



JULIAN CHARRIÈRE
JULIUS VON BISMARCK
ANDREAS GREINER
PHOTOGRAPHY FREDERIKE WETZELS

412

413

x x x x x x x x

When the Landscape Looks Back
The Elemental Vision of Julian Charrière
By Marcus Boxler
Photography Frederike Wetzels

Standing at the intersection of art, science, and exploration, Julian Charrière has built a practice that bridges the natural and the man-made, the poetic and the empirical. From radioactive islands and melting glaciers to deep-sea trenches, his work unfolds as a dialogue with the planet – probing how humans shape, perceive, and inhabit a changing Earth. For Charrière, every journey — whether physical or conceptual – becomes a means of unlearning, a search for moments where wonder and awareness meet.

STANDING AT THE INTERSECTION OF ART, SCIENCE, AND EXPLORATION, JULIAN CHARRIÈRE HAS BUILT A PRACTICE THAT BRIDGES THE NATURAL AND THE MAN-MADE, THE POETIC AND THE EMPIRICAL. FROM RADIOACTIVE ISLANDS AND MELTING GLACIERS TO DEEP-SEA TRENCHES, HIS WORK UNFOLDS AS A DIALOGUE WITH THE PLANET – PROBING HOW HUMANS SHAPE, PERCEIVE, AND INHABIT A CHANGING EARTH. FOR CHARRIÈRE, EVERY JOURNEY — WHETHER PHYSICAL OR CONCEPTUAL – BECOMES A MEANS OF UNLEARNING, A SEARCH FOR MOMENTS WHERE WONDER AND AWARENESS MEET.

Marcus Boxler: What drives your artistic curiosity? Would you say there was a defining moment that shaped your approach as an artist?
Julian Charrière: There’s a natural continuity in my work: one leads to the next, so it’s hard to identify a single defining moment. Art, like life, is an accumulation of experiences that shapes what follows. If I had to point to a particularly pivotal encounter, it would be my first trip to the Arctic landscape in Iceland just after the eruption of the Eyjafjallajökull volcano. That place forced me to recalibrate my senses. I had assumed I knew how to move through a landscape, how to gauge distance and scale, but the fractal forms and absence of orientation points made those habits unreliable. It was a lesson in unlearning, and it left a lasting imprint on how I approach both perception and making. Since then, I’ve returned again and again to the cryosphere – the high and low latitudes whose fragile immensity continues to draw me – and those environments remain a profound source of inspiration.

MB: You experiment with diverse media such as film, sculpture, photography, scientific research, and deep field expeditions. How do you decide which medium fits which idea?

JC: Each project begins as a question rather than a form. I start with the phenomenon I want to understand or the tension I want to reveal, and only then look for the material language that can carry it. Sometimes a still image is enough to distill an atmosphere; other times the work demands the temporal depth of film or the physical presence of a sculpture. I often test several approaches before one feels inevitable, because the medium is never neutral – it is the vessel that shapes how the idea breathes in the world. At times the medium is simply dictated by circumstance, while at other moments the complexity of a situation calls for a multi-medial, sensorial approach. The works that emerge often precipitate in different forms, each like a word contributing to a larger syntax. I think of an exhibition as the place where those words become sentences, where the correlation between individual pieces can render the layered reality of the subject I’m trying to approach.

MB: Much of your work involves journeys to remote and sometimes hazardous places: ice fields, volcanoes, radioactive sites. Julius von Bismarck, for his part, called “traveling art” integral to the meaning of his work. Do you incorporate the physical act of traveling and the process of encountering the subject of research into your work? If yes, in what way?

