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Abstract

Transnational ties, networks, and mobilities can constitute a social resource for diaspora communities. Resources available as a result of the migration process or transnational ties can potentially become capitalised by diaspora members. Yet, diaspora members cannot automatically capitalise on all transnational networks and ties, and only resources that are mobilisable within particular transnational networks constitute “migrant capital” (Anthias, 2007; Ryan, 2011). Migrants’ children have grown up in “transnational social space,” in a social setting that is embedded with multiple sets of interconnected networks of social relationships, memberships, identities, and mobilities of cross-border character (Levitt, 2009). Little is known on whether such transnational networks function as a mobilisable social resource, i.e., migrant capital, for the second generation. This study focuses on the transnational ties, practices, and mobilities of second-generation Kurds in France and examines whether those constitute a mobilisable resource for them. It specifically asks if second-generation members intent to or have capitalised on such resources in the transnational social space. The study sheds light on the workings of transnational resources in the lives of the second generation and asks about the extent to which they can be considered migrant capital. The analysis draws from a qualitative dataset such as interviews and observations collected with second-generation Kurds in France.
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1. Introduction

Focusing on migrants’ local and ethnic social networks and ties, studies have shown how they can function as a resource bearing an impact on migrants’ adaptation and their upward or downward social mobility within the new host societies (Nannestad, Svendsen, & Svendsen, 2008). Since the 1990s, transnational theorization has offered new perspectives on how migrants’ networks and activities span both the receiving and sending country contexts. Scholars have examined how diaspora communities maintain and create social ties, networks, or even institutions that are of a transnational character (Vertovec, 2009). It has also been suggested that—in addition to local ties and ethnic networks—transnational ties, networks, and mobilities can become a form of social resources for diaspora communities and their members (Faist, 2000a, 2000b; Ryan, Erel, & D’Angelo, 2015; Ryan, Sales, Tilki, & Siara, 2008). Members of diasporas can capitalise such resources derived from the transnational networks that are available to them as a result of their migration experience for economic, political, social, or other purposes. However, not all transnational networks and ties automatically constitute a social resource for migrants: It has been suggested that only networks that can be mobilised as a social resource within particular (transnational) networks ought to be considered to be a form of social capital (Anthias, 2007; Ryan, 2011; Wahlbeck, 2018). Such mobilisable and transferrable networks and ties that have come about as a result of migra-
social networks and ties to the second generation. Such studies have particularly focused on what role ethnic networks play in the second generation’s “adaptation” and educational and professional achievements (Fernandez-Kelly, 2008; Shah, Dwyer, & Modood, 2010; Zhou & Bankston, 1994; Zhou & Xiong, 2005). The second generation’s transnational networks from the perspective of resources and social capital has drawn less attention. The second generation continues to foster transnational networks, ties, and connections to their parents’ homeland, although differently from their parents (Kasinitz, Mollenkopf, Waters, & Holdaway, 2008; Levitt & Waters, 2002). Its members have grown up in a “transnational social space,” referring to a social setting that is embedded with multiple sets of interconnected networks of social relationships, memberships, identities, and mobilities of a transnational character (Levitt, 2009). Whether the transnational networks and ties—in addition to more localised forms of networks—constitute a form of social resource for the second-generation members and whether they manage to mobilise such resources and thereafter capitalise on them deserves more attention in scholarly debates. To what extent do transnational networks and ties represent a mobilisable social resource for the second generation?

This study examines the transnational ties, practices, and mobilities of second-generation Kurds in France. It asks: To what extent do they intend to or have mobilised and capitalised on social resources existing as a result of them having been raised in the transnational diaspora space? I shed light on the workings of (transnational) networks, ties, and mobilities in the lives of the second generation and discuss the extent to which they can be considered to be a form of migrant capital (Ryan et al., 2015). The analysis draws from a qualitative dataset (interviews, observation) collected with second-generation Kurds in France between 2016–2018. I will first present the relevant literature, the Kurdish case and the methods used, and then move on to discuss the central findings reported in this study. The article ends with a discussion and concluding remarks.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Social Networks in the Context of Migration

