

Raves in the twenty-first century

DIY practices, commercial motivations and the role of technology

Beate Peter

This chapter explores raves as occasions for the social consumption of music as a live and lived experience: live because a DJ will (most often) produce remixed music in a real-time setting, and lived because rave culture is participatory in its nature, with regard to both body and mind. By discussing the history of raves, it will be established that raves can be divided into DIY raves and commercial raves, both defined through a combination of practices and values. Although our hegemonic cultural memory is heavily informed by the practices of DIY raves, both types of rave provide an opportunity to dance to electronic music. Using Skepta's *Dystopia987* as a case study to discuss DIY practices, commercial motivations and the role of technology, I argue that future raves have to incorporate DIY activities, allowing practitioners to actively co-create the live experience. For both organizers and attendees of raves, it means that risks have to be taken. Organizers will be faced having to partly render control of the production process of a live event, as the process of co-creation relies on the resources of the creative practitioners involved. Audiences will have to become more actively involved in the creation of a live event, giving up their position as observer and archivist of a live event. The role of technology is crucial in this transition to a participatory live event, as it should be applied purposefully. That includes the possible restriction of communication channels and communication modes, in order to facilitate the creation of an immersive live experience.

The history of raves

The use of the term 'rave' can be traced to the first part of the twentieth century. As Swindells (quoted in Saatchi Gallery 2019) observes, raves have always been festive activities, in which one participates through dance. They were used to describe the sound system culture of the 1950s and 1960s in the UK. In addition to references to

(mainly) Jamaican sound system cultures, Swindells also locates raves in London's 1950s jazz scene, in particular the 'King of the ravers', Mick Mulligan. His reference to *Rave* magazine, which was first published in the UK in 1964, shows how the term 'rave' was used in a slightly different context before it became part of the hegemonic cultural memory of the 1980s and 1990s. Now, people mostly associate raves with large dancing crowds in old warehouses or in the British countryside, all happily raising their arms or hugging each other. What links these different ideas about raves and ravers is their participatory nature and a joint contribution to the 'live' event. It means that, when talking about the history of raves, one has to discuss the consumption of live music through the dancing body. DJ Paulette (Manchester Metropolitan University 2018) states that the only opportunity for ravers to hear the new electronic music of the 1980s or see a particular DJ was to attend a rave, as new records were rare, and DJs would not fly from festival to festival to play their sets as is common today. As a result, the consumption of this type of live music was exclusively social, and people were able to share a passion for a new type of live music. The absence of the internet also meant that this new music could only be experienced and lived 'in the moment'. Without live streams and other forms of transmission, participants had to be in situ. As a result, raves have to be defined as a set of particular consumption and production practices.

To understand this kind of live event better, it is helpful to consider raves as DIY activities, which, according to Lowndes (2016), are defined by two key characteristics. First, such activities have to be instigated by the creatives who organize and manage them. Second, they are defined to be not wholly commercial. Applied to raves, a distinction has to be made then between DIY raves and commercial raves. In this chapter, DIY raves are understood to fall in Lowndes' category of DIY activities. DIY raves were often organized by sound systems: groups of people who were defined by their access to resources, something that Lowndes calls an 'economy of means and materials' (2016: xiv). Their non-profit principle is evident in the funding of such events, which was based on donations. It proves Lowndes' point of DIY activities being defined as not wholly commercial. With regard to raves being instigated by the same community that would benefit from it, sound systems were made up of people who had access not only to material resources but also to creative resources, as they included DJs. They were neither commissioned nor paid for their efforts to organize raves. Raves were amateur undertakings 'exhibit[ing] what could be called an aesthetic of necessity' (Lowndes 2016: xiv). This is also partly due to the nature of DIY networks at the time. Original raves took place before the widespread use of mobile phones or the internet. Although in the UK the first mobile phones were used in the mid-1980s, mass production only started in the early 1990s. Similarly, the internet was not widely available until the mid-1990s, including the use of the internet through mobile phones. Word of mouth marketing, therefore, not only was cheap but also ensured that DIY raves were organized for the members of the community from which the desire to organize such live events arose.

