
LOVE OF MANKIND (AGAPĚ) IS THE HIGHEST GOOD

Merry Christmas! The hidden truth behind the fight against imperialism and colonialism.

By Pierre Beaudry, 12/23/2024

“Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not agapē, I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal. And though I have the gift of prophecy, and understand all mysteries, and all knowledge; and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not agapē, I am nothing. And though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and though I give my body to be burned, and have not agapē, it profiteth me nothing. Agapē suffereth long, and is kind; agapē envieth not; agapē vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up,

“Doth not behave itself unseemly, seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil; Rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth; Beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things. Agapē 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, agapē, these three; but the greatest of these is agapē. [St. John, 1 Corinthians, 13]

It is love of mankind (*agapë*), the highest good, which engenders both beauty and truth in all of the forms of classical artistic and scientific composition, because it is only through love of mankind that any human being can have access to immortality. Thus, what is required to access immortality is the higher principle of the Peace of Westphalia, *the benefit of the other*.

Ancient Greek culture comes short of establishing a complete philosophy of art, a complete doctrine of Aesthetics, because it was incapable of identifying the “*benefit of the other*” as the highest form of truth and beauty as Schiller understood it: “*Live with thy century, but be not its creature: give to thy contemporaries, but what they need, not what they praise.*”¹ This highest form of the good can only be found within *agapë*, because, like truth and beauty, love of mankind and the good require each other in order to fulfill their mutual destiny.

Why are beauty and truth inseparable from each other? Why are they not the highest qualities that mankind requires for achieving perfection? Because they cannot exist without each other, that is, because they are as two lovers who require each other for their existence. The same condition of coming together is required for mankind to survive; because that added higher quality is required to form a higher biquadratic harmony. There is only one thing more powerful than truth and beauty which is required in order to make mankind complete; that is, love of mankind, (*agapë*).

Today, *agapë* is not understood properly, not even by so-called “Christians,” because people wrongly think that beauty is in the eye of the beholder. That is an absolute deceptive lie. In fact, beauty can only be in the eye of the lover of truth. It is incorrect to think that beauty could be in the eye of the beholder, simply because beauty could never be the subjective product of individual human perception; moreover, beauty does not vary from person to person. The idea that beauty is something subjective and variable as opposed to universal and truthful, is the biggest Aristotelian lie that one could be induced to believe in.

¹ *Friedrich Schiller, Poet of Freedom*, New Benjamin Franklin House, New York, 1985, p. 242.

The idea of beauty and truth in ancient Greek drama and poetry, for instance, does not have a universal character which is identified as the highest good, because what became later, known as the principle of the Peace of Westphalia, *the benefit of the other*, has been misunderstood as a flaw of the human character, instead of a divine attribution for the benefit of mankind; for example the case of the banishment of Lyndon LaRouche. This form of ostracism practiced by the tyrants of ancient Greece may be the reason why Greek Theater could never produce a play based on *the benefit of the other* as the highest form of the good that Christ would later be identified with.

The highest form of good for humanity is the *benefit of the other*, because love of mankind (*agapē*) is the only quality which makes the human subject willing to live and die for a greater cause than his own. Ironically, this is how humanity becomes immortal. Here is a beautiful example of this fact composed by Sébastien Drochon from Solidarité & Progrès, which displays what I am looking for. Pay close attention:

Du nerf !

Mesdames et Messieurs, l'heure est grave. Il est clair
Que la Paix est en pleurs et que gronde la Guerre.
La monnaie de sa pièce, rendons à cett' dernière.
Allons, pour ce combat : du nerf, du nerf, du nerf !

Faisons chemin ensemble, visitons les chaumières.
Partageons notre pain, notre vin, nos lumières.
Ne dit-on pas ici : « Tous les hommes sont frères » ?
Pour ce combat commun : du nerf, du nerf, du nerf !

Est venu le moment où gravés sur la pierre
Ne seront point nos noms ou trophés éphémères
Sonnants et trébuchants dans l'ombre d'un cimetière,

Mais notre amour pour ceux qui après nous naîtront ;

Nos actes et nos pensées qui jamais ne mourront
Dans ce bel univers. Du nerf, du nerf, du nerf !

