



STEPHEN G. POST

Foreword by Drs. John M. and Josephine Templeton

**Is Ultimate
Reality
Unlimited
Love?**

Chapter 1: Stephen Post

Sir John's Biggest Question: An Introduction

Sir John wrote me these words in a letter dated August 3, 2001, words that I know he thought deeply about and felt to be crucial for spiritual progress:

I am pleased indeed, by your extensive plans for research on human love. I will be especially pleased if you find ways to devote a major part, perhaps as much as one third of the grant from the Templeton Foundation, toward research evidences for love over a million times larger than human love. To clarify why I expect vast benefits for research in love, which does not originate entirely with humans, I will airmail to you in the next few days some quotations from articles I have written on the subject.

Is it pitifully self-centered to assume, if unconsciously, that all love originates with humans who are one temporary species on a single planet? Are humans created by love rather than humans creating love? Are humans yet able to perceive only a small fraction of unlimited love, and thereby serve as agents for the growth of unlimited love? As you have quoted in your memorandum, it is stated in John 1 that "God is love and he who dwells in love dwells in God and God in him."

For example, humans produce a very mysterious force called gravity but the amount produced by humans is infinitesimal compared to gravity from all sources. Can evidences be found that the force of love is vastly larger than humanity? Can methods or instruments be invented to help humans perceive larger love, somewhat as invention of new forms of telescopes helps human perceptions of the cosmos? What caused atoms to form molecules? What caused molecules to form cells temporality? Could love be older than the Big Bang? After the Big Bang, was gravity the only force to produce galaxies and the complexity of life on planets?

Sir John wanted to devote at least one third of his grant to support investigations into a love "over a million times larger than human love." Anything less would be an act of human arrogance. Two months later, on September 1, 2001, he repeated by letter, "Unlimited love may be billions of times more vast than any one temporary species on a single planet can yet comprehend."

Dear readers, Sir John was not at all interested in writing a book titled *Human Love as Ultimate Reality*. He was one who knew, both by introspection and by observing human behavior, that human love is a very limited enterprise, and human nature a very mixed bag indeed. Although he condoned investigating it, he also counseled that our investigations focus to a very significant degree not on human love at all but on Unlimited Love. I found this exciting because I agreed with his analysis, although in the modern secular university situated in a materialistic era the very idea of studying Unlimited Love would prove challenging. Sir John directly chided me in a nice way for supporting one small study on non-human primates, stating, "This is just not very interesting to me. Let's focus on Unlimited Love."

Sir John was always most curious about three areas of evidence related to Unlimited Love as Ultimate Reality. First, he wanted to know quantitatively how many people experience this Unlimited Love that seems to invade and permeate their awareness, and how this experience affects their behavior. He wanted hard numbers, although he was also keenly interested in the qualitative understanding of this experience. A decade later, after I finally assembled the right research team with the immense help of the distinguished sociologists Matthew T. Lee and Margaret M. Poloma, we conducted a national survey showing that an estimated 80 percent of American adults self-report an experience of God's love (see www.theheartofreligion.net) that enlivens their benevolence and is perceived as emotionally healing. Second, Sir John wanted to know if people who love their neighbor have benefits with regard to happiness and health, and if these benefits are amplified when such love is prompted by a sense in the giver of having a participation in Unlimited Love and serving as a conduit for it. Third, Sir John wanted to know if science can objectively demonstrate through physics and cosmology that the idea of Unlimited Love as Ultimate Reality is at least plausible with respect to its lying at the very origin and continuing essence of all that exists in the universe as the underlying matrix of being.

In other words, Sir John did not wish to leave the evidence with human experience alone, but he wished to extend it to the objective essence of the universe in the form of reality itself.

Chapter 2: Stephen Post

The Spiritual and Intellectual Roots of Sir John's Biggest Question

At the age of eighty-six Sir John Templeton looked back on his life and wrote these words: “*Agape* love means feeling and expressing pure, unlimited love for every human being with no exception. Developing such divine ability has been a goal for me almost all of my eighty-six years on earth. (1999, 1). Where did this purpose come from? How did it come to shape Sir John's most central metaphysical question, *Is Ultimate Reality Unlimited Love?*”

To understand Sir John's ideas on this question it is necessary to clarify the two formative spiritual-theological influences that shaped Sir John's thought from youth. Sir John was a Presbyterian with a very realistic view of human nature, and yet he was also inspired by the Unity School of Christianity, which with its New England transcendentalist roots swept into Missouri and made its way to a young Sir John in Franklin County, Tennessee, via radio broadcasts and a little monthly reader called *The Daily Word*. In many ways, Sir John's lifelong commitments to spiritual progress emerged at the synergistic interface of these two influences. He had the realism of Jonathan Edwards and the hope of a Ralph Waldo Emerson.

THE CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH

Imagine a man of eighty-six honestly and humbly stating that his purpose of living for “almost all of my eighty-six years on earth” was to abide in the ways and power of Unlimited Love. Sir John indeed did feel this purpose or calling very early on. As a teenager in 1927, for example, at

the age of fifteen, he became the superintendent of the Cumberland Church Sunday school in Winchester, Tennessee. His beloved mother, Vella, an elected elder of the church, encouraged young John to take on this administrative role. The young Templeton also taught Sunday school lessons, and took a special interest in hymns and biblical passages having to do with the theme of *agape* love.

Dr. Templeton reports the story of how an old Tennessee farmer asked him once, “Are you John Marks’s boy?” He added, “That John Marks, he was born old!” meaning that he had a wisdom and purpose about him early in life. So it is that Sir John’s retrospective self-assessment of having a loving purpose in life all of his years seems to have considerable local anecdotal support.

On June 24, 2012, I had the opportunity to attend a Sunday commemorative service at the Cumberland Presbyterian Church in honor of John Templeton’s one hundredth birthday four years after his passing. The service comprised hymns, prayers, and scriptural passages that Sir John had personally identified to the Rev. Dr. Jonathan Clark as especially meaningful to him. Many pertained to love and gratitude. That bright Tennessee morning I heard Sir John’s granddaughter, Heather Templeton Dill, read “Sir John Templeton’s Personal Prayer of Thanksgiving” to those assembled, perhaps half of whom were family members or those associated with the Templeton Foundation. The prayer, written in the 1960s, is a meditation on gratitude for the love of God. It is an important marker of Sir John’s core spirituality and thus must be included here in full:

Almighty God, our loving Heavenly Father, through faith and the Holy Ghost, we are totally one in unity with thee. Thou art always guiding us and inspiring us to the right decisions in family matters, in business matters, in health matters, and especially in spiritual matters. Dear God, we are deeply, deeply grateful for thy millions of blessings and millions of miracles that surround us each day. We are especially grateful for thy healing presence, which gives us long and useful lives in which to love thee more and more and to serve thee better and better. Dear God, help us to open our minds and hearts more fully to receive thy unlimited love and wisdom and to radiate these to thy other children on earth, especially today and all this year. Dear God, we thank thee for blessing and healing each of our families and friends and for helping each of us to be better and better Christians. We thank thee for thy miraculous and continued blessing, guidance, and inspiration of our careers and daily work to serve others in business and churches and charities, so that all of these will be more and more in accord with thy wishes, O Lord, not ours. We listen and obey and are grateful. We thank thee for our redemption and salvation and for the gift of thy Holy Ghost, by grace, which fills us to overflowing and increasingly dominates our every thought and word and deed. To thee we pray, in the name of thy beloved Son, whom we adore and seek to imitate, our Saviour and our God, Christ Jesus. Amen. (1990/2006, 24–25)

This prayer was sent out in the form of a family Thanksgiving card. The reader is struck by the spiritual depth in this prayer, as well as by its eloquence and sincerity. It could only have been written by an individual who took God seriously and for whom Unlimited Love is the ultimate

interest. This is not a prayer about human love. Rather, it is a prayer about a “Dear God” who can “help us to open our minds and hearts more fully to receive thy unlimited love and wisdom and to radiate these to thy other children on earth, especially today and all this year.” Indeed, it is the first time that Sir John explicitly used the term “Unlimited Love” so far as I am aware.

In 1950 Sir John accepted a position on the board of trustees of Princeton Theological Seminary as a ministry to his church where he had many Presbyterian friends. There he befriended Rev. Dr. Bryant Kirkland, then minister of the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church in Manhattan, and Dr. James L. McCord, then president of the seminary. I had the opportunity to get to know Dr. Kirkland fairly well before he passed away on May 5, 2000, still Sir John’s loyal friend and close advisor. John was also a close friend of Dr. Norman Vincent Peale, and he enjoyed friendships with Dr. Robert Schuller, another Christian positive thinker. Rev. Schuller, who I knew fairly well from appearances on his *The Hour of Power*, often spoke of how close he felt to Sir John. David Myers of Hope College, Dr. George Gallup Jr., and many leading lights in the Reformed Protestant tradition remained close to Sir John over the course of his life. On the whole, he tended toward those who appreciated the power of positive thinking and affirmation as one way of keeping a wayward human nature focused on higher spiritual principles. Sir John’s Presbyterian roots were always a part of his life, and he honored them to the end, even as he became more and more eager to learn about all the religions of the world as they also had articulated insights into Unlimited Love.

