CHAPTER 1

The Underground Cultural Ecology

You know, her life was saved by rock 'n' roll. Yeah, rock 'n' roll.

—Velvet Underground, *"Rock 'n' Roll"*

It was a scene that ten years earlier could only have been imagined by a political cartoonist: American musician Lou Reed, U.S. President Bill Clinton, First Lady Hillary Rodham-Clinton, Czech President Václav Havel, and Milan Hlavsa of the Czech Underground band the *Plastic People of the Universe*, exchanging handshakes and smiles at the White House. Between formal greetings, Reed performed his Velvet Underground 1970 hit "Sweet Jane" for the seated statespeople and gathered guests. Hlavsa accompanied Reed—who was a teenage hero and model for the long-haired, balding Czech—with his distinguishable heavy-fingered bass. This unlikely meeting on September 17, 1998 in the U.S. capital started with a group of teenagers who had begun playing psychedelic rock music together three decades earlier in the former Czechoslovakia.

Indeed it was an intersection of undergrounds and establishments in the most explicit and peculiar manner. For these reasons the case of the Czech Underground reveals the similitudes that *connect* peoples, places, and objects *across* spaces and *over* time, *through* sensibilities and *for* fellowship. The White House encounter speaks to such mobilities of the life of the Czech Underground; far from being a temporally bounded phenomenon (e.g., Cold War), the story of the *Plastics* and the Underground is one that urges us to return to the narratives and experiences of this past to examine how they are used to produce and stabilize the present and future cultural ecologies.

In this introduction I give a brief overview of the music in the "Merry Ghetto" (the Underground's self-named assembled cultural ecology), then move on to discuss memory in post-socialist Czechoslovakia and the Czech Republic. I continue by examining associations between music and social activity in context: namely revolutions, memory, and popular music in the former Eastern bloc. I analyze these questions using perspectives developed in music sociology and music therapy in order to understand the interactive, piece-by-piece

assembly of groups, bodies, and consciousness—and thus social power and agency—showing what is possible, what *can be accomplished* through and with music.

AN UNDERGROUND OVERVIEW

Thirty years before this White House meeting, Soviet tanks occupied the streets of Prague. Like the effervescent moments of social change for many across Europe and North America in 1968, Czechoslovakia that year experienced the height of a socialist thaw on censorship in music, film, and literature only to be later quelled by the Soviet-led invasion[1] on August 21, 1968. This event would pave the way for the forthcoming state-driven socio-cultural-political process of *normalizace* (normalization[2]) in the central European nation. It was during this socially and culturally turbulent period in Czechoslovakia a disparate Underground collective began to take shape, which continues in an adapted form nowadays as is evidenced by presidential accolades, Underground gatherings, carrier groups, TV reportages, and even a featured plaque in Prague's touristic "Museum of Communism" (advertised as located next to the McDonalds, above the casino).

However, before these post-1989 meaning-stabilizers settled into place heroic narratives of expressive freedom, the Underground phenomenon was a far more alternative experience, triggered, constituted, and mediated by music. The Underground emerged post-1968 through the aesthetic sensibilities, shared experiences, and creative practices of "hippies, folk singers, historians, theologians, rockers, painters, photographers, feminists, radical Marxists, drug-addicts, teetotalers, environmentalists" (Machovec 2006b: 1). Over the decades that followed, the Underground came to be a diverse, intergenerational collection of people living in a cultural ecology that was parallel to that of the official culture of state-socialism in Czechoslovakia. This ecology of the *druhá kultura* ("other" or "second" culture) generated new areas of habitat (an environment for the doing of a particular set of actions[3]) for people who endeavored to develop and maintain a particular "way of life." This way of life came to be distributed across Czechoslovakia throughout the normalization period, albeit heavily concentrated in Prague, north Bohemia, south Bohemia, and west Bohemia. Many referred to this cultural ecology as the "Merry Ghetto,"[4] suggesting an emotional state, material space, and socio-political relationality.

At the beginning the Underground was a mix of musical groups (specifically members of the group the *Plastic People of the Universe*[5]), visual artists (such as those connected to the

1. Soviet Union and 175,000 troops from Bulgaria, Poland, Hungary, and East Germany.
2. Normalization refers to the social and cultural climate of Czechoslovakia throughout the 1970s and 1980s. Generally it is characterized as a socio-political project of the Husák regime to "normalize" the liberalized Czechoslovak citizen by returning to pre–Prague Spring status quo conditions.
3. For example, trees and brush are habitats that accommodate different activities within the same forest ecology.
4. Egon Bondy's widely used term referring to the Underground.
5. Referred to as the *Plastics* for the remainder of the book.

informal *Křižovnická School*) along with *mánička*[6] (men with long hair). The many who came to make up the Underground were enthusiasts of Western rock music in the 1960s, such as the *Fugs, Captain Beefheart, Frank Zappa and the Mothers of Invention*, and particularly the *Velvet Underground* as well as a host of Czech ensembles (notably *Hell's Devils, Aktual*, the *Primitives Group*). Some of these Androši were musicians who were ultimately not allowed to perform, were forced to stop playing officially during normalization, or chose not to play.

Yet despite the regime's initial attempts to suppress Western music following 1968, many still considered it a necessity to continue playing and listening to music of their choice rather than adjusting cultural practices imposed by institutionalized socio-cultural scripts (i.e., what is the appropriate way to play music). Adapting to this script would have meant joining, as some saw, "the commercial sea of mental poverty" (Jirous 2006 [1975]: 7) of 1970s "normalized" Czechoslovakia. As Ivan Jirous,[7] considered the primary framer of the Czech Underground, asserted, "it was better to not play at all than to play what the establishment demanded" (Jirous 2006 [1975]: 7). Testimonies like this point to how music played a role in constituting and stabilizing the boundaries of the Underground ecology and subsequently used to develop realities, particularly in relation to the socialist party-state.

Bands like the *Plastics* are one example of an ensemble of musicians who rejected these establishment demands exerted through official culture. In addition to the *Plastics* the Merry Ghetto afforded a flourishing of musical groups during the 1970s and 1980s: hard rock groups like *Umělá hmota, Doktor prostěradlo band*, and *Bílé světlo*, singer-guitarists Čarli Soukup and Svatopluk Karásek, poet Pavel Zajíček and his ensemble *DG 307*, happening-like performances of *Hever and vaselina* and satirical Dadaist ensembles like *Sen noci svatojánské band*, the piano-bashing energy of *Psí vojáci*—in short, a wide range of sounds, styles, practices, and approaches (i.e., habitats) that the Underground cultural ecology came to accommodate and sustain.

