Countering Pathos with Down-to-Earth *Ruhrpott* Attitude

A conversation between Meuser, Ulrike Groos and Michael Krajewski.

ULRIKE GROOS: Who taught you and which teachers were particularly important to you?
MEUSER: In 1967—I was just 20 years old—I took a general study semester in Münster. I wanted to go to the art academy but was nervous about getting a portfolio together so I enrolled for that instead. It was possible to take a kind of artistic course in Münster; we did realistic drawings, the course instructor painting pictures of realistic jet fighters, which I thought were highly suspect. As a child I had been fascinated by classical modernism starting with the Folkwang Museum in Essen and later on when I was out and about I simply had to go to the museum, it started when I was about 13 or 14.

In the art studio in Münster there had been talk of a guy in Düsseldorf who's trademark was a hat, which he never took off. In addition to that he had stuck a large wedge of fat on a chair[1]—I thought this was interesting and yet at the same time totally barmy, because I didn't know what it was supposed to mean. And then it became generally known that he had a different way with the students, he was of a mind that first they needed to be admitted to the academy without any restrictions. The idea was that everyone should just start off in order to see for him or herself where his or her interests lay. So off I went to the academy in Düsseldorf; and there was Johannes Stüttgen standing upon a ladder in the main room in the last corridor where Beuys had his class and he asked me what I was doing there. So I said that I wanted to study art at the academy and he replied: "You're in."
ULRIKE GROOS: Did you know one another previously?
MEUSER: No, he just spoke to me like that and said "You're in" and I replied "Oh, that's great. Are you serious or is this just make-believe?" I went there again some time after that and this time I actually ran into Beuys in the corridor. I thought I was going to wet myself. Anyhow, I spoke with him and he said that Johannes had been a little too casual about it and that I really would need to submit a portfolio. So I did—simple life drawings, which I had done at evening classes, and I got in.
ULRIKE GROOS: How did the name Meuser come about?
MEUSER: The nickname Meuser didn't derive from the art scene, it was much older than that. It isn't like Palermo's,[2] coined by Anatol during the academy days. Meuser is a street name, I was known by it even as a child. The teachers even call me Meuser.
MICHAEL KRAJEWSKI: And you were known as "Meuser" in the art scene from the outset?
MEUSER: Yes, always, everybody called me Meuser from my schooldays onwards. At first I gave a lot of thought to what I was going to study. I was quite good at mathematics. But I couldn't choose architecture on account of a certain anxiety regarding social situations, because I assumed that architecture is a group subject for the most part. As a child I wasn't particularly good at asserting myself in group situations because, on the one hand, I was rather earnest and on the other, unassuming. Nowadays as an artist I think nothing of it, I just get on with it. But at that time I believed that I wouldn't be happy doing architecture for these social reasons. It's not that I wouldn't have fancied building something.
ULRIKE GROOS: How did your art develop throughout your degree? You submitted a

portfolio with figurative motifs. That is completely different to the things you do today. How is it to be in Beuys' group and develop an individual style?

MEUSER: In a nutshell, it all came about after I had finished my degree. The debates we embroiled ourselves in at the academy were counterproductive in terms of our own work. But in 1968 there was a particular *zeitgeist* at the academy, which meant that it wasn't really about making art at all in any concrete sense. In Beuys' group the mood was geared to societal change. I didn't do any practical work at that time and my studies suffered from it massively. Apart from a few minor works, I practically did not gain any experience and allowed myself to be dragged into the whole debate about the superstructure, etc., etc. Ultimately we were afraid to paint or do any kind of work. Jörg Immendorff's picture *Hört auf zu malen* (Stop Painting!) captures the spirit of the time really well. However, Beuys had functioned as a teacher in a normal way before that with the likes of Reiner Ruthenbeck, Blinky Palermo and many others. Jörg had come from Teo Otto's group—he, too, had put the work in. Beuys was not someone who prevented things from happening, but the whole mood around 1968 was one of prevention—at least that's how it felt to me.

