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Fluxus in Prague: The *Koncert Fluxu* of 1966

Petra Stegmann

“I don’t like Fluxus”
—Jindřich Chalupecký, letter to Dick Higgins, 1965

“I feel that you have misunderstood the intentions of Fluxus”
—George Maciunas, letter to Jindřich Chalupecký, 1 October 1965

Although by the mid-1960s Fluxus¹ had been pronounced dead several times already,² in some environments it had merely been noticed. Nineteen

---

¹ The term Fluxus, as I am using it here, denotes the works—actions and objects—by a loose network of artists, mainly held together by George Maciunas, a Lithuanian-born, New York-based artist, who gave Fluxus its name and who was the principal organizer of many activities and editor of various multiples (Fluxkits), and publications. The artists forming this continuously changing network did not follow a unified artistic program, but shared some concepts, like the idea that art must not necessarily be created as an object, and negated the notion of the artist as a creative genius. Typical for Fluxus works are "event" scores, that—contrary to happenings—can be performed time and again like musical works, as well as Fluxkits, little boxes offering possibilities for experience and experimentation. The sources for this text are mainly interviews with artists (Eric Andersen, Jeff Berner, Milan Knížák, Alison Knowles, and Ben Vautier), as well as correspondence and photographs in artists’ archives (Eric Andersen, Jeff Berner, Milan Knížák, and Ben Vautier), in Fluxus archives (Gilbert and Lila Silverman Fluxus Collection, now in the Museum of Modern Art, New York; Archive Sohm, Staatsgalerie Stuttgart; Jean Brown Papers, Getty Research Institute Library, Los Angeles) as well as press reviews, published in Prague after the events.

sixty-six was a crucial date for the reception of Fluxus in some areas of Eastern Europe, since a number of significant, yet unrelated events took place: a series of performances by Eric Andersen, Tomas Schmit, and Arthur Köpcke in Club Reduta, Prague, from 5 to 7 April; a Fluxus concert in Vilnius, organized by Vytautas Landsbergs with his students in the summer; and a festival in Prague on 13, 14, and 17 October with Ben Vautier, Jeff Berner, Serge Oldenbourg, Dick Higgins, and Alison Knowles; this latter event, its preconditions, the course of events and the reception of Fluxus by the local protagonists will be the focus of this text.

As is well known, Eastern Europe had been the self-proclaimed “Fluxus chairman” George Maciunas’s area of special interest, and he was convinced that especially cultural players of the Soviet Union had literally just been waiting to welcome Fluxus as an official state art. Thus, in his letters to Soviet cultural authorities he suggested a unification of the “revolutionary-realist society” of the USSR with the “revolutionary-realist artists of the world.” For the Fluxus “program” that, according to Maciunas, would be realized through a bilingual magazine and a worldwide concretist art and music festival, he was hoping for leadership through the Communist Part of the Soviet Union: “it was important in our belief that we should commence coordinating our efforts with the social-political aims of your party leadership.” Maciunas’s ambitious plans, however, would never materialize, and the actual exchange between Fluxus artists and East European artists took place through initiatives by his colleagues, who—for the most part—did not share his political agenda, but were generally open to an exchange with like-minded artists around the world.

3 All three had been active in Fluxus but were “expelled” by Maciunas in 1964 as the result of an alleged tour of Eastern Europe with scandalous performances, while in fact it was only Eric and Tony Andersen who had traveled east and performed mainly in private apartments. See Eric Andersen, “The East Fluxus Tour 1964,” in Fluxus East. Fluxus-Netzwerke in Mittelosteuropa/Fluxus Networks in Central Eastern Europe, ed. Petra Stegmann (Berlin: Künstlerhaus Bethanien, 2007), 53–61.

4 Apart from the events of 1966, two later significant events took place in Eastern Europe: a Fluxconcert, organized and performed by Tamás St. Auby [at that time: Szentjóby] in Budapest in 1969; and the much later Fluxus Festival Three Flux Days of Fun and the Fourth Day in a Flux Clinic (3 Dni Flux zabawy i czwarty w Flux klinice), organized by Jarosław Kozłowski in Galeria Akumulatory 2, Poznań.


