This is a pre-print version of a chapter that has been published in the book *Preserving Popular Music Heritage: Do-It-Yourself, Do-it-Together.*

Please cite this article as:

Brandellero, A., Van der Hoeven, A. & Janssen, S. (2015). Valuing popular music heritage: exploring amateur and fan-based preservation practices in museums and archives in the Netherlands. In S. Baker (Ed.), *Preserving Popular Music Heritage: Do-it- Yourself, Do-it-Together* (pp. 31-45). London: Routledge.

CHAPTER 2

Valuing popular music heritage: exploring amateur and fan-based preservation practices in museums and archives in the Netherlands

Amanda Brandellero, Arno van der Hoeven and Susanne Janssen

The institutional context for the preservation of popular music-related heritage in the Netherlands has in recent years changed dramatically. On the one hand, this is related to major cuts in government support for all kinds of culture-related initiatives (OCW, 2011) On the other hand, it reflects a shift in priorities and a redistribution of functions across the institutional landscape. In the field of music, this has resulted in the closure in early 2013 of dedicated institutions such as the *Muziek Centrum Nederland* (Music Centre Netherlands) and the *Nederlands Muziek Instituut* (Dutch Music Institute) and the fragmentation of their collections across a number of institutions, including the Nederlands Instituut voor Beeld en Geluid (Netherlands Institute for Sound and Vision) and the University of Amsterdam.

While by far the most visible, these institutions were not the only ones taking an active role in the preservation of Dutch music heritage (Brandellero and Janssen, 2014). In fact, a number of primarily amateur and fan-run museums and archives populate the landscape of popular music preservation in the Netherlands. Examples of DIY-heritage, these bottom-up initiatives (Baker, Huber 2013) generally focus on symbolic events in the history of Dutch popular music history, or zoom into a specific time, place, or musical act. Such initiatives are *per se* not new: popular collecting and community archives in wide ranging areas, from recording the history of localities to the documentation of the struggle of marginalized communities, are well-documented globally (Kaplan, 2000; Ketelaar, 2005; Flinn, Stevens et al. 2009).

What makes DIY popular music archiving initiatives interesting is their articulation of meanings and values of cultural products intended for mass-consumption, as is generally the case with popular music products. These initiatives are therefore representative of a shift from sacred to vernacular in collecting (Belk, 1995), but also of a 'qualitative difference between objects in circulation and objects in collection' (Pearce, 1994, p.2). An example of this difference is that between a CD in a record shop, and one in a glass case at a rock museum. Moreover, these meanings and values are contested in the event of partnerships with formal heritage institutions, when often highly contrasting custodial models come into contact (Stevens, Flinn et al. 2010). More generally, popular music provides a highly relevant case in the study of heritage practices, due to the specific nature of its material culture, which strongly mediates and mobilizes individual and shared identities while leaving few palpable vestiges beyond the performance (Born, 2011). This chapter therefore considers how values and meaning are attributed to collections in the heritage practices *of amateur and fan-based* popular music museums and archives in the Netherlands. We also explore how these values are put to the test in collaborations with formal heritage institutions.

First, we will look at amateur and fan-run heritage practices theoretically, in the context of writings on collecting and associated values and meanings. Here we turn to existing typologies of DIY preservationism in the field of popular music, critically assessing their democratising potential by relating to debates in media studies on the limitations of the participatory potential of the online realm. We then discuss our research methodology and data collection and analysis, centred on interviews with personnel at popular music archives and museums in the Netherlands. Finally, we present our results and conclude by offering a typology of amateur and fan-run popular music heritage 'projects' (Dannefer, 1980. We use this to assess how these initiatives are participating in and contributing to changing conceptualisations of cultural heritage in the Netherlands.

