



PROJECT MUSE®

---

*Heredity Explored: Between Public Domain and Experimental Science, 1850–1930* ed. by Staffan Müller-Wille and Christina Brandt (review)

Gregory Radick

*Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, Volume 48, Number 3, Winter 2017, pp. 399–401 (Review)

Published by The MIT Press



➔ For additional information about this article

<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/678082>

nothing for their loss fought the bloodiest war in U.S. history to avoid such expropriation. Beauvois' work is a startling illustration of the tectonic shift in attitudes that transformed peoples' perception of the phrase and the underlying concept.

Beauvois chose her sources for the book with the premise that because abolition was accompanied everywhere (except for the southern United States and the Spanish colony of Santo Domingo) by laws that indemnified slave owners, scholars should examine the debates in the legislatures that decided in favor of them. The debates in the British Parliament and French Assemblies account for 75 percent of the source material. At first glance, this tactic may seem like old hat (it must be seventy years since a book on abolition focused on such material), but the pages of this first full-length comparative study of "slave compensation" sparkle with new insights and arguments. Erudite and measured, it establishes a new typology of abolition for the Americas (in addition to being an intellectual joy to read).

Many decades from now, this book will still be the best source for the various forms that compensation took, the monetary component, who paid the bill, and who were the ultimate beneficiaries. The largest share of compensation that owners received came from the enslaved themselves. Free-womb laws, forced apprenticeships, and emancipation withheld often to the age sixty meant that most of the slaves in the non-U.S. Atlantic world paid for their freedom with unrecompensed labor. Indemnity payments by the state to owners covered, on average, much less than half the value of slave property, with wealthy slave owners receiving much more than their less wealthy counterparts, even on a per slave basis. As noted above, the unfairness of these terms from a modern perspective is overwhelming. For Beauvois, however, "purchased abolition" amounted to a bribe from metropolitan authorities to secure the cooperation of colonial elites. Putting a relatively quick end to slavery would not have been possible without it, given the 800,000 deaths in the St. Domingue revolution and the U.S. Civil War that bracketed the abolitionist era.

Beauvois seriously underestimates the cost of British anti-slavery initiatives after 1807, as well as the dramatic effects of self-purchase in Brazil and, to a lesser effect, the Spanish Americas. These are minor blemishes, however, in a superb piece of scholarship.

David Eltis  
Emory University

*Heredity Explored: Between Public Domain and Experimental Science, 1850–1930.* Edited by Staffan Müller-Wille and Christina Brandt (Cambridge, Mass., The MIT Press, 2016) 472 pp. \$49.00 cloth \$34.00 e-book

"Studies in Mendelism and Its Multiple Contexts" would be a more plain-speaking subtitle for this outstanding volume. Its sixteen chapters touch on

everything from asylums, bachelors, and cousin marriage to Wilhelm Weinberg (of “Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium” fame), X-ray mutagenesis, and Zionist medicine. But the rise of Mendelism or, to use the later and better-known name, “genetics,” is a recurring motif, and toward the end of the volume, it becomes an explicit focus. As the editors explain in their introduction, the overall aim is to enlarge and complicate historical understanding of the diverse, heredity-related ideas, ideologies, practices, and institutions with which Mendelism meshed—or failed to mesh—as its partisans took ownership of the twentieth-century science of heredity.

No brief review can do justice to so rich a collection of scholarship. One chapter that is in every sense exemplary is Theodore M. Porter’s about asylums. By the end of the nineteenth century, Porter shows, psychiatrists internationally took it for granted that insanity, “feeble-mindedness,” and other forms of mental defect were wholly or partly hereditary; indeed, they increasingly conceptualized those defects and their hereditary causes along atomistic, proto-Mendelian lines. Throughout the same period, the recording of data, including family-history data, about the unfortunate people housed in the growing numbers of asylums became part of the standard, bureaucratized, statistically informed management of those institutions and, by extension, of the state. Officials became ever more alarmed by the statistical signs of widespread degeneration, and the more eager for expert counsel. Far from Mendelism transforming the study of human heredity, heredity, writes Porter, “had already evolved within psychiatric classification and statistics in such a way that many aspects of . . . Mendelism could be assimilated without threatening its basic structure” (95). The subsequent integration of asylum statistics and Mendelism with eugenics became the mission of the Eugenics Record Office—founded in Cold Spring Harbor, New York, in 1910—which quickly became the progenitor of claims for the Mendelian nature of insanity, criminality, and other undesirable traits.