6 Ibid.

7 This interartistic exchange between Fluxus artists and artists in East-Central Europe was the focus of the exhibition Fluxus East, curated by Petra Stegmann, that was shown in Berlin, Vilnius, Krakow, Budapest, Tallinn, Copenhagen, and Oslo (2007–11).
Both festivals in Prague, in April and October 1966, were exceptional, since they were the only group performances by Fluxus artists in Eastern Europe, organized in the tradition of the festivals held in different Western European cities since summer 1962. The personal constellation of the events reflected the changes that the Fluxus network had undergone, with George Maciunas frequently expelling artists as a result of their misconduct. Also, the events in Prague in October were informed by tensions: Dick Higgins and Alison Knowles had fallen into disgrace with the foundation of Higgins’s Something Else Press in 1963; Maciunas considered it to be a rival operation to his own publishing activities and thus what looked like a joint Fluxus festival was in fact two events, occurring at the same time. “It is mere chance,” as Jindřich Chalupecký, the prominent art critic and main organizer of the Koncert Fluxu, pointed out to George Maciunas, “that Higgins, Knowles, Berner, Brecht et [sic] Vautier are coming to Prague at the same time,”8 thus answering a reproach from George Maciunas: “I can’t see any reason for arrival of Dick Higgins on same date, unless it is for the purpose of sabotaging fluxfest.”9

The conditions for Fluxus were quite favorable in Prague. The time of the early 1960s up to the Prague Spring in 1968 was witnessing a relative liberalization in cultural life, although, as Herberta Masaryková wrote in a letter to Maciunas regarding the organization of a Fluxus concert in Prague: “however the situation is ever so much better, these things can be done only on sort of closed premises and for invited people (which is for the better sometimes).”10 Also information about international art was accessible in various journals, although censorship had never been abandoned. Fluxus was being reflected as well,11 and the articles and Fluxus works published in journals like Výtvarné umění and Výtvarná práce from 1966 onward served as an important source of information also in other countries belonging to the Warsaw Pact.
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As mentioned, the Koncert Fluxu was preceded by Andersen, Schmit, and Køpcke’s series of events nebudba, nedivadlo, neliteratura, neumění—advanced art, akce, nový realismus, happenings, event in which, although not officially a Fluxus concert, the “event,” a concept of great importance for Fluxus, was introduced and its opposition to “happenings” explained. But also much earlier the audience in Prague had been exposed to action art—through the local artist Milan Knížák and his group Aktualní umění (Actual Art), that had been performing public manifestations and actions since 1964 and shared some ideas with Fluxus: a generally antiartistic stance, a focus on everyday activities and an interest in games.

Personal contacts between Czech artists and Fluxus associates had developed along various lines. The first personal encounters took place in autumn 1964 with Eric Andersen’s legendary journey through Eastern Europe. Chalupecký—who had seen Fluxus editions in Leningrad, when visiting the art critic Gurvič, who had been supplied with the material by Andersen—was also active in establishing contact with artists abroad and promoted Milan Knížák and Aktual. Maciunas’s first contact in Prague was Jiří Kolář, a “kind of Fluxus representative in Czechoslovakia,” as he wrote, but he was also in an exchange with Vladimír Burda, Ladislav Novák, and others. Later—through Chalupecký’s intermediation—Knížák became the primary contact person and was soon promoted to the rank of “Director Fluxus East,” a title that, according to Knížák, “meant nothing.” Macunas and Chalupecký, as mentioned above, were also in direct contact, but their relationship was strained, since Maciunas felt the Fluxus objectives to be misinterpreted by Chalupecký (whose critique of Fluxus will be discussed below):

12 “They assured us that they don’t stage real happenings, but so-called actions, events. Their work consists in collaboration with the audience, whom they set various tasks. . . . So we went to take a look at it in the evening. The happenists distributed slips of paper with writing, cotton balls, some sticks and similar objects. The participants began moving in various ways from one spot to another, from one room to another, without any system at all, but according to a given plan with given assignments.” Večerní Praha (6 April 1966).
13 See Andersen, “The East Fluxus Tour”; Andersen had been in touch with Herberta Masaryková and Petr Kotík, among others.
14 Extensive documentation of Aktual’s activities had been featured in Alan Kaprow’s book Assemblage, Environments & Happenings in 1966.
16 “I knew my situation. I was a completely forgotten, young guy, living in Prague. I mean, no power, no nothing, and then I became the director of Fluxus East. . . . [Y]eah, it was fun, . . . but it means and it meant nothing, of course.” Milan Knížák, interview by Petra Stegmann, Prague, 14 September 2006.
I feel that you have misunderstood the intentions of Fluxus. Permit me to quote from our recent manifesto: Flux-art-nonart-amusement forgoes distinction between art and nonart, forgoes artist’s indispensability, exclusiveness, individuality, ambition, forgoes all pretension toward significance, rarity, inspiration, skill, complexity, profundity, greatness, newness, shock, institutional and commodity value. It strives for monostuctural, nontheatrical, nonbaroque, impersonal qualities of a simple natural event, an object, a game or a gag. It is a fusion of Spike Jones, gags, children’s games, John Cage & Duchamp.
You will note our total lack of interest in sensations & shocks.17

