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ABSTRACT

The focus of this paper is observation, self-observation and enactive management of organizational conflict situations. For this purpose we use an ontological nurturing technology call CLEHES© (body - language - emotions - history - eros - silence) applied as a tool in different groups, communities and organizations that need and wish to develop their own skills to move conflict practice resolutions in order to learn as a human activity system. Conflict situations are understood as a breakdown in-between CLEHES from the individual or social standpoints. This perspective opens management and learning possibilities for any kind of organization.

This tool allows observing the boundaries of conflict situations and building an observer system with the ability to manage, solve, or attenuate the situation attending to the context in which the organization moves.

Strategies are developed to cope with the domains and context in the perceived individual and human activities systems. We present study cases related with national family mediation system and a laboratory for high management.
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INTRODUCCION

The increasing rate of change, complexity and uncertainty that characterize the context in which organizations and human beings act has fractured the notions of planning stability, questioning the linear support instruments for decision making and the common practices for managing the conflict situations in them.

This breakage, which has shaken the paradigmatic and epistemological backbone of the administration sciences, has led to the opening of spaces that question the traditional ways of observing, understanding and operating in organizations, on the one hand, and on the other it opens the frontiers of this knowledge to other disciplines that contribute new horizons and language. This new opportunity has allowed the construction of trans-

---

1 The word Body is replaced from Spanish to English, but we keep the initials in Spanish.
disciplinary and ortho-disciplinary views that, by connecting knowledge, move the perspectives to observe and understand from another place the human activity systems and enable the space for design and innovation to create practices, instruments and tools that take up the context in which they move and in which their viability is at stake.

Therefore, the present scenario configures emerging and variable conditions that require overcoming the reductionism on which management has traditionally been supported, to shift to maps that show through human beings and their complexity in operating organizations as human activity systems.

At present, management tools attempt to represent reality at different levels to help managers direct organizations to some desired point, but they do not include in their design the experience of the person that uses the tool. The instruments created to assist in the management have deficiencies by considering that it is possible to establish an adequate objective representation of the problem situations without including considerations on the human being that operates the models that are developed (Garcia and Saavedra, 2006; Garcia and Laulie, 2010; Garcia and Salazar, 2012).

In practice we find that in the implementation of traditional tools there is dissatisfaction among managers, because at the time of applying them they do not see the real advantages of their use. This dissatisfaction is due not only to the subjective use of the tools, but also to the fact that they seem to not apply to real problems and complex situations in organizations, especially in conflicting situations within the organizations or between the organizations and their context, where fears, ruptures, frustrations, rejections, power struggles, egos, insecurities, and appearances, among others, are triggered, i.e., they do not allow approaching the overall organizational problem from the human system that constitutes and configures it.

Those in charge of managing organizations have a commitment with the difficult task of maintaining them viable in the setting in which they operate, i.e., allowing the organizations to last over time under highly complex conditions (Espejo and Reyes, 2011) This task is not easy, because the complexity that emerges from the activities typical of an organization is much greater than what the human being in charge of it can manage and take care of.

This dilemma presents the challenge and the need to link knowledge coming from various environments to understand not only the complex dynamics of the organizations, but also to take care of how the manager as a human being can operate in them and what distinctions are required to manage the conflicting situations that arise inherently from the structural dynamics of the human activity systems.

This perspective gives rise to the contributions of the social sciences, second order cybernetics, the cognitive sciences, and neurophenomenology, to propose new horizons for the understanding of the organization–manager relation. Our proposal is focused on this process, emphasizing the manager as a human being that observes, distinguishes, acts and has the ability to enact (Garcia and Salazar, 2102) the organizational system, a matter that acquires special importance in the conflict situations that must be tackled.

The dilemma is, therefore, to look through the human beings that manage, that distinguish in a particular manner, and the distinction operations that configure their action to move their position as observers in and their configuration of the world of the organization and of its breakages. This movement requires, in our understanding, the constitution of an enactor that embodies distinctions, with the ability to design conversations and generate (self)learning, i.e., that embodies a knowledge that circulates
and is exchanged, allowing a new state of perceptions, meanings and interpretations within the organizations.