Cultural ecologies, such as the Merry Ghetto, afford the being, doing, and knowing of a collective self, a group. Clarke's (2006) work outlines ecology as a perceptual system grounded in real-world events and environments to which actors adapt and attune (e.g., repression). "Attunement" highlights intersubjectivity as "the ability to align oneself and be aligned with" (DeNora 2011b: 310). Thus the dynamic social activity of actors associating meaning to musical materials takes form as a collective feedback process of *exposure, identification, adaptation, attunement*, and *alignment*. This process develops collective perception in an ecology.

Ecology, in these terms, can be understood as the various places, venues, props, narratives, people, bodies, and symbols that come to be connected together using music (as bridging material) to create a space from which to understand the world and act upon it. It is from where one filters out, tunes in, and selects evocative and subsequently resourceful material from a universe of meanings. The assembly, enactment, and effect of an ecology emerges from the often practical work of material organization of events, the situational know-how

6. Mánička is the lead female character in a well-known Czech puppet play, *Divadlo Spejbla a Hurvínka*.
7. Referred to throughout the book by Androši by his nickname "Magor," meaning madman or lunatic.

of tinkering with a broken amp, or the cultural work of weaving together aesthetic material in creative practice.

Correspondingly Underground collective activity took shape in relation to this cultural ecology, which was related to, but also set apart from, other non-official activities. The musical affordances of the Underground cultural ecology allowed for a specific rejection, or rather replacement, of perceived noxious, oppressive, and unwanted cultural practices and materials associated with "official" social and cultural life. This official script of *normalizace* followed the political consolidation of power by the Husák regime after 1968. The Underground offered, in other words, a place for potential transcendence of, and thus temporary immunity and relief from, official culture.

The Merry Ghetto is consequently a space for making possible certain selves and social environments. It presents musical opportunities and solutions (to connect, to share) through affiliative interaction while fostering shared collective experiences (e.g., police raids, concerts, communal living, prison) and communication (e.g., transnational network assembly, samizdat publication, cassette reproduction). This work in the Ghetto was accomplished tacitly by some and more explicitly by others, revealing the multiple tensions, personalities, intent, and approaches within the Underground. As such, interactions between diverse groups and materials were located, pulled together, and crafted over time, producing collective knowledge and practices of the Underground.

RESISTANCE, REVOLUTION, MEMORY, AND MUSIC IN THE EASTERN BLOC

Living in the Merry Ghetto returns to the case of the Czech Underground nearly thirty years after the democratic transformations or 1989, at a time when a majority of former Eastern bloc countries are members of the European Union and NATO. The questions posed nowadays are different than those asked in the late 1980s—how does the Czech Underground hold together after all this time? How did they/do they continue to furnish and adapt a cultural ecology that is flexible yet durable, enabling navigation and organization over differing political regimes and socio-economic conditions? This evidences a qualitatively different socio-political research climate than the early 1990s when the revolutions were still effervescent (Ryback 1990; Mitchell 1992; Ramet 1994).

Specific scholarly investigations of music during party-state socialism help outline the particularities of the Czech Underground. In an account of rock music in the East German Republic, Peter Wicke and John Shepherd (1993) detail the bureaucratization of musical genre (specifically rock 'n' roll). The case illuminates questions of "authenticity" of cultural production in a "rock state apparatus" where musicians negotiated "structural contradictions" between commercial success and still having to work within a politicized state music industry. Wicke's[8] (1992) work brings to light not only the political conditions of music-making during party-state socialism (within which some popular musicians "had

8. As well as Wicke's other work concerning popular music in East Germany (cf. Wicke 1992).

no other option"), but it also shows the particularity of the Underground when compared with other music-makers around the Bloc (and even compared with other musicians in Czechoslovakia): musicians in the Underground opted out from these state-structuring or market-driven conditions of performance opportunities and officially scripted creativity in order to build a parallel cultural ecology for musicking how they wanted. This is not to say that, when conceiving of a broad non-official cultural ecology of activity within Czechoslovakia—of which the Underground was the most radical part—that other musicians did not face these deliberations as Wicke describes. Indeed any socio-cultural ecology maintains varied intensities, which reflect the extent to which one adopts postures, attitudes, and feelings associated with said ecology.

Considering the 1980s Hungarian underground in Budapest, Szemere (2001) addresses how the transition of regimes in 1989 affected non- or semi-official musical groups. Szemere's monograph details how many of the values and alternatives that countercultural groups sustained had vanished after 1989. Once again the Czech Underground proves fruitful for analysis on how cultural ecologies hold together across political transitions: *Living in the Merry Ghetto* addresses the inter-war period to post–World War II in Chapter 2, as well as the transition from the pre-1968 era of Czechoslovakia in Chapters 2, 3, 4, and 5, and includes examination of the post-1989 years into the financial crisis after 2008 in Chapter 7.

Notable among the literature on popular music from the East Central Europe region during state socialism is Timothy Ryback's (1990) *Rock around the Bloc*. As one of the first to attempt a systematic description of rock 'n' roll scenes throughout most of the Eastern bloc from the 1950s to 1989, Ryback's explanatory efforts are a valuable map of the region's popular music during socialism. Couched in Cold War cultural politics, Ryback capitalizes on the widely argued note of rock 'n' roll's values and perceived relationship with resistance and ideology in the Bloc:

> Western rock culture has debunked Marxist-Leninist assumptions about the state's ability to control citizens. [. . .] Rock music has not only transformed the sights and sounds of Communist [sic] society but has also altered the very policies and structures of Soviet Bloc governments. (1990: 5)

From Ryback we can distill three pervasive assumptions in the so-called "rock smashed the wall" argument of transformation in the Eastern bloc: 1) rock music has intrinsic values that are exportable [i.e., the West ("us") triumphed, not people]; 2) socialist governments are unquestionably evil or rotten; 3) resistance is something oppositional toward ideologies, institutions, and policies. Kepplová (2008) targets such thinking as symptomatic of Cold War knowledge production: "[Cold War logics] can be characterized by the portrayal of the 'East' as frozen in time, grey and dusty, a bloc of mainstream per se against which countercultures could rise in a heroic gesture." In this regard a "Western" gaze tempered by Cold War logics not only cloaks the debate concerning mechanisms of socio-cultural transformation but also implies passive local reception of a reified "rock message" that ostensibly challenged every norm in its path. Such Cold War logics have postured analysis of music-related phenomena with a distinctly moral argument as opposed to a grounded socio-musical analysis of agency.

Moreover this moralism props up a romantic "power of music" perspective (Bergh 2010), which further dilutes socio-musical analysis into seemingly cause-and-effect relationships between social change and certain types of music. Pekacz (1994) has refuted this overemphasis on rock music's power. Instead Pekacz gives purchase to the other extreme of social change: systemic structural changes and unemployment as the root cause of socialist regime transformation. Yet this economic materialist perspective similarly falls short by failing to consider culture's active role as an agent in socio-political change. As a result there is a gap in analysis on events (revolutions), processes (resistance), and phenomena (rock music) that have a far more complex and unclear relationship than a claim of (Western) music's power to change (Eastern) regimes. To this end I examine how music empowers people to take various forms of action.

