Long Live the Monarchy

It is in his fourth chapter, on the British Parliament’s Millennium Commission, that O’Brien argues for preserving the rapidly failing British monarchy as the bastion of democracy! Since there can be no argument here, he makes none, preferring to spew bile over the Millennium Commission for not recognizing the importance of the monarchy to the millennium celebrations.

In order to misrepresent the monarchy as the bastion of democracy, O’Brien lies that the British Empire no longer exists, and ignores the fact, that the unelected sovereign of Great Britain is also the unelected sovereign of Canada, Australia, all of the so-called Commonwealth islands in the Caribbean, Belize, Mauritius, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, etc.

He ignores the fact that the British monarchy, under the aegis of Prince Philip’s World Wide Fund for Nature, is gobbling up vast tracts of land for “conservation,” in order to lock up mineral resources, prevent economic development, and provide safe havens for murderous terrorists, such as the Uganda-backed Rwanda Patriotic Front.

Prince Philip calls not merely for limiting, but also for “culling” the human population, to protect his oligarchical species. Nor does he have moral qualms about the methods employed.

‘Gentle Nietzscheans’

Does O’Brien agree with this particular sovereign’s Consort? He does: In his last chapter, he refers to a 1970 article he wrote for the New York Review of Books, entitled “The Gentle Nietzscheans.” In this article, he presented the “historical reasons why a Nietzschean ethic may come to recommend itself,” for advanced sector policy toward the so-called Third World, “drowning in the excess of its own population.” And so, contrary to Pope John Paul II’s firm insistence that the millennium must be greeted by a “civilization of love,” O’Brien quotes his 1970 recommendations that the “traditional ethic will require larger and larger doses of its traditional built-in antidotes—the force of hypocrisy and cultivated inattention, combined with a certain minimum of alms.”

He concludes his declaration of war against the vision of John Paul II: “The pompous frivolity of complacent Establishments has been known to prepare the way for the emergence of ferocious new elites. That is among the possibilities for even the early part of the new millennium.”

—Katherine Notley

Transmitting Kepler’s Physics to China

These two rather obscure books serve two important functions: first, each exposes a hoax perpetrated by British-dominated China scholarship in the West, in respect to the influence in China of the diametrically opposed methods of Kepler and Galileo; and, second, each throws a new light on the role of the Venetian oligarchy’s efforts to poison the scientific and cultural fruits of the Renaissance.

The curious story which led to this research is that of the brilliant young Swiss astronomer Johann Schreck, generally known by his Latinized name, Terrentius (d.1630). Terrentius worked with Galileo (both became members of the Academy of the Lincei in 1611) before joining the Jesuits in 1612. Terrentius was chosen for the Jesuits’ China mission, in direct response to a request from the founder and director of that mission, Matteo Ricci, for mathematician/astronomers to help correct the Chinese calendar.

Terrentius took several years to prepare for the journey, travelling throughout Europe, gathering a total of 7,000 books, mostly on astronomy, to take to China. He also called on his old associate Galileo for help and advice. Receiving no response, he appealed to numerous friends or officials with connections to Galileo, to persuade him to lend his assistance—to no avail. The cause of Galileo’s intransigence is sometimes explained as the result of a personal feud between him and another Jesuit astronomer, over who had first observed sunspots through the telescope. A more truthful answer was given by Galileo himself, who told one of those requesting help for Terrentius, that he simply had nothing to offer!

Terrentius finally turned to Kepler, who responded immediately, with both a careful analysis of the material he had been sent on Chinese astronomical methods, and with portions of the extensive celestial data compiled by the Dane Tycho Brahe, which Kepler was preparing for publication. This, together with the several books by Kepler among those which Terrentius had carried with him to China, became the primary
source for the work on the new calendar in China, and the foundation for the Chinese-language textbooks prepared by the Jesuits and their Chinese allies over the next century.

The difference in method between Kepler and Galileo was most eloquently captured by Kepler's response to Galileo's *Starry Messenger*, which announced the results of his observations of the heavens through the telescope. Although Kepler was delighted and enthusiastic about the discoveries, he wrote: “What Galileo recently saw with his own eyes . . . had many years before not only [been] proposed as a surmise, but thoroughly established by reasoning. . . . Surely those thinkers who intellectually grasp the causes of phenomena, before these are revealed to the senses, resemble the Creator more closely than the others, who speculate about the causes after the phenomena have been seen.”

Needham and Hashimoto
The truth of Kepler’s role in China would probably not be known today, if not for the publication of the book listed above by Keizo Hashimoto. Hashimoto had studied in England with Joseph Needham, the British intelligence operative and Bertrand Russell protégé, who became known as the world’s leading authority on Chinese science. Needham’s role in distorting the science and history of both the East and the West has been reported by this writer in several previous contributions to *Fidelio*. One such hoax by Needham and his associates, was their insistence that Kepler’s books were not carried to China by Terrentius, and that Kepler’s ideas were not influential in China. Hashimoto demonstrates that the works in Chinese by Terrentius and his primary associate and successor, Adam Schaal von Bell, were in large part translations from Kepler, a fact which he believes should have been most obvious: “The penetration (in China) of optical astronomy so far discussed, which Kepler had established in his work in 1604, has never been noticed by any other author until now, although this fact can be easily discovered if we compare the Chinese text with the original one in the West.”

Needham and Witek
There were three “generations” of Jesuits in China, before the mission was sabotaged early in the Eighteenth century through Venetian intrigue in the West. The first and second generations, those of Matteo Ricci and of Terrentius, were both trained in Italy at the Jesuit’s Collegio Romano. The third generation, however, was primarily a deployment by the circles of the French Academy, founded by Colbert in 1666, which, with such figures as Leibniz, Huygens, and Pascal, had become Europe’s center of scientific investigation. Dozens of French Jesuit scientists responded to an appeal by the great Chinese Emperor K’ang Hsi at the end of the Eighteenth century, who had opened up all of China to the missionary/scientists.

The foremost astronomer from this group was Father Jean-François Foucquet, who became the personal tutor to the Emperor K’ang Hsi and his sons. Foucquet was a dedicated Keplerian, and worked closely with another Jesuit who was in regular correspondence with Leibniz in Europe.

Foucquet translated Kepler’s primary works into Chinese, and, together with one of the Emperor’s sons, revised the astronomical and calendrical systems developed by the previous generations of missionaries and their Chinese associates. And yet, “expert” Needham’s only mention of Foucquet in his massive, seventeen-volume *Science and Civilization in China*, concludes as follows: “Down to the very end of the mission the Jesuits were prisoners of their limited motive. . . . Any acceptance of Copernicanism would equally have raised doubts about all Ricci’s teachings. In fact the penalty of enlisting live science in the service of fixed doctrine was to inhibit its development—Urania’s feet were bound.” While this is patently false, even in regard to the earlier Jesuits, it can only be considered an intentional lie in regard to Foucquet. The book by John W. Witek, which provides a full and unexpurgated examination of Foucquet’s Keplerian work in China, quotes this same passage by Needham, and comments: “It might be possible that Urania’s feet were not as bound as Needham has suggested.”

Much remains to be done in rediscovering the collaborative efforts between East and West in the Renaissance era, to the purpose of expanding such collaboration today. Disposing of British historical distortions is a necessary precondition for that task.
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