

THE IN A HURRY SERIES

Marie Curie

in a Hurry

Two Nobels, one element named after her country

Max Brocklesby

BOOKSINAHURRY.COM

Contents

The Whole Thing in One Page 4

Why You Should Care 6

The Core Ideas 8

How It Actually Works 21

What People Get Wrong 31

Use It 36

Terms 40

Go Deeper 44

Notes and Sources 46

Bibliography 53

The Whole Thing in One Page

Marie Curie is usually remembered as a severe woman in black, stirring radioactive ore in a ruined shed until two Nobel Prizes appear. The image catches the hardship and misses the work. Her great achievement was to take a weak, invisible effect through every stage required for other people to trust it, reproduce it and use it: measurement, inference, separation, chemical proof, standardisation, training and institutions.

She began as Maria Skłodowska in Warsaw, where Poland had been partitioned, Russian rule constrained Polish education and the University of Warsaw excluded women. She studied through clandestine courses, worked for years to support her sister's medical education, then reached Paris in 1891. At the Sorbonne she gained degrees in physics and mathematics, met Pierre Curie and chose Henri Becquerel's little-studied uranium rays for a doctorate.

Becquerel had discovered the rays. Curie made them comparable. Using an ionisation chamber, a sensitive electrometer and piezoelectric quartz developed through Pierre and Jacques Curie's work, she measured the minute currents produced when radiation ionised air. Activity followed the quantity of uranium, survived chemical changes and appeared in thorium too. Curie called the wider phenomenon radioactivity and argued that the emission belonged to the atom rather than to one special compound.

Then the rule failed. Pitchblende and natural chalcocite were more active than their known uranium and thorium could explain. Curie treated the excess as evidence for hidden matter. In July 1898 she and Pierre announced polonium, named for a Poland absent from the political map. In December, working with Gustave Bémont and supported by Eugène Demarçay's spectroscopy, they announced radium.

Those announcements did not place two pure metals on the bench. Radium was present in traces and behaved much like barium. Curie processed several tonnes of uranium residues, repeated chemical separations, concentrated radium salts and measured an atomic weight. Metallic radium

came only in 1910, with André Debierne. Polonium proved still harder to isolate. Discovery was a sequence of stronger claims, not one glowing moment.

The Nobel Prizes recognised different parts of that sequence. The 1903 Physics Prize, shared with Becquerel and Pierre, honoured research on the radiation phenomena first observed by Becquerel and almost omitted Marie from the formal path. The 1911 Chemistry Prize recognised the discovery of polonium and radium, the isolation of radium and the study of its nature and compounds. Between them Curie succeeded to Pierre's Sorbonne course, lost an Academy of Sciences election by two votes and endured a press campaign aimed at her sex, nationality and private life. International fame increased her leverage without removing local prejudice.

She then carried radioactivity beyond discovery. Curie helped create reference standards, equipped 18 mobile radiology cars, installed several fixed X-ray posts, organised equipment supply and helped train 175 nurses during the First World War. She built the Radium Institute around physics, chemistry, biology and medicine. The same capacity that located bullets and damaged tumours also injured healthy tissue. Protection and dosimetry lagged behind use, and cumulative occupational exposure probably contributed to the aplastic anaemia that killed her in 1934.

Her life is therefore neither a lone-genius fable nor a martyr story. It is an account of how evidence becomes shared power, and why safety, credit and resources must travel with it.

That is the book.

Why You Should Care

In 1914 a surgeon could search a wounded soldier's body by touch, enlarging an incision while metal remained hidden inside. An X-ray could show the bullet or shell fragment before the knife went in. The image still depended on a car reaching broken roads, a generator supplying steady current, fragile tubes and plates surviving transport, an operator setting the exposure and someone who understood anatomy. Marie Curie's wartime achievement was to make that whole sequence work close to the front.

That episode reveals why the life matters. A discovery does little until instruments, materials, standards, skills, money and judgement make it reliable outside the first laboratory. Curie is often placed at the instant radium was found. Her career shows the harder middle distance between finding an effect and building a field around it. Modern science lives there, among calibration, supply, training, maintenance and decisions about who may use a dangerous capability.

Her work also explains what measurement does. Radioactivity cannot be inspected with ordinary senses. Curie's apparatus registered the electrical consequence of radiation ionising air. Once samples could be compared under stable conditions, an invisible process became a quantity. An ore could be shown to violate a rule. A chemical fraction could be judged richer or poorer. A source in one country could eventually be checked against a reference held elsewhere. Measurement did more than attach numbers to the phenomenon. It made disagreement productive because laboratories could test the same claim.

Curie's two Nobel Prizes expose another useful distinction. The work recognised in Physics concerned the radiation phenomena first observed by Becquerel. Chemistry then had to follow the active matter through mixtures, obtain independent spectral evidence, concentrate salts, establish atomic weight and finally produce the metal. The 1903 and 1911 awards were related, but they did not recognise the same achievement twice. Her career sits where disciplines hand an unfinished problem to one another.

The name polonium adds politics to that scientific sequence. In 1898 Poland did not exist as a sovereign state. Naming an element for it placed a partitioned country inside the international language of chemistry. The name joined Curie's scientific identity to a country whose universities and public life were constrained by imperial rule.

It also improves the way credit is assigned. Marie chose the doctoral problem, built the comparative programme and recognised the ore anomaly. Pierre contributed instruments, precision physics, collaboration and standing within French science. Bémont, Demarçay, Debierne, miners, processors, assistants, doctors and operators performed work without which the result could not have travelled. Institutions then compressed that network into a few names and nearly omitted Marie from the first award. The useful question is not who deserves every ounce of credit. It is which function each person performed, who controlled recognition and which labour disappeared when the story was compressed.

The final reason is less comfortable. Radiation's power to damage tissue made treatment possible and exposure dangerous. Early workers saw burns and blood disorders before they possessed mature dosimetry, dose limits or a complete model of cumulative risk. Commercial promoters sold radium as vitality while doctors tested it against disease and workers absorbed it in factories. The same physical mechanism supported benefit, fraud and injury. Capability arrived first. Protection had to be organised afterwards.

Curie did not discover uranium rays, explain the nucleus, invent X-rays or create radiotherapy alone. Nor was she indifferent to money or material supply. She negotiated for ore, assistants, laboratories, standards and radium, and learned to use celebrity when ordinary funding failed. Removing those corrections leaves a saint. Keeping them reveals a formidable scientist and institution-builder working inside systems that could honour her, exclude her and exploit her image at the same time.

The prizes are the signposts. The work behind them is the reason to keep reading.

The Core Ideas

Measure What No One Can See

Henri Becquerel's uranium rays were striking in principle and awkward in practice. They passed through paper, fogged photographic plates and discharged electrified objects, yet the effect was faint and slow beside the new X-rays that made bones appear on a screen. A photograph could show that a source had acted. It was a poor instrument for comparing one weak source with another.

Marie Curie's decisive early choice was to study the rays through the electricity they created in air. Ionising radiation knocks electrons away from atoms or molecules, leaving charged particles. Put a radioactive sample near two metal plates, apply a voltage and a minute current can flow as the ions move towards the electrodes. Measure that current under controlled conditions and different samples can be compared.

The apparatus brought together work that predated her thesis. Pierre Curie and his brother Jacques had discovered piezoelectricity, the production of electric charge when certain crystals are stressed. The brothers had also developed a sensitive electrometer. In Marie's arrangement, a piezoelectric quartz system supplied a controlled charge that compensated for the charge produced in the ionisation chamber. The amount of compensation gave a measure of the sample's activity.

No instrument guarantees a trustworthy result by existing. The current depended on plate spacing, applied voltage, insulation, humidity, air conditions and whether ions recombined before reaching an electrode. Curie kept the geometry stable, controlled the electrical conditions and repeated measurements. Her achievement was therefore a method, not a heroic ability to notice a trembling needle. She created a routine in which a difference between samples could survive sceptical repetition.

The method quickly exposed a pattern. Uranium compounds produced activity in proportion to the uranium they contained. Dissolving a salt,

heating it or changing its chemical partners did not abolish the emission. Thorium compounds were active too, a result reported independently at about the same time by Gerhard Carl Schmidt. Curie named the wider class of phenomena radioactivity.

Photography and electrometry favoured different questions. A plate rewarded a dramatic source with a clear mark. Curie's apparatus made weak sources comparable and allowed activity to be followed through chemical separations. Once that became possible, a dull-looking mineral could become more informative than a spectacular image. The strongest discovery in the programme would begin as an excess in a table.

Measurement also changed how a claim travelled. Curie was a doctoral student, a Polish woman without a secure chair, a private laboratory or membership in the institutions that controlled French science. A repeatable procedure did not erase those disadvantages, as the Nobel nomination and Academy election later showed. It did give colleagues something they could reproduce without first accepting her status. The result carried a form of authority distinct from the experimenter's social rank.

That distinction remains central to science. Instruments decide which effects can be detected, which differences can be compared and which anomalies deserve pursuit. Their readings contain earlier choices about calibration, geometry, noise and acceptable error. Curie's field began when uranium rays ceased to be a curious stain on a plate and became a stable enough quantity to guide the next experiment.

Radioactivity Belongs to the Atom

Chemistry in the late nineteenth century was confident about elements and less certain about atoms. Elements could be ordered, weighed and combined. Atoms were useful units for explaining those combinations, but many physicists still treated them as permanent pieces of matter rather than structures with internal events. Radioactivity disturbed that confidence before anyone knew what the disturbance meant.

Curie's measurements separated the effect from most of the circumstances

that might have caused it. A uranium salt remained active in darkness. Chemical combination changed how much uranium sat in a given mass, and therefore changed the total activity, but did not create a special active molecule. Powder, crystal and solution differed far less than an explanation based on surface light or ordinary phosphorescence would suggest. The amount of uranium was what mattered.

