



University of Chester



This work has been submitted to ChesterRep – the University of Chester's
online research repository

<http://chesterrep.openrepository.com>

Author(s): Mark Duffett ; Anja Löbert

Title: Trading offstage photos: Take That fan culture and the collaborative
preservation of popular music heritage

Date: 2015

Originally published in: Preserving popular music heritage: Do-it-yourself, do-it-
together

Example citation: Duffett, M., & Löbert, A. (2015). Trading offstage photos: Take
That fan culture and the collaborative preservation of popular music heritage. In S.
Baker (Ed.), *Preserving popular music heritage: Do-it-yourself, do-it-together* (pp.
151-164). New York, NY: Routledge.

Version of item: Authors' final accepted version

Available at: <http://hdl.handle.net/10034/337190>

Chapter 11

Trading Offstage Photos: Take That Fan Culture and the Collaborative Preservation of Popular Music Heritage

Mark Duffett and Anja Löbert

“My memories live in a shoebox in the back of my wardrobe. Age yellowed paper getting more fragile as the year's go by but no less vibrant for the era they evoke. Symbols in biro, scene-setting in code, written in a dialect not of the author's own. Each a little window into a part of my past.

These are the letters, the photos, the ephemera from the first time round being a Take That fan. A box of crap. Or a box of little bits of love. Pre-digital ways of talking to other fans, analogue ways of building and sharing a world revolving around our boys.

I'm not alone in having such a collection. There are probably hundreds of us with these half-forgotten gateways to our teenage selves. The Thatter Exhibition at the lovely Kraak Gallery brings some of those memories out of hiding and transports you back to that world.”

(The Memory Girl, 2011)

In the first half of the 1990s, Take That fans took thousands of photos of the band offstage and traded them with each other by letter. This practice was by no means exclusive to Take That fan circles and surrounded other 1990s boy bands and Brit Pop groups as well. The fans who loved Take That during their first incarnation (1990-1996) formed a living social network of music enthusiasts invigorated through their engagement with a glossy yet academically glossed over end-of-teen pop culture. To what extent can we describe the photos and their social use as forms of self-

produced music heritage? In recent years a culture of nostalgia and the preservation of associated texts and artifacts has become increasingly pervasive (Reynolds, 2011; Fisher, 2013). A number of researchers have begun to think through the issue of heritage culture in terms of a more or less clearly defined distinction between official and ‘DIY’ forms. Using a study of Take That pop fandom, this chapter suggests that the distinction is sometimes not quite so clear. We will begin by reviewing some recent contributions to the debate on popular music heritage and consider the place of a specific example of a music heritage phenomenon. What follows will discuss the results of Anja Löbert’s empirical study among 438 Take That fans from around the globe (Löbert, 2014) and consider her 2011 photo exhibition in Manchester as a way of assessing the usefulness of the concept of ‘DIY’ popular music heritage.

Popular Music Heritage Frameworks

Andy Bennett’s (2009) discussion of ‘heritage rock’ provides some general pointers for framing our study because he discusses the connections between popular music and heritage. Bennett argues that ‘consecrating institutions’ (Bourdieu, 1991) associated with media industries have increasingly turned attention to popular culture. Where

heritage was once associated with the folk traditions that shaped geographic identities, it has now become linked to commercial products and the marketplace. Bennett uses this frame to examine an emergent discourse of ‘heritage rock’ that alternately draws on the genre’s critical canons and celebrates alternative versions of it. The first strategy is epitomized by the Classic Albums Live phenomenon, which stages the entire live performance of rock LPs endorsed by magazines such as *Mojo* as milestone recordings. Classic Albums Live borrows its rhetoric from classical music recitals and prioritizes replication of the musical text over the spontaneity of its makers. The second strategy is pursued by those who contest mainstream canonical discourse and use “DIY definitions” (Bennett, 2009, p.475) and approaches to preserve the legacy of bands whose music has informed those more widely celebrated than themselves. Bennett (2009) examines this in relation to the Canterbury Sound website and Songworks record label. He notes that heritage rock discourse can prioritize shared generational memory instead of nostalgia for specific historical moments or places. Bennett sees heritage phenomena as manifestations shaped by a discourse that emerged from a number of institutions of ‘retrospective cultural consecration’ (Allen and Lincoln, 2004). These include ‘retro’ music magazines, film and television, ‘prestige-granting’ bodies, the music industry and tribute bands. All of these have helped to reclassify rock as a heritage phenomenon in late

modernity. They provide a context within which ‘DIY preservationists’ can operate.

