritage also has a material aspect, when sharing a recipe orally, for example, the voice is transmitted through wavelengths.

One of the many problems with such definitions of heritage is that it relies heavily on the assumption of identities, such as cisgender, heterosexual and so forth (Naidoo, 2016). In other words, much of what is defined as heritage is usually influenced by privileged minorities, oftentimes either disregarding or ignoring what marginalized communities have to say. Gentry & Smith (2019) additionally point out that heritage is additionally heavily restricted by the favored usage of English as the language of academia that global centers of academia are still mostly situated in Western countries. Not only, then, is the discourse of heritage usually performed within the English language, but it also usually resides within Western contexts, even when talking about heritage that affect countries outside of that scope.

Intangible, or immaterial heritage is a recent development within heritage studies. Although many have advocated for the immaterial aspect to finally be considered, UNESCO, for example, has only added its Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage in 2003 (UNESCO, 2003). Smith (2006) argues that "[i]f heritage is a mentality, then all heritage is, in a sense, 'intangible'." (p. 54). If heritage is supposed to be a mentality, the separation of tangible and intangible heritage as done by UNESCO as two separate categories seems strange. Especially if tangible heritage has intangible aspects (such as the emotions connected to a place, the memories and so forth) and intangible heritage has tangible aspects (such as memories being connected to experiences through the sense).

One last discussion that needs to be discussed is a subtlety within the French language which adds another complex layer to the discussion of heritage. In put it plainly, since most of the literature within Heritage Discourse is in English, it usually does not consider how the language affects the way one talks about it. In French, for example, heritage can be translated into either *patrimoine* or *héritage*, which, while mostly synonymous, are still subtly different. Within Canada and Quebec, for example, the two translations had very distinct meanings, but are more intertwined in current affairs (Morisset, 2018). *Patrimoine* is understood as a political instrument, while *héritage* is heavily reliant on the acknowledgement of the people.

However, as I will explore in another section, the two words are not always simply separated on the level of state. They can also be separated on a personal level, when heritage concerns a family or a small group of individuals instead of a nation or a bigger community of people. Heritage on the personal level is intimately connected to memory, through the idea of nostalgia and the notion of home as explored by Macdonald (2013) in her book *Memorylands*.

Contrary to heritage on a larger scale as such, the scale of heritage within this research will remain at a personal level. Although, when hearing the word heritage, most expect the huge buildings such as the Eiffel Tower or Notre Dame, heritage also has smaller aspects. From the kind of food that is shared to family history, heritage can take the form of family traditions and values, affected by the shared family history.

Home

'Home' is a notion that has been conceptualized across a variety of disciplines, from anthropology to economics. As such, the definition of 'home' varies greatly depending on the discipline. Despite little cross-disciplinary research on the topic, Mallett (2004) argues that home is understood as a multidimensional concept, in dire need of more multidisciplinary research. Most of the literature on the topic of home predominantly focuses on the positive aspects of home, such as the feeling of safety or comfort (Mallett, 2004). However, home is not necessarily always associated with positive feelings. From a place of tyranny, abuse and imprisonment, home can be a dream to some, and a nightmare to others (Douglas, 1991; Young, 1997; Mallett, 2004).

As Mallett (2004) points out, how 'home' is conceptualized and understood depends heavily on the researcher and the historical and social context that they reside in. At the same time, the definition of 'home' also depends on the socio-cultural context that individuals are born in. For example, the understanding of home primarily based on its material and physical aspects (such as the house and residence) is an idea primarily found and supported in white Western societies (Mallett, 2004). This kind of understanding of home usually is supported by a conflation between home, the house and the family (Mallett, 2004) and by a consumer mindset and commodity-based identity (Young, 1997). This focus on private ownership of property as a home also encourages a divide between the public and the private sphere (in this case, the home), all the while tying one's identity to what one owns (Young, 1997). Such a divide between the public and the private is found primarily within Western societies and is a divide that I have encountered during my fieldwork as well.

This kind of division aims to separate the two spheres, just as it aims to separate the home from the outside world. The home is conceptualized as a haven where family can reside and where the public sphere cannot encroach (Mallett, 2004). In such understandings, politics are also attributed to the public sphere and separated from the private sphere (and therefore from the private life). Through this separation and by adding a romanticization of the homeland as such a home, Young (1997) argues that such a definition of home attempts to create a safe space away from politics. In other words, this encourages a lack of interest in politics, and a belief that they should not care about it as it does not have anything to do with them. It is a slippery slope of ignoring politics as long as it does not concern them.

Feminists critique such a conception of home as a matter of privilege and argue for rejecting such an idea of home. On the other hand, Young (1997) argues such critiques of home are well-founded, the conclusion should not be a rejection of home, but a democratization of it instead.

Many researchers aim to move away from this Western-centric idea of home as predominantly (or only) the physical residence, and understand home, instead, as a process of homemaking. One such attempt is Brun and Fábos' (2015) conceptualization of home in relation to migration. Through a tripartite conception of home, Brun and Fábos show how home can be understood on different levels. "home",

they explained, refers to the daily practices of homemaking, the habits and schedule that those at home (in their case, marginalized migrants) go through on a daily basis. From making a meal to cleaning, and other such activities, people continuously understand and renegotiate their daily practices. Next, they define "Home" as representing the traditions that are undertaken at home, usually affected by the values and memories of its inhabitants and how (and where) they feel at home (Brun & Fábos, 2015). The last part of the tripartite conception of home is "HOME", which they argue represents the broader context, both historical and political, that migrants situate their home in. These three aspects of home are important to understand, then, how migrants settle in a new country, both through their own efforts and through what they are expected to do to integrate into the new country.

Ahmed (1999) argued for a multi-sited understanding of home, where the home should be understood as both a place of origin and the experience of new things. By arguing for a notion of one home and a space away from home, one not only divides them into different spaces, but also different modes of existence. Other authors additionally question the idea of home as a fixed space (Gupta & Ferguson, 1992). Together, these two arguments paint home as a constantly changing, moving and transforming concept with no fixed place.

The last important conception of home is associated with both time and memory. As Ahmed (1999) put it, "homes always involve encounters of between those who stays, those who arrive and those who leave." (p. 340) Home remains a constantly evolving process where people interact with one another, establish relationships and break apart. It is not necessarily always a place safety as many wish it to be, as it can also be ground for tyranny in several aspects, from abuse and the imprisonment of women (Young, 1997) and people in general, to tyranny over taste and time (Douglas, 1991) where people are expected to adapt their taste and time management to the needs of the home. All of these intersections of people are not necessarily only good or only bad, and memory influences home through questions about leaving home (Ahmed, 1999) or as a response to being forced into being a refugee and necessitating a revisitation of conceptions of home (Brun & Fábos, 2015)

Home's connection to memory also connects to Macdonald's 'past presencing', the idea that shared memory can become cherished and starts resembling 'heritage', although not always the state-authorized kind.

Time, one the other hand, is another important aspect of home, as many conceptions of homes are usually set as goals to reach in order to feel at home. Home becomes then a never-ending project, where one can always do more to feel at home (Ahmed, 1991). However, it is also a necessary endeavor as it has become an integral part of thinking about the future that people want for themselves.

These different conceptions of home are usually related to different topics, such as the division between the public and private, memory, migration and integration. This shows that home is a multidimensional concept, which appears across a variety of disciplines (Mallett, 2004), and is often defined depending

on what role it should play in the research. Throughout my own research, I hope to tackle these different aspects of home to show how French migrants' understanding of home spans across a variety of subjects, despite it still following the previously mentioned Western-centric understanding of home.

Connections with people across space

This and the following sections aim to bring together the concepts by discussing ethnographic vignettes. I do so to work towards formulating my research question in the third chapter.

I had invited four informants for an evening focus group with snacks and drinks. After a day of preparing what is essentially an evening aperitif, I was able to greet the four female participants. C, who had helped me prepare by choosing the wine and going to the store with me, Clémentine, Luna and Num, who came to the apartment with good mood and interesting insights. Some small talk was made, as Clémentine, Luna and Num knew C, but not each other. The fact that none of them knew each other personally, I realized later, eased the first part of the group discussion. I started the discussion by asking them how they understood the idea of family. I purposefully kept my question vague, curious to see how they would interpret what I was asking. The discussion started with each of them talking about their families.

The topic of distance and family came up first, with Clémentine, a stay-at-home mother from the South of France, starting the discussion. She explained her feelings plainly: her moving from the South of France to Luxembourg did not change her relationship with her family. She had already been living about 200 km away from her family beforehand, so she felt no big difference between living 200 or 800 km away. Holidays remained a time set aside for family, where she would travel to see her side of the family, regardless of the distance.

On the other hand, Luna who had grown up with most of her extended family living in the same city expressed a sense of deep loss now that she had moved to Luxembourg. Luna highlighted this feeling with an example: when she was giving birth to her twins at the hospital, her brother had moved away to another country. She described feeling overwhelmed by the feeling of loss as she was lying in the hospital bed, crying her eyes out and mourning the absence of her little brother. This vivid memory of loss came from having most of her family members close to her, her whole life. Her little brother moving away felt as if the world was falling apart. Luna had only moved away from her native city in France about five years ago. It was her turn to leave her family, her brother and children back in the city that she had grown up in.

The two other informants, C and Num, expressed a similar opinion to Clémentine, agreeing with her statement that "Holidays were for family" and other special occasions for friends. C expressed her happiness to visit her family when she felt like it, but she also explained that she did not feel the need to go visit her family all the time. Num, on the other hand, expressed a strong need to get away from her family, feeling suffocated by their presence. She ended up working and living in Luxembourg for several decades before living back in France to join with her partner.

These testimonies show three different relations to family, and how these relations affect their homemaking practices in Luxembourg. The connection with family remains ambiguous and relative to the individual, even if there remain shared sentiments amongst French migrants.

At this point, it is important to understand that French migrants do not only focus on family connections, especially after they moved away. Other social connections, such as friendships and work colleagues, or neighbors are also important to their attempts at settling in a new country.

This section aims to explore these differences and similarities to answer the following sub question:

What kind of connections did French migrants seek to establish and maintain?

In this research, I have decided to refer to kinship ties (whether national, fictional, biological or other) as (social) connections to reflect the way that my interlocutors spoke of the ties that they have established with people. When talking about their family and friends especially, my interlocutors spoke of them as if they were branches and roots of the same tree. Their ties to other people connected them through both space and time, in some cases with little regard to geographical distance between them. These connections have different starts and end, the link connecting people ranging from blood to simply knowing someone exists.

One informant, an older French migrant who has moved from the French side of the border between Luxembourg and France to the Luxembourgish side, explained these connections as follows: family, especially the nuclear family, is a connection that remains the same, regardless of time and space, and which connects people both through blood and laws (such as the family name). This then means that there is also a special kind of responsibility between family members, a kind of duty mentioned by other informants as well. Connections between friends, on the other hand, have different origins and require a different kind of responsibility. Friendships are established by choice and can just as easily be ended. If something goes wrong between two friends, they can either talk about it or end the friendship, but family requires that the family members talk about the issue. You should not let issues remain unmentioned between family members, as they have more chance to rot and destroy a kind of connection that should persist more easily through challenges.