As such, part of the difficulty for socio-historical analysis in East Central Europe has lain in how researchers orient themselves to the research field in differing contexts: Goldfarb (1978: 920), in early work on studying on Polish independent theater, cautioned against ideological systems of knowledge production (in both the West and the East) skewing socio-cultural analysis—a call that is still relevant today. To remedy this I take a reflexive and relational focus informed by archival and ethnographic evidence to trace how social collectives realities use music to configure agency; this relationship between groups of humans and musical materials occurs in any ideological context.

The third of Ryback's assumptions regards resistance and institutions. Resistance is conceptualized as a challenge *to* something; resistance is directed toward an actor (e.g., state institutions) with seemingly consciously adopted goals and intent. This formulation of resistance is clearly not only relegated to state socialism, however there is already a wide vocabulary that conflates resistance with dissidence during the communist era (Skilling 1981, 1989; Pollack and Wielgohs 2004; McDermott and Stibbe 2006). Dissident activity within the Bloc has primarily rested on intellectual or charismatic leaders' role in the doing, conceptualizing, and/or leading of "civil society" praxis during the state-socialism. For example, in studies of independent society within state socialism in late 1970s and early 1980s, Skilling (1981; 1989) concentrates on leading dissident figures and their role within oppositional politics. Similarly, writing in the late 1980s, Garton Ash (1993) takes these dissident initiatives and civil disobedience and places them within the climate of democratic transformation in 1989 in Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary. Padraic Kenney's (2002) *The Carnival of Revolution* takes a different approach by looking toward "unsung heroes" of youth activists across the Bloc rather than examining distinct dissident groups. Their histories provoke the question: What happens after the fervor of revolution fizzles? Does one stop resisting? Although not their intended focus, these texts avoid the slippery post-socialist experience of what happens to culture learned in one environment that is transposed to another.

By decoupling resistance with dissidence, we arrive at a definition of resistance that is not based on opposition, direct action, or protest. Rather the Czech Underground shows us resistance-as-immunity, which emerges from the collective rejection of sets of cultural practices (e.g., official scripts). This resistance functions similarly to how we build up our defenses to resist certain diseases or illnesses. As Lou Reed sings, "Rock 'n' roll [saves lives]." Operationalized as relational instead of oppositional, resistance is revealed as a form

of protection and cooperation (not necessarily of goodwill) *with that which it is rejecting* in order to replace unwanted ecologies with nearly entire new ones. This is not to deny oppositional resistance as an activity in the Merry Ghetto (as Underground practices were diverse and dynamic), but it is to say expressly that resistance presented here is more akin to a cocoon or buffer.

The book's historical and contemporary study attempts to address this "mangle of practice" (Pickering 1995) and "entanglement of humans and non-humans" (Latour 2006: 84) in context. Therefore *Living in the Merry Ghetto* addresses how group cultures are built up link by link at often-tacit levels and with aesthetic materials. In other words the level of analysis in these previous studies does not fully assert culture's active properties but instead uses it as an instrumental reflection of resistance or a tool for dissent. What is missing from these robust historical studies is "how" culture worked as an active emotional and cognitive ingredient within political culture and how these are remembered and used today.

RELATIONAL MEMORIES IN (POST-)COMMUNIST REALITIES

In 1968 the *Plastics* settled on a band name with "universe" in the title, self-prophetically indicating the cosmological nature of musical experiences. Although originally borrowed from a Frank Zappa lyric that taunted the "plastic people" of a trans-local mainstream culture, the name now signals a meaningful experience of a structural pattern across political and economic systems. Often invoked by the Underground, an "establishment" is not an analytical category tied to any particular ideology, but rather an assemblage of inhibiting socio-cultural mechanisms that is mobile across time (Hagen 2012). While there is no shortage of authors who rightly reject binary formulations in their analysis of the multiplex of social and cultural phenomena in the former Soviet Union and Eastern bloc (Yurchak 2006; Grant 1995), it is useful to think of how these relational conventions of establishment-underground function as generative resources for those who appropriate them to narrate biographies—and similarly how many East Central European nations have developed such relational pairs in order to legitimate post-1989 governments (Mark 2011).

What might these historically reductionist views offer in terms of everyday life management? The language of "establishment and underground" (the English terms used by those in the Underground since the 1970s) is a trope that, while existing in opposition, goes together to organize experience and communal sense for its users (Lakoff and Johnson 1980; Sacks 1972). Sacks (1972) proposes a "*standardized* relational pair" for attributes of relationships that are typically known, understood, or common-sensical (e.g., parent-child). Within a particular historical and social context, though, "standardized" must be omitted from the concept, as the quality of the relationship, such as establishment-underground, is anything but clear.

Like memories, relational pairs in terms of analysis may distort pasts and events yet help sort realities. Within memory studies we often find such opposing forces in the form of past/present and remembering/forgetting, each establishing a for/against argumentation while constituting one another. Such pairs are taken from public testimonies—freedom/

oppression, East/West, mainstream/underground, official/non-official. It is memory work that mediates and constitutes these relational pairs not as factual representations of histories but rather as material for the telling and doing of reality coherency-work,[9] calling upon an intellectual response and emotional availability on behalf of social imaginaries (Ricoeur 1981) to an otherwise complex region of nations and history of East Central Europe.

Esbenshade (1995: 73) has succinctly described this complexity as "the conundrum of East Central European memory." Esbenshade outlines the ubiquity of counter-narratives and counter memories existent within East-Central Europe that ran parallel or against socialist era state-sanctioned forgetting and historical whitewashing; indeed, dissidents' counter-narrative claims of truth-representations of nations' pasts were not only forms of oppositional resistance in themselves but were the "anchors of opposition." Partly this complexity of narratives—be those public, collective, or private—arises from the region's twentieth century history, described as a "double past"—referring to the experiences of Nazism and Stalinism (Niven 2001; Rousso 1999). James Mark (2011: xiii) has discussed the particularity of the region's institutional memory practices for remembering "dictatorships" as far more present and widespread than one sees in "Italy, Portugal, Spain, or Germany." Mark analyzes memory practices associated with a "working through" paradigm of East-Central European governments'[10] as being part of the "unfinished revolution"; meaning that current memory paradigms propagated by post-communist elites and "institutes of national memory, history commissions, lustration bureaux, museums and commemorative memorials" have sought to complete what they see as the failure to extinguish communists' and reformed communists' political survival post-1989 (2011: xii–xiv). Clearly this is not an easy task to discern for any nation-state, its governments, or its publics, particularly when the state of the nation itself is unclear.

