

Living in paradise: acting without effort

The biologic-cultural nature of effortlessness¹

Authors:

Ximena Dávila Yáñez and Humberto Maturana Romesín²

Invitation

With this essay we wish to invite the reader to ask him or herself certain reflexive systemic³ questions that we think may contribute to expand his or her understanding of his or her living. The conceptual fundamentals for what we say in these reflections arise from our understanding of our living as biologic-cultural beings⁴, and the experiential support for what we say comes mostly from the observations of Ximena Dávila during more than ten years of research in conversations of liberation from pain and suffering⁵ in her practice as a Family Counselor. Her practice has consisted in the realization of conversations that aim at listening from where do arise the inner feelings that the different persons, families, organizations or communities live as pains, joys, suffering, or curiosities in what they do alone or with others. Through these liberating conversations each configuration of painful inner feelings and emotions that is recurrently lived in the daily living, is revealed in the history of the person that lives it as an unhappy intimate relational dynamics that has been conserved since its arising as an experience of negation of love, as a manner of daily living in self depreciation that is enacted at every related opportunity in a recurrent present that one may not wish to conserve any more. It is in the singular reflective opening generated in the liberating conversations, that a person can become conscious of the origin of his/her painful network of conflicting feelings and contradictory desires, and free him or herself from them if he or she wishes so. When a person becomes aware of his or her attachment to a particular configuration of inner relational feelings that he or she has unconsciously conserved in the doings of his or her daily living, he or she can see how that configuration of inner relational feelings has shaped his or her manner of living alone, and in his or her family and space of work, orienting him or her mostly to a living in pain, and occasionally in well-being. When we expand our ability to listen to others and to ourselves, we expand at the same time our capacity to generate new worlds or relational-operational domains. Moreover, as our listening expand our innocence disappears and we can begin to ask ourselves previously neglected or forbidden reflexive questions, such as, what world do I want to live alone and with others? And it is from this expansion of our listening and our awareness that we can chose to live in **hell** or **paradise**.

One cannot specify what another person hears when one speaks, and one cannot determine through what one writes what another person reads, or what happens to his in her intimate inner feelings with what she hears or sees. Thus you who read this writing will connect perhaps with the literal meaning of the words used, or will chose to follow a reflexive path in the desire of finding a new truth or in the hope of being inspired. Or you may read to hear or see what we say. Each one of these and other possible paths of reading and reflecting will lead to a different place in the different domains of your knowledge, understanding and inner feelings. What we ask to you with this invitation is that you dispose yourself to choose your time and place with peace, because all that you will find as you read this essay has to do with you in the present you are living now. If you have already accepted this invitation, you are welcome.

¹ This is an unpublished paper presented to MIT project to effortless attention in 2009 but the fundamentals of this work would be integrated later at "El Arbol del Vivir" of same authors published at 2015.

² They are Co-Founder of The Matriztic Institute in Santiago, Chile.

³ Whenever one finds oneself in a domain of interconnected elements such that if one acts on one of them one acts on all. An invitation to a systemic reflection is an invitation to consider the systemic connection of the domain in which he or she is reflecting.

⁴ We are proposing the notions of "systemic and meta-systemic laws" in order to reveal the spontaneous coherences of the systemic processes that we distinguish as observers in our domain of existence as human beings. Systemic and meta-systemic laws are not definitions and do not entail any ontological assumptions. Like all scientific laws they simply reveal the spontaneous coherences that we human beings distinguish as we distinguish the operational-relational coherences of our living. In this sense, systemic and meta-systemic laws are laws of nature.

1 - Introduction

Basic Systemic Law⁶:

Happenings

"It happens to us in our living that we human beings find ourselves already being living human beings doing whatever we do, when it happens to us that we find ourselves operating as observers that ask themselves ¿how do we do what we do as human beings?"

We some times say that that human life entails more pain and suffering than joy, and that we live in a valley of tears. During the last seven or eight thousand years this has been true through wars, diseases, famine, and ecological disasters. At the same there has been many reflective attempts to generate manners of living that would secure well being for all human beings or for some that supposedly deserve it more than others. But so far, such attempts have always failed, and most of the time they have generated more pain and suffering through different kinds of discriminations.

In our mythical view, we often imagine our early existence as human beings as an innocent and happy period frequently referred to as a golden age in which our ancestors lived in harmony with each other and with the other beings that inhabited with them the world in which they lived. In other words, in our inner feelings we imagine that golden age as an age in which our ancestors lived in a manner in which there was more well-being, less strife, more mutual respect and more mutual understanding than in the way in which we live now. And we imagine that in that golden age our ancestors lived spontaneously in more sensory, operational and relational coherence with the circumstances of the natural world that made their living possible than what we now do.

That is, we imagine that our ancestors lived then in a **paradise**, in some sort of protected psychic garden of abundance, cosmic harmony, splendor and beauty, in the joy of being together doing what they thought or felt that was needed or that they wanted to do in the conservation of that harmony, without effort, and therefore, without anxiety. And we can imagine that golden age perhaps because we feel that we lack in our present living something that we feel we know as if we had lived it before, and then lost. That is, we feel the absence of a well being that we do not have now, and we feel it as a memory conserved in our continuously changing present that we could not have unless we had some how lived that well being before.

Reflexive questions:

When? Where, in our mother's womb? When, in our childhood? How?

All mythical traditions tell in one way or other that that ancestral harmony was lost, and that **hell** appeared through the agency of some sort of confusing demon that tempted our ancestors to enter into the blind valleys of omnipotence, ambition, competitiveness, greediness, vengeance, envy or pride. All these temptations that as different psychic processes do the same, namely, **negate love** and destroy the only source of interconnectedness that may create, recreate and conserve the continuously evanescent present that living in harmonious coexistence with different kinds of living beings is.

We human beings like all animals in general, and like all mammals in particular, are always inclined through our learning capacity to become addicted to whatever gives us pleasure. What we like we want to repeat. Thus, in our existing as languaging beings we seem to enjoy almost above everything being autonomous in our doings and thinking, creating theories for explaining and understanding what happens to us in our daily living, and frequently we behave as if we had become addicted to our explanatory theories, treating them as if they constituted the reality of the worlds we live. In this way, we

Systemic laws are abstractions of systemic coherences of the systemic dynamics and processes whose realization does not entail the operation of the humanness of the observer. Meta-systemic laws are abstractions of the systemic coherences of the systemic dynamics and processes whose realization entails the operation of the humanness of the observer. Systemic and meta-systemic laws have been taken from the book: "*Habitar Humano en seis ensayos de biología-cultural*" Authors: Ximena Dávila Yañez y Humberto Maturana Romeśín. Sáez Editors, Santiago, Chile, 2008.

generate explanatory notions of our existence that fascinate us as propositions of ideal forms of living, without becoming aware of what happens to us when, deafened by the hubris of our ambition, we become blind to the moment in which we transform our explanatory notions of what we think should our ideal daily living into systems of fundamentalist-moral thinking through which we negate love in all the dimensions of our living⁷, and lose **paradise** for our selves and for others. Yet, we want to recover **paradise**, generally without knowing what happened to us, and we want to recover it without abandoning or losing what we **have** proposed, convinced that it was a universally valid and desirable ideal manner of living for which we are ready to fight. And we fight, acting from the perspective our moral-fundamentalist feeling ready to demand the rigorous application of what we may propose in all the dimensions of our living and the living of others, fully convinced not only that we know what human beings need to do to live together in happy harmony, but also of our moral and ethical duty to bring them out of their ignorance.

It is from this feeling-knowing that compels us to act, and that seems to us to be both generous and altruistic, that we begin to **design** the perfect world that the other human beings should live, and we create domains of coexistence which in the desire to implement it we unconsciously transform in manners of living so full of rules that negates the very autonomy of reflection and action that we claim that we want to conserve. And we do this even though we know in the depth of our inner feelings that we do not like to live in a world designed by others without our participation because as loving languaging and reflective beings we feel well only when we can act as reflective autonomous beings that can consciously chose the course of their living. We human beings can live in **paradise** only if we can chose not to live in **hell**.

Reflexive question:

How could we not share this knowledge with others?

In this essay we are concerned with the loss of **paradise** and the arising of **hell**. And we want to show how this loss happens, not in a mythical vision, but as an aspect of the cultural-biology of our daily living as loving human beings. And we think that if we manage to understand how we lose **paradise**, we may (enter in the path of) have the possibility of recovering and conserving our living in (well-being of) the **paradise** of mutual respect in the co-inspiration of collaboration, and not stay trapped in the **hell** (of the continuous anguish) of desiring to force others to live as we say that they should live. We the authors are conscious and responsible of what we say as we write what we write. We know that we have lived in the paradise of wellbeing and in the hell of the loss of paradise in the patriarchal-matriarchal culture in which we find ourselves living. Like many we have found ourselves consciously and unconsciously moving with others from one of these worlds to the other.

Reflexive question:

Paradise or hell, where do we want to live?

2- Systemic and meta-systemic laws

Systemic Law # 00

The arising of the cosmos

"We human beings explain what we do in the realization of our living with the operational-relational coherences of what we do in the realization of our living, and as we explain what we do in our living with operational-relational coherences of what we do, the cosmos arises as a recursive systemic⁸

⁷ When we speak of what we do in our daily living we refer to all that we do while awake or sleeping, whether it is science, art, philosophy or home chores. Our daily living is the continuous flow of our living in the continuous changing present in which we do all that we do without distinction of the nature of the different things that we do.

⁸ The dynamics of systemic processes is continuously recursive. It frequently happens that as we describe systemic processes these result flattened because the description does not reveal their recursive multidimensionality, and we

explanatory proposition of what we do in our living with the operational coherences of what we do in our living".

We initiate each section in this article with a systemic or a meta-systemic law. Like all the operational-relational regularities of our living that we call **laws of nature** in science; the systemic and meta-systemic laws are not definitions, they are abstractions of the spontaneous regularities of the operation the systems that we distinguish as observers in the attempt to explain and understand as scientists the worlds that we bring about with the operational coherences of our living as languaging human beings explaining their living with operational-relational coherences of their living. Or, in other words, systemic and meta-systemic laws are abstractions that we make of the spontaneous relational-operational coherences of our domain of existence as this arises in our distinctions as we generate the notion of nature as the domain of the spontaneous happening, realization and conservation of our living, in the attempt to explain the operational coherences of our living with the operational coherences of our living.

The systemic and meta-systemic laws reveal the basic regularities of the dynamic architecture⁹ of the cosmos and all that happens in it in the zero time¹⁰ of the continuously changing present of our living. That is, the systemic and meta-systemic laws reveal the spontaneous ordering of the changing structure of the operational-relational cosmos that we generate as an explanatory proposition of the ultimate fundament of our existence as living beings, in our attempt to explain and understand the biológico-cultural nature of the humanness that we find ourselves living.

The understanding of the dynamic architecture of the realization of our humanness and of the cosmos that arises with our explaining our living in the zero-time in which occurs all that occurs in our living, is the basis for our explaining of all that we do and happens to us, or in us, in our living without having to introduce semantic notions such as totality, purpose, energy, function or control, in the guise of supposedly self evident explanatory principles when we want to explain our operation as singular entities.

Accordingly, our reflections in this article about living or not living in **paradise** or **hell** are grounded in the understanding of the coherent changing processes of the dynamic architecture of the changing present of our living in zero-time that we synthesize as abstractions of the operational relational coherences of those processes in the systemic and meta-systemic laws that we present here. And it is this understanding what allows us to explain with the operational coherences of our living the flow of our human historical existence as singular biológico-cultural entities that can be conscious of their living and of what they do.

Systemic law # 29 **Result and resulting resulting:**

"The result of a process does not and cannot participate in the generation or realization of its happening"

Nothing of what happens in the realization of the living of a living being occurs because the consequences of that happening were necessary for the arising or realization of the living of that living being.