There are four kinds of connections which French migrant put importance on, and their level of importance to French migrants is usually structured hierarchically. The four types of ties are family ties, friendships, colleagues and neighbors. For most French migrants, family connections come first. They are the basis of their social network, their safety net when every other connection cannot be maintained. After, there are friendships, which are divided into close friendships, where the boundary between friendship and family blurs, and then there are simply friendships, where the connection between the individuals is held through common interest, workplace and/or views. The last two connections are less important in their emotional connection but can be just as important when it comes to their peace of mind and emotional stability and health. Connections with colleagues and neighbors, while not being

deemed as important in having to maintain them thoroughly, are often maintained at the surface, to allow for a peaceful life at home and at work.

Family connections, unlike more superficial connections like those made with colleagues and neighbors, are often maintained across borders and throughout time. Those kinds of ties are maintained through regular contact, on social media or through phone calls, and regular visits. However, as the discussion between C, Clémentine, Num and Luna has highlighted, family connections also imply a certain duty. In their cases, they were primarily talking about how aging parents (or grandparents) require more care, especially once they fall sick. Num talked about how much she must travel to see her parents because both are sick and cannot take care of themselves anymore. She explained how tiring it is for her to constantly travel, to have her phone next to her in case of an emergency. She remains constantly available to her parents regardless of their less than stellar relationship. And, despite having the help of a sibling, she still expresses fatigue at the constant need for taking care of them, and guilt when talking about taking a step back.

C and Luna could both relate to this experience to some degree, although their relationship with their parents is better. C, who lost her parents over a year ago, talked about how she regularly traveled to see and visit her dying parents, but that she, as the daughter living over 2 hours away, was not their primary caretaker. Unbeknownst to her when she was younger, her older sister had been taught that she would be the one taking care of them when they were older. C explained that this was the condition that came with inheriting most of the fortune that they had gathered. Their parents had made it clear that taking care of them when they were aging was a duty transmitted to the eldest, leaving C's sister with little choice but to live close by.

For Luna, on the other hand, the care of her parents was more a question of proximity. Now that she was living in Luxembourg, helping their parents was her brother's duty. Back when he had moved to India, she had been their primary caretaker, the helper when they needed it.

This kind of duty, however, is not one-sided. As the four women have pointed out, this duty comes together with the elderly helping with child-rearing. The two are usually seen as either an exchange of acts – the child takes care of their aging parents, and, in return, the elderly parents help with taking care of their own children – or simply as a gesture of care reciprocated by both parties. In any case, this kind of exchange and/or reciprocity is only possible if the children live close by. For migrants such as C, Num, or Clémentine, they could not always help their parents and they rarely received their help with their own children, not because they did not want to, but simply because it was impossible to do anything with a geographical distance separating the two.

These three experiences highlight an important dynamic within French migrant families. There is an expectation of the younger generations to take care of the older generation, to live close by (either by choice or by duty) to help them if they need it. Often tied to how much they would inherit; parents expect

their children to take care of them as the children were taken care of by the parents in their earlier years. The duty of care switches once the parents start aging and become unable to take care of themselves. This sense of duty towards elder family members is one that most of my informants mentioned when talking about their families. This sense of duty is present even when French migrants live further away from family and cannot always make/afford the travel to their parents.

It is important to note that a sense of duty is not only present from French migrants to their parents but also present towards their children. From what they should teach their children to what they should help their children with; French migrants put a lot of importance in helping their children throughout life. Most of my interlocutors specified that they put a lot of importance in the kind of education that they offer their children, both in school and at home.

This duty towards their children also appears in other aspects in their lives. For example, in Luxembourg, not wearing your seatbelt is punishable with a fine and two points taken off the driver's permit. One informant talked about how, after being stopped by police and the vehicle being checked, he was deducted two points and had a fine to pay because his daughter did not wear her seatbelt. He told me how he had a duty to pay it because he is responsible for her – both emotionally and legally. If this had happened with a friend, he explained that he would have expected the friend to pay the fine and lose the points.

These experiences show that family expects a certain amount of responsibility and support, whether morally, financially or legally. However, just as Gammeltoft (2018) has pointed out in her essay about belonging, one should not take for granted the support of those they relate to as that kind of care can be withdrawn. This can happen through setting down boundaries or conditions for care and can lead to the loss of connections with family members.

I have already gone over the importance of family at the beginning of this subchapter, so I will now focus on the other three types of connections. There is a broad understanding amongst French migrants that, when moving to another country, friends will become the basis of their social life. While holidays, such as Christmas or Easter (depending on the family background and their (non-)religious beliefs), are usually celebrated with family, other holidays, considered less important, are celebrated with friends or with the immediate, nuclear family instead. In many cases, friends and colleagues, sometimes even neighbors are invited to celebrations of birthdays, anniversaries and other similar occasions.

Colleagues and neighbors still play an important role in the daily lives of French migrants in Luxembourg. Colleagues can make life either harder or easier when working, and neighbors can either make living near each other peaceful, or full of frustrating moments. One informant stressed the importance of having good neighbors when living in an apartment with common rooms. "One bad neighbor can ruin it all.", he explained to me when we talked about his life in his apartment. He was talking about how, when he started to live in the apartment with common rooms such as the laundry, all

was going alright. He had a lovely older neighbor downstairs, there were rarely any issues between the two, and life was peaceful. However, after a while, another neighbor joined the older neighbor, and that was when all hell broke loose. Clothes, laundry detergent and books went missing, the doors were not closed properly, it started to smell weird, my informant was getting angry just thinking about it. This relation with one bad neighbor ended up worsening not only his home life, but also that of other neighbors, fracturing the peaceful connections that the neighborhood had cultivated before their arrival. I will discuss the connection and relevance of these kinds of relationships to the idea of home in further detail in a later subchapter.

However, neighborhood connections can not only make things worse, but they can, just like colleagues, become the basis for deeper connections. For many French migrants who have moved to Luxembourg, they have left behind even their friendships. While they can be maintained more easily at this day and age with social media and messaging apps, many expressed their need for physically and geographically close friendships as well. They have been able to establish such connections through work and their neighborhood. Clémentine mentioned how her children were a good starting point to get to know their neighbors better, especially if they had children of the same age. At the bus stop, for example, many parents of the town would wait together with their children for the bus to school. For a stay-at-home mother, this was the best opportunity that she had to make connections with the people in a new town, in a new country.

In conclusion, French migrants seek to both maintain old connections and establish new ones in a new country. Family plays a very important role, even when far away, and are usually the priority for most of them. In some cases, either when family relations are strained or when they are not present anymore (such as through death), family and other kinds of connections, such as friendships, start having the same level of importance. Regardless, the difference between friends and family lies usually in what kind of duty French migrants perceive to be associated with the connection. For many of them, family not only imposes duties, but also responsibilities and assumptions of care. However, this care is not everlasting and can be withdrawn for one reason or another. Other connections, especially those established with neighbors, can have effects on how peaceful homelife can be. Horrible neighbors will ruin the peace of home, creating a stressful situation that the individuals cannot escape even when being at home.

How heritage is named, seen and understood

It became clear to me early on that the discussion on heritage would not go the way I expected. It started with the first discussion I had with C, on New Year's Eve, when I asked her about French heritage after she mentioned it when describing the stereotypical French character. It may have been early in the evening, but it was already dark outside, and she was sitting on her couch, while I was sitting in front of her at the dinner table. My phone was set between us while we were talking about heritage. Although

we were interrupted midway by the arrival of guests, I had noticed already that the question did not invite any particularly strong emotions. This was even more so clear the following day, when we continued our interview, and we focused on the topic of French heritage. She explained that there is French heritage, and she named famous thinkers, monuments, signers, but she did not show any strong reaction – or attachment – to the things she was talking about. This set the tone for the kind of reaction I was faced with when asking my interlocutors about French heritage.

There are two things that I noticed after the first few interviews with different informants: Their attachment to heritage depended on which region they came from, and they switched between the two words "*patrimoine*" and "*héritage*". Their understanding of both translations of heritage merged intangible and tangible aspects together, often considered together, instead of only one or the other. And while there is discourse about AHD, it is not the primary focus when we started talking about *patrimoine* and *héritage*.

Given these two findings, I found that the sub question that I started with would not be adequate to show how the difference between words adds further nuance in the discussion of the development of everyday understandings of heritage. The sub question that I started with questioned the development of French migrants' understanding of heritage to accommodate both their past and present:

Did French migrants' understanding of heritage change over time to accommodate their past and present experiences?

After my fieldwork, keeping in mind my findings, I realized that I needed to adapt the sub question tackling heritage to reflect its role within the broader context of my research question. As such, I will adapt the sub question to reflect my findings, namely the exploration of the difference between *patrimoine* and *heritage* and the attachment of either notion to certain ideals and/or values. Instead of my previous sub questions which centered around the temporality of their understanding of heritage, the new sub question is the following:

Did French migrants' understanding of heritage accommodate their past and present experiences?

With this sub question, I want to address specifically the kind of nuance that my interlocutors have introduced me to when talking about both *patrimoine* and *héritage*. The temporality surrounding their understandings of these notions did not appear when they were talking about it, even if their own views and experiences have affected how they understand and view *patrimoine* and *héritage*.

To understand what my interlocutors were talking about, I resorted to asking them about what they meant with the words that they used. At first, they did not see much difference between *patrimoine* and *héritage*, as the two words are often used interchangeably without much thought. According to Reverso, *patrimoine* and *héritage* are synonymous with one another. Both appear as the first synonym for the other word.

However, I noticed that most of the time, the word used depended on what word we started the discussion with. If I introduced the subject of heritage through *patrimoine*, the language used by my interlocutors would follow my lead. Whether I used one or the other words, my interlocutors understood what I was referring to, even if they expressed deep interest in discussing the semantic differences between both.

Patrimoine and *héritage* have the same meaning, but two different associations. In most cases, *patrimoine* was seen as something positive, as something that they could be proud of, and that could be passed on. From tradition, to values, to experiences of joy and happiness, *patrimoine* represented an idea of what should be shared with others, especially with family members and very close friends. Both material and immaterial, my interlocutors associated *patrimoine* mostly with themselves and their family history. *Héritage*, on the other hand, was associated with more negative ideas of heritage. Often associated with the experience of inheriting from dead relatives, *héritage* was often linked with the burden of having to take care of the estates and finances left behind by the deceased. This includes money, life and estate insurance, estates and other material objects.

My interlocutors generally agreed that *patrimoine* and *héritage* denote two different aspects of what is passed on through the family. *Patrimoine*, or specifically, immaterial *patrimoine* refers to the kind of knowledge that is passed on. From recipes to values and traditions, these nuggets of knowledge are sprinkled with family history and personal experiences, and they affect every aspect of life. Values concerning education or traditions surrounding holidays are transmitted to the next generation in hopes of sharing beliefs and joys that the previous generation has experienced before.

Not only is it orally transmitted, but many of the things that my interlocutors have described as immaterial *patrimoine* ended up also having a material aspect. From the cookie recipe C has gotten from her aunt to the joy of Christmas that Luna wants to transmit to her children, to the values and traditions upheld within families, each of those instances have both immaterial and material aspects.

The cookie recipe was given to C both orally and through a piece of paper, and she makes them when she feels nostalgic or feels like eating them. C told me about how she was the only one who received it because those were her favorite cookies, her aunt having shared the recipe with no one else. And now, she shares those with me and my sister every time she feels like making them, which is usually around winter and Christmas.

Luna's joy of Christmas relies on her Christmas tree and the decorations which she deems extremely important. During her divorce, she explained that it was the only thing that she did not want to separate from. "I told everyone from the start, I only want the (fake) Christmas tree and the Christmas decorations, I could not care less about the rest.", she said, looking surprised at herself. She did not know why she felt it to be so important to her, and even after I asked, she could not entirely describe her feelings. She decided to settle on explaining it as important because of the joys and happiness that she

has grown up to associate with Christmas, where her whole family comes together to spend a good moment.