CONFLICT SITUATIONS AND ENACTIVISM

We postulate that the rupture, breakage or conflict situations within the human activity system that configure an organization are unprecedented spaces that open states of possibilities by questioning and opening the distinctions schemes with which one acts, i.e., it questions the human and organizational cognitive blindness spaces. In these terms, the rupture of the interaction choreographies constitute a unique source to design, create and re-create that reality (Garcia and Saavedra, 2011). This leads to the discovery or emergence of new modes of interaction that can reconfigure the system's identity. It is in this voyage between enactor and context that the states of possibility emerge, (Maturana, 1978; Maturana and Varela, 1980), and more than being captured intellectually, they configure a creative emotional growth and learning experience of the system. The language of rationality, of scientific objectivity, has hidden the human being in its existential and ontological condition and in its complex contradiction; our perspective proposes to recover and look through the human beings that we are, recognizing as a principle that being a manager is a mode of being a human being (Maturana, 1993) and that the conflict situations reveal the human part of being a manager.

We understand by conflict a collision of perceptions and distinctions situation between two or more actors or systems of human activity, which as it takes place configures an open system that operates outside the equilibrium, that is constructed and expressed in choreographies of interactions and in conversations in the social domain. Conflict situations are inherent to social life and to human interaction because of the structural dynamics that characterizes human beings; that is why the sense of alterity or strangeness that is experienced in a conflict situation with respect to Others is an inevitable consequence of social living together, but at the same time this frontier is an educational provocation that places us in the management setting to open the perceptual arches, move the distinction schemes, and transform the modes of operation.

In this sense, a conflict situation exposes and brings up all the ontic complexity that we observe in human beings: their contradictions and their limits. If we take the place of the manager, the question that arises is how to take actions in rupture or conflict situations that ensures the system's viability and learning from it?

We postulate that decision support systems are effective only if they are configured within the human activity systems, as knowledge that is embodied in the human beings that constitute the system, that arises from a recursive process of observation and self-observation, and that this self-reference process occurs when the distinctions horizon of those who are in charge and are ethically responsible for the organizational care is expanded.

This approach means to locate oneself in a perspective of the interactions and organizational processes that is sustained by the particular dynamics given by human beings and comprises what is organizational as a space of constitution of learning capable of constructing given actions and of configuring new management practices: Enactive Management, i.e., it is not only a matter of putting in evidence the practices and the meanings inherited from habits and tradition, but of recognizing the re-creation and
innovation potential that exists in the manager when he turns from being a passive observer to an enactor. This qualitative leap places the manager as an observer with the ability to listen and to embody the context to (re)design it.

Enaction is not a mode of operating, but rather an embodied effective way of knowing that allows dancing in the situation as a moment that configures a microidentity (Varela, 1988). From that perspective, we can understand organizational life as a plot of situations, each of which constitutes a microworld with its networks of particular conversations and its own dynamics. The conflict situations are the hinges between one microworld and another, and therefore each microworld is a situation that emerges and turns us into a microidentity. This microidentity is the arrangement that we get to be by means of an effective answer to each microworld, i.e., how we feel and act, or in other words, we perceive and at the same time we act. More than the universal view, it is an invitation to look at the contexts, the phenomenon that emerges, and to learn from it.

Enacted experience calls us into intersubjectivity, because our body emerges on contact with another body. This emergence as a lived experience operates as an undertone of empathy and gives sense to ethics (Garcia and Saavedra, 2006; 2011).

We postulate that this enacted experience is where the re-vision of organizational practices that bring pain, suffering or discomfort to the microworlds is possible, generating breakages that make other microidentities emerge. This inflection points calls for a methodological response that is capable of moving the observer to an enacted experience of effectiveness and/or welfare. We have traced this response in the CLEHES invention as an Enactive Management tool (Garcia, 2009).

