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SUMMARY

The different perspectives on Teilhard of six of his friends, the strange omission of a passage from The Future of Man, the tortuous and often repetitively language in his writings, the variety and non-unanimous interpretations which surround him, and a study of unpublished manuscripts and notes have led to this Thesis. The Introduction notes anomalies concerning his Identity, Methods, Science, Religion and Originality: it puts forward the method of this Thesis as that of producing an hypothesis concerning Teilhard's personality, mind-processes and psychological development, which will act as key-code by which the 'noise' of the 'babble' may be reduced so that the 'message' may emerge; and it paints the scene for the making of this hypothetical model in Part One, and for its testing on the virgin-material of UPN in Part Two.

Chapters One and Two use the Appendix A conversations to engage with a biographical sketch of Teilhard: but Speightian myth and interpreters' mental filters suggest that some more objective framework would probe Teilhard's reality more fruitfully; and a first approach is made through the value-vector model of H.A. Murray as found in the context of Parsons and Shils' Towards a General Theory of Action (TGTA).

This is inconclusive, but it has led into Freud et alia, and certain of the bases in Teilhard's personality are clarified, such as his passion for truth and freedom, and his commitments in science and religion (from father and mother); and suggestions are made concerning the anomalies raised in Chapter One, such as his proneness to times of tristitia.
This led in Chapters Four and Five to study of Teilhard via Erikson, taking Teilhard as parallel in some ways to Luther in his psychological development. Thus Teilhard is seen in Oedipal tension which is equilibrated by work in science as well as religion and by conversion to the concept of Evolution in 1911 which accompanied this; and Identity was then able to appear in the bi-polar conceptual unification of the concept of Christ-Kosmos, the executive concept which at last allowed Teilhard to be himself.

But this framework needed to be amplified by simplifying symbolism, and by some more direct and before-the-event model of discovery to balance the Freudian aetiological myth-making. With the cybernetic model of the brain as computer and with another picture of the Self as a bunch of selves, Part One was then able to end with a durational and existential model of Teilhard's personality as a central system of five value-vector-circuit selves, henceforth known as the TGTA-Naven model (Naven being Bateson's interpretation of a society by means of Information Theory analogy).

The testing of this hypothetical model takes place in Chapters Ten to Twenty. Evidence is adduced first for the executive concept being incubated by five selves and then produced as Gestalt. Then the Integrity-Crisis feedback takes place, in which the concept of Creative Union is produced to justify Christ-Kosmos and so to allow Teilhard to keep his identity. Third the story of Christ-Kosmos is followed in UPN till 1925, and this is supplemented in the Summary of Chapter Twenty by material from then to Teilhard's death in 1955, which shows that till his death Christ-Kosmos remained Teilhard's Identity through its adjusted, 'feedbacked' and developed forms as
God-Omega, Christ-Universal, Trans-Christ and God-of-Evolution.

Criticism of the method of this Thesis appears in Chapter Twenty-One, and the position is taken that the TGTA-Navel model, though it is ontological myth, is nevertheless a fruitful working hypothesis which symbolizes intensities and commitments in Teilhard usefully, which by the idea of concept-displacement (Schon) makes sense before-the-event of what is later known as Teilhard’s Dialectic, and which is able to de-code the ‘nonsense’ which such as Medawar have flatly rejected as meaningless.

The fruitfulness of the model extends to the realm of Teilhard interpretation: for interpreters tend to see only one component of the man, one value-vector, for instance, or one Gestalt (like Gray and Creative Union); and so few perceive Christ-Kosmos. Through the comprehensiveness of the TGTA-Naven approach, however, both the man and his conceptual lived-in-model are explicit, which both relativises and helps to categorize Teilhard, and allows him to be himself. The result is that it is as a new Christology and new religion that Teilhard is now portrayed. He is the disciple whose existential synthesis breeds cosmic-life Christian pantheism; whose lived-in-model is, ontologically speaking, scientific myth and science fiction but which motivates a man just as does the Resurrection of the Body; whose personal discovery is paradigm-change for himself but now also for many other Christians, and which is also original in the human community.

Thus Chapter Twenty-one ends with emphasis on the concreteness and centrality of Christ-Kosmos in Teilhard’s life and thought and with speculation that such a new Christology might fill a need in
Christendom for a Christ-paradigm which would institutionalise in the church community, within a new metaphors of Christ, such ideas of scientific and experimental reality as those of change, duration, evolution, brain-consciousness and the struggle of God-with-man in the Creation of New World.

As long as critical mind remembers that such lived-in-model is ontological myth, and that TGTA-Naven ideas are neither Teilhard's 'reality' nor 'Really-Reality', then this Thesis, its findings and conclusion, and Teilhard might be of use to the Church and - God willing - to God Himself.
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INTRODUCTION: PURPOSE, PROBLEM AND METHOD.

1) PURPOSE

Teilhard de Chardin has proved a controversial figure. Many books have been written on him and his own books have a worldwide sale. He was eminent enough in the social groups in which he lived to attract attention. Since his death and posthumous publication he has been found to have contributed to matters which still require attention today. Churchmen and Theologians, Pragmatists and Activists, Philosophers and Scientists, Searchers and Humanists, Literary Men and Poets and Composers have regarded him as interesting to their work or stimulating personally.

In controversy Teilhard has tended to be either warmly supported or deprecated. Clarification without ideological judgement or pre-judgement is still needed. Despite the extent to which his person and views have been canvassed, criticised and discussed there is still scope for further analysis of them.

Two reasons for this are that unpublished material of a more personal nature than the published essays or letters is coming to light; and, second, there is some

1. See Bibliography.
2. Simple examples might be as follows:-
   - Theologian: C.E. Raven.
   - Pragmatist: J.F. Kennedy.
   - Activist: Leopold Senghor.
   - Philosopher: M. Polanyi.
   - Scientist: W.H. Thorpe.
   - Searcher: Lord Eecles.
   - Humanist: Sir J. Huxley.
   - Literary Man: Colin Wilson.
   - Poet: Boris Pasternak.
   - Composer: Sir Edmund Rubbra.

The Bibliography shows that such a list is not exhaustive. It could continue with political ideologists like John Lewis and Garaudy, experts in Comparative Religion like Benz and Zachner, and the many hues of those who attend or lead meetings of the Teilhard Associations which have sprung up in many countries. The number of humble parish ministers or priests who read Teilhard from need or interest is also of note.
evidence of editorial selection of the published texts for other than literary
considerations. New material may clarify Teilhard's person and ideas and by-pass
such selection.

A third reason for continuing work on Teilhard is that the interpretations
of the scholars and others are so varied and even conflicting that the hope must
remain that one day some comprehensive and coherent interpretation or set of interpre-
tations will portray the "reality" of Teilhard and satisfy the mind of the reader with
its reasonableness.

The present Thesis is such further analysis within this long-term purpose.
On reflection it is reasonable to suppose that the variety of interpretations suggests
differing interests attracted to different sides of a variegated character which
produces writing of different types. Teilhard is heralded as poetry, science or mystic
exhortation, for instance, depending on which material is being studied, and by whom.

The specific purpose of this Thesis is therefore to find out who Teilhard was
and what his ideas and writings were.

2) PROBLEM.

The problems chosen for study in this Thesis are those of five anomalies. These
if they were solved would help to show who Teilhard was. In general his behaviour is
paradoxical as when he keeps writing after being asked to stop by Rome, his personal
faith is paradoxical when he asserts at the same time his orthodoxy and his and the
world's need for a "new religion", and interpreters find him paradoxical when he says
that he writes as a scientist. The further paradox is entertained by Macquarrie

1. The present Thesis will clarify these three reasons put forward.
3. Teilhard de Chardin, How I Believe, privately printed, Peking 1936,
concerning Teilhard's "originality": either Teilhard is un-orthodox and original, or orthodox and not original.

These general paradoxes may be put in a more specific form as anomalies to be solved.

a) The Identity anomaly covers broadly the problem of who Teilhard was. It raises questions of his personality development, his attitudes, commitments and personal ideas: who he identified with, who did he want to be, what motivated him. The anomaly can be presented in stark form by a passage (quoted in full on page 5) which has been omitted from the published version:

"... humanly speaking, I am incomparably nearer to W. James (I), to Bergson, to Wells than to the Masters of Rome. The spiritual connection between the latter and myself is only established very far away — at the limit — in Christ —; with the former my sympathy is immediate, radical and profound. That is the brutal truth ...".

b) The Methodological anomaly appears when almost any page of Teilhard is scrutinised for flow of argument. Medawar, with his interest in how people reach their ideas, has highlighted the problem in Teilhard. Teilhard's use of words, levels of argument and progression of thought are illustrated in the following passage, as is the problem.

"... Evolution, the way out to something that escapes total death, is the hand of God gathering us back to himself ...".

c) The Scientific anomaly appears within that of Identity since Teilhard was a professional geologist, and within that of Methodology since he claims at times

to speak as a scientist, though this is denied by some scientists. In the quotation below the use of the words "energy" and "tangential" are incorrect or at best paradoxical within the scientific community; and the origin of the statement is strange to the empirical British scientist:

"... we shall assume that, essentially, all energy is psychic in nature; but add that in each particular element this fundamental energy is divided into two distinct components: a tangential energy which links the element with all other things of the same order (that is to say, of the same complexity and the same centricity) as itself in the universe; and a radial energy which draws it to ever greater complexity and centricity — in other words forwards."  

The Religious anomaly is reflected in the quotation in a) and the ambivalence recorded there concerning Teilhard's membership of his Order and Church. Were his attitudes or ideas or both in conflict with his religious environments? To what was Rome reacting when it stopped him preaching and teaching, his ideas or person? If either his ideas or personal attitudes were unorthodox, Rome's response might be understandable. What was it about Teilhard that worried Rome? Was his "new" religion indeed new? The anomaly is suggested in the following:

"... The Universal-Christ who satisfies my personal faith is nothing else but the authentic expression of the Christ of the Gospel: a Christ of course readjusted to the modern world, but a Christ enlarged to remain Himself ..."

"... A general convergence of Religions on a Universal-Christ who, at heart, satisfies them all: that seems to me the only possible conversion of the World, and the only imaginable form of a Religion of the future."

e) The Originality question is raised within the four anomalies already mentioned. Is there indeed anything "new" in Teilhard? If there is, what type of "newness" is it? The question of his identity might be simply that he was an individual,

---

and his ideas might turn out to have been novel only within a narrow environment.

His methods may be found novel yet crankish and so of no importance, idiosyncratic without real novelty. On the other hand Teilhard may turn out to be interesting from the point of view of personal discovery, and when viewed within his environments of communities and events and belief-systems he may seem to have genuine originality.

The problem of originality is posed by the following sentence, when Teilhard is remembered to be a Roman Catholic Jesuit geologist:

"... To adore is to work and to search".  

These five anomalies appear together in many passages of Teilhard and an example is the full section omitted from the 1920 essay on Progress. This omission by its omission points to the fact of ambivalent content in Teilhard and to the possibility of choice of material by interpreters.  

But the content of the omission is such that all the anomalies are suggested in it, of who Teilhard "really" was, how his mind is working when he says what he says, whether he is being scientific or not, how he can regard himself as orthodox in religion, and whether his ideas can claim to be original. The following passage might make sense if the five anomalies were solved, and might also be a clue to their solution:

"... Si on y prend garde, le monde de la pensée humaine présente actuellement un spectacle bien extraordinaire. ([Extérieurement ce monde parait divité en multiples régions bien distinctes, définitivement stabilisées: compartiments d'états, de races, de religions, semblent dessiner des pièces qui doivent entrer dans la composition de toute société future.

En réalité, ces départements officiels de l'Humanité contemporaine sont tracés sur une enveloppe morte, sous laquelle se forme une distribution nouvelle des forces vives de l'esprit. Ce qui rapproche ou sépare "naturellement" (par opposition à "artificiellement") les hommes d'aujourd'hui, ce n'est plus immédiatement d'être chrétiens ou libre-

---

1. HIB, p.44. This sentence is reckoned anomalous because Adoration within the Catholic faith is not traditionally defined thus. cf. F.L. Cross, Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church, London, O.U.P. 1958.

2. H. de Lubac in The Religion of Teilhard de Chardin, Collins, London, 1967, pp.12-13 points this out. But the findings of this Thesis suggest that even de Lubac is not unlike those whom he castigates.
"penseurs, Français ou Chinois ... C'est de croire ou de ne pas croire
à l'unité organique de l'Homme et à l'efficacité absolue de l'Effort Humain.
Ne suis-je pas forcé de m'avouer que, humainement parlant, je suis
incomparablement plus proche de W. James (I), de Bergson, de Wells
que des Maîtres de Rome? Entre ceux-ci et moi la conjonction
spirituelle ne s'établit que très loin — à la limite — in Christo —
avec ceux-là, ma sympathie est initiale, radicale, profonde.
Ceci est de la vérité brutale; )) portes ...........

In this omitted passage the five anomalies appear as follows:-

a) Identity: how can the Roman priest adhere to Rome and its authority in the
total way symbolised by, for instance, celibacy, if initial,
radical and profound sympathy is with the thinkers mentioned?
Bergson, for instance, had been on the Roman Index since 1914.

b) Methodology: how does Teilhard's mind work when he uses the metaphors of limit,
death, envelope, compartment? How does he know what it is that
separates mankind today? Has he argued it?

Science: while mention of compartments of society might pass for sociological
perspective, is the "organic unity of the world" a biological
statement, "living forces of the spirit" biochemical or physical
or biophysical or psychological statement, and "distribution" a
mathematical one? And how do such statements combine, let alone
argue a point?

d) Religion: if Teilhard is Jesuit priest, what sort of religion does he pursue

---

1964, p.20. The omitted section is in the double brackets.
The MSS read by the present writer was dated (also) 10,3,20, and in this the
omitted section occurs on p.12 as paragraphs 1-3. As with most of Teilhard's essays,
this "MSS" is typed and is more probably an early copy. (The question of Teilhard's
"MSS" is not without difficulty and will not be discussed here).
Perhaps by coincidence and sheer accident, when the present writer returned to
Paris in December 1969 (but only for a day) to check the copy he had made of the
omitted section a year earlier, the text ("MSS") containing the omission could not
be found and even was not known. It is to be hoped that another researcher will
have more time and be able to corroborate the present writer's finding.
if he also has intense commitment to such as H.G. Wells? And is the view that "human effort" is something "absolute" not anomalous to Christian theologies of Grace?

e) Originality: while the attachment of Roman priest to James, Bergson and Wells suggests personality development in the man, and in the underlined sentence some novel ways of thinking for such a man, is this sentence original in the wider context of the thought of 1920 (or today)? What is it about the "organic unity of the world" which is to be a basis of future belief, or at least divides mankind today? And what idea of future human society is it if "religion" is only one "piece" of it? Is he speaking of Catholicism?

Such questions press upon the reader the need to understand the personality of the man who speaks. They elucidate the general purpose of this Thesis, the problem of who Teilhard is. They press the interpreter to discover how a Catholic can identify with people far from Thomas Acquinas and in what way a priest can entertain novel ideas without finding himself outside the Church. They raise the question of religious thinking when Teilhard uses language in ways which formal Logic can criticise. They press the question of how minds come to new ideas, and of how a mind works which has ideas like Teilhard’s. Who Teilhard is is a function of how his mind-processes work. Who Teilhard is, and the five anomalies specifying this question are problems whose solutions may require knowledge of Man (or at any rate theory about Man) as well as biographical material about Teilhard and his own literary (inner) testimony. How does his mind work and what is his personality? What methods might be used to find this out?

3) Method.

Two main methods are used in this Thesis to attempt to solve the anomalies. First, biographical material (which includes unpublished and intimate material by Teilhard himself and recent conversations with his friends (Appendix A,)) is able to
give a fresh picture of the man and his life. Inner tension and intellectual development may be seen in such material; for instance, in the action or direction he takes under specific pressure from environment or event. Intimate material is able to show empirical connection between pressure and idea, and the actual ideas which are written down moment by moment in a jotter reveal how a mind works, in contrast to a formal essay in which ideas are re-worked and traces of their origin perhaps totally obscured.

Second, theoretical frameworks are introduced from modern natural and social sciences so as to elucidate Teilhard's person, personality, science, religion and methods. By work on the biographical and more personal material especially from perspectives gained from psychology, ethology, sociology and anthropology, theory as to who Teilhard is and how his mind works is built up with some empirical basis; and it is from this vantage-point that the attempt is made to judge whether or not there was something original in his ideas and attitudes, whether or not Rome had good reason and need to silence him and whether or not the interpreters of today are interpreting Teilhard himself or what they incorrectly think is Teilhard.

These two methods introduce three secondary purposes in this Thesis. Unpublished material and some material entirely uninvestigated are introduced into Teilhard studies; and when this is analysed within a scientific ethos (though without pretension of scientific result) the "facts" of Teilhard put into question much present-day interpretation of the man and his ideas. While, third, a more hidden purpose follows from the use of semi-scientific concepts: to provide a semi-objective language through which to speak of religion without being either mysterious or reductionist; and from this point of view Pierre Teilhard de Chardin is a specimen made ready for experiment.

1. This refers to Medawar's interest in "un-making mysteries" (cf. Medawar (1967) p.9). Also to the general acceptance of Teilhard as either a crank or a genius.
The scientific bent of this Thesis is symbolised in this description of Teilhard as specimen ready for experiment. As long as it is remembered that the image attempts to describe the attitude of the present writer rather than the detail of what is presented in this Thesis the image is useful. But there is another way of looking at Teilhard and especially at his writings which might be reckoned a method of this Thesis: Teilhard as a "code" to be "broken". This method is in contrast to the assumption of Medawar and others that Teilhard is a muddled myth-maker whose language is nonsense.  

On the contrary, and by analogy to Birch's interest in "de-coding" Biblical mythology, what is reckoned "nonsense" by Medawar is treated in the present Thesis as "noise" surrounding Teilhard's "message". The project of the Thesis then becomes the work of finding the "associations" of the words used and the mental processes common to the leaps and bounds of Teilhard's language and argument.  

Within the symbolic system which has grown within Teilhard's mental processes, within his language-world, there are his own "logics" to be sought out and analysed. The analogy of Teilhard as a code to be broken leads to the need to gather the images in Teilhard, work out the "inner" logic of his mind, plot the associations linked to life and language: then with Teilhard de-coded his "message" may be ready to be gathered.  

There is thus need to concentrate on Teilhard's life-events and personal writings. These may produce the clues to association and so to message. Close analysis of situations in which stimuli produce responses, in which needs produce concepts, in which

---

1. Medawar (1967), pp. 71ff. Medawar's treatment of Teilhard is a sad example of a priori judgement and the making of mysteries by refusal to seek the logics of association, image and personal mental process. Medawar reifies three things: his own mental ability and process, (his own) present-day scientific knowledge and theory and the language of Teilhard. The latter tongue-'noise' he took to be Teilhard's message, thus concocting a straw-man, easily burnt up. The former two reifications over-simplify the realities pointed-to by, eg. T.S. Kuhn (1962).


3. ie. cf. the examples used above to point out the anomalies in Teilhard.
responses and concepts become associations in Teilhard’s mind-processes and in his symbolic system, in which coded symbols are fed into his information bank and later released intact or in combination with other information back into the symbolic system, or as an element in some new configuration — concentration on this ideal pattern might produce the necessary clues to decode Teilhard.

The two analogies of Teilhard as experimental specimen and as code message have here been joined within the language of information theory and cybernetics. This makes clearer the selection operating in the mind of the present writer and the relative nature of any solutions which may be put forward to the five anomalies: the use of more than one perspective to view Teilhard may produce "converging perspectives", but it is the selecting mind of man perhaps more than the phenomena which decides that they converge.

Nevertheless the hope is that by looking at the specimen from various angles the observer will build up an abstract model which bears empirical resemblance and relation to the specimen. The concept of Model differs from that of Myth at least in the Model's empirical nature: it is tested in relation to the reality under investigation.

So a model of Teilhard ought to be possible: his writings are legion and give internal

1. This idea of "mental Filter" operating in the human mind is important in this Thesis in relation to the different interpretations of Teilhard, to the present interpretation and — by no means least — to Teilhard's own interpretation and picture of himself. cf. the Epilogue in G. Bateson, Naven, Stanford, Stanford University Press, 1958 (2nd edition).
2. As in a 1967 McGill-Cree "model" of "converging perspectives" which was a stimulus concerning method to the present writer.
3. This is a reminder that "converge" is a metaphor.
evidence and biographical detail is not lacking since colleagues and family are still alive today. The overall method of this Thesis then is to make a model of Teilhard which is abstract but also experimental, such that it can be used as a rule-of-thumb to interpret any paragraph or page of Teilhard. This will be the code which can decipher the message, the logic which can give meaning to the symbols, the system which makes sense of the responses to stimuli.

To make this model which will explain Teilhard there must be a first experiment, a beginning to the gathering of data, an attempt to get to grips with the man himself. It was with this in mind that the present writer undertook to meet and converse with five men and a woman who had known Teilhard well: Joseph his brother, George Barbour his geological companion, D'Quince his Jesuit Superior, Leroy his Jesuit biologist friend, Dominique de Wespın the young journalist friend in Peking and Cuenot his disciple, biographer and interpreter. What follows owes much to these friends and it is with their words in conversation (recorded in Appendix A.) that this Thesis takes up its purpose of discovering who Teilhard really was, 1

---

1. The word "really" here reflects doubt as to whether Teilhard has yet been successfully interpreted, for instance concerning the five anomalies mentioned above. Also the experimental approach of the Thesis is hopeful of developing a Model which does have some relation to Teilhard's reality. But the concept of "really-reality", in consciously pointing up the model nature of experimental reality metaphysically-speaking, is deliberately in mind in this Thesis when the word "reality" is used. There is no suggestion at all that this Thesis will portray the "really-reality" of Teilhard: but it may elucidate his experimental reality — a task eschewed by de Lubac (op. cit.), and questionably carried out by the other interpreters.
PART ONE: THE BUILDING OF A MODEL OF TEILHARD'S LIFE AND PERSONALITY.

CHAPTER I

BIOGRAPHY AND THE APPENDIX A MATERIAL

1. INTRODUCTION: BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH.

Pierre Teilhard de Chardin (1881-1955) was a Frenchman whose overall life included travel and trial of various kinds. His childhood was spent near Lyons in the Auvergne mountain country. Jesuit education began at boarding school when he was ten and he was thirty-six before he took his final vows. This education took place in France, Jersey, Egypt and England. He worked as a Jesuit teacher in Egypt (1905-8) and as a Jesuit priest in France (1911). Professional work as a geological scientist began with student research in Paris in 1912 and continued with work in France, China and the United States, with field-work and conferences elsewhere. He experienced war at first-hand, the Great War in French and Belgian trenches, the Second World War in internship in Peking under the Japanese amid the various power-struggles there in China. He learnt the realities of ecclesiastical struggle with the civil power when his Jesuit College was forced to leave France for Jersey in 1902. He


experienced the realities of internal ecclesiastical struggle and intrigue when he was excluded from authority and power within his Religious Order, when he was posted abroad (after 1926) and excluded from the teaching work awaiting him in Paris, and when he was prevented from publishing and later from even writing his personal ideas (1926+). These ideas themselves were a struggle to do with tensions of Science and Religion, and the preaching of Christ and Evolution together in the same breath. Change and struggle is the overall pattern of his life. After his death all was well: his ideas were published and popular.

In more detail this death-resurrection myth is even more apparent.¹

The home into which Teilhard was born was Roman Catholic with some Jesuit influences and more especially with a certain fervour for the cult of the Sacred Heart of Jesus. In addition his father was an amateur Natural Historian interested also in local history, his estates and his position as a member of the landed gentry. This home helped to form the character of the fourth of the eleven children, Pierre.

Pierre told the family in 1890 that he was going to be a priest and he joined the Jesuits as a novice in 1898. The first seven years of training were at Aix, Laval and Jersey: the Egypt interlude was spent teaching simple chemistry and physics: at Hastings in 1908-12 it was philosophy and theology which led to Ordination: 1912 saw him being ordered to pursue scientific qualifications in geology under Marcellin Boule at the Natural History Museum in Paris. It was not till 1917 that he took his final vows and became a full member of the Order.

Fifty years after Teilhard joined the Order he emphasised that he would make the same decision if he lived his life over again; though there was anguish at times over whether he should leave the Order. Also one of his counsellors was against his making his final vows in 1917. His priesthood seems never to have been questioned by

¹ Much that is written on Teilhard pursues this theme: cf. Speight (1967).
himself or others.

The geological research of 1912 reflected interests which were not new: he had published a geological article in Jersey in 1904 and was known in geologically-expert circles during the next years for "finds" in Egypt and Sussex which he recorded in articles. Scientific contacts in London and Paris continued to increase, success in Piltdown probing with his friends Dawson and Woodward being both a spur to him and publicity.

Before the War also there was a "broadening" of his social and personal horizons through new friendships and new work. This is not evident in the theological articles which were published in 1912 before he left Hastings. But the reading of savants like Bergson was changing his mind. The word Evolution now sounded like a Call to him.

When war struck, Teilhard was back at Hastings, practising spiritual exercises which normally would soon have led to his Final Vows. But as soon as possible he was back in France in the ambulance corps, non-combatant because of his health. During the next four years he gained three first-class military medals for bravery under fire. As medical corporal he was the unofficial priest in his (Algerian) regiment: later he was Chaplain. When he could he studied the fossils exposed by the trenches and shell-holes, and continued his thesis on Rat-moles throughout the war, even publishing material. But during lulls in the fighting and while in the rest-areas he was pressed to other thinking too. From him came a series of highly unusual religious or philosophical ideas, disturbing to at least some clerics and others who read these war-essays at the time. The ideas were unusual because biological and geological ideas produced a scientific undertone to the religious ideas: the disturbance came

from memories of the recent Modernist crises often emanating from conflicts of Science and Religion. Teilhard indeed recognised in the same year that he became a full Jesuit that some of his new and cherished ideas were un-orthodox.¹

It was continual discussion of the new ideas in conversation and on paper which resulted in Teilhard's so-called "exile" to China in 1926. He had been lecturing in Geology after the war and carried out field-research in China in 1923-4; but wanted to remain in Paris. But he obeyed his Order and by good fortune was a member of the palaentological team which was on the spot to study the Peking fossil-man discovered (at a site predicted by Teilhard in 1923) in 1929.

The result of this was that Teilhard became internationally known in geological, palaentological and anthropological circles, for he it was who was charged with the job of publishing the geological details of the Sinanthropus finds. He attended conferences in Europe, Japan and the United States during the 1930's. He wrote technical articles on the geology of China necessary to any student of that geology today. He was chosen to advise the Viking Foundation (1950+) on the new finds in South and East Africa, and in which direction their research should be re-oriented. His paper on the history of the study of Human Origins was used by Sol Tax in the 1953 anthology Anthropology Today.²

Thus it was that, in spite of being forbidden by his Order in Rome to publish, discuss publicly and (latterly) write his personal religious ideas, these ideas of Teilhard's did receive attention in a variety of places, among critical scientists with whom he worked as well as among Catholics and Jesuits and personal friends. It was indeed pressure from outside of traditional religious circles that produced the post-

¹ Unlike all the rest of the material in this Sketch this fact is only known from unpublished material (Source U.P.W. (see below, Part Two).
² Sol Tax, Anthropology Today, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1953. The title of Teilhard's paper was "The Idea of Fossil Man". At the time it was an important book, with articles by such as S.L. Washburn, V. Gordon Childe, Margaret Mead, Lévi-Strauss and F.S.C. Northrop. A second edition appeared in 1962 (unchanged).
humous publications of his personal essays.

He died in 1955 in exile again, this time in New York, and for the last five years he had been refused permission to write, let alone publish. He had not obeyed this, and these years produced his essays on human socialisation and on the God of Evolution, so that he retained his own ideas to the end.

The Rome "Monitum" of 1962 against the dangers of some of these ideas still stands in 1970, although some claim that Vatican II incorporated most of Teilhard's thought.

Numerous books about Teilhard and his thought have been written since his death and most of his own writings are now published. But it is paradoxical that the Catholic books on him have the Imprimatur which Teilhard himself was never able to obtain. Perhaps this is the result of Vatican II: but another answer is suggested in this Thesis. The omission of passages from the published works suggests that aspects of Teilhard's most personal ideas are omitted from the published interpretations.

Nevertheless, the Bibliography shows that Teilhard has been able to speak much after his death, and that Catholic theologians and others have worked hard to allow him to speak to their modern world. Among the latter are the six people who were interviewed by the present writer in France in 1968-9. As they recall the man they knew, Teilhard comes to life. If this Thesis is attempting to discover who he really is and how his mind works, the first-hand experience of fond friends in free conversation may provide clues perhaps hidden by selection or volume of material in the biographical tomes. 2

---

1. See d'Olince in op. cit. p.17.
2. See the Conclusion for criticisms of published interpretations of Teilhard.
2. SYNOPSIS AND DISCUSSION OF THE CONVERSATIONS RECORDED IN PRECIS-STYLE IN APPENDIX A.¹

The pattern for the conversations with friends of Teilhard was set at once in the first. Each person felt a personal knowledge of Teilhard and put forward a specific view of who he was, what he was seeking and what he wrote.² Barbour set the pattern with a clear mental filter of this nature: but he also was able to produce biographical data which was not to be found in the Biographies. In this he was no different from the others.

In this synopsis such a pattern of mental filter and biographical data will be followed, though the order is reversed. Nor is it supposed that the two elements are simply separated. But in treating first the friends' pictures of the personality of Teilhard and then of his purposes the attempt is made to array the material in some order, in bundles of themes such as home and childhood, psychological development, life development and then how he seemed to other people. Though some selection is involved in such gathering into bundles, the material is in this way still allowed to speak for itself. In this way also anomalies may be seen to appear both in Teilhard himself and in interpretations of him, and perhaps with them suggestions for clues with which to solve them.

a) Home and Childhood.

The Teilhard home³ was a happy enough home though over the years bereavements occurred from which the parents never fully recovered. Pierre was attracted to his saintly and churchy mother and learnt the Love of God from her. To his father he was somewhat cool, but by his father he was given the "limitless horizons" of his future life-work. Among the children Pierre was one of the serious ones who found work easy:

---
¹ The reader is advised to read Appendix A before turning to this synopsis.
² See the introduction to Appendix A for the interviewer's method. In brief this was that of free association, and all except Cuenot no. 4 were unstructured.
³ What follows may be checked against the material in Appendix A. No other material is here being used.
but he kept himself to himself and listened to the advice of only one brother, the colourful Olivier. With the very religious sisters on the other hand he carried out lively and intimate correspondence. The technically-minded brothers of the family in fact tried to direct Teilhard to the Polytechnic College (without success); and most of the family tried to persuade Françoise not to become a Religious. Among the brothers there may even have been some animosity.

b) Psychological Development.

As a child his attempt to grasp the moon suggested an ambitious nature, and his dismay at his hair being inflammable a developing perception of himself and his environment. As his life developed he became noted for "always thinking of something else", and for being shy and taciturn. He was only happy working or out-of-doors, and then in organized or unorganized Natural History research. Shooting and dancing left him cold. So did the family history, politics and occupations. Those who knew him best were the foreign governesses who were girls of some intellectual quality. Those who shared his interests were university lecturers. The one man who is known to have "fired" him was a ruddy-bearded and colourful maths master. Only after he joined the Jesuits did he blossom forth and become "open"; though all this time he had been well-behaved, virtuous in obedience, quietness, even-temper and application.

There is here a certain ambivalence appearing in the material. Pierre Teilhard is developing over time, but with a certain freedom from his parents and family. He rejects mineralogical study for Jesuit novitiate, and a gun-dog and local history for scientific periodicals and collecting. Even in becoming a Jesuit he enters without any Superego concerning Church Dogma or Liturgy, which is far from mother's Sacred Heart.  

1. See the Introduction to Freud and Bullitt, Thomas Woodrow Wilson, Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1967, for the psychoanalytic concepts used in this Thesis.
2. The Cult of the Sacred Heart.
In religion he is "very free, accepted no details". All this suggests a saint-mother being out-dated in religion, and the by-passing of a traditional father's authority. People outside the family-group or tribal-group are also being needed, and the individual is developing within society but outside the expectations to which the family limited him.

(c) Life Development.

Such individual development is recognised also in the later Teilhard. Leroy speaks of three periods: of mysticism (1913+), of revolt (1925+) and of peaceful suffering (1939+). Cuenot sees Teilhard emerging from the Church in the 1930's, going above it and seeing it "from on high". Certainly Teilhard's later ideas of the "evolution of the Church and of Dogma" being like "a child becoming adult" (for instance) are unthinkable as regards his mother, and show him having emerged from this particular religious womb.

A reason for such development is hinted at by the reference to Teilhard's "many religious crises". There may have been "limits which he never went past", but personal experience may set up tensions when found to be different from what was expected. Another reason might be that an illness (c.1936-8) brought about "a huge change of style" and "less clarity"; or was it old age which seemed to bring a lessening of "creativity" after 1946?

If Teilhard's friends knew of mental and physical crises, of times of revolt and peace, and of a "very human man" whose life changed from time to time, his general health and personality and life-events must be investigated to unravel the story of his development. If Begouin is a convert, Raphael a Jew, Barbour a Presbyterian and

---

1. A hypothetical statement. See further below.
Rhoda an unbeliever, perhaps the people with whom he lives and works are functions of Teilhard's development also. If Valensin, Rousselot and Charles had works put on the Roman Index, if Superiors protected Teilhard and did not pass on orders from Rome, if his friends the Barbours were under the Church Missionary Society and the Church of Scotland as missionaries and were also at Duke University with J.B. Rhine, perhaps developments in Teilhard will be clarified if those whom he knows are investigated.

d) Ambivalence.

These hints from the conversations suggest anomalies within his personality as well as in his life-developments, health and the society he keeps. Appendix A reveals Teilhard as a man of dreams roused by things like a Paris Exhibition. He has gaity, naivety and a rich sensibility — and he has scruples, an unwelcome detachment, an ability to conceal; and he can be rebellious, perhaps even devious if pressed, and impulsively angered. There is a certain ambivalence also about his "simplicity". He was like a child in practical matters, and had a "transparency" "of his very soul". His laugh was gay and sudden ("Ha!") and he could not stand "bad" people or gossip about others behind their back ("hard" gossip). But in contrast this simplicity made his lectures and Thesis' defence extremely effective: it gave his inheritance to Licent for the latter's Museum; it gave morale to a regiment in battle. It was not the simplicity of a simpleton but — it may be surmised — of a simplifying mind.

More ambivalence is apparent in the question of his gaity. Teilhard was happy all his life, thought of himself as a "Jack-in-the-box", liked "gay, good meals" and New Yorker jokes including jokes at the expense of his Church. Yet when life did not suit him he would not eat, and when he was alone (certainly after the late 1930's) he

1. This refers to the behaviour concerning Licent, Breuil and perhaps the Original Sin clause which was signed.
2. This hypothesis is followed up in this Thesis in the more sophisticated concepts of the TGTA-Naven model.
would weep much. "Always there was anguish". Here the healthy narcissism which
gave him openness and reserves of buoyancy are paralleled by emotions close to those
of a spoilt child; and one might wonder whether, in spite of Teilhard showing some
self-criticism when he entertains the possibility that his optimism is somewhat naive,
the buoyancy and simplicity overweigh the criticism. Friends think that he did not
even see the everyday difficulties of existence.

Such an hypothesis of parallel forces or tension within the personality might
also be suggested by his general behaviour with other people: he "got on well with
everybody" and was very friendly, but nevertheless was very "distant" and very
"detached", thinking of something else. In a Freudian expression, "something is
cooking down there" in Teilhard's mind, personality and person. Simplicity is one
side of him, a mind which is elsewhere may be another. He had emotion and reason in
a balance: his "riche sensibilité" did not mean that his emotion was concerned only
with romanticism: he was "tiers posé vers l'action", and not more emotive than
rational. With children for instance he was kind and indeed fond of them, but he
found them cumbersome (as a Jesuit). A born artist who loved natural beauty, he yet
rather despised it.

Signs of hidden mental process are recorded in fact in the child Teilhard.
The charred curl and peach-moon episodes have been mentioned. But the conversations
record that Pierre always had "scruples" when he was young, and "moments of
inquietude" when he "desired to do well and right". Perhaps the "anguish" was there
when he was young. Perhaps the moments of anguish were "mystical" and not "physi¬
logical". But Appendix A also suggests that there may have been other root-causes.

He was a "very restive" man who was chain-smoking towards the end of his life, and

1. The concept — experimental, according to psychoanalysts — of the "treasure-
trove" of the Unconscious.
his 1936-8 heart-trouble left him with observable anguish. After this illness he began to experience "pangs of anguish" and hypochondria — latterly he would suddenly look very unhappy and say that he felt "triste" — and sometimes the pangs were healed by medicine.

That there were physiological tensions is further suggested by his health history. Though his active life showed that as a rule he had good health, his brother regards it as a question of "bad health all his life". The family, including Teilhard's generation, had a history of cardiac illness and tuberculosis. Teilhard's attack of T.B. in 1897 deprived him of military service then, and put back his education. Scars from this made it difficult in 1954 for him to receive a visa for continued stay in the United States. The doubts about the nature of the 1936-7-or-8 illness — "cardiac trouble" or some "Asian" illness — raise also the possibility of relation to T.B.

Such discussion makes it clear that whatever Teilhard's naivety, simplicity and buoyancy were they cannot be reckoned sheer escape from reality or a state of ease. Physical and mental difficulty at least of some sorts were not lacking throughout his life. The picture is of a man of psychological tension from an early age and with a history of subversive physical illness.

e) Ecclesiastical questions.

Nor is this picture that of a perfect saint. He who was a "man of peace" with sympathy for everyone and never known to be bitter behind a man's back, did put questionable pressure against a man when "he wrote against Licent ... and interfered

1. This paragraph refers to the popular idea of a saint and perhaps caricatures it. Few serious Christians would refuse to a saint the "zeal" of Jesus Christ in the Temple or the "gnashing of teeth" to which disease sometimes moved him. But there are some who would make "turn the other cheek" into the dominant Christian principle. To these Teilhard's lack of self-control sometimes might be reprehensible.
with Breuil". The one who refused to hear evil of another person became angry when himself called a genius. He was furious at someone who had abused him and could not tolerate someone who would not work. Nor could he bear the bourgeois who take no risk and "follow only straight lines". Some of the traditional virtues of Teilhard's home are here being momentarily at least forgotten under the pressure of strong feelings which cannot be suppressed.

More serious to critics within the Roman tradition might be the question of Teilhard's relations with Woman. Teilhard spoke more easily with men and generally needed people for the progress of his ideas. But he did have "affective tempests" with women and liked "young, gay, good-looking women". One interviewee thinks that Teilhard was in love with many women "but didn't know it", and the way that he sat with one woman at Boule's lectures and then after meeting another dropped the first and sat with the second does show a certain sexual depth of feeling. It is also clear that women were in love with him. One woman in a novel and poetically made out that she was Teilhard's mistress; another said that she thought seriously at one time about taking him as her lover. It is certain that women did speak directly to him and possibly he was asked by one (or more) if he would like to possess them physically. Yet it is also certain that the adolescent who was "very pure, very pure" became the man who was also "very pure", but who was not "innocent". He was "affectively troubled" by more than one woman and yet had no "complex" at all. For one woman he wrote The Evolution of Chastity, for another who was "possessive" of him he wrote or translated another essay.¹ He was "very simple, very free", "so transparent, so pure", "never, never anything shocking, never so far"; and "he had the idea of the purity of love: he used to say, I see God in every person".

¹. The hypothesis of one of the interviewees. No documentary evidence is given but the inference is that Teilhard wished to "free" her by widening her mind.
In retrospect the fact that Teilhard could have "healthy" relationships with women, could love his cousin who was really a nun "all her life", could be worried by or made "afraid" of a woman's feeling for him, and could have an affective tempest with a woman and her husband simply suggests a normal sexuality. The intensity of sexual tension is nevertheless something to be remarked upon by those who knew Teilhard. Though he may never ever have shaken them by the hand¹, he was very dependent on others and especially on women, and they were very precious for his ideas and helped his thinking. Perhaps the way that he may over-emphasise the Feminine in his writings reflects his need.² More probably his need for and happiness with women suggests the type of "very human person" which the modern world and the modern Church appreciate.

The picture continues to emerge of a complex and non-passive character, not the popular saint. In Canon Law or Dogma the priest is not expected to seek and find deep relationships with women. Negative feelings about particular people and explosions when others do not see him or treat him as he really is (or thinks he is) are not demanded in the Beatitudes. The scruples, illnesses and anguish of a restless chain-smoker do not suggest the quietness and serenity of the confident theologian.³

f) Personal Destiny.

This psychological complexity has a further ambivalence vis-à-vis traditional Church (Biblical) thinking. There is a very strong sense of personal destiny in Teilhard. He felt intensely about what his own mind was thinking, about its particular solutions to problems, about the actual life-events within which he lived. Teilhard

---

¹. But this seems unlikely in view of at least one photograph in the Teilhard Album, London, Collins, 1968, p.158.
². The view of this Thesis is that Gestalt not over-emphasis is produced by this need.
³. It is not suggested here that such public caricature is the reality.
thought that he was saying something "new", and that he had to keep expressing himself even if no one understood him. "If I don't write, I will be a traitor to my own special vocation" raises the question of who gives the vocation — certainly not the Roman Church which tried to stop him writing, nor the Bible which does not mention the word "Evolution". When Teilhard writes that "Evolution cannot be performed if Man does not work" and if this is part of what Teilhard feels called to preach, then he has a personal commitment intensely held and not thrust on him by Church, Bible or traditional Christianity.

Ambivalence appears again in this matter. Teilhard "could not turn back, once begun", and yet he could not leave the Catholic Church "without betraying something" in himself. So that the special vocation and destiny was not a rejection of his earlier faith and life. He wrote "The Phenomenon of Man "without God in it", hoping that in this way it would pass the censors in Rome, for he had been ordered not to write anything religious.

All this suggests a man with a mind of his own, a personality in tension and emotional needs that had to be cathcted. An interviewee remarks that Teilhard was refined in his feelings "and so they were complex". Now it is clear that Teilhard's "simplicity" and "detachment" and lack of concern for everyday problems were not at all the otherworldliness of the simple-minded. It was his own life-involvement in ideas, his own thought, his own career and destiny which helped to detach and simplify him or make him look a model of simplicity and perhaps transparency.

This hypothesis is backed up by descriptions of how Teilhard forwarded his

---

1. The view is taken here that orthodox Christianity holds of the "dying to self" and "not I but Christ" philosophy based in Paul. Again this is simplification which perhaps is caricature, but it attempts to throw into relief the intensity of Teilhard's feeling of "special vocation" which to his Superiors really seemed "out-of-bounds" but to which the interviewees and letters and UPN bear witness.
geological career and his personal ideas. "He had rather a keen sense of his own scientific career and how to manage it, and how to please"; and to gain prestige for his ideas he sought to preach before groups of intellectuals and at the Teachers' Training Colleges.

On the other hand this concern for the progress of his own ideas would be related to his oft-repeated conviction that "truth is what matters", and the same could be said of his willingness to "steal a good idea". A man who goes around saying that "the world's greatest sin" is such-and-such shows the intense emotional and existential commitment of a man who has the courage of his convictions and has to go where his belief leads him.

Concern for his ideas did not lead Teilhard to make any totalitarian demand however. His special vocation was accompanied by the call of "Go your own way": "Pas de disciples". "He had no soul for a leader". But this is paralleled by a certain looseness to group ideology, for he said of the Pope that "Papa often nods and then wakes up"; and would wonder about the religion of his childhood and the "God-concepts and -images" he learnt there. He was indeed no typical member of his Order: he had no "cupido dominandi" and was no gangster at all!

The man Teilhard in other words was very much "himself". He could be stimulated by Newman but scarcely remembered him afterwards. He read Leibnitz but Teilhard's meaning of "monad" is quite different from the German philosopher's. He knew Marechal but later never talked like a Scholastic and never mentioned Thomas Aquinas. Indeed it was a notable trait in Teilhard that he loved searching but quickly dropped what was not food for him. His reading was eclectic even in the early days when he read the science revues but never his father's interests.

1. In the sense of "what is" at that moment: "what is in existence".
The Mind-Processes of Teilhard.

One interviewee relates the process by which this eclectic and searching mind came to its new ideas. Barbour would introduce some idea as they were musing together after the day's field-work, and then later in a letter or new conversation the same idea would emerge from Teilhard in a new form and as Teilhard's own idea. People helped fertilise and develop his ideas and thus it was a "waste of time" to have discussions with people totally opposed to him. Perhaps he never learned Chinese because he knew that he would speak it as badly as he did English as well as because of Chinese work-habits.

But this does raise the point that though Teilhard used people to progress his ideas he was often forced by life to reach into new thought-milieus. Teilhard lived within a stone's throw of van Dusen, Tillich and Reinhold Niebuhr in New York without seeing them or perhaps even knowing they were there; only when taken into Union Seminary library one day by Barbour did he learn of the existence of Henry Drummond and *The Ascent of Man.*

Clearly it would be interesting to know who stimulated Teilhard to what new thought just as the "extraordinary gaps in his culture" tell something of who he was. But once Teilhard had read something or seen something he remembered all the details. This was true of his field-work during which he took no notes and of his book-reading for which he was like his sister Françoise in having a photographic memory; and apparently he understood all that he read. He was indeed "very strong on particulars" and was an admirer of the Anglo-Saxon emphasis on "facts".

Even when it is borne in mind that Teilhard did seem to forget about Newman's influence and may perhaps not have understood all that he read, the emphasis of those who knew Teilhard is on his ready ability to record particulars. Even when he has

what are described as "intuitions" there were "biological structures" behind these ideas.

h) The Interviewees mental filters concerning Teilhard and his Message.

At this point the individual interpretations of the people interviewed in Appendix A. are beginning to emerge. One person describes Teilhard's ideas as "blended intuitions" in which the particulars had to be dropped "so as to show the new things he had in his mind". The "large synthetic views" stole the limelight and the particulars melted into the background. It was "intuitions first" with Teilhard, with his thought coming "after visualisations", but on the basis of scientific particulars.

Another interviewee sees Teilhard as a man "always asking questions and giving landmarks" but who was "never never laying down the law except in moral matters". "Landmark" was a word used by Teilhard himself. But the question is being raised as to whether what his friends thought that Teilhard was doing was in fact what Teilhard was doing. For instance to a Jesuit Teilhard's idea of the God of Evolution might seem to be quite different from what a scientist might think of the same idea.

In other words the man Teilhard may seem different to different individuals and with different groups which have different sets of belief. From within Appendix A. there are indications of different sides to Teilhard's character which attracted different people, and of different behaviour or responses or attitudes which were dominant when he was within particular and different groups.

First he seemed different within different groups. He was "really a kind of adventurer" and a great friend of adventurers like the "brigand" de Montfleid: but he also prayed on his Rosary with a child-like candour, was very regular with his Offices, and was very strict on divorce and moral matters. He avoided talking religion and never tried to convert anyone; yet he also "was more of a Jesuit than people think". He rebelled against the conservative politics of his family and mocked the "integrist"
conservatives of his Church; but when dissatisfied or disillusioned with Rome he did not search for another spiritual family. He was "conservateur" not "conservatif". Quite "who" Teilhard was depends to some extent on whom he was with and who is speaking of him.

So, second, the six people interviewed have each been describing their own model of Teilhard. Sometimes these have been overlapping as when both Cuenot and d'Ouince see clearly Teilhard's anguish. At other times the individual perceives something specific to their mutual work as when Barbour remembers Teilhard's eyesight in spotting a worked stone at fifteen yards from the saddle of a moving mule. When it comes to the content of Teilhard, to his motivations and specific ideas, the interviewees are similarly at variance in what they noted in their friend.

As to Teilhard's message, Cuenot¹ sees Teilhard wanting to express a blended intuition of a "cosmogenesis" of the universe moving towards spirit. With this d'Ouince agrees and marks the intuition as "evolution" going towards spirit, with Christ the Centre of the Universe, Christianity as the "phylum" which is able to join transcendence and immanence, and today's socialisation as the continuance of spiritual evolution.

In this, d'Ouince thinks, Teilhard is wishing to both push Christianity to the maximum so as to "get more Christianity", and to form a new language with which to speak to atheists. Mme. de Wespin keeps to one theme here, the present progression of Man and the need of present-day Man to understand this; while Leroy believes that Teilhard was not dealing with and had no problem with Christ or Man, but was directing his energies to the problems of the Church and of Humanism.

1. It is not being suggested that Cuenot is able to say during relatively short interviews what he has written about in very great length. This applies to the other interviewees. The conversations are being used as a starting-point for this Thesis and at this point are indicating the mental filters operating in people, and so the difficulty of gaining "enough" "objective" information for the quest of the "true identity" and "originality" of Teilhard,
Each person in **Appendix A** gives their own personal answer to questions about Teilhard when they have had no prior warning as to what the questions will be.

Barbour is adamant about Teilhard's science: "I emphatically deny that he was not a good scientist". His field-work was excellent and some of his generalisations on South Africa which were reached through his knowledge of parallels in China for instance "have proved almost prophetic". There was no one who could take Teilhard's place when he fell ill in 1947.

On Teilhard's personal ideas the Barbours were equally certain and independent. He was really saying 'Work out your own salvation' and this was because he himself was doing this all the time. While he was "digging" he was trying to relate his science with his faith: it was this which was his real "work". These two commitments were such that at any given point "either science or religion" was "right", because "truth is one", and Teilhard was trying in his series of ideas to carry out his purpose of finding something to replace the pessimism of the young. The Barbours were existentially involved with Teilhard, especially at the time of a son's death when Teilhard wrote to them the words of Termier: "All that happens is to be adored". But they emphasise also the existential intensity of Teilhard. His message was that "God is still a-making" so that "Man must accelerate Evolution" (or retard or destroy it) and "Time is of the essence of things". So "Forward and Upward" and we Christians should be "the most human" among the mass of Man.

These different people see a different man when a first image appears in their mind in response to a question. On reflection they perhaps see many more sides to the man Teilhard:¹ but it may be wondered whether the selection which operates over ten seconds is totally obliterated over a period of ten years. The different books of the interviewees suggest that mental filtering operates in the case of the

¹ cf. the interviewees' books in the *Bibliography*. 
interpreters of Teilhard.

3. SPEIGHT AS AN EXAMPLE OF THE INADEQUACY OF SUCH A SYNOPSIS.

Robert Speight's biography\(^1\) symbolises these problems of filter and anomaly. Speight tackles the problem of different sides of Teilhard by mentioning them but not pursuing the ambivalencies raised. Instead the reader is swiftly taken on to new material, and the overall picture of Teilhard appears to do away with the need to stay with the specific problems. This means that the overall picture which is of the author's making may be arbitrary and is at least selective.

Examples of the selective anecdotal method of Speight abound. He quotes\(^2\) from the 23-12-17 letter concerning machine-gunning, but not concerning Teilhard's "christian pantheism" and being part of "an all", a "Totality of things" which is reached by a "sacred effort" "à travers la géologie, la zoologie, la philosophie, la sociologie et la guerre elle-mème". He does not quote this part of the letter. He uses the Fontpynant letter of 15.3.16 without mentioning the main prong of this letter which is the development of the concept of "Christ cosmique".\(^3\) Both the latter quotations are mis-quotations which especially in the second change the meaning.

Nowhere in Speight is there suggestion of recognition of Maeterlinck, William James or H.G. Wells as formative influences on Teilhard.\(^4\) Even when dealing with Cosmic Life\(^5\) Speight neglects to mention the "cosmic Christ" and this concept receives no more attention in the book. Although hints are dropped about what is dubbed the "universal Christ" this also remains unclarified; and in the light of Part Two of this Thesis and of perusal of Cosmic Life and How I Believe such reticence about these main concepts of

---

2. op.cit. p.61.
3. op.cit. pp.67,84.
4. op.cit. p.69. Even the warletters suggest their influence. UPN is certain of it. (Source: Unpublished Papers and Notes. See Part Two).
5. op.cit. pp.37,61.
Teilhard is almost unbelievable.  

There is indeed a huge volume of Teilhard material. That may justify selection of material. Perhaps Speight should be given credit for presenting the amount that he has put in view. But by baldly presenting anecdotal "facts" even when these include more than one side to a question the selection continues. He shows Teilhard as a radical Jesuit as well as an obedient one, but does not pursue the question. So the general atmosphere remains that there was no real problem concerning a new religion, a new Christology or the Jesuit Order. That Teilhard a matter of days before his death was wanting for the nth time to reinterpret completely the Ignatian Exercises, was re-emphasising the God of Evolution, Christ-Omega and the Universal Christ, and re-committed himself to the World and to the Christ in the Heart of Matter seems not worthy of mention to Speight, though he quotes some traditional thoughts from the same material.  

Basicly Speight quotes suggestive or radical material and then says "but not really". The problems raised are not investigated. Teilhard bicycled to the Chinese Communist camps, but this is not followed up, just as Barbusse is never mentioned. Modern problems concerning God appear for a moment, but no hint of their content is forthcoming.  

Speight therefore presents the reader with many "facts" about Teilhard, selected by reason of the general picture which is to be presented, and devoid of discussion of the content of either Teilhard's personality or his more personal ideas.  

But this is exactly what Appendix A and the above synopsis of these conversations has done too. Mental filters produce material, by-pass problems and in the synopsis a general outline appears under the present writer's selection of themes such as life-development and so on. But it does not solve the problem of how Teilhard could be

---

2. op.cit. p.331. This material is from UEN.  
3. op.cit. p.267.  
4. op.cit. p.284. The interpretation of Barth on p.327 is similarly devoid of information.
both an obedient Jesuit and a believer in a new religion to state that he was in fact both these. It does not solve the question of how he could be both celibate and the passionate writer of the 1934 essay on chastity's evolution to say simply that he was chaste and also needed the feminine. It does not solve the problem of Teilhard's identity to relate all the known "facts" about him.

What is needed is some interpretative framework which will be able to spot the mental filters; which will indicate the intensities of the personality and not only the "facts" (which all carry equal intensity if arrayed "democratically" in line and end-to-end); which will suggest what is "happening" in Teilhard by means of some other language than those of the personal mental filters; and which will pay attention to antitheses within Teilhard's personality or life-events and look for some more comprehensive solutions to them than the selective one of simply suppressing one side of the antithesis.

This suggestion may be re-phrased as follows. On the question of rebelliousness and conservatism there may be a mental filter in the interpreter which will favour the one or the other. But perhaps it is not an either-or question at all: maybe the rebelliousness is of much greater (or lesser) psychological intensity than the conservatism, and is not even strictly comparable. Further the interpreter may be operating with specific and personal views as to what is a rebel or conservative. Lastly perhaps both the rebellion and the conservatism are parts of some other personality component and may only be explained when this other component is open to view. There may be a wider framework which will solve what appear to be anomalies while making fuller sense of the whole of Teilhard's personality, life and writings.

2. The analogy behind such suggestion is with the progress of scientific thought, for instance in the problem of light being both particle and wave.
4. THE PROBLEMS FOR A NEW INTERPRETATIVE FRAMEWORK.

The problem then is to find or produce such an interpretative framework which will convey intensities, operate with impersonal language and concepts, and reduce mental filtering. To do this, first an attempt is to be made to include all or as much as possible of the material in Appendix A in one overall model of the man. This would presumably produce a picture of Teilhard which would show many more than one side of his personality and person, and would reduce the "filtering" occurring in his friends' minds.

Second, the possibility would arise — if such a model were both possible and clarifying and suggestive — of making a fuller model incorporating much more material both published and unpublished.

Third, such an overall picture might "feed back" and allow a reader to pick out the mental filtering in which an interpreter might be indulging.

These three suggestions point the way forward for this Thesis. First there is a value-vector model, then the more comprehensive TOTA-Naven model, and after the application of this in Part Two there is a brief criticism of interpreters on the basis of what they have wittingly or unwittingly left out.

To move out of "ordinary" language and into the use of words like "vector" or "value" might seem unnecessary. Yet if a straightforward synopsis and interpretation on Speightian lines is indeed inadequate and selective as has been suggested, new conceptual tools must be deemed as reasonable method with which to approach the problem of biographical material anew.

There are also new reasons to seek new tools. The picture of Teilhard in Appendix A has been sharpened by the synopsis and comment above. There are now the following findings which make the problem of Teilhard's identity more specific, and it is to probe these further and in particular from within and under pressure from modern scientific knowledge and theory that the next section will follow. Such findings
which cannot now go uninvestigated are:—

a) Teilhard is a complex personality. His life-development includes both physiological and psychological crises and tensions. He showed emotion and a thoughtful detachment. He had freedom of personality and a sense of personal worth and destiny. His sexual development was normal, healthy and important to him. He needed people and also used them. His personal ideas were precious to him. This picture is not of a simple saint nor does he conform to certain traditional Church expectations.

b) His friends knew particular sides of Teilhard. His brother said Pierre never wanted to contradict the Church: Barbour said there was only one Church for Pierre but that he would like to have gone beyond it. Joseph said Pierre had no sense of history and everyday life: Barbour expresses Teilhard's concern as eminently direct, existential and immediate. Who Teilhard was and what he said were many things.

c) In spite of the possibility of mental filters and also of verbal juxtaposition which may produce artificial anomalies, certain anomalies concerning Teilhard's life and personality would appear to pose genuine problems to the interpreter who wishes to discover how Teilhard "can" be so many things.

Such anomalies are as follows:—

the ambivalences to parents, family, Church and the Jesuit order.

the anomalies of the periods of his life reflected in being a priest and scientist, in refusing friendships with women and then seeking them.

the psychological anomalies of simplicity/complexity, buoyancy/anguish, sensibility/detachment, gaity/shyness, transparency/concealment, distance/concern, conservatism/rebelliousness, gentleness/anger, adventurism/strictness, sexuality/celibacy, certainty/uncertainty, searching/eclecticism.
the anomaly concerning his thought, that of emotion/intellect, general/
particular.

the anomalies concerning his communities: Church/Science, Catholic/
Christian, Jesuit/Savant.

the overall anomaly of how he could appear to be so many different people.
In the next chapter such problems will be pursued within the specific framework
of value-vector theory.
CHAPTER II

THE VALUE-VECTOR MODEL OF PERSONALITY AND BEHAVIOUR.

A Second Ordering of the Material in Appendix A.

To minimise the influence of the individuals' mental filters a model of Teilhard must be capable of using all the available particulars, and so must attempt to comprehend human person and personality, mental and physical behaviour. One such model which has been empirically tested with some satisfaction to the researchers has used the language of Physics and the concept of man as a complex of "tension systems" and "forces". By marking what happens in "action situations" the researcher is able to build up a "static" or "classifying" model of a man in terms of the man's "values" and "vectors". The result is a scale of personality intensities produced within and according to the language and framework of some modern psychology, namely that of psycho-analysis. Such a framework therefore is yet another mental filter "discovering reality" in its own terms. But by using a language which has some general use among the scientific community, and by an empirical purpose which attempts to be disinterested and to select non-selectively, such a model may be a step towards a picture of Teilhard which may claim some objectivity since it takes as data all the particulars available.

J.D. Frank writing in 1937 gives an overall view of the psycho-dynamic theory in which a value-vector model is based, and shows also how early theorists may tend to reify new language:

"Dynamically behaviour is determined by the person's needs, wishes, desires, cravings and aversions, which may be considered to correspond to inner personal regions under tension. Such tension systems cause corresponding environmental regions to acquire..."

1. J.D. Frank (1937) p.574.
"positive or negative valencies. Strength of valencies varies with the strength of the corresponding tension systems. The interplay of valencies and tension systems results in forces acting on the person, impelling him towards regions of positive valence, and away from regions of negative valence. Since such forces can be characterised with respect to direction and strength, they are regarded as vectors."

In such theory the person is conceived as a "powerfield". Further descriptions will be that a "conflict" situation occurs when someone has to remain under the influence of two opposing vectors of equal strength, and "frustration" will take place when a desired solution is hindered. Such a "desired solution" might be the posting of a letter for instance: in such a case the situation in the tension system causes the mail box or mailboxes in general to acquire a "positive valence", and results in a vector propelling the person to the mailbox.

This Lewin-type language of Frank has more recently been advanced by H.A. Murray and others with conscious repudiation of its claim to be "positivistic science". The psychologist makes intuitive inferences on the basis of sense-data, but a man's "personality" which is so inferred is "in actual practice, a hypothetical formulation, the object of which is to explain certain past proceedings and to predict the general character of certain kinds of future proceedings". A man's personality is not a chronological sequence of behavioural facts; the "internal states" and "needs" have to be inferred from exterior signs.

Murray's object is to classify all the "directional needs" — "need-aims" and "satisfying effects" — of the human animal, so as to define the "key variable, the motivation construct". Seeking a middle way between the Freudian reduction of man

1. Note should be made of the words "regarded as", "considered to correspond to" and "may be characterised". The model to be built is not to be reified.
2. Frank, loc.cit.
4. op.cit. pp.444-5.
to the sex tendency and libido, and the behaviourist reduction of man to the "viscero-
genic" tendencies of "thirst, hunger, sex, excretion, etc.", Murray builds up a language in which the "best paradigm for human conduct" is not the "culture-clear, conscience-free, maze-imprisoned, hunger-driven, cheese-seeking rat".¹

Basicly the picture produced by Murray is that from the "unconscious earth" of the personality grow "attitudes" and "needs" which include the needs of the mind and of the inter-personal environment outside the individual: so that "attitudes are 'pulls from in front'" and needs may be for creativity and the "life of the imagination", for some "imaged goal", for "interpersonal affiliations", "recognition" and the like.² Reduction of "Man, the thinking reed" to "lower" "pushes from the rear" like hunger and sex gives way to a model of personality which is able to incorporate "normal" man as he appears today.³

A man like Teilhard might profitably be classified within such language and ideas. There is a place in Murray's theory for the mental filters observed in Appendix A too, with the added suggestion that Teilhard himself may have mental filters so that his tacit, unconscious self-interpretations may differ from those he consciously relates.⁴ There is more importantly a sufficiently broad picture of human being within environment for all the material in Appendix A to receive an interpretation and classification all on the one Table.

Murray describes his value-vector model and its justification as follows:-

"... I have come to believe (after identifying myself with Dr. Allport) that action tendencies must be linked with values, which means that both values and tendencies must be classified. Following Lewin and Erikson, I am calling the action tendencies vectors, each vector being defined as a direction of transformation.

2. op.cit. pp.452, 461, eg.
4. cf. op.cit. pp.436, 447
5. op.cit. pp.440, 446ff, 452.
"Every vector may be combined with every value, giving us a large but manageable number of value-vectors, each of which is a certain kind of need."

Here the concept of value is not that of Philosophy. It is closely related to that of "need" as noted above, so that for instance the "life of the imagination" is a "value" because it is a "need" (for most humans at least). Here a man's personality is being conceived as "a more or less integrated system of attitudes, each of which is a relatively permanent disposition to evaluate some entity negatively or positively, and as a rule to support this evaluation with reasons or arguments". The general or specific entity (object of the attitude) was a value, positive or negative, or had value (power to attract or repel).² In Murray's model therefore value may include emotional interest, preference, commitment and organising dominance, depending on the circumstances,³ and it would be theoretically possible to plot a continuum of a person's values, since in specific cases such as a crisis-situation the intensities of two values might be measured against each other by analysis of the choice made.

More generally though Murray makes up a series of pictures. His example is that of the possible combinations of the value "knowledge" with the vectors (listed below). A person may renounce intellectual life, reject inaccurate observation, acquire knowledge by reading, construct new theory, maintain the old ones, express his ideas, teach others by bestowing his knowledge, retain old ideas, eliminate erroneous ones, defend his views, attack opposing ones, or avoid contacts which might weaken his beliefs.⁴

The following are Murray's values and vectors:⁵

1. op.cit. p.463.
2. op.cit. p.453, especially the Note.
3. op.cit. pp.432ff,452,460.
5. op.cit. p.463.
Values
1. Body (health).
2. Property (usable objects, money).
4. Beauty (sensory and dramatic patterns).
5. Ideology (system of values).
6. Affiliation (inter-personal relationships).
7. Sex (with reproduction).
8. Succorant object (child to be reared).
9. Authority (power over others).
10. Prestige (reputation).
11. Leader (law-giver).
12. Nurturant Object (supporter).
13. Roleship (functional place in the group).
14. Group (social system taken as a unit).

Vectors
A. Renunciation.
B. Rejection.
C. Acquisition.
D. Construction.
E. Maintenance.
F. Expression.
G. Bestowal.
H. Retention.
I. Elimination.
J. Aggression.
K. Defendance.
L. Avoidance.

The definitions of the 12 vectors and 14 values here given at first glance seem very inadequate if the model is to be made by someone who is not a member of Murray's team. The difficulty of definitions is further shown by Murray's own wish that he could devise a set of special symbols to convey what he means by each value and each vector. In Teilhard's case there is also the problem that he was celibate and had no children, yet those who knew him deny that he had no sexuality. How can Murray's classification be used in such circumstances?

The Appendix A conversation of 12th December 1968 was carried out in accordance with Murray's definitions and list of values, so the process is possible. Time prevented the vectors being used specifically but even so the conversation shows the usefulness of the method by the directness of the answers given and by its ability to hold both interviewer and interviewee to specific aspects of human personality and behaviour such as Roleship and Aggression which modern perspectives deem significant.

The definitions used by the present writer have been increasingly perceived by him to be his own unconscious and conscious selections. On the other hand they are based in Murray's language and perspectives and in the whole of Parsons and Shil's

Further over a period of two years a large range of Teilhard's writings has been approached and digested through T.G.T.A. thought as well as Freud, Fromm, Erikson and Bateson's perspectives. The result is that there is some consistency in the interpretative definitions which have produced Figs. I, II and III.

There is however a difference between Figure I and II. They were produced a year apart and Figure II (as the numbers show) is based on a larger amount of conversation material, notably the new conversation with Mme de Wespin and second talks with d'Quince, Barbour and Cuenot. Thus Fig. II gives the impression of being more important to this study because of method and material, but the differences between the findings of the two Figures only serve to emphasise the researcher's selection and the questionable nature of the model.

The least that can be said of these Figures is nevertheless that they face the reader with a comprehensive picture of a man which provokes thought, and in the case of a researcher feedbacks which question the method, stimulate re-working of the material, suggest areas of possible new material and pose the question of new theory which will comprehend anything useful in the old.

Interpretation of Figures I, II and III.

The definitions which have been used to interpret the conversations may be guessed at by noting the "code-marks" which are to be seen beside each section of material. The value-vector is designated by the value's number and the vector's letter. Thus the value-vector "rejection of knowledge" is 3/D.

The codemarks which appear in Appendix A represent the interpretation which took place from 10-12 August 1970, and a brief example of what thought decides on a codemark appears as Appendix B, though the latter does not suggest the unconscious selections which perhaps are the main forces which urge the conscious mind to choose

1. Chapters Three to Seven.
a particular combination. But there are six specific interpretations which have been used by the present researcher and which provide different definitions from those used by Murray. They are as follows:

1. The value of "Body" is taken to mean much more than "Health". In view of Freudian theory of Narcissism and Biology's emphasis on the organism's need for Survival, "Body" is treated as Teilhard's own person, mind and body, self. So that the questions about Body are in the models below questions which probe his attitudes to Himself as an individual not just as flesh.

2. "Knowledge" and "Beauty" changed their meanings between Figs. I and II. Knowledge was taken in Fig. I to include imaginative theory and theorising. But in Fig. II it has taken the meaning of "theory-facts" and "paradigms" which a community such as those of scientists or scholastics accept as norm-beliefs in their community. Knowledge is thus not less to do with "facts" but in Fig. II there is more realisation of the social womb of knowledge.

3. The "imaginative" part of knowledge, that of unconscious perception and Gestalt, has been taken over in Fig. II therefore by Beauty. This is only a development of Murray's definition of Beauty as "sensory and dramatic pattern", but in Teilhard's case it makes a place for the intuitive sides to his character and for the particular feelings which he had for "ideas".

4. As noted above Sex as "reproduction" would miss much of Teilhard. The general Freudian sense of "sexuality" almost as a synonym of "personality" is therefore used, but exclusively for Teilhard's relations with the female sex.

5. "Authority" and "Roleship". "Authority" is taken specifically as Murray has it, as to do with Teilhard's need for or refusal of "power over others". This leaves the social use of "Authority" as the Establishment or social lords in some form to be treated under the heading of "Roleship". Thus Teilhard's attitude to his Superiors in the Church is seen to be to do with his role as a member
of a community (of the Roman Church or the Jesuit Order), so that his attitude to Authority is traced by looking at his maintenance, rejection or aggression towards the role which Authority through its community rules and beliefs lays on him.

6. This raises the question of the vector "aggression". This is taken to be to do with unconscious dissatisfaction as much as to do with conscious feelings of anger or violence. Indeed all the vectors are viewed mainly as unconscious needs and wishes as well as actions, so that the overall Value-Vector Model is a picture of the unconscious Teilhard as much as the conscious one.

This last definition in emphasizing that the model is a model of Teilhard's Conscious Mind and Unconscious prompts the further critique of the model, that the conversation material as a whole is unconscious selection of material by the interviewees (and by means of the question, by the researcher himself), which material is then given unconscious interpretation by the interviewee.

Here the "mental filter" of Everyman is plain to view. This is what is laid out in Fig.III and indirectly all interpreters of Teilhard come under this cloud just as the earlier synopsis and Speight. The gathering of the material, the interviews, the views of the interviewees, the interpretation into code-mark and table of the present writer become most suspect when Fig.III is seen for what it is.

Even so the attempt which has produced the tentative Figures may be given its due as the tentative attempt to portray Teilhard within a new language which specifically tries to be empirical, to take account of all known parts of human life and personality, and to be conscious of mental filter. The present writer claims no authority by the use of scientific language and method, and Murray particularly rejects the claim to be positivist science. The classifying value-vector model must be viewed as a literary symbolism which carries with it also certain purposes of comprehensiveness, empiricism and disinterestedness. It is by means of these purposes that feedback
is encouraged and there is a feel though not the fact of science or objectivity in the attempt. Such a feel and feedback nevertheless keep the research to the problems of Teilhard, and premature flight to some filtered fallacy is rejected.

Figure I: The values, vectors and value-vectors which four close friends and Teilhard's brother ascribed to Teilhard (interpretation by present writer, 1969).

This Table gives the following values, vectors and value-vectors in order of priority:

2. Ideology (59) Construct (51) Construction of Ideology (18)
3. Roleship (58) Acquire (49) Maintenance of Role (16)
4. Affiliation (42) Aggression (31) Acquisition of Affiliation (15)
5. Body (37) Avoid (31) Construction of Knowledge (14)
7. Sex (27) Express (26) Acquisition of Knowledge (11)

Values | Vectors | Value-Vectors
--- | --- | ---
2. Ideology (59) | Construct (51) | Construction of Ideology (18)
3. Roleship (58) | Acquire (49) | Maintenance of Role (16)
4. Affiliation (42) | Aggression (31) | Acquisition of Affiliation (15)
5. Body (37) | Avoid (31) | Construction of Knowledge (14)
7. Sex (27) | Express (26) | Acquisition of Knowledge (11)

This Table gives the following values, vectors and value-vectors in order of priority:
Values.

Teilhard is here envisaged as needing, thinking of and working with facts and theories, his own part to play in whatever group he is in, and his own personal role in life. This includes friendship and his maleness contributed to this. The score for "Beauty" alone may surprise the reader for Teilhard had been said not to be interested in music or art. The definition of Beauty as to do with sense-perception, sensitivity and intuition of pattern throws a new light on Teilhard and emphasises his imagination.

Vectors.

The high scores for Aggression (dissatisfaction), Avoidance and Rejection point up the ambivalence in Teilhard. The values show need for him to be part of communities and also to be himself. Here the vectors describe selective tendencies and psychological tension. The top three vectors suggest mental processes which wish to maintain survival, reality-test and change the environment, and gather what is needed. The next shows the active person needing and working to get and change. The next two (Avoid, Reject) show unconscious and conscious mental filtering selecting what will be able to survive and satisfy.

Value-Vectors.

The maintenance of Self and Role with the high score for needing and finding friends indicates the personal survival-struggle of Teilhard to be the dominant trait remembered about him. When this is joined by the scores for constructing Ideology and Knowledge the picture of a struggling individual trying to discover for himself his own ideas which he then holds dear is built up. The tension of the man is then underlined by the opposites concerning Ideology when he rejects some ideology and constructs some of his own, and by his dissatisfaction with some roles, his avoidance of some but mainly his maintenance of the roles of the communities in which he lives.

Possibly this Model does little more than emphasise that Teilhard was a man of
active personality and of tension, something which the Appendix A material would anyway suggest. The value-vector model classifies the Self in terms of needs and cathetic action and so is simply saying that there is evidence for such personality-activity. Whether there is really any sign of "pattern" or "consistency" in the material which is not imposed on it is shown however by the model of the total conversation material which was made in 1970, Figure II. With such difference any "pattern" must be inconclusive.

**Figure II. Model of full Appendix A material (1970).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vectors</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Ren</th>
<th>Rej</th>
<th>Acq</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Main</th>
<th>Exp</th>
<th>Des</th>
<th>Ret</th>
<th>Elim</th>
<th>Agg</th>
<th>Def</th>
<th>Avoid</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Body</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowl.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beauty</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideol.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affil.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Succ.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auth.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prest.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurt.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolep.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>639</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Fig. II values, vectors and value-vectors receive the following scores:-

**Values**

1. Beauty (108)  
2. Knowledge (102)  
3. Role (99)  
4. Ideology (90)  
5. Affiliation (84)  
6. Body-Self (71)  
7. Sexuality (35)

**Vectors**

1. Maintenance (189)  
2. Acquisition (92)  
3. Expression (87)  
4. Construction (79)  
5. Rejection (59)  
6. Aggression (41)  
7. Avoidance (39)
### Value-Vectors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Maintenance of Role (48)</th>
<th></th>
<th>Acquisition of Beauty (13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Acquisition of Knowledge (40)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction of Ideology (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Maintenance of Affiliation (37)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maintenance of Sexuality (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Construction of Beauty (35)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction of Body (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Expression of Beauty (34)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Acquisition of Affiliation (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Maintenance of Ideology (33)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aggression re. Ideology (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Maintenance of Body (21)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rejection of Role (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Expression of Body (17)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Avoidance of Knowledge (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Rejection of Knowledge (16)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maintenance of Knowledge (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Maintenance of Beauty (15)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Defence of Body–Self (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Aggression re. Role (14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When compared with Fig.I this description of Teilhard is remarkably different. Though the first seven values and vectors are the same in both tables their order of priority is not. Of the value-vectors Maintenance of Role alone holds its place. Changes in the material and changes in interpretative concept as well as in the researcher’s mind may account for the almost total difference in picture of Teilhard received.

The conceptual change concerning Beauty has been mentioned above. So that what in the first Figure went under Knowledge and Ideology often appears as Beauty in the second. The question of what is Theory, Intuitive Hypothesis or Gestalt has determined much of the change of order of the values. A theory which became part of Teilhard’s Weltanschauung was treated as Ideology in Fig.I and as Beauty in Fig.II. Personal belief was in this way kept separate from intuitional belief-system.

The vector Acquisition is the main change among the vectors. In this case there was no change in definition of the word but there was in the material used. Joseph’s radio talk especially emphasises the young Teilhard’s need for knowledge and his own life, and the vector-scale and that of the value-vectors note this.

As for the researcher’s mind, this changed over time during which the value-vector symbolism was continuously used in the interpretation of Teilhard material. But among the latter was that used in Part Two of this Thesis which emphasises the
unconscious and Gestalt-type of mind in Teilhard in contrast to the academically rational, and this has led to reinterpretation as seen above on the question of whether Teilhard's own ideas should be taken as Ideology, Knowledge or Beauty.

In this reinterpretation also was involved the concept-cluster and interpretation of Erikson. For in this the idea of Gestalt is given full place in personality development.

With these provisos Figure II may now be used.

Values.

It is now clearer that the imaginative sense-sensitivity elements in Teilhard coexist with experimental reality-testing in him. He is emotional and rational.

Vectors.

Again high scores in vectors denoting tension and negative attitudes re-emphasise that he is complex and with deep needs while at the same time remaining at ease with environment, gathering realities within it and expressing his organism within it.

Value-Vectors.

The traits noted from Fig. I reappear in Fig. II. The maintenance of his own self within the environments in which he finds himself is paramount. Yet Teilhard has a need to find out the truth about particular things and he is able to form his own picture-theory with which he is personally satisfied. The selective mind of Teilhard is also dramatically symbolised in the high score for Rejection of Knowledge, as it is in social terms by that of Aggression vis-à-vis Roles and Ideology.

All in all the picture of Teilhard which the value-vector symbolism highlights is that of a particular person with a sensitive and inquiring mind who needs to be part of groups and interiorise group-beliefs and ideology, and yet is forced by personal need such as perception, thought and friendship to remain questioning and sometimes to act on this questioning.
Whether this picture is however more than literary symbolism is not proved by Figure II. The opposite is in fact suggested. Mental filter has been operating more clearly and there is no consistency discovered which could not have been chosen out of the Appendix A without recourse to value-vector symbols.

Two points of value concerning the model may however be made. First it has made clear that mental filters operate in friends and literary research, and second the symbolism has at least been able to introduce scientific metaphor into literary discussion. Indeed the sharpness of a description which says that for instance a man is spending most of his time maintaining a role, where "role" has specific connotations, is useful in the attempt to define the personality of a man. It symbolises personality intensity.

From Fig. II the mental filter of Joseph Teilhard has already been mentioned: he knew Pierre mainly in childhood when Pierre was adolescent and during these years it was the need to find out, to discover, to know which is remembered. Pierre, whether at school or at home, was the one always thinking of something else, waiting for the opportunity to go outside and find insects, visit some rocks, collect some specimens. Nevertheless in Joseph the ambivalencies in Teilhard also appear strongly in the rejection of (historical) knowledge especially and of some of the family ethos.

The mental filters of the interviewees as seen in Fig. II all note the ambivalencies, as the following shows:-

**Figure III: the mental filters of the interviewees.**
(The value-vectors' order of priority is from left to right.)


Fig. III finally presses home the uncertainty of the value-vector model and the
reader will experience the same uneasy feelings which Bateson expresses in the
Epilogue of Haven. The picture of Teilhard reached by Teilhard's friends and by the
present researcher reflect their selecting minds. Barbour the geologist sees Teilhard
the adequate geologist, Barbour the Protestant sees the Roman Jesuit priest keeping to
the Roles and Ideologies of Church and Order, Barbour the Church of Scotland missionary
and Scots gentleman sees Teilhard the cultured patrician with sensitive intuition which
leaps in metaphor from empirical fact. Since Barbour's favorite uncle was Henry
Drummond it is not surprising to find Barbour seeing Teilhard also as constructing
Beauty as well as (scientific) Knowledge. In other words the first six value-vectors
of Barbour's model of Teilhard may easily be related to Barbour's own personality and
being. His mental filter creates his own Teilhard.

The same process may be observed in the other interviewees. The imaginative
journalist de Wespin, being a person of sensitivity and a non-scientist, sees Teilhard
the man of emotion who rejects scholastic artificiality in the interests of Beauty and
to express his fundamental intuition. Joseph the conservative who remembers his
childhood and his aggressive elder brother still chooses to see the conservative
Teilhard who while he did not exactly remain in the family ethos, nevertheless did not
rock the ideological boats of Family, Church or Order. Leroy, the biological
scientist, does not pretend that Teilhard in his original ideas is working with strictly
scientific knowledge or method, but with intuition; Leroy, the questioning Jesuit,
knows of the personal struggle for one's integrity which means that the organism must
fight for survival; and Leroy, the lonely religious, knows how Teilhard needed
friends and female intimacy so as to survive by growing his own world. D'Quince, the non-scientist Superior, saw Teilhard obeying the Order during this personal struggle, knew the religious spirit which built new ideas so as to survive, felt the saintliness and loneliness of the man who filled the room with something of charismatic love.

Cuenot, the intuitive follower, views this powerful Teilhard personality needing friends and intimacy, filling his place in roles in communities, sensitively expressing intuitions, avid for scientific fact and for reality, careful for his own survival because life must be lived and what is in the mind is of value and must be expressed, dissatisfied when he was not allowed to be himself and to develop, yet building up rather than tearing down. Cuenot, the biographer, sees the detail of Teilhard's life and refuses to gloss over the struggles of organism in environments.

Mental filters have chosen out specific Teilhards as Fig.III shows. Nevertheless that Teilhard seemed different to each person only bears out the overall characteristic seen in Fig.II, that of ability to maintain roles. The Central Person of Teilhard in other words is to be viewed through all these mental filters and all the value-vectors together, and if this is borne in mind even the mental filter of the present researcher may not prevent the "real" Teilhard from appearing to view.

How to research further into Teilhard's reality is now the problem. The three Figures, the Synopsis and Appendix A have opened up the question of who Teilhard was by showing that he was different to different people and of a many-sided, complex personality. How can this be probed further?

One answer is to use biographical material from all Teilhard's life instead of what is in Appendix A which reflects (except for Joseph) mainly the older Teilhard. Another is to take the psychological bases of the value-vector model and attempt to interpret Teilhard from the more fundamental perspective of personality-development rather than by the literary analysis of value-vector symbolism. A third would be to analyse Teilhard's writings.
These three approaches may be combined in one. What follows for the rest of Part One and in Part Two is analysis of (mainly pre-middle-age) biographical and literary material by means of certain contemporary models of personality-development. The main prong of this is Erikson and the result a return to value-vector symbolism now linked with the symbolism of cybernetic development, but the start is made with the father of modern psychology, Freud. In the rest of the Thesis Appendix A is not used overtly but the researcher's meetings with Teilhard's friends have meant that Appendix A is part of his mental filter. So that though the three Figures do not reappear, what they symbolise of suggestion as well as inadequacy is to remain.
CHAPTER III

PSYCHOANALYTIC VIEWS ON THE CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT OF TEILHARD.

In the last chapter Teilhard was pictured through the words of two languages. Simple anecdotal fact and value-vector theory seem almost to portray two different Teilhards. This is not a unique occurrence in the world of biography! Recently Sigmund Freud (who did not know Woodrow Wilson) and the diplomat Bullitt (who did) combined biographical fact and psychoanalytical theory to produce an original interpretation of the American President which showed a completely different man from previous portraits. Also recently the clinical psychologist Erik Erikson interpreted Martin Luther in a similarly original manner.

In these cases the language of psychoanalysis weaves the different tapestry. Since the value-vector language is based within that of psychoanalysis among others, it might be surmised that a specifically psychoanalytic interpretation of Teilhard might also convey useful results. In the cases of both Wilson and Luther there were psychoanalytical theories as to how these men developed as personalities, and how they came to their ideas, and the Identity and Method anomalies which the present Thesis must solve might receive solutions from these two studies. To attempt a similar picture of Teilhard may at any rate probe the anomalies raised by Appendix A and begin to fill out the bare classifications of Figures I and II. In this way Teilhard will continue to be painted in new language; and a literary symbolism which may do justice to Teilhard's reality and also be acceptable within modern research and scientific communities will be further tested.

Psychoanalytic theories and clinical experience have indeed been used to

1. Freud and Bullitt, op.cit.
denigrate Teilhard, and in one case to defend him or at least show him of interest. In the latter case, J. Kosa works with some specific knowledge of Teilhard: the former critics operate from a general approach and in little detail. In neither case is a full psychoanalytic interpretation made of Teilhard; but the lines taken are suggestive for the present study. Through Freud-Bullitt, Kosa and Comfort, aided by Fromm's study of Freud himself and by the recent study of the scientific and artistic minds by Liam Hudson, this chapter can lead the way to the more integrative language-field of Erik Erikson.

1. The Freudian Reductions of Teilhard.

The denigrations of Teilhard from a psychoanalytic angle have taken three forms. First there is the portrait of the celibate priest whose sexuality is repressed and who sublimates it by means of religious life and ideas. There is indeed enough evidence of sexual language in Teilhard (as when he asks his Lord to "possess" him) for this criticism of Teilhard to be taken seriously.

The second criticism holds that Teilhard's ideas show a leap away from the reality of earth and of logical argument, and are the result of schizophrenia.

5. A possible interpretation of Medawar's description of Teilhard's concept of Omega as "pious rant" in Medawar, (1967) pp.71,80. Medawar is alleging that no rational thought has led to this concept and that the bringing into discussion of this concept is quite ridiculous. At its face value (i.e. the use of "piety" and "rant" suggesting some mental abnormality), this remark of Medawar's is close to R.D. Laing's treatment of religion, in D. Cooper's "The Dialectics of Liberation", London, Penguin, 1968. The latter, from his experience of schizophrenic patients, treats the religion which believes in personal communication with God in prayer as the same pathological illness that makes people think that they can hear voices when in fact no one is speaking. They are talking to someone when in fact "no one is there to listen to them". Medawar elsewhere rejects a Freudian interpretation of Darwin's disease; but the tenor of his article on Teilhard is that of, for instance, R.H. Thouless' Straight and Crooked Thinking, (London, Pan, 1953), which is a Freudian document.
Again the Methodology anomaly concerning Teilhard raises such questions, and any model which is made of Teilhard will have to take both these questions of sexual sublimation and schizophrenic logic seriously and make sense of them.

But it has to be remembered that such criticisms only hold if the Freudian theories from which they spring are Metaphysically correct. Even from the Appendix A material alone there would seem to be some doubt whether they work in the case of Teilhard. Though Teilhard's animates speaking did suggest to Cuenot that there was sexual repression in the face, Teilhard was able to have full relationships with women, and, anyway, was religious long before the age of puberty. Similarly these who knew him regarded Teilhard's rational processes with respect and believed that there were scientific structures behind his ideas. No one who knew him suggests clinical schizophrenia or a lofty religious sublimation.

Both these criticisms of Teilhard provide background to the third. Alec Comfort specifies the uselessness of Teilhard by putting the latter's emphasis on Immortality within the Freudian interpretation of anxiety-neurosis. Because Teilhard feared death he had to produce the illusions of Immortality, which he did by means of his Omega concept. Teilhard was a neurotic escapist.

Here the background model in Freud is found in analogies. The Ego is like a tribe which migrates. If it can face reality it travels forward, with or without stopping-places on the way. Fear of reality can however produce regression, where the tribe retraces its steps back into some safe pasture of early days (primary and secondary narcissism). This fleeing of reality is like the Arab who rode his camel

---

1. It has been pointed out eg. by Maurer, Crisis in Psychiatry and Religion, Van Norstrand Inc., 1961, how little clinical success, if any, has resulted from psycho-analysis. This perhaps explains how little use is made of Freud by the empirical, behavioural British psychologists and psychiatrists. However, his influence in the unconscious ethos of the scientific community remains (because his theory was really a personal, existential viewpoint and such a viewpoint is needed by others, simply to live by, in their work). His place as watershed of many modern studies of the human mind, through his disclosing of the unconscious areas of mind, through dream-analysis, is scarcely contestable, and so is used in this Thesis.

2. Comfort, op.cit.
along the mountain track. When they met a lion fright caused them to escape from
the reality — by leaping down into the abyss!¹ Discussion with Freudian psycholo-
gists shows that the interpretation of religion by means of these analogies is
common today. Fleeing from reality drives men to create the illusion of immortality
and a god; and in the early years when a child is under five such fear joins with
attitudes to the child's father, so that a censor grows in the child's mind (a Superego)
identifiable as God and father. Though conscience may develop thus not unhealthily,
a passivity in the face of God-father-censor tyranny may also develop; and this can
mean that the Ego ceases to grow in strength and may regress to these early stages of
fear and unthinking obedience when stern realities of life are later confronted. In
Teilhard's case the Omega and Immortality concepts are sublimations of fear in the
face of the reality of biological-physical decomposition at death.²

When applied to Teilhard this general criticism of all religion is no more
immediately successful than those reducing him to repressed sexuality or schizophrenia.
There is indeed the evidence of the child Teilhard realising that his hair could burn
and be no more; but his religious mother would surely have been telling him stories of
Jesus and Heaven long before this, and the atmosphere of Church and priests must also
have pervaded his bones years before he had the conceptual knowledge of a fear of death.

¹ S. Freud, General Introduction to Psychoanalysis, New York, Liveright, 1920,
pp.297,330-5.
² Medawar (1967) has perhaps similar background ideas in his mind when he ridicules
Teilhard for his existentialist anxiety. What is strange in Medawar and Comfort
is that such authorities rely in their professional work not upon Freud's ideas
concerning personality but upon the cybernetic analogy. Freud did originally work
with the model of the human mind as a machine, but his other models soon took over.
Today it is this analogy above all others which is popular within the scientific
community. Comfort elsewhere speaks of religion as a piece of human technology
produced to cope with environment. (Comfort in Dialogue With Doubt, G. Moir, London,
S.C.M., 1967, pp.134-5,145.) But when he criticises Teilhard, Comfort does not
grapple with him from the point of view of Teilhard's mind as a circuit-system with
information-stores and programme, input-output and controls; instead the Freudian
ridicule of religion in general is upheld.
Even if concepts of Immortality are the productions of human fear, in the case of
the individual child like Teilhard introduction to and living with such concepts
is a matter of hearing them at mother's knee. As he said, his mother filled him
with the Little Lord Jesus. Others made the "discovery" of the "new concept"
thousands of years before. This does not mean that the concepts are "true": but
it does mean that Teilhard's personal religion cannot be simply reduced to child-
hood fear of the reality of death.

The adult Teilhard may be evidence for this. He was a man of considerable
bravery in battle and received three high award-honours. In physical dangers among
Chinese bandits and Communist troops he was the cool negotiator. He had premoni-
tions of death like many in trench-warfare, but this did not lead to escapism or
piety, but to harder work on his personal writings because he thought that they were
of value to the world. "He was not a man who feared" say those who knew him, and
when he kneels by his dead friend Black and vows he will write to show hope in the
world, he does this by means of new pietistic ideas. His basis is the concepts
of complexity-consciousness and Christ-Universal, ideas which had appeared nearly
twenty years earlier. The fulfilment of his vow was not the result of existential
anxiety in the face of death.

In relation to Teilhard the Freudian reductions of Comfort then appear, at
any rate at first sight, inadequately based in the particulars of Teilhard's life.
The present Thesis will indeed bear this out in detail and thus suggest the
inadequacy of Metaphysical reification of Freudian theory to explain all of

1. This remark by Cuenot in Appendix A is reflected in Teilhard's brother Joseph's
belief that Teilhard did not experience physical fear till in the consulting
room in 1948, and in d'Quince's confidence that Teilhard never had a Superego
dominating him after his school days, either in the form of Dogma or in the
form of Superiors in the Jesuit Order.
2. cf. Hill, passim.
But the particulars of Teilhard also bear witness to the importance in his life of sexuality, the life and concepts of faith and personal religion, and the concept of Immortality, so that the questions raised by the Freudian criticisms cannot be by-passed. Further the work of psychoanalysts and the interpretations of Woodrow Wilson and Luther mentioned above also cannot be avoided in a 
Thesis which is trying to understand a man's personality and thought. The portrait of Teilhard which Kosa paints confirms the value of a psychoanalytical angle on Teilhard.

2. Kosa's psychoanalytic sketch of Teilhard's life.

Kosa operates from a broader Freudian framework than Comfort, that of Libido energy, the Unconscious, the Oedipus Complex and Ego development.  

Kosa's main emphasis is on Oedipus-tension. Teilhard's life was an escape from his roots. He left his parents and home at the age of ten, France at eighteen and his Order — in the sense that he moved into science rather than pastoral duty or teaching — at the age of thirty.

In this view the pattern of his life was rebellion, that of one authority against another. As a member of a conservative, Bourbon, Catholic family he rebelled against public opinion (at home and in France generally) by joining the Jesuits at the height of Government and people's anti-clericalism. In 1909 in his essay on Lourdes he used a reflective study of Science to attack disturbing secular

1. T.S. Kuhn's thesis goes further and suggests that reification of contemporary scientific paradigms and concepts is inadequate. History shows that theories and "facts" change over time, and to erect a theory into Metaphysical Reality — as in the cases for instance of the mind "being" a machine or reality being "one-dimensional" on the model of a machine or physical-chemical theory — is a method which hinders the process of scientific search. (See the pages of Kuhn, op.cit. and Schon, op.cit., noted above).

2. Kosa, op.cit. Kosa's article does not openly use all this language, but as a Director of the Medical Care Research Unit at Harvard Medical School he would not be far geographically from the psychoanalyst Erikson, and mentally the article is close to the latter (perhaps based on him).
ideas. Later in the middle of his scientific career he attacked scientific ideology by teaching that the real stuff of the world cannot be touched.