On June 2, 2012, only several days before this commemoration service at the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, I had spent some time in Sir John’s office in the Templeton Building in Lyford Cay in the Bahamas, where he lived and worked for the last forty years of his life. I looked up and saw on the wall behind his brown wooden desk a large framed page with a calligraphy-style set of passages from the New Testament, Luke 6:27–38 (the Sermon on the Plain). For those unfamiliar with this passage, it too is worth quoting here because time and again Sir John referred to it and took guidance and inspiration from its words daily:

But I say to you who hear: Love your enemies, do good to those who hate you, bless those who curse you, and pray for those who spitefully use you. To him who strikes you on the one cheek, offer the other also. And from him who takes away your cloak, do not withhold your tunic either. Give to everyone who asks of you. And from him who takes away your goods do not ask them back. And just as you want men to do to you, you also do likewise. But if you love those who love you, what credit is that to you? For even sinners love those who love them. And if you do good to those who do good to you, what credit is that to you? For even sinners do the same. And if you lend to those from whom you expect to receive back, what credit is that to you? For even sinners lend to sinners to receive as much back. But love your enemies, do good, and lend, hoping for nothing in return; and your reward will be great, and you will be sons of the Most High. For He is kind to the unfaithful and evil. Therefore, be merciful, just as your Father also is merciful. Judge not, and you shall not be judged. Condemn not, and you shall not be condemned. Forgive, and you will be forgiven. Give, and it will be given you; good measure, pressed down, shaken together, and running over will be put into your bosom. For with the same measure that you use, it will be measured back to you.

These words explain the Sir John who so often extolled us to give more freely and wisely to our neighbor in need, and not to be limited by any law of reciprocity. He saw expectations of payback as a complete antithesis to the free overflowing fountain of our serving as conduits of God's Unlimited Love.

Let us return again to his words quoted above, "almost all of my eighty-six years on earth." They suggest that *agape* love can be everyone's purpose from the earliest years with good nurturing in family and community, even before a child can comprehend such a noble purpose. Sir John owed so much to his parents, his community, and his church. One finds no mention in the above passage of his having had that single intense transformative spiritual experience of the newly repentant narcissist being overwhelmed by the life-changing light. Sir John greatly respected the dramatic experience of rebirth as one window to the divine, but his spiritual journey was less choppy. His profound awareness of Unlimited Love and of Divine Mind was very real but smoother than for some others. He experienced good Christian nurture in his faith community, and he stuck with the values and virtues that he learned early on. All this Cumberland experience was hugely formative, but so was the Unity school of Christianity, his second great spiritual influence.

THE UNITY SCHOOL OF CHRISTIANITY: AMERICAN TRANSCENDENTALISM VIA MISSOURI

At the Unity school of Christianity United Kingdom Conference in 1995, Sir John presented an address titled "Understanding: Acceleration in Spiritual Information." He began, "For more than seventy-five years, I have been reading the works of Unity school of Christianity, especially the writings of Charles and Myrtle and Lowell Fillmore. The Unity school viewpoint is especially attractive because of its willingness to be open and receptive and nonopposing to the writings of other denominations and religions." There is no doubt about his having absorbed Unity thought from youth. His mother, Vella also stimulated his spiritual interest; she received at the Winchester family home a small monthly booklet of spiritual affirmations called *The Daily Word*, published by Unity. This publication is still available and popular across the United States and abroad. It comprises brief daily affirmations, one per page, followed by quotes from world scriptures and a few words of inspiration. Sir John read each booklet with enthusiasm in his teenage years and developed a great admiration for Charles Fillmore and, through him, for the themes of New England transcendentalism.

As a Tennessee teenager during the 1930s, Sir John discovered a truth through Unity that arches across the ages in a trajectory from the philosophers of antiquity such as the Roman Marcus Aurelius, who wrote, "Your life becomes what you think," and carries forward to Charles Fillmore's statement, "Thoughts held in mind produce after their kind." Indeed, Sir John cites both these passages in *The Essential Laws of Life*. Could anyone seriously doubt that our thoughts have immense implications for how we focus our energies and creativity in every domain of life? This emphasis on the power of brief affirmations cultivated through daily meditation entered Sir John's young life through Unity's *The Daily Word*.

Briefly, Unity was cofounded by Charles (1854–1948) and Mary Caroline "Myrtle" Page (1845–1931) Fillmore in Kansas City, Missouri, informally in 1889 and formally in 1903. Charles was born in Minnesota, and Myrtle in Ohio. The informal beginnings of Unity go back

to the 1880s when the couple, struggling with economic and health challenges, found solutions in American transcendentalist spiritual currents of the time such as the writings of Emanuel Swedenborg, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Theosophy, Hinduism, Quakerism, New England's "mind healer" Phineas Parkhurst Quimby (1802–1866), the Bible, and Divine Science. Fillmore believed that spiritually progressive people should welcome relationships with people of all religious persuasions and that they should accompany creeds with simple "spiritual principles." Fillmore adapted a phrase found in the Hindu Upanishads, a sacred text, that "What you think you become." If we think good we become good, and if we think bad we become bad. He considered thought as the source of creativity and as real as matter.

This particular aspect of Fillmore's "new thought" had a profound influence on Sir John, and underlies his "laws of life" focus on short affirmations that focus the mind in creative directions. For Sir John as for Fillmore, mastery of one's thoughts is mastery of one's soul and fate. By practicing concentration (*Dharana* in the Sanskrit) we achieve a unity with our thoughts that enable us to unleash the deeper levels of energy that lie within us, for the soul is one with God.

Historians of American religion view Unity as a Missouri outgrowth of the New England transcendentalist movement of the latter half of the nineteenth century. The Bostonian transcendentalists were an eclectic lot. Harvard Divinity School's Ralph Waldo Emerson, the thought leader of nineteenth-century transcendentalism, wrote of the Oversoul in terms of "Divine Mind" as the origin of all things, a concept very much the same as the Hindu Brahman and the Christian *logos* (i.e., God is *logos*, or a thought blueprint that manifests in creation). All things material are emanations of the One Mind and its energies. In the transcendentalist tradition, *mind* and *spirit* are used synonymously. Also, the human mind was deemed a very small piece of Divine Mind, and we have been given our minds so that we might love and participate in the continuing creativity of the Divine Mind that is in us; here the Hindu tradition exerted itself powerfully in Americanist spirituality. This omnipresent Divine Mind was deemed immanent, enfolding and interpenetrating all things. While prayer was emphasized, daily meditation was also stressed as a way of opening up the mind to awareness of the Divine Mind, within which the soul was included. Moreover, the self-control of the mind was deemed a sacred responsibility, made possible in large part by the use of brief spiritual affirmations repeated and inculcated into consciousness. Joy flows from the union between the human mind and the Divine Mind, which are of the same essence. All these ideas would become essential in Sir John's theosophical worldview.

It is notable that Unity and New Thought figures that appear in Sir John's writings include the most influential Unity school thinker of her day, Dr. H. Emilie Cady (1848–1941), Emmet Fox, the Fillmores, Church of Religious Science founder Ernest Holmes, and other great New Thought minds. Let us take a brief illustrative quote from Holmes's 1938 classic *The Science of Mind* (1998) to touch the essence of New Thought: "Man's mind is the Mind of God functioning at the level of man's understanding of his place in the Universe. Man contacts the Mind of God at the center of his own being. It is useless to seek elsewhere. 'The Highest God and the innermost God is One God.' Through the medium of Mind man unifies with the Universe . . ." (1998, 394).

In *The Varieties of Religious Experience* (1902/1982), William James pointed out the Hindu influence on the Americanist New Thought movement, in which Unity was a hub. James wrote

of the emphasis on overcoming the barriers between the individual and the Absolute as the great mystic quest of the New Thought movement, which he considered a synergistic combination of the Gospels, Emersonian transcendentalism, Berkeleyan idealism, popular science evolutionism, “and finally, Hinduism has contributed a strain” (1902/1982, 94). But we must add Christian theology to the mix, the Bible, a bit of Quakerism with its Inner Light, and some focus on psychosomatic healing in the form of Mind Cure.

Fillmore imbibed all of these influences, and through his radio addresses from Missouri in the 1920s he influenced the young John Templeton in Tennessee, an avid listener, for life. In the 1960s Sir John would listen as well to the great Unity speaker Eric Butterworth, who he met at the Unity Center of Practical Christianity in New York City and whose Sunday services at Carnegie Hall were broadcast throughout the United States, in Great Britain, Europe, Africa, and the isles of the Caribbean.

Let me return to Sir John’s office in Nassau and that visit on June 20, 2012. Symbolically, a moment of insight into the transcendentalist side of Sir John came to me in that quiet moment on Wednesday, as I observed the details. I spent time looking at the items on the wall, shelves, and surfaces, all of these unmoved since his passing in 2008. Sir John’s much beloved daughter-in-law Pina was quietly working at his big brown wooden desk. By the well-worn leather couch where he took naps was a table, and on the table was a book by Quimby (1802–1866) with a page folded in over a passage about the healing power of God’s love. Quimby was the New England idealist metaphysician, theophilosopher, and healer whose ideas were important to the Unity school and to all subsequent New Thought. Quimby’s life and thought also gave inspiration to Mary Baker, founder of Christian Science, whom Fillmore regarded highly and whose writings clearly are in the mix of New England transcendentalism. Through Unity and its transcendentalist roots, Sir John was indebted, then, to the Hindu tradition that was so influential on Fillmore. Hinduism permeated all the synergistic spiritual circles of late nineteenth-century America, including the American transcendentalist movement in which Christian and Vedantic Hindu thought worlds synergized.

