

Alec Badenoch; Emily Clark; Marek Jancovic

## Introduction: Re-bordering the Archive: European Transnational Archives and Transnational Entanglements

2023

<https://doi.org/10.25969/mediarep/21819>

Veröffentlichungsversion / published version

Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

### Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Badenoch, Alec; Clark, Emily; Jancovic, Marek: Introduction: Re-bordering the Archive: European Transnational Archives and Transnational Entanglements. In: *VIEW. Journal of European Television History and Culture*. Re-bordering the Archive, Jg. 12 (2023), Nr. 24, S. 1–10. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.25969/mediarep/21819>.

### Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter einer Creative Commons - Namensnennung - Weitergabe unter gleichen Bedingungen 4.0/ Lizenz zur Verfügung gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zu dieser Lizenz finden Sie hier:

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>

### Terms of use:

This document is made available under a creative commons - Attribution - Share Alike 4.0/ License. For more information see:

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>

## RE-BORDERING THE ARCHIVE

### EUROPEAN AUDIOVISUAL ARCHIVES AND TRANSNATIONAL ENTANGLEMENTS

Alec Badenoch, Emily Clark, Marek Jancovic

*Excuse me, can you tell me which way to the Renaissance?* In an apocryphal story, this question was posed by hapless American tourists in Florence. From a European perspective, this self-congratulatory anecdote concerns the transformative historical contributions of Europe to cultural history, acknowledged through the superficial and somewhat confused gaze of stereotypical Americans. Two decades ago, the European Commission began a major effort to re-situate heritage in the digital sphere through mass digitization and online publication on European scale. This ultimately resulted in the creation of European digital heritage portals such as Europeana, the European Film Gateway, and of course EUscreen.<sup>1</sup> As Nanna Bonde Thylstrup has shown, this project was positioned against the US-based mass digitization of Google Books, as offering a “quality” alternative to the US focus on quantity.<sup>2</sup> These efforts were explicitly meant to break down two sets of barriers: the national, territorial boundaries of heritage (both symbolic and institutional) on the one hand, and the barriers of access to the archives on the other, both of which would allow for new narratives of shared heritage and experience to develop. On a different scale, digitization also promised to break down institutional borders between the “silos of the LAMs [libraries, archives and museums]” allowing collections of heritage institutions to circulate freely and come into dialogue with each other.<sup>3</sup> In a 2011 report, the Commission envisioned that wider and freer access to digital heritage—due also to concurrent discussions around copyright and re-use—would further generate many new commercial and creative opportunities, resulting in no less than a “new Renaissance.”<sup>4</sup>

While, as Thylstrup argues, mass digitization projects are “infused with [...] diverse, and often conflicting political and commercial motives and dynamics,”<sup>5</sup> they are predicated in Europe on an infrastructural vision of free flows across a borderless European territory that is recognizable from a wide range of material infrastructure projects, echoing back for at least a century.<sup>6</sup> The call for the most recent EUscreen symposium once more mobilises this language, speaking of “effectuating a swift and efficient exchange of data *across the geographical expanse of Europe*. It seeks to highlight *opportunities in seamless data exchange* across sectors and unravel the potential of a more cohesive, data-rich European future.”<sup>7</sup> Like many infrastructural projects of Europe, the language of smooth space is predicated upon an image of a mobile and curious citizen, driven to explore and interact with the available knowledge.<sup>8</sup> In the vision of the Commission, European citizens would find heritage available to them “at the click of a mouse,” as the Commission repeated in the mid-2000s.<sup>9</sup> With the rapid rise of portable devices, this vision of digitally mobile heritage users became physically mobile, underlining the need to “distribut[e] cultural heritage to the users wherever they are, whenever they want it.”<sup>10</sup>

Operating in parallel - and not always in concert - scholarly and social initiatives have sought to develop transnational frames for which common European heritage collections have been a recurring desideratum. Not least once the technical infrastructures were built and the hundreds of thousands of digitised items became available (including tens of thousands on EUscreen alone), it became clear that digital networks needed to be supported by cultural networks to interpret and make use of the material. (In 2010, one museum curator referred to Europeana as

“a bucket of images” in communication to one of the authors). Indeed, VIEW itself grew out of the initiative to make scholarly use of the possibilities of digitised heritage offered not least by EUscreen. In addition to technical projects supporting digital access, scholarly funding programmes such as Horizon, HERA, and the Joint Programme Initiative in Cultural Heritage aim to promote cross-border collaborations between researchers and archives to explore common themes and allow heritage objects to “migrate” across borders with an explicit aim of building more inclusive and cohesive societies. As Perla Innocenti observed in 2013, “migrating heritage” does not merely implicate the circulation of (digitised) artefacts, but also researchers and heritage professionals as well.<sup>11</sup> As such, scholars of transnational history and heritage are doubly implicated within these systems, both as core users of online heritage exploring transnational questions, and as participants in the international cultural networks that hope to add meaning and value to the digital landscape. Current pushes, both scholarly and social, to more fully address national colonial pasts as well as to decolonize heritage institutions have made addressing these borders all the more timely.<sup>12</sup>