Meuser, 1980er Jahre/1980s

ULRIKE GROOS: Sticking with you and your person for a while. Which of your fellow students were important for you during your degree?

MEUSER: The person I remember positively, the one I always had dealings with was Erinna König. I spent a lot of time with her, we were on the same wavelength; I was less involved with Johannes Stüttgen; Beuys always had a critical eye on me; then for a certain period with Felix Droese. Thinking and following particular strategies—that was something I did with Erinna.

ULRIKE GROOS: You said that you didn't do much art during your degree. How long did you study?

MEUSER: Officially for seven years because I allowed myself to be persuaded to take part in the so-called march through the institutions to become a teacher, study art history. I actually did a lot in philosophy and got relatively good marks, as well as several smaller exercises, a lecture here and there, it was fun. I was less interested in art education; I didn't really like education as a subject.

ULRIKE GROOS: These are all subjects that require you to speak. What about art?

MEUSER: Naturally I looked at everything all the time and thought about things. I didn't ignore anything, I looked at what there was to see until I had finished.

ULRIKE GROOS: Yes, but the business of finishing: nowadays there are degree shows and a tour around the academy and at the end of one's studies you take a degree. What was it like in your day? Did you ever stage any annual shows of your work?

MEUSER: Yes, I built some tables with Erwin Heerich, I really enjoyed that, yes.

MICHAEL KRAJEWSKI: And looked at things, of course that implies that there were plenty of things to look at during that period?

MEUSER: Yes, ask a dozen people about that time and you'll get a dozen different answers. My approach was simply to try to understand everything. It was crazy, because everyone somehow had their own idea how society could be transformed. Existing values were no longer acceptable and the new forms were supposed to incorporate new values. But nobody knew exactly what these new values should consist of, philosophies on life

Meuser in der Ausstellung / in the exhibition *Metrostation Oberkampf*, 1996, Staatliche Akademie der Bildenden Künste, Karlsruhe

were ten a penny. The general motto was: nothing is as it seems. I thought it was great for example that Dieter Roth came to the academy, he was considered to be an exception as an artist and was extremely individual in his approach. A good number of people were spurred on by the general atmosphere of no longer accepting the normal way of thinking and rejected so-called commonsense. We thought we were the elect as it were, although we were aware that as far as society was concerned, we didn't have a role to play at all: it was all a storm in a teacup.

ULRIKE GROOS: Then the time at the academy came to an end and things got going!?

MEUSER: Yes, all of a sudden there I was completely devoid of specific talents and seemingly only capable of crying out for help. It was obvious to me that it couldn't go on like this, and then Big Imi[3] went and hung himself on the day I was due to visit him. The other Imi[4] and I, we knew one another, but we weren't particularly close ... This was the day we became friends. We were completely devastated by Big Imi's death and then at some point I said to him: "What am I going to do?"

Imi was the one who, in totally practical, concrete terms and without making excuses, stood by me and helped me along as it were. He was just the opposite of me—a very industrious, busy creator. He understood my prevarication and could see my lack of practical experience.

ULRIKE GROOS: What did that mean in practical terms?

MEUSER: It meant that I started fetching things from the scrap yard and began to think about what I was going to make. In concrete terms, on a daily basis.

ULRIKE GROOS: Was the use of scrap as a theme your idea?

MEUSER: Yes, but it wasn't just about scrap, but more about doing something concrete, being active. I discussed everything with Imi, even the things he was doing and started to think out ways of doing things better, which theories one might develop here and so on. He wasn't necessarily so clued up about everything, but he had this basic robustness and solidity. No decent artist is ever totally sure of these matters; dialectics, reflection, mensuration. And in his case there was an exchange taking place on a relatively regular basis.

ULRIKE GROOS: Yes, but you said every day.

MEUSER: It was tangible. I asked Imi once what he thought of Beuys. He replied that he valued his art, but the whole superstructure was a bit questionable in his eyes. He

studied under Beuys during a different period. I believed him because nothing can deter him from his work, not even the lure of chocolate dessert or anything like that, he just gets on with it. Sometimes I challenged him with theoretical matters and then we started to come up with all manner of complex thoughts and criteria for artists and possible aims.