The "road to independence" was travelled by relying on one authority as he attacked another, so that he was always moving "subtly away from traditions without really breaking them". In this way he developed a personal philosophy which satisfied him and gave him peace of mind. Here Kosa has as his main source Teilhard's memory of a childhood dream. "I find," wrote Teilhard, "vague memories arising in me of long journeys when I was a child. I see the different-coloured signals in the station light up. Bit by bit the long line of signals merge in my mind into a transcontinental railroad leading off into a limitless distance, somewhere beyond everything." The strangely homeless and restless man Teilhard was, always travelling through roles and occupations and careers, yet on a steady course, an intellectual adventurer who nevertheless remained in the middle of the road.

What Teilhard was doing then according to Kosa, was developing a personal philosophy which met his needs and gave him his ego-strength. From this vantage point he proceeded to explain the world as part of himself, and expanded himself into cosmic proportions. And since this philosophy gave him personal satisfaction and peace of mind, Teilhard maintained it at great personal sacrifice: which gave him his self-consistency and steady course.

This account by Kosa makes sense in a general way of Teilhard's life. Cuenot tells of Teilhard, the very restive man who smoked incessantly and found inaction burdensome. Leroy has the story of the young Teilhard throwing the bust of the Bourbon Pretender out of the drawing-room window, and notes a long period of rebellion in Teilhard's forties. The railroad dream-desires are paralleled in fact by his adventurous travelling, his exhuberant fancy for everything, and his refusal to go religiously off the rails. 1

1. cf. Appendix A.
In two ways at least Kosa is nevertheless unsatisfactory. Little detail accompanies his article. No particulars accompany his causal Oedipus hypothesis that Teilhard's life-course flowed from a desire to be rid of a domineering mother and family. It could be argued simply that the Jesuit school at Mongré was where all the Teilhard boys went when they were eight, that Teilhard joined the Jesuits for the reason he himself gave "to be most perfect", that he travelled to Jersey, Egypt, England, China and the U.S.A. because he was ordered to and ecclesiastical authority denied him work and residence in France. The events of his life may not necessarily be seen as escape from mother, family and life: certainly, even if he was, others unwittingly helped him!

Study of his particulars may also deny the idea that Teilhard's philosophy was an expanded version of himself and anyway came only from his own need for a personal philosophy. **Part Two** does make clear the personal need which spurred on Teilhard's original writing. But it also refutes absolutely Kosa's claim by making clear the conceptual originality of the Cosmic Christ and associated concepts, their womb in other concept-clusters than himself, and the absence within these original concepts of anything to do with Teilhard himself as a person. They were personal discovery but their content was not Teilhard!


The above is in marked contrast to what Freud finds in Woodrow Wilson. Freud shows Wilson as the passive child of a domineering father. When the latter became God to his son, the son Woodrow became (unconsciously) Son of God. This flight from reality and inability to equilibrate the Oedipal tensions resulted in

---

1. Freud and Bullitt, *op.cit.* This paragraph reflects the following pages among others: the introduction to psychoanalytical ideas in pp.35ff., and pp.71,78, 101,110,113,123,125,164,170,188,204,210,214,224,232,234,239,243,244,251,261, 268,283,287,289,291.
Messianic behaviour where the Son of God, the Prince of Peace, went to the Versailles conference table to make peace amongst the nations and deliver the Sermon on the Mount, all the while thinking that his words were the reality.

"He thinks he is another Jesus Christ come upon the earth to reform men," said Clemenceau.1 The Saviour of the World gave the Fourteen Points in which he gave the sermon in his father's place to mankind. Sublimation, repression, Super-Ego identification and domination produced the actions of Wilson and supplied the lines of ideas and their rationalisations, even to the eventual assistance at the writing of a Treaty based on hate and entirely opposed to his Mount Sermon. But finally "the gaping sense of guilt, the burning hole of fact in his unconscious"2 produced physical collapse, and the Blood of the betrayed Saviour was spilt.

Failure to control the Oedipus conflict of both passivity and activity toward his father resulted in his being destroyed by that same father.

This account of Wilson may be suggestive as regards interpreting Teilhard or anyone else, but there is little doubt that it cannot be followed in any detail with Teilhard. The latter's ideas are not reducible to his Oedipal womb, though a technical interpretation of Teilhard by a psychoanalyst might turn up a novel picture.3

Since Kosa produced a way of understanding Teilhard which seems fruitful in showing at least some possible inner movement in Teilhard's life and ideas, and since Freud on Wilson does the same for Wilson, a psychoanalytical probe of Teilhard in more detail than Kosa might now be of use. With these two studies of men in

1. op.cit. p.243.
2. op.cit. p.291.
3. Kosa of course has done just that and perhaps a practising psychoanalyst will in time turn his attention to Teilhard. Here it must just be stated that the present writer cannot claim that professional expertise and simply hopes for suggestive methods and concepts from psychoanalysis which will help to paint a richer picture of Teilhard.
mind, but without holding to them, a beginning can be made. Consideration of other dream material and of Teilhard's relations with his parents follows naturally from these studies.

4. **Dream material in Teilhard: the 1916 Benson stories and the childhood memories in the light of Freud.**

   Teilhard insists that the three stories written in the style of Benson in 1916 are imaginary and do not picture true events. But he is glad to inform Marguerite that it is her room and lamp which are depicted in one of them.¹

   This raises the question of the unconscious and of motivation and image within the processes of creative writing. These stories are written against the backdrop of the Dousament battle preparations, when wishes, desires, dreams might be a part of the normal tensions of such a time. The mention of Marguerite's room recalls the nostalgic feel of "Do you remember when we walked along the foxglove path ...".² Teilhard's sensitivity here is to do with his sexuality, and the room sounds like home and even the womb. The "spontaneous and involuntary eruptions of novel symbols and novel combinations of symbols" which mark creativity (according to Murray³) are here in Teilhard a function of "dynamic functioning", in this case memory of and love for Marguerite. Unconscious events are pictured in these stories and are part of the conscious combination.

   As with any psychoanalytic interpretation, what follows is speculation or at best hypothesis. In the three stories it is a metamorphosing Christ who is appearing in image. From this Christ is radiated outwards to infinity a vibrant atmosphere and universe. In this Christ's eyes are different expressions: they change from the gentle and pitying eyes of Teilhard's own mother to those of a

---

passionately subduing woman, to those of a virile, courageous and noble man, and finally to an "indecipherable" expression which Teilhard thinks that he has once seen in the last dying look of a soldier. The passage runs as follows: 1

"Thus, for example, these eyes which at first were so gentle and filled with pity that I thought my mother stood before me, became an instant later like those of a woman, passionate and filled with the power to subdue, yet at the same time so imperiously pure that under their domination it would have been physically impossible for the emotions to go astray. And then they changed again and became filled with a noble, virile majesty, similar to that which one sees in the eyes of men of great courage or refinement or strength, but incomparably more lofty to behold and more delightful to submit to.

Now while I was ardently gazing into the pupils of Christ's eyes, which had become abysses of fiery, fascinating life, suddenly I beheld rising up from the depths of those same eyes what seemed like a cloud, blurring and blending all that variety I have been describing to you. Little by little an extraordinary expression of great intensity spread over the diverse shades of meaning which the divine eyes revealed, first of all permeating them and then finally absorbing them all ... And I stood dumbfounded. For this final expression, which had dominated and gathered up into itself all the others, was indecipherable. I simply could not tell whether it denoted an indescribable agony or a superabundance of triumphant joy. I only know that since that moment I thought I caught a glimpse of it once again - in the glance of a dying soldier."

Speight's description of this passage takes it as a work of art where Teilhard the artist is representing the humanity of Jesus so that He is not separated from but merges into the universe. Speight makes no comment on the substance of the images used. 2 To psychoanalytic gaze, however, the images are suggestive. The vision of Christ follows something of the order of sexual development. First there is Teilhard's mother, then the slightly seductive or at least eminently attractive purity of mature woman, then the transference to a manly peer and then the look of as it were every man seeking and suffering at the farthest limits of mankind. The Christ who fills the universe and is met in Man and the struggle of

2. Speight, op. cit., p. 79.
Life has been met with by Teilhard through his mother, some other woman, some man and finally the companion in the trenches in the War.

All authorities agree that Teilhard was blessed with warm affection from his mother. To him in later life she was his "sainted mother" and he kept up an intimate correspondence with her till her death. Photographs of her in the early years of marriage show her a beautiful woman and that the family was happy may be judged a function of her personality and life. To Teilhard during his early Jesuit days she used to send pocket-money. She knitted for him during the war. All accounts suggest that she was a loving mother to Teilhard. 1

Possibly the analogy of the concept of "imprinting" may describe Teilhard's relationship to his mother. 2 Mutual love at the breast was both the stimulus and the reward, so that the son's prayers for her in later life and sympathy in her troubles is the reward and the response to her religious and motherly concern for him at all times.

However their relationship is to be described, what is clear is that religion was a mutual bond between them. Teilhard early became intensely religious as his mother was. He carried out ecclesiastical routine like the daily mass with strictest regularity like his mother. He became dedicated to the cult of the Sacred Heart like his mother. He carried through his life in daily use his mother's words that "Heaven lies ahead of us", and that at death we are "transformed". Photographs of him in early and later years show Teilhard resembling his mother.

When the religious bent of Teilhard's daily routine and life-history is added to the 1916 image of Christ as at first having the eyes of his mother, the

---

inference is reasonable that the behaviour-patterns, emotions and symbols of religion became part of Teilhard specifically through his mother: even the priests and church were mediated to the babe by the personal love and religion of his mother.

In psychoanalytic terms¹ the child Teilhard grew through narcissistic love of self into an ability to love the one who caressed and loved him. That he developed healthily and normally beyond this stage is shown by his adolescent rejection of the pietistic side of Sacred Heart religion and by the steady growth of his ability to love others.

Teilhard's brother Joseph notes that the Teilhard around the age of puberty was "understood" best by the young, foreign governesses.² Since before this there were nannies to look after the children it might be inferred that from early days Teilhard was able to transfer his libido energies to other females than his mother. This is further suggested by his relationships to his sisters. The elder sister Françoise and the younger Guiguite both carried on intimate correspondence with Pierre and both their deaths affected him deeply. The idea of the elder sister looking after the younger brother and giving advice³ springs easily to mind; and the tone which Teilhard uses concerning Guiguite later suggests the usual elder brother's tyranny over the younger sister. All in all there seems to have been normal transferring of love from mother to other females in the intimate family-circle in the case of Pierre Teilhard.

This raises the question of who is the second woman in the 1916 story. Possibly it would be the Virgin Mary to whom Teilhard gave himself during adolescence.

---

2. cf. Appendix A.
3. Françoise later advised Teilhard to take up geology professionally, and one may surmise that both Françoise's and Teilhard's entrances into the religious life were intimately related.
Perhaps it is Françoise, for photographs of this girl would match the description, and her religious life and "martyrdom" in Shanghai would seem natural within a description of Christ in the world. A third possibility is that the girl is one of the governesses; perhaps one who raised sexual feelings within the adolescent. These governess girls were of high calibre and specially chosen by Emmanuel Teilhard, and would have included religious girls of sensitivity like Christ's. That one face of Christ was the eyes of a passionate and pure young woman anyway suggests both a normal sexual development (in a psychoanalytic perspective) and a functional relationship in Teilhard between his relationship to his mother, his sexuality and his images and ideas. The way in which Teilhard met with Christ was to do with the people he knew and loved. His concept of Christ here is to do with his personal experience in life.¹

What is suggested so far is that Teilhard's femininity develops healthily in relation to his mother, and that his sexual libido development is normal.

Passive development also occurred in relation to his father. His father was an amateur scientist, a natural historian and archivist who in photographs appears a gruff and military-looking patriarch who might be expected to shoot and hunt on the estate and read The Field. It is to this father that later Teilhard will remark that he owed a certain "balance" in his personality. At the age of five or six Teilhard was watching and catching insects, and collecting different types of stone and rock like a natural historian. As a child he had "scruples", "wondering if he was doing right", which in psychoanalytic theory would be the father operating as a censor, producing rules and regulations which would act as a conscience, the Super-Ego, Ego/Ideal being identified-with by the small boy. At school Teilhard was able to work well and at a high standard, as a father desires.

¹. See further Part Two.
and did scientific research with young lecturers from the university provided by his father. Teilhard much enjoyed the old soldier Croze who was brought in to further his mathematics; he joined the "military" Order of the Jesuits; he had a first-class war-record (in Croze's old regiment); he became a well-known professional scientist. Teilhard even looked very like his father during the war years and in the field. Barbour, Leroy and d'Quince were all struck by how much of a gentleman Teilhard was in his personal habits and attitudes. The family-ethos directed by the father remained with Teilhard all down the years. The "precise aspirations" of the father were fulfilled by the son.

Such an account shows normal identification of Teilhard with his father. But if the scruples could be ascribed to Superego-father or if identification with father became fixation and there was little rebellion, then what Freud found in Woodrow Wilson might apply to Teilhard.

In fact masculinity and normal sexual development appear early on in Teilhard. Probably the scruples had sexual as well as superego bases. Love was transferred from mother to others and presumably to God, but there is no suggestion that Teilhard ever identified his father with God! Teilhard may have assimilated his father's model for living just as he had his mother's: but in both cases there was soon deviation from them. Nannies, sisters and perhaps brother Olivier, governesses, priests, school-teachers, university lecturers, fiery ex-soldiers, lively physicists as well as the Jesuits running his school — such people as these became Teilhard's peers and produced in him identifying thoughts which were not always by any means those of his father or mother. Healthy activity included aggression in his deep unconscious. He was one of four boys who were dubbed "the terrible four". He put a live frog in his aunt's bed. He revealed an Oedipal urge in throwing the Pretender's bust out of the window. He showed no interest in and never followed his father's main interests in history and archives, Chartist
politics and Monarchy, shooting and the family estate. He detached himself from his mother's emotional religion and indeed ridiculed such piety. He rebelled against and rejected both his mother's religion and his father's authority when he used quickly to cross the street to the other side when he saw black ecclesiastical garb approaching.

In Freud's terms Teilhard had normal active and passive, masculine and feminine, rebellious and obedient elements in a life and an unconscious which were not repressed. The ambivalence of being a gentleman but never reading his father's journals, of feeling just as if he had just shot his first snipe when he found a piece of Piltdown fossil, of being obedient and also rebellious to authority finds its place within healthy Oedipal development as envisaged by Freud.

From this discussion the four images of Christ in the first Benson story are now understandable. Teilhard's mother and a woman to whom love was transferred produce the first two images of where and how Christ is. The noble and virile man of the third could be his father and at any rate is certainly a peer, perhaps Crose, or Schultz, or Boussac, or an unknown companion in the trenches. The fourth man could be "everyman" in the trenches; but whoever it was was able to evoke in Teilhard the deepest emotion and sympathy, and the presence of the love of God in earth and in Man.

This first story of the "fiery, fascinating life" in the abysses of Christ's eyes is followed by a story which may also be interpreted from a psychoanalytical angle and which may also throw light on the ambivalencies detected through Appendix A.

In this story the host mysteriously expands so that the whole world becomes a single giant host with everything being fashioned by the same kind of translucent

1. Or Déscribes, de Bélinae, Maséro, Boule, etc., (cf. LHP. and MM). The speculation is abortive except in showing that Teilhard was eminently capable of identifying positively and having peers other than his father.
flesh. In the end the host contracts back again, leaving the rebellious element to burn outside it, and having within it its treasures "joyously pressed together within its living light". Teilhard in the vision tried to grasp the host in various ways. But always his heavenly guest seemed to be ahead of him: "its centre was receding from me as it drew me on". Teilhard could never catch the sacred particle in his hand or by his love. It always eluded him, "leaving me at grips with the entire universe which had reconstructed itself". Thus he realised that the invisible barrier between the sacred Body and Blood and himself was "the full extent and the density of the years that remained to me to be lived and divinised".

This vision is reminiscent of the baby Teilhard's attempt to grab the moon. Two general points may be made, first that there is a use of imagery in this passage which is personal, poetic and seeming to express actual experience. Second that the picture of Christ is as un-traditional as that of the first story where Christ is seen in the eyes of four people Teilhard knew. More specifically he uses the concept of host as a metaphor to express reality, and not as a doctrine to be adhered to.

This vision of the sacred particle and host finds its conceptual explanation within the concept of the Cosmic and Universal Christ revealed in Part Two of this Thesis. Here from a psychoanalytic viewpoint the story is evidence of what Kosa describes as restless search of a man who travelled the road of independence by subtly moving away from traditions without really breaking them. Christ is followed but His face is not certain to him. The Eucharist is accepted, but its dogma is projected into a new framework of reality. Reality is known in Christ but it can never be grasped and is always ahead of him. The mind which imagines Christ as a function of an expanding and contracting dynamic universe is a mind which lacks security and complete satisfaction in traditional dogma and religious
community. It is a mind which is needing something different and is searching ahead in dream-flux and vision for something new to satisfy itself. The vision is to do with what Teilhard is going to live the rest of his life, and as such is a motivating concept.

Freud would also treat such writing as sublimation. The libido energies are channelled into passive activities without which society would have disintegrated. Mystical experience is another such channel, and it is another which is found in Teilhard. In Egypt, Jersey, Hastings, France and China (at least) Teilhard had mystical experiences which he himself regards as the "natural mysticism" and "cosmic consciousness" studied by William James and Marechal. The immensity and all-in-one wholeness of nature never ceased to affect him emotionally.

In psychoanalytic terms such experience of "oceanic feeling" might be reckoned Oedipal experience and regression to mother's presence or to father's, for father is God or Christ. Liam Hudson's reduction of the scientific search and the "synthetic" aim to the "nympholeptic" need for an Ideal which is really mother would explain both Teilhard's science and his philosophical need for the "One" and the "Whole" in a similar manner. Yet the 1916 stories do not offer themselves to such specific reduction; and although humans know the feeling of wanting the security and warmth of mother's womb and total clarity and knowledge, yet a synthetic knowledge of experimental reality just is not the search for mother, and mystical experience when waves are breaking on the cliffs is not mother or father.

1. Freud and Bullitt, op.cit., p.47
2. See below Part Two.
3. As Freud interprets Woodrow Wilson and his father.
4. Such causal Freudian analysis where explanation means re-formation of the same cluster of consents rather than "reality" is unacceptable today. Memory-associations stored in cells produce, when re-used in a displacement situation, only memory-associations stored by cells. Even when needing affection and care from a nannie or when dependent on a woman for button-sewing a man is not loving his mother, but using feelings and associations from former situations to meet needs and live with, make sense of and be satisfied by the new one.
The sublimation of libido in other words does not mean that the three Benson stories, Teilhard's science and mystical experience are regression to parental womb. The way that his mind selects may very well be a function of early associations concerning mother and father, and so may a man's ability to form a Gestalt-pattern therefore in the phenomena around him. But if Teilhard rebels, if he transfers his sexuality, if he identifies with peers, if he balances the Oedipus tensions, his Ego is developing and he is testing reality and not regressing to the womb. Since his early life and (for instance) the 1916 stories do reflect all these, it is the theory of Ego-development which is now needed to further explanation of Teilhard.

One theory which would help to explain Teilhard's professional geology, personal writings and ideas and some of their content such as search for the Whole and the Ideal is that of Hudson mentioned above. Teilhard in his early stone, metal and insect collecting, in his adolescent research with non-personal mineralogical material, in his refusal in the trenches to accept Nature as cruel, in his refusal to speak of the devil, and in the absence from his writings of a threatening Nature or God neatly fits into Hudson's definition of a "converger". As will appear below however Teilhard was also a "diverger" who accumulated life-experience, so that nympholeptia as an explanation of Teilhard is not sufficient even if it were more than speculation.

More in keeping with Freud's book on Wilson and so with psychoanalytic theory applied to biography is Erich Fromm's study of Freud himself. In this Freud's passion for truth, his scientific search is not reduced to search for mother, but is a function of Oedipal tension and rebellion. Fromm points out

1. Hudson op.cit.
that Freud was a favoured son who gave to his mother a love seldom if ever given to his wife. There was a weak, despised father, a rejected figure who used to tell the boy Freud that he would never come to anything or do any good. Rebelliously independent of his father, the son was given by his mother the unconditional love and unending admiration and protection which is normal mother-love. Because his mother bore a new baby, however, Freud fell into depression: his mother had other interests and could no longer do everything for him. It is at this point — according to Fromm — that "passion for truth" was born. Thought is born in the disillusion that sets in when love fails. Thought is born to make sense of and dispel the illusions and make-believe world in which the child has been caught up. To Fromm the "primacy of thought", the "passion for truth" and the "desire for independence" — from illusion and from those who give illusions — all stem from the insecurity which arises from the conscious realisation that the real womb is Life itself. When love fails the individual is forced to realise that he is an individual in a universe greater than himself and his mother. This is the process through which Freud is deemed by Fromm to have developed into the "conquistador" who had a sense of assurance which verged on feelings of complete certainty and even superiority, and who had the courage to go against the stream and to "dare all".

Such theory may help to explain some of the anomalies of Appendix A. Teilhard was not a messianic maniac like the Wilson portrayed above, but he did have a certainty about his own ideas and he did have superiority feelings about them and in relation to some other people.¹ Teilhard did make a "dare-all" statement which showed publically what he was already in private and in his writings,

¹ Appendix A. and UPN.
an adventurer.  He did have a "passion for truth"; "primacy of thought" is apparent in his writing, his "precious ideas" and his ideology, and his life would appear marked by continual "desire for independence". So that if there were evidence for Fromm's causal theory, these parts of Teilhard's personality might be near solution.

Little material is however to hand. But what there is is suggestive. Teilhard's mother did give unconditional love to her son, but within a short period it was the nanny who looked after him. The bust-throwing episode when added to the rejection of his father's interests suggests an intensity of feeling against his father which received indirect backing from Cuenot's statement that Teilhard was "somewhat cool to his father". It may even be that the young lad's statement that he was going to be a priest was ridiculed in the family, and that Teilhard was dissuaded by his father from joining the Jesuits just as Françoise was dissuaded later on. A letter at the time of his ordination does suggest some parental worry in these matters. His brother Joseph says that only one of the brothers "could do anything with him" in the way of giving advice which might be accepted, and does this mean that they kept giving him advice precisely because his father and his authority were being rejected? And is the present-day Teilhard family's discomforture at "poor Pierre" and his later ideas a reflection of what Pierre's father had sometime murmured in their hearing? perhaps the early death of Alberic was to the father the death of an ideal son, so that with the life-long bitterness at this event went a reaction against the unlike-Alberic second son Pierre. Perhaps the father may have grudged the son the admiration showered upon him by the religious mother. Perhaps the father who did not go to mass every day

2. eg. MM p.149,114,251.
3. LFR p.310.
rather doubted a son who followed such a mother so far.

These speculations rest upon the idea of "coolness" between father and son, and on Fromm's theory. They attempt to picture the pressures which led to the growth of Teilhard's thought. That Teilhard at an early age was "thinking" is not in doubt. The three early memories other than the peach-moon grab are all to do with reality-testing with an intellectual content. They suggest what Murphy denotes the growth of the "thought-organ"; more complex realities in the environment both need and produce more complex thought-concepts to deal with them.¹

The first memory is that around the age of four Teilhard experienced a "cosmic" feeling. This is his later description and reflects probably the language of W. James and Marechal. As an experience which was remembered, it nevertheless probably was the forerunner of all the other cosmic experiences, so that the possibility is that at this age Teilhard became consciously aware of the wider, more impersonal environment of tall trees and hills, stream, sky and stars and moon. These became perceived as real elements in environment, as real as parents, brothers, sisters and nannies. The Ego which had begun with narcissistic love of himself alone and had grown to transfer emotion and thought to mother, father and others was now reality-testing outside the environment of family and people. Now some conscious Gestalt-perception gave new understanding of the world about him, and the feelings aroused were those of satisfaction and pleasure so strong that the event was remembered and the feeling re-produced throughout Teilhard's life. His verification-needs were satisfied by this perception and his confidence in self and life restored.²

². The event is recorded in Cuenot, op. cit. No commentator probes the content of this experience. Nor is it suggested by the present writer that consciousness of the event was abstractly held, since the onset of abstract thought would probably date from the age of eight onwards.
The second memory is of feelings of shocked sadness at the age of five or six, when one of his hair-locks was blown too near the fire and burned. This brought consciousness of his own personal limitation and perhaps death limitation. The re-orientation which resulted from this was not only in terms of self-understanding but in terms of intellectual understanding of physical and biological fact; because a year or so later he was trying to find rock — or something — that would last, endure. He thought that he had found it in a piece of iron, but this soon became rusty and was thrown away.¹

It could be argued that the second and third memories show religion as developing from fear of death and morose need for immortality. But the more likely interpretation here is that the flesh-death-heaven-immortality circle of concepts which mother and church had been introducing to the boy for years was suddenly seen to be related to specific realities, some of which at least were to be experienced. The associations and attitudes which were now part of the boiling mass in his unconscious had at last been of use in helping to interpret realities which were experienced.

The later Teilhard sees the rusty-iron episode as the result of a desire to find "consistency" in the world, and as a re-orientating event which propelled him on his way to a life-work of religious and scientific research. A more reasonable and "before-the-event" interpretation would be that here was growing mind-process, intellectual awakening through reality-testing observation and experiment, the child's curiosity and need-for-verification.² Nowadays three-year-old children are known to excel in problem-solving experimentation. This and a similar continuing process makes sense of Teilhard's childhood and thought.

¹. Cuenot, op.cit.
Oedipus tension reinforced the natural history interest, lack of psychological equilibrium within the family led to his going off on his own and being detached, the insecurity of a withdrawn mother-love prompted him to search passionately for the truth and use his thought-organ to gain his independence and security. Such a hypothetical framework makes more sense of young Teilhard than the idea of his searching in abstractions at the age of six, though religious abstraction was no stranger to him at that age. Such a framework also lays a basis for understanding the man Teilhard, for so much, for instance, of the letters deals with the intimate processes of personal tension and discovery. From this framework also there appear patterns of behaviour such as nature-problem-solving which are observable all through Teilhard's life and are also the mark of a scientist and of a member of the technological age. The fact of memory denotes also pleasure in remembrance; and the joy of both struggle and discovery are seen to be parts of Teilhard's unconscious as he travels restlessly into the future.

5. The psychoanalytic model of Teilhard which emerges from the models of Freud and Fromm.

In the present Thesis' experimental approach to Teilhard the value of psychoanalytic language and conceptual models is that it provides at least some theory through which the sparse biographical data may be interpreted. As long as reification of models is not allowed to occur there need be no return to Speightian a priori myth; and as the biographical data grows in volume as Teilhard's life expands, such models as have emerged in this study will be tested, seen as models and not real-reality, and adjusted, enlarged or supplanted.

1. The use of the word "model" may seem loose but "picture" would not convey the purpose which motivates the present writer, which is to continue to test theory against the experimental facts of Teilhard. Metaphysically speaking such models may be "myths": members of the scientific community might label them thus. But as they are used empirically these "existential syntheses" are "models" with which Freud and followers have liked to experiment. That they may be discarded models today does not make them any less a model than Ptolemy's.
From the material and theory in this section Teilhard would appear to be an example of normal and healthy growth of libido-energy into a secure central Self where Unconscious, Ego and Superego are balanced within the usual tensions of development. That is:

a) Teilhard's sexual energies were channelled first into value of himself through the loving, feeding, smiling, caring, confidence-giving and admiring motherliness of Berthe Teilhard. Later buoyancy, spontaneity and gaiety of personality may here be linked with Teilhard's early self-confidence. Early narcissism became conquistador narcissism.

b) Sexual energy flowed out also on his mother. His mother's love being unconditional, Teilhard's also was unconditional in return. But it did not become fixated on his mother though nympholeptic theory may help to explain the later needs for the Virgin Mary, celibacy, the Whole and One and All. Teilhard's unconditional love was early displaced on to father, nannies and the rest of the family, perhaps especially Francoise. This ability to transfer what was originally fundamental emotional response to his mother continued especially in relationships with peers selected through passive identification with friends of his parents, that is, with priests, teachers and scientific researchers. By the age of four though, the loving response was also directed to the impersonal environment in "cosmic" feeling of oneness with nature; soon afterwards the insects too

1. Normality and health are here defined in modern psychoanalytic perspectives such as Dr. J.D. Sutherland (Tavistock Clinic and Edinburgh University) and Bishop M. Haro-Duke of St. Andrews used at the Goodham-Dunblane conference of April 1970.

2. The language of value is introduced here on four counts: it is a language much used by Teilhard himself (cf. M., p.117); it is used by many present-day psychologists and psychoanalysts; it is a cross-disciplinary language as Parsons and Shils point out in op.cit., p.389, and it is used extensively in this Thesis; and it is an ordinary language in western society today.
were responded to and needed. Such unconditional response to people and environment later became the "passion for life" in a world which was both "loving and lovable". Gay, good meals and conversation and ideas joined with Death as things loved and to be loved.

c) Passively in response to his mother's love, in anticipation of security and pleasure, in identification with her who understood his needs, in hope of the continuation of love-communion with her, and possibly by more mechanical processes such as imprinting, Pierre Teilhard grew up saturated in religious emotion and ethos, feeling the unconscious responses of the one he loved as she reacted in routine and crisis situations with events and people, experimenting with (mimicing) the roles of religion in practice and hearing the belief-system expounded didactically as well as lovingly communicated at the knee. In such ways religion as conscious and unconscious commitment, with its visual and tactile symbols, its language and images, its complex layer-upon-layer of associations and lived-in orders and thought-of orders, and its roles and expectations for individual and community grew to be part of him. The complexes of information and responses and values became stored within his mind and nervous system. Such theory explains the facts of Teilhard's life. The list of his commitments includes fifty years of Jesuit priestly life. Never did he desert religion in the crisis-situations. He could no more leave his Church than leave his mother. When his passion for truth emerged into professional adult work, religion was a dominant set of concepts, ethos


and belief-system which could never be omitted. Search for truth-reality was through the family womb, and mother’s priority-value of religion could never be left to one side.

d) Actively in response to his mother’s love Teilhard had to begin reality-testing when mother could not be possessed completely, perhaps when a new baby came, perhaps when nannies took over care for him. The realities of insecurity and of others led to reality-testing to try to satisfy his need for security and dependence. The transference of love to others brought results. Verification of the environment, thought and the passion for truth also brought results. Independence was sought and found satisfying without the mother-given need for dependence being lessened. In this way the Ego began developing, and in Teilhard’s case the experimental and independent element is plain to see. So is the growth of imagination and feeling for the wider environment. But so also does tension develop in the absence of mother and perhaps self-doubt. The question of scruples may be a sexual one with some relation to Teilhard’s emotion for his mother, though no evidence from the later celibacy issue suggests this. But what clearly grew in the boy Teilhard was the reality-testing passion which gave so many pleasurable results that the verification-need was fully satisfied and the passion eventually given professional status in his life when he became a full-time geologist. From this angle there is another side to Teilhard’s conquistador buoyancy. Success at verification of other reality gave satisfaction and confidence for the future. Mother’s love brought tension, but her confidence-giving admiration together with Teilhard’s prowess at reality-testing soon changed the tension into the self-confidence of a conquistador.

e) Passivity and activity is also seen in Teilhard’s relationship with his
father. Needing to survive and so to learn, identifying with and mimicing him Teilhard was able to please the threatening person and to take on roles which relieved the pressure of the others. So the father-peer brought into the child the ethos and behaviour of the gentleman, by his amateur science and encouragement he produced scientific excursion and collection by the son, by his methods and knowledge and interests he built a store of information into his son's brain-processes both conscious and unconscious. With rewards more-than-fulfilling the expectancy given by the role, with concrete knowledge of the real-realities in the natural environment producing pleasure and satisfaction in the young man, the horizons to be searched widened, and Teilhard's mind was soon working on its own in realms of fossil-history, volcano-geology, animal behaviour and entomology. So the concepts of science became ingredients of all Teilhard's personal thinking, the methods and knowledge-content became dominant valuations never to be abandoned, and the methods of science became essential to his personal approach to religion. Part Two shows how Teilhard's knowledge of and work in science was totally necessary to the personal interpretations and new concepts which became his new ideas.

On the other hand Teilhard's coolness to his father and his lack of any tyrant Super-Ego show that in early childhood were happenings which produced rebellion against the authority who designated roles and perhaps hatred against the one who usurped the mother's love. Again the scruples may have developed in relation to excessive superego demands for correctness in thought and behaviour. Perhaps the boy who was enjoying his growing independence in thought and action resented one who tried to control and rigidify him. Perhaps the high ideals of the family and father conflicted with what Teilhard's growing brain perceived within the family environment
he blossomed only when he left the family and joined the Jesuits —
and in some way seemed to the boy to prevent his search for truth-reality
which he both loved and needed.

From sexual development and Oedipus complex therefore many of the ambiva-

cencies found in Appendix A and all through Teilhard may find explanation: his

buoyancy and anxiety, dependence and independence, obedience and rebellion, science

and religion for a start. In terms of Ego-development similarly fruitful factors

have emerged: relationship with peers, independent thought, conquistador personal-

ity, reality-testing ability, normal development of loving, natural tension in the

parental womb, and the rewards gained within science and religion.

These theoretical understandings of Teilhard may help a reader to understand

the content of the letters and even of the essays. But what has emerged from this

psychoanalytic look at Teilhard is that in the terms of psychoanalysis itself he

is a healthy and normal man. He is free from fear when he is adult, and he does

not bow down to Superego Authority when a child. He tests reality as an adult in

geological research and as a boy by transferring love and accepting peers and

rebelling and carrying out his own detached research: he is not a paranoiac

schizophrenic. He is seen to be free from rigidity of belief in adolescence by

his reflective attitude to dogma, and as a child when he goes his own way to find

out for himself, and when aged four he starts the series of personal religious

experiences which result in his conceptual originality when a man. He crosses the

road from the cleric and prefers the world of nature which he tests. He has

Oedipal tensions but keeps them in balance. He takes pleasure in life and in the

whole of creation. He has a sense of his own wholeness which is very clear in

later life, but also apparent in his confidence at school and in keeping to his own

road when young. The deep personal security which he holds and which comes from

parental love enables him to maintain a high value-system. His thought and his
feeling, his mind and imagination grow together and are both satisfied.

Such theory may be symbolised by the following diagram, which cannot suggest all the possible combinations of function, but which simplifies the discussion above:-

Figure IV: A Psychoanalytic Model of Teilhard via Freud and Fromm.

Here the centre columns particularly relate to the child Teilhard. The right hand column suggests what becomes of him in later life and anticipates Chapter Seven. In all, the schematization must be understood as giving tentative and possibly misleading functional relations. Yet such a model helps to "fix" the "specimen" Teilhard as well as to make sense of much of his life and writings.

On the other hand the questions of Teilhard's anxiety and celibacy remain. The scruples and anguish of the child have been mentioned in connection with sexual and Superego demands. All that can be said now is that since the general pattern of Teilhard's life shows lack of tyrant Superego and also normal relationships with women there is need for further theory on these matters.

Further theory is needed on other counts too. First, so far, because to Freudians the child is father to the man, this chapter has dealt mainly with the
material available concerning Teilhard's early childhood. With material increasing as Teilhard grows older the need arises to make use of it by means of theory concerning adolescent development. Second, because the psychoanalytic language and theory used so far has been of use this does not mean that it has solved any problem nor that it will be sufficient to tackle different material. The question of Teilhard's anxiety and celibacy still remains, and so does the more important question as to how Teilhard came to his ideas. A nympholeptic interpretation of Teilhard would expect him to produce the concept of a universal Virgin Mary not a Christ-Universal, his anguish and tears did not come from lack of mother-love nor his celibacy from neurotic escape from reality.

Since such questions remain and they are to do with an adolescent and with the birth of personal ideas the theory of this Thesis is to be developed now through the modern Freudian Erik Erikson, whose Young Man Luther suggests similarities and differences concerning the young man Teilhard. Psychoanalytic theory has so far given explanations of the early life of Teilhard by means of his libido and Oedipal roots. They suggest roots for his religious and scientific commitments, his confidence and love of life, his sensitivity and desire for truth, his sexual and ideological development and his independent and rebellious thought. How this secure Central Self developed over the years of adolescence and how his tensions and needs developed in concert with this Ego is a story to be told next in the theory and language of Erikson.

CHAPTER IV

A COMPARISON WITH ERIKSON'S STUDY OF LUTHER:

TEILHARD'S JOURNEY INTO THE JESUIT ORDER.

Erikson's study of Luther has a number of similarities to this Thesis. He is not concerned with Luther in relation to Luther's content vis-à-vis Traditional or Metaphysical Truth. He aims to present a picture of a young man becoming a great one, a case-study which may take its place within the full story of religious conversion which is being written continuously, a description of the human life-cycle and the cycle of human generations. He wishes to show that genius cannot have ordinary inner balance, decency and direction, for any greatness harbours massive conflicts, for instance from childhood repressions; yet all humans in fact take part in the same "metabolism" of the generations, and Luther is like us all.¹

In his study Erikson is carrying out what he calls "psychohistorical" reconstruction, and he is well aware of dangers of reification.² He also warns on psychoanalysis' tendency to look backwards and "originalise" by reducing everything to childhood causes. Instead there must be concentration on the onward processes of youth and adolescence, of the ways in which an adult attempts to cope with his environment or perhaps declines from the discoveries of his youth. With Luther there is so much biological, environmental and biographical material that there must be theory with which to comprehend such huge ranges. The theory which Erikson invokes is that with which he has been identified from his clinical work with adolescents, through which he has modified, adjusted or

¹. Erikson, op.cit., pp.19,31,34,36,236,238ff.,247ff. cf. also 221,231 where Luther seems so different to different people which is also Teilhard's attraction.
jettisoned parts of the psychoanalysis in which his work is based.¹

In general and at first sight such an approach to Luther bears some resemblance to what is being attempted in this Thesis and the Teilhard of Appendix A would seem to be open to such investigation and perhaps not unlike Luther to some admirers. Further study of Teilhard in the light of Erikson's work and as a parallel figure to Luther confirms this first impression, though their similarity on some points should not be taken by any reader to denote similar Metaphysical Truth in their very different content.

The main prong of Erikson's theory² is that the "identity crisis" is the major crisis of adolescence. "(The identity crisis) occurs in that period of the life cycle when each youth must forge for himself some central perspective and direction, some working unity, out of the effective remnants of his childhood and the hopes of his anticipated adulthood; he must detect some meaningful resemblance between what he has come to see in himself and what his sharpened awareness tells him others judge and expect him to be." If this seems rather obvious — says Erikson — it is to be remembered that the human personality is intricate, "an immensely sensitive combination of interrelated factors", "a combination of capacities created in the distant past and of opportunities divined in the present ... of totally unconscious preconditions developed in individual growth and of social conditions created and recreated in the precarious interplay of generations". A young man like Martin Luther was for a time endangered by a syndrome of conflicts recognisable today clinically. There are various ways in which the identity crisis may be solved. What is remarkable in Luther is that his spiritual solution bridged a political and psychological vacuum of his day

and this coincidence made for his historical greatness. His new theology helped
to heal an age.¹

That in these and in other ways Luther and Teilhard are similar will be sugg-
ested below.

1. Parallels and suggested explanations of Teilhard on the model of Erikson's Luther.

The overall perspective of human individual development which Erikson holds
is that "normal" development is the working out of the Oedipus Complex, the gaining
of conscience, work, the ability to trust, and an "ego synthesis" which takes place
in relation to societal metabolism and which includes the crises of identity,
imintacy, sexuality, generativity and ego-integrity.² In the very early years
these crises are preceded by "oral" infancy, "anal" infancy and the growth of the
Oedipus Complex itself with its crisis of initiative versus guilt: mother and
freedom with mother generates imagination and unlimited aspiration, father and
the image of father prohibit the child, bring limitation and may result in scruple
and guilty conscience. When details of Luther and Teilhard concerning such
matters are compared in relation to this perspective much of Teilhard is at once
more understandable.

Chapter Two discussed Teilhard's early infancy. Now this can be pressed
further. Although Luther's home was very strict and both parents "harsh", his
later gaiety, song, poetry and pleasure of talking with people must have come from
his mother: Hans Luder tried to reduce this attachment to mother, but she provided
it secretly, and his mother's voice must have "sung to him of some kind of heaven".
Such "prehistoric" relationship to his mother gave Martin "basic trust" and "a
lasting unconscious association of sensual freedom" with the body of his mother.

1. op.cit. pp.63,171,189.
2. op.cit. pp.207,247ff,254.
Associations also will have remained to do with her reproving hand so that "mistrust" will also have remained in him. To Erikson these feelings eventually were strong enough to overcome the threats of God the Father and his father, and to allow to be discovered the overwhelming righteousness, love, faithfulness, goodness and Providence of God.¹

It is more than possible that Teilhard’s mother was a parallel to this. She was his "sainted mother" and his often-sexual language suggests early sensual freedom. His fear of pantheist mystical experience may be identical to Luther’s horror of mystical experience. To Luther Erikson ascribes a horror of intimate relations with his mother, a fear of seductive "phallic" mother.² Cuenot’s Appendix A description of Teilhard’s Egypt experiences of pantheist mysticism might suggest similar unconscious feelings in Teilhard. Certainly Teilhard was remarkable to his contemporaries for his trust, capacity for simple faith and acceptance of consistency and probability. Both Cuenot and Barbour think that he was trusting of other people to the extent of being naive. God was to him a simple Plus-sign (+). Teilhard is full of the concepts of Providence and determinism, probability-theory is a specific part of his idea of evolution and of his original concepts, and consistency was apparently a specific subject of early search, certainly of later formulation.³ There does not seem to have been a time when God and Life were things or persons not to be trusted and loved. Luther’s threatening God does not appear in Teilhard, which suggests that the latter’s problems and solutions will be different from Luther’s. If early infancy determines a person’s "innermost mood", Teilhard’s mother would appear to have been more influential to him than Luther’s was to Luther. Teilhard’s religion,

¹. op.cit. pp.69,251,253.
². op.cit. pp.123,159,163.
³. cf. Appendix A. and UFN (see below Part Two).
if it comes from mother’s love, will ring with optimism and love, and be built upon a natural assurance coming from the womb.

Here two points are relevant. First of course that father also appears in early infancy. Second, Erikson remarks that bad health in a family usually denotes an unhappy family life where there is no real love. Coolness to father, the sadness of the photographs, the early deaths and consistent departing to other lands, present-day hostility in the family to Pierre — these might suggest, contrary to Cuenot’s statement, that Teilhard’s home was not altogether happy, and this might explain his sadness. No less speculative is the suggestion that Teilhard’s father produced strong reaction against himself from his son. But on the other hand Teilhard did have scruples of conscience and the coolness to his father and perhaps Teilhard’s father — like Luther’s — did remove his son too early from his mother, thus being the instrument which broke the early trust and perhaps causing shame and guilt. As the patriarch Emmanuel Teilhard would most probably have been responsible for the ethos of the household with its "proper" values, early and strict boarding-schooling and corporal punishment (perhaps related to toilet-training), Teilhard may have indeed known his father as a threat like Luther.

According to Erikson the period of "anal" rebellion which follows the "oral" phase was in Luther’s case the crucial period, and the one to which Luther tended to regress in later life. Here the child realises its limitations in the physical universe and feels that it is alone in the universe. This is the icy riddle which chills the child’s ego and gives rise to "grave metaphysical anxiety". Luther’s rebellion and language is said to stem often from this, for the justice of adults

1. *op.cit.* p.204.
2. *op.cit.* pp.67ff,21,249ff.
is doubted and the self is doubted in this hostile world; so that a wilfulness and perhaps shame at such a thing as being naked may be traced to here. But with this inner state of rebellion there is also a sense of individual autonomy which appears at this life-crisis: will-power, will-to-survive and a certain self-discipline now grow in the child.¹

With Teilhard there is enough rebellion to delineate — with the ego-chill story of the hair burning — the phase in Teilhard’s life. Teilhard has the same rebel-honesty which Erikson regards as part of wholeness and there is the same honesty concerning scientific reality.² On the other hand, though there seems to be anal rebellion against authority³ in Teilhard, this does not seem to be the state to which he regresses when he feels "triste" in later life. Some other solution must be found to this.

Three other solutions are suggested by Erikson for such sadness. They are:— self-doubt caused by cardiac illness; the infancy-crisis; and the identity-crisis of adolescence. Each stage of life-crisis in fact produces new tasks or sets of choices, the responses to which will later be functions of later stages of the life-cycle, and may perhaps impair them and aggravate future crises; or if not represent a successful graduation into a more mature personality.

Cornerstones are laid in both cases for the future adult personality and each crisis prepares the next; and this means that if an early crisis has not been successfully resolved, the feelings and struggle which were involved in it may

1. loc. cit.
2. op. cit., pp. 151-2 and Part Two.
return during a later crisis. So in fact Teilhard's tears may be the result of more than one crisis.

Evidence for the physiological solution for Teilhard's sadness is that medicine sometimes cured it. On the other hand his early scruples were apparently to do with "doing right" which puts the sadness as a function of Oedipus tension early on in infancy. Anxiety may be produced in the infant's attempts to be obedient to and to identify with his father. Teilhard's father was such that obedience to him would be imperative and the later Teilhard and the entomologist infant show the attempt to identify with him. Like the other children he was presumably "terrified" of him and he gained his conscience through him too. Father Teilhard was the first "social limitation", the first "other" who prohibited and gave the law. Regression to this infancy-crisis may be what caused the doubts and scruples, the anguished tears, the adult acknowledgement of the "anguish" question of Man as a species, and the tirades against "juridic" religion.

Luther had refused to appease his early feelings of mistrust of his father, and Erikson views the later "impulsive, intuitive formulations" as displaying "The infantile struggle of a life-long emotional issue". The frightened, self-doubting child of infancy returned in tears, and in Martin "stored rage" produced even unconsciousness as it fought against "pious self-restraint", at least until an outlet which preserved his Ego could be found.

1. Erikson, op.cit. p.250. See also pp.113-5,136-7, where Luther, in wanting God's recognition, not the Virgin's or Anne's, is seen to be returning to the affirmation of a child's first relationship, to trust in the 'Provider', and to the 'Recognition-giver'. (Martin's father took him too early out of his mother's 'trust-stage': so he missed mother-trust and 'original optimism', and rebelled against his father because the latter did not guard his identity's beginnings, gave no guiding voice and did not guarantee Martin an established identity (pp 113,120)).
2. Appendix A.
From this point of view some of Teilhard does make sense. Though he was usually buoyantly optimistic as mother-love would make him, his letters ring with refrains of self-doubt concerning the authorities in his life, of anxiety that he would never be listened to (which suggests an uninterested or even hostile world), and of anxiety that he may not be needed at all. Wilful rebellion against father and Established Authority (in the family) was present in the throwing of the Pretender's bust; stored rage might have been present in the tears when the letter did not come for old man Teilhard, and when Teilhard (aged nine) said that he wanted to be a priest, this may possibly reflect such rebellion also. The father had aspirations for his son which later turned out to be mineralogy at the Polytechnic College, and the son perhaps realised when aged nine that the father's hand was going to limit him too much. Since Teilhard's mother much later on was "jealous" for him to be ordained, the nine-year-old's statement may be seen as a challenge to the father and the choice of mother's basic beliefs, routines, needs and authorities. It also shows oral-infancy's trust and love of mother, Nature and God; and perhaps the boy's way of making this situation continue.

Love of and need for his mother would then appear to be the dominant Oedipal relationship in Teilhard as opposed to Martin Luther's case where the father was dreaded and horrifyingly obeyed. This does not mean that anal rebellion is absent in Teilhard as noted above. It means that where Luther needed to solve the problem of his relationship with his father, with Teilhard the Oedipal tension is more balanced but with the mother being the more dominant of the two partners in Teilhard's experience, and the hypothesis would therefore be that his problems concerning God or Belief will be different and will reflect ambivalent conflict with mother where Luther's was with the fearsome God the Father.

The question of anal-infancy conflict is nevertheless paramount in Teilhard because of the experiences he records of this period. In the light of Luther's
periodic unconsciousness and dreaming — the first at least, according to Erikson, the result of massive conflict, the second perhaps more related to normal development, but also in its mystical elements to do with desire for and love of mother — Teilhard's stories of "cosmic feeling" at the age of four, of intense commitment to a stone and then a piece of iron a little later, and (also during infancy) of interest in the stars and clouds as well as trees and beetles, all suggest similar psychological happenings. When it is remembered that as an adult Teilhard was to be described as "detached", "distant", "always far away", disdainful of conversation (and history and shooting), and "unhappy" before joining the Jesuits, the idea that unconscious process and conflict was there early on in Teilhard is not too speculative.

Erikson denies that Luther's dreams and attacks of unconsciousness were neurotic, psychotic or the result of infantile sexuality. They were to do with Oedipal and Identity conflict, and with what is described as "adventure" outside an environment of scruples by means of "experimental schizophrenia". In Teilhard's case the "cosmic feeling" may have been related to pleasure in the happy, motherly world of "other" outside the Teilhard and the human family, something like the "cosmic emotion" of passively being grasped by a superior power, in W. James expression. But it could also have been early thought-experiment outside the norms hitherto experienced, in which case reality-testing, thought-experiment and experimental schizophrenia are to do with the same processes. This suggests a growth of the organ of thought which is not the "escaping of a devilish self from the Ego", but is an important part of Ego-development symbolised in the modern

---

view that "each person is at least three selves"¹ or is "a bunch of selves".²

In Luther the wholeness of personality came with solution to the Identity crisis, and Teilhard may prove similar here; but in both men in their early development a certain positive schizophrenia would appear to be part of their development.

That there was such so-called schizophrenia is given further proof by the closeness of Teilhard all through his life to the schizophrenic's experience of feeling like an animal for instance. Erikson describes this feeling as follows:- "Where so-called schizophrenic processes take over, the rock-bottom attitude (the "totalist" to be or not to be) is expressed in a strange evolutionary imagery. Total feeling becomes dehumanised, and eventually de-mammalised. These patients can feel like a crab or a shell-fish or a mollusc, or even abandon what life and movement there is on the lowest animal level and become a lonely twisted tree on the ledge of a stormy rock, or the rock, or just the ledge out in nowhere."³ In Teilhard's life there is the "cosmic feeling" at four, the intimate play with insects, the feel of identification with the priest (at nine), the oneness with rocks and wind and cliff at Jersey, the feeling that the fossils in the Sussex Weald were come to life around him, the "de-humanising" atmosphere of the Front in the War in which "Something" was being born, and the experiences in Egyptian and Chinese deserts of Matter being "alive".⁴ Such imaginative feeling, perhaps originally a "pre-conscious perception" as in Luther's case,⁵ remains during Teilhard's life and is conceptualised in his "cosmic consciousness" (1908), "presence" of evolution (1911-12), "cosmic life" and "cosmic sense" (1916),

1. So Dr. J.D. Henderson (Tavistock Clinic) in the Lecture (1970) noted above.
5. See below also for the 1902 "supernatural temptation".
Christian Pantheism (1923) and "direct" "tangible" "palpable" "Presence of God" (1916). Such sensitivity may also be in evidence in the more poetic writings such as the 1916 Benson stories mentioned above. Whatever it was it appeared early on and turned out to be part of Teilhard's life- and thought-development; and as in Luther's case may be taken as especially evident during Teilhard's passage to wholeness during adolescence.  

Before Teilhard went to Montréal School he had had the cosmic feeling at age four, the metaphysical chill aged perhaps five, the curiosity to collect insects and look inside volcanoes aged six, the Little Lord Jesus inculcated in him by the same age, a continuous search for some ideal-absolute (rock or iron) at the age of seven or eight and a statement that he was going to be a priest at the age of nine. So that religion, science, thought and imagination are part of the boy who goes to boarding-school. What he appears to be at this school is a follow-on from what has been growing.

In 1892, his first year at school, Teilhard was prepared for and took his First Communion. This might possibly, in Eriksonian theory, be a "conversion" event in which the boy took the opportunity to obey a higher law than his father's. On the other hand he wrote home at this time expressing his growing "fire" and "passion" for "stones" and looking forward to the holidays in which he would pursue this. Such interest was a form of obedience to his father, and it is a mark of Teilhard that, like Luther, until final identity was found in the executive concept and actions following from this, he quietly obeyed the institutional system and went quietly up the various ladders, first at school, then in Jesuit training and ordination to the priesthood, then in geology. Luther had risen to Provincial status before he nailed the Ninety-five Theses to the door. Both men

1. As note 7.
2. As shown below.
3. Erikson, op.cit. pp.89,90. See also below re. Ordination.
4. op.cit. p.142.
were obedient to father, but the difference would be that Confirmation would seem normal to Emmanuel Teilhard where it was not to Hans Luder.

The holiday researches clearly show that Teilhard was finding identity within one of his father’s fields. This research was in Natural History, in entomological and mineralogical study and collection. Lecturers from the local university were asked (presumably by the father) to oversee this work (which is now in the university museum), and the whole process shows young Teilhard willing and able to identify with his father and his father’s expectations for him in this school, vacation and scientific activity.

This activity and interest, added to the feelings of happiness in and curiosity about Nature which had come before or at the time of the 1885 "cosmic feeling", on the other hand produced tension in Teilhard concerning his mother and her interests. He was confirmed: that was normal school and family practice. But during his first year at Mongré he found that the happy Nature feelings he had somehow grated with the emotional, evangelical Devotions of this College of St. Ignatius Loyola. The mother-father infancy tensions are being prolonged in the beginnings of science-religion identity-crisis. The emotional influence of mother is being balanced by the father’s earth-research during the year in which puberty generally begins. Nothing is heard during this period though of childhood masturbation, neurotic sexual scruple or spontaneous ejaculation; so that tension with mother’s religious emotion would seem to have been a function of reality-testing and growing consciousness of other ways of behaving and approaching problems. Anyway, perhaps the obediently successful schoolboy was having a late sexual development just as he had a sexual moratorium later on. Holidays from 1892-7 were spent in indoor work or out-of-doors freedom where he was very happy: at school he was interesting to teachers but with the reputation of being "far away", perhaps
among stones.\(^1\) Perhaps not till his Dedication in 1895 did sexual scruple and puberty really begin, though apparently the confessionals at Montré suggest rather an emphasis on sexual sin.\(^2\)

If this interpretation of Teilhard's "detachment" and "mysticism" is correct, the picture now being painted is that of a man whose Oedipus-Complex conflicts and (via Fromm\(^3\)) need-for-verification press his unconscious processes to develop their thought-potential and begin growing an identity which would be that of neither father nor mother. Rebellion against father's hopes and interests is balanced by identification with his amateur science and general Superego structure; obedience to mother's religion and emotion is balanced also by obedience to his father's science. Scruples and anxiety show Oedipal tension. But with the early "cosmic feeling" mediated by sensual freedom with mother but initiated as so-called schizophrenic adventure leading to near-identification with rock suggested to him perhaps by his Christian name, the process of personal initiative and discovery was inaugurated consciously, or in a way which was later remembered and so conceptualised. The groping mind of the later Teilhard begins its search for more satisfying environments and identity, reaches age seven, the age of "ego-chill" and the icy metaphysical riddle, and finds at least a possible identity as potential priest a year before he went to his Jesuit school.

So runs the hypothetical story of Teilhard's infancy in which he gained a trusting nature, a conscience, some rebelliousness, anxiety and self-doubt, and a beginning to experimental thought. Teilhard the man was a man of rich sensibility, hidden suffering and intuitive conceptual-process. The hypotheses concerning Teilhard's infancy which have appeared in this section and in the previous chapter make some sense of the later man, and as the biographical data increases and theory concerning Identity-Crisis is invoked, the portrait of Teilhard becomes increasingly

---

2. Speight, loc.cit.  
3. See previous section.
coherent and comprehensive, and the relations between his ideas and his personality become increasingly clear.

2. Identity-Crisis in Luther and Teilhard.

The two causes already invoked to explain Teilhard's anguish have been physical illness (on the lines of Luther's cardiac illness which produced self-doubt) and infancy crises (which included ego-chill and obedience to, rebellion against and identification with father and mother). The third possible cause — and it follows on chronologically from the second — is identity-crisis on the model of Luther's and many adolescents'. Before Luther's "fit in the choir" he was "sad", which is interpreted by Erikson to mean "choked up". When Luther cried "That's not me" he was rejecting a false or inadequate identity and breaking through to the person which he really is. In that happening Luther was taking care of himself, breaking out into his own personal religion and moving from sadness to happiness in the move to a new identity. He had found the traditional tristitia of the monastery no good and he had leapt into a "new frame of life" which eventually fulfilled him and showed that his "true" goal had been a hedonism (in accordance with Freudian "pleasure-principle" theory).¹

This hypothesis works in with the known details of Teilhard rather better than the anal-regression-rebellion hypothesis, though not exclusive of it; Teilhard in letters and UPN changes over time concerning his interests, vocation and Gospel,₂ though how much change there is permanently will appear in Part Two. When he "cries a lot" during the war in Peking, this may have been cardiac trouble and may have included rebellion against his situation; but the thought of life slipping away from him as he has to wait with little to do and not knowing what

1. Erikson, op.cit., pp.21,27,35,37,96,149,123,245.
2. eg. cf. MM 157,197,271,273,281; UPN for 18 Nov. 16, 24 Dec. 17, 23 Feb. 18, 19 Nov. 18.
will happen in the future and what he could be doing — such a thought is to do with identity and with the work which continues identity. Further it may be part of religious man's life-long crisis of who and what he should be in God's Universe.¹ Teilhard's tears suggest the massive conflicts common to many people and especially connected with the adolescent's crisis of development. Consideration of Teilhard's adolescent growth to adulthood confirms this, and also establishes on the Luther model who Teilhard is.

The 1895 Dedication to the Virgin Mary suggests sexual scruple at puberty, but not only this. It was not the Teilhard family faith which he became identified with here. His mother was a fervent follower of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, as Teilhard had been also. He was to continue to be academically; but he later had reservations about both his mother's and his sister Guiguite's pietistic religion. Here in 1895, then, it is possible to surmise that Teilhard is rebelling against his mother by obeying a higher law than her's, just as the 1890 statement about being a priest was a challenge to his father by preferring a higher law to his. This interpretation of the 1895 consecration to the Virgin is perhaps substantiated by what happened in the next year. Then he was secretary to the sodality of the Immaculate Conception and in one meeting's Minutes there is recorded the meeting's vows that they all "attain holiness by everyday duties" and share the Christian sense of Duty so as to bring France back to God's road; and all this is to be done through love to the Blessed Virgin.² This is a different emphasis in religion to that of Teilhard's mother (which was evangelical personal religion), and reflects the voice of Jesuit teachers like Bremond. Sexuality is sublimated into faith in Virgin, and personal religion is tempered with the duties of daily life and

2. Guenot, op.cit. p.5.
political duty in the national sphere. In both Teilhard’s mother is being "balanced" by his father’s ethos and the religion of Jesuit peers. The freedom of a priestly identity is being nourished by a new freedom, that of the identity of a Jesuit novice. Father and mother are being superceded.

At the time the father may not have realised that he was being disobeyed because during Teilhard’s last year at Mongré the young man had enjoyed his higher physics (which included biology) and, as always, his researches in the field. There were hints though of what was to come. In 1895 Teilhard had written home for his sister’s "little red prayer-book", and personal religious need like this clearly might lead to intense commitment to the Virgin. But Teilhard’s letters might still have given little preview of the future, for he wrote home that he felt unable to conform to what was being taught in the Catechism, and he found philosophy "a little dry". When the father of the family and the brothers tried to persuade Teilhard during the next year to go to the Polytechnic to study Mineralogy for a mining career, there were elements in Teilhard’s recent schooldays which must have given them cause for hope because they could see that he was not — even then — a pietistic religious who did not have a mind of his own.

The crisis for this critical mind which lived ambivalently in the environments of religion and science, both of which had grown from the Teilhard parental womb came when Jesuit school was left behind and life of adult work came into view.

Teilhard had left school with many academic prizes and then suddenly and by misfortune not inability he failed his maths baccalaureate.1 At the same time he had a severe attack of the family tuberculosis and so could not do his military service. For these two reasons — to recover health and to re-take an exam —

---

1. At this point Appendix A in the form of brother Joseph Teilhard is able to correct Speight, op. cit. p.28.
Teilhard had to stay at home for a whole year just at the time when the adult world was ready to welcome him into its work. He had not left Mongré saying definitely that he was going to continue in the Jesuit environment, he had no clear idea as to what he should do, and he had to stay in a house where people smiled with perhaps more than surprise at the successful student failing an exam, and where he had only been happy at his own work or out-of-doors. In this environment the first elements of his identity had to be forged. The academically-bright, hard-working, well-behaved and very-pure Pierre Teilhard had to find himself during a year of ill-health, self-doubt and present parental attention.

3. Entrance into the Jesuit novitiate.

Luther's entrance into the monastery at Erfurt is similar to Teilhard's decision at the age of seventeen to enter the Jesuit novitiate in Aix-en-Provence. Erikson posits for Luther a time of acute identity-crisis, marked by tristitia, in which he was searching for some "direct" and "mutual recognition" of his adult identity, in which the "so-called schizophrenic" processes took him into "total psychological involvement" with monastic life, in which a "sexual moratorium" had to be begun because the time was not yet ripe for sexual fulfilment and he was not yet willing, before he was forced to, to "suffer all the adult sacrifices" such as the loss of Ego feared often in direct sexual involvement. Thus the fatherly monastery would give him the identity imagined from personal contacts in the monk-filled town, he would both obey his father in being in honourable, higher class activity, and disobey him in not marrying and not going into Law, and such a solution of both sexual and Oedipal problems would allow him to become who he was, especially as envisaged in the fearsome moment of the thunderbolt. Luther's entrance was not a conversion but a development of growing unconscious identity and freedom.

Teilhard's passage to Aix is parallel to this. While still at Mongré he had entertained the possibility of joining the Jesuits and Jesuit Authority there agreed that he probably had a genuine vocation and said that no obstacle would be put in his way from their side. Confirmation, Devotion to the Virgin, zeal in the Immaculate Conception Society and interest in joining the Jesuits show a constant commitment to the Church and some "schizophrenic" imagination at least before Teilhard left school. Fatherly direction by Jesuit priests must have been a function of all of these elements of Teilhard's behaviour in those days, and the early infancy tranferences of love-of-mother to sisters and nannies and of love-of-father to scientist peers would suggest that one or more teachers at Mongré were fruitful peers to Teilhard. From this point of view entering the Order would be a continuance of fatherly recognition of Teilhard's religious identity; and the gaiety which appeared in him at Aix suggests that here a hoped-for identity was being warmly and directly recognised by Fathers. Further the sexual moratorium begun with dedication to the Virgin and her Immaculate Conception as mediated by Jesuit priests would be continued in a community which was markedly other-worldly and fearful of sexuality.¹

Teilhard's brother Joseph tells of the depressed, worried and anti-social behaviour of Teilhard during the summer of 1898. Fear of early death may well have been with the sick young man, as it was with Luther and as it is with many going through identity-crisis. If he is to be imagined at this time "triste" as he was earlier and later, then it is possibly Identity-Crisis which is the answer to the general question of "anguish" and "anxiety" in Pierre Teilhard. Sadness at exam-failure, shame in the face of family-smiles, rebelliousness at father's demand for

Polytechnic, sexual self-doubt in refusals to go to parties and dances with flirting Alberic, identity-doubt in never having Mongré or family friends home for a meal, soreness at not being able to follow the military family's Service expectations, perhaps some hypochondria during this time as there was in his old age—such a picture of an anguished summer is not an unlikely one, and shows Teilhard taken back to infancy crises and being in the throes of adolescence.

What had happened at Mongré was that Teilhard had felt that he may be having a "call" to "leave the world": when the decision to join the Jesuits was now made sometime in 1898 he said that he wanted to join so as to be "most perfect". The story of a young Teilhard crossing the road to miss a cleric in black had shown some rebellion and also an unconscious knowledge that the Church could affect him emotionally as his mother and father did. Now in 1898 after a school history in which the ideas and practices of Church and Jesuit Order had called for devotional and practical response in Teilhard, through peers perhaps rather than through clerical pressure, he is needing devotion and repudiation in relation to his parental womb but also to further the development of his "divided selves" and eventually through crisis to establish his identity.

To be "most perfect" in relation to ideas of "leaving the world" sounds a motive of a schizophrenic mind. On the other hand it was the prevailing idea of being a Jesuit in France at that time, and it was also very much the religion of Teilhard's mother. Thus the motive for joining the Jesuits was to do with obedience to his mother and to peers at his school. The Jesuit Order also is deliberately "military" in ethos, with clear objectives, precise and unrelenting methods and planning, and ruthless execution. Its hierarchy is ruled by a "General" in Rome and its ideology rests on the spiritual "Exercises" of its founder. Its list of historical peer-examples, its world-wide missions, its

1. Fr. Décerbles sounds a reasonable mentor and not a clerical superego, though this does not mean that there were none in the Mongré Community who exerted undue pressure on the young adolescents in their care. (cf. Speight, op. cit. p.28).
ideal of absolute obedience to the Pope (in Jesus' place)—this set of ideas, this Weltanschauung and way of life was emotionally affecting to Teilhard till he died; and in that the Order held itself to have all the answers to every problem both human and divine, it must have been as attractive an answer to Teilhard's identity-problem as the monastery was to Luther.\(^1\) In this sense as well as in the military, patriarchal ethos, the Order would have taken on the role of father to Teilhard. He would be being obedient to his father in ethos while being disobedient to him in practice. This disobedience shows the healthy nature of Teilhard's development through the Oedipus crisis, and the growth of a mind of his own—he had rejected father's periodicals, shooting and dance-suggestions all year, and now he finally rejected the Mining Engineer identity thrust on him by his father. But with the disobedience was the renunciation of much parental security and ideology, and in this the divided selves were casting off earlier skins in the interest of a whole new pelt.

Entrance into the Order was also obedience and disobedience to his mother. Her religion would make her feel that one of her children should be a priest. She was a "nun at heart" and Teilhard in being priest and Jesuit would be following her as his peer and obeying her as mother. Brother Joseph notes that Pierre in his mother's eyes "was amazingly well-behaved".\(^2\) This would mean that Teilhard in wanting to be "most perfect" was following a trait in himself which was warmly approved by his mother already on the level of human behaviour, and as religious ideal just as warmly approved by her, as testified by her own devotional practice. Life-long "spiritual" correspondence with this son Pierre and the fact that she was not mentioned by Joseph as having opposed Françoise\(^1\)' entry in the Little Sisters

2. Appendix A.
suggests that Teilhard's entry into the Jesuits was approved by his mother. The way that the male members reacted to Françoise's decision, their semi-ridicule of Teilhard's refusal to go dancing and wenching, their disbelief when he did not worry if the bird he shot at did not fall dead suggests that there was a male-female tension in the family, and that at the time of entrance to the Jesuits it was a marked refusal to go father's ways and instead a mother-approved course of action that distinguished Pierre. Ill, alone with himself, denied manhood's military service, despised in some ways by his father, he found his salvation in the mother's love of oral infancy, and in obedience to her unconscious and conscious being followed her into total devotion to Mother Church and motherly religious Order.

In disobedience, too, to his mother Teilhard departed geographically from her. She always felt the geographical separations which her sons all made. None of them really stayed at home. On Teilhard's side the 1898 decision may have been a deliberate leaving of the parental womb, but if not it certainly was an unconscious renunciation of the infancy-needs of the physical presence of mother, and a sign that his Ego could envisage long periods away from mother with equilibrium, for Jesuit work was world-wide and the training usually included mission-work abroad.

In fine Teilhard's decision to enter the Jesuit Order was a matter of obedience to his mother and to the ethos and peers of his father, but also of disobedience to his mother's mother-ness and to his father's conscious wishes. It arose during prolonged identity-crisis and specifically followed the adventurous, thought-experimental, ideal-image-growing "so-called schizophrenia" which had appeared in infancy and childhood, had produced a definite identity in priesthood when he was nine and had encouraged ideas of joining the Jesuits when at Jesuit school and after religious experience in dedication to Mary the Virgin. Family womb in religion and ethical ethos was adhered to in this decision and so were the Ego's developing selves and the particular identity which was to be found by Teilhard. That entrance
into the Jesuit novitiate was also a "psycho-sexual moratorium" in which the selfs and his identity could develop, is suggested not only by choice of spirituality and celibacy and by following a path loyal to mother's unwavering love, but also by the history of the next years as the identity-crisis crises of sexuality, intimacy, generativity and ego-integrity are struggled through. This also shows that Teilhard's entrance into the novitiate had reasonable roots in normal development through solutions to the Oedipal crises and wholesome Ego-development. There is no evidence of snap decision rooted in fear, superstition or Superego in family or Order. To go into the Jesuits at the time was a going beyond mother and father, an acceptance of the validity and fruitfulness to him of earlier schizophrenic adventure, and a social and political decision since the Jesuits were at the time being suppressed by Government legislation. In 1898 Teilhard developed through the parental womb into the outside world by the narrow opening of schizophrenic reality-testing in adolescent identity-crisis. That it was reality-testing and Ego-development is shown by the tale which follows, in which the thread which makes sense of it is Erikson's theoretical framework, and in which the proof is in the impact of Teilhard's ideas on the individual and social realities which made up his environment. Erikson notes\(^1\) that religious people tend to have perpetual identity-crisis and that the age of thirty is very important for a person who has not yet found his identity. Teilhard in fact was aged thirty when the final identity appeared, yet this did not mean that the crises never recurred: they did. But Erikson quotes W. James as observing that the late teens and early twenties are the period of growing identity-crisis. Teilhard was about eighteen when he joined the Jesuits and as with Luther one may envisage a year of bliss in which all decision was unnecessary and the new ideology being indoctrinated was fully satisfying emotionally and intellectually.

---

But this course did not last very long. In 1902 the adventurous dreaming took a new form and changed his life. In 1904 Teilhard also started writing for himself. In 1912 he at last acknowledged who he was. The crises continued and continued. The story is as interesting as Luther's.
CHAPTER V

THE JESUIT YEARS: 1898-1912.

Teilhard left home and its extended family group to enter a community which had its own ethos, aims, rules and people. This community of the Jesuits he never left, but in 1912 he took as his work the work of the Scientific community. It is in this sense that it is possible to describe the years 1898-1912 as "the" Jesuit years.

The Jesuit Seminary at Aix-en-Provence has been described by Canon Martindale. On three counts Martindale notes that the students were at odds with the Faculty and on a fourth the same may be surmised. First, the "contemptuous young men" were "self-conscious" in their clerical garb. In France the Society of Jesus was so unworldly that Martindale wondered whether he was not "too worldly" for it; and he was astonished in Italy at finding the Jesuits retreating back into their self, with "modern" priests who wanted to "meet" the people being thought "audacious" by their Superiors. At Aix there were clearly some men who wished to live within the modern world.

Second the Community's policy on Chastity was one of "funk and prudery". The Novice-Master Lanversin urged them to pray to the Virgin Mary whenever they saw "poster", "nudities" or even statues in the world outside! The teaching on Chastity was "unreal and negative", for instance unchastity was portrayed as belonging to "weak and soft characters"; and the Retreats attempted to induce "ridiculous scruples". Yet some students would not accept this and Martindale says that at Aix he "saw God in created things" for the first time.

---

1. Caraman, loc.cit.
2. op.cit. pp.80,85.
Third, Martindale had entered his novitiate with a copy of Tyrrell in his pocket. At Aix he remembers that Bremond was not trusted by the Faculty. Seeds of student dissent on the issues of Modernism were present in Aix students who felt fools in clerical garb, and in Martindale at least was one who loved the sensuality of Apuleius, wished new apostolic methods and read the Modernists.

Fourth, such students (who were perhaps a minority) were inculcated with the Ignatian Rule which by its Method of Choice allowed in fact "no choice". Fitting in with this was the demand that no "particular" friendships should be made by members of the Society, for this can harm it. All the emphasis in the Novitiate was on the impersonal ideals of the Society and its Rule.

As for Teilhard (who had become a friend of Martindale's as soon as he had arrived in Aix), all these four elements became matters of concern as the later writings show. Unpublished letters to his mother might elucidate Teilhard's feelings at the time, but until these are open to view the main events of his subsequent history alone can do this. In 1902 he rejected an "otherworldly" career. In 1905+ the vastness and reality of the physical universe was formally accepted by him. In 1909 "poor Tyrrell" and Bremond come into view. In 1912 Teilhard asked for and received a posting to extra-curricular Jesuit activity in a laboratory. All the time he was making particular friends. After 1911 he was making female friends and by 1914 virginity was an emotional and intellectual issue. His later concepts emphasised Human Effort. Often in later life he wished to re-write the Ignatian

2. op. cit. pp 89, 91, 80.
3. op. cit. p. 79.
4. These are in the family vaults. The Swiss Pastor Schellenbaum has read them and used them in his Ph.D. Thesis for de Lubac at Lyons. Probably they are more interesting than he suggests, if he is as sparingly eclectic and unperceptive as he reveals himself to be in his use of UPN material.
Exercises. In Erikson's scheme such development will be a function of his sexuality, "so-called" schizophrenic adventuring and needs for intimacy, identity and generativity. Historically it shows growing freedom vis-à-vis the Jesuit Community.

1. Parental Womb and Schizophrenic Adventure.

The Twentieth Century began for Teilhard with the move from Aix to Laval (October 1900), from Novitiate to Juniorate. Here he took his first vows as a Jesuit and wished that his parents could know "the joy I feel now that I have at last given myself completely and for ever to the Society". He was happy to join at a time of political persecution and the excitement of dressing up in lay clothes for exile in Jersey in 1902 must have been considerable. This second move added to unexpected family events was soon to change his life.

Jersey was where Pierre Teilhard's elder brother Alberic (the heir of the family) had been trained before entering the Navy and had found geological interests as father would have expected. But at the time of Pierre's move to Jersey, Alberic had been brought back from the Middle East on sick leave, and on September 27 Alberic died of T.B. at the family home of Sarcenat. At about the same time Teilhard's younger sister Guiguite developed T.B. of the spine and became bed-ridden, also at Sarcenat. So that during the latter half of 1902 Teilhard became the heir and future head of the family and the family was plunged into the horror of bereavement and permanent illness from which the parents never recovered.

This is the background to Teilhard's watershed psychological experience of 1902. The date of it is not known, but the following speculative interpretation does

---

1. 25 March 1901. Quoted in Teilhard de Chardin Album, p.25.
make sense of the story. Cuenot\(^1\) notes that Françoise (the elder sister) was going through psychological turmoil at the same time as Teilhard and it is reasonable to assume that the family shock of Alberic’s death helped to produce the turmoil in both of them. The spiritual exercises of the College, the prevailing "unworldly" ideology of the Jesuit Society and the rigorous routines which prevent aspiring Jesuits from living their own life might have been functions also of psychological disturbance, but Teilhard describes what happened to him in 1902 as himself "nearly going off the rails" which is an expression which Erikson uses concerning insanity. As with Luther it is perhaps Oedipus tension and massive personal conflict which gave to Teilhard the alternatives of personal madness or greatness.\(^2\)

The exact nature of what happened is not certain. It is known\(^3\) that at Jersey (as before and afterwards) the sea, sky, clouds, stars and turbulent air affected Teilhard physically as he stood among the cliffs and watched the sea. Nature at such times certainly took hold of him. As in the 1905\(^*\) temptations in Egypt to "dissolve himself in Nature"\(^4\), it is possible that experiences such as those described in W. James in which a man gazing over landscape from a high mountain temporarily loses his own "identity" and believes that the subsequent "illumination" is "communication with God"\(^5\) was one aspect of this 1902 crisis. This might explain Teilhard’s subsequent thought\(^6\) that he ought to give up geology now and devote himself entirely to what he called "supernatural" activities, and it might also explain the feeling that he was "going off the rails".

---

3. U.P.N., 1.16., quoted below in Part Two, Chapter eight.
4. Appendix A.
5. W. James, op.cit., pp.82-4.
Outwardly this account is satisfactory. Even in the light of previous chapters of this Thesis it makes sense because his love-of-mother as it was transferred to nannies, sisters and other people was also becoming love-of-nature in the early "cosmic feeling". That now he began feeling personally that there were "super"-natural realities would be simply related to his increasing perception of the "whole" of Nature and a nympholeptic happiness here in his experience was his mother's love again and within his mother's conceptual beliefs also. No wonder that he felt that now he should totally give himself to the "supernatural" because it would be both meeting and obeying his mother within the total experience of and commitment to Almighty God.

When the family events of the summer are considered, however, this account must be supplemented if its full significance is to be understood. In the account in Cuenot the figure of the Spiritual Advisor Troussard receives emphasis and it is noteworthy that it has been Teilhard's "crucified" Christ who has been suggesting the "supernatural" development and who is now recognised (through Troussard) as wishing a "natural" development of Teilhard. For Françoise also was gazing at a crucifix during these days. Within the family depression this might be expected. Is it too much to suppose that Teilhard's advice to Françoise was the same as that given to himself by Father Troussard? They should look at the Christ who is on the cross, not only at the cross itself.

If the background to the events is that of family tragedy then Troussard's advice is to do with pastoral problems met in the psychological turmoil of bereavement as well as with spiritual experience of God. That is, Troussard is working to solve an ego-chill or identity-crisis in Teilhard which is in relation to his parental womb. This would be parallel to what Erikson found in Luther: the

---

2. Erikson, loc. cit.
father-figure Staupitz had to find a therapy by means of which the "true religion" which he perceived in Martin could eventually be released.

What is conceivable then in Teilhard's case is the following.

When Alberic died of T.B. Teilhard was suddenly the heir and future head of the family. He had always been intimate with Alberic but had had to reject most of the activities of his elder brother so as remain an individual, and this had perhaps included a rejection of the father who adored Alberic as his first-born and heir. Now suddenly the need to be different had vanished overnight and responsibility for two parents and Françoise and the other children was thrust upon Pierre. How he loved his mother, cared for her and wished to help her. How he loved his father, needed him and wished to help him. How could he uphold the honour of the Teilhards and care for them; he a Jesuit and future priest?

This would be mainly unconscious. Teilhard would take his problems to the open air. As the waves crashed on the cliffs and the wind and spray flexed the muscles of his neck and mind he met his loving God in the physical world and felt the supernatural. He knew he was priest and Christian, but how not to give up his family responsibility and their love?

In Erikson's thesis Troussard would now come to Teilhard as the latter's father. As priest and Christian who was genuinely meeting God in supernatural experience Teilhard was following one part of his personality and obeying his mother. But Troussard had been watching Teilhard and Pelletier making geological excursions and perhaps had known through Bremond or Teilhard himself of Emmanuel Teilhard's mineralogical family; and the solution which he gave to Teilhard's psychological problem was the psychoanalytic therapy of redressing the Oedipal

1. cf. Teilhard de Chardin, Letters from Egypt, New York, Herder and Herder, 1965, p.202, where Teilhard is described as in fact being very like Alberic by a priest who knew them both.
imbalance in Pierre Teilhard. Just as Staupitz had given Martin Luther therapy by ordering him to a hobby, so now Troussard encouraged Teilhard to continue and increase his geological hobby. In this way Teilhard was made to obey his father while still obeying his mother. In this way he was pulled back to his parental womb by fulfilling the expectations of both parents, supernatural and natural, the while becoming the orthodox replacement for Alberic and indeed becoming like him. In this way sanity was retained, the realities found through adventurous schizophrenia accepted, the realities of family need and expectation also accepted, and a balanced identity found and accepted for Teilhard of religion and scientific research both held together. The death of Alberic, the psychological experience which warned of schizophrenia and the father-figure Troussard's wise perception set in train the developments in Teilhard which produced both his identity and his originality.

From this point of view it was solution of the Oedipus Complex which resulted in the further development of Teilhard. What were to become his two professions were direct productions of obedience to the two parents, the Science profession being mediated by Troussard's pastoral advice. Teilhard's obedience to his mother in taking the Novitiate vows to be out of and against the world was now complemented by listening to the father-figure Troussard demanding that he follow his father into the Natural Sciences of the physical world. Yet even when a further parallel to Luther is adduced by suggesting that in the 1902 turmoil Teilhard was saying — as per the fit in the choir — "but this is not me!", the question of what happened to Teilhard is not answered completely by the suggestion of Oedipal problem resolution. When Staupitz gave the answer to Luther that it was not God who was dreaded "for God consoles", Staupitz' words acted as a "theological revelation" as well as pastoral

1. Erikson, op.cit., 21,27.
therapy. It could be maintained that Troussard’s words about “natural” development echoed Emmanuel Teilhard’s philosophy so that Teilhard realised that his father loved him just as Luther discovered. But more probably, because Teilhard seems not to have had so great a problem with his father as Luther had with his, the theological revelation which Teilhard received from Troussard was to do not with God’s nature but to do with Teilhard’s own identity. Even so the “supernatural” reality which Teilhard met on the cliffs was joined through Troussard by the idea of the theological validity of “natural” reality, a theological revelation which was to become formally conscious in the conversion to non-dualist Evolution in 1911–12.

With resolution of the Oedipus Complex by means of acceptance of both parents in two parental areas of work, therefore, there was also new theological perception. Teilhard’s identity was being molded by cleaving to the parental womb and also by emerging from it into his own work in the world by means of theological revelation.

Troussard’s direction then forged the destiny of Teilhard’s life. Seeing the young man on the verge of a psychotic state he called for the development of two separate identities in response to parental need. He recognised in Teilhard’s spiritual experience the makings of true religion. In other words he encouraged both the selves of the divided Teilhard and the adventurous schizophrenia which was experienced, but he controlled them by earthing them in human work and physical and social reality. Whether he knew like Staupitz what he was doing is not known, but that he saved Teilhard from an irrational repudiation of his identity is not in doubt. It was a common Jesuit instruction for “natural” development to be followed, nor does the Society favour much personal religious experience. Yet one cannot help feeling that Troussard did recognise something special in Teilhard. For the latter always remembered this Father and recognised that through him he became himself.

Troussard had in fact reaffirmed Teilhard's childhood solution to the Oedipus struggle. Work for Christ was being continued, the danger of a nympholeptic catastrophe had been averted and his Science had now been brought within the Order and was part of Teilhard's work for Christ. The suggestion of geology as a serious hobby indeed was all that Teilhard needed to strike out again as in his childhood towards his own destiny.

By the end of 1902 Teilhard had given geological specimens to the Jersey museum, and not long afterwards an article about Jersey appeared in a local publication. The significance of this was that gifts had been given to a new community and had been welcomed and accepted. He had been refused by the traditional spirituality when he had wanted to become a full-time member of the "other" world and had been directed instead to Science. Now nympholeptic search within his father's realm had reaped the reward of approval, acceptance and cooperation, and without repudiating one side of his personality he could learn from and work with other people outside the Jesuit community. Identity-anxiety and infancy self-doubt gave way to knowledge of, approval by and love for the scientific community. At one with father-conscience, with his parents and with God Teilhard could now roam the Jersey cliffs and beaches in scientific exploration, happy in his dual identity, working in two roles, his unconscious already no doubt incubating the future integration of his personality.

It is worth looking at who Teilhard's peers seem to have been up till 1902. There had been his sister Françoise who had in a sense replaced his mother and the nannies. Then his father, perhaps replaced by Alberic. No school-contemporaries seem to have been peers to him, but when he was nine the priest was Ideal-image, later followed by Jesuits, and meanwhile some university researchers were sparking him in vacation work, and in Physics the Père Désribes. Crozé then appeared with
the fire of Mathematics and Life and with Brémond Crozé was a first-hand experience of a literary man, having written War Memoirs and translated Sir Walter Scott. Representatives of five communities were thus present as peers to Teilhard. Albéric in the Family Community, Déscribes in the Scientific, Crozé in the Savant, priests (and mother) in the Catholic and Jesuits like de Bélinay in the Jesuit Community.¹

What happened in Jersey simply carried on this process of being within specific communities. The physicist de Valois and astronomer Noury enthused Teilhard, there were Jesuits to deepen his Jesuit commitment and fellow-students if not professors who would have introduced him to further questions raised by the Savants.

As early as 1902 Valensin was writing² to Blondel, whose lectures Teilhard may have attended in 1898–9 at Aix. With Blondel, Tyrrell and Loisy appearing through a friend of Brémond in The Bulletin together in 1904, Brémond (Tyrrell’s friend) having left the Order and Loisy being now on the Index, aspects of Modernism were in the student air. Indeed two of the Jersey professors, Nicolardot and Poncel were accused of Modernism in 1903. By all accounts Teilhard was untouched by such Modernism at the time, and yet after Brémond’s critiques at Aix and both his and Martindale’s relationships with Tyrrell, the issues of Modernism especially those directly concerned with the matter of Science and Religion must have been there in Teilhard’s unconscious. However, Teilhard did not feel as thunderstruck as Martindale when Pascendi appeared in 1907³, and though much of the later Teilhard uses identical language to that of the writers of The Programme of Modernism (1908), he was hardly joining in the Modernist controversy. During 1902–12 Teilhard’s

---

thought-organ nevertheless was taking in information from the avant-garde theological community, part also of the broader community of Savants.

In the Scientific Community Teilhard also progressed. The 1902 museum gifts turned into the first professional geological article, on the geology of Jersey, which appeared in 1904. The next year saw him continuing Jesuit training at their college in Egypt. This meant that he was teaching secondary students Chemistry and Physics. His own knowledge was pre-atomic. But during 1905-7 he must have been catching up on Planck and Einstein for by 1908 he was speaking of the "grandeur" of the new theories. In 1905 however he was still very conservative and unoriginal in his use of Duhem and Poincaré.

Egypt was soon very important to him for its geology. He was put in charge of the school museum and began spending his spare time in expeditions for fossils. During these he found rare insects and unknown fossils. Sending these to experts in the various fields he soon became known by name to eminent scientists, and new fossils were named after him. In 1908 Teilhard wrote a more specifically professional article on the Eocene in Egypt and felt a growing interest in the Tertiary, the geological age which saw the rise of mammals. He was progressively moving into the Scientific community.

Also in Egypt Teilhard entered more the general Savant community. To the early influences of his Latinist, Naturalist and Archivist father and the literary historian Bremond, and to the more recent influences of Jersey students and professors were added meetings with travellers and with the French community (especially) in Cairo. Thus the archaeologist and anthropologist Maspéro so fired Teilhard that he might even seem a peer to the Jesuit. The impressive missionary friend, de Bélinay, the Assyriologist Neyrand, the engineer-geologist Fourtau; such men widened Teilhard's horizons just as much as the physical searchings in the desert expeditions.
During the latter however occurred further psychological experience without which the Hastings events with the "executive concepts" cannot be explained.

3. The continuing experimental schizophrenia: Jersey, the Egyptian desert, "cosmic consciousness" and the Savant Community.

The experience of what was described as "supernatural" in 1902 has been interpreted above as adventurous schizophrenia closely related to love-of-mother, with Troussard being the father who kept the Oedipal balance. His schizophrenia moved Teilhard out of traditional Jesuit rule and practice and belief, and childhood self-doubt and insecurity prevailed until he was directed to his father, to the scientific home loved by his father. Thus without repudiating his mother and his identity in his Jesuit house he was able to move into the scientific community and there learn from others, be approved and find his new identity.

What must be noted here is that as well as realising that he himself was two people related to his two parents Teilhard did not deny what he had experienced although he took up Science. Whatever the experience was his mother would have said that it was personal experience of God-of-Nature, the true-reality such as our saint-mystic forebears knew, the supernatural Presence of God; and that he must believe that this God-of-Nature is no different from his personal emotional relationship with and dependence on the Christ-of-the-Sacred-Heart whom the family at Sarcenat love. On the other hand his father might (like Troussard) have seen a danger of psychotic religiosity, and from his historical and scientific perspectives might have suggested that Teilhard solve the question of his experience's reality by means of ideas of (for instance) the impact of ether- or gravitation-corpuscles on the brain-consciousness, or by study of heightened sensitivity or psychological flux-dissolution — his scientific father's values of the scientific paradigms of the day might have affected Teilhard thus.

Reflection by Teilhard on his experience anyway did not result in denial of 1. Such as Laing (op. cit.) would posit.
its reality. His belief in God was not shaken. But neither — it must be
surmised in the light of his later reading of William James as well as his 1903
commitment to the concept of "cosmic consciousness" through Maréchal\(^1\) — did he
simply accept the experience as of "supernatural" "God". Most probably\(^2\), now that
he was scientist as well as Jesuit he read anything he could find which might
interpret his experience scientifically, although its Godish reality which had
suggested at the time that he should give himself to a life of monastic practice
of the Presence of God was never reduced.

This picture of religious and scientist together probing the anomaly of
what had happened in 1902 is helped by what is known of his earlier and later
life. Not till 1905 is another psychic experience recorded, but what had taken
place with regularity since he was four and which continued all his life was awe-
gazing with the stars on still nights (as a child he knew all their names),
breathing with the surging sea on the cliffs, long walks in the lonely woods and
the happy feeling of just being with and part of Nature. His "distant" mind filled
with interest and wonder at the touch of the earth. Silent, stopped in a forest
track he could "feel" intensely the "life" filling the air. When within Nature
he had the sense of awe.\(^3\) This means that between 1902 and 1905 the dream-like
experiences may well have occurred though at lower intensities. The sensitivity
involved in psychic adventure will not have been totally absent.

Possibly there were sexual tensions in Teilhard at this time: photographs
suggest this.\(^4\) The intensity of his later thought on the matter in 1914, 1916–7

---

1. See below.
2. Judging by his later practice in time of emotional-intellectual need as
evidenced in UPN, p.XVI. cf. MM 138,152.
3. So de Terra in N. Corte, Pierre Teilhard de Chardin: His Life and Spirit,
London, Barry and Rockliffe, 1960,
and 1934 especially leave no doubt as to his psychic involvement in the matter of sexuality, and at the age of twenty-three and in the company of such as Leversin the reactionary and Martindale the sensualist, the questions raised by the Church teaching on sexuality especially in relation to priestly celibacy must have been torment to most of the young men in Jersey. Though there is no firm evidence for this there is a recollection of a missing photograph dating from the period, and the young woman involved might have been a function too of adventurous dreaming and Virginity query, albeit unconscious.

De Wespin also notes Teilhard as remembering a Paris Exhibition of this period. The exotic pavilion of some Asian people filled him with dreams of the East and an intuition of the great wide world. This memory might in fact refer to the Japanese exhibition to which Teilhard went during his Hastings days. But he was in fact little moved by that exhibition, so more probably dreams of the East which had been begun through Alberic's sojourn in Turkey were increased by some 1903-4 exhibition, and all in anticipation of going to the Egyptian diocese of the Paris-Lyons Province of the Jesuits in 1905.

In the desert in 1905+ anyway Teilhard returned to memorable psychic experience. In the towns of Egypt he had found the people, the colourful and bustling streets and the atmosphere exotic and exhilarating. Now in the fossil-strewn wastes under harsh sun and desolate darkness he consciously felt in danger, the psychic danger of a "vast doubt", a "night of the soul" and a "pantheism" in which he felt himself being "diffused" in the vastnesses of Nature.

As in the 1902 experience the phenomena referred to in W. James come at once

1. UPL (34L152).
2. By Cuenot.
3. LHP.
4. Appendix A.
5. Iac.cit.
to mind. But differences in the two accounts are plain to see. In 1902 it is 
the "supernatural" which is experienced, in 1905 the dissolution of the ego in the 
vastness of creation, of the drop in the ocean. If 1902 had seen adventurous 
schizophrenia experiencing what his mother had always said was reality, in 1905 
the same sensitivity had experienced the world as his father knew it, in its physical 
reality which held man as a particle of dust in its great spaces. In psycho-
analytic terms 1902 might have been infant nympholeptia with sudden realisation 
and rebellion that his father-ego-ideal was being repressed. In this case 1905 is 
completely different and represents not Oedipal problem but the original metaphysical 
"ego-chill" of the infant. But now it is a changed self-doubt because it is a 
conscious mind which is whirling in its aloneness in the cosmos. It is the perspect-
ive of the endless modern-physical universe which is chilling the ego and whirling 
the mind. It is the reality-world which has been feeding Teilhard's mind through 
his involvement in the scientific community which is now being tested and of which 
he now realises that he is a part. The adventurous dreaming-schizophrenia pulls 
him into the physical immensities of a fantastic universe and of this he suddenly 
feels a real part.

