Barbara Lovrinić Higgins[1]
Institute for Development and International Relations (IRMO);
Zagreb, Croatia

RESHAPING LAM INSTITUTIONS: POLITICS OF INFRASTRUCTURE, DATA AND MEMORY IN THE EU[2]

Abstract

In recent years, there has been an increase in the research of various aspects of digital cultural heritage, including issues of access, re-use, intellectual property rights, use of emerging technologies, linked data, etc. However, the specific effects of the European Union's (EU) digital cultural politics and digital impact on LAM institutions (Libraries, Archives, and Museums) have not yet been fully addressed. This paper deals with the complex relationship between technological and policy logic, placing digital cultural heritage within the EU policy context, specifically focusing on how both technological and policy drivers are reshaping LAM institutions. It discusses the impact of digital transformation on LAM institutions, as well as the implications of current EU policies that are affecting the digitisation of cultural heritage. With this paper, we aim to expand the present body of research of the development of LAM institutions by analysing the interaction of its external pressures – EU infrastructure, data, and memory politics – and institutional transformation shaped by the digital age, a connection which is largely unexplored in current literature. This perspective is important because it provides a better understanding of the evolving relationship between EU policy and LAMs in

133

Barbara Lovrinić Higgins

1   barbara@irmo.hr; ORCID 0000-0002-8823-2011

the digital age. To achieve this goal, I conducted a qualitative content analysis of EU policy documents and relevant academic literature.

Keywords

digital transformation; digital cultural politics; digital cultural heritage; cultural heritage institutions; sovereignty; platformisation;

Introduction

Libraries, Archives, and Museums (LAM institutions) are experiencing fast transformations due to digital advancements, thus requiring them to adapt to new social and cultural environments. This transformation is not just technical but also requires a re-evaluation of their roles in society. The environment in which LAM institutions operate is becoming increasingly competitive: they are expected to maximise visitor numbers, attract new users, etc. In order to achieve this, LAMs actively use platforms and social media, which alone are generators of much of today's cultural production and consumption. Consequently, the digital environment is reshaping access to culture, as well as its interpretation, production, and consumption (Uzelac et al., 2016), with a significant influence on cultural memory.

Both potentials and challenges concerning the impact of digitalisation have been addressed in academic literature (Valtysson et al., 2022; Krotz, 2017; Rogač Mijatović, 2014). The "potentials" perspective highlights the possibilities for (re)use of cultural heritage (Matanovac Vučković et al., 2021), democratisation and transparency (Valtýsson, 2020), and enhanced cultural participation (Navarrete, 2013). The "challenges" perspective raises issues concerning the potential for misuse and surveillance (Fuchs, 2010), emphasising the social and political implications (Krotz, 2017). In this context, the policies governing LAM institutions in the European Union (EU) must adapt so that they maximise digital opportunities while addressing the challenges in the digital landscape.

In recent years, digitalisation has been considered to be an imperative for the LAM sector (Stokstad, 2020), as well as a cultural policy imperative (Henningsen & Larsen, 2020). Digital cultural politics,[3] according to Valtysson

---

3   "Digital cultural politics" is a term that stands for data policies, media policies and everything that accompanies the digital age, and derives from other sectors besides culture (Valtysson, 2020).

(2020), can serve as a governing tool to promote specific interests and different rationales. This perspective aligns with the view that digital cultural heritage itself is both a political concept and a practice (McCrary, 2011).

Digital cultural policies are a shared competence between the EU and its Member States. The EU's regulatory framework is quite complex. In addition, the fragmentation of the legal system among the Member States is an obstacle to the realisation of the full potential of the EU's digital cultural heritage. The development of digital culture in the EU is very much affected by implicit cultural policies[4] that come from communication, media, and business sectors, thus shaping the wider context of digital transformation. Data policies, in particular, are increasingly central to the EU's digitisation policies (Uzelac & Lovrinić Higgins, 2025), influencing the creation, distribution, and consumption of digital content. Data has therefore gained not only economic and political importance, but also cultural significance (Capurro et al., 2023).

Recent research shows that digital cultural infrastructures, particularly Europeana, are considered both a policy instrument and a valuable social and economic asset in the EU (Capurro et al., 2023). Within the EU's digital cultural policy framework, two distinct strands can be distinguished, both grounded upon shared infrastructure: 1) a focus on data politics and a parallel emphasis on 2) identity and memory politics. Thus, digital cultural infrastructures are not only setting specific technical standards, they are also determineing the logic of how cultural (memory) institutions should operate online, directly impacting their digital practices and online engagement. Considering the relevance of such a framework and the importance of data within it, the question is, how that affects the evolution of LAMs in the digital age?