Her phrasing was cautious: the emission appeared to be an atomic property of uranium and thorium. That sentence did more work than a claim that the rays came from a particular glowing compound. If activity belonged to the atom, then chemistry could carry it through reactions without destroying it. The sample could be separated into fractions and the radiation used as a tracer for whatever active matter travelled with them. A physical measurement could guide a chemical search.

The insight also raised an energy problem. The rays continued without illumination, obvious chemical fuel or a visible decline in the source. Where did the energy come from? Curie did not possess the later answer. At different moments she considered hypotheses that did not survive, including the possibility that heavy atoms absorbed an unknown radiation passing through space and re-emitted it. Pierre and Marie resisted some versions of radioactive transformation longer than later summaries admit.

Ernest Rutherford and Frederick Soddy supplied the stronger model in the early 1900s. Radioactive atoms change spontaneously into other atoms, emitting particles or radiation and releasing energy as they do. Rutherford distinguished alpha and beta radiation; Paul Villard identified the more penetrating gamma component; later work connected these emissions to nuclear structure. The atom was not indivisible, and the element could transmute without the alchemist's furnace.

Curie's early conclusion should therefore be praised at the right scale. She did not explain radioactive decay, discover the nucleus or create nuclear physics complete. She identified a property stable enough across chemical changes to be treated as belonging to the element, then designed a research programme around it. That was the bridge from Becquerel's effect

to radiochemistry.

The bridge matters because it changed what counted as identity. Ordinary chemistry identifies an element through reactions, spectra and atomic weight. Radioactivity added another signature, one sensitive enough to detect quantities too small for a balance. The active matter in pitchblende could be followed before enough existed to see, weigh or display in a bottle.

Later isotope theory sharpened the distinction. Atoms could share chemical identity while differing in mass and stability, which explained why substances once catalogued as separate radioactive products could occupy one place in the periodic table. Curie's method had been powerful enough to follow those products before the conceptual language for sorting them existed. Radioactivity expanded elemental identification, then forced chemistry to revise what an element contained.

There is a tension here that runs through Curie's life. Radioactivity was dependable as a property and unstable as a process. The signal persisted, yet the atoms producing it were changing. That contradiction was not a flaw in the science. It was the clue. Curie made the property measurable before the community understood the mechanism, which is often how a new field begins: reliable operations arrive before a settled picture of what they mean.

An Anomaly Can Be a Map

Curie's first model was clean. If radioactivity belonged to uranium and thorium atoms, then a material's activity should follow how much of those elements it contained. Most compounds obeyed. Two ores did not.

Pitchblende, a dense black uranium ore, was more active than pure uranium. Chalcocite, now commonly called torbernite, also exceeded the activity expected from its known uranium content. That could have been dismissed as dirty material, bad geometry or unstable apparatus. Curie's measurement routine made the mismatch harder to excuse. The ore was impure, but the impurity was the information.

She strengthened the comparison by preparing artificial chalcocite from

purified ingredients. The synthetic material behaved as its known uranium content predicted; the natural mineral did not. That control cut against the idea that the mineral structure itself amplified uranium's rays. Something present in the natural ore, and absent from the reconstructed one, was carrying extra activity.

She inferred that the minerals contained a substance far more active than uranium, present in such small quantity that ordinary analysis had missed it. The logic was indirect. No new element sat on the bench. There was an excess current, a chemical mixture and a claim that something hidden must account for the difference. The instrument turned absence into a search direction.

Pierre set aside much of his crystal work to join her. They separated pitchblende into chemical groups and measured each group after every operation. Activity travelling with bismuth suggested one unknown substance. In July 1898 they announced that the bismuth-like fraction appeared to contain a new element. Marie named it polonium, after Poland.

The name was scientific and political. Poland had been partitioned among Russia, Prussia and Austria and did not exist as a sovereign state. Curie had left Russian-ruled Warsaw to obtain the education denied to her at home. Placing polonium in scientific language put the erased country into laboratories and tables abroad. The signal for the element was still incomplete, and its chemistry would remain difficult, but the name made the claim public.

A second trail ran with barium. Working with Gustave Bémont, Pierre and Marie produced increasingly active barium fractions. The chemist Eugène Demarçay found a spectral line not attributable to known material. In December 1898 the three announced another highly radioactive substance and named it radium, from the Latin for ray.

The two announcements show what an anomaly can and cannot do. Excess activity could reveal that the chemical inventory was incomplete. It could guide separations towards bismuth-like and barium-like fractions. It could

not by itself deliver a pure sample, an atomic weight or an uncontested place in the periodic table. Polonium and radium were discoveries in the strong sense that a new causal source had been identified and named, but the proof remained distributed across measurement, chemistry and spectroscopy.

That distinction prevents hindsight from making the outcome automatic. Pitchblende contains a crowded family of radioactive products. The Curies initially treated some changing activities as separate substances before isotope theory reorganised the field. The minute quantities available, the decay of separated polonium-210 and the way its activity accompanied bismuth in early separations made concentration especially difficult. Radium's close chemical resemblance to barium made separation slow. The anomaly opened the map; it did not print the route.

Curie's method is portable because it reverses a common reflex. When data violate a model, the first task is to test the apparatus and the sample. Once those checks survive, the mismatch is no longer rubbish to clean away. It is the place where the model has run out. The discovery of polonium and radium began with the discipline to ask what the dirt knew.

Discovery Is Also Extraction

The word discovery compresses years into a date. Polonium was announced in July 1898 and radium in December. Neither element then existed on the laboratory table as a pure metal. The Curies had active fractions, chemical resemblances and, for radium, spectral evidence. To turn a trace into an object that other scientists could study, they needed mass.

Pitchblende was expensive because uranium still had commercial uses in glass and ceramics. The useful material for the Curies was the residue left after uranium extraction at Joachimsthal, in the Austrian Empire. It was waste to the mine and concentrated opportunity to a radioactivity laboratory. Austrian scientific contacts helped them obtain an initial gift of residue, followed by larger quantities bought and transported to Paris.

The work divided by scale. In the shed beside the School of Industrial Physics and Chemistry, Marie dealt with sacks, iron vessels, acids, precipitates and steam. She crushed, dissolved, filtered and stirred batches, sometimes working outside because the fumes were intolerable. The image of her labour has become legend, but its scientific function deserves attention. Each rough chemical operation concentrated the active component enough for a finer separation later.

The tonnes were not evidence of scientific primitiveness. They followed from concentration. If the desired substance formed only a minute fraction of the residue, a delicate balance at the beginning would have had almost nothing to weigh. Bulk processing created enough enriched salt for spectroscopy and atomic-weight work. The industrial and analytical stages were one experiment at different scales.

Radium behaved like barium. That resemblance made the first identification possible and the final purification difficult. The two formed similar salts and followed one another through reactions. Curie used repeated fractional crystallisation, exploiting small differences in solubility. After each cycle, activity measurements revealed which crystals had become richer in radium. Chemistry divided the mixture; electrometry told her whether the division worked.

By 1902 she had prepared roughly a decigram of radium chloride from several tonnes of residue and determined an atomic weight close enough to establish radium as a distinct element. The material was not metallic radium. In 1910, working with André Debierne, she obtained the metal by electrolysing a radium salt with mercury and then removing the mercury from the amalgam. Polonium proved harder. The minute amount present in ore and the decay of polonium-210 frustrated concentration, and Curie never isolated a macroscopic sample of pure polonium metal.

This sequence matters because scientific proof has stages. A predicted source can be detected through an effect. A chemical fraction can be enriched. A spectrum can show a new line. An atomic weight can place an element. A compound can be prepared in usable concentration. The metal

can be isolated. Saying the Curies isolated radium in 1898 collapses all of them and makes chemical labour disappear.

The supply chain mattered too. Miners extracted ore. The Austrian government and Academy contacts helped make residues available. Industrial firms later processed radioactive material at scales an academic laboratory could not manage. Glassblowers sealed sources. Spectroscopists supplied independent evidence. Assistants and students kept methods running. Curie's achievement included coordinating this chain, even when later memory returned to the solitary woman and her pot.

Extraction also set the economics. Radium was scarce, expensive and difficult to standardise. A gram became both a research resource and a fortune. Hospitals, companies and laboratories could not build a field around admiration. They needed known quantities, reliable preparation and comparable activity. The chemistry that proved the element therefore led directly to the institutional problem Curie spent the rest of her life trying to solve.

A Scientific Partnership Is Not Shared Credit by Default

Marie and Pierre Curie are often forced into one of two bad stories. In the old version, Pierre was the scientist and Marie the devoted helper. In the corrective version, Marie did everything while Pierre merely benefited from her work. Their partnership is more interesting because it was intellectually real and institutionally unequal.

Marie selected uranium rays as her doctoral subject. She designed the comparative programme, established the relation between activity and elemental content, extended the phenomenon to thorium and recognised the ore anomaly. Pierre brought instruments, skill in precision physics and an established place in French science. Once the possibility of unknown elements appeared, he left other research to join her. They divided tasks, argued through interpretations and published both jointly and separately.

Authorship preserved part of that division. Marie's first radioactivity paper

appeared under her name. The polonium paper was signed by Marie and Pierre; the radium announcement added Gustave Bémont. Later publications moved between individual and joint authorship according to the work. The record is not perfectly transparent, but it is richer than the fused label 'the Curies' suggests.

The equipment itself carried family history. Pierre and Jacques Curie's piezoelectric work made the quartz compensation method possible. Pierre's contacts helped secure materials and access. Gustave Bémont co-authored the radium announcement. Eugène Demarçay supplied spectroscopy. André Debierne later helped isolate metallic radium. Marie's central authorship does not require those people to vanish.

