element of which comes from the Indian government. Finally, there is no restriction in the centre's budget: the two host governments (Italy and India) both intend to increase their contributions, and we are confident that the other member states will fulfil their obligations. If any minor financial restrictions are made, they would affect equally both the Italian and the Indian components.

Arturo Falaschi

Director, ICGEB, Padriciano 99,
34012 Trieste, Italy

K. S. Jayaraman replies — I stand by my story. When I spoke to him, Dr Chauhan confirmed my information that the last scientist to join the centre at senior level did so four years previously. The cuts in the centre's grants (10 per cent now and a total of 25 per cent by 2001) were also confirmed by Dr Chauhan during our conversation.

The lasting value of Mitchell's mechanisms

Sir — As Leslie Orgel¹ and Bo Malmström² have valuably reminded us, Peter Mitchell opened up new vistas in bioenergetics when he formulated his chemiosmotic theory. The theory itself was a special case of his more general view on vectorial metabolism, a concept which little influenced his contemporaries although it formed a critically important part of his own intellectual odyssey. The chemiosmotic theory, initially formulated without experimental support, in time provided a framework for the development of our modern understanding of bioenergetics.

Was Mitchell never right on the mechanistic level? He certainly came up with mechanisms in large numbers. When I visited him late in his life he showed me several of them, covering various questions. There were yet more piled up on the window ledge. His private papers include many more. It is true that most of these ingenious schemes led nowhere, including those covering the involvement of protons in the ATPase and in the cytochrome oxidase, as well as some curious schemes for metabolite and ion transport. Indeed, Mitchell was allergic to systems that depended on processes which at the time could not be defined precisely at the molecular level, such as the conformational processes that he regarded as 'black box' biochemistry because they relied on an unspecified and unknown mechanism.

However, one mechanism that came to him in the middle of a sleepless night has been an outstanding success. This is the Q cycle³ for the transport of protons across

the inner mitochondrial membrane by the ubiquinone–cytochrome *c* reductase complex. This surely gave major support to the chemiosmotic theory in a period when the validity of the theory was itself still under debate. Perhaps this one achievement, together with the chemiosmotic theory with all its implications, justifies so many apparently fruitless mechanisms.

John Prebble

School of Biological Sciences, Royal Holloway
College, University of London, Egham Hill, Egham,
Surrey TW20 0EX, UK

1. Orgel, L. *Nature* **402**, 17 (1999).
2. Malmström, B. *Nature* **403**, 356 (2000).
3. Mitchell, P. *FEBS Lett.* **56**, 1–6 (1975).

People must be judged in the context of their time

Sir — Alison Abbott reports on the Max Planck Society's recent efforts to shed light on its history, as the Kaiser Wilhelm Society, during the Third Reich (*Nature* **403**, 474–475; 2000). This attempt is all the more important as investigations in the past encountered some reserve, whereas new information is now available and a new generation of science historians is examining the past, supposedly without any preconceptions.

However, the example of Hans Stubbe, first director of the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute (KWI) for Cultivated Plant Research (established near Vienna in 1943 and built up after the war at Gatersleben in East Germany) raises doubts as to the investigators' impartiality. Portraying Stubbe as "an opportunist, ruthlessly following any path that would help him to advance his research and career" and saying that he "collaborated with the SS to plunder valuable Russian collections of wild and cultivated plants" is unjustified.

The Russians themselves judged differently, since Stubbe received their backing to build the institute at Gatersleben and was highly honoured by the Soviet Union in spite of being an outspoken opponent of Lysenkoism — an intervention that saved East German genetics from the damage inflicted in other Eastern bloc countries. Contemporaries know that Stubbe protected several colleagues who faced difficulties with the Nazi or the East German system and enabled them to continue their work. He had himself been expelled from the KWI in 1936 for political reasons.

We can only beg those historians who never experienced a totalitarian regime to avoid hasty moral judgements and not to base their conclusions on what Jens Jessen has described in the German newspaper *Die Zeit* as "moral maximalism", without any feeling for the unavoidable

entanglement in guilt and the tragedy always involved in making any significant decision within a totalitarian system. We need a careful documentation of all the historical facts, but we can also ask that people be judged within the historical context in which they lived and worked.

Ulrich Wobus, Ingo Schubert

Institute of Plant Genetics and Crop Plant Research,
D-06466 Gatersleben, Germany

Heim replies — Wobus and Schubert say it is "unfair" and "unjustified" to claim that Hans Stubbe collaborated with the SS to plunder valuable Russian collections of wild and cultivated plants. But there is extensive historical evidence testifying to precisely these facts.

The extended documentary trail left by Stubbe in various German archives contains a great deal of evidence about his close connections to the SS, especially his collaboration on a broad level with the SS-Foundation Ahnenerbe, or 'Ancestral Heritage' — the Nazi research organization. A 1944 document bearing Stubbe's signature shows that members of his institute were carrying out "extensive research in the field of biological warfare". Documents of this time make it clear that he supported the 'rescuing' of valuable plant materials from Russian soil.

Alison Abbott pointed out correctly that Stubbe was not an "out-and-out Nazi"; he has to be seen in his ambivalence. He came under suspicion by the Gestapo, for example, while maintaining good relations with the SS. There is no evidence of anti-semitism in Stubbe's Nazi-era correspondence, although after the war he helped at least one former SS officer from Auschwitz get his name cleared.

It is this ambiguity which makes him interesting for studying the role of scientists during the Nazi era, because his combination of attitudes is probably more typical than the black-and-white cases.

Stubbe's merits as a geneticist in post-war East Germany and his recognition and appreciation by postwar Soviet authorities do not prove anything about his role during the Nazi period. Wobus and Schubert's reprimand of "historians who never experienced a totalitarian regime" recalls the outmoded idea that one cannot write good history without having lived through the same conditions as the people being described.

The more important lesson, I would argue, is that scientists concerned about history should be as willing to examine the bad as the good. Stubbe was indeed a complex figure who lived in a difficult time, but we do no service to the past or the present of science by ignoring its seamier sides.

Susanne Heim

Max Planck Institute for the History of Science,
Wilhelmstrasse 44, 10117 Berlin, Germany