

[Reprinted from SCIENCE, N. S., Vol. XX., No. 518, Pages 766-768, December 2, 1904.]

SOME FURTHER COMMENTS ON THE GUATEMALAN
BOLL WEEVIL ANT.

IN his reply to my remarks on the feasibility of establishing the Guatemalan boll weevil ant in Texas, Dr. O. F. Cook shows how dubious are the claims for the much-advertised efficiency of this insect. Clearly there are two distinct problems involved in the discussion; first, the establishment of the boll weevil ant in the southern states, and second, its efficiency as a boll weevil destroyer. My paper dealt largely with the former, since it is, of course, the *conditio sine qua non* of the latter problem. Dr. Cook calls my remarks a '*post facto* prognosis,' wishing, I suppose, to create the impression by this *contradictio in terminis*, that his *Schmerzens-kind*, the kelep, to which the Department of Agriculture has been standing sponsor, is doing remarkably well. I will pass over the fact that this implication is hardly borne out by the latest reports from the field of experimentation, and consider some of Dr. Cook's statements.

He says that 'it was obvious to Professor Wheeler from the first that the case was hopeless.' This statement is false, inasmuch as neither I nor anybody else outside of the Department of Agriculture could have had *any* opinion on this subject till very recently, for the very simple reason that the scientific name of the ant was not made public by the Department till its great value as a boll weevil destroyer had been boomed in all the newspapers of the country. The kelep, as