CO-CREATIVE PARTS OF A LARGER DIVINE MIND

For Sir John, the question of purpose is more or less equivalent to the question, why are we created? He wrote a book of this title with a minister from the Unity school of Christianity, Rebekah Alexander Dunlap. The subtitle of their *Why Are We Created?* says it all: *Increasing Our Understanding of Humanity’s Purpose on Earth* (2003). Here, in order to avoid any iota of ambiguity about the source of ideas, I concentrate entirely on the Introduction to this book, which Sir John penned independently and signed John Marks Templeton.

Sir John asserts the following pronouncement: “Twenty-five centuries ago, Xenophanes, and twelve centuries ago, Shankara, taught that possibly nothing exists independently of God, and that God is immeasurably greater than all of time and space, let alone the visible earth and its billions of inhabitants!” (2003, xi). His message is clear—we are not going to get very far along in our understanding of human purpose without taking God into account. So we are driven to ask what the purpose of God is. “Might a purpose of infinite intellect be to express itself in increasing varieties of lesser intellects?” he asked. Then he adds, “*Were human beings created to be agents of God’s accelerating creativity? Can humans discover larger fractions of infinite*

intellect?” (2003, xv, italics added). From conversations with him, and from his writings, it was clear that indeed he did think that each of us is created to expand in freedom the creativity and love in which we participate as drops in the ocean of Divine Mind. Sir John clearly thought that our minds, in their deepest eternal element, are God’s love gifts, that they are interwoven at least in their most profound capacities in one larger Divine Mind, and that they confer upon us the purpose of extending novel creativity through our human agency as co-creators. This idea of the purpose of life is conceptually indebted to the great Indian philosopher Shankara, in whom Sir John had a considerable interest.

Shankara

Sir John made a good choice in picking out the great Shankara (788–820 CE). This Indian sage from Kalady lived only thirty-two years, but westerners consider him the greatest Hindu philosopher of them all. Why? He formulated the doctrine of *Advaita*, which refers to the identity of the Atman (“self” or “spirit” or “mind”) and the Brahman (the “Supreme” or “Ultimate Reality, Infinite Mind” that is the origin and support of the phenomenal universe, the “Godhead” or “Absolute,” the “Divine Ground of All Being”). In the Hindu tradition, the *Mahatmas* are “great souls” who have realized the union of the self and the Supreme. Shankara said that we are like individual waves on the ocean that cannot exist other than as part of the ocean itself, an idea elevated from the Upanishads and the Vedic canon.

The Vedantic school of Hindu philosophy is about Ultimate Reality (the term has its origins in Vedantic thought) and our relationship to it. This school is the largest and most dominant perspective in all of Hindu thought. A key group of scriptures known as the Upanishads—written in the form of a dialogue between a student and a teacher by many different authors starting in the seventh century BCE—constitute the final section of the Vedas. We know that Fillmore read these dialogues in depth, and was devoted equally to them and to the Bible. Two fundamental concepts are established in the Upanishads, the Atman and Brahman. The Brahman (not to be confused with the word “Brahmin,” meaning priest) is consistently referred to as the primary ground of all being and existence. Sometimes Hindu philosophy views Brahman as impersonal and sometimes as personal and loving. Shankara, whom Sir John was interested in most, takes a personal view of Brahman as something like “Love-Mind.”

Here in *Why Are We Created?* Sir John, then ninety-one years of age, was reflecting deeply on the ultimate nature of human purpose, and he was drawing on Shankara. He asks, to restate the question (italis mine), “*Might a purpose of the infinite intellect be to express itself in increasing varieties of lesser intellects?*” (2003, xv). He is stating here that the Infinite Mind of God flows through us all, dwells within us, and actually is constitutive of an element of our individual minds. Moreover, we are the creatures through whom Divine Mind expands its creativity. The Ultimate Reality wants to extend its creativity in novel and loving ways, and we are the agents of the co-creative extension.

In Shankara’s philosophy, we find best articulated the perennial formula that Atman = Brahman. None other than Marcia Eliade at Chicago, and later visiting professor Joseph Campbell, explained this concept to me. Both used the analogy of sand. Each of our individual souls (Atman) is like a grain of sand. The whole mound of sand together makes up the Brahman, which shares bits of itself with each human being, but remains infinitely large. So the deep

eternal essence of the human mind is of the same substance (in minuscule) as is the Infinite Mind. Thus, God exists in each one of us. The Hindu greeting *Namaste* is based on this concept and is translated, “The divine in me honors the divine in you.” The idea of Atman = Brahman is the basis of the nonviolent tradition in Hinduism and all Hindu ethics. Of course, the Atman can be covered over by bitterness, anger, hostility, rage, jealousy, fear, resentment, hatred, and the like. But it is nevertheless the original nature and the “true self.”

In Hindu thought, when we gaze outward at the starry heavens and the universe, we see a small part of the expanding emanation of the Brahman (consistent with big bang theory), and when we look inward at our Atman we meet the same Brahman within us. No distinction is made between our souls and Ultimate Divine Reality. Brahman, sometimes described as a universal force of pure love and pure thought, is all and created all. There is a piece of Brahman in everyone, and the Atman is not affected by emotions or the body’s physical needs. Through the Atman that is a piece of Brahman, all of us are interconnected. The highest, Brahman, is no different in essence than the smallest, Atman. The power, love, intelligence, and creativity of the Brahman can be unbound in the Atman, so we are each capable of astonishing love and creativity that go far beyond the biological substrate of the mind. As Shankara taught, that which is everything is that which is your essence. All that exists is grounded in the Great Thought from which all that is emanates continuously.

In Sir John’s very important but a tad neglected work *Agape Love: A Tradition Found in Eight World Religions* (1999), his chapter on Hinduism is in my view the most brilliant. He begins,

Hinduism speaks of the self, or soul (Atman). It also speaks of Brahman as being the ultimate principle of the universe. The fundamental religious conviction that Brahman is Atman, or that the self is ultimately inseparable from the whole, lays a firm foundation for agape in the Hindu context.

Because all human beings are in some sense one, and indeed because all of creation is one, the only way to treat others is with respect, kindness, justice and compassion. (1999, 45-47)

Aldous Huxley refers to Shankara’s thesis as follows: “The Atman, or immanent eternal Self, is one with the Brahman, the Absolute Principle of all existence; and the last end of every human being is to discover the fact for himself, to find out who he really is” (1944/2009, 4). Huxley quotes Shankara for several pages—for example, “The wise man is the one who understands that the essence of the Brahman and of Atman is Pure Consciousness, and who realized their absolute identity” (1944/2009, 6). This is little different, writes Huxley, from the words of Meister Eckhart, “To gauge the soul we must gauge it with God, for the Ground of God and the Ground of the Soul are one and the same” (p. 14). All the mystics from all traditions are more or less describing the same ineffable experience of astonishing awareness that some part of the individual mind is completely one with God. The Quakers speak of the Inner Light, and that language can be very useful. In the eternal soul, this Atman, human freedom, love, creativity, and ingenuity have their source in God.

So what is the highest human purpose according to Sir John? The purpose of any human life is to be aware of our oneness in mind with the Divine Mind, and to serve as an extension of God’s

creativity and Unlimited Love. Sir John meant it when he wrote, “Were human beings created to be agents of God’s accelerating creativity? Can humans discover larger fractions of infinite intellect?” (2003, xv). This is an idea with roots in the Hindu influences on Fillmore and Unity.

A GREEK SAGE

In his Introduction to *Why Are We Created?* Sir John mentions Xenophanes of Colophon (c. 570–475 BCE) in addition to Shankara. Xenophanes was one of the most important pre-Socratic Greek philosopher-poets, most famous for satirizing the anthropomorphic images of the Greek gods. Xenophanes was critical of the religious views of his day because they were merely human projections—a position Ludwig Feuerbach took up in relation to modern Christianity. Xenophanes made an innovative critique of Homer and Hesiod, who attributed to the gods every conceivable human image and vice. The petty hatreds, jealousies, and hostilities of the gods, and all the nefarious actions that followed, such as theft, deception, adultery, and violence, would typically be considered matters for reproach in human behavior. In this sense, Xenophanes was very influential for Plato, who in the *Republic* urged that these gods be abolished because they only contribute negatively to human behavior. Xenophanes is generally thought to be among the first ancient philosophers of monotheism. He argued for a God beyond human form, who is eternal not born, and who is conceivably the whole of the universe.

Sir John appreciated anyone who based his philosophy of religion on the idea that whatever human beings may be thinking about God or the gods is “too small,” and in this regard he identified with Xenophanes. I would also assert that Sir John entirely dismissed sociopathic anthropomorphic images of the God of Unlimited Love, and he clearly believed that because of these projections religions undermine the true God as they bring out not just the best but sometimes the worst in people.

In the famous Fragment B14–16, Xenophanes comments as follows:

But mortals suppose that gods are born,
wear their own clothes and have a voice and body. (B14)

And:

Ethiopians say that their gods are snub-nosed and black;
Tracians that theirs are blue-eyed and red-haired. (B16)

But perhaps most famously, he wrote,

One god greatest among gods and men,
Not at all like mortals in body or in thought. (B23)

And this one greatest god “shakes all things by the thought of his mind [*nous*].” This idea influenced Aristotle and many others, who followed Xenophanes in his idea of a divine

intelligence underlying all of reality. Later Greek writers indicate that Xenophanes identified this one god with the entire physical universe. Sir John would ask, is God the only reality?

Xenophanes also influenced Anaxagoras (born c. 500–480 BCE), the first pre-Socratic philosopher to live in Athens and the father of Athenian philosophy. Anaxagoras claimed that *nous* (intellect or mind) was the cause of the entire cosmos in its movements, principles, and being. He also is widely associated in Greek thought with the original idea that the mind of God is in each of us, and he equated mind with eternal soul.