Within such a context, this paper explores the impact of the EU's digital cultural policy on the evolution of LAM institutions, a relationship that has only recently gained more interest within the academic research community. Based on the desk research methodology, this research aims to analyse trends within the LAM sector, examining their evolution and the perspectives from which they are analysed. Special attention is given to the EU policy documents and their effects on the LAM sector. Following the collection of relevant literature by Google Scholar as a main resource for identifying relevant references, a qualitative content analysis of both EU policy documents

Barbara Lovrinić Higgins

---

4   According to (Primorac et al., 2015: 4), cultural policies can be explicit and implicit, depending on whether "the policy is explicitly articulated, designed, implemented and monitored in a systemic way, or if it is implicit and discretionary, its' effects on the society have to be analysed."

and academic literature concerning the LAM sector is conducted, taking into consideration relevant articles, reports, and recommendations. Through this analysis, I aim to determine the thematic focus of current EU policy relevant to the future of LAM institutions.

LAMs' Institutional Transformation and Convergence

The impact of digitalisation on the LAM sector can be observed across three domains: LAM institutions, LAM professionals, and the user base of LAM institutions (Valtysson et al., 2022). The institutional transformation presents the most visible and tangible manifestations of digital transformation's effects. In other words, LAM institutions are going through a profound transformation in the digital age, as they shift from traditional knowledge repositories to dynamic hubs of innovation and engagement. The evidence of this shift is LAMs' adoption of new models like labs[5], platforms[6], and digital incubators[7], all of which make a considerable impact on collaboration and creativity in the heritage sector, and in this way aim to address the diverse needs and interests of today's users.

LAMs' transformation has been facilitated by collaboration with diverse experts (art historians, digital humanists, science and technology experts, etc.) as well as the active participation of users. As Parikka (2013) suggests, we have all become curators in the digital age. Our daily interactions on platforms, as well as interactions facilitated by algorithms (Hoskins, 2023), contribute to the co-creation of knowledge and narratives of digital archives, influencing in this way the evolution of traditional LAM institutions. In other words, the Internet offers a transformative potential for engaging with cultural memory, enabling new forms of access, interpretation, and dissemination that exceed the reach of traditional institutions (Stainforth, 2022). This potential is additionally enhanced by open access policies, which enable the public to access and re-use digital cultural content for free. For example, in 2012, the Rijksmuseum introduced Rijksstudio[8], a digital application offering downloads of high-resolution images of the collection at no cost (for both personal

---

5   https://labs.biblios.tech
6   https://www.pluggy-project.eu
7   https://ars.electronica.art/doors/en/about/
8   https://www.rijksmuseum.nl/en/rijksstudio?ii=0&p=0&from=2024-04-27T13%3A29%3A19.6754016Z

use and commercial purposes). Two years later, the "Rijksstudio award"[9] was launched to reward the most creative uses of the Rijksmuseum's collections.

Hence, open data is expected to foster "social engagement", defined as the process of communicating and participating within online communities (Directive EU 2019/1024). Furthermore, the development of new services (apps, platforms, and digital tools in different sectors such as urban development, tourism, etc.) is of significant interest for different stakeholders in the EU. Yet, opening LAMs' collections online is far from being a default reality. According to Vézina and others (2022), barriers to open culture can be clustered into three main categories: money (lack of resources, fear of losing revenue); people (lack of staff, knowledge and skills); and policy (outdated policy and legal framework, copyright in particular, the absence of a policy encouraging openness). On the one hand, all LAM institutions must respond to digitalisation regardless of their size (Valtysson et al., 2022). On the other, many LAMs are still in the process of digital transition, and at different stages or phases of digital transformation.

In a similar regard, King et al. (2016) identify a gap between digital heritage theory and its practical application, noting that large-scale projects often exceed LAM's institutional capacities. While some European countries lag in digitisation processes, hindering national institutions' ability to meet high-tech demands, nations like the UK, Denmark, and the Netherlands are effectively translating policy into actionable practice (e.g., the UK's Culture is Digital project, the Danish Cultural Heritage project). It seems that addressing the varying institutional capacities for digital engagement across Europe requires coordinated national policies. However, research on LAM institutional development remains rather limited (Vårheim, 2019).

In recent literature (Hylland & Primorac, 2023; Rasmussen & Hjørland, 2022; Valtysson et al., 2022; Warren & Matthews, 2020; Vårheim et al., 2019), the institutional transformation of the cultural sector and LAMs in particular is mostly analysed through the concept of convergence, referring to the process of institutional characteristics merging in the digital age. However, the current push for collaboration and convergence in the LAM sector is not entirely new. The example of archives in museums demonstrates that some institutions have long been working together, even when the dominant trend was towards separation (VanderBerg, 2012). Although libraries, archives, and

Barbara Lovrinić Higgins

---

9   https://www.rijksmuseum.nl/en/collection/user/entries-rijksstudio-award--144597

museums have distinct domains, they share many similarities, such as their public administration, political goals, the social standing of their professionals, and their core values. Their shared similarities are essential for understanding the changing pressures they face, but also for the establishment of a shared institutional framework (Valtysson et al., 2022). Namely, the convergence creates the foundation for an institutional framework for LAMs known as "memory institutions" (Kirchhoff et al., 2008). From the point of view of users who access LAM content online, they are indifferent to the location of the original material (Martin, 2007 as cited in VanderBerg, 2012). This user's perspective mirrors the "single point of access" offered by digital platforms, a concept that increasingly characterizes LAM's convergence as a unified approach. Thus, the focus on convergence is largely encouraged by the opportunity to build trans-institutional portals enabling remote access. Hence, the main driver of convergence is digitalisation (Rasmussen, 2019).

