

---

---

# ON PLATO'S CONCEPT OF THE 'GOOD' AND ON ST. PAUL'S CONCEPT OF 'AGAPE'

Merry Christmas to my family and friends living in Canada

by Pierre Beaudry, 12/26/2020

---

---

## FOREWORD

As a complementary addition to my previous report of November 15, 2020, I present, here, briefly, the essentials of Plato's doctrine of the Good (*Agathos*) and its epistemological unity with St. Paul's idea of Love of Mankind (*Agape*), which I dedicate to my family and friends in Canada for the coming Christmas holiday.

*Agathos*, meaning "the Good", is Plato's eternal and changeless form of perfection, which exists completely outside of physical space-time as a pure and ideal source or cause of all human benefits. *Agape*, meaning "love of mankind," is St. Paul's axiomatic principle of change, representing the source of perfection of all human development in physical space-time. Can those two principles of no-change and of change be connected and brought together as a single unified principle for the purpose of securing a New Just World Economic Order at this present axiomatic moment of history?

## INTRODUCTION

The first time in known history when the unity between *Agathos* and *Agape* manifested itself was with the birth and death of Jesus Christ, and the knowledge of it was developed through the writings and the evangelization actions of St. Paul and St. Augustine.

A thousand years after the death of St. Augustine, in 1431, Joan of Arc restored that unifying principle with her courage and by her death by throwing out

of France the political tyranny of English oligarchism, an action which inspired French King, Louis XI<sup>1</sup>, into creating the first Nation State Commonwealth based on the same unity of two principles of *Agathos* and *Agape*.

In the subsequent Italian Renaissance, Nicholas of Cusa's *Docta Ignorantia* restored that unity, again, by constructing a modern form of Platonic epistemology which enabled the human mind to solve the paradoxes of the *coincidence of opposites*, under the diverse forms of the coincidence between the Maximum and the Minimum, or the Macrocosm and the Microcosm.

Some years later, Raphael de Sanzio fulfilled that same task in artistic composition with the unity of opposites of the *School of Athens* and *The Dispute of the Holy Sacrament*. Raphael's two frescos beautifully illustrate the axiomatic difference to be made between Plato and Aristotle on the subject of the Good.<sup>2</sup> Aristotle argued that Plato's notion of the Good was useless because it was separate and outside of the physical universe; it is therefore not practical for human action, he said. Plato argued that this "practicality" is precisely the difficulty to be surmounted and to be resolved: how does the Good connect the two opposite domains of ideas and of practical things, the opposite domains of cognition and of sense perception? How can you solve the opposition between what feels good and what is good, between what is sincere and what is true?

Some centuries later, Cardinal Jules Mazarin established the unity between *Agathos* and *Agape* by establishing the Peace of Westphalia, and during the following century, Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz adopted the same principle as the basis for his *Academy of Arts and Sciences*. After the American Revolution, that same principle was adopted in the Preamble of American Constitution.

The last contribution brought to this unity of principle between *Agathos* and *Agape* was made by the statesman and economist, Lyndon LaRouche, who, single-handedly, and with the explicit contribution of those preceding thinkers, applied the Promethean task of crafting that policy principle for the establishment of a New

---

<sup>1</sup> See Louis XI's 1483 letter to his son on the subject of the common good in [THE ROSEBUSH OF WAR](#), published in *FIDELIO Magazine*, Fall 1995.

<sup>2</sup> Some opposites are not paradoxes and therefore do not fall under the category of *coincidence of opposites*; for example, good and evil, just and unjust, true and false or Plato and Aristotle. Such opposites cannot be unified.

Just World Economic Order. Thanks to his indomitable fight against British oligarchism and its political sophistry, LaRouche was able to apply this principle to the domain of transnational world politics. However, this task will not be completely fulfilled until LaRouche becomes fully exonerated and his ideas can be considered honestly, worldwide.

### **THE TRUTH ABOUT WORLD DEVELOPMENT**

Plato knew how to derive knowledge, beauty, and justice from the Good and he accomplished these derivations in his *Republic* dialogue; however, he did not succeed in applying his knowledge through decisive flanking actions that would have rooted out the powers and principalities of the political oligarchy of his day. One can say the same for St. Paul, St. Augustine, Cusa, Raphael, and Leibniz, who applied their knowledge to theology, philosophy, artistic composition, and politics, respectively, but without succeeding in eliminating the oligarchical regimes of their times. The only ones who did succeed, albeit for a short period of time, were Joan of Arc, Louis XI, and Mazarin. The world had to wait for Lyndon LaRouche to discover the secret of how to use the polemical Socratic method of applying the epistemological power of *Agathos* and *Agape* to political organizing. That secret lies, as I will endeavor to demonstrate briefly, in the ability to make an axiomatic change inside of one's own mind.

How does an axiomatic change work? For instance, do what you do when you have lost something and cannot find it: simply trace back the steps you have taken before you lost it. You can figure out how an axiomatic change works by time-reversal; that is, by going from the future to the past, then from the past to the present, and back again to the future, by changing and reordering the pathway of transformation you have gone through in the previous momentous loss of your axioms. This is also how a crisis can be averted before it has taken place, for example, by improving the health-care of the world population before the COVID-19 crisis erupted, as LaRouche warned, as early as 1971.

What needs to be discovered, therefore, are the axioms that no longer function, which have to be eliminated, before the breakdown process begins to unravel, and how one can get out of the perplexity that sets in after the axiom

busting moment took place. You are required to discover the axiomatic change through the narrow and tight passage where your belief structure becomes rotated contrapuntally upon itself as if through the *stretto* twisting of a caustic of negative curvature. Such a self-governing *stretto* function was originally discovered by Nicholas of Cusa in *Concordantia Catholica*, when he was looking for the concept of self-government for the Bishops of the Church.