DIY raves continue to be organized to this day. Their history continues to be evidenced through the Free Party Scene and its affiliated sound systems. Based on the

PLUR (Peace, Love, Unity, Respect) ethos, such live events maintain the characteristics as outlined by Lowndes. However, most of them are illegal. Their illegality is less to do with the 'loudness and duration and the time at which it is played' and how it 'is likely to cause serious distress to the inhabitants of the locality' (Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994: c.33) and more with the question of whether or not such live events have been licensed. Licences are related to costs that have to be covered in advance of the event, which is something that DIY persons or collectives might not be able to afford. Therefore, I argue that DIY raves are characterized not only by their non-profit motivation and their often community-based organization but also by their absence of licences. Information about DIY raves is not freely available, and marketing continues to be restricted to word of mouth, as 'issues of legality and licence mean that only those "in the know" can access the space at all' (O'Grady 2012: 94).

However, DIY raves are not the only type of rave that exists today. Licensed raves have become increasingly popular over the past ten years, and they can take place outdoors in form of festivals, or in nightclubs. The worrying trend of nightclub closures in the UK (21 per cent between December 2017 and December 2018) is partly explained by an increasing popularity of electronic music festivals (Watson 2019: 18). Such developments have contributed to the global electronic music industry's worth of \$7.3 billion in 2018, with a predicted worth of \$9 billion by 2021 (Watson 2018). According to the IMS Business Report 2019, Dance/Electronic is the third most popular genre after Rock and Pop, hinting at the industry's 'integration into mainstream culture' (Watson 2018: 27). In this context, mainstream culture is understood to be commercial, and in opposition to DIY culture. Currently, DIY raves and commercial raves form either end of a spectrum of live events. Consequently, the historicizing of raves is difficult insofar that one cannot speak of a single rave narrative. DIY raves did not morph into commercial raves. Instead, they coexist. However, there seems to be a correlation between the two types of live events. The reported rise in illegal raves (Mercer 2018) has been linked to the closure of nightclubs (Slawson 2018). What this seems to suggest is a continued desire to attend live events at which electronic music is played and people can dance, regardless of those events being licensed or not. This is supported by the IMS Business Report 2019, which states that 'fans of electronic music have a higher propensity to attend live music events (74%) than those of any other genre' (Watson 2019: 17).

Raves are also impossible to define through the type of music that is being played. They usually feature a whole line-up of DJs with different tastes, techniques and time slots. If produced live, all of these aspects contribute to the kind of music that ravers consume at the event. Live sets also provide an opportunity for DJs to respond to their audiences in a much more immediate way, thus including the dancing ravers in the spectacle. Through this lens, raves can be understood as participatory events at which *all* people contribute to the overall experience. What makes raves different from rock concerts, is to what extent the audience's permanent feedback influences the music – for example, the build-up, the drop, or the increase and decrease of beats per minute during the live set. This scenario is what Ott and Herman describe as a communion, 'resist[ing] the prevailing set of cultural codes concerning the organization of space

at musical events – codes that construct the artist/audience relationship in particular ways’ (2003: 255). Both DIY raves and commercial raves benefit from a hegemonic cultural memory of raves as participatory and immersive events. This is perhaps why the term ‘rave’ has been appropriated in recent years to promote a variety of events: ‘family raves’ that include small children (Big Fish Little Fish, Raver Tots, Rave-A-Roo) or ‘sober morning raves’ (i.e. Daybreaker, Morning Gloryville). The popularity of these events is partly due to technological developments that have brought upon changes in the organization, production and consumption of such live events, and they are starting to redefine this type of live event. This will be discussed in the next section.