Institutions, however, did not read partnership neutrally. When French scientists proposed candidates for the 1903 Physics Nobel, the early formal path favoured Becquerel and Pierre. The Swedish mathematician Gösta Mittag-Leffler alerted Pierre that Marie might be omitted. Pierre replied that any honour for the radioactivity research should include her. The Nobel committee used an eligible earlier nomination to add Marie, and the prize was shared among Becquerel and the two Curies.

The episode is often told as a neat rescue. It reveals a deeper asymmetry. Pierre could write the letter because colleagues already recognised him as a person whose objection mattered. Marie's work needed an advocate inside the male networks that distributed honours. The final prize corrected the outcome without correcting the system.

Fame created new distortions. Newspapers preferred the married pair, then the grieving widow, then the scandalised foreign woman. Scientific communities sometimes treated the couple's work as one unit when that obscured Marie's initiative, and treated Marie as an isolated exception when that obscured collaboration. Her daughter Ève's celebrated biography strengthened the image of the self-denying martyr. Later retellings often reverse the bias by writing Pierre out. Both moves turn a working relationship into a moral fable.

A better credit map separates functions. Who chose the problem? Who built the instrument? Who made the measurements? Who interpreted the anomaly? Who performed the chemistry? Who supplied independent confirmation? Who obtained material and space? Who taught the method to the next group? Different answers can coexist without dissolving responsibility.

Curie herself became a laboratory director who depended on assistants, students, doctors, donors and industrial partners. She knew from experience that discovery is collective and recognition selective. This does not mean that all contributors deserve equal credit. Contributions were not equal. It means that the famous name sits at the end of a chain whose links have to be reconstructed before praise or blame means anything.

A Result Becomes Power Through Use

Radium did not wait for a complete theory before entering the world. Its radiation could fog plates, ionise air, generate heat and damage tissue. Those effects made it a research tool, a medical prospect, a commercial product and a source of fantasy. Use expanded while the underlying picture of decay, dose and biological injury was still forming.

Commercial language widened the gap. Radium's measurable power was converted into claims about vitality, beauty and general health, many of them unsupported. Luminous paints and consumer products placed exposure in factories and homes far from the laboratories that could recognise a radiation injury. A field can lose control of its discovery once the effect becomes valuable enough for other institutions to sell.

The medical promise appeared early. Pierre Curie and Henri Becquerel suffered skin injuries from radioactive sources, and Pierre deliberately exposed his arm to observe the lesion. Physicians saw the other side of the same effect: tissue could be destroyed without a knife. In 1901 the dermatologist Henri-Alexandre Danlos and the physicist Eugène Bloch at Saint-Louis Hospital used a radium preparation on skin lesions. Radium needles and tubes later allowed radiation to be placed close to some

tumours. Curie supported the supply and measurement of material, but doctors and radiobiologists developed the treatments. She did not invent radiotherapy alone.

The mechanism is blunt. Ionising radiation deposits energy in cells, damaging molecules including DNA. Rapidly dividing tumour cells can be especially vulnerable, but healthy tissue is not exempt. Therapeutic success therefore depends on location, dose, timing and biological response. Early practitioners possessed the effect before they possessed reliable control. Some patients benefited; others were burned or exposed to methods whose claims outran evidence.

The First World War gave Curie a different problem. X-rays, produced electrically rather than emitted by radium, could locate bullets and fractures. Large hospitals had machines. Casualty clearing stations and field hospitals often did not. Working through the French Red Cross, Curie helped equip 18 mobile radiology cars, installed several fixed posts and organised the delivery of apparatus and components to hospitals that requested them. A car carried an X-ray set and a generator driven from its engine. The machine still required trained judgement: plate preparation, exposure, anatomy, electrical repair and interpretation.

Curie learned the system rather than lending her name to it. She studied anatomy and vehicle mechanics, drove units and worked near the front. Her teenage daughter Irène joined the service. From late 1916, Curie, Irène, Madeleine Monin, Marthe Klein and Suzanne Veil trained 175 nurses in radiology at the institute. The trainees came through the Édith Cavell hospital-school directed by the physician Nicole Girard-Mangin. Curie moved from experimental physics into logistics and education because an image unavailable at the point of surgery was no use.

The war exposed the cost. Protection was poor, exposures were frequent and the cumulative risk was not measured with modern dosimetry. Curie also collected radon from her radium for medical sources. Her service helped make radiology ordinary, yet it may have added to the lifetime radiation burden that damaged her own body.

Use therefore changes the meaning of a result. A source in a laboratory can be handled by a few experts. A medical system requires standards, training, maintenance, patient selection, records and rules for exposure. Once radioactivity left the research bench, Curie's problem was no longer whether the phenomenon existed. It was whether institutions could make its benefits repeatable without distributing hidden harm.

Build the Institution the Discovery Did Not Have

Curie's early work took place in borrowed rooms and a leaking shed. Those spaces supported a discovery and failed as a model for a field. Radioactivity required controlled laboratories, scarce materials, agreed references, trained researchers, medical partners and funding that did not depend on a prize arriving at the right moment.

Pierre's death in 1906 forced the institutional problem into her own career. The University of Paris asked Marie to take over his teaching and the laboratory attached to it. When she lectured on 5 November, students, journalists and spectators filled the hall; contemporary accounts say she continued the physics course from its previous stopping point. She became a full professor in 1908. The appointment gave her authority and duties, but the laboratory she wanted still had to be negotiated into existence.

The Radium Institute emerged from cooperation and rivalry between the University of Paris and the Pasteur Institute. Its plan placed two laboratories beside one another. Curie directed the physics and chemistry work. The physician Claudius Regaud led biological and medical research. Construction was completed as the First World War began, delaying the intended programme. After the war, the institute joined source preparation, measurement, radiobiology, clinical work and training without pretending that one discipline could replace the others.

Standards mattered as much as walls. Commercial radium preparations differed in composition and in the contribution of decay products, so a stated mass or trade label did not guarantee comparable activity. The International Radium Commission asked Curie to make a material reference from purified

radium chloride. After comparison with a separately prepared sample, the international standard entered the custody of the International Bureau of Weights and Measures in 1913. Laboratories could then relate their own sources to the same reference.

The unit history is separate and often muddled. In 1910 the name curie was proposed in memory of Pierre, although contemporary and later accounts also attached it to Marie or to both Curies. The original definition was the amount of radium emanation, now called radon-222, in equilibrium with one gram of radium; Marie had pressed for the one-gram scale. The International Radium-Standards Commission's 1930 report defined one curie as 3.7×10^{10} disintegrations per second. The ICRU formally adopted the curie as a unit of activity in 1953. The becquerel, one decay per second, became the SI derived unit in 1975. Curie's standard, the unit called curie and modern activity measurement belong to one metrological history, but they are not the same object.

Material scarcity remained severe. By 1920 Curie's institute possessed less radium than her reputation suggested. The American editor Marie Mattingly Meloney organised a campaign that raised enough money to buy a gram for research. Curie disliked publicity, yet travelled to the United States in 1921 and accepted the source at the White House. American fundraising later helped equip a second radium institute in Warsaw. It opened in 1932 under Bronya's direction. Celebrity became useful when public and university funding failed.

The Paris laboratory also transmitted technique. It trained researchers from several countries and employed women in numbers unusual for the period, though Curie directed it firmly rather than as an egalitarian collective. Irène Curie and Frédéric Joliot used its methods and sources to produce artificial radioactivity in 1934. Marguerite Perey entered as Curie's technician, mastered demanding radiochemical separations and discovered francium there in 1939. The institution generated work Curie could neither perform nor fully foresee.

Protection remained the incomplete branch. Burns and blood changes had

warned researchers that radiation harmed tissue, but cumulative dose, internal contamination and enforceable limits were poorly controlled. Curie supported some shielding and blood monitoring while carrying exposures that could no longer be undone. She died in 1934 from aplastic anaemia. Her final medical report attributed the marrow injury probably to accumulated radiation, although no record can divide her lifetime burden among radium, polonium, other laboratory sources and wartime X-rays.

The causal loop is now visible. At the beginning, a researcher with little institutional authority made a faint effect legible through a reproducible method. At the end, she helped build laboratories, standards and training so the field no longer depended on her personal credibility or endurance. The same institutions spread useful capability faster than they spread adequate protection. What measurement began, organisation multiplied, for benefit and harm.

How It Actually Works

A country missing from the map

Maria Salomea Skłodowska was born in Warsaw on 7 November 1867, the youngest child in a family of teachers. Poland had been partitioned, and Warsaw lay under Russian rule. Schools were expected to teach loyalty to the empire. Polish language, history and political memory survived through families, private lessons and institutions willing to risk official displeasure.

The Skłodowski household joined science to patriotism. Her father Władysław taught mathematics and physics and brought laboratory apparatus home after Russian authorities reduced Polish control of schools. Scientific apparatus entered the home at the same time that imperial rule narrowed Polish education. The family also taught her that talent did not guarantee protection. A sister died of typhus; her mother died of tuberculosis when Maria was ten; her father's position and finances deteriorated.

Maria grew up between two curricula. The official one placed Warsaw inside

the Russian Empire and rewarded obedience. The private one carried Polish literature, history and language across the partitions. Her later decision to name polonium carried that political fact into international chemistry.

She completed secondary school with a gold medal in 1883, but the route open to an able male graduate stopped. The University of Warsaw did not admit women. Maria attended the clandestine courses later remembered as the Flying University, a shifting network that taught advanced subjects and Polish culture beyond state control. It offered education, not a recognised degree. Paris held the qualification she needed, and Paris cost money.

