of the German scientific community after World War II to the point that, immediately after the war, the great physicist Lise Meitner castigated the German scientific community for their moral failings in science. It was not surprising that great engineers and scientists like Wernher Von Braun were able to carry out huge science and engineering programs at Peenemunde that, had the Nazis succeeded, would have led to a disastrous course for the world.

And Laubichler is correct; many scientists and students were killed—however, they were most typically non-Aryan, Jewish, gay, or communist and not embraced into the Nazi bosom. Many physicians flocked to the Nazi party, and the SS (the Schutzstaffel) in particular, for when Jewish people were removed from their positions because of the Nuremberg Race Laws, new economic opportunities were available to German physicians. This was no different in the sciences.

Therefore, the social democratic systems of Germany after the war did follow a pattern of scientific community exclusion because many scientists were broadly complicit in Nazi programs, and there was concern for their involvement both in Germany and in the rest of the world scientific community.

Jacob J. Steinberg
Department of Pathology, Albert Einstein College of Medicine, Montefiore Medical Center, 111 East 210th Street, Bronx, NY 10467–2490, USA

References

1. U. Deichmann, *Biologists Under Hitler*, T. Dunlap, Transl. (Harvard Univ. Press, Cambridge, MA, 1996).

Response

Steinberg raises important issues that I could only touch on in my essay. As he points out, a good number of sciences and scientists thrived under the Nazis; many profited from the expulsion and murder of Jewish colleagues, or tailored their research to comply with the party line, a fact I also alluded to in my essay. But Steinberg's sweeping implication of the whole scientific community that stayed in Germany under the Nazis lacks the historical details needed to understand the role of individual scientists in Nazi Germany. Many more studies, such as Deichmann's book that Steinberg mentions or the present research project of the Max Planck Society investigating the role of its predecessor, the Kaiser Wilhelm Gesellschaft, during the Nazi years, are needed before we will have a more complete picture. In the meantime, Steinberg's comment that "the scientific community in Nazi Germany both thrived under the Reich and morally failed," while true for many cases, represents a kind of historical absolutism that keeps us from seeing the individual choices (between "good" and "evil") that scientists made in Nazi Germany and can keep us from learning from history.

Manfred D. Laubichler
Program in History of Science, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544, USA

CORRECTIONS AND CLARIFICATIONS

News Focus: "Fermat's last theorem's first cousin" by Dana Mackenzie (4 Feb., p. 792). The credit for the image of Robert Langland's letter was incorrectly listed as "R. Langlands." The image was obtained from the Web site http://sunsite.ubc.ca/DigitalMathArchive/Langlands, managed by Bill Casselman at the University of British Columbia.

"Pathways of Discovery" timeline: (14 Jan., p. 230). The statement about Edwin Hubble for the 1929 entry was incorrect. Hubble limited his discovery to the relation of redshift and brightness of spiral nebulae; the argument that the universe is expanding came from others. And in the entry for 1610, the word "Siderus" in the book title should have read "Sidereus."

Random Samples: "Warming up wind chill" (14 Jan., p. 221). The wind velocity should have been listed in units of km/h, not kph.

Report: "Modulation of brain reward circuitry by leptin" by S. Fulton *et al.* (7 Jan., p. 125). The graph in Fig. 2A was from a different condition than the remaining panels. Whereas panels B, C, and D showed the effect of leptin during food restriction, panel A depicted the results obtained in the free-feeding condition (see the supplementary figure available at http://www.sciencemag.org/feature/data/1044048.shl). The appropriate panel A for our report is shown below.

News of the Week: "Shadow and shine offer glimpses of otherworldly Jupiters" by Mark Sincell (3 Dec., p. 1822). The description of Jupiter's density in the second paragraph as "one-third the density of water" is incorrect. It should have read "one-third greater than the density of water."