ULRIKE GROOS: Where was your studio situated?

MEUSER: It was in the Harkortstraße, that's where I started and after that it was Horst Münch's former studio in the Pinienstraße. I was able to work down below in the lorry workshop and it suited me very well, because I could mess about with all my crazy ideas. The drivers from the towing company popped by on many occasions and asked me what I was up to. I always replied that I didn't rightly know myself and had I known then I would not have started doing in the first place!

MICHAEL KRAJEWSKI: Was it possible to live relatively cheaply in Düsseldorf as an artist at that time? Or was it necessary to work for five days in order to afford two in the studio?

MEUSER: More or less, but I didn't consider it a burden as such, when you remember that for someone like me—who didn't have anything for eight years like so many other students—the things that counted were friendship and moral support. Ultimately I considered Imi to be my teacher, because he offered me help that I had missed during my degree course with a far more sober basic attitude, help that had passed me by during such tempestuous times, perhaps due to my own failings.

And just so that it doesn't remain a perpetual myth, here's more on the subject of Blinky Palermo. Palermo was a very close friend of Imi's, they loved one another. He came back from New York and visited Imi and was already a mythical figure. Imi was in the throes yet again of doing some lovely little drawing with a pencil. So I asked only half seriously: "Do you have to be doing so much all the time?" Palermo looked up and answered "Nope." He wasn't that way either, he was different again from Imi. We became kind of friends after two, three or four meetings in the Camphausenstraße where Imi used to live. I really liked his work a lot and we talked about a certain shade of midnight blue. However, I was really Imi's friend and Palermo was a close friend of Imi's, not mine. His popularity seemed to generate itself; no one ever had a go at him, neither painters nor sculptors. You get one or another artist being criticised for his naturalism or something of that sort, or Imi on account of his rather cool, big white pictures, but that never happened to Palermo. He had special status, he came into the world and was a star aged barely 25.

ULRIKE GROOS: Tell us a little about your work.

MEUSER: I'll get to that, Palermo's work made a massive impression on me. The classics—so many structures there have been taken up and developed by others, there's nothing left for me to do. I'm not saying they are finished, but they have been thoroughly reworked, so realistically you can't readdress them again.

You only have to look at this complex, high-flying character Joseph Beuys who wanted to achieve more with his sculptures that anyone had ever conceived possible within sculpture up to that point: he wasn't interested in classical sculpture, he was concerned with the nature of content itself through which humanist and socio-historical contexts could be furthered; he wanted transformation and not sober reality. His methods and means were consciously elevated, for example his *Earth Telephone*.[5] It was obvious to me that Beuys wanted it just so and no other way, which is why it wasn't possible simply to work like Beuys. Individual young students made the mistake alternately to imitate,

Meuser in seinem Atelier / in his studio, ca. 1998

say, a hill with sand and salt. But if you look more closely, you can see that his language comprises a whole war aesthetic, which cannot be explained merely by the plane crash. And so there are all sorts of impulses, which Beuys generated and which can't be followed up, they are already covered in a manner of speaking, not transferable to others.

MICHAEL KRAJEWSKI: Is it possible to say that the method you employ for your own objects and perhaps your use of materials is tied up with Beuys? Are you trying to set up a contrast?

MEUSER: Well you could say that, but maybe rather more in the sense of countering pathos with a down-to-earth *Ruhrpott* attitude, sort of adjusting the whole thing to fit a context of reality. I definitely do work with meaning, but you don't have to take that seriously. Beuys was always pretty serious about things and that was all right. However, try and assimilate these meanings into your work and you just make yourself look ridiculous.

MICHAEL KRAJEWSKI: Beuys created proper meaning-generating machines.