The bargain with Bronya

Maria and her older sister Bronisława, called Bronya, made a family financing agreement. Maria would work and help pay for Bronya to study medicine in Paris. Once qualified, Bronya would support Maria's turn. The arrangement delayed Maria's formal education by several years and made it possible at all.

She tutored, then became a governess for a landowning family north of Warsaw. She taught the family's children, studied mathematics by correspondence with her father and gave lessons to local peasant children despite the political risk. She also fell in love with the family's son, Kazimierz Żorawski. His parents opposed marriage to a penniless governess. Maria remained in the post because Bronya still depended on her income. The episode did not create her scientific character, but it removed any illusion that merit dissolved class.

Back in Warsaw, she gained her first sustained laboratory practice at the Museum of Industry and Agriculture, where a laboratory was directed by her cousin Józef Boguski, a former assistant to Dmitri Mendeleev. Her experiments often failed. That was useful preparation. Textbooks present a clean operation; a laboratory presents contaminated glassware, impure reagents and results that refuse to repeat.

Boguski's rooms also gave her a first taste of chemical analysis, where

identity has to be earned through separations and reactions rather than guessed from appearance. Years later, the search for radium would demand the same patience at punishing scale. The Warsaw period did not contain a hidden version of the mature discovery. It supplied a habit of making matter answer in controlled steps.

In November 1891, aged twenty-four, she travelled to Paris. Maria enrolled at the Sorbonne as Marie.

Paris and Pierre

Marie first stayed with Bronya and her husband, then moved to the Latin Quarter to save commuting time. The rooms were cold and the diet poor. Stories of fainting from hunger have acquired a polished misery, but the academic result is clear. She finished first in the physics degree examination in 1893 and second in mathematics in 1894 after catching up in technical French and advanced preparation.

Those rankings did not place her inside a secure profession. Women could study at the Sorbonne, but academic posts, laboratory space and learned societies remained controlled by men. She survived through scholarships, teaching qualifications and commissioned research. Her career would repeatedly depend on finding a narrow institutional opening and then making the work too strong to remain inside it.

A commission to study the magnetic properties of steel created a practical problem: she needed laboratory space. A Polish colleague introduced her to Pierre Curie in 1894. Pierre was nearly ten years older, already known for work on crystals, piezoelectricity and magnetism, and employed at the Municipal School of Industrial Physics and Chemistry. His title sounded better than his rooms. He found Marie a place to work.

The relationship grew through science before marriage. Pierre encouraged her to remain in France; Marie pressed him to turn his accumulated research into a doctorate. They married in a civil ceremony in July 1895 and spent part of their honeymoon on bicycles. Their daughter Irène was born in 1897. Marie combined teaching qualifications, paid research, childcare and

the search for a doctoral problem. Domestic help and Pierre's father mattered. The laboratory partnership never removed the work of running a family.

The thesis that widened

Wilhelm Röntgen's X-rays had appeared in 1895. Becquerel's uranium rays followed in 1896. X-rays drew intense attention because they made immediate images. Becquerel's weaker effect left more basic questions open for a doctoral student.

She began by replacing photographic impressions with electrical measurements. The apparatus used an ionisation chamber, Pierre's electrometer and piezoelectric quartz. Sample after sample went between the plates. Uranium activity followed uranium content. Thorium was active too. The result appeared in her first paper in spring 1898. Her former teacher Gabriel Lippmann presented it to the Academy of Sciences, following the institution's practice of receiving communications through members.

Two minerals then exceeded the rule. Pitchblende and chalcocite produced more activity than their known uranium and thorium could supply. Marie proposed that an unknown, intensely active element must be hidden in the ores. Pierre recognised that the problem had become larger than a dissertation and joined the search.

Marie tested the mineral explanation by making artificial chalcocite from purified chemicals. It did not reproduce the natural mineral's excess. The comparison mattered because it removed a tempting alternative: perhaps the crystal structure intensified ordinary uranium activity. Instead, the natural ore contained something the synthetic version lacked. The anomaly had survived reconstruction.

Chemical separation divided pitchblende into fractions. Electrometry identified where the activity went. The bismuth fraction yielded the first claim. In July 1898 Marie and Pierre announced polonium, named for the partitioned country of her birth. The activity of separated polonium fractions

diminished with time, a difficulty later understood through the decay of polonium-210 in uranium's decay chain.

The barium fraction gave the stronger quarry. Gustave Bémont joined the chemical work. Eugène Demarçay detected a new spectral line in enriched material. On 26 December 1898 the Academy heard the announcement of radium.

From announcement to proof

The Curies had identified new active substances, not filled bottles with pure elements. Radium was present in traces and behaved almost like barium. Marie obtained residues from the Joachimsthal uranium works and spent years reducing large batches, then repeatedly crystallising salts. The shed was hot in summer, cold in winter and badly ventilated. Rain entered. The work was physically punishing because the scale required industrial handling before laboratory precision could begin.

The sequence moved from coarse to fine. Acid and heat broke residues into workable solutions. Precipitation removed broad chemical groups. Barium carried radium through the process because the two elements behaved alike. Fractional crystallisation then exploited their slight differences, while the electrometer judged which portion had gained activity. A balance could not yet see the target; radiation acted as the label on its own chemistry.

By 1902 she had produced enough enriched radium chloride to determine an atomic weight near 225, strong evidence that radium was a distinct element. Her doctoral thesis, defended in June 1903, gathered the new field into one argument. Examiners praised it as a major contribution rather than a narrow qualification.

Recognition arrived through a crooked route. French nominators proposed Becquerel and Pierre for the 1903 Physics Nobel. Gösta Mittag-Leffler in Sweden alerted Pierre, who insisted that Marie's role be recognised. An earlier valid nomination allowed the committee to include her. Becquerel received half the prize; Pierre and Marie shared the other half for their joint research on the radiation phenomena.

The Curies did not attend the Stockholm ceremony in 1903. They travelled there in 1905 to deliver the required lectures. Pierre's address included a warning that radium might become dangerous in criminal hands. The remark was prophetic, although the larger danger proved less theatrical: ordinary medical, industrial and laboratory use without adequate control.

The official division reflected a real scientific distinction. The Physics Prize recognised Becquerel's discovery and the Curies' joint research on the radiation phenomena. It did not collapse that work into the later chemical proof of radium. The two prizes belonged to connected stages of one programme, not to the same result awarded twice.

Fame without a laboratory

The Nobel money allowed the Curies to hire an assistant and reduce some teaching. Fame brought visitors, letters, requests for radium and press attention. It did not immediately bring a first-rate laboratory. Pierre received a Sorbonne chair in 1904 after pressure and an outside offer. Marie was appointed head of work in his laboratory. A second daughter, Ève, was born that year.

On 19 April 1906 Pierre crossed the Rue Dauphine, fell beneath a horse-drawn goods wagon and died from his injuries. The accident ended the partnership without warning. The University of Paris offered Marie his course and laboratory responsibilities. On 5 November the lecture hall filled with students, journalists and spectators waiting to hear the first woman in the role. Contemporary accounts report that she resumed the physics course at the point Pierre had reached rather than turning the lecture into a memorial.

Her position became a full professorship in 1908. She continued the chemistry of radium, refined its atomic weight and, with André Debierne, isolated metallic radium in 1910. She published a two-volume treatise on radioactivity and helped create an international radium standard. These were the works of a laboratory head, not the afterglow of a shared discovery.

The standard solved a practical dispute. Laboratories were buying preparations described by mass or commercial grade, while activity depended on composition and decay products. Through the International Radium Commission, Curie prepared a sealed radium chloride reference. It was compared with a separate source and deposited at the International Bureau of Weights and Measures in 1913. A common material reference allowed laboratories to relate their own sources to the same scale.

Two defeats and a second Nobel

In 1910 Curie stood for election to the French Academy of Sciences. The contest became entangled with the country's divisions over religion, nationalism and the place of women. Her opponent Édouard Branly had strong Catholic and patriotic backing. Right-wing newspapers falsely described Curie as Jewish and insufficiently French. Branly won in January 1911 by two votes.

Months later she sat at the first Solvay Conference in Brussels among many of the physicists remaking the atom, the only woman in the group photograph. The contrast was sharp. International physics treated her as an authority on radiation while France's most prestigious scientific academy refused her membership. Prestige had no single border and no final verdict.

The same year, Curie's relationship with the physicist Paul Langevin became a press scandal. Langevin was separated from his wife but still married. Private letters were taken and published. Newspapers cast Curie as a foreign destroyer of a French home; crowds gathered outside her house, and she moved her daughters to safety. The affair was real. The political and sexualised campaign built around it was also real.

During the attack, she learned that she had won the 1911 Chemistry Nobel for finding polonium and radium, isolating radium and investigating its properties and compounds. Svante Arrhenius advised her not to attend while the scandal continued. She answered that private accusations did not alter the scientific work and travelled to Stockholm with Bronya and Irène. She was the first person to receive two Nobel Prizes and remains the only

individual awarded Nobel Prizes in two different scientific categories, Physics and Chemistry.

The award did not produce immediate health or calm. Curie suffered serious illness and withdrew from laboratory work for an extended period. Hertha Ayrton, the British physicist and suffrage campaigner, gave her refuge. Curie returned to the laboratory late in 1912.

War turns the work outward

The new Radium Institute was ready in 1914. War began before its research programme could settle. Most male researchers were mobilised. Curie took the institute's principal radium source to Bordeaux for safety, then returned to Paris and redirected herself towards radiology.

The Union des Femmes de France, one of the French Red Cross societies, appointed Curie inspector of its radiography service. She assembled equipment through donors, manufacturers and government contacts. Eighteen cars were fitted with X-ray apparatus and generators. She also installed several fixed posts and organised the supply of equipment to other hospitals. Curie learned to drive, maintain equipment and read enough anatomy to work with surgeons. Irène, still a teenager, assisted and later taught.