Courage!

*Ladies and Gentlemen, the hour is grave. It is clear
That Peace is in tears and War is rumbling.
Let us give the latter a taste of its own coin.
Come on, for this fight: courage, courage, courage!*

*Let us journey together, let us visit the cottages.
Let us share our bread, our wine, our lights.
Doesn't it say here: "All men are brothers"?
For this common fight: courage, courage, courage!*

*The time has come when engraved on stone
Will not be our names or ephemeral trophies
Ringing and stumbling in the shadow of a cemetery,*

*But our love for those who will be born after us;
Our actions and our thoughts that will never die
In this beautiful universe. Courage, courage, courage!*

By Sébastien Drochon

Love of mankind (*agapē*) is the higher domain from which Lyndon LaRouche responded when a listener asked him: "Do you think that there's a science to this? What would it be called?" LaRouche replied:

"Love. What do you mean by "love"? You mean a commitment to humanity! You see children, you see all kinds of people, and you want them

to live, because of what they mean to us. But above all, you want the process of human creativity there, to activate the succession.

“So we have to have the courage, to create children; we have to have the courage to accept death when it will come. We have to devote ourselves, in the meanwhile, to those kinds of commitments which mean this continuity of progress. That humans — all life in the universe, in terms that we know it, in terms that we measured in billions of years, all life is creative. The Second Law of Thermodynamics is a fraud! Because the existence of living species is constant progress in what we might call the energy-flux density, constant rise in progress. There is no Second Law of Thermodynamics; that's only for idiots, not for people.

“So the thing that ties us, is this courage for progress, the courage to make discoveries, to rise to the new levels of competence, which the continuation of the human species requires. It means putting back the NASA program, other things like that, immediately. Go back to progress! We call it the “Extraterrestrial Imperative,” which it was called by a famous scientist friend of ours. We have to commit ourselves to the “Extraterrestrial Imperative,” in that sense; the kind of progress which enables mankind to go from Earth to other places, to have an influence on other parts of the Solar System and the galaxy. And those are our immediate objectives.

“And this goes with the love of children, why you love children, why you should love children, why you should even have them, hmm? is this kind of thing. And this is what we must transmit to one another, from one generation to the next: this devotion, to continuing the struggle for progress.”²

LOVE OF MANKIND (AGAPĒ) IS THE HIGHEST GOOD

² Lyndon LaRouche, [*The Pact of the Human Soul*](#), EIR, Vol. 51, No. 33, August 23, 2024, p. 32.

WHEN AGAPĚ HAS TO GO TO WAR, TAKE THE ORESHNIK³ WITH YOU AS A NEW HIGHER PRINCIPLE OF JUSTICE

Near the end of his presentation on the [Expanded Meeting of the Board of the Ministry of Defense](#), on December 16, 2024, Russian President Vladimir Putin concluded his statement by explaining the significant role of the Oreshnik missile for world peace:

“And finally, the Oreshnik system, which has already proven itself well, is very powerful. I would like to repeat once again—specialists know this, the commander of the Strategic Missile Forces Sergey Karakayev is here, he thinks so and told me about it—when used in a *complex manner* (emphasis added), when several systems are used in a group at the same time, it is comparable in power to the use of nuclear weapons. But it is not nuclear, since there is no nuclear fuel, no nuclear component, no contamination. And this is a very important element when deciding what means of armed struggle we can use.”⁴

When the Oreshnik missile was first deployed in the attack against Ukraine, on November 21, 2024, the purpose of that new discovery was made clear for anyone who was willing to see, but very few people saw the results with their minds and their hearts, and what the significance of its principle really was.

Most people were blinded by their sense perception, hatred, and greed, impressed by the physical nature of the new device and without investigating the epistemological nature of the new discovery of principle included in it.

For this reason, Putin used the term “*complex manner*” in his discussion on that new weapon of peace. He was referring to the “complex domain” that Lyndon LaRouche used so often, to identify the level of a higher domain of ideas which encompasses both physical and epistemological considerations.

