Please cite the Published Version

Introduction

This article is concerned with the process, politics, issues and benefits of co-curation in the context of popular music heritage. In the past few years, co-curation has become a popular term among public institutions, including museums. Many of them use it to show that they are engaging more actively with their audiences. This corresponds to the acknowledgement of what Cornwall (2008: 12-14) terms a 'democratic deficit' and a subsequent call for more citizen engagement. The attempt to extend democratization into the creative sector has meant that curation is 'no longer the preserve of the museum or the art gallery. The term is increasingly applied to other forms of creative exhibition, including popular music' (Atton 2014: 413). It changes not only the notion of curation, but also the definition of the curator. In order to be able to discuss the new characteristics of the curator and of (co-)curation, it is necessary to provide a brief, but by no means exhaustive, overview of debates with regard to: (a) museums of material popular culture, and (b) community archives (including online archives). This distinction corresponds broadly to what Roberts and Cohen (2014) refer to as, respectively, authorised heritage (museums that received government funding), and self-authorised heritage (community archives). What is particularly important here is their discussion of canonical heritage as being authorised, and also the implicit ideology and power relations of heritage practice as identified by Smith's (2006) concept of authorised heritage practice (AHD).

Museums of material popular culture

Based on a research project that compared museum practices across continents through interviews, Sarah Baker and her colleagues have provided strong evidence for current trends and museum practices among curators and also suggested new frameworks through which to understand the curation of material popular music culture in the twenty-first century (Baker, Istvandity and Nowak 2016).

In the museum context, a curator is traditionally understood as somebody who has expert knowledge (as opposed to amateur knowledge). Their expertise is called upon when designing exhibitions, and they are paid for their work. Curators are the people who represent the institution holding a collection or planning and financing an exhibition. In that way, museums and curators represent the same set of values that determines the overall nature of an exhibition. The relationship between the curator and the artefact is fixed.

This situation is not fundamentally different when considering the 'new museology' (Atton 2014; Baker, Istvandity and Nowak 2016) and its dynamics, which often use the term 'co-curation'. The 'bottom up' approach of the new museum sees curators explore ideas of how artefacts can be responded to by audience members in ways that are relevant to their personal lives (see Atton 2014; and Baker, Istvandity, and Nowak 2016). Leonard (2007) argues that the curation of music-related artefacts opens up the possibility of alternative popular music narratives to be told. This should be possible to be facilitated in 'new museums' where the co-construction of knowledge is recognised (see Baker, Istvandity and Nowak, 2016). Such alternative narratives, however, are only allowed to exist within the ideology that the curator/museum represents and this corresponds perhaps most to what Baker et al. (2016) identify as a concept-based approach to storytelling in museums. This approach does not fit objects into a grand narrative but rather allows for the co-existence of several stories. Yet, all those stories are in response to the concepts of the curator and their choice of artefacts. Although the relationship between the audience and the artefact

changes in the new museum, the curator's position towards the artefact remains fixed, making it 'authorised heritage'.

As indicated earlier, co-curation has become a popular term for museums to advertise and evidence civic engagement. However, there is a problem with the understanding of co-curation in the museum, as the focus remains on heritage rather than the curatorial process. For example, in 2018, Birmingham Museum & Art Gallery invited six women who are linked to the creative industries to curate an exhibition on the British Empire called "The Past is Now". The intention was not to provide a comprehensive overview of the British Empire, nor did the exhibition claim to have an authoritative voice. Instead, it allowed for the voices of six BAME women to coexist (Wallis 2018). The overarching narrative, however, was determined by the museum through the choice of curators. Baker et al.'s (2016) concept approach seems fitting once more, as all power lies with the institution that holds the collections. Co-curation here refers to joint working between two parties, albeit on unequal terms. In this sense, co-curation can only confirm authoritative institutions'. Similar issues are evident in Manchester Museum's 2019 exhibition "Jallianwala Bagh 1919: Punjab under Siege", which saw two museums collaborate and, indeed, co-curate (Murphy 2019). This collaboration and co-curation, however, was in the context of a partnership between two authoritative institutions. As we shall see in the next section, the idea of co-curation and the role of co-curators changes drastically when discussing community archives.

