

Re: Stephen Wolfram vs. Charles Darwin on natural selection

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.bio.evolution/2008-10/msg00078.html>

- *From:* "Entertained by my own EIMC Internetal Ptd. Lty." <ei_spamtrap_mc@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Fri, 31 Oct 2008 11:32:08 -0500 (EST)
-

"DK" <dk@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
[news:gect2p\\$m5p\\$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:gect2p$m5p$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

In article <geac95\$2hs3\$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, dkomo
<dkomo871@xxxxxxxx> 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 cerainly 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

That is one of the best ideas for measuring biological complexity I have come across! :-)

'The reverse' of your method would be to – whilst similarly focus on biological (typically procreation promoting) functions – try to roughly estimate how many responses are on an animal's (or plant's) repertoire of responses (to all relevant kinds of stimulation – possibly endogenous as well as exogenous stimulation).

Re: Stephen Wolfram vs. Charles Darwin on natural selection

It is unclear what dkomo meant by a parasite – does a cookoo qualify?
Amongst different kinds of parasitic organisms there are certainly many
different degrees of species–typical complexity.