Everything that happens in our living occurs as an aspect of the spontaneous continuously changing present in zero time of the cosmos that arises as an explanatory proposition of the operational-relational fundaments of our living as we explain the arising, realization and conservation of our living with the operational-relational coherences of the realization of our living.

are left with the presentation of a lineal dynamic. When Ximena Dávila refers to the dynamics of human processes as systemic-systemic or recursive systemic processes she wants to avoid their linealization through a fully description.

⁹ See Appendix: Basic Concepts

¹⁰ The notion of time zero is used by Ximena Dávila Y. to evoke the realization that the fact that we live in a continuous changing present is at all times an opportunity to generate a new conscious beginning, in which the presence of the image of a painful past fade as a source of bad-being to stop being conserved as an aspect of daily life without forgetting it.

3- Living systems: nature of the living process

Systemic Law # 0:

The observer and observing

"Every thing said is said by an observer to another observer that could be him or herself".

We human beings live our lives sometimes with pleasure and joy, but other times with pain and suffering. Sometimes we do what we do with ease, without effort, and some times we struggle and do what we do with difficulty and effort. How is it that as all this happens to us we live our lives longing for a living in the effortlessness of a spontaneous acting without effort as if we knew how that is? Can this be possible? Can it be possible to live in the effortlessness of spontaneous effortless actions?

Living beings

We human beings are living beings. What is living? What are we human beings? We living beings are molecular **autopoietic** (self-producing) entities, that is, we are dynamic molecular discrete entities that occur as closed networks of molecular productions that continuously produce themselves. A living system as a discrete autopoietic molecular entity exists in a stationary dynamic of self-production in a continuous flux of molecules through it. There are molecules that enter in a living system and participate in the dynamics of its autopoiesis becoming part of it, and molecules stop participating in the autopoiesis of a living system, and leave it drifting away. The result of all this, is that this closed network of molecular productions open to the flow of molecules through it operates as a self-contained dynamic totality that through its internal operation continuously defines and realizes its borders, spontaneously driven by the interplay of the thermal agitations and the structural configurations of the participating molecules.

The spontaneity of living

Autopoiesis is living, and living is autopoiesis. Autopoiesis occurs as a spontaneous self-assembling process continuously arising in a changing present. As such living is a spontaneous process and occurs in zero time in the continuous changing present of the continuous spontaneous realization of the changing molecular architecture that the autopoiesis is. There is no internal or external guiding agent in the constitution, realization and conservation of the autopoietic process. Furthermore, living beings live as totalities that interact in a medium that either arises operationally congruent with them in the realization of their autopoiesis such that they realize and conserve their living in their recursive interactions in it, or they die. That is, a living being lives and conserves its living only while it finds itself in recursive interactions in the medium that makes it possible.

When we speak of living systems in the domain of interactions in which they operate as totalities, we speak of organisms. Organisms interact in the particular part of the medium in which they realize and conserve their living and that arises with them as they realize their living. The part of the medium in which an organism realizes and conserves its living, is what we call its **niche**. The niche arises and exists only while the organism realizes its autopoiesis through its recursive interactions in it. An **organism and its niche** change congruently together in a flow of recursive interactions while those interactions result in the realization and conservation of the living of the organism. The niche does not exist independently of the organisms that generates it moment after moment in the realization of its living through its recursive interactions with the medium that makes it possible in a dynamic of reciprocally harmonious structural changes that lasts only as long as the living of the organism results conserved. As such an organism and its niche constitute an **organism-niche** operational-relational dynamic unity. The way an organism realizes its living as an organism-niche operational-relational dynamic unity, is its manner of living. Different kinds of organisms live different manners of living.

When we distinguish different kinds or classes of organisms as different species and we give them different names, we are distinguishing **lineages** of living beings as different manners of living that are conserved from one generation to the next through the systemic reproduction of different classes of organism-niche operational-relational dynamic unities. Our particular manner of realization and conservation of our autopoiesis as languaging organisms that live immersed in recursive networks of conversations is our **human manner of living**. Accordingly, all that we do as human beings we do it in open or closed network of conversations in which we can reflect and generate the different worlds that

we live as different domains of recursive coordinations of doings and reflections. Whatever happens in the realization of the living of a human being that does not occur as an aspect of the flow of its living in a network of conversations is not a human happening. In these circumstances the different recursive dynamics of inner feelings and sensory-effector correlations of the different networks of conversations in which we human beings live operate as different operational-relational dimensions of the systemic organism-niche unity in which our living takes place.

Everything that happens in the conservation of living of an organism, everything that happens in the different worlds that we live as human beings, occurs in the spontaneity of the happening of all that happens. No doubts that we feel different in the different happenings of our living; thus, we feel being conscious of what we do, we feel desires, we feel joy, we feel pains and sufferings, we feel purposes and aims ... as inner feelings that recursively change the flow of our intimate biology in the spontaneous happenings of our living. Since in general the flow of the living of an organism, and, in particular the flow of the realization our human living in networks of conversations, is intrinsically recursive, we human beings live the flow of our living continuously encountering ourselves in novel operational-sensory-relational domains in which unexpected inner feelings appear in us that may change what we conserve in our operational-sensory-relational living.

It is possible that if we feel well in that novel operational-relational domain, when we stop to reflect on our well-being in it we may find ourselves living inner feelings that an observer that sees the flow of our relational-operational living would describe saying that we are **choosing** what we do according to our **preferences**. Furthermore, in the moment that we do that we would realize that as we reflect on our inner feelings in those circumstances we would refer to them using the same words because those are the words that we use in our conversations when we want to connote our inner feelings in our relational living.

No doubt the same happens with words such as desires, wishes, joy, aspirations, pains, purposes, intentions... that we use to connote the inner feelings that support the flow of our coordinations of doings. As we shall see further ahead language in it's happening as languaging does not describe or point to any kind of entities, but it is the happening of the flow of coordinations of coordinations of doings in which we live our human coexistence.

Thus, it is because of this that as we use the words that we use when we talk of our feelings what we do is to connote the inner sensoriality that we feel in the happening of the biological processes that generate in our living the sensory-effector correlations of the realization of the coordinations of doings of our living and not the relational doings involved in those coordinations of doings.

The domain of the inner feelings of our relational living as loving beings is the fundamental domain of the realization of our living as human beings, even though sometimes we negate love when we move to another domain of inner feelings through the recursive changes in our relational space that arise in the contingencies of our reflective encounters in the course of the realization and conservation of our living. Whichever may be the case everything occurs in us in the spontaneous flow of the realization and conservation of our living in an operational-relational course of interactions in our niche guided by the sensory effector correlations that arise from the configurations of inner feelings that arise in the flow of our living.

We human beings do all that we do in the different worlds that we generate in our living, regardless of whether these appear abstract or concrete in our inner feelings, as a flow of spontaneous happenings that occur in what an observer sees as the realization and conservation of our living, with others or in solitude. In these circumstances what guides moment after moment the course of our spontaneous living are our inner feelings of wellbeing or not wellbeing in the realization of the operational-relational coherence of our organism-niche unity.

4- Human living: nature of humanness.

Systemic Law # 7:

Evolutionary drift

"The course followed by the evolutionary drift of living systems in general, and of human beings in particular, in the succession of generations that constitutes their respective lineages, arises instant after instant determined by the preferences, desires, tastes, ... in the realization of their living sliding in the relational tangent of the conservation of their well-being in their niche."

Human nature

Humanness is a manner of living conserved from one generation to the next in the learning of the children. Humanness must have begun some three million years ago with the arising of the ancestral family as a small group of adults and children living together in the pleasure of doing what they did together in sharing food, caresses and sexual intimacy.

The emotion that made possible the arising and the conservation of the intimate coherence of the living together in the desire, pleasure and caring trust that constituted the ancestral family must have been love, as love is the only relational ambience in which mutual care, tenderness and mutual trust occur as a permanent coexistence. We think that as such manner of living occurred sustained by the pleasure of doing together the activities of the daily living, the inevitable expansion of the complexities of the recursive flow of coordinations of doings that the conservation of that intimate manner of living entailed must have spontaneously become the living together in coordinations of coordinations of consensual doings that languaging is. And we think as well that as living in languaging begun to be recursively conserved from one generation to the next in the learning of the children, the human lineage arose.

A manner of living is a particular configuration of organism/niche relation that defines a lineage when it is conserved from one generation to the next through systemic reproduction. The reproduction of a manner of living occurs as a systemic process in which what is reproduces is the configuration of the multidimensional dynamic unity organism/niche that constitutes the manner of living.

The systemic reproduction of living beings, then, occurs as the coherent conservation from one generation to the next of all the dynamic and structural conditions that make the realization and conservation of the living of the living being possible. **This is why what is systemically reproduced** and conserved as the human lineage in the learning of the children **is a manner of living** and not a particular genetic constitution. Furthermore, the fact is that in the natural drift¹¹ of the evolutionary dynamics a lineage arises whenever a manner of living, that henceforth defines its class identity, begins to be conserved from one generation to the next through its systemic reproduction. As a lineage arises in this manner, the genetic variations that are produced and conserved in its evolutionary drift follows a course guided by the manner of living that is realized and conserved from one generation to the next in its systemic reproduction, and not the reverse.

In these circumstances humanness is the particular form of organism-niche relation that has been conserved through systemic reproduction as the manner of living that defines the identity of the lineage of loving bipedal primates to which we belong. As such, humanness is characterized by a manner of living that interlaces languaging, inner feelings and emotioning in networks of conversations that are conserved from one generation to the next through their systemic reproduction in the learning of the children together with the operational-relational configuration of the loving family as the niche that makes possible the realization and conservation of their living as they are born. The human lineage,

¹¹ All organisms now living and the circumstances in which they exist are the now of the continuously changing present of the evolutionary drift of the conservation of the operational-relational unity of the organism-niche relation that defines the individual identity of each organism as a living being of particular class. The organism-niche operational-relational unity occurs as a changing dynamic architecture in which the organism realizes its living while it conserves its operational-relational coherence with its niche as this arises moment after moment with the realization of the living of the organism as this interacts with the medium that contains it and makes it possible.

therefore, occurs in the systemic reproductive conservation of the organism-niche unity, that arises as **a child** and **the loving family medium** that makes its living possible, is born in the moment in which this begins his or her individual living.

Languageing and emotions

Languageing as a living in coordinations of coordinations of consensual doings in any domain of doings has the concreteness of the doings of the domain of doings in which it occurs. Language is not an instrument for the symbolic designation of objects, although symbols and signs arise in languageing as forms of recursive coordinations of doings. Objects, entities, ideas, concepts, arise in languageing as consensual forms of recursive coordinations of doings, and words are such forms. This is why the meaning of a word occurs in the flow of the recursive coordinations of doings in which it participates, as we can easily see if we look at a dictionary where the words appear revealing and hiding coordinations of doings.

In the flow of our human coexistence we find ourselves living in changing relational domains that give their particular relational character to the different configurations of recursive coordinations of doings that we generate through our languageing. When in our daily living we speak of different emotions we are connoting the different relational domains and the different configurations of inner feelings in which our recursive coordinations of consensual doings occur in the flow of our languageing. This is why the different words that some one may use, such as love, fear, curiosity, trust or ambition, to refer to the relational character of the recursive coordinations of doings of our languageing, in fact reveal the different configurations of inner feelings that generate and sustain the operational-relational domain of coordinations of coordinations of consensual doings evoked in him or her as a result of what he or she heard as an observer that lives in his or her listening.

What we say here about listening is equally valid for any kind of sensory encounters, be they sounds, gestures, smells, contacts, magnetic or non-visual electromagnetic waves that make possible recursive interactions that may result in a flow of living together in coordinations of coordinations of consensual doings. Therefore, it is not the sensory form of the recursive encounters what constitutes languageing, but it is the flow of living with others in recursive interactions that result in coordinations of coordinations of consensual doings, inner feelings and emotions at any moment in any of the different operational-relational domains being lived, regardless of the sensory dimensions involved.¹²

It is through the understanding of this dynamics that an observer that sees it in our human living can say that our human living occurs as languageing occurs. That is, we human beings live our human living in the flow of our changing configurations of inner feelings and emotions that guide our languageing in our conversations. We human beings exist and live in languageing and conversations, and what occurs with us outside our living in languageing and conversations, does not pertain to our human living.