Community archives
The examples in the previous section showed that curators in the museum context are still understood to hold professional knowledge and expertise, and co-curation only describes a collaboration between authorised institutions and/or people. Community archives function differently, thus changing both the role of the curator and the curatorial process. Roberts and Cohen (2014) understand community archives as self-authorised heritage, as they lack the authorising power that government-funded institutions and projects have. Based on such a distinction, the (public) position towards the curator becomes ambiguous. On the one hand, curators of self-authorised heritage might have the same level of subject expertise as museum curators. On the other, this expertise is valued against the existing authorising power. This poses an interesting question with regard to engagement in the curation process, as such engagement will either be deemed worthy and status enhancing if working with authorised institutions, or dismissed when working with and for community archives. Istvandity, Baker, Collins, Driessen, and Strong (2019) discuss 'third spaces' as an opportunity for communities of interest to be established and nurtured. This idea of a 'community of interest' (Collins 2019) seems fitting to describe a community archive, as it foregrounds the idea of a community to which every member can equally contribute. Some scholars have explored social media as facilitating the work of communities of interest online (see Collins and Long 2014; Long and Collins 2016; Baker and Collins 2015), whereas others have focussed on physical spaces (Nowak and Baker 2018).

What becomes apparent in the discussion of community archives is that the understanding of what constitutes heritage is no longer defined by an authorised institution nor authorised people (which would fit the idea of the curator in the museum context). The resulting discussion on democratized heritage is logical and necessary. And yet, the changing role of the curator(s) has not been sufficiently discussed in the context of democratized heritage. Collins, for example, investigates activist archivism (Collins 2015) and citizen archiving (Collins 2019) in relation to community archives, but he remains focused on the heritage

itself. Roberts and Cohen (2014) argue that self-authorised heritage projects have to deal with issues of sustainability much more than those of authorised heritage. Baker and Collins (2015, 2016) discuss sustainability issues for community archives, including founders, owners and administrators losing interest in their archives, which might result in the loss of popular music memories. Somehow, a distinction is made between those people who fulfil administrative roles with regard to archives and people who provide content. It is, however, important to note that both groups are co-curators. The first group, consisting of founders, owners, project leads and initiators, has identified heritage that is worth preserving. Furthermore, they have defined heritage with regard to place, space, time period or event for other people to recognise. Finally, those people have (through their choice of archive) defined the method of preservation (intentionally or not), and publicized the engagement opportunity. People who provide content might be as emotionally invested in the archive as the first group. They will contribute artefacts (material or immaterial) and provide the context (in terms of memories, references or captions).

When comparing authorised and self-authorised heritage projects, it becomes clear that the relationship between curators and artefacts is different. In community archives, this relationship can be defined by the emotional investment of their curators, also often described as affective communities (see Long, Baker, Istvandity, and Collins 2017; Long and Collins 2017). Although the 'new museum' similarly aims to establish affective relationships, in this case they exist between the artefacts and their audiences (Baker et al., 2016). This can partly be explained by the fact that community archives rely on the personal shoebox collections of their curators (and there will have been a reason why people keep their memorabilia in shoeboxes), whereas museums hold artefacts in their collections or acquire/lend them. The curatorial process, in the context of community archives, consist of an affective element that both motivates people to become co-curators of archives but also impacts on their sense of community and belonging to an affective community of interest.

In this article, I discuss co-curation in relation to the Lapsed Clubber Audio Map, a digital community archive that is publicly available (https://www.mdmarchive.co.uk/map/the-lapsed-clubber-audio-map). Using the map and its memories as a case study, I reflect on the issues that were encountered during the creation of the map, and discuss some of the key theoretical and practical implications that arise from this project, grouped together in terms of 'voicing heritage' and 'challenging narrative'.