Migrants’ networks have long fascinated scholars, who have examined how migrants have managed to tap into the social resources that exist in their ethnic and non-ethnic networks for social advantage (Nannestad et al., 2008). Migrants’ networks and ties have been considered to be the key determinant in their migration patterns and decisions and approached as social capital that either facilitates (or impedes) their social, political, or economic adaptation in the host society (Castles & Miller, 2003). Research on the second generation and social networks seems to have also focused on how “ethnic” networks relate to social capital, and how that in turn relates to social mobility, and thereafter to “adaptation” (or the perceived lack thereof). Such studies have examined community support networks and approached “ethnicity” as social capital, focusing also on resources and norms that affect second-generation members’ social mobility (Portes & Zhou, 1993; Shah et al., 2010; Zhou & Bankston, 1994; Zhou & Xiong, 2005). For instance, Shah (2007), drawing from Putnam’s theorisation (2000), shows how ethnic social relations influence the upward socio-economic mobility of second-generation Laotians in the United States.

Putnam (2000) distinguishes bonding ties (within a social group similar in terms of ethnicity, “race,” or religion) from bridging ties (between social groups that differ in these characteristics). However, Anthias (2007) finds this distinction problematic, as it denotes a fixed boundary between networks and ties that exist within and between different ethnic groups. Also, Ryan et al. (2015, p. 7) point out that instead of dividing networks according to the similarity or dissimilarity of the people involved, more attention needs to be paid “on the meaning as well as on the structure of networks”; in other words, on “specific relationships between and the relative social location of actors as well as the actual resources available and realisable within particular social networks.” They focus on intra-ethnic and inter-ethnic networks that are locally-based, national, or transnational in character, and examine how the social resources within those constitute a form of social capital for migrants. This is also a pertinent approach when examining second-generation’s social networks and ties that are both intra and inter-ethnic, local and transnational.

Admittedly, there is an overlap between the first and second generation’s networks and even more so with the associative structures and organisational spaces of the diaspora community in which such networks become realised. At the same time, however, the second generation is more “integrated” and familiar with the structures of their parents’ host society (Crul & Mollenkopf, 2012). For instance, they can foster a variety of non-ethnic networks that are more locally bound in the host society (via student organizations, sports clubs, trade unions, political parties, etc.). Due to language skills and knowledge of the system, they can also have easier access to such networks compared to their parents. Therefore, instead of focusing on “ethnic networks” per se, I lean on Anthias’ (2007, p. 789) understanding of “ethnicity” as something that “denote[s] articulations and practices that relate to ethnic origin or ethnic bonds, whilst recognizing that such articulations do not necessarily derive purely from identification or instrumental factors.” In other words, I focus on the second-generation’s networks that relate.
to diasporic bonds and ties that have been developed as a result of their parents’ migration and the transnational context they have been raised in.

2.2. Transnationalism, Second Generation and Migrant Capital

It has been suggested that social capital ought not to be conflated with social resources in the context of migration (Anthias, 2007; Ryan et al., 2015). A Bourdieusian reading of social capital has been offered to remedy this (Cederberg, 2012), where social capital (networks, relationships) forms one of three forms of capital, including economic (material assets, income) and cultural (education, language, behaviour). One way a social resource can come to be defined as social capital is by its convertibility to other forms of resources or capital (Bourdieu, 1986). Applied to the context of migration, Anthias (2007) suggests that instead of taking social capital as a commodity that migrants possess, we ought to focus on the resources found in the ties and networks and treat them as social capital only if they are mobilisable and transferable to other social resources in efforts to pursue social advantage (e.g., Wahlbeck, 2018). Also, the transferability does not mean to Anthias that social resources are capitalised only into economic goods and advantage, but that “transferability to education, power, authority, enablement and functionings” can have long-term social mobility effects, including in educational and professional choices and opportunities (Anthias, 2007, p. 792).

In other words, not only can migrants use cultural capital (language, skills, educational qualifications) to mobilise social resources (following the Bourdieusian approach), social resources can also be used to gain more cultural capital (Anthias, 2007).

