biosis may be genuine, but before any such statement can be made of a particular case like the cotton plant, we need much more concise, abundant and painstaking observations than have been published hitherto.

I fail to see, therefore, that Dr. Cook has produced any facts that could lead me to 'mitigate' the statements made in my former paper. The kelep is a typical ponerine ant, with all the disadvantages of a fixed and archaic constitution in the presence of experiments that require for their successful execution a plastic and adaptable species. When the kelep has succeeded in becoming a thriving component of the Texan ant fauna there will be time enough to determine whether its strenuous and enterprising efforts can 'add even ten per cent. to the cotton crop'—we will not expect it to chase all the boll weevils into the Gulf of Mexico. Dr. Cook himself admits that 'the chances are still very much against it, no doubt.' This is exactly what I have maintained. Neither I nor any one else blames the Department of Agriculture for following every clue till some 'concrete conclusion' is reached, but the premature and persistent booming of a conclusion which is far from being 'concrete' and has 'chances very much against it' can only discredit the Department of Agriculture, Dr. Cook and the unsuspecting kelep in the eyes of the general public, the Texan cotton grower and the scientist. I shall have no further remarks to make on the kelep and am satisfied to await patiently the concretion of the conclusions—even till the Greek calends.

WILLIAM MORTON WHEELER.