In the Czech Republic, if one extends the historical scope beyond the twentieth century, then a series of events that dates back to the fifteenth century shows a pattern of external forces, uprisings, defeat, and betrayal[11] for an otherwise self-proclaimed progressive and democratic national consciousness. This pattern has subsequently agitated a perplexed self-reflection on the experience and state of the Czech nation (Tucker 2000). This being the promise of

> the historical mythical narratives of western Europe and north America [that] tells how the "good" Protestant, liberal-democratic, and capitalist nations survived, succeeded, and prospered. [. . .] [They] will be among the "winners" in history. [. . .] Czech history does not fit this myth. [. . .] The Czech historical experience is the exact opposite of that of

9. As DeNora suggests: "Instead of asking *what* reality is, we ask *how* our sense of reality is generated" (2014: 1).

10. Mark refers to the region as Central-East Europe, showing, as does Todorova's account of the Balkans (1997), the constant transitional state and uncertainty of the region between the west and Russia. Mark's analysis focuses on Poland, Hungary, and Romania.

11. As Tucker (1996: 198) notes in reference to the 1938 Treaty of Munich that even as a "political, economic, and cultural part of the West, this did not affect the decision of Britain and France to sacrifice Czechoslovakia to Hitler, while the isolationist USA stood by."

western European and Anglophone countries and the antithesis of moral evolutionism. (Tucker 1996: 197–98)

Developing a similar account of questioning the place of Czech national historical consciousness in contemporary society, Bryant (2000) outlines the case of a samizdat[12] text written in 1987 in Czechoslovakia, *Czechs in the Modern Era: An Attempt at Self-Reflection*. In the early 1990s this text came to be the center of disputes and debates as to how Czech national history and consciousness were represented and narrated, how resistance and dissent were moralized during the socialist era and after, and how these points have come to function in the 1990s political field (the time of Bryant's writing). Part of this dispute arose from then-president Havel's moral philosophy, *living in truth*, which entailed that human action should be guided by a "sense of responsibility to the rest of humanity" (Bryant 2000: 38). Such a philosophy was considered an antidote to the perceived view that many in Czechoslovakia's normalization period had uncritically accepted the form of communism without much regard to the content[13] and thus they were "forgetting how to remember" the history of the nation (one supposedly characterized by progressive ideals) in an era shaped by politicized historians producing a public sphere of "a-historicalness" (Bryant 2000: 37). Thus a point of contestation within the 1990s political culture of Czechoslovakia/the Czech Republic was how dimensions of dissident thought often painted the population (those who weren't *living in truth* during normalization) as "unthinking," "mechanical," in "dehumanized conformity" (Bryant 2000). This condition of late socialism Havel termed "post-totalitarian" meaning that more than just coercive measures of oppressive state apparatus, the state entered people's actions and interactions rendering them meaningless. When Havel addressed Czechoslovakia as its democratically elected leader in 1990, he spoke of the "moral contamination" of the country, which needed to be purged (Bryant 2000). This inward-looking retribution that Havel and dissidents-turned-politicians sought in the early 1990s thus proved bold yet difficult for a public who either did not share a philosophizing account of the past nor maintained a self-perception as immorally complicit in practices of the former party-state regime.

Given these complexities of representation, it proves theoretically and empirically productive to examine how memory-in-practice filters muddy substantive debates and experiences into performative categories of relational pairs. These relational pairs aid in contemporary post-socialist everyday life management and in some cases carry on from everyday life management during normalization. These are everyday realities that relational pairs sort out and simultaneously uncover the struggle over political implications: is it, for instance, resistance/communism, underground/communism, or underground/establishment? Or is it any of these?

Crucial to the question of memory-in-practice is the relation between how actors *perceived* and *constituted* the immoral "official" and moral "non-official." Throughout the book, I rely

12. The phenomenon of clandestinely self-published and circulated textual material in the former Soviet Union and Eastern bloc (Hagen and DeNora 2011; Machovec 2009).

13. See Havel's "The Green Grocer" (1991 [1978]).

on the category "non-official," borrowed from Czech musician Mikoláš Chadima's writings on music during socialism in Czechoslovakia, which delineated musical activities as official and non-official (1992: 9–10). But why employ such a binary relationship? Again it is not an analytical effort but rather shows how people (e.g., Chadima) used music to help structure a reality during normalization and subsequently his actions within that reality. I extend this scope of non-official activity to refer to how people were able to locate and craft resources in often "make do" ways, often potentially illegal in the political climate (e.g., tinkering with antenna for tuning in to foreign radio broadcasts; non-authorized performance with home-made amps). Activities such as these highlight the extent of how one dips in to non-official cultural ecologies with varying degrees of commitment.

What can be considered official? Taken here, official practices are those that divert away from the official script, and commitment to that script, of the Socialist Republic of Czechoslovakia (be that a felt commitment or the performance of citizenry). In this sense, non-official corresponds to activity in and of the "non-socialist sphere," as agents from the communist party would describe such deviations from the script (Šimák 1984: 1). In the era of normalization this script began to foster a disconnect between actions and symbols.

Clearly non-official carries a wide array of practice of different intensities. Non-official, as such, exists as an entity of everyday practices enacted by some citizens of Czechoslovakia— albeit disparate and to different degrees and frequencies. These practices maintain an order in relation to an institutionally established script. These groups and practices often overlap; Havel's green grocer, even though he thoughtlessly puts out his supportive party slogan sign in the shop window, also sells some of his fruit on the black market. It is this margin of overlap with official practice that the Underground attempted to minimize and what sets the Underground apart from other non-official activity: the belief that all work should be un-compromisingly carried out from their cultural ecology, the Merry Ghetto. In this sense The Merry Ghetto was an effort of purification, an attempt of complete removal from the script of official culture. It is for this reason that music became a real-time exemplar and mediator for this awareness of the Underground body, mind, and habitat.

SOCIOLOGY OF MUSIC TO MUSIC IN ACTION

The perspective of music as a medium for the expression of freedom in the face of ideologies, mainstreams, or establishments has no shortage of intellectual support. Much of the pre-vious work on the Underground's music (Skilling 1989: 79–83; Falk 2003: 84–87) has concerned it as an expression of freedom. While such a perspective may be valid for the Underground, a focus on expression and liberation highlights how "repression" is mediated as a lived experience, and how music is at times less a vehicle of protest as it is a means for coping and "cocooning" (self-protection). The point here is that it is necessary to consider how degrees of repression[14] (as a result of oppressive actions) is *felt* (anywhere at anytime) and how music, configured in specific ways by groups of people, is used to alleviate and

14. Often articulated in the Czech case to questions of human rights and freedom of speech.

protect against such feelings or unhealthy environments. To this end, the Underground shows us how music was used as one material in an ecology of aesthetic forms that came to mediate activity that led to increased social agency at both individual and collective levels. For this analysis I draw on certain key developments in music sociology as it has taken shape since the 1980s, in particular the production of culture and art world perspectives and, more recently, the focus on how music gets "inside" action (Acord and DeNora 2008: 226).