Even though digitalisation has facilitated the convergence of LAM's institutional characteristics (Valtysson and others, 2022), the convergence of LAMs is arguably a complex phenomenon driven by multiple factors that, in addition to the digitalisation imperative, has to do with the evolving nature of capitalism, user-centricity, and the rise of participatory practices (Rasmussen, 2019), as well. In spite of these diverse drivers, the convergence of archives, libraries, and museums into "digital memory institutions" is helping to increase the visibility of these institutions (Kirchhoff et al., 2008). Taking this into account, LAMs' institutional convergence benefits the sector but it also does so for its different stakeholders. The benefits of collaboration in the digital environment and convergence among LAMs, in addition to the advantages this brings to users, also include their improved financial effectiveness and strengthened political advocacy in pursuit of common goals (Timms, 2009 as cited in VanderBerg, 2012). Furthermore, the EU is using LAM's convergence in terms of shared digital infrastructure to achieve its political objectives.

The Politics of Infrastructure: Shaping EU Digital Cultural Heritage

The imperative for heritage digitalisation, described in the preceding section, is further complicated by what Jin (2013) terms "platform imperialism", a concept that highlights how digital platforms can exert power and control in a globalized world, thus raising important questions about their economic, cultural, and political influence. Expanding on this understanding of platform power, platformisation is a concept derived from "platform", and here it

is understood as "the penetration of the infrastructures, economic process-es, and governmental frameworks of platforms in different economic sectors and spheres of life" (Poell et al., 2019).

Nowadays, platforms are very much part of our lives. Since the Internet of-fered new possibilities for cultural production and consumption, platforms have become instrumental in manifesting and prioritising certain cultural products and trends (Valtysson, 2022). Platforms are trending in the field of cultural heritage as well. Due to constant technological advancements, to-gether with the rise of projects related to cultural heritage, there is a rise in the number of digital platforms for heritage. The recent rise of digital platforms for cultural heritage is showing two points: first, platform logic can support the organisation of the world's cultural heritage in a way that it is accessible through "only one gateway to the digital world" (Pesce et al., 2019: 2). Sec-ond, it shows a quest for community (Lagerkvist, 2014), that is professional or local.

Europeana[10], a unique access point to European digital cultural heritage, demonstrates this evolution. Over less than two decades, it has transformed from a "digital library" to a "portal" and then a "platform" (Thylstrup, 2019; Stainforth, 2017). Furthermore, Europeana also functions as an important community for digital cultural heritage professionals in the EU and beyond.

The digital cultural heritage politics of the EU are closely intertwined with mass digitisation projects such as Europeana. With mass digitisation projects, the question of scale has been a "central point of political contestation used to signal infrastructural power" (Thylstrup, 2019: 106). In other words, the scheme is to digitise as many cultural heritage items as possible. The infra-structure of mass digitisation mediates, connects, and converges upon dif-ferent institutions, actors, social media, etc., increasing the radius of using, working, and reading (Thylstrup, 2019).

Powered by the sudden increase of data from new and emerging technolo-gies, the hyper-connected world is transforming existing businesses and cre-ating new ones. The integration of technology and data is managing both val-ue chains and ecosystems. The current framework of the EU's digital cultural politics, grounded in shared infrastructure, shows two strands: one focused on data and digital sovereignty, the other on European identity and memory.

Barbara Lovrinić Higgins

---

10   https://www.europeana.eu/en/collections

While both are influenced by geopolitical power struggles, the implications for LAMs are not yet fully understood.

Data Space and Digital Sovereignty

"Data space for cultural heritage" is a new form that is designed by the European Commission to support multi-layered ecosystems. Data sovereignty is one of the key concepts of EU data policy, which opposes the concept of platformisation, where all data is concentrated and held in the hands of private companies whose interest is to exploit data for commercial purposes, and aims to ensure that Member States reaffirm their authority over the Internet. Data space for cultural heritage is not the only "data space" politics of the EU:

> "(…) the data space [for cultural heritage] should leverage its participation in other connected initiatives such as the data spaces for tourism and media, the language data space, the cultural heritage cloud, and the competence centres for 3D." (European Commission, 2024)

Europeana is viewed as a foundation for building the "common data space" for cultural heritage, but also as a platform for re-using and sharing digitised heritage material:

> "It will allow museums, galleries, libraries, archives across Europe to share and reuse the digitised cultural heritage images such as 3D models of historical sites and high-quality scans of paintings" (European Commission, 2021).

In this regard, Member States should strengthen the role of the aggregators as intermediaries between Europeana and cultural heritage institutions and encourage their active contribution to the data space (European Commission, 2021).

