

This paper was sent to and received by
Professor Humberto Maturana
Matriztic Institute
Santiago
Chile
and he graciously acknowledged it.

The Santiago Theory – a Revisit, Part II

by
Dennis K. Chong & Jennifer K. Smith Chong ©

In this paper, the male pronoun will apply to either gender.
The nominal pronoun will apply to the first author.
The plural pronoun will apply to both authors.
The spelling is British English.

We had concluded Part I of our paper in this way:

In Part II, we extend our exploration concerning the relationship between the Santiago Theory and this proposition:
Everything is language or more accurately the language structures of the language.

Meaning arises as a pattern of relationships among these linguistic distinctions, and thus, we exist in a “semantic domain” created by our language.

To be human is to exist in language. In language we coordinate our behaviour, and together in language we bring forth our world. “The world everyone sees,” writes Maturana and Varela, “is not *the* world but a world, which we bring forth with others.

Fritzo Capra: *Web of Life*, A New Scientific Understanding of Living Systems, Anchor Books, Doubleday, 1996,, page 288.

We will now consider this subset.

By the Santiago Theory, the entire position taught by the science of Linguistics¹ changes. There is **no** surface structure that is coded into Deep Linguistic Structure, DLS because there is **no outer reality** as such from which to do so. It is from the semantic items in the **pre-existing** of our Infinite Sensory Data Base, ∞SDB that are coded into DLS. This is done by the pre-existing structures in us, the HOPs and Deep Structure.

It is from this point that our HOPs and Deep Structure will determine which language structures will be used to generate our verbalizations. Of course the question is:

¹ **science of Linguistics changes:**

We are absolutely sure that Linguistics is a science. It is a science because its requisite semantic precisions are at the highest possible scientific tolerances. Consider this sentence: The Cat chased the mouse and it ran. Now, consider this: **The mouse chased the cat and it ran**. The transposition of the nouns entails such a deviation that it is detected immediately. Its error will not be tolerated.

Linguistics teaches that all surface structures of the orthodox external reality is coded into Deep Linguistic Structure. As this paper shows, the Santiago disallows this conclusion.

What are language structures²?

The critical issues of Language Structures were first indexed in this quote:

Everything is language or more accurately the language structures of the language.

Meaning arises as a pattern of relationships among these linguistic distinctions, and thus, we exist in a “semantic domain” created by our language.

To be human is to exist in language. In language we coordinate our behaviour, and together in language we bring forth our world. “The world everyone sees,” writes Maturana and Varela, “is not *the* world but a world, which we bring forth with others.

Fritzo Capra: *Web of Life*, A New Scientific Understanding of Living Systems, Anchor Books, Doubleday, 1996,, page 288.

The quote is indexing that there is a critical difference between what we actually say vs the language structures that determine what we utter. Clearly the latter is meta to the former.

So, as proposed here, the entire Sensory Data Base is coded into Deep Linguistic Structure, DLS.

The HOPs will now determine [in relation to context for a given moment in time](#) what is the language structure to use³.

However the ∞SDB is a derivative from our Universal Physical Records. In a sense it is equivalent to what happened in the first nano second after the Big Bang happened. Suddenly there was the infinity of all the physical elements that were to be configured into the entire reality of the cosmos. From that awesome beginning and after some 16 billion years it was our time to unfold. And this was to happen by the laws that were written into cosmos by the empty set of Perfect Symmetry.

Equivalently, when we came into existence, as Maturana and Varela proposed, at the beginning of our existence there was NOTHING and us and the structures in us. As we proposed in Part I of this paper this NOTHING had to be the empty set of Perfect Symmetry. In the first nano second of our existence we were in the infinity of all the

² **language structures:**

Prior to Capra we had known about the language structures. We researched it. From our research, we arrived at certain conclusions that flew against orthodoxy. Perhaps we were weak, but we chose the course of prudence; we never published our work let alone to declare in any forum that there was such a thing as language structure and that it was the critical variable powered what a person says.

³ **The HOPs will now determine in relation to context for a given moment in time what is the language structure to use:**

This in life is the way of things. However, there is an interesting exception. Have you ever been involved in a discussion that got more and more animated and more and more passionate. Then the moment comes when you are about to say something. This something is on the very tip of your tongue. Suddenly you realize that you cannot say it. To do so will mean catastrophic consequences. Then you tell your HOPs, “No, I am not going to speak these words.” Did you remember the fight you had to finally get out the words that you knew were the better to say. From this we can learn that most times the HOPs run the show but we do have the power to override it if we wish.

physical elements that were to be and could be configured in to the entire reality of our existence.

It was from the structures in us that this entire reality of our existence was our sensory database from the smallest sub-atomic particle to the largest structure yet known in our universe. This was our ∞ SDB. It was this that was coded into our Deep Linguistic Structure.

We now put to you this diagram to show what we have written:

HOPs & DS



∞ pUPR



∞ SDB



DLS



LS

The spear point of our reality is now our language or more critically the [interpretive power](#) of our language. As cited in Part I of this paper we say that his interpretive power of language is a metaphor for our meta function, $m(f)$.

By the witness of self-evidence, our entire semantic reality is a derivative of our interpretations, evaluations, determinations, judgements, conclusions, assertions, and claims. ALL of them are in LANGUAGE. If this is the case, then we logically conclude that our entire functional reality is language. By LANGUAGE we configure our semantic reality and determine the form and manner of our relationships, and chart the possibilities of our lives.

Now we come to a very interesting question.

What is the determinant for the law that will be written in a given person in which his language structures will be pre-eminently excellent with élan and depth and in another it is defective and deficient.

It is not for us to write our answers to this critical question in this paper nor is it the business of this paper to do so. To do so will inevitably track us off into another direction.

However, it is clear that each of us best search for the answer that we can live with. If we do not, we suggest that the very structural semantic base of our being and existence might remain critically flawed. In the end it is everyone's burden to understand the other and how we can continue to share in the fabric of our common destiny.