JC: The journey into a landscape – whether a melting glacier, an atoll scarred by nuclear tests, or a deep-sea trench – is a form of research and a way of thinking with the environment. Being there means confronting time, scale, and vulnerability with my own body. Fieldwork generates the materials, the sounds, and the sensory impressions that later form the work, but it also alters my perception; the physical encounter with these places becomes a kind of collaborator, guiding decisions long after I have returned to the studio. Yet, my work is not about traveling per se, but about being present and entering into a dialogue with a site and those who inhabit it. It is less about where I go or with whom, and more about that precise point of contact, the moment of mutual inhabitation, when a landscape begins to inhabit me in return. There is an intimacy in that encounter, a quiet proximity that shapes the work as much as any material or concept, as if the place whispers its own tempo and textures. In this back and forth, meaningful works can take shape. I think of it as a form of nourishment that requires bodily involvement: the body becomes a primary instrument. We often privilege sight as the dominant sense for understanding the world, but I try to unlearn that

habit and reconnect with touch, hearing, and smell, engaging all the senses to experience a place as fully as possible. This process is demanding, yet it is within that expanded sensory awareness that the complexity of a site truly reveals itself.

MB: Which particular project took up the most of your time and thought and why?

JC: It’s difficult for me to single out one project, because I’m almost always working on several long-term pieces at once. At the moment, for example, I’m developing a permanent installation for MONA in Tasmania that has been unfolding over three years and demands extensive planning, research, and technical experimentation. In parallel, I’ve been making films – Toward No Earthly Pole is a good example – that require multiple years of shooting across different locations and an equally long, intricate post-production. Recently much of my focus has turned to the underwater world, which opens another expansive field of inquiry. So rather than one definitive project, I think of my practice as a constellation of overlapping investigations. Each demands years of sustained attention, and I’m usually nurturing three to five of them simultaneously before they finally come to fruition.

MB: When you think about the future – do you consider yourself actively taking part or rather adapting and reacting to what is going to happen?

JC: I see art as a way to open perception rather than to deliver instructions. Facts and statistics rarely shift behavior on their own; what can move people is an encounter that bypasses information and reaches the senses. By creating spaces of wonder or subtle unease – an exhibition, an installation, a carefully staged situation – art can make the entanglement between human and planetary systems palpable in a way that is felt as much as understood. I do not believe art carries an obligation to be responsible or didactic; it remains a space of freedom where each of us can discover our own implication. For me, art should never be prescriptive, but it can offer new lenses through which to see the world, and those shifting perspectives inevitably shape how a viewer feels with and within their surroundings. That possibility of reorienting perception can itself become a quietly powerful political act. I am not interested in prescribing solutions or illustrating a scientific report. Instead, I try to create conditions where someone might linger, listen, and register the complexity of our shared environment. If that moment of attention sparks curiosity or a quiet sense of care, the work has already acted as a catalyst for a different kind of ecological consciousness – one that grows from experience rather than instruction.

MB: You collaborate with scientists and use research-based methods. Has there ever been a tension between scientific precision and artistic liberty in your practice? If so, how did you bridge the gap?

JC: I’m drawn to many of the same territories that occupy natural scientists, though I approach them through a different lens. What fascinates me is the connective tissue of the planet – the subtle forces we call ecology – and the way countless systems and beings are interlaced in a single, shifting web of life. That curiosity often places me alongside researchers, listening to how they observe, question, and model the world. Their methods inevitably seep into my practice, yet the work itself is not scientific. It sometimes relies on technological development, but I prefer that infrastructure to remain invisible so the piece can stay luminous and unpredictable. My aim is for the final work to hold on to a sense of wonder and poetry, even as it speaks to the very subjects that science investigates.

MB: Where and how do you prefer to show your work?

JC: I enjoy the elasticity of context. Museums offer controlled conditions and a certain intimacy, while outdoor sites or public installations let the work engage with unpredictable elements and wider audiences. What matters most is that the setting resonates with the piece itself. Sometimes that means a white cube, other times a shoreline or a disused industrial space. Within those spaces, I try to create a dialogue among the works so that objects are not merely presented but invite the viewer to enter a situation. I aim for exhibitions that unfold like a journey, where the viewer moves through a sequence of encounters and gradually exposes themselves to the atmosphere of the

show. To shape that kind of synesthetic experience, where multiple senses are quietly addressed, it is often essential to work with the entire set of conditions and maintain enough control to guide how the works breathe together.