ENACTIVE MANAGEMENT

From the science and technology of cognition, cognitivism offers a help that allows the configuration of tools to support management, because the measurement and control of management are established as representations of organizational behavior, i.e., as representations of a reality, that configure an important source of information to be able to measure and evaluate organizational performance.

From enactivism, human beings and their experience conceived as the source of all possible courses of action are heightened, not as static elements, but emerging from one situation to another, making possible its use and its adjustment for the creation of value in organizations (Garcia and Mendoza, 2010) and therefore the focus of attention is no longer placed, as has been done traditionally, on the objects, processes, and activities, but on the human beings that configure them and execute them.

Enactive Management appears then as the action of managing and administering from enactivity, where the interpretation and reinterpretation of the events emerges as a space for strategic design of conversations in the organizations; where the decisions and forms of action come from the observer himself, i.e., from that who knows and conceives the world from his perspective (Garcia, 2009).

If we look at the manager as a choreographer of organizational viability, a spectrum of concepts appears that were not looked at under the previous paradigm, namely those involved with the human factor, i.e., we no longer have a set of tasks to be directed, but human beings and their interactions appear (Garcia and Saavedra, 2011), giving rise to increased complexity, because in this sense the manager not only has to deal with his own emotions and expectations, but he must also do so with those of the other members of the
organization, and from there generate the conditions that will allow the creation of commitments that urge the other persons in the organization to effective action.

Enactive Management brings forth the need to have representational tools delivered from cognitivism, such as measurements and indicators that reveal or help to see the behavior of the system that those in charge of the management, have under their responsibility, but it is also assumed that those measurements do not have their own meaning and neither do they lead to action by themselves, but their significance is given by the persons who interpret them through the language and affected by all their history, their emotions, and their continuous life experience, giving rise to new opportunities for action, and from there commit the rest of the workers to carry out tasks and generate commitments through their actions.

This interaction is not trivial, because it involves a paradigmatic change with respect to traditional management control, so for the tool to be effective it is suggested that decision makers must be educated and must generate distinctions that allow them to carry out Enactive Management. To that end the CLEHES technology is proposed (Garcia and Saavedra, 2006), based on self-observation, on the observation of orthogonal interactions, and on the observation of the CLEHES networks, which are explained below.

**CLEHES®, THE NURTURING TECHNOLOGY**

We conceive CLEHES as a nurturing technology in terms of the recursive and recurrent learning that this tool generates in the diverse experiences and contexts where it has been applied. Upon unveiling human beings ontologically, affective historical structural drift arises as the greatest complexity to be observed and managed, a matter that amazes, moves and challenges our own learning. It is a technology because it brings the body as a device or distinction that operativizes and moves the operational carrying out of observations, and with that it changes the conversations, ergo, it changes the action.

The CLEHES tool gets two meanings: a) as a way of ontologically understanding human beings from the six dimensions that it compromises, and unveiling the observer that has been constituted along with the learnings, and b) as a technology that allows moving this observer.

From the first meaning we understand that what human beings perceive has been configured along their social personal historical past and that it is embodied; everything learned and experienced has become part of this structure and generates a number of distinctions or differences that affect the interpretation of what is happening. So, a particular Body, Language, Emotions, History, Eros and Silence is the result of the crossing of cultural senses and meanings of the individual history and personal experience. In everyday living we tend to become trapped by the embodied learnings, believing that these actions, and not others, constitute the only bodily experience possibility, assuming them as natural.

From the second meaning, CLEHES has the character of an enactive technology that moves the observer that has been constituted; it places human beings as constructors/authors of experiences and practices, having power over them, a power that is expressed in the ability to observe them, conserve them or transform them. The observer is the one who, through a declaration in the language, configures the system’s operational closure, i.e., configures its field of action and establishes the limits within which he is responsible for the viability, and it is essential to build cognitive references that allow the
performance of the system under care and help him establish a comparison. This comparison is associated with the reference values that arise from their expectations, allowing a comparison with which the stability or instability values can be associated.