Technology

When discussing technological changes, I am going to focus on three distinct aspects and their impact on raves: the rise of superstar DJs through extended digital networks, the streaming of DJ sets and social media and their use on the dance floor. The rise of the superstar DJ can be partly attributed to the extension of networks, benefitting from digital media and marketing. If DIY raves of the 1980s are characterized through word of mouth marketing or physical flyers, then commercial raves are defined by marketing campaigns with a wider reach and frequency to attract more customers to the rave, both offline and online. Audience capture has increased the size of networks, as tickets are often booked online, and contact can be made through email or text messaging. In addition, algorithms continue to be developed in order to provide targeted marketing and further explore consumer habits through the internet. Promoters and agents as well as club nights benefit from DJs with a strong fan base, today often expressed through their social media following on platforms such as Viberate, Instagram, YouTube, Spotify or Resident Advisor. Brewster and Broughton observe that ‘seeing this kind of DJ adoration, the industry – from record companies to promoters to magazines – sensed a lucrative trend and jumped aboard’ (1999: 417). If DIY raves were partly attractive because of their secrecy with regard to their locations or the DJs, commercial raves promote locations (through drinks promotions, for example) and DJ line-ups. The rise of the superstar DJ can be seen as a sign of the commercialization of raves. DJs go on tour just like rock bands do, and they play the festival circuit similar to other live acts. Interestingly, DJs seem to have overtaken traditional live bands with regard to the number of live gigs or sets per year. Nina Kravitz, for example, played thirty-five festivals in 2018. Compared to the top performing band, the Killers, with eighteen performances, it means that she played almost twice as many live sets (Watson 2019).

The streaming of DJ sets is a relatively new strategy to increase the popularity of DJs around the globe and represents an additional income stream for both organizers/platforms and performers. Platforms such as Boiler Room have become famous for their online presence, although they have also started to be present in the physical world through, perhaps not unsurprisingly, the organization of festivals. Between 2012

and 2017, Boiler Room's audience increased from 10 million viewers to 303 million viewers. In the same time period, it tripled the audience's average viewing time (Watson 2018: 20). Mixmag's official YouTube channel generated 74 million views in 2018, which is an increase of 67 per cent in three years. In comparison, the print magazine, which was the main source of income for many years, is now only generating 10 per cent of the business revenue (Watson 2019: 25). This development has only become possible since broadband increased the speed of the internet and shortened the time for downloads at the beginning of the new millennium.

Streaming is a form of consumption that viewers to watch and hear musical performance while data is being transmitted, requiring a high speed. Although the streaming of DJ sets does no doubt increase the global popularity, it also has an impact on our understanding of a live event in general and raves in particular. Live events have previously assumed not only an artist playing live music but also a physically present audience. With the streaming of live events, the capacity for 'audiences' is unlimited. Live events are accessible wherever a fast-enough internet connection is provided. To have consumed a live DJ set no longer requires the physical attention of the event and also prevents the virtual audience from engaging with fellow consumers on the dance floor. The communal experience, which is the result of the participatory nature of raves, disappears because, if at all, people dance in their rooms – on their own. Although that might be a very pleasurable experience, what dancers will not be able to experience is what McNeill (1995) calls muscular bonding. He suggests that dancing together is an opportunity to bond and form communities for the purpose of social cohesion. This bonding with other people, the formation of communities is, however, what Lowndes considers to be vital for DIY activities. One result of the streaming of raves could be the disappearance of DIY raves because of the lack of muscular bonding that would perhaps motivate a future organization of DIY raves.

Closely linked to the streaming of live DJ sets is the use of social media on the dance floor. If the consumption of live events is no longer defined through its social component, the physical audience cannot be distinguished from the virtual audience. Subsequently, there appears to be a need to document and even evidence one's participation in the live event in order to be able to make that distinction. Social media seem to provide the platform to showcase the cultural capital that is acquired through the attendance of live events such as raves. My argument here is that social media have changed how people engage with the dance floor for two reasons. First, participation at a rave is mainly documented through images or films that are taken with mobile phones. The use of mobile phones by participants to a rave changes their role from that of an immersed dancer and co-creator of the spectacle to that of an observer or archivist. The participant becomes an outsider to the spectacle that they were previously actively co-creating. Second, the presence of mobile devices and the possibility of being photographed or filmed changes the behaviour of other participants on the dance floor. A changing level of self-awareness is inversely related to the ability to immerse oneself and documenting the live experience will alter one's experience of it.