A growing body of literature has shown how migrants’ transnational (in addition to local) ties and networks can be capitalised on and used by them for social mobility and advantage (Faist, 2000a, 2000b; Ryan, 2011; Ryan et al., 2015; Wahlbeck, 2018). The Bourdieusian approach to social capital has been criticized for its focus on national societies and falling short in analyses on migrants and how they are embedded in transnational social spaces (Erel, 2010; Wahlbeck, 2018). Similarly, Ryan et al. (2015) suggest that the previous theorization on social capital (Putnam, 2000) in the context of migration focuses on local associations, communities, and neighbourhoods without considering that migrants’ networks often expand across national borders. Second-generation members are raised in a transnational social space, and often foster transnational networks and connections to their ancestral homeland, although to a lesser degree and in different ways to their parents (Kasinitz et al., 2008; Levitt, 2009; Levitt & Glick Schiller, 2004). This means that they have grown up in a social setting that is embedded with multiple sets of interconnected networks of social relationships, membership, mobilities, practices, and identities of transnational character. To what extent, then, do transnational networks and ties represent a mobilisable social resource for the second generation?

As Faist notes (2000b, p. 13), migrants can use different types of capital in the transnational spaces they are embedded in “economic capital (for example, financial capital), human capital (for example, skills and knowledge) and social capital (resources inherent in social and symbolic ties).” This also begs the question: To what extent are such social resources, realisable via transnational networks and ties, available for the second generation? Ryan et al. (2015) suggest that migrant capital consists of mobilisable social resources that are available to migrants as a result of the migration process. This article draws from this approach and understands migrant capital as mobilisable resources in form of social relations and ties in the transnational space. These can be used to accumulate more social capital or become converted to, for instance, cultural capital. I have chosen to use the term migrant capital even when talking about the second generation to refer to the transnational space that the second generation is embedded in as a result of their parents’ migration. The term also alludes to the diasporic bonds that second-generation Kurds foster within that transnational space, and that have been capitalised on and hold the potential to be capitalised on in future.

3. The Kurdish Diaspora

Two major developments have led to the resettlement of Kurds in diaspora communities around the globe in the 20th century. The first one has been traced back to the economic boom witnessed by Western Europe since the 1960s that was followed by labour migration, and the second to the unstable political situation in the Kurdistan region that led to forced migration. Armed conflicts between the Kurdish factions and the state that occasionally involved international forces were a frequent characteristic of the interethnic relations in Iraq (1961 to 2003), Iran (1967 to 1968 and 1979 to today), and Turkey (1984 to the present; Hassanpour & Mojab, 2005, p. 218). In the 1980s, there was an increase in the number of Kurds migrating from Turkey to Western Europe due to the violent conflict between the Kurdistan Workers’ Party (PKK) and the Turkish state. Also, the Turkish state’s so-called “forced urbanisation” programmes implemented in eastern Turkey destroyed thousands of Kurdish villages and consequently led to forced displacement.

The Kurdish community in France is among the largest in Europe, after Germany. The 1960s witnessed a small-scale Kurdish labour migration to France, the 1970s the migration of Kurdish families to France, which then increasingly turned into migration of asylum-seekers in the 1980s. The violent conflict between the Turkish state and the Kurdish movement in the 1980s was one of the main migration motivations (Hassanpour & Mojab, 2005) and has been considered as one of the reasons for the high level of politicization of the Kurdish com-
munity in France (Khayati, 2008). The pro-PKK associations have a strong standing in France, although we are witnessing the emergence of second-generation associations that are less political in nature (Karagöz, 2017). The Kurdish population is estimated at between 230,000 and 250,000 of which approximately 80% originated from Turkey. Smaller Kurdish communities in France originate from Iraq, Iran, and Syria (Kurdish Institute, 2016).

The organisation of diaspora communities is also characterised by transnational social relations (Wahlbeck, 1999). The Kurdish diaspora in Europe is highly organized. In addition to familial ties and networks, Kurdish diaspora communities over time have created non-territory-based networks and contacts, and established political, cultural, social, and educational organisations and institutions—among which is FEYKA-France (the Federation of Kurdish Associations in France) consisting of about twenty associations (Dryaz, 2015). The social and transnational space in the context of diaspora movements can offer, assign value to, and devalue collective (identity) narratives for diaspora members and possibly inform them about linguistic and cultural matters related to the “homeland” (Cohen, 2008), a case in point with the second generation of Kurdish parentage (Baser, 2015; Toivanen, 2014). Not only does the Kurdish second generation have access to diaspora networks, organizations, and transnational social relations, but their motivation to engage transnationally can also be shaped by the fact that they are embedded in the transnational space of an ethno-national and exiled diaspora community.