Music in Sociology

To examine music is to examine the social. This is evidenced, to name but a few examples, through popular music as social activity (Frith 1978, 1981), symbolic and social boundaries of musical taste and consumption (Bourdieu 1984; Thornton 1995; Peterson and Kern 1996; Bryson 1996), music listening attention and associated forms of behavior (Stockfelt 1997; Bull 2000), and music as medium of collective constitution (Eyerman and Jamieson 1998; Bergh 2007), as well as musical performativity, gender, and identity management (Waksman 2006; Frith and McRobbie 1990 [1978]). Music's far-reaching implications in social life have been explored through these various lenses, contributing to an analytically robust sociology of music. To foster a situated constructivist approach to cultural and musical production, the sociological analysis gives privilege to organizational practices in concert with aesthetic practices (DiMaggio 1977, 1987; DiMaggio and Hirsch 1976; DiMaggio and Mukhtar 2004; Peterson 2004) in order to examine the musical object as not only being *the result* of social relations but also *active* in making those social relations happen (DeNora 2003: 3).

Sociologists have re-engaged with aesthetics to address this question of music ontology. The aesthetic shift within the cultural turn has been prominent within a "post-critical [. . .] new music sociology" (Prior 2011: 122; Fuente 2000; 2007), which shows how music is good material for taking apart and reassembling larger debates concerning core sociological variables as agency, emergence, and structure (DeNora 2003; Hennion 2007). A focus on music's aesthetic materials refocuses a "sociology of music" (*what causes music*) to a "music sociology," which concerns music as a key element "in and as" society (DeNora 2003: 2–3). Music sociology's focus on the use of aesthetic materials, contexts, and activities, and what they make possible in everyday life (Acord 2006; Robertson 2010; Sutherland and Gosling 2010; Bergh 2011; Hara 2011) thus illustrate a pragmatist feature within cultural sociology's "strong program" considerations of the active properties culture plays within social life (Alexander 2003).

The Affordance Perspective of Cultural Ecologies

This focus on musical aesthetics "in action" (Fuente 2007; Acord and DeNora 2008) develops the concept of "affordance." Borrowed from perceptual psychology, affordances emerge in situated contexts of use, which come to provide conditions for action (DeNora 2000, 2003,

2011a, 2011b; Hennion 1997, 2001, 2007; Frith 2003; Ansdell 1997, 2004; Clarke 2006; Fuente et al. 2012). Such a perspective highlights how actors use music's properties; in other words, how rhythm, timbre, harmony, or melody afford a wide spectrum of action associated to these materials (remembering, forecasting, mood-transforming, body-entraining). The affordance perspective as such reimagines the musical object by understanding music's meaning as located at the intersection of musical properties and everyday use; music's potency emerges in context. Accordingly music does not contain its own ends nor does it offer any guarantees but is only "completed" when *used* (drawn into practice, read, interpreted) by an actor (Hennion 2001: 12; Frith 1998 [1996]: 58). These selective, sometimes unconscious uses of music's affordances are termed "appropriations" (DeNora 2000: 45). Appropriation in this context differs from how we find the term in cultural and media studies, wherein it is taken to be a form of transculturation, or borrowing a sign or symbol from another culture (Hebdige 1979: 103–108). Consequently music emerges as a key component in producing social relations, not merely a reflection of society or a homologous structure of a social group (Frith 1998 [1996]: 108).

Along with object affordances are an actor's abilities that are attuned to an environment. J.J. Gibson (1979) outlines the co-configuring features of action by environmental affordances and actors' abilities: for example certain objects (e.g., a ball) have properties (e.g., spherical, soft, light) that allow it to do things (e.g., roll, bounce) that require of the actors (e.g., you and I) certain abilities (e.g., kick, dribble) that enable meaningful action (e.g., passing a soccer ball to another player).

To give a sonic example: musical affordances (e.g., bodily entrainment or dancing) are brought out from musical properties (e.g., rhythm or $\frac{3}{4}$ time signature) by the configuration of people and objects (e.g., aristocracy, gowns, halls) that constitute the event (e.g., a Viennese Ball); similar to a ball's spherical properties allowing a meaningful sport to be played by a team on a pitch. Affordances and abilities, as such, aid in an ecological understanding of how environments and objects can afford forms of action and how people articulate meaning to such action. The music sociology perspective of appropriation, ability, and affordance situates music as an action resource (i.e., a precondition of action) within social relations that moves away from explicit cultural products that contain semiotic codes or are commodities for consumption. Understanding "appropriation" in this manner brings to light tacit processes (e.g., attunement and embodiment) involved in learning from available resources in cultural ecologies.

Mediating/Mediated Resources in Ecologies

Musical meaning is constituted through mediation (Hennion 1997, 2005; Born 2005). Musical mediators help to clarify, shape, and negotiate agreement and meaning of musical information. This echoes Frith's focus (1978) on discursive aspects of meaning creation in music, which also serves to challenge a text-based approach to the study of musical meaning that asserts meaning as inherently intrinsic to the aesthetic material. As others have noted within the study of popular music (Stockfelt 1997; Bull 2000),

these mediations can be technological (SW radio, mobile music player, car stereo), spatial (venue, city, bedroom) or interpersonal (listening with friends, family, strangers, or alone) to name but a few. These mediations highlight the ways in which musical meaning is constituted by and through humans and non-humans (Latour 1999; Geisler and Wickramasinghe 2009).

A sociology of mediations (or attachments, associations) departs from critical sociology, which suggests the actor as a "cultural dope" or "cloaked in a social game" (Hennion 2001: 5). A sociology of mediations posits the amateur as a highly reflexive, ingenious user of cultural material—a key to understanding how one uses music for "cocooning" in everyday practice. Take for example the disgruntled teenager who, after arguing with parents, runs into their bedroom and begins playing music loudly. Is this a protest through disturbance (to the parents) or is it an immersive cocoon of volume and sound that affords emotional protection? The user, or amateur, then, is one who is able to deploy and manage instantaneously and often spontaneously, an innumerable heterogeneity of links and attachments in order to co-produce, innovate, reform, and refine the self. The co-production of the self, then, shows "traces" of intersubjectivity: learning how qualities of objects (e.g., volume) affect you and learning this effect from a collective of people (Hennion 2007: 109; Frith 1987: 272; Becker 1953).

