

Northumbria Research Link

Citation: Innocenti, Perla (2016) Cultural Networks and Social Inclusion of Migrants in Europe: Heritage, ICT, and Participatory Governance. *International Information & Library Review*, 48 (4). pp. 274-286. ISSN 1057-2317

Published by: Taylor & Francis

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10572317.2016.1243963>
<<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10572317.2016.1243963>>

This version was downloaded from Northumbria Research Link: <http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/28960/>

Northumbria University has developed Northumbria Research Link (NRL) to enable users to access the University's research output. Copyright © and moral rights for items on NRL are retained by the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. Single copies of full items can be reproduced, displayed or performed, and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided the authors, title and full bibliographic details are given, as well as a hyperlink and/or URL to the original metadata page. The content must not be changed in any way. Full items must not be sold commercially in any format or medium without formal permission of the copyright holder. The full policy is available online: <http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/policies.html>

This document may differ from the final, published version of the research and has been made available online in accordance with publisher policies. To read and/or cite from the published version of the research, please visit the publisher's website (a subscription may be required.)



UniversityLibrary



Northumbria
University
NEWCASTLE

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis. The final, definite version is available in: International Information & Library Review, 2016, 48(4), 274-286, available online: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10572317.2016.1243963>

Cultural networks and social inclusion of migrants in Europe: heritage, ICT, and participatory governance

Perla Innocenti

Abstract

This study brings together and critically reflects on the social, policy and technological contexts within which cultural heritage institutions are addressing current challenges of social inclusion in Europe. It explores the role of cultural networks in helping institutions and their host societies to manage the tensions and realise the opportunities arising from migration. The concept of 'migrating heritage' is proposed to tackle this complex interdisciplinary research area.

Keywords: Cultural heritage; cultural identity; cultural networking; ICT; participatory governance; refugee and migrants

Introduction

In a continuously shifting and more interconnected world, Europe is grappling with new twenty-first-century issues, including globalisation and demographic shifts, internal tensions and financial crisis, new security threats, need for sustainable energy sources, and migration emergencies.

In historical terms, migration flows in Europe over the last decades are characterized by new complex geographies and temporalities which are increasingly leading to a 'liquid migration' (Engbersen 2012) with individualised and unpredictable migration patterns through the open borders of multiple countries. Fuelled by the needs of post-war growing economies, mass labour migration between 1950s and 1970s (Hansen 2003) was followed in the 1980s-late 2000 by immigration into Southern Europe, new East-West migration flows and migration from Africa and the Middle East (2010-today). The recent crisis of refugees and migrant from Syria, Iraq, Afghanistan, Serbia, Kosovo, Eritrea and other African states fleeing wars, torture and famine resulted in 'more than 1 820 000 detections of illegal border-crossing along the external borders' in 2015 (Frontex, 2016, 6). Thousands have died while attempting to reach Europe (IOM, 2015; European Commission 2016; IOM 2016).

Collyer (2010) has highlighted the increasing importance of 'fragmented journeys' and 'stranded migrants' as new features of global migration systems. Temporal dimensions of migration have also changed, with a shift towards mobility, temporary and seasonal migration more similar to 'transnational commuting than a migration which includes settlement in the country of destination' (Engbersen et al 2013, 961). Such temporalities, together with new migration routes opening up and the increasingly blurred boundaries between legal/illegal, forced/voluntary, high-skilled/low-skilled migration pose several challenges to integration policies. In a time of crisis, accuracy of information

and empathy of public opinion towards migrants is also being manipulated by politicians and media (Paulissen 2014). Europe has always been a land of (im)migration. However these migrants are increasingly seen by many in the countries through which they passed or to which they arrived as a challenge to the culture, identity and stability of European democratic societies. This is reflected in the recent exacerbation of anti-immigration laws and racist initiatives throughout Europe. Those who make it through the European borders often find that building a new life within their host societies is yet another challenge.

This research was borne out of personal and professional reflections on cultural identity, national belonging and transdisciplinary collaborations, as an Italian living in the United Kingdom and as a scholar working across heritage studies, library and information science. The intention to focus on social and human issues in cultural and information management was paired with the desire of contributing to public reasoning on challenges currently faced by Europe, by contextualising them within historical terms and real-life scenarios.

The purpose of this study is to investigate, identify, and propose innovative coordination strategies between European transnational museums, libraries, and other relevant public cultural institutions around the themes of European cultural and scientific heritage, migration and culture dialogue. During a first phase a theoretical and qualitative field research was conducted with 24 real-life case studies, 43 interviews with scholars and practitioners, meetings with stakeholders and policymakers, an international workshop and an international conference. Interactions, contexts and processes of collaboration from this first phase were analysed through several case studies (Innocenti 2014, 2015). A second ongoing phase is investigating information management practices for cultural policies related to migration, to understand how the actions of the European bodies may be strengthened, adapted, or extended to produce evidence-based policies for social inclusion and cultural citizenship. This article is looking at the progress of this research within the context of further social and cultural developments in Europe.

A European cultural project

Defining 'culture' is a vast challenge in itself, because multiple meanings were attributed to this word since the nineteenth century. Since cultural anthropologists Kroeber and Kluckhohn (1952) critically reviewed 164 definitions of culture and concepts of culture theory, scholars of various disciplines and policymakers have yet to find a common agreement on what culture is (Baldwin et al. 2006). Still, culture represents an enormous social and economic value; an enabling and driving force towards social cohesion, (re)construction and development. As UNESCO puts it, "Culture is the 'place' where society meets and discovers itself; hence cultural citizenship, cultural rights and cultural creativity are deeply interlinked" (UNESCO, 2013, p.34). However, we are also surrounded by evidence that human rights and cultural beliefs are sometimes in conflict with principles of equality as set out in the European Convention on Human Rights and the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights. From this perspective, processes of preservation and transmission of cultural identities require a necessary selection and appraisal. Which elements of cultural identities should be celebrated, and which should be rejected on the basis of human rights and equal societies? These are the true challenges and hard work of real intercultural dialogue and cultural citizenship.