The use of technologies can be conceived as the ability to trigger different emotional states. In that sense it can be said that technology may be conceived in the perspective of touching and altering the emotions that drive people to action, and by means of language and in association with their experience (history) they allow enaction.

In this sense the acquisition of distinctions that is brought to the different elements of CLEHES is what configures the reality that results and is assumed as the reality.

The CLEHES technology allows developing the managerial distinctions, attitudes, and abilities that constitute an individual organizational observer. It is based on the understanding of the human being as a unit and as a system with the capacity to learn about itself, about others, and about the interaction networks in which it participates under the concern for organizational performance. In this context, the CLEHES technology presents the idea of a human being as a dynamic unit composed of six interactive and crisscrossing elements (Body, Language, Emotions, History, Eros, Silence).

(C) (Cuerpo) Body

The existence of human beings is corporeal; it is there that learning and knowledge take roots: it is its geography and its archeology. Thus, the body is a place of difference, differentiation and identity.

The body gives presence and occupies a place in the interactions; the body contains us, it is the habitat and the continuity of the other components of CLEHES. It moves like a semantic unit in whose structure we find the lived experience. Human beings inhabit their body according to the social and cultural orientations that go through it, but it enacts them again in its own manner, according to its temperament and its personal history in each deployed interaction and choreography. The manner in which we move means for itself and for the Others.

(L) Language

Human beings live in the language, our words create worlds. Understanding language as a phenomenon of life with which we construct realities takes us to the responsibility that each one has in the interactions that we make (Maturana, 1993). Every assertion has its origin in a distinction, it creates a movement and gives rise to an interaction that is coordinated with another one. In this way we create choreographies that wrap us and trap us, so the point is how can we incorporate linguistic distinctions that will allow redesigning the acts of speech that arise in daily interactions.

(E) Emotion

As human beings, our language runs across emotions and our body, and this interlocking gives shape to our psychic state. Everything we do has its origin in an emotional domain that makes action possible. All emotions: fear, pleasure, anger, pain, sadness, happiness, aversion, love, are bodily dynamics that involve an action. Observing our emotions opens up the possibility of changing our willingness for action once we can...
recognize the relation between situation, interaction and emotion, because affective culture is found in the origin of the internal regulation of behavior. Emotions are holistic and immediate bodily reactions to the current state of the body in the world.

(H) History

The CLEHES technology invites us to observe our personal history, to bring it into present experience as an opportunity to re-interpret individually and collectively some events that affect our interaction, especially when it inhibits or paralizes the possibilities for action; this opens an interesting space for self-observation and redesign: the critical situations that we live through as people or as part of organizations, triggers history and its imprint, which can open or close opportunities in decision making or in the ways in which we move in a conflict situation. Reviewing our history implies asking ourselves about those benchmarks, events or critical knots that even now paralyze us and recognize the love experiences and the trusts that facilitate our interactions.

(E) Eros

Eros is expressed in different ways in the interactions: it impels us to encounter and to create spaces for care and intimacy with others; intimacy that commits sensory pleasure and the skin as an organ for contact and pleasure. Caressing, passion, sensuality and tenderness are expressed in sexual encounters; they take different forms in filial love (Filia), in brotherly love, and in friendship in which eros is also expressed. It is also the creative impulse present in all human beings, groups, organizations, communities and cultures that allow the transformation of nature, matter, ideas and practices, and solving crisis and conflict situations. When there is eros in the interactions, the act of listening appears as an alchemy that reduces resistance because it recognizes the legitimacy of the Other, it goes to meet him from empathy, and opportunities for building trust appear (agape). All our senses are set on him or her to capture their cosmovision. It is in eros that we cultivate the desire to preserve or repair relations.