Now, over a decade down the road from these initial promises, the landscape of audiovisual heritage in Europe seems wider than ever, though its internal borders remain unclear. For example, both industry commentators and scholars have observed over the years that the budgets of the various successive iterations of the European MEDIA Programme are laughable in proportion to its lofty objectives.<sup>13</sup> Many things have changed, and many remain the same: Financing, technological interoperability and copyright restrictions are still steep hurdles that transnational projects must scale. A new ethic of preservation is emerging as calls for more inclusive, global, and sustainable practices of digitisation and equitable paradigms of archiving intensify.<sup>14</sup> In film, television and media historiography, too, scholars have been petitioning for a “transnational conception of the archive as a site of disruption and discrepancy” in order to challenge nation-centric understandings of the past.<sup>15</sup> But despite these scholarly impulses, national borders continue to orient the accessibility of audiovisual heritage on several different fronts. Besides the large portals such as EUscreen, new digital initiatives for television heritage seem once more to be emerging, often on a national basis, such as the CLARIAH Media Suite in the Netherlands, ARD Retro in Germany, the Wales Broadcast Archive at the National Library of Wales, and the new initiative of the Danish Royal Library for DR’s collection.<sup>16</sup> It seems a good moment for us to ask, in all seriousness, particularly as scholars: which way to the new Renaissance? How do the current borders to the archives structure our abilities to access and explore transnational flows, processes, and relationships?

## 1 Enduring National Borders

The era of strong transnational institutions is going through a rough patch. The European Union, an alliance once thought durable and exclusively expansionary, has seen a member state withdraw for the first time and the faint traces of the Iron Curtain re-emerge in the form of political fractions. Bodies once responsible for setting global standards for media technology that have dominated the 20th century – such as the SMPTE, ISO or EBU – now find themselves acknowledging a new reality in which their authority is multiply challenged: by jingoist national technopolitics, by fast-paced tech companies with a dislike of formal standards, as well as simply by communities of practice whose needs are not met by existing standardised technology, such as video archivists working with materials outside or on the margins of the broadcast industry.<sup>17</sup>

These political, social and technological upheavals have tempered an earlier rhetoric of the “glocal” prevalent in the 1980s and 90s. Television scholars studying the transnational TV format trade were quick to cast doubt on overblown claims of the disappearance of the nation as society’s principal orienting political entity: “[T]he advent of TV formats as a central element in the new television landscape appears to signal not the disappearance of the national in favour of the global and the local but its emphatic endurance or even reappearance.”<sup>18</sup> Albert Moran’s diagnosis of global television markets parallels the historical developments in Europe. After an interlude in the 1980s, political efforts to foster a unified, pan-European culture (understood principally as a shared *television* culture<sup>19</sup>) quickly gave way to a

discourse centred around preserving the plurality of European *national* cultures and identities.<sup>20</sup> This became especially pronounced after the eastward expansion of the European Union in the 2000s. In her 2004 analysis of the European audiovisual market, Hedwig de Smaele remarked that the “threat of Europeanization [...] adds to the already present threat of Americanization.”<sup>21</sup>

To this day, the nation state remains an ideological cornerstone in debates surrounding “European” media culture and heritage, and has proven a somewhat effective way for smaller economies - the “digital peripheries,” as Szczepanik, Zahrádka and Macek call them<sup>22</sup> - to assert their position against larger, economically or linguistically more powerful European neighbours as well as American media conglomerates and streaming services. But as we discuss below, the historical turn from European unity to diversity has yet to result in an appreciable, sustained and symmetrical transnational movement of audiovisual objects and heritage. Despite the best efforts of many archival institutions, recent geopolitical reconfigurations and (dis-)entanglements, reversions to protectionism, and renewed military conflicts have, in some cases, resulted in a re-bordering of audiovisual heritage. In Russia, for instance, some previously accessible collections have had their doors shut, records have been retroactively reclassified as confidential to restrict access, and archives and human rights organisations like the Memorial Society have been dismantled and liquidated.<sup>23</sup> In Hungary, sweeping legal and constitutional reforms since Viktor Orbán’s ascent to power in 2010 have transformed the country’s media industry and cultural institutions beyond recognition and allowed the government to, among others, appoint directors of public cultural institutions and funds, including archives and museums. The numerous laws passed since then are often interpreted as part of an on-going attempt to centralise control of the media, of the narrative of Hungarian history, and to promote a nationalist agenda.<sup>24</sup>