What has to be changed is your previous set of wrong underlying assumptions, because they were based on linear relations whose actions prevented the change to take place in your own mind. Therefore, next time you lose yourself, just surprise yourself, as Lyn said, by changing the linear causality of thinking that you had before you got lost. To do this, you must do the impossible; that is, come up with the answer before the question pops up. For example, shed the Aristotelian, Newtonian, or Cartesian misconception of causality that you have had most of your life and replace that ineffective conception by a Platonic, Leibnizian, and LaRouchian time-reversal conception of final causality; in other words, start from the future.

Just make sure that such causality is Plato's Good coming from the future as opposed to coming from what appears to be good in your past. Causality of the Good doesn't come from the past; causality comes from the enfolding and unfolding of the future. It's that simple, but it's hard to do, and you will have to exercise your mind with an epistemological tensor which has four different forms of wisdom-tempering (*sophrosyne*) memory functions by time reversal: the memory of your mind, the memory of your eyes, the memory of your fingers, and the memory of your hearing. Lyndon LaRouche explained such a process as pertaining to the *stretto* method that Beethoven developed in the Choral movement of the Ninth Symphony. Lyn put it as follows:

"I demand surprise, conceptual ironies. Look at the voices as instruments, like the voices of the orchestra, and develop the contrapuntal tension of enunciation, intonation to the point that the last drop of romanticist's sentimentality is expunged from the performance. The singers and instruments are not a worshipful chorus of Greek monks before the



shrine of Apollo, nor are they celebrating a Dionysian frenzy. This is Promethean music, in which constant discovery is piling upon new discovery, constantly transforming the comprehension of what has been already heard.”<sup>3</sup>

Thus, the truth of the change does not lie in any form of linear causal action that comes from the past and pushes you to change in the future, as in the Aristotelian form of action-reaction; the causal process is located in your own ability to look back and forward at yourself from the future and to examine by time-reversal the process that led to the breakdown of your linear thinking, and then, change your direction, inward and outward, by discovering the higher principle of the Good that must benefit mankind as a whole.

This new discovery must include, in the process of its double *enfolding and unfolding* process, the ability to use a time-reversal form of thinking that changes the past without any final resolution, except by constantly turning back to that changing past and repeatedly performing a tempering (*sophrosyne*) revision of your own quadratic tensor of memory functions. The epistemological mastery of Cusa's negative theology is the best tool to use for this purpose. Here, I refer you especially to Cusa's exemplary spiritual exercise in *The Vision of God* which should be compressed into a *stretto* counterpoint with two other voices, that of Helga Zepp-LaRouche and of Lyndon LaRouche. First Cusa:

“Trusting in Your help, O Lord, I turn once again in order to find You beyond the wall of the coincidence of enfolding and unfolding. And when at one and the same time I go in and out through the door of Your Word and Concept, I find most sweet nourishment. When I find You to be a power that enfolds all things, I go in. When I find You to be a power that unfolds, I go out. When I find You to be a power that both enfolds and unfolds, I both go in and go out. From creatures I go in unto You, who are Creator—go in from the effects unto the Cause. I go out from You, who are Creator—go out from the Cause unto the effects. I both go in and go out when I see that going out

---

<sup>3</sup> Lyndon LaRouche, [Think Like Beethoven](#), EIR News Service, Washington D.C., 2020. The Secret of Ludwig van Beethoven, p. 139.

is going in and that, likewise, going in is going out. (By comparison, he who counts unfolds and enfolds, alike: he unfolds the power of oneness, and he enfolds number into oneness.) For creation's going out from You is creation's going in unto You; and unfolding is enfolding. And when I see You-who-are-God in Paradise, which this wall of the coincidence of opposites surrounds, I see that You neither enfold nor unfold— whether separately or collectively. For both separating and conjoining are the wall of coincidence, beyond which You dwell, free from whatever can be either spoken of or thought of.”<sup>4</sup>

Apply this spiritual exercise to the concept of self-interest; that is, to the notion of the Platonic Good as Lyndon LaRouche understood the “self-interest” purpose of the citizen according to the “Great Good” of the Preamble of the 1789 American Constitution. The concept of Constitutional interest is expressed as the causality of self-interest by going in and out of oneself as a means of discovering the way to determine the future by going beyond the one-way Aristotelian fraudulent form of action-reaction causality coming from the past.

Here is how Cusa conceived of this idea of self-interest through the concept of self-government of *Agathos* with *Agape*. It actually worked as a shock wave. The question Cusa posed was how can the Church become self-governed through the Pope in concordance with the other Bishops? Cusa took the idea of St. Paul's *Agape* and the Platonic Good (*Agathos*) and united them with the idea of the consent of the governed.

He understood that for the Good to be incarnated into the universe under the condition of change, it had to relate to mankind through Christ via *Agape*. However, the relationship to mankind also required that the Good be self-subsisting; therefore, the concept of self-subsistence was contracted through the function of change, which is characteristic of the axiomatic *stretto* motion of enfolding-unfolding. And so, the idea of *self-subsisting through the benefit of*

---

<sup>4</sup>[\*NICHOLAS OF CUSA'S DIALECTICAL MYSTICISM\*](#), Text, Translation, and interpretive Study of *De Visione Dei*, (3<sup>rd</sup> Edition) by Jasper Hopkins, The Arthur J. Banning Press, Minneapolis, 1988, p. 701. See also: Helga Zepp-LaRouche, [\*On the Sweetness of Truth\*](#), The Schiller Institute, October 1988.