The ability to move with eros is developed in the unconditional acceptance relations and in play as one of its expressions. That is where creativity, curiosity, imagination, and experimentation arise, where error is accepted as legitimate. In play we place ourselves in the esthetic pleasure of being with Other and we can open up to diversity and to difference. Playing activates the sense of humor, an expression of eros that moves the observers that we are through a break in the ways of distinguishing. Sense of humor gives a mood to the situations that we live, configures a willingness to act, allows increasing the effectiveness with which we approach the situations, and allows rediscovering (ourselves) when faced with the surprise of the unexpected.

(S) Silence

Human interactions are complex not only because there are words, gestures, emotions, eros and memory, but because we make use of silence, which is full of meanings that only the body knows.

Silence has been dealt with scantily in Western literature; its generalized reference belongs to the world of religious or spiritual practice that they follow, culturally speaking,
to the private domain. The Cartesiano paradigm, by valuing reason and stating objectivity, was centered on speech as an instrument for capturing reality. If body and speech give a place and a thickness to existence, silence has the conscious power to cancel it and eliminate it. Used in this way, silence generates fear, pain and suffering in human beings and in the organizations that experience it as invisibilization and indifference.

The vision that we are proposing is focused on listening, whose counter-account is silence, understood as a resource that we can educate and manage in the interactions.

THE LABORATORY: LEARNING TO MOVE CLEHES

We have given the name hermeneutical laboratory to the movement that takes place in CLEHES, because it proposes a situation and action space where observation and self-observation of the routines take place to imagine what is possible and what is desired as a recursive and recurrent process that arises from the commitments of reliability, honesty, and respect for others. We understand our intervention as a process of capture and creation of meanings that involves actions that perturb a web of distinctions, meanings, and human interactions that sustain organizational practice. In this sense rupture, breakage, and confusion play a central role as provocation of self-observation of the psychic states associated with the questioned practices.

The laboratory is constructed as a ludic and creative space in which the play makes transparent the CLEHES of the participants, their paralysis and their ability to move, and invites them to design new conversations that provoke searches in the interactions and conversations between the actors, that is, different choreographies. The educational configuration of this space is based on the people declaring their dissatisfactions, pains, or discomforts as a consequence of unquestioned organizational practices, and allowing them to open up to alternative actions that arise from the desires of the administrators as interest in transformation or innovation. The inclusion of CLEHES as a technology that is injected in the laboratory enriches the observer by irritating, provoking, exciting, and moving the schemes of subjacent distinctions (the background, figure, and content) of the situation that is under observation.

The workshops that take place in the laboratory constitute spaces of intimacy, open conversation spaces where living experience and daily experience are the basic units of the work of self-observation.

The laboratory is essentially the space that makes variety emerge, enlarges it and reduces it by inviting to look at everything from no predefined place. In other words, it is an invitation to observe everything from the largest possible number of places and to decide with responsibility the new configurations of doing. The point is confusion: in a world full of assumed certainties, with a science that intends to account objectively for reality, confusion rises as a principle for personal and organizational change, i.e., the perceptual arcs are enlarged (Bateson, 1972).

By working from and with CLEHES a second order learning situation is created for training social enactors: in this way a system of observers is constituted as a community of inquiry in the context in which it is desired to operate.

The CLEHES space is constructed as a function of reflexive experiences that push us to construct a new narrative script and to enact it from CLEHES. The laboratory operates
on the basis of the cleanliness of judgements with respect to what happens to the other and
to oneself, opening empathy as central experience.

CLEHES is submerged in a world vision that requires or asks to be approached, in
that way turning into a life archeology that rebuilds knowledge through the experience of
human beings; from there it participates in the phenomena in the existential context where
human situations occur. It attempts to relate two questions that from the Cartesian paradigm
are unrelated: What can I know? and How must I live?, in this way integrating ethics as a
human concern present in living together.

