

# FATOS

## ÜSTEK

16. 1. 2025

**ANNA** For the beginning, I'll just start with a basic question. What do you do?

**FATOS** I normally call myself an independent curator and writer. And my practice is quite extensive in a sense that I not only make exhibitions or write books and write work catalogs or monographs or magazines and other publications. I also work on different capacities with institutions and organizations -- from local councils to property developers, art fairs and art institutions. So it's quite a wide spectrum of collaborators and partners. And I am very much involved in thinking and working along with artists, theoreticians, critics and creators in making my content production.

**ANNA** You call it content production.

**FATOS** I think that's one way to see that. I do see my cultural work and my writing also as a practice.

**ANNA** I have met you as a curator. Now you told me the whole variety of practices of yours. I'm also interested about the institutional aspect of your practice.

**FATOS** I've been working in the field for almost 25 years. I have collaborated with art institutions and I've also directed two UK art institutions. I'm very much interested in the instituting aspect of the arts. And I'm also interested in the artistic direction and artistic policies, systems and structures that inform or support the art experiences as we have today.

**ANNA** What's your practice about? What is the content of what you produce?

**FATOS** The content is mainly a display of artworks. It could also be public events in the form of conversations, screenings, performances. And that you could say I mainly work with exhibitions. I've worked internationally in various different countries, and in various different contexts in the public realm or inside the institution. I'm interested in not only the visual, but the discursive production of art encounters. I work very closely with artists, especially on new commissions. It is really about the conversation I have with the artist, the venue, the context and the levers. Sometimes it's imagined audiences. And sometimes it's physical, corporeal audiences.

**ANNA** By "imagined" you mean "imagined" at the moment of the production, or "imagined" in a way that you don't know who will be the people who come? What do you mean by this word?

**FATOS** It's a twofold. First of all, when I am installing an exhibition, I do imagine the choreography of the experience. Where people will come through, how people will view works, what will they see one after another. Almost like a montage technique of how people will start imagining, how people will be triggered imaginatively, creatively. The other aspect of imagined audiences is that, as a curator, you are not always there once your show opens. So I really don't know exactly who will be coming on the days when I'm not present. If you do an online exhibition, you wouldn't know who is really accessing the content or online talk. So as ephemeral as the project gets, then the audiences are also more unprofiled. If it is an exhibition in an art institution, in a certain city, then you can also imagine those audiences, because they will be the immediate local pickup. But if you

are doing something international, which I've done a lot, like biennials and festivals, there is always the aspect of people bumping into the event or coming to your show by chance. So you have to create space for that. You can't know all the audiences, it's impossible.

**ANNA** I imagine it's a lot about accessibility. In thinking about the exhibition or the project as an experience. If it's an experience, then there must be certain accessibility, not only from the perspective of disabilities, but in a way of making sure that these imagined audiences will be able to access the show, its discourse, to get an experience.

**FATOS** If you really think of a theoretical perspective, what differentiate an event from an experience? If you have a car accident that becomes an event, it's because you can identify the beginning, the end, the aftermath, and the impact on you. I think of exhibitions the same way. They can become events or become eventful when the experience really has a piercing aspect, a penetrating potential. That's why we still talk about "When Attitude Becomes Form" from 1970s, because that was a marker. It was an experience of art, but so different, so unfamiliar, so challenging to many of the audiences. It was a very important shift of the exhibition making, where you were showing process-based artworks instead of finalized artworks.

I make a distinction between an event and an experience. Everything in the world provides experiences, but when do you make an exhibition event? There needs to be meaning, strong emotions or thought provocations associated to that. And that's why I'm interested in proliferating access points to every project I do. It's not only an artwork on display, which is also very important on its own right, but I also think about ... do we need to do perhaps a screening? Do we need to do a debate, or shall we perhaps think about what else this display would benefit from? By bringing a new component within or outside the domain of visual arts also increases the possibility of outreach. Because if you think about yourself as a person with multiple interests, those could be common threads that connect you with other people. It's more integrated framework of thinking, rather than just saying, this is the art, you have to come and see it. That is more of a linear way of thinking. Instead of one skin, one surface, it's


about how do you layer it up, so that each layer has a possibility and potential to tune into different set of interests, different set of inquiries, different potentials of surprise, familiarity or strangeness.