These are all values and traditions that have both tangible and intangible aspects, where they interact with one another to form the *patrimoine* that French migrants find so important. Much of this *patrimoine* does not have any strong links back to France as a state or a nation, being primarily connected with the family instead.

The way that many of my interlocutors have described *héritage*, or material *héritage*, borders on the solely negative. One interlocutor, Bdb, was particularly harsh in his description, using the following metaphor to describe it: "*Héritage* is a backpack of heavy rocks that you have to drag around, stopping you from moving forward." He was talking about the different material inheritances that people can receive from their deceased parents, such as money and estates, all followed by heavy inheritance taxes that they must learn how to deal with. In that way, he stated clearly, he wants to leave nothing behind for his daughter. He does not want her to have to deal with the mess of inheriting a fortune or a bunch of houses, which will only end up weighing her down instead of helping her. Instead, he wishes for her to inherit his knowledge, his values and beliefs, hoping that those would help her build her own *héritage* instead.

In another discussion on a similar subject of inheritance, C pointed out, that while many are jealous of the money that she has inherited, both by itself and through selling her parents' home, the price for that money came at the cost of her parents. She did not see it as negatively, seeing it as a form of compensation instead. She lost her parents and received some money with which she was able to fulfil some of her goals.

The taxes and financial strain of inheritance is not the only reason Bdb mentioned for wanting to leave nothing behind for his daughter. He explained that he did not want his daughter to be defined by what she had inherited. He used me as an example when he talked about how I would be far more respected as the person who has created their own wealth, instead of becoming 'Lara the inheritor.' The first would inspire respect, the other envy.

"*Héritage* is not supposed to chain you down.", he said to me, over a cup of coffee on our last meeting, "Of course, you should know your origins, where you come from and how your family has ended where they are now. However, *héritage* should be a teacher, not chains stopping you from making your own choices and advancements." This was the core message of what he wanted to share with and transmit to his daughter: Know your *héritage*, but do not let it stop you from making your own choices and being your own person. It is more important to inherit the history of family than inherit estates and money. However, even with this kind of inheritance of family history, he cautioned not to end up enslaved by it either. While it can influence who you are, and how you interact with the world – especially vis-á-vis your own physical and mental health – it should not determine how you see everything. There should

be space for both the beliefs and knowledge shared through generations of family and for your own experiences and beliefs.

Figure 1

Alsatian Wooden Chair

Note. Photographed by the author in C's apartment, wooden chair used by her mother, Luxembourg

Héritage, however, is not always negative. While *héritage* refers primarily to the material inheritance from the deceased, not all of it is necessarily considered a burden. For most French migrants, the small objects or furniture inherited are always interconnected with emotions, their past connections and the region that the deceased family member lived in. For example, C's apartment is filled with furniture that belonged to her parents (my grandparents), full of reminders of the people that are gone. The wooden chair (Figure 1) that she leaves at the edge of the living room belonged to her mother, and her mother was the only one allowed to sit at that chair. That chair, however, is also made in a style specific to the region of Alsace, with its curves and with how it was built. Another example would be Figure 2, which is a picture I have taken of an old sofa that C has inherited from her parents' home. It was the chair that she used to sit on when sharing aperitifs with family back in Alsace, and one that she was determined to bring back to her home in Luxembourg.

Figure 2

Old Alsatian Sofa

Note. Photographed by the author in C's apartment, old Alsatian sofa, Luxembourg

In both instances, C has expressed emotional attachments to those chairs and explained how they remind her of her past in Alsace. They are reminders of the people that she has lost and the region that she still considers as one of her home regions. They are physical reminders of the artisanship specific to Alsace, both in style and construction. This kind of heritage is attached both to the family and the region that they have come from, creating an interconnection between the emotional bonds of people and the culture of the region that they came from.

I remember a moment when I was talking to C about her move to Luxembourg, and I had been wondering what had driven her to leave a land that she so loved. Alsace, as she described it to me, is a region which she is proud to have been a part of. But she still ended up leaving. She mentions multiple reasons for that, from family tensions to not feeling represented by the country with the rise of right-wing parties. She also simply wanted to travel, and she had to leave home to have her own adventures. Her roots are still in Alsace, that is where she believes her origin remains until the end, but she had to grow her own tree to live her own story.

It was only during one instance, when I was interviewing C, where *patrimoine* was specifically only associated with French heritage. As we were discussing the difference between *patrimoine* and *héritage*, she drew up the difference between the two notions. On the one hand, you had *patrimoine*, shared among

many within the borders of France. In this instance, she specifically related it to the Eiffel Tower or the Arc de Triomphe. Interestingly, she only mentioned buildings and monuments that could be primarily found in Paris during her explanation of French *patrimoine*.

On the other hand, you had *héritage*, which she defined through the usage of a family tree. *Héritage* is something that is passed down from one generation to another. It is something that could be inherited from one family member to another, something shared and valued within the specific context of the family. This division between heritage shared amongst compatriots of the same nation and a heritage shared with family members was one of the only occasions where *patrimoine* and *héritage* were separated on different scales. *Patrimoine* referred to the national, if not international heritage, often discussed in relation to monuments, cultural traditions, artifacts and other objects considered to be of importance by the nation. *Héritage* was then kept for the smaller scale of the family, of the home and its inhabitants.

I noticed that when it comes to food, traditions and customs, French migrants will refer to their native region instead of France, while they will refer to national heritage when talking about architecture, music and writers. Each region of France has their own cooking traditions and specialties, turning France's cultural landscape into a mismatched patchwork of habits, customs and traditions. In a broader context, this is one of the reasons why many of my interlocutors did not seem particularly thrilled (or knowledgeable) when talking about what they considered to be French heritage. There was hesitance, most of them trying to remember what they had been taught at school. And even then, much of the heritage that was mentioned was influenced by their hobbies and interests. When talking about writers, for example, it could range from philosophical thinkers of the Enlightenment to modern writers of comics and books.

Despite these differences, oftentimes influenced by their upbringing and the region that they had grown up in, architecture was the one constant when they talked about heritage in a broader context (such as the national one). Many informants mentioned how they believed that architecture is a very important aspect of heritage on a national scale, even internationally. Whether in Luxembourg or in France, the architecture of the country recounts histories of past artisans, of traditions and knowledge (*savoir-faire* in French) cultivated across generations. One notable style of architecture which was mentioned a lot was the Haussmannian architecture found primarily in Paris. There is a part of Luxembourg city (Place de Paris) which is also influenced by Haussmann's style.

An interesting discussion that I had with both C and Clémentine showed that both women understood *patrimoine* as being used to refer to both personal heritage and regional heritage. When discussing the notion of *patrimoine*, they told me that their first thought was to understand it specifically as architectural and cultural *patrimoine* (*patrimoine architectural et culturel*). Even though Clémentine asked me if I was referring to personal *patrimoine* when I first asked the question about *patrimoine*, both

women agreed that *patrimoine* is something that is shared amongst the inhabitants of the same region. Clémentine admitted to having a hard time seeing France as a nation, seeing it more as a regionally fractured country, where each region has its own heritage. "I think that *patrimoine* is associated to a notion of a smaller surface.", C explained after arguing that even Luxembourg is fractured into its Northern and Southern region with their respective *patrimoine*.

I have mentioned food previously in this section, and it has an interesting position within French migrants' understanding of heritage. On the one hand, it is considered a personal *héritage* as it relates back to the kind of food they have grown up with and that they associate with their own past and family history. On the other hand, they also consider it as regional and national *patrimoine*, shared amongst not only their family members, but also members of the same region. More broadly, they also agreed that there is a shared knowledge amongst French people on how to cook and eat good food. More concretely, they explained that French people know how to live a good life, '*bon vivre*' in French. This mentality has been mentioned often, and is supposedly shared amongst every French citizen, regardless of the region that they originate from.

However, when talking about the regional specialties that they grew up with, many of my interlocutors explained that they only ate (or felt like eating) those regional and nostalgic dishes when they were visiting family, or friends, back in their native region. One informant also specifically linked eating one of those regional dishes with the action of meeting up with old friends over dinner. Food is linked with sharing moments of joy with family and friends, with what they call 'a good life'.

To conclude, heritage, especially with the two translations in French, are understood on two levels. Unless I specifically mentioned French *patrimoine*, all my interlocutors talked about their personal heritage when asked about either *patrimoine* or *héritage*. They usually divide *patrimoine* into either its tangible or intangible aspect, while *héritage* is predominantly associated with material heritage. When talking about it on a broader scale, they seem to prefer the usage of *patrimoine*, especially when referring to government-related nominations of heritage. In other words, what the state sees as national heritage, or worthy of being nominated as shared national heritage is usually understood as *patrimoine*, while when it comes to the individual, *héritage* (especially connected with the act of inheriting something) is used to describe personal heritage.

This means that it depends on which scale the discussion on heritage is happening. If talking about the national heritage of France (or the regional heritage), *patrimoine* is used to refer to this kind of heritage. As Morisset (2018) has pointed out, in that case *patrimoine* is understood as an expression of an ideology of the French state, while putting forward "a system of values validated by history and through a status proclaimed by an expert." (p. 35) When my interlocutors were talking about what they understood as French *patrimoine*, they usually referred to what they have been taught at school and have seen other French citizens deem as important history.

On a smaller scale, *patrimoine* and *héritage* are generally understood as representing two sides of the same coin. They mean the same thing but refer to different aspects of heritage. *Patrimoine* is usually used to refer to what is perceived as being the 'good' sides of heritage, such as the knowledge passed on, values and traditions, and other usually intangible experiences. *Héritage*, on the other hand, refers to the material inheritance which is usually associated when talking about personal heritage. An English translation could be inheritance.

In the end, what French migrants understand as personal heritage differs from region to region, and from family to family. One of the similarities that does appear is that many associate their intangible heritage with their family history.

How to be home, how to be chez soi

In the middle of a town, at the edge of the capital of Luxembourg, an apartment can be found among many others. Two bedrooms, an open living room with a kitchen, a bathroom and a toilet. A standard arrangement of living quarters, where C started to live after having divorced her husband about three years ago. Tucked away at a corner of a street, the empty apartment was a long shot from being called home at first, especially after she had been living in a bigger multiple story house before. Slowly the apartment took on color, even if nothing changed in the looks of the apartment. It still had the same-colored walls, the same-colored floors and ceilings, but slowly, C breathed in life in the apartment by putting up paintings, by decorating with vases, plants and books, her once barren apartment suddenly taking on a whole new light. It was not a home when she first arrived, but now, after three years, she describes it as such, an apartment that she had moved into during a hard time in her life, a resting place that she can remain in when the world becomes too much. It was where she could rest, separated from the public world, not having to interact with anyone if she did not wish to.

This wish for privacy and having a space set apart from the public is one that reappears during most of the interviews about home and in literature as well. The home was divided into two different aspects: the physical space giving shelter from the outside world, and the emotional connections and attachments made within. There are also two other aspects, such as social relations and heritage, but I will discuss their link with home in the following chapter. This specific chapter will focus on the two aspects mentioned previously and on how the home-Home-HOME distinction offered by Brun and Fábos (2015) can also be useful to understand how French migrants, a community of European migrants, settle and make a home in a foreign country.