Such an interpretation which suggests a reality-testing experience of the 
universe, in other words suggests that it was a new peak of consciousness which was 
reached by means of the dark night of the soul. Both the 1902 experience of reality 
outside of himself which he could only describe as Goddish and the 1905 experience 
of physico-cosmic reality were thus thought-organ perceptions within reality-testing 
processes as well as functions of Oedipal tension and womb. In that they were 
remembered and re-lived and re-developed during later life both experimentally and 
on paper, it means that they may also be described as Gestalten. They produced 
mental re-orientation by the patterns they made in perceptual reality in Teilhard's 
consciousness and self-consciousness, and they brought paradigm-problems to be
solved and conceptual and intellectual needs to be met, if regression to super-
ego was not to occur and if his truth-need was to be satisfied. In this sense
these two psychic experiences were the beginnings of what Erikson calls
"theological revelation". Teilhard was a Christian priest and he was a geological
scientist. This produced tension on the question of the nature of Nature and of
Creation. 1902 convinced him of supernatural reality, 1905 of physical reality.
The nature-of-Nature was now an intellectual anomaly to be solved personally by one
committed emotionally to both Religion and Science. At this point the question of
Teilhard's identity is no longer that of solution to Oedipal press except at
second remove, perhaps unlike that of Luther. Now it is conceptual resolution which
is needed and an "executive concept" to meet present reality as well as the residue
of parental womb. God is known and the World is known, and new ideas are needed
to make sense of this new real knowledge. The nympholeptic man of the thinking,
dreaming mind needed to solve this with a new Gestalt.

In Egypt Teilhard had "enjoyed himself to the full" with field-work, class-
room work, rite and rosary, self-disciplined and with autonomous will-power as
obedient son and member of the Jesuit community. But in 1907 came the Encyclical
Pascendi and in 1908 Teilhard read of "cosmic consciousness". Perhaps for the
first time consciously he had to ask himself the Identity-question "who am I?",
and this because some of the ideas with which he had been thinking were now under
attack by the Institutional Church in Rome. This is speculation and perhaps the
question arose three or four years later in precise terms, but a look at Teilhard's
mental environment in his communities and at a hitherto unpublished jotting dating
1908 as a Gestalt-year shows at any rate that Teilhard's individual development was
continuing, and in a straight line towards his original concepts of 1916. That
is to say the Gestalten as they came historically in series were functions of the
one before and so of the 1916 one of Christ-Kosmos.

1. For this concept see Part Two and WTW.
Pascendi appeared in September 1907, a year before Teilhard returned from Cairo, and there was no hint at the time of anxiety in Teilhard. Argument from silence in his letters to his parents is however not convincing. If he was pursuing geology and teaching science he could not have failed to observe growing clouds on the horizons of Catholic scientists. In 1902 Pope Leo XIII had begun to control ideas. In 1904 Pius X wrote specifically against "scientific" men and denied aspiring scientists Ordination. In 1905 Condamin's Commentary on Genesis was pulled out of circulation because of its approach to the first three chapters from within modern scientific knowledge. In 1906 Tyrrell who was known as geologist as well as mystic was violently attacked and then thrown out of the Jesuit Order (1907). In 1906 Condamin attacked Houtin on Catholic Dogma and also had his own Second Isaiah stopped. In 1907 Le Roy's work on Dogma was forbidden by Cardinal Richard of Paris. 1908 saw the excommunication of Loisy and the deprival of Abbé Portal's office, 1909 the recanting of Brémond, and in the same year the Pope's rejection of the scientific view of Creation.

Since much of the Modernist controversy was conducted in the Jesuit periodical Etudes it is too much to assume that Teilhard did not have it all in his mind, though he need not have read the Modernist books himself. Personal contact also must not be minimised. At Aix Teilhard had been with Brémond with the latter's ascetic, intellectual and mystical problems, with Martindale whose problems were similar, and in the city where Laudet's religious politics were spread abroad in 1899 and where Blondel lived and taught. The move to Jersey must have sharpened

1. Books of the Modernists are, eg. as follows:—
up theory about the nature of the Church and of its future. Jersey was geology
with Buvier-Lapierre and Pelletier, astronomy with Noury and Physics with de Valois. But it also was lectures by Nicolardot and Poncel both in Modernist trouble, and it may have been also the reading of Maeterlinck's book on bees (1901) through his father, the reading of Charcot in *Revue Hebdomadaire* on Faith Healing, sexuality and hysteria (1902), and personal emotion when his father's friend Bremond's hero Newman had his *Grammar of Assent* condemned in 1902. Teilhard may also have been affected by the Jesuit Hymynthe Loyson who had written of the Religion of the Future (a future phrase of Teilhard's) and had left the Jesuits in 1901 to get married. Teilhard's lukewarm use of Sacred Heart theology also suggests that the 1901 forays at Lourdes by a Jesuit who preached the Warrior Virgin and Sacred Heart did not make up for the disreputable aspects of the history of the Sacred Heart followers at the turn of the century. While Teilhard's later friendships with the Abbé Portal (1913+), Edouard Le Roy (1924+) and the Blondelian-Newmanian Auguste Valensin (1899+, but mainly 1916+) suggest that the early controversies did make their mark in Teilhard's unconscious at least.

Inside Teilhard then in 1908 must have been at any rate the unconscious seeds of identity—doubt as to whether he was on Hume's side or not, especially since Bremond and Tyrrell at least were concerned with mystic experience such as Teilhard had himself experienced. The reference to Maréchal (and other's) "cosmic consciousness" in 1908 would confirm this.¹

There is nothing to suppose that Teilhard went to Hastings from Egypt in 1908 by way of Louvain. So probably Teilhard read of Maréchal's cosmic consciousness in the article in Louvain's new periodical *Revue des Questions Scientifiques* (1908-9).² In the July/Sept. number of *Etudes* Emile Boutroux (whom Teilhard read

---

1. UFN for 12 Feb. 19. A very important text.
2. This is among articles cited by Bremond in 1912+ in *The Literary History of Religious Thought in France*, (2 vols.), London, SPCK, 1930, pp. 431ff.
much later on) had written on Science and Religion to introduce his new book on the subject, and perhaps his recent books on Comte and Spencer and his 1909 second edition of William James' *The Varieties of Religious Experience*. If (as is likely) Teilhard had already read Bergson's *Creative Evolution* and had noted that William James would have written the Foreword to this if he had lived, Teilhard might be expected to have fastened on to an article from an established natural historian and theologian writing from the Jesuit University where Cardinal Mercier had much earlier introduced some modern psychology and new philosophical theology. Reading James and Bergson was reading people who would be on the Index, reading Bouthreau was to read a lay and perhaps minor Catholic philosopher. But an article by Maréchal from Louvain was a totally Christian and orthodox piece of writing by a theologian and scientist.

It is suggested in this Thesis that Maréchal is the clue to the conceptual development of Teilhard, that the 1906 article reinforced Teilhard's own experience and unconscious interpretations, and that later articles by him and especially by de Grandmaison in 1913 prepared the way by again reinforcing but also boosting the experiences by giving new language to describe them, the new language of the concepts which emerged into Teilhard's conscious in late 1915. Here it is necessary only to show that Teilhard in 1906 realised that there were mystics who were not Modernist and against the Establishment, that there were scientific thinkers about pantheist phenomena within the Church and Jesuit Theological Faculties, and that there were ways of thinking about modern knowledge which did not mean that he had to give up his geology or his own understandings.

When he arrived in Hastings therefore Teilhard could remain what he had been in Egypt, a Jesuit Christian with a serious commitment to scientific reality and to his own mystical experience. That at his new College a Professor Bouvier had refuted Loisy in 1903 and Condamin Houtin in 1906 would not worry Teilhard, for
in fact Condamin was still lecturing on Genesis and on more than one Isaiah, and Bouvier was in contact with Maréchal and the former Ecole professor de Grandmaison and with them was to start the Louvain Ethnological Conferences in 1910. If men like Maréchal and de Grandmaison (and their friends) could experience what Teilhard had experienced (he might have thought) and could still work and live a Jesuit for Christ, then so could Teilhard. There is no hint of intellectual worry in Teilhard until 1911 and even then "what to worry?" for Maréchal and de Grandmaison were his encouragers and friendly censors until they died. They helped him to grow into and to keep his full identity.

Mention of Surin also in the cosmic consciousness text in UPN as well as of Maréchal should perhaps lead the interpreter to posit the growth becoming more clearly defined of a Mystic self as well as scientific and Jesuit selves. The dual personality growing from parental womb and Oedipus Complex solution is becoming a tried. Surin as radiant personal Christic religion is that of mother, but cosmic consciousness in its undertone of scientific enquiry is a function of father. But neither father nor mother could produce what is growing specifically in Teilhard. At last some conceptual originality is beginning to appear within the growing third identity of Teilhard.

For the next two years Teilhard's scientific and religious selves also progress uneventfully but positively. Within a month of being at Hastings Teilhard had read up the geology of Sussex and was finding it "remarkable". Within three months he had met and worked with Butterfield of the local museum, within six he and

---

1. Mention of Surin whom Teilhard sees as a forerunner of Universal-Christ Christology (L.Z., p.63) may not mean any special new influence in Teilhard's life since Surin had probably been a peer-hero to youthful enthusiasts at Mongré. But Le Bachelet had done his doctoral thesis on the 1613-16 Jesuit controversies and so may have introduced Surin intellectually to Teilhard in 1908. So of course may Bussescot.
other students had sent a report of a meteorite to Cosmos to be published, within nine he was a friend of amateur geologist Dawson and with Dawson and Butterfield was working on a Sussex Iguanodon. With a year 1 he had the "glory!" of a Jersey geological article. Within two years he saw in print that new Egyptian fossils were named after him and his fossils from Sussex were in the Natural History Museum in Kensington. Within three years the London Geological Society had accepted a fossilised molar from him, he was sending such material to a Cambridge palaeo-botanist, and was at ease with entomologists, ornithologists, palaeo-botanists, archaeologists as well as with amateur geologists and professional experts like Smith-Woodward of the British Museum. The three years are a record of considerable geological research and increasing professional knowledge. But they may be symbolised also by Teilhard's own joke about his "glory" and by his happy presentation to his father of the British Museum's Note published about a find which he had sent to them. His science was obedience to father.

The religious self was mainly concerned with the academic learning in College. The formal text-book was Pesch's Praelationis Domaticae with perhaps predecessors to Mercier's Manual of Modern Scholastic Theology 2 receiving unofficial attention at any rate by some staff. The Theology courses were found to induce reflection though not enthusiasm but Teilhard worked well and could argue publicly in the scholastic manner in defence, for instance, of the Eucharist. Condamin was a modern Biblical critic, Bouvier encouraged

1. The letter of 16 Jan. 1911. (The biographical material is found in LHP and Cuenot (1965)).
2. C. Pesch, Praelationis Domaticae, quas in Collegion Ditton-Nall habebat, (Freiburgi Brisgoriae Sumptibus Herder, 1899*).
students like Teilhard’s friend Huby to study the History of Religions and Le Bachelot had been in trouble over his approach to Original Sin, the Immaculate Conception and Modern Apologetics. Those were professors. But among fellow-students of Teilhard were Pierre Charles who had a concept of pre-cosmic Original Sin, Huby who studied Durkheim and Fraser in the history of religions, Valensin who read Blondel, Newman, Le Roy, Laberthonnière, von Hugel and Bremond, and Rousselet who reinterpreted Thomas Aquinas, held a "universal Christ" Christology and had his "Eye of Faith" doctrine put on the Index in 1920. Such students were within the intellectual milieu of Modernism without being Modernist. The religious self was growing well beyond mother.

Among professors and fellow-students then there was reinforcement of any tendency in Teilhard to experimental thinking. But his early religious articles suggest little originality. His first one was on Lourdes (late 1908). It has been criticised by Corte for not mentioning Charcot. But it does. Anyway Freud’s first Salzburg Conference was only just over and Teilhard was only just back from Egypt so that neither Bouvier’s Louvain interests nor Freudian disciples would have made any impact yet on the new student. But Teilhard does attempt to bring scientific knowledge into the discussion of Lourdes miracles and as Corte says a scientific concept important to Teilhard in later years does make its appearance now, that of "critical point". The scientific self is becoming strong enough to introduce information from itself into a religious discussion.

1. Both Loisy who was at the Collège de France in 1909 and Laberthonnière were much interested in the "evolution of ideas" in Law and Religion, following Newman. Since Loisy had written on this in the French Clergy Revue in 1899 this idea which was so important to the post-1915 Teilhard may have been incubating since that date. But Ore Place students would now be giving added impetus to it.


3. N. Corte, op.cit.
The significance of this 1909 article \(^1\) was also that new identity was being forged. The article could not have been written by father or mother and there is a certain mysticism in it about the working of the Spirit of God which anticipates the later Teilhard. The new self of Science-Religion-Mysticism based conceptually (but not originally) in Maréchal has now been accepted publicly by the Jesuit organ of information and communication whose new editor was de Grandmaison. A Savant community had accepted his gift just as the Religious community had accepted the gift of himself and the Scientific community the gift of his finds and his articles. At Hastings he was to say that he would rather teach than preach. This was after Egypt and \textit{locum} (religious) situations. But after the war though he wished to be a university professor it often looked as though he would rather do field-research and write than either teach or preach. Here in Hastings at any rate Teilhard was beginning to write in the manner which is original to him and which is not found in his scientific articles. Experimental theological or religious writing is part of his new identity.

1910 was however the end of an era. Soon Teilhard wrote\(^2\) an article on Man for a Catholic Encyclopaedia that year which denies an evolutionary origin for Man so as to safeguard his "transcendence" and the soul's "spirituality", and at the end of November he took the papally-ordered Anti-Modernist Oath without any qualms according to letters at the time. This was after Condamin had attacked Scientism and Teilhard could go along with him and even with veiled attacks on Duhem, Poincaré Bergson and Boutroux. For he had to to become a priest. This was his aim and the purpose for which his mother was jealous and not a little worried. But Teil-

---

1. Published as "Les miracles de Lourdes et les enquêtes canoniques", \textit{Etudes}, 20 Jan. 1909. See below, Chapter Seven.

2. \textit{cf.} LEP pp.277-8, note I. At the instigation of de Grandmaison Teilhard also attended a Louvain palaeontological conference this summer and perhaps the article reflects it. It was not published till 1912.
hard had also recently seen Maréchal at Louvain and no doubt he saw himself as thinking like that man and following him, and so being orthodox. The Oath was against "pantheism" but Teilhard was a Christian Mystic like Maréchal, and anyway, Brémond had recanted and was back in the Church. Curiosity about the Sillonist Encyclical probably did not mean worry but conversational interest in his father's broad political interests in concert with a Savant's broadmindedness about the Pope. The Mystic Self was growing through Orthodox Religion, so Teilhard thought. But the question is therefore how it is that Teilhard is lecturing on Evolution with enthusiasm in 1913, is incubating original ideas using Evolution in 1914 and is producing the scientifically and religiously novel concept of Christ-Kosmos at the turn of 1915-16.

1. LEP, p.174.
2. LEP, p.182 incl. note.
CHAPTER VI

CONCEPTUAL CONVERSION AND EXECUTIVE CONCEPT:

THE SOLUTION BY FEELING, WORK AND THOUGHT OF THE IDENTITY CRISIS.

The answer given in this present Thesis to how it was that the anti-Evolutionary became Transformist is threefold. First, there was a pantheist experience in which the idea "Evolution" had a living part to play. Second, the Oedipus problem was finally, emotionally and formally solved. Third, Louvain, Maréchal and de Grandmaison — with R.H. Benson — gave the conceptual information required for Teilhard's original concept to begin incubating. All this is according to Erikson's theory, the first being Gestalt, the second Work and the third communal acceptance, conceptual information and executive concept. Also entailed is sexuality and intimacy, generativity and acceptance of responses to new identity. All in all the Eriksonian thesis finds full play as Teilhard's identity-crisis nears its climax.

1. The 1911-12 Schizophrenic Adventure.

The pantheist experience took place in late December 1911. The one referred to in 1950 may be the same one or may suggest that there were more than one. What is not at issue in view of his later self-identification as a pantheist is that such experiences did occur in Teilhard's life, and the reader should not be ready to accept the editorial red-herring about Evolution as a concept which occurs concurrently with the account of the experience in LHP. The passage is as follows and the corner referred to is the little old village of Riculver with its

1. In The Heart of Matter, so far unpublished.
2. See below, Part Two.
3. LHP, p.277. The reader might also wonder at such a crucial paragraph being unfinished because "lost" just when it is becoming interesting. It is the only sentence in LHP which receives this fate.
ruined church by the Thames and the sea:-

"Vu sous un soleil rougeatre, et par une brume qui ne laissait guère voir plus d'un mille ou deux de mer, le coin ne manquait pas d'une poésie assez pénétrante, qu'a seulement troublé pour moi un enlisement partiel dans les "marshes", par la faute d'une planche trop glis ..."

The present Thesis interprets this to be emotional involvement in the beauty of Nature, so-called schizophrenic involvement in world of marsh-mist and marsh-life, and a feeling of oneness with all experienced and experimental life, with sun and sea and marsh and village teem. The star-gazing, fossil-needling, animal-watching dreamer is living in the world which he knows and which he loves. The converger is thinking anthropomorphically about nature in his diverging moment.¹

The Mystic Self is Pantheistic Self.²

Sometime in the same year Teilhard experienced the Weald in a similar way. Among Sussex trees and in between hunting for fossils and perhaps as he lay in the sun Teilhard had suddenly a profound feeling of geological age. The fossils all around and under him became to him like a giant organism. Life was rising as a specific entity out of the rocks.

"With extraordinary solidity and intensity I saw in the English countryside about that time — at sunset in particular — when the Sussex woods seemed to be charged with all the "fossil" life that I was then looking for" ... "as though suddenly some sort of universal being was about to take shape in nature before my very eyes".³

Part Two will show how important this experienced Gestalt is for the original Teilhard. The world is becoming alive with creatures millions of years old, with Man and atom and sun part of one great Whole, and that seen as a growing organism.⁴

1. Hudson (opcit).
2. cf. MM pp.89,90 and eg. 225 for the romantic pantheist Seeger.
4. eg. MM 159-165. As Part Two will show, the English translation does less than justice to Teilhard's meaning in such passages.
How this pantheist Gestalt (which he later realised was similar to those of Maeterlinck, James, Poe and H.G. Wells)\(^1\) became functionally connected to the concept of Evolution cannot be known for certain. Teilhard had been having to write the article concerning Man and much of this had to be an attack of Evolution. But in 1911 Teilhard was also seeing Dawson, Andrews, Butterfield and Smith-Woodward, and it is possible that "Huxleyan evolutionary biology" concerned with a vast evolutionary scale was communicated to Teilhard by one of these, or perhaps through a geological crank like Abbott (who had some uncertain influence also later at Piltdown).\(^2\)

In July there was also an article in *Études* concerning Transformist Biology. What was made clear by de Sinety in this was that no, positively no, professional scientist did not believe in and work through the idea of transformist evolution. It may be that although the article ended by saying that the Church must reject transformist evolution Teilhard himself found his father fighting against his mother, with his new-found mystical self with its Maréchal and Bergson calling for a rejection of the dogmatic religious view and his scientific self for full loyalty in the scientific community.

Perhaps in view of the very Jesuit and conservative metaphysical essay which Teilhard published in 1912 it would be best to say that although in 1911 there was

---

1. According to UPN for 30 Dec. 1917ff., Teilhard means by Pantheism what he finds in Bergson, Maeterlinck, James, Poe, Emerson and Wells; though as will be seen below his ideas are not the same as theirs, for they are functions also of eg. Balzac, Newman and Psichari.


3. Such speculation may be erroneous. Teilhard’s mother (according to de Wespin) had answered her child’s horror of a hair of his burning by saying that "God transforms all". If so the original Mystical Self of Teilhard must be reckoned more a function of his mother than this *Thesis* has hitherto suggested. But the matter is inconclusive when it is remembered that Teilhard’s mother was old-world pietistic and that Teilhard does re-write his own history. (Compare HM to UPN).
adventurous schizophrenia experiencing Man as part of one evolutionary world it took many months more for this perception to be accepted in his conscious self. Since it was 1913 before he publicly stated the case for Evolution and accepted its enthusiastic acceptance by his audience it may be that not till de Grandmaison's article appeared could Teilhard finally accept that he was now who he was. But Maréchal had published again on mystical experience in 1912 and maybe the conscious acceptance of Evolution should be dated rather in the second half of 1912, that is after Maréchal but before de Grandmaison.

This would fit in with the acceptance of his scientific identity in professional scientific work and make the concept of Evolution the "executive concept" which ended Teilhard's twelve-year Identity-Crisis and ushered in his new identity. By the end of the Hastings period "the magic word 'evolution'" continually came to his mind "like a refrain, like something desired, like a promise, like a summons". Couched though this may be in de Grandmaison's 1913 language, this 1950 memory of his conversion to Evolution conjures up a recognisable picture of schizophrenic dreaming which is trying to make sense of sense-sensitivity experiences in Jersey, Egypt and Sussex, which is trying to solve the geological anomalies which his science self needs to solve, and which is needing conceptual answers for religious problems stemming from the simple piety of mother as this vies with experienced Presence known to himself and Maréchal.

"Evolution" comes as a "Call" to save Teilhard's Mystical Self, and probably it came when his new companions were men living with and studying Evolution. But the emotional Gestalt-nature of Teilhard's turning to Evolution reminds the reader of the parental womb of the problem and decision. His father wanted him to be a

scientist and "all scientists believe in Evolution". The final Oedipal wrench fixed his identity in work and concept, and he was suddenly scientist and priest and at last one whole man. It was like Luther being overturned when he found his father and Father-God just and loving, when God could speak to him by Word without his father intervening. Teilhard with Ordination and Evolution could by the end of 1912 out-science his father and out-religion his mother, and his Mystical Self was free from parental womb and their orthodoxies. He had grown his own self and he was his own man.

That he was sexually now a man, and that soon he would be intimate with another person and be writing his way toward his final identity-concept and originality is the "final" part of the Eriksonian thesis of this essay.

2. 1912: The release of Teilhard's Self through sexuality and intimacy.

The conversion of Teilhard to the idea of Evolution was a novel happening within the Jesuit and Roman Catholic communities and within his parental womb. As an idea however Evolution was not novel since "all" scientists were already working with the idea. Just as 1902 had produced experience of the "supernatural" which the religious community had always believed in and 1905 had given Teilhard the knowledge of cosmic reality which had been won through such as Galileo and Newton in the scientific community, now in 1911-12 he had emotionally and intellectually accepted the world-view paradigm of the modern scientific (biological) community. Except in terms of personal discovery there was no originality in the 1911-12 conversion.

Conceptual novelty did not appear in Teilhard until the turn of 1915-6. The Christ-Kosmos concept did not come from father or mother, from Roman or Jesuit, Scientist or Savant community. That it was peculiar to him at the time, that all his later writing can be shown in detail to be a function of this one concept, that it was the concept which released his mind and emotion to generate "writing, writing,
writing" for the rest of his life and that it and the writings it generated gave him at last "a personal faith"¹ means that it fully fits Erikson's description of the "executive concept" which finally solves the identity-crisis, fixes the identity, frees the personality and releases creativity. Teilhard parallels Luther even in the "alogical rationalization" in which he spends so much time until his death.²

In 1915, in other words, Teilhard's originality was released on paper.

The specific release of creativity in identity-solution is according to Erikson to do with Intimacy. Study of Teilhard's sexual development and discovery of intimacy is therefore necessary if light is to be thrown on the eruption of Christ-Kosmos and on Teilhard's full adult personality development.

Noted above has been Teilhard's early sexual development. Oral intimacy with loving mother gave a buoyancy which allowed early transference to nannies, to sister Francoise and brother Alberic, to father, governesses and teachers. In spite of normal self-doubt and rebellion Teilhard's early development is one of transference to peers with affection and confidence.

Before and during puberty intimacy with young governesses was remarkable; it was they who knew Pierre best.³ But unconscious sexual scruple may be thought to have appeared in the age nine Priest-Ideal, the age fourteen Dedication to the Virgin, the age sixteen Sodality promise and the entrance into the Jesuit Order. Over this period Teilhard had little or no intimate contact with the female sex except perhaps with his sisters and mother.

At Aix, Laval and Jersey there was discussion and strong feeling about the issue of clerical celibacy and Virginity, but the sexual personality was poured out

---

1. See Part Two, ETW and eg. MM pp.245,251.
in vow to the Blessed Virgin. No female contacts outside the family are known though possibly the Jersey antiquarian-geological society provided such contact, and a photograph suggests some female friendship during this period. Similarly, in Egypt there must have been meetings with females, at least to do with the convent, but there is no suggestion of intimacy.

Possibly the change may be dated in 1908 as a function of Françoise. Teilhard went to see her in the Little Sisters community at Amiens on his way to Hastings from Cairo and Sarcenat.

"On m'a aussi fait voir Soeur Delphine, et j'ai siégé quelque temps au coeur de la communauté réunie."  

Time spent in intimacy with his sister within the warmth of the female community in which she was living may have given them a feeling of happiness in female companionship and mutual love. In this case the later situation at The Towers at Bramber would be being anticipated.

All this time there was correspondence with Françoise. In this she learnt that Pierre was rather resenting his Hastings return to study:

"Entre nous," (she wrote to her mother) "notre jésuite rêve des oignons d'Egypte et, une fois prêtre, je désire pour son bonheur le revoir retourner là-bas au milieu de ses intellectuelles relations, ses fossiles, et de tous les vieux souvenirs des Pharaons. Il n'est pas pour rien le fils de Papa ..."  

Such a letter might well have worried Teilhard's mother that perhaps he would turn to science again before or without becoming a priest. But certainly such thoughts must have been conveyed to Teilhard through these two most intimate women, and their influence on his 1911-2 decision to ask to do scientific research must be deemed considerable.

2. LHP*, p. 21.  
3. See below.  
4. LHP*, p. 50.
Intimacy with male friends had also been growing. Since 1902 Teilhard had been obeying his father, unconsciously, as he had been in the early scientific years. The early peers such as Describes and Crozé were followed by de Valois and Noury. In Egypt the ability to converse intimately with visiting people seems to have developed. He was enthused by meetings with Barrès, the Goethe-follower, with Maspéro and others at the Egyptian Institute, with Couyat of the Museum. 1 Such intimacy was a function of his emerging self and the acceptance of his mother's and his father's "would-be" friends. When he came to Hastings he became friends with Dawson and Butterfield of (hopefully 2 ) the scientific community, and closer friends (than before) with Jesuits such as Valensin and Charles who began to nourish his experimental and theological mystic self. 3 Intimacy indeed was becoming a function of his growing self and of the communities within which he was beginning to think.

Both Charles and Dawson possibly helped indirectly to further Teilhard's intimacy developments. Charles knew Teilhard well enough now to tell him (as Françoise probably had done) that he should aim for future work in Prehistory and other sciences; 4 thus as a peer reinforcing Teilhard's scientific self in its unconscious progress towards being established formally in professional scientific work.

Possibly to Dawson falls Teilhard's debt in the matter of sexuality being drawn out of him by an individual woman, though it could have happened in countless other ways such as at the pastoral confessional or visit or social gathering.

The circumstances were as follows. Françoise the confidante died tragically in China in June 1911, and the younger sister and dependant Guiguite became very

1. LE, cf. also LEIP, p.20.
2. (By modern standards the science of such men would be deemed amateur and non-science).
3. Though they did not follow him into his Christian Pantheism.
ill just before that. In August Teilhard was ordained in the presence of both parents and brothers. In September he was _locum_ priest at Ashford, and parish duties which rather interfered with his "train of life" took place in October.

During this time he also read the romantic ideological Roman writer R.H. Benson, and in November he received a letter from his uncle Cirice with no doubt well-wishes from the daughters Marguerite and Alice, the former of whom became Teilhard's lifelong confidante. Then came the pantheist experience of "penetrating poetry" and man's oneness with nature, followed by _locum_ work near Boulogne and four months of private study which led to his final exams. It was during these four months in 1912 (23 March†) that Teilhard's sexuality was healthily and unconsciously developed.¹

First in his _locum_ two women (presumably relatives) Yolande and Charlotte come to hear him preach. Then for the second time Teilhard makes a note about the young Lady Katherine Ashburnham. Third he goes to Bramber for "peace and poetry". He has a little cottage here and is cared for by a lay sister from the nearby convent where there are about ten nuns and twenty children or young women, for whom he takes Mass, gives sermons and hears confessions. Nearby is Storrington and Maud Petre, which he hopes to visit. Again nearby there is the house of a "great English Lady" who is a convert and who has taken the name of Sister Marie-Agnes. Fourth, he went to Bramber just after seeing Mr. and Mrs. Dawson and Smith-Woodward with whom at Uckfield Teilhard found the molar of an elephant.

Teilhard as usual was observant of the Dawsons and their home. He liked the atmosphere there and he and Mrs. Dawson conversed well together because she was Irish but born in Bordeaux. Later Teilhard was to spend three days with the Dawsons and he found their home "comfortable" and "lovable" and was given little "attentions".²

---

1. According to _LHP._
2. _LHP._, pp.303, 402, 409.
This female influence may be significant for the question of Teilhard's culpability for the Piltdown fraud. For women were affecting him. Medawar has ridiculed Teilhard for being so easily taken in by the fraud and Professor H.W. Swinton believes Teilhard was one of a group of young amateurish geologists and was used by certain of them for their fraud. He was naively gullible. Now Woodward's wife asked him, for instance, if he were properly fed, and one Sunday morning just before he found the canine tooth, Teilhard was cutting sweet-peas with Mrs. Dawson. So the possibility arises that there was something about the two women, and indeed Woman, which somehow took Teilhard back to the womb, sensitised him and affected his intellectual and perceptual faculties. When he wrote to his mother that she would surely laugh about the sweet-peas and bouquet episode, was he indeed realising that he had been a flattered and mothered little boy, that he had had, perhaps momentarily, been affected by woman and rather liked it? Was he in fact so easily affected by people at this time that he was emotionally off balance? Did amateur enthusiasm and feminine emotion fool him for this reason?

Whatever happened, there was some emotional relationship between the priest and Mrs. Dawson at least and it included the pleasure of shared activity and interest in Dawson's finds. It is this female involvement in Teilhard's new life of scientist and Mystic self which is of note because it carries on Françoise's part in

---

1. Swinton will publish his findings when all concerned in the Piltdown matter are deceased.
2. This is not the place to discuss the Piltdown fraud itself. This must await Professor Swinton's publication. It should be emphasised however that Teilhard was home in France before the plot really materialised — and that Teilhard did show good powers of observation in picking out his "find" from the pile of rubble.
3. Since Conan Doyle was also one of the Piltdown group it may be that it was on questions such as spiritualism or science fiction that there was communication between Teilhard and, for instance, Mrs. Dawson. If so this might fit in with Sister Marie-Agnes and Benson, as it would with Teilhard's later interests in E.S.P. and the various psychic experiences, and H.G. Wells.
Teilhard's life. He was never again to be without it through one woman or another all the rest of his life. Perhaps Mrs. Dawson did not in fact take this part, or perhaps she did and is therefore to be blamed indirectly for Teilhard's part in the fraud. The fact remains that within days of being with Mrs. Dawson Teilhard was thinking of Maud Petre, living within the convent environment and having heart-to-heart talks with a woman whose thought he found intelligent and original and whose talk he found "extremely interesting".

3. Marie-Agnes and the Convent at Bramber: June 1912.

This "very holy soul" was like the abbess of old though possibly was about Teilhard's own age. Perhaps she above all is the person to whom Teilhard's originality is traceable. There was intimacy in their talk. She made a great impression upon him. She gave him Benson to read. "Sainted" like his own mother, she sounds as though she had a young boy by her knee.

Since the original Teilhard of 1915-6 uses Bensonite language and ideas, though these are acknowledged only in the Three Stories, it may be supposed that Sister Marie-Agnes lived on with Teilhard in emotion long after 1912 and that her intimacy unbound the things of his creativity.

Consider Benson's words in the light of Teilhard's psychological experiences: the 1902 experience might be thought to have given Teilhard perception "so keen that the spiritual world appears to me as visible as what we call the natural world".

In 1905 Teilhard in dark night had indeed clung to his mother "as a saint clings to God" when he felt "a strong, almost physical oppression carried him forward" "as if a force were laying hold of him in every remote fibre of his bodily and spiritual

1. LHP, p.303.
2. LHP, p.307.
3. LHP, p.307ff.
being*, as if a "power" laid hold of him.

To Teilhard the recent (Dec. 1911) pantheist sunset and fossil experiences could easily be described as "some strange Presence" and even "a Person".

Such is the present Thesis' hypothesis about the outcome of Teilhard meeting Benson 1 through this woman. Teilhard may not have made such imaginative understandings of his 1902, 1905 and 1911-2 experiences at once and may never have consciously used the above sentences from Benson to interpret them. But by reading Benson in mid-1912 Teilhard was letting concepts of Presence, Person and a physical-spiritual reality enter his mind to incubate there until they emerged in Christ-Kosmos. From this year onwards "Presence" is an important concept in Teilhard's letters. It is as though speaking with mother he could be fed with new food, new ways of thought so different from Pesch and Ore Place. A woman's intimacy nourished him by transmitting to him new concepts and a certain existential spirituality, even charisma. It was his Mystical Self which Marie-Agnes was feeding but it was by means of the sexual intimacy of his mother. The Bramber meetings prepared Pierre Teilhard for Marguerite and the sexual intimacy which emotionally prepared the way specifically for the concept of Creative Union. Just as mother's intimacy had given Teilhard the buoyancy to go his own way, so Marie-Agnes gave him the confidence and concepts with which to develop his own language for his own Mystical Self. It was she who after preparation by mother, Francoise and such as Mrs. Dawson began releasing Teilhard's creativity. This she was able to do by re-sexualising him and nourishing his own Self with concepts which could interpret his experiences and which in the Sussex Weald would produce the Gestalt necessary for the conception of Christ-Kosmos.

4. The Path to the Final Gestalt; Peers at Louvain; the Museum and Marguerite.

During the next months the priest, mystic, scientist, pantheist, priest-scientist and sexual man all grew towards that conceptual culmination of Christ-Kosmos.

On 15 August 1912 Teilhard received his orders from Jesuit Authority to proceed to Paris for further scientific work. At the time it was very unusual in the Order for a man to work outside of teaching and pastoral work, but university work would be the target. Teilhard from this time did minimum pastoral work and no school work, so that he was being marked out for life in the Savant community, in the natural science part of that community rather than the theological area.

Thus at Louvain's "Ethnological Week" which had been started by de Grandmaison and Bouvier, was addressed by Schmidt and reported on in Études by Emonet, Teilhard formally entered a world which at once released his inner needs. It was an international gathering, enthusiastic for modern knowledge, Christian and ringing with names like those of Durkeim, Lévy-Bruhl and Fraser perhaps which seemed to fit in with how he thought now that he was committed to Evolution as well as to Christ. For the second time he could meet and talk with Maréchal (the first had been in 1910) and as an Ore Place Doctor of Theology he was now on equal terms with the professors like Bouvier. He was now a priest as his mother wanted and a natural scientist in obedience to his father and here in Louvain he found a way of thinking which seemed to him open to his dreams and needs and wishes. He could indulge in adventurous schizophrenia at Louvain. He could indulge in science, religion and his mysticism. His mystic experience could be reinforced by Maréchal and de Grandmaison's language of "immediate Presence", "Absolute Being" and attachment to a "definite object". Like the language of Benson this could interpret Teilhard's psychic adventures from within the Christian tradition, Louvain could nourish his soul. Louvain was another community in which
Back in Paris, however, the Louvain enthusiasms were less free for Marcellin Boule allowed no speculative science in a laboratory in which the empirical concept of Evolution placed Man as an ordinary product of organic evolution. So the Mystic Self had to find a feeder and on October 30th 1912 Teilhard relates how he has been to his uncle Girice’s, found a gay and complete family like that of old Sarcenat days, been pleased to meet again Alice and Marguerite and accepted the latter’s invitation to visit her and use her chapel at the convent she was running in Montparnasse. Here the female, the mother and the friend who will be intimate in mind with him come to fill the needs which have been growing over years and which were recently intensified at Braine. Priest and Scientist he was ready now to become fully Himself and a Man. He had come full circle. He was happy in the womb not by regression but within fulfilling sexual identity-development.

During the next year the scientist Teilhard was also quickly to become friend and colleague to working-priests in science like Schmitz and Obermeier who were full Transformists, and the future expert in Prehistory, Abbé Breuil. Friends too were scientists of repute like Cugnien, Joubin, Boussac as well as Boule. He met Dawson and Woodward again at Piltdown and this time gained fame (and later notoriety) by finding the canine tooth, though Boule’s ridicule of this English monstrosity (at once in 1913) prevented Teilhard from over-extending himself on the subject. Teilhard as scientist quietly continued work on Quercy fossils which was published in 1914 onwards, and as priest said Masses, carried out locum duties and wrote in Études on Prehistory.

1. "Louvain" is of course being used here to denote the particular community which Teilhard knew there, that is, the group of avant-garde savants, de Grandmaison, Bouvier, Bonnet, Schmidt and later Charles — not necessarily the Faculty of the Jesuit University. See below Chapter Seven for further discussion of Marshals and de Grandmaison.
2. [LP], p.323.
In 1913 as himself and not under the auspices of Church or Laboratory, but of Marguerite he talked on Evolution to Marguerite's young convent girls. At last his science self was speaking publicly and was liked by himself and the others. Here Marguerite was able to fix his Central Self. He was now publicly committed to science, avant-garde savant theology and the avant-garde mental adventure of the savant. Now it was that the repercussions of his new identity began to be felt. He is surprised to feel "different" in "personality" in August 1913 when back at Ore, and really wondered if he fitted into the "frame" or "image" of a "theologian". His enthusiasm is scientific. He was now Scientist and the Academy of Sciences in Paris published a Note of his in December 1913. He was no less a Jesuit as happy references of Jersey and Ore bear witness, but he was moving now with laboratory scientists and scientific savants and in the literary savant atmosphere of English teacher and Headmistress Marguerite. He would always be a priest and a Jesuit and a geologist. But it is in talk with Marguerite and by letter as the War bursts forth that his Mystic self continues to grow. Her children, her war-wounded, her mind and herself move him affectively and he will work with her and for her and through her. His selves were being established each in its own work, but it was Marguerite who was nourishing his Mystic self and producing his central identity.

So by means of unconscious sexual and mental intimacy with Marguerite, by means of schizophrenic adventure and a history of personal struggle in self and communities, Teilhard's real Self reached full identity as his attitudes, his work, his experience, his perceptions, his parental womb, his love and his need were drawn together.

Eventually in 1915–6 in Christ-Kosmos his selves found fulfillment in one Self, for the concept was produced for his Mystic Self from one concept each of his

1. cf. LHP and Cuenot op.cit.
Religious and Scientific selves. In Christ-Kosmos Teilhard reached his Identity and in the same concept reached Originality. "Conceptual unification"¹ had at last been forged through mainly unconscious struggle and the identity-crisis was over except for recurrences which were always solved by the same concept or its descendants. Oedipal press had grown an adult Self and this brought novelty. But all this did not happen before the parental womb had pressed him to join Crozé’s Zouaves in late 1914 in obedience to his soldier-father but as an ambulance man because of his health-history and as a worker-priest to please both his mother and himself. His mind had been being made² for thirty-three years and a little longer would be no matter. Indeed in War and Novelty his parents and his psychological history would still be with him.

Such is the Eriksonian interpretation of Teilhard through the perspectives of Oedipus development, identity-crisis, crises of sexuality, intimacy and generativity, and the fulfilment of identity by means of work and executive concept, the concept of Christ-Kosmos. But this concept (and its appearance) is not without its problems.

5. The Concept of Christ-Kosmos: the concept which fixes the Identity of Teilhard.

To demonstrate that Christ-Kosmos is the Executive Concept for the Identity of the adult Teilhard de Chardin is the work of Part Two of this Thesis. Part One is pointing up the elements in Teilhard before 1915 which are interpreted reasonably within the Eriksonian framework. In the lead-up to the concept the ontogenetic hypothesis has been trying to explain how original writing came to erupt in idiosyncratic language in 1915+. For neither the 1912-4 Paris letters nor the early letters to Marguerite prepare the reader for the concept. Incubation in the

1. Erikson op.cit., p.144.
2. A reference to the inadequacy of the title of the published war-letters.
unconscious must have been taking place and all the associations gained from Marie-Agnes, Benson and the Louvain men would be one part of this.

Personally Teilhard was continuing to enter new community worlds, earth himself more in science, be an honour to his parents. Yet the sexual development as a function of mental development still cannot be underestimated. The Erikson thesis holds firm. For it was the meeting with Marguerite which raised the curtain for the final act. It preluded life-long companionship, but it induced generativity in writing. So that unconsciously at least Teilhard's identity was complete within five months of leaving Bramer convent. With Marguerite as emotional release and stimulus the stage was set for the new act of Christ-Kosmos.

This Christ-Kosmos is (hypothetically) the Gestalt which fixes Teilhard's identity conceptually and formally, as his Ordination did in Religion, as did the scientific work in Science and Marguerite in Humanity. Its preparations have been the unconscious struggles of Ego-development internally, and externally in relation to social and physical environments. Its immediate production is the function of an unconscious which had been incubating the idea for some time. Yet in terms of the five anomalies with which this Thesis started out, has such an interpretation been wholly successful? Is personality-press sufficient to account for the conceptual elements in Christ-Kosmos? Was Luther hearing the Word only through his father? Is Christ-Kosmos just the result of mother and father, science and religion, and is its coming simple mystery?

That the above framework needs to be augmented by value-vector and cybernetic theory is the contention of Chapter Seven.

Teilhard's specific conceptual, as opposed to personality, development needs more attention.
CHAPTER VII

INADEQUACIES IN THE ERIKSONIAN APPROACH.

1. Hints.

In reflection on the foregoing Eriksonian sections, three problems present themselves. No "enemy" has been found in Teilhard's identity-development in the way in which the Pope is seen to have become Luther's, the five anomalies are not completely solved, especially that of Methodology, for little direct linking has been suggested between such development and the Christ-Kosmos executive concept or even the earlier executive concept of Evolution. The appearance of the concept is a mystery.

(1) With the first problem Part Two is able to offer an answer by interpolation on the basis of what is found in the material in the months before the early 1916 Christ-Kosmos concept appears and what remains as a central "enemy" for the rest of Teilhard's life. This enemy is that of "juridical" religion and theology,¹ and interpolation of this anti-juridical sentiment in the previous years would place the unconscious realisation of his real enemy possibly at the time of the anti-Loisy Pascendi and the early months of 1908 spent with such as Valensin who was full of the Modernist thinkers who were all anti-juridical; or possibly the enemy appeared when the conversion to Evolution was effected and Teilhard suddenly found that organic biological concepts made sense of theology and life in such a way as to show the legal concepts of the orthodox institution of the Church as almost meaningless. Such interpolation is hypothetical in the extreme, however, because there is little suggestion of such intensity of feeling against juridical religion as appears after 1915 previous to that date. Probably therefore there

---

were unconscious sentiments about juridical religion before 1915 but not until the pressures of War were they to be released consciously.

(2) Unlike Luther, Teilhard never had "enemy" feelings against the Pope, so that an Eriksonian idea that there was strong animosity against Teilhard's father which produced the anti-juridical thought would be unsubstantiated. However, coolness to this father when carried on into understanding of the impersonal ways of Order and Church in forcing Condamin to reduce his experimental Biblical criticism or in destroying Tyrrell would be a factor in anti-juridical criticism of the Church and its Theology. That Teilhard could think violently about juridical religion may in other words be a function of his being able to think (in early life) violently about his father. Yet since clerical activity and religion generally were to Teilhard a function of his mother's love, one might expect anti-juridical religion to be a function of relationship to her too. But there is no evidence for this.

(3) What must be considered therefore is that Eriksonian interpretation is not sufficient to account for Teilhard's conceptual commitments and novelties. It is possible to see that emotion concerning father at least might be present and indeed a function of a tirade against juridical religion. But the conceptual basis of such attacks is the biological analogy of organic Evolution which can only by round-about-routes be reckoned a production of father. The analogy comes from the Mystic-Pantheist Self as well as from work in Science.

Consideration of the anomalies in the Introduction also suggests the insufficiency of the Eriksonian interpretation.


The whole Eriksonian picture brings tentative solutions to the anomalies of Identity, Originality and Methodology when these are examined in the light of it. (Those of Science and Religion receive little solution here although the fact that Teilhard joined both these communities and never left them must remind
the reader that Teilhard did think that he was a scientist and a Religious. But the question as to whether what he wrote is Science or Religion awaits further study of his Methodology.)

The following solutions have been suggested:—

a) **Identity.** The parental womb resulted in early interest in science and religion, was fixed in the adolescent when Teilhard committed himself professionally to the priesthood and to geology, and was worked out positively when both parents were at the same time rejected and accepted as Teilhard came to his adult mystic experiences, Gestalten and the Weltanschauung of Christ-Kosmos. This executive concept and his two professional commitments remained with him the rest of his life so that parental womb was retained as a personality- and life-root while at the same time he found his freedom and individuality beyond both parents as he out-scienced his father and out-religioned his mother and had further personal Gestalten. He rebelled against the particular science and religion of the parents but was obedient to their emotional commitments, so the Oedipus complex was successfully negotiated. The rebellion and disobedience remained within his personality to be a function of his originality and recurrent identity crises remained with him also as a continuous spur. But the Ego had grown into Mystic-Pantheist Self, and when Christ-Kosmos was reached, so the Central Self was formally acknowledged and the personality of Teilhard fully formed.

b) **Originality.** From Oedipus tension and identity crisis came Teilhard's professional commitments and the Gestalten which reoriented his personality and life. Commitment to the two professions resulted in growing bundles of information from them so that scientific reality eventually came to be commitment to the reality and concept of Evolution, religious faith became commitment to Christ, especially in the concept of the Pleroma, and
commitment to the experience and intimacy of Life meant that sexuality and human feeling such as sensitivity and cosmic experience could now be considered on a par with scientific reality and religion. The result of these developing commitments was the Gestalt of Christ-Kosmos which acted as executive concept to his personality and as the basis of the next forty years' work. From Erikson's viewpoint this concept itself thus is directly related to Oedipus tension and is personal novelty.

Yet the executive concept Christ-Kosmos lasted all his life for it was to do with taking concepts from mother and father for his own growing self. Christ-Kosmos and its conceptual children such as the law of complexity-consciousness and Christ in the heart of matter are to do with the creativity of God, in other words with God the Holy Spirit. From the psychoanalytic angle therefore Teilhard's originality stems in a sense from a rejection of God the Father and a refusal to exalt Mother Mary into the Godhead: instead both mother- and father-God are superceded by the concept of God's Spirit which reflects Teilhard's own development into free spirit, his own religious experience of cosmic feeling, and his own need to be free of obedience to father and mother. The originality of Teilhard may thus be expressed as a function of his personal experience and of Oedipus tension as it breaks forth in the specific concept Christ-Kosmos. It executes both his freedom from his parents and his own specific identity which has grown from roots in and tension with these parents. It is the result of sexual development and personal intimacy, psychological mystic-pantheist experience and the need of reality-testing thought to make sense of all experience, whether religious, scientific or pantheist. As such the novel concept is the production of needs and press: but when it emerges it is the revelation of Gestalt.

c) Methodology. The Eriksonian framework thus makes sense of many attitudes
revealed in Appendix A. It charts out reasonably Teilhard's development into two distinct work-professions which make his identity and place him within five communities in all. It points out the probable appearance of executive concepts and an enemy, but it does not explain the latter in their content. "Supernatural reality" did integrate his mother, "cosmic reality" his father and "Christ-Kosmos" both. The mystic discovery of "Evolution" might also be to do with the "presence" of mother and father.

What is needed is some way of thinking about the appearance of concepts such as Evolution which, while not denying Eriksonian aetiology, nevertheless allows the concept to "stand on its own feet" and be "valid" in its own right as a "novel notion" of "personal discovery". Further, such a concept must be symbolised in such a way that it is deemed "real" in the sense that "X is taken as Y". That is, the mind in coming to a Gestalt is actively committing itself to something "real". Luther's God is abstract Father, a "real" concept, as well as the function of emotional relationship to father. More complex reality needs the production of more complex concepts by the thought-organ.

Thus, the concept of God in Teilhard is a function of his Oedipus and personality-development, but also of the concept-tools which were available to him within himself and within the communities in which he lived and in which he worked. Emphasis on his unconscious and on his personality must not prevent the "reality" of concepts, as "information", "press", "specific stimuli" and "need" from being examined. So without the loss of the Eriksonian framework and its results, some way of linking emotional experience with conceptual reality and reorientation is needed. The Methodological

problem of how Teilhard's mind is working when he is actually writing down
a paragraph or coming to a Gestalt is not solved by saying that Oedipus tension
is operating or that Teilhard is trying to escape from father and/or mother
without leaving the parental womb, or that he needs to fix his identity with
a concept. The psychoanalytical "originalisation" of Erikson therefore
satisfies neither the theoretical problem of how Teilhard's novel ideas
emerged nor the practical problem of what happens when his fingers write his
words.

With the Eriksonian model not fully satisfying, a further perspective is
therefore necessary. In fact much recent research into "Discovery" does not use
the language of psychoanalysis, but the language of cybernetics and machine
intelligence. With this in mind and with the emphasis in this Thesis now shifting
to the Methodological anomaly (but with realisation that findings in this may
affect interpretation of the Identity and Originality problems), a different
perspective of dynamic value-system with a link-framework with a cybernetic picture
of a man and his mind is now to be portrayed. Teilhard did live and think in
relation to parental root and tension and he did find his identity in a concept,
Christ-Kosmos. But how did the idea come? How did his mind work?

A second look at the years 1908-15 through the filters of value-system and
cybernetic metaphors will further probe the problem of Teilhard's Methodology,
and further un-make the mystery.
CHAPTER VIII
THE PROBLEM OF TEILHARD'S METHODOLOGY.

1. Evidence of Conceptual Change in pre-1915-6 writings and a link between emotion and concept.

Among Teilhard's writings after he returned from Egypt are the essay on Lourdes (1909), the Note on Gravity (1911?), two book revues in Études (20 July 1911) and the article on Man in the Catholic Encyclopaedia (1912). From these a picture of conceptual development may be gained.

In the Lourdes essay the Jesuit Teilhard speaks from within traditional religious concepts and from within the reflective Philosophy of Science stemming at the time from such as Duhem. First Teilhard presses home that what happens at Lourdes are "facts" which must be taken into account by the "theories" of the scientists. These "facts" are "simple reality" as opposed to the "phantoms of probabilities, false analogies and sophisms" which "positivist science" uses as explanations. What must be remembered is that "n'importe l'hypothèse est l'argile obéissante que modèlent les faits". In general the perspectives of modern science are to be accepted, those of "une oeuvre de continuité" which biology, physics and history have produced. But the questions of "degree" and "properties" such as the "discontinuity" between intelligence and life and life and matter are not solved by the "illusion" of "extrapolation" like that of Maxwell's "demon" which is said to arrange matter any more than the Lourdes "facts" are solved by official science's denial that they exist. There are "critical thresholds", healing "facts" and differences in "degree", and some hypothesis must make sense of them.

Teilhard answers as conquistador for the Church "je puis résoudre l'énigme".

As with the "periodic phenomena" of light, "ce qui agit à Lourdes, c'est une

1. The revue in Le Correspondant (10 No.1912) on the Louvain Ethnological Week is also interesting: it shows Teilhard the aspiring Savant.
"volonté ... plus puissante que la notre, mais libre et indépendante comme elle".
This is the "intrusion dans la nature, de "quelqu'un" qui opère en dehors de vous".
There is "another" who is working, and at Lourdes who else can "ce mystérieux
ouvrier" be than God, "l'Être infini et personnel que l'Eglise adore". So Lourdes
is "la bonté de la Vierge Immaculée". This answer to the problem is the Church
publicly affirming the existence of "une énergie spéciale qui opère à son service"
and daring to proclaim the "transcendant" interpretation of "l'action même de
Dieu, le miracle", and it can dare to do this because it "experiences" divine action
and spiritual richness. After all how can science offer solutions to what it does
not experience?

This essay in which Teilhard is attacking "demi-savants" and "chrétiens
timides" shows Teilhard operating with traditional religious views, with Model-
theory which can overturn "la science (qui) ne veut pas de Dieu" and with consider-
able commitment to modern scientific perspectives. But the religious and
scientific concepts are kept separate and the problem is answered by the victory
of one over the other.

How this dichotomy changes is the question to be followed up.

The article on Man must have been written in 1911-12 and is still similar
in tone to the Lourdes essay. Teilhard is still the violent Jesuit attacking the
accidental world of the scientist and any idea of contingent creation. But the
science-religion dichotomy has almost disappeared in the matter of creation
because it is not now a question of divine "intrusion" into this world but of
"l'esprit peut s'allier à la matière". Teilhard is here conscious that he is

1. By 1929's Sens Humain (unpublished), the problem has changed round to a Church
which does not wish Science.
2. The Imprimatur for the Encyclopaedia was given in 1909 but publication was
not till 1912, so the article by Teilhard could have been revised by him
even as late as 1912.
trying to do away with Dualism. He remains within Church dogma because his idea of spirit unifying with matter is that this happens through the "soul", which is Church teaching. Indeed the use of "Jesus-Christ" and "surnaturel" retains the basis within Revelation. But by using the idea of duration and evolution Teilhard is here in 1911-2 coming very close to what was to emerge in 1915-6. What he was envisaging was as follows:—

"un ensemble flexible et varié, éclairé de l'amour d'un Dieu, investi de prolongements surnaturels — centré, pour tout dire, autour de Jésus-Christ. L'Univers s'harmonisera ... dans une unité supérieure ...", 1

and it is in the light of this that the "beauty" of the "physionomy of man" which the Church protects with holy jealousy should be seen.

Consider what has happened since the Lourdes essay. Instead of only general acceptance of the scientific perspective there is now the use of the Universe as a "whole" which is growing into a higher unity, and this "whole" is to do with durational "prolongements". Further, the appearance of Jesus Christ as the centre of this higher unity by means (presumably) of spirit being able to unite with matter is an affirmation of divine immanence very different to the 1909 "intrusion" idea. What has happened is that the religious concept of Jesus Christ (and spirit) has been put together with the scientific concept of evolution—duration by means of the idea of a higher union which is a christian mystical, but also a biological, concept.

Dating from 1911-2 this article thus gives evidence of a changed commitment to science and of conversion to Evolution, and of a mental process which is able to integrate ideas from different complexes of information. There is little argument in the article and no reasons are given for this hypothesis of a superior unity of the Universe centred on Christ. The new concept simply appears as one in which Man can be seen to be what he is and so the Church to be doing good work.

1 last paragraph, p. 514 : "l'homme devant les enseignements de l'Eglise et devant la philosophie", esp. foolish
Nor does criticism of the concept follow. The language of "orders" is explanation enough and needs no criticism for it is Tradition.

From this Thesis so far the picture could then be the following:— the religious and science parts of Teilhard’s personality, stemming from parents and parental ideals and communities, have within them their own concepts. Now that Teilhard’s identity is to be formalised by professional work in both religion and science, the two parts of personality need to find conceptual unity. The Religious Self and the Scientific Self must produce a mutual concept which will satisfy the Mystic Self, Self-Ego Central Self. They therefore have to integrate religious knowledge (in this case Revelation) with scientific, and through the concepts of biological synthesis and mystic unity such integration is carried out. The process would be worked out unconsciously first and then appear as a Gestalt, and since the man Teilhard did have semi-schizophrenic experiences it may be surmised that the appearance of such concepts took place during such experience. Indeed the reference in the account of the Sussex Weald pantheist experience to a "universal being" taking shape in nature before his eyes might suggest that in this 1912 article there is the conceptual re-working of the 1911-12 Weald Gestalt, and this by means of the displacement of concepts from the worlds of two different selves to make a new concept.

If this interpretation is correct a connection has been made between the pantheist Gestalten experiences and the concepts which also mark the Mystic Self and Identity of Teilhard. The Mystic Self develops through concept-displacement of other selves.

2. Tentative Symbolisms of what is happening in Teilhard’s mental processes.

The simplest symbolism of this hypothesis is as follows. The arrows denote value-vectors, that is "needs", "forces" and "directions of action". They are "directions of transformation" considered durationally.
But the pantheist experience was a function of parts of his personality which have been symbolised by the expression "Mystic Self", so that the full picture so far is:

**Figure VI.**

- **Science** → **Evolution**
- **Religion** → **Jesus Christ**
- **Mystic-Pantheist** → Gestalt of Jesus Christ, centre of higher unity of Universe via unconscious incubation and existential synthesis.

From this point of view Teilhard's method in 1911-2 was the gathering of information consciously and unconsciously from experience and community, the processing of this through at least three self-circuits and the production as output of new information or at least information in a new form which is accepted by the three-solved system as of use to it and them and a production from themselves.
When this is considered diagramatically (as above Figs. V & VI) in the case of the 1911-2 concept what appears is that the three information-circuits have each produced a concept and have each demanded that their concept be part of the final output. Jesus Christ, Evolution and Jesus Christ as Higher Unity of Universe appear together, displaced the one into the other, each retaining its integrity as a concept but in unison producing a new concept.¹

This displacing of concepts must be regarded then as part of the mental processes which produce Teilhard's new concept in this case. That such a process "exists" as a main part of Teilhard's method is further suggested by consideration of the Gravity Note of 1911.²

Possibly this Note was written during or after reading the speculative Physics of M. Lachaud which he reviewed in Études (July 20), and which he ridiculed because of the idea of ether having a movement-quality but no "life". Basically Teilhard takes the "molecule/system analogy" and posits that gravity is the secondary effect of a "superior order" just as a gyroscope and centrifugal force are (so Teilhard thinks). Gravity would then be some sort of reaction of ether: there would be a "gravitic mass" just as there is a "magnetic" and "electric" mass in the "spectrum of the corpuscles", and like the poles of an electrode there might be "mono-polar air" with "bi-polar actions".

The concepts used here are children of their time, though even today when there is no "ether" it is still not known what "space" "is". But Teilhard's use of analogy is instructive. He does not take the gyroscope analogy and apply it to gravity. He uses it simply as a flash-picture to suggest the sort of thing that he is meaning. The picture appears one moment and just as suddenly is gone

² Unpublished and undated, but thought by Cuenot to date from 1911.
for ever. What stays is the overall analogy of molecules as part of a system, of lower and higher orders of the same system. This reappears in the bipolar metaphor, the "polarising" metaphor, the "rotor of a magnetic arm" metaphor, and the "spectrum of the corpuscles" metaphor.

In other words there was a basic "control" in Teilhard's mind-circuit which was selecting possible metaphors and using them momentarily to elucidate itself. The parts/whole metaphor was a commitment in his mind and he was displacing it into other areas of thought and using the result when it seemed to be fruitful for his parts/whole thesis. The result was in Teilhard's own view extremely tentative (and he did not return to it specifically), but since the metaphor of parts/whole (corpuscles/system) was often to recur in Teilhard it must be regarded as a part of the controlling processes in him and in the value-vector symbolism of Chapter One itself a value-vector. That is to say the picture for the Gravity Note would be:

**Figure VII: A Possible Schema for Concept-development in 1911.**

\[ \text{(Physics) Science Self} \rightarrow \text{Science} \rightarrow \text{v-v} \rightarrow \text{Ether, Gravity} \]
\[ \text{(?Biology) Science Self} \rightarrow \text{Science} \rightarrow \text{v-v} \rightarrow \text{Whole/parts} \]
\[ \text{(Imagination) Ego Self} \rightarrow \text{v-v need of central self} \rightarrow \text{Concept-displacement} \]

Here there is a question-mark as to whence came the metaphor. It may have come from the system-biology of Berthelot, or from such as W. James and Bergson, that is, from Mystic or Science information stores. But in itself the metaphor was a Gestalt, the process in which it was used to elucidate Gravity the displacement of concepts, and the resultant concept a Gestalt.

From the Gravity Note therefore there is the suggestion that the Gestalten

---

1. Undated but thought by Cuenot to be 1911. Unpublished. The reason for this is that it is not in the final form for publication.

2. Value-vector.
(or some of them) become part of the Self-Ego of the Teilhard mind and that displacement-processes should be viewed as part of his unconscious mental processes used unwittingly and momentarily in the service of some need, in the above case that of clarifying a major Physical problem.

By 1911-2, in other words, the projection of a concept from one cluster of concepts into another, as evidenced in the Man article and the Gravity Note but not in the Lourdes essay, is becoming part of Teilhard's method of thinking about things. Since it may be considered a type of day-dreaming in which concepts are not held to their specific meanings it may further be reckoned a development of the adventurous semi-schizophrenia. The 1911-2 pantheist experience had shown Teilhard bringing a concept from science into his present sensual experience and interpreting the latter in the terms so juxtaposed. Both the experiences and the concept were so intensely held that neither could be watered down. With two such commitments there could be no mixture, only, by displacement, something new. The adventurous thinking was producing novel concepts.

Some such interpretation of Teilhard's mind-processes and so "method" is suggested all through the material in Part Two. It is also suggested by Teilhard's connection with Mysticism and Maréchal. That after coming in contact with Maréchal in 1908 Teilhard felt at ease with both his own psychic experiences and his own use of metaphor is suggested by a glance at the Brémond-Maréchal-de Grandmaison material of 1902+ in the light of this contact. Maréchal refused to limit the "mystical state" to "other world" schizophrenia. "Several mystics declare that mystical communication can be experienced without breaking communication with the outside world." For "the Absolute has set his stamp on the fundamental inclination

---

1. The articles are listed in Brémond loc.cit, from which the quotations below are taken.
of our intelligence"; so that the mystics should not be supposed "superhuman", for the "mystic career" should be open to all mankind. Indeed "the mystics resort to metaphors drawn from the operations of sense" and so "a whole organism of spiritual meanings seems thus to be at their disposal".

Teilhard was in such articles receiving reinforcement for adventurous existential use of metaphor from his peers in the religious community just as he had originally for his schizophrenic experience. That these peers continued to back him in his adventures is to their credit but also to be expected, for it was their language which became that of the post-1912 Mysticism of Teilhard.

Consider the following in the light of the language found in Part Two of this Thesis and it will be seen that Maréchal and de Grandmaison were peers who gave the conceptual reinforcement to the original Teilhard. Maréchal in 1908-9 wrote (following St. Thomas) that "(Mysticism) is an activity oriented in its secret depths toward a definite object, the sole one which could completely absorb it, the Absolute Being, Absolute Truth"; it is "the consciousness of the immediate Presence of a Transcendent Being" and "mystic experience ... attracts us like a promise".

This was taken up in 1913 by de Grandmaison in language which must recall to the reader the 1950 description of the 1911-2 pantheist experience. Before the above-quoted acknowledgement on the mystic use of metaphor de Grandmaison notes that the mystic experience is without doubt "reality" and a "quasi-experimental perception of God", in which the soul is conscious of entering "not by an effort, but by a call, into immediate contact, without image or speech, but not without insight, with Infinite Goodness".

Here the language of "Absolute", "immediacy", "Presence", "Being", "object",

---

"whole organism", "transcendence", "call", "promise" and "experience" is being put into Teilhard's memory-store by peers. It will not be surprising if within two years there is displacement of metaphor in the interests of the executive concept which is needed to integrate the Science and Religion selves (at least). Such displacement will be from this Mystic store into the Science concepts of Evolution and Kosmos and into the Religion concept of Christ. Thus the Mystic store will be the catalyst through which the other concepts are able to join; and since the Self-Ego already has at its disposal the Gestalt (in the Man article) in which the Universe and Christ join in a higher unity, the stage is set indeed for the appearance of Christ-Kosmos.

The 1915-6 Christ-Kosmos in the present model-symbolism of Teilhard is thus a function of selves, circuits, processes, value-vector development and existential reality. It is possible to detail these more fully by simplifying the hypotheses which have been raised in this and the previous chapters.

In the following set of models of Teilhard therefore the attempt is made to include all the above material and ideas in one overall perspective: the Methodology of Teilhard is only one of the problems which the TGA-Naven model may solve.
A TENTATIVE EXPERIMENTAL FRAMEWORK FOR TEILHARD'S PERSONALITY, LIFE-
AND MENTAL-PROCESSES: THE TOGA-MAFEN MODEL.

CHAPTER IX

The Thesis so far: Three language-pictures.

The three languages used in this Thesis have been those of Self-selves, Psychoanalysis and Scientific metaphor, the latter being biological, physical and cybernetic. Now it is possible to integrate the three perspectives which they give into one, while remembering that they are separate symbolisms.

The first grouping of the Appendix A material followed the general line of the biographies and found Teilhard's family and childhood of importance. It also saw a man free in spirit, with life-crises, new friends, psychological turmoil, a sense of personal destiny, intuitive processes and professional adequacy.

In this the framework being used is a general one. Ordinary conversation, most novels, much philosophy before the rise of modern science, talk of freedom of personality, the person's survival and idiosyncracy among the complexes of life, the pressures of people and events through which nevertheless the human self can often rise. Long before Freud the unconscious parts of man's mind were known, and before Gardner Murphy man's thought was understood as a specific mark of Man though in other metaphors than that of thought-organ. The ideas of Transcendent Self and even Central Self are age-old self-understandings of Man nurtured by his experience, religion, natural philosophy and personal need, and still communicated today in such expressions as "know thyself", "be yourself", "I'm quite myself again".

3. cf. The Renaissance, preceded by Plato and followed by such as Kant, Spinoza and James. Also Murphy, op.cit.
This general symbolism is helpful with Teilhard who was a free human spirit and also believed in his own worth as the 1909 Lourdes article shows by his conquistador but perhaps naïve belief that "I" could resolve the enigma.

But in the Freud–Fromm–Koestler–Erikson sections above this symbolism of the Transcendent Self within general turmoil and complexity has been given specific form by means of the psychoanalytic language. Thus the simple picture of development as:—

Birth in Family          Self in Life

has become the following (after and including Fig. IV and the Eriksonian chapters):—

**Figure VIII: A Psychoanalytic picture of development.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parental womb</th>
<th>Life-crisis</th>
<th>Ego-growth</th>
<th>Peers, Work, Adult-worlds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physiology</td>
<td>Infancy</td>
<td>Central Self</td>
<td>Line of peers: Family*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexuality</td>
<td>Ego-chill</td>
<td>Experimental schizophrenia</td>
<td>(Sc., Reln)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Id-libido energies</td>
<td>Oedipus Complex</td>
<td>Gestalten</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconscious</td>
<td>Illness</td>
<td>Executive concepts</td>
<td>Member of 5 communities:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense-experience</td>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>Weltanschauung</td>
<td>Family, Cath., S.J.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reality-testing</td>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td>Crises negotiated</td>
<td>Science, Savant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bunch of Selves</td>
<td>One Central Self with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brain-thought</td>
<td></td>
<td>Own writing</td>
<td>other selves integrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sexual intimacy</td>
<td>by executive concepts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thought-organ-for-survival</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The main processes involved in this model are those of resolution of crises—conflicts, conflicts of Id–Ego–Superego, transference of emotion from one person or thing to another without negating the emotion that has preceded it, and the possibility of regression to any previous state. Teilhard's "anguish" is the most observable of the latter.

But also in the picture is the presence of balance and coexistence. One part of the personality learns to "live and let live" with another. So that there is self-doubt as well as conquistador confidence both as a function of mother in
the parental womb. That such early infancy conflict lasts throughout life is a
mark of regression and of the continuance of the parental womb's "existence" in
the adult. In terms of communities also there is development without the casting
off of the past. Teilhard leaves the Family mentally and physically to be priest
and Jesuit, but returns in his work, and is always the gentleman. He leaves the
usual Jesuit life but remains Jesuit always. He continues to live with the ethos,
beliefs, attitudes and roles of the communities in which he lives, but molds them
for himself in relation to his other identities and his Central Identity and his
work. He is working to re-write the exercises the week he dies.¹

In the analogy of organism-in-environment the above pictures of Family and
Self, where the Ego grows through parental womb into a Central Self (with selves
and Identity) which lives in and is a function of different communities and interior
and exterior events may be given a further dimension by means of concepts used by
Levi-Strauss.² So far the model incorporates little environmental material.

Thus:-

**Figure IX: Growth of Selves.**

parental womb

father self

Central self

mother self

scientist self

Central-Mystic Self

religious self

Here the development of selves is recognised to have taken place in relation
to the psychoanalytical process-events of the previous Figures (IV⁺) but the
emphasis is on mainly unconscious and mainly emotional development within Teilhard's
personality. Intellectual and conceptual discovery are acknowledged for instance

1. U.P.N.
within the Identity-crises, but in the Freudian model the place of the Oedipus Complex is such that external environment is little discussed.

To redress this imbalance emphasis was made in the previous sections on Teilhard's peers and communities. More specifically now Levi-Strauss's concepts of community "lived-in order" and "thought-of order" as the environments of relationship, expectation, belief, rule, role, unconscious and conscious ethos in the community is applied to Teilhard. He is now to be viewed as the Self-Ego whose development is sketched through the processes of the Figures above but who as a Self-Ego organism interrelates with the following lived-in and thought-of orders (a very hypothetical and selective Table):

**Figure X: Teilhard's lived-in and thought-of orders.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Catholic</th>
<th>Jesuit</th>
<th>Scientific</th>
<th>Savant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>role</td>
<td>sonship</td>
<td>obed, believer</td>
<td>obed, soldier</td>
<td>objective researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rel. no.</td>
<td>personal-emotional</td>
<td>personal obed.</td>
<td>impersonal</td>
<td>team-work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rule</td>
<td>gentleman</td>
<td>Dogma, Canon Law</td>
<td>Order's Rule</td>
<td>publish, comm., judges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expen.</td>
<td>world-work</td>
<td>discipleship</td>
<td>apostleship</td>
<td>experimental research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U., ethos</td>
<td>fam. honour</td>
<td>world-power</td>
<td>world-control</td>
<td>personal ambition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C., ethos</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>spirituality</td>
<td>obed. to Christ</td>
<td>discover Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>belief</td>
<td>Roman Cath.</td>
<td>Reformation, Tradition</td>
<td>&amp; Cath. &amp; Ex. Ign., humanism, agnostm.</td>
<td>humanism, Meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U., belief</td>
<td>social elect</td>
<td>Cathm. elect</td>
<td>material power, science</td>
<td>Truth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This Figure is speculative in detail. The "Family" L-I-O list has some root in the Thesis and in the Teilhard biographies, but the others are inadequate personal speculations which further work would radically change.

But the concept of and possible use of "lived-in-order" and "thought-of-order" is what matters to this Thesis. The fact that it is theoretically possible to map

---

1. Contemporary Science and Religion, if not the Jesuit Community, are after all changing very rapidly.
out the Teilhard-organism in his environments (though with no hope of finding the whole specimen or environment) means that the work may be attempted and the specific aspects in the Figure sought out. In discussion of Teilhard's peers and new communities this has been carried out with some interesting results, for instance that Teilhard was imbibing Modernism as well as Orthodoxy. Therefore in biological metaphor Teilhard's development may be pictured like this:

**Figure XI: The community stimuli-environments.**

```
Family community -> Catholic  Jesuit  Scientist  Savant
Self-in-parental womb    SELF-EGO+DEVELOPMENT
Family community        Catholic  Jesuit  Scientist  Savant
```

or in mathematical metaphor:

Teilhard's Self-Ego is a function of five (at least) community lived-in orders. This latter description incorporates both emotional and intellectual development. It also emphasises the transcendence of Teilhard's Self (by "Self"), certain processes at any rate which have been involved in the growth of this free Central Self (ie "Ego"), and the functional inter-dependence of the Self-Ego with the specific environments of people and their individual and community mental-constructs.

In Teilhard's case, however, it is not enough to symbolise the processes which were involved in his development. What were "precious" to him in later life were his "ideas", and the above Eriksonian interpretations have shown how his Identity in work and unifying concept were functions of early changes of concept. With experience of the "supernatural" his idea of "supernatural reality" became personal commitment. The same happened with the reality of the physical world and the aeon-reality of evolution. Moreover "Christ-Kosmos" unified but also re-oriented Teilhard's mind-processes so that it may be found in all the following
personal writings. His ideas were conceptual elements in his mind-processes and they affected and reflected his personality.

Erikson uses the clinically and psychologically satisfactory concept of Gestalt to describe what there executive concepts are. They are "patterns" found in phenomena which may or may not really be there (like a "face" in a random grouping of dots ... or is it random?). By his emphasis on psychoanalytical aetiology, however, Erikson loses this element of conceptual re-orientation. "Light and cleansing" and "illumination" flood into Martin's soul, but although this means that there is a new "state" in his mind, Martin's tendency to regressive conflict rather blots out the picture of cleansing which has been painted.

The symbolism needed and which can incorporate the Eriksonian and above theory and yet release the Gestalt concept to a position in which it can make sense of Teilhard (and perhaps Luther and Religion generally) is the cybernetic value-vector theory of Ashby and Bateson. This is able to symbolise durational development and also the existential "static" picture of any one moment in time. With this the story of Teilhard can be taken forward with a great leap and all the theory of this Thesis complemented and then integrated.

b. The TGTA-Naven images which incorporate all the previous theory in this Thesis.

The cybernetic model of Teilhard begins with the idea of the "total self" as a "cybernetic model". No one part of the mind is able to report the whole of the mind. The Self is seen as "system" of which the greater part (the treasure store) is unconscious, and much harm to which is done by faulty perception, selection and so purpose. The system therefore is to be viewed critically for failure to "loop" and "feed-back" within the whole, for control-"switches", circuits and loop-circuits.

In the case of biological organisms the "whole" system is regarded as a

hierarchy of sub-systems. When the organism moves, for instance, the various systems of Central Nervous System, physiological system, motor system work together to produce the action. Ashby chooses the language of Value, Vector, Component and Sub-component with which to symbolise this systemic movement. Several different sub-component circuits of information, control and output are visualised as forming a component-system-circuit. Several components might produce a vector and the value of this is the information-sum of the systems which produced the vector-action. Thus by tabulation of the overall hierarchy of the sub-component, component, value and vector a model is made of the duration-processes involved in developing the vector and also of the value of the vector at the time of the event.

As an example of how this model might interpret Teilhard, consider again the sentence in the Man article, "L'Univers s'harmonisera ... dans une unité supérieure", with a "whole" "investi de prolongements surnaturels" centred around Jesus Christ.

In this there is — as Teilhard writes the sentence — in his mind the vector full of religious information-value, the components of which have specific histories such as, in the case of "Jesus Christ" the parental womb of Little Lord Jesus, Sacred Heart and mother's love, and the lived-in orders of the Church, the Jesuits and the Roman Catholic savants like Maréchal. The "Universe" on the other hand may appear in the sentence as a vector from science, with a history ranging from periodic cosmic feeling of the oneness of Creation to the text-book scientific world-view of modern physics. But it comes also from philosophy, so that Metaphysics might be a sub-component within the system which produced the word "Universe" in the sentence. A third value-vector may also be deemed to appear in this sentence. There is the juxtaposition of "surnaturel" and "prolongement", the one being a word (component) from the religious value-vector, the
other from perhaps ordinary language but more specifically from biological paradigm within the science value-vector. It may be said that the religious ideas of life-after-death and new world on the other hand account for this "juxtaposition" which is therefore not juxtaposition. But it is the Universe which is going to "harmonise itself" into this "higher unity", which is not the traditional Two Worlds theory of Orthodoxy.

This discussion anticipates Part Two. The sentence is very similar to statements just prior to the emergence of "christ-Kosmos" and is perhaps best described as a vision of "Pleroma-Christ". But the use of the word "harmonise" is suggestive of a particular type of mind, that of the experimental dreaming which has been noted above. The juxtaposition of religious and science concepts is itself the function of a value-vector which has been growing through components such as the series of Gestalten of 1902, 1905 and 1911-2. What has already been identified as "displacement of concepts" is here suggested as part of a Sense-Sensitivity value-vector. To make sense of the abrupt appearance of this 1910-2 Pleroma-Christ concept both durationally and in this sentence there must be hypothesised in Teilhard's concept-field a Sense-Sensitivity value-vector as well as those of Science and Religion. So that the Pleroma-Christ concept may be symbolised mathematically as a function of three value-vectors. Sense-Sensitivity would take over in Fig. VII from the "imagination" side of the Self-Ego and it would be a function of the Mystic Self.

The theory of Value-Vector is thus giving content to the concept of "bunch of selves", for the adventurous displacement, imagination and schizophrenia is being described in terms of information, circuit and system where earlier above they were the general function of a Mystic Self.

For the overall model of Teilhard therefore being drawn together there are three metaphor-tools:
Figure XII.

1. Id, Ego and Superego.
2. Bunch of selves, including Central Self-Ego.
3. Value-vectors which are both systems built up over time, and need-forces operating in the personality-field at any one moment.

In this Figure, no. 3 raises the question of dominance and priority. In the TSTA scheme which was used in Chapter One value-vectors based on psychoanalytic not cybernetic theory emerged in an order of intensity and purported to show the positive forces observable in the Appendix A account of Teilhard. Because it was based on a positive model of personality little appeared in Figs. I and II of the negative personality components.

The Freud-Fromm-Erikson accounts countered this by their aetiological ontogenetics, but the executive-concept importance is such in the latter that the Gestalten come out as dominant over regression, and still little is said about the negative controls of personality.

The illusion of continuity given by the symbolism of value-vector must be therefore now balanced by the Ashby-Bateson symbolism in which access to computer storage-compartments is easily imagined to be cut off, or the process switched off.

In the cybernetic model the negative "switches-off" are an automatic part of the picture and the idea of dominant value-vectors steamrollering all opposition disappears. Within the personality-system the negative aspects of the psychoanalytic and cybernetic accounts in other words can be incorporated. The simplistic analysis of TSTA is complemented by the picture of value-vector as process with change and discontinuity symbolised in Maven. In this the Central Self-Ego carries within its memory store the historic information of woe and conflict and crisis and the mechanisms which produce regression. It will also be fed by the Sense-
Sensitivity value-vector with new information such as the Gestalten which will reorientate the Self. So there will be Oedipal control and control by new Gestalten.

There will be continuity and change in the bi-polar model to be known as TOTA-Naven.¹

It remains to be seen whether in specific instances the controls may be perceived in the case of Teilhard. There is a Truth value-vector in him which earlier interpretation would suggest is a function of the Infancy-crisis. There is an adventure value-vector of the same origin perhaps. Both these would seem sub-components of the Self-Ego value-vector since they are specifically of parental-womb origin and part of his emotional needs. But as specific controls such value-vectors make less impact. Doubtless there are many such sub-components of personality, but since a model is by definition a simplification of phenomena, it is the set of priority and dominant value-vectors which concern the researcher. In Fig. IV the third and fourth columns show two lists of mainly sub-component value-vectors, and a glance through Teilhard’s letters gives immediate evidence of them. But it is the dominant value-vectors which the sub-components produce and serve which must be studied further.

From this Thesis so far, diagrams and text, it will be clear that from the parental womb both science and religion were growing to dominance in concert with Teilhard’s Self-Ego. So also was the Sense-Sensitivity Mystic Self. Such value-vector-selves would therefore (hypothetically) control each other. Part Two will find evidence of this. Here it is sufficient to say that although Teilhard

¹. TOTA: i.e. Towards a General Theory of Action (Parsons and Shils)
Naven: i.e. Bateson, op. cit. The word is used in this Thesis to symbolise
a) the cybernetic analogy
b) the cybernetic processes which produce and control change and novelty in the individual and in society.
probed for better answers to questions which were still unsolved in both the Religious and the Scientific communities, he never after 1898 (if ever) did not accept the Religious community's paradigms, and after 1912 he never went against what was generally accepted as true by the Scientific community. But in the twilight areas of uncertainty within these different communities he also never (after 1912) gave the dogmatic answer of either community. The two selves of science and religion could press the switch when the other attempted dogma, and the result was that the two sets of paradigm-clusters were held together in tension. The result was also that the Mystic Self was needed to resolve the tension, though not extravagantly and in opposition to the other selves.

After 1912 neither did "otherworldliness" really appear. Before then the security and confidence of the child of loving mother had returned to Teilhard. Through her he had entered the religious world, been made Jesuit and ordained priest. He was happy with this, buoyant in spirit and by 1912 sexually confident. His sense-sensitivity self was fulfilling. As he will say for the next forty-three years, he "loves life". From his ideal-peer and superego father Teilhard had in a complementary manner rebelled and discovered Life, the community of the savant Crozé and of scientists, and the specific work of geology: and then Life as a concept, as the biological reality of the world. Thus was Teilhard in 1912 healthily on the road of Oedipal satisfaction by work in the two parts of life which his two parents loved.

This love of life and Life which has such healthy narcissistic Oedipal and reality-testing roots, and which runs through Teilhard's personal buoyancy towards his concepts of Optimism and Progress, is so dominant in Teilhard that the present writer believes that the hypothesis of a Life value-vector is a reasonable one. Love of Life was both an unconscious emotion and a conceptualised need in Teilhard just like the Self-Ego, Sense-Sensitivity, Religion and Science value-
vector selves. Part Two and the dominance of the interests of Life, the World and Progress after 1912 suggest that there is indeed a dominant value-vector of Life which comes from mother emotionally, experience historically and science and the savant communities conceptually.

**Summary of TUTA-Naven model.**

To summarise this discussion and to conclude the overall TUTA-Naven model of Teilhard the following four sets of diagrams follow from the seven chapters above. (1) First, at any specific moment — existentially — all or some of these five selves may be present:

**Figure XIII: The cybernetic circuit of one whole system.**

Total Self with most part unconscious (and unknown), which is a set of control-programmes with their own information-stores, feed-back loops, etc. (Naven).

These may also be symbolised as value-vectors, thus:

**Figure XIV: The Value-Vectors:**

the five value-vectors convey the intensity and existential reality of Teilhard's ideas. (TGTA)

(2) Second, durationally in a process as opposed to static model of self-value-vector the development may be symbolised like this:
In a more biological metaphor with the organism of Total Self envisaged as developing as a function of the environment (of five communities and many events) this becomes:

Again durationally but this time using the cybernetic metaphor, the total movement over time is:
Considered quantitatively this might look like this increasing information-storage, programming, symbolised by more and more pigeon-holes.

**Figure XVIII: growth of information-circuit-system-selves.**

In more detail this increase of information-process might then look like this, information which ceases to be used directly being stored till needed in the future (thus providing the material for the "logic" of "associations"):–

**Figure XIX: particular growth of value-vectors as per Fig. XVIII.**

(4) The particular reality of mind-processes.

Fourth, it is necessary to show the "reality" as opposed to etiology of whatever thought results from value-vector-self-circuits. There are three pictures which together make sense of the Gestalten which appear. The images are from Biology, Physics and Cybernetics.
1. A new concept is "existential synthesis" in TSTA language. This analogy from biology suggests a non-mysterious process of building on what concepts and material that has gone before, by means of emotional and intellectual parts of personality. But the result is what "is" there at the time and is not the strictly "logical" result which would end a consciously rational process.

2. From the Frank-Lewin area of value-vector field-theory such a new concept is the resultant of two (or more) forces as in vector-mathematics.

3. Cybernetic theory would place the Gestalt as the final vector of much previous data-processing, data-gathering, control and programming. If the system is being fully programmed and there is no arithmetical hitch the Gestalt will be the "logical" result of the programme. If there is an element of error, uncertainty, unknowability or adventure in the programme, or error or lack of logical type in the information used, then the resulting Gestalt may be wrong information, correct information, random spin-off or controlled spin-off. Since in Teilhard's case the Goddish part of the information is Metaphysics, there is no way of checking his Christ-Kosmos Gestalt. Its usefulness however is checkable in the sense that he needed an Identity-unifying Gestalt. So that behaviourally-speaking the Gestalt is analogous to a "search-image" just as his value-vectors "were" "mental filters" and "controls". Also checkable is the academic fact of whether the Gestalt turns out to be "reasonable" within specific communities. But whatever the discussions on this decide, that Teilhard's Christ-Kosmos was "spin-off" which historically, psychologically and behaviourally met his particular need is certain.

Diagramatically these pictures are as follows:-
1. unconscious emotion reason associations (etc) -> existential synthesis

2. resultant

3. $x \rightarrow y \rightarrow z \rightarrow \text{output}$ (possibly random spin off)

This picture symbolises the unknowability "in reality" of what processes and information "in fact" produce any specific concept. It emphasises randomness but also the overall complexity of the human being.

This a rather magical picture which stresses the inevitability of the product and the need through which concepts are produced. The abstraction of the model is useful as clarification but its mystery not.

This picture indicates clearly the possibilities of error in information, program or output. It may err itself in reducing overmuch the complexity of the human being, but it conveys the detail and specificity involved in what looks to be novel discovery or Gestalt.

In more detail each circuit would have loops, feed-backs, controls, programmes: so theoretically the Gestalt Christ-Kosmos might be:-

---

1. According to UPN. See Part Two.
Figure XXII: possible concepts/associations/processes in concept-development.

In cybernetic and whole/parts metaphor:—

(New Concept)

This metaphor might be complemented by that of TOTA (above), thus:—

But this symbolism of the resultant syntheses of value-vectors gains in feasibility when the cybernetic model of personality is introduced as in the
b. The overall perspective of this Thesis.

What is now appearing is a three-fold symbolism through which to understand the mental processes of Teilhard: the language of Transcendent Self, "a bunch of selves", "Ego-development" through Infancy/Oedipal/Identity-Crises, "thought-organ" and personality-freedom and -integrity: the language of personality forces where a field of value-vectors vie for strength and result in the action for instance of existential conceptual synthesis: and the language of the mind-is-a machine analogy in which Input, Information, Memory Store, Logical (arithmetical) Process, Program and Control produce Output, in which case a concept or Gestalt is a spin-off, again an existential synthesis but one which is the production of specific processes which may (unlike "forces") be detailed and checked.

Thus these three sets of symbols are identical in purpose in this Thesis and they complement each other. They are tools through which to piece together the "reality" of Teilhard, his "really-reality" being untouchable.

But another unity between the sets is possible if they are used in two phases, first to give the existential situation for any happening, but second to give the durational history of the same happening. Thus, going back to the 1911-12 development of a higher unity of the whole in Christ there are two ways of approaching it. The above diagrams note the existential-situational-ecological happening when five selves (= five sets of information = five value-vectors) are set in motion and result in the Gestalt-concept. But looked at durationally a different picture emerges (which possibly brings the 1911-2 Teilhard closer to the original Teilhard of 1915+):-
Here it is clear that the 1911–2 concept was a function durationally as well as existentially of the selves/value-vectors/information circuits. Further the question of Teilhard's Methodology is now being probed. In the language of Self and selves Teilhard is simply having Gestalten and using reality-testing processes but little else. The only "method" used by him to reach the Gestalt was the courageous and adventurous resolution of personality conflicts, mystical experience and as much reflection as writing for a community periodical demanded. In value-vector symbolism the emphasis is also on unconscious processes ending in an existential resultant. Only in the cybernetic metaphor is the concept of "concept" taken seriously and imaged as a reality in its own right; for here it is seen as bits of information built up over time (even if minimal) through process and control and not resting on luck but on the "logic" in the system (though the result may be random).

The anomaly concerning Teilhard's Methodology will therefore have to be solved by discovering in detail whether the concepts like Christ-Kosmos are logical according to the cybernetic model, or random spin-off (or error), and whether their production is followed by feed-back. Figure XXI gave a preview of what might be done. But what is missing there is a symbol of the basic controls in Teilhard's personality. Figure IX must not be forgotten. Here with one last image this section and Part One may draw to a close. In Bateson's language 1 there was control.

of Teilhard's changing and new ideas. The "ritual" (Navon) was Teilhard's parental womb, the schizogenesis "symmetrical" because Teilhard's Mystic-Pantheist Self had to grow, but also "complementary" because parents and the other selves had equal power in his personality. There were new concepts but these were balanced by cybernetic controls. Figure XXIV holds together the change and the continuity, the obedience and the rebellion, the novelty and the conservative roots of Teilhard.

The concept-clusters which hold Teilhard's main interest are controlled by who he is as well as by what is needed. When new concepts appear therefore the situation will be something like the following:

Figure XXIV: The Navon control in Teilhard, and Schizogenesis.

Perhaps an analogy for this is in the Watson-Crick model of the Double Helix

In Teilhard's case there are the two complex information-systems of Science and Religion. They hold together in tension and information is swopped. This displacement results in new material and the double-helix system continues this reproductive function. The Teilhardian Double-Helix is the Science-Religion tension which spirals continually into new concepts.

These last figures have emphasised the Schismogenesis part of the Teilhard story. How was it that Teilhard did not become mad, a religious schizophrenic in 1902 — or a secular scientist in 1911? Bateson found the Haven ritual control to be the "thermostat" which maintained change and continuity within the tribe.

The above diagrams find that Teilhard's parental womb and the growth of information-complexes to which he was committed acted to keep his Central Self integrated. He could no more leave the Priesthood than leave his mother, and he could no more find an executive concept to form a Weltanschauung for his selves from his scientific information-commitment alone than follow only his father.

The figures also suggest what Gestalt Psychology maintains: that Gestalten reorientate the personality as well as illumine and cleanse the person. Teilhard's child-adolescent-adult history has shown how early interests became commitments, then priorities, then dominant factors in his life. The cosmic feeling became rocks- and star-need which became geology and astronomy and finally professional science and a Universe-world-view. Mother became religion, Jesus, priests, Virgin, Mass, Order, Priesthood and life-long Religion.

The conscious conceptual development was more clearly that of Gestalten. The 1902 experience of Supernatural Reality, the 1905 realisation of the physical immensity of the Cosmos, the 1911-2 feeling of the world being alive with the movement of Evolution and the growth of a universal being, and the 1916 Christ-Kosmos were personality reorientations.

What is revealed when this list is written down is that these conceptual
realisations stayed with Teilhard not just as association-memories, but as watersheds for new streams of thought. Teilhard never regresses from them. They were controls which helped to program later information. They were the conceptual bases of Originality.

Within the Self-Ego therefore or as another value-vector there should be the Gestalt-information-complex. This has been symbolised in Figures XXI and XXIV by the appearance on the right hand side of a Christ-Kosmos value-vector which continues along side the other five. By this symbolism the question of Navan control receives a further answer for once the Gestalten appear they help to control Teilhard's further thought-development.

These different ways of thinking about the same things, namely the growth of Teilhard's personality, his thinking and the appearance of new concepts have been pictured mainly by making hypotheses concerning his changes over time and seeing hints of these in the scattered biographical material available. That there is something of reality in these pictures is the suggestion of Part Two where autobiographical material is invoked as evidence for the above hypotheses and deemed to demonstrate them. In Part Two self-revealing writing by Teilhard will pinpoint the argument so far. In this the model of five selves as value-vector systems will make some sense of what appears to be Teilhard. Whether the cumulative and comprehensive effect of such material will demonstrate the above hypotheses to be reasonable will be discussed in the last chapter.

With the model of Teilhard as five value-vector circuit-system-selves symbolising his reality, this Thesis moves into the experiment of testing the model against specific material. This is Part Two, and in this the Methodology and Originality anomalies will be further probed since the lead-up to Christ-Kosmos is the voyage of personal discovery needed to produce Teilhard's full identity in an overall executive concept. In the unpublished personal papers of UPN this voyage is exciting.
CHAPTER X

INTRODUCTION TO THE UN-PUBLISHED NOTES MATERIAL, AND TO THE METHOD USED TO INTERPRET IT.

The TGTA-Naven model of Teilhard which has been built up to represent who and what Teilhard was durationally as an organism developing over time and existentially as a person "happening" at any particular moment (after 1911) is a hypothesis which is ready for experiment.

The experiment will take place during analysis of the first material which Teilhard ever wrote consistently and which alone incorporates the day-to-day changes of his thought. The TGTA-Naven theory which grew through imaginative linking of so-called "scientific" theory with sparse psycho-biographical and biographical data is now to be asked to show patterns in Teilhard's most intimate writing and so in his mind-processes and being. That this attempted demonstration of hypotheses is based in unknown material raises also the possibility of finding new Teilhard which might or might not be evidence for the correctness of the hypotheses. At all events what will be found will be further tested within the more well-known Teilhard material so that the model can be weighed for comprehensiveness.

The material of UFN has been read by the present writer in the original hand-writing of Teilhard and in type-script. The latter was checked against the MSS and found to be exact. The former proves itself of greatest importance because almost alone among Teilhard writings it is in his own hand. On the other hand the present writer was able to copy only parts of it so that what is used in this Thesis is a selection from a selection. But for the watershed-year of August 1915-6
almost a full copy was taken, and the years of 1916–25 are not inadequately represented. Thus though there is the possibility that key sentences, paragraphs or even pages may have been missed, there is nevertheless the probability that the crucial months of executive-concept creation have been well worked-upon and so understood because the emphasis in this part of the Thesis is upon that first year for which there is most evidence. At further crucial points in the story such as early 1920 there has also been dense copy taken so that, in all, the material which is used for the TGTA-Naven experiment is sufficient.