**ANNA** You've already said it's not only the exhibition, it also could be a film screening or a talk or an event. But how would be your straight answer on the question about outcomes considering the broad range of your activities?

**FATOS** I have a lot of filters in my practice that I make use of. And a trilogy of filters is studying the context. Identifying the scale - what kind of scale do we need in this context to respond? And it's most meaningful manner- and what's the potential here? That potential could actually give us the cues of what could be a level of ambition that pushes the context further. In that scale, the outcomes of my practice are very much in line with the answers of these three filters; or these three inquiries. I can give you an example. I have a show in Oxford Mathematical Institute right now. It is a mathematical institute, it is where people go to study mathematics and then higher maths and abstract geometry, etc. For me, it was very important, not only to create a diegetic display, so that it does not separate but spread the artworks through the building, in the common room, on the main floor, around the offices, etc. For that show we decided with the artist that it would be very important to add another layer of a public program. Now we devise these series of lectures with quantum theoretists, mathematicians, artists, curators, philosophers. So it was about - if we are infusing the art into a context where it's so foreign, how could we build a framework to hold it? And those lectures were really important aspects of it. They were almost like the bridges. In the audience, we had mathematics students, high school students who were interested in mathematics, art enthusiasts, art critics, journalists, other curators. The outcomes of my practice was not only the lecture series, but also the audiences that came together, which wouldn't in this scenario. And at the aftermath of a lecture, they had tea and cake together and then started a meeting point. And that meeting point was not superficial. That meeting point happened because they wanted to reflect on what they heard in the room. And maybe make a point. Maybe agree with it or disagree with it.

And then after that, they'd found out that collector speaks with a math student. This is an interesting place for me. So very long windedly answering your questions: outcomes of my practice can be varied, but it's always dependent on the context, scale and the potential of the project that I'm working on.

**ANNA** I really like how you encounter what you do methodically. It really feels you have a method, you really know how to name or frame the particular part of your process. What's your background?

**FATOS** Mathematics. 

**ANNA** So, first, you studied mathematics and then you moved into the art world...?

**FATOS** Yeah. I have been a passionate mathematics person in my high school which led me to get a degree. I did a proof based mathematics. It's all theories which I think is so strongly connected with art theory. And while I was studying math in university, I then get quite drawn into art. What was fascinating for me was the possibility of diverse, conflicting and challenging frames of perception or perspective. Maths is like language. Once you learn it, it informs your thinking, your logic. It's so embedded in me. I do think in structures.

**ANNA** Now it's the perfect time to proceed into the professional roles, the labels we're labeling ourselves in the world – professional, personal, cultural, social. You do take a role of a curator. Have you experienced that someone called you by a different role? What are the aspects of this professional identity? What roles are you playing when you're developing the whole project?

**FATOS** There were people who called me art theorist. I think I'm very comfortable with being curator and writer. But I'm also very comfortable with not marrying myself to a certain framework. For instance I can write a book about building a new model for art institutions. But I can also curate an exhibition for a Central Park in London, or I can come up with a very playful project that is not immediately an exhibition or it doesn't immediately translate into what a curator does or what a writer does. I think I'm not fixed to titles. I think I'm more interested in what

draws me in. And I grant myself the freedom to push for it, inquire, and explore, and even do it.

**ANNA** And what brings you interest? Is it the artist or the framework itself?

**FATOS** I think my central starting point, where my heart is, is with the art. And the artworks. It can be artworks from different eras, different cultural frameworks, and different materials, mediums. And of course, it then becomes a rippling out circle of the art, the artist, the conversation, the score, theory, frameworks, thinking, and then the, spectatorship, and then the audiences. So that's why I shy away from saying that I'm specialized in X and Y as a medium. I like working with multiple mediums. And I love challenging or pushing myself. At the moment I'm really trying to understand more frameworks of art that is made digitally.