*others became transformed into the process of self-governing through the consent of others.*<sup>5</sup>

As Mazarin showed in his principle of the 1648 Peace of Westphalia, the only way to work for your self-interest is to commit yourself to be the messenger for the *benefit of others*. When I go into the cause as the Good, I enfold into it; when the Good for mankind welcomes that action, I become the receptacle in which the Good is unfolding its response for the benefit of mankind. The irony about self-interest, true self-interest, is that it can only work as a messaging motion that moves *from-the-self-to-the-benefit-of-the-other-and-back-to-the-self*; that is, by both enfolding and unfolding at the same time. Similarly, in her Keynote address to Panel 2 of the *Schiller Institute Conference* held online, on December 12, 2020, Helga Zepp-LaRouche applied beautifully Cusa's concept of the *coincidence of opposites* to the self-interest of mankind as expressed by Mazarin by applying it to the American Constitution. Second, Helga:

“Now, the concept of the coincidence of opposites can be applied to the present strategic situation, and actually, every area of human knowledge. The interest of mankind, if you define it, not as the interest of the present living people, and in the here and now, but if you internalize the interest of all future generations to come, essentially the same idea which is the Preamble of the American Constitution: That it's not just the present, but all future generations who must be served with the common good, and in this time, the entire world, the entire human population.

“To get an understanding of what this means, is that if you think, or how you apply what I just said theoretically to the present world situation, if you take each nation as a microcosm, and according to Nicolaus of Cusa, peace in the macrocosm is only possible if each microcosm has the best possible development, and takes it as its own self-interest that all the other microcosms develop. That means that you're not taking the so-called geopolitical self-interest of the nation or a group of nations, positioning themselves against the supposed interest of all the others, but that you have a

---

<sup>5</sup> This connection came to me in the early hours of Christmas day, 2020.

different conception, rejecting the Aristotelian method of contradiction. If you take Plato's concept of change and becoming as the ontological primary, then the development of each microcosm can be seen like in a contrapuntal, fugal composition, where the development of each note and each idea contributes to the future development of all others."<sup>6</sup>

Thus, you have the principle of a New Just World Economic Order as it should be; that is, based on the Principle of the Peace of Westphalia as Lyndon LaRouche intended.

Music, however, is the artistic form which best replicates this axiomatic causal function, because you can hear the voices and the notes coming from the future when your mind is wisely-tempered (*sophrosyne*) with the appropriate Lydian quadratic disposition of the mind as demonstrated, for instance, by Marian Anderson's "[\*They Crucified my Lord\*](#)." Lyndon LaRouche further illustrated this axiomatic function of changing the past by pointing to the change that Beethoven made with respect to Bach in the last movement of the *Ninth Symphony*. Third, Lyn:

"That is why the human race needs Beethoven's music. He expresses and celebrates that which uniquely distinguishes man from lower beasts, feudal serfs, and lunatic Fabians. He celebrates, above all, man's unique quality of mind, the power to create entire new bodies of scientific knowledge. He celebrates, and expresses the fact that the causal principle of knowledge and human practice does not even exist in Bach's sort of preordained, fixed universe defined in terms of *a priori* space and time, but according to a universal, causal principle which governs the successive, lawfully ordered emergence of one entirely new, lawfully ordering geometry from its predecessor. He demonstrates that truth does not lie in any one of those subsumed geometries, but in the whole process subsuming those transformations.

---

<sup>6</sup> Helga Zepp-LaRouche, [\*Escaping the Danger of World War III: A Strategic Order Based on the Common Aims of Mankind\*](#), Morning Briefing, Sunday, December 13, 2020, page 13 of 36. Published by *The Schiller Institute*, [\*The World after the U. S. Election: Creating A World Based on Reason\*](#), December 12-13, 2020, Online Conference.



“The truth within such a Beethoven composition is not that it arrives through development at a final resolution, but that in its resolution it looks back upon the process by which this progress was realized. Hence, both in musical and in epistemological principle, the key to the *generative idea* of (especially) a late-Beethoven composition is those phases which perform the revised function of a *stretto*.”<sup>7</sup>

### PLATO'S CONCEPT OF THE GOOD (AGATHOS)

What I am about to present to you is difficult, but if you bear with me, I will try to replicate, as completely as I can, the concept of the Good as Plato discussed it in both *Charmides 174d*, and *The Republic VI, 505a – 511d*.<sup>8</sup> Plato's principle of the Good is the highest principle there is and every other principle depends on this superior One of the Many. Correspondingly, the geometrical discovery you are about to make is also the highest mental power that man is capable of making. Remember that Plato said the same thing about the Good in his early works as he did in his later works. In the early *Charmides*, for instance, Socrates said to Critias:

“However, my dear Critias, the execution of all of these trades would be of no benefit (*ophelimos-ώφελίμως*) if this science were lacking.

“That is true.”

“Therefore, that science, the one which is so beneficial (*ophelimos-ώφελίμως*) for us, is not the science of wisdom-tempering (*sophrosyne-σωφροσύνη*); it is not the science of science and of the non-sciences. It is the science of good (*agathou-άγαθοῦ*) and evil (*κακού*): so if this science is the most beneficial (*ophelimos-ώφελίμως*), then the science of wisdom-tempering (*sophrosyne-σωφροσύνη*) has nothing to do with extending benefits (*ophelimos-ώφελίμως*).” (*Charmides*, 174d)

Here, Critias is completely confused; he cannot understand how wisdom, as the science of all other sciences, and of itself, cannot be the source of what is

<sup>7</sup> Lyndon LaRouche, [Think Like Beethoven](#), p. 140.

<sup>8</sup> I have used Benjamin Jowett and Paul Shorey for English translations and Alfred Croiset and Emile Chambry for the French translations, all of which I have found had severe shortcomings. I have therefore found it necessary to add my own changes to the French and English translators by going back to the original Greek text.

beneficial to mankind, because he hears the words that Socrates says, but he lost track of his ideas. What is, therefore the “product” of the science of wisdom? Socrates cannot say that he knows what it is; and he can only conclude that wisdom cannot be the source of what is beneficial. On the other hand, however, he knows what the product of the higher Good is: it is what generates all benefits.

