

Yuri Albert
Elitist-Democratic Art

21 September 2018 – 20 January 2019

KUNSTMUSEUM
LIECHTENSTEIN



Y. F. Albert gives his entire share
of warmth to others, 1978

Is it possible to make an absolutely incomprehensible artwork?

Yuri Albert

Kunstmuseum Liechtenstein is pleased to present the first comprehensive solo exhibition outside the Russian Federation of Yuri Albert (born Moscow, 1959; lives and works in Cologne and Moscow).

Albert is one of the most important exponents of the second generation of the Moscow Conceptualists. Excluded from the state culture industry in the 1970s and 1980s, from the official infrastructure of museums and galleries, and also from the discourses of aesthetics and art criticism, the artists were forced to take on themselves the task of presenting, commenting on and reflecting theoretically on their activities. Thus in his works, often text-based, Albert asks questions about art and investigates the conditions of their production and reception. Following in the tradition of conceptual art, he not only explores the relationship between artwork and comment, his enactments of the image/text relation also touch on questions that go deeper into aspects of the theory and theology of images. Marked by the historical experience of self-organisation in the late Soviet milieu, Albert arrived at his critical and, at the same time, (self-) ironic reflections on the art system.

The focus of the exhibition, showcasing Albert's work for the first time outside of Russia at this scale, is on the *Elitist-Democratic Art* series (1987–2017). In this series the artist contrasts the language of art with the languages of blind, deaf and non-speaking, or also the terminology of sailors and stenographers in order to analyse the individual semiotic systems and the system of art as a whole, their comprehensibility and accessibility. Grouped around this series we see early text works in which the artist declares: *A crisis has entered my work. I am confused, perplexed and do not know what to do next* (1983), along with the later *Moscow Poll* (2009/2018), in which he links political choice and aesthetic judgement: *Does the work of an artist seem worse to you if you do not share his political convictions?* The show also features works from the series *I am not ...* (1980–2006), in which the artist defines himself negatively, not on the basis of what he is, but rather what he is not, along with the series *My favourite books* (2001), in which Albert sacrifices his favourite books, creating new artworks in the process. In addition, in *Caricatures from my childhood* (1994–2004), the artist plays with (not only Soviet) prejudices about modern art.

The museum visitor is always a discursive interlocutor in these studies of the relationship between artwork and interpretation, image and text, visibility and invisibility, original and copy. Albert's works draw us into a dialogue with and about art, inviting us to ponder the status of art: elitist or democratic.

The exhibition, conceived in close collaboration with Albert, is a production of Kunstmuseum Liechtenstein in cooperation with the ERC project *Performance Art in Eastern Europe (1950–1990): History and Theory* (University of Zürich), curated by Sandra Frimmel. The exhibition is accompanied by the publication *Yuri Albert: Elitist-Democratic Art*, (published by Snoeck Verlagsgesellschaft, Cologne) including the artist's collected writings, edited by Sandra Frimmel and Sabine Hänsgen. Together with the first translation of excerpts from his *Dream Journal* and his *Facebook Postings*, supplementing the catalogue as a 'book inside a book', along with extensive commentaries by the artist on his works, the publication allows the reader to experience the full breadth of Albert's artistic work and thinking.

All of the texts in this visitor's booklet are by Albert and are taken from the aforementioned book. Unless otherwise indicated, all works belong to the artist.

Sandra Frimmel, Sabine Hänsgen

Prologue

Yuri Albert

I was born in Moscow in 1959. I had a very ordinary Soviet childhood: nursery, school, Young Pioneer camp. Like all little boys, I made knights, horses, cowboys, etc. out of modelling clay. Because we already had sculptors in the family (the famous French sculptor Jacques Lipchitz was my grandfather's brother), my mother decided that I was talented and enrolled me for the sculpture class at children's art school. I was about ten years old at the time. That was the start of my career as an artist. First of all, I was taught at several children's art schools and then I was to register at the academy. The entrance exam for the various art schools was very demanding back then, and if you really wanted to be accepted you had to prepare specifically. My schoolmate, and later wife, Nadja Stolpovskaja, introduced me to the artist Katya Arnold, who prepared students for these entrance exams.

When I arrived for my first lesson, I was in for a surprise. On the walls of the room where the lessons were held hung bizarre works that had no similarity with what I had seen so far. Was this a joke? It certainly had little to do with my dreams of high art at that time. They were cynical parodies of art in which all manner of styles and themes were so intermingled that there was nothing left to admire. They were works by Katya's husband Alexander Melamid and his co-author Vitaly Komar. I learned that it was called conceptualism and Sots Art, and I soon realised that I wanted to work like that too. But although my head was already full of other things, I had to prepare for the exams and paint still-lives and portraits. My childhood dream of becoming a proper artist with a romantic biography, like Vincent van Gogh or Paul Gauguin, proved to be the exact opposite of everything that I saw and came to love there. The contrast between true and contemporary art is still extremely important in my works today. I dreamt of becoming a true artist, but I only became a contemporary artist. Nevertheless, I still hope that people can sense this yearning for true art in my works.

Room 1

1

Y. F. Albert gives his entire share of warmth to others, 1978

Black-and-white photograph

24 × 18 cm

2

Red, blue, black (honest work), 1979/2013

Typescript on coloured paper

3 parts, each 29.7 × 21 cm

Exhibition copy

Original: Zimmerli Art Museum, New Brunswick, New Jersey

I am very afraid of dying. I often try to imagine it when I am falling asleep. At this moment, it seems to me as if the perception of the chaotic, colourful, noisy world comes to an end and I glimpse a dark, silent void. The most horrible thing is that my soul is condemned to hang eternally in this motionless void. Common sense tells me that not even that will be the case, that this will be the end of all perception, because someone has to see dark emptiness too; but I cannot imagine the total absence of everything ... I remember all the stories I have heard about contorted bodies discovered in exhumed graves, a look of horror on their faces. I imagine these people trying in vain to escape the grave, battering against the rough walls of the coffin. I am afraid ...

My favourite poet is Osip Mandelstam. What I like about his poems is the combination of great expressiveness and classical refinement. He is a highly intellectual poet, but never gets sentimental.