MEUSER: Yes, the *Honey Pump*[6] for example ... and Beuys was formative, for autonomy is an important step you simply have to take, in fact a step that every artist who did a decent foundation course with him took. It was obvious to me that it wasn't possible to rework it thematically, it doesn't work. As far as I was concerned it was a stiff, awkward thing to do, pointless or not particularly credible. The idea of working with a particular sensibility as Palermo had done was not on as far as I was concerned. Far too many tried to rework them exactly—the historical predecessors. The last forerunner—that was Ellsworth Kelly.

ULRIKE GROOS: And what did you like about him?

MEUSER: That's quite difficult to explain, but this rigorous opening up of the pictorial format in the way that only Americans can do, the same way as Donald Judd with his boxes.

ULRIKE GROOS: Whereby the use of colour played a much more important role in Kelly's than Judd's.

MEUSER: Yes, Judd's coloured boxes are probably different to Kelly's mentally speaking. Judd is thoroughly consistent when it comes to this. The Beuys period spiritually deprived me of the possibility of becoming a painter; it was absolutely taboo. Then I turned to what I felt the most affinity for, namely a certain Russian workmanlike, constructivist haplessness. Not just Ivan Puni, Georgij and Vladimir Stenberg, Naum Gabo, there were also a lot of other artists who had difficulties—my heart rejoices. What a reality—absurd and at the same time forming a poetic break with reality. Kurt Schwitters is the only one I can think of in a German context.

ULRIKE GROOS: Kurt Schwitters incorporated language, which is also important in terms of your titles.

MEUSER: Well, I was more inclined to leave works untitled on account of the 1970s, but then I found it a little boring after a while. I was totally geared towards this abstract reception and had a high regard for artists such as Michael Heizer, Robert Smithson and others, who mostly worked without specific titles. Maybe a game—friendship with Kippi[7]—was the catalyst, for that was fun, to place yourself above it all and to question yourself. If you travelled, read literature or poetry, then you could use a quotation. You could

incorporate more than just have this somewhat obdurate end product. That was the contrast Imi had cultivated in his early years. Everything was holy and barren when he showed the large white formation in the Kunsthalle.[8] To such an extent that the visitors demanded their money back. I could have laughed my head off: "Why, the exhibition was all right wasn't it? Why did they want their money back?"

ULRIKE GROOS: People still demand their money back on occasions nowadays.

MICHAEL KRAJEWSKI: We are in the 1970s—and I can discern something akin to process of de-politicisation in what you are saying.

MEUSER: That's right, I had had my fill of these fantasies.

MICHAEL KRAJEWSKI: What next?

MEUSER: In 1978 I met Kippi, that was the start; a year after that I had the first show in Kippenberger's office; after that there was an offer from the gallerist Max Hetzler.

MICHAEL KRAJEWSKI: Was it a coincidence that you appeared as a group?

MEUSER: Half and half, the association comprising Albert, Werner, Kippi, Hubert and Georg[9] had already existed in Hamburg. But it was all very open and none of them quite had free rein. Kippi then went off to Berlin but the Moritzplatz[10] crowd were there before him as it were, and as far as they were concerned the term *Neue Wilde* had already established itself in the mainstream press. I didn't have anything to do with it but I was friends with all the people and I duly delivered my concrete or not so concrete constructs. Spiritually speaking, I felt part of Kippi's group—but it was keenly segregated, there was this polarisation, more a case of selectivity of the galleries. In addition I didn't have anything to do with painting and so I just accepted it. It wasn't necessarily my cup of tea, the Salomé paintings ... I took it to be a sort of *zeitgeist* phenomenon and was surprised that such chaotic material should hold sway after such a strong period that was the 1970s.

ULRIKE GROOS: That didn't last long though.

MEUSER: Yes, that's true; it was over by about 1987.

ULRIKE GROOS: So you followed your path undeterred and didn't allow yourself to be influenced by phenomena of this ilk?

MEUSER: No, somehow I had no choice. I didn't have the stuff to be a painter. It was inappropriate, I'd missed the boat.

ULRIKE GROOS: Let's talk about your working methods? Do you prepare a preliminary sketch when you are developing an idea?