**ANNA** Yeah, and you make your understanding by researching it. So you study.

**FATOS** Yeah.

**ANNA** Are you meeting with the artist directly, when are you making an exhibition?

**FATOS** I think multiple things happen at once. Research is very important for me. This year, I am going to be even more rigid with my timeline to make sure that I have space for research. I think research and practice always needs to go hand-in-hand. Maybe one day you're researching something and you come across an artist, and then you might actually look into them or reach out to them and have a conversation with them and that might lead you to somewhere else. In my practice, I really like the desire lines that you produce while you are engaged as a subject.

**ANNA** I really like the phrase "desire lines".

**FATOS** Desire lines is actually a term that the Bruce Chatwin used in his books. And it is meant to mean that there are no roads in the cities, and sometimes you see some people have walked the same way in the green areas. But that's not a road that was choreographed for them to walk. It was something

that they come up with, maybe it was a shortcut, maybe it's what they liked. And then once somebody started walking there, many people used it, so it became an unofficial road. That is a desire line.

**ANNA** Do you have any dreams about your practice? Or even desires?

**FATOS** I do. Absolutely. I think it's a mesh right now. It's a dream desire and ambition is to start a new institution. Because I do believe that the system is broken, and we need more bold, daring, but also times paradigm shifting solutions in our society as well as in the art. So my dream, desire and ambition is actually to start this institution, and I don't want to be the only one – I have co-partners, co-founders, co-conspirators, and that it starts to perhaps be that little rock on the lake to start rippling out, so that we don't forget why we are here in the first place. Because we are at the moment convoluted with so many different triggers, the art market and anythings.

**ANNA** I have the second block, which after the whole conversation is fitting so much, or what my PhD really brought me into is.. I started embracing my background within scenography or set design, which is like an architecture within architecture. So as you speak a lot about the practices behind the acts, behind the event, exhibition... I am actually working with this space metaphor. For me, it is like 3D thinking in developing something, layering. Can you relate yourself towards thinking within spaces and as spaces? Like support architectures or architectures of meetings. Do you feel any intersection or any points of convergence with this metaphor and the practice of yours?

**FATOS** I have a strong connection with space and place, as well as moment and time. Of course we operate in space. I could say that the first decade of my work was very much defined by my obsession with time. And when you speak about time, you have to speak about space, and you also have to think about these... As you said, like the 3D thinking and the layering. That is one thing. And the other thing is that Paul O'Neill has created this framing of exhibition spaces; the first dimension is the building, the site, the venue. And the second dimension is the display structures; the plants that you use for sculptures or

the monitors,... And then the third dimension of an exhibition is the artworks.

**ANNA** Within those layers, where would you place the time? Does it correlate with the space?

**FATOS** Time is a complex phenomenon. You, before talking about the time, have to actually define what you mean about time. Do you mean it's a measurement of change? Do you mean it is actually the difference between two registers of a day? Or are you talking about the time of the exhibition? Or do you talk about the time of the artwork, from when it's produced to when it is exhibited? So time is actually a very complex entity. And it may not even exist. It is also a construct. How are you creating a subcontext to varying things in relationship to one another? Because that's what time does.

**ANNA** I understand.

**FATOS** There is a very nice reader. It might be interesting for you. It is a series that Beatrice von Bismarck was editing, the Curatorial Things. This series is called Cultures of the Curatorial. And this one is called Timing and it is on the temporal dimension of exhibiting.

