The Meaning of Code World

By Mark White, MD

Ten years ago I invented a toy that I named Code World. It took several months to actually build this toy and develop it in such a way that it could be used to play the game for which it was intended. Very soon after it was developed, I made a remarkable discovery: Code World is the genetic code, and Life is playing Code World.

What I mean by this is that the logical principles of Code World are also responsible for the logical origin and operation of the molecular processes of Life on Earth.

This discovery is virtually unbelievable to me. I find it almost impossible to believe that such a thing is possible, and equally hard to believe that I would be the one to do such a thing. I expected to eventually find that I was wrong. I expected that somebody at some time would eventually explain to me why this simple idea is fundamentally wrong.

What I never expected was that this discovery would be completely ignored. That is to me the most unbelievable part of the whole thing. Nobody has yet to explain to me why it is wrong, simply because there is absolutely nothing wrong about it.

Perhaps the idea is unimportant.

Regardless, one would think that such a simple idea would at least be provocative. It is an inherently provocative idea. I expected to at least provoke a debate about the idea. Paradoxically, I have found the case to be the exact opposite. In fact, the idea itself seems to be repellent. It repels people and it repels debate. Why is that true?

The most obvious reason that people would not want to engage this idea is because they do not care. That is somewhat understandable. People can choose to not care about anything for any reason. The next most obvious reason is that people cannot understand it; either it is not simple enough, or it is poorly and inadequately explained. Well, I can't imagine how one could make something of this nature much simpler. I can put a Code World in your hand and tell you that it represents the logical process that drives Life on Earth. I will admit that some of my explanations are poor, but I estimate that I have now written close to a million words and made countless illustrations in my best effort to explain the idea. I now feel comfortable in knowing that the explanation is at least adequate.

Perhaps there hasn't been enough effort to engage people with this idea. That is possible too, but here again, I don't see how. People up and down and all across the intellectual spectrum, people all across the globe have strenuously resisted engagement on this idea. Journals will not print the idea. I can't even get the local newspaper to report on it from any angle whatsoever – even merely as the release of a new toy by a local inventor. What is going on here?

Am I simply insane and now merely tilting at windmills? Perhaps.

Personally, I think that the problem that others have with this idea is the same problem that I initially had with it – they just can't believe it.

Something might not be believed because it is false. Or it can be true and simply cannot be believed, for whatever reason. A thing can be factually false, logically false, or it could have false meaning. Perhaps it could have no meaning at all. In other words, it has no relevance to anything that anybody knows or cares about.

Is this idea factually true? Yes, it is. It is consistent with all known empiric evidence in this field. It is more factually correct than all other ideas in this field. The facts are easy, and they are clear.

Is this idea logically true? Yes, it is. But this seems to be where people seem to struggle the most, so I will explain it a bit more here.

Code World the toy has a logic. The logic of Code World preceded the toy. That's how the toy was invented, by first recognizing the logic behind it. The logic of Code World is embedded in the fabric of the universe. It is simple, but it is not intuitively obvious, perhaps.

Every shape has its own logic. From this the shape can generate information, and from that information languages become possible. When two shapes interact, new logic is formed with new information generated and new languages possible. So shapes and their interactions by virtue of their inherent logic create information and languages. This is a logical property of the universe. The universe contains logic, information, and languages that relate solely to the shapes in the universe.

The molecules of Life on Earth were generated by this logic and they operate on it today. This is the logical conclusion I have drawn based on the empiric evidence.

From this we can logically say that Code World is several things at once. It is the logic of shapes in the universe. It is a toy and a game. It is a perfect representation of the concept now known as the genetic code, and it actually redefines that particular concept in a fundamental way. It is the logical process that generates and operates on the Molecules of Life on Earth. It is then logically true to say that Code World is the genetic code, and Life is playing Code World.

So the idea is factually true, and it is logically true. That brings us to the meaning of Code World. People are not entitled to their own facts and logic, but they are certainly entitled to their own meaning. And so am I.

The primary meaning of Code World to me is that the universe is constructed in such a way that Life will logically emerge, develop and evolve. This logic can be understood at the level of the universe – at a point in time before the universe even develops atoms. The same logic applies at the level of atoms when they combine to form molecules. This logic is especially important when molecules begin to form Life, and remains important as those molecules develop and evolve. This logic still remains important in the molecules of Life today. This logic is perfectly symmetrical in both time and space. It extends backward and forward, up and down in all scales of both time and space. How could it not?

That simply is the meaning I take from the idea of Code World, and I think that fundamentally is what repels people from it. I assumed that people would naturally gravitate to a simple idea like this, like I

did, but I was wrong on that point at least. It must simply be human nature to be repelled by ideas like this. I guess I can understand that.

However, this repulsion manifests in many ways which are all some version of this complaint: I don't share your meaning. The most common version of the complaint to me is that I am over-invested in my meaning. Perhaps I am, but it is my meaning, and I'm sticking to it.

The next most common version of this complaint is that there is no relevance to the idea. In other words, they simply don't know and don't care about any of this. It has nothing to do with them and what they are doing. That is a fair complaint. To each his own.

However, if a child wanted to concern himself with learning and understanding the processes of Life in general, and the genetic code in particular, then this idea is entirely relevant. If a teacher wanted to teach this child those things, the idea is more relevant still. If a scientist wanted to study these processes in depth, or wanted to hold forth on them in public forums, I should think the idea would be most relevant - *if for no other reason than to refute it*. It is simply not possible that the meaning of this idea is not relevant, even if it is a false meaning, or especially if it is a false meaning.

So that's precisely where it stands. I have endured ten long years of effort and frustration, and no closer to understanding the nature of the problem at hand. Perhaps there is a flaw in my facts, or a flaw in my logic, in which case I am now merely being comically tortured by a false meaning. I surely would appreciate help in finding those flaws. But in lieu of that, I'm holding to my meaning. It's simply too important. Perhaps somebody can finally put me out of my misery and explain to me where I'm wrong.