4. Methods

The data used in this study consists of 25 qualitative interviews conducted with second-generation Kurds in France (2016–2018) as well as of observation data collected during various events. Participants’ families belong to the migration wave from Turkey (one participant’s parents had migrated from Iraq) starting from the 1980s. Most participants were born in France, and few arrived in the country as small children. As Khayati (2008, p. 143) notes, the Kurds arriving in the 1980s constituted the first refugee generation in the country and had “a good level of intellectual capital and political awareness.” The interviewees’ educational background varied considerably (from high school to MA degrees), and some of them were students, while others had already entered the work force. Overall, the majority had or were in the process of completing a university-level degree. Women and men represented an equal share of the participants, and they were between 20 and 30 years old. The participants were recruited by using the snowballing method and through key contacts in the community. I was able to gain access to the field and find research participants relatively easily as my positionality was constructed as a “neutral” outsider to the Kurdish community. Researcher positionality and how that potentially affected the data collection and knowledge production is discussed in more detail in Baser and Toivanen (2016), highlighting significant differences in researcher positionality based on “ethnicity” and national background (Turkish vs. Finnish).

The interviews were conducted in a confidential manner and all data were anonymized. The names provided are pseudonyms. Some identifiable features have been slightly modified for the purposes of anonymity. The data were analysed with content analysis (Rusuvuori, Nikander, & Hyvärinen, 2019), with the focus being on participants’ networks, practices, and mobilities. To illustrate the diversity of experiences, yet at the same time to highlight the similarities in research participants’ narrations, I have focused on three cases that in their own way are reflective of the overall dataset.

5. Embedded in a Transnational Space: Networks, Practices, and Mobilities

The participants in this study had been raised in a transnational space, taking part in networks, practices, and mobilities of a cross-border character. Their transnational networks could be divided into informal, less institutionalized ties and to formal, more institutionalized ties. The informal ties and networks were kinship ties to the (extended) family in the homeland and in the diaspora. The networks of family members (often grandparents, aunts, uncles, cousins, etc.) in the homeland were maintained through communication and visits.

The formal and more institutional ties in the transnational space were through both diaspora and “non-diaspora” organisations (student associations, leftist groups). One example of a formal network that extended to the transnational diaspora space was the one created through the collaboration between Ambition Kurde, an association established by second-generation Kurds in Paris, and the Kurdish-European Society, based in Brussels. Following the Syrian civil war and the political unrest in the Kurdish regions in Turkey, numerous seminars, discussion events, and demonstrations were organised by student associations and leftist organisations in Paris, and in collaboration with the diaspora organisations to raise awareness of the on-going situation. One of the interviewees, Azad, explained how creating links and networks in France could eventually be useful for the reconstruction of the largely destroyed Kurdish city in Syria:

Because the links we foster here are beneficial to better understand the society back there. The relations that we create here, they are as important, to facilitate activities, projects….For instance, it’s quite simple, but the construction of Kobane, it’s about the money, and one needs to find it, so we can create relations with the municipalities, projects that aim to it.

Olwig (2007) conceptualizes the second generation’s transnational context as fields of relations that includes
both local and transnational social relationships. The distinction between local and transnational (or inter/intra-ethnic) networks and ties is not always clear-cut, as illustrated by the above example, but very much reflective of the lived experiences of the second generation. This also means acknowledging that local and transnational networks can affect and shape one another (Ryan et al., 2015).

Both informal and formal networks that evoked a diasporic bond were mobilised for a variety of political, cultural, social, and economic practices that took place locally as well as in the transnational space. Such practices included participation in election delegations in Turkey, in political demonstrations in Paris, in sending donations to the region (namely to Syria), taking part in humanitarian campaigns, taking part in cultural production (translation, Kurdish film festivals, language education, etc.) as well as in discussion events, seminars, awareness raising campaigns, and so forth. Furthermore, these also included practices such as initiating study exchanges, internships, and short-term employments to gain educational and professional advantages. The practices the participants engaged in and social resources they mobilised through their networks were transnational also in the sense that they were not limited to those between France and Kurdistan. In addition, they extended in a broader manner to the transnational diaspora space. These practices took place both in online and “offline” spaces, and transnationally with other members of diaspora communities and associations elsewhere.