Collins and Carter (Chapter 9, this volume) extend the line of discussion by drawing on Howard Zinn’s (1970) notion of ‘activist archivists.’ They contrast private collectors with “activist” fans who “collaboratively construct archives of popular culture texts that might be ignored by those who curate formal archives or that are commercially unavailable”.

Collins and Carter note that such archivists act ‘politically’ because they emphasize that what they are doing is not a frivolous pursuit. In archiving texts they are also involved in the wider practice of preserving shared memories. In relation to this, Baker and Huber (2012; 2013) discuss the idea of ‘DIY institutions’ in more detail. They describe these as places of popular music preservation, archiving and display that exist outside of the bounds of ‘official’ or ‘national’ projects of collection and heritage management. For Baker and Huber such parallel institutions are staffed by volunteers and operate on donations or grants, but often aim toward the organizational structures and professional standards of their ‘official’ counterparts. They do not simply pool existing collections but are social, institutional structures which preserve items for public display or benefit. Baker and Huber see such community-based projects – such as the Victorian Jazz Archive in Melbourne, Australia (see Chapter 17, this

volume) – on a continuum between individual private collecting and ‘official’ archiving, noting that such institutions may sometimes champion specific community histories or forms of activism, but are just as likely to aim simply at creating a more complete picture of past popular music culture as it was lived. Such institutions are understood as repositories of culture guided by fannish values such as community self-representation, the development of social networks, and doing things ‘for the love of music.’ Baker and Huber (2013) explain that in DIY institutions, social interaction happens in ways that are rooted in a DIY ethos and sense of ‘collective collecting’ at community level (see Chapter 4, this volume).

Roberts and Cohen (2014) also attempted to outline a critical framework of popular music heritage, this time in relation to questions of authorship. They argue that heritage is a complex set of phenomena that operate within the context of other discourses. They also divide popular music heritage activity into officially authorized, self-authorized and unauthorized categories, the latter being, “heritage-as-praxis – that works in dialectical opposition to authorized heritage, or what we’ve more loosely termed ‘Big-H’ heritage” (Roberts & Cohen, 2014, p.244). Whereas Bennett (2009, p. 476) noted that in the case of rock musicians, “the music itself comes to be regarded as the primary focus legacy,”

Roberts and Cohen suggest that “music heritage increasingly encompasses a range of practices that are not reducible to ‘the music itself’ but linked to the wider social, cultural and economic processes surrounding the production and consumption of popular music histories and music heritage canons” (2014, p. 242). Cautioning against the “rigid binarism” of top-down and bottom-up forms of heritage, they nevertheless suggest that the point of devising categories of heritage authorization is really to explore their interplay (Roberts & Cohen, 2014, p. 243). In particular, an exploration of questions of authority and authorization raises issues about the ownership of heritage, as if asking whose heritage is being preserved for who’s sake.

In Roberts and Cohen’s schema, heritage represents an arena in which legacies are actively forged and contested. To examine this, they look at the placement of plaques as markers of heritage. The first example they offer is the controversy over whether English Heritage would commemorate the Who’s drummer Keith Moon with a blue heritage plaque (Roberts & Cohen, 2014, p.247). English Heritage’s recognized institutional status and narrow criteria for plaque selection place them as contested endorsers of official heritage. Like Bennett (2009), Roberts and Cohen (2014, p. 248) offer a series of music and media institutions which they say shape heritage along official lines, including canonical lists,

magazines, box-sets, documentaries, promotional agencies (musicians, audiences, entrepreneurs, organizations) and tourism industries. They contrast the official authorship of heritage created by English Heritage with the less staid processes of plaque development offered by the charity the Heritage Foundation. What makes such bodies different is that they often have to consider the importance of fan love for artists. Roberts and Cohen carefully note the pitfalls of such populism:

However, looked upon as another criteria, the extent to which a musician was loved by his or her fans is an extraordinarily difficult factor to measure. By definition a popular musician or artist who commands a devoted and loyal fan base is inevitably held with some degree of affection, hence popular culture, by dint of its popularity, automatically becomes popular heritage. Taken to its logical extremes, it is possible to envision a scenario whereby this more ‘democratized’ or free-for-all model of heritage eclipses the very culture to which it seeks to pay tribute: heritage culture (or cultural heritage) as a self-sustaining industry: pop indeed eating itself. The material analogue of this future vision of mass heritage pandemic is the spectacle of commemorative plaques breaking out like pustules on the façade of every other building. (2014, p. 250)

The discussion here is reminiscent of Simon Reynolds’ book *Retromania* (2011) which describes popular music culture as “repeating itself” in a recent avalanche of nostalgic documentaries, reunions, museum exhibits and re-enactments. What is interesting, however is first that commercial populist processes still have a selection mechanism built in – whether sales figures or commercial charts – and that as a social phenomenon heritage is not simply a reflection of fan love, but of sociocultural stasis

(see Fisher, 2013). After all, fans of popular cultural forms were vocal about their passions in the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s, the high modern era where heritage concerns were not as pervasive as they are now under neoliberalism. Nevertheless, the elitist assumptions embedded in some of the language that Roberts and Cohen use (eg. “pandemic,” “pustules”) come not from them but rather from official heritage itself, as a selective process. The authors contrast this by examining the case of graffiti found in a Soho flat that was once occupied by the Sex Pistol John Lydon. The case of audience-made markings raises issues for Roberts and Cohen (2014, p. 256) of ‘anti-plaques,’ and even punk ‘anti-heritage’: the notion that a revolutionary or even simply present-focused music genre should not fall into the trap of celebrating the past. The authors conclude by suggesting that different formations of heritage may suggest that there is an issue over “just how meaningful authorized popular music heritage discourses are in terms of how individuals celebrate and curate their own musical memories” (Roberts & Cohen, 2014, p.258).

The range of scholarship discussed here positions music heritage in part as a set of ‘DIY’ activities, institutions, oppositional politics or cultural forms. What these various pieces have in common is that they both explore a terrain in which ‘official’ and ‘DIY’ or grassroots heritage activities are to some extent contrasted, and in which they also tend to

reflect conventional structures of cultural capital, either by celebrating cultural forms more widely recognized as worthy of remembering (heritage rock, punk, jazz) or by finding associated antecedents. Where other cultures are archived or displayed, they are preserved under a framework of historical completism or actively contesting attributions of triviality. Viewed from the perspectives associated with cultural studies and fan studies, there may be theoretical reasons to consider other heritage activity as less contrasting than the emerging discussion suggests. Specifically, pop fandom exists in relation to a context that includes the production and consumption of commercial culture. While it cannot be reduced to those concerns, neither is it entirely a folk or oppositional form. To align it with resistance – in this case resisting the official narratives of the heritage industry or the ways in which commerce can itself enshrine memory – misses the acts of collusion and mutual support that can also occur.

Take That ‘Offstage Photos’

In 2010 and 2011, Anja Löbert conducted an empirical survey of 438 participants from the early to mid-1990s Take That fan penpal scene, a virtually all-female scene which exchanged letters and swapped Take

That-related material through the post. The fan community was distinctly international in scope: 72% reported to have had penfriends in the UK, 64% in Germany, 35% in Italy, 29% in the Netherlands and around 20% in each Spain, France and Belgium. Other countries further afield also featured prominently, such as Australia, the USA, Japan, Chile and Thailand. Löbert's study of Take That fans suggested that the pursuit of fannish "intimacy" with famous people demanded investigation as it became the premise of further interactions between fans. Fans were eager to have a contact person in places where Take That were famous and went on tour, so that they could be sent posters, newspaper clippings, and offstage photos from those countries in exchange for duplicate items from their own collection. On average, each member of the scene had 25 penfriends and received 9 letters per week. Nine out of 10 members of the scene said they collected photos of Take That. Featuring most prominently among those were so-called 'offstage photos'.

'Offstage photos' was the term that members of the scene used to refer to self-taken pictures of the members of Take That. They were candid pictures taken of the band outside or inside of hotels, outside venues and radio or TV stations, or even outside their private homes.