Here, Plato conveys a very powerful discovery of principle, by distinguishing the Good (*Agathos*) from wisdom (*sophrosyne*), because the latter cannot be beneficial without the former. As LaRouche always recommended, you cannot hammer your own personality without first orienting your agapic compass from the source of *Agathos*.<sup>9</sup>

However, Plato added repeatedly: the Good is the source of what is “beneficial” or “useful” (*ophelimos*). He makes a similar remark, much later, in *The Republic*, also by repeating the idea of being “beneficial” (*ophelimos*), but without mentioning the science of wisdom (*sophrosyne*).

This is the closest that Plato came to connecting *Agathos* to *Agape*, within the same transfinite unifying process. The point is that he used the term *sophrosyne* in connection with *Agathos*. The idea of *sophrosyne*, which most Plato scholars translate by “moderation” or “temperance,” or “wisdom” actually also means “tempering” in the musical sense of J.S. Bach. This idea of *sophrosyne* in connection with *Agathos* is, therefore, the closest that Plato comes to St. Paul’s concept of *agape* (love of mankind).

The subject of the Good is more extensively developed in *The Republic* than in the *Charmides*, but, with respect to what is beneficial (*ophelimos*); that is, by negative dialectics. Here, we are one step away from discovering the Peace of Westphalia principle; that is, what is exclusively “beneficial for others,” as a principle of self-interest. For instance, in *Republic VI*, Glaucon replied to Socrates:

---

<sup>9</sup> The French translator of *Charmides*, Alfred Croiset, noted correctly that the Greek term *sophrosyne*, which he translates by *wisdom*, implied in Greek certain nuances which don’t exist in French. For instance, during the time of Homer, the term only meant *common sense*, but later, the term acquired higher moral and intellectual qualities, which indicated “a certain equilibrium of the soul.” What has been lost through the centuries, however, is a *tempering* quality, a mastery of what LaRouche called a “hammering of one’s personality” which can range from a state of simply *behaving properly* to the highest quality of *wise-tempering* your character such as the sublime state of mind requires.

“Yes, he said, your idea is right; but do you believe that anyone will let you go without asking you what that great knowledge is and what its object of study is all about?”

“Not at all, I replied, all you have to do is ask me questions; besides, you have heard me discuss this question more than once – and now, either you have forgotten or you are trying to embarrass me with your objections. I suspect it is the latter which is true – because you have often heard me say that the idea of the good (*agathou idea*) is the object of the highest science of all, and that it is from that source that justice and other virtues derive their beneficence (*ophelima*).

“Again, and this I have told you before, I would add that this is an idea that I do not understand perfectly, and even if we were to understand everything as perfectly as possible, without its purview, this, as you know, would lead me to nothing because without the possession of the good (*agathou*), every other possession would be useless. Unless you think there is some benefit in possessing anything whatsoever, without it being good, or in knowing everything apart from the good (*agathou*), while you don't know what is beautiful and good (*agathos*).

“No, by Zeus. (*Republic VI, 505ab.*)

Thus, for Plato, all knowledge can never be useful unless we first acquire the knowledge of the Good. One would do well to ponder on this because unless you start from the Good everything else you say and do will smell of sophistry or, as St. Paul said, will be “as sounding brass.”

The Good, therefore, is never considered in itself; it is always considered from the benefits it produces in other things and for others. And if the Good is not there, in other things, something is missing and it smells in those other things. That is why “what is not there” is so important to take into account. “What is not there”

is essential to recognize because it opens the epistemological door to the use of negative theological dialectics<sup>10</sup> that Cusa will later use extensively.

Centuries later, Plato's special treatment of *Agathos* is directly echoed by St. Paul, on the subject of *agape*. Note how, for instance, in *I, Corinthians, 13*, Paul makes use of the same conditionality for *agape* as Plato did for *Agathos*:

“Charity (*agape-αγαπή*) never faileth: but whether *there be* prophecies, they shall fail; whether *there be* tongues, they shall cease; whether *there be* knowledge, it shall vanish away.

“For we know in part, and we prophesy in part.

“But when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away.

“When I was a child, I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child: but when I became a man, I put away childish things.

“For now we see through a glass, darkly; but then face to face: now I know in part; but then shall I know even as also I am known.

“And now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three; but the greatest of these *is* charity (*agape*).” (St. Paul, *I, Corinthians 13 (KJV)*)

*Agathos* and *Agape* both have God-like qualities without which nothing good or loving could properly exist in the world; for like God, the Good and Love of mankind are present in all beneficial human actions which are in *Imago Dei* and could not exist properly otherwise, or without the benefit of which everything would be fake and turned into sophistry. That is the most crucial point to stress in this entire report. The question is, therefore, how can someone become a true expression of such a Good and Love of mankind, and how can someone recognize

---

<sup>10</sup> Negative theological dialectics is not only the thinking of what God is not; that is, the awareness of not being able to positively identify what God is; it is also the awareness of the ultimate importance of what is not there, a way of knowing what is not there, when it should be there. Cusa further develops Plato's negative dialectics by developing new ways to know what is not there – i.e.: “Of Learned Ignorance.”



how what is not both good and agapic actually is nothing but a product of sophistry?

For Plato, the implication of this is that because such a subject is the most difficult of all, he cannot speak of the Good in itself; he can only access the Good indirectly through a metaphorical process. This is where the correspondence between the Sun and the Good comes into play. However, from the vantage point of epistemology, such a metaphorical process is a complex function which also involves an incommensurable transfinite proportionality between knowledge and sense perception. This is how the proportion is set up geometrically inside of Plato's mind: *The Good is to the intelligible as the Sun is to the visible.*

The reason why this metaphorical form of the Good is most difficult to conceive and to apply is because it is doubly-mediated through a complex configuration, and therefore, an epistemological form of geometry is required in order to have the transfinite nature of the Good transported to all other values known to benefit from it. In other words, beauty, justice, truth, human reason itself, etc., all derive from the Good as their generative source or principle of existence and of knowledge, through an incommensurable geometrical proportionality, including the emotions of the soul.