The transnational social space also shaped second-generation members’ mobilities. This was most evident in how they had visited the sending region and the family left behind, in most cases throughout their childhood and adolescent years and all the way to adulthood. Frequent visits to their parents’ city or town of origin and summers spent in the “homeland” helped to maintain close relations to family members, and in some cases also enabled completing student exchange programs or internships in the region of Kurdistan or in Turkey. Informal networks via extended kinship ties in the diaspora were used for mobilities, as in the case of Serkar who mobilised such networks for educational purposes:

So even if it’s not close family members, you can always find somebody in another country....When I left for Canada, I needed a place to stay. So, I stayed with people who were close to my grandparents. I contacted them and stayed at their place for five months. Then I decided to go to Toronto, and found somebody else there, and I didn’t know these people. Now they are very close.

Overall, the transnational space and the Kurdish diaspora networks, both informal and formal, were relied upon when travelling to other countries, either for leisure, but also for professional and educational purposes. The transnational social relations and networks based on diasporic bonds enabled second-generation members to engage in transnational practices and mobilities.

6. Biographical Case Studies

The following section contains three biographical cases that illustrate the extent to which transnational networks and ties represent a mobilisable social resource for the second generation, and whether they capitalise upon such resources. The first two cases show how Rojda and Zilan have successfully mobilised their transnational networks for educational and professional gains. The third case shows how Fero, conscious of the potential his transnational ties entails, intends to mobilise his resources in the near future for his professional aspirations. I will then discuss the extent to which these resources, realised or to be realised, can be considered to constitute migrant capital.

6.1. Rojda

Rojda’s father arrived in France in the 1980s, during the turbulent political times in Turkey’s history, and in the following years, he met Rojda’s mother. Rojda was born in the early 1990s, and her siblings some years later. The family spoke Kurdish at home, and she improved her Kurdish through family visits to the region. At an adult age, she had an idea of translating Kurdish songs (in Kurmanji) into French. She translated dozens of songs, out of which around some twenty were published in print. I met Rojda during a political demonstration that grouped several associations, including some Kurdish ones. She was selling the book of translated songs with her mother.

She also spent two months in a Kurdish city in Turkey, right before the violent conflict broke out in 2015. Supported by her family networks, she completed an internship at the local university, which also enabled her to visit a local institution relevant to her field of study. Indeed, one of her teachers had initiated a study exchange program between the Kurdish city and Paris, which is why she left to find out how it could be further institutionalized and made official. During her trip, she became better acquainted with the local associations and maintained contact with them afterwards:

In [Kurdish city], I met with associations that are well-made, independent of any party politics, Kurdish, neutral, student associations....They organize humanitarian trips and they were doing that there, in hidden. So, I told myself, if they manage to do it there, risking their lives, whereas I don’t risk anything in Paris, I really have to do it now. That pushed me to create the association faster, when I came back from [Kurdish city].

Her trip to Turkey prompted her to create an association for young Kurds, mainly consisting of members of the second generation. It had objectives and a wide scope of activities that had both local and transnational charac-
ters. One of them was to provide aid to young (second-
generation) Kurds in France and to promote their edu-
cational paths through one-to-one support system (sys-
tème de parrainage) and to provide support to arriving
Kurdish students. In other words, the association oper-
ated as a platform for young Kurds to accumulate edu-
cational advantages and to establish social relations
that could potentially be mobilised at a later instance.
Concerning the students, who wished to arrive to Europe,
she explained how she had helped them to find intern-
ship programs and put them in contact with relevant peo-
ples. At the same time, this had enabled her to become
acquainted with a wider network of contacts. Indeed,
her local and transnational networks were not clearly dis-
tinguishable from one another, and they were neither
uniquely “ethnic” networks, although they did evoke a
diasporic connection.

Her association was explicitly founded on non-
political grounds. It also had a humanitarian goal that
was initiated with the translated book of songs. Rojda
decided to dedicate half of the profits gained from the
book sales towards a reconstruction of a school in a city
located in the Kurdish region in Syria:

I’m in the process of creating an association to pro-
mote the education of young Kurds in France, that of
young Kurds who arrive from Kurdistan and those in
Kurdistan. It’s in three parts. So, with my book, I de-
cided to renounce my author’s rights so that half of
the gains go towards the construction of a school in
[city in Northern Syria]. It was the philosophy of the
author I translated, it was somebody who supported
children’s and youths’ education, so I wanted to con-
tinue his work.