Not only in the archives do such policies obstruct access to historical audiovisual material. Streaming platforms are not immune, either. In many European countries, the percentage of older and “classic” films available on Netflix has increased dramatically in just the past five years as a consequence of both Netflix’s catalogue expansion strategy and its attempt to meet mandatory minimum quotas for European content without too much financial expenditure. Yet in the United Kingdom, the proportion of films older than 10 years in Netflix’s catalogue has plummeted from 26% to 18% since 2018.<sup>25</sup> Lucie Česálková surmises that the UK’s departure from the European Union is to blame. And thus, “Brexit” has not only made research and collaboration between continental and British educational and cultural heritage institutions much more difficult; it also almost instantly manifested in a measurable inaccessibility of historical films on major streaming platforms, too. At the same time, many public service broadcasters are stepping into the gap and planning to use their archives to boost available streaming content on national services.<sup>26</sup>

The United Kingdom also used to be the largest contributor to the European Union Orphan Works Database, 70% of which vanished after entries by British institutions were removed.<sup>27</sup> The Orphan Works Database warrants a brief discussion because it stands in for many of the significant developments that have taken place in European copyright legislation over the past decade or so. Of particular relevance to audiovisual archives and heritage are the EU Directive on Orphan Works (2012), which aimed to facilitate the digitization and dissemination of out-of-commerce works without an identifiable copyright holder; the Digital Single Market Strategy, adopted in 2015, which recognized the need for a modern copyright framework supportive of the creation, distribution, and access to digital audiovisual content; and one of its concrete offshoots – the Copyright in the Digital Single Market Directive (2019), one of the most controversial and publicly contested pieces of legislation in the Union’s entire history. Outside of EU law, the Council of Europe’s Protocol on the Protection of Television Productions entered into force in 2014, instituting the first international, binding legal deposit requirements for television programs.

In lieu of spotlighting all of these individually, let us touch upon the Orphan Works Directive, paradigmatic of some of the dysfunctional transnational legal frameworks meant to remove barriers that frequently end up acting as barriers in themselves. The Directive continues to be widely seen as an abject failure both in its overarching European form as well as in the various national implementations.<sup>28</sup> The European Commission’s own recent independent report,

published seven years past its original deadline, understatedly concludes that “it does not seem that the mutual recognition principle [of the Directive] has increased cross-border use of orphan works across the EU/EEA”<sup>29</sup> and that the “Directive’s mechanism has been rarely used in practice and its relevance as a potential tool for the mass digitisation of cultural heritage has therefore proven to be limited.”<sup>30</sup>

Just as archival experts and scholars had anticipated, the Directive introduced complex, costly and cumbersome procedures that deter cultural institutions from digitising and disseminating orphan works. And just as the Digital Single Market Strategy, it has been criticised for sidestepping public interest and the needs of cultural heritage institutions in favour of the commercial interests of copyright holders and big audiovisual players. This is a refrain frequently heard in relation to EU’s media policies over the past 30 years. Reflecting the European Commission’s and the European Parliament’s own divergent views and struggles for power, regulation invariably ends up torn between incompatible paradigms that see the purpose of the audiovisual industry either in economic output or in cultural creation.<sup>31</sup>

And thus, although specific to objects of cultural heritage, the Orphan Works Directive echoes *in parvo* many of the legal and technological mechanisms that continuously attempt to deborder and re-border a larger European media culture and propel its transnational contractions and rarefactions. Yet another recent initiative pursued a somewhat different direction but also eventually missed its original mark: The Online Portability Regulation of 2018, another one of the Digital Single Market Strategy’s descendants, was one of the first steps the European Commission has taken against the geoblocking of audiovisual content within the EU. It effectively created something akin to a minuscule personal digital exclave: a legal bubble in which users of a video-on-demand service could temporarily remain within the copyright regime of their country of residence and access content licensed for that territory regardless of their physical location. But for the time being, such an opening of national digital borders will only last for a limited period. After outcry from the audiovisual industry, which feared that the new mobility would only benefit large and already dominant American streaming platforms, the Regulation was softened to allow these extraterritorial constructs to exist on a temporary, transient basis only.<sup>32</sup>

Such creative workarounds and negotiations give a glimpse into the intricate legal gymnastics needed to reconcile an intransigent conception of copyright with the fluid and itinerant realities of media use. Parallels exist on a smaller scale, too. The UK’s first, brand-new Wales Broadcast Archive has similarly had to invent parallel worlds to provide access to its holdings: Users can consult its 500,000 recordings and broadcasts at twelve “Clip Corners” - pockets of legality inside various institutions around Wales that are technically designated as land belonging to the National Library, where access to the materials is permitted.<sup>33</sup> Analogously, the Dutch CLARIAH Media Suite is inaccessible for the broader public; the only way to see the material is with researcher credentials under a Dutch education or research institute.