These two discussions are then aimed at constructing an answer for the following sub question:

What kinds of developments did they seek to accomplish by making a home?

As discussed at the beginning, the concept of home is one that has been theorized in many disciplines. The sub question focuses on two important aspects of home: its temporality and ever-changing state. A

home is an ever-evolving endeavor every migrant undertakes, attempting to establish and maintain a place, a space, or emotional connections that makes them feel at home. French migrants do it as well, usually working to establish a home through a combination of material construction and emotional bonds.

When looking for a French translation of home, I gravitated towards '*chez-soi*', which can be literally translated to 'at oneself'. When translating it through the dictionary Reverso, home was translated into French as *'maison'* (house), *'domicile'*, *'acceuil'*, *'résidence'*, *'logement'*, *'habitation'* and *'chez-soi'* among a few others (*Home - Translation*, n.d.). Most of those translations refer to the physical space of a house or an apartment. Just as people speaking other languages, French-speaking individuals who use *chez-soi* are influenced by a conflation between a house (*maison*) and a home (*chez-soi*), often mixing up the two to the point that they become synonymous with one another. For example, when someone says they are going home, a popular way of saying is: "*Je rentre à la maison / à l'appart.*". This can be directly translated into "I am going to the house / to the apartment." but is generally understood as going home.

Every translation, even *chez-soi*, refers to some extent to the physical house, some more directly than others. *Domicile* and *résidence*, for example, are often used to refer to a house address and are usually used in official, legal and administrative contexts. The reason I decided to settle on *chez-soi* for my questions concerning home is for what it highlights. *Soi* is usually translated as oneself, making *chez-soi* highlight where someone feels like oneself, where someone can and has the freedom to be themselves. In addition to not usually having an official and administrative connotation like *domicile*, *chez-soi* was clear enough that when I asked my informants about it, they knew what I was talking about. However, it was also vague enough that they had the freedom to interpret it as they wished.

Interestingly, after asking about what would make my informants feel at home (by using the verb '*être chez soi*' instead of the noun, '*un chez-soi'*), most asked if I was talking about the physical home. This shows that there is an association of the house to the home, even when I try to ask them about the home and all its aspects. I usually answered back that it was up to them to interpret what I meant, and this led to many focusing, first, on the house. Afterwards, they talked about how social connections with the neighbors could either make it easier or harder to feel at home, but I will explore this connection between home and social connections in another chapter.

It is at this point that I want to introduce an interesting conversation that I was able to listen to between C and Luna, one evening in the middle of February. We (namely C and I) had invited Luna over for a chat and some drinks and food. At some point, we ended up talking about the home and how, for Luna, owning the house made it a home. She explained that, right now, since she was just renting, that she could not feel at home. She described that the lack of freedom about the color of the walls, the (fixed) furniture and the appliances all played a role in her not being able to feel like she had made herself a

home. Did she feel safe where she was? Yes, she appreciated the place and the space that she had been able to carve out for herself after moving to Luxembourg to join her partner. But she could not feel at home the way she felt at home in a home that she or her parents had owned before.

On the contrary, C explained that whether she was renting or owning the place (in this case the apartment), she could feel at home for as long as she could decide what she could decorate the space with. The many chairs and paintings that she had inherited, the comics that she owned, her arts and crafts, if she could decide what goes where, she felt at home. The walls, the ceiling, the appliances, all of that mattered little to her. She was living in the space, and decorating to make it her own, so she was at home.

This view of renting versus owning a property was fairly split in half for those who mentioned that there was a difference. Some explained that owning allowed a certain amount of freedom which then allowed them to decide on what the full place looked like, from top to bottom. Others' focus was more on what kind of furniture and decorations that they could put up and if they had enough space to decorate with what they owned. In each case, the home was not solely the physical house or apartment, but was interconnected with many different aspects: the neighborhood, the town/city, the social connections made outside and inside the house, the furniture, the physical and intangible *patrimoine* and *héritage*, all these aspects intersected in order to make it a space that they liked, where they felt safe, peaceful and at home.

I mentioned several times that an important aspect of home is how it made my informants feel. Peace, safety, safe space, protection, all off these terms were used to describe what French migrants look for in a home. A home should be a peaceful and safe space, which should offer them the ability to protect themselves and to be able to retire from the public sphere at any time. In most of my interviews, the physical and emotional aspects of a home meshed into their plans to create a space apart from the world where they could be vulnerable, happy and safe.

This distinction between public and private sphere is extremely prevalent in French migrants' understanding of home. The home is cleanly separated from the rest of the world, the public sphere and politics should not infringe in that sphere beyond protecting the individuals against issues such as domestic violence. As explained by one of my informants, the laws inside and outside of the home are different, creating two different worlds who work alongside each other.

In the last part of this section on home, I want to use Brun & Fábos' (2015) home-Home-HOME distinction to further explore what I have experienced and heard about home. As a quick reminder, home represents the daily practices of the inhabitants, while Home is about the values, traditions and memories. The third aspect, HOME, focuses on the external aspects, such as the historical and political context of the country they have migrated to, as well as the demands concerning the migrants' integration. And although Brun & Fábos were talking about minorities when they were fleshing out this

tripartite division, I believe it is a useful division to understand three aspects of home oftentimes not really explored together, especially in connection with communities of migrants coming from Western countries, such as France.

When it comes to the daily practices of my interlocutors, most of them had jobs which required them to be away from their physical residence during their working hours. Some of my interlocutors were retirees or close to being retired, and most of them spent their days meeting people, being at home (usually reading or doing other activities) and/or partaking in their hobbies. Most of the time, my interlocutors spent their time in Luxembourg, and with other Luxembourgish citizens.

For example, Biraud is an art and museum enthusiast, and he told me that he regularly visits museums and art exhibitions. We both went to visit a WWII museum in Luxembourg and an art exhibition, where he was able to not only see a new museum but also share his own experiences in comparison to what was shown. I remember walking through the small museum with barely anyone there, and with him telling me about his own experiences in the military and how the machinery that was shown was not all that different to the machinery that he had to handle back then.

Another example would be a small road trip with C, who loves taking walks through the forest and discovering more of the country that she had decided to settle in. We took her car, and she traced back her first few months in Luxembourg through our journey. It ended with lunch at an old cinema that had been repurposed into a café/restaurant. These activities are born from their own interest and hobbies, which they try to add to their daily lives in one way or another.

Not every day is filled with visits, however. During my time at C's apartment, we often spent our time together (when I was not busy travelling to visit other informants) to either talk or play some board games. We either played Triominos or Rummikub, and when she was in a good mood, she would often make pancakes. When it came to meeting my informants outside of their place of living, I let them choose where they would feel most comfortable. Many chose either cafés or bakeries, such as Fischer or Oberweiss, one a well-known chain of Luxembourgish bakeries, the other a restaurant-catering chain popular in Luxembourg. According to C, meeting in cafés is a popular activity for older people in France, which can partly explain why many liked to meet at such spots.

The second aspect of Brun & Fábos' conception of home is Home, which they linked to values, traditions and memories. Values could vary depending on the interlocutor, but there is a set of values that was nearly constantly mentioned during interviews. Family is one of them, and French migrants put a lot of importance on it. I have already explored how French migrants see and understand their connections through blood in a previous section dedicated to kinship, so I will not go in much detail here. Generally, French migrants put family first, as their connection through blood creates both duties and responsibilities, both through law and through their emotional connections. While there is a division between the immediate family, the family that they build and the extended family, each part of these

family dynamics are valued in one way or another. I will explore this intersection with family and connections with other people in the following chapter.

When it comes to tradition, it is harder to generalize among French migrants because of the regional differences. France is a huge country, with a size of over 543'000 km^2 (counting only France), generally divided into 18 regions. Depending on the region that the French migrant comes from, their traditions, their heritage and their way of speaking are very different. Many times, when talking about this subject, I have heard a variation of "If x from region 1 talked with y from region 2, they would not understand each other.", while referring to how the accents and vernacular language differ. Besides spoken language, traditions such as funeral proceedings also have regional differences. For example, one informant mentioned how he did not know what to offer for a funeral arrangement happening in Alsace, as he is from the region of Ardennes.

Memories, on the other hand, are both easier to pinpoint and generalize among French migrants. Food and architecture are two things that French migrants connect to both memory and emotions, creating further connections with what they find important even away from France. When it comes to food specifically, for example, they might miss the "good French baguette" or a pretzel as it is usually made in Alsace. In both cases, French migrants usually do not wish to partake into its consumptions outside of the region (for the pretzel) or outside of France (for the baguette).

The last aspect is the historical and political context that French migrants come into when they move to Luxembourg, HOME. I have already explored the socio-economic context of Luxembourg within my communicative contexts, so I will only briefly go over it here. Luxembourg is a country that is intimately familiar with migration. From many people migrating out of it during a time where it had little to offer to a time where a lot of migrants want to move into Luxembourg, the country and its society has met people who arrive, who stay and who leave very regularly. This has affected those who have been born and have grown up in the country, as one never knows whether the person that they meet will remain in the country long term. In other words, Luxembourgish citizens tend to remain on the fence with any new arrivals, even more so with those who only see Luxembourg only as an opportunity to work and be paid well.

When migrants come into the country, the first language that they are expected to know is French, which eases the arrival of French migrants. However, as mentioned in my communicative contexts, this creates some friction between French and Luxembourgish people. French people do not feel the need to learn Luxembourgish to live in the country, while Luxembourgish citizens feel like their culture and their language is being ignored.

An important shared value is the one of education. Both within the home and within the school, many of my informants explained how education can either make or break a child. Within the specific context of Luxembourg, for example, depending on which education is chosen for the child, their life trajectory

can be very different. There are many curriculums that can be chosen, from the Luxembourgish to an international French curriculum or an English one. Parents have plenty of choices where they could send their children to school. Some informants put more importance on the choice of school than others, even going as far as claiming that choosing any other curriculum than the Luxembourgish one would just hinder the children's integration within Luxembourg. One informant, an elderly lady who has lived in Luxembourg for over 40 years, explained how she had no choice but to put her children in the Luxembourgish curriculum at the time, because there was nothing else available. In present time, she admitted that she was happy to have done so, as she has seen how much the Luxembourgish curriculum has helped them integrate and find themselves within Luxembourgish society.

To conclude, French migrants then understand a home as continuous endeavor towards creating a space where they can be free, vulnerable, at peace and safe. This space is affected by both habits and beliefs, where they attempt to nurture a family and teach their children their values and traditions. Within the broader context of Luxembourg, they can either choose a Luxembourgish curriculum or another one for the education of their children.

Building a future from the past

This chapter will be focusing on the intersection of the different notions – kinship, heritage and home – previously explored. It is impossible not to speak of one without mentioning the other, as has been proven to me multiple times during my fieldwork. When talking about home, topics concerning personal connections kept appearing and the home also was often described as the physical space were immaterial, and material heritage was kept and shared among family members.

Belonging is one of the integral parts to the connection between the three concepts. As Gammeltoft (2018) has argued in her essay on belonging in Vietnam and beyond, belonging has different scales and dimensions, which happen at the same time and are interconnected on each scale. Scale, in this case, should not be associated with any kind of hierarchy between the three. The three different scales important in the following discussion are the local, national and transnational scales. Gammeltoft divided them into intersubjective, territorial and political belonging (Gammeltoft, 2018). Each of those scales are affected by three dimensions – membership, possession and moral obligation – in different degrees.