Rojda had previous kinship ties to this particular Kurdish
region which she managed to mobilise successfully
alongside her initial contacts to the local institution, thus
allowing her to complete the internship. What is particu-
larly noteworthy is that the mobilisation of her mostly in-
formal transnational networks led to the creation of new,
more formalized link between Turkey and France. Also,
her previous cultural capital (education and language
skills) was of use when creating new networks in the
Kurdish region, in other words when accessing the local
professional milieu. This also contributed to the comple-
tion of her internship in Kurdistan, which then became
an addition to her professional expertise on return and
enabled her to leave to North America to complete an-
other internship. Indeed, her case shows how the accu-
mulation of capital in the transnational space does not
follow linear trajectories but entails building and trans-
ferring capital in/to new places (Erel & Ryan, 2019).

6.2. Zilan

Zilan’s father arrived in France in the 1980s, and the rest
of the family followed him some years later, including
Zilan, who was four at the time and met her father for the
first time. Zilan’s father knew people in France, which had
affected his choice of moving to France and eventually
also facilitated his settlement to the country. The family
did not visit Kurdistan every year, since they encountered
trouble travelling safely. They only visited Kurdistan with
the entire family twice. Zilan tells how she spent a lot
of time with her grandparents in Turkey and how she
retains close connection, calling them every weekend.
At home, the family spoke Kurdish, but the parents em-
phised that the children had to learn perfect French at
school. She was also immersed in the Turkish language
at home via television. As for her transnational connect-
tions, Zilan had some extended family in Germany and in
the UK but most of the family was living in Turkey.

One of Zilan’s main goals was to graduate from the
prestigious university she was enrolled in in Paris, which
she finally did. However, her interest in going to the
Kurdish region had been “dormant.” It was only when
she was assigned to do a presentation on a Kurdish-
related topic at school that her interest in the region be-
came animated. This was followed by an exchange year
in Istanbul. In fact, she had taken advantage of her kin-
ship ties to be able to stay with her aunts and cousins in
Istanbul and to complete a prestigious stay at the local
university. She was also able to use her language skills in
Turkish, although she felt that the cultural differences be-
tween France and Turkey were quite significant and that
it would be difficult for her to settle there:

Yes, I have grandparents, cousins, aunts, in
Istanbul, one uncle in London, family in every city
in Turkey….We often visited our cousins in Germany.
I did my internship in Istanbul and I stayed with my
aunt, then as roommates with my cousin.

During the next stage of her studies, she decided to leave
to Erbil, the “capital” of the Kurdistan Region of Iraq to
conduct a two-month internship and to network with lo-
cal professionals. She tells how being of Kurdish back-
ground had meant that she was received well, but she
had struggled with the language, as a different Kurdish
dialect was spoken in the region compared to the one
her parents had spoken with her. In that sense, her cul-
tural capital was not directly and entirely transferable to
the new context (Erel, 2010), but the experience enabled
her to acquire new cultural capital. Considering her re-
search and graduation as one of her biggest projects, she
reflects on her motivations to study.

There are two aspects in making it, and in the way oth-
ers see you. For the French professors, you had to be
excellent at school, to show that even if we are for-
eigners, you are good. And there’s the Kurdish aspect.
There are these two aspects that are mixed up….You
have filed and you have been told that you don’t ex-
ist. So, it’s also to show that Kurds can exist and that
they can make it. Because you don’t realize to what
Zilan’s account poignantly describes the significance of the transnational space of diaspora community and how that has affected her life choices in terms of education. She relates the fact of pushing herself forward towards different accomplishments to her “diasporic” past and to the fact of being of Kurdish background, of belonging to an ethno-national people that has struggled for recognition. Like Rojda, Zilan had managed to mobilise her transnational networks and capitalise on them to her educational and professional advantage. In the process, she managed to create new professional networks in the region. Her experiences in Istanbul and Erbil enabled her also to gain more cultural capital (in form of new, improved language skills, for instance).

Another goal she had for the future was to establish a cultural space for young Kurds in Kurdistan, with a similar space opened in Paris. She envisioned that she could potentially mobilise the social relations she had through kinship and the professional ties both to the Kurdish region and in Paris for future, transnational projects. As in the case of Rojda, who accumulated professional experience in Kurdistan enabling her to be mobile towards North America, Zilan’s example also points towards the accumulation of different sets of resources in the transnational space via the capitalisation of her transnational kinship networks. It also shows the potential of such resources to be utilised and capitalised on for future transnational projects (Erel, 2010; Ryan et al., 2015).