In this complex legal landscape, institutions and communities form ever-shifting and sometimes unexpected alliances. In the context of the Portability Regulation, the European Commission, consumer advocacy groups and American tech companies ended up pulling in the same direction, pitted against small film producers and national distributors. The European Union’s various institutions remain highly influential and frequently in conflict with equally strong-willed national governments, but other formations, such as the Council of Europe, the European Broadcasting Union, the European Investment Bank, and the World Trade Organization also play important roles.

## 2 Borders of Technology and Language

As far as borders go, the digitization of broadcasting and archives and the rise of video streaming services has therefore not so much entirely transformed the industry, as merely reignited long-standing debates about territorial

sovereignty, language and cultural identity, copyright, and subsidiarity in matters of cultural policy. Some of the new technical possibilities were “retrofitted” into pre-existing national frameworks and curtailed to match the established practices of local and national media producers and distributors.

Television archives are still notoriously difficult to access, despite the “beginning of a sustainable opening of the archives via digital channels” anticipated a decade ago.<sup>34</sup> In fact, some scholars argue that television today is *more* ephemeral and “resistant to preservation” than it was during the heyday of DVD and Blu-ray discs.<sup>35</sup> The interfaces and catalogues of streaming services competing on European soil are difficult to preserve and study. Inconsistent technological standards and formats hinder the interoperability of audiovisual archives, and questions of access remain central, as we discuss further below. Multilingualism – the continent’s pride – also represents a massive barrier that digital technology is yet to solve. As some of the contributions to this issue also demonstrate, linguistic hurdles operate at every stage: from production (where intra-European co-productions tend to be dominated by majority producers from large linguistic communities like France and Germany), to distribution (where subtitling and dubbing costs act as a strong deterrent against intra-European circulation), to preservation (where there is frequently no money to provide search interfaces, metadata and descriptions in multiple languages, even when copyright restrictions would allow such material to be shared across borders).<sup>36</sup>

Europe’s linguistic and cultural boundaries are frequently identified in scholarly literature as one of the primary reasons for the enormous fragmentation of what is nominally a single audiovisual market. Outside of a handful of large, integrated media conglomerates, thousands of small and mid-sized production companies exist that prolifically produce content that is rarely profitable and, on average, rarely seen outside of its country of production, and thousands of European streaming services compete with a handful of dominant US-based platforms. Even some countries that seem like strong audiovisual exporters on paper turn out to be distributing their productions almost entirely only to linguistically, culturally and geographically close-knit neighbours, such as in the case of Czechia and Slovakia.<sup>37</sup> Online streaming services have led to some tangible international successes and do provide, on average, wider cross-border circulation of films and television series than cinema and television themselves, but there are major imbalances here, too. As Petr Szczepanik documents in his meticulous analysis, “[t]he UK, France and Germany alone represent 60% of all EU films in TVOD [pay-per-view streaming] and SVOD [subscription-based streaming] catalogues combined.”<sup>38</sup> The promise of a borderless digital Europe remains stubbornly unfulfilled. Even though new technology and new market forces have reconfigured how media production, distribution and preservation operate, entrenched historical power dynamics and border relations endure. And like many of these legal and cultural negotiations, the recent efforts at mass digitization, and the value placed on that endeavour, relate to a fundamental archival concern: namely, that of access.

### 3 Rethinking Access, Rethinking Borders

Digitization is lauded as a solution to various barriers to access, as researchers can now search and use digitised records from various places and times, often in the comfort of their own homes. But there are different ways to understand access, as scholars in archival theory have explored over the last decades. What are these multiple meanings of access, and how does digitization fit into a more nuanced conversation about this principle? Does digitization fulfil the promise of erasing borders in the sense of overcoming barriers to access?

In 2001, the archival theorist Angelika Menne-Haritz posited a shift in the focus of archives from storage to access, and described this in relation to archives’ role in the making of collective memory, writing: “Archives do not store memory. But they offer the possibility to create memories.”<sup>39</sup> This active process of memory-making depends on users’ abilities not only to access archival materials, but also to engage with them meaningfully. This is reflected in Theo Thomassen’s definition of archival access, also in 2001: “Access is the suitability of an

archival system, at a particular time and place, for a user with certain competencies to interpret the archive effectively—within the limitations that the environment of the archival system imposes on that instance of use.”<sup>40</sup>

Since 2001, archival theory has interacted with various other bodies of critical literature to reiterate from different perspectives this already twenty-year-old critique—namely, that access is not just a question of technology and availability, but also of effective interpretation and meaningful engagement. In her book *Restricted Access*, Elizabeth Ellcessor draws from disability studies and critical media studies to argue that “access must be understood not in terms of availability, affordability, or choice but in terms of an individual’s ability to engage meaningfully with a medium/technology and its content.”<sup>41</sup> Evaluating access from the standpoint of disability studies, Ellcessor argues that technological developments, such as new digital search tools and archival interfaces, have the potential not only to overcome disabilities, but also to *create* disabilities by requiring users to interact with them in new ways. If we accept digitising media archives and making them widely accessible online as providing equal and democratic access, then there is the danger of understanding institutions as merely passive stewards of archival materials, while the burden of facilitating interpretation and engagement fall on users who may still be faced with various kinds of barriers to access, including physical, technological, geographic, linguistic, political, and more. Decades of critical archival theory have taught us differently.