SIR JOHN'S BIGGEST QUESTION AS A HYPOTHESIS

Sir John asked the very biggest questions about love, ones that engage cosmology and physics, questions that are so big that they go right to the underlying purpose behind the universe and are rather astonishing to read: “Is love more universal than the universe? Could it be true that in a deep way, a purpose toward love really may govern the sun and the stars? The humble approach is about many questions. How little we know—how eager to learn! That is the humble approach” (2000a, 12).

Physicists with a more mystical bent debate these same truly big questions. Sir John greatly appreciated the cosmologists and mathematicians who speculated with ease on the ultimate nature of reality as infinite mind, consciousness, and energy. He felt that scientific progress eventually will find an answer to these deeper big questions, although it might take a very long time.

I have described Sir John as a spiritually nurtured Tennessee Presbyterian with a significant appreciation for the Unity school of Christianity, and as his years advanced he became more and more engaged with Unity and other New Thought ideas about Divine Mind. He dared to ask if Unlimited Love is the enduring and perfectly reliable matrix that constantly creates and sustains everything that exists, including the laws of physics. He dared to ask if our very minds might be parts of an infinite Divine Mind given to us like a drop of water in the sea as a “Love-Gift” so that we too might participate in co-creativity and love. He dared to ask if Unlimited Love could be the essence of an original, eternal, prime creative thought energy underlying everything that is energized and materialized across the universe. Far from assuming that mind emerges from matter and cells, he felt it somewhat more plausible that at the beginning of all things and underlying all things there is a prime or original Divine Mind from which the eternal aspect of each individual minds is given, such that each of our minds is in essence a location within a larger field of Divine Mind. Further, he considered it plausible that all energy and matter, and all the laws of the universe, derive from Divine Mind.

In keeping with his vision, Sir John Templeton quoted a particular mystical passage time and time again. It is from Paul’s speech to the Athenians, where Paul asserted a much bigger God than any that they worshipped, a God who made the world, who is immanent in it, and who does not need to be searched for because this God is “not ever far from any of us.” As Paul famously continues, “In him we live, and move, and have our being” (Acts 17:18).

Sir John had a favorite phrase, “Every person’s concept of God is too small.” He felt that too many people become absolutistic and arrogant about their little notions of God and therefore get

stuck in the past; worse yet, these people are utterly unappreciative of others who have another idea of God that might be quite interesting. Moreover, small ideas of God have been developed over time without the benefits of modern scientific progress in areas such as quantum physics and cosmology, so they do not appeal to the modern enlightened mind. Sir John prescribed humility, eagerness to learn, appreciation of various spiritual traditions, and a God who is everywhere and in everything as well as plausible from the perspective of the physical sciences.

Sir John asked if God is perhaps “the only reality,” as with the title of his book *Is God the Only Reality?* Such a large idea may be hard for some readers to appreciate or take seriously, but it has its place in many spiritual traditions in Christianity and beyond. Indeed, Sir John felt that in past centuries we were too simple-minded scientifically to understand these deeper truths and take them seriously, but accelerating discoveries in physics and cosmology now may help us recover them and make new advances in spiritual knowledge. In other words, there may come a time when science unveils what in the past was merely a matter of belief, or the self-reported experience of the mystics.

Is God’s love the very mortar and matrix of the universe? In every instant of our lives are we sustained by a trustworthy Creator, however oblivious we might be to this? Is existence itself the perpetual triumph of love? As Sir John wrote on July 1, 1995, in an essay titled, “Like a Wave on the Ocean,” “God may be the only reality—all else may be fleeting shadow and imagination from our very limited five senses acting on our tiny brain.” What a contrarian idea, but those who have had those disorienting, awesome, and astonishing moments of spiritual experience in which time stands still, space disappears, and God’s love is absorbed in all its *mysterium tremendum* know that reality as we perceive it is not the whole story at all.

Sir John surmised an Unlimited Love energy underlying all the laws, order, and being of the universe that “set up” (the “anthropic principle”) evolutionary “complexification” and a creature capable of knowing God’s love. He did not claim that this was more than a plausible hypothesis at this time from the scientific perspective:

Certainly, there seems to be no conclusive argument for design and purpose, but there are strong evidences of ultimate reality more fundamental than the cosmos. So, if there are phenomenal universal forces, for example, in gravity, in the light spectrum, or in electromagnetism, can there not also be a tremendous unknown or non-researched potency or force of unlimited love? With earthly information now doubling every three years, can our comprehension of some of these intangibles of spirit also be multiplied more than one hundredfold? Could unlimited love also be an aspect of dimensions beyond what we presently know as time and space? Could unlimited love be a universal concept beyond matter and energy as they are currently understood? To what realms beyond the physical might unlimited love reach? Just how vast is the reach of unlimited love?” (2003, 95)

We see here Sir John writing of Unlimited Love as something even beyond matter and energy, as somehow preceding these in the form of an infinite Mind that pronounced in a “big bang” something akin to the passage from Genesis, “Let there be light,” or to the Gospel of John, “In the beginning was the Word.”

Not every spiritual thinker and leader takes love to the level of Ultimate Reality like Sir John did, but many have. The great Hindu leader Mohandas K. Gandhi, in his classic work *The Law of Love* (1957/1970), refers to love as “more wonderful than electricity.” “Scientists tell us,” he writes, “that without the presence of the cohesive force amongst the atoms that comprise this globe of ours, it would crumble to pieces and we cease to exist; and even as there is cohesive force in blind matter, so must there be in all things animate; and the name for that cohesive force among animistic things is Love” (1957/1970, 5). And he went much further to write that “love sustains the earth” (1957/1970, 9). Here Gandhi was writing of love not just in what we *do* but in the very matrix of the universe. Gandhi’s thoughts on love were clearly grounded in the same Hindu tradition that Sir John so greatly appreciated, in which God is explicitly characterized as Ultimate Reality.

The Quintessential Hypothesis

Here is Sir John’s biggest question in the form of a hypothesis: *Ultimate Reality is a matrix of Unlimited Love (variously described by Sir John as the Absolute, the Supreme, the Ground of Being, a Higher Power, Infinite Intelligence, God, Godhead, etc.) underlying and constantly sustaining all the energy, matter, and mind in the universe and in ourselves.*

The method. We assess this hypothesis for plausibility, not proof certain, through (1) current social science of self-reported human experience of Unlimited Love, (2) current science of human joy and health in the context of love for God and neighbor as self, and (3) the evidence from the physical sciences, especially physics. If evidence from these three domains appears to more or less converge on our hypothesis, we have at least established its plausibility.

The caveat. Science may not develop for decades the methods to formally prove or disprove this hypothesis, although scientific progress is accelerating more and more rapidly, even exponentially.

PASTOR JOHN: THE BIG QUESTION IN RELATION TO THE SPIRITUAL PROBLEM OF EMPTINESS

The hypothesis above is not something that interested Sir John for purely intellectual reasons. He once said that had he not been a good stock investor, he would likely have been a minister. He did try his hand in midlife as a Sunday school teacher in New Jersey, just as he did in his Tennessee boyhood. There was always a pastoral aspect to his life and style of interaction, and he opened his board meetings with prayer. He wished to help us all on the unending journey toward greater meaning and purpose in life—a journey filled with desperate detours, destruction and self-destruction, and inevitable suffering. Hard lessons are learned hard. *Purpose is the question; Unlimited Love is the answer.*

The timeless and universal spiritual yearnings of human beings have always prompted questions about Ultimate Reality, love, and our significance. *Why am I alive? Does my life matter? What is my purpose?* The prophet Jeremiah asked, “Why was I born?” (Jeremiah 20:18). Are we alive just to navigate the struggle for survival, cope with sorrows and losses, and “succeed” while still feeling incomplete? Are we in the end no more significant in this universe than a warm bacterial soup? If there is no God of Unlimited Love, does all discussion of human

purpose become obsolete and ridiculous, as the atheist philosopher Bertrand Russell honestly asserted?

In the Image of God

Does my life matter? Yes, because every human life matters to God, who shared a drop of Divine Mind and its immense creative potential with each of us. Each individual, emphasized Sir John, is made *in the image of God* because we each have within us a small portion of the eternal Mind, which is our true self. The Jewish tradition speaks of God breathing into each of us an eternal God-connected spiritual element. If we are spiritually aware, we sense that God is active in us all, pushing our minds to grasp true ideas and carry them into creative expression consistent with love. *We are venues through which the Divine Mind can further express itself in our love and creativity.* In each of us, Divine Mind is completing another degree of unfoldment. Sir John wrote,

The Bible tells us we are “made in the image of God.” What does this mean? How would we describe our perception of the image and likeness of the Creator? Could this mean the divine presence resides as the deepest and most intimate spiritual reality within each human personality? Could this inner-spirit-spark radiate the Creator’s unlimited love and creativity directly through each one of us? Can the sacred presence provide a source of spiritual guidance? (2003, 118)

Yes, we have deep within us, each one of us, the spark of divine creativity and love, channeled into so many expressions from fine arts to business to caring for a family (p. 118). Does my life rest on some cosmic mistake? Am I really no more than an organized collection of chemicals? Can my consciousness be explained simply in terms of chemical reactions in my brain? The answer for Sir John is no, because every life includes a little bit of God’s eternal essence. Each life is therefore so significant that God wants to love each of us forever.