Back in the 1990s, trading Take That offstage photos began as a form of offline participatory culture: a means of social networking that mediated between fan competition and friendship by facilitating shared pleasures. 76% of the respondents exchanged offstage photos. Traded primarily in glossy 4” by 6” format, these informal photos were chosen by 46% of respondents as the “thing they most liked to receive from their penpals,” making these photos the most popular exchange item, followed at a remote second by videos (15%). The average member of the scene owned 295 offstage photos. The unwritten rule within the community was anyone sending something rare and valuable, deserved equally valuable items in return. For example one respondent wrote, “I only sent photos to people who sent good photos back.”

There was a profound disparity between supply and demand of these rare ‘real life’ pictures: While over three quarters of the girls surveyed said they swapped offstage photos of Take That, only 18% actually owned ‘original’ photos which they had taken themselves when meeting Take That. In other words, only about every fifth member of the scene owned the all-important negatives. This comparatively low percentage makes sense if we consider that being able to follow and get near to Take That required that a teenager could afford to do so, that she had her parents’ permission, was located in a particular country and possessed the inside

knowledge and connections to even trace the boys. Only a minority of fans was able to do that.

In order to conjure up offstage photos to swap - despite the owner never having met the band - fans made copies of the authentic pictures they received from others. This practice was frowned upon by the owners of original photos, who invariably tried to protect their copyright by writing “No copies, please” on the backs of the photos they sent to their penpals.

In different contexts the trade in these photos could involve giving, swapping or buying – a fact that did not make it simply a “gift economy.”

One fan explained:

Another thing we used to do in Spain was buying pictures from fans. Sometimes, we met on the weekends with a group of fans from our own city and spent evenings looking through each other’s albums, we picked our favourite member pictures and bought them. (Eve M., Spain)

The female Take That fans had been dedicated collectors of a certain kind.

What is interesting is that discussions in popular music studies about collecting as a practice frequently relate it to male-dominated cultures and vinyl record collecting (see Straw 1997; Shuker 2011). Some of the original female fans who had taken and traded the much-prized photographs of their heroes still had them amongst their possessions well

over a decade later and could contribute them to Anja's study and Manchester exhibition. Indeed, as part of her survey Anja found that 81% of the members of the scene still had the photos they bartered in the 1990s in their possession and that 38% of those who had taken photos had kept the negatives. They had not relinquished these self-taken images or thrown them away. Instead, they continued to value these items, even if they were rarely, if at all, any longer circulated between fans or displayed in the public sphere. As the blogger in the epigraph beginning articles put it: "My memories live in a shoebox in the back of my wardrobe."

Offstage Photo Trade as Heritage Practice

The trading of offstage photographs formed a living culture in the 1990s and its material trace had an interesting relationship to music heritage. On one hand, taking a photograph is a voluntary and automatic act of preservation. Writers such as Susan Sontag (2002 [1971]) and Roland Barthes (2000 [1980]) have explored the nature of photographing as a ubiquitous practice and noted various contrasting facets of the medium. The photography acts to frame its subjects, highlighting and making them important. It allows what is unique to be reproduced. If the medium itself

offers opportunity for expression, it seems to do this through capturing rather than copying reality. Photographs “are a way of imprisoning reality” (Sontag, 2002 [1971]: 163). They therefore allow a very particular kind of spectatorial knowing. Photography invites us to visually experience lives, events, times and spaces that would otherwise necessarily exclude us. The images that it creates “now provide most of the knowledge people have about the look of the past and the reach of the present” (Sontag 2002 [1971], p. 6). Photographed subjects, in their looks, can evoke certain propriety or interiority, keeping emotions within themselves or giving them away (Barthes, 2000 [1980], p. 114). Captured images “do not seem to be statements about the world so much as pieces of it, miniatures of reality that anyone can make or acquire” (Sontag 2002 [1971], p. 4). Photography is therefore a form of *surrogate possession*, letting us keep a slice of time and space as our own. However, it is also a form of quotation, in that photographs encourage us to empathize with the perspective of those who take them. Their images make us feel closer not only to the pictured subjects, but also to the takers. Photography also shows that the photographer *was there*. It is an active process, transforming the subjects who do it (photographers) from passive spectators to active recorders – a point that is particularly important given that female pop fans have often been mistaken for passive consumers of music. Taking pictures is thus an event in itself: one that refuses to fully

intervene in present activity, but that subordinates the present to its future representation (Sontag, 2002 [1971], p. 11). It is therefore also associated with dissociation, nostalgia and loss.

