Scaling Biodiversity

Edited by

**David Storch, Pablo A. Marquet,
and James H. Brown**

Foreword by
Robert M. May

Scaling Biodiversity

Edited by

DAVID STORCH
Charles University, Prague, and the Santa Fe Institute

PABLO A. MARQUET
Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Santiago, and Center for Advanced Studies in Ecology and Biodiversity and Instituto de Ecología y Biodiversidad, the Santa Fe Institute

JAMES H. BROWN
University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, and the Santa Fe Institute

Contributors

SEBASTIAN R. ABADES
Center for Advanced Studies in Ecology
and Biodiversity (CASEB) and
Departamento de Ecología, Pontificia
Universidad Católica de Chile, Casilla
114-D, Santiago, Chile

ANDREW P. ALLEN
National Center for Ecological Analysis
and Synthesis, 735 State St., Suite 300,
Santa Barbara, CA 93101, USA

BRENDAN J. M. BOHANNAN
Center for Ecology and Evolutionary
Biology, University of Oregon, Eugene,
Oregon, OR 97403–5289, USA

LUÍS BORDA-DE-ÁGUA
Department of Plant Biology, University
of Georgia, Athens, GA 30602, USA

JAMES H. BROWN
Department of Biology, University of
New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM 87131,
USA, and The Santa Fe Institute,
1399 Hyde Park Road, Santa Fe,
NM 87501, USA

JÉRÔME CHAVE
Laboratoire Evolution et Diversité
Biologique, UMR5174 CNRS – Université
Paul Sabatier, 118 route de Narbonne,
31062 Toulouse, France

GUILLEM CHUST
Laboratoire Evolution et Diversité
Biologique, UMR5174 CNRS – Université
Paul Sabatier, 118 route de Narbonne,
31062 Toulouse, France

ANDREW CLARKE
Biological Sciences, British Antarctic
Survey, NERC, High Cross, Madingley Road,
Cambridge CB3 0ET, UK

RICK CONDIT
Center for Tropical Forest Science,
Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute,
Unit 0948, APO AA, 34002–0948, USA

DAVID J. CURRIE
Ottawa-Carleton Institute for Biology,
University of Ottawa, Box 450, Station A,
Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K1N 6N5

ANTHONY F. G. DIXON
School of Biological Sciences, University
of East Anglia, Norwich NR4 7TJ, UK

KARL L. EVANS
Biodiversity and Macroecology Group,
Department of Animal and Plant Sciences,

University of Sheffield, Sheffield S10 2TN, UK

KEVIN J. GASTON
Biodiversity and Macroecology Group, Department of Animal and Plant Sciences, University of Sheffield, Sheffield S10 2TN, UK

MURRAY GELL-MANN
The Santa Fe Institute, 1399 Hyde Park Road, Santa Fe, NM 87501, USA

JAMIE F. GILLOOLY
Department of Zoology, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611, USA

JESSICA GREEN
School of Natural Sciences, University of California, P.O. Box 2039, Merced, CA 95344, USA

JOHN HARTE
Energy and Resources Group and Ecosystem Sciences Division, College of Natural Resources, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA

STEPHEN HARTLEY
School of Biological Sciences, Victoria University of Wellington, P.O.B. 600, Wellington, New Zealand

FANGLIANG HE
Department of Renewable Resources, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada T6G 2E1

TOMÁŠ HERBEN
Department of Botany, Faculty of Science, Charles University, Benátská 2, CZ-128 01

Praha 2, Czech Republic, and Institute of Botany, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, CZ-252 43 Průhonice, Czech Republic

STEPHEN P. HUBBELL
Department of Plant Biology, University of Georgia, Athens, GA 30602, USA, and Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute, Unit 0948, APO AA 34002–0948, USA

TIMOTHY H. KEITT
Section of Integrative Biology, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX 78712, USA

PAVEL KINDLMANN
Institute of Systems Biology and Ecology, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, and Faculty of Biological Sciences, University of South Bohemia, Branigovska 31, 370 05, Czech Republic, and Agrocampus Rennes, UMR INRA/ENSA-R Bi03P, 65 rue de Saint-Brieuc, 35042 Rennes Cedex, France