Theoretical Framework

Initiatives collecting and documenting the history of Dutch popular music can be positioned within a broader trend whereby communities record and make accessible their history "*on their own terms*" (Flinn, Stevens and Shepherd, 2009, p.73). Examples of these include community-based archives (Flinn, Stevens and Shepherd, 2009) and autonomous archives

(Moore and Pell, 2010). Such initiatives play a transformative role in terms of putting on the map more marginal or excluded communities and their histories (Flinn, 2007). Formal heritage institutions have also embraced more inclusive and dissonant practices, moving away from a unitary vision of the past towards one that incorporates multiple pasts (Merriman, 1991). Such initiatives have focused on a number of purposes and objectives, but they are primarily centred on the collection and preservation of objects or knowledge within a specific field of human and social activity.

Research on collecting has highlighted multiple layers of meaning and value in its associated practices, both for the collectors and for the people who may view and use the collection. Firstly, the act of collection and preservation has the connotations of 'a genuine and intense subjective attraction that can accurately be described as a passion' (Dannefer, 1980, p.392). As a special type of consumption, collection also evokes personal involvement, acquisitiveness and possessiveness (Belk, 1995). While the nature of a collector's commitment might be perceived as 'eccentric' by some, such level of commitment would not be questioned in religious devotion for instance (Dannefer, 1980). More generally, the attraction to objects, and their potential to define and shape personal identities are contextualized as part of late capitalist society's commodity culture of consumption (Martin, 1999).

Collected objects pertaining to the material realm of popular music are removed from their ordinary, utilitarian use, and they acquire new meanings as part of a wider, actively selected and categorised set (Pearce, 1986; 1990; 1991; Belk, 1995). In their biographies, these objects can cross the boundary between commodity and singularity (Kopytoff, 1986; Appadurai, 1994), leading to their sacralisation, following which they are 'treated with reverence, and revered with passion' (Dannefer 1980, p.395). Vinyl records for instance may be purchased but never listened to in order to preserve their immaculate state. The object is perceived to carry meaning which goes beyond the life of the individual collector him or herself: it 'bears an "eternal" relationship to the receding past' (Belk, 1995, p.25). These objects also participate in a process of self-definition of the individuals to whom they belong, tracing their environment and roots (Morin, 1969), and becoming markers of social position (Pearce, 1986).

Types of collections can be distinguished depending on whether they centre on ‘souvenirs’, ‘fetish objects’ or ‘systematics’ (Pearce, 1991, p.194). Firstly, souvenirs are usually constituted by *memorabilia* or *personalia*, relating to individuals or groups thereof, and intrinsic to past experiences. Secondly, ‘fetish collecting’ refers to a passionate form of accumulation of the same type of pieces, where the concern is on the object per se rather than its social relations. Finally, systematic collecting strives to relate to an external reality that goes beyond the boundaries of the object itself: the latter is but a specimen, an example in a wider system of classification and a tool to communicate a pedagogic message to an audience. While the first two forms of collecting are more widespread among individual and bottom-up archivists, systematic collecting has been privileged by museums and formal heritage institutions alike. Nonetheless, the distinction between private and public practices of collection should not be over-stated: the dynamics of legitimation of collections and attribution of value work similarly in the private and public realm, while the differences lie in the actors involved (Martin 1999).

The personal attachment to the retrieval and preservation of objects and knowledge becomes problematic in instances when such collections are shared or publicly displayed, insofar as an intensely individual value is often of little interest to others (Pearce, 1986). DIY preservation initiatives generally fall within the first two collecting categories described above. They are bottom-up’ activities, driven by particular individuals’ desire to retain records of the past in an indiscriminate rather than selective fashion (Baker and Huber, 2013, p.515). They combine this with a desire to redress conventional music histories through connoisseurship and expertise (Bennett, 2009, p.483) and a range of attitudes is noted in relation to national heritage strategies and official heritage institutions (Baker and Huber, 2013, p.517; Roberts and Cohen, 2013) (Baker, Huber 2013:517, Roberts, Cohen 2013).