Digitization has also been offered as a solution in debates regarding the repatriation of colonial and contested objects in museums and archives. For collections of physical objects, such as archaeological artefacts and written documents, there remain questions of possession and ownership of the authentic original object—but for media archives, the content of physical carriers are often understood as digitizable, infinitely reproducible, and still authentic and reliable. Is the problem of repatriation then solved by making things accessible online and thus avoiding questions of geographic, political, and historical borders, as is sometimes suggested? To the contrary, we (and others) argue that digitization-as-repatriation also potentially avoids important conversations about power, history, ownership, and control. Meaningful engagement with colonial and contested archives—including television, media, and other kinds of archives—requires a deeper understanding of how archival materials have been created, transferred, claimed, stewarded, and used in the production of knowledge, and how each of these interacts with colonial relationships and ideologies. In television and media archives, digitising colonial images and sounds for wide circulation could potentially bring them in contact with users who might shed new, critical light on their creation and their meanings; but it can also result in re-circulating and perpetuating colonial ideologies (see, for example, Temu Odumosu’s incisive critique of the digitization of images of Afro-Caribbean subjects in the Danish colonial archive).<sup>42</sup> Digitization alone does not bring contested archival collections into contact with the users and communities that can interpret them in meaningful and critical ways; it must be accompanied by outreach and active dialogue, and often by translation and recontextualization of materials and metadata as well. Moreover, the complex and often uncomfortable conversations about repatriation, restitution, and repair that digitization-as-repatriation sidesteps are themselves a way of engaging meaningfully with archival materials and with the colonial politics of knowledge that frames the European archival endeavour as a whole.

If, in 2001, the focus of archives shifted from storage to access as theorised by Menne-Haritz, then perhaps two decades later we are experiencing a subsequent shift *beyond* access—or at least beyond a singular understanding of what access means for all users and all archives. Undeniably, in this age of mass digitization, there remain barriers to archival access, including ones that will not be easy to resolve. But, while barriers to inclusive access are undesirable, perhaps this points simultaneously to the utility of borders: they exist because of historical, physical, epistemological and other aspects, and in some cases it is more useful to understand them than to try to erase them through technological or other means. The more nuanced conversation about archival access that has developed over the last decades may be helpful in holding a more complex conversation about borders and what they reveal about the world we live in, outside of the archive.

## 4 The Contributions to this Issue

In this vein, the collection of essays that follows represents a number of journeys through different archives—across, along, and against borders. Tracing a clip of Laika the Soviet dog through three digital archives, Mary-Joy van der Deure, Jasmijn van Gorp and Alec Badenoch suggest that making national borders in television archives visible—for example in metadata—actually allows researchers to better identify and understand transnational aspects of television and media circulations. Helle Strandgaard Jensen, too, identifies borders and barriers that she faced in television archives while attempting to write a transnational history of *Sesame Street*. Ultimately, Jensen's experiences led her to the need to create her own personal digital archive, compiled from gathered and (largely) self-digitised materials and “biased toward border-crossing.” Resonating with aspects of Jensen's findings, Marjet Brolsma and Vincent Kuitenbrouwer's contribution explores the boundaries of medium, comparing digitised archives of newspaper and radio materials created during the Nazi occupation of the Netherlands. Like Jensen, Brolsma and Kuitenbrouwer find that institutional efforts to digitise media archives tend to overlook the paper documentation that provides important context. While Brolsma and Kuitenbrouwer argue that this omits large collections of “audio on paper” that should be included in digitised radio archives, Jensen points out that researchers' DIY digitization efforts in archives for their own research purposes could be used by archival institutions to remedy such gaps.

The remaining articles shift from case study-driven Discoveries to broader theoretical Explorations. In their respective essays, Asli Özgen and Dalila Missero each reflect on their efforts to trace complex social histories within and across archival borders. Attending to audiovisual representations of Turkish migrants in Dutch archives, Özgen shows how the limitations of both archival practices and categories of social difference (nation, race, ethnicity, language) layer uncomfortably onto the border-challenging nature of diasporic experience. Missero's research aims to focus on questions of positionality, cross-border circulation, and transnational exchange in UK feminist video productions from the 1970s and 1980s, but ultimately she finds that the digital humanities tools intended to enable this, such as mapping technologies, present their own borders and limits. Özgen and Missero both make suggestions toward, as Özgen puts it, “work[ing] with archives against the archives”: in other words, using archival tools, practices and structures to challenge archival logics that keep border-crossing histories in the margins of the historical record.

