comments (*10–13*) and seem to imply that I claim as original certain concepts supposedly introduced by them. As will subsequently appear, my views are markedly different from theirs in at least one fundamental respect. Thus their interpretation of my reason for omitting references to their papers does not seem reasonable, particularly in view of the fact that references to two of their papers (*10, 12*) are cited by McConnell and Gruner (*14*) in a paper which B.-S. and B. (*1*) do not cite but which was cited in my paper (*2*). In this same connection, they seem to attach some significance to omission of references to my own comments in the Russian literature (*15, 16*). Equal significance presumably could be attached to my omission of some of my other papers (*8, 17, 18*) on the same subject, but this sort of reasoning leads to an obvious absurdity.

Rather than being concerned with some obscure concepts presented during the interval 1938–40 by these Russians, I was concerned primarily with the results of Geiger (*19*) and of Brasseur and Dallemagne (*20*). Elsewhere (*8, 18*) the hypothesis of Hendricks and Hill (*21*) is discussed.

Although the views of Hendricks (*22*) stand in sharp contrast to my own in certain details, Hendricks agrees with me on one fundamental point: *the complete absence of any justification for assuming admixture of calcite* in pure samples of francolite. This is the fundamental point of divergence of B.-S. and B., who not only assume a specific and unjustifiable composition for carbonate apatite but also assume the necessity of calculating an admixture of calcite. Thus B.-S. and B. (*1*) reduce their own argument to an absurdity by calculating the chemical compositions to include a mineral phase that several authors have shown cannot be present. This point was adequately discussed in my paper (*2*), and references bearing on this subject were presented. Nevertheless, B.-S. and B. confine their attention to an attack on my hypothesis, without reference to that proposed by Hendricks and Hill (*21*) and, at the same time, completely disregard a fundamental premise of my hypothesis.

It becomes unnecessary, then, to reply in considerable detail to their remarks on the validity of such questions as interatomic distances, inasmuch as their assumptions include fundamental errors that completely invalidate their entire thesis.

For translations of Russian papers, I am indebted to Mrs. Justina D. Epp, Peter O. Krumin, and George S. Mitchell.

DUNCAN MCCONNELL
The Ohio State University, Columbus 10

References

1. I. D. Borneman-Starinkevitch and N. V. Belov, *Compt. rend. acad. sci. U.R.S.S.* **90**, 89 (1953).
2. D. McConnell, *Bull. soc. franç. minéral. et crist.* **75**, 428 (1952).
3. J. W. Gruner and D. McConnell, *Z. Krist.* **97A**, 208 (1937).
4. G. I. Bushinsky, *Bull. soc. naturalistes Moscou,* Sect. Geol. **16**, 348 (1938).
5. ———, *Compt. rend. acad. sci. U.R.S.S.* **47**, 127 (1945).
6. F. V. Chukhrov, *Acad. Sci. U.S.S.R.,* Trudy Inst. Geol. Sci., Mineral.-geochem., Ser. 2, pt. 10, (1940).
7. D. McConnell, *J. Geol.* **58**, 16 (1950).
8. ———, *J. Wash. Acad. Sci.* **42**, 36 (1952).
9. ———, *Econ. Geol.* **48**, 147 (1953).
10. I. D. Borneman-Starinkevitch, *Compt. rend. acad. sci. U.R.S.S.* **19**, 253 (1938).
11. ———, *ibid.* **22**, 113 (1939).
12. N. V. Belov, *ibid.* **22**, 89 (1939).
13. I. D. Borneman-Starinkevitch and N. V. Belov, *ibid.* **26**, 804 (1940).
14. D. McConnell and J. W. Gruner, *Am. Mineralogist* **25**, 157 (1940).
15. D. McConnell, *Compt. rend. acad. Sci. U.R.S.S.* **22**, 87 (1938).
16. ———, *ibid.* **25**, 46 (1939).
17. ———, *J. Dental Research* **31**, 53 (1952).
18. ———, *Trans. Macy Conference on Metabolic Interrelations* **4**, 169 (1952).
19. T. Geiger, *Schweiz. mineralog. petrog. Mitt.* **30**, 161 (1950).
20. H. Brasseur and M. J. Dallemagne, *Bull. soc. chim. France,* D135 (1949).
21. S. B. Hendricks and W. L. Hill, *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.* **36**, 731 (1950).
22. S. B. Hendricks, *Trans. Macy Conference on Metabolic Interrelations* **4**, 215 (1952).

February 5, 1954.

Variation of Susceptibility to Polio

For 6 years I have been gathering data on a peculiar phenomenon that may be of interest to some readers. The data were gathered with the aid of numerous individual pediatricians and pediatric clinics. They pertain to an unexpected correlation between susceptibility to poliomyelitis and genetic traits indicated by pigmentation of skin, hair, and eyes.

The observations may be summarized thus: cases of polio investigated, 1183; polio patients with blond hair, blue eyes, and fair skin, 1; polio patients with blond hair, brown eyes, 17; polio patients with brown or black hair and eyes, 1165.

Obviously, these observed ratios differ significantly from the occurrence of light pigmentation in the general population. It is also noteworthy that the patients with light pigmentation had relatively light cases of the disease, and only two of them suffered any permanent impairment therefrom.

These observations pertain only to the members of the Caucasian race, since it was also noted that patients from other racial groups were in marked disproportion to their ratios in the general population.

It is felt that this variation of susceptibility to poliomyelitis should be taken into account in any statistical study of the value of prophylactic measures, since it is obvious that misleading results may be obtained unless there is an equal distribution of light- and dark-haired individuals in the control and experimental groups.

In the course of my investigations, I have met several pediatricians who had independently made the same observations, but I have not learned of any other attempt to gather objective data on this point. Any summary of pertinent data from readers or hypotheses of mode of influence would be greatly appreciated.

WALLACE L. MINTO
831 Fifth Avenue, River Edge, New Jersey

March 22, 1954.