MB: How did your educational background shape your artistic practice?

JC: Studying at the Institute for Spatial Experiments in Berlin under Olafur Eliasson was formative. The program encouraged us to look at the world through many different lenses – one day we might be in conversation with a breakdancer, the next with a nanoscientist or a Buddhist monk. That constant exchange expanded my sense of what an artistic practice could be and taught me to treat dialogue as a medium in itself. Traveling, working alongside other artists, and moving between disciplines shaped not only the way I approach a subject but also how I build relationships around a work. It instilled a curiosity for perspectives beyond my own and a habit of thinking across fields, both of which continue to guide how I conceive and realize projects today.

MB: When you think about the future, whether in terms of ecological crisis or technological progress, are you more driven by hope, skepticism, or something in between?

JC: I don’t place myself at either pole of optimism or despair. The landscapes I work in—glaciers, deep oceans, sites of extraction—carry resilience and fragility at once, and that ambiguity keeps me alert. For me, the ecological crisis is as much a crisis of perception as of fact. Art can’t offer solutions, but it can shift how we sense time, scale, and interdependence. That quiet change in perception is where I locate my hope.

MB: Your works oscillate between dystopian and utopian visions. Is this ambivalence a conscious strategy, or something that emerges organically from your research and travel?

JC: That tension isn’t something I set out to manufacture, but it does surface naturally from the places and histories I work with. When you spend time on a melting glacier, a deep-sea vent, or a site scarred by nuclear tests, you can’t help but feel both awe and unease. The same landscape that embodies deep time and resilience also carries the imprint of human impact and fragility. I’m interested in holding those two realities together rather than choosing one over the other. If the work feels at once dystopian and utopian, it’s because the world itself contains both possibilities, and my role is to create situations where that ambiguity can be felt rather than resolved.



416



417

Engineering the Unpredictable
Julius von Bismarck's Worlds Between Nature and Invention
By Marcus Boxler

Detonated natural monuments, revitalized iconic buildings in the Ruhr region, literal landscape paintings, and life-size push-puppet animal toys. What sounds like a fever dream describes only a selection of Julius von Bismarck's oeuvre to date. Alongside Andreas Greiner and Julian Charrière, he is one of 12 students from Olafur Eliasson's first class in Berlin who are now themselves world-renowned artists. An artist who meticulously examines the past in order to learn about the future. Because the present is just a transitory moment in between.

Marcus Boxler: Julius, when you think about your own motivation as an artist, what is the driving force?

Julius von Bismarck: I guess people assume artists have a different motivation than others with regular jobs. For what we consider regular jobs, the motivation is mostly to get around, to cover the costs of living. But I never really entered a 'normal job' cycle. I never had a boss, never worked in an office. I've always experimented – first as a kid, and later during my studies. I started researching, experimenting, developing, and building devices. My motivation was curiosity, to answer the question. It was curiosity – finding out what would happen if I built something I imagined. That curiosity is what kept me unsettled trying to finish projects for my degree, and later, for exhibitions. Sometimes, it's pure aesthetic curiosity, sometimes it's almost sociological – like when we exploded the 'natural' monuments we had artificially built in the Mexican desert.

THE BIGGEST VALUE OF ART SCHOOL IS LEARNING THE MECHANISMS, THE LANGUAGE TO SPEAK ABOUT ART, AND THE NETWORK. YOU CAN MAKE ART ON YOUR OWN, BUT TO BE SUCCESSFUL, YOU NEED ACCESS TO THE ART WORLD – AND THAT HAPPENS MOSTLY VIA THE NETWORK YOU BUILD AT UNIVERSITY.