Recent literature highlights that the sovereignty narrative is growing in EU discourses (Bonnamy & Perarnaud, 2023; Broeders & Kaminska, 2022). The concept of digital sovereignty refers to the idea that Member States should reaffirm their authority over the Internet and protect their autonomy in the digital sphere (Musiani, 2022, as cited in Bonnamy & Perarnaud, 2023). In fact, the language of "digital sovereignty and strategic autonomy" has already become integrated into the policy statements and documents of the European Union (Broeders & Kaminska, 2022). The main rationale behind the

"European digital sovereignty" is to challenge the geopolitical dynamics and concentration of global technological market power in the United States and China (Bonnamy & Perarnaud, 2023). In its 2019 digital strategy, "A Europe Fit for the Digital Age", the European Commission declared Europe's need to strengthen its digital sovereignty and establish its own standards for data, technology, and infrastructure, rather than "following those of others" (European Commission, n.d.).

In a similar vein, the announcement of Google Print (later known as Google Books) in 2004-2005 (Jeanneney, 2007, as cited in Grincheva & Stainforth, 2024) has motivated the creation of Europeana. Google's intention was to digitise books from the most important libraries in the US and the UK (the Universities of Harvard, Stanford, Oxford, and the New York Public Library). The European Commission had a concern that Google would privatise European works, and thus proposed to start its digital library. Today, Europeana is one of the largest aggregators with more than 50 million cultural heritage items from over 4000 galleries, libraries, museums, and archives in Europe. Since Europeana is mainly funded through the European Commission, it is closely tied to the geopolitical goals of the EU.

The creation of a common European data space for cultural heritage is expected to enable LAMs to build on the scale of the single market, in line with the European Data Strategy (European Commission, 2021). Europeana has affiliations with the economic aims of the Digital Agenda for Europe and the digital single market (Valtysson & Holdgaard, 2019). For example, on the Europeana Creative project website, it is stated:

> "The re-use of digital content is an essential part of the Digital Agenda for Europe. Several activities are already stimulating the re-use of cultural heritage in order to demonstrate the social and economic value of cultural content." (Europeana Foundation, n.d.).

Another example is the EU mass digitisation project "Time Machine"[11], which aims to develop the Big Data of the Past. This will be achieved by "creating a huge distributed digital information system mapping the European social, cultural and geographical evolution across times" (Time Machine, n.d.). Furthermore, the infrastructure will "enable Europe to turn its long history, as well as its multilingualism and interculturalism, into a living social and economic resource" (Time Machine, n.d.). In one of the keynote address-

---

11   https://www.timemachine.eu/about-us/

es at the Time Machine conference in 2019,[12] it was stated that the web is not sociable, as it has become fragmented. Thus, the full digitisation of the world is currently not happening. There is a need for a third, central platform for building companies and our lives, and which will be as important as the web or social media. This new structure will be the operating system of the world. It will concern heritage, the future, and the territory, all of which are important for its governance.

There are several advantages to having an infrastructure for cultural heritage: to have dominance over data, demonstrate the social and economic value of cultural content, and to have control over certain narratives.

Memory Politics

The fragmentation of cultural heritage content across various platforms is contributing to a fundamental transformation of LAMs, impacting not only institutional structures but also the very concept of collective memory as well as the heritage community. Digital technologies, therefore, represent not simply a set of tools, but a catalyst for conceptual change when they are, for example, employed, built upon and conceptually and methodologically used by a European Research Infrastructure Consortium such as DARIAH EU that "enables, develops, maintains and operates an infrastructure in support of ICT-based research practices and sustains researchers in using them to build, analyse and interpret digital resources" (DARIAH EU, n.d.), and thus keeping this stored memory alive.

From a cultural perspective, heritage is the materialisation of collective memory. The nature of memory has been debated for a very long time now. The empiricists state that memory demands "stored beliefs". The connection between memory and its storage still makes the core area of research within memory and heritage studies theory, highlighting the critical role of storage mechanisms in shaping our understanding of how memory is created, maintained, and retrieved.[13] The intertwinement of media studies with memory studies has resulted in conceptual shifts regarding memory: Assmann (2008)

---

12   The Time Machine Conference 2019 took place on 10-11 October 2019 at the Deutsches Hygiene-Museum in Dresden, Germany. More about the conference at: https://www.timemachine.eu/events/time-machine-2019/

13   For example, the concepts of "storage" and "archive" are essential to the understanding of memory by contemporary media theorists such as W. Ernst, J. Parikka, and A. Hoskins.

used "working" or "reference" memory, Sutton (2007) proposed "connectionist memory", and Pentzold (2009) came up with "global memory".

In the recent years, media researchers have brought attention to the concept of "mediatisation of memory". The main rationale behind this concept is that through digital technologies, memory can be reshaped in different ways, so that new combinations of signification can occur (Hoskins, 2009, 2014). The concept of "connective memory", as proposed by Hoskins (2009), suggests a paradigm shift from collective memory, which is grounded in social frameworks, to a model that accentuates the socio-technical realities of the hyperconnected world. Some authors like Robinson (2012) argue that the digital age has created a need for re-evaluation of "memory institutions", as memory is increasingly shaped and accessed through digital platforms. Yet, there is still a research gap regarding the impact of digital transformation on memory creation (Yap et al., 2024).