The planning of the events and the course of actions can be reconstructed through extensive correspondence between George Maciunas and Vautier, Knížák, Chalupecký, and Berner. Photographs can be found in the archives of Milan Knížák and Ben Vautier, in Archive Sohm (Staatsgalerie Stuttgart) and in the Gilbert and Lila Silverman Fluxus Collection Gift (Museum of Modern Art New York).

In correspondence, Maciunas had mentioned his plan to travel to Prague, an opportunity that Chalupecký wanted to make use of in order to organize a Fluxus concert and a whole “Festival of vanguard (including lectures, films and concerts of new music),” that should coincide preferably with Andersen, Schmit, Köpcke, and Emmett Williams’s journey to Prague, which was planned for the end of March 1966, and above all with the visit of Allan Kaprow, who had planned to come to Prague as well.18 This idea was soon abandoned, however, and Chalupecký wrote about the plan of organizing single events instead of a festival.19 Maciunas later had to give up his plans to travel to Prague for financial reasons, informing Chalupecký in a letter dated 15 September and at the same time announcing the arrival of Jeff Berner, Ben Vautier (“chief fluxorganizer in Europe and very active member”), and George Brecht “originator of Fluxus movement” (who would not be able to

17 George Maciunas, “Letter to Jindřich Chalupecký, 1 October 1965 (postmark),” PNP Prague. The quotation from the manifesto would later be printed on the invitation card to the Prague Fluxus festival.
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deep in the end). By this time Knížák is already mentioned as a “full fluxus member” and, according to Maciunas, in charge of organizing the festival, although the main part of the organization would not have been possible without Chalupecký, who through his contacts and influence was able to obtain the performance venues and support for the financial side of the events. But not only was the relationship between the Western artists difficult, as Chalupecký pointed out: “I know you are now not in good contact with Higgins. And I am not in good contact with Knížák. Therefore it will be a little complicated.”

Performances took place on three evenings, although the invitation card originally listed four planned evenings, three “Fluxus concerts” (koncert Fluxu) for 13, 17, 18 October and one evening of “Games” (Hry).

On 10 October, Vautier left for Prague in his “Car Fluxus” (a small van with Vautier’s signature written all over it and a wooden roof that could be used as a stage) together with Serge Oldenbourg and $100 in his pocket, reaching the city on 12 October: “very Sad country No lights Bad roads etc.—Arrived in Prague went to Knizak’s house Marvelous Street [Nový Svět]—Marvelous fellow very clear—and simple.” Just after the arrival a first action took place: “Straight away first Night we arrived we did a street piece in front of Knizak house Serge and I—eat on top of my car with table and chairs etc.”

Early the next day (13 October), Vautier visited the performance venue: “Director of the Club told me that Chalupecký was against Ben Vautier and had decided in giving a Concert only for Higgins at the National Museum.” But Vautier and Higgins agreed to perform together on all evenings, a fact that Vautier defends, claiming that too few “professional performers” were present. Around noon the Californian Fluxus artist Jeff Berner arrived by plane. A rehearsal took place in the afternoon, and Vautier realized: “By the

21 Ibid.
24 Ibid.
25 Ibid.
Way Knizak had no Performance Experience Jeff Neither only Myself Serge Dick and Allison—Repetition went Well.”26

Although Maciunas had sent Knížák and Vautier detailed suggestions for performances, the “Proposed Program for a Fluxfest in Prague” (1966), with a long collection of pieces, a list of thirty-one stage props (fan, wind machine, packing paper, toys, a grand piano, a piano, a ladder, etc.) and the demand for an orchestra of fifteen to twenty nonprofessional musicians, it was ignored.

