


Another Challenge for the Roadmap Biological Complexity as a Theoretical Issue



Richard Walker & Fabrizio Davide
TELECOM ITALIA Learning Services S.p.A.
rwalker@xiwrite.com

Telecom Italia background

- Telecom Italia on the frontier between biology and information science
 - **Neurobit:** control of a Khepera robots by “neurons on a chip”
 - **I-Learning:** technology supported mental rehearsal. Brain mechanisms underlying “mental” and “motor imagery
 - **PACE:** creation of “programmable artificial cells”
 - **DELIS:** Biologically-inspired models for computation and telecommunications
 - **JADE:** a platform for agent-based simulations

This presentation

- Focus: the **theory of biological complexity**
- **The scaling problem** – a critical issue for NeuroIT
- **Key concepts**
- Use **key concepts** to describe **state of art**
 - What we know
 - What we don't know
- The need for a **theory of biological complexity**
- **Implications for NeuroIT**
- **A modest proposal**

A provocation...

Intuition, insight and learning are no longer exclusive possessions of human beings: any large high-speed computer can be programmed to exhibit them also


H.A. Simon & Allan Newell, (1958)

The scaling problem

- Natural cognitive systems involve **multi-level interactions** between **large numbers** of **heterogeneous agents** operating at each level
- **Classical AI** was **unable to 'scale up'** from small single-level models to larger, multi-level models
- **New AI** (neural networks, evolutionary computing, evolutionary robotics etc.) has not been more successful than classical AI
- To reach the goals of NeuroIT we have to **resolve the 'scaling problem'**
- This requires a **theory of biological complexity**

The Gene-Brain Hierarchy

- The brain is organized at **many different levels**
 - From gene networks to large-scale modules
- Each level involves complex interactions between **large numbers of dishomogeneous** agents (molecules, genes, neurons, small neuronal networks etc.)
- Each level has **emergent properties** which contribute to the dynamics of the next level
- Large-scale **Artificial cognitive systems** will have to model multiple levels in the hierarchy



Algorithmic and ‘design’ complexity

- Cognitive systems can be described in terms of
 - **Algorithmic complexity:** the length of the shortest possible program capable of generating the system
 - **Design complexity:** the time required to build/evolve/train the system; the way this time scales with the size of the system
- Natural cognitive systems have
 - **High algorithmic complexity:** they are complicated to describe
 - **Low design complexity:** they can evolve/adapt (relatively) rapidly

Low design complexity is a requirement for artificial cognitive systems

Current scientific knowledge

- Growing knowledge about **individual levels** in the hierarchy
 - Molecular and genetic foundations of neural/synaptic function
 - Mechanics of neurons and small neuronal networks
 - Brain anatomy and functionality
 - Basic mechanisms of ontogeny
 - Psychological knowledge
 - Critical role of embodiment
- Very little knowledge about the relationships **between levels**
 - Emergence of higher level phenomena (e.g. patterns of gene expression, cognition) from lower level interactions (e.g. gene networks, neuronal networks)

Engineering models /1

- Current systems model:
 - Single levels in hierarchy
 - Artificial Neural networks
 - Evolutionary computing
 - Evolutionary robotics
 - Agent-based computing
 - Swarm computing...
 - Are very small
 - Artificial genomes $O(10^4 \text{ bit})$
 - ANNs : $O(10^3 \text{ neurons})$

Even the genome of E.Coli has $O(10^6) \text{ bp}$

The genome of H. Sapiens has $O(10^9) \text{ bp}$

The human brain contains $O(10^9)$ neurons

Engineering models /2

- **Constraints** on what it is **possible** to design appear to be very rigid
 - Many problems (e.g. training a feed-forward ANN) are NP-complete
- We do not know how to design/train systems with:
 - Large numbers of units
 - Dishomogeneous units
 - Multiple levels
- Current systems have **high design complexity** and low **algorithmic complexity**
- They are thus **fundamentally different** from natural cognitive systems

A theory of biological complexity

- Building large-scale cognitive systems requires a **theory of biological complexity**
- **Diachronic theory**
 - How do natural cognitive systems achieve low design complexity in
 - Evolution
 - Development (ontogenesis)
 - Learning
- **Synchronic theory**
 - How can we predict the dynamics of systems with multiple layers of dishomogeneous agents (**high algorithmic complexity**)

Current complexity theory

- Current complexity theory describes **abiotic systems** (e.g. cellular automata)
 - Interactions between large numbers of **homogeneous agents**
 - **Low algorithmic complexity**: agents and populations are easy to describe
 - **High design complexity**: it is hard to design a population to produce a required behavior
- The theory does not provide an adequate basis to understand/design complex artificial systems
- A useful theory of biological complexity will require important steps forward with respect to current complexity theory

Goals for a theory of biological complexity

- Develop strategies to achieve rapid evolution, ontogenesis and learning
 - Example: ‘grammars’ for protein evolution
- Predict the dynamics of interactions between **large numbers of dishomogeneous agents**
- Validate models **computer simulations**
- Apply the models to the construction of artificial cognitive systems
- Identify **intractable problems** (problems we will never be able to resolve)
 - Hypothesis: adaptation to arbitrary environments is an intractable problem

Research strategies

- Make better use of **existing biological knowledge**
 - Behavior of neuronal networks
 - Evolutionary theory
- Integrate knowledge from **under-exploited disciplines**, for example:
 - Paleontology (evolution as a historical process)
 - Role of structural and historical constraints in biological evolution
 - Multilevel theories of biological evolution (group selection, interaction between cooperation and competition)
 - Molecular theories of morphogenesis
 - Role of neuro-modulators in cognition
- Create mathematical models that are **directly applicable to engineering goals**

Implications for NeuroIT

- The current roadmap is formulated in terms of technological outcomes and their applications
- Two key projects require the construction of systems which are orders of magnitude larger than current models
 - **Factor 10**: a growing body and a growing brain
 - **The Constructed Brain** : simulating an entire brain
- These projects are unlikely to be feasible without new design strategies
- An adequate theory of biological complexity can make a useful contribution to the development of such strategies

A modest proposal

- **Create a new multidisciplinary project**, specifically dedicated to the development of a **theory of biological complexity**
- The new project should be **complementary** to the other areas of work already identified in the roadmap
- The project should
 - **Use specific knowledge** developed within other projects
 - **Contribute mathematical models and tools** which are directly applicable within these projects

Thank you for your attention

Richard Walker

rwalker@xiwrite.com