Various authors observe how bottom-up preservation practices benefit from developments in the online sphere (Cohen, 2013; Long, Collins et al., 2012; van der Hoeven; 2012). New digital media such as social networking sites and blogs have enabled the emergence of ‘micro or hidden musical histories’ (Cohen, 2013, p.589). These online media facilitate not just the collection of physical objects, but also information and audio-visual material related to local music scenes and communities. From a media and cultural studies perspective it has been argued that web 2.0 tools for online interaction and collaboration democratize processes of cultural production and blur distinctions between producers and consumers of cultural content, enabling the latter to become ‘amateur experts’ (Baym and Burnett, 2009). Following

on from these trends towards audience participation, public and private institutions develop more consumer-oriented platforms (Livingstone, 2013). An example is a crowdsourcing project of The Netherlands Institute for Sound and Vision, in which online users were asked improve and share information on forty years of rock n' roll video footage recorded during a festival (Snoek, Freiburg et al., 2010).

However, such celebratory accounts of the democratizing potential of web 2.0 have also been extensively criticized (Van Dijck and Nieborg, 2009; Scholz, 2008). In his book on the 'cult of the amateur', Keen (2007) raises awareness of the importance of professional standards and expertise in processes of cultural production. The 'outsourcing' of tasks to audiences has even been described as a form of exploitation of their free labour (Scholz, 2008). These debates in the fields of media and cultural studies carry important implications for the study of both on- and offline bottom-up preservation practices. It demonstrates that fans actively use digital tools to initiate heritage projects and audience participation is increasingly central to the ways in which cultural and heritage institutions operate. However, the potentially conflicting aims, interests and work practices of 'amateurs' and 'professionals' should not be neglected.

Method

In this chapter we discuss 16 different projects, including archives, exhibitions and museums (see Table 1). We focus on those initiatives that are publicly visible, either through an online presence (e.g. web archive) or physical presence (e.g. archive or museum). The majority of the projects are initiated by fans and collectors or involve some form of collaboration with collectors. However, we also interviewed several professional curators at museums and archives, to glean insights into collaboration practices and contrasting definitions of value and meaning of collections. In these semi-structured interviews, which typically lasted around one hour, we discussed the rationale for establishing the project, preservation practices, the organizational setting and respondents' understandings of heritage. Each interview was attributed a code, ranging from A1 to A15 (one interviewee was in charge for two projects). These codes are used in the empirical section below to anonymize the interviews.

For the purpose of our research, we defined amateur and fan-run archives and museums as a set of practices around the collection and preservation of popular music histories and material culture set up by people with no formal training or background in archiving or museology. We conceive of these initiatives as non-professional in terms of how the organizations position themselves in relation to whether (i) it is a (paid) job or, as in some cases, a hobby or

personal collection which turns into a bigger ‘project’; (ii) the extent to which they adopt formal institutional structures (e.g. with job titles); (iii) division of tasks; (iv) formal classification of material; and (v) the quality of what is delivered (are there set standards for collection, e.g. categorical ways of collecting information on materials). While individuals may lack formal training in heritage practices, all initiatives share a strong curatorial imprint, driven by one or a few individuals acting selectively, as gatekeepers, with clearly stated aims and objectives. We thus excluded blogs or online fora where communities of individuals share knowledge and information sporadically, allowing us to distinguish an active act of collection from a less coherent expression of accumulation (Pearce, 1992).

Table 1 Overview of the initiatives analyzed for this study. Year indicates year of exhibition, or in the case of archives, year of establishment.