Plato is attempting to facilitate the axiomatic change by using geometry in order to create a transfinite bridging process between the Good and creative knowledge. He will later do this by going through a number of transfinite steps with the heuristic device of dividing a straight line into four unequal parts.

By assigning to the Good such an ontological priority over everything else that exists in the universe, Plato identified the Good with the concept of *Imago Dei*, as Moses did in the Bible. However, he did this by identifying the Good with the Sun-god as the generator of visibility and well being in the physical domain, while Moses did it by identifying the divine intention of elevating man to the divine by using faith without using any physical object of the visible domain. Plato wrote:

“And now, consider, said I, that I understand the son of the good (*agathou*) to signify the Sun; such that the good (*agathon*) generated its own resemblance, which is, in the visible domain, with respect to vision and to visual objects, what the good (*agathon*) is with respect to intelligence and to intelligible objects.” (*Republic, VI, 508c*)

This statement acting like a caustic represents a major axiomatic and transfinite moment of difference in the history of mankind, because Plato's use of the “son of the Good” is like a premonition of the Son of God in the New Testament; it is as if Plato had intimated the possibility of uniting the human with the divine, as St. Irenaeus had done in the footsteps of St. Paul, thus, establishing a transfinite caustic bridge between the spiritual and the physical by forecasting the coming of Christ.

Generating a proportion between mankind and the Good is the equivalent of creating a transfinite link that did not exist before; that is, by hypothesizing a higher hypothesis which is to bring the highest beneficial gift to mankind. The Sun shines on visible objects so that we can see them clearly, as the Good shines on intelligible things so that we can conceive of them truthfully. That connection creates a direct link to the creative process of God the Creator. Then, Socrates added:

“Do the same with respect to the soul by using the following idea: When it focuses its sights on an object which is illuminated by the truth and by being, it immediately conceives of it, has knowledge of it, and makes itself appear to be intelligible. However, when the mind turns toward something that is mixed with obscurity, that is, something which is born and perishes, it has but opinions of things, its outlook is troubled, it variegates from one extreme to another, and appears to have lost all intelligibility.

“That's obviously the case.

“Therefore, what communicates the truth to knowable objects and to the mind's ability to know is assuredly the idea of the good (*agathou idean*). Say to yourself, that the good (*agathou*) is the cause of the knowability of

science and of the truth. But, however beautiful both of those two, science and truth, may appear to be, you cannot go wrong if you consider that the idea of the good (*agathoeide*) is distinct from them and surpassed them both in beauty.

“And, as in the visible world we have reason to believe that light and visibility have something analogous which relates to the Sun, but that we would be wrong to take them for the Sun, similarly, in the intelligible domain, we are right to believe that science and truth are to one another similar to the good (*agathos*), but that we would be wrong to believe that either one or the other could be the good (*agathon*), because the nature of what is good (*agathou*) must be considered to be of a much higher level. (*Republic VI, 508de-509ab*)

Plato raises the Good to such a transfinite level because he rejects what Aristotle thought, which is that the good is merely a “pleasure.” However, Plato does not raise the physical nature of the Sun to such a transfinite level as the Good, but metaphorically to a high enough level that, as a physical object, it may be considered to have the creative power of making things visible, as well as of being the cause of their generation, their nourishment, and their growth, without being itself an essence. Then Plato adds:

“Similarly for the objects of knowledge, you have to admit that not only they derive from the good (*agathou*) the fact that they are known, but their very existence and essences are also derived from it, although the good (*agathou*) is not, itself, an essence, but something which surpasses essence by far in majesty and in power.”(*Republic VI, 509b7*)

This incommensurable proportionality is, therefore, as close as Plato comes to explain how his knowledge of the Good could be achieved; that is, by means of an incommensurable proportion between the physical and the intelligible. For this reason, Glaucon ironically replied by praising Apollo, the Sun-god, as being

behind the transcendence of the light of truth in Greek civilization.<sup>11</sup> After hearing Glaucon's exclamation, Socrates ended this discussion on the Good by inviting him not to forget anything about his proportional equation between Light and Truth. Then, Glaucon interjected:

“By the Sun-god Apollo, what a wonderful transcendence!”

“It is your fault, I retorted back: Why did you force me to reveal my thoughts on this subject?”

“If you think you forgot something, don't hold back, he said, and supposing you don't want to go any further, at least remind me of your comparison with the Sun.

“Without a doubt, said I, I have forgotten many things.

“Then, he said, from now on, don't leave anything out, no matter how small it may be.

“Very well, I replied, but I fear that I am leaving a lot out, Nevertheless, I shall attempt not to omit anything, as little as possible, in view of my improvisation.

“Try not to, he said.

“Conceive, therefore, that as I have said, there are two entities, and that one of them reigns over (*basileuein*) the intelligible (*noetou*) ordering and region and that the other rules over the visible (*oratou*) – I don't want to say the heaven (*ouranou*) because you might accuse me of flaunting my knowledge of etymology – You surely get my point on the subject of the two types, the visible and the intelligible.

“I do, he said.” (*Republic VI, 509c1*)

---

<sup>11</sup> I remind the reader that the truths that were voiced by Pythia at the Delphic Shrine of Apollo were all coming from the dark fumes of a sacrificed python in the ground under the tripod that she was sitting on, and not from the Sun.



Here, Socrates makes a play on world with “heaven” (*ouranou*) and “visible” (*oraton*) in order to prepare the reader to make a great leap over the issue of a proportional transfinite bridge between the physical domain and the intelligible domain.