Culture is one of the areas in which the European Union has competence to carry out actions to support, coordinate, or supplement the actions of member states (European Union, 2007, Article 3.3, p.13). The concept of a common European culture and heritage was formalised in the 1992 Maastricht Treaty on the European Union, and legally and financially framed in Article 151 of the

Treaty of Amsterdam. This notion of culture not connected to a specific, national community but rather as a common European heritage intended to legitimize the EU was reflected in an EU Cultural Policy (originally Article 128 of the Treaty on European Union, Maastricht 1992). A common European cultural policy aims at respecting the rich cultural and linguistic diversity of EU member states, while assisting and complementing their actions with a view to highlight a common European heritage (The Member States, 2012, p. 161). For example, in a 2013 speech given by European Commission President Barroso on “Culture: The Cement that Binds Europe Together” to an audience of culture-sector representatives in Vienna, the role of culture was emphasized as fostering a sense of unity and shared identity in a Europe “that accords a central place to the individual, to every human being, and to respect for human dignity” (Barroso, 2013). The European Union also promotes access to and participation in culture, cultural awareness and expression, culturally inclusive cities, and multilingualism through a variety of initiatives and programs.

On paper the European identity is really a “project identity”, “a blueprint of social values and institutional goals that appeal to a majority of citizens without excluding anybody, in principle” (Castells 2010c, p. 369). In practice, however, there is an intrinsic tension in promoting European unification by advocating at the same time a common cultural heritage and the flowering of national cultures and national/regional diversities. As the historian Tony Judt remarked in his masterly essay on the European Union, although cross-continental and intercontinental migrations have been and are now again a feature of European society, “there is very little tradition in Europe of effective assimilation – or, alternatively, ‘multiculturalism’ – when it comes to truly foreign communities” (Judt, 2011, p. 107). Moreover, the EU “project identity” seems to imply that both the European Union and a European common cultural heritage are a good thing. This leaves out of the picture the crisis of the European Union and European histories such as the Holocaust, genocides, scientifically justified racism, colonialism, and – more recently – disowning the binding principle of “non- refoulement”, a core principle in International Refugee Law.

The problems related to the definition and implications of European cultural identity and its semantic history have been widely discussed by scholars who have noted that there are many European cultures and identities, whose multiplicity would be endangered by the homogenising idea of a European common culture (Morin, 1987; MacDonald, 1993; Anderson, 1993; Delanty, 1995; Chakarabarty, 2000; Shore, 2000; Orchard, 2002; Sassatelli, 2002; Delanty, 2003). European collective cultural identity is being rhetorically constructed and fostered by the European Union via a dynamic, ongoing process of cultural policies and symbolic initiatives under the motto “United in diversity” (borrowed from the American motto *E pluribus unum* – “out of many, one”), which has become the canonical frame of reference for European integration (European Commission 2015).

How can this cultural multiplicity be operationally and practically implemented and supported, without being susceptible to self-referentiality and ghettoization? Philip Schlesinger warned early on that Europeanness “does not add up to a convincing recipe for collective identity” without an adequate place for culture (Schlesinger, 1994, p. 320), and Ash Amin rightly noted that, in parallel with EU promotion of a pan-European identity, “racism and xenophobia have become trans-European phenomena” (Amin, 1993, p. 15), increasing exclusion in the name of cultural differences.

From early 2000 the promotion of cultural diversity and intercultural dialogue has been one of the strategic objectives of the European Commission, within the overall ideology of a common cultural heritage the European Union. Cultural diversity, intercultural dialogue and accessible and inclusive culture were top of the six main priorities in the Commission’s culture work plan for 2010–2014 (Council of the European Union 2010), accompanied by cultural heritage as one of the priorities.

Culture heritage is also a priority in the new Work Plan for Culture 2015- 2018 (Council of the European Union 2014). At the same time the EU has been extremely active in “bordering, ordering and othering”, creating a biopolitical and geopolitical border ideology to effectively blacklist categories of aliens whose cultural and/or economic diversity is not welcomed (van Houtum & van Naerssen 2002; van Houtum 2013). The increased permeability of borders in Europe is still mostly concerned with the shipping of goods rather than the migration of those perceived as alien outsiders; those not bringing income as do tourists or business people (Houtum and Naerssen 2002).

It could be argued that all cultural identities imply a process of othering, and that cultural identities can either support or conflict with human rights. Hence the challenge is to manage inevitable borders in a more humane way. From this perspective what is an acceptable level of migration and diversity in Europe? What kind of cultural identities can be welcomed in and across the European space? How much of this recoding, narrating, and canonization of a common culture operated by the European Union mirrors or is influenced by the real-life context of cultural institutions across Europe?

The conceptual framework of migrating heritage

We are witnessing a complex mixture of shift and continuities from the classic identity-marking heritage of European nation states to a contemporary *migrating heritage* - a new concept introduced in Innocenti (2014, 2015). Cultural identities, which define what represents cultural heritage for us, are not written in stone but continuously evolve and reshape themselves, adapting to new contexts determined by contacts with our own and other cultures. Such encounters allow us to assess and to create our cultural identity. One key feature of migrating heritage is the drive to unbind identities and let them interweave in new networks, in new pathways of exchange and hybridization. Migrating heritage encompasses the migration of post-colonial artefacts, further developing the approach of ‘object biographies’ (Briggs, 1988; Gosden and Marshall, 1999; Joy 2009). It also acknowledges the migration and mobility of people, technologies and disciplines, crossing boundaries and joining forces in cultural networks to address emerging challenges of social inclusion and cultural dialogue, new models of cultural identity, citizenship and national belonging.

These new ferments in Europe reflect magmatic movements that are affecting the traditional roles of cultural institutions, including cultural activation and participation. For example, although they are tied to the creation of institutional identities, museums and sites are no longer the only places in which identities are being performed and transformed. An array of cultural institutions – with public libraries on the frontline – is increasingly being pressured to take larger roles in welfare and social services, and engaging with socially controversial issues. In addition to this, Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) have been bringing new possibilities and also new challenges to the world of cultural institutions, changing the dynamics and scope of cultural networking and of memory construction, display, and understanding in a networked society (Castells, 2010a, 2010b, 2010c; Benkler, 2006; Latour, 2010).

Cultural networks

Thanks to the World Wide Web and the widespread use of social media, ‘network’ is a widely used, semantically rich and potentially ambiguous word, both as a noun and as a verb. Writing from the perspective of an almost pre-Web world, Bruno Latour pointed out that the term network “clearly meant a series of *transformations* – translations, transductions – which could not be captured by any of the traditional terms of social theory. With the new popularization of the

word network, it now means transport *without* deformation, an instantaneous, unmediated access to every piece of information” (Latour 1999, 15; italics in original). In recent decades, cultural networks and networking have played an increasingly important role as infrastructures for supporting transnational and cross-sectoral cooperation and cultural dialogue, and creating cultural value. The concepts of transnational partnerships, cooperations and networks for common heritage projects developed in parallel with the conceptualization of a European cultural diversity and reached maturity in the mid-1990s. The Council of Europe and the European Union played an active role in this development - see Pehn, 1999; Myerscough, 1994; Gerth, 2006.