6.3. Fero

Differently from Zilan and Rojda, Fero’s family moved from Iraqi Kurdistan to France in the late 1980s. His parents had visited the region several times after their departure, but he had only returned to Iraqi Kurdistan twice, the latter time being at the age of five. He had grown up speaking Kurdish with his grandfather and both French and Kurdish with his parents, although he was not satisfied with his level of Kurdish. Indeed, in order to encourage second-generation children to speak Kurdish, he had created Kurdish language course with his aunt. He explained about the difficulties in transmitting the Kurdish culture and acknowledged the importance diaspora associations could play in this regard. Now the second generation, according to him, aimed to organise things differently from the first generation. The activities were more locally orientated, although they did have the reference to a diasporic bond. He considered that networking among the second-generation members was of importance, referring to other diaspora communities he considered successful in this regard:

In Paris, for instance, I try to meet up with young people belonging to the second generation like myself, who have studied and who work, in order to be able to organize professional networks. A bit like the Jewish people have done, or the Armenians.

Fero recognises the importance of local networks in France for educational and professional advancement, and how the lack of those has had an impact on second-generation members like himself. He explains how it has been frustrating not to possess the same networks in France as his fellow students or colleagues, and that this has made it complicated to find an internship in a law firm. This is like Cederberg’s (2012) observations on the obstacles that migrants might encounter when creating contacts with the majority population, and in this case, as Fero’s account shows, extends to the second generation. Instead, Fero’s aims to create localized networks with second-generation members shows how he aims to tap into his existing networks in the diaspora space for professional advantage. This also resonates with Cederberg’s findings on the significance of co-ethnic networks and how social networks and resources in terms of capital are also structured according to majority-minority relations.

Fero also acknowledges the importance of having transnational connections and networks between France and Kurdistan. He is thinking of spending some months in Iraqi Kurdistan for work in order to improve his Kurdish language skills. For him, this was an issue of personal importance. He describes how his language skills would eventually allow him to work in Iraqi Kurdistan, and how capitalising on such transnational connections would also be beneficial for his professional career in the long run. Regarding this, he situates himself within the larger Kurdish diaspora community that has the potential to operate as a bridge between France and Kurdistan. In other words, he does not consider the transnational networks that he has access to (merely) as individual social resources, but as more collective ones that the Kurdish diaspora beholds:

Today we are Kurds. We are the bridge between Iraqi Kurdistan and France. Tomorrow when Daesh won’t exist anymore, economy will take on and we can be the bridge between the French and the Kurdish societies, why not? I think that economically speaking, the French are very pleased to have the Kurds who speak Kurdish and who can help them to set up stuff there.

Erel and Ryan (2019, p. 2) suggest paying attention to the spatial and temporal dimensions of migrant capital, to understand better the “ebbs and flows in the valorisation of migrants’ resources through space and time.” Whereas Rojda’s and Zilan’s examples illustrated the spatial dynamics of capital in the transnational space, Fero’s example also points towards its temporal aspects.
I would love to open a school in Kurdistan and to teach in the French way. I really like my current job because I think that I could have opportunities to go and work in Kurdistan. I’ll be in contact with some people next year to see if there’s a possibility to work there.

Indeed, he envisions mobilising and capitalising on his transnational connections and transferring his skills and know-how by eventually moving to the region. The motivation to move there, even if temporarily, stems from his wish to contribute towards the development of Kurdistan, showing again the significance of being raised in a transnational diaspora space. However, in addition to this, it is also accompanied by a desire for professional advancement as he considers the region to have increasing economic significance, which would mean that his cultural capital could become valorised differently in future (Erel & Ryan, 2019). However, the political instability in the region has prompted him to postpone his plans for the near future. Fero’s account differs also from Zilan’s and Rojda’s accounts in the way that his mobilisable networks are not necessarily kinship-based but are through professional contacts to the region. The context of the sending region, for instance in form of the security situation, also shapes how kinship or other networks can be safely mobilised to fulfil educational, professional or other objectives. Also, Fero’s account shows how he has mobilized his networks in the diaspora space in a local manner, whereas the networks of local native youth have been closed to him.