WILLIAM E. KUNIN
Earth and Biosphere Institute, School of Biology, University of Leeds, Leeds LS2 9JT, UK

FABIO A. LABRA
Center for Advanced Studies in Ecology and Biodiversity (CASEB) and Instituto de Ecología y Biodiversidad (IEB) and Departamento de Ecología, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Casilla 114-D, Santiago, Chile

JACK J. LENNON
The Macaulay Institute, Craigiebuckler, Aberdeeen AB15 8QH, UK

PABLO A. MARQUET
Center for Advanced Studies in Ecology and
Biodiversity (CASEB) and Departamento de
Ecología Pontificia Universidad Católica de
Chile, Casilla 114-D, Santiago, Chile, and
Instituto de Ecología y Biodiversidad (IEB),
Facultad de Ciencias, Universidad de Chile,
Casilla 653, Santiago, Chile, and The Santa
Fe Institute, 1399 Hyde Park Road, Santa Fe,
NM 87501, USA

GÉZA MESZÉNA
Department of Biological Physics, Loránd
Eötvös University, Pázmány Péter stny. 1/C,
H-1117, Budapest, Hungary

BEÁTA OBORNY
Department of Plant Taxonomy and
Ecology, Loránd Eötvös University, Pázmány
Péter stny. 1/C, H-1117, Budapest, Hungary

MICHAEL W. PALMER
Botany Department, Oklahoma State
University, Stillwater, OK 74078, USA

IVA SCHÖDELBAUEROVÁ
Institute of Systems Biology and Ecology,
Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic
and Faculty of Biological Sciences,
University of South Bohemia, Branigovska
31, 370 05, Czech Republic

ARNOŠT L. ŠIZLING
Center for Theoretical Study, Charles
University, Jilská 1, 110 00-CZ Praha 1,
Czech Republic

DAVID STORCH
Center for Theoretical Study, Charles
University, Jilská 1, 110 00-CZ Praha 1,
Czech Republic, and Department of
Ecology, Faculty of Science, Charles
University, Viničná 2, 128 44-CZ Praha 2,
Czech Republic, and The Santa Fe Institute,
1399 Hyde Park Road, Santa Fe, NM 87501,
USA

GYÖRGY SZABÓ
Research Institute for Technical Physics
and Materials Science, P.O. Box 49, H-1525,
Budapest, Hungary

CHRISTOPHE THÉBAUD
Laboratoire Evolution et Diversité
Biologique, UMR5174 CNRS – Université
Paul Sabatier, 118 route de Narbonne, 31062
Toulouse, France

GEOFFREY B. WEST
The Santa Fe Institute, 1399 Hyde Park
Road, Santa Fe, NM 87501, USA

ETHAN P. WHITE
Department of Biology, Utah State
University, Logan, UT 84322, USA, and
Department of Ecology and Evolutionary
Biology, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ
85721, USA, and Department of Biology,
University of New Mexico, Albuquerque,
NM 87131, USA

Foreword

ROBERT M. MAY

(Lord May of Oxford)

University of Oxford

One of the appealing things about physics is the existence of invariance principles and conservation laws, which provide the basis for powerful simplicities and generalizations (if the laws of physics are the same at all times and places then, for example, momentum is conserved). Extending this, if we are presented with a set of equations describing how a physical system behaves – the Navier–Stokes equations describing fluid flow, for instance – then we can immediately set about recasting them in terms of appropriately dimensionless variables (coordinates of space and time rescaled against the system's characteristic lengths and time) and dimensionless combinations of other parameters (the Reynold's Number, which is essentially the ratio between inertial and viscous forces, for example). Such scaling laws then allow us to construct a small model of a racing yacht, or Formula I car, or airplane, and test its fluid dynamical behavior in an appropriately constructed testing tank or wind tunnel. On the back of an envelope, we can explain why the V-shaped waves break away from the bow of a ship in deep water at an angle of $\theta = 19.5°$ ($\tan \theta = 1/2\sqrt{2}$), independent of the ship's speed, a result first established by Kelvin in 1887.