Marcus: But you are not only destroying supposed natural monuments, you have also resurrected buildings in the Ruhr region that were demolished in the 2000s. Your practice is marked by experimentation. One gets carried away when trying to place your art in the vicinity of a particular genre. Does a specific medium actually feel most natural to you?

Julius: When I'm working with film or photography, I can do everything myself – be the camera operator, the photographer. But whenever it's something bigger, I need a team, and that becomes a completely different process. But, in the end, the medium is not what matters most for me. Sometimes I just set out on a trip and build something enormous with locals, and learn more from their perspectives than from anything else. This 'travelling art' – using journeys as mediums and context – has become central to my practice.

Marcus: Your studies were in various fields – social, natural, or philosophical science. Was it always the plan to end up in art?

Julius: Not at all. I started in computer science, moved to visual communication, went on exchange to New York where I studied fine arts, then I joined Olafur Eliasson's Institute for Spatial Experiments in Berlin. I liked robotics, programming, new media, and film. The way along visual communication and later arts gave me access to all these workshops and classes – I didn't have to decide.

Marcus: At your studio, I was allowed a little sneak peak of a huge installation you are currently preparing for a German airport. Andreas Greiner told me that he had already seen a sketch for this particular project in your sketchbook during your joint studies with Olafur Eliasson. If you had already planned such projects and simply lacked the means to carry them out, what did your studies actually do for you?

Julius: The biggest value of art school is learning the mechanisms, the language to speak about art, and the network. You can make art on your own, but to be successful while you're alive, you need access to the art world – and that happens mostly via the network you build at university.

Marcus: What makes art 'good' for you? Do you apply any personal standards?

Julius: For my own work, I want to move something – whatever that means – emotionally, socially, aesthetically. But for the art I view, I

value surprise. Think of a big exhibition – you might forget most of it, Marcus: Is there a site where you'd most love to realize a work, regardless of obstacles? but three works stick in your memory a year later. That's good art to me: it surprises, maybe confronts or irritates you, sometimes even makes you uncomfortable.

Marcus: When you think about the future, does the thought of how much you can change that future prevail, or the question of how the consequences of the future will affect you?

Julius: I always see myself as an active participant in the scenario. Whether it's war, the climate crisis, AI anxiety, I instinctively ask: 'How can I act, how can I change something?' In my mind, I save the world! I guess it's just my way of staying proactive instead of feeling powerless.

Marcus: In an exhibition at the Berlinische Galerie in 2023, you dealt with your own family history and the name Bismarck. How much does that history influence what you do?

Julius: My art itself isn't about my lineage, but viewers inevitably see 'Bismarck' on the label. I have to contend with that context, like it or not. My show in Berlin engaged with that history, in part because colonial legacies are a huge subject in Germany right now. But honestly, it's more about being a German artist dealing with colonial states seem powerless. So, what next? It's an open question – but that's narratives than about being Otto's descendant. I have been studying how much of our current nature construction stems from the colonial era. And there was really no way around Bismarck. And although he didn't play such a major role in what I'm actually interested in, he has a big influence, he kind of shines through, so to speak. And then I thought, okay, we share the same name, so instead of trying to get around it somehow, I'd rather go all out. But I feel more responsible as a German or as an artist living in Germany to deal with this history than I do as the great-great-grandnephew of Otto, who feels somewhat connected through family ties.

Marcus: And yet you tried to rename the Bismarck Sea.

Julius: The Bismarck Sea is another example where one might think that it actually reminds us of a very brief period that we need to remember because we were the perpetrators, but which perhaps no one in Papua New Guinea wants to remember anymore. And so it might make more sense to build a memorial here, which doesn't necessarily have to be called Bismarck, but simply commemorates the colonial crimes of the Germans in Papua New Guinea, and we somehow remove this name because it never really belonged there anyway.

Marcus: This isn't the first time I've spoken to an artist about a form of memorial that translates past crimes in distant places into a space that is present here in Germany. This immediately brings to mind your buoy, which simulates and transmits distant events in another location.