It is important to understand that all the scales and dimensions are interconnected and influence one another. While I will be separating them for the purpose of analyzing them with my fieldwork experience, they influence one another constantly. The three scales and the dimensions come together at the small scale of the home, interconnecting through the different dimensions. The interconnection becomes especially clear with how French migrants talk about their connection with their native region. This connection is not only affected by territorial belonging, but also by intersubjective belonging. Many expressed how connections with family and friends influence how they feel about their native region, whether the region is a place they visit a lot or is reduced to a nostalgic home that they do not feel any need to go back to. This chapter will explore how the different scales and dimensions, as well as Home and HOME, are realized on the smaller and local scale of home, to create a *chez-soi*.

This chapter will focus on this interconnection between home, kinship and heritage, using primarily Tine Gammeltoft's (2018) article on belonging, Sharon Macdonald's (2013) article on heritage and Brun & Fábos' (2015) article on home to explore my findings in more detail. With the help of Gammeltoft, I aim to discuss how home, kinship and heritage are connected in French migrants' attempts of settling in Luxembourg and to find and/or nurture a sense of belonging. Macdonald will be useful to understand how heritage, especially the one in relation to memory, is constantly present within homemaking practices. Brun & Fábos' article with their tripartite division of home (home-Home-HOME) will be useful to see how the different aspects of home relate to both kinship and heritage, especially in the case of migrants.

Before exploring these connections, I will re-define the research question of this thesis.

Problem Definition

After exploring both the academic debates and the French migrants' understanding of home, heritage and kinship ties, this last chapter will be focusing on answering the research question of this thesis. The research question concerning the homemaking habits of French migrants is the following:

Do French migrants make a home in Luxembourg by employing French heritage or other memories of their French past, and do kinship relations, whether national, fictive or based on biogenetic metaphors, play a role in this?

To answer this question, I have divided my three sub questions according to the three following notions: home, kinship and heritage. The previous chapter attempted to offer a comprehensive understanding of both the academic debates behind the concepts and how French migrants understood them. None of the three concepts can be understood fully on their own. Home, heritage and kinship ties are interconnected, even during my attempts to tackle one notion at a time.

The following sections will primarily focus on how home relates to both kinship ties and heritage separately. It is, however, impossible to fully separate them, even if I attempt to do so. There are times where I will mention heritage within the discussion of home and connections, and where social connections impact how home and heritage work together. I have separated them regardless, for an easier understanding of how the respective notions work with one another, before finally connecting them in the last section.

Home and Social Connections – Make or Break a Home

The way French migrants understand home shows that family ties, and more broadly social connections, play a big role in the establishment of the home. Both physically and emotionally, the home is a local space where personal connections affect how it develops. Throughout this chapter, I will be discussing how home and kinship are connected through a discussion of three scales and dimensions of belonging, heavily inspired by Gammeltoft's article on belonging in Vietnam and beyond.

To start, home and social connections are connected through both intersubjective and territorial belonging (Gammeltoft, 2018). Intersubjective belonging refers to how people are mutually connected to one another, through biogenetic connections and those established otherwise (Gammeltoft, 2018). Territorial belonging denotes a bidirectional relationship between places and people: how people understand, define and relate to places, but also how places define people in return (Gammeltoft, 2018). The third kind of belonging Gammeltoft refers to is political belonging. Political belonging is more broadly connected to political communities, and subjects of citizenship, nationalism and migration. There are three scales that I am taking from this: the local, the national and the transnational.

In the case of this thesis, I want to connect these three kinds of belonging to three different scales. Intersubjective belonging refers primarily to the local scale, where French migrants connect with others

in their immediate environment. Territorial belonging, on the other hand, can refer both to the local and national scale, through connecting French migrants to the place of home, their native region, and different countries. Political belonging, in the case of French migrants, plays a role on the transnational scale, from Luxembourg to France. It is important to note, again, that the different kinds of belonging, both scale and dimensions, all end up being realized on the local scale of the person.

Gammeltoft (2018) explains that the literature on belonging usually shares three dimensions: "possession, membership and moral obligation" (p. 88). Possession, she explains, is a mutual attachment created through interactions with other people, where each person is affected and transformed by it. For French migrants, mutual possession is usually between family members. However, through migration, these connections lose their local aspect, leaving French migrants with the necessity of rebuilding their local network of connections in a new local space. There is also a difference (especially in degrees of mutual possession, membership and moral obligation) between family members and friendships, even with the distance between them and their family. Connections with friends do not have the same amount of mutual possession as connections with family do. This becomes especially clear when considering membership and moral obligation.

Membership is about how people attach themselves to larger social bodies, especially in scenarios where their attachments to different social bodies can be contradictory and competing with one another (Gammeltoft, 2018). While Gammeltoft remains unclear about what she means with larger social bodies, I will understand this as referring to groups of people, connected to each other through shared interest, ideals, identity and/or biogenetic ties.

Membership on a local scale happens in different places. Such places are, among others, home, work, school and other public spaces. Home requires some level of membership from all its inhabitants to maintain it. Since home is usually connected with family, family members sharing a roof usually expect a certain level of participation from other family members when taking care of the home. From cleaning dishes to doing laundry to maintaining the garden, there is an expectation of help from each party living in the home. For example, during my time at C's apartment, I helped around the house, loading the dishwasher, sweeping the floors, doing laundry and other chores that are necessary for the maintenance of the home and its inhabitants.

Connections with friends are different to family connections when considering how the person's membership of the group asks for different kinds of moral obligations. Moral obligation is about how each attachment and relationship between people gives rise to moral expectations and demands (Gammeltoft, 2018). In an example I have already mentioned when talking about connections, Bdb illustrated this difference by explaining how connections to family, specifically the nuclear family, brought a different kind of responsibility than the responsibility one has towards friends. During a group discussion between Luna, Num, Clémentine and C, they talked about how family usually demands a

duty of care from its members, whether for good or for bad. While Gammeltoft (2018) argues that care remains conditional, there is a reluctance to break contact with family members among many French migrants. In the case of Num, despite having expressed not having the best relationship with her parents, she still feels like she must take care of them now that they are sick. This duty to take care of their family is not only from the child towards the parents. Parents also have a duty of care towards their children, which most of my participants expressed by saying that they are supporting their children emotionally and financially.

While some of my interlocutors mentioned wanting to support their children for as long as they can, others explained that, while they did not mind helping, they expected their children to learn how to rely on themselves to make things work. For example, C has always said that it is the duty of the parent to pay for the children's education. Another interlocutor, however, mentioned how he would have preferred for his daughter to work to pay for her university education.

Mutual possession on the local scale does not solely affect the connection between people, but also the connection to objects. I will explore this connection in further detail in the next sections, given its importance when discussing heritage and people. Mutual possession also happens to different degrees on different scales. The first scale was the local one, where I discussed intersubjective relationships. The next scale, the national one, refers to territorial belonging, which can be either Luxembourg or France. Territorial belonging also refers to how French migrants create attachments with local places, such as the home. Luna's attachment to her home city, Clémentine's attachment to her home back in the South of France and C's attachment to her home region are all examples of what this territorial belonging can look like.

Possession appears within the need to own the home to feel at home. French migrants do not only desire to possess (own) the home but are also being possessed by the home insofar that the home itself affects and transforms the person in some way, shape or form. The appearance and the purpose of the home affect how and when a person feels at home.

As I have discussed in the second chapter, French migrants associate ownership (a form of possession) with freedom, especially when being able to decide the material aspects of the home. As several of my interlocutors have explained, owning a home comes with the freedom to choose the materials and decorations of a house. This freedom, then, allows French migrants to choose how to feel at home physically. I referred to this example in a previous chapter, but one interlocutor explained how he grew up in a house that he described as a 'cardboard' home. He explained that such homes have extremely thin walls and little sound insulation, where you could hear everything that was happening in another room. Since privacy is important to him (and to many of my other interlocutors), this felt like a constant violation. Now that he is older, sound insulation is one of the aspects of home that he insists on. Both for his own privacy and the privacy of his children.

In a discussion with Luna and C, Luna explained how ownership is not simply about the materials of the home, but also the decorations within it. She specifically referred to how, by owning a home, she can decide where which furniture goes, especially furniture that cannot be moved afterwards (such as kitchen counters and lamp placements in the ceiling). With her being in the process of buying a home at the time, she explained how she wants to be able to decide where everything goes within the home, not only how it is built.

Moral obligation, in the case of home, is tied to the moral obligation towards family members. There are duties linked to the safe keeping of the home, to make sure that it continues to fulfil the expectations put on it by the inhabitants. This is also connected to the membership mentioned previously, about how French migrants expect all parties living under the same roof to work together to maintain the home. This involves negotiations about what goes where when living with a partner to general rules of conduct. Bdb, for example, explained it in legal terms, describing how the home has its own laws and rules different from the laws concerning the public spaces. The home is not only regulated through rules of conduct agreed upon usually by the elder inhabitants but also regulated through laws. This is one of the cases where the local and national scale meet again, where national laws affect the local home.

I associate political belonging with the transnational scale, but intersubjective belonging also plays a role on this scale. While one side of political belonging refers to their political affiliation and the expectations that follow, the other side refers to the kind of connections that are maintained across borders. For many French migrants, the transnational scale of belonging is also about those whom they have left behind. While they have left behind parents, siblings and other family members in their native region, they remain in contact in some way. It is also here that the connectedness between the different scales becomes the most obvious. C, for example, talked about the importance of her connections with many family members and friends that continue despite the geographical distance between them. This shows that her previously local connections persist when they become transnational connections. This kind of transition happens for every French migrant I have discussed the topic with, especially when considering how migration shifts the dynamics of their connections with other people.

Some of them, such as Luna, took this switch harder than others, while others did not see much change with the additional distance, such as Num. Luna was possessed by her family as they were part of how she understood herself, while Num felt her parents possessed her too much, leaving her feeling suffocated.

Mutual possession, membership and moral obligation on the transnational scale differ slightly from the others. Similarly to the previous two scales, there is a mutual possession with other people across borders and there is a level of membership, whether political and/or familial. The moral obligation towards family remains but is found to a lesser degree because of the distance between family members. For example, C lived two hours away from her parents, while her sisters lived closer by. This meant that her

siblings were the first people contacted if anything went wrong with their parents. The same applied to Luna, who, before moving to Luxembourg, was the one taking care of her parents. Now that she lives in Luxembourg, it is her younger brother who oversees taking care of them.

French migrants do find ways to connect on the transnational scale with other French-speaking individuals as well. While I did not talk about a connection through nationality with my interlocutors, French migrants do establish organizations that cater specifically to French-speaking individuals. The ones I had direct contact with were the CFL and the AFL, their goal being to regroup French migrants in Luxembourg to offer community help and an avenue where they can discuss different beliefs, values and opinions. These encourage primarily an intersubjective belonging based on a shared nationality and past in France.

Both territorial and political belonging are also encouraged through l'Assemblée des Français à l'étranger (AFE; Assembly of French Citizens Abroad). It is a political organization which focuses on representing French citizens who have moved away from France through an Assembly where they can have a say in who represents them in France. I was able to meet the Benelux (Belgium – Netherlands – Luxembourg) representative during one of the monthly meetings organized by the AFL. These organizations create a connection to France as whole, not always considering the regional connection expressed by many of my interlocutors.

Their regional attachment is more connected to family and the *patrimoine* and *héritage* associated with and shared within the family, whereas their connection to the country is maintained through political organizations such as the AFE and national pride. The AFE is there to remind French migrants that France cares about all its citizens, inside and outside of its borders.