Conversations

We human beings live in languageing and exist in the flow of the continuous interlacing **of** our languageing with our emotioning. In this interlacing our emotioning constitutes the relational grounding of our doings in a dynamic that is generated moment after moment by our inner feelings in a flow of change recursively modulated by what we live in our relational domain. We refer to our living in the interlacing of the flow of our languageing with our emotioning when we say that we human beings live in networks of conversations. Thus, humanness occurs in languageing and is realized in the flow of our daily living in networks of conversations. In these circumstances, due to the manner of origin of humanness in the ancestral family, the basic emotion in human living is love, and for the same circumstance, the configuration of the inner feelings that constitute the fundamental grounding that makes human living possible in its existence in networks of conversations, is love. Love, therefore, is the emotional fundament of the manner of living that defines our lineage in the evolutionary drift.

What defines a lineage is a manner of living that is conserved from generation to generation in the continuous realization of the dynamic operational-relational organism-niche unity in a process of systemic reproduction that occurs in the present of the realization of the living of the organism in reproduction. Accordingly, as we refer to our lineage we shall call **Homo sapiens-amans** the basic manner of living in a flow of coordinations of coordinations of inner feelings, emotions and doings, that

¹² This is why different people, whether they are deaf, blind, mute or in any other sensory way, are incorporated into the languageing when there is a human environment in loving that makes it possible for them to living together in recursive consensual behavioral coordinations.

as a recursive manner of living together in networks of conversations constituted the fundamental biologic-cultural identity of our lineage as **the human manner of living** as well as our primary psychic identity as loving beings. Or said in other words, this fundamental psychic-biologic-cultural identity constituted, as it was systemically conserved from one generation to the next in the learning of the children, the basic identity of our lineage around which arose and arise all the different human manners of living that have happened and are happening now in our evolutionary drift. According to this, in our naming the basic human form **Homo sapiens-amans** we have chosen the word **sapiens** to connote our languaging condition, and the word **amans** to connote the basic emotion that sustains our humanness. As we put together these two words in the expression **sapiens-amans** we want to make evident that we think that these two aspects of our biologic-cultural human nature arose together and occur in an inseparable manner in the realization of our living as its psychic-biologic-cultural fundament since our origins in the ancestral human family.

We also like to call the human manner of living to which we presently belong, and that has been conserved in our evolutionary history through systemic reproduction since its origin in the ancestral family until now, **Homo sapiens-amans amans**. We add the second **amans** to emphasize that love has been, and still is, the guiding emotion that has sustained our evolutionary history in the systemic reproductive conservation of our basic manner of relational living as reflexive, loving and ethical human beings. And we also think that variants of the form **Homo sapiens-amans arrogans** and **Homo sapiens-amans agressans**, that are manners of human living that do not conserve the loving dimension **amans** in their daily living, and that arise in our historical present as cultural variations, must have occurred in many occasions in the evolutionary drift of our lineage. The lineages that may arise from these cultural variations are necessarily transitory lineages that become extinct because they do not conserve in their systemic reproduction the loving dimension **amans**, and in the conservation of a living **agressans** or **arrogans** they generate dimensions of systemic blindness in the feeling-doing of the daily living that unavoidably lead to the destruction harmony of the anthroposphere-biosphere relation that makes possible the realization and conservation of human living. As we can now see in the human cultural history of the last twenty thousand years or more, the **agressans** and **arrogans** human forms of living have always been self-destructive as they negate the possibility of the ethical-loving vision of the living **amans** in the negation of the living **Homo sapiens-amans amans**.

5- Manners of human living: our biologic-cultural existence

Systemic Law # 3:

Conservation change and transformation

"Whenever in a collection of elements some configuration of relations begins to be conserved, a space is open for all else to change and transform around the relations being conserved".

Networks of conversations

Our human living occurs and is realized in the relational-operational flow of our living together in networks of conversations. And as we said above, conversations occur in the flow of our living as operational-relational dynamics in the interlacing of languaging, inner feelings and emotioning that are distinguished by an observer as domains of coordinations of doings and emotions in which we may be conscious of what we do and reflect about, how do we do what we do?

When we attend at what we learn when we learn any activity in our human living as human beings, we can see that what we learn is indeed a network of coordinations of doings, inner feelings and emotions, regardless of whether we are learning to weave a basket, to cook, to do medicine, do science or to make a table. Whatever we learn as human beings, we learn it as a network of conversations.

Thus, the worlds that we human beings live arise in our living as closed or open networks of conversations that constitute our different domains of existence as different domains of inner feelings, doings, thinking and reflections that define the relational character of what we do, think or reflect in them. Furthermore, the different worlds that we generate in the flow of our living in networks of conversations constitute different operational-relational-psychic spaces under the form of different classes of conversations that differ in the configurations of inner feelings that support our relational

doings as emotions that orient the course of the flow of our living alone or with others. Emotions these that may take us either to the **hell**¹³ of complaint and conflict in the unpleasantness of doing what one does in effort, or to the **paradise** of the wellbeing of doing what one does in effortlessness.

Our claim that we generate the different worlds that we live as different networks of conversations is not just a daring claim, but it is also a call to be conscious and aware of what conversations we are living as well as of our total individual responsibility in relation to the worlds that we generate or wish to generate with them. Moreover, we immerse our children in the psychic space of the different worlds that we live by just talking with them in what are for us ordinary conversations of our daily living, frequently unaware that the configurations of inner feelings that they learn in the recursiveness of their living with us in coordinations of emotions and doings, can be for them negations of the fundamentals of their loving living if we live with them in **hell** rather than in **paradise**.

Cultures

When we speak of a culture we speak of closed network of conversations that we generate, realize and conserve mostly unconsciously as we realize ourselves as human beings living in it. Therefore, a culture exists only as it is realized and conserved while it is being lived in a human community as the closed network of conversation that it is. The fundamentally unconscious nature of the closed network of conversations of the culture that we live, determines at every instant what we may spontaneously think, feel or do, without being aware of this if we do not reflect on what we feel, think or do, unless we reflect on the fundamentals of what we think, feel or do.

The not reflected behaviors of the members of a culture arise as unconscious doings determined at every instant by the operational coherences of the cultural matrix of inner feelings, doings and emotions in which they live immersed according to the contingencies of their encounters with different configurations of operational coherences that the flow of living in their organism-niche relation offers to them. Moreover, all that occurs in the flow of our individual living, consciously or unconsciously, arises in us moment after moment as a particular unconscious happening of the continuously changing present of our living, and occurs in the no-time or time zero of the spontaneous happening of our present in the continuous now in all domains of our relational living. The consciousness of a conscious act does not happen in the intimate dynamics that generates it, but it occurs in the reflective dynamics of the flow of living in a languaging community in which there are reflexive conversations in which a person can distinguish what he or she does as something that she does as she does it. And a reflective conversation is possible only in languaging beings like us human beings.

As a closed network of conversations, a culture does not pre-determine the life that its members will live, they become transformed according to the psychic space of the culture as they live in it. Thus, the human beings living in the midst of a particular culture become members of it as they incorporate its psychic identity in their bodyhood, inner feelings and emotions. And this happens in them in an unconscious dynamic that interlaces all the operational-relational dimensions of their daily living as they realize and conserve the culture as they live it.

So, as a child grows in a particular culture and becomes transformed in his or her epigenesis in its operational-relational dynamics, it is the psychic space that the culture generates what spontaneously guides the course of the continuous transformation of the bodyhood, of the inner feelings and the emotions of that child, in the relational drift that makes him or her a member of it. Therefore, as we grow becoming members of a particular culture in our epigenesis, what we learn consensually in it are its manners of living, the inner feelings, the manner of emotioning, and the different configurations of coordinations of coordinations of doings, of inner feelings and emotions that are adequate at the to the different operational-relational circumstances in the continuous present in the living of its members according to their individual histories. Furthermore, when we speak of consensual learning, we refer to the spontaneous dynamics of congruent transformation that result whenever we do something together in the pleasure of doing what we do together explicitly or implicitly accepting the legitimacy of what we do.

Indeed, any manner of living that does not kill us before it is conserved as a closed network of conversations from one generation to the next in the consensual learning of our children becomes a

⁷ We speak of being in **hell** when we refer to feeling trapped in an unhappy living. Without consciousness of being trapped in an unhappy living, there is no **hell** or **inferno**. The same happens with being in **paradise**. When we say that we are in paradise we mean that we are conscious of being immersed in well-being. Without being conscious of living in well-being, there is no **paradise**.

culture: a human manner of living that is realized and conserved as a historical lineage. It does not matter how bizarre or strange may seem to us the emotioning, the thinking, the way of reflecting or the way of reacting of the members of a human community, or how unacceptable may seem to us the psychic space of their manner of living, if it is conserved from one generation to the next in the consensual learning of the children it becomes a cultural lineage that will last until it is no more lived and conserved by them in their daily living. And the members of that culture will live in **wellbeing** or in **suffering** according how harmonious or disharmonious are they in their inner feelings as they live it. That is, they will live in wellbeing or in suffering according to how much their cultural living puts them in contradiction with the biology of love that is the ultimate fundament of their human identity in their biológico-cultural existence.

Theories

We human beings generate with our living the worlds that we live as networks of conversations; and we also generate theories as systems of arguments coherent with the regularities of our living aimed at explaining the happenings of our living in whatever operational-relational domain this may be taking place. Moreover, when we accept or adopt a theory, its basic concepts become henceforth **de facto** the operational-relational fundamentals of our doings when we find ourselves in the domains in which we feel the theory applies. The result of this is that in those domains the basic notions and concepts of the adopted theory begin to determine at every instant of our conscious and unconscious living the networks of conversations we can generate, and we cannot generate, as well those in which we may wish or not wish to participate. The basic notions and concepts of the theories that we adopt become our conscious and unconscious determinants of how we live in the operational-relational domains in which we accept their validity.

When we generate a philosophical theory, a religion, a myth, or any system of explanations that we live as a closed network of conversations that denies us the possibility of reflecting on the fundamentals that supposedly give it its validity, we generate a fanatic world or a fundamentalist way of thinking that constitutes a manner of living that destroys the possibility of any individual or collective reflection in it. When this happens, reflexive questions about how we do what we do, questions that expand our doings and understanding, become consciously or unconsciously, directly or indirectly forbidden. And as this happens, thinking and acting from the **expanded systemic vision that love generates** as a disposition to reflect in every circumstance before negating its validity out of a prejudice, is denied.

However, even though the adopted theory may define all the possible doings and thinking as well as all that is valid or not valid in its domains of applicability, it is always possible that should arise from the multidimensionality of our inner feelings, something not admissible, a contradictory desire of reflecting on what one knows that one should not reflect. And it is always possible that due to some unexpected relational circumstance one may find oneself desiring something that one knows that one should not desire because it violates the operational-relational coherences of the adopted theory, as occurs, for example, when we fall in love and we begin to ask forbidden questions. And when one of these events happens, the **psychic wellbeing** the blindness that one wanted to secure by accepting such theory is lost, and the **unhappiness** of frustration appears. What is remarkable is that these reflective events always arise either through some **pain** generated by the negation of love, or as a **curiosity** in front of something unexpected. This is why a fundamentalist community can only exist in the simultaneous active negation of love and of the unexpected.