The future of raves

If original DIY raves are partly defined by having taken place long before mobile phone technology or the internet became affordable, then the future rave will be defined through its use of technology, both with regard to internet technology and digital media. Market research firm Mintel state that ‘the potential of smartphones within the nightclubs market, in terms of promotion, booking and in-club behaviour, is still underexplored’ (McGrath, quoted in Mintel 2016: 2). They suggest to explore mobile phone apps for customers to be able to order drinks or receive drinks promotions – services that further commodify the rave experience without taking into consideration the actual music or dancing. Focusing on commercial motives has, one could argue, already resulted in a dooming prognosis for nightclubs. Mintel (2016) also found that 44 per cent of their respondents feel that ‘most nightclubs are too similar’. Within the nightclub experience, streaming changes the performer’s and audience’s level of awareness and influences their behaviour both on stage and on the dance floor. Recently adopted no-photo policies in some UK nightclubs seem to echo these concerns over a changing dance floor atmosphere and the disappearance of the ‘vibe’: a particular time period in which people ‘experience both the dissolution and performance of self within the context of music and dance’ (St. John 2009: 100).

Around 35 per cent of Mintel’s (2016) respondents state that they prefer to go to a concert or festival rather than a nightclub. Festivals are worth considering as possible locations for a rave. As they often take place in the countryside, they escape social control mechanism in a similar way to DIY raves. Bennett and Woodward claim that ‘a critical function of the festival is to allow a collective representation, a collective celebration and, in many cases, a collective outpouring of a commonly articulated form of socio-cultural identity’ (2014: 12). In that sense, festivals provide an opportunity for people to engage with the event not only as individuals and consumers but also as part of bigger (even if ephemeral) communities. Although the organization of festivals has often a commercial motivation, the space that is being created promotes in-real-life (IRL) processes: embodied, immersive and intimate, and possibly distilling one of the essentials of a live experience, the vibe. Consequently, the streaming DJ sets should not be seen as substituting the live experience.

The following case study, which was attended by the author, is an example of a live event in the twenty-first century that heavily draws on the hegemonic cultural memory of DIY raves. It is used to assess whether it is possible to combine DIY practices, commercial interests and the latest technology to create an immersive, communal experience.

Skepta’s Dystopia987 at Manchester International Festival

Skepta is a famous grime artist who, in 2016, won the Mercury Prize for his self-released album *Konnichiwa*. In 2019, he released his album *Ignorance is Bliss* with popular songs such as ‘Bullet from a Gun’ and ‘Greaze Mode’. In July 2019, Skepta headlined Dystopia987 as part of Manchester International Festival (MIF). This arts festival runs

bi-annually and ‘commissions, produces and presents dynamic new work by leading artists from different art forms and backgrounds’ (MIF 2019). It started in 2007 and has since featured musicians from many different genres. In 2019, such musicians included, among others, Janelle Monáe, Abida Parveen, Oliver Coates, Hatis Noit, Chrysta Bell, Anna Calvi, These New Puritans, Laurie Anderson and Afrodeutsche. In 2017, the festival attracted about 300,000 visitors (Manchester City Council 2018).

The manner in which the event was promoted appeared to intentionally echo practices of non-commercial raves. Upon booking, the venue was ‘to be confirmed’. After receiving the ticket, reference was made to a ‘secret location’, nodding towards the particular practice to not reveal the exact site of a rave. Jaimangal-Jones et al. (2010) argue that the rave journey constitutes a form of pilgrimage, which heightens the feeling of being part of a community of ravers. This alluding to DIY rave practices was confirmed when ticket holders received a text message: ‘Raver, Our time has come. Are you ready?’ (MIF communication, 17 July 2019). It was the first time that ticket holders were informed of the show being a rave. In fact, there was no reference to a rave as such, but participants were addressed as ravers from then on, through further communication and at the event itself. The difference here is that rather than being an observer to a rave, people were expected to behave (and perhaps feel) in a particular way if labelled a ‘raver’, and the event being referred to as being of participatory nature (‘our’). Subsequent MIF communication through text messaging instructed ticket holders where to meet (a crossing in the city centre), and also ‘not to attract attention’. They were then guided past a building site and disused land to the actual (indoor) venue. Associations with original raves were aplenty even before entering the venue, as the instructions mirrored the way in which people prepared for a rave: meeting like-minded people at service stations, driving to a rave in convoys, and ‘fine-tuning’ with one another before entering the site of the rave (Peter 2020).