The significance of the intimate nature of this UFN material is that in it Teilhard is writing words and sentences for himself alone. Ideas and needs come popping out of his head and through his fingers on to the paper. So that where the later essay may show after-the-event understanding the UFN pages give the spontaneous creation and even the before-the-event preparation for the novel concept. The later essay may show Teilhard the man who re-works ideas with a reflective mind, but UFN brings the reader into the existential situation of personal discovery and in a Thesis on how a mind works it takes him veritally into the lion’s den. The interior and exterior needs and pressures are there to see. The people, environment, events and ideas which act as stimuli are there open to view in some detail. The inner and outer organism is fixed for analysis in its environment. The information in-put and out-put is laid out there on paper.

In this the UFN material differs from the published letters of the Great War because these are selections which include editorial re-working, addition and omission. To prevent unintentional reworking of UFN indeed the passages to be quoted will be quoted in full with no omissions and in the original French. In this way the reader knows that it is the intimate and true voice of Teilhard which he hears. But two points should be made. First that with length of passage comes so much material that the reader may have difficulty in noting the particular phrase or sentence
which is being referred to in the Thesis. Second, this means that the reader will have to develop the faculty of noting the associations of concepts rather than logical progressions in the paragraphs. In the present Thesis the rhythms of Teilhard's unconscious are deemed the logic in his mind and the quotations below will begin to show such rhythms and (if the reader looks for Logic), the lack of strict logical progression of idea. Third, there will be a certain overlapping of material simply because of Teilhard's mind-rhythms. For the latter mean that ideas come round again and again in slightly changed form or for different motives, and in the following attempt to disentangle the strands by TGTA-Jiaven model this will mean studying similar or identical material from different angles.

On the other hand the later chapters of this Thesis where little full quotation is deemed necessary will be more readily understandable on the basis of the earlier full quotations.

The commencement of the UPN writings: Existential¹ problems and hints of originality² and method: the first days.

According to the UPN material³ Teilhard wrote an essay on Evil for one of his comrades in the trenches in 1915. Though this essay has not survived and so the idea cannot be checked it has been suggested that what Teilhard wrote in this first essay was felt by him to have been profoundly unsatisfactory, so that he had to begin experimental thinking again to work out his own salvation.

Whether this was so or not Evil was with Collectivity in being mentioned on the first page of UPN as pressure and problem to be solved. He had need (he says) also to put down his particular personal thoughts because he might be gone soon and

---

1. "Existential" in the sense of what "is" there at the time in Teilhard's mind and life.
2. "Originality" in the sense of personal discovery outside what he had been taught in the communities in which he had lived.
3. See below. The passages quoted from UPN may be confirmed at the Teilhard Foundation in Paris or in the papers of Dr. K. Schmitz-Moormann.
they might be valuable for posterity. The overall press and experience of trench-warfare forced him to write.

So much of Teilhard is exposed to view on this first day:

"Pour tromper l'ennui du cantonnement et me forcer à penser, à observer, à préciser, je commence une espèce de journal" ...
"le lendemain c'est Ypres et son radieux canal abordé sous l'éclatement des marmites" ... ("Aujourd'hui, je suis aux Cinq-Chemins" ...)
"C'est tout le mois de mai, son vacarme étourdissant de canons frappent des heures entières, ses vapeurs asphyxiantes ...
Reverrai-je jamais de semblables journées, et n'ai-je pas perdu l'occasion unique de recueillir et d'utiliser des impressions que je ne connaîtrai peut-être plus?

N'importe, commencions. Que, sur ce mauvais papier d'école, pour la gloire de Notre Seigneur, toute ma meilleure pensée s'écoule ... désirs, remarques, croquis, idées enfin mères, qui tous par un coup, lorsque je les tâtais à peine, se seront détachés, bien formés dans ma main. Ici, point d'amour propre (je le désir, au moins), point (ni) de dilettantisme ni de volupté prise à me saouler moi-même ... Mais seulement l'effort pour ne rien abandonner de ce qui peut glorifier Notre Seigneur ..." (UPN 1,1)

Here in this passage there is the Self-Ego of Teilhard which wishes to generate and write down the thoughts unique to itself but which find their purpose within the concepts of and so within total commitment to his Religion self. Personal destiny and identity within Christian discipleship are value-vector-needs and information-circuits within the first droplets of what will be the stream of his personal discovery.

Within a few more lines there is vivid proof of Sense-Sensitivity experience which brings to mind the earlier pilgrimages of the Self-Ego especially those of experimental schizophrenia. It may even remind the reader of the Sussex Weald Gestalt of a universal being by its picture of being at the "threshold" of some "immense" things of happiness, rather like the travail of a woman in labour:

"Tout-à-l'heure, dans la vaste grange où je faisais ma sieste, le vent gémissait, - comme à Sarcenat, comme à Vialles, comme à Jersey, comme à Ore ... Oh le tourbillon de souvenirs obscurs et
"profonds que le bruit du vent remue dans nos coeurs, comme s'il nous portait au seuil de quelque immense bonheur triste!"

Deux principaux problèmes m'occupent l'esprit ..." (UPN 1.1b)

With this passage the two problems are introduced. They have both occupied him for some time. Concerning the one of Evil Teilhard differentiates between physical reality and moral. In discussing Collectivity he uses the scientific concepts of "crystal", "matter" and "inertia" and displaces them into social phenomena, and he also uses the biological concept of "wholes" for these.

That is to say the Science self has provided physical and biological concepts which are used to speak of human freedom both individual and social. This question had been raised by writers who were discussing the organisational excellence of the German State, and war-machine, one of whom was Emile Boutroux, a philosopher of Science and Religion, so that it was the Savant community which particularly had prompted the tension in Teilhard. But the tale comes full circle when the next jotting shows the Religious self attacking Durkheimian ideas of universal consciousness by exposition of the concept of individual soul. For it is only when all souls are in unison and are one heart and one soul that "social matter" will be "liberated". One moment Science, the next Religion is the value-vector pressing Teilhard and producing his thought, specifically his orientation to the problem.

The two remarkable passages run as follows:-

"Deux principaux problèmes m'occupent l'esprit depuis quelque temps: celui de Mal et celui des collectivités: En ce qui touche le premier, il y aurait sans doute lieu de dissocier bien plus complètement que je ne le fais dans mon dernier essai la mal physique du mal moral. Non seulement le mal physique est le revers inevitable de la faculté de sentir, mais on conçoit que Dieu l'ait constitué positivement, à titre d'aiguillon, d'épreuve, d'obstacle à traverser ..." (UPN 1.1a)

"La collectivité fait cristalliser à l'extérieur de nous une seconde matière. Notre spontanéité est prise entre l'inertie des ensembles sociaux et celle des liaisons biologiques (réflexes, habitudes, etc ...) - Il n'y a pas d'autre "Conscience universelle" que celle de "l'universalité", apte à se développer dans toutes âmes  }

"individuelles. La libération de la matière sociale se fera quand, tous, n’aurons qu’un cœur et qu’une âme. (Et la libération de la matière proprement dite ...) (UPN 1.1a)

In the first intimate notes of Teilhard therefore there is evidence for four value-vector-system-selves each with their own concepts. There is evidence for adventurous schizophrenia and multiple displacement of concepts. There is evidence of personal quest but in relation to problems raised within the Savant community, answers to which are given by means of concepts from the Church and Scientific communities. Even the Life value-vector may be deemed present in the total acceptance of biological reality and the life he is experiencing: God after all is sending the "physical" to be "traversed" ...

Such evidence might suggest either hotch-potch irrationalism or a personality-system with unusual components. But that what is happening is nearer the latter is shown by the element of thought-reflection in the last passage from this first UPN entry. Here is evidence of a reflective mind realising that it is using metaphorical language so that there enters in right at the beginning the metaphysical enigma of language and so of Teilhard: can reality be described or thought of in any other way than metaphor? is an orthodox metaphor more correct than a colourful or outrageous metaphor brought in from some unusual part of life? are metaphors which are successful in describing experimental reality better for describing what is not? With Teilhard the question will finally be, does metaphor like "second matter" lead to useful reinterpretation of reality, especially Christ, and is such metaphor as valid or more so (or less so) than metaphor from the Legal Profession. Is Teilhard reifying the displaced concepts or is it thought-experiment? In what sense is his metaphor Christ-Kosmos not a metaphor?

The reflective entry runs as follows:--

"Il y aurait grand intérêt à étudier l'évolution (ses lois générales, sa "mécanique" vraie, plus ou moins analogiquement, dans tous les ordres) sur les cas où nous percevons directement
The existence of reflective mechanisms in Teilhard is shown by his approach here to analogy: he has such knowledge in his mind-store. But this is only one sub-component of his Self-Ego value-vector. At the very beginning of the original Teilhard it is the stimulus of personal need to solve problems by means of religious and biological/social concepts which is mostly in evidence. The response is imaginative displacing of metaphor which is so keenly felt that "second matter" is a Gestalt. Personal need continues then for within a few more lines and with some reflection the Teilhard mind has leapt into another dream, this time in need-desire to study Evolution. Vectors press sometimes in unison, sometimes one by one.

Concerning the problem of Evil the Religion and Science value-vectors operate side-by-side and the biological milieu is given positive value vis-a-vis religious pilgrimage. The scientific reality is given theological meaning so as to offer at least a temporary solution to the existential (Self-Ego) problem of Christian discipleship in time of war. Strictly reflective thought comes after first emotion.

That at the beginning of UPN it is already "original" Teilhard is suggested by the adherence to the concepts of "second matter" and "social wholes" in connection with the metaphor of "crystallisation", for the later Christology of UPN and the lifelong interest in Man evidenced for instance at the end of his life by his study of Socialisation rest on this 1915 Gestalt. It may be that the idea of "second matter" and "social whole" came from someone like Oswald or even from Boutroux¹ who had recently written on Comte, W. James and Spenser. The reference to "one heart" and "one soul" could have been a function of Boutroux.² But in relation to

---

1. Oswald and Boutroux are mentioned at this time in UPN.
Teilhard himself whose last known writing was the article on Man in 1911-2, the understanding of social organisation as the gathering together of elements into a "whole" which forms and behaves as a "second matter" was personal adventure and discovery. The first page of UPN suggests the original Teilhard and hints at the same time at his methods of thought.

Since the first day's entry gives evidence of concept-clusters and paradigms from religion and science as well as of happenings in Teilhard's personality processes which make sense within the process-models used in Part One of this Thesis, it is reasonable to continue to interpret UPN by means of the TSTA-Naven model.

Within the sentences and paragraphs quoted above the pressures of distinct selves may be imagined without mistreating the material. Such selves are unnecessary hypothesis if the processes of literary creativity are maintained as mystery or if Teilhard is a priori dubbed "nonsense". As an attempt to unmake mystery they are however not yet unreasonable hypothesis. Indeed looking back on the first day's paragraphs there may even be seen to have been a paragraph-rhythm: Self-Ego interests are followed by Religious; then Sense-Sensitivity, Self-Ego, Religion, Science, Sense-Sensitivity, Science and Self-Ego again. Teilhard's intimate thoughts come out in rhythms which reflect specific needs and interests which have been observed in his earlier personality- and life-development.

What Part Two of this Thesis therefore must do is test whether such rhythms are in evidence throughout this material, so as to, if possible, fix by his writings who Teilhard is and how his mind works.

The main section of UPN which will be used for this task is the early part which leads up to Vie Cosmique. First the TSTA-Naven value-vectors are considered separately and the hypothesis of their continuing development tested. Second the development of "original" Gestalten is traced and their relationship to the value-vector circuit-selves. Thus is reached an understanding of the executive concept
Christ-Kosmos which fulfills Teilhard's personality.

By tracing the TGTA-Naven model within phrases, sentences, paragraphs and sections in this intimate material a possible answer to the emergence of novel ideas is given and their progress non-mysteriously outlined.
CHAPTER XI

THE SELF-EGO REALITY IN TEILHARD
CONSIDERED DURATIONALLY UP TO MID-APRIL 1916.

The UPW material begins and continues with the story of the Self-Ego development to accepted adult personality and identity.

The personal tension of Teilhard in late August 1915 was introduced in the last chapter. He had personal need to put thoughts to paper before it was too late, to resolve the problem of Evil to his own satisfaction, to enter the Savant arena where German collectivity was being weighed for human value against French individuality, to make play with his childhood-originating mystic sense when the wind groaned sad happiness, and to embark on a study of Evolution’s mechanisms and so analogically on matters of social evolution. Teilhard’s mind was active and his tensions were personal and intellectual, and that is how the story continues.

1. Personal Stimuli: books, people, Marguerite – and the growth of the Mystic Self.

The reality of Identity-Crisis is specified on 9th September. Before this Teilhard had been on dangerous night patrol with his company among "animal panic". He had read Boutroux’s article on Materialisation, had some new ideas based in Biblical concepts, conducted numerous Masses and met some brother priests by chance. Now on the ninth he has an "intimate" talk with P. Emonet who had been at the Louvain conference (1912).

To Emonet must fall the responsibility for "triggering off" much of the original Teilhard. First he pressed Teilhard to be Chaplain not stretcher-bearer so that he should be seen a Priest above all. Second (two days later) Emonet was part of a "fusion esquise" with Teilhard and three other Jesuits. Not only must he have refreshed Teilhard with Louvain memories. He reopened the Oedipus Complex, the childhood tensions and the 1911-2 decisions and solution.
That Teilhard did not become a Chaplain for two years and then only with much misgiving shows that Teilhard did not regress. In fact within a month he was exploring with P. Cugnien for fossils and only became Chaplain after the Identity-Crisis had been solved conceptually by Christ-Kosmos. It was advance to new positions, not regression. But what Emonet did was to throw Teilhard back into himself, into personal introspection so that on 25th Sept., after a day of "intense" bombardment before a day attack he could write the following passages of self-doubt, self-perception and renewal of identity in Christian discipleship and ordination:

"je n'ai pas su, à ce moment supreme, me maintenir au niveau adopté; je me suis senti égoïste, petit, uniquement soucieux de ma petite préservation personnelle; ... Et puis, j'ai intensément perçu que celui-là seul épreuve jusqu’au bout le poids et la grandeur de la guerre qui doit, à certaines heures, sortir des abris et monter à l’assaut, ce qui ne m'arrivera jamais. Non, je n'ai rien du héros, et, en moi, les vérités de la foi sont bien lentes à renouveler la nature et à lui apprendre à se sacrifier. Jusqu'au bout, Seigneur, je crains de rester le froid calculateur, ou le snob qui accepte le danger comme un ornement ajouté à un édifice de perfection humaine destiné à survivre à la guerre." (UPN 1.5)

"Jésus, ma vie doit désormais être telle, pour vous plaire et pour captiver les autres: "Recevoir-donner-sourire." Recevoir votre Volonté, donner mon coeur, mes dons, mon temps, - Toujours être doux et accueillant,"
"difficiles vis-à-vis de mes hommes, - dont je me fatigue, et réciproquement. -Et pourtant, il faut être, comme N.S., "Benignitas." (UPN 1.5a)

From the end of September until after Christmas there is something of a lull in the UPN writing, including a total gap from 9 October to 9 November. But, during this time, Teilhard had read Sterne's Tristram Shandy and Bourget's Sens de la Mort, in between battles. Possibly English teacher Marguerite had supplied the books so that intimacy with Marguerite may concretely here be a function of

Teilhard’s development. Balzac was a keen student of Sterne and Balzac was soon to be read, so perhaps Marguerite’s 1912+ introduction of Teilhard to wider worlds and Savant interests was being continued. The curiosity which Sterne exhibits concerning life and people fits in with this suggestion. Bourget likewise might have come from her since human suffering was a personal problem to her. Both books however by themselves show Teilhard’s mind searching unconsciously perhaps for information which may pursue the questions raised; those of the existence of Evil and the social humanity of Man.

Sexuality and intimacy appear together specifically on 15 December when at a Convent the Superior is "maternal" and makes Teilhard think of his sister Françoise and he is there in a roomful of priests with many friends. His mother, his peer sister, the Church and Order peer-communities reinforce his commitment to religion.

On the same day there are mathematical and scientific concepts, reflective questioning of the Church Institution and specific personal ideas (concerning "dead" Life and the "whole").1 The Identity as sketched in Part One is active. After a gay Christmas in a Baron’s entourage and a "bourgeois" existence in another house the need to be himself becomes overpowering. He acknowledges that his ideal horizons always take pantheistic and christian forms and he now has a sharp "need" to become individual again and take his place in some great movements of thought. He needs to put down a testament of the better things which Nature has evoked in him.

"Dans cette détente de danger et de la vie"instantanée", je sens sourdre en moi un vif besoin de redevenir personnel, de penser, de concourir (à la manière d’une personne, et non plus d’un atome) à quelque grande movement de pensee, attitude, progrès. Et, tout naturellement, je me trouve reporté en face des horizons panthéistiques et chrétiens qui sont toujours la

---
1. These ideas may have come from Boutroux op. cit., though they were part of the atmosphere of those days of Bergson.
2. As noted above, Bergson and Maeterlinck are instances of what Teilhard meant by pantheism.
forme prise par mes aurores d'idéal ... Si Dieu me prête vie, je crois qu'en me laissant aller au fil de moi-même, j'arriverai à mettre debout un testament qui contiendra quelque chose du meilleur évoqué par la Nature en moi." (UPN 1.7a)

Here the Mystic self, Religious self and the Self-Ego in existential press are forcing him to produce the executive concepts which will fix him as he really is. His Integrity-crisis of formal and reflective acceptance of who he is is emphasised.

Marguerite in her collection of letters to Teilhard and in a mention by Teilhard perhaps to a letter which she has omitted specifies the specific parts of this press. First Teilhard has been walking in the woods, along trench duckboards and the canal, by night, at times "by a wonderful moon"; and at such times he experiences the "veil of poetry" which is flung over the warring armies. So experimental schizophrenia was present now. Second Marguerite has from her personal need and love for Teilhard given him the boost of women's love by suggesting that in the turmoil of war he will be sensitised to discover new being in himself. This passage runs as follows:

"Marguerite pense que, semblable à une passionnante musique, la guerre doit me mettre dans un état de supra-sensibilité au soin duquel je me trouverai des accents ignorés ... Est-ce vrai?" (UPN 1.8)

2. The first executive concept of the war.

With both the need now to think out and write down his own ideas and the reinforcement of this plan by Marguerite's love there came (on 28th January 1916) realization that there was one point at which his last year's impressions and views met. This point was the intellectual problem of "God and the World", and no sooner had he written that down than Teilhard notes that this problem arises from his personal need as a pantheist and in the same breath gives his answer that "divine

1. MM, p.39.
**Matter** reconciles "God and matter" and is there already in Our Lord Jesus Christ.

"Si j'écris quelque chose, si j'agis intellectuellement, il me semble que ce doit être pour concilier, réconcilier (en un sens) Dieu et le Monde, c'est à dire montrer que Dieu termine éminemment nos aspirations immanentes et panthéistiques. - v.e.g. Dieu et matière; "La Matière divine" réalisation étonnante de ceci en N.S. J.C." (UNN 1,8)

This first executive concept of Divine Matter emerges into this sentence without preparation according to UNN or UN1, though in the latter Teilhard says that he is opening up his mind as much as he can to contact with God. 1 He had also been reading the Revue Hébdomadaire and Newman's Apologia (both sent by Marguerite2) so that preparation for the Gestalt will have been to do with concepts from these. Otherwise, with "sensibilised spirit"3 ideas just emerge from the intense psychological tension. But once begun the flow of thought continues unabated for nearly two months, at the end of which the full concept which fixes his identity has been produced and worked out, to be written down within another month in the first formal essay of the adult Teilhard.4

In the TGTA-Naven model of Teilhard the Gestalten, though produced in the Sense-Sensitivity value-vector-system, take their place soon enough in the controlling system of the Central Self-Ego because (by definition in Gestalt-theory) they reorientate the Central Self. Thus here it would be possible to continue tracing the Self-Ego development by tracing the Gestalten. Since the latter however form a section by themselves that particular approach will be left until later, so that the emphasis now will be to note further instances of the problems of Ego-development as they occur in the story of Teilhard's further mental survival.

---

1. UNN, p.91.
2. UN1, p.90,93.
3. UNN for 4 Feb, 16.
3) The Mystic Self posings problem and solution in adventurous schizophrenia.

That Teilhard's Self-Ego in its search for identity by means of solving the crucial problem of God and the World ("Nature") can only be successful by means of the Sense-Sensibility information- and vector-system, is suggested by two passages which soon follow. It is only in mystical adventure and schizophrenia that Teilhard can even see the Problem. Abstract thought cannot do for his personal idea-making what the warmth of personal psychic experience does:-

"en écrivant sur le monde, veiller à ne pas laisser ma pensée s'appauvrir et se refroidir, par abstraction; mais, de même qu'un artiste repose son regard, d'instant en instant, sur le modèle qui l'inspire, — de même dois-je retremper, re-sensibiliser mon âme, dans tel ou tel spectacle de grandeur, de poésie, ou de mystère, — me remettre en face du Problème ..." (UPN 1.10)

"Je me sens le cœur plein de ce que je ne puis exprimer; Mon être cherche évidemment quelque chose à quoi s'accrocher: amour à réchauffer, influence à exercer, courant à créer ... Le seul Object apte à me rassasier, c'est évidemment Notre Seigneur. Mais est-ce assez? Sans doute, une conversion amoureuse vers son Coeur, une intense convergence sur Lui, satisfaisant aux exigences essentielles de ma vie, et me valent un gain indécible et incorruptible. Mais de même que le mot "charité" n'est pas la réponse assez précise aux exigences sociales, et demande une specification en fonction de l'état présent (v.g. syndicats ...) de même le geste de me retourner vers Jésus appelle des précisions, des specifications ultérieures. (UPN 1.10a)

With mystical experience a necessity for his identity, originality and creativity Teilhard's Self-Ego is needing the Sense-Sensibility self to see both problem and solution (Gestalt). But again the Religion self appears with Our Lord as the only possible solution, and Teilhard's emotional religious passion bursts through with "intense convergence on Our Lord". Science and sexuality appear too in one phrase with the "conservation of passion-energy" (energie passionelle). His "pantheist soul" is reaffirmed, he commits himself to "love of the world" and to the "new earth" being reached "through the totality of things", he praises the "ardent human heart", he is searching for the "palpable" influence of God and
dreams that God may be possessed in the "palpable" things of earth; Heaven seized in the Earth. Though not till April does Teilhard formulate such thoughts as "faith in Life" and "love of Life" the commitment to experimental reality is now present, and then follows the conceptualisation of the narcissistic-buoyancy feelings so long a part of Teilhard. A letter of 7 Feb. 16 shows this conscious acceptance of pantheism which is in the context of an expanded understanding of his place in the universe:

"Quelle que soit la vivacité de mes ambitions je n'éprouve aucune anxiété à songer qu'elles peuvent ne pas se réaliser. Il me semble que j'ai perdu la préoccupation des avantages de mon petit individu. Je ne suis plus guère touché que par les Causes qui me sollicitent, et par l'idée d'épouser, flexiblement, le vouloir divin, à travers la totalité des choses et des événements. J'ai toujours eu, je crois, l'âme panthéiste. C'est très commode pour être chrétien ..." (UPN 1.11)

Meanwhile the external stimuli which press Teilhard's development continue. Marguerite sends Balzac. Teilhard takes personally the artist's possible "suicide of a talent". War teaches Teilhard to "passionately love the Causes and the World". Moral effort sensibilises his soul and releases his "long compressed speculative energies". Danger purifies the thirst for speculation and chronic danger forces one to live on a different level. There is little doubt that life in the trenches encouraged Teilhard's mystical thought-experiments, (though he found that in crises his thirst for ideas was dried up.)


This picture of adventurous thought and speculation must nevertheless be balanced by Teilhard's own description of what is happening in war to his mind. His own feeling is that he is having enhanced self-perception and that this reality-testing then is being applied to the whole of the outside world: he is being "disinterested" in his views and his faculties are being enlarged:-

"Son âme est sensibilisée par l'effort moral, bandée aussi
"dans ses énergies spéculatives, longtemps comprimées."

"L'homme s'attache à ses pensées sans orgueil, sans arrière-pensée d'un avenir ou d'une carrière a s'ouvrir."

"sitôt qu'une éclaircie se fait dans l'existence des camps, qu'une oasis de silence s'étend autour de l'esprit, l'homme se retrouve lui-même et au-dessus de lui-même, parce que désintéressés dans ses vues et agrandis dans ses facultés (aiguisées et affamées). A la guerre, on apprend à s'aimer passionnement les Causes et le Monde, sans trop penser à soi..." (UFN 1.15)

So far there has been date in UFN 1.1ff which suggests that the Eriksonian thesis and five-selves TGTA-Naven model which incorporates it are useful tools with which to see what is happening in Teilhard.

The Eriksonian thesis now receives further backing from a series of passages in this month of February 1916. While noting that "the whole man moves" (as Newman says) and that his own ideas are on the move Teilhard suddenly realises that at the end of the day and in spite of pressures and changes of attitude he is basically the same person as before. Although there are many associations of ideas from a wide area his Self and its problems move without discontinuity:

"Les raisonnements, les fluctuations sentimentales ou intellectuelles passent sur mon âme comme les lamas sur une tête d'écuil, sans modifier son attitude fondamentale — finalement suivant les lignes de force anciennes ... invinciblement, en dépit des attitudes nouvelles, transitoirement adoptées, je me retrouve épris d'union — tout bandé vers la Communion au Vouloir Divin." (UFN 1.20)

In this passage there is perhaps some association of ideas with the "lines of force" metaphor which appears in a jotting a week earlier. Here the vector image comes out of his mind, used in another way:

"comme je l'ai déjà présenté il y a quatre ans, les tendances de l'homme ne sont pas des forces parallèles, mais dirigées dans des sens divers, chaque nouvelle composant reposant sur les précédentes, mais angulairement par rapport à elles." (UFN 1.13a)

What is remarkable in the former passage is that his identity as Christian disciple in the world is the final resultant. But what in 1911–2 was the tension
between Religion and Science is now different. The week of 14-21 February is full of scientific concepts like "cell", "laws" and "fossils", and religious attitudes and concepts abound like "mystical union" and "the Divine". But these value-vectors which can be traced to parental womb are now joined by attitudes and concept-clusters which are to do with Self-Ego development, Life and Sense-Sensitivity, those of Teilhard as an individual Human. What earlier had been described as the tension between God and the World which existed in the struggle between his pantheist and Christian souls now returns as the existential need for a "synthesis" of the two attitudes of Struggle and Resignation so as to carry out "practical life". He wants to be God's "pure instrument" but as such an instrument to work in God's World in His work of Creation.

This appearance of Teilhard's Self as himself and not his parents has been prepared for a long time, as seen above. One of these preparations was Marguerite and Teilhard's sexual development. To press home how firm now was this commitment to Life and World as he himself experienced them, and to himself as he was now, human being, the following two passages must be considered, the first of which is followed (in the UFN text) by a paragraph on sexuality, perhaps suggesting self-conscious reflection on his relationship to Marguerite. (The second would then re-emphasise his celibate reality)

"Les 2 vocations:
celle oû le choix est donné entre le plus doux et le plus dur; - et puis celle oû le plus dur est tout choisi, tout imposé, - le consentement restant seul à donner. Dans le premier cas, c'est par les attraits que Dieu nous aborde;
dans le second cas, il nous enlace au préalable dans quelque déterminisme. "Alius te singet ..."
Pourquoi ma préférence pour le passif, pour la mystérieuse matièr, pour l'irresponsable liaison sociale ..." (UFN 1.139a)

"Agir comme le pur instrument de Dieu, en vue de pousser plus loin l'oeuvre de la Création, l'âborton de la matièr, même visible,
(saimée comme l'oeuvre de Dieu à parfaire, et un des milieux qui nous transmet son Action) n'est-ce-pas l'attitude que je cherche à fixer et à prendre, le geste d'Israël.
This (what Teilhard calls "pantheist") commitment to world- and self-reality was what was necessary for the final run-down to the "original" Teilhard. He was committed to Science and the scientific paradigm- and concept-cluster. He was committed to Religion. As he realised that he was sexual, human and lived and loved Life and wrote this on paper so that he could see what it meant conceptually, he took the step which Erikson calls the Integrity-Crisis and accepted himself and what this meant.

This was different from the acceptance of his mother and father (1902-1912), and from his mystical adventuring. It was the emotional commitment to the World as he now experienced it for himself. So the full solution of his Identity by means of Executive Concept was going to include acknowledgement and reinforcement of this emotion for Life and the World as well as of his parental womb and the parts of his personality which had developed specifically from this. Cosmic Life is the response to Christ-Kosmos. It was the formal expression of the life which he was living already and which had produced the Christological image for which he had been searching.

So Teilhard wants a Christian attitude to the World (24 Feb.). While he wants "an intense communion" with God in Mass and prayer he nevertheless finds the expression used in Cosmic Life of "communion with God through the Earth" on the same day (3 Mar.). Then on 12 March he is wanting to "systematize" his dual life as a "very human man" and as a "detached christian", and later (21 April) this has become the need to "weld together" the faith and the "concrete view". All this takes place within the need for "intense" Christian discipleship, and he even reinforces (20 Mar.) his commitment to the World by identifying his apostleship in War and Science as the very areas of life in which St. Louis Gonzague would now be
working if he were here. Teilhard wants to "surnaturalise" human interests and duty. He above all needs in his Central Self to feel and see on paper that his own attitudes and being are Christian, and he will work to this end in his own writing.

In two letters (of which he kept copies) this theme-need of Teilhard's is spun out in some detail. He has passionate love for both Kingdom of God and Greatest Earth, he wants to be a man as well as a Christian, in study and research he desires the study and research to be loved for its own sake, he needs his action itself to be of value. In these extracts may be seen the coming of the concepts which gave him satisfaction by allowing him to remain who he was, in this case the concepts of faith in Life, the Life of the Earth and the World.

The problem is posed (first to Pontoynant, then to Boussac) in terms which show the existential personal need from which Teilhard emerged with novelty: he demands concrete work which is of ultimate value, Science must be this to Teilhard:

"Donc, je me suis remis à penser, et à jeter sur un cahier d'écolier, des notes sur un sujet qui, pour moi, a toujours été le problème de ma vie intérieure, — un petit comme la question de l'âme pour Psichai —, je veux dire la conciliation du Progrès et du Détachement, de l'amour passionné et légitime de la plus grande Terre et de la Recherche unique du Royaume des Cieux. Comment être aussi chrétien que pas un, tout en restant homme plus que personne? — C'est très joli de faire des Sciences, de la Philo, de la Sociologie pour plaire à Dieu, pour remplir une tâche assignée. Mais ce n'est pas assez dire.

Tant que, dans mes études ou mon labeur je ne me reconnaîtrais pas la possibilité d'aimer mon œuvre; tant que je ne verrai pas la nécessité de m'y consacrer pour que au moyen de mes conquêtes elles-mêmes (et non pas seulement à raison de la valeur morale de mes efforts) je progresse et m'organise dans un certain Absolu; tant que le Monde ne me représenter qu'une occasion de mérites et non quelques κτλάψις ἐπί τοῦ ἡδύναμος ἀρχήν, à construire. — Je me serai qu'un titi qu'ammi les hommes." (ÜF N 1.34a)

1. The text here is uncertain.
"Depuis toujours, je me suis senti le besoin d'unifier, non seulement par unité d'intention, mais par unité d'objet - ma vie de naturaliste et ma vie de chrétien. Je sens que la passion qui porte tant d'esprits à scruter et à conquérir le monde de la Matière et de la Vie doit pouvoir se ramener, non seulement par la valeur morale, mais dans ses progrès et ses conquêtes elles-mêmes, à l'Établissement du Regne de Dieu.

Le terme de la création et de la Rédemption étant un nouveau Monde, je crois qu'à son édification aucun des efforts humains pour plus savoir et pour mieux être ne doit être inutile; - ne serait-ce qu'en préparant (par la prolongation de l'évolution, devenue conscient et sociale après avoir été surtout organique et phylétique) de nouvelles âmes, plus parfaites dans leur nature, et donc plus sanctifiables."

(UPN 1.39a)

These lengthy passages show the emotional and conceptual womb of Teilhard.

The specific need concerning personal discipleship in Science (which had been chosen in 1912) is more directly stated as follows:

"Concourt—au régime de Dieu en trouvant un Eoanthropus ou un effet électro-magnétique? Sans doute." (UPN 1.40)

This theme is developed further (again to Boussac) after the latter had returned the traditional christian answer as to what is discipleship: Teilhard cannot go back now on who he is:

"En vertu des mêmes conceptions, j'ajouterais un élément à votre système d'unification des vies d'un savant et du chrétien. Vous êtes surtout frappé du travail d'élaboration qui se poursuit dans l'âme individuelle, dans les facultés du savant. "Le chrétien, dites-vous, cultivera avec dévotion la science, pour se faire, sa vie durante, une image plus vrai de Dieu, et, en même temps, pour aiguiser, en soi une vie plus capable de pénétrer en Dieu, au moment désiré de la Contemplation céleste. Par la Science, le chrétien se développe et s'exerce pour le Ciel à la faveur des créateurs." N'y-a-t-il pas quelque chose? ... invinciblement, j'y reviens, parce que j'en ai besoin pour soutenir mon action, pour me convaincre, quand je cherche, que cela en vaut la peine. Je crois que nous faisons plus, par la Science, que de contempler et de nous développer par la contemplation: nous travaillerons à réaliser, à faire se développer, à soutenir le Monde. Par chaque brin de connaissance nouvelle, nous édifions, hors de nous, quelque chose, ce fameux quelque chose, qui est le Terme propre du Devenir humain et cosmique naturel dans son ensemble." (UPN 1.43)

In these passages in UPN the real Teilhard is laid bare. But their develop-
ment of ideas is nevertheless only part of what takes place within the larger development found in *Cosmic Life*. In the above passages it is shown simply that what he calls the problem of his interior life is all the time a function of the development of his ideas. He needs to "surrenaturalise" human interests and duty because these are known to and loved by him. Teilhard above all needs in his Central Self to feel and see on paper and hear from friends that his attitudes and being are Christian, and he will work to this end by writing and writing.

Teilhard's Sense-Sensitivity Self, his Science Self, his Life Self, his Religion Self all need to be one integrated system with the Central Self-Ego through which they have grown.


The development of Teilhard's ideas are treated below in their own chapter. Here further aspects of the Self-Ego as imagined through Ego-development theory are noted.

First the self-doubt mentioned earlier and which includes self-perception appears in another highly intimate passage in which superego scruples may be inferred:

"Il est question d'attaques, au moins locales, où je sens que je me devrai de m'exposer ... Et cela me fait froid! J'ai honte de moi, quand je me sens aussi timide, alors que milliers de combattants se lancent à l'assaut et se font tuer chaque jour depuis trois semaines. Je suis humilié et un peu inquiet sur l'efficacité de mes principes les plus chers, sur la solidité de ma vie surnaturelle ... Jésus, je suis heureux de me sentir petit et faible. Mais donnez-moi la confiance invisible en votre secours du moment, et la foi absolue en la Vérité de vos paroles et de graces de renoncement qui, plus denses qu'aillleurs, doivent tomber sur les âmes de vos serviteurs, de vos prêtres surtout. — Que c'est humiliant, Jésus, d'avoir peur de souffrir, de mourir ... Cœur de Jésus, j'ai confiance en Vous!" *(UPN 1.31)*

Hints of Ego-chill merge with traditional Christian utter reliance on the Grace of God here, and his mother's Sacred Heart religion is returned to by the
little, feeble infant newly born. Yet though mother is the root of Teilhard's
religion this passage does not show regression because it was existentially satis-
fying. Writing these words down released the scruple tensions and the Self was
now able to go forward. The very next words show the Self-Ego reactivated with
sense-sensitivity mysticism reaching a new Gestalt:—

"L'âme humaine étant formée, au sein des déterminismes de la
matière et de la vie, se trouve, en outre de sa loi particulière
de développement, assujettie à une aspiration fondamentale qui la
constitué élément du Corps du Christ — C'est un nouveau Cosmos
qui s'épanouit ... Mais bien remarquer ceci: mon plan consiste
moins à exposer et faire savourer cet État mystérieux, qu'à le
relier à nos aspirations cosmiques senties." (UPN 1.31a)

The confidence of sentences such as these suggests the narcissism of the
conquistador. But possibly it is also reflecting the satisfaction which is brought
to the mind by a Gestalt. The simplicity of Teilhard's remark of 17 March (below)
would be deemed naivety if a link between mathematical imagination and Gestalten
received no substantiation, and if he had failed to make definite reference to
Gestalt-phenomena at the end of March. The two paragraphs are as follows:—

Même si l'image la plus vraie du Monde était telle "des bulles
qui s'envolent," il resterait à travailler pour que le courant
persiste où naîtront des nouvelles "bulles". — Et toutes ces idées
sur le cosmisme sont si simple que j'ai une impression semblable à
celle de retomber sur A=A au terme de manipulations algébriques
complicées! (UPN 1.36b) (17 Mar.)

A certains moments *, on a l'impression que la pensée, les idées,
sont de la sensation (au sens large, = du senti) figurée. (4 April)

Et à d'autres, on sent que les idées entre elles, s'attirent,
se dérivent, par une interaction fatale, objective. 'si on
elles, ou dans le cerveau? ... (UPN 1.42a) (16 May)

What is certain is that the new ideas which Teilhard had did satisfy him.
With them he could with equanimity entertain the possibility that he was being
heretical or even blasphemous — even that he might be condemned. Nothing would
stop him adhering to his "dare" of the Cosmic Christ once it solved his problems.
He identifies specifically with Newman who agreed that emotional certainty in
practice overrode logic, and so with certainty Teilhard could criticise the Church, its people, its Theology, its Law. His personality, his identity had been so pulled together by his new thinking that he at last had the confidence of his convictions.

Fortunately self-doubt remained, as the last quotation showed by the critical doubt in it. He continued to say "perhaps" with his statements. He likens his ideas sometimes to a dream. He denies that Cosmic Life is an Apology or even discussion. It is just a point of view.

In all, there is growth (according to UFM) of Teilhard's Central Self towards conceptual solution of the Identity-Crisis. He had the specific need to find a "unity of intention and object" which would satisfy human, scientific and religious emotion-commitments and thus fix identity and promise survival of himself. This specific need was then satisfied by Christ-Kosmos as the whole of UFM is able to show.

As to other parts of his development, the oscillation between self-doubt and self-confidence is in evidence and healthy. Parental religion and science are satisfied, as also is the Central Self through continued experimental mysticism, sexuality and reality-testing. Gestalten set patterns, and (if liked) form part of the growing conceptual system. A little anal rebellion against other people's solutions, some infant anxiety, emotional certainty critical of paper-thinking, such a general picture is one of a normal Ego-development; and the thought-organ was growing with concept-clusters and personal ideas which it found useful in coping with outer and inner realities.

Of note too is that early loving and being-loved emotions, narcissism and adult buoyancy have emerged into concepts such as Faith in Life and Love of Life. Early curiosity, reality-testing and experiment have also become concepts in a sense when ideas' "shape" are "felt" and the World is "palpable". Symbolisation
of this tangible-world set of needs by Sense-Sensitivity value-vector is paralleled by that of the life-buoyancies by Life value-vector. By virtue of the ontogenetics of Part One these two value-vectors are deemed to "exist" as concept-clusters as well as emotions, just as those of Religion and Science.

This symbolism of information-circuits and certain aspects of personality is no more to be reified now than it was in the last Part (One). But Teilhard’s four conceptual faiths in Life, World, Science and Religion do "exist" conceptually in his mind with his identity-faith in himself, Self-Ego in this early UPN material. Therefore just as a sketch has been possible of the overall Self-Ego development from August 1915 to April 1916 so are sketches of the other value-vectors possible. If the reader is careful to refuse to reify the symbolism the exercise is useful. That there will be some overlapping of material is inevitable because although the attempt is being made to pick out five strands in Teilhard’s Self he has in fact only one life and the various parts of his Self are "in fact" functions of each other in one Central Nervous System. But a story of their "separate" developments is possible and with the Sense-Sensitivity and Life components of the Mystic Self this Thesis can proceed.
CHAPTER XII

SENSE-SENSITIVITY AND LIFE: THE MYSTIC SELF

In the TGTA-Navon model of Teilhard pictured in Part One the Science and Religion selves are coupled together as being particularly functions of the parental womb, and the growth of Teilhard's Ego is portrayed as especially to do with narcissism, verification-need and so-called schizophrenic adventure, symbolised as Mystic Self and Sense-Sensitivity and Life value-vector-systems. Growth of this Mystic Self in function with gradual solution of the Oedipal- and Identity-crises "was" the growth of the secure Central Self, the Self-Ego. In continuation of this story and in more detail than that sketched in the last chapter the development of Sense-Sensitivity and Life value-vectors in UPN is now to be portrayed.


Three groups of material may be considered to be sub-components of the sense-sensitivity value-vector: the earliest infant-emotions such as sensitivity, sensibility and self-understanding leading to introversion; the reality-testing needs and experimental tendencies; and the imaginative processes of displacement of concept and Gestalt.

The introversion brought on by the Identity-question of stretcher-bearer or chaplain and which produced the unflattering picture of (Teilhard) himself as cold calculator and snob was mentioned in the last chapter. Though the problem is little discussed overtly in UPN it is possible to gauge what was happening in Teilhard's unconscious at this time. His self-doubt had come when M. Leonard said that for priests to carry arms and be combat troops was not Christian, and P. Emonet counselled Teilhard with orthodoxy. This was the voice of mother and not of father.

1. UPN 1.3.4-5.
and Alberic-Crozé-Schmitz, and Teilhard's response in a time of "intense" self-perception was the decision to be neither his mother nor father but "himself". As mentioned above being himself meant pursuing his own ideas so that when he eventually became a chaplain he had his own idea of what this meant. But in 1916 being himself included widening horizons and critical reality-testing, and what he saw when he looked at the chaplains around him was not attractive to him. He deemed them "parasites", but he was soon to be "disgusted" with his role as medical orderly also,\(^2\) so that the crisis would continue. He really wanted to be a machine-gunner priest and "over the top").\(^3\)

Such a statement may not suggest the "rich sensibility" noted by D'Quince but in the mother/father identity-situation in which Teilhard found himself in the trenches the criticism of others around him was to do with intense feelings about who he was and who he did not want to be. He wanted to be in the world with men.\(^3\)

Such crises must have nourished Teilhard's dreaming. Sensibility is much in evidence in the weeks before he finds his focal point of Matter. The wind has been reminding him of home and school and college. He is to be pictured alone in the woods at nights, feeling the steady current of the wind pressing him onwards. He feels the wind as an immense sad happiness. He is sensible to the things, the people and the world around him, and they make him think. During an "intense" day's fighting he experiences "intense" self-perception, and when a shell lands in the trench next door his feelings for his friends are such that he knows the "anguish" felt by Our Lord in His Passion. He may wish to fight with a gun but he also wishes to be with His Lord in His suffering.\(^4\)

---

1. UPN 1.7a.
2. UPN 1.15a, 43a. cf. 18a.
3. AM p.183.
4. UPN 1.6 cf. UPN 1.33a and Chapter 11.
Sensibilisation by sexuality was also occurring. The rest-area where nuns and Mother Superior reminded him of sister and maternal love was mentioned above.\textsuperscript{1} But it was when Marguerite wrote to him that she thought the war would "suprasensibilise" his spirit\textsuperscript{2} that one of the most important images in Teilhard came to his mind:\textsuperscript{3}

"Jamais, depuis le début de la campagne, je n'ai été aussi confortable pour écrire et pour penser. Mon esprit, en même temps, est sensiblé, alerte ... N'est-ce pas la "muse" qui m'appelle, non pas l'inspiratrice légère et superficielle du poète, mais le Sphinx, la mystérieuse, — la Matière à Visage céleste et à prolongement diaboliques et dégradants, — dont nous sommes les paillettes conscientes, étincelantes et fugaces ..." (UPN 1.8a)

What Marguerite wrote in the letter which stimulated this is not known. But two days later Teilhard is reading Balzac and copying out a passage of over a hundred words about the artist suiciding his talent. He at the same time writes this:—

"Parmi les courants (non les mécanismes) qui nous entraînent, et qu'il faut critiquer (mais ne point tuer ... du reste c'est impossible: il y a une certaine conservation de l'énergie passionnelle;) je dois compter l'instinct sexuel. C'est délicat à traiter; mais il est essentiel d'aborder cet élément fondamental de notre dynamique intime "cosmique".

Les "passionnés à vide" (Balzac. Bonheurs peuvres) ... "L'amour de l'inconnu, l'amour vague." (UPN 1.10a,11)

If Marguerite's sending of Balzac has not suggested her unconscious sexual need then the matter is finally made certain by the letter which Teilhard received on 9 March. In this she wrote on Feminism and specifically on modern marriage. The influence of this is readily seen in the following passage:—

"En traitant de la ségrégation, signaler (si non traiter) la question de savoir si le don de l'être humain au Corps du Christ ne le rend pas plus froid pour le Progrès, ne désespère  

\textsuperscript{1} Chapter 11.  
\textsuperscript{2} UPN 1.8a.  
\textsuperscript{3} UPN 1.8a.
"pas sa nature, ne la rend pas moins décidée et moins franche. Ne faudrait-il pas dire que ces inconvénients de sécheresse et de timidité naissent précisément de la méconnaissance de la vie cosmique, que mal homme ne doit étouffer? ...

Ainsi, le but de l'étude serait in abstracto, de maintenir d'Eglise en phase et en contact avec la conscience humaine, et, in concreto, d'étouffer, viriliser beaucoup d'âmes d'habilitées. Le mariage, par exemple, dans une vie de femme surtout, peut-il être supprimé humainement? Cui, sans doute, mais à condition que les perceptions intenses des liens naturels et surnaturels avec Dieu et le prochain équivalent à l'excitation normale produite par la possession d'un époux."

Further when the next day's entry is viewed the sensibilisation of Teilhard's sexuality in continued within consideration of the single woman and the doctrine of Virginity,¹ and five days after the idea of the "maternal" had been displaced on to the single woman, the concept of Virginity was displaced on to the World. Involvement with Marguerite by means of her letters and the Balzac and Psichari which she sent, was part of the mental womb in which Teilhard's imagination leapt towards originality ...

De ceci, que conclure relativement au destinées de la femme et à l'importance psychologique de la vie sexuelle? Serait-ce que jamais la femme ne pourra s'émanciper de son devoir physiologique (déséquilibre des aspirations intellectuelles et du support organique ...), ou bien, simplement, qu'elle devra toujours donner à sa vie, même la plus isolée, la nuance maternelle, qui permettra à son être de retrouver l'excitant et la matière nécessaires à son plein développement?

Objection - La doctrine de la virginité n'est-elle pas un faux-fuyant (ne risque-t-elle pas, veux-je dire, de devenir un faux-fuyant) pour absorber, sans réaction ni lutte, la triste condition de la jeune fille actuelle? .. (UFN 1.29a)

Le Monde, par sa grandeur, sa virginité, ses beautés ... demeure la racine od les âmes elle-mêmes doivent sans cesse revenir pour trouver des excitants appropriés. (UFN 1.34)

It will be seen below that ideas such as the sex instinct being fundamental to the cosmic dynamic and especially interesting for the phenomenon of "passions à vide" were functions of the concept of Christ-Kosmos and Creative Union. But the

¹. UFN 1.29a
fact that on 8th February via Balsac and Marguerite Teilhard was talking of love-of-God being the "transplantation" of the "ardent human heart" in the context of sexual love shows the rooting in his own emotion of his own ideas. In this sense his sexual sensibility was sexual experience and a form of reality-testing.

When therefore Teilhard decided to write his testament and be himself, War, Mystic and Sexual experience were all there in his life sensibilising him. That he did in fact have a rich sensibility is further emphasised by music's ability in his opinion to induce Nirvana, by his sensibilisation by a Rodin sculpture and subsequent use of understanding from this to produce a new image, and his preference of the artist's personal and visual understandings to those of "abstraction". The description of Matter which appears on 23 February is furthermore not science but poetry.

After the sexual, mystical and battle times of sensibility at the turn of 1915-6 onwards this sensibilisable man flowed forth with ideas. He was ready to accept on paper that Nature evoked good in him. He called for an "intense" religion with great love of the earth. He demanded "intense" interior life. He wanted "adoration" of the New Earth in its cosmic dimensions which were "dazzling". His inner being, emotion, feeling, imagination, "coeur" and thought-processes were sensibilised and now productive.

Teilhard was now loving the earth.

At the same time this self-perception and sensibility was working itself out

1. UPN 1,12.
2. UPN 1,42
3. UPN 1,21a
4. UPN 1,10
5. UPN 1,20a
6. UPN 1,7a
7. UPN 1,10
8. UPN 1,35a
9. UPN 1,11a, 33
in relation to the matters of organised religion. Just as the aside concerning
the "bourgeois" Villa Kleis has a hint of irony in it, so the first mention of the
Pope is not without a hint of hard criticism of the Church institution:—

"... (il) n'a pas dit que son Eglise serait toujours la plus
belle. Il y a eu déjà des scandales, des éclipses". 1

In spite of a continuing commitment to God to which all of Teilhard testifies,
in spite of his being scandalised by the "modest" condition of "God" in Masses among
the people and in spite of a certain "excessive liberalism" and "fear" being blamed
for this condition, Teilhard in UPN is progressively critical of the Church, people,
Pope and dogma. His position of utter loyalty with criticism of what is less than
the ideal is summed up in the following passage:—

"La Guerre et le Catholicisme"

"Sans aucun doute, les notions de Catholicisme, civilisation,
Patric, martyre, justification, héroïsme, se sont mélangées;
(les Causes humaines ont obscurci les (intérêts divins
( Beautés morales naturelles (agrandissements
( + larges + généreuses + libérales (surnaturels ...

Certaines revendications ecclésiastiques ont para méquins, intempéristes, ... ou absolument malheureuses, comme celles du
Pape ...

N'y a-t-il pas là un cas particulier, caractéristique
étrange, de contact et de conflit entre l'humain (sous ses
formes les plus nobles) et le Divin (dans ses intrusions les
plus déplaisants ...) En même temps, quand donc le grand
Catholicisme a-t-il été plus enviable, plus triomphant, Lui qui
seul révèle capable d'établir la Fraternité, la Paix, ou au
moins, dans chaque nation, la cohésion, l'ordre, la fécondité
des familles ... Mais alors, aussi, quelle disproportion entre
les Catholiques et leur Doctrine?" (UPN 1.16)

Teilhard's sensibility and perception within the physical and mental world of
Roman Catholicism is shown here and in further passages below. Roman Catholicism
alone can produce order, brotherhood, right family and heroism in war, but with his
increasing experience and understanding of the world Teilhard sees more of the

1. UPN 1.20a
inadequacy of his Church. Catholics tend to be more timid, scrupulous and less frank and tough than others; and the Church is guilty of pharisaic pretension, reactionary tendencies and "extrinsecism". Christians need "virilising" like those who have passion for the world and for social and human progress: dogma and attitudes sometimes lack reality in the face of modern knowledge; there is coldness and lukewarmness and timidity in the World-Struggle and concerning Progress. The three passages are demanding a 'hard' Christianity in the concrete world of Life:—

"Comment se fait-il qu'aujourd'hui je puisse (malheureusement) reconnaître les catholiques pratiquants à ce signe qu'ils sont timides, scrupuleux? ..."

L'admission de Dieu dans notre vie aurait-elle comme résultat de nous rendre moins francs, moins hardis, dans la Conquête du Monde? ... Bien réellement, il me semble, par moment que l'attitude des catholiques vis-à-vis du Progrès Social et Humain doit changer, devenir plus comprehensive ... Mais n'est-ce pas une chimère, une herésie, que le catholicisme devenu immanent, cet amour de Dieu embrassant le Monde et la Matière ... Au moins faut-il imaginer une situation franche, conciliant les tendances naturelles et l'asservissement au Progrès avec la Loi de renoncement et d'Abnégation ... cf. La Via Media de Newman ... N'y pataugeons-nous pas, nous et notre ascétique, entre la passion du Monde et l'amour de Dieu?" (UPN 1.17)

"le voile qui ternit la surface de contact Eglise/Monde la face éblouissante de l'Eglise, et au gens du dehors ... ne laisse voir qu'une surface, mesquine et déplaisante, d'égoïsme en conflit, de vanité satisfaite, d'oisiveté cultivée, de suffisance ridicule.

"A quoi tient ce voile? Extrinsécisme dogmatique, pharisialisme social, prétention à monopoliser toute vérité et toute charité, paresse et inutilité dans la lutte pour le Progrès ... autant de défauts attaquants (par une déviation ou perversion naturelle) les Détenteurs de la Vérité, comme le milieu s'en prend aux vignes et la rouille au blé.

"Il y a les maladies spécifiques du croyant, de l'ascète, du théologien, etc., dus à la confusion des plans du réel (histoire et réalités surnaturelles, science et dogme, Eglise et Etat, Progrès et abnégation ;.) Les maladies du croyant (de la foie), voici donc un autre titre.

"Et ce sujet est très lié à la difficulté signalée ci-dessus: quelle espèce de passion pour le monde peut et doit admettre un catholique?" (UPN 1.18a)
"N.B. Veiller à ne pas traiter ce sujet a priori, d'impression, mais scientifiquement, d’après les faits.
Par exemple, il est indubitable (cf le testament du zouave Bador) que la moyenne des héroïsme guerriers, ces mois-ci, est nettement en faveur de catholiques. Chez les belles âmes, la synthèse des devoirs divins et humains se fait toute seule, et l'agrandissement divin n'est payé d'aucun rétrécissement des horizons terrestres..

Mais le danger du rétrécissement ou de la "suffisance" demeure, et combien! de la "Froideur pour le Monde" et son Emancipation de la tiédeur dans la lutte pour vivre."

(UPN 1.18a)

Further development of such criticism takes place after the 8 March letter from Marguerite. Virginity, extrinsicism and traditional asceticism are followed as objects of criticism by the supernatural and the de-rootedness of Roman Catholicism. Both the latter become more specific as the future of Matter and the church's detachment from the Cosmos lead to the understanding that work is not to be carried out just to "please" God (on the analogy of filial obedience) but because of the "Absolute" ontological value of human "effort" as a "function" in the becoming of the New Earth, the truly "corporeal" Mystical Body of Christ, the "famous Some Thing" which and who is the End of human and cosmic becoming.

This is far from Roman orthodoxy and reflects both his love of science and laboratory work and his perception that religious practice tended to de-value the work of the world. Being himself had led to this tension. But the appearance of his new concepts and his integrity-crisis-need to accept them once they made sense to him were beginning to press him as feedback. Once the Gestalten were there his reality-testing processes were looking out for evidence for their usefulness. Thus when he becomes committed to the Universe, the All, the Whole, with the World by analogy an organism, Teilhard perhaps unconsciously and unwittingly at the time has to see much traditional Catholic practice as outmoded. To one who perceives that

1. The material in this paragraph is taken from UPN 1, 29a, 30, 31, 33, 39a, 34a, 35, 35a, 35b, 36b, 37f, 41, 43.
men must live as conscious atoms of All the Cosmos, as atoms of the All who is the Person, Christ, the life and dogmas of non-cosmic prayer, over-personalist and over-individualist asceticism, confessionalism and "purely supernatural works" is inadequate. What Teilhard was sensibilised to unconsciously and what was then symbolised in a series of Gestalten was found by him to thereafter reflect reality and to have reality-tested his environments.

Teilhard's sensitivity and sensibility to himself, to his need to be himself and to aspects of his environment are therefore reality-testing processes, womb for the birth of imagination and continuous feedback process. That talk of "reality-testing" is not extravagant is demonstrated by Teilhard's physical and conceptual adherence to sense-impression and sense-experience.

2. Sense-Impression.

Reference was made above to the memories which a physical sensation like the wind may recall and to the ideas it may suggest. An intense day of battle similarly presses out ideas from Teilhard. As \_\_\_ material appears chronologically the importance of the physical environment grows. Experimental event and sensation become increasingly the control of what is reality. Reality-testing becomes something tactile by direct test of what is or is there, and this is applied soon to the thought-of order of religion.

After discussion with Emonet and other Jesuits (Sept. 10, 1915) and so perhaps reflecting a priestly understanding of what confessional (but also trenches) record of there being children of light and children of darkness, Teilhard asserts that two distinct humanities are being separated out at each instant of life. He ties this idea to St. Paul (and later he will be reinforced by Newman), but what he is doing is to take the Biblical sheep/goat image and apply it existentially to what is happening around him. He has seen something intensely and is committed now to the Gestalt. Teilhard concretises the image so as to describe realities in which
he is living.

"Deux humanités, absolument distinctes spécifiques, irréductibles, sont actuellement quotidiennement, en voie de création, in fieri (cf St. Paul). Elles se séparent à chaque instant, divergent, commencent la séparation définitive celles des enfants de lumière et des fils des ténèbres." (UPN 1.3)

Within two months this segregation idea has become the centre of Teilhard's conception of Matter by means of which the pantheist concept of gradual transformation of an All can be countered. There is a "cosmic ascessis" but this "theory of segregations" is really a biological phenomenon because it will "realise" the "immédiatement palpable en bas" of the pagan as well as the naturalist dream of the collective "surhumain".

After copying out Newman's words of preference for the Personal as opposed to the Abstract Teilhard is found pressing home the reality of the end of the segregation-movement, "son terme réel". In a passage which anticipates much of the later Teilhard he then asks where the divine influence is more "palpable": why more in the "natural" than in the "artificial", in the "unconscious" than the "conscious"? And this is followed by re-emphasis on the "palpable" world as a milieu in which God may be possessed:

L'influence divine est-elle plus palpable dans le sens de l'inconscient, ou dans la direction du plus conscient, du plus personnel, du plus individualisé? ... Sans doute, dans les deux sens, mais d'une manière diverse - ici agissant sur les libres attraits de l'intelligence, - là guidant les démarches enfantines d'une existence rudimentaire incapable de se diriger seule."

1. (Inexact. Sans cette hypothèse le Divin s'évanouirait devant la spontanéité croissante! Le "naturel détermind" n'est ni spécialement infaillible, ni spécialement innocent. Il est insécuris, immoral et tâtonnant) (27 juillet) (UPN 1.12a)

"Il me semble qu'on peut arriver à saisir le Ciel dans la Terre, à anticiper la possession de Dieu par l'adhésion à quelque chose des charmes et de l'intérêt palpable du monde ... Les puissances d'aimer et de sentir, éveillées naturellement à l'occasion
et en vue des joies de la famille, sont neutralisées au ½
par la rencontre des object humains ..." (UPN 1.13)

Commitment to sense-impression phenomena continues.

It is at this stage that the formula of communion with God "à travers"
Matter is being produced and the experienced world gains in formal metaphysical
value when the "prize of heaven" is seen as a function of the "little things" and
happenings of everyday life. The attraction of pantheism is "de faire toucher
le Divin" (16 Feb.) though Teilhard does not yet know how to put this into a
Christian formula. When "extrinsicism" is further criticised and "visible Matter"
and its "elaboration" viewed as (a) milieu of God's work, the concretising tendency
is nevertheless continuing. The attitudes wanted in Christianity are those of
Israel/Angel struggle and love of the elaboration of the Kosmos of Matter, and
when this is compared to the first UPN entry in which the problem of Evil was
still answered by the orthodox outsider-God who makes Evil as a positive test,
Teilhard's change of thought is shown to be considerable. Without losing the
latter element there has developed the idea of a "palpable" God who is met through
the struggling world of "palpable" Matter which in fact is transmitting His action.

Such "immanence" of God is realised to be a heretical¹ theological concept.

But on Feb.21 Teilhard quotes Newman's "great dislike of paperlogic" and it is clear
that the Integrity-crisis of accepting himself when at last he is himself, (even if
heretical) is going to be successfully concluded.

At this time when the à la faveur concept is being born the commitment to
experimental reality receives further backing. First Teilhard is sensibilised by
memories of the scientific laboratory. Second the concept of Matter is defined
in words which are derived from Teilhard's own experience. When he is thinking of

1. With Evolution this concept of "immanence" was one of the marks of the condemned
Modernists. cf. A. Vidler's chapter on the Catholic Modernists in The Church
Matter he calls to mind his own passivities (determinisms), and the Analogium Princeps is the world's immediacy, primitive-ness, consistency and palpability.

What he experiences by sense-impression is Matter, and in Matter's "ambience" Christ's Body must be grounded. The commitment to the world of sense-experience is now conceptualised.

L'expérience (de laboratoire)

"Combien passionnante chose! et pourquoi? parce que nous révèle quelques-unes des inextricables affinités, ressources ou énergies, qui nous baignent, nous constituent, d'où nous sommes nés!" (UPN 1.21b)

"Méditations sur la Matière." Décidément, ce titre me plaît:

Matière = "tout ce qui constitue, tout ce qui lie, tout ce qui entraîne, tout ce qui relie .."

on peut objecter que tant de choses (c'est à dire en somme, toutes mes passivités, et toute notre héritage, et toutes nos potentialités) débordent de beaucoup ce qu'on appelle généralement la matière. Et cependant ce terme me plaît parce qu'il désigne principalement ce qu'il y a au Monde de plus immédiat, de plus primitif, de plus constant, de plus palpable (Analogum princeps) (Titre plein d'insistance, légèrement paradoxale ..)" (UPN 1.24)

The appearance of Teilhard in the scientific laboratory suggests unconscious motives for his science profession. It also reminds the reader of UPN of what has been happening till now and now accelerates: the use of scientific concept. The realities found by science are a function of Teilhard's own experience and understanding of experimental reality. Science is a control to his own thought as well as an information-store concerning himself and life. It discovers the palpable world. The sense-impression profession of Science provides the concepts which reflect what Teilhard experiences in the sense-impression world of human life.

The tactile basis of Teilhard's understanding continues to disclose itself

1. cf. UPN 1.21 (for 24 Feb.16).
in the rest of the run-up to Christ-Kosmos and *Cosmic Life*. He sees a Rodin statue where rough stone has become beautiful sculpture and he imagines the cosmos as one block of total matter within which human consciousness is produced by involution, so that in the Rodin image "we are matter". The concept which is displaced is a concrete image with associations which are of basic earth-reality, so that when it is displaced its effect is to press the earthiness of experimental reality on to the universe, man and consciousness.¹

This earthiness of experimental reality by 9 March is "correcting" proud Utopias. It then rejects the type of "supernaturality" and "extrinsecism" which is the Church's orthodoxy. Teilhard continues by querying the ideas of Virginity which allow a girl to flee the world by asserting ("as a matter of fact") that priests patronise the Virgin Mary for sexual reasons (and nuns likewise Our Lord), by criticising Catholics for being "de-rooted" in their dichotomy of Form and Matter and their use and choice only of the former, by rejecting as inadequate the "psychic fusion" interpretations of the Creation and the Fall while accepting their double contingency.

Such examples of hard realism were accompanied and so the functions of a new sensibilisation. This occurred during the reading of *Psichari*² who needed a "palpable world" for his Christian discipleship. Teilhard feels an intensification of his need to "love Matter". He needs to "touch", to "play with" Matter. He needs to struggle with the Angel as Jacob.³

The need for palpable life and religion continues. Teilhard transposes human love to be love-of-God. Now the Object of love and hope must be transfigured into the Absolute, thus concretising the Absolute. The work of Man and Nature and

1. UPN 1,24
3. UPN 1,34
moral perfection will then be a real function of the "truly corporeal Mystical Body of Christ", and the "reality" of the evolution of consciousnesses will "endure" as an "absolute" work of the universe.

Teilhard is therefore building up an ontology which is based in empirical realities known in personal experience or to science, though it relies on concepts displaced into such realities from the paradigm-clusters (including experience) of religion and idealism. He needs "Jesus, the hand of God, and tomorrow", something palpable; and when as Cosmic Life is being finished he notes that he has been wanting to give value to his scientific effort and to work generally by welding together the faith and the concrete, this is his own self-understanding of who he is. He is a man who felt God "thickening" around and in front of him, physical reality only describable by concepts from religion and science held together, sense-impression taken as God.

To touch reality directly, to feel absolute value in his existential life, to make sense of his personal religious and mystic and scientific experience, Teilhard had to produce an experimental religion of a tangible God. Needs produced concepts.

This tension between Teilhard's religious faith and his reality-testing by means of sense-impression and science, which is the tension crucial to the formation of his original concepts and his new religion, is symbolised in the following passage. It shows his need and it emphasises his commitments. It suggests the hope and courage needed by a man who must fix his identity with integrity. The sense-impressions of war-life and science, the pantheist needs and the revelations of faith must reach a common term ...

Introduction = Ceci est la solution d'un problème vécu, de perplexités senties.

Je me suis senti pris entre deux sortes d'Absolus, l'un s'imposant à moi par toute mon ambiance et ma vie présente, l'autre par les dogmes de la foi et les espérances de mon cœur.
J'ai voulu être un chrétien intégral, mais restant un homme plus humain que qui que ce soit.

Est-ce possible? — est-ce soluble intellectuellement? De mes aspirations (panthéisme païen — domination humaine. - Coèmes divin dans les nues) j'ai donné la peinture la plus expressive, la plus sentie ... En cours de route une conciliation, une solution se dessine. On la trouvera au terme.

(UPN 1.33)


When Teilhard in the last quotation speaks of his present life imposing an Absolute upon him, he is formalising his commitment to his present and true identity which nevertheless has been developing over time (according to Part One).

In Part One he was seen as a mother-loved child who thereafter was able to love himself in normal narcissism and then others in the wider environment and finally that environment of Nature itself. In Part Two so far this ability to love has been shown in Teilhard's sensibility to woman, music, art, sculpture, the poetry of Nature and even suffering. Further as a function of such feeling, especially for peers the infant-childhood reality-testing processes emerged in the sense-experience work of the scientific laboratory Teilhard. Thus, the total environment in which he lived was being valued by him, often intensely.

It remains now to show how this complex of emotional and conceptual associations which came from durational development and existential reality was gathered up and formally adopted in the concepts Faith in and Love of Life.

The UPN material begins with self-valuation and the ontological value of his ideas: they will glorify His Lord and be useful to others. But in this same opening passage in the paragraph on Evil valued also are Religion and Revelation, Science and biological concepts, and biological life itself. Evolution and its mechanisms, studied as biology and as analogy concerning social and moral reality, is what Teilhard seeks to work upon.
Such concepts from religious, empirical and scientific paradigm- and concept-clusters are now seen to be representing Teilhard's inner commitments. They come from the life he knows and loves. Needs are producing concepts but the concepts used also represent his needs. The information-system which is the Mystic self is emerging in its own concepts.

The adventurous schizophrenia soon afterwards, in accepting the existential reality of determinisms which make him experience them (that is, "passivities") and also the religious faith in God and experience of Him, then makes concept-displacement so that the determinisms are God's Will, that is Providence, that is God. With this religious value given to life Teilhard then (in UPN') proceeds to enter the strange worlds of particular men and women, which Sterne and Balzac paint. In the trenches too he found the idiosyncratic nature of man and the uniqueness of the individual. With Bourget also (and Marguerite herself) he also entered particular human psyches, the multitude of sexual currents, the earth of moral and immoral men and women. By book, friend and trench-war Teilhard entered "real life" in concert with religious belief that within this was God's Will. He then in fact interpreted this life by means of his religious concepts.

By the beginning of February 1916 this acceptance of existential reality and religion was being concentrated conceptually on the problem of Matter. Teilhard was now determined to be himself. Thus the self which was immersed in the earth and life was speaking of the goodness of Nature and her ideals, while his religious self was speaking of God. These two selves, religious and pantheist, then together chose first the Sphinx and the image of Matter as Divine Matter and, second, Jacob-Israel as the image of the Christian which were needed to reconcile each other. By now also Teilhard's existential commitments are linked to the concept of Progress as

1. UPN 1.1b, 3, 5, 6, 10a.
2. UPN 1.7a, 8a, 18.
this passage shows:

"Est-ce que le sens du Progrès n'est pas l'élimination de tout déterminisme? la libération (des servitudes, de la matière, des servitudes organiques, de la mort) par la Lutte, la Réaction, la Science? ...

Et alors, toute communion aux passivités, tout laisser aller aux "courants fondamentaux" n'est-elle pas une faiblesse ou un recul? ... Le formule n'est-elle pas "non serviam"? La Lutte d'Israel et de l'Ange ...

Ainsi, il y a compétition, dans notre vie pratique, entre les deux attitudes: abandon au devenir; - Résistance à toutes les dominations. Comment se fait la synthèse? (panthéisme) (individualisme et syndicalisme)." (UPN 1,18)

In this jotting (cf. 18 February) Teilhard is specific about his two commitments. At the beginning of the month¹ though Teilhard's ability to "synthesize" his two commitment-attitudes had resulted only in the Sphinx-image. The turning point (discussed more fully below) came when Matter was looked at from the point of view of its future. The value of Matter would be shown in the "final synthesis" with the "realisation of ultimate potentialities". Thus the future of the earth was suddenly given an absolute value.

From this point on (cf. 4 February)² Teilhard began to speak of Life's "immediate palpable reality" and of loving the earth and its "immediate palpable future". Since there is the "totality of things" "all events" are given value: they are part of the Great Cause.

Since the world-process is interpreted by Teilhard through his theory of segregations his religious self is not threatened by such language. He can say that we must "adore the New Earth" and love the world, he can enthuse with pantheism touching the divine and with the natural charm of life, he can have "passion for the World". The individual, Science and Religion will struggle together for Progress and Freedom against the determinisms and for the future world. This Teilhard can

1. UPN 1,8a
2. UPN 1,8a,9,10,11,11a,15a,17,18.
say because his religious self is holding to Newman and "segregation".

As the existential valuation of life grows in Teilhard and is more accepted so the concepts reflect the growth.

On the one hand¹ Teilhard "prefers" Matter, enjoys the passivities of life, accepts "irresponsible social liaisons" for their possible value. He finds the "thing" more precious than the theory, he loves Matter and wishes to love Matter, he wants a life of intense communion with the Earth and with God. With his passionate interest in and enjoyment of the laboratory he demands that human work should have absolute value. The concrete life into which the faith must be welded is the "intense" life of the disciple who is a worker for "Surhumanity (Israel) realising itself". The "noble passions" of the Christian will be love of Nature, the cosmic passion of love of the Universe and of "all of life" and love of life. The "coldness" of the present-day Christian to the Earth is unacceptable.

On the other hand² the "Surhumanity" concept roots the emotion in intellectual life. The future is the key to God's purposes. Nature, Man and the Universe are to be loved — with all effort, life and reality — precisely because the absolute value is in the "total development" and "effort towards God" in the work towards the All. It is the "actual" universe which is being divinified.³ To be a "cosmic life" Christian is to be an "atom of the All", to back the Progress of the "Whole" World, to be part of the "Great Total Effort" of "Holy Evolution".

These concepts fix Teilhard's attitudes and so identity.

Thus when in April "Faith in Life" is reached there is a wealth of emotion, concept-cluster, new concept and association behind it. Personal self-confidence and love of mother, people, environment and Nature; personal pleasure and experience

---

1. For the following of UFN 1,19,19a,23a,26,31,32,32a,33,21a,21b,23a,35a,39,39a, 40,42,43a.
2. UFN 1,32a.
3. UFN 1,42
in laboratory, sexual relationship, war-struggle; personal enjoyment of scientific
work which explains to him the world, universe and life; these emotions, experiences
and needs of Teilhard's give him faith in Life. Yet to produce equilibrium between
religious self and mystic-experimental self and to fix his identity as both these
selves and the scientific self as well the new concepts had to be found. Thus the
segregation theory, the pantheist ideas of an All and the Biblical image of New
Earth inter-leap with those of biological and scientific reality. So that Teilhard's
emotions are fixed in the conception of a concrete future which has absolute value.

Thus, the unconscious love of life has become the conscious commitment to
Life. In all there is a system of sub-systems in Teilhard which is a Life Value-
Vector and is part of the Mystic Self. The Mystic Self is to do with sense-
sensitivity, it is pantheist, and it loves Life.
The present Thesis concentrates on the unconscious happenings in Teilhard's being. The argument is that his thoughts and writings are more readily explained by theories of 'press' and 'spin-off' than by theory of cautious academic rationality. In this section the material of UPN furthers the Thesis but now with the caveat that there was some critical feedback as his ideas were worked out. In TGTA-Naven theory feedback is synonymous metaphor to reality-testing, so that what is being said is that Teilhard was not schizophrenic in the sense of diverging off into a make-believe world of ideas. If what feedback there is seems inadequate to the reader consideration should be given to a man in trench and rest-area who had no library or friend to check him. If he had been in the Ore Place library after all his writing might have been confined to essays like 1912 Man!

1. The Emotional Thought of Teilhard.

What is suggested by the TGTA-Naven theory when Teilhard's use of concept-displacement is under scrutiny is first (as above) that there was no clinical schizophrenia and second that the bunch of value-vector-system-information-circuit-selves were not out of communication with one another and may act as control to each other, all in the interests of Self-Ego identity and integrity. In other words Teilhard was perhaps not just an example of adventurous schizophrenia but more especially of a multi-(schizo)-phrenia which because of the tension in the system had to produce, discover and create for equilibrium to again be reached. In that case this Thesis goes beyond the mysteriousness of Erikson and offers a new hypothesis for some personal creativity.
The feeling which the reader may have concerning Teilhard that the latter has an emotional certitude usually which overrides logic is shared by Teilhard himself. He copies out Newman's dictum that God carries "he who wills" to this certitude over and above the logical force of his conclusions.\(^1\) The Personal is also culled from Newman as being preferred to the Abstract.\(^2\) But the following passage fixes the fundamental point about Teilhard's thought-processes: his attitudes are more important to him than abstractly-argued philosophy, and the attitudes from parental womb are strongest of all. His emotions and his parents are regular feed-back presses.

"Les raisonnements, les fluctuations sentimentales ou intellectuelles passent sur mon âme, comme les lames sur une tête d'écueil, sans modifier son attitude fondamentale.

Toute vague qui passe dépose sur elle une couche nouvelle, mais toujours orientée, finalement suivant les lignes de force anciennes .. Invinciblement, en dépit des attitudes nouvelles transitoirement adoptées, je me retrouve épris d'union - tout bandé vers la Communion au Vouloir Divin. Suivons cette voix de notre âme; son appel est infaillible, et il est temps que je m'y abandonne." (UPN 1.20)

Furthermore Teilhard is conscious of personally being unable to do justice in his writing to what he is feeling. Here he follows Bergson but adds the caveat of the reflective scientist that the parts do not add up to the whole in experimental reality. These passages show some feed-back related to earlier reading and study. They explain much of the later Teilhard.

"Tout ce que j'écrirai jamais ne sera qu'une faible partie de ce que je sens ... Faut-il que le travail de la précision et de l'expression soit inutile ou appauvrissant? C'est surtout le problème de la valeur comparée de l'intelligence-raisonnante (du discours) et de l'intuition. Faut-il voir un cas particulier de cette loi de toute existence qui veut que la réalisation soit toujours accompagnée d'appauvrissement (parce que la "puissance" est une somme de choses qui ne peuvent pas être à la fois; ou bien faut-il reconnaître que la "langage" est un procédé

---

1. UPN 1.37
2. UPN 1.9a
pragmatique comode, affaiblissant la pénétration et l'adéquation des perceptions, appauvrissant des connaissances plus profondes? ...

Quel est le sens de cette faculté intellectuelle de simplifier, analyser ...

Distinguer les concrets 1. continues 2. à n dimensions (intuitions à partir d'un point de vue, vérité soluble en n filets convergents) 3. à multiples réalisations disparates (solide évoquant n surfaces ou courbes géométriques ..) (UPN 1.26)

Peut-être faut-il dire que la connaissance la plus parfaite allie le logicisme et l'intuition, celui-là étant simplement la dissociation analytique d'une perception synthétique, également et purement intellectuel, et qu'il ne faut pas confondre avec des vues obscures, des présentiments, ni comparer aux puissances à réalisations multiples et disparates.

Nous aimons à dissocier, à réduire les choses en points, et les démarches intellectuelles en raisonnement linéaires ... Mais nous n'en avons pas moins la perception intellectuelle du continu et du vrai complexe.


Que voulons-nous donc, en somme? À quelle tendance obéissons nous? Aux besoins et aux commodités de l'action sure? Mais n'y a-t-il pas davantage? .. (UPN 1.26a)

2. The Reflective Position concerning Model and increasingly tactile experimentation.

On 15 December 1915 a further critical tool is deployed. Following Duhea Teilhard shows himself conscious of the Model nature of scientific theory: geometric models of snow or gas are ideals superimposed on the realities concerned. He is conscious of the "image" and "analogy" which is being used to "represent" the "phenomenon" in a jotting concerning molecular separation. He notes that his use of the word "formula" for his description of the World is a "false and ambitious
term”. He is conscious that scientific images are not reality unless and until experiments demonstrate their approximation to reality. He is indeed able to criticise his own new idea that the Future holds the secret precisely because the Future is non-experimental.¹

This consciousness of the dangers of abstract idealisation is conveyed in the following:

"Comprends maintenant très clairement, que la géométrie (physique de la matière en tant que douée des seules dimensions) est une superposition idéale à la matière, un édifice intellectuel découvrant les choses, mais n'exprimant pas leur nature. L'hexagone est dans la neige, l'ellipse dans l'orbite des planètes, comme la loi de Mariotte dans les gaz, — et réciproquement. (c'est une idéalisation et une simplification simultanées).

Toute loi physique est la simplification théorique d'un donné absolument inépuisable de complexité, d'attache, d'explication intellectuelles et logiques. (UPN 1,6a)

This empirical strain in Teilhard is not minimal. This is shown by the link between it and his pantheistic life. The reality-testing, tactile part of Teilhard is to be adhered to in the same breath as the existentially involved part of him. When the possibility is faced that experimental reality may prove that Life is just a series of bubbles and not what religion and idealism have suggested, Teilhard adheres to his Sense-Sensitivity self: if reality-testing discovers reality it must be accepted. In this case of bubble life (if it were true) Teilhard and Man should nevertheless back life-as-it-really-is, which is the Life value-vector-self solving the practical problem. In other words the scientific Sense-Sensitivity self and the pantheist Life self are applied (the two of them together) to the same problem; and when a joint solution is not found the one provides the answer if it can.

Suggestion and feedback by separate selves may therefore be deemed to "exist"

¹. UPN 1,6a-7,10,13,14,21b.
within the argument put forward. Nevertheless although Teilhard is conscious of
the inadequacy of images he seldom argues them out, either for or against. Usually
he has a simple feeling of certainty that something is right or wrong, and he gives
his own solution as the conquistador:--

Faire la volonté de Dieu, s'entend généralement par
analogie avec l'obéissance à un père, à un chef ... Mais ce
point de vue est insuffisant et doit se compléter de l'idée
cosmique de souplesse aux forces organisatrices qui font mûrir
le Corps du Christ. (UPN 1.39a)

Only very seldom are analogies questioned, but the following shows that it
does happen sometimes:--

"Une image, une comparaison un circuit métalique, et
liverait ainsi passage à un courant .. (ceci, le courant)
à la faveur de cela
-- Exp. "cruciale:"

Êtant réalisé une molécule, un aggrégat = (physico-
chimiquement) substance vivant, cet aggrégat vivrait-il?
(Non, sans doute, pas plus que le spectre magnétique ne
donnerait naissance à un champ H...)

1. Mais qui n'est-il pas précisément de l'artificiel?
(UPN 1.22a)

As to why this situation of little technical questioning of analogy and
Gestalt occurred only speculation is possible.

It is the position of this Thesis that the reason for so little feedback
taking place in Teilhard is that the emotional personality erupted in Gestalten so
strong that they were virtually (ie. psychologically) unquestionable. They fitted
the needs and so entered the Self-Ego as dominant forces, so they were not questioned
by less dominant sub-systems. Teilhard in later life was always so certain that his
ideas were what the world needed precisely because they were what he needed. Man
in general in community and as individual is strangely attracted to his own mind and
thoughts. In Teilhard's case the integrity of his recent and more distant (past)
personality would be questioned if his Gestalt-reorientation were questioned. He
had to keep his identity with integrity.

3. The Metaphors and Gestalten.

In UPN Teilhard's Gestalten abound, to be outnumbered only by his metaphors. The Gestalten will be treated in a later chapter. Here one example shows the suddenness with which they appear. He has not mentioned the Future before in UPN and very little closely-worked material has been written. But immediately after having said that he might "figure" his Lord, Teilhard writes the following poetic-mystic paragraph which feels like experimental schizophrenia and which is a, if not the, specific function of the flood of writing which is let loose on this day:

"où cherchons-nous le Secret? - dans le Désert? Dans le lointain passé? dans la secrète matière? Il est dans l'Avenir et ses surcroits (imprévisibles, parceque inexpérimentables encore ...) (ex: la vie avant son apparition! la pensée avant les âmes!...) (UPN 1.21b)

Examples quoted above have already suggested that Teilhard was conscious that he really thought and wrote by means of series of Gestalten. Elsewhere he specifically says that he "feels" the "shape" of some ideas and wonders if they therefore represent reality or just come from the simplifying mind. He tries consciously to maintain balance between "intuition" and "analysis", the latter being "linear intellectual reasoning" and the former "synthetic perception". But leaps like that quoted above remain with him in such a way that they remind the reader more of the mystery of transcendental self than any logical or synthetic process. There must have been peers in book or person who had told him that the secret was the Future (and this will be pursued below): but the sudden appearance on this particular day suggests a Self-Ego which suddenly and as it were transcendently chose this concept out of the mass as the one which would fit the need of continuing thought which would satisfy tension. So that, though "Gestalt" is the word used throughout this Thesis to denote unconscious perception of pattern which can then reorientate the
mind, nevertheless the fact is that Teilhard very seldom seems to have come to
these Gestalten when specifically regarding the "dots" concerned. That there
was scanning of the information in the systems of the system—Teilhard cannot be
in doubt, but the choice of concept as Gestalt is remarkable in its ability to
satisfy so often. It was scarcely a matter of random spin-off and as answer to
need it was not error. Either the sub-system selves were working well or the
Self-Ego was in some sense transcendent to the system.

Not all Teilhard's metaphors and new concepts were however satisfying! The
long list shows him casting around for descriptions of what he could not yet describe.
The metaphors reflect the unconscious search for a pattern.

Nevertheless some of the metaphors of these first six months remained with
him all his life. The following is a selection taken in chronological order. It
shows the wide-ranging imagination of one living in five communities and having five
selves:—

UPN 1. 3a: the image of Religion is the priest's offering and union in the Mass
8a: Matter is the Sphinx with the heavenly visage and devilish results
9ab: Our Lord is the star who sweeps into the world and pulls forth the
elect in his wake
10: Matter goes (up or) down as gravitational pull causes a man's arm to
drop
10: Nature is a mirage and it is impossible to see the reality behind it
12: by transplantation, sexual human love becomes the ardent human being
loving God
15: a man in war is disinterested in himself and lives on a different
level (given to the Great Causes of Totality)
15: heaven is a prize
15a: chaplains are parasites
18: the type for the Christian is Jacob-Israel
20: Matter is a mother who will transmit God's action
18+: there are planes of reality, orders of matter and degrees of life
21: souls which gather are nebulae of souls
21: Man has roots and the roots of everything are atomic
21b: there is an issue to the struggle of mother and Matter
21a: Rodin's sculpture is the image of the origin of human consciousness
22a: the image for the movement of the cosmos comes from the spreading
of light-rays and the spreading and rising of water as it changes
state
22a: current in a metal conductor is a possible image of the synthesis
of life
UPN 1.22a: the call and attraction of God is suggested by the magnet image
23a: the Whole Cosmos, the All is a superior organism, the solar star-system a molecule of this
23a: Matter is hierarchical
24: the principle analogy for Matter is (Teilhard's) experience
24: spiritual souls are stones of the heavenly Jerusalem
24a: centripetal forces in Matter bring immanence, centrifugal transience
25a: scientific-pantheistic dominance of the earth-resources is that of Prometheus or Faust
26: there are currents of Matter
26: there are superior centres
26+: convergent threads, geometric curves, many-sided solids give pictures of intuition and analysis
26+: reason is linear and perception synthetic
27: the World and God may have a Physiognomy, and Our Lord be figured
27a: consciousnesses may converge
29a: Virginity becomes the giving of maternal nuance to life
34: there is a scale and a spectrum of attitudes
34a: there are canalising currents in the universe
35: an object can be transfigured
35a: the Earth is a Great Host
35b: Totality is completed by fermentation
36b: the Mystical Body is real and corporeal
36b: the World could be a series of bubbles
37: the Church is an organism
38: Man is the fruit of the Cosmos
39: the images of centres and spheres are useful in determining morality-levels
41: souls may be centred on God and the sphere image used here also
40a: there are strata of Matter

Some of the passages quoted already in Part Two demonstrate how metaphor suddenly appears with no preparation and often no follow-up in his paragraphs. On the other hand reflection will often suggest to the reader that much knowledge lies behind the sudden appearance and incubation of the metaphor after it has appeared to disappear will take place.

For example consider the Wallace/Darwin/Lamarck set of theory-facts which lies behind this passage (and consider how convergence and cephalisation turned out in later Teilhard):

Les ocelles d’un avion: sur toutes les faces. (cf. Wallace: les signes de reconnaissance des oiseaux, curieuse convergence). - L’organisme artificiel (fabrique du dehors) assujetti aux mêmes conditions que la machine naturelle. -
1 d. cephalisation de l’avion ...

(UPN 1.28a)
4. Is there critical feed-back?

In this paragraph the characteristic which Barbour notes of projection of knowledge from one locality to another and which in this Thesis is known via Schon as displacement of concepts is already appearing. There is the biological concept of convergence which describes particular phenomena, and on the face of it an aeroplane looks as though it also is showing convergence.

The question is, does Teilhard really mean that the aeroplane has (or will have) a brain? Or is he using the description strictly metaphorically? or sometimes one, sometimes the other?

The answer to this is important to a final analysis of Teilhard. The view of the present writer is that usually the images are strictly metaphorical and serve the purpose of attempted descriptions of what it is difficult to describe: that is, they are experimental displacement (adventurous schizophrenia). But that at other times the experimental or scientific reality of the image is taken as itself and worked upon as such.

That is to say, Teilhard did not think of an aeroplane having a brain as such. But when he talked of human love being "transposed" into love of God\(^1\) he was speaking not only of the concept of love being used in a wider context than human sexual relations, but more especially of the biological phenomenon of displacement of behaviour as when a bird's ritual is recognised to be displaced aggression.\(^2\)

In this case Teilhard is using metaphor but also the scientific associations of that metaphor.

This situation is demonstrated conclusively in the opinion of the present writer in the discussion of the Rodin sculpture. Teilhard sees the block of stone, imagines himself or Man the block, perceives that there can be beauty of the

---

1. UPN 1.32
2. cf. Hinde, op.cit.
features of a face moulded from that block. We are made from Matter, he exclaims.

And a week later? We are Matter, he realises, and he draws the picture which is so fecund which anticipates Christ-Kosmos, Creative Union and Omega-Christ.

"Dans Studio (1898), je suis tombé sur cette oeuvre de Rodin: une tête de femme, passive et inclinée, émerge d'un bloc de pierre informe —... N'est-ce pas l'image de la conscience humaine se dégageant de la matière (au sein de la matière et en naissance: nous sommes de la matière devenue consciente par introversion, élevée à la conscience par un surcroît) (surcroits = Matière Totale), nous sommes faits (inadequatement — exception l'âme) avec de la matière, voilà ce qu'il ne faut pas oublier ..." (UPN 1.21a)

"Si on définit la Matière = "tout ce qui est relié, tout ce qui s'assimile", les âmes spirituelles sont vraiment de la matière éléments du Corps du Christ, pierres de la Jérusalem céleste."

Alors, non seulement nous sommes baignés de matière, mais nous sommes Matière." (UPN 1.24)

First Teilhard displaced the concept of a sculptured stone on to Man's becoming: that was experimental metaphor and general description.

Second he treated the Matter of the rock as the same as the Matter of which Man also is made: the concretisation-process had set in, fed by the pantheist self.

Third the concretisation is applied to the spirit of man and indeed the Mystical Body (at least); and the point is that this latter is being treated just as concretely as the block of stone in the first place.

Fourth it is to be noted that criticism of the displaced metaphor does not follow. Why? It could be that since the new concept was imaging physical-biological reality (Teilhard thought), it could be criticised only through scientific experiment. For it was this precisely that Teilhard attempted for the rest of his life.

5. Teilhard's Method: the hypothesis of production of image and feed-back criticism by five selves.

The answer therefore to the question "is there critical feed-back?" must be a
qualified "No". There was no technical, philosophical criticism of image by consideration of negative and positive aspects in it. But the image arises from personal search-image need and the bunch of selves do consider the image critically as to how or whether it satisfies their need. Then if it does the selves set to work to justify it, even to demonstrate it scientifically.

This hypothesis that Teilhard was reaching out gropingly for images which would satisfy his identity as five selves, and that when he found something it was tested by the selves for its viability in the system and from time to time changed in the process would explain what appears in Teilhard. As the five sub-systems were fed with more information and produced stronger vector-attitudes and clearer concepts they would probe what concepts were previously satisfying the Self-Ego and perhaps demand better.

Such a picture is one of tension and energetic system, and the results would be spin-off from five more-and-more highly tuned circuits. As noted above, if the metaphors thrown up were totally random it is amazing that they were so satisfactory, so many of them. So that spin-off from a consistent system is a more reasonable hypothesis. The needs of the selves and the central need for Identity and Integrity explain why metaphor and displacement and new idea were necessary. The information-stores of five value-vector systems explain the variety, number and type of concept thrown up. The control of the Central Self, transcendental Self-Ego, explains how the metaphors were chosen, for they were chosen to be the search-images which would integrate the Identity-crises of this same Self. The culling of concepts from the five selves shows the Central Self in control and the five selves as five sub-systems working together in the interests of the central needs.

If such a picture of Teilhard's thought-processes makes sense, attention may now be given to the two selves which had grown from mother and father, and by education and the need of his Mystic-Pantheist-Sense-Sensitivity-Life-Self had
gathered in myriads of concepts, paradigms and associations of concept and emotion.

For one concept in Teilhard's "bi-polar" executive concept came from Religion and one came from Science.

How these two selves developed during the six months up to Cosmic Life is the story told in the next chapter.
CHAPTER XIV

THE RELIGION VALUE-VECTOR:
DEVELOPMENT FROM WITHIN PARENTAL WOMB (MOTHER).

Three groupings of religious material in UPN relate to Teilhard's durational development. There are concepts and attitudes which are basically Biblical, orthodox in Tradition and to do with general Christian experience. There are more specifically Roman Catholic ideas. Third there are notions which rely on underlying Metaphysic or the individual's personal understanding.


The first grouping of traditional-Biblical concepts is very large in Teilhard generally.¹

In UPN "Christ Jesus" and Revelation are basic concept-commitments, for instance, so:—

"JC - astre bien aimée qui a traversé notre monde pour en capturer une fraction (dans sa totalité: matière et âme)." (UPN 1.9b)

A selected list of such concepts from UPN might run like this:—

UPN 1.1: Teilhard is writing down his ideas to "glorify Our Lord"
5a: his gifts, heart and time are being given to the Divine Will
9,26: he wishes intense mystical union with God and communion with His Will
3: Paul's language of Darkness versus Light is used
3: God uses Evil
3: Heaven demands response
6: man's nature needs to be renewed
6: suffering is fecund, dogma is fecund
6,9: the Christian's ascesis follows the sufferings and ascesis of Our Lord
7: there are Christian Ideals
9a: there are angels
9,10: Christianity already has Cosmic Life and He is already "enough" for man to meet

¹ For instance all the doctrines of Christ appear throughout the personal writings as in eg. Christology and Evolution, (1933), Paris, Du Seuil, 1969.
UPN 1.11a: there is the Body of Christ, and the New Earth
12: Christian life is sacrifice, charity and loving God
15: there is reward in Heaven
16a: War is bad but there is the logic of sincere war (and Holy War, 42)
17: heresy and blasphemy are possibilities
18: there is the struggle of Jacob and the Angel, and also passive resignation
20: moral perfection may make a pure instrument of God
20: man can be divinised by communion with God
20, 21a, 27a: there is Creation, Fall, Source, Agent and End
22: there is Spirit
24: there is the Heavenly Jerusalem
26, 38a, 31, 33a: there is Incarnation and Revelation
29a: virginity is both problem and state pleasing to God
32a: there is immortality
35: there is Resurrection
35a: there is sanctification
35b: the picture of yeast-fermentation is used
36, 37a: there is the Humanity of Our Lord, the Kingdom of Heaven and Jesus
38: there is election
38a: Christ is Divine and Human
39: there is transcendence
39a, 40: there is Redemption and New World
42: there is Providence

Traditional beliefs were therefore very much part of Teilhard. Mainly they were Roman Catholic as the list suggests in, eg. 20, and such religious need and motive is shown in the (Roman Catholic) orthodoxy in UPN 1.10a:

"En plus d'une certaine timidité, et surtout d'un certain libéralisme excessif, je souffre de sentir que la messe que je vais dire est une humble manifestation, à quelle certain fidèles s'uniront avec joie, mais devant laquelle beaucoup pourront en toute liberté passer comme devant une chose libre, arriérée ou insignifiante ... Cette modeste condition de mon Dieu m'attriste et me scandalise; mais n'est-elle pas la situation providentielle où demeure l'Eglise, jusqu'au bout! celle de la présentation et de l'attente." (UPN 1.10a)

Nevertheless the list and this example (and the previous one) reveal a certain idiosyncratic usage. The rhetorical question is answered by the Gestalt. A particular and personal view is being maintained.