The Lapsed Clubber Audio Map (LCAM)

In 2015, the author was awarded funding from the Heritage Lottery (Memories, Communities & Belonging: The Lapsed Clubber Heritage Map of Greater Manchester 1985-1995, Project Ref: OH-16-02562) to create the Lapsed Clubber Audio Map. The motivation for the project came out of a desire to preserve rave culture's heritage; a need that felt particularly relevant given the fact that members of this particular culture had been marginalised in the 1980s (in relation to drug use), and subsequently criminalised through the introduction of the 1994 Criminal Justice and Public Order Act. Of particular concern was the fact that the voices of the raving community had become silent. The recording of voices became the prime motivator to establish this crowd-sourced digital online archive that allows members of the original raving community of Greater Manchester to record, preserve and share their spoken word memories. One the one hand, many of them have reached an age at which mortality is starting to become a feature. On the other, academic debate is shifting towards an understanding of participation in youth cultures as a lifestyle

choice, one which does not prevent people from reaching life-course events such as settling down, getting married, or having children (Bennett 2013; Author and other, 2020). Those memories, then, can help to create knowledge about our current society in the same way as the creation of a new museum allows us to make statements about our relationship to heritage.

Co-production was introduced as the overarching principle of the project, which resulted in the establishment of a steering committee, regular online consultation through an established Facebook group, and workshops. The original project proposal saw a content-free map being created as the result of a collaborative process, with the aim that content would be added following the end of the project. Co-curation as a second principle was added at a later stage, when it became clear that the map itself without any content in form of memories would be similar to an empty museum or a Facebook group without any postings. This became particularly clear in a project workshop on archiving in which members of the community refused to follow the workshop's plan and instead made clear that all they wanted to do was fill the map with memories. For this reason, engagement with the map in terms of both listening to memories and sharing memories became part of the project.

Once it was agreed that by the end of the project the map should contain memories, concerted efforts were made to encourage members of the raving community to add memories. Those efforts included public events (to raise awareness, to train people and to facilitate the recording of memories), interviews (to be edited into bite-sized memories and uploaded by the project team), and 'pinning parties'. The character of these meetings is similar to those of Tupperware parties: hosted in a person's flat or house with an intimate setting, a 'sales person' advocates a particular product through application. At the pinning parties, a fully trained project member would be present to introduce the map by showcasing examples, to train the people that are present, and to facilitate both a conversation about Manchester's rave culture and the recording and uploading of memories. The LCAM was launched on 11 June 2018. To date, 377 memories have been uploaded. The map has had 5,743 unique visits, and 2,338 users have engaged with it. Visitors to the map can engage with it in two different ways: they can either browse the whole map for memories, or they can become co-curators by recording and sharing their individual memories. They can do so by pinning a geographical location to the map and giving it a title. As the name of the map suggests (Lapsed Clubber Map), most locations that have been identified are nightclubs. However, no restrictions are placed on the labelling of the locations. Once a pin has been dropped, people can record their memories. They are able to listen back to their recordings before uploading onto the map. Once the memory is uploaded, it is publicly available. Despite the immediate availability of the individual memory, a quality control process is in place. It allows the hosts of the map (Manchester Digital Music Archive [MDMArchive], who were the heritage partner in this project) to screen the memories for incriminating information, as the themes that people might want to respond to, and which are known to be part of a definition of club culture, can be of a sensitive character.

Implications

Voicing heritage
The aim of the map was to add both depth and breadth to the popular music history of the city by giving the members of Manchester's original raving community a voice. Nodding

