

single group. Furthermore, it follows at once from the data that Mg^{24} is formed in an excited state.

The existence of gamma-gamma coincidences means that in at least some cases there are two or more gamma-rays emitted per disintegration in dropping from the excited state of Mg^{24} to the ground state. If one assumes that the sensitivities of the counter to the different gamma-rays emitted by the source is not very different from an average sensitivity S_γ , one may get an estimate of K , the average number of gamma-rays per disintegration. We have, from the beta-gamma coincidences data,

$$N_{\beta\gamma}/N_\beta S_\beta = S_\gamma K = 3.0 \times 10^{-3}, \quad (1)$$

where $N_{\beta\gamma}$ is the beta-gamma coincidence rate, $N_\beta S_\beta$ the number of beta-rays recorded.

From the gamma-gamma coincidence data we have⁷

$$N_{\gamma\gamma}/N_\gamma S_\gamma = (K-1)S_\gamma = 1.72 \times 10^{-3}. \quad (2)$$

Therefore,

$$K = 2.36.$$

The level scheme proposed by Richardson and Kurie permits the transition to the ground level to take place either in one jump by a 3-Mev gamma-ray or in two steps of 2 Mev and 1 Mev. This should result in an average value of K less than 2. The scheme of Feather and Dunworth, on the other hand, calls for a 1-Mev gamma-ray followed by one of 3 Mev or alternatively a 2-Mev gamma-ray followed by another of 2 Mev. This should give $K=2$. Our value of $K=2.36$ suggests that in some cases the transition to the ground level may take place in even more than two steps.

The authors wish to express their thanks to Professor E. O. Lawrence for furnishing a strong source of radioactive sodium and to the Penrose Fund of the American Philosophical Society for a grant.

LAWRENCE M. LANGER
ALLAN C. G. MITCHELL
PAUL W. MCDANIEL

Department of Physics,
Indiana University,
Bloomington, Indiana,
October 12, 1939.

¹ L. M. Langer, A. C. G. Mitchell and P. W. McDaniel, *Phys. Rev.* **56**, 380, 422 (1939).

² N. Feather and J. V. Dunworth, *Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.* **34**, 442 (1938).

³ S. Kikuchi, Y. Watase, J. Itoh, E. Takeda, and S. Yamaguchi, *Proc. Physico-Math. Soc. Japan* **21**, 7 (1939).

⁴ J. L. Lawson, *Phys. Rev.* **56**, 131 (1939).

⁵ J. R. Richardson and F. N. D. Kurie, *Phys. Rev.* **50**, 999 (1936).

⁶ J. R. Richardson, *Phys. Rev.* **53**, 124 (1938).

⁷ This formula differs from that given in our previous papers. A full discussion will be given elsewhere. The use of this formula rather than the previous one makes no change in our conclusions on the spectrum of In, but necessitates a different interpretation of the value of K in the case of Mn.

therefore, that ordinary nonradioactive sodium, contrary to what had generally been thought, passes as readily through the red cell membrane.

Since the red cell is known to have a charged surface² composed of a polar lipoidal substance probably of monomolecular thickness,³ it is fair to raise the question as to whether (1) the charge on the limiting membrane of a red blood cell and (2) the polar properties of the lipoid molecules of which it is composed, might not be modified by the radiations (electrons and gamma-rays) emanating from the radioactive ion being studied. One would not expect electrically asymmetrical polar molecules in a monolayer to remain indifferent to bombardment by electrons and gamma-rays at short range and any change in the polar properties of the membrane would, according to Wilbrandt,⁴ alter its permeability. Fricke⁵ has shown that beta- and gamma-rays are capable of denaturing proteins. Radioactive sodium, once it has traversed the cell membrane, might, therefore, also denature the proteins in the vicinity of the cell surface and grossly modify surface conditions. Since the cell membrane is assumed to have a thickness of the order of one molecule, the radioactive sodium might even modify intracellular proteins while outside the cell, its radiations traversing the cell wall before the ion itself has penetrated. Any conclusions as to the permeability of the walls of a red cell for radioactive sodium ion cannot, therefore, be properly extended to embrace the behavior of the nonradioactive forms of the same element, until or unless it is first shown that the radioactivity is without effect on the membrane and on the proteins with which the latter is in contact.