**ANNA** In the very beginning of your answer on a space, you've answered that time has the same value as space for you.

**FATOS** It's like in physics. We live in a three dimensional space. And time is mostly referred to as the fourth dimension. It basically cuts through diagonally. And space expand or grows. What we need to do is to bring it to the curatorial framework or to concrete examples. For me, time is not linear. Even though you have an exhibition that opens on the 10th of January and closes on the 10th of February, it's still not linear time. Because the exhibitions also have a timeline that is very much defined by when it expands and it shrinks. The opening is a great expansion, but maybe on Tuesday at 10AM where there's no one in the exhibition, it's perhaps a no time for the exhibition. It's really about the question of when do you register something? Their presence happens.



**ANNA** I chose to not that much involve myself into the time thinking because the performing arts are very much grounded in here and now, and it would took me to different places than those I work with. But I like how you speak about it. Your perspective is very different. This combination of strong visual arts curatorial point of view combined with the mathematics. What spaces do you like to work in and work with?

**FATOS** My levels of freedom is a deciding point of which spaces I engage with. And also, which spaces I choose to make-build projects and build ideas and build conversations. Some of the spaces could be ideological spaces. There are spaces where is a limitation on artistic expression. Those spaces are also important for me. There isn't a regard for artists labor, you know. I have co-founded the organization called Frank Fair Artist Pay. And since 2021, I don't agree on any limitations if there is no allocation for fees for the artists. So, you know the space conversation becomes the context conversation as well. I'm very open to working with different types of spaces. It could be spaces of confinement like prisons. Any kind of social space is a possibility for me. Either it requires committed engagement with art or non committed engagement. What is very important for me is the context and the conditions of those spaces that become an important filter decision point.

**ANNA** I like that you broadened it. This connection with context and its conditions. I think this is very important. It brought me back to myself because I'm really interested in what's behind things we see, what was the process like. All of the interconnections of for example the labor, the conditions... What happened we can't see but it shaped the outcome. When I imagine all of this it creates these architectures of relations. A wire; a structure of things that shape the outcome, the execution of an art event or presentation.

---

19. 2. 2025

**ANNA** Now I know what you do and also know a bit more about your practice. Now I would focus more into the context rather than outcomes. The next part is relations or relationships, the other one is on tools. For the beginning, I feel that it's quite important to set

the level of understanding. How do you understand the difference between relations and relationships?

**FATOS** I would say, relation is a force field and it is also a comparative framework. Something is related to something, "A" is related to "B"; that means something is connected to something. In between of those two liminals, there is the force field, that could have different texture and different reverberations. This is a conceptual framework. Relationship subjectifies those two entities in connection. The relationship is about the people or the things, bodies, entities, as well as what is in between. There is an added layer of subjectification of what is in relation to what.

**ANNA** As I'm interested in curating as a relational practice, I would like to ask you about your relationships within your practice. What relationships do you create through your practice? Or how do you understand this relating?

**FATOS** I think that everyone has certain values or their work or their practice evolves around some. Through time I have been able to identify my key values, and those values inform the nature of my relationships with people that I work with, people that I get in touch or contact with. Those connections could be of many fold - making a collaboration, having an idea exchange or planning something together. So my key values are accountability, responsibility, conscientiousness, playfulness and holistic engagement. I take accountability for decisions and promises I make. How I make my decision, how I arrive to that decision is a very important process to think about. I need to ensure that it is leveled, it is not coming from a benefit basis - benefiting myself or benefiting some stakeholders in that relationship. But also my promises are what I say I would like to make happen. And once I make that promise, I really work towards that. Together with accountability, responsibility come hand in hand. My relations are really informed by a strong sense of responsibility that I feel towards artists, art itself, partners and further field. And then I have conscientiousness, in-depth research and reflection to the process of those relations or relationships being built, formed, nourished and nurtured. And playfulness or risk-

taking is another one. I am very much interested in thinking outside the box or extending the given. For instance, when I invite an artist, I'm also interested in understanding what are their innermost desires or what are their limiting beliefs about themselves, about their practices. By poking those glass ceilings, maybe I am resourceful in leading the artist have a different possibility of realization in their life or their practice. Like a breakthrough or an epiphany of sorts. And my fifth value is holistic engagement. All these five values are very interconnected because I'm very much invested in thinking 360 degrees of needs and expectations. And it's not only about what is needed here or what is expected there. It's like, what are my needs, what are my expectations? Let's say if you're in a relationship, what we are doing right now, a conversation. So what are your needs, what are your expectations? So there is about how can you be aware of how that relationship could also be actioned, activated.