³P.Beaudry, [VLADIMIR PUTIN'S ORESHNIK MISSILE DELIVERY TO UKRAINE; A TRANSFORMATIVE DISCOVERY OF PRINCIPLE.](#)

⁴ Vladimir Putin, [Expanded Meeting of the Board of the Ministry of Defense](#), Moscow December 16, 2024.



The Science Drivers of Physical Economy Today



Schiller Institute
74.6K subscribers

Subscribe

123



Share

Save



Figure 1. Professor Theodore Postol and the Oreshnik remains left behind for the Western leaders to examine. [*The Science Drivers of Physical Economy Today*](#).

Russia's opponents saw in that new deployment a demonstration of force, a challenge for increasing the arms race. None among even the best thinkers of the West, except members of The LaRouche Organization, responded appropriately to the new discovery of principle that Putin had brought into the world; then, blind confusion was spread over its epistemological significance altogether. As EIR editor, Marcia Merry Baker, stated clearly to EIRNS – on December 16, 2024:

“The reality represented by the Oreshnik would indicate to anyone sane that we are now in a domain of kill-technology, in which initiatives for cooperation among nations, not conflict, must be pursued. But the warhawks of the Collective West continue to perpetrate conflict, economically, politically and militarily. This is so, even to the point where high-ranking figures and programs are actively working on how to “win” a nuclear confrontation. This was dramatically evident on Nov. 20 at the meeting held by the [CSIS Project on Nuclear Issues](#), whose thematic was how to think

the unthinkable about nuclear war. “We’re working on it,” was the message conveyed by Rear Adm. Thomas Buchanan, Director of Plans and Policy, J5, U.S. Strategic Command. [Buchanan’s public remarks](#) have been all but blacked out in the world media, but a new video has just been released, to bust through the blackout, and add to the efforts of those sounding the alarm.”⁵

TRUE JUSTICE AT THE END OF TWO THOUSAND YEARS OF COLONIALISM

The new dissonant polyphonic interaction between the United States and Russia, caused by President Putin, is the last hope for a definite resolution of the present nuclear conflict which might also put an end to the last 2000 years of imperialism and colonialism.

From the vantage point of Russia, Oreshnik is not the “pulverization” of the enemy, nor is it “checkmate” in a game for world domination; it is the opening of a new dialogue among adults, a new polyphonic game changer which intends to bring happiness to the world through a discovery of principle which establishes the difference between the just and the unjust. Curiously, the reason why the Russian Oreshnik missile is not understood as a principle of peace and reconciliation can be found in the failure of understanding the discovery of principle of justice that Plato identified more than 2000 years ago in his [Republic](#), Book II, Section IV:

“But to come now to the decision between our two kinds of life, if we separate the most completely just and the most completely unjust man, we shall be able to decide rightly, but if not, not. How, then, is this separation to be made? Thus: we must subtract nothing of his injustice from the unjust man or of his justice from the just, but assume the perfection of each in his own mode of conduct. In the first place, the unjust man must act as clever craftsmen do: a first-rate pilot or physician, for example, feels the difference between impossibilities and possibilities in his art [361a] and attempts the one and lets the others go; and then, too, if he does happen to trip, he is equal to correcting his error. Similarly, the unjust man who attempts

⁵ Marcia Merry Baker, [Putin Reiterates Import of Oreshnik Missile, as West, in Political-Economic Breakdown, Continues Belligerence](#), (EIRNS) – Dec. 16, 2024.

