

Pierre L  pine, director of the Virus Division of the Pasteur Institut   in Paris, and Valentine D. Soloviev, director of the Experimental Department of the Institute of Epidemiology and Microbiology in Moscow. Dr. Soloviev is in London at the present time and is gathering material for a book on virus diseases. He is anxious that it be as current and complete as possible.

I shall be glad to forward any material to them, or reprints may be sent directly to Dr. L  pine in Paris and to Dr. Soloviev at 65, Inverness Terrace, London, W 2, England.

JONAS E. SALK

School of Public Health, University of Michigan

On the Use of "Fission"

In both the technical literature and popular accounts dealing with nuclear fission one notices inconsistent or incorrect uses of the various forms of the word "fission." Curiosity on the part of the writer prompted him to look into an unabridged dictionary for help, with the following result. The work consulted was *Webster's new international unabridged dictionary*. (2nd ed.) Springfield, Mass.: G. & C. Merriam, 1946.

"Fission" is, of course, the noun, as well as both the transitive and intransitive verb forms. The correct adjective describing nuclei capable of undergoing the process is "fissile," pronounced either fis'il or -il. As with similar words ending in -ile, the former pronunciation is preferred in this country, while the latter is more common in Britain. The universally encountered "fissionable" is not, as far as I can find, given by any of the accepted authorities.

It is regrettable that a word having such awkward parts of speech as "fission" came to be used to describe what is probably one of the most important phenomena in nature. However, from the point of view of meaning, "fission" is probably the most appropriate of all the terms that might have been settled upon, since it conveys the idea of spontaneity of occurrence, which such words as "split," "cleave," and the like fail to do.

Since the biologists have been using the word for a long time, it would be interesting to hear if they have encountered difficulties in the application of this term.

IRA M. FREEMAN

Department of Physics, Swarthmore College

A Note on the Meaning of Normal

This note is prompted by (1) the recent publication of a paper by the present writer, entitled "The meaning of normal" (*Yale J. Biol. Med.*, 1945, 17, 493) and (2) the even more recent publication of a report by the Grant Study of the Grant Foundation, Inc. (Clark W. Heath and collaborators. *What people are*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1945). The Grant Study claims to be investigating normal young men; further, it claims that its concept of normal is in essential agreement with that proposed by the present writer. The latter feels obligated to challenge the Grant Study's

statement, since it applies specifically to him and since it seems to him that their use of the term normal is a clear example of the very looseness against which he protests; indeed, it has the further appearance of involving self-contradiction.

By the Grant workers "'normal' is defined as the *balanced*, harmonious blending of functions which produces good integration" (p. 3). With that the present writer would agree, but the authors then proceed to state that none of their subjects "nor indeed any man is quite free from abnormalities. . . . To be otherwise would in itself be 'abnormal'" (p. 3). And here we can see only incongruity, a shuffling back and forth of meaning which has no place in scientific discussion. The first use of abnormality is obviously in the sense of malfunction; the second, just as obviously in the hackneyed and incorrect sense of average. These two uses are mutually incompatible and serve only to obscure whatever concept is being advanced. Moreover, *if* no man is free from abnormality (a general negative which the authors somewhat boldly assert), then what excuse can be offered for labeling their subjects normal when their subjects are men?

Finally, they add: "The term 'normal' is automatically defined by the nature of the method of selection of the young men" (p. 4). It is here that they claim agreement with the present writer, but very certainly it is here that he totally disagrees. For this last definition is merely an operational one, not strictly a rational one at all. The meaning of normal is now made to depend upon the method of the subjects' selection; and there is a difference amounting to contradiction between selecting the subjects in accordance with the defined meaning of normal and defining the meaning of normal in accordance with the selection of the subjects. This is the precise fallacy to which the writer referred when he wrote: "There are those who despair of discovering fundamental human design through a direct consideration of the apposite data and hope to come upon it more easily by observing a sufficiently numerous and otherwise 'fair' sample of specimens. Can we not see that any such plan is doomed to failure by its inherent contradictions?" (*Yale J. Biol. Med.*, p. 496). To define normal in accordance with the exigencies of the selection of laboratory subjects is to take leave of any possibility of investigating the true nature of the normal, since now normality is already defined in terms of those who (for all we know) may as well lack it as not.

All this is a far cry from the definition of normal as "that which functions in accordance with its inherent design" (*Yale J. Biol. Med.*, p. 500). The whole purpose of investigating the problem of normality is to discover its real nature—that is, the basic human design from which every specimen *may* be shown to depart in this or that fashion; it is not the attempt to cram any particularly selected group into a merely terminological pigeonhole.

We should, of course, inquire how the Grant Study in fact did select its subjects. The report states: "Mainly