MEUSER: Sometimes I have an idea, for example with this workman's hut.[11] A few associations will arise later on, not arbitrarily, but coming from outside. "So, I'm building a funny little hut here, which will house all manner of rubbish." Then I prepare a sketch to reduce the idea from reality and try to send it in a different direction. Alternatively, I sometimes let myself be guided by reality, that means I go to the scrap yard and find something—that looks funny, I'll take it with me, I'll try to cut it out and give a new reality. It's changeable, for example the work *Deutsche Bundesbahn*. With constructs of this kind made from lots of bars and struts I have to think for years how I can I get the whole crazy shebang together and I say to myself, no, I'll leave it be; I agree to two or three things that are too much for me, then I leave them as a found object. It has some function or another, but you don't know which one, it isn't clear in the slightest to such an extent that it takes on a life of its own. That's how I play it. Or sometimes I just build something, add something to it and make

Meuser, 1980er Jahre / 1980s

Meuser in der / in the Galerie Nordenhake, Berlin 2002

an abstract form out of it. It becomes a bit of an emergency: this one, but not that one. Blinky was able to work like that using a little to go a long way: daft long wooden batten—I thought it was really cute.[12] I was really envious, the ability to create such a lot of charm using so little.

MICHAEL KRAJEWSKI: How about you? Do you like working or do you get inhibited in the studio?

MEUSER: It depends, but I always work with my whole spirit. When I'm in a good mood then yes, I like working. But it is never actually the case that I don't like working, but sometimes I make some odd decisions. Then I suffer when nothing works.

MICHAEL KRAJEWSKI: Do you work alone?

MEUSER: I work alone, I don't listen to the radio. I can't bear that. When I'm on one then I just do it, I'm thinking about it all the time: "How do you do that? Why this way or that way?" When I'm working artistically then there's no room for an assistant.

ULRIKE GROOS: Do you often go to scrap yards?

MEUSER: Yes, if I had a penny for every time I'd been to one ... It hasn't been possible recently, I'm not allowed.

ULRIKE GROOS: Why not?

MEUSER: Don't know exactly, something to do with health and safety regulations, unions—there's a total ban in North Rhine-Westphalia. You are not allowed to go anywhere at all. There is one I've known for years that I can go to at five o'clock. But then I'm tired, done in, finished. If anyone hassles me with questions—"What do you want?"—then I've had it. Sometimes you don't have a clue and you let yourself be inspired by a particular thing or you develop an idea in connection with that piece of scrap. You follow this up and you take the piece of scrap with you. I've been there many a time: there was nothing, I didn't feel anything, it was literally just scrap, rubbish. Not everything appeals to you; you need to be concentrated just like when you are painting. You can work away at painting but that doesn't mean that a good painting will emerge at the end of it, not by a long chalk. Sometimes you have to repaint or reconstruct things. You can't just start in the morning and everything turns out well; that would be too perfect.

MICHAEL KRAJEWSKI: You can destroy a painting with a single brushstroke. Sculptors are fortunate because they are able to work differently.

MEUSER: That's rubbish. I have ruined works before.

MICHAEL KRAJEWSKI: There are sculptures in your studio that never make it to the outside.

MEUSER: Loads of them, I got rid of three tons of them when I moved. But if you are straight with yourself you would logically need to finish this or that one. If you leave them lying around, then you arrive at the point when you simply have to finish them. If I drag all that crap over to the new studio with me then I'm impeding other stuff. You've really got to view it—as they say—economically. Every artist is like that, you have to have your own intellectual and spiritual system of economy regarding the way you manage to finish work. And even the disciplined ones, let's say someone like Imi, don't always succeed with everything all the time. That's the way it is. I had a real go at him the last time and told him to pack in the whole stupid, sentimental red, green, blue thing. Every other painting there was great.

ULRIKE GROOS: What is it like then when you talk about his works and criticise them, does he do that with yours?

MEUSER: Yes, I always get it in the neck, but it doesn't bother us.