Julius: That is a general theme that I find interesting, namely the extent to which landscapes can be political, the extent to which nature has a religious character, and the extent to which we somehow change our relationship to it. Many of my works are based on this background. I don't really care how some streets here in Berlin happen to be named. A sea or an ocean or a lake or an archipelago are landscape constructions, and I'm very interested in how they came about. And that's why it was just up my alley.

Marcus: Do your concepts originate from a place, or do you seek out places for your ideas?

Julius: Both. Sometimes someone suggests a site, I visit, and suddenly an idea clicks. Or I have a concept and search for a suitable place, even applying for public art competitions to find the right match. But sometimes, when restrictions get too heavy, I just walk away.

Julius: Always – somewhere inaccessible. Remote places fascinate me. Maybe someday I'll curate a show there, too!

Marcus: What does being visionary mean in your daily life?

Julius: I'm at a midway point in my career – looking back, but with (hopefully) a long way ahead. Sometimes, I'm frustrated seeing ideas I had turn into successful products because I didn't pursue them hard enough. That's visionary: having the courage to persist with an idea, even when everyone thinks you're crazy. But if you fail, people just call you foolish. Especially in Germany – we're not great at rewarding visionary risks. The atmosphere is risk-averse, conservative. Instead of fostering innovation, everything seems designed to slow you down.

Marcus: Is your view of the future more utopian or dystopian?

Julius: That's changed. I grew up optimistic, in an era of UN, NATO, NGOs, globalization – this sense the world could unite to solve big problems. That hope has collapsed a bit. The structures we counted on are failing, private enterprise is profit-driven, and nation also why it's an interesting and demanding time to be alive. If we want things to change, everyone needs to pitch in, not just talk about it or leave it to the next person.



From Empathy to Ecosystem
Andreas Greiner on Art as Living Network
By Marcus Boxler

What do a hybrid chicken named Heinrich, discarded yet planted trees, and artist Andreas Greiner have in common? They are all living sculptures. At least according to an artist whose interest in people and bodies has shifted from an object-based understanding to a general principle of design and transformation. Alongside Julian Charrière and Julius von Bismarck, Andreas Greiner belongs to the first generation of Olafur Eliasson’s Institute for Spatial Experiments – and just 10 years later, he himself is a professor of art.

IT IS A CULTURAL ACHIEVEMENT THAT WE HAVE MANAGED NOT TO THROW ATOMIC BOMBS AT EACH OTHER SINCE HIROSHIMA, AND FOR 80 YEARS NOW. AND IT IS EXISTENTIALLY IMPORTANT FOR OUR SURVIVAL THAT WE LEARN TO USE THE TOOLS WE INVENT AND WORK WITH IN A WAY THAT BENEFITS US AND DOES NOT LEAD TO OUR MUTUAL DESTRUCTION.

Marcus Boxler: Andreas, we last spoke at length a few months ago on my podcast. A lot has changed since then, most of it not for the better. What motivates you to keep going?
Andreas Greiner: Probably curiosity, but I might have said this already last time and I am wondering if I can say something different now so that it’s not all so repetitive. Curiosity in general is definitely an important driving force for me, in a nutshell. Curiosity about a human beings and humanity. And I am an optimistic person, so I always hope for the better.

MB: Julius von Bismarck cited curiosity as the initial driving force behind his artistic work.
AG: Oh, interesting. Maybe I can draw a different conclusion later.
MB: Let us start with your personal journey. You wanted to study art, but took a little detour via medicine and anatomy. How did that come about?
AG: It started with the desire to be able to depict people in a classical

way and to understand how this comes about: a kind of Renaissance-like understanding of the human body, as with da Vinci or Michelangelo. Using anatomy and a constructive understanding to figure out why there is a change in shape somewhere. And that began with studying figurative sculpture in Florence.
MB: And then came the Institute for Spatial Experiments?
AG: When I joined the Institute for Spatial Experiments and studied with Olafur, that’s when things started to diverge. Olafur said something that really struck a chord with me at that moment – if I remember correctly: It’s a classic thing that many artists revolve around their own drama and existence like a moth around a flame.

