

*"How could somebody say that one style is better than other?. One should be able to be an abstract expressionism next week, or a pop artist, or a realist without feeling that he has conferred something."*

*Andy Warhol*

I would say that the discourse of Suso Fandiño awakes in the silence or in a doubt moment that suddenly appears when we wonder what is a work of Art and what is not placing ourselves in a universe of perceptual resemblances that care from postulations once argued by artists as Andy Warhol, who was able to see a kind of Art without special characteristics and close to the world of the daily objects. Arthur C. Danto remarks that till the XX century it was thought that works of Art could be always identified as such and he praises the possibilities of the indecipherable from the impossibility of differentiate among dreaming and be awake that Descartes exemplified in his First Meditation, to the difficulty of Kant to differentiate a moral action or the conflict among the concepts of authentic and vital falseness in Heidegger.

In this new history of Art without direction the works of Art do not need to look like them they do not give us time to write a manifest.

Suso Fandiño gathers all this to add a touch of his own, and he does it, with a marked critical sense of humour and supporting himself on the pop valves of repetition and serializations. In this way, he exhibits his collection of objects questioning the ways of production, distribution, reproduction and even authorship by means of epigraphs that do not let to understand the meaning, as works without titles and numerical references that present a kind of Art ready for mass-consumers. We could see it in his "Sample Collection", his introduction into society, in the gallery Ad Hoc, in Vigo, where he took elements from the market to exhibit them in an intelligent and ironical way

So, most of this work seemed to be alike, they consisted in the repetition of same element that presented some differences proving their singularity although they have fine chromatic variations which provide a movement among exclusivity and inflation.

In his strategy, Fandiño uses images from mass media and after their discontextualization and digital manipulation, he reflects about capitalization and the uncertain future of the cultural industry.

Fandiño make us to reflect about the possible changes the cultural industry will suffer as a phenomenon of consumes in the near future, through images of the Warhol's brillo boxes, Manzoni's shit cans, or Duchamp's urinal and direct quotations are usual in Suso Fandiño's work, he proposes us, in this way, new ways of relation among the work of Art and the spectator.

He prepared a change in the space, for the Torrente Ballester, in which he played with several environments, object and images that, although they were familiar to the spectator of contemporary Art, they were distorted.

So he uses a great variety of means but mainly photography, infography and installation, he questions the concept of authorship as a mystifying element of the author and his product.

An acute observation we will notice an intersecting contrast, from the privacy of one of this videos which has a dog as principal character, to the creakily threat of another video of great dimensions that makes us part of the action. In this last video a chicken is spinning, there is a sound that could remind us minimalist music and could mean the death that waste us away, little by little and could be compared with other works as the video installation of

Anna Jermolaewa “Hendltriptychon” , although, here it is almost an irony because it is a toy. The work of Suso Fandiño could be a homage, mere appropriations, forgeries or versions which adquire different interpellations depending on the context in which they are integrated but always from a critical point of view, which plays with our perception of things and demonstrates that creation is not only novelty or exclusiveness but the richness of reflections that move the artist. Somehow, we are speaking of fractures that misleading at first sight and then start a fight among the spectator and their own expectability.

David Barro.