ULRIKE GROOS: What topics crop up when you are talking about your work?

MEUSER: Well, we haven't done it in a long while. But the last time Imi came in and said: "No, not like that, no." I got it in the neck massively once again, but at the same time he gave me a clue as to how I could do it better.

MICHAEL KRAJEWSKI: These gruff, harsh judgements ...

MEUSER: ... we don't take things so seriously anymore. It gives us the impression that there's something going on. In concrete terms, I try not to insult anybody, it just sounds as if I do. We've only really fallen out once in twenty years. Sometimes I don't say too much because I see that he is in another world with his media. The twenty-four colours he uses are all right, but it's not for me. So I let him get on with his twenty-four colours. Why should I say to my friend: it's a load of nonsense?

MICHAEL KRAJEWSKI: Can we talk a little about Martin Kippenberger?

MEUSER: Kippi, no, I loved him. In the beginning when I first met him I said: that can't possibly work. Not like that.

MICHAEL KRAJEWSKI: Obviously the clash of two different artistic temperaments?

MEUSER: We came together initially on account of our social background, it didn't exist on an artist level whatsoever in that way. I approached it from the angle that one could not attempt that kind of idiocy—the way he approached it—because I had learnt to do things differently and was convinced that it wasn't possible. I didn't say this to him because the way he dealt with reality was so strange that it was funny, totally individual. For that reason alone he was on a pedestal as far as I was concerned. I haven't seen anybody process the world the way he did, it was impossible. But he showed me that it was possible and when he started to quarrel with both himself and his fate, I told him that he needed recourse to a more sober praxis, which he had once started. I told him in plain language to start painting all the crap that he had in his head. That's what I said! He had done some nice black and white things, half of which he squandered on suits and drinking sessions in the Paris Bar and other such nonsense. He lost the economic ground beneath his feet with his actionism. And yet he was so individualistic in doing this that I accepted it. In the beginning I couldn't accept it all, after all I had studied art seriously under Joseph Beuys. I wasn't used to the kind of things he was coming up with, besides we came from the same city and I understood his quirky way of speaking straight away. Kippi had made something out of nothing and tried to make something out of himself. In actual fact he was an inwardly vulnerable failure at school who had made this failure his central theme. That was his attitude to life, which didn't seem to worry him at all, the main thing was that something was moving forwards. There are so many references, it makes me laugh my head off. He had a desk and above it there were four portraits, a tram or bus driver, a GDR bird with a cap with a star on it and so on ... when I said to him "You know what, you can't do that" he said "Yes I can. These are glowing examples of public servants." Kippi always answered like that and was totally serious. I didn't take it seriously at first. Is that a new trend in art? All of them were on that plum clown kick. If you had studied with Beuys, everything was deadly serious contextually speaking. And that's fine. Look at Ruthenbeck, there isn't a dry eye in the house. Reiner is serious. But Kippenberger came to me at the Kunsthalle in Zurich—I was doing a show there at that time—and he asked Mendes Bürgi when he could exhibit there. Mendes answered quite pointedly that there weren't any plans for that as such. Kippi had his *Sky bag* with him

Meuser mit seinen Töchtern / with his daughters Pia and / und Clara, 2007

with sawn-through broom handles and was talking about getting an invitation from the Centre Pompidou with these things. That's how he just barged his way in. And he did get a show at the Pompidou after all. So, it's not as though he just did things for a laugh!

ULRIKE GROOS: You have a teaching chair in Karlsruhe.

MEUSER: In 1992 I felt that I needed to do this. I had children and nothing was working out at that time when the call came. Then I called the Chancellor Dr Franzke and said "Ok, you can fix it for me." And then the reply came: "We are desperately searching for someone with teaching experience." I had really only taught in school for two and a half years. I couldn't really endure school, the young pupils are all right, it's fun.

ULRIKE GROOS: What's it like with the students. You experienced Beuys, do you engage in a lot of discussion?