Thus, though traditional attitude accords with the theological orthodoxy shown

1. UPN 1.38a
in the above list and for instance in Teilhard's use of the Hypostatic Union in a passage on the Incarnation (UTN 1.38a), there is also change of meaning. In the latter the concepts are used in such a way that their meaning is not unchanged, for Incarnation is envisaged in a biological cosmos (see below). Yet enough has been said to show that the Ore Place Doctor of Theology had been acquainted with thought and concept-clusters which were orthodox and which provided him with orthodox images.

2. Roman Catholic concepts.

The more specifically Roman Catholic concepts follow a similar pattern in their appearance and use. The example of priestly offering and union in the Mass as the type for Christian relationship with God was given above, and later the Elevation and Union are used as images of the elevation of New Matter through the Incarnation-union of Our Lord and the World. Other examples of concepts and attitudes which are particularly Roman Catholic might be the following:-

UTN 1. 7: the Pope
12: Mystical Body
13: the wish to seize and possess God
14a: beatitude in a higher spiritual being
16: Roman Catholics alone are able to bring order, brotherhood and right family-life
18a: the Roman "moral synthesis" alone is capable of producing real heroism in battle
20: one may be divinised through moral perfection
21: the Beatific nebula of souls
22a,24: the use of analogy as in God as "attraction"
28a: God as superior Unity
29a: the doctrine of Virginity
30: achievement of a supernatural life
37a: the Host
38a: Newman's belief that the sole option is Catholicism or Atheism
38a: Catholic attitudes are exhaustive

The abstract differentiation of "Roman" from "Christian" concepts serves to show two things. First that Teilhard was his mother's son, a Catholic and a Jesuit at the period during which his novel concepts were produced. His lived-in orders

1. cf. UTN 1.3a ff.
included in them Sacred Heart theology, Pesch and Louvain's Mercier.

But second it reminds the reader that Teilhard in using analogies which were orthodox in Roman Catholicism (such as God as superior Unity) was thinking within the metaphysical language and thought of post-Thomas theology.

Teilhard's religious life, in which he was totally committed to Christianity, was indeed a matter of rosary devotion and Mass, that is of psychological and practical commitment to Roman positions, which — when they were "not enough" — formed the basis conceptually for the as yet un-formed concepts which were needed. So when Teilhard talks of the Earth as "Host" or the elaboration of Matter as its "elevation" the metaphor-displacements are taking place out of concept-clusters which he loved, had lived-with and needed — those of Roman Catholic Religion.

This list set in order of chronological appearance of concepts makes two points. First there is no obvious logical progression in the order in which the concepts have appeared. The list is not inclusive but in UPN there is never any lead-up to the use of such concepts from academic study of Bible or Theology. They reflect the priest's daily prayers and Mass and the Jesuit's sixteen years' training, but as they appear they are not defined, they are not worked upon, they enter and leave abruptly. For instance in UPN 1.3a:

"la messe à Basseux.

J'ai eu l'élévation et la Communion, — l'offrande et l'union, — les 2 actes fondamentaux du prêtre et du chrétien — ceux par lesquels on se joint à Dieu et on lui joint le monde, le monde qui lutte et qui souffre, surtout .." (UPN 1.3a)

In this passage Teilhard's own belief and training are paramount. In a situation of existential press he has found useful concepts. But it is remarkable that the fairly traditional first half of the sentence is used to go beyond traditional

1. UPN 1.10 cf. 33,38a.
ideas to act as a pointer for and to express the idiosyncratic beliefs of Teilhard concerning God and the world. Concepts are not first defined, then used and worked. They merge as the production of needs, as associations vis-à-vis ideas already being worked out by Teilhard, as elements pointing up the subject-matter of new Gestalten. What are traditional elements in Theological systems are used as metaphors for Teilhard's own ideas.

Two other passages illustrate this, as does much of Teilhard's writing. In the case of the "Sphinx" the legend and its varieties of interpretation are not mentioned. The image suddenly appears as an executive concept. It resolves the particular problem in Teilhard's mind at the time. "What is Matter when I a priest love it" is solved by an image which meets up with Teilhard's need-feelings, an existential need by an existential concept. Thought here is ahead of language and Teilhard has to project a concept from a (pantheist) thought-cluster which he already knows into the situation of existential need.

A second example would be the appearance of Jacob and the Angel in [UPN 1,18,21]. Here "Jacob and the Angel" is imaging Teilhard's own synthesis concerning living in the world, and remains a major concept all his life. But now it is introduced already interpreted in Teilhard's particular way. Old Testament scholars of that decade might for instance not have accepted that the Angel represents God-in-the-world in the concrete way suggested by the rest of the paragraph!


A further point which underlines both the value-vector commitment (emotional and conceptual) to Religion and the fact of idiosyncratic usage is that the metaphysical bases of Roman concepts like the Host remain when such concepts are displaced. There is no discussion of the Roman doctrine of the Mass when the Earth is described as Host, but it does not need detailed analysis of Host for the metaphysical elements of Transubstantiation to be projected into the Earth-as-Host
The new concept reached by displaced metaphor is more than a helpful imagery to Teilhard: as the fermentation image also shows, the metaphor is attempting to concretise what is being conceived by Teilhard as physical. So metaphysical images are of special use to him. He does not as yet know consciously the full conceptual shape of that he is needing and seeking. But the experimental groping with metaphysical concepts being displaced helps him to keep to the realities which he knows, those of religious and physical experience and paradigm-tradition.

When therefore Teilhard uses images from Christian-Roman concept-clusters, these images are not to be deemed bereft of historical association and contemporary interpretation. They are used with general, traditional but simple paradigm-connotations and without technical specification, so as to throw light on particular conceptual-existential problems concerning the form and purpose of the World. They are part of the mental filter through which Teilhard is trying to "see" and their "reality" is that of emotional-conceptual commitment made from the womb.

To Teilhard therefore in such metaphor displacements Religion is suggesting meaning for what Science is discovering as reality. The religious concepts are searchlights for terrain which human mind is now passing through. But more specifically Religion has always suggested metaphysical solutions to the problem of Reality. The concept of God itself is metaphysical, as is symbolised by the "thought-of order" in Levi-Strauss. Thus, when Teilhard finds Christ-Kosmos as his executive concept he is producing a metaphysical image. Indeed the traditional ideas of metaphysics abound in Teilhard, from Aristotle and Thomas to Leibnitz and the Pantheists.

A list of metaphysical concepts may be made from this early section:

1. ultimate potentialities will be realised in a final synthesis which will show Matter's value
2. degrees of Being
3. different planes of the real
4. superior orders of Matter
Vital pressure producing life from supra-chemical agglomeration

17a: intrusion by creative flows of more-being
17a: God as the final synthetic Consciousness: \( C_N, N_c \)
20a: the basic stuff of ether has unalterable consistency
21a: the concept of contingency in relation to Creation and Fall
22a: the idea of spirit and immanence inside Matter
24: the substance and secret energies of souls
24: monads
25: the notion of Progress
26: the idea of the All
32: supernatural
38a: the Pleiad
39: transcendence
43a: the progression of the Universe is by divine plan

Again such a list gives no hint of progression of argument. Again, also, it highlights the difficulty of categorisation of material. In the 1.8a example the Aristotelian notion of potentiality is being used very concretely by Teilhard to denote a physical-biological end-product to Matter and the World. But both Matter and value are themselves metaphysical notions, and ultimate is ambivalent. It is perhaps the verb "realise" which carries Teilhard's sense furthest by its biological undertones. But the latter are not clarified. When other examples are viewed in this way they become full of similar ambivalencies. For instance, modern scientific understandings of space might see "universe" as a specific area of empirical testing-ground, while to Teilhard it may be this but it is also the metaphysical notion of a oneness.

All in all the language of Teilhard is shown to be full of metaphysical idea. This is apart from the mainly religious concepts of, eg. soul, heart, absolute, ideal, universal (which notions make Teilhard's motives and concepts plumb full of metaphysics). For instance:--

"mes diverses idées fondamentales sur la Matière"

= "ses séductions, d'abord, dues à une certaine symétrie avec le Divin: immensité, puissance, stabilité, "esse fontale", réceptacle de tout savoir et de toute réponse ...) menant au paganisme et au panthéisme naturaliste;
4. The Method and the Man.

The examples of UPN 1,17a,24,26 and 38a relate Teilhard specifically to the Pantheists. This part of the story will be told below, but here the same point made concerning the Christian and Roman concepts may be reiterated. Whether concepts come from Rome or Leibnitz (or anyone else) they emerge from Teilhard's mind without formal preparation, they are associated with some other notion, and they disappear without in fact any analysis having taken place.

There are exceptions to this. Concepts such as Spirit, Ether and Matter do not disappear. But they still receive little preparation or little analysis. Such concepts continue on UPN pages because they are building-blocks for the original ideas, concepts used in the process of formation of executive concept. So Newman's Angels lasted only a second though they perhaps prompted questions about Teilhard's Second Matter. Yet Newman's "Some Thing" which is hidden in Nature became the cornerstone of Teilhard's thought.

Such a strictly metaphysical notion (like that of the All) symbolises the metaphysical nature of Teilhard's quest and discovery. But it also symbolises the idiosyncratic method with which these were pursued.
By isolating out the Religious value-vector and showing it to be a complex of images and paradigms from Christianity, Roman Catholicism and Metaphysics, with historical roots in information-gathering in Family, Church, Jesuit and some savant (Pantheist) communities, the present writer is emphasising the leap-of-faith womb of Teilhard's original idea. The ontological questions of whether there is Really-Reality, a Gardener or a City over the hill\(^1\) were answered in no uncertain terms by Teilhard from the very beginning by his emotional and intellectual commitment to and use of concepts such as those tabulated above.

Furthermore, this becomes even clearer as the story unfolds. The religious concepts do not appear within religious argument or demonstration. Teilhard is less and less to be deemed the technical philosopher or theologian. His use of the concepts within him is that of a needy man who makes experimental displacement so as to make sense of psychological attitudes and conceptual vacuums within himself. The Teilhard who uses his concepts in this way is far from critical study. He is the emotional man pressed to existential synthesis and grasping at images in the hope that these will when displaced reveal the search-image which will soothe his soul and fix his identity. This is how Teilhard developed his own language, by means of which he could express what at first he could not symbolise at all. In this and in his transferences of image into new field and association Teilhard was like the poet not the scholar. Since the transferred images were so often religio-metaphysical what Teilhard produced — whether valuable or not — was a matter of faith and leap-of-faith, and as such was the poetry of ultimate concern.

5. Religion/Metaphysics as Control in Teilhard.

Both the personal and metaphysical motivations in Teilhard and the religious control which prevents defection to Atheism or Pantheism are shown in the three

---

pieces which end this chapter. These are representative of all of the personal Teilhard. The Religion value-vector acts to produce and control in every paragraph of original Teilhard.

"L'Essay on Development" de Newman est né des besoins mêmes de sa vie intime, il représente la solution du problème religieux (et total) tel qu'il s'est présenté à sa vie ...

Il me semble que j'ai à écrire (au moins pour moi) quelque chose d'analogique, non plus sur le terrain de l'Église (Ancienneté à concilier avec "nouveautés"), mais sur celui du Devenir cosmique (Détachement à concilier avec amour légitime de la ...)

"Essay on Matter", Attitudes en face de la matière."
(UFN 1.20a)

"Où trouver, autour de nous, dans ce qui nous appelle et nous passionne, du Divin, de l'absolu, à étreindre? ..."
(UFN 1.17)

"Mon but: englober, dans et pour l'effort vers Dieu, la sève et les ressources cachées dans la conscience et l'amour des réalités cosmiques et de leur semi-Absolu." (UFN 1.31)

How the Religion value-vector works in with that of Science, and how these two chronologically produce through the mutual medium of the Pantheists the original bi-polar concept of Christ-Kosmos is the tale told in Chapter Fifteen.
CHAPTER XV

THE SCIENCE VALUE-VECTOR: DEVELOPMENT FROM WITHIN PARENTAL WOMB (FATHER).

In the previous section the maternal parental womb of Teilhard which resulted in his being Roman Catholic, Jesuit and so metaphysically-based was shown to have produced a set of concepts which were displaceable in the interests of the needs of Teilhard to be himself. Further the production of these concepts was a function of the set of abilities, processes, attitudes and information which are symbolised in the Sense-Sensitivity value-vector, the Mystic-Pantheist self.

Now the Science value-vector from father but similarly the function of the Sense-Sensitivity value-vector, especially in the latter's reality-testing and sense-impression sub-components, must be abstracted and tabulated from the pre-Cosmic-Life pages of UPN. For if the Pantheists were metaphysicians with religious feelings, some of them were also professional or journalistic scientists. To the latter at least Teilhard looked for the solution of his integrity-problem.

1. The "Scientist" Teilhard.

The presence of scientific content in Teilhard’s mind is to be noted from UPN’s first entry. There Teilhard takes a physiological (as well as religious) view of Evil, setting it within a biological world-view.

This scientific ethos reappears when the question of "universal consciousness" arises. Rejecting the abstract (Durkeimian) concept of some type of group mind for all mankind, Teilhard sees the biological reality of plural souls, of the individual's possibilities for particular deepenings of personality. In this refusal to reify common mind the particular reality of humans is kept intact without the existential phenomenon of common mind being rejected, since "universalisation" is seen as biological possibility in common paths of individual consciousneses.

1. eg. H.G. Wells.
Talk of "consciousness" is according to some modern empirical scientists\textsuperscript{1} metaphysics not science. To Teilhard's generation it was a commonly accepted concept however, just as "Matter" was an acceptable shorthand for Physical Reality, and Ether the current concept for what made up Space. Such concepts were used by Teilhard according to contemporary usage. But two points must be made. First, though he had particular scientific knowledge he always changed it when he used it.\textsuperscript{2} It never remained what was in the text-books but served the purpose (noted above in the case of the religious concepts) of basic concepts on which Teilhard could build his own ideas as he engaged in experimental schizophrenia. Second, Teilhard never rejected what science was in the text-books, though on contemporary anomalies within the scientific community's research he chose his own solution which at times (as in the case of Ether) has not turned out to be the scientific paradigm-solution. When he joined the scientific community in 1912 he accepted its paradigms, so that, eg. Dobzhanski, can accept much of him. But what Teilhard's Mystic-Pantheist Self in Self-Ego need did with particular scientific ideas is symbolised by the empiricist Medawar's rejection of him as well as the religionist Dobzhanski's following of him.\textsuperscript{3}

These points may be noted in the following two examples. In the first Teilhard (who, since Crozé, had loved numbers and mathematical methods and ideas) commits himself to Probability Mathematics and the language (often used by him) of "function" and "large numbers". From which he then proceeds to wonder if such statistical theory helps ideas of monadic atoms and his own theory of "dead life". In the second the scientifically orthodox concepts of atomic chemistry, astronomy and bio-chemistry appear only to be at once joined by a non-orthodox and metaphysical concept of "total matter" with which there is "vital pressure". Thus the scientific concepts are used to further metaphysical theory.

\textsuperscript{1} So Crick in Men and Molecules, London, 1963.
\textsuperscript{2} cf. Cuenot in Appendix A.
Poincaré re "la plus heureuse des circonstances pour calculer très bien un phénomène d'ensemble, c'est d'ignorer les lois particulières, individuelles, comme cela on prend les éléments uniquement en fonction de leur grand nombre."

"les foules n'agissent pas suivant la loi des grands nombres, puis-que'elles se plient comme les moutons de Pamurge, à certaines influences, à certaines unités, à certains "atomes" ou "monades" de tête. Est-ce inconciliable avec ma théorie de la vie morte? Cela la complique, voilà toute." (UFN 1.7)

"Hier, en regardant des planètes, au ciel, j'ai songé que dans l'une ou l'autre d'entre elles, peut-être la vie est en formation. Qu'y verrions-nous, au point de germination? Un concours accidentel d'atomes chimiques, ou bien, plutôt, une agglomération supra-chimique, fruit de l'affinité. ou, plus exactement de la pression, vitale, suspendue partout? Les images nous font défaut, pour un phénomène non expérimenté encore. Mais enfin, la solution doit être en accord avec ce principe; le chimisme (C, A, H, O, etc.) est, par rapport à la vie, comme les déterminismes pour la liberté, comme l'analyse par rapport à l'intuition. Les molécules, les atomes, les ions sont de la matière ratiocinée, réduite, par principe, à des propriétés infra-vitales. La vie est en puissance dans la matière, mais dans la matièrre totale. Le premier protoplasme se forme par une maternité matérielle, et la première vie s'y pose ..." (UFN 1.14)

In the second example Teilhard is shown (as in an earlier Chapter¹) to be conscious of the model—nature of scientific theory. His use of "represent" in the following quotation (and again that of "image") further exemplifies this:

"Quand la matière cède au bout d'un temps (vg. un bloc sous l'action d'un coin laissé au repos), on peut sans doute représenter le phénomène par un mouvement de décollement continu des molécules; mais l'image d'une fatigue, analogue à celle qui lasse, vg. notre bras levé et le fait retomber, n'est-elle plus profonde et plus vraie?" (UFN 1.10)

These three points lay bare what happens when Teilhard is at work within his own needs. He accepts scientific reality and this follows his Sense—Sensitivity commitment to sense—impression. He knows that in scientific data are theory—facts, in accordance with Sense—Sensitivity verification—need feedback. He produces dream—like

¹ Chapter 12.
thought-experiment so as to gather more satisfying theory, which is sense-sensitivity imagination-process. So (in Cuenot's words) Teilhard "twists" scientific "facts". But only where there are not yet paradigm-interpretations which cannot be contravened and only in the interests of personal exploration towards the executive concept which he needs does this take place. In UEN this is so. But so it is also in the later re-workings such as The Phenomenon of Man because here also it is the 1915+ personal Gestalt of Christ-Kosmos which is being demonstrated. The personal need produces the adventure.

In other words Teilhard uses scientific concepts as images which may be displaced so as to describe something which he does not yet know, the while accepting experimental reality to which both personal reality-testing sense-impression and the scientific paradigms of the scientific community testify. Thus does Teilhard keep to parental womb and chosen-needed professional work, while yet letting this Science self be controlled so as to satisfy the tensions of the whole system of five selves.

Because of its control as empirical reality and as a set of theories for this the Science value-vector is dominant in the system. It is produced by father and the Sense-Sensitivity value-vector and now the latter feeds it.

Further, it now provides the concepts and work for the Life value-vector. In a simplification of the system of specimen Teilhard in regard to the concepts which he uses, Teilhard "is" two main value-vectors, Science and Religion; and though it was the Sense-Sensitivity value-vector which provided the processes which produced the executive concept for the Self-Ego value-vector (and the Life value-vector fulfilment), it was Religion which produced Christ and Science which produced Kosmos.

Overall, therefore, the development of Teilhard's Science value-vector in the months before Cosmic Life happened in two ways. There was deepening commitment to scientific reality. But at the same time there was progressive utilisation of scientific concepts in displacement-processes to provide metaphysical notions. This
second side of the Science value-vector is thus strictly-speaking not Science, just
as Metaphysics may not strictly-speaking be deemed part of Religion if the latter is
defined as Revelation. In both cases orthodox concepts are used (well-) outside of
their paradigm-situations and in relation to particular ideas from outside the community, so as to cast light in new fields. But in the case of Teilhard the scientific ideas did not thereby lose their concreteness (in his eyes), for he was totally committed to their concrete reality. So that even when displaced and joined with (to him) Religious Reality, they must in his case still be deemed within the Science value-vector system in which they began. They were that concrete to him; they were Science. 1

The processes just outlined may be seen in the first pages of UFN. On the
question of Evil the empirical reality of physical evil is a function of capacity for
feeling. To this scientific basis the religious idea of God's Will is added by
Teilhard. So that any solution to the problem from now on in Teilhard will have to
be built on these bases. From now on a religious solution from Revelation will not
be sufficient for him for he is committed to scientific reality, specifically to what
he has just thought of. Thus, any answer in the future will be metaphysical, but meta-
physical specifically because it must be built on a physical base.

All through Teilhard such bases will appear. In UFN they are for instance:
cells, corpuscles, molecules and atoms: Duration, Time, Space and Evolution: the
chemical elements, electrical energies and biological systems: biological sexuality
and reproduction. The quotations from UFN in this Thesis show further that such
general notions of contemporary science were part of Teilhard (long) before ideas such
as "convergence" occurred to him. So that it was on such orthodox bases that he
built for the satisfaction of his own needs. He did not reject his Science; he
built upon it.

The above scientific concepts show that his Science self was commitment within

1. This means of course that strictly-speaking, eg. by Medawar's orthodox view of Science
Teilhard cannot be claimed to be working as scientist outside his technical geology.
the scientific community. But the way he builds upon them with Sense-Sensitivity displacement shows him entering the religio-scientific Savant community of the Pantheists.  

2. A chronological view of Science value-vector development, and further hints of non-scientific method.

On the first UNN entry Teilhard displaced the metaphor of crystallisation into the social phenomenon of Collectivity. By this he produced the Gestalt of Collectivity as a new and "second" Matter. Biological metaphor perhaps also underlay this. But within a short time mathematical metaphor came to the fore. When he was thinking of "wholes" (in this case "social"), Teilhard had in mind ideas of statistical probability, the collectivity and plurality thus being viewed in concrete scientific fashion via number, thereby receiving biological concreteness and direction:

"10 libertés (mises ensemble) font un déterminisme (la pluralité, par elle-même, mécanise)"  (UNN 1.3a)

The phenomenon of man-in-groups is therefore being interpreted by chemical and mathematical metaphor.

The result is that man-in-groups is asserted to be concrete and new reality, biologically, ethologically and physically. Collectivity as a Determinism is a new form of Matter-world-stuff, so different from man-the-individual that there is a definite break with individual indeterminacies.

Further, Teilhard in the next breath is conscious of the biological mechanisms of evolutions and (by analogy) of evolution which is appearing in the conscious elements which are seen in Man, in his ideas, words and so on. So that on this first day of the original Teilhard he is on the one hand conscious that it is by analogy that the evolution of ideas and social group may be studied as "evolution".

1. As shown above, Teilhard's peers here were such as Bergson and Maeterlinck, cf. MM pp 50ff.
2. cf. MM p.64.
Yet on the other hand the concreteness of these phenomena is such that they must be related to physical-biological development in Nature and thus be deemed part of the concrete reality of evolution.

What is noteworthy is that this Gestalt is not argued in detail. It is a building-block which will receive attention from time to time in later work. But in its beginning it is the conceptual answer to personal need, so that emotional commitment to it precludes critical discussion of it. Even later, since this Gestalt-understanding though new to himself was not new within society, this latter fact acted as reinforcement and helped to protect and nurture this first bud of his personal originality.

The "New Matter" Gestalt became gradually more specific. As Teilhard became more aware that his problem was Matter and the World (and God) he began to define this as the question of what were the bonds and liaisons between individuals and Matter; and when the "totality of things" was envisaged he could see that ideas were specific liaisons and bonds within Matter. So that the Second Matter was to do with ideas and thought as well as with the materialisation of organised groups on the German pattern. As Teilhard thought about the problem over time he gathered new information, made new associations and from time to time changed his approach - most processes and needs being unconscious, and no material being gathered in a professional way.

From August 15 until April of the next year Teilhard's quest of finding conceptual execution of his identity was recognised by him to be concerned with what he meant by Matter. Although the "totality of things" (mentioned above) could have been a scientist's recognition of Physical Reality, it very soon was couched in overtly metaphysical language which must suggest that Leibnitz and others (as well as Bergson) had pressed Pantheist concepts into Teilhard's mind.

1. nb. Leibnitz was a course at Ore Place, and is favourably mentioned in the 1909 Lourdes essay.
The record is the following. At the beginning of February the cosmos is All and One. As per Maréchal¹ Teilhard does not accept the pantheist's equal and uniformly happy transformation of the All. But the scientific realities ("material phenomena are real") of molecules, elements, life, causes and laws of nature are part of the Matter which has immensity, power, stability and fundamental "esse". As many scientists of the time would have said there is an "Integral" Matter, a basic stuff, which is "unalterable," "consistant" — Ether. But this is part of the Kosmos which is initially ("primitively") an All which has fundamental bond-cohesions. There are laws of probability and gravitation, but through these Matter changes in Time from plural fact to Wholes, since the Whole is a function of large numbers. Matter increases over time, but this means that there is a Future which is the "increments of Matter" and that the experimental earth will produce and is producing a "palpable future" which is the Some Thing hidden in Nature. The Cosmos is a Whole and it is Matter.

At every step in which scientific concept symbolises concrete reality there is in the same breath a metaphysical leap of faith which is to do with Pantheism which includes Leibnitz, Bergson and now Newmanite vision. This is the method of Teilhard — always thinking out his problem and producing tentative solutions from within his selves.

Two excerpts from UFN for 23 February 1916 make this plain. Here scientific concepts are used concretely but then projected by the Mystic self into a pantheist world-view so as to give a totally concrete but metaphysical not scientific concept of reality and future reality:

"la forme sous laquelle, à mes yeux, se divinise la Matière: métal inaltérable, énergie, éther: tout ce qui est partout, inaltérable, consistant ..."

¹. eg. Brémond, loc. cit.
Such examples which show Teilhard's imagination at work also conclusively show that his original ideas are not the result of painstaking technical essay. He is well aware that the Savant's Science is the result of slow "extrinsic" analysis, that Science deals with "facts" and not a priori impressions, that there will be experiments set up one day which will be able to settle once and for all such questions as the artificial synthesis of life. But his Testament is specifically not such scientific work and laboratory experiment. Teilhard wishes to equate palaeontological or physical discovery with cooperation with the Kingdom of God. He wants to adore his laboratory work as work of absolute value. He wants to show that the illumination of the Savant and the latter's progress in Consciousness is in reality Creation. It is what the "ultra"—development of civilisation will be after the War with the Boches that he wishes to imagine. Teilhard is pressed by existential need.

What his war Testament is is therefore the thinking out conceptually of personal needs. Concepts of Matter appear which have roots in what he had learnt in science in college but which are functions of his own attitudes, his commitment to earth and sense, to religious paradigms and pantheism. The concepts which he produces have had to make sense of all these together, and since they helped his motivation at the time and integrated his personality and faith they became dominant needs themselves.

Thus the Science value-vector in Teilhard is ambivalent like that of Religion. There is no chronological technical toil and so no technical scientific logic. Scientific concepts are used as bases, and the results in Gestalt are reckoned to be
empirically verifiable, as in social reality and the case of the Future "increments". What logic there is would seem to be that of regular presses concerning need for concepts, especially for those which would satisfy his identity as scientist and priest. So specifically the logic is of the workings and outputs of selves which form a central system which is Teilhard. The logic of the paragraph which is written is that it represents the solution, given over time by a five-solved system in response to particular press, which in these early sections is particularly the Self-Ego need of the personality of Teilhard himself.

Such alone can be the reason for the sudden introduction of Sex (in the *A la faveur* concept) into the conceptual problems of Teilhard. Sexuality erupts into his scientific concept-cluster and takes a watershed position in Teilhard's scientific and then original thinking. Indeed since part of the scientific basis of Teilhard was the function of existential sexual press the originality of Teilhard cannot be said to have resulted from logical thought at all. This basic concept comes from Marguerite! But yet this does not necessarily mean that this concept which resulted from sexual sensibility and is the clue to Teilhard is not science or logic, though its origin is neither of these. But the above interpretation of Teilhard's method nevertheless would not suggest that what he would do with the *A la faveur* concept (once discovered) would be science.

3. The *A la faveur* concept.

It was by being himself sexual and by attempting to interpret sexuality scientifically that Teilhard earthed his executive concept in scientific reality. Christ-Kosmos is of the earth, earthy, precisely because of the *A la faveur* interpretation of sexuality. So that Omega may be metaphysics but it is not by origin or design out of this world.

At the beginning of February 1916 and after the early passages of general philosophising and dream Teilhard is suddenly found reading Balzac. This was not
long after Marguerite had written. She had been hopeful of his "supra-sensibilisation" and she had also discoursed on Feminism. Marguerite and Teilhard's vows would be reasons why this first mention of Sexuality notes it is a subject "delicate" to treat. But it was "essential" to tackle it, and the Sterne-Bourget-Balzac reading increased this necessity.

The new concept which Balzac gave to Teilhard was that of the sex instinct as fundamental to the inner cosmic dynamic, with the corollary that "passion" energy must be conserved. The "passions à vide" are a biological way in which life progresses into new activity.

The passages which follow show that what Teilhard is trying to describe is what nowadays is known as "displacement" by Animal Behaviourists. It is also close to the Freudian concept of sublimation.

The first passage is quoted in full since it touches on so much of the later Teilhard — the emphasis on Love, the reflective position on Religion, the social relations of the human monad. But it also shows the existential womb and the dream-thought method of Teilhard:

"Il est impossible de traiter des affinités profondes de la monade humaine et des courants généraux qui l'entraînent sans aborder la question de l'amour sexuel, cette sève des relations sociales, cette affinité profonde dont la satisfaction paraît neutraliser la monade humaine et lui faire trouver son terme réel. Toute la reste, poursuite anxieuse d'idéal (en pensée, en religion, en terre ...) ne serait-il pas des fantômes qui se forge l'amour sexuel désorbité, des objets de "passion à vide"? Il faut se garder de condamner en bloc cette idée, à première vue inacceptable. De même que la parole est née de l'utilisation inattendue d'organes pliés à émettre des sons articulés, mais primitivement formés pour d'autres fins, — de même, peut-être, la liaison amoureuse, avec Dieu, fondement de la cohésion du Corps mystique, est l'utilisation fortuite, secondaire

1. MM only mentions Bourget's Sens de la Mort, (MM p.78) and Psichari's Voyage du Centurion, (MM p.98). But WF/H's evidence of the reading of Sterne and Balzac, perhaps also of Goethe, gives the fuller picture of Teilhard's emotional turmoil.
d'un tempérament passionnel. Pour former des élus, il a fallu des coeurs qui aiment, et donc des coeurs doués d'une affinité puissante (apté à être détournée sur du sur-naturel), et donc de coeurs pris dans un courant sexuel sensibilisé par lui, pour toute recherche ... Dans ces conditions, on pourrait dire que le monde a été conçu, dessiné, dans toute sa complication et son dédale de transformations, dans son enchevêtrement de fins secondaires et particulières, pour aboutir à donner un cœur humain-ardent, destiné, par une sorte de transplantation, à brûler d'amour divin, "tout comme on porte de la braise dans un autre foyer. (N.B., cependant, que l'amour humain demeure sous quelque chose de sa forme naturelle, reliant les hommes entre eux (charité) et avec l'humanité de N.S.)."

*I id: "passions cosmiques" préparant à aimer, À comprendre, le Corps du Christ. (UPN 1.12)

In this there is the biological base which by faith-leap is given metaphysical significance which is specifically religious. But the resulting concept of transplantation serves to elucidate for Teilhard the concrete phenomenon of religious love of God, so that the biological basis is retained, so that "displacement" is an apt description for what Teilhard is meaning.

The second quotation with its diagram is specific in this matter. It anticipates the later meaning of "sur-naturel", it shows that the scientific value-vector is one of "hard" science by the introduction of the idea of chance, it keeps to biological reality by emphasis on the discontinuity in development, and it introduces the process by which the "separate planes" are to be conjoined and thus continuity be shown as well as discontinuity. While in terms of Teilhard's method it demonstrates the feedback and self-doubt which accompanied his dream-hypotheses:

Le formule du monde (si l'on ose employer ce terme faux et ambitieux) n'est pas le développement régulier d'une chose en une autre, mais d'une chose à l'occasion d'une autre, d'une chose sur une autre. Ce ne sont pas des transformations linéaires que nous voyons, mais des utilisations accidentelles, ou les utilisations par circuit, ou des conjonctions de plans séparés. (UPN 1.13)
In these passages the idea blossoms that sexual love may be the "occasion" for the commencement of some other activity, for instance it may be "transplanted" into being love-of-God. With love-of-God two other displacements are mentioned: the ability to love another object than the reproductive partner, and so to love generally; and the intellectual activity which starts a new "axis" for human life. Both of these displacements are to do with "new energy" and so as to demonstrate that this displacement-concept is the watershed for the original Teilhard, consider what happens when Teilhard returns to the theme a few days later with the à la faveur and à travers concepts, now more satisfying descriptions than à l'occasion with this time the brain being scrutinised and with the changing degrees of being now in the place of a series of separated planes:—

"Dans mes notes du 10, je semble considérer l'amour sexuel comme un réservoir, un excitateur, générateur d'énergie, utilisable à autre chose (au-dessus ou au-dessous). Il serait plus exact (?) d'y voir un débouché provisoire, par où s'engouffre l'aptitude à vivre (= à aimer) qui caractérise la vie. Développé le cerveau, à la faveur de la longue élaboration des générations successives, — des dérivations de plus en plus importantes (accompagnées de réaction sur la passion sexuelle) se font du courant principal passionnel vers l'intellectualisme ou la religion. En d'autres termes, deux conceptions en présence: a) celle d'une aptitude indéfinie d'amour et de vie se poussant et se réalisant à travers la matière. b) celle d'une création d'énergie nouvelle en fonction de chaque degré d'être matériel atteint."
Suivant a) l'amour sexual est une manifestation d'une tendance, incarnée sous cette forme accidentelle et transitoire, mais qui peut trouver un autre extérieur.

Suivant b) au contraire, le système des générations sexuelles est un procédé, un moyen de fabriquer de l'énergie, non pas en donnant un débouché à une tendance, mais en l'allumant. (UPN 1.13a)

In this latter passage there is the earliest notion of "axis" in Teilhard — hardly that of vitalist orthogenesis! It is accidental transplantation which results in "linear development" and so in "axis". Yet such accidental development is the result of "needs", and it is this which roots the changes in biological reality even though for instance speculation may not be "of this world". Thus, when transplantation occurs it may result in growth of soul on a separate plane although in linear development in a higher degree of being yet still in biological reality. Thus, the scientific concreteness remains (though it may not be Science).

Two new concepts have now emerged from consideration of the concrete phenomena of sexuality: the separate plane of the soul has been brought into functional relationship with the plane of biological, sexual and intellectual development; and (second) displacement-transplantation of the cosmic energy of love to one thing à la faveur, à l'occasion and à travers another thing can produce a new axis in life and even new energy. So from the phenomenon of sexuality which

1. So the attack by Medawar (op.cit) is hardly appropriate in this matter.
his Self-Ego knows in Marguerite, his Sense-Sensitivity knows from the world around him and his Science value-vector knows as basic in biology, Teilhard has produced while reading the Pantheist Balzac a metaphysical concept which will allow him to pursue his Christian Pantheism and find his executive concept without leaving the physical-biological press-paradigms of his Science self. Thus the À la faveur concept specifically holds Teilhard to his Science self while he is pressed by his Mystic-self to satisfy his Religious-self. It is only one vector in his mind and it will be synthesised so as to gain the metaphysical resultant needed by Teilhard. But it remains to root Teilhard in its origin in his own sexual experience, his own dream-adventure and Gestalt, his own commitment to Science. It is the first total executive concept and the first original concept in Teilhard de Chardin.

But it cannot be labelled as science either in origin or in development.

The concept is continuously used after that day in early February. The natural development of the World is a series of À la faveur steps. There is a "synthetic construction" produced à travers the opportunities that appear over time. From the atomic roots where "everything joins up" there is gradual materialisation of energy as in biological heredity, with life developing "immanence" À la faveur des agrégats", and this is what appears in the "visible elaboration of the Kosmos of Matter". Human consciousness springs from the involution of the atomism of matter. Biological continuity is the question of "pro-vie" going back and back into the past "by degrees", so that the roots of man can be traced from the basic energies up by degrees to life; and new degrees of consciousness become the result of "concentration" and "complication" which arise from the monadic aptitude of physical-chemical elements themselves. From these ideas of the complexity of being and its development comes the idea of a "hierarchy" in Matter where all things are constituting, enveloping, carrying and binding the rest, and then of the
extension and prolongment of Matter. Thus can the elaboration of Matter be related by analogy to an organism and to gravitational up/down language: Matter's elaboration may go up or down vis-à-vis hierarchy and it may by prolongment seem an organism.

The organism metaphor in Teilhard is therefore associated with the à la faveur Gestalt.

The climax of the à la faveur notion comes when it is "cosmic becoming" which is seen through the biological image. For here to the metaphysician-mystic Teilhard supernatural life is realised to be à l'occasion of the biological phenomenon of life, so that Man's effort and Life's effort in the real world is a function of the New Earth and Resurrection in the Heavenly World.

This leads to the specific problem of the soul. What was earlier seen as development on a separate plane is now also given a physical-biological basis. Psychic ascension is a function of organic elaboration. The soul is à la faveur of organic life and the elaboration of Matter.

In fact the early idea of the soul being on a separate plane had been soon affected by the basic commitment of Teilhard to scientific reality. The soul which had been on a realistic enough plane to have "tact" and "intuition" of the "within" of things so that it could meet, seize and possess (consciously and unconsciously) the "palpable" God was by the beginning of March seen to have the world as its root, and its substance was "what binds and allows to build, carries and causes to act".

Man indeed is now Matter, and as "spiritual Matter" is in another plane:

"Non seulement les monades dites physico-chimiques, mais les monades spirituelles, en s'associant, deviennent le siège de propriétés nouvelles, dans leur ordre ... (Les énergies secrètes d'une âme, éveillée par certains existants, certaines affinités ...) il y a une matière spirîtuelle

(comme des liaisons et réactions entre âmes spirituelles)

Difficulté: bien définir ce que j'entends par matière. J'ai en vue, pour une part, la substance des âmes, mais en tant que liée
aux autres, en tant que susceptible d’édifier, en tant qu’entraînée, en tant que sujette à agir plus ou moins (violemment) autour d’elles sous certaines influences ...

Then the à la faveur theory continues into the question of the Body of Christ. Since Christ’s Body is "corporeal" it is made up of such matter-rooted spiritual souls as its elements. On the analogy of cells obeying the laws of the whole these (immortal) souls obey the superior "current" of the plane of the Superior Body of Christ which is a superior Unity. So that souls whose root is the world find their "absoluteness" in the "supernatural Issue" of the corporeal Body of Christ, which is an "organic issue", which is a function of "surnasain" collectivity and which is a Mystical Body and the full "realisation" of the humanity of Our Lord. The Body of Christ is being interpreted through a Gestalt of the Mystic Self as it pondered on Self-Ego experience and scientific reality.

4. The scientist Teilhard and the non-scientific concept of Christ-Kosmos.

When such progressions of ideas are viewed in the light of the concept of à la faveur transplantation as scientific basis and of the presence of religious concepts in the system of Teilhard at the same time the progression is more understandable. The development of what appears as an orthodox concept of God as "centre of unification" receives similar explication.

The Leibnitzian monad-concept is assumed first as physical basis. The monad has oneness with energy centring upon itself and it has autonomy. As centres join together so that immanence-consciousness is expanded then the "plane" concept is used to show a hierarchical development. Then there is the analogy of the individual being completed in a "higher" collectivity, and a soul is completed in a "spiritual being" who is God. Indeed the monads are "attracted" by this superior Unity which will then hold the nebulae of souls in purified collectivity in its

1. \[\text{MM}, \text{p.68.} \] The rest of this paragraph is from UPN. See below.
superior collectivity.

What Teilhard has therefore done is to build upon the *À la faveur* Gestalt of biological transplantation a theory of the steps in cosmic evolution which relies on metaphors such as hierarchy and plane, on religious concepts and on religio-metaphysical concepts. Thus when the material-social body of souls which are biological and physical energy are to be seen in terms of their future and what happens in evolution, the superior steps which they must take are supplied by assumption from religion concerning God and Christ's Body, and from science and metaphysics with the analogy of organism and parts.

This could perhaps be explained by saying that Teilhard was following the scholastic method demanded by, for instance, Mercier, and was supplying Revelation because if this is known it must be used. But the emotional flow of UPN suggests rather the TGIA-Naven system of unconscious pressures as explanation of, for instance, God as the final Consciousness who is spawning his purposes by his effort à travers the opportunities of the world. Such an idea comes not from Church or Revelation but from information-stores of the Mystic-Pantheist self which have been culled or conjured up in adventurous searching in the Savant communities. The idea of God which appears comes neither from text-book information nor from text-book method. The "Great Monad" Gestalt comes as Gestalt and as part of a series of Gestalten.

The vector nature of the ideas which emerge to explain the problem at hand becomes increasingly clear in UPN: the discontinuities of the planes are the result of the "intrusion" of a "creative flow of more being", perhaps just as the "vital

2. Mercier, op.cit.
3. The essay of this name comes much later in time, i.e. not in 1915-6, but incubation is beginning. cf. Teilhard, *Écrits Du Temps De La Guerre*, Paris, Grasset, 1965.
pressure" was needed to produce life from the supra-chemical aggregations which by accidental atomic meeting became the mother-material during planetary formation. These are concepts which come out of the blue. Similarly, when it is asked who calls life from the albuminoids and gives the spur to consciousness, there can only be a metaphysical answer to such a question. It is the answer to a rhetorical question. The metaphysics of monads with the idea that the Matter of our cosmos has the "predestined" in it gives the overall response. The Spirit of God works through the "laws of the Whole". The divine plan orders and progresses the universe. The superior Unity will attract the superior collectivity which is nevertheless rooted ultimately in the fundamental Unity of Matter. The Religious Self and the Mystic Self can with the rhythm expected of a circuit of five selves produce the concepts needed.

The parallelism of the vectors of concepts from religion and pantheist metaphysics is indeed explicitly stated in UPN 1.22 where the scene is laid for the mutual displacement of the religious concept of "spirit" and the pantheist idea of monadic centre, both of which together are then placed among the scientific laws of physics and chemistry. The passage is therefore informative as showing one reason why The Phenomenon of Man¹ is to be reckoned a scientific fraud, because its Preface does not relate that pantheist and religious concepts are working throughout although mostly hidden ...

"déjà bien ancienne, pour moi" = "la seule façon acceptable de comprendre le matérialisme d'est pas de regarder la vie comme un produit des forces physico-chimiques (essentiellement transientes) mais comme un développement de l'immanence à la faveur d'aggregats des monades les plus élémentaires ...

Ainsi, du point de vue matérialiste, l'éther serait vu 
du dédans, de la conscience dissociée (cf âme de nouveau-né): mais alors on peut aussi bien tout hausser à la dignité d'esprit 
(face interne homogène) que tout niveler à la mesure des énergies...

¹. And Polanyi, according to Crick, op.cit.
métaniques. Pratiquement, l'intérêt panthéistique du matérialisme dépend à cette question: "Quel est le degré d'immanence des monades élémentaires, ou, même de l'éther?"

Du point de vue de ses relations avec l'intérieur, la matière initiale (si on lui refuse la spiritualité) peut se définir par cette unique propriété énergétique: aptitude à se contrôler, à se "monadiser". Chaque progrès dans la concentration appelle un degré de conscience de plus, et ce processus se termine en autonomies indépendantes (âmes séparées) (Distinguer le contrôle matériel et le contrôle psychique, celui-ci ne se réalisant que dans la complication! Le cas concret précis, est le suivant: sous quelle action, pression, où était la vie en T? dans l'archéen, certaines molécules se sont-elles groupées en protoplasme? hazard utilisé "artifice" pré-action? loi physico-chimique vague d'enroulement coincentant, avec les exigences psychiques? Action de vie diffuse "organisation" la matière, le self-organisation de la matière, dont l'immanence est une poussée vers la conscience? (Quelle forme phénoménale du germe de la vie? partout ou localisé?)

Définition de la matière du dehors, transmuter (URN 1,22)

From this passage come more questions. How is there a "degree of immanence" in Ether and the monad, for instance? What evidence is adduced to show that more concentration leads to more consciousness? Anyway, is there "immanence" in an atom at all? Further is the use of analogy even as experimental displacement justified? A little further on Teilhard states that the history of the World is that of the involution of Ether followed by its aggregation. Is it? Is evidence adduced for this? Is involution as a metaphor applicable to atoms? Or when the image of centripetalism is said to point to immanence and the centrifuge to transience in monadic phenomena is this valid in any sense? Do these images help the understanding that Matter becomes a nebula through pleiads, which nebula is then prolonged into some "Other Thing"?

As Science such thinking is, what Medawar stated, preposterous, even allowing for the generation of Wells, Whitehead and Buxley being different from that of ideologically non-metaphysical empiricists such as Crick, Comfort and Medawar. Therefore to state that Teilhard's science-commitment meant that he thought and argued as a modern empirical scientist is incorrect.
Yet there remains the fact that Teilhard continued to use scientific concepts, that he gave scientific work absolute value and that he kept his ideas rooted in what he knew of physical-biological reality. The symbolism of Science value-vector must therefore be retained to emphasise his personality and to demonstrate his method and the rhythm of his mind, even though his executive concepts were not science.

But the Science value-vector also symbolises the concreteness of these mystic ideas. There is a continuing movement in UPN towards the physical reality of one World and of Christ. So that the question is posed when at the end of the section under discussion Teilhard writes that science and religion deal with the same reality but on different planes. For then what is Christ-Kosmos? One reality revealed by displaced metaphor? A reality on two planes? In what sense is "plane" being used?

The metaphor of plane, order, degree will remain the problem of metaphor in Teilhard. If there are superior currents and superior centres are they on different planes from the superior Body of Christ? If God forms by "organic transformism" the new material of a "sur-naturel" plane — the stones of the new Jerusalem — what plane is this? Only further probing of Teilhard's writing will give answers to such questions. What is, after all, the unconscious search-image which Teilhard is needing to find?

Three specific scientific concepts mark the road to Christ-Kosmos. One is the à la faveur notion which concretises the ideas of earth-development and includes in this the mental-spiritual developments of love, intellect and ideas at least. The second is the metaphor of organism which is allied to the à la faveur notion. The third is Matter as cosmic totality.

The organic metaphor joined with that of à la faveur above. The elaboration of Matter with its growth through determinisms and superior centres leads to the World as an organism to be transformed and achieved. But then the question is
asked, Is Matter just Ether or the whole Cosmos? "All or Nothing?" The answer must be All, so that the "more-being" and Progress which is being elaborated is going to result in a "totality", a "complete being", a "more-life", a "cosmic becoming", a "New Universe".

So it is that what is "sur-naturel" is "organic issue", the "sur-humain" new Matter which is a function of Man-organisms and Collectivity, and which is the "future" to which the ascending movement of life is going. Though religious concepts like Revelation, Christ, Heavenly Jerusalem, immortality, Resurrection, Mystical Body and New Universe are also analogous to this "future", it is the "sur-naturel" which springs from the historical movement of atom to cell to soul to cosmos. It is not the "supernatural" life or humanist super-man, for these do not hold to the All of the Universe.

Such then is Christ-Kosmos. Christ-Kosmos is based in the à la faveur biological concept and extrapolated into the future as Gestalt of new possibility for Matter. It is a beyond-nature and beyond-cosmos "issue". It is a vision of continuity and discontinuity gained by Sense-Sensitivity adventuring with concepts from Religion and the Pantheists. As such Christ-Kosmos cannot be Science.

The executive concept of Teilhard is existential synthesis and spin-off from five circuits, from a five-selved-system. It is built upon stones gathered and used for defence and survival, so that Teilhard could meet existential need at a particular time. There is its logic, in the "fact" of five selves vying in tension in Teilhard.

But the scientific concepts used by Teilhard are such that Christ-Kosmos is certainly a function of the Science self. Indeed the Science self controls Teilhard's speculation more than any other self concerning the reality ahead. For the speculation of Christ-Kosmos rests in the reality known to experimental science, it rests as a function of the physical-biological world which science
reveals. It is a physical-biological "issue" which is later to be studied by an "ultra"-physic. It is concrete reality.

This does not make Christ-Kosmos science, for the programme and other value-vectors make metaphysics. Yet Teilhard, the individual, could not have Christ fulfilled in any other world but this world which we know and which we experience. Christ must be experience and totality, palpable and incarnate, real-world and the faith-reality of Revelation, to the man Teilhard. Science to Teilhard — like Religion and like Experience — is a metaphor for Reality. Teilhard's search-image need is for Total Reality, and all his person has to struggle to incubate and to produce this concept of Christ-Kosmos.
CHAPTER XVI

CHRIST-KOSMOS, THE EXECUTIVE CONCEPT WHICH FIXES TEILHARD’S IDENTITY.

1. Introduction to the main series of Gestalten.

The previous chapters have shown how there is "inner logic" in Teilhard in the form of ideas being functions of five value-vector-system-selves. Metaphor and association not technical analysis mark the progression of his thought, always in the interest of some particular press. These presses, as the months went on, were more and more narrowed down to the problems of conceptualisation of his unconscious need-thoughts on Matter. The presses which led to the Mystic Self producing the executive concept of Christ-Kosmos were those of Teilhard’s Religion Self and Science Self: Matter and the World in the case of the former; Christ and God in the case of the latter.

In this chapter the processes which produced Teilhard’s ideas, either his displaced-metaphor experiments or the Gestalten to which he became committed (though these were such concepts also), will be left to one side. Simply Teilhard was always thinking unto his problems in his unconscious.

Now without the distraction of wondering whether such and such an idea is nonsense, the reader of Teilhard must consider the series of Gestalten which were original to him. Possibly the whole story will affect previous judgement on his ideas. Certainly from the psychological angle that Teilhard was able to fix his identity with an executive concept which was as durationally fruitful as Luther’s of the Word is something of note: it denotes mature psychological development and successful conclusion to the Integrity-crisis. The list of Gestalten therefore is the development of a successful human specimen; and if they are irrational metaphysics, that the total process of the Teilhard specimen was psychologically healthy might pose questions to the rationalists, for perhaps some search-images
are better than others ...

The assumption is made in this Thesis (per Erikson) that there is one overall executive concept for Teilhard's identity, and that therefore the series of ideas which proceed this are unconscious searchings for the executive concept. In Teilhard's case the lead-up to Christ-Kosmos is specifically pointed-up in UPN. But as the quotations used so far have shown, what Teilhard writes is the result of varied presses and often a concept appears out of the blue and then is left as his thought hurries on to something else. In quotations therefore the new concepts and Gestalten have to be hunted for by the reader; and the environment in which they appear is to be taken as womb and not as demonstration or justification.

Simply the ideas appear from out of tensioned-system; and in study now of Teilhard's novelty it is the progress from novel understanding to novel understanding from association to association, all in the unconscious search for a unifying concept which is of concern. Although it is an abstract simplification to suggest that there is indeed a series of concepts which build up to produce Christ-Kosmos, nevertheless on the TGTA-Naven model there is good reason to look for a series: if five selves are needing concepts which will fix them harmoniously in one Central-Self-system they will press information from themselves into the central system, selecting appropriate data and themselves being controls and so functions of the output.

So it should be expected that there is a canalising of ideas towards the

---

1. It is not the object of this Thesis to make technical philosophical judgement. The point here is that if a rat has a search-image of beer when it is thirsty it is unlikely to survive; and since humans have particular faiths, including those of religion, it is biologically important that their search-image-faiths relate to God's World, the real world in which they live ...

2. This is important. Since all the quotations which follow are in full, it is often necessary for the reader, after reading the whole passage, to return to it, this time to ask himself whether there are ideas in it which have not appeared before, or which are reappearing regularly (and so are central to Teilhard), or which have returned after a period of time in a reworked or unchanged form.
final search-image synthesis and its formal conceptualisation.

As Teilhard says on the first page of UPN he should have begun writing his own ideas earlier. They had been long "repressed“. So that by reason of incubation over time there was already in August 1915 a group of ideas which needed to come out just so that he could be mentally up-to-date. Since this process seems to work itself out until the first five-solved satisfaction is reached by the concept of Christ-the-All in UPN 1.9, this Gestalt is taken, albeit artificially, as the end of the first phase of original Teilhard. Christ-the-All is the first cataract-gorge through which the current of Teilhard's total self is canalised on its way to the serenity of ocean.

2. The Gestalten of UPN 1.9: Second Matter, the Whole and Cosmic Ascesis: the road to Christ who is ALL.

Starting with the problem of evil, the UPN material is securely based in the existential reality of war-horror (S-S¹), in the biological necessity of pain (Sc.), in the traditional concept of evil as a test for saints (Bel.) and in his own need for mental survival and development (S-E). As he looks around him, Teilhard can also see the real segregation of people into children of light or darkness (S-S), which is a Gestalt satisfying to his Religion also since it is a displaced concept from the latter (S-S). Further he is aware of the team-phenomenon of the trench-warfare; and now with the Oswald-Boutroux analysis of organisation-collectivity in Germany related to the scientific metaphor of crystal, the Gestalt of collectivity as a "second matter" is produced again by metaphor displacement (S-S, Sc.).

This is the first of the main Gestalten series: social reality comes under the laws of wholes and is (or can be) physically a second, New Matter.

Perhaps because collectivity is a matter of number-quantity forming a block,

1. For the rest of this Thesis the value-vector-system-selves are represented by the shortened forms:- Sense-sensitivity – S-S, etc.
or because he observed that spontaneity in a war-team group can become defunct, Teilhard next notes that "ten liberties" make a determinism. Whether or not this idea came from observing behaviour or from reading or from being reinforced by Poincaré, it was closely followed up by commitment to Poincaré's probability theory: the "whole" is the function of or is produced by "large numbers" (S-S, Sc.). This was a Gestalt-watershed in Teilhard's conceptual development, a set of concepts to which he would return again and again in his later essays. It set him solidly on mathematical and physical foundations (Sc.) in this present matter of the biological and existential realities of evil; and probability-mathematics was just what his father and his professional career demanded. But the idea of statistical development in biological process to a whole was a preparatory scientific basis (in retrospect) for a philosophy-metaphysics of organism.

Indeed the first result of the Gestalt of "whole and large numbers" is that it presses the idea of biological number-quantity into the idea of Matter: the "future" is produced by the workings of probability so that there are "increments" of "matter":-

"la valeur morale de la matière (mauvaise, coupable, doureuse, expiante ...) de son avenir, des ses "incrementa".

(UPN 1.9)

Meanwhile (as seen above) Teilhard had been openly committing himself to the concept of Matter, to the "ideals" of Nature and pantheism, and to the image of the Sphinx. It was from tension with these and particularly through the concept of "visage", introduced by the Sphinx-image that the idea of Divine Matter emerged by displacement process (S-S, Rel.). For the Sphinx was the model with two faces. The Sphinx's mystery was the dual visage of heaven and the devil.
At this point, after probability-maths had given a scientific basis for the concept of whole, and while Teilhard's Mystic-Pantheist self demanded that matter be given his love and hopes and moral value also, two more arguments — information adduced by selves — were introduced which were able to bring about commitment to the totality of matter.

First, from Religion came the idea of mystical and supernatural liaisons which carry out the will of God.¹ This concept was probably a function of the previous definition of Matter where Matter is Matter, bonds and liaisons, and individuals;² and it seems to link God in some sense to the world-processes by the double use of the word "liaison".³

Second, from traditional metaphysics emerged the view of Matter as full of ultimate potentiality, and of its value as being perceived from what it finally is built into, from its final synthesis.⁴

So with God in some way in the total process and with Matter being given ultimate value by what it becomes, there is a merging of the concepts of Matter and the Future with the probability theory, and the whole is now something which has ultimate potentiality and value (S-S, Rel., Sc.). Total Matter therefore is Divine Matter, and it is the future increments of Matter which will show its divinity. The total future of total matter is of total value.

The second major Gestalt of Teilhard is therefore that of Total Matter being Divine Matter.

At once Teilhard's Religion controls this new Gestalt. Earlier he had found the idea of "segregation" (of elite and elect) necessary and useful. Now when faced with the Gestalt of the Whole of Matter developing in the future by increment

---

1. UPN 1.8a
2. UPN 1.8
3. Later it was the concept of monadic centre which did this.
4. UPN 1.8a
into an ALL, Teilhard takes the leap of faith (and ecclesiastical orthodoxy) in the assertion that this ALL "must" be Our Lord.

Mankind is to be segregated, and those in communion with Christ will follow in his wake (like a star pulled to earth and which then pulls the Elite up after it). Such ascending segregation is already here in Christianity: the "cosmic ascesis" of union with the All of the cosmos is the Christian's belief and practice. For the All is One in the final synthesis, which is the whole result produced in a probability system; and the One can only be Our Lord.

The following passages illustrate this Gestalt of cosmic ascesis of Matter into an All which is Our Lord:

"la nature et la théorie, du déchet, des ségrégations: la conception panthéistique vraie n'est pas celle d'une transformation égalitaire et uniformément heureuse du Tout." (UFN 1.9)

"tous ces pensers dans la forme suivante, plus vibrante et plus condensée:

"La Vie Cosmique"
1. ses appels, sa réalisation païenne vers (l'immédiatement ( palpé)
   (en bas
2. son rêve naturaliste surhumain est collectif
3. sa réalité immédiate, intégrale et inespérée dans la christianisme

Et ainsi, passer en revue tout le spectre, depuis les aspirations les plus païennes, jusqu'aux attitudes les plus raffinées de la dévotion. —

Et remarquer que la communion est à base de sacrifice, parce que impliquant un sens ascensionnel et la ségrégation d'une élite (conséquemment).

Then (quand tomberont les mots et les situations instables...) indeed will be the stern encounter, when two real and living principles, stern, entire, and consistent, one in the Church and the other out of it, at length rush upon each other, contending not for names and words, or half views, but for elementary notions and distinctive moral characters." *

* Newman in Butler's "Analogy". (UFN 1.9)
"une "ascension cosmique" où des actes d'union, de prière, d'offrande, de sacrifice... seront puisés dans le sentiment profond et ardent de l'Union de Tous en Tout et en Un (NS) ---" (UPN 1.9)

The three Gestalten of UPN 1.9 are therefore that social reality can crystalise into New, Second Matter; that the Future All because it is God's Will and by his liaisons means that Matter is Divine; and that this All (to a Christian) can only be Our Lord. In the visual symbolism which Teilhard uses later, the World is and is becoming an ALL:

Les coupes S du monde suivant l'espace semblent n'avoir aucun intérêt (= agrégé essentiellement contingent)

But this ALL "must" be a Person, who "must" be Christ, so:-

Here at last the "logic" of Teilhard is beginning to appear. Thinking rhythmically with a bunch of selves on the one question of what is Reality, the experimental reality which will make sense of the world as his selves know it, Teilhard finds his thought being canalised into the concept which will be Christ-Kosmos.

3. The Gestalten of UPN 1.9a-17a: Feedback with increasing concretisation by tactile metaphor and by the À la faveur Gestalt: the À la faveur Body of Christ and God the final synthesis of consciousnesses.

This section (which covers only two weeks in time) falls into two parts:
first, the continuation of (1.9) into the concept of the "new" All and Earth as the "body" of Christ: second, the new theme of sexual cosmic energy which leads to a new concept of God, a new formula for the mechanics of cosmic becoming, and so the first concept of complexity-consciousness.

First, then, the New Matter idea of the earlier section is probed by another metaphor, this time that of elements constituting a substance. The existential womb of this description is Religion but the probability metaphor is not necessarily absent here since "segregation" suggests that Teilhard's thought is following on from UPN 1.7-9. Thus:

"Le sacrifice (élèvlation) ne représente pas (uniquement) une communion, une union de NS et du monde, mais (directement) une ségrégation autour de Lui, par la douleur, conséquemment à l'Incarnation, des éléments destinés à constituer la matière nouvelle (Terra nova)."

"- Et ainsi, la vie cosmique vraie est une mixte de communion et de renoncement, une identification au courant par où une élite est entrainée dans le "sillage" de J.S. — astre bien aimé qui a traversé notre monde pour en capter une fraction ..."

(UPN 1.9a)

To further elucidate "Matter" a new metaphor now appeared in UPN 1.10 through the stimulus of Newman. Newman in detail was rejected by Teilhard, but in general feel and concept he was maintained, so:

2 quotations from Newman, in Butler's 'Analogy':
(Newman Apology 1914 Longmans-Green, pp.18,6,65).

Newman: Angels = "the real causes of matter, light and life and of those elementary principles of the physical universe, which, when offered in their developments to our senses, suggest to us the notions of causes and effects, and of what are called the laws of nature."

"Ces Étres puissants sont cachés derrière toute chose."

1. Or possibly reinforces.
2. In view of MM p.66 ("mould") the Abbé Breuil as well as Marguerite might have directed Teilhard into such lines of thought.
between good and bad angels = "certain unseen powers" giving the very different life of "bodies politic and associations", i.e. giving inspiration, intelligence to races, nations, classes of men.

Newman's "sacramentalisme (les phénomènes sont pour ... symbolisme universel, unreality of material phenomena".

"l'importance des probabilités dans notre vie réelle est pratique
"Rome quiescent (dogmas) and Rome in action - popery (vivant sa vie religieuse intégrale, débordant son Credo).
(UPN 1.9a)

Here the ideas of probability and segregation were reinforced. But the main significance of this passage is the suggestion that angels are "hidden" causes and that there are "Beings" "hidden" behind the phenomena of Nature. Teilhard does not follow Newman's sacramentalism now, but Newman's language sparks off the following thought:-

"Un point important, c'est de fixer, saisir, le "problème de la Nature." -
Indéniablement, son spectacle nous émeut: Quelque chose se cache en Elle.
Mais quoi? (une Source, une Issue) mais où? solution pour l'Esprit? Aliment pour le cœur? -
Et l'homme se précipite sur le mirage. Il cherche dans le plus vaste, dans le plus lointain, dans le plus passé ... et jamais il n'entreint rien.
La "chose" pressentie et cherchée s'évanouit à l'analyse, à la lumière ... Elle est diffuse partout, ou différée pour l'avenir, ou posée dans un autre plan ..."
(UPN 1.10)

From this the idea of a Being whose face ought to be Our Lord's is destined to grow. But is the face of Christ "enough"?

At this Teilhard's (S-S) and the earlier Gestalt about the palpable future of the earth suggest that there is going to be — he "feels it — some great Christian work which will take place: and the "Some Thing" may be on another"plane" (Rel.). Further, Matter such as molecules is in fact changing in Time (Sc.) so that Teilhard consciously using the gravitational metaphor (S-S, Sc.) pictures this
earth's future as a question of Up or Down. This Gestalt now fits in with the idea of segregation, and with that of the "elevation" and "union" of the Mass. This latter idea is promptly displaced into the relations of Our Lord with the world so that through the Incarnation there is a "New Earth" and a "New Matter", an "Elite" pulled up in the wake of Jesus Christ (Rel., Sc., S-S). By 8th February 1916 the situation is therefore as follows:— The Some Thing which is being segregated out in the Life of the Cosmos, which is hidden in it, is the New Matter of the New All who is Our Lord, the formation of the Body of Christ:—

"Dans mes conceptions cosmiques, une part de plus en plus importante tend à se faire à la "ségrégation". Cette notion très riche, implique les éléments suivants: 1. Union initial avec le Tout (et donc coexistence, au moins radicale, avec lui, pour jamais). 2. Tendence à la séparation, à l'isolement, au sacrifice de beaucoup de choses constituant le Tout, et réalisation progressive de cette isolation. 3. enfin, marche, non point à l'éparpillement individuel, mais à la communion plus stricte avec un nouveau Tout, plus réduit, mais plus pur, plus homogène, plus organisé. Et ces divers éléments, dans la ségrégation fondamentale où est engagée la Vie de Kosmos (comme le succès de l'arbre dans sa graine ..) s'appellent respectivement: amour du monde, sacrifice, formation du Corps du Christ. — Or, de même qu'il y a beaucoup de fausses ségrégations, ou au moins des ségrégations-idoles où on serait tenté de voir la vraie affaire du monde, la nouvelle Terre qu'il faut adorer: telle est l'humanité future, la Société idéale des philanthropes païens. — Le panthéisme, païen, naif, exclut l'idée de ségrégation, et n'envisage que la fusion avec le Tout initiale: alors, ni degrés vrais dans l'ètre, ni progrès, ni touffes latérales, ni déchets. — La force de ségrégation est un succédané de la force de cohésion du Tout primitif; une dérivation, une transformation de ces liens fondamentaux." 

(UPN 1,11a)

In this section the concreteness of Teilhard's eschatology is becoming stronger all the time. He is using tangible metaphor, images from the experimental realities of gravity, from the priest's work and from dogma. These he displaces on to experimental and scientific reality, so that the result is to emphasise

1. cf. UPN 1.35a.
further the empirical nature of what he is trying to say.

This concreteness opens the way to a Gestalt of metaphysical significance when a dualistic world is rejected. The "World" is assumed now to be "matter and soul" together. Teilhard is wanting to view the whole of reality via probability, a palpable future, the ultimate totality of matter, the divineness of matter. So no dualism can therefore be accepted in these concepts of the whole world, of the All.

Teilhard is still distinguishing Matter and Soul, but seeing them as ultimately together making up the One World.

With a palpable future of increment-issue and a great Christian "work", with the world being body and soul together, with the Gestalt of an All who is our Lord and which is brought about by segregation-elevation of the Elite in Christ's wake, it is the cause of little surprise that Teilhard is now discovering, in the "Body of Christ", the metaphor-Gestalt and central expression needed to further the concretisation which the five-selved system needs. Towards the end (UN 1.36b and 1.42a) this Body will be "corporeal", the Something will be "the end of all human and cosmic becoming", and Life will be the basis of "supernatural" life. These are tactile terms. But already concretisation is under way when it is the "Body" of Christ which is the new Earth and the new All.

This process of concretisation, and the question of Matter and Soul together making up the World, are carried forward in the meditations on sexuality which take place in UN 10a-17a and which result in the watershed Gestalt of à base de, à l'occasion, à la faveur and à travers noted above.

So, second (in this section), the new metaphor-Gestalt which acted as feedback and further interpreted Christ—the-All.

1. UN 1.9a
The specific stimuli for this new subject of interest were Balzac, Sterne, Marguerite and perhaps Bourget and Goethe (as noted above). These had been preparing Teilhard for emotional involvement with sexuality as a concept. Now Balzac's "passions à vide" lead Teilhard to think of the possibility of all-pervading cosmic sexual energy, of surplus energy, and even of new energy, the function from sexual intercourse. The latter idea is not taken up seriously till the run-up to Creative Union (1917), though it reappears briefly in UPN 1.13a and 19a. But the former receive important treatment now from Teilhard, including an ontological valuation.

The ability to love (to Teilhard) is rooted in the biological function of reproduction; or rather, the "cosmic energy" of love finds that its opening into higher reality, its passageway into being more freely itself, is through the method used by (sexual) organic entities to survive. The joy of family sexuality further brings into being the more general ability to love, which itself (in its form as cosmic energy) brought into being that very family sexuality. Then the cosmic sexual energy finds sexual intercourse as an "occasion" for the flowering of itself in more of its real form. So as Teilhard says later (following Plato), $\zeta \rho \omega \delta \sigma$ becomes $\Pi \pi \varepsilon \rho \omega \delta \sigma$ (in UPN).

From this personal understanding of Balzacian theory Teilhard goes on to posit novel ideas. First, the idea comes into Teilhard's mind that the "transplantation" or "transposing" of sexual love from a mate or person (or object) of the other sex to Our Lady (in the case of celibate men) or to Our Lord (in the case of nuns and sisters), has its full possibility realised in the transposition of sexual love on to an "absolute" or on to a "Final Divine Object", a "Definitive Object". Thus, by using a biological concept of displacement possibly culled from his early

---

1. UPN 1.35
entomological studies, Teilhard is able to free his own sexuality (S-E) both emotionally and intellectually, from his religious superegos; to feel at home in the real world which he experiences and loves (S-S); to base his own religious passions in biological reality (Sc.); to give a scientific foundation to his own needs and beliefs and commitments (Rel., Sc.); and to produce a concretising and defining set of metaphysical ideas concerning the future (S-E).

In other words the solution to personal needs led to conceptual discovery.

Having found that the idea of "transplantation" was a satisfying explanation of himself and his Religion in the world as he knew it, Teilhard discovered that the biological sequence of transplantation held ontological possibilities within it (precisely because it was biological). Sex may have been the "occasion" for cosmic sexual energy bursting out generally within life: but from this occasion came also intellectual life and consciousness so that both spirituality (love-of-God) and the intellect come from the same root. So the future is built upon such occasion.

This Gestalt sets in train a flood of ideas. To Teilhard the world becomes a series of steps, one à la faveur, à base de, à travers another. The sexual reality (of sexual union) gives rise to the reality (evidenced in experience and biology) of intellect, so that there is a continuity between these two "planes" of the "real".

As noted above, the transplantation of sexual to intellectual energy can be described as a new "axis", but an "axis" which is at the same time a "divergence": intellectual activity is a new and diverging axis of human activity. Thus the development of the soul (as contact with God) and of the intellect are both functions of human sexuality. Sexual passion leads to love in the Mystical Body, to love of God — and to fitness for survival. Love and life both realise...

---

1. For instance, Maeterlinck (1901)
2. See Part One.
themselves in the same tendency of sexual passion which is the manifestation of cosmic energy. The two ends are reached à travers la matière.

By UPN 1.13a therefore a novel idea of evolutionary continuity has been reached on the basis of a biological idea received mainly (perhaps) from the novelist and human-behaviour-observer Balzac. By means of the à la faveur-occasion Gestalt the image of an axis has been used in immediate conjunction with the concept of divergence and of a world which is a series of steps which are different planes of the real.

So this is the picture:—

Thus can linear transformation appear in the same breath as "accident", "circuit" and "separate planes". Later the concept of the world as a natural development in a series of steps may be juxtaposed with the concept of "discontinuity" and "intrusion of more-being" (17a) from the same image. From the same à la faveur basis the one-world concretisation is being pressed home:—

"Le monde est une série de choses créées les unes à la faveur des autres, la vie à la faveur d’un certain équilibre-chimique – la pensée spirituelle à la faveur d’un certain développement cérébral – la grâce à la faveur d’un certain perfectionnement moral …

Le sève du monde est dans ses espérances, fonctions elles-mêmes de deux facteurs:
a) un certain développement amorcé, se poursuivant "naturellement" (vg. évolution du cerveau)
b) de loin en loin, des discontinuités paliers, dues à une intrusion de plus être ayant trouvé un terrain favorable (influx créateur)
Que signifie "À la faveur"? Quel degré de liaison entre le terrain et le germe?? Celui d'une effluve créatrice, matérialisée dans la cohérence de l'œuvre et son évolution. L'action créatrice de Dieu est identique (vue en dehors) à l'effort d'une conscience (la Conscience finale) qui se frait un passage à travers les opportunités et les constructions de plus en plus synthétiques échafaudées au moyen de la matière et des monades d'ordre inférieur ... le mystère, le secret du monde n'est pas dans le Haut-passé, mais dans le suprême avenir (exceptions faites? pour certains paliers; apparition de la première conscience, de la première âme spirituelle) ... (UPN 1.17a)

In this the concretisation process has continued. The question of the origin of life is seen to take its place within the strictly scientific one world of "total matter". Among the supra-chemical conglomeration of atoms with the planetary formations, some "vital pressure" in accidental atomic meetings brings the point of germination: so that it is "total matter" which has "life" possibility in it. Further, it is the "Supreme Future", the synthetic "final Consciousness" constructed through à la faveur steps, à travers the opportunities of the world, which holds the key to the meaning of life, and is in fact God.

With the à la faveur notion the unconscious needs of Teilhard are thus being fulfilled. The Scientific, Religious and Mystic-Pantheist selves are working to release each others' tension.

The Body of Christ as the new All and the new Earth is the form of the divinised matter: the collectivity of beings is New Matter. Heaven is a function of the human doing of the "little things" of life. The Divine "calls" in "things". Confidence in Life and love of Earth appear with Religious and Pantheist commitment to "absolutes" in the science-based Gestalt of à la faveur. For instance:-

"Le grand charme du panthéisme est de nous faire toucher du divin, ou coopérer à du divin, dans ce qui nous charme naturellement. C'est la consécration et la transformation en absolu de nos amours humains ... Dans tout ceci, il y a à laisser, mais aussi à prendre."

(UPN 1.15a)
"Nous avons vraiment par la guerre aujourd'hui, telle qu'elle s'est ultra-développée en quelques mois, progressé en civilisation (sans ironie) ... Oui, la guerre actuelle est belle, parce que logique, sincère à outrance, limpide dans son processus; elle est un geste très pur."
(UFN 1.17)

Now it is that Teilhard's Central Self-Ego can be further integrated in the concept of Jacob-Israel discipleship. This satisfies the existential problems and needs of identity: with this metaphor-Gestalt Teilhard can be priest, scientist and pantheist. Then in the same breath the one world process explains the existence of evil, for the latter is a necessary function of progress, a "probability" remainder-residue. So that by UFN 1.17a the Gestalt of Christ-the-All reinforced by the Gestalten of Segregation-process, à la faveur mechanism and Jacob-Israel existential discipleship have solved the original problem (Evil), made use of the first Gestalt (collectivity Second Matter) and produced a set of ideas which have to a considerable extent equilibrated Teilhard's Person-system.

Side by side with the pressure to take seriously the world of experience and science and to find novel understandings of religious experiences, attitudes and concepts, there was during this time nevertheless a continuation of commitment to traditional religious ideas of the otherness of God. In UFN 1.9a the "hidden Being" could only be Our Lord, and the new All the Body of Christ. In UFN 1.14a during discussion (Rel., S-E) of egoism but just after the introduction of the biochemical-biophysical question of "vital pressure" in total matter (Sc.) — that is, after provocation to re-enter metaphysical speculation on this (S-S) — Teilhard noted that individual beatitude is reached by completion in a "higher" collectivity, in a higher "object", in the higher "spiritual being" of God. From "energy centred on himself", man should "excentrate" himself. "Immanence" should be directed to something higher, and this will end the egoism of man. The transcendence of God is being defended.
This passage sounds like traditional religious and spiritual guidance. Aristotelian-Thomistic metaphors of centre and sphere (after plane, order and degree) the concept of heaven as a "nebula of souls" and the idea of God as a Being of a higher degree might be ordinary Roman Catholic theological belief. 

But then in UN 1,17a comes a physical concreteness not found in Two-World Theology. The above concepts reappear strictly as ontology. Into the "discontinuities" of à la faveur world-becoming pours the "intrusion" of "more-being". This suggests not the extrinsic *deus ex machina* Deity but a higher sphere of reality which can pour its higher being into the lower sphere (at the right à la faveur time). Further, God is now the Final Consciousness who "spawns" consciousness at the right "opportunities" in the world which is Pantheist not Orthodox Christian belief. The seeds are sown here of the idea that this higher sphere is what can "attract" man to itself (Himself). To Teilhard it is the determinism-passivities of life which hold him and are God "binding" him, which is Jesuit theology. Yet when the à la faveur steps are juxtaposed with the higher-sphere metaphor the stage is set for the later portrayal of God "ahead" who is attracting Matter to its absolute future.

There is thus a double notion of God appearing in Teilhard. The traditional concept of God as transcendent and as Mind; and an à la faveur-based modern Pantheist concept of God as \(C_N\) and final synthesis in which God is in Matter and binding man in it. In the latter idea creation is to do with discontinuity and à la faveur steps: in the former it is the simple intrusion of more reality from a higher sphere (though this is taken more physically by Teilhard than by Orthodoxy).

By mid-February 1916 Teilhard's concretising mind-system has carried out feedback re-interpretations on the early Gestalten, produced new metaphor-Gestalten and begun going outside Orthodoxy because of the needs of this same mind-system.

It is a self-sufficient system working out its own steady state.

1. cf. scholastic analogies in eg. Mercier, op.cit.
2. cf. The God of Evolution (1953)
3. MM, p.303.
The Gestalten of UFN117a-44: the one-world concretisation which leads to Christ-Kosmos: then more feedback.

Such notions of God which are orthodox and unorthodox metaphysics have been the work of the Religious and Mystic selves of Teilhard and of metaphor (S-S) and Self-ego survival-development. But what happens now — until UFN 1.24 and 1.33 when his original concepts are firmed up — is feedback-pressure on the traditional notions from Teilhard's Sense-Sensitivity, Life and Science selves, though without reducing or demolishing the orthodox religious self in him.

The feedback begins by return to the problem of Matter on the question of its increments and the palpable future which is absolute. Three Gestalten serve to fix this world-view and in doing so cast doubt on the traditional concepts of God.

First, it is the Supreme Future and the Issue of Matter which is the "key".

Second, this means that man must love the "visible elaboration" of Matter, indeed of the Kosmos of Matter. Third, however, the Kosmos of Matter is only one ("a") milieu of God's work. The main passage is the following:

"Trois manières, pour l'homme, de parvenir à la divinisation qu'il rêve:
1. se fondre dans le Tout, considéré comme source et issue (fusion - volupté, communion = matérialisation)
2. s'isoler en centre absolument autonome = déméteralisé et libéré (lutte, émancipation des déterminismes - orgueil)
3. rejoindre Dieu par communion au Corps du Christ, élaboré par une ségrégation crucifiante. Là évidemment est la vraie solution. Elle comprend à la fois les facteurs de communion et de lutte, et synthétise ce qu'il y a de bon dans ces deux premières attitudes.

Ce qu'il me reste à débrouiller c'est qu'elle place, dans la formation du Corps du Christ, revient à l'élaboration du Kosmos de la matière (étroite et maîtrisée)

dominée
utilisée.

(UPN 1.20)

Such ideas from Sense-Sensitivity, Science, Life and Religion value-vectors
give to Teilhard an absolute value for human work (S-E) while he yet is able to refuse to say that the universe is God.¹ Teilhard feels Matter as a Mother who must be wholly cherished for the sum of her additions but he conceives of separation—epuration as part of the process leading to the Body of Christ. That is to say, he is now firmly committed to the ultimate value of the totality of Matter in that from this will be produced Christ's Body. But the metaphor of centre and sphere, and of different planes, degrees and orders of reality, stops him from confusing the Kosmos for Christ or for God.

The next problem then will be how exactly is the Kosmos related to the Body of Christ if it is a function of it (i.e.)? Teilhard needs a Gestalt, a "figure" of Christ's Body.

Earlier Teilhard had spoken of his experience of God as determinisms binding him and this concreteness has been developed. Now the metaphor is picked up and transferred from personal experience to ontology. Teilhard finds that Our Lord is the "centre" binding our "souls" in Matter:

"Une question que je me suis déjà posée, je crois; si j'avais à figurer Notre Seigneur, faudrait-il lui donner un Corps se fondant dans l'ambiance matérielle, — ou au contraire un Corps plus nettement tranché que le nôtre de tout le cadre environnant? Et, dans le premier cas, pourquoi pencher vers un dégrade avec la matière seule, et non avec tout degré, toute vie? ...

La réponse est encore à chercher dans le sens de la "séparation". N.S. est intimement lié avec tout son Corps, c'est à dire
1. avec les âmes (son âme est nimbée d'une nébuleuse faite des âmes saintes)
2. avec l'Humanité
3. avec les racines de l'Humanité ...

N.S. est le centre et le liant d'ensemble des monades destinées à édifier l'homme glorieux (ie de toute matière, d'une part de la Vie ...)

¹ cf. UPN 1.37a.
Previously the soul was a development from roots in matter (an à la faveur divergence); and the movement from love to morals was also a divergence. But now divergence-segregation is taken by Teilhard to be a Second Matter as in UPN 1.1 where collectivity was taken to be this. The soul is a new axis and a "superior order" of matter. Christ the monadic centre is building "L'homme glorieux".

In the following quotation the concreteness of the picture is further emphasised by the one-world metaphor from scientific reality of the physical behaviour of H₂O. The higher order has emerged from the lower by à la faveur mechanism—

"NB. Le développement de B à la faveur de A ne signifie pas proprement discontinuité entre B et A, mais développement suivant une autre ligne, suivant un autre plan attenant. Le mouvement cosmique est semblable à de l'eau montant et s'élevant sur des stratus, à un faisceau de rayons engagé dans les couches hétérogènes (réflexions, réfraction, émeraude ..) La construction physico-chimique d’albuminoïdes a fait atteindre à certaines lignées de courants physico-chimique le plan vital. Dès lors une imminence spéciale apparaît, s'installe ...; id l'intelligence ..

Etude: "Les apparences (externes de
(internes (physiques)
l’apparition (de la Vie
(de ses degrés
(= problème connexe à la valeur + divine de la matière.)"
(UPN 1.22a)

At this same time human consciousness receives a first mention and is seen as developing from matter specifically by "involution".

This makes the concretisation complete. The Body of Christ is the nebula of souls, of the sum of all the consciousnesses; and the consciousnesses develop from the basic stuff of integral Matter à l'occasion-faveur. The consciousnesses of monads have Christ binding them in Matter as their centre anyway, so that the concept of Matter must be now changed. There is now "spiritual matter"; the sum of the liaisons of souls, in a one-world with different planes but the same atomic roots.
This then is an à la faveur one-world with developing planes. So that the Body of Christ and the Heavenly Jerusalem are built by the Matter of spiritual souls, and the "Rest" and "Other Thing" come through "prolongment". Just as the War had seemed to prelude an "ultra-development", now the World will see such prolongment.

This one-world movement is continued with the analogy of organism being applied to the All. This is followed by the metaphor of smaller and smaller spheres. The "spur" to consciousness (à la faveur Life) is reckoned to be therefore a physical "attraction" and "formation" by the God who is $C_N$ (in the organism and sphere images); and it is also the function of the "spirit" which can utilise the "liaison" part of matter (soul-centre), since it "is" the case of the Whole using the cells to carry out its purposes. God sanctifies and inspires through this liaison within the setting pictured by means of the metaphor-Gestalten of à la faveur organism, centre and sphere.

The concreteness and tactile ethos of Teilhard's thought now is illustrated by the following passages:

"Pour le chrétien, l'attitude intime et passionnée, vis-à-vis du Monde, est d'aimer, de rechercher, l'Action Créatrice de Dieu materialisée en toute énergie, thésaurisée dans toute l'hérédité biologique — trésor à garder et à accroître par une lutte et une épuration continues.

NB. L'élaboration de la matière naturelle et sociale peut se faire, doit se faire "laïque"."

(UPN 1,21)

"Dans notre corps, les cellules sont dominées par les lois de l'organisme d'ensemble, c'est à dire par l'âme, pour elles donc (si elles étaient (sont) conscientes) l'influence de l'esprit se traduit par une liaison ... De même, l'action sanctificatrice et "aspirante" de Dieu sur les âmes est un liaison et une "reliaison". Saurait-on la comprendre sous le terme "matière"?

... Donc, changer le titre, ou limiter mon sujet. = revenir à l'ancienne idée "Les Courants et les Liens" (et les Pentes) — ou "La vie cosmique" ou "Dieu et Matière"."

(UPN 1,24a)
In the second of these passages the metaphysical reality of consciousness is being posited. Here the laws and evolutions of the Whole appear in relation to the consciousness which is in the cells and on the same UPN page is the image of smaller and smaller spheres descending from an All:

"Au dessous d'une certaine limite, à l'intérieur d'une sphère suffisamment petite, la matière vivante cesserait d'être perceptible comme vivante (vri. intérieur d'une molécule de C dans le cerveau), sauf qu'elle serait assujettie à certaines lois et évolutions d'ensemble, non perceptibles pour un spectateur noyé à l'intérieur ..."

Application: si le système solaire ou astral constituait la molécule d'un Tout ou organisme d'ordre supérieur, nous ne nous en apercevions pas!"

The association of ideas in the case of the metaphors of atom, cell, sphere, organism and solar system was immediate. On the basis of these analogies Teilhard could now describe Cosmic Life as being that of an individual soul in the Rest or in the Other Thing. Later this will be Life as a conscious atom of All the Cosmos, consciousness of being an element of the All and then giving oneself to its Superior Causes and Interests. In the words of a week later:

"Vivre comme une parcelle de Tout, du Christ, — un atome, une cellule —"

That was the existential Self-Ego application of these metaphors. But its basis was the ontological displacement of Christ-Kosmos.

1. UPN 1.25,27a.
As noted above, the à la fauve-à l'occasion steps from cosmic sexuality were held to include spiritual and intellectual development as new planes and new axes of the real; and the case of moral perfection and collectivity-organisation which was produced by transposition was Second, New and Superior Matter. This had lead on to the first description of what will later be Teilhard's law of complexity-consciousness. Now this idea returns.

Earlier, human consciousness was held to develop via involution of Matter and à la fauve mechanism. Now it is an example of progress to a new "degree" (of being) as a result of "concentration" and "complication", just as life is the development of immanence "à la fauve des agrégats".

In other words the idea of complexity-consciousness originates within the milieu of the à la fauve idea of physical-biological development on to another "plane" of reality which is reality so concrete that it must be described as "spiritual matter". The discontinuities are stressed by the scientific metaphors of boiling water and the phenomena of light which (may be said to) produce many planes, and by the à la fauve mechanism. But the same mechanism produces the "axis" and "line" metaphors for the continuity of immanence and intelligence; and, with the further metaphor of sphere, consciousness becomes one of the secret energies of the soul, only unseen in the physico-chemical monads by virtue of optical illusion in smaller and smaller spheres.

The concrete reality therefore includes both continuity and discontinuity, and everything, body and soul, is destined to an All. Everything is destined to build Some Thing:—

"L'idée qui me séduit, au fond, et que je cherche depuis plusieurs jours à préciser serait peut-être bien la suivante: critiquer, épuré, réhabiliter la "matérialisation", cad. l'immersion dans la matière-fondamentale, l'aptitude à

1. UFN 1.22
s'envelopper de mécanismes, la destination à former des 
egregats sous l'influence des courants et des centres 
supérieurs ... (passivité, potentialités, destination à 
un Tout.)

= la matière qui enveloppe, la matière qui engendre, la 
matière qui gagne comme une marée, qui incruste, qui 
s'identifie avec nous considérés comme destinés à édifier 
qu'elle chose,

= les côtés passifs, étrangers, de notre être ... 
"in nobis sine nobis".

(UPN 1.26)

With this set of background concepts as his associations the developing 
language of Teilhard is more readily understandable. What will it mean when Teil-
hard writes that the souls - now conscious elements of the All - will converge into 
a "greater than me", that there shall be "ulterior" survival in a "superior Unity"? 
What is it that is in or will emerge from Matter?

Here on the 7th March 1916 feedback concerning the Body of Christ is contin-
uing. Teilhard is thinking very concretely of the "issue of monads" in association 
with the idea of "supreme future". He has been operating the sphere metaphor with 
the nebula and involution images together, using the "plane" metaphor with the 
sphere image also, and displacing into these the à la faveur-based concept of 
complexity-consciousness. He has used probability ideas to concretise the Whole. 
Now Teilhard is wanting to delineate the "Physiognomy" of the World, of its Forces 
("= God ..."), of the "Superior Body". Now as Cosmic Life is being sketched out 
the one-world axis of new states leading to Christ's Body is made explicit: the 
Body of Christ is the new state of the city of souls:

"Il y a d'abord les courants et les liens physico-chimiques 
au-dessous de nous, qui forment un réseau fragile de détermin-
ismes capricieux; - il y a ensuite de courant de vies, dont le 
faiseau nous supporte et nous conduit quelque part, dans notre 
plan; et il y a enfin les aspirations de l'intelligence vers 
qu'elle cité des âmes, élaborée et construite au prix de l'épu-
sation souffrante, au-dessus de nous-mêmes = une énergie qui se 
dénoue - une "vis a tergo" arrivée à son apogée d'actuation - 
une aspiration vers un état nouveau où les âmes se seront, avec
un lambeau de matière entraînée, pour former la Jérusalem nouvelle, le Corps du Christ.

Tout en nous dérive (corps, vie, âme) et tout en nous est lié à une pléiade qui dérive en même temps."

(UFN 1.28)

Thus "ulterior" survival means both development into the future and up in plane-degree, and "superior Unity" is a higher organism, a sum of souls, a new degree of consciousness (the "issue" of monads), a City of God built on with souls.

The New Jerusalem is the Body of Christ, produced through cosmic ascesis. The idea is of larger or higher unity of a larger or higher sphere with lower and smaller ones inside it - the centre which is "superior". It is into this picture that there now fits the new emphasis on Man, the individual and social monad, who is intimately connected now with the process of creation of New Matter:

A Marguerite

"Petit à petit, mes idées se groupent et se précisent autour de ces mots, un peu mystérieux et prétentieux: la Vie cosmique. Je pars de ce fait que, à l'incroyant pour essayer de mettre un peu d'absolu dans sa vie, -- au croyant pour rester en phase et en contact avec le monde de son temps, il est indispensable d'élargir la vie intérieure jusqu'à lui faire englober la conscience des liaisons et des courants qui nous assujettissent et nous entraînent. -- Il y a le courant des énergies physiques et de la matière, nouées transitoirement en notre organisme et qui vont à se dénouer, puis à se perdre, dans quelque homogène éthéré. -- Il y a la vie sur laquelle nos individualités naissent comme des tourbillons sur un fleuve, -- la Vie organique, née au sein de la matière, qui se prolonge à travers nous, et par nous, pour aller plus loin. La vie consciente et individuelle avec son déterminisme particulier (the whole man moves) et ses tendances fatales vers quelque complétion et achèvement de lumières, -- sa vie sociale, si riche de déterminismes qu'on croirait, en la voyant évoluer, assister à l'édification d'une nouvelle matière. Il y a, nous le croyons, la Vie surnaturelle et ses affinités, même conscientes ou confondues avec une de nos aspirations humaines.

- Nous avons parfois ...

(UFN 1.30)

This Gestalt of Man's cosmic importance had appeared earlier in UFN 1.21 (quoted above) and more explicitly in a description which anticipates much of the later Teilhard in:-
"Ne pensez-vous pas, bien mieux que sur les fossiles, ou dans la cellule, c'est dans le développement social - de l'Humanité, spécialement aux moments de crise, que le naturaliste devrait chercher certaines lois, intimes et fondamentales, de la vie? Le génant est d'être autant dominé (toujours et partout) par le sujet, et de plus, si un à lui que chacune des perturbations qui l'effectent, nous atteint et risque de nous réduire en miettes ..."

(UPN 1.19)

But this perspective on Man was indeed of earlier origin. In UPN 1.11a the "actual" developments of human consciousness had been taken as functions of "cosmic" relations, so that the Man Gestalt appears at the same time as the À la faveur theory. From this time on Man and his consciousness are the central specimen of monadic reality.¹

This leads (chronologically at least) to the new Gestalt of Kosmos-is-Person. Perhaps because of the new emphasis on Man, perhaps because of the person of Jesus Christ or the monad and organism metaphors, in UPN 1.29+ the Superior All, the Kosmos is a Person and personal. Here (unconsciously at any rate) the organism, sphere and À la faveur metaphors hold together, the Pantheist and Scientific selves inter-displace concepts to satisfy themselves and the Religious self.

This Kosmos-is-Person Gestalt is a feedback on that of Christ-is-All in UPN 1.9, but it is more concrete and more adventurous because where All is Metaphysics, Kosmos is metaphysical but also scientific reality. The passage runs as follows:-

"Nous devons donc promouvoir de toute notre âme l'œuvre humaine par excellence de la domination et de la libération, mais sans mépriser (en chérissant au contraire) la matière dont quelque chose doit resusciter avec nous, et qui nous transmet l'influx divin.

¹. Probably the uniqueness of Man was understood by Teilhard much earlier on. His Religion would emphasise it by Incarnational Theology. His Geology and Piltdown-excitement must have emphasised it. Men such as Maeterlinck (1901) had preached it. Indeed it is suggested in the 1911-2 Man essay.
Nous devons aimer la Nature comme les païens, et lutter contre elle comme le plus passionné disciple de la surhumanité (Israel); car Dieu est dans le monde, et l'élaboration souffrante du monde (physique et moral) va à réaliser le Corps du Christ, — sublime et mystérieux organisme où l'assujettissement insoupçonné (porté à son comble) des individus à un Tout supérieur (Kosmos qui est une Personne) s'allie à une réalisation exhaustive de leur personnalité.

Ceci est une réaction contre "l'extrinsécisme", l'isolement dans les mues, de la construction ascétique et surnaturelle de l'Eglise."