A mobile unit joined several technologies that failed separately. The car had to reach damaged roads; its engine or generator had to supply steady current; the tube and induction coil had to survive transport; plates had to be exposed and developed; the patient had to remain positioned; the surgeon had to understand the image. Curie's achievement lay in making the sequence dependable enough for wartime use, not in inventing the X-ray machine.

The service depended on operators. From late 1916 Curie and a small teaching team trained 175 nurses at the institute in electricity, anatomy, photography and practical radiography. The point was operational independence: after a fixed post had been installed, someone local had to keep the apparatus working and choose between radioscopy and

radiography. X-ray examinations helped locate bullets, shrapnel and fractures, although claims about an exact number of soldiers saved or treated cannot be established with confidence.

Curie's wartime work added repeated exposures from machines without modern shielding or dosimetry. She also prepared radon sources from radium for treatment. The war demonstrated her skill at building a service from incomplete parts and added to the physical cost of her field.

The institute and the final years

After the war, Curie and the physician Claudius Regaud developed the Radium Institute as paired laboratories for physical and chemical research and for biological and medical work. A Curie Foundation, created in 1921, supported treatment and opened a dispensary the following year. The arrangement placed measurement, laboratory research and patient care within one organisation while preserving different professional responsibilities.

The laboratory was international and unusually open to women, though Curie's own authority remained stern and hierarchical. Assistants prepared sources, measured activity and learned separations that could take months. Physicians and biologists tested effects in living tissue. The institute made radioactivity a profession with routines and careers, rather than a phenomenon held together by the endurance of one couple.

Radium remained scarce. In 1921 Marie Mattingly Meloney led an American campaign that bought a gram for Curie's research. President Warren Harding presented it at the White House, and Curie ensured that the source was secured for laboratory use rather than treated as disposable personal wealth. A later campaign helped equip the Warsaw Radium Institute, opened in 1932 with Bronya as director.

Curie also served on the League of Nations' International Committee on Intellectual Cooperation and argued for research support, scholarships and scientific exchange. She disliked public display but had learned that scientific independence required organised money.

Her health declined through the 1920s. Cataracts impaired her sight. She supported shielding and blood monitoring for radiation workers, yet protection remained incomplete and her own exposures could not be reversed. She died on 4 July 1934 at a sanatorium in Haute-Savoie. Her final medical report identified aplastic anaemia and judged that the marrow had probably been injured by accumulated radiation. No historical record can divide the dose among radium, polonium, other laboratory sources and wartime X-rays.

Months before her death, Irène Curie and Frédéric Joliot had produced artificial radioactivity. Natural radioactive elements no longer set the limit. A laboratory built from Curie's work had learned to make new radioactive atoms.

How we know

Curie's papers, thesis, laboratory notebooks, lectures and autobiographical notes preserve methods and public claims. Pierre's papers, Academy proceedings, Nobel archives, university records and correspondence clarify collaboration and institutional decisions. Newspapers document the 1911 campaign, but they are evidence for prejudice and publicity rather than neutral reports of private motives. The 1898 papers also fix what the Curies claimed at the time, preventing later retellings from moving pure elements backwards into the announcements.

Ève Curie's 1937 biography preserved family material and shaped the durable portrait of heroic self-denial. Later historians restored money, industry, laboratory organisation, sexuality and intellectual property to the account. Numbers for ore processed and wartime radiology differ because sources combine separate batches or collapse Curie's work into the wider French military system. This narrative follows the narrower archival reconstruction: 18 equipped cars, several fixed posts, organised equipment supply and 175 nurses trained. It does not assign the wider system's installations or examinations to Curie personally. No dosimetry record can reconstruct her lifetime exposure, so the account uses bounded language where an exact figure would imply knowledge the evidence does not

contain.

What People Get Wrong

"Marie Curie discovered radioactivity"

Henri Becquerel discovered uranium's spontaneous rays in 1896. Wilhelm Röntgen's X-rays had helped make penetrating radiation a scientific obsession, and several researchers were probing related effects. Gerhard Carl Schmidt reported thorium activity independently close to Curie's own result.

Curie's achievement was different and larger than repeating the first observation. She made the effect quantitative, showed that activity followed uranium content across compounds, extended the class of active elements, named radioactivity and used it as a method of chemical search.

Pitchblende's excess current then led to polonium and radium. Becquerel found the door. Curie helped build the field beyond it. Giving her the first discovery erases him and obscures what she contributed.

The myth survives because one famous name is easier to teach than a change in method. Nobel language also joined Becquerel's discovery to the Curies' research, which later summaries often compress into one event. The distinction matters. Finding an effect, creating a comparative science around it and using that science to find new matter are separate achievements. Curie's reputation needs no borrowed first.

"Pierre did the science and Marie did the stirring"

Marie chose the thesis problem, established the measurement programme and recognised that anomalous ores implied unknown active substances. Pierre supplied instruments, expertise in precision physics, scientific contacts and sustained collaboration once the search for elements began. The crude processing and fine separations involved Marie, Pierre, assistants and chemists, with Gustave Bémont named on the radium paper and Eugène Demarçay supplying spectral evidence.

The old sexist version makes Marie manual and Pierre intellectual. The modern counter-myth makes Pierre decorative. Both fail. Their work was a partnership with identifiable contributions and unequal access to recognition. Marie's authorship becomes clearer when the chain is reconstructed, not when everyone else is removed.

The stirring image helps the distortion. Bulk chemistry was visible, exhausting and easy to code as obedient labour, while instrument design and interpretation looked more intellectual. In this case the rough processing was linked to a measurement strategy Marie had established, and she also performed the analysis that turned fractions into evidence. Pierre's physics made that strategy stronger. A partnership can be unequal in status without being fake in thought.

"The Curies isolated two pure elements in 1898"

In 1898 they announced evidence for polonium and radium in active chemical fractions. Polonium travelled with bismuth. Radium travelled with barium and produced a new spectral line in enriched material. Those were strong discovery claims, not bottles of pure metal.

Marie spent the next years concentrating radium salts, measuring atomic weight and establishing chemical identity. By 1902 she had about one-tenth of a gram of radium chloride after processing residues on the scale of tonnes. Work with André Debierne produced metallic radium in 1910. No visible bulk of pure polonium metal emerged from her programme. Discovery has stages, and collapsing them into one date removes the chemistry that made the claim durable.

The 1898 announcements were still discoveries. Science does not require a new element to appear immediately as a shiny lump. It requires evidence that excludes known explanations and continues to survive harder tests. The correction protects both sides: it refuses the claim that nothing was found until 1910, and refuses the picture of two pure metals emerging from a cauldron in one remarkable year.

"The Nobel Prizes ended the prejudice"

The first Nobel nearly omitted Marie. Pierre's intervention helped bring her into the 1903 award, which made her the first woman Nobel laureate but did not make French scientific institutions neutral. In 1911 the Academy of Sciences rejected her by two votes after a campaign shaped by gender, nationalism, religion and false claims about her identity. The Langevin scandal then turned a private relationship into public licence to treat her as an invading foreign woman.

The second Nobel arrived during that attack. International prestige gave Curie leverage, money and a platform. It did not dissolve exclusion. Nor was every setback reducible to sex: institutions had factions, rival claims and scientific disputes. The correction is not that prejudice explains the whole life. It is that achievement and prejudice operated at the same time.

Prizes are decisions by particular committees, not certificates that every gate has opened. Curie could be honoured in Stockholm, invited to an international physics conference and still denied an Academy seat in Paris. She could inherit Pierre's course after his death and remain dependent on male colleagues, donors and administrators for laboratories. Recognition changes bargaining power. It does not erase the structure that made bargaining necessary.

"The Curies refused patents because money never mattered"

Pierre and Marie published their radium methods and did not patent the process. They expressed a belief that scientific knowledge should circulate, and a patent on a newly found natural element was not the same proposition as a patent on a machine. Their choice helped laboratories and firms enter the field.

The saintly version then removes economics. The Curies needed ore, chemicals, assistants, space and equipment. They accepted grants, worked with industrial producers and used prize money. Marie later negotiated standards, ownership of radium sources, donor campaigns and institutional

budgets with care. She crossed the Atlantic because her famous institute lacked enough radium. Open publication was a real choice. Indifference to material resources was not.

The relevant commercial object would have been a process, preparation or application, not private ownership of a natural element. Firms still built proprietary skill around production, and open papers did not make tonnes of residue or trained chemists free. The lesson is narrower than a slogan about patents. Knowledge can be shared while material capacity remains scarce, expensive and unequally controlled.

"Early radiation workers had no warning at all"

They had warnings. Becquerel and Pierre Curie suffered skin injuries. Doctors deliberately studied radium burns. X-ray operators reported damaged hands, hair loss and chronic lesions. In 1925 Curie joined a French Academy of Medicine commission that recommended lead screens and periodic blood-cell tests for workers in industrial laboratories handling radioactive materials.

What they lacked was a complete risk model and reliable control. They did not have modern dosimetry, exposure limits or a mature account of cumulative and internal dose. Warnings were translated unevenly into rules, especially for chronic and internal exposure. Low doses were often advertised as stimulating or healthy. Saying nobody knew turns preventable delay into innocence. Saying they understood modern radiation protection projects later knowledge backwards. The evidence sat between alarm and system.

A burn supplied an immediate warning but not a safe threshold. Blood changes could be monitored without revealing which past exposure caused them. A shield useful against one radiation type could be inadequate against another, and material inside the body changed the geometry again. Protection required physics, medicine, measurement and authority to interrupt work. The missing piece was an organised system, not the total absence of clues.