7. Discussion

Second-generation Kurds have been raised in a transnational space meaning that their lived experiences are characterised by transnational networks, practices, and mobilities. Their transnational networks were formal or informal, transnational (kinship ties in Kurdistan) or more local (second-generation networks in Paris). They had mobilised and capitalised on them to gain access to internships, study programs and associative work. The first transnational networks to be mobilized were based on informal kinship ties. However, it is noteworthy that these enabled the creation of professional networks in the Kurdish region and led to the acquisition of new social and cultural capital thereafter (Erel, 2010) that were employed for professional advantage. Indeed, the findings from this study illustrate second-generation members’ agency to mobilise and capitalise on such resources that exist in their transnational networks and ties (see Ryan et al., 2015; Shah, 2007). Whereas the second-generation members did not necessarily possess (local) social capital like their fellow students and colleagues of French parentage, they were aware of the opportunities embedded in transnational networks and connections between France, Kurdistan, and Kurdish diaspora communities elsewhere.

Such networks were not uniquely “ethnic” nor transnational, but they contained a diasporic dimension in the sense that they were the result of the second-generation members having been raised in a transnational diaspora space. Furthermore, the mobilisation of transnational networks was motivated by a wish to contribute towards the development of Kurdistan, in addition to personal educational and professional ambitions. The statelessness of the Kurdish nation and the political mobilisation of the Kurdish diaspora potentially contribute to the diaspora taking a more active part in homeland development than would be the case with other diaspora groups. A similar case has been found among the Tamil diaspora in Switzerland, for instance, where the ethno-national struggles for greater autonomy in the homeland and the state repression following it has mobilised both the first and second-generation members (Hess & Korf, 2014). Also, as a case-specific observation, it needs to be mentioned that such resources are perhaps more mobilisable for some diaspora groups than others. The Kurdish diaspora is highly organised in terms of associations, cultural centres, and media outlets. Also, the Kurdish diaspora originates from Iraq, Iran, Turkey, and Syria, and instead of being situated between a specific sending or receiving state, its communities (and their networks) extend across the globe.

Migrant capital was earlier defined as mobilisable social resources that are available as a result of the migration process. By extension, I argue that migrant capital can also encompass social resources that are available for and mobilisable by second-generation Kurds as a result of their parents’ migration process and specifically, as a result of them having been raised in a transnational diaspora space. These social resources exist in second-generation members’ transnational networks and ties, mostly informal rather than formal, and they have the potential to be mobilised and converted to accumulate educational and professional advantages. Therefore, in addition to focusing on social capital in second-generation’s “ethnic” and “non-ethnic” networks, in this article the need for more research on how the second generation mobilises and capitalises upon its transnational networks is highlighted. Also, how social capital embedded in transnational networks can be converted to other forms of capital and what spatial and temporal dynamics are at play in the accumulation of migrant capital in the transnational space deserves more attention.

8. Conclusion

Whereas previous research has shown that transnational networks can become a social resource for migrant communities (Faist, 2000a, 2000b; Ryan et al., 2008, 2015), little is known about how the second generation mobilises and capitalises on their transnational networks. Instead, focus in earlier research regarding the second generation had been on their “ethnic” or “non-ethnic” networks and the social capital such networks entail. Yet, transnational ties and networks persist among the second generation, although the character of transnational networks and
ties might differ from those of their parents (Kasinitz et al., 2008; Levitt, 2009; Levitt & Waters, 2002). This study set out to consider the transnational ties, practices, and mobilities of second-generation Kurds in France, drawn from a qualitative dataset (interviews, observation). It examined the extent to which the second generation mobilises and capitalises on its transnational networks, and extent social resources embedded in their transnational networks can be considered as migrant capital. It showed that the second-generation Kurds have been raised in a transnational diaspora space, entailing cross-border contacts, networks, practices, and mobilities between France and Kurdistan and to diaspora networks elsewhere. Second-generation members mobilised mostly pre-existing kinship networks for two closely interrelated reasons: to advance one’s educational and professional advantages and to contribute towards the development of Kurdistan. The conclusion from the study is that social resources mobilised by second-generation members (namely their transnational networks) can be understood as a form of migrant capital that has become available to them as a result of their parents’ migration and as a result of them having been raised in the transnational diaspora space. More empirical research is needed on how the second generation mobilises social resources embedded in their transnational networks, what motivates the second generation to capitalise on them and whether these social resources can be converted to other forms of capital depending on the spatial and temporal contexts.
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