(UFN 1.31)

This recapitulation on UPN 1.9 marks the result of just over a month's feedback-process-system which had kept Matter and its relation to God as central anomaly and had produced concretising metaphors, the à la faveur mechanism and monadic metaphysics. But once this second peak-Gestalt is reached the feedback occurs again at once. The New Cosmos, the Body of Christ is a function (not automatic) of the human consciousness of the free monad:

Pour l'analyse des "courants", faire progresser l'introspection du dehors au dedans:

1. le corps matériel
2. le plan vital, ses prolongements
3. le déterminisme psychologique individuel (développement spécial, vitesse de développement)
4. la destination au Corps du Christ en fonction de l'obéissance libre des monades, de leur annexion consentie au nouveau Cosmos.

(UFN 1.31)

Here the higher sphere cannot be reached except by means of the lower, which is the à la faveur-based human consciousness and soul. Nor is it an extrinsic God who forms the "sur-naturel". God attracts or pulls (or intrudes) from the sphere above, spawning each à la faveur step when the opportunity-occasion is there; and the second matter of the soul develops in this way à travers la matière, so that the spiritual is "constructed" on the basis of Nature as Science knows it, but above and beyond such Nature in terms of value and ontological plane.
"Sur-naturel" is in other words not a two-world connotation: the "Sur" and hyphen concretise the traditional "supernatural" into the reality of a Second and Higher Matter built on the physico-chemical foundations of the one world known to human Science. It is developed therefore (according to Teilhard) through the biological displacement of reproductive sexuality. At a lower degree in the human consciousness the sur-natural may thus be love for the Divine Person-Object who is the Supreme Future, the Sum of the Elect Souls and the Body of Christ. But ontologically and at a higher degree the sur-naturel consciousness is actually a chosen part of the cosmos, an elect soul-cell which is one of the members of this Mystical organism.

By 9th March Teilhard's specific need to be a Christian disciple with his whole personality is nearly satisfied.

To realise the above set of ideas is to have the "cosmic awakening" of the Vie Cosmique.¹ Psychologically, this gives cosmic Beatitude. Ontologically, as body and soul are drawn to the Superior Unity of the Body of Christ this is the divinizing of the "actual" universe, (perhaps on the analogy of religious virginity). Existentially, Cosmic Life means loving Life (Nature) and working for the "surhumain" – for the Body of Christ.

Further this whole series of concepts is showing Our Lord as the "attracting" side of the Cosmos. Previously Teilhard the Jesuit had known and experienced God's determinist binding by human passivities. Now the 1912+ "seductions" of Matter were complementing the 1902+ omnipresence and traditional dogma.

Thus in UFN 1.33,33a the two main simplified concepts which Teilhard needed appear: to be a Christian means to be Jacob-Israel struggling with the Angel-divinity in Matter; and the religion that this entails and from which it springs is that of (the concept of) Christ-Kosmos.

1. UFN 1.30
... Et la dernière position, l'abandon au Christ-Kosmos, assure la vie, la persistance immortelle, de tout ce qu'il y a de vraiment bon, et durable, dans les deux attitudes premières.

En celle-ci, insister sur tout ce qu'il y a d'imprécis, de pressenti ... "Quelque Chose".

Terminer par un chapitre sur le coeur de NS, "Centrum omnium eorum", aboutissement régulier du mouvement assensionnel commencé dans l'ivresse du monde et l'apréte de la lutte pour le Progrès et la Vie. —

Le "Christ-Cosmique."
(UPN 1.33a)

This Christ-Kosmos concept expresses what has been only too clear in the preceding paragraphs of this Thesis and this Chapter: Teilhard desperately needs to live in and accept both experimental and scientific reality, and his parental and Religious self. He is unthinkable without any one of these elements and without his search for an integral identity.

Christ-Kosmos is indeed the executive concept which simplifies his selves and meets their various needs. He admits now\(^1\) that his "life" and "ambience" are as "Absolute" to him, that "one" (he) can be "dazzled" by the cosmos, that reality to him must be "touchable". He is now sure that the physical-biological realities of the part will show the "issue" of Matter in the future. He is totally committed to Matter as he knows it in Science and Experience: but — and here his Religio-Metaphysical-Pantheist roots appear — Matter must have a "Form"\(^2\).

In the feedback on Christ-Kosmos, then, the first question will be: what is the Form of Matter?

Teilhard answers this as in \(\text{UPN 1.9-11a}\). With dogma and the hopes of his heart (presumably "immortality"\(^3\)) "Absolute" to him, with \(\text{UPN 1.9}'s\) Christ-the-All a Gestalt-component in his memory-store, and with the "Quelque Chose" in close

\(^1\) \(\text{UPN 1.33}\)
\(^2\) But cf. \(\text{UPN 3.45}\)
\(^3\) ie. \(\text{UPN 1.33a}\)
proximity on the UPN page (and so ready for association) with the Heart of Our Lord, Christ and "a Revelation", there could never be any doubt about the answer:— The Form of Matter must be Christ, and the cosmic realities only "semi-Absolute" without the segregation to a Person. ¹

So to Teilhard the formula for the Form and Matter of the World, that is All the Kosmos, must be Christ-Kosmos. The "Physionomy" of the world, of its forces, of God forming and creating in all energy and life ² and the "great light" and "superior Unity" into which all consciousnesses are converging ³ is the Christ-Kosmos which and who is the "ulterior" survival of the sum of the nebulae of souls and the synthesis ⁴ of the New Matter of the ascending movements of Matter in world and life.

Yet with this Gestalt certain warning notes of different kinds are sounded. The issue of Christ-Kosmos is a Revelation not found in the desert, in life, in the past or in ether, though it comes through these and through social life and through Our Lord. Human collectivity and the surhumain are such that human effort will be a function of the new Earth, but only one. The Cosmic Christ joins atoms and conscious hearts to his Person, but this is not all. There is an organic issue: yet the Body of Christ cannot be described in any other way than as "surnatural issue". God is hidden in the cosmic life-organism, ⁵ so that the Earth is a great Host: but the Divine is at the end of Evolution and at the Beginning.

Nevertheless in the following set of paragraphs which date from 11-13th March 1916 all Teilhard's selves find fulfilment in the series of Gestalten ending with Christ-Kosmos—

Mon but est multiple (mais doit rester confiné dans les limites suivantes):

a) montrer que nos aspirations cosmiques ont un succédané inespéré (nous devons les éléments conscients d'un Tout personnel ... (c'est à dire faire servir à l'amour de Dieu et du Christ nos aspirations cosmiques.)

1. cf. UPN 1.29
2. UPN 1.27
3. UPN 1.27a
4. i.e. the chemical and biological analogy.
5. UPN 1.34a
b) indiquer comment nos amours terrestres ont leur part
   transposable, convenable, dans le plan surnaturel;

   À savoir: l'action formatrice de Dieu subie, communée
dans la Matière et la transformisme organique;

   l'action créatrice de Dieu continuée activement
par la domination de la Matière et l'édification
de l'organisme social (les Touts), à atomisme
visible ...);

et ceci dans le but de donner à certaines individualités
ultérieures la possibilité de naître (cf l'élaboration
passive du cerveau dans certains phyla), et peut-être de
fournir un nouveau matériel à la Jérusalem nouvelle ...  
(UFN 1.32)

"Corriger ainsi la phrase du 9 Mars

"Nous devons aimer la Nature plus (mieux) que des païens, et
lutter contre Elle comme les plus passionnés ouvriers de la
Surrhumauté, en vue de réaliser, corps et âme, les éléments
fondus, en pleine conscience, dans l'Unité supérieure du
Corps du Christ.

Dans ma théorie "Ceci à la fauve de cela", il faudrait
dire que l'utilisation des passions cosmiques est seulement
de maintenir en nous des tendances nécessaire à comprendre,
à aimer, le Corps du Christ. (cf. supra: tier degré)
(UFB 1.33)

Tout de même, est-ce que la position vraiment vivante du
problème dont je veux exposer l'évolution n'est pas celle-ci,
L'Issue, l'issue cherchée en arrière, dans le désert, dans
l'éther, dans la matière divine, dans le travail de la Vie,
dans l'élaboration sociale ... et finalement trouvée en NS.

Inconvenient de cette position: l'angoissante opposition
entre Renoncement et Progrès n'est plus mise en relief. Au
lieu du conflit entre les Passions (du ciel
(de la Terre,
je risquerai de ne plus montrer qu'une déception en face
d'une Révélation.
Le côté positivement attirant du Kosmos ne serait pas assez
en saillie.
(UFN 1.33a)

The last two quotations show feedback beginning again, first in orthodox
correction of an earlier note (quoted above) and then in orthodox reaffirmation
of Revelation.
Indeed by Teilhard feels that he is back within theological orthodoxy. He now has the concept of a Final Divine, Definitive, Absolute Object which is the harmony of Totality and which reaches this through the movement of all purified-segregated being towards God who moves all. This — Teilhard asserts — is the movement of the chosen monads to form the Mystical Body of New Universe as in St. Paul and St. John.

At this point non-Roman Catholic theology might have objected that to make the "truly corporeal mystical Body of Christ" a function of moral perfection, of Man's work and of Nature's effort is to put forward an inadequate doctrine of Grace. But to Teilhard by this time the reality of the evolution of consciousnesses, of their enduring beyond death and of their being "absolute" work of the universe¹ is such that when these concepts are inter-displaced with the theological concept of Merit the latter only serves to further describe the universe's concrete future reality and to confirm a real after-life. So the theological arguments of Merit versus Grace are not immediately relevant² because the religious concept is being used metaphorically. In a passage in which the concreteness which is demanded by Teilhard is shown vis-à-vis Teilhard's personal effort and the Resurrection-metaphor³:

L'ivresse de panthéisme païen, je la détournerai à un usage chrétien, en reconnaissant et embrassant l'action créatrice de Dieu dans toutes les caresses et tous les heurtes, dans toutes les passivités inévitables et irréductibles; — la haute passion de la lutte pour la Science, la Domination, l'organisation, je la déchainerai sur des objets naturels, mais avec oeuvre créatrice de Dieu, commencée par exemple, dans l'élaboration inconsciente du cerveau, mais destinée peut-être à produire des âmes de tonalité plus raffinée, ou de nuance nouvelle, grâce aux

1. The first mention of the word Universe.
2. cf. eg. MM, p.191. Essays like How I Believe (1936) confirm this. The whole structure of H.I.B. is to do with "Faith in ..." The mechanisms of cosmic asceticism such as suggested in "Le Milieu Divin" (1926) (for the individual) would also confirm this.
3. nb. "metaphor" because its primary and historical N.T. usage is being expanded into general terms. Teilhard does of course at times adhere to such primary usage, eg. MM.
influences et aux organes d’une civilisation supérieure.

L’amour naïf ou inquisiteur de la Matière, je le diviniserai en songeant que de Tout mystérieux qu’est la Matière quelque chose doit passer, par la résurrection, dans le Monde céleste, mes efforts pour le Progrès humain étant même, peut-être, la condition nécessaire pour que s’élabora et naisse la Terre nouvelle.

(UPN 1.35)

Nevertheless even after feeling that he has Biblical reinforcement for his ideas and that these do not go against dogma but deepen dogma’s interpretations, Teilhard continues to have feedback-reflection on the matter of his orthodoxy, this time concerning the theological orthodoxy of Christ-Kosmos. He speaks of a Christian limit past which he cannot go:—

"Le charme du monde réside dans ce qui en sortira, dans sa sève, i.e. de son évolution. Pour le panthéiste, l’absolu est de travailler à réaliser Dieu en quelque chose du monde. Pour nous, le but du labeur est d’édifier le Corps du Christ.

Il est toutefois une limite que je ne saurais chrétienne-ment dépasser, à savoir aller jusqu’à dire, en étreignant la Matière, ou la Vie, ou l’Humanité: "Vous êtes mon Dieu". Et pourtant si je peut dire de la "main de Dieu", je puis dire du prochain, je puis dire de Jésus ...

Mais alors je m’adresse à une formalité qui n’est pas dans le plan humain, palpable ... ou qui n’est pas celle qu’adorent les païens (v.g. dans le prochain, dans les événements ...)

(UPN 1.37a)

Teilhard goes on to emphasise that the Kosmos it not "itself" a God realising Himself, and then goes on to proclaim his unorthodox idea of monads and a Centre and Term of the Divine World synthesis which is the "sur-naturel" view:—

"Si je m’analyse sans parti pris, je trouve que, devant un "effet" physique trouvé, par exemple, je voudrais pouvoir m’agenouiller comme devant quelque attribut divin, quelque perfectionnement absolu qui serait aussi un secret de plus-vie. Et bien, évidemment, je ne puis savoir cela ... Le Kosmos n’est pas, en soi, un Dieu qui se réalise.

On pourrait classer autrement les attitudes naturelles:—

1. Le Monde Divin dans son Centre de jaillissement, dans son réservoir homogène.
2. Le monde divin dans son Terme évolutif

(diverse attitudes: se laisser mener, par δημιουργία)

Exploiter (domination) - se libérer

Homme = centre (ou Humanité)
   = fruit du Cosmos, cosmique (Monade? ou Pleiade)

l'attitude surnaturelle = synthèse de 11 + Atomisme conscient.

1 ne peut s'absorber chrétiennement, sinon dans son Culte très passif ... mais celui-ci existe, plus sainement, dans 11a. (UPN 1.38)

- Dieu n'est pas purement immanent au monde. Mais le Corps et l'Humanité du Christ (en voie d'achèvement jusqu'à la fin des siècles), si. (UPN 1.37a)

Though Man is the fact of the Cosmos, and indeed the "cosmic thread", Teilhard again re-emphasises the segregation involved in the formation of the Body of Christ only for the concreteness of his concept to be made clearer:

Dans l'attitude panthéiste-païenne, Toute la matière est conservée et divinisée, puisqu'on la considère comme revenant sans cesse à son réservoir initial ... 

Mais dans toutes les autres attitudes, qui admettent un perfectionnement absolu des choses, il y a une part de déchet, (raté, ou inutilisé): un grande part "numeric" de la matière et de la Vie est laissé de côté par la Ségrégation. "Pauci electi"

L'attitude de Domination peut cependant se flatter de garder toute matière, puisque, en ayant trouvé les secrets, elle pourrait l'exploiter, la vivifier toute entière ...

Par la Libération, on élimine la Matière ...

(UFN 1.38)

"Et je voyais le Corps du Christ de fondre, par sa péripheérie à toute la pléiade des êtres qui ont été élus pour faire à sa Divine Humanité une atmosphère, un milieu, une Terre nouvelle, un monde de prédilection, - par leurs âmes, - par leurs corps, - par la matière sanctifiée qu'ils auront entrainée avec eux.

- Faire grande la part du déterminisme interne, si caractéristique dans le cas des perversions — c'est un filet, en nous, du grand devenir cosmique ..."

(UFN 1.38)
Then Teilhard reminds himself that Christ is Divine and Human, Personal and Cosmic, Origin and Humanity and End; but with Man having the ineffable responsibility, the novel concepts are not hidden:

Parce que nous sommes, ainsi que je viens de dire, un "filet" cosmique, nous portons en nous une ineffable responsabilité.

Le "Cosmique" chrétien a la supériorité vraiment divine de satisfaire à la fois les passionnés et les dégoûtés du monde.

Du reste on pourrait faire une étude complète sur les extrêmes qui se touchent en NS: Divin-Humain, Personnel-Cosmique, etc., l'origine et le Terme de l'Humanité ...

(UFN 1.38a)

Again Teilhard needs the historical Jesus, he needs the "hand of God" as a concept, and the "future" as a reality; but then he presses this "palpable" "reality" again and again and the novel ideas emerge once more:— the future, the functional role of social man and of moral man, the elaboration of the Kingdom of Heaven, the truly solidly ("corporeal") Mystic Body, and the Kosmic Christ are all of the à la faveur reality of molecule, cell and soul:

Le travail "absolu" de l'Univers est, on peut le mettre en principe, l'élaboration des âmes, l'évolution des consciences! * Or, ce travail dure encore, car, par le concour des énergies physiques, biologiques, et surtout par les efforts intellectuels et moraux des âmes, un perfectionnement réel se poursuit encore, vers de nouvelles et autres âmes.

* = condamnation de l'attitude de fusion psychique (fausse évolution, chute).

(UFN 1.36b)

"Avant NS, tout le travail de l'Univers était de réaliser l'Humanité de NS (= terme des Progrès de la Matière, de la Vie, de la Société); depuis lors, l'effort total du Monde est d'achever la réalisation du Corps mystique; et parce que le Corps est vraiment corporel, et formé d'âmes liées à des Corps, et dominé par un Christ appartenant vraiment à notre Kosmos – non seulement les perfectionnements moraux, mais encore le labeur inconscient de la Nature, et le travail autonome, industriels de l'homme social, doivent être mis à
contribution, — sont une condition efficace et ont un rôle réel, (et non absolument secondaire) dans l’élaboration du Royaume des Cieux.”

(UPN 1.36b)

Furthermore self-doubt is still able to enter in. Teilhard knows that his language is dreamish and that it may even be blasphemous or a chimera, yet he just has to keep to and note down the ideas which please him:

N’est ce pas une chimère ou un blasphème? En plus de la communion avec Dieu et de la Communion avec la Terre, y-a-t-il la Communion avec Dieu par la Terre? celle-ci devenant comme une grande Hostie où Dieu se tiendrait pour nous? Je le voudrais (pour moi, et pour beaucoup d’autres, et pour que s’évanouisse le plus fort prétexte qu’ait le siècle de nous regarder comme des anormaux); Mais je ne sais. En tout cas, il me plait de noter mes idées en ce sens, quitte à écrire en dernière ligne:

"Et tout ceci était un songe."

(UPN 1.35a)

Such paragraphs demonstrate Teilhard’s personal tension, his attempted orthodoxy and the undiluted method of proving his orthodoxy by reasserting his Gestalten rather than by theologically-technical argument.

That this method did not serve to convince Teilhard is shown by his continuing worry over orthodoxy. But even in this anxiety after the Gestalt of Christ-Kosmos Teilhard never argued at all like a professional theologian with historical or theological detail just as he never argued even with the à la favoïr concept like a professional scientist.

Instead Teilhard began to use the general categories of Theology to save his orthodoxy.1 The Holy Evolution through a Great Total Effort into an Objective and Consistent Future — a perspective which leads to Christ as the religion of the entire world2 is now balanced by the traditional language of the new World being a new “transcendent” end, the Kingdom of God and brought into being by Redemption.

1. UPN 1.39a
2. ie. à travers la totalité des choses (UPN 1.10a).
Segregation means that it is the chosen cosmos which "goes to Jesus à travers the tomb.\textsuperscript{1} The famous Some Thing may be the function of effort, the End of human and cosmic becoming and the Progress of the Whole of the World; but Christian Festivals may still give the clue to it all. But even here there is reinterpretation in terms of physical reality: the Easter Week is union in a great warm totality of One Lord, the Annunciation is the feast of the Cosmic Body and the physical beginning of the Mystical Body:–

\begin{quote}
Fête de NS l'incarnation dans le monde, grâce à N. Dame ... Fête cosmique par excellence, où commence physiquement à s'animer le Corps Mystique! ...
(UFN 41a)
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
Jeudi Saint Fête du Corps Mystique.
Joie à retrouver NS, à m'unir à sa grande et chaude totalité ... L'annonciation était la fête du Corps Cosmique ...
(UFN 1.43a)
\end{quote}

Now with the idea of Cosmic Body taking over from Mystical Body the essay \textit{Vie Cosmique} has been written and is thought by its author to be orthodox.

Cosmic Life is "living as an atom of Christ" as well as making the "effort towards God" and the attempt to "prolong", "coincide with" and "obey" evolution and "all being". Life is seen as the basis of sur-natural life, which may seem naturalistic: but when, in Jesus Christ, it is the World as well as Man who suffers, both the human and cosmic becomings are shown not to be the case of naturally producing a Some Thing, but of helping Him into being through cosmic Christian discipleship on the basis of Christian Revelation; the novel ideas have taken on the look of orthodoxy.\textsuperscript{2}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{1} On the other hand this may be an early understanding that Death is necessary to fully release Spirit for its building of the Universal Christ (HIB).
\textsuperscript{2} This situation remains for under a year. See below.
\end{flushright}
5. Summary of the UPN 1.1-44 Gestalten series, and critique of Teilhard's method.

With the concept of Cosmic Body of Christ Cosmic Life was complete. What had happened in UPN 1.1-44 was first a lead-up to Christ-Kosmos and then a time of feedback mainly from religious orthodoxy which resulted in the further metaphor-displacement from this orthodoxy of the Biblical concept of Body.

Feedback has been observable from the earliest sections, however. After the initial inter-displacement of religious and pantheist-scientific concepts to form the Gestalt of Christ-the-All there was a time of probing this concept from various angles until the Kosmos was seen as a Person, so that Christ-the-All could become Christ-Kosmos, the Cosmic Christ. When Cosmic Body of Christ appears after further feedback the series of central Self-Ego Gestalten is therefore:-

Christ-the-All \rightarrow Christ-Kosmos \rightarrow Cosmic Body of Christ.

If these are the dominant Gestalten, what are their sub-components? This question may not be answered with certainty because the mind-processes of Teilhard were emotional and mainly unconscious, so that his associations may only be hypothetically perceived. But at times the movement of sub-components to Gestalt-vector are clear. This is especially true in the case of Christ-the-All, for which the following diagram may be made which is chronologically correct:

Figure XXV: Components of the first executive-concept Gestalt.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sub-components</th>
<th>concept-displacement</th>
<th>dominant Gestalt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Second Matter</td>
<td>Increments</td>
<td>Christ-the-All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probability</td>
<td>Future</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ</td>
<td>Christ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visage</td>
<td>Matter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sphinx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A similar diagram to Christ-Kosmos is less clear. Pressure from the religious self led to the Segregation and Cosmic ascesis concepts; and pressure from the scientific self led to the A la faveur mechanism theory. Together these two sets
of ideas linked with probability maths and religious needs to give the realism which Teilhard was wanting.

At the same time the earlier concepts were being developed and new ones appearing, especially concretising metaphors. Again very schematically what happened was something like this:

**Figure XXVI: The Formation of the Christ-Kosmos Gestalt.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UPN 1.1-9</th>
<th>UPN 1.9-33a close association</th>
<th>New Metaphor-Gestalten</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Second Matter</td>
<td>Absolute</td>
<td>nebula of souls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probability</td>
<td>cosmic ascesis</td>
<td>chosen cosmos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ-dogma</td>
<td>segregation-election</td>
<td>Jacob-Israel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ</td>
<td>immanence/transcendence</td>
<td>Body of Christ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visage</td>
<td>Hidden</td>
<td>Figure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Something</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sphinx</td>
<td>Divine Object</td>
<td>Definitive Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matter</td>
<td>Sexuality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>Palpable future</td>
<td>à la faveur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>axis of con. ss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consciousness</td>
<td>centre-sphere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>Totality of Matter</td>
<td>organism-cells</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the TGTA Naven model is imagined to give the process-cluster, at work such diagrams unmake some of the mystery of the Teilhard Gestalten without reducing the absolute mystery involved in such conscious and unconscious process. The various value-vectors are at work with their own specific information and controls, with their own specific problems but mainly with the central God/World anomaly being thought-unto for solution.

This value-vector-selves-system analysis is simply demonstrated in the
third Figure which shows the Cosmic Body of Christ:—

**Figure XXVII: Feedback to the Cosmic Body.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figures</th>
<th>UFN 1.1-33a</th>
<th>UFN 1.33a-44</th>
<th>new metaphor Gestalt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XXV</td>
<td>Man Key ----→ Synthetic Final Con. SS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td>Kosmos-Elaboration → Physiomy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXVI</td>
<td>Body of Christ → &quot;Corporeal&quot; Mystical Body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dogma → Merit, Resurrection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These three Figures show the conceptual novelty of **UFN 1.1-44**. What is so clear now is that the overall build-up of concepts was not methodically planned or worked at with technical tools any more than the many paragraphs quoted above.

Instead such rhythm as there is in paragraph and section points to particular presses from problems raised by chance or unconscious need, and to system-selves of Life, Religion, Science, Sense-Sensitivity and central Self-Ego as they press into the whole system these latter needs and/or their particular information with which they attempt to cope with these needs and the external stimuli.

For instance in Figure XXV the "rhythm" of five selves would be, schematically:—

1. Sense-Sensitivity v-v notes war-organisation, team spirit and comes to Gestalt of Second Matter.
2. Science v-v notes mathematical phenomenon of statistical probability, and biological reality of whole organism.
5. S-E, Life and S-S takes pantheist-religionists' concepts of All, Visage, Sphinx.
6. S-S inter-displaces (1-3) to make idea of durational real whole.
7. S-S displaces (6) on to (4-5) which produces executive Gestalt of Christ-the-All.
Such an interpretation without being reified may nevertheless suggest how it is that Teilhard usually seems satisfied with the ideas to which he comes: he is emotionally committed to them precisely because his emotions have produced them, and the final executive concept is "executive" to his identity precisely because all his personality has produced it.

This interpretation also explains the concretisation-process which has been occurring, and what feedback there is. The feedback is press-need from particular conceptual and emotional information in the selves, and the concretisation is the S-S and Science selves demanding verifiable reality. But this concretisation is controlled (as by a switch in the whole circuit) by the Religion self with its faith and tradition, while both Science and Religion selves are controlled by the parental womb and need for identity which are in the Self-Ego system. So that the projection of religious, scientific and pantheist concepts into experimental situations as displaced metaphors is controlled by the need for survival and identity of the Central Self.

This set of processes which the TGTA-Naven model symbolises is what makes sense of the appearance and survival of the Christ-Kosmos concept. It was a more concrete, specific description than Christ-the-All, and once produced it was reworked into many other formulae than Cosmic Body of Christ. In this way it was a control within Teilhard's whole system as well as a search-image, and simplifying existential synthesis.

In one form or another Christ-Kosmos lasted Teilhard his whole life. This is ample evidence of its emotional and conceptual satisfaction and of his identity-integrity. That it produced thousands of words from his central need for it is also evidence of its over-simplification yet model fruitfulness. Further, that Christ-Kosmos was not accepted by the Roman Church during his life-time or even today demonstrates both Teilhard's originality and his unorthodoxy.

---

1. See final chapter.
In conclusion of discussion of UPN 1.1-44 Teilhard's originality is that of displacement and juxtaposition of various images which occur to him so as to solve existential conceptual problems which result from the tensions of five selves. Some of the Gestalt-solutions are retained by him as satisfying re-orientating patterns which act then as feedback and control within the total system.

Therefore the origin of his novelty lies in Teilhard's personal discovery of approximations of search-image. His originality comes through existential synthesis and not reasoned argument. What he writes is poetry, not in the sense of poetical feeling rhyme, rhythm or even form of language; but in poetry's attempt to reach human language which will meet and interpret existential reality in such a way as to point to and communicate general or ultimate meaning.

Another way to put this is to point to Teilhard's series of Gestalten as the free perceptions of Transcendent Self. In no sense can the lead-up to Vie Cosmique be described strictly as "logical": the only logic it has is that of an unconscious bounding back for more metaphorical description of what he cannot describe but only feel, and of finding progressive satisfactions in personal syntheses. The only logic is such metaphor as it is added to and controlled by the language and ideas of consciously held paradigms, sometimes helped by conscious reason to find a solution but never receiving the logical treatment which might have resulted in a "spiral" argument. The argument is by Gestalt of Transcendental Ego.

Even the feedback fails often in its purpose, for instance, is UPN 1.38a a true statement historically speaking?

Bien noter que mon point de départ est une question de fait: Nous sommes liés et entraînés. Et à cette situation imposée correspond une sympathie intime, faite surtout de nostalgie de l'Absolu.

(UPN 1.38a)

Not even in the context is it accurate. Teilhard's basis is five selves and Christ-Kosmos!
So often (as later in The Phenomenon of Man) the development of Teilhard's thought is hidden by means of such selective inattention, and any pretence to abstract logic serves only to hide what real processes there are of inner logic.

Finally the TGA-Naven model suggests how the unorthodoxy, novelty and realism of Teilhard's ideas were produced. None of the five selves was left out of the Gestalt-processes. The Christ-Kosmos concept needed five selves to come into being. But its concreteness owes most to the S-S and Science selves, so little known within the Church community. From these particularly, then, came the Christian pantheism (cosmic life) and the Epigenetic Christ (Christ-Cosmique) which are far from traditional religious asceticism and from static concepts of Beatific Vision, Heaven and indeed the Mystical Body of Christ. But it was the linking of these with the à la faveur group of ideas which were free Gestalten and with \( G_N \) (B of X) and CN (God) which makes a new language for the traditional concepts and which with new language brings new content. So it was five selves and the Gestaliten as they appeared which is Teilhard and which are his novelty, no less.

Teilhard felt all his life that he had "seen" something "new" and this is evidenced in his early worry over blasphemy and heresy in this early UPN section. Later he was to pay the penalty for novelty in theology. He is still half-silenced today when the "omitted paragraph" is omitted. This suggests that the above interpretations are substantially correct for they emphasise and symbolise by value-vector his commitments far outside the Church community. Teilhard suffered for a free Gestalt-mind which did not reason logically, made poetry by metaphor and

---

1. More probable than conscious deceit; lack of wide academic knowledge (except in science and Jesuit religion) might be another factor.
2. This is why the English (Collins) translations of Teilhard suggest another Teilhard than the one who is clearly an emotional thinker.
3. See final chapter.
concept-displacement and was a five-fold process.

In UFN 1.1-44 Teilhard's personal discovery, his conceptual novelty, his poetry and personal salvation are fully revealed by TUTA-Naven symbolism. His Method, Identity, Originality, Science and Religion are bare to view with his Gestalten-series in this statement of the central executive concept:—

Et ainsi, sans rupture, porté par la graduation naturelle et nécessaire du matériel, du vivant, de l'humain, du social, je retrouve, au terme de mes désirs, le "Christ cosmique" (si j'ose dire) Celui qui noue au Centre conscient de sa Personne et de son coeur tout mouvement des atomes, des cellules, des âmes (pour opérer leur souffrante et sanctifiante ségrégation) ... Je voudrais pouvoir aimer passionnément le Christ en aimant beaucoup (dans l'acte même d'aimer) l'Univers.

(UFN1.35a)

With this summary of UFN 1.1-44 the stage is now ready for Teilhard's first public appearance and first formal acceptance of his Mystic-Fantheist self — the essay of Cosmic Life.
CHAPTER XVII

A COMPARISON OF THE FORMAL ESSAY, VIE COSMIQUE, WITH THE UPN BACKGROUND TO IT: A FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF TEILHARD'S METHOD.

The following points are apparent on a comparison of these two sets of writings:—

1. Their arguments are different in content and in chronological order of appearance. The early bases of the Second Matter Gestalt and the Pantheist and Newmanite ideas of a "hidden" Some Thing are scarcely to be seen in Vie Cosmique. Nor does the à la faveur-occasion mechanism receive mention.

2. In their places are the concept of Ether, the metaphors of centre and sphere, and the direct introduction of Revelation as the answer to the problem of God and the World.

3. The Introduction of Vie Cosmique corroborates the TGTA-Naven picture of Teilhard's mind-workings. It emphasises his reliance on displacement of concept, on Gestalt, and on the selectivity which results in existential synthesis.

4. All five hypothetical value-vectors appear, and provide the necessary leaps for the argument.

5. When the Gestalten appear, there is some discussion of them, but little hint of their origins. The movement of thought, besides being as if per five selves in rhythm-circuit is from Gestalt to Gestalt. It is poetic and individualistic throughout and without regard to technical questions concerning Teilhard's new ideas in relation to the paradigms of other lived-in-orders such as those of Religion and Science.

As noted in previous chapters the UPN material shows a movement from the questions of biological evil and collectivity to the idea of regulations of elites (dark/light), the whole as function of large numbers, and the future as bio-physical reality which has total value since Matter is Divine and Sphinxian. But Vie Cosmique opens with commitment to the concept of Ether, and with the metaphors of "centre" and "sphere". Segregation is then assumed as a natural biological law, and no mention at all is made of cosmic sexual energy and the specific à la faveur concept of a world of displacement steps, though the latter is hinted at briefly in the idea of hierarchy.

Perhaps because Vie Cosmique only became writeable after Christ-Kosmos appeared it seems mainly to be concerned with clarification and orthodoxy after this main Gestalt. With this situation it might be unreasonable to expect the same chronology of ideas to be followed in the essay with the ideas which led to Christ-Kosmos appearing in their original order. But the question must be raised as to whether after-the-event reasoning on behalf of the Gestalt should not include use of such bases of the Gestalt as were known; and Teilhard could have looked over the earlier pages of UPN to have seen these.

The other side of this point is to gauge whether by use of non-original bases such as the ideas of centre, Ether and the general conceptions of a tangible future successfully "justify" the concept of Christ-Kosmos. In the opinion of the present writer Teilhard's re-working is unsuccessful rationalisation and is the cause of the unsatisfying, muddling "noise" which surrounds him.¹

The movement of Vie Cosmique is as follows: after an Introduction which portrays openly but unconsciously what the present Thesis symbolises as value-vectors

¹. i.e. the "noise" which a "code" must reduce so that the "message" may be collected.
   cf. the Introduction to this Thesis.
and their processes Teilhard asserts that the law which governs the structure of the cosmos is the recurrence of aggregations of centres building up more complex centres of a higher order. The metaphor of river current and eddy adds to this the idea of physical, temporal development, as does the concept of Ether as the original and ultimate term of all being. This fundamental substance unfolds and radiates itself, transmits and perhaps dispenses energies, and produces or is the medium for everything in the Universe. Its unique centre is prime matter, and from its property of infinitely "extended" centre (in space), it gives unity of origin to everything, and by the network of links sets up its "phenomenal continuity". With the internal involution of Matter, that is of physical-chemical forces, there comes a "general orientation of the current of increasing perfection", and in the "heart of matter" there emerges more and more consciousness. There the monad is clear to view, and it is through man that the radiations of common structure and common destiny glow most. Though it is a shock to realise how little man has yet emerged from unconsciousness, yet this free monad has the "great cosmos" now emerging in himself; and if he "sees" this, he has to live cosmically in union with the totality.

Here Teilhard breaks off. The overall vision may or may not be identical to that seen in UPN. But Teilhard has made the basis of the essay a concept which hardly appears in the UPN material. UPN has God doing the "binding", and "primitive stuff" just "primitive stuff". What is new in the essay is that the metaphor of "centre", which appeared first in UPN 1.14 and is Leibnitzian metaphysics is displaced into the "scientific" concept of Ether (as per Maeterlinck) to give an

1. WTB, p.19
2. op.cit. p.20
3. op.cit. p.21
4. op.cit. p.23
5. op.cit. p.24 ff.
6. op.cit. p.27
ontological basis for creation, transformist evolution, and continuity to higher destiny. Nothing appears in the essay of à la faveur step—changes and divergence into new axes. The rise towards brain is part of "inexorable determinisms", and represents simply the "modification of one and the same thing"—the monadic centres entering more and more on the Centre.

It will remain to be seen whether Teilhard reinterprets the à la base "sur—naturel" of UPN in other ways in Vie Cosmique. Here note should be taken that what was the basis in UPN of his idea of the world as a series of steps or planes is not included in Cosmic Life. Instead of "discontinuity" and "intrusion", which reflects at least some biological phenomena, there is the metaphysics of Ether and monadic centre.

This is a change from one metaphysical notion to another, for Balzac's cosmic sexual energy which led to the à la faveur notion is not science. But the change of metaphysical synthesis from à la faveur to monad—centre may serve to reduce the coherence of the Christ—Kosmos Gestalt. The latter's origins may be needed in demonstration of Christ—Kosmos.

Unconsciously or in a deliberately hidden way the à la faveur idea is contained in the picture of Man as the new "bud", since this is a biological metaphor. Here Man's growing soul and unknown resources of collectivity will lead to a new phase by segregation and concentration. This phase is one of freedom—spiritual—

---

1. op.cit., p.21
2. UPN 1.14
3. On the speculative question as to whether or not Teilhard was conscious of such change in emphasis and so as to whether or not Teilhard was deceitful in this matter, the present writer is of the opinion that Teilhard's unconscious and his emotional processes were so dominant in his mind—system that he did not realize that he was shifting his ground. On the other hand, Cuenot's remark in Appendix A concerning concealment might suggest otherwise, though this remark is not to do with Teilhard's concepts and essay—work.
4. op.cit., p.34—7
isation of Matter of a higher consciousness and so of the spiritualisation of the Universe. Such a description is in fact making use of À la faveur ideas as well as "centre" metaphor, since the former is the basis of "segregation". But without the mechanics of À la faveur the segregation theory appears as an a priori assumption, which reduces the credibility of Christ-Kosmos.

Moreover in the picture being painted by Teilhard Life and Matter are taken as "Absolute" values, so the one-world À la faveur ideas must be present. But again they are not specified. When Man is to decentre himself on the Secret, "the great thing of which he is a constituent particle", it is the "circle" metaphor which is dominant and any idea of À la faveur mechanism remains unconscious and informal, a hidden assumption and a retreat from Teilhard's original position.

This "centre" metaphor continues to dominate in the following interpretation of the Christian's beliefs. But another new element enters into the argument. God is the "Centre who spreads through all things". But this is given further metaphysical connotation. Christianity believes that souls are formed in the "fundamental substance" of the Godhead, at once transcendent and immanent: indeed, as the higher environment. He is the Christian's Ether.

With "substance" traditional Aristotelian motions learnt at Ore place are being used. In UPN Teilhard had spoken of "Divine Matter". Now it is the word "substance" which is appearing in Cosmic Life and the displacement being made is that of God on to Ether and centre so as to form the concept of Divine Matter.

Nevertheless it is only the language which is changing. The vision is the same. The concreteness of thought of UPN is only being put into different but

1. op.cit. p.89
2. op.cit. p.41
3. op.cit. p.28
4. op.cit. p.42
5. op.cit. p.47-9
traditional metaphor. With the "immortal substance" of the soul, and with a "common centre of beatitude", souls combine through grace and convergence to form a "natural Whole" which is in fact a "physically organised Whole" in which individuals are "functions" of God and not isolated particles. It is this which is the Body of Christ, and it is specifically more absolute than the already "cosmic" Communion of Saints. The additional metaphors do not take the place of the à la faveur process, but supplement its vision.

With the change of emphasis of changed metaphors therefore Teilhard has not reduced his set of ideas. Merging monadic metaphysics with the Metaphysics of orthodoxy he has put his ideas into a language more acceptable to his friends in Religion, and which was being used by such as Maeterlinck.¹

Nor has the concrete vision of future Christ–Kosmos been hindered by the change of language so as to make Teilhard less radical. As in UPM he proceeds to reject extrinsic, juridical (moral or legal) analogies. He wishes the Body of Christ to be a new world — "animate and in motion" — in which all are united "physically and biologically".² On the previous page Teilhard had demanded a "world" of souls, not a "harvest": now the Body of Christ must be conceived as "a physical Reality, in the strongest sense the words can bear".³ This Body is made through the "Law" of Segregation which is carried out by the "immanantisation" of the chosen, the "physical incorporation of the faithful in the Christ who is of God".⁴ By the Incarnation, by His Heart, by the Eucharist, by charity, by activity animated by grace — by all this grace the Body is built up. Thus the Body of Christ is the Centre of all final repose and also "the bond who holds together all faithful becoming".⁵ The Kingdom of God is "absolute and tangible".

The Incarnation has exposed the Universe-roots of the supernatural cosmos.⁶

---

1. Maeterlinck, op.cit. 4. op.cit. p.50.
2. WTW, p.50. 5. op.cit. p.52.
3. op.cit. p.51. 6. op.cit. p.53.
This concretisation is as per UPN and it continues. While accepting the idea of "merit" as a solace and a "heartening concept" (and goodwill and pure intention), Teilhard nevertheless demands that the "cosmic quality" of what we do is just as important. If work and action have no absolute value, the heart suffers and the mind cannot understand.

This is the TOTA-Naven logic of Teilhard. His Mystic-Pantheist self and his Religious self are pressing him to personal resolution of the problems of his own personality: as in the letter to Boussac quoted above, need to feel his own laboratory's work as valuable has led him to Balzacian concepts of Absolute and to the displacement of this into physical-biological Evolution.

Teilhard now writes that he himself does have and hold together cosmic love of the World and "heavenly love of God". So he feels that at last he is a man — Self-Ego, S-S, Life, Science and Religion fulfilments have led to this. Is there a rational conceptual formula to express for him this psychological reconciliation?

The solution which Teilhard produces in Cosmic Life (as in UPN) is the executive concept of Christ-Kosmos, in this case in its form as the cosmic Body of Christ. This cosmic Body extends through the whole universe. Since the mystical Christ has not yet reached the peak of his growth neither has the cosmic Christ. They "are": but at the same time they are "becoming". So that Teilhard's psychological needs are fulfilled in a concept which calls for his participation in building this Body by using all his Self.

Again as in UPN the Gestalt lends to feedback, again vis-à-vis theological orthodoxy. In his new thinking Teilhard notes that souls make up a single whole

1. WTW, pp.54-8
2. P.205.
3. WTW, pp.58-9
with the universe. This means that for Christ to give them "life" He had to enter into the "universe that bears mankind" — not just into mankind. This He did with the dignity and function of directive principle, of centre upon which every form of love and every affinity converge. So through Him "everything is created, sanctified and vivified"; and since the Incarnation everything has continued in motion because He has not yet attained to the fulness of his "form".

This Christ the Centre binds His creation of centres and is growing His Pleroma.

Such formal displacement of the Metaphysics of centres into Incarnational theology is not technical theology, nor is it a feedback from technical theology. It is further Gestalt — incubated development from the "centre" metaphor of UPN — to make the pattern of Christ-Kosmos clearer and more concrete. It also roots Teilhard back in orthodoxy; and this need is now recognised formally by Teilhard in his use of the theological concept of Revelation to show the reality of Christ-Kosmos.

From Revelation the Resurrection is used to show Matter as the physical basis of the Body of Christ. Matter is "lower in order but primordial and essential" for union: so that Matter to some extent anyway will be in the foundations of the New Jerusalem "by assimilation" to the Body of Christ.

This becomes a basis for allowing non-believers to help in producing the "chosen matter" which will serve the new earth. The rhythm of Teilhard's selves is here apparent as they press their own hoped-for solutions into practice. The Life value-vector especially wishes to free all of life for God. The analogy of the unconscious is brought out to show one world for the unconscious collaborates with life. UPN

---

1. is. the Bible and Dogma.
2. This word is used to suggest the regular spinning process of Teilhard's mental circuits. It does not denote an actual observable regularity of rhythm.
passages suggesting the need for and future success of "laïque" life reappear in *Cosmic Life* in the theme of practical commitment to the world's work. Self-Ego, Life, Sense-Sensitivity value-vectors join Science commitment within non-orthodox commitment found in the religious Gestalt of Christ-Kosmos. It is the religious model of Jacob-Israel understood within the God-is-All set of concepts which shows Teilhard the Christian pattern of working for the advancement of the earth. But this is not orthodox Christian religion which has emphasised resignation. The new world built through Jacob-Israel struggle-discipleship will not be an envelope of souls. The concrete new world will be a function of progress and evolution, a physical Pleroma produced by — amongst other things — human effort.¹

With this emphasis on the totality of the Pleroma Teilhard nevertheless reaffirms what is found at the beginning of the essay. The other side of this Pleroma is the segregation-ascesis of the Cross, "the centre on which all earthly sufferings converge and in which they are all assuaged". Christ must "test" His Mystical Body in "cosmic suffering". His Passion showed us how He gathers sufferings to himself. Physical and moral evil are produced by the "process of becoming" itself, not as an expiation for sin. The Cross is a symbol of the "arduous Labour of Evolution" and Christ's compassion is "cosmic compassion". Hell has the marks of "organic inevitability" and is to be dreaded as Heaven is to be loved.

The Pleroma, in other words, is physical-biological fulfilment. In the organism of the universe the Cosmic Body is developing and this through the Mystical Body. This is the biological analogy. With the circle metaphor the Centre which began us is being converged upon by all life and by everything with affinity, which Centre is Christ who is also each monad's centre too. The organism metaphor and the circle-sphere metaphor describe the Cosmic Christ.

¹ *op.cit.* pp.65ff.
Some criticism on Teilhard's use of metaphor might apply here. Earlier in *WTW* p.37 Teilhard had taken a critical line on the idea of "collective soul" (as in *UPN*) and elsewhere in *UPN* he is wary of analogy. So might he have been at this juncture in *Cosmic Life*. In the concept of Cosmic Body as in that of collective soul as a function of the development of life, metaphor is being used to describe something not in fact known. But there is a further difference between these two concepts in regard to their type: collective soul might be empirically verified in the scientific laboratory, while anything to do with the future of Christ will not be verifiable until it happens. So that "Cosmic Body" is speculative description held in faith as a search-image, and should be clearly stated by Teilhard to be this.

Nevertheless, in *WTW*, p.37, Teilhard regarded it as reasonable if a description is desired for a speculative future which is a definite function of monad-beings with souls and bodies (souls as a function of bodies), to project the metaphor of body (=soul) on to this future thing. The Cosmic Body of Christ is similarly an experimental projection. Jesus Christ was a human person: the Biblical image for the corporate entity of his followers is the Body of Christ and for their future life (in some theology) the Mystical Body: so it seems reasonable to continue the displacement progression into the universe with "Cosmic" Body. In this case the Cosmic Body is the New-World-Matter being built by the Mystical Body.

If this was Teilhard's train of thought a further question raised is whether the displacement of "Body" as it occurs in Christian theology is valid at all, even in relation to the community of believers in Christ, and in Teilhard's case whether the double displacement of Cosmos and Centre (as well as Body) on to (the metaphor) Christ helps to interpret Jesus of Nazareth. Yet it is only by metaphor that Jesus can be interpreted ontologically at all; and since Revelation does use both "Body" and "cosmic" in relation to Him as Christ, Christian thought cannot oust the
metaphor or double metaphor at once. If the use of metaphor in Teilhard is rejected by theologians, much of theology itself will be vulnerable to similar criticism.

What has to be stated quite categorically is that the use of what was at the time an accepted scientific notion — Ether — as a metaphysical basis, followed by the displacement of the metaphor of centre on to this Ether, and then by the displacement of Christ into this Ether-centre — this process of mind is imaginative thought-experiment. But it is dream and poetry. The process cannot be called science at all for there can be no laboratory testing of such hypothesis. Much religion builds up its ideas in such imaginative metaphor-displacement and tested against the community experience of the Church, but it is still poetry. Yet the form of Teilhard's writing — the formal, rational layout and his periodic use of the word "logic" — suggest otherwise. It explains much of the so-called difficulty of Teilhard if he is seen to produce as assumptions in the essays what are to him "old" displacement-Gestalten. In the essays he give no thought to an explanation of how his concepts came about. In the UPN material Ether appeared long after Christ was the "centre" binding souls, and the Hidden Being was at least Christ (Christ-the-All) almost from the beginning. But this is not so in Vie Cosmique. The new concepts are put in a rationalised order which Teilhard's critics have correctly guessed form inadequate and indeed pseudo argumentation. From a poetic point of view, Teilhard would have no need to explain his images. But to the scientist a criticism of "collective soul" without a criticism of "cosmic Body" is scarcely acceptable practice by Teilhard, when the physical-biological concreteness of the new concepts is being emphasised as in Cosmic Life. The issue reappears in eg. the Introduction to the Phenomenon of Man with Teilhard's suggestion-assumption there that the language of centres, general evolution and convergence is science.

1. cf. Ephesians, ch.1.
2. op.cit. p.20ff.
3. The English translations of Teilhard unhappily exemplify this misunderstanding.
4. Since eg. Medawar did not have UPN to hand.
No wonder that empirical scientists have shied away from Teilhard when he assumes that such particular and personal Gestalten are paradigms in the international scientific community. They are not.

Such criticism follows this Thesis’ interpretation of Christ-Kosmos. Christ-Kosmos was existentially satisfying and "rationally" acceptable to the man Teilhard who needed this identity-fixing concept all his life. Produced by and for his five selves, it gave harmony to his system. His life-long commitment to it shows their satisfaction. But his attempts at formal logic only impress on the reader that the writer is writing poetically in personal Gestalten. The rhythm of the value-vectors is not the regular consideration of the technical paradigms of scientific or religious community.

The value-vector material is easily observed in the essay as well as in UPN. The essay shows various sources for Teilhard’s argument such as experience or need for personal wholeness or traditional religious concepts. Argument does not follow consideration of technical questions. So the "reasons" given have in fact the same origin as the Gestalten themselves, the five-selved Teilhard, as noted in UPN. Just as ideas are produced to meet the needs of himself, so the rationalisations of these ideas meet his own needs first and foremost, not those of professional members of the theological community. In other words, both Teilhard’s ideas and his reason-demonstrations in Vie Cosmique are existential syntheses and poetry, functions of his own private world and private needs, spin-offs from his five-selved system, which fulfil the individual needs of this personal system rather than meet the arguments of the outside world.

Nevertheless as man is organism in environment, his private worlds are seldom very private. In Teilhard’s case, no sooner had ideas taken root than one

1. cf. Figure XXVI.
of the value-vectors would produce material — or take information from the environment — which put in question the new idea. The feedback did occur.

Such feedback is to be seen in the **UPN** hints of heresy and blasphemy which show that Teilhard was conscious of himself in the particular environment of the Roman Church and Jesuit Order. After all he had internalised virtually all of their ideas and values, and even in *Cosmic Life* he hurried to re-orthodoxise his new Gestalt. Thus the movement of intellectual pilgrimage which had its watershed in the acceptance of the concept of evolution in 1911-2 and in the professional scientific work of 1912 continues now in **UPN** and the essays, but now not only as a personal pilgrimage. The criticisms of Church priests, Christians and even Pope in the **UPN**, and of some of these but especially of legal-moral-extrinsic-juridical theology in *Vie Cosmique* mark the beginnings of the "public ministry" of Teilhard in relation to his theological ideas.

This "public ministry" represents the formal challenge of his integrity-crisis. Teilhard was to send *Vie Cosmique* to Marguerite and to others; and he received their comments and criticisms, and tried to answer them by correcting his texts. But sending texts to Etudes and to the theologians among his friends meant entering the field of public debate; and because Teilhard's Self-Ego need for survival, truth and identity was so strong, criticism and danger only prompted more Gestaltten and more poetic rationalisation.1 As far as the Church was concerned, Teilhard was carrying out a complementary schismogenesis.2 His intellectual pilgrimage never ceased.

One reason for the Self-Ego determination was the very intensity of the commitment to Christ-Kosmos, which was commitment to the full identity of himself. **UPN**'s description of the gropings towards the "corporeal" Body of Christ, and

---

1. cf. **UPN** 1.44-44a
Cosmic Life's final, triumphant "Cosmic Body" (also in UPN) show that Teilhard's whole personality was flooding into this intellectual challenge. The Gestalt was a re-organisation of his inner being which shook him to the core, but gave him a life-long intellectual root.

The concept Christ-Kosmos was in other words a value-vector within Teilhard's conceptual, conscious belief-system from early 1916 onwards. It was a component in his central self-system. Further, it provided him with an actual experimental search-image because of its content as something growing in the world now and forever in the future. It was an experimental model with which to test existential reality around him (for signs, for instance, among world religions in the early thirties) as well as a root-concept in his personality such that if it was threatened, so was he in his identity. It was to Teilhard such a fruitful interpretation of experienced World-Life and so fruitful a personal search-image that to him it seemed that if theology generally did not hold it, theology was lacking in something of immense worth.

So it was that Teilhard tried to demonstrate Christ-Kosmos reality from within Science, to force Rome to change its theology.2

Such is the hypothesis of this Thesis based in the NTU-Naven theory-set. In the attempt to demonstrate this the history of the Christ-Kosmos concept will be sketched below. Its evolution runs through Universal Christ, Omega-Christ and Trans-Christ to the God of Evolution. It is suggested that they are all variations on the same theme. But other concepts also emerged to be value-vectors in Teilhard's mind-system which were functions also of this development of Christ-Kosmos and so have a necessary place in the story of this development. One such concept was

1. HIB
2. cf. the Introduction to the original French edition of Ph.M., including the Zanta letter. Also cf. Appendix A.
Creative Union.

To Creative Union therefore we shall now turn. In preparation for this it should be remembered that the à la façeur concepts are absent in Vie Cosmique: the latter's language of God as being Beginning, End and so on is traditional. After the Christ-Kosmos Gestalt there seems to have been an intense effort by the Religion value-vector to be fully represented in the concept and the essay; so that the sexual bases and such ideas as God "spawning" consciousnesses, and God as $C_N$ do not appear in Vie Cosmique.

Yet the rooting of supernatural life in Life and Universe, and the rejection of extrinsic and juridic theology did appear in the essay so that the à la façeur concept-cluster had not been superceded and such roots were soon to reappear after this essay and in more advanced form. In retrospect, once the Cosmic Body of Christ was seen to be developing within the universe and its evolution, the doctrine of the Fall and of Creation itself were in question as was that of the Parousia. In any event, historically, Teilhard could not stop now. He had his executive concept and to live with it and remain himself he had to return to the roots of the concept shown in UFN. Cosmic Life was hiding Teilhard’s ideas, or at least his commitments were not fully explained in it. It represented him but he had now to go on; he was not satisfied. He was a restive man.

Once Christ-Kosmos was Teilhard’s dominant belief-concept then the intellectual pilgrimage gathered momentum. Teilhard was not a man of abstract reason or logic, but through personal need and by Gestalt-leap as a function of five selves, he was able to reinterpret the major Christian doctrines in such a way as to remain himself. He could not do this technically as a professional. It was done poetically by an organism-in-environment whose needs produced concepts through the organ of thought from the systems of information and press in the process of experimental schizophrenia. Such concepts, because of their existential and
"future" content joined Christ-Kosmos to operate in a search-image, as one additional value-vector in his being. Creative Union was one of these; and in the feedback process it was also a demonstration of how Christ-Kosmos could be true, how He could be verily coming into being now.

Creative Union joined the a la faveur mechanism to the centre-sphere imagery to produce the physical-biological, concrete reality and mechanism for the change-evolution-development to Christ-the-All, Christ-Kosmos.
CHAPTER XVIII

CREATIVE UNION. 1

1. Introduction.

At this stage in the present Thesis the Originality, Identity and Methodology of Teilhard have been fixed. What follows is a sketch-demonstration of how the identity-fixing Christ-Kosmos concept developed by Teilhard under the impact of new pressures and metaphors; and in this process Teilhard's originality and methods will both be checked and lead to possible judgement as to whether his novel ideas are Religion, Science, both or none.

This sketch of the 1916-21 Teilhard will not use the UFN material in full. 2 The UFN pages continue to be similar in form and type to the passages quoted in previous chapters. So the method of the text will be to reproduce the images and Gestalten in chronological series as they appear in UFN without the earlier emphasis on the picture of value-vectors.

In this way the picture of a continuing active mind will be shown but without the difficulties introduced by the "noise" of his own paragraphs. This method is possible only because of these two things: first, the Executive Concept Christ-Kosmos remains the Identity's search-image, and what is written is to do with the integrity-crisis in which identity had to be re-accepted and re-bolstered in the continuous process which resulted in reworkings of the concept. Second, Teilhard's methods do not change, so it is not now necessary to consider in detail what led to

1. Donald Gray in The One and the Many, London, Burns and Oates, 1969, correctly emphasizes the importance of this concept: but Gray did not have the UFN material to hand, so knows little of its origins.
2. See Appendix C for a selection of quotations from UFN which give some background to the present chapter and to that on Universal-Christ-Omega.
his ideas. As before the Gestalton appear under stimulus and are not "argued" by preceding sentences. Thus a simplification of Teilhard's conceptual development can be made; and it is Creative Union which is the next in the Gestalt-series on the way to the Omega-Christ.

2. Creative Union as the formal beginning of unorthodoxy and as the conceptual solution to critical feedback concerning Cosmic Life.

At the end of August 1916, just after Vie Cosmique was written, the stimulus of an 'opposite' mind presented itself to Teilhard:— the adventurous but dogma-based theology of Valensin.

This was a crisis-point. Teilhard discovered that he believed essential Christianity to be outside of Dogma; and after this criticism of orthodox theology and of the 'norm' Church increased, and for the first time this criticism and the rejection of more usual theology were specifically linked to a new concept: "creative union" meant that there was no need for an "extrinsic mover".

The following passages illustrate the concept's meaning and the cutting-edge which it produced in regard to orthodoxy's Transformism, Metaphysics and Theology:

Dans mon étude sur le Néant de la Multiplicité, de la Multitude, il y a un point à éclaircir: c'est celui de la valeur ontologique de la multiplication. Mon plan est surtout conçu dans l'hypothèse d'une réduction continue des êtres par simplification et concentration.**

** Universal mouvement de Réduction (Multiplication des êtres ramenés à une condensation qui gagne de proche en proche)...
(côté pas de vraie multiplication.) (créatrice) (Et progrès est en réalité une réduction du Nombre)

Mais quand il s'agit des vivants, au moins, n'y-a-t-il pas une multiplication qui représente vraiment une accroissement d'êtres (ce qui n'empêchait pas du reste que la somme ainsi obtenue fût une puissance d'Unité supérieure, côté un "néant concret" relativement à cette Unité.

Pour ramener toute évolution à une réduction, il faudrait

1. UPN 1.44
2. UPN 3.37a, 38, 38a.
considérer la multiplication des ames elles-mêmes comme dues à une condensation successive d'une vie diffuse cosmique (alors l'apparition des monades vivantes suivrait la même loi que celle des atomes ou des cristaux ...)

La multiplication ne serait autre chose qu'une progression plus ou moins géométrique dans un mouvement de ségrégation. (UPN 3.36a)

Il y a dans ces considérations matière à une métaphysique (celle de la Multitude: les phases onthologiques: un multiplexe divergent, une forma cosmica convergente, une matière (somme des mouvements inorganisés) - une vie) - à une physique et une Biologie évolutive - à une morale - à une Mystique - à une Ascése ...

La consistance de l'Esprit, la formation de l'Esprit (par concentration du multiple), la transience entre esprit (unité, liaison non pas matérielle et résiduelle, mais in fieri, croissant avec la spiritualisation ...), - le rôle générateur de la Charité et la Pureté - le vrai sens de l'Union ... autant de points fondamentaux résolvant les grands problèmes du Devenir, du Morale, et de la Connaissance ... Traité déjà dans mon étude sur la Multitude. Mais à reprendre ...

(UPN 3.37)

Mon idée de 18 prend consistence. Il y a lieu de rédiger, dans mon Étude de théorie pure, comme une dissertation, la "philosophie du Multiple". La clef du Monde dans cette philosophie est donnée par cette vue que l'être progresse dans, et vers, une unification future.**

** L'Union Créatrice.

Cette vue est une conclusion d'expériences et d'essais multiples: elle vaut surtout parce qu'elle réussit ... Voilà comment on pourrait la développer, elle et ses conséquences:

1. La Loi de Multiple. Les degrés d'être. Esprit et Matière. - Exception apparent de la multiplication vitale. Tout naît par convergence. - La contingence à chaque Cercle entitéatif (cld. ma synthèse vraie, irréversible ...) Le déchet.

2. L'action de la connaissance.
   (La Transience est le fondament du Progrès et donc de la stabilité de l'être ... Elle sa somme croît comme une sorte d'Entropie ...)

3. L'existence du premier Provident (Théodicee)

4. L'illusion de la Matière consistante, de la Matière unissante, du Passé plus poétique et plus riche que l'avenir ... (L'amour)

5. La Morale et son effet morphologique - L'ascèse - la souffrance - Le Christ ...

(UPN 3.39a)
A Marguerite ...

"j'éprouve presque physiquement que Dieu me reprend et m'enserre de plus près, comme si le chemin disparaissait en avant et les hommes, à côté, s'évanouissaient dans leur impaisance, Dieu seul étant devant et autour, s'épaississant à mesure qu'on avance ..."

Le vrai intérêt de la vie n'est pas dans la découverte et le savoir - mais dans la réalisation ... Je voudrais arriver à des vues me montrant Dieu aussi présent que possible - Dieu envahissant et transformant tout physiquement ... J'aimerais à faire passer en Dieu toute consistence et tout transience cosmique. Aucune "clé" du monde, sans doute, ne pourra me permettre d'aller plus loin dans ce sens que l'idée de l'Union créatrice". (UPN 3,43a)

In such unconscious and often open criticism of orthodox ideas Teilhard is continuing the main lines of UPN 1,1-44. Teilhard had earlier rejected extrinsicism. Now he will criticise juridical theology and the orthodox notion of supernatural. In opposition to extrinsicism the Church must adapt its dogmas as time passes 1: for instance Revelation is not to be set the crystallised world 2 of the "fixist". Dogma is often "a priori", "extra-réal" and to do with disciplin ary rules, and as such it is relative 3: indeed the Church's views are often a priori deduction - "logicism" - as for instance in the cases of divorce, family planning and women in the priesthood. 4 In the "Evolution" of dogma "legal" terms are now "caduce" 5, and so are the "juridic" and "Exterior" theology that went with them. 6 Such freedom with Teilhard takes a scholastic versus Molinist position 7, but in UPN 3,25 he rejects the scholastic position on soul and spirit, in UPN 3,38 that on "becoming", and in UPN 3,47, 4,18 and 2219 that of a metaphysics of "prime matter". Overall what happened was that the analogy of the biological idea of Transformism being made (by others) into an evolutionary philosophy, Teilhard

1. UPN 1.75
2. UPN 3.28,28a.
3. UPN 1.35a.
4. UPN 3.41,35a.
5. UPN 3.35a.
6. UPN 4.7
7. UPN 1.66b,69.
produced a philosophy-metaphysics from his "creative union" "mystique" which was metaphor-displacement-Gestalt: and the result was that all his unconscious or semi-conscious presses concerning the inadequacies of old dogma, narrow religionists and de-rooted religion were given an intellectual and academic reason for their existence (that other views are inadequate metaphysics), and an emotionally and intellectually satisfying "solution" (by means of a new metaphysics).

This is to say that the "hypothesis" of creative union gave ontological value to chastity-renouncement-charity (his Rel. V-V). But it also was able to fulfill Teilhard's pantheist-discipleship beliefs and needs (Self-Ego, Life, Rel. V-Vs). It gave absolute value to the world (S-S, Life) and made extrinsecism of Kosmos/God "doubly repugnant" (Sc., Life). It removed the extrinsic concept of "surnaturel" to make way for the "sur"-natural, the "supplanting" (sur-planting) of the natural world-end by Christ, (Self-Ego, Life, S-S, Sc., Rel.). It replaced the "extrinsic Mover" with a Living God, (the "Presence of a great Reality"), (Sc. S-S, Rel.), so that Revelation was used as fully as it would be if used by a Fundamentalist (Rel.), while Christ was nevertheless made "integral" and "integrated" in the transformist world (Sc. Rel.).

Finally the hypothesis worked to replace current theology with reinterpretations of doctrines such as those of Creation (including Angels and Paradise), Transcendence, Grace, Two Worlds, Spirit, Resurrection, the Hypostatic Union, the Fall and Redemption, and the Parousia.
Such reinterpretation emphasises the Religion commitment, the Sense-Sensitivity processes, the Self-Ego survival needs and the Scientific and Life realities which Teilhard experienced, needed and worked with in the scientific and life laboratories.

In all the above cases, the basis of the argument is traceable to the notion of 'creative union'. So that this Gestalt is the key to many areas of Teilhard, both concerning the more original ideas and concerning his criticisms of the norm thought of his day.

As will be expected from the discussion of UPN 1.1-44 and from Part One, the mental environment of the years which followed the finding of this new Creative Union mystique-metaphysic was not to be orthodox. There were traditional thinkers among Teilhard's friends, and there is no reason to suppose any non-Christian life or practice in Teilhard during this time: his daily routines no doubt continued as per usual in the trenches. But unorthodox influences through books at least were now to abound.1 Newman and Noël were Christians. But the first glimpse of creative union came with Balzac, and its first specific mention took place within one page of jottings about H.G. Wells' *The First Men on the Moon.*

The list of eccentric or non-Roman influences and stimuli from there on is long. It includes Sully-Prudhomme, Balzac, Maeterlinck, William James, Emerson, Poe, Wells again, Benson, Kipling, Schuré and Barbusse. It is a mixture of poets, pantheists and ideologists, many of whom were on or hovering near the Index at the time. Though Wells and Barbusse seem to have pressed Teilhard to the final one-universe Christ-Omega-God, James, Emerson, Poe and Maeterlinck were with Wells in reinforcing and reorganizing Teilhard's thoughts during the two years leading to

---

1. *ie. UPN* 3.5
the concept.

So it may be said that without a reduction of intensity in the Religion value-vector there was a levelling-up in intensity of the Life and Science selves by means of accelerated information-gathering which occurred in regard to the actual concepts or notions inherent in the paradigms of Science and of the Pantheists. Conceptually as well as emotionally Teilhard by the end of 1919 was needing and using Wells as much as Thomas, and James as much as the Pope. Thus substantiates the content of the paragraph omitted from *The Future of Man.*

By the end of 1919 the five value-vectors were of equal intensity in terms of the value given to the concepts, paradigms and intellectual content of each community needed, as well as in terms of emotional value. The five value-vectors themselves were equally dominant in Teilhard's personality emotionally and conceptually by December 1919, so that the processes of displacement and mutual control of metaphor and of ideas continued even more freely. The whole movement of thought in Teilhard - his "method" and "turn of spirit" - is in fact aptly summed up by himself in *UN* 1.71a. He notes that when he meets something new he first "flees" from it and then adopts it into his "Weltanschauung". In other words he values the "harmonization of facts" rather than the "facts themselves"; and he accepts that this is presumptuous and dangerous.

This perhaps explains how Teilhard is so clear that "creative Union" is an "hypothesis", an experimental concept which at least is "pratique" though philosophically questionable; and how he can separate scientific, ontological and experimental views so easily. Teilhard is now well aware of the different elements in his thought and Self, of the emotional need which presses him to think,

1. cf. the paragraph omitted by Du Seuil-Collins which is quoted in the *Introduction* to this *Thesis*.
2. *UN* 4.60a.
and even of the dangers of this pressure.

This awareness brings the student of Teilhard back to an appreciation of Teilhard's adult self-consciousness, or (if one will) to some idea of Transcendental Self: his self-consciousness, commitment to his Gestalten-series and need for self-determination was considerable. His reality-testing Self-Ego drove him to see Christianity outside of dogma and Church\(^1\) in spite of his continuing commitment to priesthood, Order and Church:\(^2\) to be "transformist" and "pragmatist" as well as to seek absoluteness and Christ:\(^3\) and to want Poetry and Ideal with and within the science-based "real" human future.\(^4\) Teilhard appeared to see existential, religious, poetic, ontological and scientific contents all at the same time, and he then had to act to "harmonize" them. This 'diverger' freedom of personality which is such a mark of his life must have been — in retrospect — a function not only of five selves which had wide ranges of need-interest, but of the production of new and harmonizing concepts which themselves were able to maintain his ability for transcendent thought, yet which, being related specifically to his identity-need, helped by elucidating the search-image to keep intact this same Transcendental Self.

In some such symbolic description Teilhard and his ideas remain to the reader non-reduced, and the functional significance of "creative union" comes into view as such linking of the needs of five selves to the Self's need for the executive search-image is thought of as producing feedback to keep the Self intact.

3. **The formation of the concept and the growth of metaphor.**

It was noted above that in UPN 1.10a-11 Balzac's "cosmic sexual energy" was made to give a biological basis to the concept of segregation and indeed formation of a new plane, order, degree or stage by the notion of \(\text{A la faveur, \ A l'occasion,}\)

---

1. UPN 1.44, 3.17.
2. UPN 1.45, 3.28b.
3. UPN 1.60, 69, 69a, 4.27a, 5.53a, 54.
4. UPN 3.37a.
À la base and À travers.¹

At the time a diagram symbolized what Teilhard meant (cf. 1.264). Later, in UPN 1.49:

Thought grows à l'occasion of feeling.

This did not have metaphysical undertones at the time. It was a physical-biological concept. The "C_N" God or Body of Christ, indeed Christ-Kosmos and the sur-natural were produced and seen to come into formation À travers the series of steps which were made, À base de the process-stage below. This was how segregation in the cosmos was first pictured.

The formal metaphysical tones of "centre" and "sphere", which produced Our Lord the centre, the Leibnitzian monadic centre and the concept of the transcendent future, of "ulterior survival" in a superior Unity in the Divine World's Centre did not appear in UPN 1.1-44, though they were there in embryo in UPN 1.14.

Instead the physical-biological ideas continued, the ideas of "consistency" and "objectivity of the future", of stages and hierarchies and of organisms. These were the original À la faveur-based notions and they remained to Teilhard in UPN 1.1-44 scientific concepts - comparable to those found in biology textbooks today,² but discernable as hidden metaphysics by such as Crick or Medawar.³

All this changes in UPN 1.54ff. Reiteration of the À la faveur idea had been taking place in UPN 1.46-50. Virginity had been seen as an example of development from a physical-biological base and this was virginity's justification. Indeed the world appears as and to develop by the À la faveur "natural law": the "buds" of biological evolution are "parasitic" and spirit is parasitic. Life

¹ cf. also UPN 1.50b.
³ op.cit.
itself is "artificial".\(^1\)

This idea of "à la faveur"-based artificiality now becomes central: "What is ontological becoming?" Teilhard asks. In response to his own question Teilhard almost at once produces his organisation/consciousness law to describe what happens.\(^2\) To this immediately is added the Leibnitzian-pantheist law of monadic recurrence,\(^3\) soon to be joined by the "expansion" metaphor which helps to describe creation.\(^4\)

But these ideas are not enough: Teilhard wants something more. He is now reading H.G. Wells and is following Wells in \textit{Dr. Moreau} in the desire for a "great law of matter".\(^5\) Teilhard in wanting a solution to the phenomenon of transformism has to find an ontological reason for creation and the syntheses into new things.\(^6\) Under pressure from Religious and Mystic-Pantheist selves, Teilhard has to expand the scientific question into the Metaphysical one of ultimate concern, and to solve this all his selves must have free play, as will appear below. All his life Teilhard was clear that his solution to this metaphysical problem was Metaphysical.

The solution which he found to the "great law of matter", though not fully expressed till after UPN 3.25a, was the "mystique" and "metaphysique" of Creative Union, which used the metaphors of circle, sphere and cone, but still its roots were in the physical-biological concept of à la base.

Previous to the formulation of the question in UPN 1.60, "creative union" had appeared in embryo in more than one form. The original Balzac-stimulus of UPN 1.10a resulted in the idea of sexual union actually producing "new" energy, with the accompanying diagram:-

\(^1\) UPN 1.54.
\(^2\) UPN 1.55.
\(^3\) UPN 1.55a.
\(^4\) UPN 1.57, cf. also UPN 1.59a concerning the "wave" metaphor.
\(^5\) UPN 1.60, nb. possibly Medawar's attack on Teilhard concerning the "universal law" of Evolution was a veiled attack on Wells as well as Julian Huxley.
\(^6\) UPN 1.61.
The Gestalt of Creative Union may therefore be seen as originating from a Balzacian interpretation of sexual phenomena. But nothing more is heard of this until UPN 1.66 where sexual love is taken to "liberate energies".

In the meantime other functional predecessors had appeared. The religious idea of "sacred union" in UPN 1.45 had picked up "excentration" on to a higher object (UPN 1.14a). The "convergence through statistical probability" of UPN 1.11a had reappeared in UPN 1.51. The ideas of unification, union and assimilation had appeared in close proximity to the analogy of soma and germen, and to the Mass as an analogy of creation. Further, "convergence" was thought to be the "solution" to the stated problem in UPN 1.60, and this later became defined as what happened in monadic recurrence and the concentration of the Multiple.

In other words, metaphors were being introduced which were affecting Teilhard's overall views.

These changes become specific in UPN 1.59a. There, "influx" is reinterpreted to be "the development of energy", so that an idea from extrinsic theology is replaced by one which comes from a modern world-view and which provides a link to those of monadic metaphysics and which leads quickly to a new concept, the new theological concept of God forming things through the play of group actions. This latter concept appeared on the same day (4 Aug. 1916) on which "extrinsecism" was defined as "the tendency to decide theologically on "tout le réel"", so that the rejection of the old was specifically a function of the production of the new concept.

1. i.e. union with Christ. UPN 1.56a-58.
2. UPN 1.63.
From now on "creation" was viewed through the three methods of monadic, à la faveur and liberation-by-union formation.¹ The à la faveur series came to be described as "lateral" and "tangential" development so as to symbolize transformation over time and upwards. But the creation part of this process was by the liberation-by-union physical methods, so that the "axial-energies", which with the "lateral" "create divinely" and bring about "assimilation to the real, physical Cosmic Body", are seen to be produced by the law of recurrence of monadic centres as these are in process of being released. Thus it is that the later "radial" and "tangential" energies are without a doubt of metaphysical, religious, metaphorical and Gestalt origin, so that Medawar was correct and the "physical energy" of the first edition of The Phenomenon of Man was by no means a misprint.²

In the UFN context, nevertheless (see Appendix C), the world-processes were undoubtedly being pictured by Teilhard from within the ideas of biology as he then knew it: that is from within Leibnitz and Mercier, Bergson, Wells, Maeterlinck and the Transformist pantheist evolutionarists. His Science Self demanded this, while at the same time his commitment to experience-Life as he knew it, to the "team", experience of war, to his sexuality and to Balzac led to the same Gestalt as that of biological synthesis and of the doctrine of the Mass. Teilhard could see the processes around him through the eyes of his five selves. He could see from his own experience the processes leading to the phenomenon of consciousness. He could see the religious and "more solid" "extra-human End" of the Body of Christ which he needed: he could see all this, which seemed not to press for the positing of an Intrusive Divinity to carry out Creation. Teilhard could retain God's transcendence by accepting the contingency of Man³ and the concept of Absolute and the union of the

1. UFN 1.66-71a.
3. UFN 2.1.
lower with the higher sphere. 1 His Religious Self indeed continued to rely fundamentally on Revelation and its concept-cluster. Yet in spite of contemplation of the Kosmos as being created through successive injections 2 and as being transformed "substantially" by grace, 3 such thoughts, though acting as theological controls, did not produce the answers which Teilhard was seeking to his ontological question. It was above all these answers which must conform to the Christ-Kosmos Gestalten-series.

So now it was the scientific language of "grafting", "condensation", "metamorphosis", "organism" and "discontinuity" which continued to demand his attention. 4 The natural joins the supernatural through the à la faveur axis of "segregation", rupture and discontinuity to form the "universal" "One". 5 Sexual union is the one palpable opportunity (known to man himself) for the monad to penetrate itself. 6 The "Total organism" comes through the segregation, de-segregation and aggregation of matter. 7 Thus the ontological question of "how is becoming" is being tackled by Teilhard through his Scientific, Sense-Sensitivity and Life value-vectors just as much as through his Religious value-vector: so that in UPN 3.0ff, in the meeting with and stimulation by ideas such as those of Wells, it is the current of his true identity which hurries him along - Dogma is of no use to him by itself.

Chronologically, UPN 3.23a shows Wells pressing Teilhard existentially in a new direction:— from Wells there emerged in Teilhard the concept of a need for a common Ideal. 8 This was one of Wells' most consistent themes, and one which was

---

1. UPN 3.10a.
2. UPN 3.11a.
3. UPN 3.17a.
4. UPN 3.1, 3, 1, 17, 23.
5. UPN 3.14a.
6. UPN 3.13b, 14a.
7. UPN 3.23.
8. UPN 3.23a.
to reappear in Teilhard during the final formation of the Omega Concept which took place during another reading of Wells.\textsuperscript{1} Here in February 1917 the idea may perhaps have come from some earlier reading of Wells, that of Dr. Moreau or some other non-documented book.\textsuperscript{2} But the need for an "axis" for human effort, and for a natural "issue" to it and to evolution, was unconsciously (at any rate) pre-figured in the pre-Cosmic-Life passages of such as UPN 1.10, 35.

Now, anyway, the concept of "new action" is fed by the new Gestalt that charity and union are "fecund".\textsuperscript{3} Teilhard suddenly feels that matter and the universe have a "soif d'union", that monad plurality is "new" matter, that he himself should be and could be "more Man", that Man is the tip of a "cone" of organic plurality, the sum of a series of pre-existent psychisms perhaps analogous to the Great Lunar.\textsuperscript{4} Teilhard now feels that the scholastics and spiritualists (Idealists) are incorrect in thinking that the human soul is not a function of animal psychic development and of, eventually, the atom.

With many of the above thoughts Teilhard is returning to earlier ideas, as with his demand for Christian "salvation" to be "palpable" in a "natural form", in a "convergence upon Jesus": and he has now a metaphysical mechanics with which to explain his idea of "new" and "second" Matter which appeared in the early pages of UPN. But in UPN 3.25b Teilhard makes the following diagram to suggest the origins of Man:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Matière} \to \text{plurality organique. Homme} = D
\end{align*}
\]

\textbf{References:}
1. \textit{UPN} 1.2119
2. cf. \textit{UPN} 1.24a and 1.64a.
4. From \textit{La Grande Monade} in \textit{Écrits} it is clear that Teilhard was also reading Wells' \textit{The First Men on the Moon}.\textit{.}
and it was after this that the first clear leap to the concept of creative union was taken. For Teilhard now the "union of the multiple" made sense of the development of matter to Man; and, further, the hypothesis was consistent with Leibnitz' "pan-psychism", for it was to the latter scheme that Teilhard had committed himself firmly in UPN 3.24a. There was now a metaphysical idea which made sense of the Christ-Kosmos Gestalt and of the experience and knowledge of his own five selves. The Gestalt both served to preserve and develop his identity. It fulfilled the integrity of Teilhard.

4. The result of this formal conceptual statement: ontological feedback.

What follows after this conceptualisation in UPN is the gathering of data to support the creative union hypothesis, the series of suggestions which resulted from this hypothesis, its change into a conscious metaphysic after UPN 3.47 and the ontological and theological problems which it brought in its train, for instance in UPN 4.9b.

As is suggested by UPN 1.44 and by the lead-up to the concept (ie. UPN 1.44-3.24a), there was no consistent logical pattern in the development of Creative Union, except that suggested by the TGTA-Naven model with its ideas of need for a search-image and existential synthesis with which to satisfy the selves, to respond to the stimuli received from outside, mainly of pantheist reading, and to meet the religious controls of friends.

In UPN 3.26b one way in which the concept was worked out is seen to begin. The soul is a function of "psychic convergence", of lower monadic centres. This idea uses the circle metaphor, the idea of biological synthesis and creative union. It also incorporates the idea of support from the "other thing", the other layer-foyer, which again comes from a metaphysical use of the circle concept as per

1. According to Eriksonian theory.
but now is supplemented by the biological basis of  

disable  

change

and axis.

In other words, the circle metaphor and its metaphysical connotation is now found in conjunction with biological ideas which also have metaphysical undertones. So the concept of creative union has unconscious metaphysical foundations from the beginning, though as a consciously-held metaphysical concept it did not appear until UPN 3.36a, 37.

Two more uses of the circle metaphor occur in UPN 3.28a. First in the word "cyclic": in Matter, Christ is the radioactive "disquiet", who gives out the original properties of Matter which are seen in Mankind in general to be just "vestiges": Christ shoots out "cyclic irradiation". Second, there is the "pole" of love; and there is the union of love of the Person and the Totality in Notre Seigneur - and so in Him the mystique of love of the Person and the World.

In this second example the metaphor is displaced to suggest alternative possibility: the centre Jesus being Person and All and loving Person and All, the possibility has arisen for Man to live loving Person and World. So also, then, is the All One and the Some Thing Universal, when they are Notre Seigneur, Our Lord; so man's loving of the exciting Object is therefore the making of "cosmic love".

This displacement occurred at the time that the circle metaphor was being developed by that of the cone. The 'cone' image first appeared in UPN 3.25a, and after this the joining of the circle metaphor with the  

disable  

concept is firmly entrenched in Teilhard's mind so that the solidity of the cone was now being

---

2. In the sense that Teilhard's idea goes 'beyond' what is strictly demonstrated in Physics, Biology, etc.
3. UPN 3.30.
4. UPN 3.29.
5. This may reflect the Goethe of UPN 1.10a. But it may go back to the Marshal type of language of 1908-13 in Brémond, op. cit.
displaced into the realities of duration. This is suggested by Teilhard's discussion now on a great existential reality, that of chastity. To him now, the image behind chastity as convergence and confluence towards a higher plane is that of a cone. Both religion and life are solid to Teilhard; so here the outer circles are working upwards to a centre through biological duration-reality, the milieu Divin is developable and the inferior circles are "assimilated" to the superior. Thus the All is reached _à travers_ the adhesion, "union" and "condensation" of the "Divine"; and God is now "Archi-matter, life, energy", and "Becoming" is the development from the Multiple through Brownian motion to "centred" and "conscious" organisation.

There follows growing commitment to the cone metaphor, and in this Teilhard's value-vectors are all in evidence. His Self-Ego has found a new mystique and a concept of priesthood which satisfies him: his _S-S_ is reality-testing, criticising the church world, feeling his sexuality and finding images and displacing them: his Life value-vector demands the All, his Religion shows him God "working" and "creating" and "omni-present", and his Science value-vector brings him metaphors of radioactivity, crystallization, Brownian movement and the mathematics of statistical convergence, circles and accumulation. All this is filling out the cone metaphor in concrete terms.

In _UPN_ 3.34 another scientific concept appears, that of Energy. The "circle" of "Energy" starts the union movement, reaches the circle of humanity and finally the Person. The Universe itself (that is, Energy) is the "intermediary of union". Spirit is a function of spirit now through the "bond" of "becoming" and not through

---

1. _UPN_ 3.30b, 30, 32.
2. _UPN_ 3.27a.
3. _UPN_ 3.28, 28a, 29.
4. _UPN_ 3.29a.
5. _UPN_ 3.30, 32, 33a.
6. _UPN_ 3.35a.
being a "residue" from "matter." In other words, and in a metaphor-bearing
Gestalt, the concrete "Neant" has within it the "power of concentration", the
"elements" of "being" have "aptitude for union", and all movement is through union
of these elements, through their fitness. 

At this Teilhard is formally and consciously leaving behind the metaphysics
of "prime matter". He now calls on a new "Law of the Multiple", in which the
essence of the Multiple is its aptitude for union, in which the fundamental
property of monads - "transience" - is seen as a trace of this aptitude for union,
and in which more being equals more union, for all is born through "convergence".
By this Law superior degrees of Being are born in the "womb" of the lower degrees
by virtue of co-operation and bending, by the workings of "large numbers", and
through the "morphogenetic" action of the "punctiform" and radioactive Christ who is
the "centre" also of "attraction" (as is God).

So here an ontology of Multiplication, a Law of the Multiple is taking over
as the practical, experimental metaphysic of Creation. This includes a change
in the "properties" of elemental matter to "positive transience" and the positive
valuation of the un-united Neant; and to this is added (by displacement) the image
of probabilities being convergence. This then is made to dovetail into the meta-
phor of centre, when the universe is said to be an "infinitely diffuse surface" of
a sphere which converges to the centre of confluence and attraction, God. In
this image, the "rays" become more luminous the nearer they get to the "real
Centre " of attraction "en avant" (which is formally opposed to Bergson's

1. UPN 3.37.
2. UPN 3.38a.
3. UPN 3.36, 39a, 47.
4. UPN 3.33b, 36a, 45.
5. UPN 3.36a.
6. UPN 3.40a, 46a.
7. UPN 3.44, 45b.
8. UPN 3.45.
vis-à-tergo), and this is now seen to be a "transcendent" Centre, the metaphor for which is now the cone, and the "consistence" of which is physical, organic and "infallible" with the "finality" of the "future", (see Appendix C).

Finally, even with such process-metaphysic of Multiple and the other metaphors, there comes (to confound the reader who does not see the Religion value-vector) talk of the "intrusion of the Other" (just before Teilhard's rejection of the "extrinsic Mover"), the radical contingency of the Multiple and its union and of Spirit (which point to Divine Providence), and the concept of Providential Finality. The memory-store of Religion puts in Teilhard's need of God to keep the tension and to prevent a premature solution.

Thus in this set of images and ideas there is S-S displacement and Gestalt, the Science self's attempts at Science, Religious concepts from Revelation and Tradition and an attempt at physical concreteness of thought which mirrors Teilhard's Self-Ego and his Life value-vector.

In other words, Creative Union is out-and-out existential synthesis and Gestalt in its formation as a concept, logical only at first as a product to meet Teilhard's needs which were especially the concepts and metaphors already living in his head. But as soon as it became formalised and a dominant value-vector, the system had to be reorganised, reorientated so as to lay the concept's foundations more correctly in formal fashion.

5. Results of this Ontological Feedback: the formal conceptualisation of the concreteness of Spirit.

The movement from experience to ontology had included logical links as well as those of metaphor displacement and association, so it was not a matter just of

1. UPN 3.46a.
2. UPN 3.37a.
3. UPN 3.38a.
5. UPN 3.47a.
chance spin-off. The ontological value of Multiple and Multiplication\(^1\) was to do with monad-theory. If souls are regarded as functions of successive (circle- and science metaphor) condensations of diffuse cosmic matter, creation is a function of the number of possible centres, and so of the Multitude of the Néant – which makes each "circle" of Creation contingent, and the spirituality (spirit-content) of the Cosmos a function of the number of unities at any given layer.\(^2\)

Again, therefore, God cannot be "realised" all alone;\(^3\) the priority of the Spirit is not historical but ontological,\(^4\) and Creation must start on\(^5\) from a Transcendent Source. Indeed the Multiple Néant is needed by God in order for Him to create.\(^6\) Spirit is therefore a function of number and of maximum instability (which shows the contingency of the multiple) as well as of complexity\(^7\) and the law of Recurrence. Further, spirit is always "en avant", that is, post-union and post-multiple, so that it is the future which is more "absolute" than the past and more consistent.\(^8\) Spirit indeed is the "most absolute" thing in the Universe.\(^9\)

Over time therefore and consciously Teilhard in UPN moved from the idea of "plural necessity"\(^10\) to study of union creatrice,\(^11\) to the ontological value of multiplication,\(^12\) to a Metaphysics of the Multitude converging,\(^13\) to the law of the Multiple and a Philosophy of the Multiple,\(^14\) to the hypothesis of Creative Union,\(^15\) to the Law of Evolution posited as the synthesis of a pre-existent Multitude, which law equals the law of the genesis of the Spirit\(^16\) and this movement grew all the while conceptual fruit. The "prime matter" metaphysics is no longer needed,\(^17\) for "true matter" is now "the fecund, the active". The true Matter for Teilhard now is the Spirit.\(^18\)

---

1. UPN 3.36a, cf. 3.25a.
2. UPN 3.37
3. UPN 3.33b.
4. UPN 3.41a.
5. UPN 3.44a.
6. UPN 3.45a.
7. UPN 3.46-7.
8. UPN 3.39, 45b.
9. UPN 3.46.
10. UPN 3.22.
12. UPN 3.36a.
13. UPN 3.37.
15. UPN 3.48.
16. UPN 3.46.
17. UPN 3.47.
18. UPN 3.47a.
From this point on in UPN the metaphysics of Creative Union becomes productive of the new concepts later known as Universal-Christ and Omega; and it from time to time provides questions and anomalies, for instance, what was before the Multiple, and how is Creative Union different from Newtonian attraction? But once Man had been seen as crown of a "cone", and the Kosmos as a multitude of elements in a "cone of attraction" - via creative union - the centrality of the concept of creative union in the continuing Teilhard was assured. The concept brought together the metaphors of circle, sphere, cone and the à la faveur parasitic-biological development of a series of stages and planes. It gave an intellectual basis to his earlier and more spontaneous intuitions, so fulfilling his Self-Ego's Integrity-crisis needs. Further, and perhaps as important, the mathematical and diagrammatic possibilities of the "cone" metaphor were to provide endless food for Teilhard's concretizing thought, even perhaps to the extent of producing mischief in the sense of Omega's potential reification by virtue of the image's hold on the visual perception of the man, especially the "point" of the cone. The cone is a very concrete image.

In other words, what started off in the Self-Ego's existential reality as hypothesis and fruitful experimental concept, may have become too uncritically a Metaphysic. UPN 3.38a, 44a and 45a have already suggested that this was going to happen. Nevertheless, the transcendent circle metaphor remained as the "real Centre of attraction" (if not as the "Source"); and since it was still there at the end of Teilhard's life, the strength of the Religion value-vector with its orthodox beginnings and commitments is symbolized in it. The Thomist circle kept

1. UPN 4.22.
2. UPN 3.25a.
3. UPN 3.45b. In fact UPN 1.73 speaks of human/church development as a 'cone' with K below and θ on top: θ. No doubt this figure aided the unconscious selection of the cone as his main image later: but e.g. UPN 3.23 still does not use it. The cone received its force and crown by means of the mutual suggestiveness of the idea of creative union and the metaphor.
4. Much of Teilhard's present-day notoriety is traceable to misunderstanding of the metaphorical nature of cone-based concepts such as "convergence".
5. UPN 3.40a, 46a, 48.
6. UPN 3.46a.
the \textit{à la faveur} cone prettily in place, and so did the \textit{à la base} organism.

Teilhard was later to say that it would not matter too much to him if his idea of "Creative Union" were dropped from his thinking. This might suggest that the image does remain an image. But it must not be forgotten that originally Teilhard's concepts of "convergence" and God "ahead" (as well as Omega and the metaphor of cone) came from this concept. Therefore, unless Teilhard can prove Convergence by other methods than those of the cone image and the Creative Union Gestalt – and he did try to do just this in his Geology and in the writings of 1940-55 especially – he cannot not use this Creative Union image. To do so would mean treating 'convergence' and 'Omega' as Forms just as arbitrary as those rejected by him in UPN 3.44, 44a and 45a concerning traditional Creation, Angels, Paradise and Original Sin. But if Creative Union is seen as existential synthesis through displaced metaphor, Omega remains still hypothesis within existential concept-formation. It therefore retains the usefulness which arbitrary choice would have removed from it. It appears on the Litany found on Teilhard's table after his death. Spirit can only be a more-real-Reality and a greater 'physicity' than Matter by some such leap of faith as that of Creative Union; and at the end of the day even Complexity/Consciousness always needed the ontology of union.\footnote{1}.

Taking Teilhard's Creative Union concept as such existential synthesis and as a development from different sources and over time, we may note its conscious appearance in the essay Creative Union and some of its strands in Struggle Against the Multitude. The circle metaphor is especially apparent in Milieu Mystique. But as appeared in the comparison of Vie Cosmique with UPN 1,1-44 above, the composed essay Creative Union adds little of substance to UPN. The subject-matter is not approached with any more 'logic' than in UPN, even though the circuit-processes are

\footnote{1. see final chapter.}
more formalized, as is evidenced in the re-worked plans for the essay.

The new concept of Creative Union had therefore come as a Gestalt-synthesis just as Christ-Kosmos, and was held firm and given demonstration by means of similar feedback. Each new concept gained stimulus and weapon from the perspective of its new and reorganising position in Teilhard's thought.

So again the 'logical' pattern in his thought-development is from Gestalt to Gestalt, in this case from Christ-Kosmos to Creative Union. It is the interplay of these two value-vectors (as they now are) which leads to the further - and virtually final - Gestalt in Teilhard, that of the Universal-Christ who is Omega and (later) the God-of-Evolution. This interplay is not unaided by outside stimuli. But the Universal-Christ is a Gestalt to which Creative Union would lead almost by itself, which helps to suggest that it was produced to build up Christ-Kosmos further.

This new concept of Universal-Christ was to be so intensely held by Teilhard that it may be viewed as the final executive concept for his personality and the solution to his Integrity-Crisis. It also became the specific object and search-image of his scientific thought and research for the rest of his life. Further, it led to his most public troubles for it was the climax of the argument in the Phenomenon of Man, the Achilles heel where Medawar saw Jack being saved.

From time to time Teilhard remembered the concept's origins and its tentativeness. But he seems usually to have kept it as his hidden and hopeful aim in his scientific work, and when he forgot its hypothetical nature, it became unguarded extrapolation. If the TGTA-Naven basis to its development is accepted, such extrapolation and reification should not occur, for Universal-Christ unifies

Veilhard's life and thought before and after its appearance, while as value-vector it may sometimes be over-dominant in Teilhard's mind-system.

But to relativize Teilhard thus is not to reduce him or his ideas. It simply pushes the mystery of personal discovery one step further back, from magic to mind, for Teilhard took what was his own mind's model and with this touched a multitude of men. After all, if the scientist has no faith-commitment to his hypothesis, will he do justice to it? Teilhard at least had the courage of his convictions, and this in the laboratory of his everyday life, both with and in his model.

Nevertheless as his life and convictions sweep him along, Teilhard does not stay with criticism. The Blondel-Teilhard letters1 show Teilhard meeting this only by restatement and reiteration of the biological-physicity of his Christ-Kosmos concept. "He was no technical theologian" (Cuanot).