Reflexive questions

*From where in our living comes our desire of living in love?
From where in our living could arise the desire to negate love?*

Capacities

We human beings live a cultural present of scientific knowledge and technological abilities that gives us the capacity for doing whatever we may imagine if we act within the domain of operational-relational coherences in which we imagine what we imagine. However, the value of what we do does not reside in the nature of what we do, it resides in the intensions, in the aims, in the configurations of inner feelings that orient our doings and define the psychic-operational-relational conscious and unconscious space

from where we chose what we wish to do and eventually we do what we do. In other words, It is the psychic space that we generate from our inner feelings, and that we live as the emotional fundament from where we use our knowledge and abilities as elements for reflections and actions in the daily creation of the different worlds that we live, what gives value and sense to those worlds, as well as to our own living as human beings that give rise to the world that they live with their living.

There is no doubt that we human beings can now generate with our scientific knowledge and technological abilities an ethical world of social well-being, dignity, honesty, mutual respect and co-inspiration for collaboration in the generation and conservation of a harmonious anthropospher-biosphere operational-relational unity from the psychic space of the biology of love. And there is no doubt either that from the psychic space of omnipotence we can also generate a non-ethical world under the temptation of arrogance, domination and submission, authority and obedience, of greediness and disharmony in the operational-relational interplay of the antroposphere that we generate in our living as human beings and the biosphere that we inhabit as living organisms and makes us possible.

Reflexive questions:

Do we indeed want to do all that we can do, or we think that we could do?
On what depends that we should chose to do or chose not to do what we can do?
On what depends that we should want to live an ethical or a non-ethical world?

Rationality

It is frequently said that we human beings are rational animals and that our emotions interfere with our rational thinking. We think that this is not so. Indeed, we think that we human beings as all living beings are emotional beings, and that what is peculiar to us is that as languaging biologic-cultural beings we are rational beings that use their rationality to invent arguments to support or to deny their our inner feelings and our emotions, and that it is our inner feelings and emotions that guide our living, not our rationality. A rational argument is an operational-relational construct that we proposed within a particular domain of operational-relational coherences of our daily living (which henceforth becomes a logical domain) thinking that if it is realized as we propose in the domain of operational-relational coherences of our daily living to which it corresponds, it will give rise to the desired results.

A rational argument, therefore, is a conversation of coordinations of doings, inner feelings and emotions in a particular domain of operational-relational coherences that describes a generative process that says: "if the processes here described are fulfilled according the operational relational coherences of the domain of operational-relational coherences in which they apply, they will give rise to the consequences expected". Every scientific system, every philosophical system, every mystical system is constructed on arbitrary basic fundamental premises accepted **a priori** according to the desires or preference of the person that propose it. That is, every rational argument is founded on arbitrary basic premises accepted **a priori** according to the desires and preferences of the person that proposes it. That is, every rational argument is founded on some emotional grounding. If we are not willing to reflect on the (not rational emotionally chosen) basic premises with which we give fundament to our scientific and philosophical theories or to our rational arguments, whichever these may be, we enter into the path of an ideological, fundamentalist, fanatic or delirious thinking. The fact that rational arguments are founded on basic premises accepted **a priori** according to the desires or preferences of the observer (person) who proposes them does not negate the operational-relational effectiveness that they may have when they are applied in the domain in which they apply.¹⁴

Languaging and conversations do not operate as abstract systems of symbolic communications about a "reality" supposed to exist independently of what the persons in conversations do as they distinguish whatever they distinguish. Languaging and conversations occur in the recursive flow of coordinations of coordinations of consensual doings, inner feelings and emotions of the persons that live together as biologic-cultural languaging beings in conversations. Therefore, whatever happens in the languaging and the conversations being lived has the operational-relational concreteness of the doings, inner feelings and emotions coordinated in them as they occurred. And it is precisely because of this that all

¹⁴ A rational argument is an operational system designed to operate in some specific operational domain. If a proposed rational argument does not work in the operational domain in which it should operate out of its design, means either that it is not what the designer claims it to be, or that there was a mistake in its application.

that happens in scientific reflections, conversations of technological design or of home chores, is always the coordination of the different doings, inner feelings and emotions in the operational-relational domains of doings, inner feelings and emotions of the persons that participate in them.

Therefore, even though the basic premises of a rational argument in any human operational-relational domain are arbitrary, to the extent that a rational argument is proposed as a network of coordinations of the doings, inner feelings and emotions of the persons that adopt it, every rational argument has operational-relational effectiveness in the flow of the doings, feelings and emotions of those persons in the particular operational-relational domain of their living in which they apply. And this is so because the basic premises that an observer can choose for his or her rational arguments, however bizarre they may seem to another observer, can only come from the field of the operational-relational coherences of the different domains of the realization of his or her daily living as a biologic-cultural human being. Furthermore, this is also why whenever our rational arguments fail even though we have not committed any logical¹⁵ mistakes in their proposition, they fail because we have confused operational-relational domains treating doings that pertain to one operational-relational domain as if they pertained to another.

So, the operational-relational effectiveness of our rational conversations, regardless of whether they are scientific, technological or homely conversations, in any domain of our operational-relational living, rests on the fact that we use the operational-relational coherences of our doings, inner feelings and emotions of our daily living to describe and explain the operation of the worlds of doings, inner feelings and emotions that we generate in our daily living

6- Human Contradictions: hell and paradise

Meta Systemic Law # 23:

History and desires

"The course followed by the history of living beings in general, and by human beings in particular, arises moment after moment defined by the desires and preferences that at every instant determine what the living being or the human being does and conserves, or does and refuses in the flow of its living."

Hell and paradise

We human beings are multidimensional beings that exist at the same instant in many different simultaneous operational-relational domains, that under the vision of an observer that knows how to look, appear coherent in the unity of the of the continuous present of the changing dynamic architecture that is the realization and conservation of our living in the realization and conservation of the organism-niche unity in which we exist. Thus, an observer that looks at how an organism does what it does, or in particular, at how we do what we do as human beings in our living in networks of conversations, sees that everything in the realization of the living of a human or non-human organism, appears to him or her as if it occurred consciously or unconsciously oriented by the purpose or intention of reaching a particular result. All this appears to the observer that sees it, as if all the dimensions of the internal and relational happenings in the realization of the living of a living being occurred directly or indirectly subordinated to the processes that lead to that result. However, nothing occurs in the happening of the realization of the living of a living being oriented to the attainment any particular result, everything occurs in the living of a living system as a spontaneous happening in the operational-relational coherences of the changing present of the self-assembling dynamic architecture of the organism-niche unity in which it occurs. That is, the intimate operational coherence of all the processes involved in the realization of the living of an organism, is the continuously arising result of the operation in the present in time zero of the spontaneous happening of its changing dynamic architecture in the continuous realization and systemic conservation of the organism-niche unity in which it exists.

¹⁵ The logical coherences of any argument correspond to the operational coherences of the domain in which the argument is applied. Different domains of operational coherences imply different legitimate possible orderings for the processes that can occur in them, that an observer lives as different logics.

In other words, it is the coherent interlacing of all the operational-relational dimensions of the realization of the living of an organism that results of the realization and conservation of its living in time zero in the changing dynamic architecture of the organism-niche relation in which it lives, what gives operational-relational unity to all what an organism does as it operates as a totality. And it is here, in the domain in which an organism operates as a totality in the realization and conservation of its living in the changing unity organism-niche, where wellbeing and not wellbeing happen in the living of any organism, and where we human beings find ourselves living in a continuously moving¹⁶ from **paradise** to **hell** and from **hell** to **paradise**¹⁷ in the awareness that we are living in one or in the other. However, it is only as we become aware that with our choices we generate **paradise** or **hell** in our living and in the living of the other persons that live with us in the patriarchal-matriarchal culture that we live, that is possible for us to chose to release the attachments that lead us to live the **hell** of the loss of **paradise**. In other words, it is in our conscious or unconscious attachment to the power that gives us the obedience of others in the relations of domination and submission that are in the center of the patriarchal-matriarchal culture where we, conscious and reflexive human beings, generate the duality **paradise-hell** that traps us in the suffering that we begin to conserve in our daily living when we lose **paradise**.

With these reflections about living in **hell** or **paradise** we are **not proposing** to accept the dualism of the patriarchal-matriarchal culture where notions such as good and bad, true and false are lived as transcendental values from the conscious or unconscious intimate desire of obtaining the total power over ourselves and others that absolute knowledge would supposedly give us human beings. What we indeed want is that we do not lose is our awareness of the fact that what is fundamental in us human beings that it is we human beings who generate with our daily living the systemic-systemic domain of inner feelings, emotions and doings that constitutes and realizes our living.

Organism and niche change together congruently, sliding in the encounter of their recursive interactions in the operational tangent in which the structural changes that they trigger in each other result in the conservation of their reciprocal dynamic-operational congruence in the conservation of the organism-niche relational unity. In the instant in which this reciprocal dynamic-operational congruence is not more conserved in the organism-niche relational unity, the niche of the organism vanishes, the organism-niche relation disintegrates, and as the organism finds itself immersed in a medium which is not congruent with the operation of its dynamic structure, dies. When this does not happens, and the organism finds itself in an unexpected situation that we as observers see as dangerous, ambiguous or contradictory, either as a result of its own internal dynamics or as a result of the singular dynamics of its niche, the organism usually appears to us first as pausing for a moment and afterwards as if it had changed its inner feelings orienting itself in a different direction possible more coherent with its well-being. In the normal circumstances of their free-living organisms appear to us to be spontaneously in the well-being of the **paradisical configuration** of inner feelings in which there are no contradictions or ambiguities in the operational-relational realization of their living in dynamic unity with their niche.

When due to some unexpected circumstance the spontaneous **well being** in the living of an organism begins to vanish, **not well being** appears, and if well being does not arise again soon, the organism eventually dies of physiological malaise or psychic depression, which are only different forms of disintegration of the realization of the autopoiesis. From the perspective of our living as reflective languaging beings that exist in conversations, we would say that when an organism stops being in well being loses **paradise** and **hell** appears in its living. In this sense we human beings are not fundamentally different from other organisms and we behave essentially in the same manner under similar circumstances, but with a difference.

We human beings as languaging beings that exist in conversations when facing a contradictory or an ambiguous situation can stop for a moment abandoning our certainties to reflect and adopting a more expanded perspective ask ourselves if we like what we feel, and then consciously choose the path that we want to follow. Sometimes, however, as we do this we face in our inner feelings the **demonic temptation** of the attractive security that the certainty of fundamentalism offers us, and we refuse to

¹⁶ When talking about hell and paradise in our lives, we are not connoting desirable or undesirable experiences, we are only revealing that our human living happens as a continuous opportunity to move from one to the other according to the changing flow of our intimate feelings and emotions. We are in paradise when we feel in paradise, and we find ourselves in hell when we feel in hell. Without consciousness of paradise or hell there is no experience of paradise or hell, and these do not exist in our life. However, in this cultural present we realize both domains.

¹⁷ What is at stake here is the spontaneity of the ontogenetic and phylogenetic natural drift that follows the course that results from the conservation of the living of the organism in the organism-niche unit in which only the unity of the organism-niche relationship is preserved. it satisfies the systemic dynamics that we have spoken about in the text. The conservation of living and of the organism-niche unit is a continuous result, not an achievement.

reflect on what we do because we know that what we do is right and that it is the world around us is what is not well. Yet, if we so wish, in the openness of self respect and self love we can release once more our certainties and stopping to reflect in the new operational-relational domain that now appears, choose if we wish or do not wish to live in the security that we think we would have if we accept such temptation. All these are reflections and elections that other organisms that do not live in languaging and conversations cannot do.

In our living as conscious reflective observers we human beings can see the uncomfortable inner feelings that other organisms that do not live in languaging and conversations are living when we see them trapped in contradictory emotions; and we can see their pain when they enter in a manner of living which we know from our own experience, and that we call the **hell** or **inferno** of the denial of love. Since the living beings that do not live in languaging and conversations have no way of reflecting on the living that they live, they live the living that they live without **paradise** and without **hell**. Ye, we, as languaging human beings can reflect on our own living, and we be aware that we know that when we are trapped in contradictory inner feelings and emotions we lose **paradise** and enter in **hell**. In this same manner we also know that living in **paradise** only occurs with the consciousness of living in love, and that living in **hell** only occurs with the consciousness of living in the negation of love. We human beings as loving bipedal primates that live as languaging beings in conversations are the only living beings on the earth and in the cosmos that we generate with our living that can live in **paradise** or in **hell** because we are the only ones that can be conscious of living in **love** or in the **negation of love** when they are living in **love** or in the **negation of love**.