In the next chapter, Plato will introduce the paradoxical situation between the mental and the physical domains by doing something impossible. He draws a straight line between sense perception and transcendental ideas. At that point, Plato folded the question of the Good within a quadratic geometrical proportionality of four objects of knowledge. The geometrical proportion reads chronologically on a straight line from the past to the future and from a lower to a higher manifold: ***Conjecture or opinion is to belief as understanding is to reason or to intellect.***<sup>12</sup>

It is interesting to note that Plato puts opinion and understanding in the same proportional category as belief and intellect. The question is: how can Plato use a line in order to connect two such domains that cannot be related to each other by any linear means? It can only be done through an incommensurable line. How can you do that? The way to solve this paradoxical problem is by using the power of irony and metaphor. I have already discussed this matter in my previous report: **[PLATO'S 'DELIRIOUS ART' OF FORECASTING THE GOOD.](#)** ]

As history demonstrates, St. Paul, St. Augustine, Nicholas of Cusa, Raphael, Leibniz, and Lyndon LaRouche have each brought the same Platonic moral and epistemological outlook of the Good to higher transfinite and incommensurable levels, especially in religious practice, spiritual exercises, artistic composition, epistemology, science and politics. However, only the exonerated Lyndon LaRouche will make it possible for this Platonic doctrine to be completed and applied fully, worldwide, in the near future.

## **LAROCHE'S AGAPE AS THE COMPASS OF THE GOOD FOR HUMANITY**

“See, we are not emperors; we cannot, with a wave of the hand, declare a principle and then impose it by our will, on people. The way

---

<sup>12</sup> Plato, *The Republic VI*, 509de-510ab.

we convey a principle is as philosophers, philosophers in action, who convince people that that principle is the way in which they ought to live and act. When a people is aroused to act for that principle, then the great good comes. No man is a god; no man can decree by a wave of the hand and give the world something according to principle. What a man can do, an individual human being, is to transmit ideas, utilize ideas, to convey them to others. The function of leadership is essentially that of a philosopher, which few politicians seem to understand. It is the philosopher who conveys and implants ideas in people, ideas of principle, like a scientist who conveys discoveries. It is the implanting of those ideas in the social process, the creation of political and other institutions around ideas, which mobilize humanity to do a great work. [...]

“So, when somebody talks about my self-interest, what is that? If you're going to die, what becomes of your self-interest the minute you die? Your self-interest in pleasure, in gluttony, in riches—What happens to them? They go! Your self-interest is in having lived, and having your life mean something to humanity. You live for your self-interest. [...]

“In former times, more people had that kind of commitment, which they expressed in terms of their obligations to improve society, their family, and so forth. Those values have more or less passed away, during this decadent cultural period in which we have lived. We have come to a time when people suddenly realize that "My money, my money, my money!" is not the essence of humanity or life. the essence of the ability to buy is not the essence of life. It is being human that is the essence of life.

“When people have taken away from them, some of the false values to which they have clung too ardently, sometimes they are forced to look and say, "What is really valuable?" Sometimes, for that reason, it is the poor who are the best fighters for freedom. Because they have the least to lose, and freedom means everything to them, because they have nothing else, except freedom. So, when we come to

a time of great peril and depravity, the secret is leadership. The secret is the development and spread of ideas, sound ideas, which enable people to mobilize themselves about actions which will address the problem. In such a moment, when that occurs, suddenly the majority of people are able to decide on how to run this planet. And those few tyrants who dominate us, become pitiful wrecks running into places of refuge, or hiding or changing their identity.”<sup>13</sup>

The General Welfare Principle in the Preamble of the American Constitution is known, in the Christian tradition, as the principle of the general Welfare of all of the people and their posterity, the unity of *Agathos* and *Agape*. This doesn't mean that Americans have been given the right to police the world by imposing regime change wherever they see fit. On the contrary, the American Constitution is a principle of the common good for anyone in the world who has been disoriented by oligarchism. LaRouche stated:

“Under that principle of international law concerning the common good, no government has a durable claim to the moral authority to govern, except as it is efficiently dedicated to promoting the general welfare of all of its population and their posterity.”<sup>14</sup>

This is what is unique in the historical role of the American Experience, which became known sometimes as “American Exceptionalism” as opposed to what it has been misrepresented to be, today. The idea of American Exceptionalism has been too often misunderstood as the special responsibility and role of policing the world and imposing democracy. In fact, the role of the American Constitution has been to give an orientation to the Good for all human beings, provided they understand it, and provided they are willing to accept it, for the benefit of others. LaRouche's idea of *agape* is the compass of *Agathos* for mankind. And this is how to understand the meaning of Ben Franklin's famous statement: “A republic, if you can keep it!”

---

<sup>13</sup> Lyndon LaRouche, [Winning the Ecumenical Battle For the Common Good](#), ICLC-Schiller Institute conference, Bad Schwalbach, Germany, on May 4, 2001.

<sup>14</sup> Lyndon LaRouche, Op. Cit., p. 15.

This principle also relates to John Quincy Adams's "community of principle" encompassing all sovereign nation states, as well as to Nicholas of Cusa's *Concordantia Catholica*, and to Louis XI's and Henry VII's Commonwealths for both France and England against any and all oligarchical forms of government.

It was with the coming of the 1648 Peace of Westphalia of Cardinal Jules Mazarin that, for the first time in history, the principle of *agape* was established as the principle of moral conduct for all of civilized nations of Europe under the notable principle of the "benefit of the other" or the "good of the other."

Mazarin was an Italian diplomat of Pope Urban VIII who acted as the head of the government of Anne of Austria, the Queen Regent of the future King of France, Louis XIV. By looking at the role of Mazarin, one can see how he became the first powerful leader to be able to hold off the evil oligarchical principalities of Europe, unfortunately, only for a short period of time. Wilhelm Gottfried Leibniz extended the same principle to his *Academy of Arts and Sciences* with the hope of extending it to America, Russia, and to China. The Fathers of the American Revolution established the Leibnizian principle of *agape* to the Declaration of Independence in the form of the *Pursuit of Happiness*, while the Good appears in the form of the *General Welfare* in the Preamble of the American Constitution.