towards Smith's (2006) AHD, many of the original ravers did not consider their voice (and memories) to be worth recording. It was unexpected to see how many denied themselves their historical relevance. The public events had to facilitate this 'voice-finding' process. Moreover, relationships with ravers and other invested people had to be nurtured. In Kettel's Yard *Conditions for Creative Communities* (2018: 10), they suggested that allowing time is considered crucial "to appreciate the nuances of our partners, community and artists", and they added (ibid.), "If you can, allow time to forge your collaboration to enable the process to be equal and inclusive throughout its development". Additionally, such fostering of a relationship makes community partners feel appreciated. Unfortunately, the 'short-termism' of funding (see Lynch 2014) makes it difficult to establish relationships with less vocal members of the community. If we want the voices to represent diverse backgrounds and experiences, we need to invest in relationships with members of the community that are less used to contributing and participating. Although the LCAM has now officially ended, it is only after the end of the project that some people were willing to contribute and share their memories; people whose contributions are vital for both the breadth and depth of the map. What has become apparent is that there are certain groups of people, defined by race, gender, social or cultural capital, who are used to contributing to debates and discourses through their voice. Those people are aware of the authority of their voice, especially when confirming a musical canon. Rave culture, for example, is often told through the voices of DJs, who might have a vested interest in the dominance of the canon and the confirmation of their social capital.

The LCAM contains memories from a range of people including former bar staff, glass collectors, security staff, drug dealers, hired dancers, regular ravers, or DJs. In order to give equal importance to voices from all groups and to validate their memories, LCAM recordings are anonymous. Although originally thought of as solving the issue of inequality in heritage practice, the anonymity of the memories led to issues of recognition and acknowledgement. Project partners, communities, or co-curators are usually publicly acknowledged for their work. The LCAM was designed to protect the identity of the co-curators. Instead, it emerged that many were hoping for a public acknowledgement in some ways. Some revealed their own identity and signposted to their contribution on social media. Others were hoping to directly link to individual memories on the map, which is currently not possible. Usually, users of any social media platforms measure their reach and impact partly through other users' responses such as likes or comments. This is also not possible on the LCAM, but has been discussed. On the one hand, it would benefit the communication process between co-curators and the audience, as co-curators would feel appreciated (see Open House 2018). On the other, it might lead to a particular kind of memory being posted. For example, many co-curators whose relationships needed to be nurtured admitted that they were reluctant to record their memories because they were not funny enough. A similar perception might arise if memories started to be compared with regard to their popularity. Adding a feedback button or enabling comments needs to be carefully considered.

Social media plays an interesting role in the life of an online crowd-sourced archive; on the one hand it can help to make a grassroots archive more public and gain visibility, while on the other hand it can reinforce inequalities. Many DJs are seen as the mouthpiece for their particular music culture. In that role, they are used to having and maintaining a public presence/persona that benefits from social media communication. This also applies to DJs from the original rave generation (mid 1980s to early 1990s), although this generation grew up in an analogue world. Herein lies the issue, as not every person from that generation is

familiar with social media. Even if members of the raving generation are familiar and engage with social media, their communication practices might differ vastly from those of younger generations or communities in other geographical regions. For example, consultation for the Lapsed Clubber Project took place via Facebook. When deciding on this channel, statistics were used that showed how other social media platforms cater for quite a different user profile, including age. Also, feedback and comment functions were explored, as well as the opportunity to use a social media platform as an archive in itself (containing images, comments, likes). However, we are aware that a single line of communication does not reach all members of the community. Some of the co-curators that we had to identify, find and nurture in order for them to give us their voice were disconnected from social media, as they continued to communicate mainly through analogue channels. Again, there seems to be a hierarchy in terms of how much power a voice has and how much this voice is able to influence discourses. Comparing the two positions, one being the social media influencer who is used to managing their public persona (including their voice), the other one never having been trained or practised in using their voice (on and offline), it becomes clear that rave culture is in danger of being misrepresented. This is because both types of communicator exist within the generation of digital immigrants.

Issues around digital literacy are potentially preventing certain groups of people contributing to the LCAM. Taylor and Gibson state that "digital literacy tends to be socially and culturally determined, meaning that the Internet cannot be an inherently neutral and democratic space for sharing knowledge and accessing heritage on equal terms" (2017: 411). The technology that was used to create the map is, at the time of publication, not yet supported by all browsers, nor can memories be added through mobile devices. When planning projects that employ the newest technologies, it is important to weigh technological advancement against inclusive practice. Through regular evaluation (Fowler 2018) it became clear that some of the reluctance to record and share memories stemmed from fear of technology. Although the project team responded by adding other methods (such as interviews and pinning parties), these had significant implications for resourcing and budgeting.