Ticket holders were also informed that, for the duration of the event, they would be prevented from engaging with social media: ‘Our night will be phone-free. Mobile phones, smart watches, smart accessories, cameras or recording devices will be secured in Yondr cases on arrival. For full details, check your email’ (MIF communication, 17 July 2019). This move appears to be extraordinary at a time when people use a variety of communication channels through their phones. Moreover, in the age of selfie culture and consciously manufactured online identities, not to be allowed to use a phone is a radical request, one that might create a buzz around such a live event. It could be seen as a clever marketing tool. However, it comes at a cost. Rather than adapting the practice of disabling camera phones by means of stickers (usually at the door), the collection of mobile phones, their storage in containers and the return of mobile phones is resource intensive. It is questionable whether such expensive practice will be successful with more commercially oriented events or festivals. And yet, the retraction of mobile phones could be seen as an attempt to re-create a particular communal atmosphere without appearing to be nostalgic. Withdrawing the opportunity for participants to switch into the role of observer or archivist also denies them to consciously mould their public persona outside of the venue. The lack of opportunity for self-representation away from the dance floor mirrors the situation of DIY raves and could potentially

facilitate the full embrace of the joyous spectacle that is co-created by every participant (Ott and Herman 2003).

Upon entering the venue, ticket holders were handed plastic coins that could be traded for face tattoos, fairy lights for the face and head, or hugs. Although exchanging goods and services on a non-profitable basis might appear to link to the PLUR ethos of raves, it is not all what is understood by sharing or gifting. This is most evident through the trading of coins for hugs. Again, our hegemonic cultural memory of raves draws on images of people hugging each other and providing comfort, but the lack of hugging at the venue might suggest a certain awkwardness with that practice when encouraged or enforced. Original raves might be remembered as live events with a very tactile component, but the lowering of inhibitions is often linked to the use of drugs, particularly MDMA. Although bag searches took place, nobody was body searched, and sniffer dogs, used at many club nights, were also absent. The drug-induced communal euphoria that is linked to the hegemonic cultural memory of raves might not have been facilitated, but it was not made impossible either. Unsurprisingly though, most coins appeared to be traded for facial applications rather than hugs. Although all the services were signposted by handcrafted signs, and alluding to DIY culture, they did so in a fully licensed and health and safety compliant and accessible space.

At the same time that DIY rave practices were encouraged, there were signs of commodification. In addition to bars selling drinks in every room, beer was sold from a vendor's tray during the event. Contactless payment allowed for quick purchases without the need to queue. Select businesses traded inside the venue. Reviewing the event in *The Guardian*, Daniel Dylan Wray wondered 'whether this is a satire of rapacious commerce, or just rapacious commerce. The vibe is Secret Cinema doing a 1989 rave but replacing ecstasy with craft beer' (Wray 2019). And yet, free water was available from a water dispenser. Before the full commodification of raves, nightclubs were known to provide free water for their visitors, and ravers driving to a location in the countryside would always have water in their vehicles. It is the act of sharing that is invoked through the water dispenser, at the risk of losing out on sales at the bar (even just for water). As a result, the event is no longer wholly commercial, thus fulfilling one of Lowndes' characteristics if DIY activities.

This is perhaps where Skepta's rave becomes a good case study to look at the future of raves. Attempting to force engagement beyond our current selfie culture might be one way of exploring new (or old) ways of being 'in the moment'. Interestingly, this is done by strategically selecting and implementing practices, something that MIF called a 'forward-thinking rave experience' (2019). The tension between the DIY ethos and raves as commodities is evident in the dressing up ritual. Rather than dressing for likes and comments on social media, the individual applications of face tattoos, fairy lights and hair braids can be seen as a self-motivated creative activity, as the lack of mobile phones prevents people from communicating to people away from the live event.

The use of technology is another interesting point in this case study. Similar to the conscious selection of rave practices is the conscious embrace of certain technologies that defined Skepta's rave. Rather than using social media as a marketing platform for the venue, the artist or products, its use was prohibited. And yet, prior to the rave,

online communication was embraced. Moreover, upon entering the live venue, people were scanned and digitally traced in order to become part of the production and projection of live art onto the walls of the venue. Employing 'Dambrin_IRS', where IRS stands for Intelligent Rave Software, shows that full use was made at Skepta's gig of technology that is available today, but with the aim to further facilitate an immersive experience. The use and experimentation of augmented reality (AR) and mixed reality (MR) devices was advertised to 'promote human interaction'. In that sense, it was an event of the post-digital era, one at which the use of technology was normalized to enhance the overall experience. The overt use of technology to 'create' an event does not contradict the banning of social media engagement. Rather, it constitutes an attempt to encourage people to engage with one another in person and through music without ignoring the technological developments of the twenty-first century.