If, on the ample evidence provided in this book, Mendelism was a thoroughly interdisciplinary affair, the same cannot be said for the historical study of Mendelism. To be sure, the chapters vary considerably in scope and style. Some of them take whole fields of wide-ranging, transnational endeavor as the unit of analysis and others concentrate on particular scientists or achievements. Some of them cover topics that became the stuff of textbooks, and others consider only marginalized and unfamiliar matters. Agriculture and medicine receive their due, along with “the public domain”; so does a debate on the meaning of regression for evolution. Literary studies have their moment, as do gender studies. Nevertheless, broadly speaking, the volume is recognizable as a cultural history of scientific ideas, based on the interpretation of selected texts, mostly published but also unpublished.

The sole chapter co-authored by a scientist—Diane B. Paul and Hamish Spencer (an evolutionary geneticist), “Eugenics without Eugenicists? Anglo-American Critiques of Cousin Marriage in the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries”—offers minor but intriguing exceptions. A graph

charting the increase over time in American states outlawing cousin marriage is a small gesture toward more systematic approaches to evidence gathering (51). So, in a different, digital-humanities mode, is a footnote reporting newspaper database searches to test a possible explanation for why Europe went a different way from the United States regarding cousin marriage (73, n. 74). Diversifying the methods used for making historical sense of Mendelism—and developing the disciplinary alliances needed to make it happen—are tasks whose prospects this volume makes tantalizing.

Gregory Radick  
University of Leeds

*Great Philanthropists: Wealth and Charity in the Modern World, 1815–1945.* Edited by Peter Mandler and David Cesarani (London, Valentine Mitchell, 2017) 214 pp. \$84.95

The philanthropy of wealthy donors is often cast as a decidedly American phenomenon. *Great Philanthropists* provides a welcome and much-needed corrective to that view. The book is an outgrowth of a project on Jewish philanthropy in Europe, with articles about donors from South Africa, Europe, the United States, and Japan. Both Christian and Jewish donors are included, with figures as diverse as Nathan Mayer Rothschild (England's first Lord Rothschild) and King Edward VII, Betty de Rothschild in France, such cosmopolites as Moses Montefiore and Calouste Gulbenkian, South Africa's Sammy Marks, Ei'ichi Shibusawa in Japan, Friedrich Alfred Krupp and other donors in German cities, and Andrew Mellon in the United States.

Although the geographical focus is admirably broad, the intellectual framework is surprisingly narrow, emphasizing individualism. The result is that many of the articles offer engaging narratives of individual personalities, careers, and gifts, but far less in the way of theoretical models or cross-national comparisons. William D. Rubenstein attempts some framing in his introductory chapter, but even he focuses primarily on discrete individuals.

Two of the strongest articles are by Hideko Katsumata and Frank Prochaska. There is a tendency to think of individual philanthropy in Japan as an anomaly in a highly statist society. Katsumata overthrows this idea by casting Shibusawa as a virtual Benjamin Franklin who spun off hundreds of voluntary associations and invested millions of yen (amounting to millions of dollars) during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. These activities promoted Japan's modernization by knitting it into a global philanthropic arena and served as a conduit for new ideas to fuel the Meiji Restoration. Prochaska underscores the symbiotic ties between the British monarchy, philanthropy, empire, and new industrial wealth. In the process, both articles move beyond individual narratives to provide intriguing insights into how philanthropy worked in different cultures.