

Product and producer.

The relationship of Suso Fandiño with his objects and images proposes a debate among these both terms, their fractures and their meeting points throughout the last century.

Interrelationship and quotations are usual elements in the author's work, who proposes us, in this way, new ways of relationship among the work and the spectator, new answers and new questions.

We find in the work of Suso Fandiño signification expectatives derived from the (re)readings of iconographic elements that, somehow, have started a discussion about the authorship, the ways of production and distribution of the artistic object. The appropriation of these elements and their (re)presentation in a present context perverts their original signification and the relation of coexistence among the spectator and them. In this (re)vision, it is developed a discourse where the object, as a recourse is activated due to its dialectic interaction with the temporal context or because the formal and textual manipulation that the author suggests.

Appropriation in such cases is not a simple stylistic recourse, but an element of significative continuity among the quotation and the quoted element, a (re)elaboration where it is suggested to us to be part of the productive process.

In this type of works, the appropriation of artistic objects that with an industrial origin have been used throughout the XX century (brillo's boxes, urinaries, shit cans...) insists on a vision of them in two fields: on one hand their signification as elements in their artistic context, on the other in their appreciation as objects that come from productive industrial patterns free from the auratic signification. Among these both points of view is developed a discourse that questions the social and physical ecosystem of the artistic context, its models and the figure of the author as "creator".

The main thematic strategy in this kind of works makes a reflection and questions the authorship as a mythification element of the author and his "product".

The reference through the direct appropriation leads the spectator towards a derive in his relationship with objects and images that being familiar to them are presented sometimes distorts some others in a literal way without any other authorship concession than its relationship as a principle for a transhistorical dialectic of them.

The gamble, as regards the means and supports that the author uses, is varied although photography, infography and installations are prominent in his work. The supports he uses and their quality of reproducible elements emphasizes as significative elements in the discourse of each specific proposal. The most common operations transmute the original sense of the elements presented with formal or contextual modifications, producing, in this way, new significatons.

Este tipo de estrategias de permutación se basa fundamentalmente en operaciones de reubicación, fractura, corte o adhesión similares a las utilizadas por el fotomontaje o el collage más tradicionales, desapareciendo en este caso concreto

cualquier elemento de huella o señal operacional por la utilización de medios infográficos.

Por otra parte encontramos otra línea de articulación en la producción de Suso Fandiño, nos referimos a trabajos donde el referente de citación o apropiación ha desaparecido, al menos de un modo directo.

This kind of strategies of permutation are mainly based on (re)placement, fracture, cuts and adhesion operations that are similar to those ones used in the most traditional photomontages or collages, disappearing in these specific cases any operational mark or sign element due to the use of info graphical means. Also, there is another important point of articulation in the production of Suso Fandiño, we are referring to works where the quotation reference or appropriation has disappeared, at least in a direct way.

In this type of works, the author does not take as starting point an iconographic element related to the history of art, in these cases reflections are directed to different aspects of the social and physical ecosystem of the artistic object in general, that make us to face a tautological way of (re)reading the different metalanguages of the artistic objects and their habitat. In this type of proposals, thematic references lead us to the use of the text, installation, serial objects, their relation with the space (museum, gallery, public space...) and their relationship with the spectator.

The relationship involves the spectator in an ironic interpretation of the usual ways of understanding the object, text or installation due to a meaning rejection strategy. So it is established a fracture space where the author starts a discussion about the credibility of the relationship among the spectator and his own expectability.

In this kind of works, the author uses means as texts or video projections but always in a context of installation with the environments. So the author generates a thematic interrelation among both elements, producing a real dependency due to the integration that leads them to an only signification element or a blurred one.