Knowledge and the Public Interest, 1575–1725

Many studies relate modern science to modern political and economic thought. Using one shift in order to explain the other, however, has begged the question of modernity’s origins. New scientific and political reasoning emerged simultaneously as controversial forms of probabilistic reasoning. Neither could ground the other. They both rejected logical systems in favor of shifting, incomplete, and human-oriented forms of knowledge that did not meet accepted standards of speculative science. This study follows their shared development by tracing one key political stratagem for linking human desires to the advancement of knowledge: the collaborative wish list. Highly controversial at the beginning of the seventeenth century, charismatic desiderata lists spread across Europe, often deployed against traditional sciences. They did not enter the academy for a century but eventually so shaped the deep structures of research that today this once controversial genre appears to be a musty and even pedantic term of art.
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Advance praise for *Knowledge and the Public Interest, 1575–1725*

“This is the mature, highly original, and fascinating book of a still young scholar. It brings together fields of research that have rarely been connected: history of science, economics, and political thought. Keller not only discovers the *desiderata* list as an object of historical research and gives for the first time its history – she also uses this topic to make wide-ranging statements about the so-called scientific revolution and the emergence of modernity.”
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