The fundamental thesis is that the world that we experience arises from ourselves,
and therefore all understanding is always construction and interpretation of the living
subject. These movements require a change in the ways of observing (incorporating new
distinctions) that are promoted in the educational space or laboratory in which the
participants learn on themselves by interacting with others. They only require their bodies
and accepting themselves as human beings that observe and act.

The design of the educational interactions is done according to the following
strategies:
1. Self observation in CLEHES: What to keep and what to transform of our CLEHES.
2. Observation of orthogonal interactions: The affective listening (listening with eros:
   affection), coupling in language and emotions with others to maintain autonomy
   conversations of trust, cooperation, collaborative work, and cohesion, in different domains
   and organizational contexts.
3. Observation of CLEHES networks: To understand and transform the structure of our
   conversational networks, and the resulting commitment networks in which we operate.

The main thrust of this technology is to support managers throughout a process of
acquisition of a new set of distinctions, abilities, and practices that constitute an
organizational observer and actor. Their embodiment results as a redesign of the network of
relations in which the manager participates and as an adjustment of the interactions he has
with people.

This process may have different forms according to the context of the intervention.
The main issue is the design of a configuration of bodily, linguistic, and emotional
experiences associated with the understanding and competencies to take care of the
viability. The methodology attempts to create dramatic instances in which the participants
go through a cycle of encounters, disencounters, accidents, and surprises, not only with
others but with their self observation in the context of organizational care.

The different episodes of the observer transformation process occur in different
educational forms such as workshops, automatic writing, the development of poems and
songs, coaching sessions, project review meetings, presentations, modeling, theater
composition and acting, scenographic and choreographic arrangements, report analysis,
linguistic exercises, analytic and self observation homeworks, body observation, and dance.

The apparent anarchy of the interactions is a result of the concern to expose people
to situations which are new to them, in which they have scarce competence and in which
their functional expertise is not useful. It is a result of the acceptance that what occurs,
occurs in the bodies of people through linguistic and emotional coupling, and therefore it
does not seem wise to restrict the interactions to the professional, analytic type of languages
that dominate the organizational conversations

The purpose of the CLEHES technology is to create design conditions in
autonomous identities, i.e., observers with ability for self-regulation and organization when
faced with situations that generate unease in the human activity systems in which they are responsible or participants, in a continuous learning process. A community, an organization or a human being have the possibility of recognizing their resources and generating changes in their practices if they so desire. The key question is what do we want to preserve and what do we want to change? The answer arises from a process of observation, self-observation, design, action, and learning from ourselves, and from the relations and networks in which we participate, which is not exhausted in the laboratory space, but is rather the initial stage of a process that gets installed in the bodies of the participants. In this respect we can highlight two realms of experience:

**National Family Mediation System**

The experience of generating and applying an educational program for family mediators was carried out in Chile since 2002, when Mediation became a matter of public interest as it is part of the State's juridical structure. The training program attracted thousands of professionals from the human and social sciences, and it consisted in setting up a system of observers (mediators in training) with the ability to metaobserve the distinction schemes underlying conflict resolving practice embodied as a consequence of the process of enculturing, to move them toward dialogic ethical generative practices, a matter that is paradigmatically a constituent of mediation and was among the expectations and demands of the future role. By accepting the invitation to interact as human beings and not as specialists, the participants legitimate the learning space and dare not to know, turning this declaration in the more exciting space of individual and collective self-learning inquiry.

The esthetic conversational movement that arises from the laboratory experience as an expression of the re-designing of conflict resolutory practices is seen as a learning of the system oriented at opening its possibilities and declaring its limits and resistances. This reconfiguration emerges from the perturbation generated by the CLEHES tool in the ways of distinguishing the conflict situations and the associated meanings (individually and collectively), and by daring to enact emergent situations by moving the distinctions schemes. The mediadores in training move, speak, listen, occupy the silence, generate trust, provoke, suspend judgements, and operate in objetivity with parentheses, embodying new learnings in observation skills and in conversational design.

This experience has set the basis to implement a laboratory addressed to pedagogy students, who must learn how to manage school and classroom life in their future role in the country's schools.