Leaving aside the wide literature on networks and cooperation management epitomised by Hofstede, Hofstede and Minkov (2010) and research on policy networks (Kickert, Klijn and Koppenjan 1999), there has been relatively little work dedicated specifically to cultural networks across European cultural institutions (Staines 1996; Pehn 1999; Yarrow, Clubb and Draper 2008; Goddard 2009; and Cvjetičanin 2011). Libraries and museums figure only marginally in those endeavors and are inadequately related to cultural heritage, cultural dialogue, and migration. They are historically separate institutional contexts and distinct cultures, yet their commonalities are increasingly important to their sustainability in a globalised world. In the last century policymakers and fund holders attempted to group and bridge these communities of practice through ‘their similar role as part of public educational structures, and their common governance’ (Trant 2009, 369). Some studies on collaborations between museums and libraries (Gibson, Morris and Cleeve 2007; Zorich, Gunter and Erway 2008; Yarrow, Clubb and Draper 2008), have highlighted the benefits for museums and libraries of joining forces and resources in a variety of areas. Museum studies scholars have begun to reflect on the roles of museums as agents for social inclusion (see for example Sandell 1998, 2002, 2007), focusing in particular on storytelling and actively engaging visitors in the construction of meanings. Extending the role that Castells proposed for museums, I suggest that cultural institutions have the potential to be “connectors of different temporalities” (Castells 2010d, 433).

Europe today offers an opportunity for cultural institutions to contribute to the shaping of what Mark O’Neill has called “cultural welfare” (O’Neill, 2011), not only at local but also at translocal and transnational levels. Cultural institutions are the historical collectors of cultural heritage, presenting collections to users within the frame of systematic, continuous, organized knowledge structures (Carr, 2003). They typically address public knowledge and memory and deal with the need to create a coherent narrative, a story of a society and its cultural, historical and social contexts. Cultural networks can be instrumental in this process because they have played an increasingly important role in supporting transnational, cross-sectoral cooperation and cultural dialogue and in creating cultural value. UNESCO’s notion of cultural diversity (UNESCO, 2001) and the Council of Europe’s holistic definition of heritage (Council of Europe, 2005) leave the dimension of interactions and exchanges between cultures to be further explored and defined; for example in terms of “cooperation capital” (European Commission, 2002, 83–4). Furthermore, the idea of a network, or system of cooperation, between cultural institutions based on a non-territorial approach is an appealing way of questioning and breaking through Europe’s geographic, sociological, and political borders.

A further dimension that calls for our attention is the possibility of moving the institutional focus and political discourse from the concept of “cultural diversity” to that of “cultural similarity.” European collective cultural identity is constructed and fostered by the European Union via a dynamic, ongoing process of cultural policies and symbolic initiatives such as the European Heritage Label. Verena Stolcke

has argued that this has led to an increasing “cultural fundamentalism” over the last decades, “a rhetoric of inclusion and exclusion that emphasizes the distinctiveness of cultural identity traditions and heritage among groups and assumes the closure of this culture by territory” (Stolcke 1995, 2). This cultural multiplicity also needs to be operationally and practically implemented and supported. Acknowledging various degrees of difference through the perspective of cultural similarity might represent a way to engender and support cultural dialogue, both in cultural networks and in individual initiatives. In the words of writer, philosopher and former Serbia National Library director Sreten Ugričić: “Through discovering similarities a relation is established, relatedness is established, mutuality is established. [...] Similarity means to make common, to communicate, to understand, to bring closer, to accept” (Ugričić, 2012, p. 39).

Heritage and ICT for cultural dialogue

In his influential book *Modernity at Large*, the anthropologist Arjun Appadurai identified media and migration as the “two major, and interconnected, diacritics” of his “theory of rupture” in our contemporary, globalised world (Appadurai 1990, 3). Media and migration have both a destabilising power for homogenised nation-states identities and a reshaping power of the cultural and of societal imaginings.

The use of digital technologies in the service of cultural heritage has been rapidly growing since the early 1990s (Hemsley, Cappellini and Stancke 2005). Digital technologies and the Web provide new ways of creating, managing, and providing access to resources and of redefining collections, whilst at the same time supporting translocal, transnational, and transdisciplinary networking between libraries, museums and cultural institutions. A good example is the EU aggregation project Europeana, an Internet portal launched in 2008 providing access to over 50 millions digitally aggregated books, paintings, films, museum objects, and archival records.

However, digital and communication technologies in cultural heritage also raise challenging questions regarding the convergence and integration of ‘memory institutions’, the arts sector, and ICT. How could and should cultural heritage be preserved, represented, accessed and disseminated in digital and networked environments? How can digital media be contextualised, interpreted and considered authentic? Who are the privileged users of digital literacy and who is excluded by the digital divide? How can cultural dialogue and social inclusion initiatives benefit from ICT and information management?

New interdisciplinary areas of study and of practice have emerged to circumscribe the use of such technologies to cultural heritage, such as ‘virtual heritage’ (Addison 2000, 2008), ‘digital cultural heritage’ (Cameron and Kenderdine 2007), ‘new heritage’ (Manovich 2001, Kalay, Kvan and Affleck 2008), ‘cultural heritage informatics’ (Dallas 2007) and ‘eCulture’ (Ronchi 2009, 9). The intention behind these definitions is to address new social, political and economic dimensions of sites, artefacts, and other aspects of cultural heritage. The definitions of these areas of study and practice have been evolving in parallel with the development of a normative definition of what constitutes cultural heritage, which over time has moved from the eighteenth-century European approach of preserving and collecting material culture and artefacts (Jokilehto 2005). Cultural heritage now includes significant buildings, people and objects, industrial buildings and sites, landscape and natural heritage (Bouchenaki 2004), intangible heritage (UNESCO 2003b) and native digital resources (UNESCO 2003a). The recent UNESCO conference, ‘The Memory of the World in the Digital Age: Digitization and Preservation’, produced a further advancement in the preservation and dissemination of digital heritage, with the UNESCO/UBC Vancouver Declaration (UNESCO 2013b). As

technology comes to play an increasingly crucial role in understanding and representing our cultural heritage, digitized and born digital artefacts become fragile and susceptible to technological change, and require interdisciplinary cooperation to keep it alive (Innocenti 2013).