Gomart and Hennion (1999) address how objects may act on subjects, putting the latter into a "passive state" while actors actively prepare to be taken over by the object. Primarily, this arises through the co-configuration of objects: "works make the gaze that beholds them, and the gaze makes the work" (Hennion 2005: 134). This reflection on a state of being as dually active/passive brings to view how ways of feeling, thinking, and knowing *emerge* from a configured set of mediations that come to constitute musical meaning, which acts on our bodies, minds and hearts (Hennion 2005: 134). As such meaning is fashioned indexically through individual and collective associations, providing a malleable material for identity assembly. This focus, then, suggests what could *not* happen when those materials (or rather bridges between sociability) are *unavailable*, or suppressed.

Specific features of local everyday cultures form according to what is *available* in the local environment. By focusing on situations, contexts, places, moments, people, and objects, an ecological perspective of music examines how collective efforts *furnish* a cultural ecology. These furnishing activities of *locating, putting together/opening up*, and *crafting* help assemble resources in relation to what information is available, or not available, in material surroundings. In this sense to speak of "furnishings" is much like the collaborative and coordinated action in how we might construct a house and furnish a home with activities and materials: build walls with wood, stormproof windows with glass, roof with shingles, drag in a chair one found at a flea market, install locks on the door, put up light fixtures, quilt blankets for beds, and then renovate when material is worn or someone moves in or out or next door. However instead of nails, glass, and wood, I speak here about aesthetic materials, properties, qualities, and resources—heavy bass lines, minor tonalities, non-syncopation, screamed vocals. The potentializing aspect of aesthetic resources for assembling a habitable place is not determining of actions, rather it provides cues for action through the referential nature of aesthetic material.

Musicking

How resources afford action turns the question from *What is the Underground way of life?* to *how* such a way of life comes into being. With whom and how is it enacted and sustained? How does this activity afford not only communing but also rejecting unwanted forms of culture? To accomplish such an analysis (that explores the sharing and negotiating of a way of life), we move from considering music-as-text to music-as-practice wherein music is a resource and mediator for social interaction (e.g., cooperating, sharing, negotiating). Music-as-practice helps to address how a clustering of people, objects, and materials come together in relation to music: for example in real-time musical practice (rehearsing, performing) or in the ways people come to hear, listen to, talk about, and think about music.

In particular this delineates music-as-practice as "musicking." Musicking frames meaning not as something that lies in the text of music but rather as arising through the social activity of engaging with music (Small[15] 1998: 9). Such a conceptualization allows us to take apart how music is not just notes on a page or something performed or expressed by people with talent but rather as a resource that people—anyone and everyone—use everyday to achieve, maintain, and transform realities. While Small's musicking concept focuses explicitly on performance, for this study I expand the concept to consider a wider range of activity: attending concerts, tuning into the radio, practicing scales, humming, clapping, foot-tapping, dancing, imagining music, or singing along; in other words, micro attunements to music that rely on a form of core musicality. Therefore by taking a modified form of Small's definition, musicking helps us to consider how aesthetic materials are located ("Hey, that sounds great!"), patterned, and put together ("I listen to this album every evening."), and crafted ("Beer, Led Zeppelin, and some friends") in often tacit ways that come to empower how one cares for the self against unwanted "pollutants" ("Helps me unwind").

This expanded definition of musicking gives us an operationalized way of understanding music as it enters collective action incrementally in a variety of activity (hearing, listening, imitating, anticipating, composing, rehearsing, distributing). Considering how music affords the work of "cocooning" at a collective level, Ansdell (2004: 78) suggests that music sustains and realigns "disparate moods, energy levels, [and] modes of attention in a sense of mental, physical and emotional congruence." Such emotional, embodied, and cognitive experiences stabilized through musicking are at the center of how togetherness affords resistance.

In this sense community assembly is a form of social change (e.g., disparate individual to group) that is a liminal activity occurring in certain environments furnished with materials. In other words, combinations of furnishings—place, aesthetics, objects, people—can bring about liminality when there is a "click" (i.e., felt convergence) between resources and action within a meaningful ecology. Within such an ecology, "togetherness" is not only between people but also a relation between a network of objects and materials. "Togetherness" takes into consideration an entire range of what can be considered to be the "social" (Latour 2006). As such a cultural ecology is a post-humanist configuration, following Pickering's

---

15. Smalls' "musicking" has been presaged by Elliot's (1995) "musicing."

(1995) rendering of decentering the human subject in analysis. Liminality then (be that of an object or a person) may be pursued at subtle degrees of commitment over time. Therefore it is possible to consider how liminality occurs in everyday life in meaningful ecologies, not only rituals. To understand how music is implicated in "togetherness," I interrogate how cultural resources make possible fellowship. These resources help us explore how to frame resistance and immunity in everyday politics.

The Possibilities of Togetherness

To speak of "togetherness" is to speak ecologically about social learning. Music is a resource and environment for this learning—it is a key point in how people "enter" communities over time as well as how these relationships are mediated. Often the learning process is negotiated in tacit activity where one may not be coordinating action to a specifically adopted goal. Rather the conditions of an environment can afford action coordinated with material objects. In this perspective the vocabulary changes from *strategy of action* to *action by chance, likelihood or possibility*. This makes room for seeing not only how one enters a community but also shifts the focus away from determinate explanations of action within a community based on ascribed social positions and inscribed dispositions. How we learn environmental affordances from others and attune our abilities with others helps to frame the community activity that occurs in cultural ecologies. In keeping with an ecological perspective of grounded collective activity, social learning is a central process in how things come together and stabilize in situated contexts thereby opening up the possibility for action.

Forms of cooperative interaction between people around objects are at the heart of Becker's *Art Worlds* (1982). This approach's description of networks and collectives organized around cooperation, which also contributes to the artwork's aesthetic conventions, helps to see a quality (e.g., cooperative) of interaction that is useful when considering aspects of community activity where trust, kinship, and fellowship emerge. Becker's worlds approach proves beneficial particularly for what it offers to marginalized groups. Implied in the worlds approach is a "sociology of the possible" (Becker and Pessin 2006: 279), where social relations exist not in a field of limited resources (as Bourdieu's "trajectories in fields" would have it), but rather in a world of limitless resources. Indeed, "you could always do something else" as Becker notes (Becker and Pessin 2006: 279).

Similarly in her critique of Habermas's single elite bourgeois public sphere, Fraser (1990) proposes the existence of a multiplicity of publics, not as a threat to democracy but as a positive benefit in establishing participatory parity between different groups. She calls these publics "subaltern counter-publics" and sees them as "parallel discursive arenas where members of subordinated social groups invent and circulate counter-discourses to formulate oppositional interpretations of their identities, interests, and needs" (1990: 67). Thinking with the idea of limitless resources within counter-publics, it is possible to analyze how power is built up between (human and non-human) relationships as well as how counter-discourses between these groups may "converge" or "meet up" at different discursive and experiential points for the generation of more resources.