In the end, the home is the local space where these three dimensions and the scales of belonging are tied to the personal connections French migrants make. They will be affected by the people they meet, both positively and negatively, inside and outside of the home. It is specifically that aspect that influences the process of homemaking so much. Through positive interactions, the home grows, the home develops and accommodates the ever-changing wants of its members. Through negative experiences, the development of the home halts, sometimes even takes a step back and might not even feel like home anymore. I already mentioned the example of the interlocutor who had to deal with a horrible neighbor, but this also happens during divorces or other kinds of separations. In the case of C and Tck, their divorce meant that they had to rework what home meant to them without the other.

The home is a multi-sited place where people arrive, stay and leave (Ahmed, 1999), and it remains a constantly changing sphere, physically, emotionally and locally. Home and HOME are all affected by and affect home in return, shaping how it is established, maintained and re-located.

When it comes to intersubjective belonging, French migrants must connect and create attachments with people outside of their families, especially after migration. Oftentimes, these attachments are developed

through friends and coworkers, sometimes even neighbors, in attempt to diversify their social network and recreate the feeling of intersubjective belonging that they have left behind through their migration to Luxembourg. Some French migrants, especially those of older generations, also moved as a couple. This means that they do not have to uproot themselves fully from their social network. This migration, whether done alone or with a partner, usually reduces the familial network to the nuclear family, especially when it comes to establishing a new home. This establishment of a new home after migration is where territorial belonging comes in.

As mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, French migrants do not only connect to the region through territorial belonging, but also through intersubjective belonging. The intersubjective connections are the motivation that many of my interlocutors have cited for not only feeling connected to the land beyond nostalgia, but also to have a reason to go back beyond going for holidays. In other words, French migrants intimately connect their attachment to their native region (or France on a broader scale, for that matter) and their attachment to people. The larger scales of both territorial and political belonging end up being affected and realized on the local scale of intersubjective belonging, where personal relationships with others affects how French migrants connect to home, their native region and to Luxembourg and France.

In their article on space and identity, Gupta and Ferguson (1992) mentioned 'remembered places', which are places that can connect scattered people in a community. They argue that homeland is one of such places which can unify displaced people, even if the person's relation to the homeland can vary. This small distinction is especially relevant for French migrants, who might see France as their home country, but who see their native region as their homeland. French migrants also create attachments to their homelands, to remembered places which reunites them with others, creating this feeling of territorial and intersubjective belonging.

For French migrants, they feel as if they are defined by the region that they originally came from. For example, C and Clémentine express a deep connection to their home region and its culture. In the case of C, her home has furniture built in a style specific to Alsace, while Clémentine explains that the isle in Nouvelle-Aquitaine is her home to the point that Luxembourg can only remain a temporary placeholder for her. This feeling is both influenced by her reluctant migration to Luxembourg done solely for the sake of her children, and the weather of Luxembourg influencing her mood negatively. She has expressed countless times that she cannot wait to move back to that region of France. She described a visceral connection (possession) with the place, affected by the weather and her friends. When talking about nationality and the connection to the land that comes from it, most participants described themselves as first Europeans, then as belonging to their home region. It is only after, that they connected either to Luxembourg and/or France.

However, there are also French migrants who do not want to have anything to do with their native region anymore. Most of my interlocutors who have expressed such a feeling come from the region of Île-de-France, specifically the region surrounding Paris. Most of them expressed that they did not want to go back or that they do not feel any connections to the current state of the capital. An older interlocutor explained that he longs for the Paris of the past, for the France of the past, expressing deep nostalgia for the glory of what once had been. The current situation simply leaves them feeling hollow, looking for another space that could give them the feeling that they had experienced during childhood. There are a rare few who express overt dislike for their home region. For example, Num expressed how she disliked her native region because she feels that there was nothing to do, especially when she was younger.

The participants who complained about the current situation in France are mostly older gentlemen who identified as being center-right-leaning on the political spectrum. One of those participants explained how he came from the region surrounding Paris and remembered how he grew up in a big, but relatively safe city. He remembered days of glory that had long past, of a France that he could be proud of, mentioning French president De Gaulle as being the fact of that glorious France. It was a time when there was more freedom, far less restrictions and constraints on both people and businesses. Now, he describes France as being a bureaucratic and administrative nightmare, with paperwork plaguing all attempted changes and procedures. Just as C left France because of the rise of extreme right within the country, some left because of the fall of what they expressed as being their national pride in France. There was little to be proud of when everything was starting to be manufactured outside of France and imported instead.

Even with these difference between French migrants, all of them established territorial belonging to their native region and their physical residence. The difference in political affiliation only appeared relevant when connecting it back to France as a nation. The home, specifically, is where territorial and intersubjective belonging intertwine to create the feeling of being 'at home' (*chez soi*). The home becomes a place that they build, and that they constantly try to improve, both for themselves and for their family. In previous discussions concerning home, I mentioned how French migrants seek out safety, protection and peace through its establishment. It is important to note that this is not a once-and-done kind of situation. Their quest is to create a safe home, where the inhabitants (especially the owner/renting person) feel at peace and feel like they can be vulnerable. There is always a possibility of feeling safer, just as there is the possibility of the home failing to live up to the demands of its inhabitants.

This territorial belonging is made more complex through the process of migration. In my conceptual framework and during the discussion part, I mentioned that home is a multi-sited and multidimensional concept, with research spanning across many disciplines. By connecting home and family together, French migrants usually have multiple physical spaces that they consider home. They connect those homes to places where the people that they care for live. From family members to very close friends, the fact that those close social connections are in one place makes them feel at home. Some talked about

the home back then and the home now, where the home back then is where their parents still reside (or resided) and the current home refers to the home that they have established after migrating to Luxembourg.

With the way all French migrants (regardless of gender) understand home; to be the place where *they* feel safe, where *they* feel protected and cared for, where *they* can decide what goes where, it is necessary that they work with whoever they are living with to make such a place. These goals, however, demand constant negotiations and re-negotiations of rules, decoration and values, given the ever-changing nature of people and the developments of their needs.

The development of their social network will also affect how someone feels at home. In the discussion of connections, I mentioned an interlocutor who talked about a horrible neighbor who ruins their peace of mind, especially since he must share some common rooms with her. Situations like these, where the home and social connections clash, make it harder for the person to feel at home where they live. It tampers with their territorial belonging. Intersubjective belonging will come with its ups and downs, since relationships are complex and oftentimes difficult to navigate, affecting territorial belonging both locally and regionally.

French migrants, then, use both territorial and intersubjective belonging to connect home to their social network of family, friends and other types of connections. Home is connected to social connections through these types of belonging but also removed from it when home is sought after as a haven from the world instead. Whenever the home stops fulfilling its intended purpose, it does so when affected by social connections in some way, from family, friends, neighbors and/or colleagues. In the end, social connections help create a sense of belonging in a home, but they can also be the very reasons why a home might break apart.

Home and Heritage – A Teacher in one Home, A Burden in Another

C's current home is an apartment in the middle of a city, with a small balcony overlooking a road, and the whole building facing a school. I remember coming back to her for the first time after several months away in the Netherlands and finding a lot of different furniture adorning the place, much of which she had inherited from her parents, or other older family members. The whole space felt like a physical manifestation of what C had lived through, learned and kept. When entering the living room, there is a wooden chest that used to hold only liquor but was now filled with all kinds of trinkets instead. The old wooden chair at the end of the living room, near the big window, was her mother's chair, the one that she always sat on when we were having family dinners. No one else was allowed to use that chair, everyone respecting her mother's claim. Now, C sits on it when she writes poems and short stories, while other times it remains a subtle reminder of her deceased mother.

Another informant, Biraud, talked about how his home is adorned with both his heritage and his passion. The military medals that he proudly showcases, reminders of his and his family's past in the military

and the many artworks on the walls are both two very important aspects of his life (both past and present). Luna's home, contrary to both Biraud and C's home, has primarily minimalistic decorations, gifts and souvenirs brought along their travels and from family and friends. However, during Christmas, she takes out the fake Christmas tree and a Christmas nativity scene (*crèche de Noël*) that she puts underneath the Christmas tree, trying to recollect and experience once again the joys that have become synonymous with the holiday.

I have described these places and customs to show how home and heritage (both *patrimoine* and *héritage*) are connected, especially within the local scale. For many, the home becomes the space which holds heritage of all kinds. From memory to traditions, from recipes to habits, the home becomes the grounds upon which heritage can be shown, shared and taught. This heritage that is shown and shared, that is taught and transmitted, is a kind of heritage that is perpetually rooted in personal memories. Just as I had mentioned within my conceptual framework, this kind of intangible heritage rooted in memories also has a material aspect. In the section where I discussed how French migrants understand *héritage* and *patrimoine*, I mentioned how C has chairs that she has inherited from her parents. One chair that belonged to her mother, the other a physical reminder of all the aperitifs that she has had with people who are no longer there to share them with her. This kind of heritage is heavily associated with both emotional connections to people and a home long gone.

Being 'possessed' by objects you possess plays an important role here. In the case of C, the chairs represent a connection that she had with her parents, who are now dead. These connections to people do not just disappear, and objects can take the place of the people who are no longer here. Through the chairs that she has taken with her after cleaning her parents' home back in Alsace, C continues a connection that she had established with her parents first, and with these objects after. She is affected by these chairs just as much as she affects them, and the importance that they have for her. Another example would be Biraud and his military medals. Both his own and those from his grandfather are displayed, and he explained that they were important to him. They are a physical reminder of his and his family's experience, memories that are passed from one recipient to the other through physical objects.

In the fourth chapter of her book *Memorylands*, Sharon Macdonald (2013) goes over two notions that are relevant in this discussion. The first notion is nostalgia. Nostalgia plays a big role for French migrants, especially in relation to home. Macdonald (2013) first associates it with discourses on the memory phenomenon and the heritage industry. She explains how the way that we understand nostalgia in English differs in some notable ways from its Greek understanding. In English, nostalgia is usually associated with a longing for something long past and "a romantic 'freezing' of the past" (p. 88). Macdonald (2013) points out that in Greek, nostalgia is about how the past now affects the present. The way that nostalgia affects French homes in Luxembourg appears in both ways. The French word, *nostalgie*, is usually about a longing to the past.

A saying, *la madeleine de Proust* (Proust's Madeleine[2]) is popular to refer to this nostalgic feeling, usually appearing when eating food associated with their native region or family home. This feeling of nostalgia connects a home long left behind to the present home in small ways. Through family recipes that evoke the sentiment of peace and joy surrounding the food to traditions and celebrations that bring forth past joys, reflecting them in the present. As Macdonald (2013) has explained, food can link back to a wider range of experiences, especially through more senses than just taste. The saying also came up during a discussion between C and Clémentine. C explained how the biscuit recipe that she has gotten from her aunt is her *madeleine de Proust*. She describes how every time she remembers the recipe, she is reminded of a time during her childhood where, every New Year's Eve, she would have a plate with those biscuits waiting for her. Nostalgia and memory are connected with heritage as C connects the recipe (both intangible and tangible aspects) to both her own memory and to a familial history where the recipe had been passed down from one generation to another. She does so by calling the recipe a *recette ancestrale* (ancestral recipe).