Skepta's actual performance was almost like a traditional concert. The audience was moved to another room with the stage being set up in the middle of it. Skepta performed high above the audience, and people applauded after every song. With the focus shifted away from the dancing bodies towards the stage performance, one felt reminded of superstar DJs and their self-conscious sets. Animators did their best to engage the audience through highly energetic dance moves, never quite sure whether to adapt the grime moves or personify a raver. The superstar DJ is a crucial part of the current landscape of live music and future live events have to continue to feature famous artists. At the same time, they will have to work out their unique selling point, which could be a novel piece of technology. Skepta's rave was not a rave. And yet, it showed how technology could facilitate a communal experience. Additionally, it made obvious the tensions between self-representation in form of social media and the loss of self, promoted through dancing as an immersive experience. Future raves cannot and should not be defined through the banning of technology. However, technology should be used selectively, and *Dystopia987* is an attempt to not succumb to technology but use it purposefully.

Future organizers and attendees of raves will have to take risks. Organizers will have to work closely with audiences and creative practitioners in order to not reproduce existing power structures. Events will have to be designed, organized and managed to allow audiences to collaboratively co-create an experience (with or without the use of technology). Such collaborative practices (Ott and Herman 2003) are directly linked to a DIY ethos, as the focus is not placed on the final product (and how predefined it is) but on the process of co-creation. It corresponds to Lowndes' 'economy of means and materials' (2016: xiv) in that it relies on the resources and skills of the people involved. Such approach would allow participants to a rave, or any other live event, to feel appreciated not only as individual consumer but also as part of a community of like-minded creative practitioners who jointly create meaning and belonging on the dance floor. Such work should be reflected in the ticketing of events so that creative work is acknowledged at all levels. For example, some festivals reward creative contributions through stalls or workshops with free admission. The same could be applied to other live events.

Audiences will have to take risks in that they could be invited to contribute to an event through their active participation in a creative process. Dance is one example of

such participation, but a DJ cannot read the audience if they are looking into hundreds of camera phones filming them. To work collaboratively with a DJ means to focus on that interaction, to give permanent feedback and thus inform the DJ's performance. This suggests extending the ban of phone cameras to many other live events. Where this is not manageable, mobile phone reception could be manipulated in a way that prevents communication via social media. As a result, technology is not perceived as a threat to live events but, through selecting to feature and support particular aspects of the live experience, as a tool to enhance it.

Events that require a high level of audience participation might not be everybody's choice. However, they would add to the breath of live events and, by including DIY practitioners, cater for more diverse audiences. By including DIY activities in the live experience, new audiences and markets could be identified and explored. In order for such efforts and risks to pay off, however, the live experience has to include non-profit motivations. For O'Grady (2012), such activities have to be defined by four components: time, space, people and technology. These might be hard to measure and quantify, but they will help making live events more sustainable in the long term.

Conclusion

In this chapter I have presented raves as particular forms of live events. Applying Lowndes' (2016) definition of DIY activities to the history of raves, a case was made to distinguish DIY raves and commercial raves. I argued that it is DIY raves that have informed the hegemonic cultural memory of raves, as they are associated with thousands of happy people dancing somewhere in fields. And yet, both DIY raves and commercial raves coexist in the twenty-first century. If the rave experience is defined by time, space, people and technology, as suggested by O'Grady (2012), DIY raves and commercial raves are positioned at different ends of the spectrum of live events. It was shown that there is a link between nightclub closures, on the one hand, and an increase in illegal raves, on the other. This correlation suggests that there is not only a continued demand to dance to electronic music but also the experience that seems to be sought is more of a DIY character.