The sociology of the possible thus analytically aids in understanding how a group of people reject unwanted material by engaging in the cultural effort of "doing something else" in order to locate and craft a parallel or alternate ecology for more comfort and less dis-ease; in short, for greater agency and well-being. People's actions and responses within this limitless world of resources are anything but determined or predictable but rather based on interaction with available resources within local environments. Often these resources are aesthetically mediated. But how do aesthetics help hold together togetherness?

COMING TOGETHER MUSICALLY

Community activity that unfolds while musicking reveals the subtle ways we use cultural resources to "get on the same page," as it were. In his account of musical identity, Frith (1996: 111) identifies "coming together" through music as a performative social and emotional project. Togetherness results from collective aesthetic confirmation achieved through "experience and collusion." Highlighting collective cognitive and emotional project of togetherness, he stresses "[social] *groups* only get to know themselves [. . .] *through* cultural activity" (1996: 111, Frith's italics). To pursue this nexus of action and music (Witkin and DeNora 1997: 2) "aesthetic agency" helps formulate interaction as not only following cultural conventions of aesthetic form (e.g., improvising jazz with others) but also takes into account sensibilities and embodied orientations that constitute the "emotional preparation" for action (Acord and DeNora 2008: 228).

Emotional preparation helps to prime emotional convergence with others. As an example of how groups may come together emotionally via music, Frith (2007: 167–68) points to the social and emotional performativity of musical works using Elton John's "Candle in the Wind" at Princess Diana's funeral as "performing sincerity [. . .] a performance of grief in which we could all take part." Here, "we" could converge because of emotional preparation. "Candle in the Wind" shows us how these "patterns of emotional attachments" order and anchor culture (Connell 1990). Anderson et al. (2003: 1054) describe the process of "emotional convergence" in relationships as becoming "increasingly similar over time [. . .] as they navigate the terrain of long-term bonds. Emotional similarity [. . .] promotes coordinated thoughts and actions, mutual understanding, and interpersonal cohesion and attraction." Taking these together, we see how music is well suited to analyze this pattern: how groups organize themselves around emotional anchors and how music mediates these anchors.

This emotional convergence echoes Turner's normative communitas. Ansdell addresses the musical communitas as "a common shared world of time, space, gesture, and energy, which nevertheless allows diversity and unity" (2004: 78). Musical communitas thus points to how the social and emotional effort of "togetherness" is enabled, empowered, and made possible by musicking. Musicking, in short, helps people to "tune in" to relationships to find the "We" (Schutz 1976: 161) and reveals the material, experiential, and imaginative affordances of a cultural ecology.

Ecologies subsequently implicate thresholds of emotion, activity, and cognition. Such thresholds, situated at the boundaries of other ecologies (e.g., official cultural ecologies),

in turn indicate liminal points where transition (from one ecology to another) may occur. These thresholds, however, require an amount of upkeep via community activity, similar to how one performs upkeep on a house (repairing, repainting, re-shingling). The doing of up-keep means promoting a healthy habitat of continuity for collective well-being. Coordinated collective activity is therefore a question of health promotion.

EFFECTIVE RESISTANCE AND COLLECTIVE WELL-BEING

Antonovsky (1987; 1996: 13) has proposed the "salutogenic" model of health promotion for solving, preventing, curing, and rehabilitating problems related to collective well-being. Within this model Antonovsky (1996: 14) proposes a continuum of "healthy/dis-ease" as a more realistic (and holistic) understanding of health in relation to an environment and how that environment may promote well-being. Therefore using a "salutatory" (health-promoting) approach we start from a more flexible and emergent definition of health as being relational to a material and imaginative environment, which one builds with others (Freund 2001: 690). Health in this regard—which considers not a single pathogen but rather health as a complex system—lends itself to the complexity of practice. Similarly the salutogenic model helps us consider cultural ecologies' affordances as health technologies, which help collective well-being by making us feel "good" or "comfortable" and less at "dis-ease."

More specifically Ruud (2002; 2006; 2008: 48) has described music's health technologies as "cultural immunogens." By this Ruud refers to music as a medium for care of the self—how it can come to regulate emotions, aide in coping, maintain concentration, and also keep out, or replace, unwanted "pollutants" within an ecology (DeNora 2000). Consequently musicking aids in the assembly of immunity to that which is perceived and experienced as "dis-ease." This type of immunization is, then, the upkeep of defense at the thresholds of a collective cultural ecology accomplished and achieved through community activity. Such collective immunization highlights two qualities of community: *commune* (sharing with) and *immunity* (resistance from). Cohen (1985: 15) points out that boundaries may be thrown up and accentuated for protection (or prevention) for collective well-being. In a similar fashion Derrida has alluded to these forms of exclusion through his alternative reading of community: "to have *communion* is to be fortified on all sides, to build a "common" (*com*) "defense" (*munis*), as when a wall is put up around the city to keep the stranger or foreigner out" (Derrida and Caputo 1997: 108, qtd in Ansdell 2004: 80). Or when a boundary is assembled to keep out establishments.

In short immunity is implicated in coming together (which is in itself a cultural activity of "upkeep") and therefore a question of resistance ("keeping out"). Resistance, as a process of assembling something impermeable, has been presaged as ideological resistance (Corrigan and Frith 1976: 235–36) wherein there is a rejection of norms and values of a dominant institution. We can see resistance as a rejection of not only norms but of cultural material that threatens a particular way of life or would change its path. This perspective of using music to reject certain modes of being or feeling associated with official culture

resonates with Gomart and Hennion's (1999: 242–45) effective resistance: "making oneself *not* open to the possibilities of passion induced by music" (my italics)—in other words how and why some music moves you and other music does not. Accordingly how music is (or is not) potentialized helps problematize resistance as an everyday aesthetic occurrence: a social actor learns abilities that aid in conditioning the acceptance/rejection of pleasure of certain music and therefore an acceptance/rejection of a mode of being or a regime of action. Effective resistance, in these terms, focuses analytic attention at ecological psycho-social collective levels of subconsciously learned aesthetic reflexive techniques that are oriented toward keeping out unwanted modes of feeling, thinking, and being. The psycho-social negotiation process of how we might use music to "keep out" or distance ourselves from unwanted materials is where actors dip in tacitly to cultural ecologies (to circulating media, environmental properties, or actor capacities). The question is then how do musical materials, representations, and sound technologies contribute to social agency.