That is precisely why his best poems are dedicated to poetry and language. You can read Mandelstam like Alexander Pushkin, open the book at any page you like, particularly with the late poems. I know many of his poems by heart. I really love Mandelstam's 'Italian' poems and his translations of Petrarch's sonnets, particularly this one:

*That nightingale who weeps so sweetly,
perhaps for his brood, or his dear companion,
fills the sky and country round with sweetness
with so many piteous, bright notes;*

*and it seems all night he stays beside me,
and reminds me of my harsh fate:
for I have no one to grieve for but myself,
who believed that Death could not take a goddess.*

*Oh how easy it is to cheat one who feels safe!
Who would have ever thought to see two lights,
clearer than the sun, make earth darken?*

*Now I know that my fierce fate
wishes me to learn, as I live and weep:
nothing that delights us here is lasting.*

I am afraid of leaving Russia. I will probably find it hard to adjust. I speak hardly any English and see life very differently to people in New York. I am not sure whether my idea of the American avant-garde is right, because the information about it that gets through to Moscow is not always correct and usually fragmentary. How embarrassing it would be to want to reinvent the wheel! I find it hard to be away from my loved ones because I cannot rule out the possibility that I will never see them again. What is more, my absence might cause them problems. And even if I am not happy in my new home, I will never be able to return ...

3

Chair on clay legs and two chairs (Victor Skersis), 1980

from the series *Continuing other artists' series*

Black-and-white photographs, Indian ink and typescript on paper

36 × 48 cm

Centre Pompidou, Paris

Musée national d'art moderne/Centre de création industrielle

Donation from the Vladimir Potanin Foundation, 2016

4

Four Fettecken (Joseph Beuys), 1980

from the series *Continuing other artists' series*

Black-and-white photographs, Indian ink and typescript on paper

36 × 48 cm

Centre Pompidou, Paris

Musée national d'art moderne/Centre de création industrielle

Donation from the Vladimir Potanin Foundation, 2016

5

Excerpts from Terry Atkinson's *Introduction* (in *Art-Language*, vol. 1, no. 1, May 1969, pp. 1–10), 1980

Ballpoint pen on paper

4 parts, each 20.4 × 17 cm

6

**Sculpture of 36 sheets of paper (Carl Andre),
1980/2018**

from the series *Continuing other artists' series*

Black-and-white photograph, paper, ballpoint pen
on paper

Photograph 15 × 21.5 cm, sketch 16.7 × 20.5 cm,
36 sheets of paper, each 70 × 70 cm

Artist's copy

Whereabouts of the original unknown

7

**Why are my works regarded as dry and boring?,
1982**

Ink on paper

21 × 14.8 cm

8

**Did the meaning of this work change after it was
photographed?, 1981**

Black-and-white photograph

39.9 × 29.7 cm

9

Art instead philosophy, 1979

From: M. A. N. I. (Moscow Archive of New Art)

Typescript on paper

5 sheets, each 29.7 × 21 cm

10

See p. 14

11

**I think that the action against the Toadstools group
is driven by the wish to shift the balance of power
in the Moscow avant-garde towards a more intel-
lectual approach, 1984**

Ink on paper

20.6 × 16.5 cm

12

Letter to Vadim Zakharov, 1981

from the series *Continuing other artists' series*

Typescript on paper

20.4 × 14.5 cm

Dear Vadim!

*For a year now I have been working on the series Con-
tinuing other artists' series. It includes:*

1) Numbers in colour (Jasper Johns);

2) Sculpture of 36 sheets of paper (Carl Andre);

- 3) Jar with sour cream (Nadezhda Stolpovskaya);
- 4) Chair on clay legs and two chairs (Victor Skersis);
- 5) Four *Fettecken* (Joseph Beuys).

I would now like to continue your series dedicated to the idea of stimulation. Therefore, please conceive and realise a work continuing this series. Once you have made this work, please send it to me so that I can add it to my series.

Thanking you in advance,

Yuri Albert

30 April 1981

13

Washing Sven Gundlach's floor, 1981

from the series *Household help*

Typescript and ballpoint pen on paper, black-and-white photographs

4 sheets, each 29.7 × 20.8 cm

8 photographs: 2 à 12 × 17.7 cm, 2 à 14.5 × 10.5 cm, 14.5 × 10.8 cm, 17.1 × 12 cm, 17.5 × 12.3 cm, 17.7 × 11.8 cm

Dear _____

The artist Yuri Albert offers his help in the household.

Types of service: washing the floor, tidying the apartment, preparing meals, minding children, shopping for food, doing the laundry, etc. _____

(underline or fill in as appropriate).

Indicate convenient days and times

All work will be performed free of charge.

Please fill in and send the order form to the following address:

*Moscow, 117421, ul. Novatorov, d. 18, korp. 2, kv. 51,
Albert, Y. F.*

Telephone: 431-17-45

14

Translation of an excerpt from an interview with Bernar Venet (in Ursula Meyer, *Conceptual Art, University of Michigan: Dutton 1972, p. 214*), 1979

Typescript on paper

29.7 × 21 cm

15

Translation from Terry Atkinson's *Introduction* (in *Art-Language*, vol. 1, no. 1, May 1969, pp. 1–10), 1979

Typescript on paper

29.7 × 21 cm

16

Ö. L., 1986

Oil on canvas, typescript on paper

29.7 × 21.2 cm

Book of poetry, edition: 6

AP

17

Eight tasks for Nadezhda Stolpovskaya, 1980

Black-and-white photographs, typescript on paper, card

Card 84.3 × 61.6 cm

The work Eight tasks for Nadezhda Stolpovskaya was realised in 1980. It consisted in Nadezhda Stolpovskaya making works based on the tasks that I set her. Nadezhda Stolpovskaya is the sole author of all of these works. I tried to set her tasks that are not characteristic of her own work:

- 1) Work that represents someone else's work;*
- 2) Drawing from nature;*
- 3) Multiples;*
- 4) Painting that is dedicated to the definition of painting;*
- 5) Sculpture portrait;*
- 6) Sculpture that is dedicated to the definition of sculpture;*
- 7) Poem;*
- 8) Analytical text work.*

Two situations are modelled in this work:

- a) The artist Albert influences the artist Stolpovskaya;*
- b) The art scholar Albert explores the work of the artist Stolpovskaya and tries to identify the boundaries within which it can change.*

Yuri Albert

20 March 1981

18

I will accept as gifts works by: Alekseyev, Bulatov, Vasilyev, Donskoy, Zakharov, Infante, Kabakov, Kizevalter, Lutc, Makarevich, Monastyrski, Panitkov, Pivovarov, Roshal, Rubinshtein, Skersis, Stolpovskaya, Chuikov, Yulikov, Yankilevski and other artists ..., 1980

Tempera on hardboard

80 × 60 cm

19

I'm working under the influence of: Arnold, the Art & Language group, Donskoy/Roshal/Skersis, Zakharov, Lutc, Komar/Melamid, Skersis, Stolpovskaya, Tynyanov, 1981/2013