The question raised here is, of course, broader than the illustrative case given. It applies to the general body of work now currently appearing in many journals and involving the use of radioactive forms of the common elements as tracers. Until it is answered, it will be fair to doubt the validity of conclusions drawn as to the corresponding behavior of nonradioactive forms of the same elements.

A. BARNETT

New York State Psychiatric Institute and Hospital,
722 West 166th Street,
New York, New York,
October 14, 1939.

¹ W. E. Cohn and E. T. Cohn, *Proc. Soc. Exp. Biol. and Med.* **45**, 445 (1939).

² E. Gellhorn and J. Régnier, *La Perméabilité* (Masson et Cie., Paris, 1936) p. 217.

³ H. Fricke, *J. Gen. Physiol.* **9**, 137 (1926).

⁴ W. Wilbrandt, *J. Gen. Physiol.* **18**, 933 (1935).

⁵ H. Fricke, *Cold Spring Harbor Symposium* (1938) Vol. 6, p. 164.

The Nature of Visual Observations at Low Light Intensities

We were led to conclude from visual observations that the minima reported by Allison in his magneto-optic method were reproducible. Our conclusions¹ are certainly wrong as we have not been able by any purely objective method to check these results. In order to clear up the record we wish to make this retraction.

There have been so many cases of erroneous deduction resulting from visual observations at very low light in-

The Use of Radioactive Forms of the Common Elements in Physiology

The use of radioactive forms of the elements as "tracers" for studying cell-wall permeability and metabolic processes is becoming increasingly common in physiology. For example, Cohn and Cohn,¹ using radioactive sodium, have recently reported that this form of the element readily traverses the wall of the red blood cell. They conclude,

tensities that the problem is worthy of serious consideration. In addition to the magneto-optic effect, we may list the numerous N -ray experiments,² the Davis and Barnes³ experiments on the capture of electrons by α -particles, and the Pokrovskii⁴ experiments on the emission of α -particles from lead by x-ray excitation.

In all of these cases the experimenters have been convinced that their observations are real and that their eyes cannot deceive them. This effect might be explained as arising from slight movement of the eye so that the light falls upon a less sensitive region of the retina. To the observer this would appear to be a change of intensity. There may also be some question as to the nerve centers which respond to low order stimuli and the possibility that such centers may be lacking in the usual power of discrimination. However, an element of suggestibility or hypnotism must also be present. Thus there were regions on the scale where we were never able to observe minima although we had expected to find them. Our initial readings appeared to set a pattern which was then reproducible. The observer had no knowledge as to the scale reading, so apparent reproducibility was due either to coincidence and would have

disappeared when a sufficient number of readings were taken, or was due to some unknown mode of communication between the observer and his partner who recorded the scale readings and operated the trolley settings. In order to eliminate the possibility of inference from the tonal qualities of the voice, we used a system of buzzer signals as a means of communication. This, however, appeared to have no effect upon the reproducibility of the readings. We are inclined to question whether, under the conditions of these experiments, reproducibility has any physical significance when one member of the pair has knowledge of the previous result. Whatever interpretation one cares to make of this statement, it will at least be granted that this is a safe assumption to make in future observations of this character.

W. M. LATIMER
H. A. YOUNG

University of California,
Berkeley, California,
October 12, 1939.

¹ W. M. Latimer and H. A. Young, *Phys. Rev.* **44**, 690 (1933).

² Stradling, *J. Frank. Inst.* **164**, 177 (1908).

³ B. Davis and A. H. Barnes, *Phys. Rev.* **37**, 1368 (1931).

⁴ G. I. Pokrovskii, *Phys. Rev.* **38**, 925 (1931).