When speaking about how someone tacitly self-assembles a range of sensibilities via aesthetic related practices, the distinction between "operational" (quasi-conscious, practical) and "active" agency (fully conscious, intentional) becomes important because it helps to highlight the heterogeneity within non-official culture (Batt-Rawden and DeNora 2005). In some instances, dipping in to a non-official cultural ecology may provide expression or may help for a removal from a (perceived and experienced harmful) public in ways that could be described as having "buffer zone" or "cocooning" qualities (i.e., resisting public life). Such dipping in for cocooning purposes affords transition further and further—or just a bit—depending on how much and what one needs in order to balance the public and private emotional life to achieve a state of well-being.

Aesthetically mediated community activity, as a learned way of togetherness that rejects threatening material, is then one that promotes well-being for its members by offering protection. This conceptualization of resistance rests on replacing one ecology (e.g., the establishment's regime) with another, healthier ecology that is located and configured aesthetically by engagement between community members and objects. Resistance is similar to immunity, with music acting as a cultural immunogen. To be more immune, thus healthier, an actor appropriates aesthetic material that has been placed as furniture in the cultural ecology using it to get something done. As such the liminal practice of dipping in to an ecology is where one begins to be sensitized to objects via a continuum of mediations and thus learning (socially, tacitly) how one engages with the furnished ecology for "pleasurable" effects (i.e., how might the space promote health for the individual by being together in different ways). Therefore, in this light, "dipping in"—a concept that harmonizes liminality and tacit learning—becomes a question of coming together/resisting by aesthetic practices associated with rejection and re-placement.

EMERGENCE AND ACTION IN CULTURAL ECOLOGIES

What are the practical means of keeping up this "togetherness"? How is music effective? What *work* does it do? How is "dis-ease" made right? How do aesthetics nurture political

consciousness? How does engagement with aesthetic materials offer a way of making things better (e.g., more hospitable for imagination)? These are questions of ontological security—people doing it because it "feels right" or "that's just what they do." Bourdieu (1984: 486, 478) would describe such "feeling right" by posing this as a matter of taste imposed or conditioned by our class, wherein embodied dispositions lead to "an instinctive bodily reaction against those things which do not fit our habituses." However, as I will show, this is not only a question of taste and class but it is also a question of sanity and well-being that takes on aspects of relational forms of health promotion. Ontological security, then, is a matter of well-being that corresponds to being with certain people in a certain way that is both "hedonic" (pleasurable) and "eudaimonic" (prosperous) (Huppert, et al.: 2009): the social effervescence of fellowship.

Thus music is more than just a resource for cognition. It is a medium and embodied practice connecting entire ecologies of living—ways of being with other people, ways of feeling, how to learn, how to protect, how to work with other people, how to know the self and as a collective. In order to examine ecologically the multiple uses and reconfigurations of music in the Merry Ghetto, I focus on how clusters of individuals in local arrangements learned and appropriated cultural resources. Such examination of music's role in community activity demands an ethnographic methodology that gives a grounded voice to the many ways people musick and its potentializing effects for acting upon us. By focusing on processes of mediation—such as the technologies, situations and processes, discourses, performance style, and organization of an ecology—I reveal black-box mechanisms of how music "works" or how music is "powerful." That is to say I do not pursue a narrative that seeks to answer rock 'n' roll's assumed power for expressing freedom and defeating politicized ideologies. Rather my interest is simply in how music gets into community activity, regardless of how historical events have unfolded.

By prioritizing music I do not intend to suggest that other non-official cultural practices in Czechoslovakia at this time were not important; on the contrary, practices such as explicit political activism (Skilling 1989), literature production (Gruntorád 2001; Machovec 2009; Pilař 2002), embodied practices (Blažek and Pospíšil 2010), visual arts (Klimešová 2001), photography (Moucha 2001), magnitizdat (Vaníček 1997), and theater (Just 2001; Jungmannová 2001) were all vital components of Underground activity. Indeed as this literature suggests, these extra-musical practices are critical to understanding the complex richness of non-official activity in Czechoslovakia. Music was, in other words, but part of the story.

In what follows I discuss how the Underground furnished a so-called "other" culture (*druhá kultura*[16]) by exploring the diverse ways people participated in musical practices. This participation ultimately created a habitable, health-promoting cultural ecology for communing and assembling immunity against things that they sought to reject. The musically mediated participation created a space (the Merry Ghetto) for the "doing" of community. Chapter 2 addresses the beginnings of aesthetic assembly of the Underground cultural ecology by looking at historical conditions from the 1930s to early 1970s Czechoslovakia.

---

16. *Druhá kultura* translates as both "other" and "second" culture.

I focus on how actors tacitly "dipped in" to a non-official cultural ecology creating, for some, a liminal transition into what would eventually come to be arranged into a more particular Underground cultural ecology. Such furnishing of the Underground relied on locating aesthetic materials, putting them together with other sounds and materials, and crafting them through patterned ways of use. Chapters 3 and 4 seek to ask in what ways (and with whom) one furnishes a cultural ecology and what this furnishing activity can do. I consider some of the core assembly blocks of the Underground by asking how music mediates knowledge production, commitment-making, and ontological security. It is important to stress the uncertainty in the assembly of such ecologies: looking back on processes that unfold over time, certain activity may appear "strategic." However in the case of putting things (aesthetic materials) together with other things (style of playing) that consequently open up cultural ecologies, the result may be more similar to, as Pickering (1995: 564) puts it, "tuning up a car or radio [...] in that the character of the signal is not known in advance. [...]"

From this crafted non-official ecology in the 1960s, a more distinct Underground cultural ecology emerged in the 1970s. Chapter 4 outlines how acts of state oppression lead to suppressing environmental conditions that enabled a feeling and practice of *truth to self*. This repression in turn led to heighten forms of collective awareness of an Underground way of life and exposed the politics of musicking in the Merry Ghetto. Chapter 5 highlights this politics of music as we see Androši arrested, put on trial, and imprisoned in 1976, setting the stage for dissident initiatives to enter into the Merry Ghetto's ecology.

Continuing on from the regime's crackdown on the Merry Ghetto in the late 1970s, Chapter 6 concerns musicking during the 1980s that grew out of the space furnishings of amateur, semi-official, and non-official musical streams in the 1970s. Here I examine the convergence between the wider non-official cultural ecology (jazz, protest music, alternative music, New Wave) and transformations in the Merry Ghetto in the face of police pressure. Chapter 7 takes stock of some of the contemporary features of the Underground Renaissance—a flourishing of Underground activity since the early 2000s—examining the entry of different carrier groups within Underground mnemonic activity. Finally Chapter 8 concludes on the possibility of togetherness and how the case of the Czech Underground helps us to understand the revolving nature of how cultural ecologies are enacted in everyday life regardless of political contexts—revolutions in other words, but spelled with a lowercase "r."