The use by LaRouche of the term *agape* has to be understood not only as the Christian principle established by St. Paul in the thirteenth chapter of his first letter to the Corinthians, but also as relating directly to natural law and to the Good as Plato understood it and as both principles were implemented conjointly from natural law and for the same general purpose in the Preamble of the American Constitution. LaRouche stated:

"All that is distinctively good in globally extended, modern European civilization's contributions to human culture at large, is centered in a conception of natural law which is implicitly as ancient as the famous poem of the great reformer Solon of Athens, and in a related conception, called *agape* in that ancient Greek, which Europe's most useful philosopher, Plato,



places in the mouth of the Socrates who is the chief protagonist of his dialogues. [...]

“The notion which is termed the common good, or general welfare, is a product and corollary of that underlying of natural law.”<sup>15</sup>

As Plato warned the reader against reducing the idea of the Good to that of pleasure, LaRouche similarly deplored the fact that this profound concept of *agape* had been falsified by public opinion through the Latin mistranslation of “*caritas*” meaning “charity,” a notion which was further reduced and banalized to mean “giving money to the poor.” I am using this example, especially to emphasize the fact that when one does not pay attention to what the “principalities and powers” are doing to undermine society, civilization degenerates and all that remains are reductionist values which are all curtsies to the oligarchy. LaRouche concluded:

“The fact that the principle of the general welfare is part of our constitutional tradition does not signify that the principle of the common good is a mere tradition. It is no mere matter of some people’s debatable opinion; it is a principle of natural law, as the term natural law implies the kind of law which is neither a mere legal fiction, as the positive law is merely such fiction, as the notion of “common law” [Footnote 21: E.g., customary law, as in the Romantic school of Kant, Savigny, et al. Throughout this report, as in other published locations, the use of the term “Romantic,” by me, signifies the cultural legacy of ancient pagan Rome, and, thus, implicitly, the cultural legacy of the Delphi cult of the Pythian Apollo, and of ancient Mesopotamia’s so-called “oligarchical model,” earlier. “Ro-mantic” is to be recognized as the cultural adversary of its opposite, the Classical humanist model.] is a mere, Romantic’s fiction, nor is it a matter of belief in the efficacy of the mere phrase-mongering

---

<sup>15</sup> Lyndon LaRouche, [Faith, Hope, And Agape!](#) EIR, Vol. 28, No. 21, June 1, 2001, p. 22. See Appendix at the end of this report. On the subject of *agape*, see also: Lyndon LaRouche, [You Have Nothing to Fear As Much as Denial Itself](#), Labor Day conference of the Schiller Institute and the International Caucus of Labor Committees, in Reston, Virginia, September 1, 2001. “The Apostle Paul referred to this repeatedly, as in *I Corinthians 13* as *agape*... Concentrate on *agape*, which is the essence of all morality. And, when you have *agape*, you don't need any other code, except good judgment. *Agape*, essentially, is knowing what a human being is; knowing what humanity is; knowing what cognition is; and loving what you have received as benefits from the past—cognitively. And loving the future, by giving to the future, that which the future, as human, needs.”

recitation of some traditional phrases. When we speak of natural law, rather than any other kind of law, we must use the term to identify a universal principle, which, as I shall explain, is proven to be universal, from physical evidence, with a scientific quality and degree of certainty.”<sup>16</sup>

What “physical evidence” is LaRouche talking about? Most people do not pay much attention to the differences of meaning that St. Paul gave to the words “[Faith, Hope and Agape!](#)” You don’t need to be a theologian to recognize how easily misleading these words can be. The question that LaRouche posed to the reader was: How can you give “a personal reading” to these words which virtually guarantees you that such a reading will be universality acceptable as scientifically valid? LaRouche thinks like Kepler, he sees that no matter how you gyrate your mental solar system in multiply-connected physical space-time, *Agape* will always orient you toward *Agathos*, because Love of mankind is the compass of the Good for humanity. LaRouche makes the point:

“In physical science, ‘faith’ signifies belief, but not belief in one’s own, or someone else’s mere opinion, nor faith in horse-betting, stock-market trend-charts, or the other mere statistics popularly worshipped among virtual idiot-savants. It signifies belief in the idea of validated universal physical principles. These are not principles “proven at the black board” by the Delphic sophistries of so-called “formal logic.” As I shall explain here, these are principles which can be proven by the same methods of physical experiment used to test, and prove the validity of any discovery of a universal physical principle.

“Although you may not have thought of this fact before, I shall demonstrate, once again, to you here, as I have in numerous other published locations, that the principles of natural law are knowable with the same precision one might wish to attribute to what are otherwise regarded as experimentally validated discoveries of universal physical principles. Therefore, bearing in mind this promise to demonstrate that connection, think of “faith” as an expression of confidence in the conditional [Footnote

---

<sup>16</sup> Lyndon LaRouche, [Faith, Hope, And Agape!](#) EIR, Vol. 28, No. 21, June 1, 2001, p. 23.

22: By “conditional,” I signify that the discovery of new universal principles not only transforms our knowledge of the universe as a whole, but corrects the errors embedded in our lack of knowledge of additional such principles.] efficacy of those validated universal principles, which the act of discovery has made part of one’s own knowledge.

“ ‘Hope’ references the expectation of the possibility of a happy, even a sublime outcome for the effects of success in applying validatable universal principles. [Footnote 23: As I shall clarify that point later in this report, there are two contrasted but sometimes overlapping notions of the term happiness which Gottfried Leibniz’s attacks on John Locke imparted to the writing of our 1776 Declaration of Independence. This is a matter of distinction between the ‘profane’ and the ‘sublime.’ ‘Profane’ pertains to such matters as short-term sensual’ gratification; “sublime” refers to joy in the immortal outcome of one’s having lived, including the outcome of the risk of one’s mortal life for the sovereignty and future of one’s nation or civilization as a whole.]