Recent academic research re-focuses on memory in the context of digital transformation in LAM institutions (Yap et al., 2024), but mostly in the context of digital cultural politics of the EU (Grincheva & Stainforth, 2024; Stainforth, 2022). The drive behind the renewed focus on memory within LAMs is due to the shift from physical to virtual representations of cultural heritage, but also due to the underlying political interests aligned with this institutional change. The EU's focus on data and memory politics is closely connected to this institutional shift.

The growing trend of shared digital infrastructure within LAMs is revolutionising how cultural narratives are shaped. McCrary (2011: 357) argues that the problems that arise with the curation of physical cultural heritage, that of "authenticity, vocabulary control, image control, and ideology control", are also present with digital cultural heritage. Despite this continuity of challenges, mass digitisation projects are not the continuation of the existing politics of cultural memory. They need to be approached as emerging sociopolitical and sociotechnical phenomena that create new forms of cultural memory politics (Thylstrup, 2019).

Europeana was one of the flagship projects in the EU's i2010 strategy for a European Information Society for growth and employment. In 2005, on the occasion of the presentation of the i2010 Strategy for a European Information Society for growth and employment, Viviane Reding, former Information Society and Media Commissioner, argued: "without a collective memory, we are noth-

ing, and can achieve nothing. It defines our identity and we use it continuously for education, work and leisure." (Europa, 2005, as cited in Stainforth, 2017).

The recent research has turned its focus on Europeana being a social and political actor. For example, Capurro and others (2023) highlight that Europeana is a social structure acting on three levels: firstly, in curating transnational digital heritage collection; secondly, in building a network of European cultural heritage institutions; and thirdly, by bringing together the audience, practitioners, and end users around its collections. In addition, it is a highly political structure that operates beyond and between national and supranational structures (Grincheva & Stainforth, 2024). Taking this into consideration, recent research (Capurro & Severo, 2023; Grincheva & Stainforth, 2024; Valtysson, 2020) shows the tendency of the EU to create European memory politics. In other words, Europeana is seen as an instrument or, better said, engine for the creation of cultural identity in which local and national heritage is merged with European heritage (Capurro & Severo, 2023). Similarly, Thylstrup (2019: 57) argues that Europeana "produces a new form of cultural memory politics that converge national and supranational imaginaries with global information infrastructures".

Europeana is the evidence that the politics of infrastructure, or the "underlying rules of the world" (Verhoeven, 2016, as cited in Thylstrup, 2019), are behind the creation of a new cultural memory paradigm.

Future Directions for LAMs

Since digitisation leads to significant transformations in societal, cultural, and institutional contexts (Valtysson et al., 2022), institutional transformation must be examined from a broader perspective. The EU's digital cultural politics are grounded in large-scale initiatives, such as Europeana, which exert governance over infrastructure, data, identity, and memory politics. The expansion of digital heritage and the huge amount of data have generated new possibilities and opportunities, but also challenges for the cultural sector. There is a question of how to manage and exploit data in the cultural heritage context. Furthermore, the heritage sector needs to keep up with the increasing role of data in decision-making as well as policy development (Harrison et al., 2017). Clearly communicating the value and impact of digital collections is essential for attracting funding, engaging the public, and gaining internal support (Uzelac & Lovrinić Higgins, 2025; Shaw, 2016).

In addition, the future of LAMs will largely be shaped by the common Data Space for Cultural Heritage. In 2024, 21 out of 27 EU member states have reported taking different kinds of actions to encourage their cultural heritage institutions to share their digitised cultural heritage materials on the EU's common data space. So far, only four countries within the EU have made it a requirement that cultural heritage institutions must make their digitised assets available on the EU's common data space to receive public funding (European Commission, 2024).

It is also reported that the Europeana Country Groups pilot program is designed to boost collaboration on cultural heritage data within a shared European digital space. This initiative is being tested in Bulgaria, Italy, and Slovenia, and the leaders of these national groups presented their progress at the national level (European Commission, 2024). Overall, the EU's approach to digital memory remains largely reactive, particularly in projects like Europeana, Time Machine, and Data Space for Cultural Heritage, and continues to be shaped by anxieties about private influence, thus creating ongoing tensions (Stainforth, 2022).

Conclusions

In theory, the concept of convergence has created the foundation for LAMs' shared institutional framework in the digital age. Yet, both the representation and interpretation of digital cultural heritage are political issues. The current EU's digital cultural politics, based on large-scale digitisation, data utilisation, and European memory transformation, places significant pressure on the digital transformation of LAM institutions. Digital cultural infrastructures are already setting specific technical standards, and more importantly, the logic of how cultural (memory) institutions should operate online.