injustice rightly must be supposed to escape detection if he is to be altogether unjust, and we must regard the man who is caught as a bungler. For the height of injustice is to seem just without being so. To the perfectly unjust man, then, we must assign perfect injustice and withhold nothing of it, but we must allow him, while committing the greatest wrongs, to have secured for himself the greatest reputation for justice; [361b] and if he does happen to trip, we must concede to him the power to correct his mistakes by his ability to speak persuasively if any of his misdeeds come to light, and when force is needed, to employ force by reason of his manly spirit and vigor and his provision of friends and money; and when we have set up an unjust man of this character, our theory must set the just man at his side—a simple and noble man, who, in the phrase of Aeschylus, does not wish to seem but be good. Then we must deprive him of the seeming. For if he is going to be thought just [361c] he will have honors and gifts because of that esteem. We cannot be sure in that case whether he is just for justice' sake or for the sake of the gifts and the honors. So we must strip him bare of everything but justice and make his state the opposite of his imagined counterpart. Though doing no wrong he must have the repute of the greatest injustice, so that he may be put to the test as regards justice through not softening because of ill repute and the consequences thereof. But let him hold on his course unchangeable even unto death, [361d] seeming all his life to be unjust though being just, that so, both men attaining to the limit, the one of injustice, the other of justice, we may pass judgment which of the two is the happier.”⁶

The limit that Socrates identified at the end of this process is the axiomatic limit that the so-called sense perception dominated individual person cannot see, and cannot be made to see, unless he is willing to change. This is the cryptic argument that Socrates used in this Platonic dialogue in order to teach the curious reader how to understand the reason why our present imperialist and colonialist system can only condemn the unjust man to appear to be happy, but without ever making him truly happy.

⁶ Plato, [*Republic*](#), Book II, Section IV, 360e-361d. [Perseus Digital Library](#).

The key word here is “perception.” In order to be effective in their design, the imperialist lies require to be recognized as lies by a majority of the people of that empire, because they must be frightened by the message which is: “You are no longer free. Your lives are under our control.” This will be understood, as such, by only a handful of people who are going to be willing to oppose this new dogma for the benefit of mankind. Those are the Platonic conditions of “perception” which are necessary to make the imperialist system work as long as possible until it breaks down, because Plato’s conditions of “perception” remain too difficult to understand and to assimilate for the majority of the people.

However, the moment when such Platonic conditions of “perception” no longer function properly as the dominant characteristic of the imperialist system, it must fall apart and its so-called “perceived” justice system must fall with it as well. The reason is because the end of the imperialist and colonialist system is also the end of the domination of the Aristotelian sense perception system. This is the truth of what happens to the unjust man who is “perceived” to be the most just person in the world. Once the majority of the people of the world discover the fallacy of this arrangement, they will also discover that the moment of their liberation is at hand, because the happiest fool of the unjust becomes what he was from the start: an “Emperor without clothes.”

This is how Putin’s Oreshnik principle works: it does to the imperialists disbelievers what they are incapable of understanding, which is that love of mankind (*agapē*) is the true principle which has the power to stop nuclear war by demonstrating that it is the principle by means of which the truth of reality is superior to all of their perceptions and deceptions, because they are simply not perceived and understood by any of them. That is the reason why the just man who is perceived as unjust can never be unhappy, because no injustice can ever make him unhappy about what he knows to be the truth. Thus, Gottfried’ Leibniz’s “pursuit of happiness” was put in the American Declaration of Independence by our forefathers who understood this Platonic principle.

THE PURPOSE OF THE JUST IS IMMORTALITY NOT THE HOBBESIAN 'PURSUIT OF PLEASURE AND THE AVOIDANCE OF PAIN'

What is at stake in today's society is the decision that every citizen must make with respect to the future of art and poetry in their society, because those are the imperialist instruments that control them. The question is to figure out how mankind will be able to decide whether to be good or evil in spite of all of the considerations of glory or money. Let's see, one more time, what Plato had to say about this form of social manipulation:

[606e] "Then, Glaucon," said I, "when you meet encomiasts of Homer who tell us that this poet has been the educator of Hellas, and that for the conduct and refinement of human life he is worthy of our study and devotion, and that we should order our entire lives by the guidance of this poet, [607a] we must love¹ and salute them as doing the best they can, and concede to them that Homer is the most poetic of poets and the first of tragedians, but we must also know the truth, that we can admit no poetry into our city save only hymns to the gods and the praises of good men. *For if you grant admission to the honeyed muse in lyric or epic, pleasure and pain will be lords of your city instead of law and that which shall from time to time have approved itself to the general reason as the best* (emphasis added)." "Most true," he said."