A particularly notable example of the use of dimensional arguments was given in the 1950s by G. I. Taylor, the leading fluid dynamicist involved in the Manhattan Project at Los Alamos (an appropriate example in the context of this book, perhaps, given the geographical proximity to Santa Fe). In an atomic explosion, there is an essentially instantaneous release of a large amount of energy, E, from what is effectively a point source. The subsequent spherical shock wave propagates into the surrounding air, of density ρ, with the pressure behind the early-stage wave front being vastly larger than the air pressure. It follows that the only physical factors determining the radius of the spherical shock wave front, R, are E, ρ, and the elapsed time, t. In terms of the basic scaling dimensions of mass, length and time (M, L, T), these three independent variables have dimensions $[E] = ML^2T^{-2}$, $[\rho] = ML^{-3}$, $[t] = T$; R has dimensions $[R] = L$. To get the scaling relation between R (dimension L) and t (dimension T), we eliminate M among $[E]$, $[\rho]$ and $[t]$ to get $L^5 \sim T^2$. This implies $R \sim t^{2/5}$ or a straight line with slope 1 when ln R is plotted against $(2/5)$ ln$t$. Taylor used the data from a series of

high-speed photographs of the fireball expanding over the test site in Nevada to verify this result, and then further used the y-axis intercept of this line to estimate $E \sim 10^{21}$ erg. He published this simple and elegant analysis in 1950, causing a furore among the military bureaucracy; although the film was not classified, the energy release figure was Top Secret (for a more detailed account, see Barenblatt, 1996).

These ideas have made their way into several areas of biology, mainly at the level of the physiology and behavior of individual organisms. D'Arcy Thompson's *On Growth and Form in Biology* (see particularly Bonner's 1961 abridged addition, with commentary) is one notable early example. Further developments and applications are surveyed by Berg (1983), Vogel (1988) and others. The first sentence in Berg's book begins "Biology in wet and dynamic". His book elaborates this theme, brilliantly drawing out the distinction between those organisms whose physical dimensions in relation to the medium through which they move are such that inertial forces dominate (e.g. airplanes, or us walking down the street) and those where the medium's viscosity dominates (e.g. bacteria propelled by rotating flagella). Here the scaling questions involve the above-mentioned dimensionless Reynold's Number, Re $\sim \rho v L / \mu$, where ρ, v and μ are the density, relative velocity, and viscosity of the fluid, and L is the "characteristic length" (diameter of pipe or channel for internal flows; maximum length of a solid object – submarine or bacterium – moving with relative velocity v against the fluid). More broadly, it is fascinating to see how scaling laws can illuminate biological issues as varied as how prairie dogs ventilate their burrows, how tiny worms withstand high pressures, or why a mouse walks away when it falls down a mineshaft but we break and horses go splat.

Going beyond Berg's "Wet and dynamic", I particularly like the application of these ideas first made in 1680 by Giovanni Alfonso Borelli, and later independently presented by John Maynard Smith (1968), to show that, to a good approximation, the characteristic height to which an animal can jump (i.e. lift its center of gravity) is common to all, fleas to horses (around one meter). This result, sometimes called Borelli's Law, is derived as follows. The energy needed to lift an animal of mass m (which scales as L^3, where L is the animal's characteristic length scale) to a height h is mgh, where g is the acceleration due to gravity. This energy is provided by the animal's downward force on the ground, F, multiplied by the distance through which the force moves (the leg extension giving the uplift, which is of the order of L). The force F is limited by the mechanical strength of the limb, which scales as L^2. Hence we have $h = FL/mg \sim L^2 \times L/L^3$. That is, h is, to a rough approximation, independent of the animal's characteristic size. Obviously there are fluctuations around this characteristic height, set by particular adaptations to the animal's life history, but even so the rule holds remarkably well across the animal kingdom. This and other examples are to be found in Maynard Smith's wonderful little

book on *Mathematical Ideas in Biology* (1968), whose cover is a schematic diagram illustrating the above calculation for a jumping mouse; the Russian edition has replaced this schematic diagram with a socialist-realist mouse!

