

can republic, sixty years later.

In 1738, Queen Sophie Charlotte's grandson, Frederick, was being prepared to be King of Prussia. That summer, in Holland, he had entered into a series of discussions with his cousin Princess Anne, the eldest daughter of Caroline and her husband King George II.¹⁷ They revisited the specifics of the Leibniz-Clarke letters of the fight over her mother, Caroline, twenty-two years earlier. Frederick reported the discussion to Voltaire on August 6, 1738: "I have talked a great deal about Newton with the Princess . . . from Newton we passed to Liebnitz, and from Liebnitz to the late Queen of England [Leibniz's student Caroline] . . . who, the Prince told me, was of Clarke's sentiment." Here, the Prince of Orange, Anne's husband, was boasting to Frederick that his recently-deceased mother-in-law, Caroline, had been won over to the Newtonians' ideology.

Frederick's letter was in response to a suggestion from Voltaire, that Maupertuis be appointed to head, i.e., re-fashion, the Berlin Academy of Sciences. Voltaire was immersed with his mistress, Emilie du Chatelet, at her estate in Cirey, France, in their project to extend the London operation against Leibniz to the continent. Emilie would produce the first French translation of Newton's *Principia*.¹⁸ In sum, while the Venetian Party of London was running the Newton operation on Frederick in the summer of 1738, Voltaire was pushing Frederick to appoint the Newtonian Maupertuis to head Leibniz's Berlin Academy.

That very same evening, August 6, 1738, Frederick dined with Count Schaumburg-Lippe. They had been in discussions for at least several weeks. The Count's circle included a Graf von Kielmannsegge and the Baron de Bielfeld, who would write (in 1763) that Schaumburg-Lippe had won Frederick over to his way of thinking, and even inaugurated him into his specific Freemasonic lodge in August 1738. Without evaluating the claim about the lodge, it is enough to indicate that this circle certainly knew intimate details about the operation against Leibniz a generation earlier.

First, the Kielmannsegges had been one of the few defenders of Leibniz and of Caroline in London at that time. In January 1716, Baron von Kielmansegge had led the group of ambassadors who examined the documents which, according to Newton, proved the plagiarism of Leibniz, finding them insufficient. And, second, Schaumburg-Lippe's mother, Countess Bückeburg, had been close to the Crown Princess Caroline during the previous decade, when Caroline had been a student of Leibniz.¹⁹ Besides Leibniz, the Countess and Caroline were the closest to Sophie, even to the point of being the last two with her when she died in 1714. And with

The Leibniz-Newton Conflict

Leibniz summarized the core of the misguided philosophy that gripped England, and that was being forced upon his student, the future Queen Caroline of England: "Natural religion itself seems to decay [there] very much . . . Sir Isaac Newton and his followers also have a very odd opinion concerning the work of God. According to them, God Almighty needs to wind up his watch from time to time, otherwise it would cease to move. He had not, it seems, sufficient foresight to make it a perpetual motion. . . . I hold that when God works miracles, he does not do it in order to supply the wants of nature, but those of grace. Whoever thinks otherwise must needs have a very mean notion of the wisdom and power of God."

Leibniz taught that God had created beautifully, and that the harmony of His mind and His creation reflects this beauty. This, indeed, is miraculous, and an act of grace. God did not create a material world with an innate, fixed quantity of energy which periodically ran down. Such a view of matter and energy would leave man as a passive consumer, dependent upon miracles to avoid destruction. Rather, Leibniz (and Genesis, and, in fact, the Declaration of Independence's "more perfect union") presented man as struggling to act in the image of his Maker, and thereby creating revolutions in science and culture which both solved earthly problems, and brought us closer to God.

Newton's method masked questions about the physical universe—for example, how gravity works—behind numerological magic, which Leibniz properly compared to a medieval, occult power. By relegating man to a mere measurer of material effects, lacking the power to act on the universe for the good, he left man as a steward of some universal estate, awaiting the Lord to avert disaster, or perhaps not.

Leibniz' investigation of the multiply-connected geometries of light moving through the physical world, and Bach's investigation of multiply-connected heard ideas moving through the mind, would not allow for answers that left man out of God's ongoing project. At the core of the fight between Newton's "British Empire/feudalist" view and Leibniz's "American/republican" view, was an argument over God, the human race, work, physical space-time, and happiness. —DS