Reflection is the greatest treasure that we human beings have as loving beings that exist in languaging and conversations: if we love our present whichever this may be, that is if we accept its legitimacy without denying it through our prejudices before we see it, we can release our certainties and reflecting on our living we can choose either the **paradise** of living in love, or the **hell** of living in the absence and negation of love, as the fundament of our daily living.

Reflexive questions

Can we indeed choose to live in paradise or in hell?

If we find ourselves in a fundamentalist thinking, can we indeed release our certainties, reflect, and come out of that manner of thinking?

Acting with effort and acting without effort

We think that initially our ancestors must have lived in the well being of **effortlessness** or **acting without effort** as a matter of course, in unconscious spontaneous harmony with the circumstances of their living in networks of conversations as languaging beings. And we think also that living in effortlessness must have begun to disappear with the expansion of self-consciousness in the growth and diversification of the domains of coordinations of inner feelings, emotions and doings that created by the recursive distinction of one's own daily living that appears with the arising of the desire of explaining one's own existence.

Furthermore, it seems to us that in our ancestors this expansion of their domains of coordinations of reflexive behaviors in the desire of understanding their own existence must have progressively become recursive in the creation of theories and explanatory systems of their origin and of their living that were transformed in intimate, unconscious, fundamental, and necessary guides of their relational doings and thinking. Moreover, we think that it is due to the predominance of our use of rational theories and explanatory systems as guides and justifications of what we do, and that we conserve from our ancestors as a central psychic aspect of the almost universal patriarchal-matriarchal culture that we presently live, that now spontaneously acting without effort does not arise easily in the flow of our daily living. And it is because of this that in order to attain (or recover) the **well-being** of acting without effort, many cultures have invented religious paths, mystic visions, and special reflexive exercises that would lead to it in through our conscious effort, effort that becomes in fact our greatest difficulty for obtaining what we want.

To go from a form of living in which we do what we do **with effort** to a form of living in which we do what we do **without effort** we need as self-conscious human beings a new form of feelings and thinking in our reflexive living. Such a change requires from us now a psychic transformation in which we consciously abandon our belief in that our living should be guided by rational explanatory theories, and in which we must also consciously accept that our inner feelings and emotions are the fundament of all that we do,

and that what we want most deeply is that our inner feelings of love should constitute the emotioning that guides all our operational-relational doings in all the dimensions of our daily living.

We human beings as all animals are emotional beings, and what is peculiar to us is that as living beings that live in languaging we are also rational beings that use their rationality to support or to negate their inner feelings, emotions, desires and purposes. And it is in the interplay of our inner feelings, emotions and rationality that we can reflect and choose if we want to live and act **in effort**, at the same time wanting and not wanting to do what we do, and therefore living in the **hell** of the absence of love, or if we want to live **without effort** wanting to do what we want to do, and therefore living in the **paradise** of in love. We shall call **Homo sapiens-amans ethicus** this manner of human living centered in love as the psychic space of inner feelings and emotions that makes possible the reflections that permit to choose the living that one wants to live alone or with others.¹⁸

Our ancestors did not speak as we speak here, but they understood the intimate nature of humanness as they evoked it with mythical notions that we do not understand now because we listen to them expecting concrete descriptions from the perspective of our actual analytical thinking. Perhaps the most that we can say in this moment with respect to the mythical evocations of our ancestors in relation to what concerns us in this essay, is that they understood that **paradise** occurs in the domain of love and that the **hell** arises in the negation of love, that the **paradise** lives in the effortless doing, and that **hell** appears in the acting with effort, that **paradise** exists in the harmony of living of well being, and that one enters to live in **hell** when the harmony of living in well being begins to disappear, and lastly, that the **paradise** happens as one sees by letting be, and that the **hell** happens as one becomes blind in the desire to control.

Now living and acting **without effort** requires from us the audacity and courage of wanting to generate in our living a cultural change that entails abandoning the networks of conversations of mistrust and control, of domination and submission that we consciously and unconsciously generate, realize and conserve as spontaneous intrinsic aspects of the patriarchal-matriarchal cultural living in which we find ourselves presently immersed. And, furthermore, **effortless** living and acting requires from us also the audacity and courage of replacing those networks of conversations for networks of conversations of co-inspiration and collaboration in mutual respect. And this is possible now only if we are willing to consciously do all that we do in our daily living having the configuration of inner feelings of living in the unity of **love and ethics** (the love-ethics unity) as the operational-relational fundament of our reflecting and acting until these inner feelings becomes our spontaneous unconscious manner of living-relating.

How can we do this? There is no doubt that when we become aware that we lose our well being when we **act in effort**, we immediately wish to return to a living in which we recover the well being of **acting without effort**. To do that requires the audacity of daring to change the **ontological question** that has been the fundament of all philosophical reflections in occident during the last two or three thousand years, which is the question that asks for the **essence of the being** of what we distinguish as if what we distinguish existed independently of what we do when we distinguish it, for the **epistemological question** that ask for how do we do what we do as living beings and human beings, or for how do we operate as observer as we distinguish whatever we distinguish. This change of question implies that we consciously accept as a constitutive feature of our existence as living human beings that in the experience itself we do not distinguish between what we call perception and what we call illusion in our daily living, and, therefore, it also implies that we realize that we cannot pretend to be able to say anything about what we usually call the **real or objective** world as if what we call **real** or **objective** existed independently of what we do as we distinguish it.

We human beings find ourselves living when we ask our selves about our living. The world that we find ourselves living at any instant of our living does not exist by itself and does not preexist to our living it, but arises moment after moment as the matrix of dynamic sensory and operational-relational configurations in which we find our selves realizing our living as human beings. In these circumstances what we call **reality** or **real** in our daily living are explanatory notions o imaginary referents invented by our ancestors with the purpose of understanding the operational-relational coherence of our operating as living human beings that in our cultural present we unconsciously or consciously accept as denoting some domain of transcendental being that exists with independency of what we do as observers. The notion of **reality** as all explanatory notions or explanatory principles hides what we do as observers in the process of explaining whatever we explain, and does not let us see that we explain the sensory-operational-relational coherences of our living with the sensory-operational-relational coherences of our

¹⁸ "Habitar Humano en seis ensayos de biología-cultural" Authors Ximena Dávila Y. and Humberto Maturana R. Sáez Editores, Santiago, Chile, 2008.

living, and leads us to believe that we explain the sensory-operational-relational coherences of our living with the operational and relational coherences of that transcendental domain.

Being aware that we explain the operational coherences of our living with the operational coherences of our living opens us the path for our detachment of our beliefs, theories and explanatory principles, permitting us to reflect on their fundamentals as we see that we live many different "realities" as many different domains of sensory-operational-relational coherences in our daily living with which we explain the different sensory-operational-relational coherences of our daily living. Furthermore, as we become aware that it has no sense to speak of a transcendental "reality" independent of what we do as observers, we can also become aware that we human beings live many different worlds or realities that arise as we live them, whether alone or in organizations or communities, as different domains sensory-operational-relational of our living with which we explain the sensory-operational-relational coherences of the realization of our living as human beings. Finally, as we become conscious of all this we can also become aware that the worlds that other living beings live arise in the same manner that arise the worlds that we live, namely, in the moment that they are lived, only that as they do not live in languaging they do not reflect about the worlds that they live as we do.

Languaging, conversations and reflections are aspects of the realization of our relational living in coordinations of coordinations of inner feelings, doings and emotions in the recursive dynamics of our living together, and as such they are part of the operational-relational organism-niche unity in which our human living is realized and conserved. In these circumstances the questions that we make, and the answers that that we accept, are never trivial because they define at every moment the course of our reflections and our actions in our living. As a result, the reflexive consequences of changing the question that ask about the being of the being for the question that asks for the doing in what we do, recursively become part of the operational-relational organism-niche unity in which our living is realized in a way that permits us to live a course of reflections, understanding and actions that arises from our understanding of the operational-relational coherences of the realization of our living that would not have been possible if we had not made such change of questions. The question about how do we do what we do can always be answered from the operational-relational coherences of the realization of our living without resorting to any ontological assumption, conversely, the question about the being of the being can be answered only by inventing some transcendental ontological supposition alien to the operational-relational coherences of the realization of our living as human beings.

As we reflect about our existence we become aware that everything in us and around us occurs in continuous change and transformation, and we see that everything changes according to what we do, feel or think. Thus, as we replace the question about the **being of the being** for the question for **how we do what we do** in our biological and philosophical reflections we see that the configuration of our inner feelings changes and transforms, and as that happens the dynamic architecture of the realization of our living changes too. Furthermore, in this reflective process we realize also that everything in the flow of the realization of our living changes and transforms around what we conserve, and we become aware also that if we want to conserve, at least a transitory well-being in the patriarchal-matriarchal culture in which we are immersed, we must abandon our certainties and our attachment to the truths of our theories, and submerge ourselves in the wonderful adventure of feeling that we exist as the center of the cosmos that we generate with our living, fully aware that we are always responsible of the living that we generate with the living that we live, regardless of whether we live doing what we do **in effort** or **without effort**. The change of the question that asks for the **being of the being** for the question that asks for **how we do what we do** is a change of question that takes us away from an inadequate attempt of explaining our systemic living with a lineal transcendental vision, and leads us to realize that our living can be explained only from the understanding of the recursive systemic dynamics of the realization of our daily living. The domain of the realization of our daily living constitutes as a "unitary epistemological substrate" the only reflexive domain that permits us to see, explain and understand the recursive systemic worlds that we live as they arise from the operational-relational multidimensional coherences of the realization of our daily living as human living beings guided by our inner feelings in all the domains of operational-relational coherences in which we do whatever we do.

Reflexive question

*Do we want and dare to intentionally become **Homo sapiens-amans ethicus** in our daily living so that our descendants may learn to do all their relational living, their thinking and their creative doings mostly in the spontaneous in pleasure of effortlessness and effortless action?*

Living has no purpose

In the course of our history we human beings have reflected on our living in the attempt to explain our origin and history, and we have done so generating many different explanatory theories under the view that we inhabit a cosmos that exists independently of what we do. In the process of generating these theories we have introduced explanatory notions such as purpose and goal as if they were fundamental ordering elements intrinsic to the operation of natural processes, particularly in what refers to what happens with living beings. Yet, if we reflect on our biological condition we discover that what we in fact do in all our explanations is to use the operational-relational coherences of our doings in our living to explain the operational-relational coherences of our doings in our living, and we also discover that we generate the cosmos that we live as we explain our living with the operational-relational coherences of our living without ever using, or needing to use, the notions of purpose and goal as explanatory arguments. And that this is so and that we can do all that we may wish to do without ever needing the notions of purpose, aim or finality, is one of the greatest wonder of our existence.

Living has no purpose or meaning. Human living as a biological happening has no purpose or meaning; yet, we human beings as conscious languaging biologic-cultural living beings generate networks of conversations that give meaning and purpose in our living. And as we generate purpose and meaning in our living, we generate the possibility of finding ourselves consciously or unconsciously immersed in networks of conversation with which we justify our simultaneous living with contradictory desires, purposes or motives that we feel are all valid at the same time even though we know that they cannot be so. We find ourselves desiring what we do not want to desire because we know that they cannot be.

In our biologic-cultural living we human beings exist in networks of conversations generating the different domains of recursive networks of consensual coordinations of coordinations of inner feelings, emotions, doings and reflections that constitute the worlds that we generate as we live them. The operational-relational diversity and complexity of the networks of conversations that we live result in recursive change and transformation of our psyche and bodyhood in such a way that the worlds that we live extend as much as our psyche and body in their dimensions of beauty and ugliness, curiosity and indifference, generosity and egoism, theories and practices. And it is from these dualities of beauty and ugliness, curiosity and indifference, generosity and egoism, theory and practice possible in our living in networks of conversations that this manner of living is both our greatest treasure and our bane.

