

## Coded Information Systems

I am thoroughly enjoying the Information Series by Royal Truman in *J. Creation* 26(3), but would like to offer a perspective that seems to be missing from the works of Werner Gitt that I have read; perhaps Truman will cover this in his Part 4. This concerns Coded Information Systems (CIS; thank you, Royal, for that term) which do not contain an apobetics layer and have no sense of intentionality. This is most easily understood in visual systems.

The CIS is comprised of subsystems linked by communication nodes. When the sun emits visible light, there is no intentionality other than in God's design—the sun itself is not attempting to intelligently communicate. The sun's rays strike a tree and are reflected, causing the information stream to be altered to include attributes of the tree. Again the tree has no intentionality outside of design, and couldn't care less whether anyone is watching or not. Nevertheless, the CIS is at play. The next node, for example, is the human eye. The eye has no intentionality in receiving or retransmitting the message, but it performs its intended function by recoding the message for transmission to the brain. So far, the three nodes have been unwitting participants, and have neither intentionality nor understanding in their participation.

It is at this point that I would offer a different definition of 'information'. What has been transmitted so far is what I would term 'data'. Information is only derived by superimposing an external referential framework called meta-data, i.e. data about data. When the message is received at the brain for processing, it needs to apply other

data not just to decode the message, but to understand it. The reflected light from the tree is interpreted as a specific colour, shape, texture, size, and distance from the eye, but the brain cannot know that this is a 'tree' without being told. At a deeper level of analysis, we should note that sight is not a closed-loop system in that there is no method of verification that what the brain perceives it has seen is the external reality.

This is still an autonomous process with no apobetics layer. If one is lazily lying in the meadow in the noonday sun, the presence of the tree can go entirely unnoticed by the unwitting observer. In this case, intentionality can only arise from within the observer.

This scenario has particular applicability to the evolution narrative, for evolution cannot explain how the sense of sight could evolve. It might also have wider application, but I will leave that for others.

Wayne Talbot  
Kelso, NSW  
AUSTRALIA

### » Royal Truman replies:

I'm pleased to note that Wayne and others are pondering information theoretic matters carefully. The example offered was challenging, since by Coded Information Systems (CIS) I envision seamlessly meshed components consisting of coded messages; signals; engineered components; and preloaded resources and not something as disconnected as the sun's rays beaming in every direction with the next component being an individual eye.

To interpret Wayne's comments, let us keep in mind my observation that the sender and/or receiver can be intelligent or inanimate. Furthermore, it is common to classify information systems as 'push' or 'pull'.

He is right that the sun is not attempting to communicate anything about the tree. His perspective is a *push* system (the sun sends out photons) and it is inanimate. However, it is not sending *coded messages*. Therefore, it is not related to Gitt's model and cannot be required to show apobetics.

Let's re-examine it now as a CIS *pull* system. The retina scans the environment, initiating, seeking, *pulling*. I agree that what lands on the retina should not be called 'information'. Sensors interact with signals like photons, and can be converted into coded messages (see Part 3, p. 117). The further processing in the brain/mind mentioned by Wayne involves what I call 'preloaded resources', which includes the ability to reason and to integrate context.

Note that this cognitive pull system can display an apobetics aspect: to clarify or verify the current interpretation, messages can be sent to other portions of the brain/mind to reflect upon its reasonableness; and commands can be sent to the eye to rescan the environment for additional signals to be integrated with the present interpreted concept.

Royal Truman  
Mannheim  
GERMANY

## Asteroid impacts

In his two articles,<sup>1,2</sup> Michael Oard suggests that asteroids have impacted other 'inner orbit' planets, but not apparently on Earth to any great extent. He proffers the idea that the earth was struck in the early days of the Genesis Flood, which destroyed most of the evidence for impacts. In particular, he makes the assumption that the moon's pattern of impact craters is so evident that it should be taken as a standard for asteroid impacts on the earth.