

# Re: Stephen Wolfram vs. Charles Darwin on natural selection

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.bio.evolution/2008-10/msg00073.html>

---

- *From:* [dk@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:dk@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx) (DK)
  - *Date:* Thu, 30 Oct 2008 13:06:17 -0500 (EST)
- 

In article <geac95\$2hs3\$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, dkomo <dkomo871@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

I have yet to see a good quantitative measure of complexity. I don't think the essence of complexity can be captured quantitatively.

How about the following?

The more ways a system can be broken (e.g., its properties changed in some way), the more complex is the system.

Not in the case of parasites. In general, I don't think complexity is correlated to organismic fitness.

It certainly is not. It's would be silly to argue that bacteria are more complex than mammals, yet the former constitute majority of not only cell count but a biomass on this planet. If fitness is capacity to reproduce, bacteria are more fit than mammals.

DK

.