"Radium was either a miracle or a mistake"

Radium attracted both claims. It appeared in cancer treatment and serious research, then spread into patent medicines, cosmetics and promises of restored vitality. Workers handling luminous paint ingested radium with lethal consequences. Poorly controlled therapy injured patients. The market treated a physical effect as a moral guarantee.

Yet radium was not a medical dead end. Sealed radium sources helped establish brachytherapy, radiobiology and the principle that radiation can control some tumours. Radium-226 was later replaced in many uses by safer, more convenient isotopes and electrical radiation machines, while modern nuclear medicine uses other radionuclides with targeted properties. The correction is a rule: a substance can be medically valuable, commercially abused and technically superseded without any one description cancelling the others. Early enthusiasm also followed a real asymmetry in evidence. A tumour shrinking or a skin lesion healing could be seen soon; cancer caused by exposure might take years to appear. Fast benefits and delayed harms create a market for premature certainty.

The women who painted luminous watch dials show why the distinction matters. The glow was useful; the practice of shaping brushes with the lips carried radium into bone and caused appalling disease. That industrial history is not evidence that every therapeutic exposure was fraudulent. It is evidence that benefit depends on source, route, dose, geometry and control. Radiation is a mechanism, not a verdict.

Use It

Follow the instrument

When a claim rests on something invisible, abstract or too large to inspect directly, begin with the device that produces the evidence. Curie's current was not radioactivity itself. It was the electrical consequence of radiation ionising air, passed through a particular chamber, voltage, geometry and compensation method. Knowing that chain explains both the power and the limits of the result.

This lens improves reading across science and public life. A number comes from a sensor, assay, survey, model or accounting rule. Ask what the instrument responds to, what it ignores, how it is calibrated and which comparisons remain valid. Curie's advantage came from making weak samples comparable. A sensitive device without stable comparison would have produced impressive noise.

Then follow the chain one step farther. Who maintains the instrument, owns the reference standard and decides when a reading is invalid?

Measurement looks impersonal at the point of display because earlier human decisions have been built into the apparatus. Trust the number in proportion to how well that hidden work has been exposed and tested.

Let anomalies challenge the model

Pitchblende mattered because it violated a rule Curie had already tested: activity followed the quantity of known radioactive element. She did not leap from one odd reading to a new entry in the periodic table. She repeated measurements, separated the material and watched where the excess activity travelled.

Use the same sequence. First test the measurement. Then test the sample and the boundary conditions. If the mismatch survives, treat it as evidence that the model omits something. This is not a licence to celebrate every outlier. Most are error, contamination or chance. The valuable anomaly is the one that remains after those cheaper explanations have been attacked.

Curie's artificial chalcocite is the model. Rebuilding the mineral from purified ingredients separated an effect of structure from an effect of hidden composition. A good anomaly programme therefore includes an attempted reconstruction: make the world without the suspected missing factor and ask whether the mismatch disappears.

Separate the stages of proof

Polonium and radium expose how one verb can hide several achievements. Detecting an effect, inferring a source, concentrating a fraction, obtaining independent spectral evidence, measuring atomic weight and isolating a metal are not interchangeable. Each answers a different objection.

Before accepting a claim that something has been discovered, proven or solved, ask which stage has been reached. A mechanism suggested by data is not a mechanism directly tested. A laboratory demonstration is not a scalable process. A product that works once is not a reliable service. Curie's work became durable because she kept moving the claim through harder forms of proof rather than protecting the excitement of the first announcement.

Name the next objection before celebrating. For polonium it was chemical separation. For radium it became spectrum, atomic weight, quantity and finally metal. In another field it may be replication, external validity, manufacturability or long-term safety. Progress becomes clearer when proof is treated as a ladder rather than a switch.

Map the work before the names

The name on a prize is an output of institutions as well as a record of work. Reconstruct the work before deciding who owns an achievement. Curie's programme included the choice of problem, an instrument inherited from earlier crystal research, repeated measurements, chemical labour, spectroscopy, ore supply, laboratory access, publication and nomination.

This avoids two errors. One is the great-person story in which everybody around the famous figure becomes scenery. The other is a flattening in

which collaboration means no contribution can be distinguished. Credit should track function and responsibility. The hardest question is often not who had the idea, but who turned it into evidence that others could use.

Also map the gatekeepers. A nomination, appointment or publication can misrepresent work even when the underlying collaboration was fair. The person who can correct the record may possess status that the omitted contributor lacks. Credit analysis therefore needs two maps: production of the result and distribution of recognition.

Build safety with capability

Ionising radiation's capacity to injure tissue created the therapeutic opportunity and the hazard. Early practice advanced because the effect was strong. Protection lagged because cumulative dose was harder to see than a burn or a tumour response. The gap was institutional, not merely personal.

Whenever a new capability spreads, pair each route to benefit with a route to harm. Identify who is exposed, how exposure accumulates, what monitoring could detect early injury and who has authority to stop work. Do this while the system is small. Once equipment, money and professional prestige depend on continued use, uncertainty acquires defenders. Curie's history warns against waiting for accumulated injuries to make protection respectable.

Separate a missing measurement from a missing effect. Early workers could see burns before they could calculate cumulative dose. That was reason to narrow exposure while measurement improved, not reason to treat unmeasured exposure as zero. Precaution is strongest when it specifies the mechanism, the exposed group and the reversible step available now.

Spend reputation on capacity

Curie's fame could have remained a collection of medals. She spent it on laboratories, radium, scholarships, standards and international cooperation. The American campaign was awkward and highly public, but one gram of radium in an institute could support years of research. Her name became useful when it secured equipment and training for other people.

The transferable question is what remains when the exceptional person leaves. If the answer is contacts, memory and heroic effort, the work is fragile. Convert reputation into equipment, documented methods, decision rights, funding and trained successors. Curie's institution produced work she did not live to complete, including artificial radioactivity. That is a stronger measure of influence than imitation.

Capacity also needs an intake route. Curie's laboratory admitted and trained people who could not have created a radium programme alone. A durable institution does more than preserve the founder's method. It gives newcomers a way to become competent, disagree and eventually extend the work beyond the founder's own model.

The limits

Curie's life does not prove that hard work defeats exclusion. Her ability, family culture, French training, Pierre's partnership, scientific timing, donors and international networks all mattered. Many women with comparable discipline were denied the route she found. Treating her as proof that barriers can be overcome turns an exception into an excuse for the barrier.

Nor does measurement remove judgement. An instrument can stabilise a comparison while leaving the interpretation wrong. Curie was right that radioactivity belonged to the atom and wrong about parts of its cause. Institutions can preserve knowledge and preserve blind spots. The Radium Institute advanced treatment while protection remained incomplete.

The final limit is moral. Scientific usefulness does not decide how a capability should be distributed or marketed. Radium could treat a tumour,

enrich a company, injure a worker and finance a laboratory. The physics did not rank those outcomes. People and institutions had to do it, often badly. An account of how power travels does not decide which destination is just.

The one thing to keep

Ask what the result still needs.

Curie's first decisive evidence was a current too small to see. That did not yet give her a new element. An anomalous ore did not yet give her a pure substance. A radium salt did not yet give medicine a safe treatment. A Nobel Prize did not yet give a laboratory enough material, and a laboratory did not automatically protect the people inside it. Each achievement was real. None completed the next task by magic.

That is what should look different now. When a breakthrough is announced, ask what makes it visible, what would independently confirm it, what material or skill would make it reproducible, what standard would make comparisons honest, what organisation would carry it into practice and who bears the unmeasured risk. The missing requirement may sit far from the celebrated idea.

Marie Curie found two elements and won two prizes. Her larger achievement was to keep identifying the next unfinished job, then build enough method and capacity for other people to take it on. Her history also records the cost of failing to ask one final question soon enough: what protection does this new power require?

Terms

Radioactivity. The spontaneous emission of particles or electromagnetic radiation from unstable atomic nuclei. Curie introduced the term for a class of effects that had first appeared as separate uranium rays.

Ionising radiation. Radiation energetic enough to remove electrons from atoms or molecules. The resulting ions explain the electrical current Curie measured and much of radiation's biological damage.

Uranium rays. The early name for the penetrating emissions Becquerel observed from uranium compounds in 1896. The phrase belongs to the period before radioactivity became a general category.

X-rays. Electromagnetic radiation commonly produced in an imaging tube when high-energy electrons strike a metal target. Röntgen discovered them in 1895; Curie's wartime units used them for diagnostic images rather than radium as the source.

Electrometer. An instrument for measuring electric charge or potential. The Curie apparatus detected tiny currents in ionised air, converting radiation from a photographic effect into a quantitative comparison.

Piezoelectricity. Electric charge produced when certain crystals are squeezed or stretched. Pierre and Jacques Curie's quartz work supplied the controlled charge used to balance the current in Marie's measurements.

Ionisation. The creation of charged atoms or molecules by adding or removing electrons. Radiation ionised the air between metal plates, allowing a current to flow through the measurement chamber.

Pitchblende. A uranium-rich ore, now usually called uraninite. Its activity exceeded what known uranium could explain, directing the Curies towards trace quantities of polonium and radium.

Chalcolite. An older name used for the uranium mineral now commonly called torbernite. Its unexpectedly high activity supported Curie's conclusion that some ores contained unknown radioactive matter.

Uranium. Element 92, the source of Becquerel's original rays. Curie's measurements showed that activity followed the quantity of uranium across compounds, helping separate atomic behaviour from molecular form.

Thorium. Element 90, identified as radioactive by Curie and independently by Gerhard Carl Schmidt in 1898. It showed that the uranium effect belonged to a wider class.

Polonium. Element 84, announced by Marie and Pierre Curie in July 1898

and named for Poland. Its minute abundance, short-lived polonium-210 and tendency to accompany bismuth in early separations made isolation difficult.