It could be argued that digital imagining is the linchpin between 'traditional' cultural heritage studies and the brave new world of cultural heritage informatics, data management and access. However as evidenced by Preston (2003), since the early 1990s the European Union ICT policies has been neglecting social and cultural dimensions, reflecting an ICT market-driven focus and quantitative metrics prevailing at local, national and global level.

Participatory governance

A step towards a conceptually richer and more operational approach to participatory heritage was taken when the Council of Europe (currently 47 member states, 28 of which are members of the European Union) addressed these issues and provided a new framework for cultural heritage in 2005 with the so-called 'Faro Convention' (Council of Europe 2005). The Council of Europe Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society provided a new holistic and dynamic characterisation of both tangible and intangible cultural heritage, seen as important means of fostering democratic dialogue between diverse cultural communities (Council of Europe 2005, Art. 2). In this newly expanded heritage model, there is a strong integrated connection with the concepts of landscape, natural heritage, biodiversity, and environmental issues, which are the product of human actions and processes and whose conservation must be addressed culturally. The Faro Convention also introduced a reference to 'heritage communities' linked by a 'purposive commitment to specific heritages' (Council of Europe 2009, 10), and the concept of a 'common heritage of Europe', connected to the idea of open citizenship (Council of Europe 2005, Art. 3). It identifies a vision of cultural heritage based on partnerships and cooperation between various stakeholders to increase and deepen international cooperation towards heritage management actions (Council of Europe 2005, Art. 11, Art. 17), supporting 'the use of digital technologies to enhance access to cultural heritage' as an integral part of the information society (Council of Europe 2005, Art. 14).

Participatory governance and community engagement approaches have been also highlighted at policy level by UNESCO in its recent Florence Declaration (UNESCO 2014) and in the European Commission communication 'Towards an integrated approach to cultural heritage for Europe' (European Commission 2014). The communication was echoed in the Council of the European Union statement that "Cultural heritage is a shared resource, and a common good", therefore its care is a "common responsibility". It was also noted that a participatory governance to cultural heritage "triggering new opportunities brought by globalisation, digitisation and new technologies which are changing the way cultural heritage is created, accessed and used" (Council of the European Union 2014). In 2015 the European Parliament has adopted a resolution on the role of intercultural dialogue, cultural diversity and education in promoting EU fundamental values, which also "highlights the role of new information and communication technologies and the internet as instruments for promoting intercultural dialogue" (European Parliament 2015).

In the light of such technological and policy developments, how can public cultural institutions concretely and sustainably reaffirm their role in society to support cultural dialogue and social inclusion? Implementing participatory governance is a hard challenge. Canadian scholars compared international heritage policies and suggested that good governance in cultural heritage depends, among other factors, on a 'supportive democratic and human rights context', an 'appropriate degree of decentralization' and 'collaborative management' in decision-making, 'citizen

participation at all levels', the 'existence of civil society groups and an independent media' and a 'high level of trust' (Shiple and Kovacs 2008, 8). At European Union level, a voluntary process for political cooperation entitled 'Open Method of Coordination' (OMC) (Eur-Lex n.d.) has been introduced by the EU in the early 2000s with the aim of decentralising, engaging with local actors, spreading best practices among Member States and increase convergence towards major EU targets (initially employment, followed by social protection, social inclusion, health care and pension). However OMC has been strongly criticized (Zeitlin and Pochet 2005) for its legitimacy, practical value, and implications for the European Union. In my research I decided to take an approach that explored bottom up (at times grassroots) initiatives of collaboration and cultural networking fostered within the strategic mission of cultural institutions. Case studies were systematically analysed in their history, aims and vision, organisational structure, approaches to networks, partnerships and collaborations and initiatives towards cultural dialogue. Two representative examples are selected here to illustrate real-life practices of participatory governance, social inclusion of migrants and use of ICT to promote cultural dialogue and enhance access to heritage.

Performing cultural networking: Cité Nationale de l'Histoire de l'Immigration, France

Public cultural policies on cultural diversity differ widely between European countries, from the French model of 'assimilation and civic incorporation' to the Anglo-Saxon model, based on the concept of integration as an ethnic mosaic of different cultures (Stolcke 1995). The limits of the latter model and of UK Cultural Diversity Policy also have been recently discussed in the context of art museums (Dewdney, Bibosa and Walsh 2013). The Cité Nationale de l'Histoire de l'Immigration (CNHI, <http://www.histoire-immigration.fr/>) offers an interesting and much debated example to illustrate the application of the French model on cultural diversity and immigration (Blanc-Chaleard 2006, Murphy 2007, Arquez-Roth 2007, Hommes et Migrations 2007). CNHI hosts the National Museum for the History of Immigration in Paris, France - so far the only national museum of migration in Europe. The project to create a place dedicated to the history and cultures of immigration in France dates back to the early 1980s, after the persistent appeal of various civil society associations and historians. In a country where more than half of the population has foreign roots, this programme addressed all immigrants: immigrants of previous generations, the large number of new migrants arriving in France each year, and French people in general. In 2004 it launched an ambitious museum project to be housed in a contested formal colonial national landmark. The institution was designed to be a network of actors and a unifier of existing initiatives, a resource centre, and a showcase with a large permanent and temporary exhibition space. CNHI opened amid controversies in 2007 and was officially inaugurated only in 2014 with the new added name of Musée national de l'histoire de l'immigration.

CNHI addresses two key challenges. On one hand, as a national museum it leads historical and scientific research around issues such as the historical legitimacy and contribution of immigration, weaving them into the definition of a common French heritage. On the other hand, CNHI is a participatory place and a network whose partners (associations, cultural institutions, businesses, researchers, teachers, local authorities in France and abroad) actively contribute to the multimedia coproduction and documentation of cultural activities and initiatives. CNHI network acts as a guarantor of a participatory approach and as an online and offline unifier of initiatives for cooperation, dissemination and innovation (Arquez-Roth 2014).