On the other hand, pop music has traditionally been understood as indicative of the ephemeral blooming of each new post-war generation. Young pop fans have often understood themselves as participating in a social process that unfolds in the present moment and shapes public opinion about their artist. Take That fans responding to the questionnaire emphasized the photos as reflections of a present moment:

I have to say that I really looooooovved to swap offstage photos because it allowed me to see a part of the boys that you couldn't see on stage or in interviews. For me it was the “real life.” I always had that feeling. You could see them getting in touch with fans, how they reacted in front of them, or just to see them being spontaneous with fans. (Eve M., Spain)

In principle, the idea was to take nice offstage photos yourself, and then swap these with other people for their offstage pictures. I think that, behind all this, there was the desire to take a peek into the boys’ “real” lives. Through these pictures you had the feeling, at least for a short moment, that you were looking into their “private life.” It was nicest when the photos were taken by your pen pal herself, and there was a “story” behind them. Pictures that had been copied and recopied a thousand times over were practically worthless. (Kathrin H., Germany)

What these responses highlight is that offstage photographs of Take That were not taken by fans with an eye to them becoming historical artefacts.

In fact, these images and the practices surrounding them, have only become 'heritage' when claimed (or rather reclaimed) in recent times for a new purpose that now positions them as such.

When fans circulated the photos between them in the early 1990s, Take That were still actively releasing records and touring. By 2002 Tara Brabazon observed that the organized faction of Take That's fan culture had almost slipped into non-existence:

Take That split in early 1996. The fan allegiance evaporated very quickly. While a Take That Appreciation Page survives on the web, the bulletin board shows highly intermittent messages. There are very few regular members, so few that an event scheduled to commemorate the group's dissolution became embarrassing in its unpopularity:

It is with much sadness that we have to announce that the 2001 Thatters Reunion has been cancelled due to lack of response. We are very surprised that so few Thatters wanted to get together to remember the guys on the 5th anniversary of their split, but we guess a lot of fans have moved on. We have received a total of 25 payments so far but unfortunately because we have to pay the hotel by the end of February, we cannot wait any longer to see if more fans will be coming.

Melancholy punctuates this message. There is a tragedy in establishing a relic of youth that no one visits. It is a virtual ghost town. This vacant fandom is odd, not only when considering the place of Take That in recent memory, but also the current fame of Robbie Williams. His present fans practice textual amnesia about his boy band past. 'Thatmania' has disappeared even faster than the Duranmania, Rollermania and Beatlemania. (Brabazon, 2002, p, 8)

This suggests that Take That fandom operated as a living culture. Although each photo represented a moment or memory that was later shared, its trading was still part of a fan practice based on a fascination with present-time celebrity intimacy. The domestic mass adoption of the Internet had little effect in maintaining an organized fan community following the band's split, when the existence of some other fan bases – Beatles fandom, for example (see Chapter 10, this volume) – have appeared more continuous. Take That's break up did not quickly translate into developing heritage practices around the band. Neither did the coming of online archives or a more pervasive nostalgia culture. Indeed, the example from Brabazon indicates early memory sites and activities were unsustainable. It was not until Take That's reunion as a five-piece act in 2010/11 that heritage practices around the band began to come to full fruition.

In the context of fans pursuing heritage practices, it is relevant here to consider Baker and Huber's (2013, p.528, footnote 7) comment on the work of Leadbeater and Miller (2004):

Leadbeater and Miller's report on the 'Pro-Am Revolution' (2004) noted the increasing cultural importance of amateurs who acquire skills that approach those of professionals. However, we connect these DIY institutions to this broad trend with the caveat that many of the people involved in running the institutions we investigate did not necessarily begin with the intention of becoming professional

amateurs.

The issue of ‘intent’ is interesting, because it brings into focus why people pursue heritage projects in the first place. It could be argued that while there are various reasons for music heritage preservation, in some instances one of the primary motivations is a fannish one: to keep alive the memory of particular performers, to celebrate their talents and help more people reflect upon their connection with them. Crucial to this is that people do not begin their heritage practice with the intent of developing capacities as Pro-Am curators or archivists. Rather, they started as fans and their fandom became a motivation for developing these other roles. There may even be a sense in which heritage preservation is not a predisposition primarily chosen by pop fans in relation to their object, but is, rather, something ‘forced’ upon them with the passage of time.