The dynamics of the spread of an infectious disease within a host population also can, in simple limiting circumstances, be illuminated by dimensional analysis and scaling laws. Suppose we have an infection which is transmitted directly by contact between susceptibles (S) and infected/infectious (I) individuals, in a homogeneously mixed population. Individuals recover (R) from the infected/infectious phase after a characteristic interval D, thereafter being immune. If a few infected individuals are put into a wholly susceptible population, the resulting equations for this so-called SIR system can be put in dimensionless form, and the shape of the consequent epidemic curve is seen to have a form that depends only on the single dimensionless parameter, R_0, which measures the average number of secondary infections produced by an infected/ infectious individual in the initial stages, when essentially everyone is susceptible. The total number ever infected as the epidemic sweeps through the population, I, is given by $I = 1 - \exp(-R_0 I)$; the fraction of the population who are infected/infectious at the peak of the epidemic is simply $y_M = 1 - (1 + \ln R_0)/R_0$ (Anderson & May, 1991, ch. 6). This dimensionless quantity R_0 is called the basic reproductive number, and it can among other things be used to assess the proportion of the population we need to vaccinate in order to protect against a possible epidemic (i.e. to drive the population's effective basic reproductive number below unity); this fraction is $1 - 1/R_0$. Although the shape of the epidemic curve depends only on R_0 in this simple limiting case, the timescale over which an epidemic unfolds – possibly eventually extinguishing itself, or possibly oscillating to settle at a state of endemic infection – involves other parameters (such as D and the rate at which new susceptibles enter the population by birth or migration). Interestingly, ecologists have long recognized the importance of what they call a population's "basic reproductive rate", R_0. When Roy Anderson and I first emphasized the central role played by R_0 in epidemiological theory, we underlined the basic relationship with ecologists by using their conventional terminology – "reproductive rate" – even though we recognized that R_0 was dimensionless, not having the dimension of 1/(time) which "rate" would strictly imply. Later epidemiological workers, incensed by such terminological inexactitude, have prevailed in establishing "basic reproductive number" as approved usage; ecological texts, however, remain unrepentant in their time-honored use of "reproductive rate".

More generally, of course, computationally sophisticated studies aimed at better understanding of HIV/AIDS, foot and mouth disease, SARS, avian H5N1 flu, and much else deal with heterogeneities in individual behavior and transmissibility, in guiding public health policy. The basic understanding provided by scaling relations, however, remains important (Keeling *et al.*, 2003; Keeling, 2005).

Efforts to apply such scaling considerations to observed patterns of biological diversity are, in general, more recent. The present volume, very much in the spirit of the Santa Fe Institute, outlines work on several different levels, beginning with the relation between spatial scale and numbers of species. Later chapters in this rich offering widen the scope to scaling relations involving taxonomic groupings, species–energy relations, latitudinal gradients in species numbers, and more. Some of the work closely parallels the physics-like scaling rules sketched above, while other chapters take a broader view of "power laws" and possible mechanisms causing them.

In my opinion, the complex and contingent workings of evolutionary processes, playing out in an ecological theater which itself undergoes environmental change, mean that we cannot generally expect to find the crisp scaling laws of physics in assemblies of species. But we can sometimes hope to come close, and – at very least – this book shows the quest itself is interesting and informative.

References

Anderson, R. M. & May, R. M. (1991). *Infectious Diseases of Humans: Dynamics and Control.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Barenblatt, G. I. (1996). *Scaling, Self-Similarity, and Intermediate Asymptotics.* Cambridge Texts in Applied Mathematics 14. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Berg, N. C. (1983). *Random Walks in Biology.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Bonner, J. T. (ed.) (1961). Abridged edition of D'Arcy Thompson's *On Growth and Form.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Keeling, M. J. (2005). Models of foot and mouth disease. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London, Series B,* **272**, 1195–1202.

Keeling, M. J., Woolhouse, M. E. J., May, R. M., Davies, G. & Grenfell, B. T. (2003). Modelling vaccination strategies against foot-and-mouth disease. *Nature,* **412**, 136–142.

Maynard Smith, J. (1968). *Mathematical Ideas in Biology.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Vogel, S. (1988). *Life's Devices: The Physical World of Animal and Plants.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Preface

This unusual book had an unusual origin. It resulted from a symposium entitled "Scaling Biodiversity" that took place in Prague, Czech Republic, on 19–22 October 2004. The goal of the symposium was to bring together a diverse group of scientists who are applying ideas, approaches, and methods of scaling to address major conceptual questions about biodiversity.