MB: Your Renaissance-driven interest in the human body, too?
AG: At that time, I did many rather absurd things, for example, I had a pope costume and painted myself figuratively wearing it – I did many self-portraits. And then it dawned on me: This is actually quite vain – does it even have relevance for the rest of the world? To distract myself a bit from that, and also because at the time my friend Julian Charrière and I probably had something to learn from each other, I started working with him for a longer period. We conducted many experiments and interventions, in public spaces or with bioluminescent organisms such as algae. Slowly, the focus shifted away from humans, and also from myself as a subject, toward the non-human, toward living organisms and the ecosystem. Looking back today, however, I am not sure whether I really moved so far away from this early approach of self-reflection. Because when I first tried to understand other people through observing, portraying, or listening to them, my resonance with them would, in turn, tell me something about myself. Perhaps I later transferred this practice, at least in part, onto non-human life. The later work is also an attempt to explore this kinship and perceive other lives in their otherness, but also to discover similarities. So, to return to your first question, maybe it is fair to say that empathy, too, is a driving force for me.

MB: A professor at the Düsseldorf Art Academy with a penchant for sculpture and conceptual art once referred to the art of Julian Charrière, Julius von Bismarck, and you as the “New Berlin School” (Neue Berliner Schule) in a private conversation. Fondly. Do you see yourself in that?
AG: I recall there was an article by Silke Hohmann where she wrote about “Eliassons Erben” (Eliasson’s heirs); there this term was also mentioned – more in relation to interventions into public space and life beyond the so-called “white cube.”
MB: So, which group do you belong to?
AG: I am not sure if I agree with the “New” in “New Berlin School.” This is quite relative. Now, 11 years later, I am not sure if this practice is really something new. I think a lot of our work and aesthetics

were informed by growing up in an analog world, artist references from the 60s to the 90s, and many of the strategies we used were already established by artists before us. Almost parallel to our emergence, there was a huge hype around so-called “post-internet art.” I always felt—and still feel—that we, the first generation of participants at Olafur’s Institute for Spatial Experiments like Julian, Julius and I, were much less new in terms of approach and aesthetic style than the post-internet artists.
MB: It was also part of a paradigm shift.

AG: That’s more like it. In the end, you follow your intuition. But you’re right: There has been a paradigm shift in the art movement itself. What was maybe new to this type of conceptual art is that we fused many different ways of producing art, and that we turned a little bit away from an abstract art-for-art’s-sake towards more storytelling and relating to the worlds around us. Many art professors retired in this period, and the internet became an increasingly powerful phenomenon. This gave rise to a type of conceptual art using contemporary technical means of production and exploring the associated implications for the environment and society that has become quite mainstream by now.
MB: I don’t want to refer too much to the other interviews, but it fits too well: Julius said that he would probably have found himself in a start-up environment if the circumstances had been slightly different. Perhaps this openness to technology and risk also fits in with the concept of the “New Berlin School”?
AG: Maybe. There is a lot of overlap between the way start-ups work and the way we work. And we also do it: I co-founded one association (Wald für morgen e.V.), one company (Tree and Rocket), and one NGO (art4biodiversty), and the output of those organizations is not only art.