ANNA Great. it's a good values.

FATOS Thank you. I'd be curious what your values would be?

ANNA I think I can really attune to accountability and responsibility for sure. And 360 thinking I would be 100% with too. It's also about transparency - what is it that they need but also what I need or which standpoint I have. Where can I help, which sources can I use. And then we can establish the relationship and we mutually understand each other's positions. I then would ask you about the broader shape of the relations. It's not only about the artist and curator; there also are many other relations, we are relying on. So if you can expand or name some of those?

FATOS It's connected to not only being a curator but also to being a human being. I think you have to start thinking about relations from the relationship you have with yourself. How do you talk to yourself. How kind are you to yourself, how considerate, compassionate. And of course, in the art field, you are in touch with so many different people from different professions - it could be fabricators, security staff, people who work in local councils and assessing your permission requests to, the person who makes tea for your meetings. Everyone that

gets to be involved in what you do. In that sense, it is about how do you bring a leveled intention to those relationships. For me, being kind, calm and being able to create space is very important. To create not only space for myself and for my personal, professional, idealistic needs, but also for people that I come in contact with. It's very important to bring that space of exploration, wonder and compassion. It could be different for different people, people have different choices and different ways of being in the world and different needs of setting boundaries, but for me, I have a very porous way of existence. I find more comfort in being the way I am in my personal life and in my professional life. And I think that reflects on how I engage, not only artists, but also audiences.

ANNA I like how you approach relations holistically. Curating is work with people so we need to come there as a human beings to be able to relate. But, there are also some unpleasant things sometimes connected within relating. How do you approach hierarchies? Even though we want to challenge them, we still live within a hierarchically organized society. How would you approach this?

FATOS I'm going to share it through very personal way. Being a migrant, I had a very hard time with authority. I had a fear someone who has no idea of who I am, what do I do, how do I contribute to life, has a decision over my decision of living in a country or in a place. Growing up in 80s Turkey, my parents suffered from the coup d'état and all the violence that it brought to their lives and livelihoods. So I grew up thinking authority is not really useful. It was more about its potential violence that can be induced on you, on your life and livelihoods.

When it comes to working in the arts, I have to say I am not in favor of hierarchies. That is also in my book. If there's someone who comes into your team with less experience, they usually have to be kept in a certain place until they gain more experience. I'm interested in that less experienced person's ideas. Which artists do they get excited by, what kind of exhibitions do they like. That's something I did in my directorial roles. To credit other people than the director wasn't part of the organization's culture. It's really about coming to that position of being able to delegate responsibility, and once you have that trust,

to pass that trust threshold. When I delegated some curating responsibilities to people in my team who were assistant curators, I would also credit them as curators of that specific project. I would take a backstage role to support them in leading what they're doing. That was not because high moral values, but that's how I like working with people. I like working on an eye level experience, and that's also why my new model for art institutions is this more distributed model. We all have our biases, we all have our limiting beliefs and there isn't a single genius that should decide on everything that needs to be decided in an organization. We don't have that luxury anymore, organizations need to be multi-fold and multi-vocal and multi-angled. In that sense, I'm not someone who is interested in building pyramidal, hierarchical relationships.

Having said that, it's also very important to have a clear outline of real roles and responsibilities, so at any given time, you know who's leading. Let's say for example on the level of biennial, the assistant curator in our team was leading this outdoor commission. So they're leading it, they're making decisions, they're making calls for that commission to be successful, they're organizing the bus routes, and whenever they needed support, discuss something or explore the artwork or identify the artist, I'm there to be a conversation partner. While it's a distributed structure, it's not a structure where it's stretched to every different direction at any given time.