The final two essays move from tracing narratives across archival collections to reflexive questions of scholars' archival behaviours and of changing research paradigms. Crossing into an information science perspective, Pia Borlund, Nils Pharo and Ying-Hsang Liu examine scholars' information-seeking behaviours in three European audiovisual media archives to identify barriers to archives meeting scholarly needs. They find that barriers remain in terms of domain knowledge, “archival intelligence,” and access to archivists' expertise. Finally, Grietje Hoogland revisits a 2012 analysis by media theorist Sonja de Leeuw of the “archival turn” in the Netherlands and then-ongoing efforts to digitise Dutch media archives. Taking up De Leeuw's predictions of how digitization would transform the landscape of television and media research, Hoogland investigates whether the potentials for transnational networks of connections and border-crossing research have come to fruition—with a focus on research published by *VIEW* over the last decade.

Taken together, the articles here suggest that while digitization projects have shifted many archival borders in Europe, and online availability has seen archival content re-emerge in several places (see the previous issue of *VIEW*<sup>43</sup>) there is no clear path to any kind of “new Renaissance” of borderless access to audiovisual heritage. Given the complexity of archival borders, the articles assembled here offer neither a map of Europe's shifting archival borders, nor any kind of passport that would allow researchers to pass them more easily. To remain in metaphors of space and travel: they can perhaps better be seen as a backpack full of useful items for our journeys in the archival landscape. What we hope to show as well is that archival borders are not merely barriers - though as the articles here attest, they are undoubtedly also that. They are also places of interaction and exchange, where technical, legal, and economic regimes meet cultures of scholarship, preservation, creation, and memory, and as such remain vital sites for our attention and intervention.

## Acknowledgements

The editors would like to thank Yasemin Bağcı for all of her hard work and collegial discussions as co-editor in the early phases of this special issue.

## Notes

1. Cinema has been a precursor to such initiatives within Europe long before the digital era. Already in 1991, the MEDIA Programme's Lumiere project aimed to establish a European Film Archive, a comprehensive database of current collections, and a joint effort to restore European film heritage. See Catherine F. Pinion, "Preserving Our Audiovisual Heritage: A National and International Challenge," *Alexandria* 4, no. 3 (1992): 155–70, <https://doi.org/10.1177/095574909200400302>.
2. Nanna Bonde Thylstrup, 'The Digital Dimension of European Cultural Politics: Index, Intellectual Property and Internet Governance', *Culture Unbound* 3 (2011), <http://www.cultureunbound.ep.liu.se/v3/a21/cu11v3a21.pdf>; Nanna Bonde Thylstrup, *The Politics of Mass Digitization* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2019).
3. Diane M. Zorich, Günter Waibel, and Ricky Erway, 'Beyond the Silos of the LAMs: Collaboration Among Libraries, Archives and Museums' (OCLC Research, 2008), <http://www.oclc.org/research/publications/library/2008/2008-05.pdf>.
4. European Commission, Directorate-General for the Information Society and Media et al., 'The New Renaissance : Report of the Comité Des Sages on Bringing Europe's Cultural Heritage Online' (Brussels: European Commission, 2011), <https://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2759/45571>.
5. Thylstrup, *The Politics of Mass Digitization*, 9.
6. Alexander Badenoch, 'Harmonized Spaces, Dissonant Objects, Inventing Europe? Mobilizing Digital Heritage', *Culture Unbound* 3 (2011): 295–315.
7. 'EUScreen Symposium - Reimagining the Future of Data Flows: A European Digital Public Space', 4 December 2023, <https://pretix.eu/euscreen/symposium-2023/>, emphasis ours.
8. Andrew Barry, *Political Machines: Governing a Technological Society* (London: Continuum, 2001), 127ff.
9. See also Sonja de Leeuw, 'Transnational Radio Research and the Digital Archive: Promises and Pitfalls', in *Transnationalizing Radio Research: New Approaches to and Old Medium*, ed. Golo Föllmer and Alexander Badenoch (Bielefeld: transcript Verlag, 2018), 171–72.
10. European Commission, Directorate-General for the Information Society and Media et al., 'The New Renaissance : Report of the Comité Des Sages on Bringing Europe's Cultural Heritage Online'; CIBER Research Limited, 'Europeana - Culture on the Go', 30 September 2011, <https://pro.europeana.eu/post/culture-on-the-go>.
11. Perla Innocenti, 'Introduction: Migrating Heritage. Experiences of Cultural Networks and Cultural Dialogue in Europe', in *Migrating Heritage. Experiences of Cultural Networks and Cultural Dialogue in Europe*, ed. Perla Innocenti (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013), 1–24.
12. In the Netherlands, see initiatives such as the series of Inward/Outward symposia, of which the Netherlands Institute for Sound and Vision is a co-initiator, which "investigates the status of moving image and sound archives as they intertwine with questions of coloniality, identity and race," <https://inwardoutward.nl/about-inward-outward/>
13. Carmina Crusafon, "The European Audiovisual Space: How European Media Policy Has Set the Pace of Its Development," in *European Cinema and Television: Cultural Policy and Everyday Life*, ed. Ib Bondebjerg, Eva Novrup Redvall, and Andrew Higson, Palgrave European Film and Media Studies (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015), 81–101, [https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137356888\\_5](https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137356888_5).
14. Giovanna Fossati, "For a Global Approach to Audiovisual Heritage: A Plea for North/South Exchange in Research and Practice," *NECSUS: European Journal of Media Studies* 10, no. 2 (2021): 127–33, <https://doi.org/10.25969/MEDIAREP/17281>.
15. Asli Özgen and Elif Rongen-Kaynakçı, "The Transnational Archive as a Site of Disruption, Discrepancy, and Decomposition: The Complexities of Ottoman Film Heritage," *The Moving Image* 21, no. 1 (2021): 79.
16. 'Large Project to Open DR's Archive', kb.dk, accessed 15 November 2023, <https://www.kb.dk/en/current-affairs/large-project-open-drs-archive>.
17. Jimi Jones and Marek Jancovic, *The Future of Memory? An Oral History of Lossless Video Standards* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, forthcoming).
18. Albert Moran, "Global Franchising, Local Customizing: The Cultural Economy of TV Program Formats," *Continuum* 23, no. 2 (2009): 123, <https://doi.org/10.1080/10304310802706932>. Also Schlesinger, Philip. "Wishful Thinking: Cultural Politics, Media, and Collective Identities in Europe." *Journal of Communication* 43, no. 2 (1993): 6–17. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1993.tb01258.x>.

