

FC: Can you talk about how *Living as Form* developed its Nomadic Version? We realized it was originally a large commissioned exhibition at Essex Market, what's the difference between the initial one and the Nomadic Version later on?

NT: There are significant differences some formal and some content related. The entire project of the Living as Form exhibition was to attempt to do a sort-of Wikipedia model of creative activism and socially engaged processes. This wasn't meant as a "best of" type of authoritative exhibition but instead a mapping of a kind of ecology with different approaches, subject matters, geographies, and poetics. In that respect, the nomadic version is almost the more compelling iteration in that each host site can add a local context to an already vastly global array. It provides the opportunity for the show to evolve organically and reflect local considerations. The idea came out of conversations with Kate Fowle at Independent Curators International.

FC: This traveling show is circulated via a hard drive, on which a new project will be uploaded and sent to the next venue. I think it's very interesting, in terms of curatorial strategy, to experiment the "presentation" of certain art works that required very much on audience's experience at a specific moment. However, when most of the socially engaged art is related to the development of local political and economical structure, how do you think this show would be able to build up connection with local audiences and the knowledge behind, when we can only see works from the documents?

NT: You have placed your finger on one of the difficulties of presenting this kind of work. Documentation isn't the real thing. That said, I try to not get hung up on that issue too much. For many artists interested in this kind of work, they understand that they can't fly around the world to see all these projects, but glean different techniques and possibilities from a variety of models internationally. Even if the documentation doesn't present a complete picture, it does provide valuable information.

This iteration puts a lot in the local host organization's curatorial hands. The local curator needs to develop connections with local audiences and the local commissions and conversations should provide a bridge between the documentation of international projects and those happening on the ground in the local venue.

FC: Do you think the development or obsessive usage of social media would influence artwork that is largely engaged in the society or political orientated ones? What I mean is when people are arguing the relationship between politically correct art and its artistic efficacy, what possibly you think social media would change that,

because it averts even more its aesthetics and extend the experience of audience's participation.

NT: I believe that the powerful thing that social media can provide are alternative formats for legitimization narratives. It isn't all that different from what pirate radio and **alternative television** offered before. It is a mechanism for sharing information and providing social forms to produce new ideas of what actually matters. Because power tends to deflect from things that are obviously of concern (wealth inequity, colonialism, patriarchy), these issues tend to rise up when new modes of social conversation emerge. So, in a sense, social media is a powerfully political tool and its growing role in social movements comes out of the fact that a global legitimating of a bottom-up narrative has profound effects. This not only will be reflected in the arts, but all levels of society.

FC: Do you think small and guerrilla-like exhibitions will change curator's position, in comparison with their jobs in traditional institution exhibitions?

NT: Big museums will continue to be around and so too will small more guerrilla-like exhibitions. The changing identity of the curatorial is particularly given emphasis today in that the role of sorting information is particularly helpful. Between social networks and a growing mass of global cultural producers, there are simply increasing opportunities to play with how to demonstrate that.

FC: Can you elaborate a bit more how do "sorting information" relate to the change identity of curatorial? "

NT: There still remains those that believe the curators job is to present the "best" of some kind of art. That role has shifted. It's a big world. What curators can provide are new arrangements of gestures and forms of being in the world that provide a new insight into potential relationships and new modes of being. Living as Form isn't meant as a best of but instead an ecosystem of possibilities. Not that I don't think the projects are amazing, but everything requires context.

FC: Many of your projects adapt different forms, could be a convention, a summit or solo artists on socially-oriented projects outside metropolitan areas. What was the initial striking point to make you want to do different forms of project? And how do you position yourself as a curator in these projects? What I am interested here is what do you think a curator will bring to a project when his/her involvement alters in the development of art production.

NT: The term curator is strange. I don't know. Sometimes it means just being a voice of reason in administrative discussions, sometimes it means choosing great art projects, sometimes it means crafting a nuanced argument or poetics through the arrangement of art projects.. It is ever evolving. For me, one of the more exciting opportunities, and fortunately working at Creative Time provides that, is to provide new platforms from which artists can work. The exhibition model is not the only arena in which artists can flourish.

FC: What has made the development of your unique curatorial or seeing its role as in evolving?

NT: One of the major opportunities for me has been working at Creative Time. We do public art and basically that means not doing typical museumological or gallery based exhibitions. Not that I don't like doing those. I just think that in thinking what art can be in the public realm allows a freedom to produce new possibilities for art. We are a collective kind of organization with all of us thinking like one big brain. So, the projects we work on with amazing artists always push us toward new horizons of what culture can do that historically important. From working with Trevor Paglen to send a sort of time capsule of images into outer space to providing a summit on the global state of socially engaged art to an on-line platform that connects artists with journalistic outlets like the Guardian and the Nation. These are all new possibilities that I have been blessed to explore because of the mandate of Creative Time.

FC: Many of your projects are no longer emphasizing on the artistic concept or aesthetics of works, I believe there's a long way from being "accepted" by audiences to be "expected". What is the transition during the process and what do you think have made differences up to now?

NT: As much as art is supposed to be "out of the box", it is literally, so often, in a box. When you say the word "art" to people, they really have a specific idea in their mind. We imagine labels on the way, something hanging or a sculpture or a performance. We have modes of presentation we have come to expect and many of them are determined by the venues in which we have come to expect to find art. So, in a sense, what a curator can do is slowly evolve the ideas of aesthetic presentation such that audiences learn about new possibilities of experience.