Project	Focus	Organization	Outputs	Year
Museum RockArt (Hoek van Holland)	The history of Dutch popular music from 1950 to nowadays.	Private museum initiated by a music enthusiast and which is supported by several volunteers.	Permanent and temporary exhibitions on prominent national and international artists and movements.	1994
Streektaalzang	Dutch dialect music.	Online archive on Dutch dialect music, organized by region, curated by a private individual.	Online archive.	1996
Poparchive Achterhoek / Liemers	The music history of the Achterhoek en Liemers region.	Group of music experts and fans, connected to a local heritage organization.	Several books. These publications led to reunions of some bands and a list of dialect music from the region which was broadcasted by a local radio station.	1998
Stichting Norderney	The cultural heritage of offshore radio station Radio Veronica, from 1959 to 1974.	Run by several volunteers, who used to work for Radio Veronica. Donors get access to a members-only section of the website.	Physical archive, online archive and annual events organized in collaboration with Museum RockArt.	1999
Offshore Radio Club	Offshore radio.	The website is run by volunteers and has a restricted section for members only.	Online archive.	2001
Zaanse pophistorie	Bands and music venues of the Zaanstreek region located North of Amsterdam, from 1958 to nowadays.	This project is run by volunteers involved in the local music scene.	Online archive.	2005
‘Geef mij maar Amsterdam’ (Amsterdam Museum)	The history of the city of Amsterdam through song from the XVII century to nowadays.	Hosted by the city museum of Amsterdam.	Temporary exhibition.	2006/2007
Europopmusic	European Pop Music	Run by two collectors.	Online archive.	2008
Music Center the Netherlands.	Dutch music.	Closed in December 2012 due to its public subsidies being cut. MCN was formed in 2008 following the merger of a number of genre-specific institutes, including the National Pop Institute set up in 1975. This institute was run by paid employees.	Library, physical archive and online archive.	2008
POPstudio (Sound and Vision Institute, Hilversum)	Dutch popular music.	POPstudio is housed in the Institute for Sound and Vision. It is a permanent exhibition of audio-visual material on Dutch popular music.	Permanent exhibition.	2010
Het Geluid van Rotterdam	Music from Rotterdam.	A local foundation supported by subsidies.	Online archive.	2011
Stempel Broodje	The punk movement.	Private collection. One of the founders is involved in the Offshore	Their material was used in the travelling exhibition ‘Europunk’.	2011

		Radio Archive. In 2013 they stopped their collaboration.		
Golden Earring – Back Home (Historical Museum, The Hague)	The band Golden Earring, which originated in The Hague.	Showcased material from the archives of Museum RockArt, as well as from other collectors.	Temporary exhibition.	2011/2012
Drents Museum (Assen)	This museum acquired a private collection on the Dutch blues band Cuby & the Blizzards.	Museum of Drenthe, a rural province located in the North-East of the Netherlands.	Physical archive.	2012
God Save the Queen – Art, Squatting, Punk: 1977-1984 (Centraal Museum, Utrecht)	The visual arts, music and social movements of the late seventies – early eighties.	This exhibition used materials from the Stempel Broodje collection (see above).	Temporary exhibition.	2012
Special request -Cuby & the Blizzards in the sixties (Centraal Museum, Utrecht)	Dutch blues band Cuby & the Blizzards.	Curated by an art handler of the Utrecht Centraal Museum in honour of 25 years in service. The exhibition is primarily based on collector loans and material from the Cuby & the Blizzards museum in Grolloo.	Temporary exhibition.	2012

Personal motivation and meaning giving

Collectors and enthusiasts have been noted to structure their passion for specific objects around 'projects' (Dannefer, 1980), through which their experience and passion is ordered and collectively shared. In our fieldwork, we found these projects to be structured around four practices: retrieving, cataloguing, sharing, and displaying. The four are not mutually exclusive, and some projects can combine several of these practices. Sharing and displaying were particularly rich in formats, ranging from temporary museum exhibitions, public presentations and debates, to web-based archives and publications. Moreover, a number of initiatives interacted with local media (radio stations and press), at times as an outlet for their activities, but also as a means of crowdsourcing knowledge and expertise from other collectors.

Frequently collections started as personal souvenirs, memories of the time when collectors were active in the music industry for instance or avid fans of a band or genre, who treasured items of clothing, correspondence of known musicians and memories of concert-going years. We found Pearce's second category of 'fetish collecting' to correspond to cases where collectors attempt to retrieve and catalogue knowledge on the musicians active in specific locations, or the collection of all releases from a band for instance. We noted this in particular in archives focusing on specific locations, as with the *Zaanse poparchief*, focusing on the *Zaanstreek*-region, and *Streektaalzang* concentrating on dialect music in the Netherlands. Finally, we found several instances of 'systematic collecting' in the form of recent exhibitions

focusing on popular music or bands (for instance the Golden Earring exhibition at the Historical Museum in The Hague in 2011), which serve to tell something about the social history of a locality through music.