Fans, Aca/Fen and the complexities of popular music heritage

Anja Löbert’s research led to the creation of an exhibition curated in affiliation with the University of Salford. It was advertised on a website < <http://www.fan-networks-exhibition.org> > that received 509 Facebook

likes from fans and was titled *Fan Networks in the Predigital Age: Take That Fans between 1990 and 1996*. This installation was staged between 2 and 28 June 2011 at the Kraak Gallery in Manchester and attracted a stream of visitors, many of who were in the city to witness the reunited band play live at Manchester City's Etihad Stadium.

The exhibition was based on fan-created materials – among those, offstage photographs – that were both designed for preservation and yet previously transient in their social circulation. It was a form of ‘collective collecting’ at community level (Baker and Huber, 2013; see also Chapter 4 this volume) that allowed fans to curate and celebrate their previous experiences by collaboratively constructing an archive of popular culture materials that had previously been “ignored by those who curate formal archives or that are commercially unavailable” (Collins and Carter, Chapter 9 this volume). Thus, comments left in the exhibition guest book included “Thanks for all the memories. What a wonderful celebration of something that was much, much more than ‘just’ being a fan!”. On the other hand, Anja had augmented her earlier interest in *Take That* with academic qualifications and publications as a fandom scholar. She wished to consider the generational memories of the fan base of which she had participated. Was this therefore an example of ‘DIY’ heritage

preservation? In order to answer that question, it is relevant to consider the relationship between fandom and the academy.

Researchers who self-consciously serve and speak for fan communities by using their own identities as fans are, in effect, academic fans or ‘aca/fen’ as they are known (the second part of this hybrid term denoting a plural of fans). Henry Jenkins (2006, p. 251) summarized this position when he stated: ‘I come to both *Star Trek* and fan fiction as a fan first and a scholar second. My participation as a fan long precedes my academic interest in it’. Similarly Will Brooker (2002, p.19) declares his own fandom and its role in his study: ‘This entire book is an example of a childhood passion channeled into an academic career’. Scholars like Jenkins and Brooker are, in effect, people who synergize two roles. They are ethical and articulate popular culture enthusiasts who are schooled and tooled, ready to use the space of academia to their advantage *as fans*. Since the rise of fields of study based on popular culture, including popular music studies, such researchers have used their fandom productively to both contribute to their disciplines and increase wider understandings of their fan communities. One might even posit that most popular music researchers are fans in some sense.

Our analysis of Take That heritage culture provides one example of a wider process of collusion between fans and legitimating agencies of the kind that can sometimes be ignored when music researchers contrast ‘official’ and fan-created heritage. The University of Salford-affiliated 2011 Kraak Gallery exhibition capitalized on a commercial moment in which discussions about Take That were revived in the public sphere when the band staged a reunion. In turn, a consideration of generational memories was sparked within Take That’s resurgent fan base. The exhibition was pursued by Anja as an aca/fan, collectively sourced, and authorized by the academy. It was therefore a curation of popular music’s material past that fitted the categories of both ‘DIY’ heritage *and* authorized culture simultaneously. To use Roberts and Cohen’s (2014) terms, heritage-as-praxis and Big-H heritage may not always therefore be separate, far apart on a continuum, or even in a process of interplay. In some circumstances such as the Take That exhibition they might instead be barely distinguishable as constituent parts of the same process. This is not to say that there is no worth in exploring the term ‘DIY’ preservation in this context, but rather that more work needs to be done exploring the ways in which popular music archivists, fans, aca/fen and other scholars evoke it as a kind of discursive strategy or resource to support specific music heritage projects (see, for example, Baker & Huber, 2012).

