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Male moths freeze females by mimicking bats

Flying through the night sky, a moth hears the sound of danger - the ultrasonic squeak of a hunting bat. She freezes to make herself harder to spot, as she always does when she hears these telltale calls. But the source of the squeak is not a bat at all - it's a male moth. He is a trickster. By mimicking the sound of a bat, he fooled the female into keeping still, making her easier to mate with.

The evolutionary arms race between bats and moths has raged for millennia. Many moths have evolved to listen out for the sounds of hunting bats and some jam those calls with their own ultrasonic clicks, produced by organs called tymbals. In the armyworm moth, only the males have these organs and they never click when bats are near. Their tymbals are used for deceptive seductions, rather than defence.

Ryo Nakano found that the male's clicks are identical to those of bats. When the males sung to females, Nakano found that virtually all of them mated successfully, if he muffled them by removing the tymbals, they only got lucky 50% of the time. And if he helped out the muted males by playing either tymbal sounds or bat calls through speakers, their success shot back up to 100%. Nakano says that this is a great example of an animal evolving a signal to exploit the sensory biases of a receiver.

More on bats vs. moths from me

Reference: Biology Letters http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2010.0058
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Aesthetics is variously defined as beauty in appearance (Lavie & Tractinsky 2004), visual appeal (Lindgaard & Dudok 2003), an experience (Ramachandran & Blakeslee 1998), an attitude (Cupchik 1993), a property of objects (Porteous 1996), a response or a judgment (Hassenzahl 2004a; 2004b), and a process (Langer 1967). Common to all of these terms is that aesthetics is seen to have something to do with pleasure and harmony which human beings are capable of experiencing.

The wide variety of definitions testifies to the complexity of the concept,

which has not deterred researchers from working in this still rather nebulous and evasive area.

Early studies in experimental aesthetics led to several theories, the most comprehensive of which was formulated by Berlyne (1971; 1972). Berlyne's research showed consistently that moderate complexity was preferred over simple or extremely complex stimuli.
Trust, authority, and reputation are central to scholarly publishing, but the trust model of the Internet is almost antithetical to the trust model of academia. Publishers have been so preoccupied with the brute mechanics of moving content to the online world that they have virtually ignored the challenge that the Internet trust model poses to the scholarly publisher. Publishers can learn much about approaches to handling Internet trust from the actions of major online players outside the publishing industry. Publishers should also benefit from watching the trust models that are being experimented with in the nascent realm of social software applications. Publishers once led the way in establishing the apparatus of trust during the transition from manuscript to print culture in early modern Europe. Ultimately, publishers should again take the lead in helping to establish new mechanisms of trust in what could reasonably be described as "the early modern Internet."

Every day, Internet users are pelted with spam, hoaxes, urban legends, and scams - in other words, untrustworthy data. The Internet is largely without any infrastructure to help users identify authoritative and trustworthy content. Indeed, the history of the Internet is littered with examples of how technologists have underestimated the crucial role that social trust and authority play in communication. Authority is the sine qua non of academic publishers and librarians, and

the trust model of the Internet is almost completely antithetical to the model


one possible reason for these results is that the ratings reflected people's attitude towards local Government rather than being the result of their interaction with the particular web site.

One possible reason for the results is that the satisfaction ratings reflected subjects' attitude towards their country's local Government rather than being the result of their interaction with the particular web site.
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