Personal backgrounds

The DIY archivists we spoke to have different professional backgrounds: the majority had a background in the music industry, some work in other sectors, but most respondents shared the commonality of having no directly transferable skills to collecting and archiving. Learning by doing and the development of networks reaching out to people with complementary skills predominate (A1; A3; A12; A6). Archivists also found inspiration from friends and family, but also fellow archivists, highlighting the 'affective' qualities of DIY institutions (Baker and Huber 2013, p.522). The process of discovery of other, similar activities was a source of inspiration and encouragement, and provided frames of reference for how to pursue and manage one's own collection (A1; A8).

DIY archivists expressed the personal motivation for starting their collection and preservation activities as arising from a pressing need. In the words of one interviewee, "The only motivation was that something should be done" (A1). The discourse of cultural heritage appears fully internalized by many of the respondents (A1; A2; A8; A14; A15): "Well... objectives... the main objective is to make sure that what is still there, that that rises to the surface and that it is preserved for posterity. That's my core" (A14). Objectives and goals can change over time, as new interests come to inspire further collecting (A15).

Becoming more visible as collectors, for example by setting up a private museum or an association, was an important step towards gaining trust of other collectors and potential donors of materials: "As a foundation, you can make requests, it's also an easier platform. Anyone who knows me knows that I am not just collecting things to be better off myself, but as a foundation […] it's more reliable" (A1). Institutionalising bottom-up practices generates greater collective trust, or at least the perception thereof. Moreover, as word spreads that "someone is taking up this giant kind of work" (A8), archivists noted that people would get in touch to volunteer information and material for the cause.

The reliance on own resources (particularly time and finances) and the invaluable support provided by family and friends were widely acknowledged. The financial arrangements of the initiatives draw on the support of family and friends, or indeed in some cases of fans as 'donors'. The non-publicly funded initiatives we surveyed generally struggled to break-even, and personal investment was often necessary (for example the use of own property or land). As one archivist put it, "it doesn't have to become a millionaire business, we find it terribly fun, it's a real hobby project" (A1). Indeed, collecting practices which have a more commercial intent and approach were scorned for 'trading' and selling "copies of copies of copies [of radio recordings]. And then they would calmly ask for 25 Euro per hour" (A6). Capitalizing on collections was frowned upon, and DIY archivists felt the need to ensure that they were not seen to be doing this. This is also noticeable when DIY archivists reliant on membership arrangements, as in the case of a web-based recordings archive, are discussed: when members complain about pages not getting updated regularly, they are reminded that "the 20 Euro you pay are not just for the extra pages, but also to support us" (A1).

Setting the record straight

Straddling the line between personal and collective memories, many archivists were also motivated by a desire to set the record straight as far as the factual history of Dutch popular music goes. For some, this meant ending discussions over the facts – finding the real version of events among hearsay and oral histories, and the tendency to romanticize the past somewhat (A12; A3; A6). Other respondents (A4; A6; A8; A12) signal that a more accurate version of popular music history is one that is more truthful to the lived experience of individuals rather than mediated by present day collective memory or narratives about the past. Two underlying purposes can be gleaned from the data. Firstly, it is about filling gaps in the more widely recognized music canons, giving space for smaller names: in the words of one archivist, "I want a complete history, with all the names, also the unimportant names" (A8). Secondly, there are attempts to promote a particular reading of the (musical) past. For example, when curating a museum exhibition on music, the arts and squatting movements in the late 1970s - early 80s, a curator explained that the intention behind highlighting the openness of the Netherlands to foreign influences was motivated by a desire to counter 'private' readings of history where "you are here and that's your world and then there is nothing around it" (A4). This was seen as significant in the context of the rise of populist tendencies in Dutch politics and in the discourse on immigration.

