



15\_09 colocación inicial de los bancos



16\_09 un banco queda en el sitio, el otro lo llevan dentro del bar



18\_09 aparecen un banco



21\_09 rehabilitación bajo el árbol



21\_09 un banco vuelve a la colocación inicial



22\_09 uno sigue bajo el árbol



22\_09 el otro en la posición inicial



22\_09 mismo momento cómo se el solar y las bancas



26\_09 y el de debajo del árbol



26\_09 un banco aparece en una zona solobombada



27\_09 desaparecen los dos bancos



4\_10 el banco pequeño bajo el descompañado

# Maps of the place

The projects I am going to present are based on the question of space as representation. My interest in this subject comes from previous work on identity, on an experiential subject, of representation. Accordingly, the context and subject are discursive elements and become interpretative frameworks of each other. The naturalisation of this relation, as the interpretation the context makes of the subjects is assumed as something natural (and, therefore, rendered invisible), is one of the goals of my work. That rendering invisible occurs because the discursive effect is often ignored.

Each space is organised with specific rules, with an «argument» and with a protagonist with whom we are supposed to identify. Thus, the text of the space, with the full range from public to private, since I do not see them as two independent realities, has been deconstructed, reinterpreted, read by many artists and theoreticians to reveal that off-field nature. A critique process that has appeared in all the spheres of representation. In the case of projects for

the public space or the projects that hold space as a problem, these critiques are often assumed on a theoretical level, but not on a practical level. Giving up the monument is more complex than it seems. At least, that is what I have seen.

Rather than speaking about space to refer to this text or to the staged story, I will now speak about place. In other words, including what is physical and has to do with life. However, if we consider how it is presented, how it is counted, how the coordinates are established for its growth and development, its function as representation (in other words, this constant idea of what is «representative»), I think that certain questions have been lost along the way.

We understand the place through its various cartographies: maps, road networks, signs and often through milestones, which generally overlook life matters to stand out as important in terms of usefulness. Because perhaps we forget what has to do with life for practical reasons. The criteria of the growth or «decency» of a place



applied in accordance with representative matters, diagrams, typologies. These are the «main» arguments, which are responsible for visibility policies. But that is only one of the many layers in existence in the place. Being more visible in a representative way is only one function. The other places that are also present have their own visibility rules. It is not another reality, but rather another reading and, perhaps, other forms of representation. At least, it is a question of visualising other things that are not recorded by the more established forms. Because the visible ideological diagram does not always coincide with life. This is multiplicity. There is not one single life experience. A place differs depending on the time, the period of the year, each multiple partition... And that multiplicity breaks down the idea of «one» representative space. A multiplicity of policies. So, instead of speaking of the policies of space, I prefer to speak about micro-policies.

Therefore, the first step in my work is positioning myself as a subject. Both in this text and in my role as a player. The

definition of my place does not exclude other possible places, but rather views the place from where I speak and denies the neutral appearance of abstraction. There is a director (or protagonist, or scriptwriter or set designer). And that nomination makes the possibility of other visions, the life experiences, evident.

And perhaps that is the place I can assume as an artist. That idea of being in the way, saying that I am in the way. And not having a role defined from «usefulness». Usefulness with capital letters. The usefulness that solves a problem. Or which the place has. Both the local residents, users and «professionals» have a professionalised space: in a plaza, in a suburb, in an open field. And under the view of each of these professions, there is no conflict. Perhaps the conflict or, rather than conflict, the lack of coordination, the idea of speaking different languages occurs in conversation.

That idea of «being in the way» is the function that is configured with each project. It is not defined beforehand, it



changes. Speaking of conflict perhaps suggests the need for correction, for moving to the correct place. But that is not what it is about. It is more a question of making the limits of the conversation visible. Perhaps the easiest part is to say that it is a question of showing the places in the middle where each profession (each job well done) meets the other.

From my life experience, not all the streets are as accessible as each other, not all the spaces belong to me, not all the public places are actually public, not all the growth is pertinent. That is why I cannot be monumental, because the monument supposes a certain legitimation and, above all, a central point, that of the correct place. And that has never been my place.

Using «spatial interpretation objects», as I have called them, I am going to mention a few places: Travesía de Vigo, Barrio de San Pedro in Santiago de Compostela, the routes of Calaf and the Álvarez factory in Vigo. At no time did these objects seek to create a physical belonging or oppose a

specific use, a certain way of being used. Their «function» is not to show places of discontinuity and offer the possibility of other visions «appearing» through uses other than those prioritised in an organisation, but which exist (or which do not exist and their absence also speaks to us about the non-place).

For example, the planning of a suburb has unwritten rules of how and where to build and situate the space for public use. There are traditions, spaces that have to do with unstable identification processes that are not normally taken into account in the abstract plannings used to generate the city. The specific nature of the proposed objects falls on the possibility of creating dynamics that visualise these present life experiences in some way. They do not seek to discover anything or create anything that did not already exist, but rather to change the perspective from which certain «forms of life» are seen. So, in the case of Travesía de Vigo, my aim was not to discover a community or solve a planning problem, but rather to visualise an order that already



existed in the place. The apparent lack of planning hides the fact that there is actually an «informal» order that governs the occupation in different layers. Layers that correspond to different life experiences that also have a staggered use of time. Therefore, the proposal did not come as an imposition, as an unwanted imposed object, but rather as an instrument that could be moved and used in accordance with invisible but existing laws.

The benches were a 1:1 scale copy of the flowerpots in the city centre with a photograph of the season's flowers on the seat. The benches materialised the struggle for space, for placing limits to use among communities that understand territorialisation in a different way: the most formal (those who use the more formal parks or have a more formal idea of their use even though they do not use them) and the less formal (the more spontaneous who took over the benches to use them in their social space, an unurbanised corner).

In other cases, such as *Nos caminos*, CGAC, Vigo 2007, the object, a working model, acts to channel discourses. They are not new stories, but rather very well-known old stories, knowledge to be found in certain places (publications of the homeowners association, leaflets, etc.), but not found in the place, i.e. visualised on a spatial level. All the important places in these stories people tell cannot be seen in the territory. And the speakers look after themselves and become the leading actors without a casting session. The model, which reproduces the suburb without a centre, typical of radial growth around a factory, becomes a plaza during the public exhibition. The plaza that has disappeared with the end of the factory. But which continues to be the centre of all the discourses that link the land with the river with the factory and again with the river. And these stories about the place, these texts about the space are as real as the visible order. It is another form of professionalisation.

As in the case of the plazas in Barrio de San Pedro in Santiago de Compostela, where the text and the visible order are not so far away. An accepted order. We have grown accustomed to always providing the expected response, to finding the removal of 50 cm of parking space offensive and, at the same time, to speaking about our daily problems with places. We have grown accustomed to seeing things grow on our roads.

So, I have decided that my role is being in the way. And designing the stage (stitching). And adding a voice (dubbing). Providing the experience of life with place.

And, at times, when providing place, in this territorial struggle, voices can be heard speaking through intervention (they come to me and spontaneously tell me about their experiences, their complaints, their requests). And these voices demonstrate that apparently informal and not heavily identifiable spaces have specific laws, that their inhabitants have a specific idea of

what they need. They also showed their discontent with how they are interpreted in a fickle, stereotyped manner.

These voices constitute the genuine material nature of the projects presented.

Although it is not easily shown.

Or demonstrated.