MEUSER: I used to conduct a lot of individual discussions before. More recently I have tended to hold group discussions about where the strengths and weaknesses lie, where the ideas come from. How has this been represented is that over-exaggerated or wrong? The students do it on their own actually. If the critique is too strong then I peg it back a little. You have to play it a bit by ear. But it's not as if it's just the cool installation types get the nod. It's fashionable at the moment, you have to be careful.

ULRIKE GROOS: Sure, painting was *en vogue* for a long time. I don't think much of concentrating upon one single genre. Even when painting was the order of the day, there were other forms of art around. We have always avoided such phenomena with our programme of events.

MEUSER: It's too elevated for me, I used to sub-divide it, but it is so profuse nowadays. Of course I only know art the way I create it: the very fact of making things. You were born into a different era characterised by considerable social activity. I find it taxing when you constantly need all the references. You are used to the fact that there are all these references. Many a time you have to deal with out and out sociology. The Kunsthalle once showed an artist with a strange cart.

ULRIKE GROOS: You mean Allen Ruppersberg, the American?

MEUSER: There's a great deal of sociology at work there.

ULRIKE GROOS: It's more historical, because this wooden cart refers to the Battle of Arnhem.[13] Ruppersberg gathered some books that the soldiers might have read. There's a certain degree of background information necessary.

MEUSER: Yes, socio-historical contexts. That's what I mean. The problem is we had a different *zeitgeist*.

ULRIKE GROOS: Different themes and concepts interest artists at different times.

MEUSER: I know what you mean; but you have to put yourself in the shoes of people who don't know anything else ...

1 Joseph Beuys, *Fettstuhl*, 1963 (wood, wax, metal; Block Beuys, Hessisches Landesmuseum Darmstadt).

2 Palermo, whose given name was Peter Heisterkamp (1943–1977).

3 Imi Giese (1942–1974).

4 Imi Knoebel.

5 Joseph Beuys, *Erdtelefon*, 1968 (telephone, clod of loam with grass, length of cable on wooden base, 20 x 76 x 49 cm), depicted in Heiner Bastian, ed. *Joseph Beuys. Skulpturen und Objekte*, exh. cat. Martin-Gropius Bau, Berlin (Munich, 1988), illustr. 55.

6 Joseph Beuys, *Honigpumpe am Arbeitsplatz*, Installation at the documenta 6 in Kassel, 1977.

7 Martin Kippenberger (1953–1997).

8 Imi Knoebel's *24-teiliges Bild*, 1975 (oil on canvas and wood, 200 x 4000 cms, Dia Art Foundation New York) was exhibited in the Kunsthalle in Düsseldorf as part of the show *W Knoebel*.

9 Albert Oehlen, Werner Büttner, Martin Kippenberger, Hubert Kiecol, Georg Herold.

10 The Galerie am Moritzplatz in Berlin-Kreuzberg, founded as an artists' gallery by Salomé, Helmut Middendorf, Rainer Fetting and Bernd Zimmer, existed from 1977 until 1981.

11 *Bauhütte: Pissen am Bahndamm*, 2008 (see pages 154, 155).

12 Palermo, *ohne Titel*, 1967 or earlier (casein or gouache and pencil on wood, 326 x 4.8 x 3 cm, Sammlung Block Neues Museum Nürnberg), depicted in *Palermo*, exh. cat. Kunsthalle Düsseldorf (Cologne, 2007) p. 124.

13 The installation *Siste Viator (Stop Traveller)*, 1993, is depicted in Allen Ruppersberg, *One of Many—Origins and Variants*, exh. cat. Kunsthalle Düsseldorf et al (Cologne, 2005) p. 137ff.