Acrylic on hardboard

40 × 50 cm

Exhibition copy

Original: Zimmerli Art Museum, New Brunswick, New Jersey

20

In what tradition was this work executed?, 1981

Rub-on letters on paper

48 × 36 cm

21

I think that the most interesting people working in Moscow right now are Vadim Zakharov and Victor Skersis, 1981/2013

Acrylic on hardboard

37 × 34 cm

Exhibition copy

Original: Zimmerli Art Museum, New Brunswick, New Jersey

22

I have influenced the following artists: Zakharov, Skersis, Stolpovskaya, 1981/2013

Acrylic on hardboard

40 × 50 cm

Exhibition copy

Original: Zimmerli Art Museum, New Brunswick, New Jersey

23

This work is intended to hang between Nadežda Stolpovskaya's work *Table with tablecloth* and the first work from the *Stimulation* series by Vadim Zakharov, 1981

Indian ink on paper

48 × 36 cm

24

This work is intended to resemble the previous ones, 1981

Indian ink on paper

48 × 36 cm

25

This work is not intended to stand out against the works of other artists in Moscow, 1981

Indian ink on paper

48 × 36 cm

26

How has it happened that I made this very work and I made it in this very way?, 1981–90

Tempera on canvas

70 × 50 cm

27

A crisis has entered my work. I am confused, perplexed and do not know what to do next, 1983

Mixed media on canvas

50 × 70 cm

28

Down with New Wave, long live New Style!, 1987

Acrylic on plywood

24 × 30 cm

Collection of Peter Pakesch, Vienna

29

Neo-Pseudo-Art, 1987

Acrylic on plywood

24 × 30 cm

Collection of Peter Pakesch, Vienna

30

My works can be described as artistic onanism, 1987

Acrylic on plywood

24 × 30 cm

Collection of Peter Pakesch, Vienna

31

I hope that this is my last text work, 1987

Acrylic on plywood

24 × 30 cm

Collection of Peter Pakesch, Vienna

32

Autoseries I, 1979–80

Typescript on paper

20.2 × 16.5 cm

Imagine a member of Art & Language who does not engage in serious research in his works but only tells everyone that he is planning to do so without ever realizing

his intentions. He keeps stopping halfway and makes a joke of it. In the end, he no longer understands the problems that he once wanted to solve.

The main thing about my art is that I am very interested in art. Each of my works takes up a thesis related to art and embodies it in one way or another. Yet, as soon as I am confronted by the possibility of serious research, I stop. Or I engage in pseudo-research. One may say that my works examine possible 'conceptual' works (in the spirit of early Art & Language).

33

Autoseries II, 1981

Typescript on paper

20.2 × 16.5 cm

In my work, I make use of the following model of art: points in three-dimensional space represent individual artworks. They are connected by numerous lines – traditions, influences, analogies, associations, oppositions, imitations, etc. In my opinion, these connections are more important than the works themselves. The place of each work in art is determined by its relations to other works (its 'function', to use Yury Tynyanov's term). I try to trace lines directly instead of drawing points. My recent works are nothing but orientations in the artistic space and have no value outside of it.

I do not set myself the goal of defining art and its characteristic features. Art has no permanent features: its unity and continuous development are the result of the continuity of the ties of which I spoke above.

34

Autoseries III, 1982

Typescript on paper

20.2 × 16.5 cm

I have always wondered whether it is possible to make works that are not 'my own' in any way without violating the structure that is called the 'art of Y. Albert'.

35

Autoseries IV, 1984–85

Typescript on paper

20.2 × 16.5 cm

My works are artworks not because they have all the necessary characteristics of art but because they are not fit to be anything else. Indeed, by what other name could one call them?

36

Autoseries V, 1987

Typescript on paper

20.2 × 16.5 cm

Artist's copy

Whereabouts of the original unknown

My attitude towards art resembles the attitude that people have towards someone who is terminally ill. They are afraid to tell him about his diagnosis but only say cheerily, 'When you get well, we'll go fishing, I know a great place ... we can also gather wild mushrooms there...'

37

Autoseries VI, 1989

Typescript on paper

20.2 × 16.5 cm

Artist's copy

Whereabouts of the original unknown

Our work is somewhat like an orchestra with the volume turned off: the conductor waves his baton, while the musicians puff their cheeks, move their bows and turn the pages, yet one does not hear a sound. Nevertheless, such a situation brings real music to mind. (By comparison, we do not hear the music that is broadcast on the radio; it remains in the background.) In the same way, our work simply consists of ritual gestures, metaphors, hints and winks surrounding art.

All our attempts to be forthright are doomed to failure: it turns out that we have nothing to say. One can only speak about the possibility or impossibility of utterance or pretend that everything is going fine and make works about possible works. All our art is nothing but a determined attempt to pretend that we are making art. Yet then why do artists still exist and why do they make the impression of engaging in real work? I believe that it is simply a cultural habit. Culture is used to the fact that art plays a role in it, just like a person is used to his arms and legs – so much so that an amputated leg, for example, continues to ache despite the empty trouser-leg. All these phantom pains of art make our work credible, producing an existential surrogate. On the other hand, one can also call this the emancipation of art – the emancipation from cause and effect, somewhat like a person in the secularized world who makes an ethical choice without waiting for salvation or punishment.

38

Ape, 1983

Oil on hardboard

73 × 59 cm

39

Painter, 1989

Acrylic on canvas

150 × 150 cm

40

Rabbit-Artist, 1985

Oil on canvas

100 × 100 cm

41–48

See p. 14–15

49

**The magic power of art (dedicated to Erik Bulatov),
1990**

Oil on canvas

8 parts, each 100 × 130 cm

Ludwig Forum für Internationale Kunst Aachen, loan
from the Peter and Irene Ludwig Foundation

50

Red, yellow, blue, 1990

Oil on canvas

3 parts, each 200 × 150 cm

I am not ...

I started working on the *I am not ...* series in 1980. It is dedicated to the quest for 'finding one's place in art', a vital process for every young artist. In this series I made use of the style and techniques of various artists so as to challenge the similarities between our works.

My early works were based on the idea that the connections found between individual works of art are much more essential than the works themselves. So I set out to create pieces that either illustrate these connections or reference other works, in some cases even to works of art that have never existed.

Using foreign languages and styles came naturally to me as I did not (and do not) possess a characteristic 'language' of my own, which might have pointed to me or my work.

In choosing the artists I was guided by two criteria: how important was the artist to me personally and/or how easily could his or her particular style be emulated and identified?