"[607b] Let us, then, conclude our return to the topic of poetry and our apology, and affirm that we really had good grounds then for dismissing her from our city, since such was her character. For reason constrained us. And let us further say to her, lest she condemn us for harshness and rusticity, that there is from of old a quarrel between philosophy and poetry. For such expressions as 'the yelping hound barking at her master and mighty in the idle babble [607c] of fools,' and 'the mob that masters those who are too wise for their own good,' and the subtle thinkers who reason that after all they are poor, and countless others are tokens of this ancient enmity. But nevertheless let it be declared that, if the mimetic and dulcet poetry can show any reason for her existence in a well-governed state, we would gladly admit her, since we ourselves are very conscious of her spell. But all the same it would be impious to betray what we believe to be the truth.

“But nevertheless let it be declared that, if the mimetic and dulcet poetry can show any reason for her existence in a well-governed state, we would gladly admit her, since we ourselves are very conscious of her spell. But all the same it would be impious to betray what we believe to be the truth. [607d] Is not that so, friend? Do not you yourself feel her magic¹ and especially when Homer is her interpreter?

“Greatly.

“Then may she not justly return from this exile after she has pleaded her defense, whether in lyric or other measure?”

“By all means.

“And we would allow her advocates who are not poets but lovers of poetry to plead her cause in prose without meters, and show that she is not only delightful but beneficial to orderly government and all the life of man. And we shall listen benevolently, [607e] for it will be clear gain for us if it can be shown that she bestows not only pleasure but benefit.

“How could we help being the gainers, said he.”⁷

THE REASON FOR MANKIND TO EXIST IS FOR THE FUTURE

The reason for bringing philosophy and poetry together is to stop the faking of self-centered writers and artists who keep orienting their works toward sense perception and leave their readers in the pits of pleasure and pain without giving them any help to get out of the muck. The required approach for resolving this problem was addressed by Lyndon LaRouche, when a leading member of Manhattan Project, Megan Beets Dobrodt, asked him a question about what he meant by saying that “man is not a creature of the senses.” To which LaRouche replied:

“Yes, I understand exactly. No, the issue here is: what is the nature of mankind, and how does mankind’s nature differ from that of animals? That’s the issue. And it’s a very important one. Because only mankind is capable of being mankind; others are just animals. Now that doesn’t mean the animals are bad creatures, but it means they’re not human. They don’t have the essential qualities of humanity. And so, this defines the concern on that account.

⁷ Ibidem, 607c.

“Human Immortality

“I’ll keep it short: The point is, do you believe that there’s a meaning to the death of a human being? Do you think that there’s a positive meaning in the death of what had been a living human being? Because there’s no animal that can meet that standard; no animal, no species of animal. *Only the human species has a reason for existing in the future. In other words, you live a life which comes to a point of death, and is there a future of that person? Or is there some continuity of the presence of that person? In a good human society, a real human society, there is an immortal principle: that the dead, when they’ve lived an appropriate life, will bring about the discovery of creativity, the discovery of creativities, which give mankind a higher standard of achievement than mankind has ever achieved before, in that circle* (Emphasis added). And therefore, you have a quality of immortality of the dead human beings, which can be achieved, because they live a life, and when they died, they are able to have supplied a contribution to the future of mankind,—and only human beings can do that. And the shame is, when human beings don’t do that, when the human beings think they can’t do that. And the point is, they should all be developed to be able to make that kind of contribution to the future.

