

Life Runs on Gradients

QTC-008 · From Quarks to Consciousness

The Universe, Life, and How We Found Out

Author: Juan Segurolo

Version: v1.1 EN · 2 September 2026

Epistemic profile: Established knowledge

License: All Rights Reserved

Article Abstract

Life does not merely spend fuel. It continually builds differences across membranes and lets molecular machines spend those differences in controlled ways. The electrochemical gradient that powers ATP synthesis combines concentration and voltage, while ATP itself is a coupling molecule whose usable free energy depends on cellular conditions. Peter Mitchell proposed this proton circuit in 1961 against serious chemical-intermediate alternatives; acceptance came through converging experiments, not one decisive demonstration. Later work supplied what Mitchell had not: Boyer's enzyme-level binding-change mechanism, structures of ATP synthase and direct observation of rotation. The same ion gradients also drive transport and bacterial motion, and some organisms use sodium rather than protons. Their antiquity makes gradients relevant to origin-of-life research, but natural gradients at alkaline vents remain an active hypothesis, not a complete account of life's beginning.

In 60 Seconds

Cells are powered less like fuel tanks than like rechargeable circuits. Electron transport, light or other processes pump ions across selectively permeable membranes. The resulting electrochemical difference, usually involving protons, stores usable free energy in both a concentration difference and a voltage. ATP synthase provides a controlled return route: ion flow turns a molecular rotor whose conformational cycle makes ATP. ATP then couples that chemistry to cellular work, but it is not a fixed energy packet, and not every ATP molecule is produced by chemiosmosis. Mitchell identified the membrane circuit; Boyer later supplied the enzyme mechanism. Acid-base transitions in chloroplasts, mitochondrial voltage measurements and reconstituted vesicles built a cumulative experimental case. Modern structures and single-molecule observations revealed rotation directly. Gradients also power nutrient uptake and bacterial flagella, and sodium-motive systems broaden the rule beyond protons. Their deep evolutionary history is strongly inferred, while proposals that natural vent gradients powered prebiotic chemistry remain model-dependent. A gradient is an energy source, not yet a living system.

Why This Question Matters

The phrase "cellular energy" invites a misleading picture of ATP as a microscopic battery stored for later use. In reality, cells survive by maintaining disequilibrium: they rebuild ion differences, channel their return and regenerate a small working pool of ATP continuously. That reframing connects thermodynamics to visible biological work, from transport to motion. It also shows how science

handles a radical mechanism fairly: Mitchell's central idea survived, some of his details did not, and the enzyme mechanism came from other researchers. The result is both a physical explanation and a history of distributed discovery.

1. Energy Is a Difference

The Question

If ATP is not a fixed packet of energy, what exactly does a cell spend? The answer begins before ATP itself: life creates controlled differences in concentration and electrical charge, then couples their relaxation to chemical and mechanical work.

A living cell is not at equilibrium with its surroundings. It keeps particular molecules concentrated, charges separated and reactions coupled in directions they would not take on their own. Energy is therefore not best pictured as a substance poured into the cell. What matters is the capacity of a difference to drive change while the cell controls the route back toward equilibrium.[1]

ATP is central to that control. Its hydrolysis can be coupled to otherwise unfavorable synthesis, transport and mechanical work. Yet ATP does not release one context-independent packet of energy. The free-energy change depends on temperature, chemical conditions and the concentrations of ATP, ADP and phosphate. Calling ATP the cell's energy currency is useful only if the exchange rate is understood to vary.[1]

The scale of regeneration makes the point physical. A human body turns over roughly its own mass in ATP each day, although only a small working pool exists at any moment.[33] The same molecules are continually made, used and remade. This is a statement about total turnover, not a claim that tens of kilograms of ATP are stored in the body at once.

Nor does every ATP molecule come from a membrane gradient. Glycolysis can make ATP directly by substrate-level phosphorylation, transferring phosphate from a metabolic intermediate to ADP. [2] Chemiosmosis is the dominant framework for oxidative and photosynthetic phosphorylation, not an exclusive definition of cellular energy production.