10

I am not Vadim Zakharov, 1983

Black-and-white photographs

5 photographs, each 12.5 × 12.8 cm

42

I am not Vadim Zakharov, 1983

Black-and-white photograph on card

Photograph 24 × 18 cm, card 48 × 36 cm

43

I am not Andy Warhol, 1990

Screenprint on paper

76 × 58 cm

AP III

44

I am not Roy Lichtenstein, 1990

Acrylic on canvas

140 × 140

Private collection, France

45

I am not Georg Baselitz, 1986

Oil on canvas

100 × 100 cm

46

I am not Jasper Johns, 1997

Collage, encaustic on canvas

150 × 110 cm

Sparkasse KölnBonn

47

I know how you must feel, Yuri, 2001

Acrylic on canvas

170 × 97 cm

Bierfreund Collection

48

I am not Timm Ulrichs, 1989

from the series *I am not ...* and *Elitist-Democratic Art*

Mixed media on hardboard

122 × 200 cm

Private collection, Cologne

41

Self-portrait as another artist, 1991

Screenprint with acrylic on canvas

114 × 57 cm

Gleb Albert

65

Self-portrait in an artist's costume, 1990

Colour photograph

50.5 × 70.5 cm

Edition: 1/3

My favourite books

I have always appreciated abstract monochrome painting, the indefinable, non-verbal, restrained, yet deep impression it leaves on the viewer. The fact that this essential tradition, which is so firmly entrenched in the artistic canon of other countries, does not exist in Russia has always been a source of regret to me. Maybe that is why I started this project in the first place: artists, after all, always seem to concern themselves with aspects they miss in their own artistic tradition.

My favourite books, a series of pictures painted with the ashes of burned books, can be seen as an attempt to understand what painting is made of. Of course, they should not be compared to the spectacular, unruly traditions of Viennese or Moscow actionism, but to those of abstract monochrome painting.

There is without doubt an autobiographical angle to this project, which also determines the dimensions of the pictures: 168 × 45 cm (my height × my shoulder width). In a way, then, all these pictures are self-portraits.

51

Jars with ashes for the pictures from the series *My favourite books*, 2001

Colour photograph

26.5 × 63.8 cm

52

Picture made with the ashes created by burning the book *Myth and Religion in European painting, 1270–1700* by S. and R. Bernen, 2001

Ash and acrylic emulsion on canvas

168 × 45 cm

53

Picture made with the ashes created by burning the book *Verses, Poems. Contemporaries on Fet*, 2001

Ash and acrylic emulsion on canvas

168 × 45 cm

54

Picture made with the ashes created by burning the book *Oblomov* by Ivan Goncharov, 2001

Ash and acrylic emulsion on canvas

168 × 45 cm

55

Picture made with the ashes created by burning the book *The Unknown Masterpiece* by Honoré de Balzac, 2001

Ash and acrylic emulsion on canvas

168 × 45 cm

56

Picture made with the ashes created by burning the book *Tracts, Diaries and Letters* by Albrecht Dürer, 2003

Ash and acrylic emulsion on canvas

168 × 45 cm

57

Picture made with the ashes created by burning the book *Gulliver's Travels* by Jonathan Swift, 2001

Ash and acrylic emulsion on canvas

168 × 45 cm

58

Picture made with the ashes created by burning the book *Novels* by Alexander Pushkin, 2001

Ash and acrylic emulsion on canvas

168 × 45 cm

59

Picture made with the ashes created by burning the book *Recollections of a Picture Dealer* by Ambroise Vollard, 2001

Ash and acrylic emulsion on canvas

168 × 45 cm

60

Picture made with the ashes created by burning the book *A Sportsman's Sketches* by Ivan Turgenev, 2001

Ash and acrylic emulsion on canvas

168 × 45 cm

61

Picture made with the ashes created by burning the book *Letters on Cézanne* by Rainer Maria Rilke, 2001

Ash and acrylic emulsion on canvas

168 × 45 cm

62

Picture made with the ashes created by burning the book *The Pickwick Papers* by Charles Dickens, 2003

Ash and acrylic emulsion on canvas

168 × 45 cm

63

Picture made with the ashes created by burning the book *The Song of Love. Lyric Poetry by Russian Poets of the XIX–XX Centuries*, 2001

Ash and acrylic emulsion on canvas

168 × 45 cm

64

My favourite books, 2001

Video, silent, colour, 17 min.

65

See p. 15

66

Fountain '89 (The further development and intensification of Marcel Duchamp's thoughts about art), 1989

Plastic, permanent marker

15 × 12.5 × 8.5 cm

67

Boy with dog, 1969

Bronze

12 × 9 × 9.5 cm

68

Air from the State Tretyakov Gallery, 1979/2013

Glass bottle, metal lid with rubber band, ballpoint pen on paper

24 × 15 × 15 cm

Artist's copy

Whereabouts of the original unknown

Room 2

Elitist-Democratic Art

When I set out to concern myself with art in the Soviet Union, contemporary art exhibitions were still deemed illegal. And so the viewer as a mass phenomenon was yet to emerge.

My works were studied by my friends – and I studied theirs. Quite simply, nobody else was able to experience the forbidden products of contemporary art. It was only in the wake of perestroika, when the first legal exhibitions of contemporary art were held, that the first ‘genuine’ viewers appeared on the scene, people I did not know personally. And with them came the problem of an inexperienced audience ‘unable’ to understand contemporary art. Viewers who, since their childhood, had imbibed the paradigm of an ‘art that must be both realistic and comprehensible’ asked: ‘We don’t understand. Why should this be regarded as art?’ There is only a very small circle of insiders who do not ask such questions. The *Elitist-Democratic Art* series set out to address this issue. In creating these ‘pictures’ I made use of Braille, sign language and the terminology of sailors and stenographers.

Back then I used to offer the following explanation: Think of an ‘ordinary’ human being who happens to attend the opening of such an exhibition. Strange things await him or her there: surfaces, more or less evenly covered in paint, huge canvases displaying the messy traces of paint, geometric shapes, photographs. People with wine glasses in their hands are wandering about, exchanging impressions and opinions; in short, they mostly seem to grasp the meaning of these strange objects. They are able to ‘read’ the artist’s message. Naturally, any ordinary man or woman in the street, when faced with this situation, will feel like a complete idiot. So what I did was to try and reverse this process. ‘Insiders’ will interpret these works as standard artistic messages expressed in languages they are familiar with: gestural painting, geometric or monochrome abstractions, conceptual photography. But of course, they are mistaken – for once it is the ‘insiders’ who look stupid as only a sailor, a stenographer or a blind person who happens to visit the exhibition can understand these works. Thus, my pieces for blind, deaf-mute people and similar ‘elites’ are concerned with understanding (or rather not understanding) the languages of art on the one hand and searching for the right viewer/reader of these languages on the other.