CNHI collection of tangible and intangible traces of the history of immigration is partly based on civic participation and public appeals fostered by its network and cultural centre. The so-called

'Gallery of Gifts' (Galerie des Dons) represents an example of innovative, dialogic and participatory acquisition policy in a national museum which did not have a pre-existing collection. Each of the Gallery objects (fragments of immigrants personal life, often photos and household artefacts handed down from one generation to another) is connected to a witness and his/her personal testimony, exhibited in showcases discussed in collaboration with the lender or donor. Some scholars have been rather critical of the results of the museological project of the Cité National de l'Histoire de l'Immigration. For example Thomas noted that together with the Ellis Island Museum, the Cité is an example of 'normalizing and rationalizing the process of migration', of defusing and removing the economic and cultural threat of transnational migrants (Thomas 2011, 220). However CHNI has pushed the boundaries of museological projects and societal engagement with migration and gained some notable successes along the way, including the formal acknowledgment of the objects in the Gallery of Gifts within the French national heritage inventory in 2012.

CHNI's latest exhibition, 'Autour des Frontieres' (Gastaut and Wihtol de Wenden 2015), aims to understand the role and contemporary issues of borders around the world and to trace back the stories of those who cross borders today. Old and new borders creation, control and crossing around the world, stereotypes and prejudices associated with migration are critically discussed and addressed through a variety of media in the exhibition, including archival documents and maps, personal objects, artworks, photographs, videos, testimonies, literary works, and even an interactive digital installation to experience first-hand illegal people smuggling in Britain in a truck. The exhibition is accompanied by lectures, screenings, debates, and online resources.

In sum, CHNI is an example of participatory governance in action in a democratic society, engaging with citizens and civil organisations at all levels through collaborative management. A further case in point, shaped by a different national context but aiming at similar objectives, is provided below.

Experimenting with Art, Technology and Socio-political Engagement: ZKM | Center for Art and Media Karlsruhe, Germany

In Appadurai's framework, widespread access to media has both a destabilising and reshaping power. Through access to media "ordinary people have begun to deploy their imaginations in the practice of their everyday lives" (Appadurai 1996, 5), and thus found a possible way to resist globalisation and its homogenising forces. The ZKM | Center for Art and Media Karlsruhe (<http://zkm.de/>) embodies the focus on how new media in arts intersects with everyday life in our society, and offers appealing examples of how to engage and reach out in cultural dialogue initiatives. ZKM is a public foundation created in 1989, with the mission of taking forward the existing interactions of traditional and technical arts into the digital age. It is a successful example of how "art museums have to integrate the double role of remaining (or becoming) an independent institution and, at the same time, serving as a new political forum" (Belting 2007, 37). This cultural institution is a sort of digital Bauhaus with a rich technological environment, hosting under one roof archives and collections of twentieth- and twenty-first-century art, exhibitions and events, and a centre of research and development with various institutes, laboratories, the Karlsruhe University of Arts and Design and the Städtische Gallery.

ZKM has an educational mandate from the local government, which partially funds specific educational workshops. Since its creation, one of the goals of ZKM has been to collaborate and network worldwide with institutions of different scales, local, regional, national, European, and worldwide. About half of these collaborations are with museums and the other half with various

kinds of cultural institutions, including universities, research institutes, libraries, archives and broadcasting stations. Several hundred of its regional partners are schools, with whom ZKM actively collaborates. ZKM is also connected with the Ministries of Culture of the two regions in which it is situated; with research institutes, and with many music academies.

The Department of Museum Communication is the interface between ZKM and its visitors, partners, schools and other educational institutions. Educational programmes are prepared for specific targeted audiences – including a rich programme for schools – and a wide range of thematic events such as Open House and Family Day, workshops and multilingual tours in ten languages. Museum Communication is shaped by ZKM’s founding idea of engaging visitors and providing a critical examination of information society and new media. In 2012 this department also collaborated with two local schools, in which pupils do not speak German at all, and organised various ICT workshops for children and teenagers to assess pupil capacities beyond language skills.

ZKM | Institute for Media, Education and Economics, founded in 2001 as an interdisciplinary research institute, is dedicated to developing initiatives towards inclusion of all individuals in culture, education and employment. Its thematic areas of action include educational television and Internet projects in the field of ‘media and migrants’; the Federal Initiative for Integration and Television is located at the institute. This institute developed and implemented the project *Ağaç Yaş İken Eğilir* to bridge the gap between the integration of Turkish immigrants and the shortage of skilled workers in Germany, in particular in the Baden-Wurttemberg area. The project, supported by the Federal Institute for Vocational Education, is under the patronage of the German Commission for UNESCO and was included in the National Integration Plan of the German Federal Government. *Ağaç Yaş İken Eğilir* stems from an increasingly key role that more than 150 Turkish broadcast channels have for Turkish-speaking immigrants living in Germany and the potential that Turkish television. In cooperation with Turkish TV channel Avrupa, the project targets Turkish-speaking families, in particular children and youth, interested in pursuing vocational training or higher education. Since 2010 this TV channel aired a series of interviews in Turkish with German subtitles with Turkish volunteers and education professionals in Baden-Wurttemberg companies, with the goal of encouraging further education. The interviewees explain their career development path, the roles of parents, friends and siblings, and give advice and recommendations for family support. The accompanying website provides additional and detailed bilingual information on professional training.

At ZKM there is also the Department for Interreligious Affairs, and twice a year the Christian and Muslim community gather at ZKM for a collective peace prayer. In 2009, on the request of the City Council, these communities also held a successful intercultural and interreligious peace prayer in ZKM – an idea that came from the mosque and the Christian churches in Karlsruhe. Guided tours also take place every year with artists, scientists, musicians and with a Protestant and Catholic priest alternating each year. The latter are a type of dialogic-guided tours with usually older audiences who would probably not come to ZKM otherwise.

Conclusions and outlook

This study explores and develops further the dimension of interactions and exchanges between cultures, as defined by UNESCO’s notion of cultural diversity and the Council of Europe’s holistic definition of heritage. Despite the disconnection between EU rethoric and its actual implementation, within diverse socio-cultural, policy, legal and technological contexts, several cultural institutions are striving to promote mutual understanding amongst individuals and

communities of different cultures within and between them, inside and outside Europe. After all, borders are dynamic and are not only shaped by history, politics and power but also by cultural and social factors. Therefore borders are to be crossed and broke down not only at spatial but also at interlinguistic, intergenerational, interfaith, interexperiential levels.