As we return to the executive-concept it should be noted that whether Teilhard thought that he could do without Creative Union or not, it was not only this concept which depended on the organic, centre-sphere and cone metaphors for its content. It was only one of the group of ideas which helped him to make sense of and peace with his executive concept Gestalt: the others like à la faveur were equally needed, no less and no more. But Creative Union was his attempt at specific Metaphysics, just as Complexity-Consciousness would be his attempt at specific biology-physics, though in the latter case he did not recognise its origins.

Such concepts were in other words needed for, but did not exhaust the content of the search-image. They were pointers but not the point. They underlined his theological unorthodoxy, but did not refute his orthodoxy. In favourite

expressions of Teilhard himself, they were signposts to others and landmarks which revealed his own development. His pilgrimage itself and his Destiny were not to do with these, but with Christ-Kosmos.

Overall therefore the picture is of Creative Union as the result of need for Christ-Kosmos to be formally explained and accepted, but the elucidation of which produced new ideas which in turn were fed back into further clarification of Christ-Kosmos. Mingled in the idea of Creative Union were metaphors of sexual union, convergence, cone, monadic concentration, centre/sphere relationship, à la base stages and consciousness as a function of organisational complication. The feedback was mainly that of metaphor, and so now it would hardly be surprising if such a list of new conceptual commitments did not lead to Christ-Kosmos in new form because of such new metaphors. To this we now turn.
CHAPTER XIX

THE UNIVERSAL-CHRIST AND OMEGA.

In the previous chapter it was seen how Creative Union was the Gestalt-product of stimuli which pressed Teilhard to ask the question, How does God create? and which in answer also provided Teilhard with a justifying concept for his actual way of life; it reinforced his value-vectors. But as well as being a function of these selves and of the Christ-Kosmos Gestalt which helped to frame the question, Creative Union also acted as feedback on this concept and, by the metaphor of cone which was associated with Creative Union, over time reinterpreted and developed Christ-Kosmos.

It is this story which follows.

In overall perspective an uneventful development of the Christ-Kosmos concept of UPN 1.1-44 was allowed to continue uninterrupted until UPN 3.17a which was when the concept of Creative Union appeared and was used as a conceptual tool. This was at the time when Teilhard was reading H.G. Wells again. Then, further changes occurred at UPN 4.6a after which Teilhard reads Maeterlinck, Poe, Emerson, Benson, James (W.), Schuré, a Thomist Noël (S.J.) and then Wells again. The 'final' changes took place after more reading, again of Wells in the continuation of UPN 5.53a, but also now of Bourget (as in 1915) and Barbusse.

To prepare the reader for this journey, a summary of the Executive Concept's development so far will be attempted. Thence it is to the annals of UPN in chronological sequence that the detective must repair.

1. Doctor Moreau was read at UPN 1.60, and First Men on the Moon appeared first on 12 February 1918 and was still in mind two days after the elaboration of Christ-Kosmos noted in UPN 3.24a.
2. UPN 5.53.
Summary of Christ-Kosmos in UPN 1.1-44: the All is Our Lord.

On the basis of Notre Seigneur as centre, of a la faveur theory, of the Kosmos as an All, and of Christ as the only possible "figure" to be the end of the elaboration of the cosmic segregation, the notion of Christ-Kosmos was by UPN 1.44 of a gigantic organism, a Cosmic Body and the Pleroma-fulfilment of the total cosmos, on the analogy of the development of the Mystical Body into being the chosen fulfilment of Man.

A diagram of this Cosmic Body might be as follows: 1

Figure XXV

ALL → probability, segregation → issue, visible elaboration of K → ALL = CHRIST-KOSMOS

God Spirit → Beginning →

Time/space →

Physical/Biological → organism → palpable future → new world via prolongment → Pleroma = transcendence of the future.

---

1. According to the present writer, the cylinder figure is best to describe Teilhard's thought, since this makes way for the later use of the horizontal cone.

Notes on this diagram:

1. K is treated as a 'block' universe as in CJC (1934).

2. The sur-natural ontology shows the actual Universe being divinized.

3. The Some Thing is a function of human and cosmic becoming.

4. From the Christian Pantheism, Christianity becomes the religion of the whole world.
After this summary-diagram, the chronological development of Christ-Kosmos after UPN 1.44 will be described.

1. The Development of Christ-Kosmos. UPN 1.44–3.17a: the need to re-work central concepts if Christ-Kosmos is to be orthodox.

In this section, and under orthodox pressure from Valensin at least, Teilhard reaffirms what has gone before. The Cosmos is "One" and "Organic" and it equals Christ. It is organizing itself into the new cosmos, into a new autonomous sphere. Reaffirmed also is the à la faveur base of this, ¹ so that the cosmos has a "summit", man produces the "sur-homme" Notre Seigneur and will be "virginised", and Christianity will be "supplanted" through (and as it were, on top of) Catholicism.²

Consciously committing himself then to the essence of Christianity being outside the dogmas, Teilhard asks what is going by analogy to follow the New Testament if the New Testament followed the Old Testament.³ Here unorthodoxy is heralded, and the answer, by inference and by comparison with later words of Teilhard (see final chapter below), will be the "new", "ultra"-religion of the Universal-Christ. Teilhard continues further by standing the "Some Thing" in "natural ground". He believes that there is a hereditary residue from (and in) the soul, and regards heaven as a "natural bloom". The centre metaphor as well as à la faveur operate here with perhaps the Mass giving an image of creation too. Entering too are the metaphors of "creative expansion" and soma-germen, and with biological synthesis and genetic ideas appearing, Teilhard's roots in Science and the earth are being adhered to.⁴ The displacement processes in Teilhard's mind are indeed producing ever-more-concrete concept and theology; and concerning Christ-Kosmos this means that he is able to retain his orthodoxy while reinterpreting both

1. cf. UPN 1.50b where à la faveur = à travers.
2. UPN 1.45–49.
3. UPN 1.46
4. UPN 1.51a–58.
Christ and the Universe in a way which allows him to remain himself.

However, perhaps stung to opposition by Wells\(^1\) or just as a function of his discipleship-life,\(^2\) Teilhard restated the Christ Revelation by talking of the Divine "figure" in the future, by showing JESUS as the summit of love, and by choosing Christ to be the transcendent and the Body of Christ to be the End of the World.\(^3\)

In this way Teilhard was able to relativise Nature and Man. Human progress is only one axis of the Kingdom of God;\(^4\) and the Pleiad, though developing on the basis of souls being functions of more souls, is seen as a growing wave and not as a stem.\(^5\) It is indeed as "extra-human" target goal which is sought, since this will be more solid.\(^6\) Man's contingence, moreover, means that the Universe may evolve and may have to evolve through other "buds of the Spirit".\(^7\)

There the process of Teilhard's thought is still that of metaphor-displacement with control by value-vectors. Religion, Science, Metaphor, Gestalt, Pantheism press on as the Body of Christ is formed through all human perfections and sacrifices, as the "graft" of the "sur-natural" is pictured as a cone of human effort with the Church on top, as the "complete" Christ is a "metamorphosis" of the Whole.\(^8\) But the overall executive Gestalt always remains, for Teilhard, among the experimental metaphors, keeps to the central vision of assimilation to a real, physical Cosmic Body,\(^9\) while refusing to say a priori exactly what this "terme" is.

In other words, Teilhard is trying to find ways of describing his search—

\(^{1}\) UPN 1.60
\(^{2}\) UPN 1.61a, 62a.
\(^{3}\) UPN 1.59, 63a, 65, 65a.
\(^{4}\) UPN 1.58.
\(^{5}\) UPN 1.59a.
\(^{6}\) UPN 1.64a.
\(^{7}\) UPN 2.1. Note also UPN 1.69, 3.45a where Spirit is contingent and parasitic.
\(^{8}\) UPN 1.71a, 73, 3.1, 2.1.
\(^{9}\) UPN 1.71.
image intuition of cosmic organism, but keeps these either general or so numerous that he is not forced to reify the unconscious idea through commitment to some over-specific, overconscious and anthropomorphic analogy.

The perspectives of the central metaphors, however, when aided by the growing body of supporting metaphor, gave a clear enough picture for Teilhard to know that they were not orthodox.¹ The condensation-centering of souls and their maturation via their agglomeration in the whole, the A la faveur axis of segregation and union with a higher sphere, and the "successive injections" from the higher sphere all point to Transformist continuity and rupture. But the Church's anti-Transformist stance is surely and steadily subjected to explicit criticism as Teilhard continues:— the human block is to be organised in the "complete unity", "the true matter" of Christ; the universe is an "organic Becoming One"; death is an evolutionary step which forms a Cosmos of separated souls; and the sur-natural prolongment of the old natural is the "reconstruction" of the Cosmos into the new Cosmos: it is indeed the Resurrection of the Flesh.² Transformism is now more than elucidating Dogma.

Having consciously accepted that extrinsic dogmas must be adapted and that Revelation was "not enough"³ Teilhard was now taking the model of reality which he had made in UPN 1.1-44 and was committing himself more deeply to his biological view of the universe. Commitment to his metaphors of organism and centre sphere and to his Gestalten of A la faveur and Christ-Kosmos held his Self-Ego now, as his senses and Life commitment pulled him back to experimental reality and his Science and Religion selves to the parental womb. Yet from his Weltanschauung-model with its "whole" and "global" emphases, Teilhard finds that he can view marriage in a different way, criticise the Church's "side-issue" religion and see

1. UPN 1.71b.
2. UPN 3.1-17.
3. UPN 1.75.
non-Christians as sometimes more religious than Christians themselves.¹
For the segregation of the Elect is biological,² and the superior target-goal is
À la faveur the Mystical Body (and so the Church), yet not human as such, so who
knows if only Christians will produce this Cosmic Organism of Jesus Christ?³ The
Christ-Kosmos model probes previous assumptions.

Here the new concept which was originally produced by displacement to satisfy
existential needs is operating as critical feed-back vis-à-vis one of the informa-
tion-systems which had helped to produced it. For there the conceptualisation of
those needs into reasons for relativizing the Church and the ideas and life of
Christians, and for the higher valuation of Teilhard's laboratory colleagues is
leading to new concepts free of their feed-back origins. So because the feed-back
was clarifying Teilhard's unconscious thoughts, they were gaining in value in his
mind-system and gaining dominant position in his information-store, whence they
could reappear from time to time in controlling and feeding and critical roles,
for instance, in regard to the above case of the Spirit operating apart from the
Church in his late-in-life wish to have positively no clerics, only scientists, on
the team which was to study 'human energy'.⁴

Such then is the movement of UPN 1.44 to UPN 3.17a, 19a: the elaboration,
over time of the at first fragile notion of Christ-Kosmos, in concert with some
feed-back both critical and positive but hardly technical. This feed-back was
continued in UPN 3.19a ff., for instance in the first purposeful attack on Paul's
document of Redemption: but as noted in the previous chapter, it is the appearance
of new metaphor and the acceptance of the satisfying new concept of creative union,

¹. UPN 3.1, 15, 16, 17.
². cf. UPN 4.24a.
³. UPN 1.64a, 71. cf. also UPN 5.55a where physical science is thought to produce
"the greatest Ω, the total Ω"; and thereafter the Salzes and Leroi letters.
which mark UPN 3.19-29 ff; and as has been suggested above it will be the spin-off uses of the new metaphors in relation to Christ-Kosmos and not to the womb of metaphysical need which will now mark the progress of Teilhard towards the Universal-Christ and Omega. The feedback becomes the progress of the mind.

2. UPN 3.17a-4.6: Creative Union and new metaphor.

It was suggested in the previous chapter that the discovery of Creative Union was a function (with Balzacian sexuality and with religious feeling) of Teilhard’s reading of H.G. Wells: perhaps the huge ganglion-brain of the great (large) lunar helped Teilhard towards the cone image for Man — the "tip" of "organic plurality".\(^1\)

Now previously there was another Wellsian interest (also mentioned above), that of "need" for a "common ideal".\(^2\) Set beside Teilhard’s own concern for a palpable and natural Christ-salvation "form" and for an axis for human effort,\(^3\) there is already here an inkling of the late-1919 "precise target-goal" of UPN 12119: the later application of the cone-image to the Cosmos as well as to Man may be here being anticipated in regard to the lunar.\(^4\)

However that may be — and this suggests otherwise — in spite of ideas of convergence and the beginnings of union créatrice, the main image for universal becoming from UPN 3.17 to 3.44a is that of the inverted cone, not the cone itself, thus:

Here in UPN 3.23 "free" monads form a "sort of new matter, more consistent than passing souls" by means of their plurality, in other words, by aggregation, segregation and de-segregation (of evil); and this All that is formed is a Total organism outside time. It is the mystical organism of Christ’s plenitude, the figure of the chosen Kosmos; and it is his Heavenly and Total Physiomy.\(^5\) Further, this

1. UPN 3.24a, 25, but cf. 1.73.
2. UPN 3.23a.
3. UPN 3.23a, 19a.
4. cf. also UPN 1.73.
organism is contingent: it will only be reached when all the Earth and all Her powers are realised: the metaphor of the inverted cone, sketched to convey movement and duration, establishes the Pleroma of Christ as Christ-Kosmos.

This is the lead-in to a new element in Teilhard’s thought-development: for in UPN 3.26, when man's "purified acts" give Christ his "complement" (that is his plenitude, or at least one part of it), Teilhard is retaining and re-working the concept of Merit. In UPN 1.28 he had criticised Sertillanges for remaining with the concept of individual merit. Now Teilhard makes this concept into an ontological-biological model. If the concept of Merit is displaced into biology to form a metaphysic, God is accumulated and the Real is Realised. There is accumulation in One Spirit, and a sum of souls. The milieu Divin is developable. Salvation becomes a function of increase in natural love, which itself is a function of convergence on a superior Centre. So from this theory Teilhard can give a religious reason for work and a cosmic reason for good works; and it also serves in his own mind to emphasize the spirituality of his Cosmic Christ, and his own orthodoxy, since a central concept of his Church was being used to elucidate his ideas. Surely a displacement is a control ...?

Teilhard's concept of ontological merit however, since it was displaced metaphor and specifically produced to meet Wellsian needs for human effort and the latter's justification, can hardly be regarded as a throw-back to theological orthodoxy. Teilhard was trying to picture the development of the Cosmic Body of Christ: so the concept of Merit as applied to this growth was an attempt to put into religious language what had previously been held to be biological. It

1. UPN 3.19a, 21, 23, 26.
2. cf. Hymn of the Universe, p. 70. The milieu Divin, being Matter, is the womb in which work/love produces the 'merit' of second Matter, that is, Spirit. That is why it is 'Divin'.
3. UPN 3.28, 30, 33b, 34, 36a.
clarified the process of transformation denoted by the à la faveur concept, and thereby filled out the mechanics of the theological Pleroma–Christ, though Teilhard used this displacement of the Merit concept to press home the necessity of human effort and the contingency of the Cosmic Christ, and to indicate the higher plane of the latter by further theological concept, yet the Cosmic Christ was no more to be delimited by the concept than Creation was to be by the analogy of the mass.¹

For with neither Merit nor Mass did Teilhard use traditional argument. General metaphor could make no limit, after all.

The Merit displacement did not become a central metaphor to Teilhard even though it was so committedly used by him in this time of feed-back on Christ–Kosmos and incubation of Universal Christ. This may have been the result of friends' criticism of this use of Merit; or Teilhard may have wished to play down (in reply to orthodox criticism) the idea of ontological merit leading to the C N Pleroma – this notion does lose explicitness after 1916. But more probably the abrupt appearance and disappearance of the Merit–displacement shows simply how Teilhard uses bundles of concepts to give converging perspectives on his search-image, and so does not reify concept like that of Merit. For as UPN continues it produces a continuing series of metaphors, and during the same set of passages in which the Merit ontology appeared, these metaphors described Christ, suggested once again the Grace of God in His Omnipresence, and without being reified pressed home the concreteness of the Cosmic Christ. The metaphor of Merit is a displacement without explicit feed-back.

Metaphors now abound.² First, Christ is seen as the original radioactive disquiet, the particle of totally free energy.² Second, this irradiation is cyclic, and is radiating from the centre of being outwards; so Christ is the

¹. UPN 1.57
². UPN 3.28-36a.
centre of attraction and of segregation as He pulls people-things-monads from the multitude-outer-circle to Himself. Third, He is the punctiform, and fourth, the morphogenic gene. The particle and centre are images already noted: but the latter two introduce new elements into Teilhard's thought.

The 'punctiform' — literally dot or point — is to become very important in Teilhard. Its subsidiary use is to describe the set of spots with which a scarlet fever patient is afflicted, and contemporary (1971) usage is for skin trouble caused by nervous or psychological tension. Displaced by Teilhard into his ideas of Christ and Kosmos, punctiform at once becomes the image of "Christ the centre" binding matter,\(^1\) the radioactive power-element in matter, the "centre of matter and the Cosmos"\(^2\) and (so one might add) the 'Christ in the heart of matter' of later years.\(^3\)

It is the punctiform—Christ which is behind the idea of the elements of being, being "spacially distended in time" and with an "aptitude for union";\(^4\) and this is formally presented in \textbf{UPN} 3.45 in the diagram of cosmic "organisation in Christ Jesus" as:–

\[ \circ \cdot \circ \]

Since this punctiform—Christ appears in company with the concepts of the consistency of the future and of everything "substantial" in the universe, Teilhard is clearly pursuing the concreteness of Christ–Kosmos. In \textbf{UPN} 3.43a Teilhard speaks of creative union as the key with which to show God "as present as possible" and transforming things "physically": but in the same section he speaks of God "thickening". This might be thought of as a sensation simply as in the version which appears in his letter to Marguerite concerning this thickening.\(^5\) But in

\[1. \text{ cf. } \textbf{UPN} 1.20b.\]
\[2. \text{ UPN 3.48.}\]
\[3. \text{ cf. H.U.}\]
\[4. \text{ UPN 3.38a.}\]
\[5. \text{ cf. M.P. p.207.}\]
the context of punctiforms this "thickening" takes on physical and ontological meaning of the closing together and uniting-to-create of punctiforms. The Universe is thickening with the creating, punctiform Christ.

Further, the punctiform image may be the key metaphor in the idea of universal formation as convergence from the surface of a sphere infinitely diffuse to the centre of attraction-confluence, which is God. The image was in his mind because the universal formation was being dismissed in a punctiform section.¹ This would mean that the punctiform's link with Leibnitzian monad-metaphysics would be appearing in UPN 4.38a, this time as the basis for the idea of Christ's "universal coextension", "coextensivity" and "coextensibility"; and again in UPN 4.59a, where Christ is formed by prolongment travers the monadic groups and by the assimilation to Himself of those monads who so choose.

In other words, the punctiform image is the spacial metaphor which is displaced into the ontological metaphors of centre and being, and which allows Creative Union to be treated spacially and durationally, so that the Universal Element (Christ) equals monad centration² and the future of monadic centration will therefore be the Christ who is a "super-individu".³ By the idea of punctiform therefore Teilhard is able to suggest both spacial immanence and spacial extension; in this medical picture of the physical-biological realities of experimental concreteness and durational growth, the organic and centre metaphors meet to portray Christ in the Cosmos. Christ is indeed ⁴ the Universal Element who is the punctiform, thus:

\[ \text{Universal Element} \]

It is in this specific way that there takes place the "universalization" of

---

1. UPN 3.45.
2. UPN 5.51a.
3. UPN 5.52.
4. UPN 21119.
Christ, which becomes eventually the concept of the All as equalling the Universal Christ. The sweep of the inverted cone of UPN 3,23 has now reappeared in an Immanence and a Pleroma Christology. The Universal Element segregates the All into the All of the Universal Christ.

If this progression of metaphor-ideas—Gestalten is accepted as a valid interpretation of Teilhard's thought, the punctiform analogy is seen to be of first-order importance in Teilhard. It is the link-metaphor between a theological ontology-metaphysics of centre/space and a physical, biological scientific-ontology-metaphysics of space and duration. The "accumulation" of God, which had previously been thought of by Teilhard in terms of accumulation of souls, centres and consciousnesses—albeit producing an organism (the Cosmic Body of Christ) as well as the Heavenly Jerusalem—is now given a specific meaning concerned with the spacial hugeness of the scientifically observable universe, by means of a concept of physical happening in space (specifically physiological space) which is the metaphysical equivalent of Hoylian continuous creation rather than the traditional religious idea of intrusion in ex nihilo creation. Christ is now viewed (in UPN 5419) as bursting out all over the universe, in the heart of matter and as its centre.

The chicken-pox, as it were, is both micro-organism cause and spacial-spot result. The physical vastness of the universe further means to Teilhard that the punctiform Christ as He assimilates the universe will be—in the end—greater, that is larger than the universe—"Christ can be no smaller than the Kosmos." So the Universal Christ is the universalized Christ (cf. UPN 1721a) —universal as the "gigantic cosmic organism" as well as universal as the Soul of the World, the

1. UPN 17319.
2. UPN 7920.
3. cf. UPN 1.17a ff.
4. UPN 4.37a.
radioactive disquiet, the centre of the monad and the heart-element in matter. But while the punctiform metaphor is used as the image of the "omni-presence" of God in space, and thereupon for the corporeal Cosmic Body of Christ, the radioactive activity metaphor speaks only of the first type of presence.

This comprehensiveness of the punctiform metaphor is found in that of Christ as a "gene". Here Christ is the complex molecule working in the heart of matter to produce first the punctiform-monadic centres, and then through His "morphogenetic" activity to select out through creative union His full (punctiform) Cosmic Body.

Thus as gene Christ is the Form as well as the Matter, and His characteristics work from the beginning as morphogene to make His Form. God is indeed "Archi-Matter, Life, Energy", that is particle; but Christ is also the centre of attraction who orders the separation into aggregation in One Spirit; so that God is accumulated as the Real Realized; and as God who is the "condition" of all life "thickens" around us physically, it is His own Universe which is converging into Himself as Centre of attraction. The Gene/Form and the Punctiform Christs make concrete the search-image of Teilhard, feeding his mystical experience with images of Omnipresence and his religious and scientific selves with glimpses of metaphysical understanding of their own concepts and realities.

But in this complex of concepts, of constant displacement of metaphor to produce unconsciously-known and unformed concepts, the morphogenetic-punctiform Christ gives an ontological and spacially-durational picture of cosmic becoming which goes on to meet existential reality for Teilhard by its description of what

---

1. See above. cf. also UPN 3.39.
2. UPN 3.29a, 34.
3. UPN 3.36a.
4. UPN 3.33a, 33b.
5. UPN 3.41a, 43a, 45.
happens when the Christian virtues are practised: these are "morphogenic"¹ and by analogy with the earlier Merit image are ontologically forming the new matter of Christ; and the positive feed-back from this is that unlike Bonhoeffer's vision where the Church takes on the Form of Christ, Teilhard's Church is building Christ's Body physically in such a way that in later writings the Church will be deemed a necessary (but not the only necessary) phylum of the ultra-human.² Christ-Kosmos is now clarified by the morphogenic virtues.

Closely related to the use of these two main concretizing metaphors is (as seen above) the growing commitment to the metaphysics of the Union of the Multiple.³ Punctiformal organization takes place within the "convergent march of monads to higher union", which is the march to synthetic Spirit, which is Being; and the convergence is also pictured as attraction from the centre of the sphere, who is God.⁴ But it is when the "consistance of the future" is linked to the punctiform and to matter in UFN 3.45, and is in UFN 3.45b seen by means of creative union to operate to produce a cone-like future, that creative union metaphysics is beginning to take on major significance in Teilhard's mind. The cone with the punctiform and gene includes in itself the metaphors of organism-à la faveur, centre-sphere and union, pulls together all Teilhard's thought so far and then projects it forward to the Omega-Christ.

The key factor had appeared by UFN 3.44a. Creative Union of the Multiple was seen as what operates in the "universal Evolution" which ends in the "physical" unity of Christ. This then had been formalized into the "Law" of Evolution and the "Law of genesis of the Spirit",⁵ which had coincided with specific rejection of

---

1. UFN 3.48.
3. UFN 3.37 ff.
4. UFN 3.45
5. UFN 3.46
the Bergsonian *vis-à-tergo* transcendent "Source", in favour of commitment to a "real" Centre of attraction \( \Omega \) "en avant", which is the transcendent future.¹

Thus the "cone" figure is seen concretely as the figure of physical duration when it is laid horizontally on its side; it is able in itself to incorporate both the convergent ontology of creative union, and the centre and \( \text{à la faveur} \) figures which serve to retain the metaphysics of transcendence and indeed God; and it can include also the punctiform and gene metaphors.

By \( \text{UPN 3.47a} \) therefore the images of organism, centre-sphere, \( \text{à la faveur} \) steps and creative union, joined by those of cone punctiform, gene and radioactive energy-element have produced a metaphysics of union and consistence which is all the time clarifying the Christ-Kosmos Gestalt of Cosmic Body-Organism which is produced from the Mystical Body. This metaphysical entity is now shown by the cone metaphor to be in terms of product the sur-natural "crown" of the Kosmos. It is this because Christ's Body as punctiform is the centre of matter and the Cosmos; and being the transcendent Centre of attraction of the whole sphere and Cone of the All,² it crowns the All. The future is the Christ.

Except for the monarchical figure, these images are taken from mathematical and natural science. This has been the case all along, but now it must be remarked that as the religious paradigm of Christ is displaced into the pantheistic-experimental-metaphysical conceptions of reality and the Cosmic All, it is being interpreted almost exclusively by displacements of scientific concepts, and, further, these are increasingly visual metaphors. Teilhard had used Paul early on to tell of segregation and in \( \text{UPN 4.37} \) he will see the Resurrection of the Flesh in similar religious language; but his movement of thought scarcely starts or finishes with such traditionally religious concepts. Scriptural ideas are displaced and

---

¹ \( \text{UPN 3.46a, 47.} \)
² \( \text{UPN 3.48} \)
projected on to the Christ-Kosmos Gestalt as it is further interpreted; but they act as analogy and control. They are not reifying materialization of traditional ideas of the supernatural. The Cosmic Christ is not to be explained by the Scriptural expressions, nor now by the scientific metaphors. It is the set of visual metaphors from mathematics which will take over Teilhard. Try as he will to demonstrate the Omega Point from biological complexity-consciousness, his argument is useless without the simple cone.

The explicitness of visual perception is shown in the increasing number of diagrams in UPN, but also in matter like the following. In UPN 4.32 Benson is quoted as noting that "everything has two faces", and similarly in UPN 4.35 Emerson speaks of Nature as the "visage of a man disguised". These passages come long after the idea of a Quelque Chose, culled originally perhaps from Newman, was pictured by Teilhard to be Christ, for Our Lord alone could be this hidden All. But this notion had been changed in UPN 3.36 under pressure from the scientific fact that there are probably many other universes within which life exists. If this were so, the Cosmic Christ must be "polymorphous" showing a different "face" in the many different "worlds". So the Scriptural Christ-human is "one face" of Christ-Kosmos, so the Chalcedon formula cannot be enough: Christ's cosmic nature must be emphasized, for He cannot be smaller than the sum of all the worlds. The visual metaphors and mathematics are, in other words, pressing for the reinterpretation of Christ.

This is the other side of what is found in 1-3 Feb. 1919, where Fundamentalist notions are welcomed inasmuch as they hold to the full "quality" of Christ and to the "rich dynamisms" of a Living God and living religion: indeed, it is to intensify the Scriptural interpretations and to make Christ "intègre" and

---

1. Teilhard returns to this explicit criticism over thirty years later in Le Coeur de la Matière.
"intégral" that Teilhard uses concepts from outside Scripture and from outside the realities specifically described in Scripture. For in Christ is the "centred form of the Cosmos" -

the Incarnation is not just "verbal", nor the hypostatic union: it is "not God in Christ" but "the Christ-God" who integrates Scripture and the experimental world.¹

The new metaphors are now feeding back into the system and disturbing the Biblical metaphors and metaphysics with which Teilhard had lived his religious life. Christ was being freed ...

This has been to anticipate. The cone metaphor had only appeared in UPN 3

But by UPN 4-6 the situation was that the metaphor of cone and the metaphysics of union were firmly established with the specific images referred to above of the immanence of Christ (God), His punctiformal energy, His morphogenic development and His ultimate transcendence in the future. This, then, was the position when Teilhard started to once more read the "pantheists",² as he called them in UPN 4.9a, from which reading came into being the concepts of the Omega–Universal–Christ. The Pantheists were rooted in the world and so was Teilhard, and now his metaphors and metaphysics could respond to the Pantheist–stimuli as his senses always had. His executive concept was becoming conscious - at last.

3. UPN 4.6 – 5.51a: the Mystic Self and the World Pantheists.

Though he believed that Christ–Kosmos was orthodox, Teilhard accepted that basing "surnaturel" in experimental roots and in human effort (at least) was contestable.³ He knew himself now to be "suspect".⁴

With the courage of his convictions therefore and perhaps needing ammunition

¹. cf. UPN 23219.
². cf. UPN 4.53 ff.
³. UPN 4.6, 15a.
⁴. UPN 4.13.
for his coming Integrity-Crisis battle, he now embarked on reading the pantheist
metaphysicians; and at about this time he stated his non-orthodoxy in explicit
and pictorial terms:—

1. God-with-us means that He offers himself as an objective "prolongement" of
the Universe, that is, as the "natural-bridge" "Supernatural Term" of the
"issue of the Cosmos". This is the Cosmos prolonging and achieving itself
in the Christ.1

2. a) Christ is either a "point of convergence", to do with action and the
result of creative union:—

This symbolises the concept of Omega-
Christ, through the cone-convergence.

b) or He is the result of "lateral success" and à la faveur "rupture" such as:—

In this symbolism are to be found the
concepts of Universal- and Trans-Christ,
based in à la faveur planes.

c) Together a) and b) give Teilhard's overall Christology.

In these passages = the centred monad, before this is centred on God ( ).2

So that the monads in 2 a) are not viewed as necessarily being routed directly
on to God, though their union creates the new energy which forms the Christic
issue. The destination of God is not automatic and in 2 b) only one of the
monads appears to be segregated on to the axis of God. The intense religious
understanding of Teilhard in which spiritual, inner development is the basis of
segregation as with Newman is here retained in the concept of monadic centration,
and in both 2 a) and b) the punctiform-gene may be operating.

At this point in UN there enters the "intense cosmic vision" of Masterlinck.
Masterlinck speaks of a "universal consciousness", of "interpsychism in formation",
of cosmic liaison with the Absolute, and of the unconscious and the Universal
Spirit.3

1. UN 4.6, 7.
2. UN 4.20.
3. UN 3.9a, 4.59a, 62.
Such a vision of Universal Energy as Maeterlinck's in UPN 4.8 joins up with the centre/sphere metaphor as this returns to Teilhard's mind, and it emphasizes the one of the universe. The "supra-vital" world must have its experimental roots here.¹ The "soul of the world" is the milieu of God's action which includes Incarnation; and it is the experimental Reality in which man meets Christ, which creative union maintains and Vie Cosmique and Milieu Mystique portray.²

From this point of view since "true matter" is the fecund, the active, in other words the Spirit,³ the spiritual world is not intrusion but prolongment, giving birth to "a Cosmic Reality in which we are divinized",⁴ and that "palpably".⁵ Thus, if the Néant Multiple is omicron, the natural end omicron is not to be portrayed as a cone, the top of which is "surnaturel", but as a cone whose "immanent spiritual centre" is "distended" as many material centres: for cosmic concentration is a function of monadic concentration.⁶

There is therefore one universe:

Its beginning was through the Spirit and ex nihilo (versus Poe),⁷ but there is now genuine creation by creative union (versus Poe's principle analogy of Gravitation with its corrolaries of disunion and lack of meaning.⁸)

So the picture is one of the metaphors of centre, sphere, cone, concentration and convergence, and of the metaphysics of creative union, monadology and the Néant. Teilhard's own note by the following figure might also be added to by his statement in UPN 3.25a that monadic concentration is a function of cosmic

---

¹. UPN 4.15.
². UPN 4.12.
³. as per UPN 3.46-7.
⁴. UPN 4.13, 15a.
⁵. UPN 4.18.
⁶. UPN 4.18, 25a.
⁷. UPN 4.20.
⁸. UPN 4.22.
concentration, and by the above note that the omicron is the natural end of the Multiple-Néant. But might he not have left the caveat that the cone-image when placed within that of sphere is tending to suggest an automatic centre-progress-development which was never in the à la faveur metaphor?

\[ \text{distended material centre} = \text{immanent spiritual centre.} \]

After Maeterlinck and Poe, William James with his "human effort" and One-and-the-Many stimulate Teilhard further.¹ From the fact of human "creative freedom", the diagram of "creative differentiation" (of \( \omega \) monads) appears:

\[ \text{that is:} \quad \omega_1 \diamond \omega_2 \diamond \omega_3 \ldots \]

Such a diagram seems to emphasize monadic choice and the lateral progression of the "pluri-providential" monad; and it emphasizes the contingency of the Kingdom of God. It also might suggest Pelagian thought about man working his own salvation. However, what Teilhard formalizes in UPN 5.37, that there are two circles in his Gospel – that of Christ-Kosmos and that of natural human effort – appears explicitly also in UPN 4.28: the "true" natural is centred on \( \Omega \) and it is the artificial (second degree natural) which is centred on the \( \omega \)-monad. The "common trunk" in spite of its ramifications is centred on \( \Omega \). Thus the alternative³ to the above diagram is one in which God is reached by prolongment of Kosmos, by captation-interference-assimilation, by concentration of the Multiple, and by the chain of \( \omega \)-monads:

\[ \text{(It is in UPN 4.28 that Teilhard ridicules Thomistic "two worlds" theory.)} \]

1. UPN 3.26a.
2. UPN 4.31.
3. In fact these two diagrams are held together under the radial/tangential concepts which have already appeared.
From this latter diagram (perhaps more than from the thought underlying it) Teilhard is now able to suggest that "pragmatism" is part of cosmic life and that science is simply discovering a different "plane" from religion. Further, the Christ-through-prolongment who is in All because He is the One Centre is exactly the "palpable" God realizable through the All, whom Teilhard had needed.

In other words, the concepts cone, sphere and centre are taking Teilhard closer to what he had been given in Christ-Kosmos mainly unconsciously, and by their written appearance on the page visually direct him to explanations not originally envisaged by him when he drew them first. Teilhard seems now to be increasingly moving from drawing to drawing, carrying out closer and closer integrations as in the calculus. He maintains that he always sees things in relation to their "fond", universality, \( \Omega \), Totality and limits;\(^2\) and each diagram or new concept appears as a term in the binomial. Teilhard always knows where he is going and the result is in fact known at the limit, which is his Executive Concept solution to his five selves. But until he (or his reader) gets there, the actual location and form of the solution is not to be found.

The reading of the pantheists, for instance, is no surprise, for his Mystic self was Pantheist and he had read such material before. This Self and his Science Self had experienced and known the Kosmos. Nor was his continuing acceptance of the Jesus-Christ-concept extraordinary, since his Religion was of the Society of Jesus. So the prediction could have been made from these value-vectors as to what Teilhard would produce in the end if his Mystic Self had a liking for metaphor-displacement: Christ and Kosmos together. But the responses which the Pantheists received from Teilhard, and the specific interpretation of Christ-Kosmos which eventually was arrived at could not be guessed beforehand, for there is no knowing

1. UPN 4.27a.
2. UPN 4.34.
what different nuances will be given by turning a cone on its side, or making a circle a sphere. So although with Teilhard the hypothesis evinced by Stallworthy concerning Yeats is more and more attractive, that "blueprints" in the mind are finally made free on paper, consciously, it still cannot be said that in Teilhard's case the "blueprint" search-image of Christ-Kosmos was necessarily going to become the Christ-Universal, let alone the cone-based concept of the Omega-Christ. The blueprint produced the metaphor, but the metaphor then adjusted the blueprint almost, but not quite, out of all recognition.

4. UPN 4.31a - 5.55a: Universal-Christ-Omega. 1) The one-world cone.

The UPN material continues first with discussion of Spirit, continues with the lead-up to Element Universal, and then reaches the full Omega-Christ-Universal concept.

First Teilhard reads more Pantheists. Emerson's idea of the "structure of the Spirit" (which is reminiscent of Wells' "great laws of matter" of UPN 1.60) gives to Reality an Absolute, an "immanence" and a "tendency". This is at once incorporated into Teilhard's monad ontology in the ideas of Destiny, of all the Cosmos going towards Spirit, and of all Spirit being in every spirit.

This Emersonianism is perhaps reinforced by Teilhard's own preference to look for principles rather than to subtle words for explanation, according to UPN 4.33-4: and to the principle of Destiny Teilhard now turns. Though the universe can go back, Teilhard nevertheless envisages the world now as follows:—

This diagram indicates the upward trend of Spirit by the higher position of on the page, omits any à la faveur notion except this raising of plane, and introduces an End which is a sharp point and which, since the curving lines indicate movement, suggests that a physical point is reached in durational-dynamic time. This is rather different from the previous static cone-images, and indeed from UPN 4.6a where the point of convergence was left rather vague. Indeed, from now on till UPN 12119 and Wells' "but precise", the image of lines converging to a point matures unconsciously; and except for a brief punctiform jotting in UPN 3419, the 'free sweeping' of UPN 3.23 seems forgotten, though it returns soon enough in the Universal Christ and in the Noosphere of later years.2

Emphasis on the "oneness" of "a" Reality had also now commenced.3 Emerson said that all Spirit is one, Pascal that All is one on the analogy of the Trinity, and Bergson that all is one in the Real present; and this leads to Teilhard viewing Spirit as a "function (Energy)", and God as identified with (≡) Spirit, which ≡ Matter: for "in Him we live and move and have our being".4

It is this ontological conclusion which helps Teilhard to commit himself more fully to the already-formed concept of the punctiform-gene-radioactivity Christ in the concept of Element Universel; and it lays the metaphysical foundations for the theological statement of UPN 5.6a where in a one-world world the Creator is found "au bout de son développement", the function of "all Kosmos" while transcendent "beyond" it, and indeed the "conclusion" of K.5 The Christ-Kosmos of UPN 1.1-44 really is All and really is God.

This "oneness" is emphasized in the following drawings. First there are two

1. cf. UPN 25219.
2. cf. UPN 5.46a and 20125 which herald the 1923-34 Universal Christ.
3. UPN 4.35 ff.
4. UPN 4.39.
5. UPN 4.29.
alternatives, though they are soon amalgamated,

\[ (\text{either}) \quad \omega \quad \xrightarrow{\text{or}} \quad \Omega \]

Almost immediately these are amalgamated and become:

\[ \Omega \quad \xrightarrow{\text{or}} \quad \Omega \]

That is to say, in both cases God had been reckoned as the final attracting centre: but by UPN 4.38a the Emersonian "tendency" was taken to be God also, the radioactive punctiform Christ perhaps, and not just monad-centres jostling in Brownian motion.³ So it was now the Centre Himself "diffuse in all the sphere" who was coming to his own fruition through the Law of Union, this time of superior forms. By assimilation to Him by their own choice Christ is formed à travers the monads, and through His universal coextension. Indeed Teilhard thinks of studying the many "cosmic Forms", \( \Omega_N \), which are making up the many worlds and cosmos.⁴ It is not just the concentration of monad-centres to make \( C_N \): the centre Christ, attracting the monads into centredness first and then into centrated unity, is producing \( \Omega_W \). In one à travers à la faveur universe, even with planes and free monadic choice, the cone-image nevertheless is beginning to suggest necessity.

'Une universe' is again the theme of UPN 4.64, though Teilhard has realised for a second time that his creative union "philosophy" may be seriously criticized as philosophy, but as "mystique" it is valid, so Teilhard continues with the Kosmos viewed as able to collect all perfection through the "medium of the vivifying Christ". Thus:

1. UPN 4.36, 36a.
2. UPN 4.38a.
3. UPN 3.33
4. cf. UPN 4.36.
Here the word "perfection" suggests a reappearance of the merit image, the religious concept used again as ontology, this time to emphasize the one-world result of election while reaffirming human choice.

After this, the two-world theories are regularly dispatched one by one, Benson's extra-cosmic centre in *UN* 1.56a, traditional K/D extrinsicism in *UN* 5.21, Christian manichaeism in *UN* 5.37 and Schuré's two ethers in *UN* 5.43. In full consciousness Teilhard can no longer think of Two Worlds.

Such dogmas as the Two-Worlds theory are to Teilhard no longer good at showing the "secret nature of things". The "new universe" is formed in the "figure" of Christ, yes; but it is the ontological meaning of sexual passion - the general, "universal" passion of "union" - that is the "great secret of the Cosmos": the changing of Eros (which has wings) into Pteros (which gives wings) is "transformation créatrice", the à la faveur method of creation; and when the real world in which Teilhard lives is seen by him to include real creation and this by means which he can experience and understand, it is this real world which is known by him to be God's world. Matter, in other words, as the Divine Milieu developpable into Christ forces the disappearance of a separate Godish world of Spirit.

This 'inner logic' of Teilhard's continues in his interest in the "physionomy" of the new universe as it is formed in Christ. It will include the individual traits of the chosen, though there may be a relevant analogy from Schuré's two ethers, so that in \( \omega \supset X \), the \( \omega \) is like inferior ether, to be compared to

1. *UN* 4.31a.
2. *UN* 4.36.
the superior, concentrated ether of X. The Form of Christ's new universe is after all not known, and Pantheist visions and metaphysics may help the searcher's search.

In another picture Teilhard sees the souls of the dead forming an "O" Néant which, through Christ-Ω are held "suspens in X". Here in UTN 5.42 Teilhard is modifying what was previously written in Soul of the World and Mon Univers (1918); there the non-Christians' multitude was reckoned to be able by creative union to form a (pagan) "echo" of Christ-Néant: pagans could be perfect men and just, an "O" which is a full monadic centre. Teilhard now disavows this. From reflection on UTN 4.38a (Ω -Ω -Ω ), on UTN 4.39 where God = Spirit = Matter, and on the "co-extensive" Christ of UTN 4.59a Teilhard now sees Christ as X-Ω, the supernatural Centre which prolongs the perfect in man, the Universal Element which brings both concentration and division, unity and struggle, and which is the superior Centre and the "Absolute divine transcendent", and the sum of whose futures equals ω, for ΣX=ω, so Σ future X=ω. The one-world metaphysics has in other words pressed into consciousness the concreteness and necessity-suggestions of the cone image as this is used with the metaphysics of monadology.

Furthermore, from the above it followed that the Unity of the World will be "World ω", a K which is "un super-individu" and not at all the inferior entity such as an individual soul. The Pantheist vision of a Total sum of the Cosmos is gathered at last into the Christian concept of Jesus the Person, with the organic, centre-sphere and gene-punctiform metaphors once again integrated in a way which can satisfy Teilhard and his selves.

So by the end of UTN 5. the spacial and quantitative metaphors are again having their say. The sum of Christ cannot be less than the Kosmos (ΣKΣK),

1. UTN 5.43 nb. Teilhard had rejected Schuré's concepts, but uses them metaphorically.
2. UTN 5.42, 51a.
3. UTN 5.52, 52a.
which is reminiscent of UFN 4.37a where and are rejected as images of Christ-Kosmos because $X$ cannot be smaller than $K$.

Teilhard is solving his Integrity-Crises not by rejection of earlier conceptual commitments, but by reintegration of these in a further position which has developed from these same commitments.

What Teilhard has done is again best imaged by the metaphor of calculus. He has "integrated" Christ and organism and centre, and followed this through with analogies of sphere, cone, radioactivity, gene, punctiform, energy and element.

Another description would be that of the constant displacing of concepts on the pattern of a constant overlaying of transparencies - ideally to give more than two-dimensional viewing. Certainly sums of monads or sums of Christ are mathematical treatments of physical-biological Kosmos on the basis of a monad metaphysics into which are displaced Religious concepts; and this follows on the trail of $C_N$, $\subseteq C_N$ and the concept of 'limits', which are all found above in UFN. If Christ-Kosmos was the Identity-giving executive-concept search-image, it has been overlaid by other transparency-images and has gathered more meanings accordingly.

In UFN 5.45-6a the cone and sphere metaphors re-appear briefly, as if to remind the reader of the multitude of analogies used. That concerning the sphere is used to suggest the magnitude of the mystery of God, Man being a thin layer in the sphere, his experience being tangential to God: thus:--

lower psychisms

human experience.

On the other hand, in the cone-centre metaphor where the Universal Element was the Superior Centre and the Absolute transcendent, Teilhard seemed settled into a concept of Kosmos which held one world and a transcendent 'beyond' together. But Teilhard seldom stayed still, mentally, for long. At the end of 1918 he returned to Wells again; and in response to Wells' need for a precise Ideal and a
common Goal, and to Wells' one-world criticism of churchiness and religious illusion Teilhard returned once more to the field of conceptual novelty – and in under a year had reached the concept of the Universal-Christ and Omega.

5. **URN 5.55a – 20125: Universal-Christ-Omega.** 2) Christ-God, the precise End-Goal of All.

It was while reading Wells at this time that Teilhard's Life and Science value-vectors each reached their conceptual fulness. Since late 1915 (as seen above) Teilhard's Self-Ego had carried out an intellectual pilgrimage with integrity. The ultimacy of Christ had been cemented in the Christ-Kosmos concept to satisfy his Religious Self. The Sense-Sensitivity Self had been given full reign with metaphor-displacements, and with experience as *analogium prinnens*. Now the passion for Science 1 which had been so needed formally received its place as a sub-concept in Teilhard's concept of the Kingdom of God, and Life itself became formally recognized as the base for the surnaturel.

The main ideas and problems which faced Teilhard now in Wells were those of the natural end of this earth, and the human collective duty concerning this end. To solve these problems Teilhard brought into play (the method of) his five value-vectors and the Gestalt-concept-vectors of Christ-Kosmos and Creative Union with their sub-component concepts. Thus the resulting conceptual synthesis was both continuous in that the conceptual solution produced was specific to the new problems (or new forms of the old problems) which were raised by Wells.

That is to say, Teilhard's original ideas form a new complex of information by themselves, and so operate as controlling vectors which reorientate Teilhard's mind. By the symbolism of value-vector here it is hoped to suggest the reorganising force of such analogies as those of punctiform and gene and their ability to reinforce, so that "value-vector" suggests unconscious as well as conscious images,

1. cf. **URN 1.40, 43.**
symbolizes the complex of information which produces as output the conceptual filter which is sometimes viewable in times of existential press as specific search-image, and yet warns explicitly of the abstract world of ideas which is both so real and specific, and so un-reifiable.

Exemplary "existential press" exists in the material of January 11-12, 1919. Teilhard here says that "above all" he "feels the Presence of a great-Reality". He feels that he must try to identify it with the Christ of his faith. He is searching for an image/reality which meets up with this specific need for a great-Christ-Presence.

With similar feeling Teilhard thinks that Religion must give to people the "sense of human collective duty", "the Hoc" which equals the World. Again he has need of a Christianity which is "not smaller" than the sum of all the other religious put together. Such passages show him searching for an image specifically related to his Religion Self, and which must satisfy a particular Self-Ego need. But Teilhard now has an unconscious idea, an incubating Gestalt of which the embryo was Christ-Kosmos, a search-image of the religion which he is looking for, which would acknowledge both the beauty and the grandeur of the world.

The first movement of this last stage in the fulfilling of Teilhard was an even deeper emotional commitment to his Science Self, but this time in a formal concept from monadology.

The Science Self made its demands and was satisfied when physical science is deemed to give to the human spirit "the greatest ☀️, the total ☀️". Science pulls the monad most fully to reality. It centres the monad. It shows the centres of the world. Science gives enlightenment and personal knowledge in the heart of matter, for really it is research into Jesus Christ himself, the Universal Element

---

1. [URN 5.55a]
and Punctiform-Gene of Life.

By the middle of November 1919 this scientific commitment formally becomes dominant. The search-image needed will certainly include recognition of the scientist's need. The immortality of souls and the existence of God are "du physique" and seen as "physical prolongment".\(^1\) There is no going away from scientific reality now.

It is not to be thought that Teilhard is uncritically accepting Wells in these pages.\(^2\) But Wells reflects too many of Teilhard's own feelings and value-vectors for Teilhard not to be moved by him. Wells seems to him to express parallel ideas to his own Gestalten.

Teilhard sympathizes with Wells' criticism of feeble clergy who have a "non-natural" faith.\(^3\) He welcomes the warm commitment to sexuality.\(^4\) He joins with Wells' religion of a "God who struggles"\(^5\) and of "construction of an Absolute"\(^6\). He feels as a fellow-pragmatist that Christianity must share in the human "effort vers ëcos" of Wellsian pantheists, to the "êcos naturel".\(^8\) Above all, Wells (with Maeterlinck and James) is reckoned to be advocating exactly the basic idea of Vie Cosmique, that Man should live as an "atom" of the vast Rest,\(^9\) finding his "full individuality" only in the All,\(^10\) and letting himself be "a thread of the great synthesis".\(^11\)

Teilhard at this point has again become fully conscious of his Christian unorthodoxy in 'cosmic life' as well as in 'creative union'.\(^12\) But these Gestalten are not now in question. Any integrity-crisis is over. The concern of Teilhard now (apart from a slight attempt at an orthodox formula "creation unites" which does

1. UPN 12119.
2. cf. UPN 11119.
3. UPN 5.53.
4. UPN 12119.
5. UPN 10119.
6. UPN 13119.
7. UPN 5.53a, 54.
8. UPN 12119, 14119.
9. UPN 5.53a, 54.
10. UPN 13119.
11. UPN 10119.
12. UPN 13119.
not reappear) is to carry these Gestalten further and to build upon them. To Teilhard God is not a "theorem"; a gospel must "coincide with our hopes". It cannot just "preach". Christ Himself must be "intensified" conceptually if Teilhard is to be satisfied.¹

It is not therefore surprising to find that on 5th January 1919 Teilhard had returned to study of the Evolution of Dogma. He was prepared then² to question whether Arius was not holding to a partial truth and demanding a more "human" Ideal of Our Lord. Criticism of Thomist scholasticism from the position of cosmic life and creative union was present when Teilhard was committed to God as "the absolute One" and to the idea of creative expansion and existence, so that Thomist concepts of "pure being" and "essence" could not be readmitted.³ The "Two Kosmoses in our Kosmos" was finally formally rejected in UPN 12219. Teilhard's Weltanschauung was a perspective from which to view the Church as well as the world.

Part of Teilhard's justification of such dogma-change was from St. Ignatius Loyola himself. Loyola, like Wells wanted to "achieve Christ in achieving the world (Intra Christum)";⁴ so that it is Christian discipleship⁵ to want a palpable, immediate, human Goal, a "visible work" to carry out, a "precise Ending". This is contrasted with the religion of, for instance, the scientific collector Licent which is not "grafted" in any way on to the Kosmos.⁶ Against Licent, Teilhard gives his "worker priest plan", where the goal of the Néant is a 'ω (centration)' which equals Christ-World, so that human effort will be sanctified; and as noted above in UPN 5.55a Science can give this most total ω.

1. UPN 2219.
2. UPN 11119.
3. UPN 2219.
4. UPN 12219.
5. The present writer's understanding is that what Teilhard means by "apostleship" is what Bonhoeffer was referring to in "discipleship".
6. UPN 5.53.
Teilhard is building therefore upon the foundation of his Self-Ego developments and his Gestalten as he reflects on Christianity today; and he is holding with integrity to his own identity when he is stimulated by Wells to consider the palpable and precise natural Ending to human work and to the world. Two concepts especially begin the January-February 1919 changes, both of which have appeared and been formative earlier on:— à la faveur with its attendant rejection of extrinsecism, and the Universal Element. 1

In UN 10119 the "sur" of surnaturel is taken to mean the transformation and re-creation of natural qualities. This is the formal acknowledgement of the movement of thought which began four years earlier. Creation becomes the supplanting, "crowning by transplanting" of inferiors. It is the "efflorescence of being". In UN 14119 the 'sur'natural soul is seen as the analogy for the 'sur' of a natural World-end, so that this natural World-end is an "Opus" and "But" made by supplanting through our efforts. Christ therefore is to be "sur" the "ω"; and Christian discipleship is therefore the joining in the cosmic movement to "ω". When the Merit displacement is recalled, this ontology appears as a simple feedback-development in Teilhard's thought. 2

But again the Merit ontology is not contrasted with Grace and Revelation. Christ is the Universal Element, who is World and its Form, 3 the centre-particle and morphogene (as above). There is an "ω naturel", but also a physical prolongment of the soul in immortality and of the world. There is some sort of "Christ naturel", but it "veils" the surnatural Christ. The "natural end ω" indeed reinforces the value put by Christians on chastity and work, and in fact the "ω" is really "in some sense" the "body" of Christ, "his matter", and this according

1. UN 5.52, 52a, 14119.
2. cf. the section on UN 1.44 - 3.17a, earlier in this chapter.
3. UN 12119.
to the à la faveur "base" of Teilhard's thinking. It is a 'one-world' religion, but not a Monism. After all, Christ-Kosmos is a bi-polar concept.

Thus the concept of precise Goal, which in Wells has the State defining the figure of Humanity and in Teilhard "the Ideal" of the "veiled" Christ, includes and indeed is the "attraction" of a "human collective end", but it is an end which ends the "natural space of Christ". This Goal will be the "attraction" of a "crown" of Christ on this natural end - and, continues Teilhard, is not the "bipolar vision (K-X)" "simply" the vision of this "corona"? "Christ s'achèvera extra mundum" through a "new tendency in human effort, specifically". Man has come from the corpuscle: will he not now assist at a dawn? From Wells therefore has come a stimulus to make Man the centre of a new world-development, but from Teilhard's Religion value-vector, once again, has come Revelation, and from his Self-Ego the value-vectors of his personal Gestalten.

To Teilhard now the Ideal is that of a natural which will take on the "figure" of Christ, and eventually be "detached" as the new Kosmos. In another metaphor Christ will be the "centred form of the cosmos":

No longer therefore can He be described as "God in Christ". Christ is "the Christ-God". He is the hypostatic union which is not just verbal explanation, but to do with the "cosmic soul" analyzable today, as well as with the Patristic idea of Redemption; and diagrammatically the Christ-God is as follows:

\[ \text{Diagram of Christ-God} \]

(Where \( n + N = \text{relations vis-à-vis } K \) and the \text{Word}).

1. UPN 14119.
2. \text{nb}. Collective Ideal was culled also from Bourget, cf. 12219.
3. UPN 12119, 13119, 14119.
4. 12, 13 January 1919.
5. 14 February 1919.
6. \text{nb}. This expression is rooted (for Teilhard) in Maréchal and Louvain (1908) according to UPN 12219.
Discussion of these ideas must again begin with emphasis on the personal environment in which they were incubated. Teilhard was enthralled by Wellsian emphasis on the need for collective effort and himself was so motivated. So he called on his à la faveur soul metaphor to finally define sur-naturel. He used his cone image of Universal Element in UPN 24119\(^1\) to suggest the relation of the Word to the monadic centre of the above diagram, thus:

Universal Element. This also suggested duration–natural–progress–convergence.

He reinterpreted Christ–Kosmos as the Christ–God by means of the juxtaposition of à la faveur prolongement with his commitment to there only being one universe. Yet Teilhard's Religion value–vector still controlled the outcome and pictorially–speaking, the Word must always appear from the other side opposite the multitude ...

What is now certain from a glance at what preceded this section (up to 23 February 1919), and at what followed, is that Teilhard is still producing concepts in immediate existential tension and as response to stimuli. He is still not building strictly logically on what went before. Before Christmas there was the metaphysical question of the Universal Element \(\bigcirc \bigtriangledown \bigcirc\) which was the preoccupation while he read some Process Philosophers. After Christmas, and as the war ended and as future work loomed up, it was the future of collective man and the enthusiasm of H.G. Wells which Teilhard had to meet and from which his Self–Ego had to make some sense if his integrity was to survive.

That such existential stimuli led to a metaphysical solution was because of the biological nature of, eg. human future, because of the metaphors which suggested ontology, and above all because creative union forced the Religion value–vector to be committed in the realm of Metaphysics. So what in UPN 4.33, 36a, 38a with convergent and cone diagrams was the simple suggestion of future coming–together

---

1. _cf._ UPN 4.38a.
and 'confluence' with God was changed by Teilhard's concretizing, religious mind as well as by Wellsian Goal-need into the concept of a physical End-Goal which is to be reached by human effort and biological prolonging. From the earliest days of UPN this end-concept might have been predicted, although even by UPN 4.6a's "point of convergence" (through creative union), such an end was hardly specific and was not treated existentially. But the cone metaphor, with the Law of the Multiple, was all that was really needed for the Omega Point to be uncovered, and this was soon to be.

By February 1919 the existential concreteness of the natural end which is the veiled Christ had entered into Teilhard as an element in his search-image. It was now a Gestalt sub-component of the set of concepts making up his worldview. It was a controlling unit of information. In later years the physical attributes – sociological, noospheric, anthropological – of this "point", "natural end" and "Goal" would be studied. But now in 1919 the existential concreteness of Wells was a conscious part of Teilhard, so that in the omitted passage from this same year he can say that he is nearer Wells and Bergson and James in their pantheist pragmatism of "human effort" than he is to the Masters of Rome. The concreteness is emotional commitment and formal conceptualisation now. This concreteness may be marred in later years by over-dreamy poetry about the noosphere in which Teilhard sees it exploding into the mind-fire-light of a new universe.¹ But it did periodically emerge. It is there in his writing against false two-world Masses.² It pervades The Phenomenon of Man. It sets in his last commitments to social convergence in Human Socialisation.

2. 31 June 1924.
This concreteness of concept of monadic $\omega$, human effort's $\omega$, the $\omega$ of natural end and the Christ-$\omega$ formally integrates Teilhard's mind. It reminds the reader that it is in existential discipleship and in a God-in-the-midst of person and of Life that Teilhard's concept of Omega-Christ is rooted. Yet as functions of existential discipleship the images in which the concreteness is pictured must be expected to change over time, and especially when the disciple was a restless man with a searching mind who needed always to keep to his identity.

The "God-Christ-Omega" of 3 September 1948 (in UPN) is one of the series which marks this changing mind as it further probes Christ-Kosmos. This is the "Trans-Christ", the "Universal-Christ", the "God-of-Evolution" of the last years; all come from that earliest Christ-Kosmos as it was formally concretized in the Omega-Christ Christ-God. The particular pressures produced the particular formulations, reactions and conceptual synthesis at different times of Teilhard's life, but the search-image was remaining always the same.

The UPN material for the next half-year (February to July 1920) shows such almost rhythmic change.

In UPN 25219 Teilhard is back with punctiform ideas, first in a biological picture, then in UPN 5419 with the centre metaphor and with the cone. Again in UPN 5419 the punctiform is further related to the metaphor of the sphere in a way which perhaps provides the pictorial base for the later Noosphere concept.

The centre metaphor continued much in evidence: on 29 February 1919 this diagram appears where $V =$ Verbe; and convergence towards the centre of the sphere is shown in UPN 20319 and UPN 31319, and indirectly by the spiral metaphor in UPN 29219. The cone appears as above, and also in

1. Teilhard by such an image would encourage misinterpretation of eg. his ideas on orthogenesis. It is tragic that he seldom reflected on the hazards of the metaphorical origins of his thought.
UPN 5419 in [diagram] and to show the à la faveur-base "hierarchy" of the spirit, in [diagram]. In UPN 5419 is also portrayed the "total cosmic form", presumably as possibilities and fullness perhaps in relation to punctiform bulge as well as to sphere: [diagram].

Further metaphor is provided by the magnet in UPN 19319 [diagram], and by the simple victor which suggests inverse results [diagram], and also force gathering over duration [diagram].

With this latter diagram there re-enters into the diagrams of UPN 22 March the suggestion of the movement in the universe. Thus over the next year and a half there appear the following pictures which are not unlike some earlier ones such as eg. UPN 3.23, 4.33:–

[Diagrams]

With these figures many of the central themes of Teilhard are suggested: the oneness of K, the à la faveur and creative union development of Matter = Spirit = God, the specificity of Parousia-Omega, the continuity and discontinuity of the new Kosmos, the convergent cosmogenesis, the punctiform dynamic, and the Wholeness and segregated Allness of the Christ-God-Omega as a new Kosmos totally different from, yet a function of, the growth of spirit in the Kosmos throughout the latter's prolongation. By such figures the concept of the Christ-universal as the All "en 2e bas", as the "truly real", as the "ultra-human" and as the "supra-organism" makes its appearance.¹ Here at last and in simplest diagram is the search-image

¹. 7, 13 September 1920.
which has fixed Teilhard's identity for five years already, but which he has been long in clarifying into formal concept. Christ-Universal is Christ-Kosmos with more specific metaphor describing Him.

The next years in UPN see little new in terms of conceptual development. Even the appearance of Noosphere in UPN 20125 is imaged in a way which has been anticipated in the earlier diagrams of UPN. Thus and So Noosphere is seen in origin as an à la faveur concept concerned with organic synthesis into higher whole-level, as to do with the monadic \( \Theta \) in which is Christ-\( \Theta \), and as a punctiform-growth through which the Universal Christ is formed to be the Christ-God.

Thus in UPN the ten years in which Teilhard's novel personal ideas developed show evidence of only one central concept, and even the Noosphere concept of 1925 may be seen as a function of this same Christ-Kosmos and its supporting metaphors and components.

Towards an appraisal of Teilhard.

The above is the development to be found in the private papers of Teilhard. Between UPN 3.23's and UPN 3.25a's had come such images as the great Lunar-ganglion and creative union of the multiple. But none of the ideas of UPN 1.1-44 had been removed by Teilhard by these new concepts. The Cosmic Corporeal Body of Christ had His formation pictured by new analogies such as punctiform, converging lines and the cone. The concept of Universal-(Christ)-Element as circle, centre, monadic-centre, morphogene, radioactive element, energy and end attempted to convey special reality, universalism and grandeur. Reiteration of Christ as Universal and All, with the figure showing the full fruit of the one Kosmos (and so its "beyond" and "ultra" prolongment-transcendence) conveyed the Christ-Kosmos' totality and organic, corporeal Body. Visual metaphor had become totally necessary to a perception which "saw" and "felt" shapes.
The man who in tactile language felt God "thickening" around him demanded that the physical Presence of His God in all Creation and His Fulfilment in the End be described in the visual metaphors of both Science and Mathematics.

But as the metaphors multiplied the dangers of uncritical "harmonization" in Teilhard grew. The Universal Element with its corresponding ideas of Cosmic "polyvalency", the individuals' "pluri-providence", and Christ's "polymorphous" visage could become a weak concept if Creative Union and convergence became over-dominant. Taken by itself the diagram suggests that the growth-structure of the Spirit is natural and automatic, that Christ-in-matter is totalitarian, that the future Pleroma is necessary. That this was not Teilhard's intention originally is stressed by his view of the contingency and frailty of the Spirit and of the future, and also by his stress on Man's part to play, by Effort and Collectivity, in the forming of the Universal-Christ: all Creation rests on the Grace of God and Christ's action in the Heart of Matter. But also to Teilhard Christ's fulfilment can only come if Man is Jacob-Israel in the struggle of the World - and none of this segregation-election is suggested by the above diagram by itself.

Such diagrams therefore lend themselves to misunderstanding. The one above could suggest that Teilhard was a one-world Pantheist Humanist. The tactile, existential disciple-Teilhard who had five selves is not represented in the diagram. Even the cone metaphor could lead to over-emphasis on convergence even in his scientific work, to be followed unhappily by "The Phenomenon of Man" and so by Medawar.

In other words UPN suggests that tactile experience which led to the visual Gestalt of Christ-Kosmos, and the more tactile re-workings from which the visual Christ-Omega derived must be held together to show the full Teilhard. The Universal-Christ concept was able to carry out such a holding operation without losing existential and feed-back strength, precisely because it was the simplest conceptual integration of the Religion and Science value-vectors, giving Grace and
Christ in the same breath as Kosmos and Growth. With this concept Teilhard was able to operate with the earlier and later concepts of Cosmic Body, Creative Union and Omega, indeed this was the concept chosen as the conceptual basis for the 1934-6 credo How I Believe, written when Teilhard was at the height of his powers, and which was still there on his Litany Card. In other words, Universal-Christ is the concept by which Teilhard should be recognised and through which he might be taught and criticized, since it integrates Christ-Kosmos, Omega-Christ and the God-of-Evolution, as well as the sub-component concepts like Creative Union.

This will briefly be demonstrated in the next section where a reconstruction of Teilhard's overall Christological thought will be attempted. In Part One the present Thesis posited five value-vector selves which needed an Identity, which in Part Two so far has been shown to be to do with, if not identical to, the concept Christ-Kosmos and its developments. The latter, further, have been thought to be also functions of the five selves as these produce spin-off in the interest of Teilhard continuing with his integrity, his acceptance of Identity in Christ-Kosmos.

This abstract TGTA-Naven picture of Teilhard up to 1925 may seem very frail and too simple. But the next chapter shows that there is evidence that the rest of Teilhard's life and writings may be interpreted by means of the same conceptual tools. The model in other words remains fruitful: and the question will be whether or not the simplifications of the above and of the diagrams of the next chapter will allow a critical reflection to ensue which will be of use in 'clearing the air' of Teilhard studies as well as of his own thought. To the present writer the answer is of course in the affirmative.
CHAPTER XX.

THE CENTRALITY OF CHRIST-KOSMOS: A SUMMARY OF THIS THESIS.

In the last two chapters it has been suggested with little evidence that Christ-Kosmos was the abiding identity concept. It remains therefore to show, first, that Christ-Kosmos did remain, though in developed forms, throughout all Teilhard's life, and second, that it really was the central concept all this time. To do this it is necessary to define what is meant by Christ-Kosmos, and so a summary of the UFN concept will now be made.

Without the above TGT-A-Naven interpretation the idea of an Executive Concept might never have occurred to a reader of Teilhard. So without such assumptions both Christ-Kosmos and Teilhard's 'inner logic' might vanish. But with these assumptions the picture of the logic-method of Teilhard is that there was an Executive Concept and that it was a Gestalt-result of stimuli and responses, displacements and associations of concepts. There was some analytic feedback; but the main element in the progression of his thought was the rhythm of five circuit-selves as these pressed in information and attitudes to interpret the specific stimuli; from which processes spin-off output emerged which temporarily at least resolved the tension and gave harmony to the Self-Ego. As the central Gestalt-spin-off (in that it reoriented Teilhard throughout the pages of UFN) Christ-Kosmos, with concepts from the two parental selves, can be said not to be random because it was a concept controlled as well as produced by the selves.

Similarly, the continuing spin-off-Gestalten which reinforced and reinterpreted the Executive Concept were not random spin-off: "gene" for instance was a natural metaphor for a convert to Transformism to use, and Teilhard's Science value-vector made sure it was used to press the Kosmos pole of Christ-Kosmos.

In the sense, then, in which computer language uses the word to indicate
up-to-date decision, Teilhard's 'logic' and its concepts were 'real-time'. For Christ was experimental reality to Teilhard. The Kosmos and Evolution-Universe were experimental reality to him through the so-called experimental schizophrenia, the Pantheism and the Science. But the point is now that the Mystic Self in which the Executive Concept was incubated, being to do with Sense and Sensitivity, was producing in Christ-Kosmos primarily a tactile concept which then became visual. The person who could feel God thickening around and in front of him and who could feel Christ-Kosmos thickening into the Universal future with the World being assimilated to Christ was a man who could feel presences around him in the shape of an idea and almost at once see it in a diagrammatic form. The 'real-time' concepts then, since they were experienced by both feeling and sight, really were Gestalten.

Thus, for instance, the A la faveur notion, creative union and the cosmic thrust to the All evolved with feeling and perception hand in hand, and were soon followed by the cone metaphor with its convergence to a point, and by the other visual metaphors such as the spiral.

Overall then the process was one of progressive interpretation of an originally tactile concept by means of visual metaphor and on the basis of an information system of five selves who included both tactile and visual input systems.¹

Once he sees his concept in diagram on a page Teilhard's mind leaps on, for instance, when the A la faveur notion in diagram suggests an axis going up at forty-five degrees, and this metaphor becomes central because the axis is seen in retrospect as a tangent, as the movement Forward and Upward and perhaps even as Orthogenesis.

Now if the UPN Executive Concept is summarised according to this interpretation of a shift from tactile to visual metaphor without loss of the real-time tactile

¹ There does not seem to be much acoustic metaphor in Teilhard apart from use of Revelation's 'Word'. Yet acoustic metaphor is always present in Teilhard since Christ to Teilhard included Revelation and the daily practice of saying Offices: even the tactile Christ who is seen melting into His vibrant universe is also seen in the eyes of those who could speak to Teilhard – his mother at least.
basis, the outline of original Teilhard is much simplified since the processes of specific Gestalt, normal feedback and of development specifically related to visual feedback are both included and redistributed in the simplicity of the artificial model.

The point is that to look at Christ-Kosmos' developments from such a perspective will allow diagrams to be used, and the 'message' in Teilhard was thought by him to be surrounded by less 'noise' in his diagrams.

The over-all Christ-Kosmos was then as follows.

By around Christmas 1915 Teilhard had already come close to a one-world interpretation of reality. Most evil was biological-physical. Pain was the result of sensory development. Wholes were built through the determinisms of statistical probability. Biological-Physical segregation of the Elect meant that by statistical-probability-development the Multitude of Matter was physically becoming an Elect All. The cells were forming an organism and when added to the idea of probability in a Whole the organic universe was one of movement and direction. Reality was implicitly a Block which was growing into a Some Thing. This Some Thing had to have a visage. After Creation by the Spirit of God the Kosmos was a Multitude of Matter, physically numbered. It was changing over time by the probability of large numbers, developing in space-time-duration by physical-biological segregation. So from atomic particles it was being transformed into an All. But this All had to be a Person who must be Our Lord. So all the wholes - the collectivity, the determinist probability making the Second Matter of social wholes, the souls of whole beings, the whole of the Mystical Body of Christ made from whole souls - these were all a-making the Whole of the Cosmic Organism of the Cosmic Corporeal Body of Christ.

By [UPN 1.44], therefore, Teilhard's thought schematically was something like this (compare the diagram on p.361):-
Later on (UPN 3.23) when it was more explicitly put as 'free monads forming an ALL by aggregation', it was more sharply:--

The way towards this concept was that of the *À la faveur*-mechanism theory as this had become associated with the idea of monadic recurrence. Religion was going to produce the Pleroma. Science had to produce physical-biological reality to form a real All. But it was the diagram which described *À la faveur* in the idea of the development of cosmic-sexual energy which set in train the concepts referred to above:--

Such a diagram was produced by unconscious or perhaps conscious association with concepts such as plane, degree, step and so on. But when Teilhard looked at it, the idea of physical continuity of plane must have implanted itself in his mind.
For from now on the world was to Teilhard a series of steps: pre-life was behind life; there is always something before another. So the supernatural becomes the sur-natural, and development in the future is ultra- and up. The oneness of the world which Teilhard had known since 1902 when he had met God-supernatural in experimental reality was formally acknowledged by the À la faveur Gestalt, but the actual visualization of this oneness produced by association with concepts such as plane produces a whole new set of concepts with which to reinterpret Christ, Christianity and the World.

The visual metaphor further explained the Mystical Body of Christ. If the idea of the souls and consciousnesses of Elect Man is portrayed according to the À la faveur diagram these cells and elements of the Mystical Body (in the orthodox theological metaphor) receive physical-biological concreteness since their collectivity becomes a Higher Matter. Thus:

\[
\text{Mystical Body of Christ} \quad \text{à la faveur} \quad \text{new Matter}
\]

This is an interpretative diagram not in Teilhard. But it explains the final early-1916 conclusion of Christ-Kosmos. The milieu of God's work was now seen to be the visible elaboration of the Cosmos of Matter. The Body of Christ was the prolongation of the Kosmos and the issue of Matter. The New Jerusalem of Christ's Body was built by the Second, New Matter of souls and was the superior Unity of the cosmic organism of Christ-Kosmos. This Cosmic Body of Christ was \( C_N \), a truly corporeal Body, an organic issue built sur-the natural world and so the sur-natural prolongment of the World. By the À la faveur interpretation as above, Christ-Kosmos was therefore:
By this time in UPN the metaphors of centre, circle and sphere had entered in; and in Cosmic Life as noted above these had taken over the role of dominant metaphors to describe Christ-Kosmos. Monad metaphysics joined organic metaphor without difficulty. But as was also noted above the à la faveur theory-metaphor remained underneath to return later, and indeed when God was conceived as attracting the lower, earth-level collectivity of consciousnesses up to the superior unity of the next circle there was something of the à la faveur notion present. For in the monadic theory there was the attraction by the wholeness of the organism of the cells: the monadic centres are pulled together to form the higher unity. So that entering a different plane-circle of the sphere and becoming a new body are à la faveur steps of discontinuity with continuity remaining beneath, and the law of recurrence of centres which is implicitly that of a cone is a hierarchical notion which is à la faveur in the sense that one stage relies on the one below it for its development.

So with the Christ-Kosmos concept there was a joint use of two metaphors with an inter-displacement of them. The Cosmic corporeal Body of Christ filled the whole physical universe as the All: this was a production of the Mystical Body's matter-plane of souls. Such metaphor comes from the Church's Body of Christ. But the physical segregation in à la faveur language had emerged from Science, the monadic circle-sphere-centre metaphor from Pantheist metaphysics, and the making of ever-more-centred organisms with development to higher unity and sphere from Science,
Pantheism and the Christian writings of such as Mercier and Boutroux. 1

One way of picturing these centre and sphere metaphors might be the following:

Now both these metaphors are visual. But their value was that they joined with Teilhard's tactile experience in religious--psychological development and in scientific understanding, and resolved the tensions in his selves. Further, with 'block' and sphere Christ was symbolized spatially as the religion and fulfilment of the entire world, all known reality. Human effort could then be absolute value: by à la faveur building it creates the New Earth. Christianity could now be existential Jacob-struggle with the Angel of Matter to produce the holy issue. Discipleship could be the question of living in Holy Matter, stimulating Holy Evolution and working as an atom of the All. Concepts therefore produced to meet Teilhard's needs have coped with his environment. By means of metaphors and displacement of concepts from both tactile and visual experience and knowledge, his thought has produced his personal survival in terms of integrity of personality and identity.

The previous chapters have noted the different metaphors which now began to find their way into Teilhard's thought. The continual process of concretization continued as the World became more and more One and was envisaged more and more as assimilation to the "real, physical Body of Christ", as metamorphosis into the Physionomy and Pleroma of Christ and as growth into "gigantic cosmic organism".

1. See Part One.
But there was still in mid-1916 no idea of scientifically-observable physical-biological point for the future of the World in Time. The theme was spatial, experimental expansion of Universe into the Christ-Pleroma. The à la faveur, centre and sphere metaphors were so far images of growth - expansion.

The turning-point in Teilhard occurred (as noted above) with H.G. Wells and the image of the cone. Although the latter had been implicit in the early centre-circle-hierarchy image, the cone image only appeared with the recapitulation on the earlier idea of new energy as created through sexual union. Wells held to the latter in connection with his need for a Common Ideal and End-Goal. But to Teilhard it was formative first in the development of the Creative Union concept, and later through the visual characteristics of the cone it took hold of Christ-Kosmos and made it into Omega. The diagram which prefigured the cone metaphor and so the most well-known part of Teilhard was this:-

What seems to have happened at this juncture was that the expansion metaphor-set lost its monopoly in Teilhard's mind when the cone-image emerged and it is this suggestion which is to be pursued.

Other earlier notions implicitly suggested the cone too, for instance, probability-maths and statistical convergence, the religious idea-need to "converge on Our Lord", Wallace's understanding of evolutionary convergence of characteristics were all noted by Teilhard. But it was with monadic centres converging together to make larger entities and with the "psychic convergence" in "pan-psychic monads" that the image gained momentum. The ontological reality behind Creation was that Spirit is produced by "concentration", "condensation" of Matter the Multiple. With everything created by union, "convergence" is an experimentally-verifiable metaphysics unlike that of the Prime-Mover; and the Law of the Multiple, the second definition
of the Law of Recurrence of monadic reality was now what was bringing into being the Christ-Kosmos. The Spirit being contingent, there has to be union for the new to come into being.

With H.G. Wells had come the specific image of the cone to portray Creative Union, but within a short time Teilhard was using the image to describe the peak evolutionary point reached by man and his brain as well as the need for commitment to Wellsian motifs of a Common Ideal or End-Goal. In other words, though the image was turned to the question of Creative Union, it at once was suggestive for drawing together much of what Teilhard had been thinking. A cone of Multiple-Matter has an aptitude for union in it just like the monad-centres, when the mathematics of a cone are considered. The image of a horizontal cone going from Matter to Spirit at once suggests that "real" Matter is in fact Spirit, the liaison-bond-producing union. Then if the real centre is Our Lord, the point of the cone is by the cone's mathematical qualities the Lord, and all parts of the cone, all monadic centres will reach there. The Lord, as any part of the cone, is "coextensive" with all the rest because of the common future centre of all parts in the apex.

By early 1917 the cone had become the dominant image. It could incorporate the "la faveur" theory in the "hierarchy of Spirit" diagram, and in this both the frailty of Spirit and the increasingly precious, intra-individual as well as extra-personal reality which was brought about by each union and each new level could be incorporated. But now the cone was seen also to picture the whole movement of Matter over duration as "convergent" and this became such a dominant concept that, though originally based in metaphor, it was to be accepted as scientific hypothesis for all Teilhard's later writing, with a confidence that makes Teilhard most vulnerable to scientists.¹

This convergent cosmogenesis of cosmic evolution received further impetus from the cone-image in 1918.

¹ *eg.* Medawar, *op.cit.*
First of all there was a diagram in which the Greek letter "omega" was used of "monadic fulfilment", analogous to the nucleic centre of a cell and the idea of centred matter:

\[
\begin{align*}
\omega &\rightarrow \omega \\
\omega &\rightarrow \omega \\
\omega &\rightarrow \omega \\
\end{align*}
\]

In the context Teilhard is suggesting that human beings who are not centred on God the centre of being, on Christ in the Heart of Matter are failing to be human monad, and that when there is monadic fulfilment through such Christ-centre and where they are in union together they create a new reality, a biological synthesis which is Omega with a Capital O. Further this reality which comes into being is God as Immanuel, but not in the sense of Christ as God-in-Christ Incarnation. The new reality is God as Immanuel-"prolongment" of the Universe.

Teilhard was in other words envisaging an À la faveur synthesis-series in space-time-historical terms and he put it in diagram thus:

\[
\begin{align*}
\omega_1 &\rightarrow \omega_2 \\
\omega_2 &\rightarrow \omega_3 \\
\end{align*}
\]

The cone metaphor can image this in fuller ontological language, using the ideas of properties of a cone:
Here the chain of monads are "captured" by God through concentration of the Multiple, and there is convergence to a synthesis.

And here the "immanent spiritual centre of the Neant (0) = the distended spiritual centre", where the Neant is the growing multiple of the universe.

Thus with both à la faveur and cone metaphors Teilhard is coming closer and closer to the unconscious search-image which he needs to survive as himself, to a clarification of both Christ and Kosmos held together. The unconscious and tactile commitments and concept are becoming visually conscious.

Soon enough were clearer conical expressions:–

This was followed by the more specifically durational and one-world-like:–

The third metaphor of sphere on the other hand returned to guard the Transcendence of God while it yet retained the earlier ideas (as did the idea of the absolute future in the cone metaphor, when à la faveur levels were introduced and the final
centre is All):--

It was at this point that the cone emerged once more to describe the Universal Element who is Christ. Teilhard was still needing the Wellsian "precise Goal" and an absolute value for Science. So he integrated (in the maths metaphor) the monadic-natural-end omega with the Body of Christ. The Christ who is the unifying centre of Matter, who is the radioactive element and the punctiform, in other words, who is the Universal Element, is Himself the Superior Centre and Divine Transcendent, and the "centred form of the Kosmos", since durationally as well as vertically speaking all the movement from the multiple base of the cone is towards the apex which is both central and sum of all parts.

The cosmic "figure" of Christ, His Body, is therefore the tip of the cone of monadic fulfilment:--

Possibly at this point Teilhard might have moved from cone to cylinder image as in the present writer's reconstruction of UIN 1.1-44 on p.361. The Whole-Universe-Block image which reappeared all through the later writings on the basis of the first Christ-Kosmos Gestalt would in that case have looked like this:--
Such a symbolism would have been not only the spacial-extension metaphor of the earlier image. But it would have retained the cone image without taking away the wholeness of the final reality, and without suggesting a narrowing reality by the over-emphasis on the point of the cone. The following picture (as well as the next section) shows that Teilhard is held to the idea of total cosmos and the cosmic form which is a totality of monadic ramifications, nevertheless while working with the cone/sphere image:

This same point is symbolised by the return of the punctiform image. The new kosmos was one in which the "souls" took all their K(osmos) with them:

Finally the cone and the À la faveur images joined to produce the final diagrams for the Omega-point. This showed that the Omega-Christ was no "point" at
all, but the totality of the Universe itself, the Universal-Christ:-

yet the true reality of the future is the "ultra-human" "supra-organism" of the Universal-Christ who is both Element and Universe, who is now by concentration the ALL:-

Christ here is indeed the "Christ-God" beyond the God-in-Christ. Later He will be described as the Trans-Christ, the God-Christ-Omega and the God-of-Evolution. The Gestalt-vision is reached by the a la faveur spacial metaphor which symbolises the ALL-fulfilment and by the cone-metaphor through which the Universe is viewed as concentration to total quality symbolised in the cone's apex and in the properties of the cone. If the idea of segregation is thought to have been lost by the wayside (which it was not existentially since every page of Teilhard notes the struggle through which Spirit-Matter emerges), then perhaps the cone can symbolise this if made to fit a cylinder. That the idea was there formally is demonstrated by the presence of ideas of assimilation. Perhaps therefore the total picture of Christ which emerges in Teilhard's personal material is that of a genetic-assimilation metaphor, indeed of an Epigenetic Christ.

1. cf. below, final chapter. The word 'Epigenetic' comes from C.H. Waddington, The Strategy of the Genes. Also see final chapter.
Whether this particular word were used or not, the notions of genetic development were part of Teilhard,¹ and in such a picture Christ would retain the concrete physical–biological reality which Teilhard's Science and Sense–Sensitivity value–vectors demanded. It uses the metaphor of gene which Teilhard himself used; and monad–centre, especially when "segregation" is a Mendelian word, is not a dissimilar concept to genetic–information–molecule. The environment in epigenetic–molecular theory is stimulus to the gene just as it is to the monad, so that the human monad must use all his effort to bring Christ into Pleroma–being. The final result of both images is that of a whole organism, the result of canalisation and complex inter–formation over time. It suggests directedness and contingency as Teilhard's theory and also points to the possibility of 'local faces' of Christ which Teilhard foresaw. So an Epigenetic model of Christ–Kosmos might be as follows:–

Possibly on the other hand it would be more satisfactory to retain what Teilhard calls the "bi–polar" structure of the Christ–Kosmos concept. This would mean that both the A la faveur expansion and divergence metaphor, and the concentrating, concretising metaphor of cone (with its underpinning by creative union) be retained together in tension, so as to retain the full sense of Christ–Kosmos–Omega–God.

In this case by placing both images within the cylinder image the bi–polar

---

¹ Mendel's First Law was the Law of "Segregation", and after Mendel's re–discovery after 1900 the "genes" as the units of heredity were posited by Johanssen in 1909, which is just when Teilhard was awakening via Louvain.
Again if the circle–sphere metaphor is used the expansion and concentration sides of Teilhard's Christ–Kosmos will be as follows:–

What is clear is that these visual metaphors are necessary to Teilhard's ideas and that without any one of them Teilhard's meaning is diminished. They were there as functions of their production. But they were retained for their ability to elucidate what Teilhard was meaning. For the reason is simple: Teilhard did not work on his ideas by scientific data-verification techniques, nor by analytic argument. His ideas emerged unconsciously by Gestalt under pressure from sub-systems of information and attitudes which needed an integrating search-image. They came by way of metaphor and so they are metaphysics, as is evidenced by the scientific community's rejection of his attempts to demonstrate that the ideas were scientifically-demonstrable. But precisely because they were metaphysics, the metaphorical bases had to be retained. Whatever Teilhard is read, they will be found; and an exposition of Teilhard should include them all.

The list of metaphor-metaphysics which has outraged scientists such as Medawar is lengthy. The Omega-point, the two energies radial and tangential, the axis and
orthogenesis, the idea of convergence as a cosmic happening, the idea of general evolution itself. But when Teilhard’s mind-processes, especially his use of metaphor are disclosed, the picture of Teilhard is changed. Tangential energy is what takes Matter up an à la faveur axis, but the stage and the axis orientation are the results of radial monads. Convergence is what would happen through statistical probability if the Universe were a Block-Universe, and if the World were made of Monads, but as such it is therefore only tenable through the metaphysic-Gestalt of Creative Union. The Omega-point is not a "point" at all: it is one metaphorical way of describing what another metaphor describes as the ALL reached by à la faveur development, and what yet another holds as the centre and wholeness of the total sphere of reality. Assimilation to the Universal-Christ is a biological picture of canalisation to do with union of monad-information-centres to the Centre-process, the result of which process (and by the same biological language) is a total and new organism, the gigantic cosmic organism Christ.

Teilhard may therefore be described as Mystic Visionary because of his visual metaphors, as Mystic Pantheist because of his pantheist experience and tactile metaphors of, eg. presence, and as Metaphysical Poet because his existential syntheses were to do with ultimate meaning and used metaphorical language to communicate the personal vision.

Such an interpretation of Teilhard based in UPN and the Christ-Kosmos concept has served as a Summary. It may now be demonstrated from a wide range of later material. First, that Teilhard’s argument in both personal and formal essays was always based in metaphor and that the metaphors used in the earliest days were retained throughout his life (as well as added to) is shown by the following examples of Teilhard’s concepts of Christ and by the à la faveur monad, creative union and eg. cone argument-metaphors which surround them. But second, what later appears is that Christ-Kosmos became reflectively accepted by Teilhard as a new Christology leading
to new religion; and it is both these aspects which are shown in the following set of paragraphs.

1. The continuation of Christ-Kosmos 1925-55:

1926-7 MD pp.57-9, 61, 62, 102-3, 109, 114-5, 119, 123, 125, 130-1, 143, 146, 154.

1934-6 HIB pp.26, 27, 28, 37, 38, 39, 40, 212, 221, 222.

1947-8 JW pp.(115-120), 174, 179, 180, 181, 208, 209, 212, 221, 224, 231, 236, (267, 268...).


The above include the one-world integration of Christ and Kosmos by means of the metaphor-Gestalten of à la faveur organism, centre-sphere, creative union and the cone. A typical example is the following which appears soon after an appreciation of the dangers of analogies from organic life (p.57):

"... we must also recognise that in the whole process which from first to last activates and directs the elements of the universe, everything forms a single whole. And we begin to see more distinctly the great sun of Christ the King, of Christ amictus mundo, of the universal Christ, rising over our interior world. Little by little, stage by stage, everything is finally linked to the supreme centre in quo omnia constant. The streams which flow from this centre operate not only within the higher reaches of the world, where human activities take place in a distinctively supernatural and meritorious form. In order to save and establish these sublime forces, the power of the Word Incarnate penetrates matter itself; it goes down into the deepest depths of the lower forces. And the Incarnation will be complete only when the part of chosen substance contained in every object - given spiritual import once in our souls and a second time with our souls in Jesus - shall have rejoined the final centre of its completion. Quod est quod ascendit, nisi quod prius descendit, ut repleerit omnia?

... Omnis creatura adhuc ingenisicit et parturit. And we serve to complete it, even by the humblest work of our hands. That is, ultimately, the meaning and value of our acts. Owing to the interrelation between matter, soul and Christ, we bring part of the being which he desires back to God in whatever we do. With each one of our works, we labour - in individual separation, but no less really - to build the Pleroma; that is to say, we bring to Christ a little fulfilment."

(MD pp.61-2)

2. The UFN Christ-Kosmos remained the central concept in Teilhard: for example:

"God exerts pressure, in us and upon us - through the intermediary of all the powers of heaven, earth and hell - only in the act of
forming and consummating Christ who saves and sur-animates the world. And since, in the course of this operation, Christ himself does not act as a dead or passive point of convergence, but as a centre of radiation for the energies which lead the universe back to God through his humanity, the layers of divine action finally come to us impregnated with his organic energies.

The divine milieu henceforth assumes for us the savour and the specific features which we desire. In it we recognise an omnipresence which acts upon us by assimilating us in it, in unitate corporis Christi. As a consequence of the Incarnation, the divine immensity has transformed itself for us into the omnipresence of christification. All the good that I can do opus et operatio is physically gathered in, by something of itself, into the reality of the consummated Christ. Everything I endure, with faith and love, by way of diminishment or death, makes me a little more closely an integral part of his mystical body."

(MD p.123)

"The only satisfactory way of interpreting this process (as I added earlier) is to regard it as irreversible and convergent. Thus, ahead of us, a universal cosmic centre is taking on definition, in which everything reaches its term, in which everything is explained, is felt, and is ordered. It is, then, in this physical pole of universal evolution that we must, in my view, locate and recognise the plenitude of Christ. For in no other type of cosmos, and in no other place, can any being, no matter how divine he be, carry out the function of universal consolidation and universal animation which Christian dogma attributes to Christ.* By disclosing a world-peak, evolution makes Christ possible, just as Christ, by giving meaning and direction to the world, makes evolution possible."

* In other words, Christ needs to find a world-peak for his consumption, just as he needed to find a woman for his conception.

(HIB p.38)

"The total Christ is consummated and may be attained, only at the term of universal evolution. In him I have found what my being dreamed of: a personalised universe, whose domination personalises me."

(HIB p.39)

"But I continue to believe, if anything more strongly, in the hidden existence and eventual release of forces of attraction between men which are as powerful in their own way as nuclear energy appears to be, at the other end of the spectrum of complexity. And surely it is this kind of attraction, the necessary condition of our unity, which must be linked at its root with the radiations of some ultimate Centre (at once transcendent and immanent) of psychic congregation: the same Centre as that whose existence, opening for human endeavour a door to the Irreversible, seems indispensable (the supreme condition of the future!), for the preservation of the will to advance, in defiance of death, upon an evolutionary path become reflective, conscious of the future ..."

(PM p.236)
"... dans le cas d'un Monde statique, le Créateur (cause efficiente) demeure, quoi qu'on en ait, structurellement détaché de son œuvre et, partant, sans fondement définissable à son immanence, – dans le cas d'un Monde de nature évolutive, au contraire, Dieu n'est plus concevable (ni structurellement, ni dynamiquement) que dans la mesure où, comme une sorte de cause "formelle", il coïncide (sans se confondre) avec le Centre de convergence de la Cosmogénèse. Ni structurellement, ni dynamiquement, je dis bien: parce que si Dieu ne nous apparaissait pas maintenant en ce point suprême et précis où se noue désormais à nos yeux la Nature, ce n'est plus vers lui (situation absurde!) mais vers un autre "Dieu" que graviterait inévitablement notre pouvoir d'aimer.

Depuis Aristote, on n'avait guère cessé de construire les "modèles" de Dieu sur le type d'un Premier Moteur extrinsèque, agissant à retro. Depuis l'émergence, en notre conscience, du "sens évolutif", il ne nous est plus physiquement possible de concevoir, ni d'adorer, autre chose qu'un Dieu Premier Moteur organique ab ante.

Seul un Dieu fonctionnellement et totalement "Oméga" peut désormais nous satisfaire."

(CJC p.288)

"Tout de même, dans les circonstances présentes, comment ne pas estimer que la montée graduelle du Christ dans la conscience humaine ne saurait plus continuer bien longtemps sans que se produise, dans notre ciel intérieur, l'événement révolutionnaire de sa conjonction avec le Centre, désormais prévisible, d'une co-réflexion terrestre (et, plus généralement, avec le foyer présumé de toute réflexion au sein de l'Univers)?

Forcés toujours plus étroitement l'un sur l'autre par les progrès de l'Homénisation, et plus encore attirés l'un vers l'autre par une identité de fond, les deux Omégas, je répète (celui de l'Expérience et celui de la Foi), s'apparentent certainement à réagir l'un sur l'autre dans la conscience humaine et finalement à se synthétiser: le Cosmique étant sur le point d'agrandir fantastiquement le Christique; et le Christique sur le point (chose invraisemblable!) d'amoriser (c'est-à-dire d'énergifier au maximum) le Cosmique tout entier.

Rencontre inévitable et "implosive", en vérité, ayant pour effet probable de souder entre eux demain, au milieu d'un flot de puissance évolutive libérée, Science et Mystique, – autour d'un Christ identifié enfin par le travail des siècles, deux mille ans après la Confession de Pierre, comme le sommet ultime (c'est-à-dire comme le seul Dieu possible) d'une Evolution reconnue décidément comme un mouvement de type convergent.