Our Purpose Is Love and Co-creativity

We are alive to experience joy, but joy flows not from self-love alone but from the love of self that is interwoven with sincere love for God and neighbor—the three conjoined in a tapestry. Within so many spiritual systems, deep joy comes from an awareness of God’s surprising and overwhelming affirmation of our very being and that of our neighbors. Sir John had nothing at all against the love of self, but he endorsed only the right and most enduring self-love that comes when we discover the joy of abiding in the double love commandment (Matthew 22:37–40) that he often cited, as in the above passage.

Life is never a straight line, but it helps to have a noble purpose. Most of us have been anxiously concerned that someone we care about seems to lack even the hint of noble vision or elevating purpose. We see a vacuum of emptiness in his eyes and facial expression, and we hear it in his voice. Human beings need meaning and purpose to flourish. Sir John believed that most lives of noble purpose are shaped by the power of love, and by a loving God who lies in the very grain of the universe, in the very forces and energies that underlie and shape the visible world, and also within us in our minds. Our most noble purpose, he believed, is to live in the light of

Unlimited Love and to increase human awareness of it (a) in every single one of our encounters and (b) worldwide both now and for future generations through spiritual progress.

Sir John clearly affirmed that each of us has a capacity to connect with Ultimate Reality:

The true, universal self within us is an individualized center of God consciousness. As we become more willing to release the personal ego, we open up the door to greater communication with God. The one who relies on his own wisdom, beauty, skill, or money seldom relies on God. But the one who is humble and grateful for all such God-given blessings opens the door to heaven on earth here and now. (2012, 140)

Here Sir John emphasizes the humility that can invite each of us to be more deeply at one with a Higher Power.

Second, our purpose is to continue the work of creation as a co-creator. Each of us is given the precious mind that we have to be the hands, voices, and creativity of God. We each have the seeds of divine creativity within us, and our responsibility is to cultivate that seed and use it for loving purposes. Sir John felt that God gives us the spiritual part of our minds in order to be inspired with creativity and continue the work of Creation.

UNLIMITED LOVE DEFINED

In a letter from me to Sir John dated August 30, 2001, in which I had asked him for his definition of *Unlimited Love*, he faxed back a copy of my letter (August 31) with the following handwritten note on it:

Dear Stephen,

Congratulations on an excellent beginning! Hopefully you can craft a “definition” which avoids implying that “unlimited love” is only from humans toward humans. Possibly love is older and more universal than gravity. Possibly humanity is just the latest creation on one planet of the unlimited creative reality called LOVE? You may want to read carefully my little book “Pure Unlimited Love.” God Bless you. John M Templeton, 31-8-01

I understood clearly that Sir John had in mind something much greater than mere human empathy, affection, and the like.

He faxed me another letter of response a day later, on September 1, 2001, just ten days before the attacks on the World Trade Center:

A complete definition of “unlimited love” is not possible by humans, because perceptive abilities of humans are so limited. Instead we can research possible pathways toward unlimited love.

Unlimited love may be billions of times more vast than any one temporary species on a single planet can yet comprehend. . . .

Gravity is easier to measure than love; but the power of love may be more creative, more timeless, more vast, more beneficial.

As we develop methods to increase our perceptions, we may discover more about unlimited love and the biblical words, “God is love; and he who dwells in love, dwells in God and God in him.”

In short, Sir John was a bit hesitant to overdefine Unlimited Love because we do not know enough about it yet to be very precise. I often thought back to these exchanges after 9/11 and felt that human “spiritual progress” really did need to be accelerated because human beings distort the glory of God with so many sociopathic anthropomorphisms and then act accordingly.

However, Sir John did approve these words used on the website of the Institute for Research on Unlimited Love, which were distilled from his writing:

The essence of love is to affectively affirm as well as to unselfishly delight in the well-being of others, and to engage in acts of care and service on their behalf; Unlimited Love extends this love to all others without exception in an enduring and constant way. Widely considered the highest form of virtue, Unlimited Love is often deemed a Creative Presence underlying and integral to all of reality: participation in Unlimited Love constitutes the fullest experience of spirituality.

Sir John liked the word “presence” and, having used it on page 34 of *Pure Unlimited Love* (2000b), he highlighted it for me several times. He meant a true living presence of Unlimited Love that is all around us even if we are oblivious to it. Now, this by no means is the precise wording Sir John would have articulated in the solitude of his study, but it seemed to include some of the elements he wanted, and it is certainly resonant with his many writings from which I tried to distill it. He definitely wanted the idea of a “Creative Presence underlying and integral to all of reality,” because Sir John was less interested in love between people when this is separated from the love for and from God. So, any definition of Unlimited Love is bound to limp, but this one seemed serviceable enough for the nonce.

I did share another definition of love with Sir John that he thought was very clear and understandable. This came from the great University of Chicago psychiatrist Harry Stack Sullivan, who wrote, “When the happiness, security, and well-being of another person is as real or more real to you than your own, you love that person.” There is truth in his definition. After all, whether we are looking down at a child sleeping, talking with a close friend, or listening attentively to someone’s narrative of a hard life, goodwill and concern for well-being, security, and health seem to be the common thread of love. Sir John would merely add that God alone is capable of loving all people in this definitional sense, and that we are too when we abide spiritually in God’s love.

Sir John was very clear, though, that he did not want to confuse Unlimited Love with altruism. On August 3, 2001, he wrote a letter in response to my query to him about the name of the institute. Our lawyers had already petitioned the state of Ohio for nonprofit corporate status (July 2001) using the title “Institute for Unlimited Love and Altruism Research.” I brought this to Sir John’s attention by fax, and he faxed back that it should be called *The Institute for Research on*

Unlimited Love, because this was the only title that would allow a focus on God's love. He was entirely correct. So on September 7, 2001, we reported a name change to the state of Ohio and the IRS, advising them of the Institute's new name. We received our response of approval from the IRS on November 2, 2011. Sir John's August 3, 2001, letter included the following statement: "The somewhat related subject of altruism is important also," but "altruism could be included as one of the many consequences of unlimited love."

Sir John's hesitancy about "altruism" made sense to me. Altruism, or "other-regarding action," might be the result of an evolved innate rescue impulse, or of a moral principle ("a common humanity" [Kant]), or of habituated virtue and good modeling, or of empathy and compassion (see the Dalai Lama, Hume, Smith), or of meditation deflecting attention from self. But Sir John was especially interested in that form of "other-regard" that was grounded in spiritual experience, in alignment with a Higher Power, that had to do with the living reality of Unlimited Love.

"PURE" UNLIMITED LOVE

Sir John titled his most significant essay on this subject *Pure Unlimited Love*, knowing that human love alone can be tainted by the desire for reputational and reciprocal gains, manipulative and controlling tendencies, an exclusive focus on the nearest and dearest that demonizes outsiders, and self-destructive tendencies. We see hints at *pure* unselfish love in such things as benevolent friendships, parental love, and compassion for the neediest, but as anyone who picks up a newspaper can see, human love without some grounding in Unlimited Love is often unwise, narrow, inconsistent, impatient, harsh, and even easily inverted into rage and violence. The normal human being harbors a certain natural empathy, but this capacity is easily overwhelmed by poor role modeling, negative hierarchies (e.g., gangs), greed, selfishness, and the will to power. Sir John was a realist about human nature: "This [Unlimited Love] does not mean that you need to admire each person or weaken legal penalties for crimes. It does mean that if your mother were murdered, you should try to eliminate the poisons of hatred and revenge. While a murderer is being properly punished and prevented from a criminal life, *agape* love allows you to pray for his conversion and his soul" (1999, 1).

Writing this book is mind-expanding for me because Sir John wrote as much about deep physics and Ultimate Reality as he did about love and Unlimited Love. Bringing the two together requires an appreciation for his reflections on matter, energy and the laws of physics, divine idea, mind, spirit, humility, and many other themes. *Is Ultimate Reality Unlimited Love?* draws on the full range of Sir John's writings, many of which are posed as questions for exploration—for example, "Can love be an eternal universal force more potent than gravity, light, or electromagnetism?" (2000b, 32). Talk about a big question! Sir John challenges us to think about a big idea: Could Unlimited Love underlie all the laws of the universe, and all of being itself, including energy? Is all energy a modulation of a divine universal prime energy? Could this be the ineffable Ground of Being? This type of mysticism evokes the Sufi love poet Rumi, whom Sir John quoted as follows:

O Love, O pure deep love,
be here, be now.
Be all; worlds dissolve

into your stainless endless radiance,
Frail living leaves burn with you
brighter than cold stars:
Make me your servant,
your breath, your core. (1999, 6)

Is Unlimited Love like gravity? Sir John wondered if Unlimited Love is a force always present in our lives, however much we are utterly unaware of it. Perhaps God's love holds us close to it like we are held close to the earth by the energy of gravity—but of course we do not actually *see* gravity, nor are we conscious of it. Maybe much of the goodness that occurs in the world is more inspired by such energy than we realize, including all the astonishing synchronicities in life when we feel that someone said or did something that was in answer to a prayer. If Unlimited Love is like gravity, a basic force in the universe, then like gravity if it ever stopped we would know it instantly.

ULTIMATE REALITY DEFINED

Ultimate Reality as Sir John viewed it is something we have not yet understood and may never grasp fully. His hypothesis was that Ultimate Reality is divine creative thought constantly shaping and sustaining all that is, energized and motivated by a Godhead or Divine Mind of Unlimited Love.

Sir John saw a spiritual crisis in our age in which sensate materialism drives people away from a culture shaped by spiritual principles and new “bigger” ideas about Ultimate Reality. I believe that Sir John saw the culture of sensate materialism at the end of its rope, in a stage of decay and senility. He was clearly an ontological idealist in the sense that Ultimate Reality is not matter. He saw a more creative epoch on the horizon as the light of sensate materialism fades in the shadows and human beings become aware of who and what they are as beings uniquely participating in Divine Mind.