Challenging narrative

By inviting members of the raving community to record and share their memories, they become co-curators of an archive. Traditionally, co-curation is understood as a shared experience; one that assumes an agreed upon context. Such context arises out of a shared understanding of events, developments, experiences or historical interpretation. Rave culture was neither underground nor mainstream (Ott and Herman 2003), nor was it a straightforward subculture (McKay 1996). Instead, it was a melting pot of people across classes, races and sexual orientation who united in their love for new music (Author 2020). The LCAM is testament to this and shows how the rave discourse is problematic because of the heterogeneous nature of rave culture. Co-curation in the context of the LCAM can therefore be understood as a process that promotes the co-existence of varied, sometimes opposing, voices. Moreover, co-curation is neither confirming nor contesting canonical history. Instead, co-curation is changing how popular music history is represented. Rather than representing rave culture as a directional culture that fits into the chronology of popular music history, it is made audible as non-directional culture with internally antagonistic positions. As a result, co-curation challenges what Atton describes as "epochal history, where music is often considered as movements" (2014: 416). This challenge is

reinforced by the fact that the co-curators neither know each other's contributions nor do they share an overall vision for the final version of the archive.

Baker, Istvandity and Nowak (2016) identify storytelling as a common characteristic of 'new museums'. They argue that it is a way of creating an affective connection between a material artefact and a visitor's personal experiences. But how one can talk about collections in the absence of artefacts? In their framework, Baker et al. (2016) understand the material artefact as an object that still holds some absolute value but the new museum allows the audience members to relate to it individually. Regardless of the new, participatory culture of the new museum, the hegemonic value of the artefact is still transmitted through the curator's choices. In the absence of artefacts, the LCAM can be seen as an attempt to establish an affective relationship with the audience as well as the co-curators without the assignment of hegemonic value. In this sense, it is the affective relationship itself that is the primary purpose of the collection of memories. Capturing the core of an affective community opens up opportunities to describe and explain the sort of spectacle that Ott and Herman (2003) refer to as being the essence of the original rave culture before commodification. This method of enquiry corresponds to recent changes in popular music studies, which sees scholars starting to focus on the individual's experiences and their (subjective) judgements as a way to capture the core of a participatory music culture. Similar to the postmodern novel that features an unreliable narrator and is characterised by fragmentation and a lack of chronology, an experiential framework (rather than a subcultural) allows scholars to move away from a structural line of enquiry (see Author 2020).

Understanding those memories in the context of affective communities (see Delanty 2003, Duffett 2017), one has to wonder what it is the memories of the map are to convey. One of the debates that arose from the project is related to the aspect of truth/fact, something that had not been anticipated prior to the project commencing. The steering committee were forced to take a position because two memories appeared in the map, describing the same night at the same nightclub: the Hacienda's 8th birthday on 21st May 1990.

> Memory 1: (…) but nearing midnight they just switched everything off and all the music went off and the lights went up and we was just basically all told we had to go home. But no one was up for going anywhere, so eventually people start stamping their feet and in the whole club all you can hear people do is stamping their feet and just asking for it to come back on. Twenty minutes later after this the lights go out and Madonna comes on and the whole club just erupted and it went mental for the next four hours and I still don't know why they stopped it at that time [laughter] and told us we had to go, but it was great.

> Memory 2: I remember the birthday party, the 8th birthday party. Paul played it [the song] at about 10 o'clock and Mike Pickering wanted to play it as well, so he played it again at midnight and the balloons came down and it was an incredible, incredible moment.