The impact of new technologies was discussed with regard to live music, with particular focus on the rise of superstar DJs through extended digital networks, the streaming of DJ sets, and social media and their use on the dance floor. Skepta's *Dystopia987* was employed as a case study to show how attempts are made to reconcile the perceived dichotomy between DIY raves and commercial raves. I argue that future raves have to maintain element of DIY activities, allowing creative practitioners to take shared ownership of the live experience. Collaborative efforts to create an immersive experience should be encouraged by organizers through ticketing policies but also through the use of selected technologies. Organizing live events that incorporate DIY activities means to take risks, as live collaborations always entail an element of unpredictability. At the same time, audiences have to take risks when participating in

live events, as their role is to actively contribute to the live experience. Participation, however, is irreconcilable with the role of an observer or archivist, which audience members would take on when evidencing their presence through taking photographs or filming, and their sharing on social media. A voluntary abstinence from social media for the duration of a live event would facilitate an immersive experience, one which can have a lasting transformative impact.

References

- BBC (2019). 'Manchester International Festival 2019. MIF Transmission: Dystopia987', 24 July, <https://www.bbc.co.uk/events/exz3v2/live/cgrp5v>, accessed 20 September 2019.
- Bennett, Andy and Ian Woodward (2014). 'Festival Spaces, Identity, Experience and Belonging', in Andy Bennett, Jodie Taylor and Ian Woodward (eds), *The Festivalization of Culture*, Farnham: Ashgate, pp. 11–25.
- Brewster, Bill and Frank Broughton (1999). *Last Night a DJ Saved My Life: The History of the Disc Jockey*, London: Headline.
- Jaimangal-Jones, Dewi, Annette Pritchard and Nigel Morgan (2010). 'Going the Distance: Locating Journey, Liminality and Rites of Passage in Dance Music Experiences', *Leisure Studies*, 29: 253–68.
- Legislation.gov.uk. (2019). *Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994*, <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1994/33/section/63>, accessed 30 October 2019.
- Lowndes, Sarah (2016). *The DIY Movement in Art, Music and Publishing: Subjugated Knowledges*, New York and Abingdon: Routledge.
- Manchester Metropolitan University (2018). *Lapsed Clubber Project: Rave On*, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MwkvOyMCosg&t=102s>, accessed 30 October 2019.
- McNeill, William H. (1995). *Keeping Together in Time: Dance and Drill in Human History*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Mercer, David (2018). 'Police Warn of "Growing" Illegal Rave Problem as Numbers Soar', *Sky News*, 18 November, <https://news.sky.com/story/police-warn-of-growing-illegal-rave-problem-as-numbers-soar-11496151>, accessed 30 October 2019.
- Mintel (2016). *Nightclubs – UK – May 2016*, London: Mintel, <http://academic.mintel.com>, accessed 30 October 2019.
- O'Grady, Alice (2012). 'Spaces of Play: The Spatial Dimensions of Underground Club Culture and Locating the Subjunctive', *Dancecult: Journal of Electronic Dance Music Culture*, 4 (1): 86–106.
- Ott, Brian L. and Bill D. Herman (2003). 'Mixed Messages: Resistance and Reappropriation in Rave Culture', *Western Journal of Communication*, 67 (3): 249–70.
- Peter, Beate (2020). 'Rave Journeys: Intimacy, Liminality and the Changing Notion of Home', in Mark Duffett and Beate Peter (eds), *Popular Music and Automobility*, London: Bloomsbury, pp. 83–96.
- Saatchi Gallery (2019). *Sweet Harmony: Rave Today*, London: Saatchi Gallery.
- Slawson, Nicola (2018). 'Number of Illegal Raves in London Doubles in a Year', *The Guardian*, 4 March, <https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2018/mar/04/illegal-rave-s-in-london-double-in-a-year>, accessed 30 October 2019.
- St. John, Graham (2009). *Technomad: Global Raving Countercultures*, London: Equinox.

- Watson, Kevin (2018). *IMS Business Report 2018*, <https://www.internationalmusicsummit.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/IMS-Business-Report-2018-vFinal2.pdf>, accessed 30 October 2019.
- Watson, Kevin (2019). *IMS Business Report 2019*, <http://www.danceconomics.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/IMS-Business-Report-2019-vFinal.pdf>, accessed 30 October 2019.
- Wray, Daniel Dylan (2019). 'Flat Energy in Nightclub of the Future', *The Guardian*, 19 July, <https://www.theguardian.com/music/2019/jul/19/skeptadystopia987-review-manchester-international-festival>, accessed 19 July 2019.