When assessing the wider context of collecting and preserving popular music in the Netherlands, many archivists expressed concerns. Two perspectives were frequently shared: firstly, a lack of pride in Dutch popular music history translated in privileging the preservation of items relating to foreign bands and acts (A14; A13), signalling a perceived lack of interest or attention among audiences. Many shared the feeling that the government is not supportive of popular music and that people in general are not proud of Dutch popular music (A1; A14). Secondly, Dutch frugality meant that some materials, such as film reels, were reused or simply thrown away, in order to cut down on preservation costs (A1; A6), pointing to the scarcity – and rarity - of material to preserve.

External use of collection

While often being a desired goal of DIY archivists, making collections accessible also contributes to adding meaning to the collection practice. When asked what made organizing a museum exhibition on his favourite band meaningful to him, a curator explained "I can show to people who Cuby is" (referring to the 1960s Dutch blues band Cuby + the Blizzards). The desire to share an interest can have wider pedagogical undertones. Similarly to what Pearce (1991) noted for systematic collectors, for many DIY-preservationists, the experience of music – via all its related material culture – should become part of a collective consciousness of that particular time and place (A8; A11). Staging exhibitions also has a pedagogical objective. As one curator stated, "My intention was […] not only to amuse and inform the public, broad public, but also make a start with serious research in this period, on this time" (A4). The public of such initiatives can broadly be characterised as containing music industry employees, fans and music lovers, and people searching for specialised knowledge (students and journalists for instance).

At times, archivists experience some frustration when complex requests for information cannot be met due to understaffing. For example one DIY archivist notes "Obviously, this isn't an institute, such as *Beeld en Geluid,* with 100 staff" (A1). Moreover, some frustration could be detected when archivists discussed instances of media articles on local music histories for which their expertise was not utilized (A3; A6). An archivist refused to provide information to a journalist researching local punk bands, because the latter would not agree to acknowledge the former's assistance to the article: "if he'd received the whole lot from me, he would have been able to write a much, much nicer story" (A3).

Individuals connected to publicly and privately-funded initiatives alike pointed towards similar issues relating the external use of the collections. Collecting was seen as binding people together on an emotional level, creating a convivial sphere where like-minded people can come together (A1). It also binds family members together, as memories and tastes are transmitted from generation to generation. Yet collecting can become quite cliquey, as archivists focusing on the same materials also highlight instances of competition among each other over rights and access (A6).

Inter-institutional collaborations

Institutional collaborations reveal different collecting practices and valuations of popular music. The growing recognition of bottom-up practices in mainstream heritage practices has been noted elsewhere (Moore, 2000). We observe a combination of complementarity and tensions in the relationships between DIY preservationists and formal heritage institutions, as exemplified in a number of collaborations at Dutch historical museums. The complementarity of missions and roles was generally expressed as a mutual reliance on resources and collections. Particularly for the more specialized collections, museum curators noted the reliance on external sources (with a reasoning echoing the 'we can't keep everything but others can' attitude). One of the key areas of tension pertained to the definition of uniqueness and how this varies according to whether audiences are fan-based or not.

This tension comes to the fore in a number of ways. Putting together an exhibition raised questions as to the differential appreciation of objects by fans and collectors and more general audiences. Professionalizing and formalizing DIY preservation initiatives, by making the transition from personal collection to online archives or physical museums for instance, provides preservationists with an opportunity to widen their potential audiences and boost the collective effort of gathering and cataloguing materials. Yet connecting fans and amateur collectors to wider audiences raises the challenge of how to communicate value to a diverse audience, as the curator of a temporary exhibition pointed out:

> "I got a lot from other people, and I must make a choice because it was so much […] there were also a lot of things that were the same, so you see then different kinds of designs of covers… sometimes you look at the same cover and you think, but then 'it's the one from Holland and the other one is from

> Chile'. So collectors focus on the special pressings of the records. But you can't … I can show two versions of the record, but sometimes you have five or six, but people don't see this, they see the same cover". (A12)

On the other hand, unique can also mean less accessible and known. As the editor of a public multi-media collection stated, when selecting clips for a TV recordings' installation it was important to focus on items that "don't show up on YouTube or something, it has to be unique" (A5).