26 Ibid.
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by Vautier for the most part.27 Maciunas had planned that Knížák should be the conductor “since he put so much effort in organizing the events.”28 the evening itself, however, was organized and directed entirely by Ben Vautier, who complained that except for a piano “No Material was ready.”29 The concert took place in front of a large audience (of around 150 to 200) in Klub Umelecků, in the Manes Exhibition Hall (Vystavni sin Manes), a central exhibition space in Prague.

It began with Vautier’s Tying up Piece for Christo in which Jeff Berner was tied up with a white cotton string, while seated on a chair, and removed from stage at eight o’clock, after which a talk about Fluxus was commenced by a “Tchek official,”30 Vladimír Burda. The concert contained a cross section of Fluxus classics, like Mieko Shiomi’s Disappearing Music for Face, in which a performer slowly transforms a smile into a neutral expression; George Maciunas’s In Memoriam to Adriano Olivetti, a number is assigned to each performer, who performs an action (lifting a bowler hat, making a sound with the mouth, opening/closing an umbrella, etc.) each time when his/her number appears on a row of an adding machine paper roll, which is indicated by the beat of a metronome; Nam June Paik’s One for Violin Solo, with a violin that is gradually lifted up by a performer in very slow motion over his head, and then quickly smashed into pieces on a table; Ben Vautier’s Apples, the action of which consists simply of the performers eating apples; but also less-known compositions like René Koering’s Piano Concerto, with two players at a piano, trying to occupy the other’s territory. According to Vautier, Ben Patterson’s Paper Piece and his own Plastique31 were especially successful during this evening.32

The second evening was planned as an accompanying program to the exhibition Avantgardní edice (organized by Chalupecký, running until 23 Oc-
tober 1966, and described by Vautier as “very well done”\textsuperscript{33}), presenting artistic publications, among others by Higgins’s Something Else Press as well as Fluxus editions. It took place in the Museum of National Literature, Strahov monastery. After an introduction by Chalupecký, mainly pieces by Dick Higgins and Alison Knowles were featured, as well as compositions by Jackson Mac Low, Emmett Williams, and Philip Corner. The evening was styled as a lecture performance, with Higgins giving “a very long talk on his works with Slides—Cutting it with Pieces exeples [sic] very Proffesor [sic] like.”\textsuperscript{34} The most successful pieces, according to Vautier, were his \textit{Public Amusement}, also known as \textit{Baudruche}, and Dick Higgins’s \textit{Danger Music \#3}, which consisted of incense sticks being handed to the audience. This event was also mentioned by Bohumila Grögerová and Josef Hiršal: “In the hall, everybody was handed a handful of incense sticks, giving off a scent of sandal wood and flickering like fireflies. That was probably the most expressive number.”\textsuperscript{35} For \textit{Public Amusement} Vautier “blew a big, big tube of plastic, which was like a huge snake” as Milan Knížák describes: “and people were very happy . . . and went down to the city. Because it was on the hill beside the castle, and there is a slope, and the people went down . . . carrying that big snake, and in the end police came.”\textsuperscript{36} The aspect of the spectators’ participation (to which I will return) is missing from most Fluxus pieces, but it was important to Vautier in this piece: “Because we wanted always to finish up the concert with the public participating . . . most of the pieces by George Brecht and by Robert Watts were pieces, where we show the public something, but they don’t participate.”\textsuperscript{37}

Nevertheless, Vautier writes that the Fluxus evening (13 October) was the more successful event; “at least 10 people and 1 top official Government Critique official much higher then Chalupecký said that Fluxus evening was less boring and better.”\textsuperscript{38} Also in Knížák’s opinion \textit{Public Amusement} was the highlight of the events: “That was very nice, symbolic, people liked very much

\textsuperscript{33} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{34} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{35} English translation Petra Stegmann; Bohumila Grögerová and Josef Hiršal, \textit{Let let. Pokus o rekapitulaci, Vol. 3} (Praha: Mladá fronta, 1994), 86.
\textsuperscript{36} Milan Knížák, interview by Petra Stegmann, Prague, 14 September 2006.
\textsuperscript{37} Ben Vautier, interview by Petra Stegmann, Nice, 10 April 2011.
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to join the performance and it went far out than Ben was expecting.” Also he stresses the aspect of public participation and unpretentiousness:

I would say, the best part of the Festival was this part, which was very natural, which went out of the closed rooms, no performance, and no stage, and no audience, all together, totally mixed. And this I think was typical for Prague, typical because they knew our activities, . . . they wanted to go out, they didn’t want to do closed things.39

Vautier, Higgins, Knowles, and Berner had left long before the last Fluxus evening took place, with only Serge Oldenbourg performing. Vautier was scheduled to stay until 18 October, but he departed early for financial and personal reasons:

1) I thought it better to leave on a good impression since I had played best pieces on the 13th. . . . 2) also the place was in a gallery—with No chairs 3) had very little mony left 4) Higgins and Jeff had left or were leaving so I had no actors 5) Very little corporation [sic] from the Gallery for help etc—So I decided to leave but Serge refused—he wanted to play.40

The course of the evening, which took place in an artists’ club, is not easy to reconstruct. The few existing photos suggest that Ben Patterson’s Paper Piece played an important role. But this evening was especially memorable for the events that were to follow. After the concert, and obviously intoxicated, Serge Oldenbourg gave his passport to a Slovak soldier, who successfully fled to the West with it, which led to Oldenbourg’s and also Knížák’s temporary arrest.41 Maciunas was more concerned about the possible consequences for Fluxus than about Oldenbourg’s uncertain future:

41 For Knížák this had been the second arrest during the Fluxus festival, since some days earlier he had been picked up by the police and brought to Ruzyně prison, where his long hair had been shaved, since a doctor had declared that Knížák had lice. See Milan Knížák, “A-Community 1963–1971,” in Fluxus East. Fluxus-Netzwerke in Mittelosteuropa/Fluxus Networks in Central Eastern Europe, ed. Petra Stegmann (Berlin: Künstlerhaus Bethanien, 2007), 90.
It seems a very serious problem is being created for us. It may be a worst sabotage of Fluxus yet. . . . This would be the death blow to Fluxus in all East Europe and USSR, since we would be suspect as US Central Intelligence [sic] agents. . . .

1 We must denounce & renounce Oldenbourg as irresponsible and make it clear that he never was Fluxus member.
2 We must try to catch the defector with Oldenbourg passport. . . . The defector may be comming [sic] . . . You must try to establish contact and get his confidence. When you know his whereabouts quickly Telefone Czech embassy in Paris.42

After fourteen months Oldenbourg was finally released from prison, later on giving an account of his time in jail in his book *Journal de prison*, and reflecting on the experience in his works, for example self-portraits behind barbed wire.43

Although the festival seems to have been successful—“Many people, a great interest, a real success”44—especially in regard to the positive response to Vautier’s *Public Amusement*, which joined spectators and passers-by in a simple, joyful action, Fluxus in general provoked ambivalent reactions, ironically, in particular, among the organizers of the events: Chalupecký and Knížák. Long before his first personal encounter with Fluxus artists, Chalupecký had criticized the scandalous aspects (as they were presented, for example, in Nam June Paik’s pieces) and also Maciunas’s design of Fluxus publications (although he did appreciate the works of Ben Patterson). Chalupecký wrote in a letter to Dick Higgins:

I don’t like Fluxus. I have various numbers of *TRE V*,45 and I’m rather disappointed by them. These big collages—what a difference between them and those of Hausmann and Baader, dated 1920! Basically these

---

43 “For years after the event, Serge Oldenbourg lived the life of a victim of Bolshevism and based his career on it from then on,” Knížák, “A-Community 1963–1971,” 90.
45 Chalupecký refers to the *TRE* magazines, that were very much informed by Maciunas’s graphic design, which was controversial also among the Fluxus artists themselves.
were aggressive, offensive, but I have the impression that those of Fluxus are something ornamental. The latter antiart is basically awfully awfully artistic. To shock? What can shock us now! After the second world war, after Auschwitz and Hiroshima—are we really to be shocked by a pissing contest? . . . sure, for the snobs,—but for me?46