Where That Leaves Us

ATP matters, but its usable free energy depends on the state of the cell, and its small working pool must be regenerated continuously. Some ATP is made directly in metabolism, yet much of life's large-scale energy conversion begins elsewhere: with a maintained difference across a boundary. The next step is to see how a membrane turns separation into a usable circuit.

2. A Membrane Makes a Difference Usable

A biological membrane is not a perfect insulator. It is selectively permeable: some molecules cross slowly, others use channels or carriers, and controlled leaks can be part of regulation. That selectivity allows pumps to create unequal ion concentrations and separated electrical charge without requiring an absolutely sealed wall.[1,22]

For an ion, the useful difference is electrochemical. A proton-motive force combines a chemical term, associated with the proton concentration difference and expressed through pH, with an

electrical term, the voltage across the membrane. Either component can dominate in a particular organism or compartment; the gradient cannot be reduced to pH alone.[1,5]

Electron-transport chains in mitochondria and many microbes use redox reactions to move protons across a membrane. Photosynthetic systems use absorbed light to support comparable separation. ATP synthase then provides a controlled return path. Proton flow down the electrochemical gradient is coupled to ATP formation rather than dissipated entirely as heat.[1,4,5]

The machine is reversible. Under appropriate conditions ATP hydrolysis can drive ion pumping in the opposite direction. Direction depends on the balance between the ion-motive force and the chemical free-energy difference involving ATP, ADP and phosphate. The same architecture can therefore behave as a generator or as a pump.[1,18]

This principle is not confined to mitochondria. Related rotary ATP synthases operate in bacterial and archaeal membranes and in the energy-converting membranes of chloroplasts. The compartments differ, and some systems use sodium, but the shared logic is separation, selective return and coupling.[1,22,24]

Where That Leaves Us

A membrane makes an energetic difference durable enough to control. Pumps build an electrochemical gradient; ATP synthase lets ions return while coupling that flow to chemistry; reversal is possible when the balance of forces changes. This circuit now looks coherent, but before 1961 researchers already knew that respiration and phosphorylation were linked. What they lacked was the physical connection between them.

3. The Missing Link before Mitchell

By the middle of the twentieth century, researchers knew that electron transport and ATP production were coupled in mitochondria. They could disrupt the relationship with uncouplers and follow parts of the respiratory chain. The unresolved question was how energy released along that chain reached the machinery that phosphorylated ADP.[3,12]

A reasonable answer was a high-energy chemical intermediate. In 1953 E. C. Slater proposed that electron transfer generated an energy-rich compound that could pass chemical potential onward to ATP formation.[3] That model fitted the period's biochemical instincts: metabolism was already understood through sequences of enzymes and transient intermediates, so another intermediate was not an ad hoc fantasy.

The problem was that the required common intermediate resisted identification. Negative searches did not instantly prove that none existed, and different variants could accommodate some observations. The chemical model therefore deserves the same evidential courtesy given to other serious theories: explain what it addressed, then identify the evidence that made a membrane circuit more productive.[6,12]

This was the field Mitchell entered. His proposal did not merely name a missing chemical. It changed the kind of entity doing the coupling, from a diffusible intermediate inside a reaction sequence to an electrochemical state of the membrane itself.[4,13]

Where That Leaves Us

Slater's chemical-intermediate hypothesis was a disciplined response to a real missing link. Its eventual displacement was not the correction of obvious foolishness, but a change in what could carry energy between reactions. Mitchell's alternative made the membrane itself part of the mechanism. That reversal was conceptually powerful, experimentally exposed and, at first, reasonably difficult for many biochemists to accept.

4. Mitchell's Proton Circuit

The Question

How could a membrane-wide voltage and pH difference replace the missing chemical link between respiration and ATP? Mitchell's proposal was radical because it changed both the carrier of usable energy and the spatial organization that biochemical explanation had to include.

In 1961 Peter Mitchell proposed that electron transfer drives protons across an energy-transducing membrane and that their return is coupled to ATP formation.[4] His mature 1966 formulation expressed the driving force as the proton-motive force, combining pH difference and membrane potential within a testable circuit.[5] The proposal treated vectorial organization across a membrane as essential, not as packaging around ordinary solution chemistry.

