

VU Research Portal

[Book review of:] Lyvia Diser. Wetenschap op de proef: Laboratoria in het Belgisch overheidsbeleid, 1870–1940

Flipse, A.C.

published in

Isis

2018

DOI (link to publisher)

[10.1086/696562](https://doi.org/10.1086/696562)

document version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

document license

Article 25fa Dutch Copyright Act

[Link to publication in VU Research Portal](#)

citation for published version (APA)

Flipse, A. C. (2018). [Book review of:] Lyvia Diser. Wetenschap op de proef: Laboratoria in het Belgisch overheidsbeleid, 1870–1940. *Isis*, 109(1), 196-197. <https://doi.org/10.1086/696562>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

E-mail address:

vuresearchportal.ub@vu.nl

vue de Métaphysique et de Morale, was a middle way between scientistic positivism, on the one hand, and scholasticism, on the other. His rationalism is discussed from several points of view in the volume: Couturat clearly saw Leibniz as a model for his rationalism and sided with Leibniz over Kant. He argued against intuitionism, especially in Bergson but also in the philosophy of mathematics, siding with the logicians. He also argued against nominalism in several forms, seeing it as leading to relativism and as rejecting the objective validity of science. As part of his rationalism, Couturat saw international auxiliary languages as the key to cooperation on many fronts, since they would in principle allow for easy communication in science and commerce. In fact, Couturat's advocacy of Ido, which is derived from Esperanto, led to many controversies with the Esperantists, rather than the cooperation that he sought. Still, he remained a committed rationalist in all of his endeavors. This volume is a fitting tribute to Couturat and is an invaluable resource for those who would study his work.

David J. Stump

David J. Stump is a philosopher of science at the University of San Francisco and the author of Conceptual Change and the Philosophy of Science (Routledge, 2015). He is coeditor, with Peter Galison, of The Disunity of Science (Stanford, 1996) and one of the editors and translators of a new edition of Henri Poincaré's Science and Hypothesis (Bloomsbury, in press).

Lyvia Diser. *Wetenschap op de proef: Laboratoria in het Belgisch overheidsbeleid, 1870–1940.* 300 pp., illus., bibl., index. Leuven: Universitaire Pers Leuven, 2016. €59 (cloth).

The nineteenth century saw the origin of the modern laboratory, which in virtue of its unique characteristics has contributed, more than any other institution, to the construction of scientific standards like credibility, objectivity, and replicability. This is the most important lesson from studies in the area of laboratory history in recent decades. The laboratory originated within the university, but later it also acquired a place in hospitals, museums, industries, and so forth.

Lyvia Diser's *Wetenschap op de proef: Laboratoria in het Belgisch overheidsbeleid, 1870–1940* (Science Tested: Laboratories within Belgian Government Policy, 1870–1940)—based on her Ph.D. work at the University of Leuven—analyzes the origin of one particular type of laboratory: the government laboratory. On the basis, especially, of agricultural laboratories in Belgium she shows that the government laboratory, which took shape in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, was a unique type, with its own culture, characterized by “a unique set of practices, structures, behaviors, etiquette and moral codes . . . that cannot be reduced to what had happened at the time in academic, industrial or private laboratories” (p. 202).

Diser distinguishes three general periods during which this novel type of laboratory took shape in Belgium. Each period is characterized by a particular (and changing) relationship between state and laboratory. Scientist and state alike were busy trying to achieve their own aims and constructing an identity. The first period, described in the part titled “Science for a New Nation,” shows how in 1870 a few scientists, together with the local Brabant agricultural elite and a few politicians, joined forces and founded the Association pour la Fondation de Stations Agricoles en Belgique. Guided by a laissez-faire ideology, the Belgian government was at that time very reluctant to develop such initiatives. The first agricultural station of the association was built in the provincial town of Gembloux and operated under the inspiring leadership of Arthur Petermann (1845–1902), a German who introduced the recent advances of agricultural science from Germany into Belgium. Other stations followed in the course of time. The laboratories carefully set about constructing authority through the rhetoric of the advancement of the nation, for which the modernization of agriculture was necessary. An important concrete program was the organization of a fertilizer control service.

The second period, described in the part titled “Between State and Science,” began in 1883—an important symbolic moment, as that was when the formal alliance between the Belgian government and

laboratory science came into being. It had gradually become clear that the association would not be able to implement its development scheme with private money alone. In the end all stations and laboratories were handed over to the state. A newly formed Catholic government felt greater responsibility for developments in agriculture, and the laboratories could be deployed to support that purpose. In the long term the transfer to the state was to have far-reaching effects both for the laboratories and for the state, which began to employ more and more scientific advice in setting its policies. In practical terms, this also involved more and more bureaucracy, as well as uniformity of methods, techniques, and instruments; in addition, the laboratory employees now became government officials who worked for the “common good.” “Efficiency” and “devotion” became important for these workers—in contrast to scientists in university laboratories, who instead presented themselves as engaging in “pure” research.

In the third part, “The Science of the State,” the period around 1900 and the decades up to 1940 are discussed. This part leads—rather quickly—up to the moment when the government laboratory as a type took on its present shape. Particularly after World War I, the Belgian government expected a great deal from the laboratories in contributing to the economic and social recovery plan, so that they became even more an extension of the state. All kinds of novel, specialized institutes were founded, in various areas of agricultural science: for example, a state dairy station and institutes for plant diseases, plant improvement, animal husbandry, and the like.

Although it is arranged largely chronologically, this study is much more than a straightforward narrative about particular Belgian laboratories. In both the introduction and the concluding chapter the account is embedded in a broad theoretical framework, and Diser promises a “macrosocial history” (p. 26). This “macro account” of the origin and the transformation of “the” laboratory in relation to “the” state is indeed presented convincingly, and the author doesn’t shrink from making big claims. To tell her story she mainly uses tools from the arsenal of laboratory studies. This means that the account remains rather too abstract for my taste: the actual laboratories, the actual scientists, and the actual politicians are underexposed. As a result of this approach, I wonder whether this study will play much of a role outside the history of science—for example, in the historiography of politics, although Diser does make a few suggestions in that direction (pp. 252–254). This doesn’t detract from the quality of the book. Its strong theoretical embedding is the strength of the book: as a result, it transcends the Belgian context. An English translation is certainly justified.

Abraham C. Flipse

Abraham (Ab) C. Flipse is a historian of science and the University Historian at the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam. His research focuses on the history of universities in the twentieth century and the historical relationship between science and religion.

Jeanne Kisacky. *Rise of the Modern Hospital: An Architectural History of Health and Healing, 1870–1940.* vii + 448 pp., figs., index. Pittsburgh, Pa.: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2017. \$65 (cloth).

In this book Jeanne Kisacky describes changing hospital design from the 1870s through the 1940s. She analyzes a broad range of hospitals, mostly in the United States (especially on the East Coast), but she does discuss some European hospitals, insofar as they either had an influence on U.S. hospital design or offer an enlightening contrast to U.S. hospitals. The text leans heavily on existing literature by historians of the hospital (especially Annemarie Adams, Rosemary Stevens, and Charles Rosenberg), and to some extent it is a summary of that literature as it pertains to hospital design. What sets this book apart from previous works is the detailed analysis of multiple case studies. The reader’s understanding is greatly enhanced by some 173 illustrations, many of which are hospital floor plans. The high-quality paper on which *Rise of the Modern Hospital* is printed makes it attractive and the illustrations easy to read, but