

But if this is true, we should be led to inferences very different from those announced by Dr. Cook. Far from having 'complete socialization' and representing a higher and more economical form of social life, the kelep would seem to be a retrograde, degenerate or, at any rate, highly specialized ant for the reason that just such conditions, at least so far as the suppression of the nuptial flight and intranidal mating are concerned, occur, in all probability, among the parasitic ants like *Anergates*, *Symmyrmica*, *Formicoxenus*, etc., and in highly specialized ants like the *Dorylinæ* and *Leptogénys*, which are either rare or have an unusual mode of life. And far from being a promising trait in an ant introduced for economic purposes, the very opposite would be the case, as seems to be indicated by the flat failure of Dr. Cook's propaganda. It may be best, however, to refrain from all speculation on this matter till we know more about the colonizing habits of the kelep than can be learned from Dr. Cook's desultory statements. There can be no doubt about the fact that isolated fertile females of certain *Ponerinæ* are able to establish colonies. In the Bahamas I found satisfactory evidence of this both in *Pseudoponera stigma* and in *Odontomachus insularis*, and Dr. Cook is still a long way from having proved that the same method is never adopted by *Ectatomma*.

Additional confusion is introduced by Dr. Cook with a set of new terms. He calls 'an insect colony in which all the eggs are furnished by a single laying queen' a 'strictly determinate organization, that is, it reaches a natural limit after the mother insect dies or ceases to reproduce,' and 'colonies may be called indeterminate when the social economy of the insect is such that a lost queen can be replaced.' "Colonies with more than one egg-producing queen may be called compound indeterminate." All of these distinctions are