Painting for stenographers

69

I love modern painting, 1987

Oil on canvas

100 × 300 cm

70

Beauty is worse than theft, 1988

Oil on canvas

100 × 300 cm

Private collection, Cologne

71

**Not understandable in form, understandable
in content, 1989**

Acrylic on canvas

100 × 300 cm

72

**Understandable in form, not understandable
in content, 1989**

Acrylic on canvas

100 × 300 cm

73

I like art a lot, 2017

Acrylic on canvas

100 × 300 cm

74

I hate the avant-garde, 2017

Acrylic on canvas

100 × 300 cm

75

I love contemporary painting, 2017

Acrylic on canvas

100 × 300 cm

Art for deaf-mute people

76

The further development and intensification of Ludwig Wittgenstein's thoughts about art (*Whereof one cannot speak, thereof one must be silent*), 1988

Black-and-white photograph on hardboard, acrylic paint
100 × 560 cm

87

What did the artist mean by that?, 1987

Black-and-white photograph on hardboard, acrylic paint
100 × 350 cm

Painting for the blind

77

See p. 22

78

Neo-Pseudo-Art, 1987

Plastic and enamel on hardboard
15 × 150 × 3.8 cm
Collection of Peter Pakesch, Vienna

79

I love painting, but with a strange affection, 1988

Plastic and enamel on hardboard
122 × 200 × 3.8 cm
Natalia Turine

80

Everyone who has soon this work will die, 2017

Wood and enamel on hardboard
122 × 200 × 4.8 cm

81

What should this work look like in order for you to like it?, 2017

Wood and enamel on hardboard
122 × 200 × 4.8 cm

82

Is it possible to make an absolutely incomprehensible artwork?, 2017

Wood and enamel on hardboard
120 × 200 × 4.8 cm

83

**You will never see this work for the first time again,
2017**

Wood and enamel on hardboard

122 × 200 × 4.8 cm

84

**What happens to artworks if we don't look at them?,
2017**

Wood and enamel on hardboard

122 × 200 × 4.8 cm

85

**This work looks like you wouldn't want to look at it,
2017**

Wood and enamel on hardboard

120 × 200 cm

Art for sailors

77

Neo-Geo, 1988–90

Acrylic and mixed media on hardboard

50 parts, each 120 × 24 cm (12 parts exhibited)

86

I don't understand anything, 1988/2001

Inkjet print on paper on hardboard

10 × 120 cm

A. Chilova

87

See p. 21

Room 3

Self-portrait with closed eyes

My installation *Self-portrait with closed eyes* consists of eighty-eight descriptions of paintings and drawings that Vincent van Gogh included in his letters to his brother Theo. They are mounted on the wall in the form of text panels printed with Braille (written language for blind people). On the one hand, then, these descriptions are genuine van Goghs for blind individuals as they were given by the artist himself. At the same time, I am experimenting with the idea of what van Gogh would have done had he not severed his ear but put his eyes out.

In addition to the 'ordinary' art audience the aim is to invite blind people to view the installation. The project seeks to facilitate encounters between different visitors or, to be more precise, between different forms of incomprehension. Experienced museum goers cannot read the texts in Braille, but they will probably be able to locate the exhibition within the context of contemporary art. Blind visitors, in turn, who are unlikely to be regular museum visitors, are able to read von Gogh's texts but will mistake them as the main aspect of the installation. Last but not least, I cannot begin to imagine how people who are unable to discriminate between different colours will respond to van Gogh's breath-taking and picturesque descriptions. What incomprehensible images will their imagination produce?

In view of all this I hope that all participants in this project will become aware of their lack of understanding and develop a sense of uneasiness: sighted people through the presence of blind individuals and vice versa. Even if we are to assume that some viewers identify with the author of the work, believing they rise above individual incomprehension and grasp all aspects of the work, they are mistaken, as this piece is certainly not about what he or she assumes. That is to say, my work is not about the viewer's interpretations as the author himself is unable to apprehend his work in its entirety. The installation, then, presumably deals with the idea of finding the ideal viewer: the blind connoisseur of painting and lover of contemporary art.

88

Self-portrait with closed eyes, 1995/2018

Embossed print on paper, mounted on hardboard

88 parts, various dimensions between 10 × 27 cm and 40 × 81 cm

Artist's copy

Whereabouts of the original unknown

110

Spectators, 1995–2012

88 black-and-white photographs, projection

Exhibited on the staircase to the first floor.

I am still alive

Every day I breathe on a mirror as if to make sure that I am still alive. Then I scan the mark created on the mirror before printing it on another mirror, using transparent varnish. The aim is to produce a total of 365 mirrors – in keeping with the number of days that make up one year. Obviously, this project also belongs to the group of works aimed at examining monotonous everyday activities. On the other hand, however, it also points to a body of works in which I deal with abstract painting (pictures made with the ashes of burned books, etc.). I have always been interested in the message conveyed by abstract paintings, in what all these brush strokes, patches and rectangles might signify. How do they manage to convey what some art scholars have termed the ‘breath of life’? Why should I believe that a certain painting communicates a ‘sense of cosmic solitude’, for example, while another reveals a sense of ‘joie de vivre’ or ‘metaphysical vacuum’? What is the basis of this trust in the artist? Each of these mirrors constitutes a small abstract painting which informs us that the artist is still alive and breathing – that is to say, if you give credence to my account of how they were produced.

89

Thirty days in May, 2017

Screenprint on mirror

30 parts, each 30 × 21 cm

Road signs

In 1997, I put up a road sign in the small Montenegrin town of Cetinje, indicating the directions and distances to a number of major museums of classical art. Now similar road signs have been put up in Moscow and Perm, reminding the incidental viewer of the fact that somewhere, far away, true art exists.

90

Road signs, Cetinje, 1997

Road signs, Moscow region, 2005

Road signs, Perm, 2008

Colour and black-and-white photographs,
each 30 × 21 cm

Exhibition project for works that last one minute

I have always been fascinated by the idea of a work of art whose existence is limited to one minute. How can an intoxicating artistic experience be squeezed into such a short space of time, tantamount to a flash of lightning? I do not consider myself capable of creating 'great' or 'true' art (the kind of art that is worth being exhibited in museums). All my endeavours are limited to creating 'contemporary' art.

What is more, I am actually a visual artist whereas this project is based on time, both in terms of concept and material.

Here, then, is my proposal:

On 'my' day, one of the big museums (e.g. the Louvre or the Metropolitan Museum of Art) shall open one minute earlier than usual.

An announcement shall be put up at the entrance of the museum reading: 'On [date] our museum will open one minute earlier, in accordance with a request from the artist Yuri Albert.'