“Mankind is essentially, virtually, the immortal species. And even death of the individual does not end the meaning of their life, if they give a meaning to their life. If they’re creative, if they make discoveries that mankind has not known before, they make steps in progress in that direction. All of these things are that virtue which is specific to the human being’s opportunities. Mankind is the only immortal species of which we know.”⁸

Mankind is not immortal because human beings can master durable survival. Mankind is immortal because individual human beings contribute to discoveries of principle which improve humanity in the *simultaneity of temporal eternity*; that is again, not because what is discovered is durable and cannot die, but because what is made available in that discovery of principle is always present for the original discoverer as well as for future ones, in an unstoppable and always available here

⁸ Lyndon LaRouche, [*Creating the Harmony of Nations*](#), EIR, Vol. 51, No. 50, December 20, 2024, p. 51.

and now. This is how Plato and LaRouche are always going to be alive. The immortality of mankind, thus, is our constant rediscovering of how to improve and share this power with others of our unique species. Immortality has always been and always will be our future. Such is also the nature of Putin's Oreshnik discovery of principle. Take a peak: It is worth rediscovering.⁹

CONCLUSION: DURABLE SURVIVAL IS NOT IMMORTALITY

The shocking but ironic conclusion of Plato's discovery of the fact that happiness can only come after life, comes at the end of the last book of his [*Republic*](#), Book X (608d), where he finally gives the solution to the riddle of the just man's reward; that is, 'immortality.'¹⁰ Aha! Is that what we have all been waiting for during such a long period of time? Maybe, but what is the cause of that reward? Plato says that it is the good. But, what is the source of that good in mankind? And why can't immortality come before the end of life and only come after a life and death struggle has passed away? Plato doesn't answer that last question.

Lyndon LaRouche was the first to recognize the timely differences among life, momentary survival, durable or permanent survival, and immortality. All of these kinds of survival can be achieved by degrees; immortality cannot. Momentary survival, like the swimmer who is saved from drowning, can be understood as getting a second chance, while durable survival can be understood as LaRouche makes clear, as the economic power of *increasing relative potential*

⁹ Pierre Beaudry, [VLADIMIR PUTIN'S ORESHNIK MISSILE DELIVERY TO UKRAINE: A TRANSFORMATIVE DISCOVERY OF PRINCIPLE](#), December 9, 2024.

¹⁰ The Platonic idea of immortality was not a new idea among the orphic and Pythagorean circles of Ancient Greece, but now as then, the general population has no idea of what it means for the human soul to be immortal, because society has forgotten to make the difference between good and evil. Other arguments on the subject of immortality can be found in several areas of the [*Republic*](#), especially at 330d/e, 496e, and 498d; however, the best known can be found in the *Phaedo* dialogue.

population density. But, that is not the case for immortality, because immortality is a true human defiance of sense perception timeliness. What are we missing here?

In 2018, LaRouche identified the *simultaneity of eternity* as the highest form of thinking for mankind in relationship with the mystery of the crucifixion of Christ. And there lies the answer that Plato was unable to find as the source of the highest good for mankind, the self-sacrifice of Christ, *the benefit of the other*. Although this *mystery of Christ* is beyond the scope of this report and the reach of this writer's capabilities, the reader should note that human civilization will not survive this century without understanding "that this notion of *simultaneity of eternity* is the most interesting, important, and profitable idea in all of physical science."¹¹ Suffice it to say with LaRouche at this point that the issue revolves around "the relationship of the existence of the cognitive activity of the mortal individual to the existence of all humanity within the universe as a whole."¹²

Immortality and *simultaneity of eternity* go together; because for mankind *immortality means living in the simultaneity of temporal eternity*. This is the higher state of becoming which can and must be acquired before death in order to achieve a true epistemological understanding of Plato's argument on justice and immortality. In that sense, immortality means discovering previous and future principles of discovery for the improvement of mankind as a whole.

However convoluted this argument may appear to be about Plato's conception of evilness, and goodness of the human soul, as stated in Book X of his [Republic](#), it cannot but win the happy soul of his reader on this matter of timeliness, because it is only in the form of the *simultaneity of temporal eternity* that love of mankind (*agapē*) can secure human immortality for all times past, present, and future. It is for that reason that I recommend listening to the following concert to make this and all future Christmases Merry: – [BLESSED ARE THE PEACEMAKERS](#).

FIN

¹¹ Lyndon LaRouche, [Jesus Christ and Civilization](#), EIR, November 23, 2018, p. 60.

¹² Ibidem, p. 61.