

flying weight still more strongly point to the existence of such marked blanketting in the solid form that we cannot shut our eyes to it.

There is one point which should not be lost sight of in making deductions from these experiments and that is, that what is true of these Kites on a small scale need not necessarily apply to larger Kites of similar design.

Because cells may be efficient in the interior of Kite A is no reason for assuming that similarly situated cells are efficient in a Kite the size of the Frost-King. The question of interference which is the one with which we are dealing depends directly upon the number of cells which deflect the wind, before it reaches the interior and rear cells, and not upon its position relative to some other kite of the same form but of different dimensions.

Let it be granted that Kite A is <sup>a</sup> better Kite than Kite B. What does it prove? Not that type A is any better than type B but simply that more than two rows of cells can be banked advantageously.

How many cells deep the shell should be is still a question which experiment alone can settle, but undoubtedly there is a limit. Last year the Frost-King had 705 cells cut out from its interior leaving a shell of 595 cells, that is 54% of its surface was removed yet in the only experiment made with it <sup>in</sup> this condition it flew in about the same wind and carried substantially the same load with a slightly higher