These ideas should not be surprising. How else would someone influenced by American transcendentalism, the Unity school of Christianity, the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, world religions such as Hinduism, and the ontologically idealist strands of modern quantum physics post-1930 be expected to think?

The word *ontology* means “knowledge of Being.” Sir John's ideas lie broadly within the category of ontological idealism, which asserts that mind and spiritual principles are fundamental to the universe as a whole, as opposed to the view that mind and spiritual principles emerged from or are reducible to matter as epiphenomenal. Classical theism is an idealistic approach in that God, the uncreated and unconditioned Mind and Spirit, created everything *ex nihilo* (from nothing, other than divine prime energy) and is more fundamental than anything that was created. This outlook does not make the material world unreal or unimportant, but it does assert that the material world is an aspect of or manifestation of a deeper sustaining matrix of Divine Mind. In all idealist ontology (order of being), some ultimate spiritual reality exists beyond what appears to common sense and ordinary experience.

According to classical monistic idealism, matter is real but secondary to consciousness or Divine Mind, which is itself the grounding of all being. Consciousness and thought are fundamental. In the Judeo-Christian tradition, as *logos* proclaims, “Let there be light, and there was light.” In Hinduism, all energy and matter emanate from the Brahman or Godhead. Monistic idealism is the antithesis of monistic materialism, for it makes consciousness, not matter, fundamental. Most spiritual traditions are historically grounded in monistic idealism, as are many philosophical traditions.

The American transcendentalist movement of Christianity was steeped in the ontology of monistic idealism, and was powerfully and definitively interwoven with the Unity school of Christianity and the New Thought movement. In one of his most famous poetic essays, “The Oversoul,” the deeply Christian Emerson wrote words that echo into Sir John’s thought world. The Over-Soul, “within which every man’s particular being is contained and made one with all other,” is very much something Sir John would endorse. Further, “We live in succession, in division, in parts, in particles. Meantime, within man is the soul of the whole; the wise silence; the universal beauty, to which every part and particle is equally related; the eternal ONE,” for “the subject and the object are one.” In this oneness with the divine One, we flourish: “When it breathes through his intellect, it is genius; when it breathes through his will, it is virtue; when it flows through his affection, it is love.” Emerson continues, “We know that all spiritual being is in man,” and “there is no screen or ceiling between our heads and the infinite heavens, so is there no bar or wall in the soul where man, the effect, ceases, and God, the cause, begins. The walls are taken away.” We are the beneficiaries of “an influx of the Divine mind into our mind.” This Over-Soul is in us, as we are a small piece of it, and in freedom we are able to create in love as the instrument of Divine Mind on earth.

To those versed in spiritual thought, history of religions, and the perennial philosophy (discussed later in this book), all of these ideas are unfamiliar. The main expression of mysticism in Judaism is the Kabbalah, which began to be taught in twelfth-century Europe. In Kabbalistic metaphysics, there are ten *Sephirot* (divine emanations) through which an infinite and incomprehensible God continuously creates and re-creates the material and spiritual dimensions of existence. There is a “light that fills all worlds” (divine immanence) as well as “light that surrounds all worlds” (divine transcendence). In the ancient Greek philosophy of Neoplatonism, the divine *nous* or Mind is that from which all of reality continuously emanates.

In Hinduism, again, Brahman is the universal Spirit or Mind that is the origin and the continuous sustaining support of the entire universe. Brahman is referred to as the Absolute, the Godhead, Ultimate Reality, and the Divine Ground of all being. The degree to which Brahman is personal and loving varies according to the school of Hinduism, but is especially strong in the tradition of *Bhakti*, with its doctrine of celestial love. All the great sages whose teachings are captured in the Hindu Upanishads teach that Brahman is the origin of all things, even of our own minds, such that an enlightened individual is aware that the true self (Atman) is a gift from and participation in Brahman. We are each then like a drop of water proceeding from an infinite pool of Water. Ultimately, our souls (Atman) or Minds are of the same eternal spiritual nature or “stuff” as the Brahman. Everything we see in the world and everything that is in the universe (material and spiritual) are manifestations of the different energies of the original and sustaining Absolute Mind, which contains within it all the archetypes behind all phenomenal forms. Brahman is filled with bliss, and to the extent that we realize our participation in it, we also

experience bliss or ecstatic joy. Those who realize this are called *Brahmins*. Atman is the inner essence of the human being. *Atman* is the Sanskrit word that means “self,” and one’s true self is not part of this material world but instead is eternal, spiritual, and of the same essence as Brahman.

Kalam is Islamic systematic theology, and it encompasses a number of schools. The dominant one, for centuries now, has been Ash‘arism, which opposed and overcame the famous Mu‘tazilite rationalist school of theology. Ash‘arism expounds the doctrine of “occasionalism,” that God re-creates the world at every instant, essentially in the way that God sees fit (leaving the door open for miracles), though God almost invariably follows “habits” (allowing for the formulation of laws in nature). Ash‘arism doesn’t say that the first principle that God acts upon is love, but the latter is certainly one of God’s attributes and defining features.

Sufism, however, another branch of Islamic thought, puts more emphasis on love as the defining relation between God and God’s creatures, including humans. Sufism is a general term for Muslim mysticism as it arose in response to the worldliness and materialistic values of Islamic leaders in the eighth century. Teaching consciousness or awareness of Divine Presence and pure love, Sufis practice nonviolence and understand God as an Ultimate of perfect universal love. Sufism professes that God is the All-Encompassing, and in some bolder versions, God is the All-That-There-Is, so in essence we swim in God’s manifestation; to be more accurate, we and the world at any instant represent the state that God wanted to be in or wanted to manifest. A Sufi believes that our goal should be to feel God and identify with God, which is the purpose of worship. So in this school, God is definitely the Ultimate Reality, even the Only Reality, and God is Unlimited Love. One of the mainstays of Islamic thought, at least in some schools, is the idea that an immanent God is continually re-creating the universe and all things in it at every instant through Divine Love. Thus, every moment represents a new universe formed in the energy matrix of love. The book sitting on your desk looks as it appears, but at the deepest energetic level it is in constant re-creation. This sounds odd, perhaps, but it is not too much different than what comes from the realm of quantum physics. So it is that Sir John Templeton quoted the Sufi poet Rumi with appreciation, and invited the Islamic scholar Sayyed Nasr to his home for discussions of Unlimited Love in the Sufi tradition.

According to William C. Chittick, the authoritative Western scholar on Sufism and love in the Islamic tradition, the philosopher Avicenna in his *Treatise on Love* explains that love motivates the Absolute Good to create the universe (2010, 177). Those who “actualize their full potential to love God and to be loved by Him” are sometimes called “perfect human beings” (2010, 180). Moreover, “Despite the emphasis in most texts on earning God’s love by following the Prophet, many authors stress God’s unconditional love” (2010, 182). As Chittick sums up Islamic thought, “Love is the very Reality of God Himself. It gives rise to the universe and permeates all of creation. God singled out human beings for special love by creating them in His own form and bestowing on them the unique capacity to recognize Him in Himself and to love Him for Himself, not for any specific blessing” (2010, 193).

Religions refer to the nature of God or Ultimate Reality in different ways, as a personal loving God and as an impersonal Being. In Judaism, Christianity, Islam, Sikhism, and certain traditions within Hinduism, God is highly personal, loving each person in a deeply personal way. But there is also the image of Ultimate Reality as impersonal Being—the Primal Tao of Chinese Taoism,

the Aristotelian Unmoved Mover, the “Suchness” of Mahayana Buddhism, and the Brahman of Hinduism at least in some of its traditions. There is also the idea that Ultimate Reality is immanent within each of us, that we each are given forever a small inner light or soul that is in essence a piece of the eternal Mind of God.

It cannot be overemphasized that *Ultimate Reality* with regard to the history of religions is a particular translation of the Hindu term Brahman. It is somewhat different than the Abrahamic concept of God in that it focuses attention on the deepest level or underlying matrix of all of reality, from which everything in the universe emanates. God is not “above” reality but behind it. In the Hindu tradition, this Ultimate Reality is Divine Mind or Infinite Thought, and this Thought can manifest itself in the energies, matter, and physical laws of the universe. Sir John was a Christian, but he was fascinated by various other religions, especially with regard to their conceptualizations of God and love. As Glenn R. Mosley underscores, Charles and Myrtle Fillmore studied Hinduism with great diligence, and their emphasis on God as Ultimate Reality had roots in this tradition, which was so popular in the spiritual circles of their transcendentalist culture (2006, 11). Sir John lies squarely within the *philosophia perennialis*, the perennial philosophy, which has its deeply spiritual element. In the words of one interpreter, this is “the metaphysic that recognizes a divine Reality substantial to the world of things and lives and minds; the psychology that finds in the soul something similar to, or even identical with, divine Reality; the ethics that places man’s final end in the knowledge of the immanent and transcendent Ground of all being” (Huxley 1944/2009, vii). What we shall discover is that Sir John, consistent with the mystical perennial philosophy of old but carried forward through the Unity school of Christianity, surmised that our eternal mind or “soul” is “identical with, or at least akin to, the divine Ground” (Huxley 1944/2009, 1).