19. Crusafon, "The European Audiovisual Space."
20. Hedwig de Smaele, "Audiovisual Policy in the Enlarged European Union," *Trends in Communication* 12, no. 4 (2004): 166, [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15427439tc1204\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15427439tc1204_3).
21. de Smaele, 164.
22. Petr Szczepanik, Pavel Zahrádka, and Jakub Macek, "Introduction: Theorizing Digital Peripheries," in *Digital Peripheries: The Online Circulation of Audiovisual Content from the Small Market Perspective*, ed. Petr Szczepanik et al., Springer Series in Media Industries (Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2020), 1–31, [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-44850-9\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-44850-9_1).
23. Lynne Viola, "Putin's War on History Is Another Form of Domestic Repression," *The Conversation*, March 18, 2022, <http://theconversation.com/putins-war-on-history-is-another-form-of-domestic-repression-176438>.
24. András Bozóki, "Mainstreaming the Far Right: Cultural Politics in Hungary," *Revue d'études Comparatives Est-Ouest* 47, no. 4 (2016): 87–116; Sanjay Sethi et al., "Systematic Suppression: Hungary's Arts & Culture in Crisis" (Artistic Freedom Initiative, 2022).
25. Lucie Česálková, "Film Heritage on Demand? Curation and Discoverability of 'Classic Movies' on Netflix," *Television & New Media*, August 1, 2023, <https://doi.org/10.1177/15274764231188932>.
26. See plans of both the Danish Ministry of Culture to make DR's back catalogue available for streaming on DRTV: "BREDT FORLIG SKAL SKABE TRYGHED OG FREMTIDSSIKRE MEDIEBRANCHEN." *Kulturministerie*, accessed 26 November 2023 <https://kum.dk/aktuelt/nyheder/bredt-forlig-skal-skabe-tryghed-og-fremtidssikre-mediebranchen> and the Netherland Institute for Sound and Vision plans to collaborate with streamer NPO Start: *Nederlands Instituut voor Beeld & Geluid* "IN MEDIA: MULTI-YEAR POLICY PLAN 2022-2026.", 2022. [http://files.beeldengeluid.nl/pdf/BenG\\_meerjarenplan\\_2022-2026\\_ENGELS.pdf](http://files.beeldengeluid.nl/pdf/BenG_meerjarenplan_2022-2026_ENGELS.pdf). Many thanks to Sandra Becker for pointing these initiatives out to us.
27. Directorate-General for Communications Networks (European Commission) et al., *Study on the Application of the Orphan Works Directive (2012/28/EU): Final Report* (Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2021), <https://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2759/32123>.
28. Simone Schroff, Marcella Favale, and Aura Bertoni, "The Impossible Quest – Problems with Diligent Search for Orphan Works," *IIC - International Review of Intellectual Property and Competition Law* 48, no. 3 (2017): 286–304, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40319-017-0568-z>; Merisa Martinez and Melissa Terras, "'Not Adopted': The UK Orphan Works Licensing Scheme and How the Crisis of Copyright in the Cultural Heritage Sector Restricts Access to Digital Content," *Open Library of Humanities* 5, no. 1 (2019), <https://doi.org/10.16995/olh.335>.
29. Directorate-General for Communications Networks (European Commission) et al., *Study on the Application of the Orphan Works Directive (2012/28/EU)*, 86.
30. European Commission, "Staff Working Document: Report on the Application of the 'Orphan Works Directive' 2012/28/EU," December 6, 2022, 13, <https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/library/report-application-orphan-works-directive>.