Popular music heritage is evidently a complex and empirically variable phenomenon. Rather than seeing academia as a bastion of elitism assaulted by fans, or as a means by which “official” heritage could move into the cultural territory of fandom, the idea of the aca/fan suggests universities can be used as a vehicle for the concerns of fans leveraging ‘consecrating’ or ‘prestige granting’ institutions to include their interests in ‘official’ or ‘authorized’ heritage phenomena. In the realm of history, this meant that such bodies have become conduits that can help to redefine the material ephemera of fan communities as part of legitimate fields of historic enquiry and heritage production – a process that is actively created and pursued by scholars who are also dedicated fans. In light of this we would suggest that pop fans do not usually set out to be ‘DIY preservationists’ any more than they set out to be ‘amateur professionals.’ Indeed, there is a danger of oversimplifying the production of music heritage and perhaps also patronizing its fan participants by the use of such terms. Any portrayal of fans as marginalized, different and resistant forgets the ways in which they can collude with and mutually support both commercial culture and ‘prestige granting’ institutions in their bids to assert the legitimacy of shared cultural interests and generational memories.

Since the exhibition ended, the displayed materials gathered from a total of 26 fan donors have been in the possession of Anja Löbert. Some fans only donated their materials under the condition that their originals would be returned to them safely, itself an indicator of the sentimental value of these items. In these cases, photos were digitized in order to preserve them for the purposes of the archive, as the long-term aim is to set up a publically accessible digital archive of these offstage photos, as well as other constituent artefacts of this female fan scene, at the University of Salford.

References

- Allen, M.P. and Lincoln, A.E. 2004. 'Critical discourse and the cultural consecration of American films', *Social Forces* 82, 871-894.
- Baker, S. and Huber, A. 2012. "'Masters of our own destiny": cultures of preservation at the Victorian jazz archive in Melbourne, Australia', *Popular Music History* 7, 3, 263-282.
- Baker, S. and Huber, A. 2013. 'Notes towards a typology of the DIY institution: identifying do-it-yourself places of popular music preservation', *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 16, 5, 513-530.
- Barthes, R. 2002. *Camera ludica: Reflections on photography*, London: Vintage.
- Benjamin, W. 2008. *The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction*. London: Penguin.
- Bennett, A. 2009. "'Heritage rock": rock music, representation and heritage discourse', *Poetics* 37, 474-489.
- Bourdieu, P. 1991. *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Brabazon, T. 2002. 'We're one short for the cross: Abbey Road and popular memory,' *Transformations* 3, 1-16.
- Brooker, W. 2002. *Using the force: creativity, community and Star Wars fans*. New York: Continuum.
- Duffett, M. 2014. 'Celebrity: The return of the repressed in fan studies?', in Duits, L., Zwaan, K. and Reijnders, S. (eds.) *The Ashgate companion to fan cultures*, Farnham: Ashgate.
- Fan Networks Exhibition. *Take That Fandom before the Internet: A fascinating glimpse into the global network of Take That's first fans*. 2010. Web. 20. Jan. 2014.
- Fisher, M. 2013, *Ghosts of my life: writings on depression, hauntology and lost futures*, Winchester: Zero Books.
- Jenkins, H. 2006. *Fans, bloggers, gamers*, New York: New York University Press.
- Leadbeater, C. and Miller, P. 2004. *The pro-am revolution: how enthusiasts are changing our economy and society*. London: Demos.
- Löbert, A. 2014. 'Penfriendships, exchange economies and "FBs": Take That fans networking before the digital revolution', *Popular Music and Society* 37, 5.
- Reynolds, S. 2011. *Retromania: pop culture's addiction to its own past*, London: faber and faber.
- Roberts, L. and Cohen, S. 2014. 'Unauthorising popular music heritage: outline of a critical framework', *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 20, 3, 241-261.
- Shuker, R. 2010. *Wax trash and vinyl treasures: record collecting as social practice*. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Sontag, S. 2002. *On photography*, London: Penguin.
- Straw, W. 1997. 'Sizing up record collections: gender and connoisseurship in rock music culture', in S. Whiteley, ed. *Sexing the groove: popular music and gender*. London: Routledge.

The Memory Girl, 2011. Thatter Exhibition, Kraak Gallery, Manchester. *Mirror of the Graces* [blog], 14 June. Available at: <
<http://mirrorofthegraces.blogspot.co.uk/2011/06/thatter-exhibition-kraak-gallery.html>> [Accessed 11 November 2014].

Zinn, H. 1970. 'The Activist Archivist', *Society of American Archivists 34th Annual Meeting*, Washington, DC. 30 September 1970.