Sustaining collections

While the personal motivation of DIY preservationists is strong, they also refer to being inspired by the activities of other preservationists, through personal connection or friendship as well as through the realization that others are actively pursuing similar goals. This is also the case when thinking about the future and sustainability of initiatives (Baker, Huber 2012). When discussing whether he thought someone would continue his documentation of local music history in the future, an archivist stated that "I get a lot of reactions, they are very positive. There are more people like me who are interested in cultivating this heritage", while also admitting that this was possibly more his hope than a realistic perspective (A8). Interestingly, the guaranteeing of the future of collections was generally interpreted as reliant on the continuity of the collecting process, rather than ensuring a continued external interest in the initiatives.

Although some of the DIY projects applied for external funding or collaborated with local heritage institutions, public subsidies were generally not considered a viable option when assessing the financial sustainability of initiatives. Funding cuts for culture, the perception that popular music is not valued in the public realm, combined with the lengthy and time-consuming application procedures were mentioned as discouraging attempts to apply for such resources. Additionally, independence from both private advertising and public funding was highly prized.

Conclusion

DIY preservation of popular music in the Netherlands comes in a variety of forms. Many of the initiatives we looked at tell as much about the richness and variety of Dutch popular music as about the personal histories and passionate commitment of a generation of music lovers. The archivists' active preservation of music illustrated their desire to leave a trace and keep the memory of a time and place alive, often aiming to achieve recognition of the music heritage of particular communities, genres or media. In many cases, these practices of DIY preservationists go beyond mere collecting, as they provide an impetus for nostalgic concerts, radio shows and local encyclopaedias.

Privately-led and funded DIY preservationism appeared to be more sustainable than public institutions in the Netherlands. One of the reasons is their relative independence from temporary subsidies or changing cultural policy priorities. However, DIY projects are vulnerable due their reliance on the efforts of a few key individuals and their appeal to restricted communities of interest (Baker and Huber, 2013). Furthermore, preservation and memory practices of public institutions can have more cultural legitimacy (Roberts and Cohen, 2014) and a wider recognition in heritage communities. Nevertheless, we noted several collaborations in which established cultural institutions benefit from the meticulous collecting and archiving conducted by non-professionals.

With many new projects initiated since the mid-nineties, DIY preservationists and professional heritage practitioners together have enriched the field of popular music heritage in the Netherlands. In so doing, they ensure that the preservation of popular music's past is steadily achieving a solid position in the Dutch cultural and heritage industries. One of the key challenges for DIY preservationists will be to find new ways and formats to engage with younger generations who do not share the personal memory of this popular music past, thus extending its value beyond the often autobiographical nature of collectors' endeavours.

References:

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), pp. 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), pp. 513-530.

Baym, N.K. and Burnett, R., 2009. Amateur experts international fan labour in Swedish independent music. *International journal of cultural studies*, 12(5), pp. 433-449.

Belk, R.W., 1995. Collecting as luxury consumption: effects on individuals and households. *Journal of economic psychology*, 16(3), pp. 477-490.

Bennett, A., 2009. Heritage rock: rock music, representation and heritage discourses. *Poetics*, 37(5), pp. 474.

Born, G., 2011. Music and the materialization of identities. *Journal of material culture*, 16(4), pp. 376-388.

Brandellero, A., and Janssen, S., 2014. Popular music as cultural heritage: scoping the field of practice. *International journal of heritage studies*, 30(3), pp. 224-240.

Cohen, S., 2013. Musical memory, heritage and local identity: remembering the popular music past in a European Capital of Culture. *International journal of cultural policy*., 19(5), pp. 576-594.

Dannefer, D., 1980. Rationality and passion in private experience: modern consciousness and the social world of old-car collectors. *Social problems*, 27(4), pp. 392-412.

