

Anthropocentric gaze:

For years the human being's gaze has been on himself, he has always looked after his interests, both social, capital and cultural; he has made his interests the centre of everything, making everything else revolve around him, making them depend on this. Like all other living beings, nature, objects, the environment, space.

The anthropocentric gaze as the highest point of the hierarchy. And how Paycha cited "we have to break the patriarchy, instead of building feminism " (Lievens et al., 2020, p.24). To end this hierarchy, we have to break this verticality in order to transform it into horizontality. A space where we are equal, reciprocal, of coexistence. Changing the way, we relate to each other will not be enough if we do not put an end to the anthropocentric view that places the human being above all things.

We live in a world where everything interacts, if you give you receive, and if you receive it is because you are being given. This should be equal at all levels and not for one purpose only, to please the human being. For this is nothing more than losing respect and interest in everything else. As long as the human is pleased, the rest is not important.

Breaking the vertical line to make it horizontal and promoting interaction between everything that inhabits it. Understanding this interaction as the reciprocal relationship between two or more elements; in this case living beings, nature, environment, objects...

If each person, thing, object, being, etc., is a vertical line that is transformed into a horizontal one, a space of equal lines is generated that interconnect to form a network.

Each of the lines is a path created with each step each entity takes to build its own world.

And as we are not alone, we cross each other, we relate to each other, feeding back to each other so that these lines, networks or connections are transformed. These lines are straight, knotted, intertwined, independent, joint, undulating.

The network that is created is a set of each of the paths created, giving rise to life, to the world, to the space. The space is a network of interconnected lines, linking everything that forms it.

Space is like a big nervous system, and every movement or action we make generates an electrical impulse that is sent through these lines, passing through all the connected bodies. Like a domino effect. As Henri Bergson says, the nervous system is composed of a great number of threads that extend from the periphery to the centre and from the centre to the periphery.

Each of the knots found in the lines is each of the individual, personal, invisible, imaginary spaces, which differs from the rest, from each entity that inhabits the space.

The stories of these lines are due to the interconnections that are created between each entity. To understand this relationship is to understand that we [the human being] are not the centre of everything, but that we are part of it. Every choice we make has its repercussions, we cannot believe that we are the tip of the iceberg, that we have the power, because if it were not for everything around us, we would not be able to achieve what we have and achieve.

The visible and the invisible are directly related, the history, the culture, the why of things inhabits everything we see. It is like a line that advances in time, it is continuous because it has a past, a present and a future, and on it there are experiences, people and situations that

make it continue on one side or the other, and that is why we can see it. The invisible forms the visible, and the visible shows the invisible.

The lines, the web, occupy a space. It occupies a body.

Whether space or body, we are always occupying a place and it occupies us. We perceive the world through observation, we are topographers of our lives and our bodies are the different starting points.

The line, which has no beginning and no end, which understands neither walls nor borders, inequalities nor hierarchies, can never be destroyed.

And what happens with this in the circus?

Reading the Thinking Through Circus book I came across a section that caught my attention. In this section Paycha cited: "Painless pain was not a conscious method of practice. Today, it reveals itself as proof of my embeddedness in a (neoliberal) structure in which success is the goal and pain are the only way to reach it", (Lievens et al., 2020, p.18).

The romanticisation of pain within the circus is something that has been accepted since its inception. The more suffering the more work and experience, therefore the closer to triumph. It doesn't matter the pain if the result is successful. The success and the result is the visible part, the work, the effort, the pain is the invisible part.

When I work with the harness, I sometimes feel pain, and to accept it as something successful is to accept the violence towards the body as something normal.

—+ pain → + success → + productivity—

Accepting our pain and work as unique puts us back at the tip of the vertical line. If we break that verticality within the circus and the relationship between the artist and his discipline, we will create a horizontality where not only the artist suffers and succeeds. "In this 'anthropocentric' worldview, the subject 'acts', while everything else is passive matter" (Bauke, 2020, p. 22).

From my discipline as an aerialist, my flying companion is the harness. And I wonder if, just as I suffer, it will suffer. We are both part of the work, the effort, the process, the success and the spectacle. If I break the anthropocentric gaze, I cease to be in the main role and the harness as a secondary role, to turn us both into characters of equal importance.

From my work of the transposition of bodies through space, of the transformation of space, which is born from the work and discipline of many artists known as the manipulation of objects, I seek to break with this terminology. For its meaning is nothing more than that of handling, controlling or changing a thing in order to obtain some benefit or specific purpose. In short, another way of understanding the anthropocentric gaze.

I wondered at the time who [what] controlled who [what], but instead of trying to be the artist who controls the object, or allowing himself to be controlled by it, I now understand that it is a question of two, of connection. Adaptation and observation between two bodies to

embody the space, to occupy and transform it. I am not above the object, the object gives me, I give it and together we move.

Let us weave networks where we are accountable for our actions, intersectional, interconnected, equal, where we adapt to each other in order to build, look from all other perspectives, put ourselves in the place of the other, empathise, understand, listen and create.