Skepticism was legitimate. Individual postulates were initially underdetermined, direct measurements were difficult, and chemical-intermediate accounts could absorb some findings. Acceptance also proceeded at different rates in oxidative phosphorylation, photophosphorylation and bacterial bioenergetics. Mitchell's later fame should not be projected backward as if the 1961 paper made the answer obvious.[6,12,13,30]

The institutional setting was unusual. After leaving the University of Edinburgh, Mitchell used family resources to restore Glynn House in Cornwall and established the private charitable Glynn Research organization with Jennifer Moyle.[32] Moyle became his principal long-term experimental collaborator there. Exact page locators for the financing and role descriptions remain a mandatory human verification item before publication.

At Glynn, Mitchell and Moyle measured proton translocation and designed comparisons between chemiosmotic and chemical-intermediate explanations.[6,7] Their results contributed to a cumulative case; even their 1965 paper noted that some observations could also fit a chemical hypothesis. The history is stronger when uncertainty is retained instead of converting every experiment into retrospective confirmation.

Mitchell was not the only researcher developing proton-centered ideas. R. J. P. Williams advanced related concepts in 1961, and later correspondence produced a long priority dispute.[14,15] The surviving record supports parallel intellectual development and genuine disagreement. It does not require this article to award every element of the theory to one claimant.

Where That Leaves Us

Mitchell supplied the proton circuit, Moyle helped turn it into a sustained experimental program at Glynn, and Williams's parallel ideas prevent a lone-genius account. The hypothesis survived because it generated discriminating tests, not because later prizes made it true. Those tests came from several systems and laboratories, and their force lay in convergence rather than in one legendary experiment.

5. Experiments That Forced the Issue

In 1966 André Jagendorf and Ernesto Uribe exposed chloroplasts to an acid-base transition and observed ATP formation in darkness.[8] The treatment imposed a pH difference without requiring the normal light-driven sequence. It showed that an artificial proton gradient could be sufficient to drive phosphorylation under the experimental conditions, a striking prediction of chemiosmotic coupling.

Mitochondrial work supplied another strand. Liberman and colleagues linked oxidative phosphorylation to membrane potential in 1969, supporting an electrical component in the coupling process.[9] Such measurements did not reproduce every element of Mitchell's theory independently, but they made an electrochemical description of mitochondrial energy conversion increasingly difficult to avoid.

The most visually persuasive reconstruction came from Efraim Racker and Walther Stoeckenius in 1974. They combined bacteriorhodopsin, a light-driven proton pump, with mitochondrial ATP synthase in artificial vesicles. Illumination drove proton uptake and ATP formation.[10,29] Components from different biological sources could therefore be wired into a simplified light-to-gradient-to-ATP system.

No one experiment settled the full theory. Acid-base transitions established sufficiency in a chloroplast preparation; voltage measurements addressed another component; hybrid vesicles tested a stripped-down circuit. Mitchell and Moyle's work added further physiological comparisons.[6–10] Together these lines reduced the room for a universal hidden chemical intermediate and made the membrane gradient the common explanatory link.[12]

The 1978 Nobel Prize records the extent of historical acceptance, not an independent experiment.[11] By then the important change was methodological as well as theoretical: researchers could manipulate gradients, reconstitute components and ask whether a proposed circuit was sufficient. The membrane was no longer merely the place where energy conversion happened; it was an experimentally tractable part of the mechanism.

Where That Leaves Us

Chemiosmosis won through a network of interventions: impose a pH difference, measure the voltage term, reconstitute pump and synthase, and test competing predictions in intact systems. Convergence converted an unusual membrane hypothesis into the organizing framework. Yet it still left a precise question unanswered. A gradient could reach ATP synthase, but how did the enzyme turn ion flow into new chemical bonds?

6. ATP Synthase Is a Rotary Machine

F-type ATP synthase contains two coupled sectors. The membrane-embedded F₀ sector conducts protons and forms a rotary motor; the F₁ sector projects from the membrane and contains the catalytic sites that make or hydrolyze ATP. Rotation links movement through the membrane to changing chemical environments in the catalytic head.[1,16,18]

Paul Boyer's binding-change mechanism supplied the enzyme-level account Mitchell had not provided. Catalytic sites cycle through different conformations that bind substrates, form ATP and release product, with relative rotation coordinating the changes. Mitchell explained why a proton-motive force reaches the enzyme; Boyer explained how the enzyme converts mechanical conformational change into catalytic work.[16,19]

The 1994 structure from John Walker's group showed three catalytic beta subunits in different conformations around an asymmetric central stalk.[16] It strongly supported rotary catalysis, but a static structure did not itself film movement and did not contain the complete membrane motor. Structural asymmetry and direct motion remained distinct evidential steps.