“As Paul wrote, the third, and greatest of these three concepts, *agape*, references what thoughtful reflection shows to be a still higher quality of principle than either faith or hope. That is the implication of the Classical Greek and Christian understanding of the scientific truthfulness of the Mosaic conception of man and woman, as made equally in the image of the Creator, and as obliged to exercise increasing dominion over the universe. This is not believed simply because those reported words are attributed to Moses; rather, confidence in Moses is strengthened by the experimentally demonstrable scientific certainty, that those words, as I read them here, are true. [Footnote 24: In science, when we encounter those kinds of striking words which express an opinion which could not be derived by any means but a valid act of discovery of universal physical principle, we know the mind of the author of such an expression in the most intimate way.] This conception of human nature is, as I shall show you, if you did not already know it, the entire basis for the conception of natural law.

“Thus, the proof of the proposition, that man and woman are equally superior to all other living things, which are, in turn, superior to non-living things, defines the essential, sublime nature of the human individual, and of society. That is a nature which imparts to both the sovereign individual and the society certain intrinsic rights, and also certain intrinsic obligations. This notion of the nature of man, and of mankind’s relationship to the physical universe, as expressed by the Declaration of Independence’s adoption of Leibniz’s concept of “life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness,” as a refutation of the philosophy of John Locke, is not an opinion; it is a validated universal physical principle of science.

“The broad conclusion to be drawn, as to the matter of law, is that that sublime quality of efficient intention which is called *agape*, [Footnote 25: The use of the term “sublime,” throughout this report, is coherent with the treatment of that subject in the work of the great Classical historian-playwright Friedrich Schiller.] must rule the conduct of both the individual person and society. This conduct, and its implied outcome, are the common good, or, the general welfare.”<sup>17</sup>

The connection between *Agathos* and *Agape* should, therefore, be of no surprise to anyone who is fighting for mankind to sever its historical shackles from oligarchism. The connection is not obvious unless one introduces the question of Friedrich Schiller’s understanding of the sublime.<sup>18</sup> Most people don’t realize the extent to which they have already lost the ability to use their free-will for the benefit of mankind; and as a result of having lost their freedom, they have also lost their ability to make discoveries of principle. That has to change.

## CONCLUSION

To summarize this report, the connection between *Agathos* and *Agape* should now be clear to anyone who is guided by such a universal principle as the *general welfare* of the American Constitution. It should also be anathema to our

---

<sup>17</sup> Lyndon LaRouche, [Faith, Hope, And Agape!](#) EIR, Vol. 28, No. 21, June 1, 2001, p. 24.

<sup>18</sup> Friedrich Schiller, *Poet of Freedom, Vol. III*, The Schiller Institute, Washington D.C., 1990, *On the Sublime*, p. 255.



enemy, the British-American oligarchy, because this is a principle which never dies and will forever haunt those families at every turn in history until the end of time. How do I know this to be an actual true fact? I know it because man is given the authority through natural law to speak out for the Creator, as “stones cry out.”<sup>19</sup> Again, let LaRouche’s voice be heard one more time on the truth of the matter:

“This concept, of letting the stones speak, is, as I shall show once again, here, the most important, the most fundamental principle in all knowledge. ‘*Letting the stones speak,*’ refers to the way in which those non-deductive mental processes which are called “cognition,” “reason,” or, sometimes, “insight,” enable the human individual to do what no lower form of life, such as the great apes, can do: discover an experimentally validatable, and universal, physical principle”<sup>20</sup>

#### **APPENDIX: THE CONSTITUTIONAL ORDER BY SOLON OF ATHENS<sup>21</sup>**

*Never will our city be destroyed by Zeus' decree,  
Nor by the will of the bless'd immortal gods,  
For, born of a potent father, great-hearted guardian  
Pallas Athena spreads her hands o'er our city;  
But, by money seduced, the Athenians themselves  
Seek mindlessly to corrupt the great city,  
Joined by the iniquitous schemes of their leaders,  
Who from arrogance great woes shall suffer:  
For they understand not how to restrain gluttony,  
Nor best to order their feasting in quiet.*

*[ The Greek manuscript breaks off here; a fragment  
refers to "corrupt ones becoming rich."*

*Sparing neither sacred ground nor public goods,  
Greedily they steal from the one place or the other.*

---

<sup>19</sup> Luke 19:40 KJB : “And he answered and said unto them, I tell you that, if these should hold their peace, the stones would immediately cry out.”

<sup>20</sup> Lyndon LaRouche, *Idem*, p. 24

<sup>21</sup> [\*On the Athenian Constitution by Solon of Athens\*](#), The Schiller Institute, reprinted from *FIDELIO Magazine*, Vol. II, No. 2, Summer 1993.

*They fail to protect the rev'rend temples of Justice,  
She who notes silently the "what is and what has been,"  
Who in time shall come exacting retribution.  
Behold, an inex'rabable harm visits all Athens:  
To vile slavery is she swiftly progressed,  
Which rouses up from slumber civil strife and war,  
War that wipes out for many their cherished youth;  
Now our much-loved city is soon worn down by faction,  
While the wicked stir them to confrontations.  
These evils ensnare the whole people; but the poor,  
Many of them, depart to a foreign land,  
Plundered, and bound up in shameful fetters.  
[For the slave's yoke bears all other wickedness.]  
Thus, does the public evil come home to each of us:  
Straining, the courtyard gates no longer hold fast,  
The evil leaps o'er the high walls; it finds everyone,  
Even him fleeing to the inmost chamber.*

*This my soul commands me teach the Athenians:  
A bad constitution brings civic turmoil,  
But a good one shows well-ordering and coherence,  
As it puts shackles 'round about wrong-doing  
It smoothes out the rough; it checks greed, tempers hubris,  
And withers the fruits of reckless impulse.  
It takes crooked judgments and makes them straight,  
Softens arrogant deeds, halts seditious acts,  
And ends the bile of grievous strife. And so under it,  
Everything for mankind becomes whole and wise.*

FIN