European project is facing a severe financial crisis (already pointed out by Habermas 2012), its future sustainability is under discussion and historical unity seems to be primarily found in commemorations such as that of the centenary of the First World War and the cultural heritage of war. The Humanities in many European countries are also sailing through a storm. In the nineteenth century they were directly involved in the creation of national identities, today the Humanities are under siege by critics of their utility and market value (see Belfiore and Upchurch 2013). Meanwhile thousands of extra-European immigrants and refugees fleeing wars and hunger are trying to enter the European borders, fundamentalist groups are thriving and separatists movements across the continent are pressing for self-government and questioning their own national identities. During the preparation of this article our 'Europe à la carte' (Castells 2010c, 351) with different levels of integration has received a further critical blow. Following a referendum in June 2016 with 33 million voting British citizens, United Kingdom narrowly voted to leave the European Union amid heated debates at times misrepresented facts regarding, among other issues, immigration from other EU countries. The process to exit the EU is yet to begin, in a climate of political, financial and cultural uncertainties.

However crisis also represents opportunities. The way is open for once more redefining what culture heritage and cultural networking mean and how they could best help to manage the tensions and realise the opportunities arising from migration. We need more cultural networks such as the ones discussed for CHNI and ZKM, rooted within own local communities yet acting as unifiers of initiatives, cultural connectors of the 'spaces in-between' intersections of people, ideas institutions, routers for cooperation and dissemination, scaled up at national and European level. From an information science perspective, this is also an opportunity to refocus on its social and human dimension (Saracevic 1999) and reconcile quantitative and qualitative approaches to address research and cultural practices around migration. From an ICT perspective, digital technologies offer new ways of communicating, creating, archiving, access and interpreting individual and collective memory; the challenge here, as noted by historian Milad Doueihi, is "to work together on the modalities of a new form of managing memory, identity and knowledge, and to instigate an ethical framework" (Doueihi 2013). From a policy perspective, cultural heritage networks for cultural dialogue engage on theory and practice in the areas of collection and preservation, dissemination, creation, research, training and education. Further work is necessary to support evidence-based sectoral policies in these areas.

To conclude, heritage is active, it can *do things* in the contemporary experience of Europe, not least in the context of the recent migration. Heritage can be mobilized to address contemporary societal challenges, shift and continuities, tensions and crisis that characterize the European project and its cultural dimension today. Most especially we see that cultural institutions may significantly contribute to strengthening the social fabric towards open and inclusive societies, thus converting EU rhetoric into action.

Acknowledgments. This research was partly conducted as part of the activities of RF03 Network of Museums, Libraries and Public Cultural Institutions in MeLa (*European Museums in an Age of*

Migrations) 2011-2015, a research project co-funded by the European Commission under the FP7 Socio-economic Sciences and Humanities Program (SSH-2010-5.2-2), Grant Agreement No. 266757.

References

- Addison, A.C. (2000). 'Emerging Trends in Virtual Heritage. In *IEEE Multimedia* 7(2): 22-5.
- Addison, A.C. (2008). 'The Vanishing Virtual: Safeguarding Heritage's Endangered Digital Record'. In *New Heritage. New Media and Cultural Heritage*, edited by Y.E. Kalay, T. Kvan and J. Affleck, 27-39. London and New York: Routledge.
- Amin, A. (1993). 'Multiethnicity and the Idea of Europe'. In *Theory, Culture and Society* 21(2): 1–24.
- Anderson, B. (1993). *Imagined Communities*. London and New York: Verso.
- Appadurai, A. (1990). 'Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy'. In *Global Culture: Nationalism, Globalisation and Modernity*, edited by M. Featherstone, 295–310. London: Sage.
- Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. (Ninth printing 2010). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Arquez-Roth, A. (2007). 'The Cité Nationale de l'Histoire de l'Immigration: A Place for Partnering and Networking'. In *Museum International* 59, Issue 1-2: 85-96.
- Arquez-Roth, A. (2014). 'La Cité Nationale de l'Histoire de l'Immigration: A Central Venue and National Network; An On-going Challenge'. In *Migrating Heritage: Experiences of Cultural Networks and Cultural Dialogue in Europe*, edited by Perla Innocenti, 109-124. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Baldwin, J.R., S.L. Faulkner, M.L. Hecht, S.L. Lindsley. (2006). *Redefining Culture: Perspectives across the Disciplines*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Barroso, J.M.D. 2013. Speech 'Culture: The Cement that Binds Europe Together'. European Commission – SPEECH/13/280, 04/04/2013. Retrieved from http://europa.eu/rapid/pressrelease_SPEECH13280_en.htm
- Belfiore, E., and A. Upchurch, eds. (2013). *Humanities in the Twenty-First Century. Beyond Utility and Markets*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Belting, H. (2007). 'Contemporary Art and Museum in the Global Age'. In *Contemporary Art and the Museum: A Global Perspective*, edited by Peter Weibel and Andrea Buddensieg, 16-38. Ostfildern: Hatje Cantz Verlag.
- Benkler, Y. (2006). *The Wealth of Networks: How Social Production Transforms Markets and Freedom*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- BlancChaléard, MC. (2006), Une Cité nationale pour l'histoire de l'immigration. Genèse, enjeux, obstacles. Vingtième Siècle. Revue d'histoire, 4(92), 131140.
- Bouchenaki, M. 2004. 'Editorial: Views and Visions of the Intangible'. In *Museum International* 56 (221-2): 6-10.
- Briggs, Asa. 1988 *Victorian Things* London: Batsford.
- Cameron, F., and S. Kenderdine, eds. 2007. *Theorizing Digital Cultural Heritage: A Critical Discourse*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Carr, D. (2003). *The Promise of Cultural Institutions*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press
- Castells, M. (2010a). *The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture*. Vol. 1. *The Rise of the Network Society*. 2nd ed. with new preface. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.
- Castells, M. (2010b). *The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture*. Vol. 2. *The Power of Identity*. 2nd ed. with new preface. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.
- Castells, M. (2010c). *The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture*. Vol. 3. *End of Millenium*. 2nd ed. with new preface. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.
- Castells, M. (2010d). 'Museums in the Information Era: Cultural Connectors of Time and Space'. In *Museums in a Digital Age*, edited by R. Parry, 427–34. Abingdon and New York: Routledge.
- Cvjetičanin, B. ed. (2011). *Networks: The Evolving Aspects of Culture in the 21st Century*. Zagreb: Institute for International Relations, Culturelink Network.
- Castles, S., H. de Haas, M. J. Miller. (2013). *The Age of Migration: International Population Movements in the Modern World*. 5th Edition. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Chakarabarty, D. (2000). *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Collyer, M. (2010). 'Stranded migrants and the fragmented journey'. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 23 (3): 273-293.
- Council of Europe. (2005). *Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society*. Retrieved from <http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/Commun/QueVoulezVous.asp?NT=199&CM=8&CL=ENG>.
- Council of Europe. (2009).