**ANNA** So you rather try to disseminate the power. I can relate to that. In my block about relationships, there was also section about the struggle. Do you have any wish to speak a bit more about some particular struggles within the relational structures we're living in?

**FATOS** There's many things we can say about this topic. Even if we are at a highly hierarchical structure of some relationship, it's important to make clear to everyone what are their remits, how are they expected to contribute, and what can they expect to receive? That is very important. There is still a possibility of hierarchical organizational models, but one thing that goes wrong is when people don't have clarity of these boundaries. Let's say you start as an assistant curator at MoMA, then maybe you really need to know what is it that you can initiate

and bring to the organization, and what is it that you can gain from that organization. And when it's not clear, then people do things, and then that becomes very personally executed, and that creates a drama for everyone involved. Because the moment that you introduce a resentment or disappointment into work relationships, you actually start failing yourself and failing everyone.

**ANNA** Yes, that's a powerful statement. There was one particular struggle that also came to my mind as you were speaking, and that's the issue of funding. This creates a lot of uneven power relations. How do you approach this? Because there's always someone we ask funds from.

**FATOS** My funding approach has also been inclusive, in the sense that I'm not interested in building another transactional exchange. You give me this, I give you that. You give me money, I put your logo on my press release. You give me a kind support, then I will give you a project. I'm always interested in how can I build a value-based alignment with people? Then it does not make a difference if it is a funding organization, or if it is ultra-high wealth person, or a very major collector, or a local council that you work with. In that sense, I don't have tiered treatments to my relationships. There isn't a hierarchy in my relationships. The way I approach funders - let's say it's a collector - is about what are the connecting threads that we align? How can I build a project that is exciting for all of us? How do we align qualitatively, through aspirations, through ideologies, and through more intangible means of meaning production? That goes beyond the monetary values, level of social impact, the quantitative metrics. It is about how do you join others to your vision, to your dream. And when they join it becomes a joint, co-opted dream. Because they become a partner in that. Even though they still give money, they need to become a conversation partner.

**ANNA** Yeah, then they become also responsible for the project. That's a very good way how to put it. There is quite often this inner struggle in us, when asking for money. We feel almost ashamed, but there is the universal value in art. If we believe in that, why would we should feel ashamed? I think it's the lack mindset, I lack it, therefore there is shame, you know? So you're right. But what if you

can go beyond that?

It's not only about the money, it's actually not at all about them. Well, of course, we have to survive, and we have to eat things and pay the rents, but think about you want to have an important birthday, but you don't have the money to do everything. What would you do? Maybe you would then celebrate at home, make a potluck. Because the vision is celebrating your friendships. I know I'm simplifying it, perhaps, but a gala dinner is that too, you know? Perhaps that time in the gala dinner, they don't bring a pot of lentil soup, but they dress nice clothes, and bring more food, or more money on the table.

This is why I address networks a lot, because I think it's partially about changing the economies. There are more things we can shape with being together with people and being on the same level. There are many examples of art institutions in less income or politically struggling economies. These institutions work on the communal level, but still have very fierce power - but it's distributed and delegated, without the funding hierarchies.

**ANNA** Now I would move into more pleasant part. How do you take care about the relationships you have? How do you nourish them?

**FATOS** I think that is a really beautiful question. I think humanity doesn't really have the tradition of nourishing relationships. Because either you have given relationships like family, they will be there for you whether you nourish them or not. You're born into it, doesn't matter if you love them or not. But there are different degrees of care. For myself, it's been a learning experience and I'm still learning. There isn't a template or a care instructions that comes with relationships. Even if it did come with that, it changes, because we change through time, the world changes through time. Those care instructions might need to be continuously updated. I think we also have stages in our lives that informs us to have different relationships. I would say there are stages of self awareness. Our relationship to art is changing. My relationship to art is changing. There is an interview I gave 10 years ago, where I was skeptical about digital art. And today, I'm actually not that skeptical. I would then answer your question, it's about how can you build a muscle of care, or how can you build

care as a muscle, that it is not a one-off outline. Maybe the way to care is to be present. To be present in the moment, to be present with the work, to be present with the artist, to be present with everyone who you are engaging with. That's when you can allow yourself to see the nuances of what they've changed, how they're thinking now, or what is that negotiated field between you and that person. Or that body of work. Because that also happens with art.