Nostalgia also appears in a longing for a past long gone through rose-tinted glasses (Macdonald, 2013), especially when put in relation to the homeland. I briefly mentioned in the previous section how some older French migrants mentioned their longing for a national glory long gone, for a political success not found in the present anymore. This kind of longing for a country that they can be proud of has been cited as one of the reasons why they're only visiting France as a vacation spot. An older participant explained that he does not visit Paris anymore because he has nothing left there, besides the memories of what once had been. Neither family nor the current state of affairs makes him want to visit the capital which had been his home when he was younger. For France as a whole, he explained that how it is being run now is not something that he can feel proud of. Describing it as a paper hell, where everything is just another form that he must fill out, he finds little reason to have any attachment or pride in the country.

Other participants were not as radical with their statement but expressed a similar feeling of disappointment in how France was being run, solving no problems and creating more issues day after day. I noticed that they talked about the 'good old times', of a political era full of success (usually associated with the era of De Gaulle) and continuously thriving. They usually do not really consider the negative sides of the period, just remembering how life felt easier back then. Most of those who expressed such feelings also identified themselves as being center-right-leaning on the political spectrum.

In her section about home, Macdonald (2018) describes that home has different scales, that it can be seen as referring to the homeland or to the domestic space. And since memory has different scales as

---

[2] This is a reference to the novel 'Á la recherche du temps perdu' (In Search of Lost Time) by Marcel Proust, published between 1913 and 1927

well, it also means that it affects French migrants differently on those scales. The memory of the homeland is imagined insofar that those memories are about the abstract concept of a nation. This concept is associated with memories of what happened to the people in the past, not to the present people living in the nation. On the other hand, within the domestic space of home, memories are about what happened to the person. From Biraud's experience in the military to the aperitifs that C has had with her family on her favorite sofa, those are memories about their lives with the people around them.

In the discussion between Clémentine and C, C described how familial heritage was, in part, the familial home, which she described as being an anchor within the family. Clémentine seemed to agree with her, but she pushed it further by asking why a familial home would be an anchor in the first place. "What is the point of interest for you?", she asked rhetorically before continuing, "It's your memories, everything that you have lived inside, it is what your parents have built with certain intentions." The house would not be a familial home otherwise; it would simply be a house (*maison*) like any other.

The domestic space of home, as multi-sited as it is, is intimately connected to memory, which then leads to its connection to heritage. Memories are the foundation of what French migrants connect to home, especially to the familial home that they have left behind.

Even within the current home, memory plays a big role in what is shared and transmitted. C connected memories with emotions when she talked about the recipe that her aunt had shared with her. She described how her aunt's act of sharing the biscuit recipe with her was an act of love shown through the physical act of transmission. Both C and Clémentine agreed that the way something, a memory, a recipe or an object is transmitted, matters little in this context. "What is transmitted, it is really an emotion, a memory, a taste, a *savoir-faire*.", Clémentine explained.

Habits are also part of a home, and habits are affected by the memories, experiences and past that my interlocutors have had in France. After moving to Luxembourg, they had to adapt their everyday lives (home) to match with the life in Luxembourg. For example, many of my interlocutors mentioned how they have a hard time adapting to the time Luxembourg society seems to have dinner. Most restaurants will fill around 19:00, whereas in France, people are more likely to eat dinner at later times. Many older migrants mentioned how, when they first arrived, they were surprised to see that there was a whole different culture surrounding cafés. These required some adaptations from French migrants to the daily habits and time management in Luxembourg, which are often more influenced by German rather than by French custom.

As mentioned in the previous chapter, the way that French migrants understand heritage is dependent on how they understand both *patrimoine* and *héritage*. On the level of the individual, when talking about *patrimoine*, they most often refer to intangible heritages, such as traditions (Christmas, Easter, the specific ways to celebrate a birthday) and values (education, freedom (*liberté*) and respect).

The values will affect how French migrants integrate into Luxembourg. What I mean by that is that if they feel that the country represents their values they will feel more encouraged to try and integrate. For example, many of my interlocutors described how Luxembourg and much of its culture are centered around respect and care. For C, specifically, this respect was much sought after, with what she described as the rise of disrespect, discrimination and that of the far-right parties happening in France at the time. With Home (the traditions and values) that she had in France not reflecting her values anymore, she moved to Luxembourg (HOME), where the culture and values reflected what she wanted most: respect.

When asking about what my participants thought of Luxembourg when they first arrived, many of them described the country, its people and its culture as generally respectful. However, they also explained that the situation in Luxembourg has changed now, where they are experiencing a loss in respect. One interlocutor explained the situation as follows: Luxembourg follows the broad developing trends (in this case the perceived rise of criminal activities, delinquency and the deteriorating feeling of safety) of the surrounding countries with a distance of about five years. In other words, Luxembourg usually experiences what happens in other countries later.

The Home that Brun & Fábos (2015) described, then, is affected by both external and internal values. For example, what many French migrants look for when moving is both security and respect. One of my older interlocutors explained that while he first came to Luxembourg hoping for a better life, he stayed because of the safety that the country offered in comparison to the rest of the countries who already had to face the rise of criminal activity. C explained that the small size of the country allowed for easier maintenance of safety amongst its inhabitants. These two values are applied both inside the home, where the home is sought to be a safe space, and onto the world outside of the home. It will be harder on them to feel at home if the world surrounding their home is chaotic and unsafe. Some of my interlocutors explain having to be faced with this kind of situation when I was interviewing them.

One older female interlocutor explained how when she first moved to Luxembourg and the town that she now resides in, it felt far safer than how it does now. The streets felt safe; she could take walks around the neighborhood without having to fear for her own safety. She explained that with the rise of delinquency and criminal activities, it becomes harder for her to travel through her town nowadays. She resents its development affected by the rise of crime rates and delinquency among the youth. Not only is the home then affected by the historical and political situation of the country (HOME), it is also affected by social developments, good and bad.

I mention this kind of example after explaining how safety and respect are important for French migrants to show the non-fixedness of a home. Since it is affected by both external and internal developments, the home can either develop positively, offering more safety within its space, or negatively, where it becomes a seemingly unsafe space.

The next section will focus on gathering all the insights mentioned within this thesis, and build towards the last chapter, the Conclusion.

Conclusion: where Home mediates between Kinship and Heritage

As explored before, home can be a space, can be an idea, can be emotion and/or physical, and can be at multiple physical spaces at once. It can be geographically disconnected or connected through close proximities to one another; it can house a whole family or be just strangers sharing a living space. A home takes the shape of its participants, changes constantly through life experiences, good and bad, and will forever remain an ongoing project. Home also does not necessarily only remain in one place. Especially in stories of migration, home travels with people, in small objects, in the connections made and lost, in the teachings and traditions.

The home connects *patrimoine*, *héritage* and social connections both through emotional and physical spaces. *Patrimoine* and *héritage* cannot mean anything, if they have no one to be shared with. They will only become memories, reminders of a long gone past, disappearing with the last person who remembers them. Home not only establishes a connection to others, but also encourages the sharing of ideals and beliefs, of habits and traditions, of memories and experiences.

Clémentine explained how she is attached to a nearly visceral level to the spaces where people once lived. She was talking about when she had to move out from one of her previous homes, and how she needed to do a small ceremony to say goodbye to the home that housed so many of her memories. A little bit later, she continues, saying that she does not know how she could possibly let go of the familial home, with how attached she is to the 'soul' of the house. The soul, here, is used to describe the memories, the experiences and the traditions that the house has experienced through its inhabitants. And this soul is also what distinguishes a home from a house. The connections to others through memories, heritage and emotional bonds, then, are what gives the house the chance to become a home for the people living in it. And while the home can be a mediator between heritage and kinship, it is also affected by them both in return. And while Clémentine's connection to the house and describing it as the soul of the place is a view only she has described, other participants also described how the home is a place for family connections.

Those family connections are usually maintained through space and time, and through the small objects that one is given, and that one can inherit from family members. These objects will often travel through space during migration, following the person from one home to another. Luna talked about an old clock and comb that she cannot live without, that have followed her from her teenage years to now. Gifts from her parents, that she constantly keeps close, a reminder of the memories they shared and of the love they hold. C has the furniture that she has inherited from her parents, small reminders of the people that they were, of the times spent together around the dinner table, of the connections that they had maintained through time. Biraud has his military medals, sharing a story of his family through years of working in

the military, of ideals passed down from parent to child, of his own stories within the military. Others have recipes, photo albums, traditions and values that they attempt to share and teach with their children in hopes of teaching them more about where they came from, who they are and what they could be.

These objects are then possessions that each French migrants own, but they are also owned by those objects in return. As mentioned in the previous sections, this mutual possession with objects is an extension of the mutual possession between people. Luna's old clock and comb are an extension of the relationship that she has with her parents, now that she does not live with them anymore. They are objects which hold the memories of those that have either passed (as is the case for C) or those that cannot be seen regularly anymore (as is the case for Luna). In other cases, these objects are used as the physical manifestation of values and traditions. Luna's Christmas tree and C's family biscuit recipe are both cases in which the *patrimoine* shared with family is about sharing the intangible memory passed down from one generation to another. These kinds of heritage are about sharing how it affects the people concerned.

Objects are not the only thing that travel with migrants, emotions and memories do as well. Memories shared with family when experiencing holidays together, traditions where the family gathers back together and they meet extended relatives that they did not have the opportunity to meet much after moving to Luxembourg. Connections with friends and family are maintained through regular contact despite the physical distance that separates them. The attachment to the region, the nostalgic feeling of the region, the longing for something long gone, the wish for something new despite it all are all emotions that are experienced as French migrants migrate. These emotions travel with them, often creating long-lasting attachments to both people and spaces, finding a place to be expressed in homemaking practices.

However, as Bdb has so clearly stated, home and social connections can also be burdened by heritage. He explains how *héritage*, especially the kind of heritage dealing with estates and insurance money, are usually burdens that the child must bear once the parent passes. Not only does it burden them financially, with all the taxes, but it will also burden their social connections. *Héritage*, especially where one gets a lot of money, will inevitably create envy and jealousy within others and an additional strain on the person inheriting it. It is with this in mind that he explained the role *héritage* and *patrimoine* should play within the home: to be a guide and not a law that people must follow. They should be suggestions about what could lead one to lead a good and happy life, to what is important and to how one can connect with others.

C, when talking about the subject of inheritance from parents, talked about how she felt that the money is some kind of small compensation for the loss of her parents, for having to say goodbye to people she held dear. Bdb talked about the jealousy that might occur, and C agreed that she had to face envious and jealous words concerning the money that she had inherited, about how people tell her how 'lucky' she

is to have inherited the money. “I do not feel lucky.”, she told me, looking away, “I have lost my parents. This is not luck. This can only be compensation for the emotional pain of the loss.”

The three dimensions and scales of belonging are also what connects home to connections and memories. Intersubjective belonging connects the personal connections on a local scale to the everyday activities of home. Territorial belonging is what connects both home to Home, where people are affected by both places and people, on both a local and a more regional scale. Political belonging is affected by the HOME, the political and historical context that French migrants move into. Each of these scales are also affected by the three dimensions of belonging, mutual possession, membership and moral obligation. From what I have seen during my fieldwork, the different scales of belonging and home all boil down to and are experienced on the local level.

For example, C’s connection with her region is affected by intersubjective connections with her family and friends. Luna’s connection to France, which she sees as being her homeland, is also experienced on the local scale of her own life. The political (or apolitical) organizations which focus on helping French migrants in a new country are all present on the local scale, even if their actions affect the national, and/or transnational scale. Additionally, through migration, previously local connections shift into becoming transnational connections, creating physical distance, but not always followed with emotional distance.