Awareness

We human beings claim that we chose to do what we like to do and that we chose not to do what we do not like to do according to the inner feelings that we live in the networks of conversations in which we do what we do. Thus, an observer that looks at us will say that we like doing what we do or that we do not like doing what we do according to the pleasure or displeasure that he or she sees in us as he or she observes us doing what we do. Moreover, the observer that beholds us will say that we do what we do with pleasure or displeasure according to the different configurations of inner feelings that evoke in us at any moment the different networks of conversations that we have learned along our lives as children, adults or old persons as a matter of course, in the communities in which we have lived, or that evoke in us the theories that we have accepted from others, or that we have developed in the intimacy of our reflections. What we like or do not like, what we desire or do not desire, what we accept or do not accept, what we think and how we think what we think, are aspects of our biologic-cultural living that arise in the networks of conversations that we live and of what we reflect or do not reflect according to the configurations of inner feelings that we have learned to live as we lived in them. In these circumstances it is only to the extent that we operate as human beings conscious of our living in open or closed networks of conversations in which we have learned the doings and inner feelings of reflecting on what we do and what we feel, that we can realize that we can do **without effort** what we are doing **with effort** and that we have the ability for recovering our acting without effort when we have lost it.

Thus, acting in **effort** appears in our living only when in our reflexive conversations we find ourselves living contradictory desires, that is, not wanting to do what we do, and doing what we do not want to do in displeasure. Similarly, acting **without effort** appears in our living only when in our reflexive conversations we find ourselves living without contradictory desires, doing what we want to do in the pleasure of doing what we want to do it. Yet, we are mostly not aware that we always do what we want to do,

even when we say that we do not want to do what we do, and also that we are frequently not aware that when we act in **effort** and we do what we do not want to do, we do it because we want to conserve something that we do not want to lose. Finally, it is only as self-conscious reflecting human beings that we can be aware that we are acting **in effort** when we are acting **in effort**, and that we can be aware that we can regain our acting in **no-effort** when we have lost it.

Hell or paradise?

When we attend at our cultural traditions we find that when we speak of living in **hell** we refer to a living submerged in two networks of contradictory conversations that generate in us a double feeling of guilt: in one we feel guilty because we have consciously or unconsciously submitted, in an act of lack of self respect and lack of self love, to a cultural demand that we accept as morally valid but which we consider to be not ethical; in the other we feel guilty because we did not have the courage to disobey the moral demand and to follow instead, in an act of self respect and self love, our ethical consciousness because we wanted to conserve something that we would otherwise lose. When this happens to us the negation of self-respect and self-love that living in **guilt** entails leads us to become ill in body and soul as biologic-cultural beings. At the same time when in our cultural tradition we speak of living in **paradise** we refer to a living in self-respect and self-love in non-contradictory networks of conversations that continuously generate in us a spontaneous well-being of being in operational-relational coherence in all the dimensions of our living with some transcendental inspiration through find ourselves continuously in the conscious and unconscious harmony of doing what we want to do in the pleasure of doing it. When this happens to us as a spontaneous aspect of our daily living, we live the body and soul of the well being of a non-contradictory living in the organism-niche unity of our biologic-cultural living. In our present daily living acting **in effort** feels like **hell** and acting **without effort** feels like **paradise**.

Our daily living, however, is not usually even, and although we would like to live continuously in the inner feelings of **paradise** living in networks of conversations in which we find ourselves doing what we do without contradictory desires, in the inner harmony in which the demoniac temptations of wanting to do something different from what we are doing does not arise, we frequently find ourselves living in networks of conversations in which we find ourselves not wanting to do what we do, and we live in the inner feelings of **hell**. Much of the cultural history of our ancestors has occurred in the conscious attempt to generate networks of conversations through which **effortless acting** would appear as a spontaneous aspect of daily living. Thus, practices such as praying, meditation, body-psyche exercises such as yoga and martial arts, to mention a few of modern ones, are all practices grounded in networks of conversations aimed at attaining **acting** or living in **effortlessness**. Indeed, much of religious art in the last four or five thousand years has had to do with this purpose, either in the intent of evoking in us the well being of acting without effort, or of showing us the pains of **hell** when we fall in the demonic temptation of contradictory desires, or of the **effort** of acting **without effort** through the belief in some infallible methodology.

The **hell** or **inferno** of acting with **effort** arises in us when we consciously or unconsciously immerse ourselves in a network of conversations that obscure our reflective vision and trap us in continuous recursive conversations that generate in our daily living an unconscious background of inner feelings of self-depreciation, lack of self-respect and lack of self-love in which we do not see our constitutive biologic-cultural loving nature. However, if a network of conversations that obscures our inner vision of our loving biologic-cultural nature puts us in the **hell** of living without self-respect and self-love, another network of conversations can take us out of **hell** by expanding our vision and understanding of our biologic-cultural existence as fundamentally loving-ethic reflexive human beings permitting us to recover our self-respect and self-love see that we were mistaken about self-devaluation.

Liberating conversations

It is a feature of our existence as human beings that we live immersed in networks of conversations in which the inner feelings of **paradise** and the inner feelings of **hell (inferno)** can appear as aspects of our daily living. Indeed, the inner feelings of pain and suffering are frequent aspects of our daily living in the patriarchal-matriarchal culture in which we are presently immersed, inner feelings which are, perhaps, much more frequent than the inner feelings of well-being and joy. Thus, the pains for which we human beings ask for relational help are always of cultural origin. When a human being lives in some moment of his or her life a negation of love under the form of a degrading aggression in a cultural background of conversations that seem to justify the aggressor, and the person that lived such an aggression believes the cultural justification, he or she will most likely conserve the inner feeling of degradation that the aggression generated in her as an unconscious network of conversation of self-devaluation which

as a stationary configuration of inner feelings of self-depreciation penetrates all that he or she does in his or her daily living. At the same time, it is also a constitutive feature of our existence as human beings that we are always capable of generating at any moment a network of reflective conversations through which the **hell** of the inner feelings of believing the cultural justification of the self-depreciation in which we may be immersed can disappear in the recovery of the inner feelings of self-respect and self-love that leads to **acting without effort** and the inner feelings of **paradise**.

One of us, Ximena Dávila Yáñez, has proposed to name **reflexive liberating conversations**, or **liberating conversations** with therapeutic consequences, those reflexive conversations that result in the dissolution of the intimate personal conversations that justify the unconscious or conscious inner feelings of self-depreciation in which it is not possible the reflection that opens the path out of the **hell** of living in the feelings of self-devaluation, guilt or shame. The liberating conversations are reflexive conversation in which the recovery of self-respect in self-love expands or opens in us the vision and understanding of our biologic-cultural loving nature in a way that permits us to choose to do what we want to do as ethical-loving autonomous human beings, if we want to.

7-How do we want to live?

Meta-systemic Law # 24:

Center of the cosmos

"Every living being lives it's living as the center of the cosmos. Or, in other words, every living being acts as if it were living in the center of a relational-operational matrix that arises with its living, operational-relational matrix which in human living constitutes the biológico-cultural matrix of his or her existence as a living being that lives in language and conversations".

We human beings exist in an anthroposphere that we generate with our living. As such the anthroposphere is the ecological domain that arises with our living in the biosphere as the operational-relational biológico-cultural domain in which we realize and conserve our living. Moreover, the anthroposphere as the ecological domain of our human existence is part of the biosphere that arises also in our living as the domain of all the biological happenings that we distinguish through all that we do in the realization of our living. So, all that we human beings do as biológico-cultural living beings in our daily living, be these fantasies, science, religions, technologies or daily home chores, arise as aspects of the anthroposphere and the biosphere in the realization of the cosmos that we human beings generate when we explain our living. Furthermore, all that we do and feel as biológico-cultural human beings takes place in the locality of the multidimensionality of our daily living in the continuous generation of the anthroposphere that we generate with what we feel and do in our living.

It is here in the anthroposphere, where we find our selves living at every instant either in **paradise** or in **hell**, it is here in the anthroposphere, where we find ourselves desiring to live in **paradise** only, and where we find ourselves in the continuous uncertainty of the possible arising of the unexpected temptations that that will plunge us into **hell**. Frequently in our present times we do not believe that love may provide us with the wisdom and strength that we think that we need to live in **paradise**, and we frequently think that perhaps it could be easier to generate **paradise** through the design of a relational-operational space that would specify all that human beings could do, so that they would never find themselves living in contradictory desires. After all, we frequently say to some other persons that could be our children, our friends, or our enemies, that we know what is good for them. Human history is full of cases in which communities, societies or countries, have been seduced or forced to accept the "inspiring" philosophical, political or scientific idea of some manner of coexistence whose creators claim that it will bring well-being to all human beings through the design of a **paradise** in which all human needs and desires would be satisfied without emotional contradictions.

Reflexive question

How it is that all those attempts have failed, or eventually always fail in doing what they are "**designed**" to do?

As we showed above, being in **paradise** occurs as a particular configuration of inner feelings in reflexive freedom that the members of a community of autonomous human beings live when they have presence, are seen and listened, and can act choosing what they do according to their taste and preferences, and are not coerced by a set of previously designed operational-relational conditions that specify what they can do and what they cannot do. A person can be in **paradise** only in the silence of the inner feelings of the consciousness that she can chose what to do without being physically or chemically manipulated. Any attempt to design the manner of coexistence of the members of a human community by specifying all that they can do and cannot do with the purpose of assuring that they should always live in well-being, results always in that the living in that community becomes an **inferno**.

Reflexive question

What manner of living do we want to live?

Paradise and **hell** are individual experiences that occur in the deep solitude of our inner feelings, however, whichever may be our manner of living, or whichever may be the way we want to live, we as human beings always live in some human community which is unavoidable influenced by the relational ripples that we generate in its psychic space¹⁹ with the way we live. We think that nobody wants the certain **hell** of the path of "social design", we think that all human beings, consciously or unconsciously want to follow the path of the biology of love with the expansion of vision that it brings to our inner feelings the understanding of our biológico-cultural existence.

We influence the psychic space of the community we integrate with the way we live as members of it, and, recursively, the psychic space of the community in which we live influences the way we live in it. And it is in the flow of this never-ending recursive dynamics of change and transformation that we can chose to live in **paradise** rather than in **hell** if we want to conserve **love** as the fundament of our doings in the conscious and unconscious realization and conservation of the autonomy and freedom of a continuous co-inspiration for living together in collaboration in self and mutual respect. It is only in the domain of inner feelings that constitute the psychic space of love that we can chose to do this and participate in the generation of an anthroposphere that arises in harmony with the biosphere as a common project that recursive gives us freedom and autonomy for the realization and conservation of such common project in the midst of the continuous changing present of the cosmos that we generate as we explain our living with the operational-relational coherences our living.

8- Synthesis

Systemic Law # 5:

In the experience we do not distinguish between what we shall later call perception or illusion.

"Living beings live as valid all that they live at the instant that they live it"

"Anything that we do in our daily living without emotional contradiction and in complete sensory, operational and relational coherence with the circumstances in which we find ourselves in the moment in which we do what we do, we do it without effort and we live it as an effortless action regardless of how much energy we spent in doing it".