**High Management**

Since 2000 a *Hermeneutical Laboratory for Emotion and Action* (Laboratorio Hermenéutico para la Emoción y la Acción, LHEA) has been implemented, which was designed for human beings who have high responsibilities in top management. Experience in hundreds of situations have been dealt with using the CLEHES technology in different organizational domains and contexts: those in charge of Latin American governments, ministers, directors of large and middle sized companies, and managers of various functional areas. The self-learning reports are focused on detecting, correcting and questioning personal and organizational errors in the observation and self-observation of CLEHES, using the already shown strategies. Structural adjustments in the areas under
their responsibility, and adjustments in organizational conversations and interactions, as well as in cognitive references.

To have clarity of the system under care implies that the administrators should be capable of distinguishing the limits and boundaries of their field of action and know which elements are or are not under their responsibility, besides knowing and understanding how the CLEHES network is related. Knowing the system it becomes possible to generate expectations on its performance, and from there establish the cognitive references that allow the evaluation of its achievement, and that is why having clarity on which is the system under care and who are the relevant actors of viability is the primordial task of the managers.

Configuration of the expectations with respect to the performance of the system will be made as a function of the congruence that the observer attributes with respect to past events, which is a construction made in the language. To the managers not all the performance levels can be acceptable, and that is why they operate with their cognitive references in such a way that they can determine if they are fulfilling their organizational commitments. The limits of these systems are configured in relation to the relevant cognitive references that serve as support of stability and cohesion. Once the cycle of observation and configuration of the references has taken place, it is possible to begin the cycle again in order to continue a search for cognitive references that make the system more representative.

**LEARNING AND FINAL REMARKS**

The CLEHES laboratory has been applied in different settings: High Management (businessmen, people in government, politicians), Mediation (families, teachers, students, administrators of justice, community leaders, neighborhood leaders), undergraduate and graduate Educational Curricula (engineering, education), Overcoming Poverty (vulnerable localities, model schools in Haiti). Each of these programs has focused on a specific problem situation experienced in the CLEHES of the participants, and has developed distinctions of observation, self-observation and design of new interactions. One of the largest efforts of these programs consists in inviting the participants to open new conversations and take the risk of designing unexplored actions observing the contexts in which they are acting.

Incorporating the CLEHES technology as a self-observation tool allows going into the interactional and communicational systems to turn them transparent in their complexity where human and social practices are discovered. We believe that it is in these moments of clashes of perceptions, inflection, difference, rupture, conflict and breakage where identity is manifested in the configuration of historically cultivated senses as embodied durable provisions. It is precisely this space that opens the educational, reflexive and self-referential possibility of second order learning, as we have observed in the laboratory experience.

The CLEHES technology configures a distinction from which we observe and meta-observe; it is a resonance or password that we inject into a system of human activity to move toward the declared utopias: their development becomes an aesthetics of the interaction in which human beings see themselves with the ability to question what they do, of re-writing their discourses and their practices, becoming responsible for their decisions considering the social context in which they are situated. This proposal places us in the
relevant reflections of the social sciences and of management that transforms us as researchers into actors that also produce sense and that aim to know. We consider that we can gain access to the ways of observing of a system of observers by incorporating and embodying this technology.

We have characterized the CLEHES technology as an enactive tool that allows new structural couplings and going out of the naturalized routines according to the worlds that are desired. The system acquires self-observation and self-learning competencies that are expressed in the development of conversations that open up possibilities and prepare for action, turning around the management movements. Along these terms we consider that our proposal opens an interesting educational space when we understand that identity in the context of society is complex, it is a construction that is being more than actually being.

We have seen that the CLEHES technology generates a high reflexive impact by unveiling the subjectivity and intersubjectivity of the actors that configure the human activity systems. Opening the possibility of questioning the position from which each actor observes in and his conformation of reality, allows self-learning and organizational learning, injecting new distinctions into the system.
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