In 1997 Hiroyuki Noji and colleagues attached a visible filament to isolated F₁ and directly observed rotation powered by ATP hydrolysis.[17] The experiment showed the catalytic motor running in the reverse chemical direction. In 2004 Manuel Diez and colleagues observed proton-powered subunit rotation during ATP synthesis in membrane-bound F₀F₁, connecting transmembrane flow, rotation and synthesis more directly.[18]

Mitchell was therefore centrally right without being right about everything. He identified chemiosmotic coupling through a membrane proton circuit, but he did not supply the binding-change mechanism, and early calculations of the number of protons required per ATP were revised as rotor stoichiometry and associated transport costs became clearer.[1,5,16–19] Nobel recognition in 1997 again marks reception, not proof.[19]

Where That Leaves Us

The mature explanation is layered, not eponymous. Mitchell provided the membrane circuit; Boyer provided the catalytic cycle; Walker's structure revealed asymmetric states; single-molecule experiments showed rotation in hydrolysis and synthesis. Revised proton-to-ATP accounting is evidence of refinement, not failure. Once the motor is understood, gradients cease to look like an ATP-specific trick and become a general biological way to perform work.

7. Gradients Do More Than Make ATP

Cells use ion gradients to import nutrients and export wastes. In secondary active transport, the downhill movement of one ion is coupled to the uphill movement of another solute. The transporter spends electrochemical potential directly rather than first converting all of it into ATP. [20] A gradient is therefore a shared power supply for multiple molecular machines.

Bacterial motility provides a mechanical example. Proton or sodium flow through flagellar motors can generate rotation. In 1995 David Fung and Howard Berg drove an *Escherichia coli* flagellar motor with an external voltage source even when ordinary metabolic generation of membrane

potential was bypassed.[21] The result made the electrical component of the motor's power supply unusually direct.

Protons are common but not universal. Some microbes use sodium-motive force for ATP synthesis, transport or motility, and some combine proton-coupled and sodium-coupled systems.[22,23] This is not permission to replace every proton in the textbook with sodium. Many alkaliphilic ATP synthases remain proton-driven despite living in proton-poor surroundings.

That leads to an active mechanistic puzzle. In extreme alkaliphiles, a calculation based on the measured bulk proton-motive force can appear too small to support observed ATP synthesis. Retention of protons near the membrane surface, local transfer routes and specialized enzyme adaptations are live explanations.[22] The energetic anomaly is established; which combination of mechanisms resolves it remains contested.

The qualification matters because a simplified diagram assumes perfectly mixed compartments and a single bulk value on each side. Real membranes have surfaces, microenvironments and crowded protein complexes. None of this overturns chemiosmosis. It asks how a well-established principle is physically implemented in organisms near its apparent limits.

Where That Leaves Us

Ion gradients form a cellular power grid. They can feed ATP synthase, transporters and rotary motors, and the working ion may be a proton or sodium. Alkaliphiles show why an established framework can still contain contested local mechanisms. The wider the principle becomes, the older it appears, which raises a final temptation: to turn an ancient energy strategy into a complete story of life's origin.

8. An Ancient Clue, Not an Origin Solution

The Question

If ion gradients are ancient, widespread and available in natural environments, have they solved the origin of life? They have supplied a powerful constraint and a plausible energy source, but neither antiquity nor energetic sufficiency creates heredity, boundaries or evolution automatically.

Rotary ATP synthases and ion-gradient bioenergetics are widespread across Bacteria and Archaea, supporting the current interpretation that they are extremely ancient.[24,25] Distribution alone does not identify the first energy system, and horizontal gene transfer complicates deep reconstruction. Ancient does not mean unchanged: modern complexes carry long evolutionary histories of divergence, replacement and adaptation.