In comparison, midnight seems to have been experienced totally different. One raver mentioned the light being switched off and no music being played, only for Madonna to come on stage. The other raver talks about DJ Mike Pickering playing a particular tune at midnight. Through archival research, it is possible to establish which memory states the correct facts. And yet, both memories convey something beyond the facts. Memory one makes reference to a dancing crowd responding in unison to an event ("in the whole club all you can hear people do is stamping their feet"). Additionally, the memory describes how

this nonverbal action on the dance floor constitutes communication ("just asking for it to come back on"). Also, we get a sense of atmosphere ("the whole club just erupted and it went mental") and duration of the spectacle ("went on for hours"). In memory 2, somebody makes reference to a song that they had a deep connection to. We learn something about the DJs' attitude to new music, in that they did not shy away from playing a song twice if they deemed it 'good'. Also, the use of balloons tells us something about a particular cultural practice.

The likelihood of one of the two memories referring to another night is very high, and neither memory appears to be out of kilter with other memories collected about that time. I would argue that in the case of the LCAM, fact-checking memories is the wrong approach for two reasons. First, it makes grassroots projects such as this even more unsustainable, as the archival work that would be required to check every fact increases resource requirements exponentially. Second, it will be possible to contextualise the memories in an experiential framework rather than a structural one that focuses on chronology and reliable narrative. In that way, the two Hacienda memories can coexist and issues around accurate memory recall can be ignored. What the map presents is neither just a collection of individual memories nor what Baker et al. understand as cultural memory, which is "the experience of, and subsequent memorialisation of the past by the collective public" (2016: 371). Rather, the term 'collective memory' seems appropriate, as it is the memories of this particular cohort of co-curators that is framed through the map. In their entirety, they are able to give a voice to a whole community.

The negative public perception of rave culture as drug culture, as well as its criminalisation and political condemnation, have led to this social and cultural phenomenon not being considered heritage until recently. In 2018, UK newspapers commemorated the 30th anniversary of the second summer of love. In the same year, Historic England included the nightclub Hacienda, which has strong links to rave culture, in its new heritage list entitled 'A History of England in 100 places'. Perhaps unsurprisingly, the Hacienda secured a spot because the places for music were nominated by the public. The historicizing of rave culture seems to have caused a shift in its assessment. Newspapers and magazines reported on rave culture in a historical context and often provided narratives of people's lives. Interestingly, those narratives do not centre around drug consumption (as did the original media campaign) but on discourses on youth cultures and subcultures. It comes as no surprise to see those old discourses resurface that look at rave culture structurally. They confirm Smith's (2014) AHD in that they show how the aesthetics of this culture have to remain fixed in order to be controlled by "elite social groups and official organisations and policies" (Roberts and Cohen 2014: 4). On the one hand, we see a renewed interest in rave culture. On the other, this interest is expressed in authorised discourses. I argue, however, that this renewed interest, as evidenced through media coverage, is also always an opportunity to challenge those discourses. Resources play a vital role in those endeavours, but to change the discourse about heritage is easier than to change what heritage is. Taylor and Gibson (2017: 409) state that "much of the attention given to democracy though digitisation has focused on the ability to reach larger user numbers, rather than how the discourse itself is created and mediated". Ideally, co-curation questions not only a singular narrative, but also the authoritative voice that creates such narrative. In the museum context, curators who select and present artefacts are valued for their professional knowledge. In discussions on community archives, this knowledge is often represented in opposition to vernacular or amateur knowledge of community archivists, thus devaluing a

particular type of knowledge. A certain meta-knowledge that allows for artefacts to be interpreted as part of a wider hegemonic discourse is absent if the discourse itself is challenged. And yet, the 'vernacular' knowledge of particular groups can become the source of new knowledge about wider society. The expertise of the content-providing co-curators of the LCAM derives from their presence and participation in club culture in a particular place at a particular time. It is only participants of that culture that have the expert knowledge about practices, rituals, or relationships and connections. Content-providing co-curators did not feel at ease to communicate this knowledge, as they did not consider their knowledge as relevant. This perception of vernacular knowledge is strongly linked to the perception of their voice being inferior.