What is crucial here for LAMs' future development and their relevance in society is their management of digital cultural heritage, since "mediated memories" play a key role in the construction of individual and collective identity. Today's management of digital cultural heritage in the EU is challenged by the formation of new knowledge spaces that are used to promote a certain political agenda. The cultural domain often highlights the premise of the intrinsic value of culture and knowledge. Nevertheless, within the context of digitalisation, where data assumes significant value, it is necessary for LAMs to formulate their digitisation efforts and assert their relevance in soci-

ety while considering the larger EU framework that is setting certain trends. Thus, the future of cultural heritage institutions depends on their ability to demonstrate meaningful societal impact.

It is expected that digital cultural heritage will become more important and widespread with time, and it will enable participation in ways that are beyond mobilising knowledge and research. For this reason, it is important to understand how digital technologies and cultural policies interact to shape the future of LAM institutions in the EU. A perspective that cannot be overlooked in future research is LAMs' need to actively engage with data politics, which governs data collection, use, and dissemination. Consequently, how digital technologies (media) enable a multifaceted understanding of our reality, and how LAM institutions are using this advantage, needs to be further explored. Thus, there is a need for a combined approach that considers the complexities of digital culture as a political issue, which makes a significant impact on LAM institutions.

Bibliography

- Assmann, A. (2008). Canon and Archive. In A. Erll & A. Nünning (Eds.), *Cultural Memory Studies: An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook* (pp. 97-108). De Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110207262.2.97
- Bonnamy, C., & Perarnaud, C. (2023). Introduction. EU Digital Policies and Politics Unpacking the European Approach to Regulate the "Digital" *Politique européenne,* N° 81(3), 8-27. https://doi.org/10.3917/poeu.081.0008.
- Broeders, D., & Kaminska, M. (2022). EU digital sovereignty: When top-down meets bottom-up. Introduction. In D. Broeders (Ed.), *Digital sovereignty: From narrative to policy?* (pp. 9–11). EU Cyber Direct.
- Capurro, C., Plets, G., & Verheul, J. (2023). Digital heritage infrastructures as cultural policy instruments: Europeana and the enactment of European citizenship. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, *30*(3), 304–324. https://doi.org/10.1080/10286632.2023.2193401
- DARIAH EU. (n.d.). *A research infrastructure that enhances and supports digitally enabled research and teaching across the Arts and Humanities.* Retrieved from https://www.dariah.eu/about/dariah-in-nutshell/Directive 2019/1024 (accessed on 3 April 2025).

- Directive (EU) 2019/1024 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 June 2019 on Open Data and the Re-Use of Public Sector Information (Recast). Retrieved from https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A32019L1024 (accessed on 3 April 2025).
- European Commission. (16-17 October 2024). *Minutes 7th meeting of the Commission Expert Group on the Common European Data Space for Cultural Heritage (CEDCHE)*. Retrieved from https://ec.europa.eu/transparency/expert-groups-register/screen/meetings/consult?lang=en&meetingId=59024&fromExpertGroups=3800 (accessed on 3 March 2025).
- European Commission. (2021). *Commission Recommendation (EU) 2021/1970 of 10 November 2021 on a Common European Data Space for Cultural Heritage.* https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A32021H1970
- European Commission. (n.d.). *A Europe fit for the digital age*. Retrieved from https://commission.europa.eu/strategy-and-policy/priorities-2019-2024/europe-fit-digital-age_en (accessed on 21 February 2025).
- Europeana Foundation. (n.d.). *Europeana Creative Project*. Retrieved from https://pro.europeana.eu/project/europeana-creative-project (accessed on 22 February 2025).
- Fuchs, C. (2010). How Can Surveillance Be Defined? Remarks on Theoretical Foundations of Surveillance Studies. In Unified Theory of Information Research Group (Ed.), *The Internet & Surveillance – Research Paper Series*.
- Grincheva, N., & Stainforth, E. (2024). *Geopolitics of digital heritage*. Cambridge University Press.
- Harrison, R., Morel, H., Maricevic M. & Penrose, S. (2017). *Heritage and Data: Challenges and Opportunities for the Heritage Sector*. Report of the Heritage Data Research Workshop held Friday 23 June 2017 at the British Library, London.
- Henningsen, E. & Larsen, H. (2020). 3 The Digitalization Imperative: Sacralization of Technology in LAM Policies. In R. Audunson, H. Andresen, C. Fagerlid, E. Henningsen, H. Hobohm, H. Jochumsen, H. Larsen & T. Vold (Ed.), *Libraries, Archives and Museums as Democratic Spaces in a Digital Age* (pp. 53-72). Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Saur. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110636628-003
- Hoskins, A. (2009). The Mediatisation of Memory. In J. Garde-Hansen, A. Hoskins & A. Reading (Eds.), *Save as ... Digital Memories*, (pp. 27-43). Palgrave Macmillan.