Effortless actions happen when one does what one does in the pleasure of doing it, without competing in the intimate feeling of play. Indeed, one is in the intimate feeling of play when one does what one does fully attending to what one is doing in the present, without past or future, conscious of the

¹⁹ When we are speaking of **relational waves** in the psychic space we want to use an evocative image of the multidimensionality of the configurations of reciprocal influences that occur between living beings in general, and among human beings in particular, that are not assignable to a particular mode of interaction or encounter between them. No doubt there is no influence without interaction or encounter that triggers structural changes among the participants of the meeting. We do not know all the possible dimensions of interactions between living beings, between living beings and non-living entities, or between non-living entities, but we do see their effects in the areas we observe them.

circumstances in which one is doing what one is doing, aware of the possible desirable and undesirable results of what one does, but without being distracted in the doing by the wish that one may have that of obtaining the result that one wants to obtain. And how does one enter in the flow of inner feelings in which one does what one does in the operational-relational well-being of being in play? The operational-relational well-being of doing what one does in the inner feeling of play happens in the operational-relational harmony that occurs when one acts from the **center of oneself** as one does what one does without contradictory desires.

The experience of **effort** in what one does is not related to the nature of what one is doing, nor does it depend on the magnitude of the energy needed to complete the desired task. The experience of **effort** occurs as a configuration of inner feelings that appears in a person in the course of its living when he or she finds him or herself holding opposing desires under the general form of feeling that he or she both wants and does not want to do what he or she is doing. That this is so is apparent in the following commentaries and complaints expressed by persons that find themselves torn in the emotional conflict of at the same time wanting and not wanting to do what they are doing: "I have to do it"; "It would be terrible if I did not finish this task, I must do it even though I am tired and I do not wish to do it". These commentaries reveal that the person that is doing them feels unexpectedly extremely tired or exhausted but is not aware that this is the result of finding him or herself continuously trying to overcome his or her own emotional resistance to do what he or she is doing because he or she does not want to do it. As a matter of fact, this is precisely what is happening with us when we say that we find ourselves doing what we do not want to do because we do not dare not to do what we do not want to do because we do not wish to lose something that we want to conserve.

Whenever we feel unduly exhausted with what we do it is because we are acting immersed in contradictory emotions, and we find ourselves in effort because we fear the relational consequences that would arise if we were to do to what we know we should do according our inner feelings. Indeed, this is precisely what is happening when we say that we are doing what we do not want to do because we do not dare not to do what we do not want to do. And who asks us to do or not to do what we do not want to do? Perhaps it is our couple, our children, our boss, or the network of conversations of the culture in which we realize the living that we live? Perhaps it is our own self-demands, or our hearing invitations as commands?

As we said above, we find ourselves in **effortless actions** when we find ourselves in inner harmony and we do what we do in a flow of relational and operational coherences with the circumstances in which we find ourselves doing what we do, seeing them as they appear in the now of the changing present that we are living in a way not distorted by fears, expectations, demands, mistrusts impatience urgencies. When those distortions do not arise, or when they disappear, effortless actions occur as acts of spontaneous poetic inspiration from the center of oneself, in a relational-operational flux of unconscious doings which happens as a matter of course even though it is done in full consciousness of what is being done.

The emotional contradictions that give rise in us human beings to the configurations of inner feelings that we live as **acting in effort**, arise and occur in the relational domains of conflicting desires that we generate and conserve in the conscious or unconscious conversations with which we justify or negate the validity of what we do, want to do or do not want to do, in our living as languaging beings. That is, the tiredness, the exhaustion, the feeling of reduction of our intelligent and creative behaviors, that we live when we do what we do in effort, arise in the feeling of self negation and obligation that we live through the theories with which we justify as languaging human beings our doing what we do not want to do. And this is our daily living in the patriarchal-matriarchal culture that we live, as this is a culture centered in relations of domination, submission, competition, mistrust and control.

Therefore, since acting in **effort** arises in our daily living when we submit to the dictates of theories that justify our living in contradictory emotions that we do not want to live, acting with effort will dissolve, and effortless actions will appear, only if we change that manner of living abandoning those theories while we recover our autonomy of choice through asking ourselves in the domain of self-respect and self-love whether we want to do or we do not want do, what we do. **Effortlessness** or **effortless actions** occur only under the inner harmony of living in the domain of self-respect and the respect for the other of the biology of love because love is the only operational-relational domain in which we can see when others or we are living without emotional contradiction in the responsibility of choice. That is, **effortlessness** and, therefore, living in **paradise**, occurs only when one does what one does in self respect, acting in the operational-relational harmony that arises when there is love in one's own living and one can be aware of his or her inner feelings without being trapped in the temptation of vanity in that can appear in the blindness generated in the joy of that awareness.

We think that humanness arose some three million years ago when the consensual forms of the coordinations of doings, inner feelings and emotions of the daily living of a permanent little group of bipedal primates that lived in the pleasure of doing together whatever they did in the gathering and sharing food and the joy of sexual intimacy in the domain of love in mutual care and tenderness, begun to be conserved from one generation to the next in the learning of the children. That is, we think that the human lineage must have arisen with the spontaneous constitution of **the ancestral family** as a close domain of stable nearness that made possible the arising of what we could now say was the beginning of the living together in the consensual recursive coordinations of doings, inner feelings and emotions that is our living in languaging and conversations.

What we are saying is that if we observe our daily living we can see that humanness exists as a manner of consensual living that is systemically conserved from one generation to the next in the learning of the children. And with this we are saying that what defines humanness is not a particular genetic constitution, but that it is the manner of living that is conserved from one generation to the next in the systemic realization and reproduction of the singular **organism-niche dynamic relational unity** that constitutes our operational-relational identity as human beings. In the history of a lineage the dynamic organism-niche relational unity that is conserved through systemic reproduction guides the course of the evolutionary drift of the genetic configuration that makes possible its realization and conservation. In fact, a lineage of living systems only exists in the realization and conservation through systemic reproduction of the dynamic relational organism-niche unity that constitutes its particular identity.

In these circumstances our living in consensual coordinations of coordinations of doings, inner feelings and emotions, that living in languaging and conversations is, has become recursively transformed from the beginning of our evolutionary history in our niche, and is now the central aspect of the operational-relational domain that constitutes the dynamic relational organism-niche unity in which our human living is realized and conserved. Moreover, the conservation of the dynamic organism-niche relational unity that defines through its systemic reproduction our lineage as living beings that exist in languaging and conversation, has guided the course of the evolutionary drift of the genetic configuration that makes possible the realization and conservation of our living in the changing cultural worlds that we generate as different manners of human habitation in the biosphere under the form of the many different networks of conversations that constitute the anthroposphere that we generate with our daily living. In other words, we think that to the extent that the origin of humanness must have happened in the arising of the ancestral family as a domain of sharing food, coordination of doings, inner feelings and emotions in a loving coexistence around a female that gave stability and permanence to the group, the consensual forms of coordinations of doings and emotions could be spontaneously conserved from one generation to the next in the learning of the children, humanness has been from its origin a **biologico-cultural** manner of living.

In accordance with all that we have said we think that at the arising of our lineage the children of the first generations were already immersed in the basic human psychic space of sharing and collaboration in the dynamics of love of the family living in which living in languaging and conversations begun. We wish to call **Homo sapiens-amans amans** this fundamental-basic psyche or manner of living of our ancestors that as it was conserved in their evolutionary drift through systemic reproduction since its origin some three million years ago until now under the form of an operational-relational configuration of consensual doings and inner feelings has constituted the biológico-cultural psychic identity of our lineage.

And with this name we want to evoke the fundamental operational-relational manner of living that has defined and constituted us as human beings since then, and around which has arisen all the diversity and complexity of all the different cultural forms that have existed and exist now in our lineage. And we want to give this name to our psychic biológico-cultural lineage because we think that only **love** could have been the emotional fundament (in *Homo sapiens-amans amans*) that made possible the psychic space of a coexistence in the recursive consensual coordinations of doings, inner feelings and emotions, that made possible the arising of languaging and conversations as the manner of living in the **interlacing of emotions and rationality** that has defined from its beginning our human living (in *Homo sapiens-amans amans*).

Furthermore, we want to give this name to our psychic biológico-cultural lineage because we think that **love** (in *Homo sapiens-amans amans*) is the only emotion that could make possible, and which still makes possible the conservation from one generation to the next of the operational-relational configuration of the joy of the body nearness and intimacy in the well-being of co-inspiration and

collaboration that constitute the recursive living in languaging and conversation as the coherent living in the biological-cultural psychic being **Homo sapiens-amans amans** that we still are.

Reflexive questions:

Do you know the temptation **Homo sapiens-amans arrogans**?
Do you know the temptation **Homo sapiens-amans agressans**?

The manner of living that constitutes humanness as a biológico-cultural living in closed and open networks of conversations is not in its fundament as a living in recursive consensual coordinations of doings and inner feelings, something extraordinary in the domain of animal coexistence in general. What is peculiar in the origin, realization and conservation of the manner of living of the members of our lineage, is the coincidence of the delicate manipulation with the fingers, the use of the hand as a caressing organ and the enjoyment of the body nearness and intimacy, and the conservation of the pleasure of living together in small groups united by the sensuality and tenderness of sexual intimacy in relation with a female that wants that intimacy as a continuous and permanent relation of mutual care. When this happened with some female of our ancestors, that female became the fundament of a manner of living in languaging and conversation that begun to be conserved from one generation to the next in the learning of the children as a family lineage that remained open to the transformation and change of the operational-relational living that the consensuality of the recursive coordinations of doings, intimate feelings and emotions, make possible as the historical drift of increasing complexity that we live.

Our ancestors must have initially lived in **effortlessness** as a matter of course, in a spontaneous unconscious harmony with the circumstances of their living as languaging beings. And we think that that manner of living must have begun to be lost in the daily life of our ancestors as the expansion of their self-consciousness in the increasing complexity and diversification of the domains of doings and self-distinctions that were unavoidably taking place in their living in conversations, lead them to develop theories and rational systems of explanations with the operational-relational coherences of their doings and inner feelings that begun to operate as the guiding fundaments of their operational-relational feelings, doings and of their thinking. The **effortless living** of our ancestors as they lived it without a reflective awareness of its effortless happening was not a living in **paradise** because living in paradise occurs in the consciousness of living it with the continuous possibility of losing it, without being aware that the **paradise** is lost at the arising of the temptation of not wanting to see that one is living in a conflict of contradictory desires in the unaware feeling that one simultaneously wants and does not want to do what one is doing. The arising of unconscious contradictory desires makes daily living a living in **effort** that becomes a living in **hell** when one becomes aware of the loss of effortlessness in daily life in the deep desire of recovering living in paradise. Furthermore, we also think that it is *due to the systemic-systemic conservation of the habit of our ancestors of explaining, describing and justifying the different aspects of their living with theories, explanatory systems and methodologies that would assure their desired results* still present in our daily cultural living, that now **effortlessness** or **effortless action** cannot arise easily as an aspect of our spontaneous human manner of living. However, since we wish to live the well-being that we imagine as the **lost paradise**, we look for it with passion and dedication, and we enter without noticing it in the paradox of not being able to live the **lost paradise** precisely because we enter in the **effort** of recovering it through the impeccable application of what we believe is the adequate method for obtaining it.

We think that In these circumstances living in **effortlessness** cannot now arise as a spontaneous aspect of our daily life if we do not consciously abandon our belief in that our quest for inner and relational harmony in our living must be guided by methods and explanatory theories that we believe can secure our success in what we do because of their operational validity. And we will not be able to do so if we do not become aware that **love** is the only configuration of inner feelings or relational-operational domain that can open in our living the possibility of our doing whatever we do spontaneously in **effortlessness** without ever losing our awareness and understanding of what we do in the moment that we do it. Acting **without effort** requires that we have the audacity of abandoning the conversations of domination and submission, of mistrust and control, that we consciously or unconsciously generate, realize and conserve as natural aspects of our living in the psyche of the patriarchal-matriarchal culture in which we are presently immersed, and that we have the courage of replacing them by conversations of co-inspiration and collaboration in the pleasure of doing together what we do together in mutual respect. To do this is possible now only if we are consciously willing to live our daily

living always from the inner feelings of the basic psychic unity of **love and ethics** as the operational-relational fundament of all that we do as human beings. In these circumstances we would like to call **Homo sapiens-amans ethicus**²⁰ this new psychic form of human existence that would arise if we consciously chose to act in the domain of **love-ethics** in all that we do in the awareness that we generate the worlds that we live with our living them. Do we want and dare to intentionally become **Homo sapiens-amans ethicus** in all the dimensions of our daily living, so that our descendants may learn to do all that they do in their operational-relational living as a spontaneous flow of effortless actions, feelings and thinking? To do this is possible now only if we are willing to intentionally orient ourselves in our daily living to continuously have the unity of love and ethics as the operational-relational fundament of whatever we do.