On the following days the wording of the notice shall be altered as follows: 'On [date] our museum opened one minute later than usual, in accordance with a request from the artist Yuri Albert.'

91

One minute, Louvre, Paris, 2010

Colour photograph
40.2 × 40.2 cm

Prize for the Third Moscow Biennale, 2009

Photocopy

2 parts, each 40 × 30 cm

*Vita brevis, ars longa***Regulations****Concerning a Prize for the Third Moscow Biennale of contemporary art**

1. *The Moscow International Biennale Prize is an art project by Yuri Albert in collaboration with the Administration of the Biennale.*
2. *The Prize of the Third Moscow Biennale of Contemporary Art (hereafter MBCA) is directed towards:*
 - a) *strengthening solidarity among artists and stimulating their interest in the life and work of their colleagues;*
 - b) *confirming the participants' serious attitude towards contemporary art;*
 - c) *additional social protection for the participants of the Third MBCA and the perpetuation of their memory.*
3. *The Prize is to be awarded to one of the participants of the Third MBCA in accordance with the results of voting by the participants of the Biennale, to be conducted by the Administration of the MBCA before the opening of the Third Moscow Biennale of Contemporary Art.*
4. *The decision concerning adjudication of the Prize is to be taken from a simple voting majority. The Administration of the MBCA is to determine the Laureate of the Prize according to the results of the vote, of which it is to inform the participants of the MBCA and the Laureate.*
5. *Those participating in the vote may not vote for themselves. Yuri Albert, initiator of the project, is also to be excluded from the nominees.*
6. *The Laureate of the Prize is to be awarded a certificate of the adjudication of the Third Moscow Biennale of Contemporary Art Prize to him/her.*
7. *The contents of the Prize are those funds which, in the instance of the Laureate's death in the period between the date of the adjudication of the Prize to him/her and the date of the opening of the next MBCA, will be remitted towards payment for his/her funeral and the perpetuation of his/her memory by the Administration of the MBCA.*

The Prize is to consist of 450,000 (four hundred and fifty thousand) roubles. Funding of the Prize is to be realized by the Administration of the MBCA from the budgetary resources of the MBCA.

8 In the case that the next Biennale is postponed to a later date, the administration's obligations remain in effect until the opening of the next Biennale. In the case of the next Biennale's cancellation, the obligations are effective for two years from the day of the Prize's adjudication.

9. In the instance that the Laureate's relatives or descendants present Confirmation of the Laureate's death, the Prize is to be paid to them by the Administration of the MBCA to cover the costs of the organization and conducting of the Laureate's funeral, memorial wake, and other such mourning events, in addition to the establishment of a memorial (gravestone) at the place of the Laureate's burial.

10. If the Laureate refuses the Prize, the Biennale's obligations are to remain in force and the relatives/descendants may avail themselves of them.

11. The Biennale has no right to interfere or introduce any conditions concerning the time, place, and rites of the funeral. If the relatives/descendants do not object, a wreath from the Biennale is to be placed on the grave. The Biennale has the right to announce the Prize's implementation through its organs (on its website or in its publications).

12. In the case that the Laureate's death fails to occur within the duration of the Prize, the MBCA's obligations before him/her are to be considered fulfilled, and the adjudication of a new Prize in accordance with the conditions of the current regulations is to take place at the next MBCA.

13. In the case that the Laureate's death occurs within the duration of the Prize, the matter of a new Prize's adjudication is to be decided by the Administration of the MBCA during preparations for conducting the next Biennale.

14. In recognizing the artist Yuri Albert's authorship of the idea of the MBCA Prize, the Administration of the MBCA retains, in accordance with him, the right to inform an unlimited group of individuals of the adjudication and/or payment of the Prize in the mass media, including the Internet.

Yuri Albert, on his part, retains the right to publish facts and documentation of the Prize and demonstrate them at exhibitions as his own work of art.

93

See p. 31

My height

I have repeatedly pointed out that the difference between true art and contemporary art is very important to me, more important even than Marcel Duchamp's discrimination between art and anti-art. Of course, this distinction goes back to my childhood days. It was inspired by the Soviet notion of real, genuine museum art – and its corruption by modernism. As far as I am aware, no such rigorous boundary exists in European culture.

I admit that I have come to understand that there is a grain of truth in that distinction. Let me put it this way: if we see something that we immediately recognise as art then what we are dealing with is true art, in most cases old paintings or sculptures. However, if we have misgivings about whether something is art or not then it is contemporary art, mostly installations, objects or texts. Casting doubt is of paramount importance in contemporary art. Unfortunately, I am a contemporary artist myself, but I do hope that my work communicates a sense of nostalgia for the real thing.

In my family, on every birthday, we used to record a child's height on the doorframe.

I grew up to become an artist in Moscow's various museums, and so I wrote my height on the doorframe of a room in the State Tretyakov Gallery which shows Russia's most important painting from the nineteenth century: Alexander Ivanov's *The Appearance of Christ Before the People*.

94

My height, 21 March 2007, 2007

Black-and-white photograph

2 parts, each 40 × 60 cm

Excursion with blindfolded eyes

I have always held the view that art which is imagined or recollected is better and more fascinating than art which we can actually see. I have dedicated a number of projects to this imagined art.

In 1998 I launched a project which deals both with the viewer and with the aspect of 'viewership': excursions to various museums in which the visitors' eyes are blindfolded so as to enhance their sense of 'viewership'. Most of the participants are insiders, i.e. either artists or art scholars. The exhibition guide presents a standard text for sighted people: 'Take a look here, in this picture you can see ...'. The tour lasts about one hour during which the participants either try to imagine the works of art described by the guide or to recollect them while struggling not to stumble and fall or bump their heads on the wall. I have organised similar performances in museums from Italy to Moscow, including the Gemäldegalerie Berlin, the Galleria Nazionale dell'Umbria in Perugia, the State Tretyakov Gallery in Moscow, the Louvre in Paris and Museum Ludwig in Cologne, among others. Like all the other performances these excursions were, of course, videotaped, but the recordings have a curious quality about them – the camera is shaky and what we get to see are legs, the ceiling, empty walls – as if filmed by a blind person. And that is indeed what happened: one of the participants in the excursion carried the camera without seeing what he or she was recording, guided only by acoustic signals. The ensuing video provides a commentary on the relationship between a specific performance and its documentation. This is what happens when the documentation is produced by participants who play by the rules of the performance (with their eyes blindfolded, they cannot see what they are recording).

95

Excursion with blindfolded eyes, since 1998

Performance, documentary video, colour, sound

What did the artist mean by that?