Barbara Lovrinić Higgins

- Hoskins, A. (2014). The mediatization of memory. In K. Lundby (Ed.), *Mediatization of Communication*. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton. 661-680.
- Hoskins, A. (2023). New Memory and the Archive. In A. Prescott & A. Wiggins (Eds.), *Archives: Power, truth, and fiction* (pp. 87-99). Oxford University Press. Retrieved from: https://global.oup.com/academic/product/archives-9780198829324?cc=gb&lang=en (accessed on 15 January 2025).
- Hylland, O.M., & Primorac, J. (Eds.). (2023). Digital Transformation and Cultural Policies in Europe (1st ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003334576
- Jin, D. Y. (2013). The construction of platform imperialism in the globalization era. *TripleC: Communication, Capitalism & Critique. Open Access Journal for a Global Sustainable Information Society*, 11(1), 145–172.
- King, L., Stark, J. F. & Cooke, P. (2016). Experiencing the Digital World: The Cultural Value of Digital Engagement with Heritage. *Heritage & Society*, 9(1), 76-101. 10.1080/2159032X.2016.1246156
- Kirchhoff, T., Schweibenz, W., & Sieglerschmidt, J. (2008). Archives, libraries, museums and the spell of ubiquitous knowledge. *Archival Science*, 8(4), 251–266. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10502-009-9093-2
- Krotz, F. (2017). Explaining the Mediatisation Approach. *Javnost – The Public, 24*(2), 103-118. 10.1080/13183222.2017.1298556
- Lagerkvist, A. (2014). A quest for communitas: Rethinking mediated memory existentially. *Nordicom Review*, *35*(s1), 205-218. https://doi.org/10.2478/nor-2014-0113
- Matanovac Vučković, R., Kanceljak, I., & Jurić, M. (2021). Cultural Heritage Institutions During and After the Pandemic: The Copyright Perspective. *EU and Comparative Law Issues and Challenges Series (ECLIC)*, *5*, 379–397. https://doi.org/10.25234/eclic/18312
- McCrary, Q. (2011). The Political Nature of Digital Cultural Heritage. *LIBER Quarterly*, *20* (3–4), 357–368. https://doi.org/10.18352/lq.8000
- Navarrete, T. (2013). Chapter 12: Digital Cultural Heritage. In Rizzo I. & Mignosa A. (Eds.), *Handbook on the Economics of Cultural Heritage*, Edward Elgar Publishing, i-i.
- Parikka, J. (2013). Archival Media Theory: An Introduction to Wolfgang Ernst's Media Archaeology. In W. Ernst (Ed.), *Digital Memory and the Archive*, (pp.1-23). University of Minnesota Press.

- Pentzold, C. (2009). Fixing the Floating Gap: The Online Encyclopaedia Wikipedia as a Global Memory Place, *Memory Studies*, *2*(2), 255–72.
- Pesce, D., Neirotti P. & Paolucci E. (2019). When Culture Meets Digital Platforms: Value Creation and Stakeholders' Alignment in Big Data Use. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 22(15). 1883–1903.10.1080/13683500.2019.1591354
- Poell, T., Nieborg, D., & van Dijck, J. (2019). Platformisation. *Internet Policy Review*, 8(4). https://doi.org/10.14763/2019.4.1425
- Primorac, J., Obuljen Koržinek, N., & Uzelac, A. (2015). Access to culture in Croatian cultural policy: moving towards explicit policies. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, *23*(5), 562–580. https://doi.org/10.1080/10286632.2015.1102906
- Rasmussen, C. H. (2019). Is digitalization the only driver of convergence? Theorizing relations between libraries, archives, and museums. *Journal of Documentation*, *75*(6), 1258–1273. https://doi.org/10.1108/JD-02-2019-0025
- Rasmussen, C. H., & Hjørland, B. (2022). Libraries, Archives and Museums (LAMs): Conceptual Issues with Focus on Their Convergence. *Knowledge Organization*, *49*(8), 577-621. https://doi.org/10.5771/0943-7444-2022-8-577
- Robinson, H. (2012). Remembering things differently: Museums, libraries and archives as memory institutions and the implications for convergence. *Museum Management and Curatorship*, *27*(4), 413–429.
- Rogač Mijatović, Lj. (2014). Kolektivno pamćenje u digitalno doba: Europeana i Veliki rat. *Zbornik radova Fakulteta dramskih umetnosti*, *25/26*, 275-293.
- Stainforth, E. (2017). From Museum to Memory Institution: The Politics of European Culture Online. *Museum and Society*, *14*(2), 323–337. https://doi.org/10.29311/mas.v14i2.646
- Stainforth, E. (2022). Collective memory or the right to be forgotten? Cultures of digital memory and forgetting in the European Union. *Memory Studies*, *15*(2), 257–270. https://doi.org/10.1177/1750698021104
- Stokstad, S. (2020). 5 Norwegian National Policies for Digitalization in the LAM Sector – Imperative and Implementation. In R. Audunson, H. Andresen, C. Fagerlid, E. Henningsen, H. Hobohm, H. Jochumsen, H. Larsen & T. Vold (Ed.), *Libraries, Archives and Museums as Democratic Spaces in a Digital Age* (pp. 91-110). Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Saur. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110636628-005
- Sutton, J. (2007). *Philosophy and Memory Traces: Descartes to Connectionism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Thylstrup, N. (2019). The Politics of Mass Digitization. In *The MIT Press eBooks*. https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/11404.001.0001

- Time Machine. (n.d.). *About us*. Retrieved from https://www.timemachine.eu/about-us/ (accessed on 22 February 2025).