Reflexive question.

Is all this a theoretical or an experiential reflexion?

Which would be the difference?

What we say is not a theory, not a biological-cultural discourse that pretends to become a foundational philosophical proposition and not an ethical or moral doctrine, it is a corroboration of the operational-relational character of all that happens and may happen as we operate as human living systems. Regardless of whether we like this or not, all that happens in our human existence happens in the realization of our living as human beings and occurs in our living in the realization of the networks of reflexive conversations that constitute the fundament of our conscious and unconscious human existence. All the thinking and acting of what we call science, art, literature, politics, domestic life, physics, biology, technology, dreams, fantasies, cybernetic, near death experiences, encountering with the beyond, ... that is, all human activities and experiences, all doing, thinking or imagining, only occurs and can occur as aspects of the realization of human daily living.

When a person speaks of his or her experiences she speaks of his or her inner feelings and of what she says that she has lived through those inner feelings, and we cannot say to her that she has not felt or lived what she says that she felt or lived unless we claim that she is laying. In other words, no human experience can be denied under the claim that the person that describes it did not feel what she says that she felt as she lived it; similarly, no explanatory proposition of the experience lived can be denied as an explanatory proposition. In these circumstances one can only be in legitimate agreement or disagreement with the criteria of validity used to accept or reject what is proposed as an explanation for the experience lived, not with what the person says that he or she lived. What we accept or reject as valid in our living depends on what we accept or reject as valid in our explanations, our justifications, our desires, and these depend on the manner we live what we live according to how we answer our questions according to the criteria of validity that we use to accept or reject what we accept or reject. In any case, the ultimate fundament of all that we do, feel or think is always the same, the operational-relational coherences of our daily living-feeling even though we are not always aware of this or accept that this is so. All that happens to us happens to us in the realization of our daily living, and when we stop living we stop happening.

What would happen with the other human beings we die? Any answer that we may propose we will propose it from the perspective of our living, and will make sense only as it rests in the wonder-full trust that we may have in that many of the worlds that we bring forth in our living will continue in our absence following some course of transformation that may be comprehensible to us because is not alien to our domain of existence. On this trust we can say that the other human beings will live whatever they live in the realization of their living. And we can say that they will live in **paradise** or in **hell** according to the flow of their living, and that they will generate in their living the worlds or the cosmos that they happen to live, whether alone or with others that may arise in their living as aspects of their living. If we had died, we would not exist anymore even if some memory of us still lingered in the inner feelings of those that still conserved in their living some remembrance of us. Human living occurs as it happens, and in this happening the reflexive question about how human living happens will arise in many occasions in the process of explaining-understanding the cosmos that arises as the human manner of living that explain the human living of those that accept that explaining. If the human lineage disappears, nothing will henceforth have human meaning.

²⁰ See: "Habitare Humano en seis ensayos de biología-cultural" Authors Ximena Dávila Y. y Humberto Maturana R. Sáez Editores, Santiago, Chile, 2008.

Reflexive questions:

How do we live our living, lone and with others?

How do we want to live our living alone and with others?

9- Innocent reflections

Meta-systemic law # 30:

Invitation

"An invitation is an invitation when there is no blame for not accepting it"

At the end of this essay we wish to invite you and us, to reflect on what we have said, and in the only act that mobilizing our inner feelings and our reasoning would permit us, if in an act of self respect we accept the legitimacy of the present that we live, to become aware of where we are and of where we want to be, and in an expansion of our vision, find the path out of where we are if we so wish.

Reflexive questions

What culture do we want to generate and conserve in our daily living?

What do we want to do in the antroposphere, in the biosphere or in the cosmos that we generate with our living?

What network of conversations do we want to generate as our habitat in the operational-relational unity organism-niche that arises with our living?

What world do we want to live and to conserve in our living?

Do we want or we do not want to participate in the cultural present that we live in the art of the continuous conscious creation of the well being of living without effort that arises in our daily living when we consciously live in the psychic unity of love-ethics of **Homo sapiens-amans ethicus** living?

As we have already said, living is the continuous realization of the autopoiesis, and the continuous realization of the autopoiesis is living. Living occurs spontaneously as a continuously changing present in the continuous flow of the molecular changes of the dynamic architecture of the realization of the autopoiesis in zero time. When we as observers speak of an organism we are connoting a living being operating as a totality as it realizes its living in the relational-operational domain that makes it possible as its niche. The particular ontogenic configuration of the operational-relational dynamics of the organism-niche unity that arises in this way is to what we refer when we speak as observers of the **manner of living** of some kind of organism. When the particular **manner of living** of an organism begins to be conserved from one generation to the next through the systemic reproduction of the operational-relational organism-niche relation that realizes it, a lineage arises. In these circumstances, what has guided and guides the course of the evolutionary drift of the different classes of living beings has been and is the systemic reproductive conservation of the realization of the operational-relational dynamic configuration of the organism-niche unity that constitutes in each class of organisms **its particular manner of living**. This, of course, is our case too. Our human lineage arose when in a family of bipedal primates some three million years ago begun to be conserved from generation to generation through the systemic reproduction of the **ontogenic organism-niche** dynamic relation that realizes it, the manner of living together in recursive networks of conversations that became henceforth the central aspect of the operational-relational dynamics of the manner of living **Homo sapiens-amans amans** that constitutes our humanness. Humanness is our manner of being organisms that live in networks of

conversations in which they operate as observers observing their living and observing themselves as they observe their observing their living. Since the living of an organism occurs as its relational-operation in its niche as its manner of living, it is in the operational-relational living of an organism in its niche where an observer can see when it conserves its well-being as the harmony of its inner feelings, doings and emotions in the realization of its manner of living, or when losing this harmony it loses its well-being and eventually dies.

We human beings arise as observers in the act of observing, in the happening of living in the reflexive experience of distinguishing what we do and what happens to us as we operate in languaging. We live the act of observing in the inner feeling that that which arises with our distinctions was there prior to our distinguishing it. These inner feelings constitute the sensorial fundament of what we want to evoke when we speak of reality as that which we deem to exist with independency of our distinguishing it. Yet, we human beings can reflect on what we feel, on what we think and on what we do, and thus ask ourselves about the fundamentals of what we feel, think and do. Thus, one of the most fundamental reflexive question that we can ask ourselves is, do I like the living I am living? And then, regardless of the answer to the previous question, we can also ask ourselves, do I like what I say that I like? do I like my liking or not liking what I say that I like or that I do not like?

As we reflect we generate a new world that as we distinguish it becomes part of our experience, and we begin to live it. Experience is what an observer distinguishes as happening to him or her, and what an observer does not see as an aspect of what happens to him or her in his or her living, is not an aspect of his or her experience. The act of reflecting occurs as an act in the emotioning-feelings that consists in releasing one's certainties disposing oneself to look at the present that one is living without prejudices, expectations or demands. As we reflect we live a change in our relational space as well as the transformation of our inner feelings and domain of doings. When I ask myself a reflexive question my domain of existence changes and I cannot return to where I was before. If we reflect about our living and we ask ourselves, for example, a question such as, **how do we do what we do?** we do not know where we shall arrive. Every act of reflection is a demoniac invocation that can be threatening because it arises from the destruction of the protection of our certainties, but which can also be a source of liberation as it offers us a treasure of expansion of consciousness if we dare to live it. There is no doubt that in the change of world that we live with the act of reflection we may find ourselves in the **malaise** of **acting with effort** trapped by the demons of pride and vanity in the search for success, but we will always find in the depth of the change of word that we live the hidden treasure of the autonomy and freedom that gives us the consciousness of knowing that we know where we are in the present that we are living, and with this the possibility of the **well-being** of **acting without effort** from the vision that love brings.

If we become aware through our reflections that we want to **orient ourselves** from the **vision of love** to the living in the **well-being of acting without effort** releasing our certainties, expectations, demands and judgments, we can come out of any trap in which we may find ourselves in our inner feelings, desires and doings no matter how adverse the circumstances that we live such as poverty in its different material and spiritual dimensions, or of the impotence that generates in us our own illness of the illness of some one that we love. The act of reflection entails opening our hand releasing our certainties in a continuous dynamic of detachment through which we find ourselves sliding in our living without ultimate truths, open to a living together in a world of inter-objectivities in which many realities arise and in which we can choose which we want and which we do not want to live.

Furthermore, as we reflect on our own living we can become conscious of the **malaise** that generates in us our acting with effort or doing what we in the absence of love because we do not want to do it. Moreover, as we reflect we can also become aware that we unconsciously or consciously generate, realize and conserve that **malaise** as a manner of living that has progressively transformed from a living in occasional pain into a legitimate natural daily existence in continuous suffering. As we orient our living from the configuration of inner feelings of the **malaise** of **acting in effort** as we act in the negation of love, we enter in a self-destructive recursive process that takes us in the path of the disintegration of the harmony of our relational living with ourselves, with others and the cosmos that we generate with our living, without being aware that we enter in a destructive course of human life itself.

Life and death go together as an indivisible unity in the living of every living being, and, therefore, of every human being. We human beings are not different from all other living beings as molecular autopoietic systems. It is only in our peculiar manner of living as reflexive languaging beings that we can generate both, theories with which we justify discriminations that lead to the opposition-aggression between different cultures or classes of human beings, and the vision of love that leads us to live the

wonder of human diversity in the co-inspiration and collaboration without effort that that vision makes possible.

When an observer speaks of **love**, he or she connotes a domain of relational behaviors in which the participants do together what they do together open to listen to each other while they do what they do in the pleasure of doing it without demands or expectations, with an inner feeling of full legitimacy in their living together. We usually connote this manner of being in our daily living by speaking of **well-being** in the pleasure of being human beings enjoying their reflecting together. **Acting without effort** occurs as we live loving what we do because we want to do what we do, and this is possible only if we find ourselves operating in the harmony of our inner feelings, emotions and doings that occurs when we act from the center of ourselves in self-respect without expectations, prejudices or demands. If we reflect on how we do what we do we can become aware that even when we say that do not want to do what we do, we always do what we do because we want to do it because we want to conserve something that we feel is central or valuable for our living. **Love** as **acting without effort** is not kindness, solidarity or compassion, **love** is to act fully present in what one does without demands and without expectations in self-respect and respect for the others. We human beings are primary **loving** beings from our fundamental biological constitution. Any historical or present deviation in the conservation of this fundament in our daily living has been and is the result of our acceptance as valid the networks of theoretic, philosophical or religious conversations with which we justify the negation of love, and that we consciously or unconsciously generate in our cultural living.

All that we human beings do we do it in networks of conversations. All cultural living occurs as a closed network of conversations that is learned, realized, cultivated and conserved in daily living, and as such it can be changed in an act of reflection in which as one releases one's certainties one asks oneself if one wants to continue living the manner of living that one is living and that one says that one wants to live. Do I want to continue living the manner of living that I am living? The manner of living that we live alone and with others arises from our intimate inner feelings and our operational-relational conscious and unconscious desires, and it is, therefore always both the result of what we want to conserve and our responsibility.

To the extent that we do as human beings occurs in networks of conversations, any transformation or change of the world that we live will happen as a change or transformation in the networks of conversations that we live. Accordingly, if we want to change or transform the world that we are living we must change the networks of conversations that we generate in our conscious and unconscious daily living. And we must do so in an act of reflection that permits us to see and understand the world that we generate in our living, because it is only from that vision and understanding that we can have the reflexive and acting autonomy that would permit us chose in a conscious manner the manner of living that we want to live. Do I want to go on living the living I am living?