46 Jindřich Chalupecký, "Letter to Dick Higgins, translated into English from the original French by D. H. [Dick Higgins?], n.d. [1965] copy," Archive Sohm, Staatsgalerie Stuttgart. Higgins sent copies of this letter to Tomas Schmit, George Brecht, Jackson Mac Low, Al Hansen, Allan Kaprow, Jerome Rothenburg, George Maciunas, Ben Patterson, and Robert Filliou with the remark "I THINK THAT WE SHOULD DEFINITELY SEND THIS MAN MATERIALS."
In a letter to Maciunas—who had been forwarded Chalupecký’s critique, to which he had responded by quoting his Fluxus manifesto (see above)—the Czech critic modifies his critique and mentions that he had never seen a Fluxus concert.\(^{47}\) In Fluxus according to Chalupecký, the artwork’s “consistent internalization” (“konsequente Verinnerlichung”) is important, of which only a “psychic action” is to remain, possibly without a material carrier.\(^{48}\) In a later letter, shortly before the concerts in October, Chalupecký repeats his “definite critical reservations against Fluxus,” stating that his “views are closer to Higgins’s and Kaprow’s.”\(^{49}\)

Although Fluxus in some performances could be shocking and destructive, as Chalupecký criticized, the actions did not go as far as Aktual’s street actions that had left the realm of art altogether and melted into everyday life in the streets of Prague, in sharp contrast to Fluxus that insisted on artificially staged situations and even on formal clothing, with references to Vaudeville, cabaret, and stressing its musical background. “But for all of us here we had a feeling that this kind of art should be very social, very normal, very average, let’s say, and all these Fluxus activities seemed to us to be very chamberlike”\(^{50}\)—as Milan Knížák pointed out.

And although the “Director Fluxus East” did perform in the Fluxus events in Prague, he chose not to contribute any actions of his own, although at that time a Fluxus edition of his works was already in the planning.\(^{51}\) Also Chalupecký’s suggestion to Maciunas to “insert in your evening the phonic


\(^{48}\) Ibid. “Ich glaube, daß die Fluxus-Aktivität von einer großen Bedeutung ist. Was darin das wichtigste ist, ist die konsequente Verinnerlichung des Kunstwerkes; es soll von ihm nur seine psychische Aktion bleiben, womöglich ohne irgendeinen materiellen Träger. . . . Aber dann muß man von Fluxus unterscheiden: a) alles was theatralisch und großartig ist . . . b) alle neo—wenn diese neo . . . schon von der Außenseite der modernen Kunst inspiriert sind. Dazu gehört auch die Ausstattung Ihrer Zeitung.”


\(^{50}\) Milan Knížák, interview by Petra Stegmann, Prague, 14 September 2006.

\(^{51}\) Later Knížák criticized Maciunas for reediting his Actions for Fluxus, that were printed in a compilation of Fluxus scores, the Fluxfest Sale, where—to give an example—Knížák’s action “paper birds are given to all of the crowd” was transformed by Maciunas into an event called Snowstorm No. 1, the instruction of which reads “Paper gliders are distributed to an idle and waiting audience,” causing Knížák to comment “George Maciunas reedited it! BAD! TOO ARTIFICIAL! MY OWN WORKS ARE VERY NATURAL!” Comment on a piece of paper torn from Flux Fest Sale as part of his book Some Texts of Works by Milan Knížák, Archive Sohm, Staatsgalerie Stuttgart.
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poems (on tapes) of Ladislav Novák” was not taken up, Maciunas had not reacted on the suggestion, and Vautier may have been more focused on organizing a classic Fluxus concert than on an interartistic exchange. Thus, the Prague Fluxus concerts were more of an import than a collaboration, which was not typical, especially of the early Fluxus concerts, where contributions from local artists were generally cherished and often brought to further Fluxus events in different cities, leading to the continuous growth and development of the Fluxus network.

Also after the Prague events of 1966 the interartistic exchange continued and developed in quality. Knížák spent time in the US in 1968 and 1969, working together with Fluxus artists in New York and performing a few actions in the US. An interesting part of the artistic exchange, however, would still develop in the years to come. Some artists from Czechoslovakia created event scores, obviously inspired by those of George Brecht, Mieko Shiomi, or Robert Watts, and he used these as a means of interartistic exchange. Vladimir Burda, Jiří Valoch, Jiří Hynek Kocman, and even Petr Štembera, who is especially known for his radical body actions, created these works and even a few editions, calling to mind Fluxkits, that seem to have been created for the sole purpose of international exchange, since these works are usually in English and can be found mostly in (Western) artists’ archives. But this should be the focus of another study.

53 While researching in Eric Andersen’s archive various examples were found.