- Uzelac, A., & Lovrinić Higgins, B. (2025). From Data to Impact: Assessing the Value of Cultural Heritage in the Digital Age. *Heritage*, *8*(4), 117. https://doi.org/10.3390/heritage8040117

- Uzelac, A., Obuljen Koržinek, N. & Primorac, J. (2016). Access to Culture in the Digital Environment: Active Users, Re-use and Cultural Policy Issues. Medijska istraživanja, *22* (1), 87-113. Retrieved from https://hrcak.srce.hr/161255 (accessed on 3 April 2025).

- Valtýsson, B. (2020). *Digital Cultural Politics: From Policy to Practice*. Palgrave Macmillan.

- Valtysson, B., & Holdgaard, N. (2019). The Museum as a Charged Space: The Duality of Digital Museum Communication. In K. Drotner, V. Dziekan, R. Parry, & K. C. Schrřder (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Museums, Media, and Communication* (pp. 159–171). London/New York: Routledge.

- Valtysson, B., Kjellman, U., & Audunson, R. (2022). The impact of digitalization on LAMs. In *Libraries, Archives, and Museums in Transition: Changes, Challenges, and Convergence in a Scandinavian Perspective* (1st ed., pp. 117–129). Retrieved from https://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:uu:diva-496293 (accessed on 11 March 2025).

- VanderBerg, R. (2012). Converging libraries, archives and museums: overcoming distinctions, but for what gain? *Archives and Manuscripts*, *40*(3), 136–146. https://doi.org/10.1080/01576895.2012.735826

- Vårheim, A., Skare R. & Lenstra N. (2019). Institutional Convergence in the Libraries, Archives, and Museums Sector: A Contribution Towards a Conceptual Framework. In *Proceedings of CoLIS, the Tenth International Conference on Conceptions of Library and Information Science*, Ljubljana, Slovenia, June 16-19, 2019. Information Research, *24*(4), paper colis1918. Retrieved from http://InformationR.net/ir/24-4/colis/colis1918.html (Archived by the Internet Archive at https://web.archive.org/web/20191217173326/http://informationr.net/ir/24-4/colis/colis1918.html)

- Vézina, B., Françoise, C., Anuken, O., & Harris, D. (2022). *What Are the Barriers to Open Culture? A Report by Creative Commons – July 22, 2022*. Retrieved from https://creativecommons.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/3.Final-Barriers-Report_compressed.pdf (accessed on 21 February 2025).

- Warren, E., & Matthews, G. (2020). Public Libraries, Museums and Physical Convergence: Context, Issues, Opportunities: A Literature Review Part 2. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*, *52*(1), 54-66. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0961000618769721
- Yap, J. Q. H., Kamble, Z., Kuah, A. T. H., & Tolkach, D. (2024). The impact of digitalisation and digitisation in museums on memory-making. *Current Issues in Tourism*, *27*(16), 2538–2560. https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2024.2317912

Barbara Lovrinić Higgins

Barbara Lovrinić Higgins
Institut za razvoj i međunarodne odnose, Zagreb, Hrvatska

PREOBLIKOVANJE „LAM" INSTITUCIJA: POLITIKA INFRASTRUKTURE, PODATAKA I SEĆANJA U EU

Rezime

Poslednjih godina povećano je istraživanje različitih aspekata digitalnog kulturnog nasleđa koje uključuje pitanja pristupa, ponovne upotrebe, prava intelektualne svojine, korišćenje novih tehnologija, povezanih podataka, itd. Međutim, specifični efekti digitalne kulturne politike Evropske unije (EU) i digitalnog uticaja na „LAM" institucije (biblioteke, arhive i muzeje) još uvek nisu u potpunosti razjašnjeni. Ovaj rad se bavi složenim odnosom između tehnološke i političke logike, stavljajući digitalno kulturno nasleđe u kontekst politike EU s posebnim fokusom na to kako i tehnološki i politički pokretači preoblikuju „LAM" institucije. Razmatra se uticaj digitalne transformacije na „LAM" institucije, kao i implikacije aktuelnih politika EU koje utiču na digitalizaciju kulturnog nasleđa. Ovim radom želim da proširim sadašnji korpus istraživanja o razvoju „LAM" institucija analizom interakcije njenih spoljnih pritisaka – infrastrukture EU, podataka i politike pamćenja – i institucionalne transformacije oblikovane u digitalno doba, što je veza koja je uglavnom neistražena u trenutnoj literaturi. Ova perspektiva je važna jer omogućava bolje razumevanje evoluirajućeg odnosa između politike EU i „LAM" institucija u digitalnom dobu. Da bih postigla ovaj cilj, sprovela sam kvalitativnu analizu sadržaja dokumenata o politici EU i relevantne akademske literature.

Ključne reči

digitalna transformacija, digitalna kulturna politika, digitalno kulturno nasleđe, ustanove kulturnog nasleđa, suverenitet, platformizacija