I once noted that most of my 'works' are in fact representations of other works, that they are merely suggestive of the actual pieces. By the same token, the majority of my 'exhibitions' are in fact installations which take the form of exhibitions. This is why, for the retrospective of my works in Moscow, curator Yekaterina Dyogot and I chose an exhibition design which reflected the process of organising and conceiving such an event.

On the day of the opening of the show not a single work of art was on display in the exhibition rooms. All that the viewers could see on the walls were interpretations of almost all works by Albert in the form of texts. These texts had been written specifically for the show by various authors and took the place of the actual works. Bit by bit the artworks appeared on the walls, gradually covering the descriptions as time went on. On the last day of the exhibition all that could be seen were the artist's works; all the texts had disappeared.

This is an installation-in-progress focusing on the theme of an exhibition by Albert. Critical reflection and exaggeration serve to reverse the roles of artist and curator, blurring the boundaries between the exhibition of an artwork and the artwork itself.

96

What did the artist mean by that?, 2013

with Yekaterina Dyogot

6 colour photographs

each 30 × 45 cm

Caricatures from my childhood

At the beginning of the 1990s I started working on a series of pictures in the form of greatly enlarged copies of anti-modernist caricatures dating from the 1940s to 1960s. It was from these caricatures that I gleaned the first pieces of information about contemporary art when I was a child – quite reliable information, in fact, as I have come to realise. If we consider socialist realism as a modernist movement and the contest between different movements as a driving force in the history of modernism, then it becomes apparent that socialist realists were particularly serious about criticising other artistic traditions. Soviet scholars authored numerous texts in which they denounced the ‘decline of the West’s degenerate bourgeois art’ and caricaturists created no end of caricatures depicting modernists and avant-gardists of every shade.

As far as I know, as a genre these caricatures are unique; only the Third Reich had a comparable movement. For example, while there are no cubist caricatures dealing with impressionism we do find a number of socialist-realist caricatures satirising cubism. Yet, the creators of these caricatures had never set eyes on these artistic traditions themselves, living behind the Iron Curtain in a country which had banned modernism and where no modernist works of art were exhibited.

So in order to be able to caricature modernism they were forced to imagine it first. Most of their works were published in the satirical magazine *Krokodil*, of which millions of copies were published and which was found in almost all Soviet households, in all villages and in even the remotest provinces of the country. The aim was to make its readers, many of whom had never been to a museum before, laugh at phenomena of which they knew nothing, all their information deriving from those funny little pictures. I decided to add another layer to this bizarre construct by reclaiming these strange fruits of human imagination from the realm of artistic propaganda and taking them into the sphere of contemporary art.

93

The picture of a caricature by Ivan Semenov (*Krokodil* no. 7, 1960), 2005

Acrylic on canvas

200 × 55 cm

97

**The picture of a caricature by Mark Vajsbord
(Krokodil no. 29, 1950), 1999**

Acrylic on canvas

115 × 200 cm

98

**The picture of a caricature by Boris Leo
(Krokodil no. 10, 1963), 2000**

Acrylic on canvas

170 × 140 cm

The Arbat in the morning, impression No. 257/31

99

The picture of a caricature by the Kukryniksy, 1994

Acrylic on canvas

160 × 300 cm

Moscow – Dresden

100

**The picture of a caricature by Leonid Sojfertis
(Krokodil no. 13, 1953), 1996**

Acrylic on canvas

120 × 120 cm

I paid 10,000 dollars for this portrait of you. Please at least try to look a bit like it!

101

**The picture of a caricature by Evgenij Šukaev
(Krokodil no. 4, 1963), 2000**

Acrylic on canvas

140 × 140 cm

The title of this painting is Storm over the Atlantic. Do you like it? Not bad. But I've seen it somewhere before, in exactly the same frame too.

102

The picture of a caricature by Boris Prorokov, 2000

Acrylic on canvas

140 × 200 cm

103

**The picture of a caricature by Evgenij Šukaev
(Krokodil no. 29, 1960), 2000**

Acrylic on canvas

120 × 140 cm

104

**The picture of a caricature by Victor Čížikov
(Krokodil no. 26, 1969), 2004**

Acrylic on canvas

200 × 200 cm

Female Kolkhoz farmer, saleslady, fisherwoman

105

**The picture of a caricature by Boris Leo
(Krokodil no. 29, 1957), 1999**

Acrylic on canvas

140 × 120 cm

Brilliant! Although it seems to me that I look a little older here.

106

**The picture of a caricature by the Kukryniksy
(Krokodil no. 23, 1958), 2000**

Acrylic on canvas

145 × 120 cm

107

**The picture of a caricature by Aleksandr Baženov
(Krokodil no. 35, 1952), 1999**

Acrylic on canvas

105 × 200 cm

For the portrait of the Stakhanov worker Ivanov I am urgently looking for the following specialists for the brigade: for ears ... 2, for noses ... 1, for necks ... 1

108

**The picture of a caricature by Ivan Semenov
(Krokodil no. 12, 1966), 2001**

Acrylic on canvas

220 × 200 cm

111

Why they don't love me, 2007/2018

LED display

New production for the exhibition

Exhibited in the Foyer.

Misha Roshal said recently that I follow the road of the least resistance – Ira Kulik called my works glamorous – Anna Romanova said that people are wrong when they regard me as a conceptualist – Andrey Monastyrsky believes that my systematic approach fails and demands that I produce works going beyond the limits of the system – When I asked Kovalev what he didn't like in my creative work, he just said: 'Shit!' – Vladimir Dubosarsky wants more pathos or energy in my works – Salnikov believes

that I am lagging behind life and live in the past tense – Olga Lopukhova doesn't like negligence in my works – Faina Balakhovskaya thinks that I am just a bore – Oleg Kulik says that I make trivial works which look too much like art – Sasha Panov reprimands me for total egocentrism – Natasha Nikitina believes that my narcissism is not radical enough – Yekaterina Dyogot believes that I am lazy and too possessed with intra-art topics – Anatoly Osmolovsky believes that my works are a bit too simple-minded, reasonable, negating sensuality and work on material – Nikita Alexeyev and Sasha Obukhova say that I am too straightforward and predictable – And Nikita thinks that my works are a deceit – Milena Orlova says that I don't have a face of my own – Sergey Yepikhin thinks that I am just a marauder – Victor Tupitsyn doesn't like that my works do not fit the image of their author – Boris Groys believes that I want to be a contemporary artist, but I don't like contemporary art – Yuri Leiderman believes that I am a conformist, and that my art lacks gaps, ridiculousness and pain – Victor Skersis reprimands me for insufficient concentration on fundamental theoretical issues – Sabine Hänsgen says that I want to do as little as possible, but still want it to be perceived as an artistic gesture – Zhenya Kikodze accuses me of fake aristocratism and overfastidiousness – Antonio Geuza thinks that I simulate modesty – Margarita Tupitsyna is amazed by the fact that people can find anything in this Albert – Dima Gutov characterizes my art as an explosive mixture of infantilism, sentimentalism and intellectual mannerism – Yuri Zlotnikov thinks that my works lack weight – Andrey Filippov believes that I am an autopsist of art