31. Jean-Claude Burgelman and Caroline Pauwels, "Audiovisual Policy and Cultural Identity in Small European States: The Challenge of a Unified Market," *Media, Culture & Society* 14, no. 2 (1992): 169–83, <https://doi.org/10.1177/016344392014002002>; de Smaele, "Audiovisual Policy in the Enlarged European Union"; Christopher Gordon, "Culture and the European Union in a Global Context," *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society* 37, no. 1 (2007): 11–30, <https://doi.org/10.3200/JAML.37.1.11-30>.
32. Ramon Lobato, "On the Boundaries of Digital Markets," in *Digital Peripheries: The Online Circulation of Audiovisual Content from the Small Market Perspective*, ed. Petr Szczepanik et al., Springer Series in Media Industries (Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2020), 51–62, [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-44850-9\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-44850-9_3); Pavel Zahrádka, "The Czech and Slovak Audiovisual Market as a Laboratory Experiment for the Digital Single Market in Europe," in *Digital Peripheries: The Online Circulation of Audiovisual Content from the Small Market Perspective*, ed. Petr Szczepanik et al., Springer Series in Media Industries (Cham: Springer, 2020), 101–21, [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-44850-9\\_6](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-44850-9_6).
33. Owens, David. "History Made as First National Broadcast Archive in the UK Opens in Wales." *Nation.Cymru*, March 16, 2023. <https://nation.cymru/culture/history-made-as-first-national-broadcast-archive-in-the-uk-opens-in-wales/>.
34. Leif Kramp, "Media Studies Without Memory? Institutional, Economic and Legal Issues of Accessing Television Heritage in the Digital Age," in *Media Practice and Everyday Agency in Europe*, ed. Leif Kramp et al. (Bremen: Edition Lumière, 2014), 243.
35. JP Kelly, "'This Title Is No Longer Available': Preserving Television in the Streaming Age," *Television & New Media* 23, no. 1 (2022): 5, <https://doi.org/10.1177/1527476420928480>.
36. Dagmar Brunow, "Curating Access to Audiovisual Heritage: Cultural Memory and Diversity in European Film Archives," *Image & Narrative* 18, no. 1 (2017): 97–110; Lobato, "On the Boundaries of Digital Markets"; Petr Szczepanik, "Channels and Barriers of Cross-Border Online Circulation: Central and Eastern Europe as a Digital Periphery," in *Digital Peripheries: The Online Circulation of Audiovisual Content from the Small Market Perspective*, ed. Petr Szczepanik et al., Springer Series in Media Industries (Cham: Springer, 2020), 159–80, [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-44850-9\\_9](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-44850-9_9); Zahrádka, "The Czech and Slovak Audiovisual Market as a Laboratory Experiment for the Digital Single Market in Europe."
37. Szczepanik, "Channels and Barriers of Cross-Border Online Circulation."
38. Szczepanik, 161. Also Crusafon, "The European Audiovisual Space."
39. Angelika Menne-Haritz, "Access: The reformulation of an archival paradigm," *Archival Science* 1 (2001), 58.

40. Thomassen, Theo, 'De veelvormigheid van de archiefontsluiting en de illusie van de toegankelijkheid', in: Theo Thomassen et al. (eds.), *Toegang. Ontwikkelingen in de ontsluiting van archieven* (Den Haag 2001), 13. Translation by the authors.
41. Elizabeth Ellcessor, *Restricted Access: Media, Disability and the Politics of Participation* (New York: NYU Press, 2016), 6.
42. Temu Odumosu, "The Crying Child: On Colonial Archives, Digitization, and Ethics of Care in the Cultural Commons," *Current Anthropology* 61 suppl. 22, S289-S302.
43. Special issue 'Curation and Appropriation of Digital European Heritage' edited by Abby S. Waysdorf and Eggo Müller *VIEW* 12 (23) 2023 <https://viewjournal.eu/27/volume/12/issue/23>.