A 2023 phylogenetic analysis inferred that F-type and A/V-type ATP synthase lineages diverged more than four billion years ago, potentially before the diversification of Bacteria and Archaea.[25] That result is a model-dependent reconstruction, not a directly dated molecular fossil. Rooting, calibrations, gene histories and assumptions about rates all affect dates so deep in time.

Alkaline hydrothermal vents offer a suggestive geochemical analogy. Reactions between vent fluids and ocean water can sustain pH and redox differences across mineral barriers. This motivates the active hypothesis that natural gradients powered some prebiotic chemistry before cells evolved

pumps and genetically specified membranes.[26–28] Laboratory models show that plausible redox chemistry can generate proton gradients across simple lipid membranes.[31]

The hypothesis remains one contender among several origin environments and energy sources. Demonstrating a gradient, or even gradient-driven chemistry, does not demonstrate the historical pathway by which life began. Geological plausibility, chemical productivity and evolutionary continuity are separate questions that must eventually agree.[26–28,31]

Most importantly, a gradient is not yet life. It does not by itself provide a selectively permeable cellular boundary, a self-sustaining catalytic network, heredity or Darwinian evolution. QTC-009 asks what it means for a system to be alive; QTC-021 owns the transition to open-ended Darwinian evolution. This article stops at the energetic clue.[26–28]

Where That Leaves Us

Life repeatedly rebuilds differences and couples their controlled collapse to work. That principle is established in modern bioenergetics and plausibly ancient, while its role at life's origin remains an active hypothesis. A vent gradient may help explain an energy source; it does not yet explain a living system. The boundary is productive: energy comes first in this article, definition and evolution come next.

What We Know, and How

- Ion electrochemical gradients combine concentration and electrical-potential differences across selectively permeable membranes.[1,5]
- ATP synthase couples ion flow to ATP formation through a rotary mechanism supported by structure, direct observation and reconstitution.[1,10,16–18]
- Chemiosmosis became established through converging tests in chloroplasts, mitochondria, microbes and simplified membrane systems, not through one decisive experiment.[6–10,12]
- ATP is a condition-dependent coupling molecule regenerated at enormous total turnover, and some ATP is made without chemiosmosis by substrate-level phosphorylation.[1,2,33]
- Gradients also power secondary transport and bacterial motility, while sodium-motive systems show that protons are not the only possible coupling ions.[20–23]

What We Still Don't Know

- Which local proton-transfer, membrane-surface and enzyme adaptations quantitatively resolve bioenergetics in the most extreme alkaliphiles.[22]
- The exact early evolutionary sequence that produced the common architecture and diversification of rotary ATP synthases.[24,25]
- Whether natural gradients at alkaline hydrothermal vents actually powered the historical origin of life, rather than merely supporting plausible laboratory chemistry.[26–28,31]

What Could Change Our Minds

- Reproducible measurements showing that ion electrochemical gradients are not the immediate coupling variable in systems now treated as chemiosmotic.
- Structures and single-molecule data that replace rotary catalysis with a different mechanism while explaining the existing results.

- Nanoscale measurements that select a different resolution of the alkaliphile energy balance than current local-transfer and surface-retention models.
- Phylogenetic, geochemical or experimental evidence that strongly favors a different early energy system or origin environment over gradient-based vent hypotheses.

If You Remember Only One Thing

Life is powered by differences it continually rebuilds, then spends through molecular machines; ATP is part of that circuit, not a stored daily fuel supply.

Related Articles

- QTC-009 — What Do We Actually Mean by Life?
- QTC-021 — When Chemistry Began to Evolve