Council of the European Union. (2010). *Work Plan for Culture 2011-2014. Conclusions of the Council and of the representatives of the governments of the member states, meeting within the Council*. Retrieved from http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/educ/117795.pdf.

Council of the European Union. (2014). *Conclusions of the Council and of the Representatives of the Governments of the Member States, meeting within the Council, on a Work Plan for Culture (2015 - 2018)*. EUR-Lex Official Journal 2014/C 463/02. Retrieved from <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=OJ:C:2014:463:FULL&from=EN>.

Delanty, G. 1995. 'The Limits and Possibilities of a European Identity: A Critique of Cultural Essentialism'. *Philosophy and Social Criticism* 21(4): 15–36.

Delanty, G. (2003). 'Conceptions of Europe: A Review of Recent Trends'. *European Journal of Social Theories* 6(4): 471–88.

Dewdney, A., D. Bibosa and V. Walsh. 2013. *Post-Critical Museology: Theory and Practice in the Art Museum*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Doueïhi, M. (2013). 'About Digital Humanism'. Institut National de L'Audiovisuel. Retrieved from <http://www.inaglobal.fr/en/ideas/article/about-digital-humanism?rq=17>.

EUR-Lex. (n.d.). Open Method of Coordination. Glossary. Retrieved from http://eur-lex.europa.eu/summary/glossary/open_method_coordination.html?locale=en.

European Commission. (2002). *The DigiCULT Report: Technological Landscapes for Tomorrow's Cultural Economy: Unlocking the Value of Cultural Heritage*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

European Commission. (2014). *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions. Towards an integrated approach to cultural heritage for Europe*. European Commission. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/culture/library/publications/2014-heritage-communication_en.pdf.

European Commission. (2015). *EMN Glossary and Thesaurus*. European Commission, Department of Migration and Home Affairs. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/what-we-do/networks/european_migration_network/glossary/index_n_en.htm.

European Commission. (2016). *COMMUNICATION FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT, THE EUROPEAN COUNCIL AND THE COUNCIL. Second Report on the progress made in the implementation of the EU-Turkey Statement*. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/what-we-do/policies/european-agenda-migration/proposal-implementation-package/docs/20160615/2nd_commission_report_on_progress_made_in_the_implementation_of_the_eu-turkey_agreement_en.pdf.

European Commission. (2004). *Many Tongues, One Family: Languages in the European Union*. European Commission. Retrieved from <http://europa.eu/languages/en/document/85/20>.

European Parliament. (2015) European Parliament resolution of 19 January 2016 on the role of intercultural dialogue, cultural diversity and education in promoting EU fundamental values (2015/2139(INI)). Retrieved from <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-%2F%2FEP%2F%2FTEXT%2BTA%2BP8-TA-2016-0005%2B0%2BDOC%2BXML%2BV0%2F%2FEN&language=EN>.

European Union. (2007). 'Treaty of Lisbon amending the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty establishing the European Community, signed at Lisbon, 13 December 2007'. *Official Journal of the European Union* 2007/C 306/01 50:1-202. Retrieved from <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=OJ:C:2007:306:FULL&from=EN>.

Engbersen, G. (2012) 'Migration transitions in an era of liquid migration. Reflections on Fassmann & Reeger'. In: M. Okolski (ed.) *Europe: The Continent of Immigrants: Trends, Structures and Policy Implications*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 91-105.

Engbersen, G. et al. (2013). 'On the Differential Attachments of Migrants from Central and Eastern Europe: A Typology of Labour Migration'. *Journal Of Ethnic And Migration Studies* 39 (6): 959-981.

Frontex (2016) *Annual Risk Analysis*. Retrieved from http://frontex.europa.eu/assets/Publications/Risk_Analysis/Annula_Risk_Analysis_2016.pdf

Gastaut, Y., Wihtol de Wenden, C. (eds.) (2015) *Frontières, le catalogue de l'exposition*. Paris: Coédition Magellan and Cie et Musée national de l'histoire de l'immigration.

Gerth, H. (2006). *EU Cultural Policy and Transnational Networks*. ECPR 3rd.

Gibson, H., A. Morris and M. Cleeve. 2007. 'Links between Libraries and Museums: Investigating Museum-Library Collaboration in England and the USA'. *Libri* 57: 53–64.