The symposium was cosponsored by the Santa Fe Institute and Center for Theoretical Study, Charles University in Prague and co-organized by David Storch of Charles University, Pablo Marquet of the Catholic University in Chile, James Brown of the University of New Mexico, and Geoffrey West of the Santa Fe Institute. This sponsorship and organizing committee says much about the origin and operation of the workshop, the identity of the invited contributors, and the contents of this book. All of the co-organizers and many of the participants have strong relationships with the Santa Fe Institute (SFI). Much of the funding for the symposium, the activities of the co-organizers that led up to it, and the preparation of this book came from the SFI International Programs. Founded in 1984, the Institute is an interdisciplinary research center in Santa Fe, New Mexico. It is widely regarded as the birthplace and leading center of modern "complexity science". It is a special place that attracts mathematicians and physicists, biologists and ecologists, economists and anthropologists, who are dedicated to working on big, challenging questions in the natural and social sciences. There is a heady atmosphere of intense interaction and collegial collaboration at the Institute, and it results in a special kind of SFI-style science.

The symposium and the resulting book are representative of this kind of science. The participating scientists represent a blend of card-carrying ecologists and interlopers from other disciplines, established scientists and new, young investigators, theoreticians and empiricists. Several of the participants have been affiliated with SFI. Geoffrey West and Murray Gell-Mann are members of the Resident Faculty, James Brown is a member of the External Faculty, David Storch, Pablo Marquet, and Beáta Oborny have been International Fellows, and Timothy Keitt, James Gillooly, Andrew Allen, John Harte, Andrew Clarke, Jessica Green, and Ethan White have

all participated in Institute workshops or other activities. That said, however, the other participants in the symposium and authors of this book are fresh faces.

This book and the symposium that gave rise to it represent an initial effort to bring the perspective of scaling to address the challenging topic of biodiversity. Concepts of scaling relations, along with theoretical approaches and analytical methods for studying them, are well represented across the physical, biological, and social sciences. Classic examples of so-called "scaling laws" include the Maxwell–Boltzmann distribution of kinetic energies of gas molecules, the size distribution of heavenly bodies in physics, the three-fourths power scaling of metabolism with body mass, the relationship between body size and longevity, the Gutenberg–Richter distribution of earthquake magnitudes, the Horton–Strahler hierarchy of stream and river orders, the Zipf distribution of word frequencies in languages, and the Pareto distribution of incomes among households. Classic examples in the scaling of biodiversity include species–area and species–time relationships, trophic pyramids, and distributions of abundance, range size, and body size among species.

Indeed, over the last two centuries, and accelerating rapidly in recent years, major empirical patterns of biodiversity have become increasingly well documented: across landscapes and geographic space, ecological and evolutionary time, and organisms of different body sizes, functional groups and trophic levels, and phylogenetic lineages and taxonomic groups. Many of these patterns represent scaling relations with respect to space, time, body size, environmental temperature and productivity, and other variables. Still missing, however, is a theory of biodiversity that can provide a unified, synthetic explanation for these relationships. Indeed, there is no general consensus explanation for the quintessential pattern, the decrease in number of species and many other measures of biological diversity from the tropics toward the poles.

Neither the symposium nor the book reaches definitive conclusions. The contributions do, however, present a special perspective on the state of the science. They focus on scaling as a way to characterize empirical relationships and explore theoretical concepts across the many dimensions and enormous spectrum of biodiversity. They highlight some of the progress that has recently been made, and some of the promising lines of investigation that are currently being pursued. In particular, they showcase the contributions and promise of some of the more theoretical and quantitative approaches to biodiversity. The contributors are interested not only in documenting the patterns of biodiversity with increasing accuracy and detail, but also in understanding the ecological and evolutionary processes that generate and maintain these patterns. Perhaps most importantly, the symposium presentations and book chapters collectively articulate an optimistic vision of biodiversity research. Half a century ago, the eminent ecologist G. E. Hutchinson asked, "Why are there so many species of animals?" Twenty-first century science can see into the

farthest reaches of the universe and rapidly sequence the genome of any organism. Hopefully it will soon be able to explain why there are so many species of organisms, and more in tropical rain forests and coral reefs than in arctic tundra and the abyssal plain.