When the internet was first explored for creating shared heritage through digital archives, people were keen to contribute their artefacts, as it presented a new way of communicating cultural capital (thinking about gig tickets, album covers and other memorabilia). Since the advent of social media, crowd-sourced archives are in direct competition with social media. In discussion with project volunteers it became clear that many prefer to post their artefact, including memories, on their preferred social media account. Imagine that you have finally made it into the attic and found that shoebox which contains your old reel to reels, photographs, and a few tickets. Before social media, a crowd-sourced archive to which a person could contribute through their expertise would have been on the shoebox holder's mind. As phones had not yet developed to take and store images, people would go through the effort and digitize their memorabilia because they were able to judge the (high) 'value' of their contribution. Today, photos are taken on the phone and directly uploaded onto social media accounts. This changed practice has a big impact on the role of the curator of crowd-sourced archives. If before the curator was concerned with the sorting and labelling of digital artefacts, perhaps even the quality of the images, now they have to actively seek out potential contributors and establish a relationship with them, convincing contributors that their contribution to an archive has at least the same value as sharing heritage on social media. This development poses a challenge to crowd-sourced collections and could be overcome if archives could be cross-linked with social media accounts (similar to the linking of, for example, twitter posts and Facebook posts). However, to do justice to the idea of co-curation, the efforts to maintain should be shared. An archive does not just survive through content provision but also through engagement with stakeholders, patrons or funders. Additionally, administrative responsibilities should be of concern to all co-curators equally. In doing so, sustainability issues (Baker and Collins 2015) might become less threatening.

Conclusion

In this article, I have discussed the process of co-curation in the context of popular music heritage. Using the Lapsed Clubber Audio Map (LCAM) as a case study, I have reflected on issues that were encountered both during the creation of the map and its population with audio memories. The first aspect that was elaborated on was the voicing of popular music heritage. Often, co-curators did not consider their voice to be of relevance, particularly given the hegemonic discourse on rave culture. Finding and nurturing voices is important for any project that aims to represent a particular culture. Unfortunately, the funding system does not cater for such intangible outcomes as establishing and nurturing relationships with co-curators. The authority (or lack of) was discussed in relation to ideology and a prevailing popular music canon. Although the LCAM hoped to minimise the issue by anonymising memories, other issues came to the fore. Co-curators were often hoping for public

acknowledgement, mainly through social media. Allowing archives to function in a similar way to social media platforms carries risks and opportunities that need considering for individual projects. A project's use of social media is also to be considered as it can lead to or confirm inequality (access) on the one hand, and increase popularity and traffic on the other. Related to this is the consideration of the demographic of co-curators. The LCAM is co-curated by people who grew up in the analogue world. As digital immigrants, some have embraced the internet, while others are digitally illiterate. Given such a demographic, it is important to discuss aspects of inclusion and exclusion, as a music culture might be misrepresented.

The second aspect of concern was the ability to challenge a singular chronological popular music narrative. Co-curation facilitates the co-existence of multiple voices without a positioning toward a hegemonic discourse. The LCAM allows for rave culture to be represented as a non-directional, internally antagonistic culture. It achieves that by removing the object/artefact from the archive and exhibits memories themselves. Those memories help create affective communities, which reflect a general move to try and understand the core of popular music cultures by creating collective bodies of experiences. I argue that the recent interest in rave culture should be used to challenge how a particular popular music discourse is created and mediated through, for example questioning the distinction between professional and vernacular knowledge. I conclude by promoting co-curation as a process in which all co-curators have an equal voice and equal responsibilities. It is to see founders, owners and administrators as equally important as content-providing co-curators. This could allow an archive to become more sustainable. Applying Roberts and Cohen's (2014) model of heritage, the LCAM is not easy to categorise. As a heritage lottery-funded project, it is considered 'big H' heritage as the funder itself authorises the 'object' (the LCAM itself is tangible). However, the curatorial process of the LCAM identifies this heritage as self-authorised. Finally, memories are considered unauthorised heritage. However, I would argue that the LCAM constitutes self-authorised heritage as it creates a 'place of pilgrimage' in order 'to give validation to the experiential, affective and embodied contours of musical memory' (2014: 12). The question arising from this project is to what extent self-authorised heritage is able and willing to challenge the creation and mediation of heritage discourses.