So here I offer an interpretive description of Sir John’s primary thoughts on Ultimate Reality:

- Ultimate Reality is the deepest substrate or underlying energy matrix of the universe that lies behind the virtual reality that we see.
- Ultimate Reality, while everywhere and in everything as the Infinite Intelligence from which all things emanate (but that includes within it original energy), is present in a special form as the “eternal part” of each human mind (soul), which Sir John wrote of as in essence a “little part of God.”
- Ultimate Reality, while often considered impersonal in Hindu thought, in this Christian synthesis is equivalent to Unlimited Love (Sir John referred to “God is love” as the greatest theological “equation”); moreover, because we have a soul that connects us with this Ultimate Reality, we are able to receive such Unlimited Love and participate in it, thereby rising to a level of universal and unconditional love of which unaided human nature is simply incapable.
- Ultimate Reality is infinitely creative. By virtue of having souls of the same essence, we also are capable of astonishing creativity that is frequently self-reported as involving God’s inspiration; moreover, as co-creators with God we should always pursue loving ends.
- Our purpose in life is to experience joy (bliss) through awareness of God’s love for each of us, our love for God, and our love of neighbor as ourselves.

This Ultimate Reality is a fountainhead of Pure Unlimited Love. In *Story of a Clam*, for example, he noted,

Agape!

Feel the essence of pure love glowing ever more brightly within you, bringing forth warmth. This love can transmute the last residue of old hurts, misconceptions, and egotistical ignorance into greater awareness and understanding. It can help you release any emotional remnants of guilt or shame. And this love can invite the larger warmth of the Great Creator's Unlimited Love to dwell within you eternally. (2001, 91–92)

To Sir John, “this essence of pure love glowing ever more brightly within you” is something we can come to become increasingly aware of or “feel.” It is something that seems to already be there within us, but we are oblivious to it. The tone of this passage is more meditative or contemplative, more one of realization than of a singular dramatic episode. As awareness grows, destructive emotions and thoughts are “crowded out”—a favorite terms of Sir John's. Then there is room for “greater awareness and understanding” of Unlimited Love “eternally.” We must take seriously the phrase in this passage, “dwell within you eternally.” Across Sir John's many writings, growth in love is our purpose on earth—preparing for the eternal life of that aspect of the human mind that he referred to as “the soul,” because it is quite literally a piece of the Infinite Mind given unto us in love as our own, desiring reunion with its Source.

Owen Gingerich

Essay on John Templeton and Unlimited Love

Among other book projects, Sir John envisioned one on the near future, the prospects for the next four decades in a variety of fields. He invited me to take on the challenging task of describing physical science in the 2030s. I found it irresistible to see how past futurologists had fared in their predictions, and in a vast barn full of secondhand books in New Hampshire I found a large cache of such material from the 1920s and '30s. Disposable paper dresses, driverless cars, and inoculations to prevent tooth decay were predicted by 1980. The ability to control rain, fog, and the climate was envisioned by 2018. Then there were a few right on target, including a 1902 prediction that by 1950 there would be heavier-than-air flying machines.

As for the future, I mentioned finding planets around other stars, the Higgs boson, controlled nuclear fusion, computer modeling of future trends such as global warming, and earthquake predictions. Finally I concluded with a quotation from the seventeenth-century astronomer Johannes Kepler: “I consider it a right, yes, a duty to search in a cautious manner for the number, sizes, and weights, the norms of everything He has created. . . . For these secrets are not the kind whose research should be forbidden; rather, they are set before our eyes like a mirror so that by examining them we observe to some extent the goodness and wisdom of the Creator.”

Sir John was not merely in favor of that—he set up his foundation to include funding for such endeavors. He was fascinated by what astronomers call fine tuning, which I wrote about in his 1994 book, *Evidence of Purpose*. I mentioned the remarkable properties of the carbon nucleus, predicted by Fred Hoyle, which leads to the high abundance of carbon atoms in the universe, and which in turn makes complex life possible. The specific resonance levels in the carbon nucleus and those in the oxygen nucleus could not differ by more than a few percent without suppressing the high abundance of carbon. Fred Hoyle, who was essentially a skeptic, nevertheless famously wrote, “Would you not say to yourself, ‘Some supercalculating intellect must have designed the properties of the carbon atom, otherwise the chance of my finding such an atom through the blind forces of nature would be utterly minuscule.’ A common-sense interpretation of the facts suggests that a superintellect has monkeyed with physics, as well as with chemistry and biology, and that there are no blind forces worth speaking about in nature. The numbers one calculates from the facts seem to me so overwhelming as to put this conclusion almost beyond question.”

By a superintelligence we can no doubt envision a brilliant wizened scientist twiddling knobs on a vast control board in his laboratory. To Sir John this was interesting but far from making the point about the deep, fundamental nature of the universe, a universe made for us and caring for us. Sir John’s was a trinitarian cosmology of sorts, not in the traditional sense, but a triangle with God at one corner, Ultimate Reality at another, and Unlimited Love at the third vertex. Linking it all together was 1 John 4:8: “He that loveth not knoweth not God, for God is Love” (King James Version), or “Whoever does not love does not know God, because God is love” (New International Version).

...

How can we understand the existence of the exquisite design that makes possible not only this physical world but also thinking beings—thinking beings who wrestle with understanding not only the matter and energies composing the universe but its purposes and relationships? Sir John was a wrestler, with a vision of spiritual progress. Surely the link between ultimate reality and God is a manifestation of Unlimited Love, the glue that holds this remarkable vision together.

Glenn R. Mosely

Unlimited Love as Ultimate Reality

Over a hamburger lunch one afternoon, Sir John Templeton said to me as he smiled broadly, “When I hear a choir, I’m inspired by the harmony of voices united. The same is true when I look at a pastoral scene, although I rarely take time to see much of nature. I admire a vibrant landscape blending flowers, trees, and grasses. That blend seems like singing voices to me.” We had shared a few Chinese meals previously, and we mostly talked about finances and Unity writings of Charles Fillmore (cofounder with his wife, Myrtle, of the Unity movement).

So on this occasion, the “poetry” I heard in the above statement caused me to ask him to tell me more about what he believed. He was a many-faceted man, and the question was not answered in

that brief lunch. As I recall, we met in early 1971 and became friends, and over the years I learned much more about what he believed.

When I was minister at Detroit (Michigan) Unity Temple, Sir John called me from New York to say he would like to take me to lunch the next day. He also told me he'd been listening to my radio program from Detroit in the Bahamas. I asked him, "Is this 'the' John Templeton?" His quick-witted reply: "No, my son is another one, and there may be others."

Among other phrases and fairly comprehensively full-blown ideas he discussed was the idea of Unlimited Love and Ultimate Reality, which fostered a brief conversation about Plato's *Symposium*. What I recall of Sir John's comment was, "This is another way in which love manifests a desire to have what we value most to last forever. As Plato explains in connection with the beauty, or appealing character, that arouses love, what is *most* forever is what is unchanging. And what is most unchanging is absolute truth and absolute reality. These 'absolutes' are simply what they are, and therefore involve no change at any time. Love, then, as a desire to possess forever, is really an experience of the desire for ultimate, absolute truth and reality."

Sir John quickly added that he admired Charles Fillmore's work along these lines.

Graciously, when speaking of Charles Fillmore's beliefs and Unity teachings, Sir John would often introduce a thought by saying, "As you well know," or "You know this better than I do, but here's what I understand Charles was saying." Sometimes I did know well, often I did not believe I knew better than Sir John did, and sometimes I was familiar with the writing he would mention, and very often, what he said about it gave me a whole new dimension to look at and ponder. May I add that when we met I was thirty-six, and without trying, he became another teacher of mine.

Sir John had long since given up the idea that God is a personality or is a manlike being, or even a man exalted far above human characteristics, indeed if he ever believed that. I had the feeling he may have resisted any anthropomorphic view of God as a child. He told me his mother gave him *Weekly Unity Magazine* to read when he was fourteen. Shortly afterward, Sir John began reading *Daily Word Magazine* (the world's first published daily inspirational magazine) and continued all his life. He was a voracious reader and had read all of Charles Fillmore's books and "legions" of his articles. In his own early books, in particular, Sir John quoted Mr. Fillmore quite liberally.

Sir John also had a strong interest in science, which paralleled Charles Fillmore's interest. Mr. Fillmore always contended that science and religion had no legitimate quarrels with each other, and Sir John agreed strenuously.

David Myers

Selfless Love as the Supreme Virtue

The germ of John Templeton's idea of *selfless love as a supreme virtue* surely was rooted in the soil of Winchester, Tennessee. It was there that I came to know him, over early Foundation gatherings on a family member's porch in nearby Monteagle, and then through conversations,

some of which occurred as we together drove the streets of his boyhood Winchester, shared a long ride to the airport, or when he would take me aside to solicit my support of his ideas of “spiritual progress,” “humility theology,” and a science that would explore “laws of life.”

John Templeton’s roots in Winchester and Andrew Carnegie’s in Scotland both were (like my own in Seattle) nurtured by a Presbyterian culture that drove into our souls the idea of *stewardship*. We do not exist for ourselves alone. All that we have is a gift from God. Any wealth we possess is entrusted into our care—our stewardship—for responsible management and disposition. “Like good stewards of the manifold grace of God, serve one another with whatever gift each of you has received.” (1 Peter 4:10, NRSV)

This idea of stewardship, anchored deep in Sir John’s soul, extended to his passion for purpose, as expressed both in his encouraging youth to formulate their own statements of purposeful life and in his supporting the extension of purpose into retirement. The U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops likewise embraces this “stewardship of vocation: Each one of us—clergy, religious, lay person; married, single; adult, child—has a personal vocation. God intends each one of us to play a unique role in carrying out the divine plan. The challenge, then, is to understand our role—our vocation—and to respond generously to this call from God.”