Dieses Buch erscheint anlässlich der Ausstellung /
This book is published on the occasion of the exhibition

MEUSER

Die Frau reitet und das Pferd geht zu Fuß /
The Woman Rides and the Horse goes on Foot

Kunsthalle Düsseldorf, 10.5. – 20.7.2008
Kuratoren / curators: Meuser und / and Ulrike Groos
Wissenschaftliche Mitarbeit / research assistance:
Michael Krajewski

Die Ausstellung wird gefördert durch /
The exhibition is supported by

SAMMLUNG RHEINGOLD

Herausgeberin / editor: Ulrike Groos
Redaktion / editing: Michael Krajewski
Übersetzungen / translations: Tim Connell
Grafische Gestaltung / design: Kühle und Mozer, Köln
Gesamtherstellung / production:
Snoeck Verlagsgesellschaft mbH, Köln

ISBN 978-3-936859-87-4
Printed in the EU

Cover

AEG (Aufhängen, Einschalten, Geht nicht);
Angefangenes Kellerregal, 2006

Meuser, ca. 1982,
Porträt von / portrait by Hans Günter Mebusch

Seite / page 2

Meuser in seinem Atelier / in his studio, 2006,
Porträt von / portrait by Nic Tenwiggenhorn

Bildnachweis / photo credits
© Nic Tenwiggenhorn, VG Bild-Kunst, Bonn 2008: 2, 138
Wolfgang Günzel, Offenbach: Cover, 4, 10–13, 16–19, 24, 32–45, 59, 62, 63, 68, 75, 76, 83–97, 99, 100, 102, 104–106, 108, 111, 113, 118, 144–149, 151–155, 166, 167
Courtesy Galerie Max Hetzler: 9
Courtesy Nachlass Martin Kippenberger / Galerie Gisela Capitain, Köln: 14, 29, 132/133
Courtesy Galerie Bärbel Grässlin, Frankfurt a. M.: 15, 25, 26, 50, 57, 62, 69, 70, 71, 77, 80, 82, 98, 101, 107, 122
Jaroslav Adler: 20f.
Sammlung Deutsche Bank: 22, 23, 52–54, 56, 64, 65, 72, 73
Veit Loers: 30
Reinhard Mucha, Düsseldorf: 47
Axel Hütte, Düsseldorf: 48
Walter Kranl, Frankfurt a. M.: 51
Courtesy Galerie Nordenhake, Berlin/Stockholm: 140
Gerhard Kassner, Berlin: 55
Sven Adelaide: 58
Courtesy Galerie Ascan Crone, Berlin: 60, 61
Courtesy Sammlung Grässlin, St. Georgen: 78, 79
Heinz Pelz: 103
Courtesy Galerie Gisela Capitain, Köln: 112, 116, 117
Lothar Reichelt, Düsseldorf: 122
Thomas Walther, New York: 129
Ikra Weiss: 135
Pe Wolf, Karlsruhe: 136
Heinz Günter Mebusch © Artforum Culture Foundation / The Mebusch Estate, Thessaloniki, Greece: Cover, 156, 157

Trotz intensiver Recherche konnten nicht in allen Fällen die Urheberrechte zweifelsfrei geklärt werden. Herausgeber und Verlag bitten gegebenenfalls um Nachricht. / It has not been possible to establish copyright unequivocally in certain cases, despite intensive research. The editor and the publisher hereby request details where applicable.

Kunsthalle Düsseldorf
Direktorin / Director: Ulrike Groos
Wissenschaftliche Mitarbeit / Assistant Director: Magdalena Holzhey
Direktionssekretariat / General Office: Claudia Paulus
Verwaltung / Administration: Ariane Friedrich, Stephanie Müller
Presse und Kommunikation / Press and PR: Beate Anspach
Technik / Technicians: Jörg Schlürscheid, Siegfried Verheyden
Wissenschaftliches Volontariat / Trainee: Jari Ortwig
Praktikum / Internship: Bea Bodenstein, Madeline Sagner, Elena Sánchez

Kunsthalle Düsseldorf
Grabbeplatz 4 · 40213 Düsseldorf
Telefon +49 (0)211-8 99 62 43 · Fax +49 (0)211-8 92 91 68
mail@kunsthalle-duesseldorf.de · www.kunsthalle-duesseldorf.de

Die Kunsthalle wird gefördert durch /
Kunsthalle Düsseldorf is supported by

Landeshauptstadt
Düsseldorf