MB: What role can art play in the discourse on ecological issues?
AG: Art is simply part of the transformation process that we all face moving forward. On the one hand, art reflects its time and the discourses of its time, but on the other hand, it also participates in them. The best-known and most prominent example for its role in ecological issues is Joseph Beuys, who co-founded the Green Party and also changed the understanding of art, in order to justify in practical terms that such activist forms of intervention can also be considered art from an artistic perspective — for example, as working on a “Social Sculpture” (Soziale Plastik).
MB: Where can you observe this in concrete terms?
AG: I noticed it at university, for example. When I talk to professors from other fields, I realize that this artistic environment is a kind of experimental kitchen for new behaviors, new ways of speaking, and new perspectives. That doesn’t necessarily mean that art always pioneers. The impulses are often definitely set in other places, but they are then taken up by art and given shape. It practically translates what was not really perceptible before into something we can perceive.
MB: But wouldn’t that mean that everyone works in the same way? A kind of artistic egalitarianism?

AG: The form of perceptibility into which it is translates depends on the artistic personality. There are activist artists, there are more narrative artists, and there are phenomenological artists, but there are also antagonistic artists. They then reflect this in turn. Basically, it is a mirror of how our climate discourse is conducted in society. And all other discourses as well.

MB: It does not come as a surprise you mentioned Beuys. Your tree plantings show parallels to Joseph Beuys’ oak trees, and you like to use the term “living sculpture,” which is reminiscent of his concept of “social sculpture.” What does the term “living sculpture” mean to you?
AG: It has transformed. At the beginning, I spoke of co-authorship and collaboration with non-human organisms. However, I came to realize that there is a clash, that it doesn’t really fit together because I can’t ask the algae if they want to collaborate with me, and art for humans most probably is highly irrelevant to them.
MB: So, how has the term changed, in your understanding?
Andreas: Accordingly, it is now more of a concept of design on this planet. So, a very simple visual example: I breathe in air that has been co-created by the tree. The tree produces oxygen, I breathe it in,

use it to fuel my metabolism and oxidation processes, and breathe out CO2. The tree breathes in that CO2. And, so, we inform each other with a few molecules that we tailor to each other – the tree shapes me and I shape the tree. That’s why we are both sculptors, in a way. I am a living sculpture and the tree is a living sculpture.
MB: In particular, your connection of sculpture to humans through natural processes such as metabolism or oxidation is also reminiscent of Erwin Wurm’s understanding of sculpture. Humans as malleable, living sculptures.

AG: I have worked extensively with this concept in works such as Heinrich and Der freie Grundriss, where a fly was hatching in the Neue Nationalgalerie. It is also a play on the concept of art and on the expectations directed towards art. Maybe I also intended to change one’s perspective on living beings in general. Nonetheless, it is very important to me that the term “living sculpture” carries a non-hierarchical meaning in relation to my work.
MB: Are you thinking of a specific counter example?
AG: Piero Manzoni, for example. He signed nude models, naked female bodies. Not only is this sexist, seen from today’s perspective, but above all it symbolizes a power imbalance that was very pronounced in the understanding of art at that time: “I am the artist, and therefore I decide what is art and what is not.” For me, it’s really about exploring the fact that design, transformation processes, change, and present dependence all have a certain beauty. On an abstract level, that’s what the sculptural process is for me.
MB: So, artists are those who can make the beauty of this in-between or this network of relationships visible?
AG: No, that brings up the question of art and skill again—what can the artist do, what makes it art? I’ve moved away from that completely. It doesn’t play a role in my categorization – art or non-art, artist or non-artist. I’m probably so dispassionate about it because I worked so hard to get into art school, and then realized how highly individually led this discourse is. I’ve moved away from this attitude and hierarchies.

MB: Finally, a question about your resources. You use the latest technologies such as machine learning systems, LLMs, and 3D printing. What vision do you associate with these new technologies?
AG: What initially draws me to these technologies is curiosity: the desire to understand, to apply, to experiment. But what ultimately drives me in the practical creation of the artwork is the question of the culture surrounding the use of these tools. Artificial intelligence, genetic engineering—these are also related to questions of culture and values. To put it bluntly: It is a cultural achievement that we have managed not to throw atomic bombs at each other since Hiroshima, and for 80 years now. And it is existentially important for our survival that we learn to use the tools we invent and work with in a way that benefits us and does not lead to our mutual destruction.