References

- [1] Wolfgang Junge and Nathan Nelson. ATP Synthase. Annual Review of Biochemistry 84, 631–657 (2015). DOI 10.1146/annurev-biochem-060614-034124. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-biochem-060614-034124>
- [2] Nicole Naifeh, Manjari Dimri and Matthew Varacallo. Biochemistry, Aerobic Glycolysis. StatPearls / NCBI Bookshelf, updated 2023. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK470170/>
- [3] E. C. Slater. Mechanism of Phosphorylation in the Respiratory Chain. Nature 172, 975–978 (1953). DOI 10.1038/172975a0. <https://doi.org/10.1038/172975a0>
- [4] Peter Mitchell. Coupling of Phosphorylation to Electron and Hydrogen Transfer by a Chemi-Osmotic Type of Mechanism. Nature 191, 144–148 (1961). DOI 10.1038/191144a0. <https://doi.org/10.1038/191144a0>
- [5] Peter Mitchell. Chemiosmotic Coupling in Oxidative and Photosynthetic Phosphorylation. Biological Reviews 41, 445–502 (1966). DOI 10.1111/j.1469-185X.1966.tb01501.x. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-185X.1966.tb01501.x>
- [6] Peter Mitchell and Jennifer Moyle. Evidence Discriminating between the Chemical and the Chemiosmotic Mechanisms of Electron Transport Phosphorylation. Nature 208, 1205–1206 (1965). DOI 10.1038/2081205a0. <https://doi.org/10.1038/2081205a0>
- [7] Peter Mitchell and Jennifer Moyle. Chemiosmotic Hypothesis of Oxidative Phosphorylation. Nature 213, 137–139 (1967). DOI 10.1038/213137a0. <https://doi.org/10.1038/213137a0>
- [8] A. T. Jagendorf and E. Uribe. ATP Formation Caused by Acid-Base Transition of Spinach Chloroplasts. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 55(1), 170–177 (1966). DOI 10.1073/pnas.55.1.170. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.55.1.170>
- [9] E. A. Liberman, V. P. Topaly, L. M. Tsofin, A. A. Jasaitis and V. P. Skulachev. Mechanism of Coupling of Oxidative Phosphorylation and the Membrane Potential of Mitochondria. Nature 222, 1076–1078 (1969). DOI 10.1038/2221076a0. <https://doi.org/10.1038/2221076a0>
- [10] Efraim Racker and Walther Stoeckenius. Reconstitution of Purple Membrane Vesicles Catalyzing Light-driven Proton Uptake and Adenosine Triphosphate Formation. Journal of

Biological Chemistry 249(2), 662–663 (1974). DOI 10.1016/S0021-9258(19)43080-9.
<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/4272126/>

[11] Nobel Prize Outreach. The Nobel Prize in Chemistry 1978.
<https://www.nobelprize.org/prizes/chemistry/1978/press-release/>

[12] David G. Nicholls. Forty Years of Mitchell's Proton Circuit: From Little Grey Books to Little Grey Cells. *Biochimica et Biophysica Acta Bioenergetics* 1777, 550–556 (2008). DOI 10.1016/j.bbabi.2008.03.014. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbabi.2008.03.014>

[13] John N. Prebble. The Philosophical Origins of Mitchell's Chemiosmotic Concepts. *Journal of the History of Biology* 34, 433–460 (2001). DOI 10.1023/A:1012946715673.
<https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1012946715673>

[14] Bruce H. Weber and John N. Prebble. An Issue of Originality and Priority: The Correspondence and Theories of Oxidative Phosphorylation of Peter Mitchell and Robert J. P. Williams, 1961–1980. *Journal of the History of Biology* 39, 125–163 (2006). DOI 10.1007/s10739-005-3052-4.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10739-005-3052-4>

[15] R. J. P. Williams. The History of Proton-Driven ATP Formation. *Bioscience Reports* 13, 191–212 (1993). DOI 10.1007/BF01123502. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01123502>

[16] Jan Pieter Abrahams, Andrew G. W. Leslie, René Lutter and John E. Walker. Structure at 2.8 Å Resolution of F₁-ATPase from Bovine Heart Mitochondria. *Nature* 370, 621–628 (1994). DOI 10.1038/370621a0. <https://doi.org/10.1038/370621a0>

[17] Hiroyuki Noji, Ryohei Yasuda, Masasuke Yoshida and Kazuhiko Kinosita Jr. Direct Observation of the Rotation of F₁-ATPase. *Nature* 386, 299–302 (1997). DOI 10.1038/386299a0.
<https://doi.org/10.1038/386299a0>

[18] Manuel Diez et al. Proton-Powered Subunit Rotation in Single Membrane-Bound F₀F₁-ATP Synthase. *Nature Structural & Molecular Biology* 11, 135–141 (2004). DOI 10.1038/nsmb718.
<https://doi.org/10.1038/nsmb718>