**ANNA** This also brought to my mind something I've read somewhere, according to relationships - they change you. This also brings another level of instability to the whole relationship systems we live in. How would you, then, understand the curatorial tool? Is there any that is "the tool" for you? I understand the tool as a methodology, an active thing - rather than a simple object.

**FATOS** There are multiple frameworks I have identified over time informing my methodology of approaching a specific project or context. They are in sets of three. The very important starting tool is the trichotomy of context, scale and potential. Through these, I build initial ideas and particular curatorial approach or framework. And then, as I deepen the inquiry, it's the merit, scope, and outreach. What is the conversation here? What kind of conversation do I want to build, cultivate, and be part of? What is the curatorial intention that will inform the scope of the project? And then with the outreach is: Who is it? In my ideal scenario then, there is then this triangulation of connections, relationships, and a feedback loop. I always look back and then have a checklist. Is the curatorial framework crystal clear? How can I make it more clear so people really understand what I mean? And what about the scale of the project - not only the scale of ambition and scale of execution - does that align with the artistic ambition that I want to correlate around this project and the outreach that I envisioned? Because if you want this kind of outreach, perhaps the artistic ambition that you dreamt of is not strong enough. And then the other thing is thinking about the aesthetic style or the intellectual rigor that is needed for the project.

I could give you an example. I have the exhibition at the Oxford Mathematical Institute. The building is resided by mathematicians who work in abstract geometry, topology, or numerology. It's also a public



building that is open to public 24 hours a day and seven days a week. There are some areas closed to public, such as offices, and areas that everybody can come through like the cafe or the common rooms to study or read. For that project, it was very important that an art exhibition taking place in this context needs to build umbilical cord to the place. We had a series of lectures with artists, curators, philosophers, mathematicians, quantum physicists to discuss certain topics and themes that both resonate and have the possibility of cross fertilization. It was about sharing how we think and how we work and creating these juxtapositions. As you can imagine, it was quite an intellectual experience, but it not only engaged mathematicians or high school students who want to study mathematics. It also engaged artists or collectors, who are interested in this juxtaposition. We had to match the level of intellectual rigor that is already emanating from the place and then enrich it with other radiations that is not part of their everyday. And then we could actually bring people to think together.

This example is a lot about infusing different fields with each other. It's about how porous could a curatorial approach be to show the willingness of bodies to be infused. And also to show how art can be infused, so it's not seen as a finalized concept.

**ANNA** Now I would like to conclude with ending. How do you navigate endings? What's your relation towards the ends of the exhibitions or the projects?

**FATOS** This relationship has changed through time. I believe every exhibition or every curatorial project has an intangible legacy because it still lives on in the bodies of the people who visited it. So it's more, you could say, a romantic approach. But it is a bit like that (I wonder who said it) you only really die when the last person who loved you dies. So whoever you touch and whoever you build a relationship with, even if you physically don't exist on Earth, you still keep living until the last person who has the memory of you passes away. So there is no end. Or there is an end, but it is rather in the future within an undefined timeline. Things end, things change, die, born again. But maybe it's not within the precursors of our measurements of time.



Fatos Üstek is a writer and curator based in London. In 2023 and 2024, she was the curator of Frieze Sculpture in London. She is a co-founder of FRANK - an alliance for fair artists' pay and an author of a publication The Art Institution of Tomorrow.

The conversations were held online between January and February 2025.