For those of us rooted in the culture of stewardship, self-indulgent greed was scorned. Those coming of age in Depression-era Winchester would be embarrassed to live in a palatial house that strutted their wealth. And strutting his wealth was not John Templeton. In contrast to other billionaires, he had but one nice but not ostentatious home. Until he faced health challenges at the end of his life, he flew coach. In one of our car rides, I once ventured to ask him what resources the Templeton Foundation might eventually have—“something like Foundation X?” I inquired (naming a \$300 million foundation). He just smiled and replied, “More than that” (giving me no clue how many times more).

Sir John’s sense of stewardship infused not only his self-giving philanthropy, his passion for purpose throughout life, and his modesty about his own wealth but also his overarching idea of unlimited love. If God is love, and if God’s spirit is present in each of us, then we realize our spiritual essence when we seek others’ well-being and engage in acts of unconditional care and service on their behalf. Our stewardship of wealth and vocation feeds and is fed by our embracing love as the ultimate reality.

Harold Koenig

Rooted in Yet Not Limited to Christianity

Sir John did not restrict the source of Unlimited Love to the Christian God only, and felt that love was common to all religions. In order to make his point, he quotes Ella Wheeler Wilcox’s poem, *All Roads That Lead to God Are Good*:

A thousand creeds have come and gone
But what is that to you or me?
Creeds are but branches of a tree—
The root of Love lives on and on.

He goes on to emphasize her point further by noting, “There is room for many branches on the tree. The lifesap of pure unlimited love lives on and on.” (2000a, 39)

However, many of his ideas about Unlimited Love *did come* from Christian Scriptures, which he quoted liberally. Consider the following:

We may especially reflect god if we create out of love. Thus, in the end, humility raises the morally challenging question of whether possibly the purpose of humans is to become helpers in the accelerating creativity expressed in the famous equation in theology, “God is love.” (1 John 4:8: “He that loveth not knoweth not God; for God is love” [KJV]; Templeton 2000a, 88)

Without god as our source of inspiration, we are not likely to bring forth much good. We may never learn to radiate love as long as we love ourselves selfishly, for if we are characterized by self-concern, we radiate self-concern. “Jesus then said to his disciples, ‘If anyone wishes to be a follower of mine, he must leave self behind; he must take up his cross and come with me. Whoever cares for his own safety is lost; but if a man will let himself be lost for my sake, he will find his true self.’” (Matthew 16:24–25 [NEB]; Templeton 2000a, 127)

Sir John immediately follows this citation with a quote from Emil Brunner:

Every human relationship which does not express love is abnormal. In Jesus Christ we are told that this love is the whole meaning of our life, and is also its foundation. Here the Creator reveals himself as the One who has created us in love, by love, for love. He reveals to us our true nature, and He gives it back to us.

Later, in his chapter on “Laws of Spiritual Growth,” Sir John returns to quoting Christian scriptures (2000a, 160):

When Jesus was asked what is the greatest law, he said: Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and greatest commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets. (Matthew 22:37–40, KJV)

And he followed this quote with long quotes from 1 John 4:7–21 and Luke 6:32–38. Sir John realized that loving God was a necessary prerequisite for humans to experience and express Unlimited Love for others. He wrote,

Love of god comes first and makes it easier to love in other ways. If we want our enemy to see only our good qualities and not our flaws, then should we not set the example by looking first for the good qualities of the other? That person, too, is a child of god. God loves us both even though neither of us is yet perfect. (2000a, 164)

He had also earlier questioned whether the pantheistic view of God could produce the kind of love that could be experienced in a relationship with an intensely personal God, noting that,

Traditional pantheism can serve a useful purpose in suggesting the co-terminacy of spirit and matter and a personal relationship between the creator and creation. But it may not be compatible with the Christian concept of a personal god vastly greater than material things and who loves all of us and numbers the hairs of our heads. (2000a, 86)

Pina Templeton

“Papa Templeton”

When Jack spoke to his dad of the girl he wished to marry, he listened intently and then he had three questions: “Is she thrifty, is she a Christian, and do you love her?” And with that, Stephen, I began my life in the Templeton family and with Papa Templeton, the man whom I grew to love and respect and who became more than a father-in-law. This was to become more evident to me, for after my own father died, Papa became my father in situ. Papa was not a perfect man, but he was a loving man. Why? Because he was sure that there was something special in every person he met.

...

As you probably know, when Jack and I met we first became intellectual friends. He had a girlfriend, and I was to return to Italy after internship. This friendship gave us much more freedom (I think) to discover each other. It was during one of those dinners while on call that Jack told me that his dad, after analyzing Jack’s work at school, had come to the conclusion that yes he would be willing to support his son’s further education. At first this attitude may seem cold and calculating. Instead, I think it demonstrates a father who followed his child very closely while he tried to decide what was best for his son.

As you probably know, Jack’s mom, Judith, and dad took their first vacation after the first company was established and was solid enough that they could take a vacation. It was during this vacation that Jack’s mom died secondary to what we can deduce was an epidural bleed as result of a scooter injury. Sir John had to come home and tell his children that Mommy was not coming home. I can only imagine the anguish that this man had to have had experienced, having lost his own mother six months before. Jack told me that though they had not owned a television (probably because Papa did not think that it was of any value), his dad, on returning home, quickly went out and bought a TV for his children. This may not seem much but it is the love that this man (who very likely was trying to make sense of what had happened) had for his children that he quickly thought of something, anything, that could make the loss easier.

Heather Templeton Dill

Grandpadaddy's Affection

While it is only recently that I have learned how much Sir John thought about love and the extent to which he was interested in divine love, I grew up with a grandfather who greeted us each morning with a big hug and a warm “I love you.” My own immediate family did not express our love so effusively; Grandpadaddy’s affection and uninhibited use of the word *love* made an impression. I don’t remember that I ever returned the greeting in the same way. I think I was too shy to do so. But the very fact that I couldn’t get those three simple words out of my mouth demonstrates how much my grandfather valued love. I do remember sharing this story about Sir John’s daily greetings with the staff at the foundation after Sir John had passed away. Clio Malin later told me that Sir John would also hug her and say, “I love you.” In some ways, she hardly knew him and he hardly knew her; but his expression of love extended far beyond his own family.

I don’t think Sir John always articulated love in this way. I never asked my grandfather about how the loss of his mother and his wife within three months of each other affected him. My aunt and Sir John’s only daughter, Ann “Candy” Zimmerman, told me that she taught my grandfather to say, “I love you.” He had not always expressed love so openly and that is no surprise given the hardships he faced in life. At some point in her life, Ann decided to reach out to her father with words by saying, “I love you,” and with actions by holding Sir John’s hand or giving him a hug. Over time, as she described it, he too adopted these practices. In some ways, his ebullient display of affection and love developed in response to those who had demonstrated love toward him. In other ways, I think his daily effort to say, “I love you,” focused his thoughts. In *Wisdom from World Religions*, he wrote, “Love, as with any other spiritual virtue, doesn’t simply fall into our life as manna from heaven. Like an inquiring mind, it needs to be cultivated.” The act of saying, “I love you,” and sharing an embrace was in part his way of cultivating love within himself and sharing that love with others.

Jennifer Templeton Simpson

“A Little Bit of God’s Love Flows from Me to You”

When I was around ten years old, my family and I went to Vancouver for an exciting trip to the World’s Fair. When we arrived we were greeted by someone who knew us and was waiting to give us a ride to our hotel. I always enjoy being met at the airport, but what made this event memorable was overhearing the man driving tell my parents that my grandfather had saved his life. The man was a widower whose wife had died of cancer and had left him with young children. He had turned to alcohol to deal with his grief and stress. Alcohol soon became the predominant problem, and he was on the brink of losing his job and his family when he met my grandfather at a meeting. After hearing my grandfather present, the man, who was a stockbroker, waited in line to speak with him. My grandfather had to leave by the time the man was at the head of the line, but he asked the man for his hotel room number and said that he would come by

after the meeting. The man returned to his room and waited until midnight, and just when he was about to give up and go to bed, thinking that this was another disappointing moment in his life, my grandfather arrived, sat down with the man to talk, and stayed until two in the morning. My grandfather did not give the man any money nor did he offer him a job, but whatever he did say to this man that night enabled the man to turn his life around.

I remember even at a young age being so amazed that just the words that my grandfather said were enough to help someone face things as difficult as grief and addiction. I also remember the expressions on my parents' faces as they were also amazed and filled with pride and admiration for my grandfather and the impact that he could have on people. The story told by this truly grateful man to my family is the first time I understood why my grandfather was a special man. It was not because he had made a lot of money or was internationally famous but because he wanted to and did strive for higher purposes. My grandfather wanted to live for more than the riches of life; he wanted to know, understand, and practice the richness of the spirit.

...

From time to time, I have been asked what my grandfather shared with me either about his views on finances or his hopes for his foundation. I honestly do not have any or at least no significant memories of my grandfather wanting to share his take on the economy. I have some memories of my grandfather explaining why he started the foundation along with several interesting stories about the challenges of communicating to the world his intentions for the work the foundation would fund. In reality these conversations with my grandfather were few because what he always seemed to want to talk to me about was one thing: Love. It seemed very important to my grandfather that I would find someone to love who would love me. He seemed very keen on telling me stories of how much he had loved my grandmother. I, of course, loved hearing stories about the grandmother I never had the chance to meet, but I also loved these stories because I thought it was amazing that out of anything he could choose to talk to me about it was always this.