Radium. Element 88, announced by Pierre and Marie Curie and Gustave Bémont in December 1898. Its intense emissions made it central to early nuclear research and radiation medicine.

Barium. Element 56, chemically close to radium. Their similar salts allowed radium to travel with barium during separation and made the final purification painfully repetitive.

Bismuth. Element 83. Activity accompanying bismuth through pitchblende separations supplied the first evidence for polonium. The Curies inferred kinship, but later chemistry placed polonium among the chalcogens and showed that the resemblance was incomplete.

Fractional crystallisation. Repeatedly dissolving and crystallising a mixture to exploit small differences in solubility. Curie used the process to enrich radium relative to barium, checking progress through activity.

Spectroscopy. Identification of matter through the wavelengths it emits or absorbs. Eugène Demarçay's new spectral line supplied independent evidence that the active barium fraction contained an unknown element.

Atomic weight. The relative average mass assigned to atoms of an element under the conventions of the period. Curie's radium measurements helped secure its place as a distinct element.

Isotope. One of two or more forms of an element with the same proton number but different neutron numbers. Isotope theory later explained why chemically identical radioactive substances could decay differently.

Radioactive decay. The spontaneous transformation of an unstable nucleus into another state or nucleus, accompanied by emitted radiation. Rutherford and Soddy developed the transformation model after Curie's first work.

Half-life. The time required for half the radioactive nuclei in a sample to

decay. It describes a population statistically, not the scheduled lifetime of any single atom.

Alpha radiation. Helium nuclei emitted in some decays. Alpha particles travel only short distances but can cause intense damage when alpha-emitting material enters the body.

Beta radiation. Fast electrons or positrons emitted during nuclear change. Rutherford's early classification separated the more penetrating beta component from alpha radiation.

Gamma radiation. High-energy electromagnetic radiation emitted from nuclei. It is often more penetrating than alpha or beta radiation and demands dense shielding for intense sources.

Radon. A radioactive noble gas produced in radium decay chains. Early medicine called it radium emanation; Curie collected it for sealed therapeutic sources during the First World War.

Curie. A non-SI activity unit, symbol Ci. Proposed in 1910 in memory of Pierre, its first definition referred to radon-222 in equilibrium with one gram of radium. A 1930 commission report set 1 Ci at 3.7×10^{10} disintegrations per second; the ICRU adopted the unit in 1953. It is not Curie's 1913 reference ampoule.

Becquerel. The modern SI unit of activity, symbol Bq, equal to one nuclear decay per second. It measures event rate, not the biological effect of the radiation.

Dosimetry. Measurement and calculation of energy deposited by ionising radiation, often adjusted for radiation type and exposed tissue. The lack of reliable early dosimetry helps explain why medical use, industrial exposure and occupational harm developed together.

Radiography. The production of images using penetrating radiation, most commonly X-rays. Curie's mobile units brought diagnostic imaging closer to wounded soldiers and the surgeons treating them.

Radiotherapy. Treatment using ionising radiation to damage diseased tissue, especially tumours. Modern practice depends on planned dose, geometry, timing and protection that early radium work did not yet possess.

Go Deeper

The full life

Susan Quinn, *Marie Curie: A Life* (1995). This is the best next step for the complete biography: Warsaw, the bargain with Bronya, Pierre, the laboratory, the Langevin affair, the daughters, the American campaigns and the politics surrounding the prizes. Quinn treats Curie as an ambitious working scientist rather than a plaster saint and reconstructs the private life without making scandal the explanation for everything. It is long enough to show how money, family and institutions shaped the science. The warning is age: later historians have added more on laboratory organisation, intellectual property and women in Curie's research network. Quinn remains strongest on the emotional and political continuity of the life, especially the years that short summaries rush between the two prizes.

Curie in her own voice

Marie Curie, *Pierre Curie: With Autobiographical Notes* (1923), translated by Charlotte and Vernon Kellogg. The first part is Curie's account of Pierre's life and work; the shorter autobiographical notes supply her own public version of Warsaw, Paris, radioactivity and the war. Read it for tone, selection and the way she described scientific duty after fame. It is a primary source, not a transparent window. Curie wrote with reserve, protected family privacy and shaped a usable public memory. The omissions are as informative as the statements. Pair it with a later biography and notice how little space Curie gives to grievance, even when the surrounding record shows how fiercely she fought for posts, materials and recognition.

The science around her

Marjorie C. Malley, *Radioactivity: A History of a Mysterious Science* (2011). Malley follows the phenomenon beyond one life, from Becquerel and the Curies through Rutherford, Soddy, isotope theory, nuclear structure, medicine and public fascination. It is the clearest way to see which parts Curie established, which questions she left open and why radioactivity forced physics and chemistry to change together. The scientific explanations are approachable, though the book expects attention to experiments and competing models rather than offering another heroic biography. It is especially useful for understanding radioactive transformation, the point at which Curie's reliable measurements outgrew some of her own early interpretations.

Fame, ownership and institutions

Eva Hemmungs Wirtén, *Making Marie Curie: Intellectual Property and Celebrity Culture in an Age of Information* (2015). Read this after a conventional biography. Wirtén examines the unpatented radium process, laboratory notebooks, donor campaigns, publicity, property and the manufacture of Curie's public image. The argument corrects the idea that science and commerce occupied separate worlds. It is more interpretive than Quinn and narrower than Malley, which is its value: it shows how open knowledge can coexist with scarce material, strategic ownership and a name powerful enough to raise a gram of radium. The book also explains why the saintly image was productive for institutions that benefited from it.

Notes and Sources

Warsaw, education and the family bargain

The chronology of Russian-ruled Warsaw, Curie's family, the clandestine courses commonly called the Flying University and the agreement between Maria and Bronisława draws chiefly on Susan Quinn's *Marie Curie: A Life*, Curie's autobiographical notes and the American Institute of Physics exhibition *Marie Curie and the Science of Radioactivity*. The underground institution changed form and venue, so the familiar name does not imply a permanent campus. The Żorawski relationship is supported by correspondence and biography. It is used to reveal a class boundary, not to invent a psychological cause for Curie's later work.

Early laboratory training and Paris degrees

Quinn, Curie's autobiographical notes and the AIP exhibition support the Museum of Industry and Agriculture, Józef Boguski's role, the 1891 move to Paris and Curie's degree results. She placed first in the physics examination in 1893 and second in mathematics in 1894. Accounts of cold rooms, poor diet and illness depend partly on later recollection. The narrative therefore retains the material conditions and removes decorative travel props or reconstructed scenes that the evidence cannot carry.

Pierre Curie, piezoelectricity and the instrument

Pierre and Jacques Curie's piezoelectric work, Pierre's electrometers and Marie's ionisation method are documented in the Curies' papers, Marie Curie's thesis and Pierre Radvanyi and Jacques Villain's review. The apparatus compensated charge generated through ionised air with a controlled piezoelectric charge. Currents varied with sample, geometry, voltage and atmospheric conditions, so the body describes them as minute rather than assigning one theatrical value to the whole programme.

Uranium, thorium and the atomic-property inference

Marie Curie's 1898 paper, presented to the Academy of Sciences by Gabriel Lippmann, supports the relation between activity and uranium content, the thorium result and her conclusion that emission appeared to be an atomic property. Gerhard Carl Schmidt reported thorium activity independently at about the same time, so priority is stated narrowly. Curie's inference was operationally decisive but did not contain the later theories of nuclear structure, radioactive transformation or isotopes.

The mineral anomaly and artificial chalcophile

Curie's thesis and early papers describe pitchblende and natural chalcophile as more active than their known uranium could explain. Her artificial chalcophile, prepared from purified materials, lacked the natural mineral's excess. This control weakened an explanation based on mineral structure and supported the presence of unknown active matter. Chalcophile is retained as the historical term; torbernite is the common modern name for the relevant copper uranium phosphate mineral.

Polonium and radium

The polonium announcement is Pierre and Marie Curie's "Sur une substance nouvelle radio-active, contenue dans la pechblende", *Comptes rendus* 127 (1898), 175-178. The radium announcement is Pierre Curie, Marie Curie and Gustave Bémont, "Sur une nouvelle substance fortement radio-active contenue dans la pechblende", volume 127, 1215-1217.

Eugène Demarçay's spectral observation supplied independent support for the enriched radium fraction. Polonium was named for partitioned Poland; radium took its name from the Latin root for ray. Both papers concerned active chemical fractions and new substances, not isolated pure metals. The polonium paper suggested a chemical kinship with bismuth because the activity accompanied that fraction. Later chemistry showed that the resemblance was incomplete, so the body describes the observed separation behaviour rather than treating polonium and bismuth as elemental twins.

Ore, residues and the stages of proof

Curie's thesis, her 1911 Nobel lecture, Quinn, Malley, the AIP exhibition and Musée Curie material support the account of Joachimsthal residues, bulk processing, fractional crystallisation and atomic-weight work. The often quoted total of about 13 tonnes combines residue acquired and processed across stages that popular retellings do not always distinguish. The body therefore says several tonnes. By 1902 Curie had about one-tenth of a gram of concentrated radium chloride and an atomic-weight result near 225, compared with the modern relative atomic mass near 226 for radium-226. Work with André Debierne produced metallic radium in 1910. Curie's programme did not yield a visible macroscopic sample of pure polonium metal.

Radioactive transformation and isotope theory

Radvanyi and Villain, Malley and the contemporary work of Ernest Rutherford and Frederick Soddy support the account of alpha and beta classification, spontaneous transformation and the later reorganisation produced by isotope theory. Paul Villard identified the especially penetrating gamma component. Curie considered alternatives involving absorption of an unknown external radiation and did not immediately accept every transformation claim. The text credits the reliable atomic-property inference without assigning her explanations developed by others.