Migration makes it so that the homes move from being situated on the local scale, to gaining a transnational aspect. The multi-sited-ness of home makes it so that home can be at multiple places at once, connected on the transnational scale to the local scale of the person. The home, then, is a place that moves across both time and space, as shown through discussions about the familial home left behind, and the home built in hopes for a better future. Home is a flexible space, affected by personal connections with others and the host of shared memories among family members.

Home also becomes a space of negotiation between connections and heritage. When selecting what is showcased, what kind of furniture or decoration goes where, French migrants must negotiate with whoever they are living with (usually their partner). Biraud mentioned how he had to select what kind of medals he could showcase where, what kind of art he could put on the wall, all these decisions affected by negotiations with his partner. When living with family, the space of home becomes grounds for constant negotiations about rules, values and beliefs, about what should be taught and what should be forgotten.

Another aspect of the connection between home, heritage and kinship appears when talking about genetic connections. During our last meeting, Bdb mentioned that *patrimoine* is also relevant in discussions of genetics. He connected family and *patrimoine* on a genetic level and explained how it affected us. He talked about how our genetics predetermine our characters and, consequently, our lives to some degree. As someone who works in medical research, he explained that who our grandparents

were will influence who we will be. Our genetic *patrimoine* is an intrinsic part of who we are, and what has been passed down to us. The home, then, becomes grounds where these genetic connections are given emotional significance, where the development of the relationship between genetically connected people can be developed and further enriched.

Conclusion

One question that remains unanswered since the introduction is the question of integration. Why does the integration (or non-integration) of French migrants seem to be such a non-issue? While the concept and ideals of integration have its own issues, this seeming lack of integration reinforces the idea of how integration concerns communities differently. Integration is either an issue a community must worry about or one that they do not have to worry about at all (Schinkel, 2018). However, even within communities, integration differs greatly from person to person. When C first came to the country, she worked in the North of Luxembourg, where the most-spoken languages were Luxembourgish and German. Besides her own beliefs, she had no choice but to learn Luxembourgish to communicate with her colleagues. Tck, on the other hand, started working in the South of Luxembourg, where French was already becoming more commonly spoken. C lived in the country surrounded with Luxembourgish and French-speaking people, while Tck was primarily surrounded by French-speaking individuals. C learned the language fully and even took the Luxembourgish nationality. Tck learned the basic necessary phrases for his job. Despite these differences, both have lived in the country for over 30 years, worked their whole life with no issues. These differences are what motivated me to question how French migrants integrate (or do not) in Luxembourg.

Before continuing, I want to note that this question of French integration in Luxembourg is not seen as a political issue, unlike in the case of marginalized (and non-European) migrant communities, such as Muslim migrants in the Netherlands. Both French migrants not always learning Luxembourgish and the possibility of them leaving at any time, leaves Luxembourgish people reluctant to connect with them. However, this does not lead to the kind of racial discrimination that other communities, such as the Muslim community, must face when moving into a Western country.

The first part of my research question is whether French migrants make a home by employing their French heritage or other memories of their French past. To answer that first part, which links heritage to homes, French migrants do make usage of their French pasts when making a home. The heritage in question, both *patrimoine* and *héritage*, will affect how French migrants make a home, the kind of decoration they use, the sense of belonging that they will attempt to establish. However, at this point, it would be more correct to refer to that past as a past in France, rather than a French past, as most of French migrants are more affected by their memories and experiences (both their own and those of their families) made in the different regions of France, than with France as a whole. On an unconscious level, French migrants also do not generally feel inclined to learn any other language, usually referring to their education not having put much effort in teaching them a new language.

While French *patrimoine* does come up when discussing heritage, it is not necessarily what is immediately associated with only *patrimoine*. What I mean by that, is that unless I specifically mention French heritage, most French migrants will first think of their own personal relationship with heritage

concerning their family and their past. Especially in relation to a home, French heritage does not play many roles. When it comes to relations outside of the home, some interlocutors have expressed how they had to adapt their lifestyles to some degree with how it is done in Luxembourg. Luxembourg's multi-cultural society, however, made it so that French migrants did not have to adapt much, given that it offered plenty of options for many different cultures.

The home is connected to both *patrimoine* and *héritage* through the usage of memories as the foundation for what connects them to their past, their familial home and the people that they have left behind.

The second part of my research question asks whether kinship relations (national, fictive or biogenetic) play a role in how French migrants make a home in Luxembourg. The role of kinship ties is especially important. While there is some level of national ties that are supported through political organizations such as the AFE, or smaller scale organizations such as the CFL or AFL, French migrants are often more likely to surround themselves with like-minded people instead. Family connections (genetic or otherwise) are seen as the priority and do affect how (and where) French migrants make a home. They see a home as a place of safety, where one can be vulnerable and separated from the public sphere, where personal relationships with the family can be nurtured and maintained. The home is especially affected by the nuclear family, especially when they still share the same living space. Family connections help to either further develop this feeling or can become grounds where one feels restricted under someone else's roof.

Biogenetic connections are often times only used as a starting point for relationships, but they do have a more robust foundation and more importance than other kinds of social connections. French migrants still put a lot of importance on the biological family, a reasoning their support through their connection through blood, legalities and emotional attachments. This is where both territorial and intersubjective belonging will be established, to the home, social connections and a shared family history. In the end, the home becomes the space where social connections and heritage, such as memories, objects and recipes, are connected to one another. Family are the inhabitants of the home using what they have learned, the memories they hold, the tastes they want to share to teach and educate the next generation. Whether that generation uses and applies it is not put in question, because the goal is not to force beliefs, it is to share, to transmit what the older generations have learned in hopes of helping the next develop further in world.

For that, the home is a constantly evolving place, multi-sited across borders and shared amongst people (both family and otherwise), where everyone is connected through the emotional connections forged through thick and thin.

Bibliography

42 Festival of Migration, Cultures and Citizenship 2025 @ LUXEXPO THEBOX. (2025, February 13). LUXEXPO THE BOX - Building Original Experiences. https://thebox.lu/en/events/41-festival-of-migration-cultures-and-citizenship-2025/

Ahmed, S. (1999). Home and away: Narratives of migration and estrangement. *International Journal of Cultural Studies, 2*(3), 329–347. https://doi.org/10.1177/136787799900200303

Biraud, C. (2025a, January 9). *Recherche de participants à une étude sur la Communauté Française au Luxembourg – message de Lara Persin Rexer*. Communauté Des Français Du Luxembourg. https://communautefrancaisluxembourg.com/2025/01/05/participants-etude-communaute-francaise-au-luxembourg-lara-persin/

Biraud, C. (2025b, March 26). *Thèse sur l'intégration des Français au Luxembourg : le témoignage de Lara Persin Rexer*. Communauté Des Français Du Luxembourg. https://communautefrancaisluxembourg.com/2025/03/02/integration-des-francais-au-luxembourg-temoignage-de-lara-persin-rexer/

Biraud, C. (n.d.). *Communauté des Français du Luxembourg*. Communauté Des Français Du Luxembourg. https://communautefrancaisluxembourg.com/

Brun, C., & Fábos, A. (2015). Making Homes in Limbo? A conceptual framework. *Refuge*, *31*(1), 5–17. https://doi.org/10.25071/1920-7336.40138

Bryman, A. (2016). *Social Research Methods* (5th ed.). Oxford University Press.

Carsten, J. (2000). Introduction. In *Cultures of Relatedness: New Approaches to the Study of Kinship*. Cambridge University Press

Clark, T. (2008). `We're Over-Researched here!'. *Sociology*, *42*(5), 953–970. https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038508094573

Douglas, M. (1991). The Idea of a Home: A Kind of Space. *Social Research*, *58*(1), 287–307. http://www.jstor.org/stable/40970644

Dutch Anthropological Association. (2018, December 4). *Ethical Guidelines*. https://antropologen.nl/app/uploads/2019/01/ABv_Code-of-Ethics_2019.pdf

Free stock photos, royalty free stock images & Copyright Free Pictures · Pexels. Pexels. (n.d.). https://www.pexels.com/

Gammeltoft, T. M. (2018). Belonging: Comprehending Subjectivity in Vietnam and Beyond. *Social Analysis: The International Journal of Anthropology*, *62*(1), 76–95. https://www.jstor.org/stable/26952401

Geismar, H. (2015). Anthropology and heritage regimes. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 44*(1), 71–85. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-anthro-102214-014217

Gentry, K., & Smith, L. (2019). Critical heritage studies and the legacies of the late-twentieth century heritage canon. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, *25*(11), 1148–1168. https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2019.1570964

Gupta, A., & Ferguson, J. (1992). Beyond "Culture": Space, Identity, and the Politics of Difference. *Cultural Anthropology*, *7*(1), 6-23. https://doi.org/10.1525/can.1992.7.1.02a00020

Hohenadel, K. (2022, February 4). *What is Haussmann Architecture?* The Spruce. https://www.thespruce.com/what-is-haussmann-architecture-5180196

Home - translation. (n.d.). Reverso. Retrieved May 23, 2025, from https://context.reverso.net/translation/english-french/home

Levine, N. E. (2008). Alternative Kinship, Marriage, and Reproduction. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 37*(1), 375–389. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.anthro.37.081407.085120

Leyton, C. A. (2018). Ritual and fictive kinship. *The International Encyclopedia of Anthropology*, 1–3. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118924396.wbiea1442

Macdonald, S. (2013). 4. Feeling the Past. In *Memorylands*. Routledge E-Book. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203553336

Mallett, S. (2004). Understanding Home: A Critical Review of the Literature. *The Sociological Review, 52*(1), 62-89. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-954X.2004.00442.x

Morisset, L. K. (2018). But what are we really talking about? From patrimoine to heritage, a few avenues for reflection. *Journal of Canadian Studies*, *52*(1), 11–56. https://doi.org/10.3138/jcs.2017-0077.r1

Naidoo, R. (2016). All that we are – heritage inside out and upside down. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, *22*(7), 504–514. https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2016.1171246

Patrimoine - Synonymes. (n.d.). Reverso Dictionary. Retrieved May 31, 2025, from https://synonyms.reverso.net/synonyme/fr/patrimoine

Pearce, S. M. (1998). The construction of heritage: The domestic context and its implications. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, *4*(2), 86–102. https://doi.org/10.1080/13527259808722224

Schinkel, W. (2018). Against 'immigrant integration': for an end to neocolonial knowledge production. *Comparative Migration Studies, 6*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-018-0095-1

Smith, L. (2006). Uses of heritage. In Routledge eBooks. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203602263

The American Anthropological Association. (2025, January 10). *AAA Statement on Ethics - The American Anthropological Association*. https://americananthro.org/about/policies/statement-on-ethics/

UNESCO. (2003, October 17). *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*. Retrieved June 2, 2025, from https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000132540

Waterton, E., & Watson, S. (2013). Framing theory: towards a critical imagination in heritage studies. *International Journal of Heritage Studies, 19*(6), 546–561. https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2013.779295

What languages do people speak in Luxembourg? (2024, July 8). Luxembourg. https://luxembourg.public.lu/en/society-and-culture/languages/languages-spoken-luxembourg.html

World Heritage - UNESCO. (n.d.). UNESCO. Retrieved May 29, 2025, from https://www.unesco.org/en/world-heritage

Young, I. (1997). CHAPTER VII. House and Home: Feminist Variations on a Theme. In *Intersecting Voices: Dilemmas of Gender, Political Philosophy, and Policy* (pp. 134-164). Princeton: Princeton University Press. https://doi.org/10.1515/9780691216355-009