- Goddard, S. (2009). 'Heritage Partnerships – Promoting Public Involvement and Understanding'. In *Heritage and Beyond*, 141–8. Council of Europe Publishing. Retrieved from http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/heritage/identities/PatrimoineBD_en.pdf.
- Gosden C. and Y. Marshall. 1999. 'The Cultural Biography of Objects' *World Archaeology* vol 31 no 2: 169-178.
- Habermas, J. 2012. *The Crisis of the European Union: A Response*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hemsley, J., V. Cappellini and G. Stanke, G. 2005. 'Introduction and International Overview'. In *Digital Applications for Cultural and Heritage Institutions*, edited by J. Hemsley, V. Cappellini and G. Stanke, 1–13. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Hansen, R. (2003). Migration to Europe since 1945: its histories and its lessons. In: *The Politics of Migration: Managing Opportunity, Conflict and Change*, edited by Sarah Spencer, 25-38. The Political Quarterly Publishing Co.
- Hofstede, G., G.J. Hofstede & M. Minkov. (2010). *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind: Intercultural Cooperation and Its Importance for Survival*. 3rd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hommes et Migrations. (2007). 'The National City of the History of Immigration: What Public?' *Hommes et Migrations* special issue, October.
- IOM. (2015) *IOM Counts 3,771 Migrant Fatalities in Mediterranean in 2015*. Retrieved from <http://www.iom.int/news/iom-counts-3771-migrant-fatalities-mediterranean-2015>.
- IOM (2016) Mediterranean Migrant Arrivals in 2016: 204,311; Deaths 2,443. Retrieved from <https://www.iom.int/news/mediterranean-migrant-arrivals-2016-204311-deaths-2443>.
- Innocenti, P. ed. (2014). *Migrating Heritage: Experiences of Cultural Networks and Cultural Dialogue in Europe*. London: Routledge.
- Innocenti, P. (2015). *Cultural Networks in Migrating Heritage. Intersecting Theories and Practices across Europe*. London: Routledge.
- Jokiletho, J. (2005). *Definition of Cultural Heritage: References to Documents in History*. (Originally for ICCROM Working Group Heritage and Society 1990.) Comité international de la Formation. Retrieved from http://cif.icomos.org/pdf_docs/Documents%20on%20line/Heritage%20definitions.pdf.
- Joy, J. (2009). 'Reinvigorating object biography: reproducing the drama of object lives', *World Archaeology*, 41: 4, 540-556.
- Judt, T. (2011). *A Grand Illusion? An Essay on Europe*. New York: New York University Press.
- Kalay, E.Y., T. Kvan and J. Affleck, eds. 2008. *New Heritage: New Media and Cultural Heritage*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Larsen J., J. Urry & K.W. Axhausen. 2006. *Mobilities, Networks, Geographies*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Latour, B. (1999). 'On Recalling ANT'. In *Actor Network Theory and After*, edited by J. Law and J. Hassard. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Latour, B. (2010). 'Networks, Societies, Spheres: Reflections of an Actor–Network Theorist'. Keynote Speech for the Second International Seminar on Network Theory: Network Multidimensionality in the Digital Age, University of Southern California, 19–20 February. Retrieved from <http://www.bruno-latour.fr/sites/default/files/121-CASTELLS-GB.pdf>.
- Macdonald, S. (1993). *Inside European Identities*. Oxford: Berg.
- Macdonald, S. (2003). 'Museums, National, Postnational and Transcultural Identities'. *Museum and Society* 1(1): 1–16.
- Macdonald, S. (2013). *Memorylands, Heritage and Identity in Europe Today*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Morin, E. (1987). *Penser l'Europe*. Paris: Gallimard.
- O'Neill, M. (2011). 'Museums Access – Culture Welfare or Social Justice'. *Heritage, Regional Development and Social Cohesion*, edited by Christina Wistman, Sofia Kling and Peter Kearns, 14–27. Östersund: Jamtli Förlag.
- Orchard, V. (2002). 'Culture as Opposed to What? Cultural Belongings in the Context of National and European Identity'. *European Journal of Social Theory* 5: 419–33.
- Pehn, G. (1999). *Networking Culture: The Role of European Cultural Networks*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Preston, P. (2003). 'European Union ICT Policies: Neglected Social and Cultural Dimensions'. *The European Information Society. A reality check*, edited by Jan Servaes, 33-58. UK/US: Intellect.
- Ronchi, A. 2009. *eCulture: Cultural Content in the Digital Age*. Berlin and Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag.
- Sandell, R. (2007) *Museums, Prejudice and the Reframing of Difference*, Routledge: London and New York
- Sandell, R. (ed) (2002) *Museums, Society, Inequality*, Routledge: London and New York.

- Sandell, R. (1998), 'Museums as agents of social inclusion'. *Museum Management and Curatorship* 17: 63-74.
- Sassatelli, M. (2002). 'Imagined Europe: The Shaping of a European Cultural Identity through EU Cultural Policy'. *European Journal of Social Theory* 5(4): 435–51.
- Saracevic, T. (1999). 'Information Science'. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*. 50(12): 1051–1063.
- Schlesinger, P. (1994). 'Europeaness: A New Cultural Battlefield?' In *Nationalism*, edited by J. Hutchinson and A.D. Smith. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Shiple, R. Kovacs, J. F. (2008). 'Good governance principles for the cultural heritage sector: lessons from international experience'. *Corporate Governance: The international journal of business in society*, 8(2): 214 – 228.
- Shore, C. (2000). *Building Europe: The Cultural Politics of European Integration*. London: Routledge.
- Staines, J. (1996). *Network Solutions for Cultural Cooperation in Europe*. Brussels: European Forum for the Arts and Heritage. Retrieved from http://www.efah.org/components/docs/networks_ngo_5.pdf.
- Stolcke, V. (1995). 'Talking Culture: New Boundaries, New Rhetorics of Exclusion in Europe'. *Current Anthropology* 36(1): 1–24.
- The Member States. (2012). 'Consolidated Version of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union'. *Official Journal of the European Union* C 326(47). Retrieved from <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:12012E/TXT&from=EN>.
- Thomas, J. 2011. 'The Manipulation of Memory and Heritage in Museums of Migration'. In *Heritage, Memory and Identity*, edited by H. Anheier and Y.R. Isar, 213–21. London: Sage.
- Trant, J. (2009). 'Emerging Convergence? Thoughts on Museums, Archives, Libraries, and Professional Training'. *Museum Management and Curatorship* 24(4): 369–87.
- Ugrčić, S. (2012). 'Similarity (Meditation on a Utopia)'. In *European Crossroads: Museums, Cultural Dialogue and Interdisciplinary Networks in a Transnational Perspective*, edited by Perla Innocenti, 32–42. Milan: Politecnico di Milano.
- UNESCO. (2001). *UNESCO Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity*. Retrieved from http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=13179&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html.
- UNESCO 2003a. 'Charter on the Preservation of the Digital Heritage'. In *32nd Session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation*. UNESCO. Retrieved from http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=17721&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html.
- UNESCO 2003b. 'Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage'. In *32nd Session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation*. UNESCO. Retrieved from http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=17716&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html.
- UNESCO. (2013). *37 C/4 2014–2021 Draft Medium-Term Strategy*. UNESCO. Retrieved from http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0022/002200/220031e.pdf#485.13_37_C4_Inside_E.indd%3A.2_8951
- UNESCO. (2014). Third UNESCO World Forum on Culture and Cultural Industries "Culture, Creativity and Sustainable Development. Research, Innovation, Opportunities". Florence Declaration – 4 October 2014. CLT/CRE/DCE/2014/1 REV. Retrieved from <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0023/002303/230394e.pdf>.
- Van Houtum, H., T. van Naerssen. (2002). 'Bordering, Ordering and Othering'. *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie* 93(2): 125–36.
- Van Houtum, H. (2013). 'Human Blacklisting: The Global Apartheid of the EU's External Border Regime'. In *Geographies of Privilege*, edited by France Winddance Twine and Bradly Gardener. London: Routledge.
- Yarrow, A., B. Clubb, J.-L. Draper. (2008). *Public Libraries, Archives and Museums: Trends in Collaboration and Cooperation*. *IFLA Professional Reports* 108. The Hague: IFLA. Retrieved from <http://www.ifla.org/VII/s8/pub/Profrep108.pdf>
- Zorich, D.M., G. Waibel and R. Erway. (2008). *Beyond the Silos of the LAMs: Collaboration among Libraries, Archives and Museums*. Dublin, OH: Online Computer Library Center. Retrieved from <http://www.oclc.org/research/publications/library/2008/2008-05.pdf>.