James H. Brown
Geoffrey B. West
Murray Gell-Mann

Contents

Introduction: scaling biodiversity – what is the problem?

DAVID STORCH

Charles University, Prague, The Santa Fe Institute

PABLO A. MARQUET

Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, CASEB, IEB, The Santa Fe Institute

JAMES H. BROWN

University of New Mexico, The Santa Fe Institute

Biological diversity is the most fascinating phenomenon on the Earth. Biologists, amazed by the splendid variety of life, spent several centuries collecting, describing, and classifying living things. We are still engaged in this endeavor. Some groups, such as birds, mammals, molluscs, and vascular plants, have received most of the attention, while others, such as mites, nematodes, fungi, and prokaryotes, remain very poorly known. Moreover, we are still only beginning to understand in depth the processes that generate and maintain the global biodiversity. Part of our ignorance comes from the complexity of observed biodiversity patterns and of the processes that have produced them. These range from evolutionary events that occurred millions of years ago to contemporary interactions between individual organisms and their environments, from biogeographic processes that play out on the scale of continents and oceans to local interactions that can occur on miniscule spatial scales. Part is simply due to the fact that the diversity of life is determined by a multitude of processes which are unique for each taxon and each environment: each kind of organism has unique features of structure and function, which are due to evolutionary constraints and which affect its strategies for survival and reproduction, each type of habitat has its unique abiotic conditions and biotic composition and its own dynamics, and each land mass and body of water has its own geological, climatic, and organic history. Searching for universal laws might seem to be a hopeless task.

There are, however, general, perhaps universal, patterns of biodiversity, suggesting that they might be due to equally general underlying processes. Biological diversity increases with the area sampled, decreases from the equator towards the poles, and is generally high in hot and humid places. Species richness tends to increase with total abundances of individuals and is promoted by

the turnover in species composition of local communities, which, in turn, is affected by habitat heterogeneity and spatial aggregation of individuals. Also, although, or perhaps because, biodiversity is scale dependent, species richness of local ecological communities is always related to the richness of the larger surrounding biogeographic regions. Many potential explanations, some of them mutually exclusive, some not, have been advanced to explain these patterns (see e.g. Gaston & Blackburn, 2000, and Blackburn & Gaston, 2003, for reviews). Discerning between competing explanations requires careful formulation and quantitative testing of formal models relating pattern to processes (Storch & Gaston, 2004).

The study of biodiversity is therefore a sophisticated quantitative modern science. Similarly as in other branches of science, it is necessary to discover and quantify those properties of systems that remain relatively invariant and stable regardless of the system-specific details and intricacies, and to develop formal models that capture the general features of system structure and behavior (Maurer, 1999). Such an approach has been very successful in disciplines such as statistical physics and cosmology, and is best exemplified by the theory and methodology of scaling. Scaling, in its broadest sense, is the effort to discover and explain how some state variable or dynamic parameter changes with some other variable.

Scaling in ecology is perhaps best developed in the context of spatial scaling, i.e. changes in observed patterns with the spatial scale of observation. Ecologists have long been aware that different patterns are apparent and different processes are operating on different spatial scales (e.g. Rahbek & Graves, 2001; Whittaker, Willis & Field, 2001; Rahbek, 2005). Only recently, however, have ecologists and biogeographers been able to reveal *quantitative* rules that describe how the patterns change across scales. This is an important first step toward a true scaling theory that would use models based on first principles to accurately predict such empirical scaling phenomena. Recent progress toward such quantitative treatment of biodiversity based on principles of scaling is the topic of this book.

The chapters in this volume are the written versions of talks presented at a workshop "Scaling Biodiversity", which was held in Prague, Czech Republic, on 19–22 October 2004. The workshop was cosponsored by the Santa Fe Institute and the Center for Theoretical Study, Charles University in Prague. It brought together an eclectic mix of scientists interested in biodiversity and scaling theory. These ranged from empirically oriented ecologists and biogeographers to mathematical biologists and theoretical physicists, and from graduate students and postdocs to eminent senior scientists. The lively interchange of data and ideas by individuals with very different backgrounds, approaches, and methodologies made for a memorable conference. Most participants agreed that the conference substantially broadened their own limited perspectives on