[19] Nobel Prize Outreach. The Nobel Prize in Chemistry 1997.
<https://www.nobelprize.org/prizes/chemistry/1997/press-release/>

[20] D. E. Cohn, G. J. Kaczorowski and H. R. Kaback. Effect of the Proton Electrochemical Gradient on Maleimide Inactivation of Active Transport in *Escherichia coli* Membrane Vesicles. *Biochemistry* 20(11), 3308–3313 (1981). DOI 10.1021/bi00514a050.
<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/7018574/>

[21] David C. Y. Fung and Howard C. Berg. Powering the Flagellar Motor of *Escherichia coli* with an External Voltage Source. *Nature* 375, 809–812 (1995). DOI 10.1038/375809a0.
<https://doi.org/10.1038/375809a0>

[22] David B. Hicks, Jun Liu, Makoto Fujisawa and Terry A. Krulwich. F₁F₀-ATP Synthases of Alkaliphilic Bacteria: Lessons from Their Adaptations. *Biochimica et Biophysica Acta Bioenergetics* 1797, 1362–1377 (2010). DOI 10.1016/j.bbabi.2010.02.028.
<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20193659/>

- [23] Armen Y. Mulkidjanian, Pavel Dibrov and Michael Y. Galperin. The Past and Present of Sodium Energetics: May the Sodium-Motive Force Be with You. *Biochimica et Biophysica Acta* (2008). DOI 10.1016/j.bbabi.2008.04.028. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC2695506/>
- [24] Armen Y. Mulkidjanian, Kira S. Makarova, Michael Y. Galperin and Eugene V. Koonin. Inventing the Dynamo Machine: The Evolution of the F-Type and V-Type ATPases. *Nature Reviews Microbiology* 5, 892–899 (2007). DOI 10.1038/nrmicro1767. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrmicro1767>
- [25] Tara A. Mahendrarajah et al. ATP Synthase Evolution on a Cross-Braced Dated Tree of Life. *Nature Communications* 14, 7456 (2023). DOI 10.1038/s41467-023-42924-w. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-023-42924-w>
- [26] William Martin, John A. Baross, Deborah S. Kelley and Michael J. Russell. Hydrothermal Vents and the Origin of Life. *Nature Reviews Microbiology* 6, 805–814 (2008). DOI 10.1038/nrmicro1991. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrmicro1991>
- [27] William Martin and Michael J. Russell. On the Origin of Biochemistry at an Alkaline Hydrothermal Vent. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B* 362, 1887–1925 (2007). DOI 10.1098/rstb.2006.1881. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2006.1881>
- [28] Nick Lane and William F. Martin. The Origin of Membrane Bioenergetics. *Cell* 151, 1406–1416 (2012). DOI 10.1016/j.cell.2012.11.050. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2012.11.050>
- [29] Journal of Biological Chemistry. JBC Classics: A Simple Model for Biological Energy Coupling. Retrospective page. [https://www.jbc.org/article/S0021-9258\(20\)50387-6/fulltext](https://www.jbc.org/article/S0021-9258(20)50387-6/fulltext)
- [30] Peter Mitchell. Citation Classic: Coupling of Phosphorylation to Electron and Hydrogen Transfer by a Chemi-Osmotic Type of Mechanism. 1986. <https://garfield.library.upenn.edu/classics1986/A1986E685800002.pdf>
- [31] Daniel Milshteyn, George Cooper and David Deamer. Chemiosmotic Energy for Primitive Cellular Life: Proton Gradients Are Generated across Lipid Membranes by Redox Reactions Coupled to Meteoritic Quinones. *Scientific Reports* 9, 12447 (2019). DOI 10.1038/s41598-019-48328-5. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-48328-5>
- [32] John Prebble and Bruce H. Weber. *Wandering in the Gardens of the Mind: Peter Mitchell and the Making of Glynn*. Oxford University Press, 2003. Chapter 6, The Creation of Glynn: 1962–1965. <https://academic.oup.com/book/53137>
- [33] Susanna Törnroth-Horsefield and Richard Neutze. Opening and Closing the Metabolite Gate. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 105(50), 19565–19566 (2008). DOI 10.1073/pnas.0810654106. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC2604989/>