Moscow Poll

I once asked myself why the audience still appreciates Hans Haacke's piece *MoMA Poll* (1970). At the time of its creation the situation was clear for museum visitors: the Vietnam War was not yet over, Richard Nixon was still president, and Nelson Rockefeller served both as the president of New York's Museum of Modern Art and as one of its trustees. Back then, the artistic strategy of introducing a contentious political question into the museum space proved to be highly topical and scandalising. Today, very few people are aware of who fought against whom in Vietnam and why, or who Rockefeller and Nixon were. Yet Haacke's work continues to fascinate a lot of people.

I think I understand the reason behind all this: the project works both ways. It is not solely about art as a metaphor of politics but also about politics as a metaphor of art. In keeping with Marcel Duchamp, Haacke lent the artwork the status of controversial political relevance, while also exemplifying the relationship between artwork and audience. When standing in front of an artwork we are always forced to make a choice – at least we need to decide whether we like it or not. This is the democratic aspect inherent in art.

I have created a number of situations that are similar to the one generated by Haacke. However, although my questions may appear to be political on the surface, essentially, they all point to our relationship with art. The answers are by no means self-evident. Wherever *Moscow Poll* was presented, the audience never succeeded in deciding on an answer straight away and the ballots were comparatively evenly distributed between the boxes.

112

Moscow Poll, 2009/2018

Perspex boxes, posters

8 parts, each poster 100 × 100 cm;

each box 100 × 50 × 20 cm

Exhibited in the Foyer.

Room 4

109

Collection presentation

Kunstmuseum Liechtenstein

From major museum expositions to compact private presentations, organising an exhibition inevitably requires the selection of works. It is generally assumed that a selection comprises only the finest works in a collection, i.e. those particularly worth being shown to the audience. However, there is no way for the viewers to decide themselves which pieces are to be displayed as others decide in their stead. This is fundamentally unfair. What is more, museums are exhibiting no more than five to ten percent of their holdings, with the remainder sitting in storage facilities. Therefore we are unintentionally lying when we say 'This museum has a beautiful collection' as no human being has ever set eyes on a collection in its entirety, nor will this ever happen in future.

So when I was asked to present works from the collection of Kunstmuseum Liechtenstein in one of the exhibition rooms I set out to find a possibility to exhibit 'the whole lot': I do not feel entitled to make a selection on behalf of the audience, thereby unfairly disregarding some of the works. On the other hand, no original is shown in the exhibition either, as due to lack of space, all artworks have been replaced by bureaucratic catalogue descriptions and reproductions: As a result, I have no idea what is actually on show here: 'the whole lot' or 'nothing at all'?

Publication

Edition

The exhibition is accompanied by the publication:

Yuri Albert: Elitist-Democratic Art

including the artist's collected writings and a comprehensive overview of his works

Edited by Sandra Frimmel and Sabine Hänsgen

352 pages, 185 coloured ill., Cologne: Snoeck 2018

Friday, 26 October 2018, 6.30pm

Presentation of the publication and Artist Talk

Yuri Albert: Kunst für ein besseres Leben?

Venue at Kunsthalle Zürich, Limmatstraße 270, Zürich
with Yuri Albert, Sandra Frimmel and Sabine Hänsgen

On the occasion of the science festival *100 Ways of Thinking*

The exhibition is also accompanied by a print:

You have purchased this work. Now is this my work or yours?, 2018

Screenprint on hardboard

24 × 30 cm

Production: Yuri Albert

Publisher: Kunstmuseum Liechtenstein, Vaduz

Edition: 45 + 5 AP

Price: CHF 500

Opening

Thursday, 20 September 2018, 6pm

Public guided tours

Thursday, 27 September 2018, 6pm

Thursday, 6 December 2018, 6pm

Thursday, 10 January 2019, 6pm

Take Away (short, guided tour)

Thursday, 27 September 2018, 12.30pm

Thursday, 25 October 2018, 12.30pm

Side programme

Thursday, 27 September 2018, 6pm

Guided tour

Was wollte der Künstler damit sagen?

with Alex Hanimann

Thursday, 4 October 2018, 6pm

Lecture

**Wohnungsausstellungen, Küchengespräche
und Reisen aus der Stadt**

**Yuri Albert im Kontext der inoffiziellen Moskauer
Kunst**

by Sandra Frimmel

Thursday, 18 October 2018, 6pm

Filmclub im Kunstmuseum

The Diamond Arm

(Brilliantovaya Ruka)

by Leonid Gaidai, USSR 1968, 88'

Sunday, 4 November 2018, 11am

Public guided tour 'One Hour'

Museumsführung mit verbundenen Augen

with Didi Fromherz

Yuri Albert will be present

Thursday, 22 November 2018, 6pm

Filmclub im Kunstmuseum

Kidnapping, Caucasian Style

(Kavkazskaya plennitsa, ili Novye priklyucheniya Shurika)

by Leonid Gaidai, USSR 1967, 82'

Thursday, 6 December 2018, 6pm

Guided tour

Was wollte der Künstler damit sagen?

with Stefan Baltensperger and David Siepert

Thursday, 17 January 2019, 6pm

Filmclub im Kunstmuseum

Ivan Vasilievich Changes Profession

(Ivan Vasilyevich menyayet professiyu)

by Leonid Gaidai, USSR 1973, 93'

Texts

Yuri Albert, Sandra Frimmel, Sabine Hänsgen

Editing

Sandra Frimmel, Sabine Hänsgen

Copyediting

David Gray

Proofreading

Gila Strobel

Translations

Sabine Hänsgen, Anne Krier (Russian/German)

Übersetzungsbüro Watts (German/English)

Graphic Design

Sylvia Fröhlich

Print

Gutenberg AG, Schaan

© 2018

Kunstmuseum Liechtenstein, Yuri Albert and authors

Kunstmuseum Liechtenstein
with Hilti Art Foundation
Städtle 32, P.O. Box 370
FL – 9490 Vaduz
Tel +423 235 03 00
Fax +423 235 03 29
mail@kunstmuseum.li
kunstmuseum.li
hiltiartfoundation.li