The 1903 Nobel and scientific credit

Nobel Foundation records, the AIP exhibition, Quinn and Eva Hemmungs Wirtén's *Making Marie Curie* support the nomination account. French nominations prominently advanced Becquerel and Pierre. Gösta Mittag-Leffler warned Pierre that Marie was at risk of omission, and Pierre objected to honouring their joint work without her. A valid earlier nomination gave the committee a route to include Marie. The process was therefore more procedural than the familiar story in which one letter instantly reverses a completed decision. Becquerel received one half of the prize; Pierre and Marie received one quarter each.

Pierre's death, the Sorbonne and metallic radium

University records, Curie's autobiographical account, Quinn and the AIP exhibition support Pierre's death on 19 April 1906, Marie's succession to his course, her lecture on 5 November 1906 and her full professorship in 1908. Contemporary accounts say she resumed the course where it had stopped; the narrative treats this as a reported public action, not invented dialogue. Her two-volume *Traité de radioactivité* appeared in 1910. Her work with Debierne and the 1911 Nobel lecture support the metallic-radium account.

The Academy election, Langevin campaign and second Nobel

Quinn, Wirtén and the AIP exhibition provide the main reconstruction of 1911. Édouard Branly defeated Curie in the Academy of Sciences election by two votes. Gender, Catholic politics, nationalism, institutional factions and false claims that Curie was Jewish all appeared in the public struggle. The relationship with Paul Langevin and publication of stolen private letters are documented; the narrative does not supply private motives that the record cannot establish. Nobel records recognise work on both element discoveries, radium's isolation and the study of its nature and compounds. As checked on 2 September 2026, Curie remains the first person to receive two Nobel Prizes and the only individual awarded Nobel Prizes in two different scientific categories, Physics and Chemistry.

Medical use, commercial claims and radiation injury

Malley, Institut Curie material and histories of early radiology support the account of radiation burns, Pierre Curie's deliberate skin exposure and the early treatment by Henri-Alexandre Danlos and Eugène Bloch at Saint-Louis Hospital. Curie is not credited with inventing radiotherapy. Physicians, physicists, biologists, hospitals, instrument makers and source producers developed the field. Modern introductory mechanism is used only to clarify the shared physical basis of benefit and harm: ionising radiation deposits energy in tissue and damages molecules including DNA, while treatment depends on source, dose, geometry, timing and tissue response. Radium's later replacement in many applications does not erase its role in brachytherapy and radiobiology.

First World War radiology

Curie's *La Radiologie et la guerre*, Natalie Pigeard-Micault's 2024 archival reconstruction, Musée Curie, Institut Curie and the AIP exhibition support the wartime account. Pigeard-Micault identifies 18 equipped cars, several fixed posts, organised equipment supply and 175 nurses trained. Older summaries often turn this into 20 cars and 200 fixed units directly attributable to Curie; the body rejects that compression. The wider French service grew through the army, the Red Cross and other organisations, so system-wide installations and examinations are not presented as Curie's personal output. No precise number of soldiers saved is retained because the records and causal definition cannot establish one.

Radium Institute, Curie Foundation and American campaigns

Institut Curie records, Quinn and Wirtén support the paired Curie and Pasteur laboratories, Claudius Regaud's medical leadership, the Curie Foundation, the 1921 American gram and the Warsaw institute opened in 1932. Marie Mattingly Meloney organised the first United States campaign. The source was secured for laboratory work rather than treated as disposable private treasure. A later campaign supported Warsaw. These episodes show deliberate negotiation over publicity, property and funding, not indifference to money.

International radium standard and activity units

Céline Fellag Ariouet's "Marie Curie, the International Radium Standard and the BIPM", BIPM records and NIST histories support the metrology account. The International Radium Commission asked Curie to prepare a reference in 1910. She prepared a sealed radium chloride source, compared it with an independently prepared source and deposited the international standard at the BIPM on 21 February 1913. The original source contained 21.99 milligrams of radium chloride.

The unit history is related but separate. The name curie was proposed in

1910 in memory of Pierre, although contemporary and later accounts also attached it to Marie or to both Curies. The original definition was the amount of radium emanation, now radon-222, in equilibrium with one gram of radium; Marie had pressed for the one-gram scale. The International Radium-Standards Commission's 1930 report defined one curie as 3.7×10^{10} disintegrations per second. The ICRU formally adopted the curie as a unit of activity in 1953. The becquerel, equal to one decay per second, was adopted as the SI derived unit of activity in 1975. Activity is an event rate, not absorbed dose or biological effect.

Laboratory transmission, Irène and Marguerite Perey

Soraya Boudia's work on Curie's laboratory, Dava Sobel's *The Elements of Marie Curie*, Nobel records and institutional histories support the network described. Irène Curie and Frédéric Joliot announced artificial radioactivity in 1934 and received the 1935 Chemistry Nobel. Marguerite Perey entered Curie's laboratory as a technician and discovered francium there in 1939. These examples demonstrate institutional transmission. The full science of artificial radioactivity and the later nuclear age belongs to other books.

Cataracts, aplastic anaemia and exposure

Nobel and AIP biographies, Institut Curie records and medical histories identify aplastic anaemia as Curie's cause of death and strongly associate it with occupational ionising radiation. Cataracts and blood abnormalities are consistent with substantial exposure. No surviving personal dosimetry record can divide her lifetime burden among radium, polonium, other laboratory sources and wartime X-rays. The narrative therefore uses probable or strongly associated causation rather than inventing a recovered dose or single fatal incident. Early burns, later shielding and blood monitoring are acknowledged, while precautions remained incomplete by modern standards.

Bibliography

Primary and contemporary sources

Curie, Marie. "Rayons émis par les composés de l'uranium et du thorium." *Comptes rendus hebdomadaires des séances de l'Académie des sciences* 126 (1898): 1101-1103.

Curie, Marie. *Recherches sur les substances radioactives*. 2nd revised ed. Paris: Gauthier-Villars, 1904.

Curie, Marie. *Traité de radioactivité*. 2 vols. Paris: Gauthier-Villars, 1910.

Curie, Marie. *La Radiologie et la guerre*. Paris: Librairie Félix Alcan, 1921.

Curie, Marie. *Pierre Curie: With Autobiographical Notes*. Translated by Charlotte and Vernon Kellogg. New York: Macmillan, 1923.

Curie, Pierre, and Marie Curie. "Sur une substance nouvelle radio-active, contenue dans la pechblende." *Comptes rendus hebdomadaires des séances de l'Académie des sciences* 127 (1898): 175-178.

Curie, Pierre, Marie Curie, and Gustave Bémont. "Sur une nouvelle substance fortement radio-active contenue dans la pechblende." *Comptes rendus hebdomadaires des séances de l'Académie des sciences* 127 (1898): 1215-1217.

Nobel Foundation. Marie Curie prize records, nomination histories, biographical materials and Nobel lectures for the 1903 Physics Prize and 1911 Chemistry Prize. Checked 2 September 2026.

Modern scholarship

Ariouet, Céline Fellag. "Marie Curie, the International Radium Standard and the BIPM." *Applied Radiation and Isotopes* 168 (2021): 109528.

Boudia, Soraya. "An Inspiring Laboratory Director: Marie Curie and Women in Science." *Chemistry International* 33, no. 1 (2011): 12-15.

Malley, Marjorie C. *Radioactivity: A History of a Mysterious Science*. New

York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Gear, Jonathan. "Milestones in Dosimetry for Nuclear Medicine Therapy." *British Journal of Radiology* 95, no. 1135 (2022): 20220056.

Curie, M., A. Debierne, A. S. Eve, H. Geiger, O. Hahn, S. C. Lind, St. Meyer, E. Rutherford, and E. Schweidler. "The Radioactive Constants as of 1930 Report of the International Radium-Standards Commission." *Reviews of Modern Physics* 3, no. 3 (1931): 427-445.

International Commission on Radiological Units. "Recommendations of the International Commission on Radiological Units." *Radiology* 62, no. 1 (1954): 106-109. Recommendations revised at the Seventh International Congress of Radiology, Copenhagen, 1953.

Pigeard-Micault, Natalie. "Marie Curie, la radiologie et la guerre, 1914-1918." *Les Cahiers du Comité pour l'histoire de l'Inserm* 5 (2024): 10-19.

Quinn, Susan. *Marie Curie: A Life*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1995.

Radvanyi, Pierre, and Jacques Villain. "The Discovery of Radioactivity." *Comptes Rendus Physique* 18, nos. 9-10 (2017): 544-550.

Sobel, Dava. *The Elements of Marie Curie: How the Glow of Radium Lit a Path for Women in Science*. New York: Atlantic Monthly Press, 2024.

Skwarzec, Bogdan, Alicja Boryło, Jarosław Wieczorek, and Klaudia Lanczewska. "Polonium on the 125th Anniversary of Its Discovery: Its Chemistry, Radiotoxicity and Application." *Journal of Environmental Radioactivity* 268-269 (2023): 107259.

Wirtén, Eva Hemmungs. *Making Marie Curie: Intellectual Property and Celebrity Culture in an Age of Information*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2015.

Institutional and reference sources

American Institute of Physics. *Marie Curie and the Science of Radioactivity*. Historical exhibition and archive materials. Checked 2 September 2026.

Bureau International des Poids et Mesures. Historical records on the international radium standard and radionuclide metrology. Checked 2 September 2026.

Institut Curie and Musée Curie. Biographical, laboratory, medical and First World War collections. Checked 2 September 2026.

International Atomic Energy Agency. Reference material on radioactive activity, radiation measurement and radiological protection. Checked 2 September 2026.

National Institute of Standards and Technology. Histories of the international and United States radium standards and radioactive-activity units. Checked 2 September 2026.