Appadurai, A., 1986. Commodities and the politics of value. In: S.M. Pearce, ed, 1994. *Interpreting objects and collections*. London: Routledge, pp. 76-91.

Flinn, A., 2007. Community histories, community archives: some opportunities and challenges. *Journal of the society of archivists*, 28(2), pp. 151-176.

Flinn, A., Stevens, M. and Shepherd, E., 2009. Whose memories, whose archives? Independent community archives, autonomy and the mainstream. *Archival science*, 9(1-2), pp. 71-86.

Kaplan, E., 2000. We are what we collect, we collect what we are: archives and the construction of identity. American archivist, 63(1), pp.126–151.

Keen, A., 2007. *The cult of the amateur: how the democratization of the digital world is assaulting our economy, our culture, and our values*. New York: Doubleday Currency, .

Ketelaar, E. 2005. Sharing: collected memories in communities of records. *Archives and manuscripts* 33, p. 44-61

Kopytoff, I., 1986. The cultural biography of things: commoditization as process. In: A. Appadurai, ed. 1986. *The social life of things: commodities in cultural perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.64-91.

Livingstone, S., 2013. The participation paradigm in audience research. *The communication review*, 16(1-2), pp. 21-30.

Long, P., Collins, J., 2012. Mapping the soundscapes of popular music heritage. In: L., Roberts, ed. 2012. *Mapping cultures: place, practice, performance*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 144-159.

Martin, P., 1999. *Popular collecting and the everyday self: the reinvention of museums?* London: Leicester University Press.

Merriman, N., 1991. *Beyond the glass case: the past, the heritage and the public in Britain*. London: Leicester University Press.

Moore, K., 2000. *Museums and popular culture*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Moore, S. and Pell, S., 2010. Autonomous archives. *International journal of heritage studies*, 16(4-5), pp. 255-268.

Morin, V., 1969. L'objet biographique. *Communications*, 13(1), pp. 131-139.

OCW, 2011. *Meer dan kwaliteit: een nieuwe visie op cultuurbeleid*. Den Haag.

Pearce, S.M., 1986. Thinking about things. In: S.M. Pearce, ed, 1994. *Interpreting objects and collections*. London: Routledge, pp. 125-132.

Pearce, S.M., 1990. Objects as meaning; or narrating the past. In: : S.M. Pearce, ed, 1994.*Interpreting objects and collections*. London: Routledge, pp. 19-29.

Pearce, S.M., 1991. Collecting reconsidered. In: S.M. Pearce, ed, 1994. *Interpreting objects and collections*. London: Routledge, pp. 193-204.

Pearce, S.M., 1992. The urge to collect. In: S.M. Pearce, ed, 1999. *Interpreting objects and collections*. London: Routledge, pp. 157-159.

Pearce, S.M., 1994. Introduction. In: : S.M. Pearce, ed, 1994.*Interpreting objects and collections*. London: Routledge, pp. 1-6.

Roberts, L. and Cohen, S., 2014. Unauthorising popular music heritage: outline of a critical framework. *International journal of heritage studies*, 30(3), pp, 241-261.

Scholz, T., 2008. Market ideology and the myths of web 2.0. *First Monday*, 13(3).

Snoek, C.G., Freiburg, B., Oomen, J. and Ordelman, R., 2010. Crowdsourcing rock n'roll multimedia retrieval, *Proceedings of the international conference on multimedia 2010*, ACM, pp. 1535-1538.

Stevens, M., Flinn, A. and Shepherd, E., 2010. New frameworks for community engagement in the archive sector: from handing over to handing on. *International journal of heritage studies*, 16(1-2), pp. 59-76.

Van der Hoeven, A., 2012. The popular music heritage of the Dutch pirates: illegal radio and cultural identity. *Media, culture & society*, 34(8), pp. 927-943.

Van Dijck, J. and Nieborg, D., 2009. Wikinomics and its discontents: a critical analysis of web 2.0 business manifestos. *New media & society*, 11(5), pp. 855-874.