Voilà ce que je prévois.

Et voilà ce que j'attends."
3. The Phenomenon of Man.¹

The following elements in this book demonstrate the present Thesis:

(1) p.29. This is the first page of the book. The attempted scientific approach of the first paragraph is made specific (lines 9,13) in the "choosing" of a hypothesis with which to demonstrate the "experimental" Law of Recurrence. So Man-the-centre will demonstrate the Creative Union Gestalt of Recurrence of Monadic Centres. Unfortunately (as becomes apparent) Teilhard cannot understand that by the projection of the metaphor of centre on to a human he is entering straight into metaphysics and not "carefully avoiding" speculation. (cf. pp.300ff)

(2) p.30, 1.8. Teilhard thinks visually (cf. eg. p.199,1.27-30) and tactilely (cf. eg. p.184, 1.7).

(3) p.30, 1.13. The plane metaphor.

(4) p.30, 1.18. Teilhard by "hyperphysics" is meaning "sur-natural" A la faveur ideas, but he does not explain this.

(5) p.30, 1.21ff. Teilhard is explicit about his assumptions concerning Thought and Human Social Fact, which correspond to Monad-Metaphysics and the organic, A la faveur metaphors. He has thus made a series of explicit hypotheses and the rest of the book will try to demonstrate them. If this Preface therefore is heeded while the book is read, Teilhard can be understood as writing 'within reason': if it is not, he will simply be making a series of unsubstantiated and inexplicable leaps, for he is not explicit concerning the A la faveur, morphogenic, monadic, creative union or even cone bases to his thought.

(6) p.31. If the Gestalt-nature of Teilhard and his need for visual perception is still not clear, pp.31-6 makes amends. "Focussing eyes" and "seeing" are both the basis

¹ Teilhard de Chardin, The Phenomenon of Man. London, Collins, 1959. (The reader might prefer the French text since the English translation is not accurate. The points made in this Section are more clearly demonstrated by the French text.)
and the object of the book. But the tactile perception of the other senses, to sense "movement" for instance, is also needed.

(7) p.33-4. The metaphors already abound. Lines are convergent, Man is a centre and at a ganglion-position in the cosmos, a point. The past is layers, the world is a physical unity, and the physical links in the movement in this unity are organic. Above all, man is a summit and crown of cosmogenesis (which is by definition convergent, so the cone metaphor is there), and the axis and leading shoot of evolution (p.36).

(8) p.35, 1.4. The basic assumption is seen, that of a "whole".

(9) p.40, 1.6,9,26. Teilhard wishes to find "faces" and "configurations" in the "world" and "matter".

(10) p.41, 1.25-7. The punctiform image emerges in the "heart" and "co-extension" of "each cosmic element".

(11) p.42. "Energy" is the "unifying power" which "aggregates", "absorbs" and "cements" atoms, and is the "sphere above the centres" which "envelops" them.

(12) p.43. The Whole is a totum, system, quantum – that is an All – which on p.44, 1.9-10, becomes an "organised whole", each element being an "apex" used by "unities of a higher order". Metaphor and Metaphysics are here to stay.

(13) p.46. Teilhard is conscious of using Metaphor. The centres and sphere are followed by eg. "elements" on "each successive rung of the ladder" (p.48), "granulation" (p.49), chemical/biological "synthesis" (p.51) and "condensation" (p.52); so that the idea of complexity-consciousness – even in this book – is explicitly produced in concert with metaphor.

(14) p.54-5. The "Within of things" is explicitly imaged by radioactivity, as is Christ in UFN.

(15) p.56, 1.16. Teilhard explicitly acknowledges a displaced-metaphor Gestalt concerning the "cosmic extension" of consciousness (though cf. ) above).

(16) pp.50-1. Monad-Metaphysics, the sphere metaphor, statistical probability and
and Creative Union together, are Teilhard's argument for 1. a "convergent structure" to the world, 2. the Law of Complexity/Consciousness and so for "radial" and "tangential energies" (pp.63-6). No new argument has emerged for these. Entropy is simply the slipping back of energy into lower centres.

(17) p.66. Teilhard (last line) states explicitly that the concept of Omega Point is needed to further explain ) (at least) - this "point" being a "superior pole".

(18) Pages 67-74 begin the task of adducing material from geology, biology and palaeontology which back up the above: the world is to be a "work of synthesis" and an "organic whole".

(19) pp.77-97. Examples of formative analogies:- p.79 "threshold" as "beginning of a new order"; p.84, 1.15-16, "axis" and "morphological end-form or stage" are combined; p.89 circle, surface, sphere, symmetry; p.97 "new buds" at the "tips" of the world's "branches".

(20) p.99. The А la faveur notion appears, to reject a multi-causal dis-unity of the world (1.31). On p.101 it becomes the "ever-ascending curve" with unrepeatable "points of transformation", to give a "deep organic likeness" in the "propagation of that unique wave" of Life (p.102).

(21) p.108. Orthogenesis appears in concert with Mendel, diversification-segregation, the metaphor of vertical component, and the monadic idea of "centro-complexity" (note).

(22) Further metaphors:- tactile: p.110,116,118 "groping". p.118 "pulsation". p.139 "born", "grown". visual: p.103ff Tree of Life, branches. p.112 "radiating ripple". p.114 "the living 'bundle': the line of lines". p.115 "initial angle of divergence". p.117,129 "phylum in full bloom" is a "verticil of consolidated forms". pp.123ff diagrams.

(23) p.133. Teilhard attempts to use pp.103ff to demonstrate the hypotheses of pp.29-66. There are "facts" which require "explanation" (p.140). Ariadne's threat is the
growth of a "vast nervous system" in the world of living creatures (p.146) (reminiscent of the Lamar), and the explanation is the "inner principle" (p.139) of "radial" energy, which makes the orthogenesis axis to higher degrees, which was (p.108) monadic and Mendelian (à la faveur segregation).

(24) p.165. Thought is the à la faveur "new sphere" and "another world", which stops man's specialisation and so thwarts extinction. The metaphors of cone with summit and point, and the boiling of water image this (p.168). This is the "radial" pushing up the axis as the ordinary tangential ("water") increases. Centre and sphere pictures help also (p.169); and the word "transcendence" makes its first appearance in these circumstances.

(25) p.178. The "effort" of "intelligences" - and Man is the "front" of evolution (p.187), "crowning" the noosphere (p.184).

(26) pp.208-9. In Homo Sapiens Teilhard finds "synthesis" via an "axis" of "convergences".

(27) Some personal points about Teilhard.

p.219, 1.20. Teilhard's personal Gestalt concerning the illumination of Evolution.

p.224, 1.7. Teilhard's concretizing mind is displacing metaphors, not just picturing ...

p.233, 1.14ff. Teilhard is a 'diverger': Nature cannot be threatening.


p.26-7, Teilhard's Sense-Sensitivity Value-vector ("awareness of a Great Presence").

(28) p.231, 1.14-15. The future's openness is via convergent nature and higher spheres.

p.243. This means by creative union: this brings consciousness in the mega-synthesis of Evolution.

p.244. This "super-arrangement" is "psychobiological", and is an "advance of all
together" into "some great body" of "that great Thing" of an "evolutionary All" - and all this because of man's "cosmic roots" which are "its particular substance" (p.246).

(29) p.251. This mega-synthesis is not metaphor. Teilhard is explicit. The universe is a spiral, and the "still unnamed Thing" is therefore "supre-physical", a function of the "sum of all human beings", a sort of "super-consciousness", the unanimous construction of a spirit of the earth" (p.253).

(30) pp.257ff. Teilhard here gives a "face" to the "Thing". He rejects the "impersonal" "All" of the Pantheists (pp.257-8,262), though the Thing must be "Universal and Collective" if it is to be "real". It is in fact the All and Person who is born "a single centre from the convergent beams of millions of elementary centres", the "centred" "whole" which is the centre of the noosphere-structure, the "point" called Omega which is produced by "convergent" space-time, the sphere's point at which the radii meet, the richest possible "concentration of being", the "super-humanised" noogenesis, Personal and Universal "extension" of man's being - the "Hyper-Personal" "Future-Universal" met at the Omega Point whose "essence" is human consciousnesses, who is the unity-system made by the concentration of the harmonized complexity of the monadic centres, who is their Centre (p.262).

(31) pp.267ff. Who is this Omega Centre? The S-S value-vector suggest (in tactile metaphor) a "Great Presence", "supremely present". On page 270 the à la faveur mechanism, the cone image and biological synthesis suggest a transcendent crown. On p.271 in a "divine focus of mind", the explicit Religion value-vector displaces its contents into the "ultra-synthetic sphere". At once the "Prime Mover ahead" appears as a "punctiform" in the "sublime physics of centres", and as persons the elements can now begin to react. With p.272 with "souls" "breaking away", the "building" of the universe at last reaches the "point of convergence". The UPN punctiform-Christ who is the Universal Element producing the Universal Christ is
almost (but not) explicitly posited.

(32) pp.273. In this last chapter Teilhard begins by re-emphasizing the "curve" of geogenesis and the future, and the contingency of Man. Life is struggle (p.280). So there is the "option" for the human organism of "synthesis", "totality", "future" and "all", via "adoration" - or not. Mankind can, through "cosmic convergence of mind" via complexity and consciousness, shift its centre to the "transcendent centre" of God-Omega, thus building by laborious synthesis a new universe of the segregated part of the noosphere. (Teilhard's existential need has produced a concept which operates as a search-image to demand choice.)

(33) So (p.294) Christ the "element" the "principle of universal vitality" "aggregates to himself the total psychism of the earth"; "invests himself organically" with the "majesty of his creation" (p.297); and is the "Someone", the All and the Person "in a single living act", the "summit of the world" (p.298). The "synthesis of centres" has produced the "fulfilment" of the universe "in conformity with the laws of union" (p.294).

(34) So the "Someone" who is "an other" influences us "palpably".

Summary of The Phenomenon of Man.

There are anthropological/palaeontological details in Books Two and Three which are not in UPN. But as the above has shown all the details of Christ-Kosmos as it was developed in UPN (through metaphors like punctiform) are there, and no additions have appeared as argument. The diagram in this Thesis on p. can summarize The Phenomenon of Man's vision more than adequately; and the Preface, Forward and Postscript - if read sympathetically - adequately show that Teilhard has a Gestalt-series as his hypothesis; and that the book is an attempted demonstration of this.

1. One conclusion of this section must be that Huxley's Foreward was both utterly incorrect in its interpretation of Teilhard as an "intellectual" synthesis, the end-elements of which he "could not follow" - and most harmful in starting false views on Teilhard which have yet to be righted. (See final Chapter of this Thesis.)
Even the form of the book carries echoes of UFN, for instance in the lead-up to Christ as Omega. But Teilhard is less than explicit about his Creative union and \_la_faveur notions, and the UFN diagrams would have helped the book.

4. Teilhard’s Christological Realization.

The Christ-Kosmos concept of 1915-16, in its developments as well as bringing the abiding need and search-image-object of concern through the years until he died, also became the explicit personal subject of Teilhard’s work and the basis of a new Christology and new religion. ¹

The subject of new Christology exercised Teilhard during the nineteen-thirties, forties and fifties both in private letters and in print. Christology and Evolution appeared in 1933. Leroy in Appendix A drew attention to this concern of Teilhard’s. Leroy was with Teilhard during the writing of The Phenomenon of Man, which was studied in the previous section and where the UFN concepts were found to be surviving. As will be noted below, the organic circle and cone metaphors used to denote what Teilhard was trying to describe in the earliest years of novelty now produced the New God and Third Nature of Christ of the God of Evolution and the Universal- and Trans-Christ, and this dating at the latest from the New Religion of HIB (1936) to the very last jotting made before his death and on his litany card.

The New Religion and New Christianity were indeed central interests of the autobiographical essay How I Believe, itself the 1934 result of 1929-34 thinking, and the 1936 translation into English under his own auspices which was to express Teilhard’s whole perspective to his English and American friends. In this the chapters on Spirit and Immortality, ending with the Universal-Christ passage quoted in the Introduction, make clear the total commitment to the Christ-Kosmos, God-Omega, Christ-Universal, Trans-Christ, God of Evolution dominant value-vector. Here the concepts of Complexity-Consciousness, Creative Union, Human Socialisation and

Convergence are metaphorical and science-suggested tools by which the Universal-Christ concept was elucidated and elaborated. Here in How I Believe Teilhard's so-called scientific theories appear in fact and in origin metaphor-displacements more or less closely related to data and theory from the scientific and savant communities, and produced in Teilhard to meet existential conceptual need to maintain identity and integrity, and so to develop the search-image Christ-Kosmos. But here in HIB above all the new religion of the Christ-Universal is proclaimed as a going-beyond the Neolithic Christianity of Tradition as well as beyond Marxism and the passivities of Oriental religion. Here Teilhard's New Religion is based in New Christology.

In the following passages explicit descriptions of Teilhard's Christological concern and of his knowledge of his own novelty in this field are shown. Publicly the shift beyond Chalcedon had appeared in his 1950 essay on The Heart of Matter.1

1951: "Mais quel besoin de Réforme! non plus dans les moeurs, mais dans la conception même de Dieu!" (U.L. 28351)

1955: "le Christ de la Révélation n'est pas autre chose que l'Oméga de l'Évolution ... le Christ total ... cette troisième nature du Christ (ni humaine, ni divine, mais"cosmique")... l'Universalité du Christ, transposé à ces dimensions nouvelles..." (U.L.)

In other writings the reflective Christological concern expresses itself as follows:-

1937: "The most fascinating property of an awakening universe is that it requires physically, somewhere ahead, the attraction and the light of a Supreme and Personal Apex — a Divinity."

1944: "Ne plus vivre que de, et pour, le Christ-Evoluteur (X-W) ... En fait, je tends à expliciter le Christianisme en une "Rédemption de l'Evolution"; — ou, plus simplement, à développer, à partir du Christianisme, une Rédemption de l'Evolution ... ce qui arrive finalement (tout étant fait) = L'adorable, (ex Évolution). Etre "l'apôtre de l'Evolution ..." (UPN)

1945: "Création = face génératrice, Incarnation = face unitive, Redemp-

1, cf. CJC.
tion = face laborieuse, et synthèse — Fléromisation = constitution
de l'Être totalisé suprême (Maximum de spiritualité dans le maximum
d'unicification).

(UPN)

1950: "Non point metaphysiquement, mais génétiquement, considéré, l'Esprit
... devenait le cœur même de la Tangibilité que je cherchais
atteindre."

"Non point metaphysiquement mais physiquement parlant, l'Energie
d'incarnation ..."

"Point Oméga, c'est la Consistance de l'Univers que je tiens ramasser
... en un seul centre indestructible QUE JE PUIS AIMER."

"Christ-Universel ... Univers se personnalisa par convergence ...
une Personne (celle du Christ) s'universalisant par Radiance." (HM)

1952: "... L'Univers a un Centre à venir ... ce Centre de Convergence
evolutive (coincide avec) correspond au Christ (convenablement
universalisé) de la Mystique ... nouveau Dieu est très biologi-
que par prolongement." (U.L. 2452)

1953: "un Dieu de l'Évolution ... Ainsi que j'ai repéré et écrit tant de
temps, le Monde n'adorera devenir qu'un Dieu (une Croix) exaltant et
transfigurant au maximum l'énorme réalité (en train de se découvrir
dans) d'un formidable Univers (des millions de Galaxies ...) où
partout d'une même "Matière" montre la même tendance à se vitaliser
et à s'hominiser", (MEPO, unpublished)

1954: "j'adore le Trans-Christ ... Nouveau-Dieu ..." (UPC)

Such quotations note new Christology and Teilhard's recognition that he has
gone beyond Chalcedon. Many of the quotations referred to below will also show the
same.

5. If doubt remains concerning the centrality and durability of the Christ-Kosmos
terms and interest, consider the following examples from a wider range of Teilhard's
writings:-

a) MPN pp.120-1
b) RE pp.91-2, 155

c) SC pp.163ff.
d) VP pp.138, 77-9

e) MM pp.160, 215, 262
f) LT pp.151, 269, 347
g) LZ pp.58, 60, 110
h) LTE pp.32, 110-12

So much for Christ-Kosmos.

6. For the whole TOTA-Naven model of Teilhard a comprehensive demonstration of the
presence of the components posited may also be given, as the following Table shows:-

1. Without the editorial note.
### TABLE OF TOTA-NAVON CONCEPTS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTA-Navon concepts</th>
<th>The Making of a Mind pages:</th>
<th>Letters to Zanta pages:</th>
<th>Letters to Two Friends pages:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesuit</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scient</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savant</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Ego</td>
<td>272-3</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense-Sensitivity</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gestalt</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displacement</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reality-testing</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactile-need</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search-Image</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ-Kosmos</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; la faveur</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>centre-sphere</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cone</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>creative union</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>convergence</td>
<td>164-5</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>segregation-selection</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>visage-face</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>element</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosmic life</td>
<td>264-5</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian-pantheism</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogma-change</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary.

The above sections and Tables are not able to demonstrate each component clearly in every case. But over-all, even where Teilhard's thought has developed, the early Teilhard still lives in his 1915-25 identity.

Taken with the diagrams and the brief analysis of The Phenomenon of Man, they help to summarize this Thesis and the UFN material. From this and in answer to the questions put in the Introduction, the Thesis may now be drawn together and summarized finally in the following paragraphs and diagrams.
Figure for Summary: The Early Teilhard.
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1. This figure should be in concert with those on pages 313# and 361ff.
This means to say that Teilhard

(a) $5 \times v-v. \text{ circuit-selves} \preccurlyeq 5 \times \text{lived-in-orders} \preccurlyeq \text{need for Identity/Weltanschauung.}$

(b) Christ-Kosmos Gestalt $\preccurlyeq 3 \text{ main metaphor-series} \preccurlyeq S_S \text{ processes, especially concept-displacement. This gives lasting identity.}$

(c) À la faveur-Organic/Centre/Cone metaphors $\preccurlyeq \text{the 5 v-v. circuit-selves}$

changing mental/physical environment to develop Christ-Kosmos by feedback so that at all times in his life Christ-Kosmos was a Living God, needed, present, physically tangible and existentially fruitful.

(d) Existential synthesis, sought/found search-image, personal Weltanschauung.

So Teilhard $\quad (5 \times v-v) \preccurlyeq (5 \times 1-i-o) \preccurlyeq \text{(other press)} \rightarrow \preccurlyeq (X-K \text{ Gestalt}) \preccurlyeq$

(metaphor/Gestalt-series).

Further, in the terms of the anomalies put forward in the Introduction:

1. Teilhard's Identity as Adult was fixed

   a) by work in science and religion (communities and concepts,
   b) by writing mystic/pantheist personal synthesis to elucidate his experience,
   c) by membership of the Savant community (religious, scientific, pantheist searchers),
   d) by the executive concept Christ-Kosmos which was preceded by the executive concept of Evolution and was followed by the executive concept reworkings of Christ-Kosmos (Universal Christ). These oriented his personality, and though originally spin-off from the top of his mind, became commitment-bases for all the rest of his life.

2. Teilhard's Method was mainly unconscious and does not correspond to traditional ideas of logic:

   a) it depends on spin-off Gestalten, and so on the rhythm of 5 selves spinning, pressing, producing and then inter-displacing the concepts.
b) It includes feed-back from the five selves, from particular technical criticisms mediated by personal contacts, and from selected viewpoints known from academic sources by Teilhard.

c) it is based in metaphor which is pressed by the value-vectors to satisfy personal needs, but which is not criticised except in terms of its fruitfulness in the realm of the integration of Religion, Science and Pantheist experience.

d) it is, overall, a series of Gestalten, but since these are bi-polar, coming from at least Scientific and Religious concepts, there is a certain dialectical bent in Teilhard's unconscious which in the later Teilhard becomes explicit.

3. Teilhard's Originality is
a) the Executive Concept Christ-Kosmos and the later reworkings of this concept. These were what prevented self-destruction and schismogenesis. They were beyond- not non-orthodox commitments.

b) the Christian Pantheist 'cosmic life' set of attitudes, commitments and behaviour-patterns. Both these specific sets of concepts were novel to Teilhard in 1915-6+ and to the Church, Scientific and Savant communities of the time, (though the metaphors themselves were of course not novel to Teilhard).

a) and b) were thus genuine discovery in the wider sphere.

c) the A la faveur-base concept, though coming via Balzac and possibly Freud, may possibly have been a novelty to 1916 Zoology when used so concretely.

4. Teilhard's Religion is
a) Christian,

b) new Christology,

c) beyond traditional Catholic, Jesuit and Protestant attitudes and concepts, but on the traditional bases.

d) his motive and need in writing; his concern is for a Greater Christ, better Christianity and so new religion.
5. Science.
   a) Science to Teilhard is an "absolute" commitment and value (and to Mankind).
   b) His original writing is not science, but is a function of scientific concepts, theory and metaphor.
   c) The concretisation which Teilhard's senses seek is produced by Science, 1) by his work-profession and concept-commitments, 2) by displacement of scientific concept.

6. Pantheism.
   a) the omitted paragraph is now seen as integral Teilhard,
   b) but Teilhard goes beyond, on the conceptual bases of eg. Wells and James,
   c) so without pantheist concepts such as monad and All, Teilhard is unintelligible in UPN: but he transforms them in welding them into Christology.

Thus can the TOTA-Naven model of Teilhard in this Thesis be summarized.
By the concept of a healthily-centred multi-phrenia Teilhard can be explained as priest and scientist, Roman and Christian Pantheist, and the executive concept explains his central Self as this was secure and fruitful in work and social life, and so his personal conviction concerning his ideas. His lived-in model coped with his environments and with the physical, social and mental realities of his life.

But if this Thesis is correct, certain conclusions follow, for this 'model-of-a-man-with-a-model' is not the current norm-interpretation of Teilhard, and few interpreters stress Christ-Kosmos. It is with this situation that the final chapter deals, after a Critique of this Thesis' method and before certain speculations.

No wonder Teilhard is misconstrued if his central concepts have not yet been proclaimed.

---
1. See Teilhard Review, Volume 4, No.2 for the present writer's article of this title (Appendix E).
CHAPTER XXI

CRITIQUE, CONCLUSION AND SPECULATION:
THE RELIGION OF THE EPIGENETIC CHRIST.

A) Critique of the Method of this Thesis: Myth or Model? The Code to break the Strange Tongue.

It has been the task of this Thesis to cross the disciplines in an attempt to discover language and tools with which to describe and interpret Teilhard the man and his Weltanschauung which has become in the process his Lived-in Model. The result is that to someone not versed in TGTA-Naven concepts the Summary chapter just ended may have seemed less manageable than the neo-logisms of Teilhard himself. But the use of perspectives from particular soft-scientific studies, adapted to serve the selective mind of the present writer, was the methodological premise of the Thesis; and as tools these have been applied to virgin-material from Teilhard and his friends in the hope that his psychological and conceptual developments might be portrayed in such a way that he would appear both real and un-muffled by the blankets which some interpreters¹ have wound around him. Conceptual tools were needed to probe his complexity.

How valid, though, was this method, and what degree of reasonableness may be ascribed to the model of Teilhard which has appeared above?

The following points may be made in answer to these questions:-

1. The use of method-concepts from different disciplines has shown "convergence" in a single series of models of Teilhard and his thought only because of the present writer's unifying mind. Taken in isolation Freud, Fromm, Erikson, Murray, Kluckholm, Hinde, Schon, Bateson and Ashby were dealing with particular problems with their particular tools, and any arbitrary and selective transference of their concepts to interpret Teilhard cannot be given validity because of the "success" of

1. See below.
the above men. On the other hand such experimental use of others' tools is how investigators work; so that whether or not the TGTA-Naven model of Teilhard is thought reasonable should depend on whether Teilhard is better understood by means of the methods used. On this score the TGTA-Naven results are scarcely less successful in coherence, reasonableness, consistency and fruitfulness than e.g. Rideau.¹

2. The use of direct data from people (Appendix A) was inconclusive because of their and the inquirer's mental filters. Further, the UPN and UL sources, though these are genuine documents, do not necessarily give the full picture, nor are there no assumptions in the use of them. For instance the quotation of full passages has not meant that there was no selection of the passages used.

More important, the making of a model from chronological date dating from 1915 to 1925, in which the chronological developments were given an historical concreteness, may have led to a certain pseudo-historicity, a glossing over of later changes and distillations in Teilhard's thought. That is to say, the fact that he in 1915 uses "element" "Christ" and "centre" together to denote a physical reality does not necessarily mean that in 1939 "Christ" and "centre" include in them the physical notion of "element". The idea of such association of concepts in later life is hypothetical.

The present Thesis therefore should be followed up by similar study of Teilhard's uses of metaphor in later years, so as to see in detail if the early Gestalten were indeed "positive feed-back" or "runaway", or if they came to be controlled, or left in some minor and unused store.

3. Left to one side in this Thesis has been the question of the "truth" scientifically

¹ See below.
speaking of, for instance, Erikson's scheme of Identity Development. If such ideas are reckoned by the reader to represent real and generalisable realities, then their projection on to Teilhard will be more reasonable and deemed to result in a near approximation to the "real" Teilhard.

4. However, if the ideas of the TGTA-Naven model (or some of them) are not accepted, this does not necessarily mean that this Thesis must be rejected.

That is to say, it was admitted in the Introduction that for instance "value-vector" is a "literary symbolism" and that a "model" is not the "reality". From this point of view the TGTA-Naven method and the model it produced do not attempt to be matters of "Science" as the Physicist might have demanded; after all, like most biological specimens Teilhard is dead and so not available for physical and psychological dissection in controlled experiment.

The value of the method has rather been the penetration into the Appendix A and UFN-UL data in a way which has pulled out of these a picture of Teilhard which has not been portrayed previously in Teilhard studies and which is startling in its simplicity when it is compared to eg. Rideau or de Lubac.

This does not mean that this new specific picture is true! But the first specific value of the method was to the present writer in the detective work of unravelling the different strands of Teilhard and the new material; second, the TGTA-Naven language has produced a "rule-of-thumb" for him; and third, the simplicity of the result is intellectually satisfying.

If these are taken as valid reasons for the use of the symbolism for the present writer, the reader may therefore accept it as at least a useful set of tools for Teilhard interpretation at the present moment without having to follow this by quickly denying that Teilhard "really" "was" "a man of five value-vectors". The reader, in other words, may drop the symbolic language of this Thesis after (if he so wishes) accepting the main lines and content of the Thesis. But the case
against the TGTA-Naven framework is inconclusive because the latter has been fruitful both in experiment and in simplification.

5. There it must be questioned whether the time is ripe in the present study to drop the TGTA-Naven symbolism. For the symbolism forces the reader a) to accept what is there in the data of Teilhard, and b) to keep in his mind, for instance, that there were at least five main circuit-selves or bunches of ideas-and-emotional commitments in the computer-person of Teilhard. A simple instance of pressure to reduce the intensity of Teilhard's commitment would be given if a reader were to see Teilhard as a priest only, or as a scientist only, or as a priest and a scientist without the pantheist-mystic Life commitment, or as only a poet. The value-vector symbolism at least prevents Teilhard from being emasculated by a premature simplification of his personal complexity.

From this point of view the TGTA-Naven model operates like a scientific model. It does not pretend to "be" the "reality", just as a physicist does not pretend the light "is" a wave or a bullet or both. The latter treats light as both a wave and a bullet and by means of mathematical models incorporates the complementary phenomena. Similarly with Teilhard the various complementary models which come together in the TGTA-Naven symbolism make sure that no side of him is lost. It may be one necessary way. At the present time in Teilhard studies therefore the TGTA-Naven tools come to grips with and make sense of a very comprehensive range of complexities in Teilhard and at the least hold the student to the data of the specimen, which - as will appear below - is not always what has happened in interpretations of Teilhard.

The point of view of this Thesis is therefore that the methods used are reasonable even though they scarcely provide the reader with the "reality" let alone the "really-reality" of Teilhard. Some such symbolism is necessary if Teilhard's complexity is to be struggled with and even partially understood: so that, although the TGTA-Maven model of Teilhard is not Teilhard, its literary symbolism may be a
useful guide for any student of Teilhard since there is as yet no other symbolism through which the organism Teilhard's reality might be approached within a non-literary milieu. Thus, though this Thesis' symbolism is symbolising first of all the present writer's own needs and his own working out of his own salvation, the fact is that it incorporates also the need-commitments and much of the complexity of Teilhard and is at least a partially successful tool with which to interpret him.

But how then could the picture of Teilhard which has emerged from this study be described? Is the TOTA-Naven picture really a Model as has been claimed above, or is it Myth?

Ontologically speaking the picture is of course Myth. The picture is not Teilhard's really-reality. But with this limitation in mind, it can also be posited that it is also a Model. The TOTA-Naven picture of Teilhard reached in Part One was tested semi-experimentally, that is in the laboratory of untouched and previously unknown material;¹ and there was data in this material which gave backing to the hypotheses, and (it seems) none which challenged it from within the material.

So the 'selves' and 'lived-in-orders' may be said to exist experimentally insofar as concepts related to some reality may be said to "exist". But so does Teilhard's lived-in-model itself "exist". That is to say, the picture of the concepts in Teilhard's mind (eg. Fig. ) also gives the appearance of being Model to him, not Myth. Teilhard does not luxuriate in these concepts. They course around the fields of his mind, leaping over the hedges, searching for their prey which is a conceptual association which gives pleasure to his mind and which helps to produce and prolong his identity. Indeed UIN has shown how Teilhard's mind has to have concepts which meet up with and make sense of the experienced, tangible world in which he lives; and when he arrives with Christ-Kosmos, all the parts of himself, such as his Science-need-commitment, while having helped to produce it, now must work to test it, for instance, by study of fossil-brains, human socialisation

¹. The Appendix E article was written before the present writer had met the UIN, UL material, so this Thesis has been a genuine experiment on the bases of virgin hypotheses and specimen...
and the convergence of species. So he really was "living" in the concept-cluster.

It makes no difference in this matter of Myth or Model, in the first instance, if the reader as scientist says that species do not converge. The point is that Christ-Kosmos was to Teilhard an experimental reality known through all his selves, tested by them and needed by his central self to give identity and motivation. It was not a myth in which he lay satisfied for the rest of his days. As a concept (in the second instance) Christ-Kosmos may be, ontologically speaking, a Myth, an un-testable Metaphysic. But existentially speaking, Christ-Kosmos was experimental search-image as well as existential synthesis, and so was Lived-in Model, not Myth, to the organism Teilhard. A Myth cannot be tested experimentally.

From this point of view the Lived-in Model and the TGTA-Naven system are the map of Teilhard's mind and the blue-print of his processes and concept-clusters. So together these are the Code which will break the noisy nonsense of his language. For example, if the Introduction's omitted passage is taken as coded babble, the following might be the result if it is decoded by the TGTA-Naven model.

B) The Omitted Paragraph Decoded.

First, the five value-vectors all appear. The "brutal truth" shows the intensity of Teilhard's Self-Ego need and Integrity-crisis re-commitment to his 1915+ Identity. "At the limit", ultimately Teilhard's need is Christ, which is the Religion self. The Science self is there in the mathematical metaphors of limit and distribution, in the concepts of force and in the idea of biological synthesis occurring in "composition" and made explicit in "organicity". The S-S value-vector obliges with metaphor-production in "dead envelope", "live forces" and "limit", and in the sensitivities involved in the brutal truth of the total commitment involved

---

1. But see below.
2. The basis of the argument here is the definition given for Myth by Garaudy, op. cit., and the concept of psychological/behavioural Search-image used by eg. Hinde, op.cit.
3. Above pp.5-6.
in the underlined Gestalt. The Life value-vector is felt in the commitment to such as Wells and James, but it is conceptualised in the "absolute efficacy" given to "human effort" and in the commitment to the world's future.

Second, Teilhard's lived-in-model is present here. The Christ-Kosmos Gestalt is all but explicitly stated when "absolute" is used of human effort and when belief in the organic future of man into unity is to be the new belief. Since the 1920 essay goes on to speak of Man's phylogenesis as that of a "living organism" which has the responsibility of "All the Universe as a Whole" in his hands and since there is one evolution of matter and spirit and this completely equals the Pleroma of Christ, it must be assumed that the Christ-Kosmos Gestalt in its God-Omega or Universal-Christ form is in Teilhard's mind - or how else can the effort be absolute?

The TGTA-Naven code thus is able to break the Teilhard babble. It reduces the noise by showing that the logic of Teilhard here is that of the rhythm of mind-circuits which are committed to certain Gestalten: the logic is not abstract reasoning, but the type of selection which operates in computer-logic¹ and decision-making. As such, it is a type of dialectic. The Code in fact brings out the message which Teilhard would have proclaimed² if he had been more explicit and more aware of the unconscious nature of his reasonings and so of his concepts. Even if it were argued that the option in the underlined sentence shows Teilhard as a conscious dialectician and so as an abstract reasoner, the above Thesis is not invalidated: for such dialectic will be the feedback on thought conceptualised earlier by inter-value-vector tension and displacement - it was not the first time that Teilhard has thought of the option. Indeed in the earlier Gestalt of the option the bi-polarity


² It is possible also that in 1920 he was already being guarded about the basis of his personal belief, after all Blondel had severely questioned it (cf. Correspondence). Or, possibly Teilhard was in this paragraph choosing to overemphasize his radical Pantheism, at the expense of the truth which was his bi-polarity.
will have been produced by parallel value-vectors just as in the case of Christ-Kosmos itself and it would be from such Gestalten of the mutual fruitfulness of juxtaposition of concepts that the habit of conscious dialectical thinking would have arisen. If this is true, in all probability what Teilhard had been taught at Ore Place concerning Rhetoric would have been growing as a function of his emotional (S-S) mind; and Christ-Kosmos would have provided the demonstration that imaginative dialectical thinking on the Ore Place model could be fruitful. But that is far from saying that Christ-Kosmos came from Aristotelian Rhetoric.

Thus, although ontologically the picture of Teilhard and the picture of Teilhard's mind and the concepts like "God" which were lived-in by him are all Myth, the TGTA-Naven "code" nevertheless comes through with the "message" from Teilhard because the pictures are all experimental model testable in the known data of the specimen.

But besides producing the lived-in model of Teilhard and a diagram of the specimen, the TGTA-Naven model is able to carry out one more service at least for the student of Teilhard: it can be a tool by which the interpreters of Teilhard may be classified. Such classification may again not be reality of course, but it may be suggestive.

C) Conclusions.

If the above Thesis is viewed from such perspectives, with its limitations and fruitfulness both allowed, the following conclusions may be deemed to follow:

1. If Christ-Kosmos is the central and integrating concept in Teilhard, then many interpreters seem to have missed this conceptual essence of Teilhard, either from ignorance or from conscious or unconscious selection.

2. If the value-vectors in the TGTA-Naven model are indeed there in the man Teilhard and are the total commitments which have been suggested, then some interpreters have missed one or more of these particular forces in the man, or at least
underestimated their strength.

3. Since Christ-Kosmos and the value-vectors did produce (and justify) a new religion specifically known as Cosmic Life and Christian Pantheism, the Jesuit Order and the Roman Catholic Church did in fact react to Teilhard in an understandable way: a new Christology through which a man had "emerged" from Order, Church and Neolithic Christianity was not acceptable in environments where the disciplines of juridic behaviour and thought were strongly adhered to. No wonder the Monitum stands.

D) Notes on these Conclusions.

The third conclusion may be taken first to introduce numbers one and two. It reflects Part Two of this Thesis, where the diagrams above all show the unorthodox ideas of Teilhard. But the story of Teilhard's fall from Establishment favour gives further background to the conceptual emergence.

It was in 1923 that Teilhard began to be harrassed by Church authorities, in other words, soon after _Pantheism and Christianity_. In 1920 he had let fellow Jesuits know that to him Redemption must have "multiple faces", since the Christ-Redeemer, as a "cell" who has a "universal morphological function", and as one who must be "All or nothing", must redeem "all the stars" (on the analogy of the Mass), because the Universe must be a matter of growing "organic connection" of all its elements as it "converges" to its "cosmic point of supreme confluence". But by 1923 Teilhard had not toned down his belief-system, indeed he had begun to formalize it. What had appeared in _UFN_ in the war as an absolute \( \frac{1}{\text{commitment to Science and to scientific work was now formally proclaimed in Pantheism and Christianity in an idea of Christian discipleship which seemed to hold loose to the Church and to its practices — and this on the basis of the novel concept of Christ which was using ever-more-physical metaphors to affirm the concreteness of the Cosmic-Christ-Pleroma:—}} \)

1. This essay appears in _CJC_.

---

443.
"La possibilité, et même l'obligation de tout faire pour Dieu ("quid quid facitis, in nomine D.N.J.C. facite") ... s'expliquent en définitive, par la merveilleuse grâce communiquée à tout effort humain, si matériel qu'il soit, de concourir efficacement par son résultat physique, à l'achèvement du Corps du Christ."
(Panth. Xty. 10.2)

"concevoir pour la Pléisme un type d'union "graduée" (temprée par l'excès même de sa perfection physique) telle que les élus, sans rien perdre de leur consistance, de leur personnalité, se trouvraient cependant englobés physiquement dans le Tout organique et "naturel" du Christ consommé?"
(Panth. Xty. 8.3)

No wonder Church authorities were restive. From UPN Teilhard appears as one who thought organic metaphors must replace the 'caduque' juridic metaphors. It is clear that with increasing concreteness of metaphor Teilhard was really believing in Christ as a more physical reality. The metaphors were not 'just' metaphors, they were describing indescribable realities which were Teilhard's search-image, but they were realities which had to be expressed through the ideas of physics and biology, they were so concrete.

In UPN Teilhard had looked for a new Testament as the follow-on from the Old and the New. He had even posited a new Christology which went beyond Chalcedon so that the "cosmic" nature of Christ was the "new God" of "Christ-Omega" — and his new ideas of discipleship underlined the dangers of this new Christology.

The authorities were in other words not mistaken. Students were seduced by the new ideas. Later the worker-priests were given intellectual backing from them. Criticisms of Dogma and Pope were not lacking. What this could mean within the Jesuit Order can best be shown by the following example of advice to a fellow-priest (after the second world war):—

"En attendant, je ne trouve mieux à vous dire que vous suggérer ma propose méthode: aimez fortiter le Christ (un toujours plus grand Christ) à travers, et cependant, si j'ose dire, au-delà de l'Eglise; et, pour l'adorer et le découvrir, ce plus grand

1. See Cuenot, op.cit.
Divin, vouez-vous au sur-développement de l'Humain par la recherche. quelques douces influences ménagées par la Providence feront la reste. Mais, par-dessus tout, gardez, comme dit Whitehead, l'esprit d'aventure et de conquête." (U.L.)

Such an example can be paralleled in much of Teilhard, and formal essays are no exceptions. But such thought was dangerous not only to other priests, but to the faithful in general: for a friend of Teilhard's who had wanted his son to be a priest was told by Teilhard that there were many types of work which were needed by God if His universal purpose was to be carried out, and if the young man did not become a priest the father should be thankful that his son might be carrying out a deeper will of God.

Such ideas, both Christological and Christian-pantheistic, when taken with their personal and charismatic presence in the man Teilhard, were more than enough to press the Jesuit Order and the Roman Church to banish the presence from France and French students, and to deny the man the formal publication of his views. But this action in itself stimulated him to symmetrical schismogenesis which took the form of conscious emergence from the Order, Church and traditional Christianity. This story is told in Letters to Zanta, but the following unpublished paragraph illustrates the basic TGTA-Naven Teilhard as well as the emergence which only took place 'on the shoulders of' all his previous life-and-commitment:-

Au fond, et ceci me fait passer au domaine intérieur, je suis parfaitement paisible. Les longues semaines solitaires de mon voyage d'été ont été marquées par l'établissement, en moi, d'une sorte de définitive sérénité - comme si j'étais évadé, ou si j'avais émergé, par le dedans, du réseau de tant de choses qui me déplaissaient, ou me paralysaient, dans la vie. J'ai l'impression curieuse d'avoir perdu la faculté de jouir (ou d'avoir envie) de quelque ce soit par rapport à moi; en même temps que la suprême grandeur de l'Affaire universelle en laquelle nous sommes engagées par l'existence me domine

2. According to Professor Ian Barbour.
continuellement. C'est une sorte d'indifférence passionnée, en
laquelle toutes les interférences ou ambitions humaines me sont,
sensiblement, presque inexistantes. Je ne crois pas que ce soit
de l'orgueil; encore moins de la sainteté. Plus simplement,
c'est l'évanouissement des meaquineries individuelles (qua tales,
dirait la scolastique) au soleil des grandes Réalités que nous
avons si souvent évoqués ensemble. Alors il me semble que,
plus que jamais, je suis stabilisé dans ma vocation extérieure,
côté, dans mon Ordre. De celui-ci, aussi, je crois bien que
j'ai "émergé" par le dedans. Mais, vraiment, il est ma place
et mon lieu d'action; pour cela, je lui serai toujours, j'espère,
cordialement attaché. Cette conscience me donne un grand calme.
(U.L.)

Thus in terms of the existential and political realities of the Roman Church,
Teilhard was quite understandably silenced. But the question now arises (to return
to Conclusions one and two) whether this silencing has continued to operate after
his death; that is to say, when a Jesuit or Establishment Roman writes on Teilhard,
is there still some silencing of Teilhard?

This questions cannot be answered with any certainty, though the omission of
the 1920 paragraph suggests pressure of some sort in the French editorial offices;
and the refusal by Collins Publishers of Teilhard's own 1936 How I Believe, only to
be followed by their eventual production of a strange translation of this work,
suggests some non-academic motivations in Teilhard publications. On the other hand,
most of the serious work on Teilhard has been done by Jesuits and Roman Catholics.

Since motives are not a fruitful area of quest, the present Thesis can do no
more on this matter than suggest the following: it is a matter of fact that Jesuits
like Rideau, de Lubac and Mooney will have read all the unpublished letters and most
of the other unpublished material, and they will also be conscious of the 'political'
and personal dangers of the new Christology and of the man who "emerged" from the
Order "from within". It is therefore possible that if, say, Christ-Kosmos (and the
"emergence") is under-emphasized by them, some of this under-emphasis might be
conscious and in deference to eg. the Monitum. On the other hand, it might be that
their own unconscious selections are operating. One can say no more than that.
Indeed since Teilhard himself notes that neither de Lubac nor Rideau understand his ideas, the possibility that there could be deliberate suppression is minimal. When the Jesuit interpreters are being considered, however, it is only right to recollect Authority's reactions to what TGTANaven and the unpublished letters have shown is the Identity of Teilhard. For the truth is that Christ-Kosmos is obscured in the Jesuit interpreters, when they of all people had the best chance to make the new Christology clear.

But the Jesuits are only one group of interpreters; and the truth is that Christ-Kosmos seems unnoticed by almost all of them, and when noticed it is minimally emphasized.

E) The Interpreters of Teilhard in the light of this Thesis and its Conclusions.

1. Rideau, de Lubac and Mooney: the Jesuits.


It had already been mentioned in this Thesis that de Lubac and Rideau are amongst those who have changed the text of Teilhard in places. When the question now is raised as to whether they have accurately communicated his attitudes and ideas the answer must be negative. Rideau's final aim of freeing Teilhard from the scientific idea of a converging universe is balanced by the early inaccuracy concerning the "stages" of Teilhard's life, and thought, especially by the statements that the one-many problem was abstract till 1923, and that it was the "Christ of the Eucharist" particularly who was "coinciding" with the universe in movement during the war years.2

What happens is that Rideau reduces the intensity of Teilhard's Science value-vector and maximises that of his Religion. This results in Teilhard's attitudes being inadequately represented, and in Christ-Kosmos being absent even

2. op.cit. pp.25,27.
from Teilhard's "Intuition and Project". The omission from Rideau's list of Teilhard's adjectives of "sur-") is symbolic of flight from the executive concept and the physicalness of the "sur-natural"; even when the physical "universal Christ" appears it is as the "mystical body"; and the "Christian God" is the "universal Christ", which is not the way that Teilhard has put the matter. Such interpretation is in keeping with Rideau's wish to retain "vertical" symbolism, re-emphasise Christ as the saviour of souls, identify Teilhard's "spirituality" with that of the Exercises, and point to "sacred symbolism" instead of the "logic of science" as "the key to universal history".

These are reasonable desires for Rideau to have but such interpretation is in danger of causing misunderstanding in the valuable quotations of Teilhard which he adduces. Teilhard wrote so much that many positions can be claimed from him; but the UN day-by-day intimate thoughts surely balance the "academicising" of Teilhard which appears in Rideau.

Further, to say that the "final union" will be "Mankind-Church" or that

1. op.cit. pp.31-8. Here there is no mention of Christ-Kosmos, indeed no quotation from pre-1919 writings, which in view of Cosmic Life's recognised water-shed position among Teilhard's writings is strange. Surely the first writings would include the "intuitions"? cf. p.329!
2. op.cit. p.261. cf. also p.263.
3. op.cit. pp.149,164-5.
4. op.cit. pp.223,166,168,192ff,71. cf. also pp.223ff. for a tirade against Garaudy (op.cit) and his Marxist-Humanist interpretation of Teilhard.
5. op.cit. pp.147,197,499,193,577. Some of Teilhard's pantheist commitment is allowed to appear but not as a dominant intensity (cf. p.149). The idea of Omega as an "assembler of consciousnesses" or a "dust-cloud of souls" is more-than-balanced by Rideau by his "distinction" made between "supernature" and nature by the "analogy" of "two orders". This nicely reduces any à la faveur thought in Teilhard, and is not how Teilhard himself argued the matter!
6. op.cit. p.522. The "academicising" referred to may be symbolised by the addition which Rideau makes here to Teilhard's letter of 21 Dec. 1919. The original runs "I believe that my position or tendency is pretty well as follows: to bring out and restore the bases - pre-material, material, natural - to be found in all things". Rideau has "restored the significance of the bases". (There is also an omission at the end of the paragraph which might change the meaning).
Teilhard does not really depart from orthodoxy concerning Creation¹ is — in the light of the CM material concerning the union of the multiple and Christ-Kosmos — a selection which much of Teilhard, especially CM disputes. As has been shown, the CM interpretation of Christ-Kosmos and Universal-Christ can fit in simply and consistently with all the later material and a Mankind-Church fits nicely into Christ-Kosmos. There is no need for Rideau's type of interpretation from within Teilhard's own writings. Though Teilhard did envisage a Thomist or Aristotelian framework for his ideas as a possibility,² the total absence of his main concept would surely have been too high a price to pay for this. For the Cosmic Body³ of Christ does not appear in Rideau.


This erudite and comprehensive book would appear at first sight to include all the value-vectors, and the concept of Cosmic Christ.⁴ It appears however soon enough that the five selves are not treated as equally important, and Cosmic Christ has become something quite other than that found in this Thesis.⁵ Further, Creative Union emerges only momentarily and then as a mistake soon corrected, and even ridiculous.⁶ Predictably the Religious value-vector is dominant. Teilhard did not have pantheist religious experience or search for the Absolute: the latter came from orthodox mysticism and the former was in no sense out-of-the-ordinary.⁷ Indeed Teilhard was orthodox in his doctrine of Creation, his spirituality was traditional and followed Ignatius' Exercises, he was Thomist and Aristotelian, his novelty was not in the domain of faith concerned, but with the part played by man and his work "in the setting of a dynamic vision of the universe" and its construction.⁸

¹ op.cit. pp.66,251.
² U.L.
³ The "cosmic role" (op.cit. pp.164,529,532) of Christ, in spite of Rideau's sincerity and clear Christian understanding, does not adequately communicate Teilhard's most novel concept.
⁵ op.cit. pp.60-2,65,125ff,133,143,190ff,209ff,221,319,321.
⁶ op.cit. pp.197ff,277,319.
⁷ op.cit. pp.13,31,84,221.
⁸ op.cit. pp.30-1,92,127,169,174,197.
No new theology or religion appears in Teilhard, no new Christology. He simply helps religion (Catholicism) in the Twentieth Century by correcting old views on Man by scientific re-interpretation of Man as key to the universe; and by living an outstanding Jesuit Catholic life.\(^1\) Such an interpretation is reasonable, but in de Lubac’s case not easily understandable. Many texts are adduced which contain hints concerning the "physiccy" of the Cosmic Body of Christ, and de Lubac even notes that there is more to the idea of Christ "forming" Himself than meets the eye.\(^2\) Basically the "supernatural" is the concept to which de Lubac adheres, and he is at pains to demonstrate that Teilhard was always thinking of "two orders" and of a world of more than one dimension.\(^3\) But this means that Teilhard’s emphasis on durational "prolongment" as noted in this present Thesis does not find a place in de Lubac, so that the Universal-Christ is the traditional Christian Christ who is "personal" and "universal",\(^4\) and the "super-Christ" is neither acceptable nor understandable.

It is difficult to believe that de Lubac did not understand what Teilhard was meaning. The Great Monad is no more "myth" than the Noosphere or Omega, yet de Lubac takes the latter two seriously.\(^5\) It is strange indeed that his chapter on Death has no reference at all to the concept of Universal-Christ which in Je Crois shows is Teilhard’s answer to the problem of Death.\(^6\) Perhaps more strange is that Cosmic Life finds little mention in de Lubac, and if the early essays are quoted, it is to supply the concept of supernatural complete with two orders that is the tentative pre-Wells Teilhard of 1919.\(^7\) Moreover, the changes made to the letters to Fontoymont in the Appendix, when added to the omission of the written

---

2. \textit{op. cit.} pp.68, 97, 363ff.
5. \textit{op. cit.} pp.48ff.
positions on Monogenesis, for instance, suggest that de Lubac really does know more than he is telling, and is choosing not to dwell on the more radical sides of Teilhard. If this is not the case then de Lubac must be seen as one who quotes texts which suggest new Christology, but does not see the latter in them. Possibly this would mean that within traditional Jesuit-Catholic thinking he is not able to see that there could be other meanings to what Teilhard is saying with traditional words; or if he does see other meanings he genuinely cannot believe that Teilhard could have meant them. Or more probably, de Lubac is himself following Maréchal and when reading Teilhard is thinking that even after Wells Teilhard is keeping to Maréchal. This would explain how du Lubac has to interpret anything suggesting a physical Cosmic Body in terms of human consciousness not a universal growing.

Perhaps, basically, de Lubac and Rideau do not have Teilhard's value-vectors, perhaps they stay with Maréchal and never see the Maeterlinck in Teilhard, and so they cannot see how he could think what he does in the essays as well as in the more personal writings. They do not have the same intensities of Life or Science or Sense-Sensitivity value-vectors, and they do not need the search-image of Teilhard. Their mental filtering is too selective for them to note and believe in the originality of Teilhard. Unfortunately, this leads to a silencing of Teilhard in the public (market-) place of publishing; and Mooney in his own way follows them.


Basicly Mooney agrees with the TGTA-Naven finding that Christology is Teilhard's originality. Furthermore, the description of this Christology from pages 67 onwards include most of the sub-components demanded in this Thesis. On the other hand the book is a work of technical theology; and although correctly

1. op.cit. pp.51,62,95,158,221-5,363ff.
2. eg. op.cit. pp.31,51,66,97,122,218,223.
Mooney stresses\(^1\) eg. that convergence is an hypothesis and Christ as head of Creation a postulate, his main assumption is that Teilhard kept the natural/supernatural dichotomy, an assumption which has been more than questioned by the UFN material in this Thesis. How Mooney keeps the dichotomy is by attempting to show that the concreteness of Teilhard's Christology (its "boldness") when the Body of Christ forms a physical Centre for Man and the World rests on his ideas of Incarnation and Eucharist; and this relies on the Cosmic Life quotation of p.70.

Such an approach finds much in Teilhard to commend it. Teilhard does keep to the Jesus-of-Nazareth Revelation, but Mooney knows nothing of the "other faces" of Christ on other planets,\(^2\) and so is missing the universality of the Christology. Thus Mooney can assume that Teilhard moved away from the unorthodox "physical supernaturalism" of the letters to Blondel after Blondel's criticisms, and took up the basic orthodoxy of Christ's omnipresence being now through the Eucharist, after the Incarnation: but this was not so. Mooney has difficulty with his Thesis and the book's casting around for quotations does not help. The present writer suggests that the UFN \(\text{à la faveur}\) physicity, organicity and sur-natural-prolongment ideas - as well as the gene and punctiform metaphors - would have made Mooney's book clearer as well as putting into perspective Teilhard's view of the Eucharist. For is Teilhard's "omnipresence" "a real prolonging of Eucharistic transubstantiation"?\(^5\)

And was Christ's Incarnation the first springing up of the "principle of universal vitality"? Was Christ not the monadic element–centre in UFN? Again, did Teilhard mean that the "glorified Body of the risen and ascended Christ" comes from the Eucharist-fed community only?\(^6\)

---

1. op.cit. pp.68,74.
2. op.cit. pp.79ff.
3. op.cit. p.82.
4. op.cit. p.81.
5. op.cit. pp.85ff.
6. op.cit. p.91.
In spite of such questions, Mooney's constant emphasis on the "Body-Person of Christ" and His "physical omnipresence" as the key to Teilhard\(^1\) accords with what this Thesis has found, and though Mooney minimizes the "new religion" aspects of Teilhard he is well aware of the new Christology. Although he keeps to the traditional two-world dichotomy, Mooney can be seen as one who has taken Christ-Kosmos seriously from within his own tradition.

2. Some Protestant interpreters: writers from a more free group of Christian thinkers.


Murray scarcely\(^2\) sees Christ-Kosmos with the concreteness of UPN and TGTA-Naven.


Macquarie knows little of Christ-Kosmos.\(^3\) (But if he did, he would now judge Teilhard unorthodox).


Here 'Gestalt' is used, but it is not used in the sense of this Thesis.\(^4\) On the other hand, R.B. Smith knows Creative Union and Christ-Kosmos, for "God builds up a body for his Christ", a "cosmic body", built through the influence of the "real universal element", Christ's "cosmic influence";\(^5\) and Smith's discussion of the Trinity and the Fall are reasonable, though hardly in Teilhard's own language. On the other hand Blair\(^6\) is incorrect concerning Omega, and knows nothing of the Christ-Kosmos of this Thesis, while Boyd\(^7\) rather too simply shows Teilhard's cosmic Christ to be just the traditional Logos-doctrine.

1. op.cit. p.100.
4. Hanson, op.cit. pp.7, 39, 42ff, 67, 70.
5. op.cit. p.50.
6. op.cit. p.97, 98, 102, 110.
7. op.cit. pp.115, 141, 143, 154-5, 177.
Hanson himself touches on much of this Thesis. He realises the new Christology (though this is not clearly Christ-Kosmos): he sees much of Part One's struggle concerning modernism, pantheism and the open searching rooted in christocentric theology and catholic practice. But where in this book is the explicit notion of "other faces" of Christ and a "third nature"? It can hardly be said that the TGTA-Naven picture is found in much clarity here.


The inadequate reading of Teilhard evident in Medawar's article was mentioned early in this Thesis. What is now clear is that the description of Teilhard's Omega concepts as "pious rant" is incorrect in view of the TGTA-Naven system. Any "piety" and "rant" were continually controlled by the Science and Sense-Sensitivity selves. Teilhard's methods included concepts being displaced from one concept-cluster to another, but this imaginative process is not that of salivary ravings. There is at least bi-polar logic. But in a way Medawar was correct after all. Teilhard did mislead. When the new concept of Cosmic Christ emerged as the executive concept of which the rest of Teilhard is a function, this was not the logically-reached basis of future logical constructions, but the Gestalt-hypothesis to which such personal commitment was given that the rest of the man's life produced series after series of attempted demonstrations of the hypothesis. But Teilhard's language never emphasized this in public quite enough.

Since Christ-Kosmos was also a function of a religious value-vector, the appearance of Omega was not something pulled out of a hat so that "Jack is free"; it was again the simple attempt at demonstration of the executive concept: the world when "seen" from within a particular interpretation of the scientifically-observable

1. op. cit. pp. 162, 164ff.
2. The work of G. Crespy is similar to that of Hanson (see Bibliography).
3. Which is a pity because this is one way in which (it is accepted) many scientists work; cf. Kuhn, op. cit.
phenomena might be found to suggest something like Omega.\textsuperscript{1} But again, as this Thesis has shown, the metaphorical language of Teilhard and his illusion concerning the formal logic of his argument allow Medawar to reason critically and justifiably against him.

The fact should not be hidden that without fully comprehending the Zanta letter and the Preface to the \textit{Phenomenon of Man} Medawar was unable to follow the hypothesis-demonstration pattern of Teilhard's book. But Medawar's criticism must be accepted valuable in pointing out (by his misunderstanding) the real nature of Teilhard's argument. Any blame must be laid at Teilhard's door for not making clear that his book rested on the Christ-Kosmos Gestalt-intuition-hypothesis (and the following ones like Creative Union) both in the Preface and Introduction and throughout the book, especially in the last section: when Teilhard's attitudes and concepts are recognised as in this Thesis, \textit{The Phenomenon of Man} appears as an unclear and inadequate description, although it does (as seen in the previous chapter) try to represent Christ-Kosmos.

Perhaps, as in the case of the Jesuits, the basic lack of Medawar was in the differences of his own value-vector-selves: he could never have loved Masterlinek as Teilhard did, and Christ could never be a commitment to him. So he could hardly see when the argument was moving into a different set of associations.\textsuperscript{2}

At least, now, the TSTA-Naven picture makes explicit the simple understandings of Teilhard which an interpreter must first have in order to be speaking about the real man Teilhard. Perhaps, after all, Medawar was only asking for the real Teilhard to be explicitly put by Teilhard himself and by those who interpret him. The scientist wanted the specimen to be unwrapped and laid out on the table.\textsuperscript{3}

\textsuperscript{1} cf. \textit{PM}.
\textsuperscript{2} Medawar's feelings on Koestler suggest that such 'bissociationalism' would still not be appreciated!
\textsuperscript{3} It is hoped that this Thesis un-makes the mystery of Teilhard in this sense, without pretending that analysis necessarily shows the whole of the specimen.
4. **General Teilhard Interpretation.**

When the majority of interpretations are considered, it becomes clear that either the central Gestalt Christ-Kosmos, the sub-components or one of the value-vectors are being missed. So much of Teilhard is suggestive that little parts of himself or his work can be taken in isolation from the rest and still be fruitful.

Towers¹ can thus enthuse over Teilhard's discovery of complexity-consciousness without pointing out that in the Great War it was more of a Gestalt than the result of formal reasoning and that Teilhard accepted the idea from others, for instance, Lachelier.² Further, it can be severely questioned whether Towers' little book - still thought by many to be the best introduction to Teilhard in English - is doing justice to Christ-Kosmos, when only ten lines in fifty pages mention it,³ and then with no explicit understanding of what this Thesis has found.

Charles Raven and D.M. Mackinnon⁴, on the other hand, emphasize the "cosmic" and Logos Christology of Teilhard. In *Scientist and Seer* Raven notes something of the Sense-Sensitivity womb of Teilhard's ideas⁵ and, though perhaps emphasizing the "point"-ness of Omega, is conscious of the basis of organic metaphor in Teilhard's Universal and cosmic Christ.⁶ Nevertheless it can hardly be said that Christ-Kosmos comes out of Raven with the explicitness and directness of Figure xxv above.

The same may be said of de Solages and M. Barthélemy-Madaule. The latter⁷ views the personal drama of Teilhard in similar terms to that of the TGTA-Naven model. But although with Figure above in mind, the reader can see that Madaule is talking at times of Christ-Kosmos, there is a tendency for her to see Omega without Christ,

---

2. cf. de Lubac's Introduction to *Correspondence*.
3. p.37. Nor does Towers take seriously the pantheism in Teilhard.
through emphasis on Teilhard's biological language and metaphysics of centres. The Omega of How I Believe can be talked of without specific mention of Christ till page 41.

In none of the above is the A la faveur-base notion mentioned. Nor does the question of metaphor - organic, cone or centre - receive much critical attention. In de Solages, however, the question of analogy is explicitly raised,¹ some of the existential elements in Teilhard's development² are noted and the biological synthesis to one concrete end-achievement to the Universe is portrayed.³ But considering that de Solages had the UPN material to hand it is surprising that no mention is made of the A la faveur basis; and it may be that the total commitment of Teilhard to earth/science/kosmos is still not completely made clear in de Solages. Even when correctly he notes that Teilhard is an apologist in presenting Revelation in a perspective which inclines reason to adhere to it, this statement has the effect of lessening the existential element of Religion in Teilhard at the same time as it overemphasizes his abstract logic-making. It also lessens the commitment to the one A la faveur world. In other words, de Solages probably has an accurate understanding of Teilhard (though Teilhard himself did not think so, at one time anyway⁴), but he had not made the total picture clear to the reader.⁵

Only in N.M. Wildiers⁶ does the full Christ-Kosmos emerge with the poignancy of new cosmology, the sub-components and the intensities of personality which produced these concepts. Yet even with this book it must be questioned whether the result is as clear as Teilhard's own visualisations; it is hard to symbolize in words only the attitudes and ideas of a man who thought visually and tactiley.

². op. cit. pp.26ff.
³. op. cit. eg. pp.18,68,133,173,176,247,300,339ff,390.
⁵. ie. in the opinion of the present writer. That is, compare Figs. of this Thesis with de Solages' pages.
The lack of the à la faveur notion is common to all interpreters of Teilhard, (even Wildiers does not have it), but Creative Union is noted by many. Gray\(^1\) concentrates on it and uses it to show the centrality of the Church. This might have been à la faveur thought: but then Gray seems to know nothing of the "Ω" of science, or of the monad-centre who punctiforms in all the universes; so he is another who misses a whole area of Teilhard.

Demoulin\(^2\), on the other hand, hardly chooses to underline Teilhard's Christian pantheism, nor his more emotional and non-reasoning thought processes. George Barbour stresses all the value-vectors, especially those of science and mystic-pantheism, but the Christ-Kosmos sub-components like Creative Union and the metaphor of eg. cone\(^3\) receive no mention at all. The picture is by no means fully painted.

But without personal involvement in Teilhard such as Barbour and Demoulin have, such partial interpretation only serves to cloud the issues, and the author's own perspectives then shine through. Jarrett-Kerr\(^4\), for instance, knows of Christ-Kosmos but communicates it little; and Kopp,\(^5\) who also knows Christ-Kosmos, loses this Kosmos in emphasizing man in it.\(^6\)

There is indeed layer on layer of concept in Teilhard, and unless the metaphors and Gestalten are simplified artificially by some method like that of this Thesis, a short study of Teilhard is likely to be very inaccurate. To recount Teilhard in his own words is likewise to lose the basic factors.

More accurate are those writers who recognize in Teilhard and themselves sympathise with one (or more) of the value-vectors: they feel with Teilhard and

---

and understand the value-vector and the Teilhard in it with enough depth to nearly carry out a full interpretation, even without Christ-Kosmos. Thus it can be said that the Self-Ego was described by Cuenot, the Life value-vector by Zaehner, the Sense-Sensitivity value-vector by Benz, the Science value-vector by Dobzhanski, the Religion value-vector by Raven, Christ-Kosmos by Wildiers and Creative Union by Gray.

With these paragraphs the Conclusions of this Thesis have been examined and it has been shown how the TGTA-Naven can categorise the interpreters of Teilhard.

It remains to offer suggestions and speculations, first in the matter of possible justification of Teilhard and his ideas, and second, in an attempt to categorise Teilhard in the environment of world-thought and, through this, to describe him in some explicit picture which will communicate all the TGTA-Naven elements noted above.

This will not put Teilhard in the readers' power, for any labelling will be selective speculation: but it might further and fruitfully simplify him.

P) Suggestions which follow from this Thesis.

1. Future work on Teilhard.

When the TGTA-Naven model of Teilhard is considered in an historical context, it is clear that certain of his value-vectors and concepts had been anticipated by Christian thinkers before him. For instance, consider the following list of people

---

1. See Bibliography. They are able to understand Teilhard because they feel the same realities as him and are engaged in their own similar search.
who had accepted evolution into their Christian thought over fifty years ago:


Similarly, today, some of Teilhard's concerns are apparent in many different areas; the writings of Zaehner and Benz are examples of this.

But the Christ-Kosmos concept shown in the present Thesis has appeared nowhere except in Teilhard. So presumably what Teilhard now needs if he is to be justified is a) a general Christian realisation that a new Christology is needed, beyond Chalcedon, and b) the sympathetic working towards a new Christology (not necessarily his) by the various groups of people, the antecedants of whose types of thought had originally in 1915 produced Christ-Kosmos in Teilhard.

That is to say, (taking b) first) the sub-components of Christ-Kosmos were:

1. a) metaphors: so that today scholars might work to fill out, supplement, control (and reject if necessary) Teilhard's metaphors. In other words Mooney's attempt can be furthered without his evasions and without ignorance of Christ-Kosmos.
b) physical/biological concepts: so that open-minded scientists might elucidate such concepts as 'centre' and 'consciousness' to show both what is for and what is against such metaphysics.
c) the sense-sensitivity processes: so that philosophers could probe the metaphysics involved with sympathetic acumen.
d) the concepts like punctiform which were needed to describe existential realities specifically to do with the search-image Christ-Kosmos (and the disciple-adoration stemming from this); so that practising disciples might search to see if Teilhard's personal Weltanschauung search-image makes sense as a possible motivating concept.

1. For the writings of the following scholars, see Bibliography.
2. eg. I.J. Ramsey, E.L. Mascall, J. McIntyre, A. Hanson, D. Jenkins or N. Smart.
4. eg. Hepburn, Koestler, Edge or Hick.
5. eg. Hamilton, Cox, Nicholls, Zaehner or MacLeod.
for the future Church and world religion, and to produce new metaphors if Teilhard's do not work. Above all the Church community should study Christ-Kosmos: the theologians mentioned above might consider this new Christology.

But all this would depend on the Christian community believing that it needs a new Christology...

Such speculative suggestion may seem ill-advised. But in these four areas of Christology, metaphor, metaphysics and existential discipleship, Christianity has been on the move in recent years. The problems of religious language are well-known: the Bible abounds in metaphor and e.g. 'organism' is a well-used theological metaphor. One does not change Christ, but human minds, by use of a new metaphor for Him, and few Churchmen would say that ideas of Christian discipleship have no need of change today.

The theological scene has recently seen new metaphysics. Beyond the 'fringe' of Polanyi and Hardy, Gregor-Smith has recently specifically accepted that Theology needs to probe God's relationship with His Universe, and to break with the separation of God and His World which has tended to be linked with a juridic fencing-in of Revelation.

Further, the phenomenon of "Teilhardians" so diverse as Kennedy, Zaehner and George Barbour, and of Teilhardian groups carrying out Christian acts as well as verbal discourse suggests that Teilhard's personal ideas can become fruitful Christian paradigm for individuals and groups. So that the possibility arises that Teilhard's lived-in-model, based in a new Christology which accepts all the modern ideas like evolution, change, energy and world religion, might become the norm-Christology for the future Church, since the present theologies which separate the Church from the World by static categories are almost daily being eroded as acoustic

---

1. In the company of Wildiers and Mooney.
metaphor becomes nervous and more shrill.

In this case Teilhard's concepts (suitably mulled) would produce a paradigm-shift in the world Church just as it has in small groups already; Christ-Kosmos could be the search-image needed by Christianity today because it roots the Christian in visual and tactile as well as acoustic metaphor. It roots Man indeed to Earth, Earth-Purpose and to Living God in Christ.

2. Teilhard and the Real and Really-Real.

So far in this chapter the vantage-points from which the above observations have been made have been a picture of TUTA-Naven model of the specific intensities of the man Teilhard, a certain acceptance of emotional ways in which his mind worked and a refusal to let the concept which gave Teilhard his Identity be dropped out of sight: and interpreters have been looked at from this perspective.

But it is time to ask the question. Was much of what Teilhard wrote really true, that is, ontologically true? This Thesis has not been concerned with the ontological truth of Teilhard's lived-in-model. Some of the above theologians and philosophers will of course probe this. But the realisation that Teilhard is Gestalt and metaphor first and attempted demonstration a lowly second might more specifically suggest the following 1:

1) Christ-Kosmos is a concept which comes in a historical series which stems originally from St. Paul's first cosmic Christ, and St. John's Word. Today's Biblical scholars also search for the meaning and Christology of the cosmic Christ. In Teilhard Christ-Kosmos followed Surin, Lallemant and the Pantheists' idea of the All. So the question of Teilhard's search-image's "ultimate truth" is basically to do with the "truth" of first the Biblical notion of Christ, and

1. This Thesis is not the place to discuss the linguistic questions: here the words "really true" stand as pointers to matters of ultimate concern, as in M. Grene, The Knower and the Known,
with Paul's meaning of "cosmic" and second it is to do with modern cosmology-Metaphysics. To both a non-Christian and a non-metaphysician Teilhard's key concept and the thought which it controls will in other words be nonsense. But to Christians who use the word "organism" of the Church, and who take Biblical notions like Resurrection as at any rate something which is concrete and real, there is no a priori reason why Teilhard's metaphors and concepts should not be treated with like sympathy. After all both Roman Catholic and Protestant doctrine has developed in recent years and Teilhard is as likely to be "true" as Karl Barth. Both depart from the Bible in their presuppositions, but not from Christ.

2) Concerning Teilhard's metaphors and the metaphysics which are to do with them, the same sort of situation exists: if you think that consciousness is "real", you are already in metaphysics, for it cannot be empirically demonstrated. Clearly, demonstration of the metaphysical truth of Teilhard's ideas will await a breakthrough in the discipline of Metaphysics. In recent times in Britain two men have used the centre-monad ideas: Macneile Dixon and Michael Polanyi. But Crick has ridiculed Polanyi. The à la faveur hypothesis on the other hand accords better with modern science, in the biological concept of displacement, in which some part of the system is used at a later stage in evolution for a purpose different from its original one. Creative Union and the cone metaphor have not (to the present writer's knowledge) been used for metaphysical purposes other than by eg. the Pantheists like Wells. Certain writers, however, do concern themselves with the questions of Man's future and his consciousness: science-fiction writers in general, novelists of the John Buchan genre, intellectuals

4. See the forthcoming Thesis of J.A.M. Mathison of London University.
like Becket and the poets. Such writers work with imagination and speculation and seldom satisfy the Philosophers and Scientists with empirical data and logical reasoning. But this means that unfortunately for Teilhard (as for the above) there is little philosophical backing possible for his speculations, especially for Christ-Kosmos from the orthodox Scientific and Philosophical Establishments, and so, strictly speaking, how can he possibly be "true", since it is the latter who define truth today.

3) Religion alone (by faith) may be said to depict Teilhard's ideas as ontologically true; and in religion today there are pointers which suggest similar concerns to those of Teilhard. Many thinkers in theology and Church know that these need new ideas, and even in Reformed churches there is interest in Science and Metaphysics. In the scientific community further there are voices which wonder about the "quality" of life and even the idea of consciousness as a reality is sometimes accepted by individuals in the community. Certainly the phenomenon of Teilhardian groups suggests a reality in Teilhard's concerns, if not in his solutions, and if there is any connection between experimental reality and Reality-Reality, some of Teilhard's model could be 'true'.

It has not been the purpose of this Thesis, however, to ask these questions concerning Metaphysical or Philosophical or Religious Truth. But speculations concerning Teilhard's own and his lived-in-model's "truth" might nevertheless be helped by speculations now as to what Teilhard was in terms of to what community of writers he have belonged (if there were such communities). For it is a problem noted in the Introduction as to what Teilhard did write - Theology? Philosophy? Science? Poetry? or Novel? Even if his Theology, Science and Philosophy could be proven invalid, the question still remains (if there is such a thing as Truth): can a novel communicate Truth ...?
3. The Literary Content of Teilhard

First, the writings of Teilhard are Individual and Personal Discovery. If this Thesis is correct Teilhard's originality is located in the executive concept of Christ-Kosmos and in the developments of this concept. It is probable that many Christians have value-vectors comparable to Teilhard's, fight similar battles with environments, remain or become integrated individuals. There are scientists who are Christian, clerics who love Life, young people who need to be free. People emerge from ideas, change to others, search for the new.

But few people find executive concepts which thereafter rule their lives, claim their attention, press them with anomalous religious problems; and few write about them. With Teilhard the specific needs of his selves-in-tension produced a spin-off concept which oriented his mental-spiritual life and his practical scientific work, and this discovery he wrote about all his life. It can be analogously called a "specific search-image": he had needs, he scanned the mental environment, and he took from this mental food which satisfied the system: Christ was one food, evolution and the cosmos another. All-Christ-Kosmos was the food Teilhard's mind needed for the system to return to equilibrium, with feedback resulting in more scanning and attempts at further specification, and with the information in the mind producing varying codes for the same basic need and its equilibrating food.

Thus the story of personal self-discovery in the search-image Christ-Kosmos which gave him his identity and motivations in work and savant-thought, and which allowed him to appear to others a man of startling wholeness is a reasonable picture to hold of Teilhard. So that much of his writing could be considered as autobiographical and as such would explain some of the re-writing which has been observed by eg. de Lubac.

Second, Teilhard is an example of a new concept becoming new paradigm and ideology. It was stated above that Balzac pre-dated Creative Union, Drummond the use of Evolution for religious purposes, and Surin and Lallemant even the concept of Christ-Kosmos. But the individual discovery of a personal search-image in Teilhard's case resulted in a Christological discovery for the Christian Church so that Teilhard is the purveyor of a novel concept of Christ, the originality of which is therefore "world-wide". During the twentieth century the Judge-Victim metaphor has dominated the Churches like the Church of Scotland: law-court images have been the dominant paradigm. Going further back in history the Nicene and Chalcedon formulae described Jesus of Nazareth the Christ as both fully human and fully divine, and the metaphor of "Man" and the metaphor of man's images of "God" have been ascribed to Christ ever since. But Teilhard goes now beyond both the metaphor of Judge and the Church Tradition in introducing a new theological concept in Christ-Kosmos, and this changes the consciously held paradigm, first in his own case, and then for anyone following him. So that the Cosmic Body of Christ not only allows a new discipleship to emerge with new attitudes to life and work: it is itself a radically distinct understanding of Christ which views God's nature and grace differently (but not separately) from the Bible and the Creeds; and as such it is a new belief-system. This perspective would describe Teilhard a gifted creative artist, and his writing would be Ideology.

Third, Teilhard is an example of pioneering religious discovery that became a paradigm-change which introduces a Micro-Meso-and-Macro-Religion and Planetarian Ideology. Since Teilhard is totally committed to his new ideas, these concepts represent a paradigm-switch in his mind in which the paradigm-change does not mean that the older paradigm is jettisoned. But there is personal and group reorientation

when the Christ-Kosmos change occurs. From the general perspective of this Thesis in which Teilhard is seen as individual in community and in world, there is one further way in which Teilhard's originality may be described: his is perhaps the first Christian Theology to be a "macro"-religion. That is to say, in Teilhard there is the "micro"-religion of personal faith and individual salvation for the believer. There is also the need for and validity of the religious community: the "meso"-religion of religious groups everywhere, with belief-system and institution, sanction, rite, sacred and profane. In Teilhard, however, religion takes on the dimension of the Earth and Universes, whereas the Bible either keeps to ancient cosmology or erupts in eschatology. In Teilhard, not only is Man an Elect and key: there is a choosing of the multiple Kosmos: All the Kosmos is being separated out within the cosmic process towards the physical growth of the Cosmic Body of the Universal Christ. Teilhard's Christ is therefore Saviour of Individual, Community and Kosmos and is Himself the Providential Hand of the Living God within the physical-biological processes and the Great Work to be adored, sought and worked for; and when the Universe takes on the Form of Christ within "sur"-natural "prolongement", this is a macro-religion quite distinct from the human realities of the Church taking on Christ's Form. The concreteness of Bonhoeffer concerning humans is being followed by the concreteness of a belief concerning the election of the universe. Christianity hitherto had on the whole reserved such ideas of Election and Salvation for individual and group faith, with Paul's "cosmic Christ" as either apocalyptic metaphor or eschatological "super"-natural hope. Teilhard is thus giving new religion to the Church in his paradigm-switch. He is institutionalizing change, development, science, the World and much else by means of a new Christology.

It would then be possible to categorise Teilhard as an example of autobiography of an individual discoverer who experienced and then communicated a "paradigm-shift"; and then he could be seen as ideologist, overturning the norm ideas of his
religion; but he is always still searching, so he is really a non-ideological ideologist. In more specific religious terms, the voyage of discovery shows Teilhard as the existential disciple who knows and seeks the Presence of God, the beyond in the midst of life, working out his own salvation in thought and action.\(^1\) Here he would be the 'hard' Christian who takes Revelation and the Living God seriously, and demands real answers concerning experienced reality.\(^2\) Or the voyage could show the poet, seeking meaning, ultimate reality and truth, and attempting to communicate it in imaginative language.\(^3\) But when personal discovery and paradigm-change are considered together, Teilhard is perhaps seen best as the theological innovator (as opposed to technical theologian) who bubbles up with new metaphors for Christ and does not rest with second-hand ideas.\(^4\) He has the courage of his convictions and copes with their consequences by further personal discovery.

But the result of this is that what he writes is really science-fiction, Christian science-fiction. He uses Christian and scientific concepts outside of their orthodox contexts, he develops them together to give meaning to his own life, Life and the experimental universe, and he suggests meanings and Reality for the future of reality. It is with this description that Teilhard is given his literary place. He is akin to H.G. Wells in his psychological reality, but Wells was such a main component function of the Omega-Christ-Kosmos that the title is peculiarly apt for Teilhard. But its aptness is fullest when modern science-fiction is studied and found to be concerned with reality and the Really-Realities of Ultimate Concern.\(^5\)

---

4. As Biblical writers such as St. Paul -- or in our own day, in their original writings, eg. Barth and Berdyaeff.
5. *cf.* Lois and Stephen Rose, *The Shattered Ring*, London, SCM, 1970. The description is also particularly apt since Verne had influenced Teilhard the schoolboy before Wells influenced Teilhard the Man.
Thus, as science-fiction writer Teilhard enters the literary scene; from
Theology's point of view he is creative artist with metaphor and Gestalt; his
Christian reality is that of hard discipleship, and personal discovery was his life.
Teilhard can thus be categorized. He can be relativised by such categorization,
by the TGTA-Naven picture of a specimen motivated by a search-image, and by the
fact that Christ-Kosmos is firstly spin-off personal discovery, and secondly fiction
that is not demonstrable. But no one else produced Christ-Kosmos, so Teilhard can
receive the accolade of genuine originality in the history of ideas. Nor were
these ideas divorced from reality, although as metaphysic they cannot be claimed
to be Reality. Although Christ-Kosmos was personal solution to personal tension,
it was a sufficiently reality-testing cluster of concepts to meet wider needs in a
world-set of ideas. The Christ-Kosmos ideas were functions of himself, though in
no sense (as claimed by Kosa) extensions of himself. But as functions of the
communities he lived in they kept to the ideas of real communities and so were
experimental model in a real person in real communities, and not schizophrenic
myth. The Christ-Kosmos ideas met and coped with the exterior as well as interior
environments of Teilhard. This was why they survived and why they made sense to
many around him. So the lived-in-model was experimental religion, though ontolo-
gical and science-fiction myth — but so is Biblical religion, for instance, in the
idea of the Resurrection of the Body. Yet both Teilhard's own and Christianity's
ideas historically meet and make fruitful real realities of human life. So these
ideas are not the fairy-tale myths which Medawar ridicules.

With personal integrity therefore Teilhard produced ideas which were functions
of both his own reality and of the realities around him, and so may, in part at any

1. What in literary circles might be seen as science-fiction is from the philosopher's
   point of view "scientific myth". See S. Toulmin in A. MacIntyre, Metaphysical Beliefs,
2. No one, that is, known to the present writer.
3. See Chapter Three.
rate, be to do with Real Realities, if such exist and if they have a relation to experimental reality. So that the man who writes existential synthesis, metaphysics, scientific myth and science-fiction may yet be without Truth. Much of science-fiction is real, but it may or may not be True; and in that it is no different from the position of any religion that holds to the idea of God.

As the final section of this Thesis then, it is suggested that since Teilhard's science-fiction centred on Christ-Kosmos, and since it was meant to be as physically real a concept as is possible, an attempt should be made to put it into terms of 1971. Christ-Kosmos being the result of both Religion and Science, with concepts from these communities being displaced by the Mystic-Pantheist Self to produce the Gestalt which would motivate and make sense of Self and Life, it is speculatively suggested that this contemporary description of Christ-Kosmos should use the concepts of Science, Religion and Mystic-Pantheist Science-fiction. As such, however, it should be remembered that only by leaps of faith can the speculation 'be' Truth; and it may not even be an accurate description of Christ-Kosmos.


The problem of how to bring the Christ-Kosmos concept up-to-date in the way in which Teilhard's personality has been brought up-to-date by means of the language of Tota-Naven might be tackled in two ways:— a) scholars like Rideau and de Lubac might reinterpret Teilhard in Aristotelian terms so as to fit him into some preconceived framework. But this makes little impact within circles which live within the concepts and theories of Kuhn, Schon, Medawar and the scientific community as a whole; and there is always a danger that parts of Teilhard might be buried beneath the philosophical tomes, b) since new metaphor from within his scientific work and savant community produced Christ-Kosmos, a speculation on what Christ-Kosmos is meant to be could be made by means of further but more modern scientific
metaphor. So the biological metaphor of genetic/environmental change could be used to describe what Teilhard meant by Christ-Kosmos; and the particular model of epigenetic development put forward by C.H. Waddington, when displaced into Teilhard, includes all the elements of Christ-Kosmos including the starkness of the search-image, the possibility of a human cell-person experiencing existential reality as in Cosmic Life — and the limitations of a visual metaphor which sees the Universe as a Block.

The following factors support this modern metaphor which is acknowledged by Waddington to be only a "rough and ready" model. In Waddington the genetic molecules are taken to hold information which includes multitudes of developmental potentials; in Teilhard Christ is the gene-cell who is the information and energy in the centre-heart of Matter: He is the punctiform who bursts out through the tension in Multiple-Matter by *À la faveur* canalisation, by centre-to-centre union and by assimilating Matter to Himself; and since His Presence in Matter as Element is Universal, this means that Christ will have many different faces in the universes — on this particular planet the visage-Logos being that of Jesus of Nazareth, Word made Flesh. In Waddington's model the information is also already in the system, and it also is canalised to an end-product which will depend contingently on what information comes from the environment.

In Waddington the environment acts as stimulus and produces specific genetic selections, each new combination acting to canalise the organism's development. In Teilhard the development of the gigantic cosmic organism is a function of environment as well as of Christ the gene: within the physical-biological and psycho-social environments the human particles of what is going to be All react to the stimuli of the environments, and react to themselves with or without union; and if the canal-

   
   
   Parallel pages in Teilhard are referred to in this Thesis on pp. 364-371.
isation towards the fulfilment of the "Something" Christ is to continue, the human efforts must be specific to the segregation of Spirit *À travers-occasion* Matter, so that morality is biologically important and greater consciousness is the moral norm. Indeed, without the fullest possible use of the spiritual information of humans within the universal system the Cosmic Body of the Whole, the Universal Christ-Omega may never be produced because Creation and Parousia are contingent happenings. Spirit *À la faveur* Matter and *et* consciousness may never give rise to soul, Mystical Body and Cosmic Body because Man may choose not to love, to unite and to adore the Great and Absolute work of the future.

In Waddington the cybernetic development of the organism means that there is directional progress but no teleology. In Teilhard the growth of the Cosmic Body of Christ receives direction by the concepts Christ and Body: there is directional development so that human effort in *eg.* science is to be equated within the Christ-Kosmos Weltanschauung with Christian discipleship. But as in Waddington there is no specific teleology because of the above-mentioned contingency: there are many potential "faces" of Christ, and it is possible that the human species will not rise to the occasion of evolutionary struggle and will die out. There will, however, be some result even if this is just the end of the species, so Teilhard, like Waddington, has a "telic" view: the gene and the environment will synthesize something between them, and since to Teilhard the gene is Christ-Evolver, he is optimistic that the result will be Christic and indeed the Christ-God.

In this interpretation of Christ-Kosmos certain other factors in Teilhard are given correct value. First, Teilhard's Identity as fully committed to Science and to Religion is upheld. The refusal to think himself Metaphysical in his writings, the anti-supernatural and anti-extrinsicist bent of his ultra-physics in both public and private writings, the need for tangible and palpable reality and God, the physical and biological language he keeps using, the tenacious emphases on
the necessity of Human Effort and Struggle — such elements in Teilhard show him keeping to scientific and experimental realities to such an extent that when he uses the word "body" this is more model than myth and more model than metaphor. Spirit is A la faveur Matter, and so as real as Matter: indeed, since it is "up" it is more real than Matter. Teilhard's rejection of Eschatological theology underlines this. He displaces biological concepts on to Christ so as to conduct a living experiment with Christ within known experimental reality both of himself and of the world, and not so as to add another image to Christian description of Christ, and Waddington's model is a similar attempt to visualize a very concrete process.

Second, though metaphorical description does take place as soon as the experimental model has been produced, Christ is now interpreted as having three natures — cosmic, human and divine — though the concept first appeared from existential, psychological need. Having once appeared, this belief in Christ's cosmic as well as human and divine natures in the Hypostatic Union was now a model to be lived-with and experimented with existentially in discipleship and in theological discourse. So the Cosmic Christ was a human search-image and an immediate evolutionary Presence; and it was a map for use in theological pilgrimage. And in the description of the Cosmic Christ as Epigenetic Christ these same factors of metaphysical, physical/biological developmental and motivational reality, which are needed by the wholeness of the five-selves searcher Teilhard, all appear. Taking it as a search-image, Teilhard can see how the Epigenetic Christ develops, eg. by struggle-effort-assimilation of the particles as they respond to the environment; and he can see that the result is a full organism. Taking it as a theological description, Teilhard can see how Christ is All the result of information and environment, how there is a cosmic (biological) segregation-ascesis, and how each particle can unite to be an "atom of the All" and a cell in the cosmic organism. The Epigenetic picture even has in it, by its very diagram-nature, Teilhard's
favorite expression of the Cosmos as a Block and then a Whole.

Negative sides to the analogy will be found. Waddington's is a mathematical as well as pictorial model, and Teilhard relies on Creative Union and the Universal Element, rather than on mathematical and automatic progress: though his idea of statistical probability might not be too far from Kaczer's Quantum Mechanics for the model. Further, the centre and cone metaphors do not appear in the Epigenetic model.

On the other hand, Teilhard's cone metaphor in organic terms would be 'canalisation to an organism' (point): indeed the Epigenetic Christ would be 1. a cone–canalisation–ascesis–election which was a function of the Multiple including 'within' and 'without', Brownian motion and centre-monad-principle; and 2. an All-organism which was the product/function of such canalisation-processes which could include an effect by consciousness on evolution, and the possibility of conscious learning from the environment.

In other words the Epigenetic Christ includes in it the metaphors of à la faveur, organism–synthesis, centre and cone, some of the Gestalt of Creative Union, the ideas of punctiform, gene, element and information, and the basic assumptions of evolutive development, change, contingency, chance and individual Providence. The individual with this model as his Christian search-image would be like Jacob and the Angel, a Christian Pantheist and a Cosmic Lifer. It is a model for a concrete discipleship in the growth of the really-organic Spirit-Consciousness-Body of Christ-Kosmos.

In a diagram the Epigenetic Christ-Kosmos might be this:

[Diagram description]

Total organism is à l'occasion all the universe. produced a minute but specific complex = Christ-God, God-Omega, Christ-Universal, Christ-Kosmos, God-Q. Evolution.
Such a speculation may seem inadequate as well as ill-advised. But it is not altogether out of keeping with the Teilhard of each epoch of his life. In 1951 he was demanding an Ultra-Christ of physical/biological reality. This was the "other face" of 1950, and the "très biologique" "nouveau" God realisable by "prolongement", and showing "organicity", of 1952. This is the specifically "surnaturel", not supernatural, à la faveur base, as in the 1954 description of "Christogénèse". Surely the "Christogénique" of 1953 is close to the idea of Epigenetic Christ.

In fine the Christ-Kosmos models of UPN may be supplemented by a speculative contemporary model. But the basis of this Thesis has been the TGTA-Naven hypothesis, and its aim has been to show how Teilhard was an integrated personality who can only with difficulty be treated as his various parts rather than as a whole system. So an Epigenetic model can only be a metaphor for Teilhard's reality. Christ-Kosmos needs the physicity of science, but this is permeated by the mystic experience and metaphysical speculation of the religious pantheist, and this C.H. Waddington might reject. Teilhard could not deny the convictions of his being.

To the present writer, the overall TGTA-Naven model with the Epigenetic metaphor makes sense. Even in the death of his mother as these last pages have been written has the present writer found Christ-Kosmos, the Great and Thickening Reality. To Teilhard, Spirit was the à l'occasion-faveur spin-off from physical/biological reality, and is more real since it is the whole so much greater than the parts. So the writer's mother is more real now as she helps her Lord in the building of His spinning-off Universal Body. Indeed the writer can join in, hic et nunc, in the adoration of the Great Work of Christ-Kosmos, which adoration is to work and to search, to love and to create. For Christ-Omega, the God of Evolution, pulls Man by His Living Presence into the Body of His Universe; and the Absolute in which we move will produce His Chosen Future, His Elect, His Christ who is All the Kosmos, who is Person.
As long as critical mind knows that this is religious scientific myth, this Christ-Kosmos faith is a fruitful and testable model in which to live; and if it became part of the institution-community-church's belief-system, this new Christology might be a paradigm-change which would have fruitful repercussions in Christian discipleship in this agnostic, technological and post-scientific age.
APPENDIX A
CONVERSATIONS WITH SIX FRIENDS

(A) 4 Dec. 1968: Claude Cuenot

In answer to a question concerning Teilhard's relations with women, Cuenot replied:

"He had no taste for the female; they were usually unintelligent, unattractive women. He loved the feminine but had no sexual trouble. Zanta did not have feminine feelings for him, I think. She was the first beautiful woman he was fond of. He had quite a few affective tempests. The two women of Letters to Two Friends were Ida Treat* (in French, first part), and Rhoda de Terra (in English, second part). Mlle. Mortier met his mystical sense. Claude Riviere was rather typical. This was a healthy friendship with no hint of flirtation."

Q: Did he forget things?
A: "Yes, he did forget for instance the influence that Newman had been to him. A 1954 letter says he had 'only read The Grammar of Assent,' and he had no influence over him. This was not true; the 1917 letters show Newman as a great influence.

He was like a child in practical matters. He always wanted someone to look after him, to care for him — arrange his passport and so on — to look after the practical details, as Rhoda de Terra did in South Africa.

As a rule, he didn't forget things, though. He remembered his infancy, see Le Coeur de la Matiere; and he told Mme. de Wespin much about his infancy. And Barbour says that he took only a few notes in the field, yet at night remembered it all."

Q: Did he have 'anguish' towards the end of his life only?
A: "No. Always, there was anguish."

(B) 5 Dec. 1968: Claude Cuenot

Q: Do you know of instances where T. went against the scientific community's paradigms?

1. Married to a Communist, and therefore embarrassing to an anti-Communist churchman, and is the divorce of the de Terras. So the letters are published anonymously.
2. n.b. This was put on the Roman Index in 1902.
3. Source UPN says that Newman was read a year earlier.
4. De Lubac (1967) notes that Teilhard's memories were restructured in the light of his later thought.
B) 5 Dec. 1968: Claude Cuenot contd.

A: "He always slightly distorts scientific fact and theory. His 'organized liberty' in the 'foule', through 'statistical determinisms' are not accepted by the physicist. His curves and graphs are not orthodox. His idea of consciousness is scholastic analogy. Gravity haunts him, but his notes on it are nonsense — embarrassing to the family. Remember, his base holding is the dialectic of biological continuity and discontinuity. See also his Lamarkism in Tome 3, concerning the tiger's teeth. And his law of complexity-consciousness was philosophical, the result of his dialectic of nature.

Q: What about his religious personality?
A: "He had many religious crises, though there is a limit which he never went past. The biggest shake-up was in Egypt — a subtle, very heavy temptation, very deep, to dissolve himself in nature. But it had no effect on his religious activities — he was still two men, two parts of his soul. At Hastings in 1905 he nearly gave up science. In the 1920's the questions of Original Sin showed him disillusioned with the church; while in the 1930's he emerged from the church, he goes above it and sees it from up high. After 1946 his relations with the church authorities were taut, he prays that he will end well and not leave the church. In a letter to Leroy, he asks him to pray that if he leaves the church he may still love the world.

In my talks with T., he says that the historical Christ is necessary. But there's a letter where he says the evolution of the church and of dogma is that of a child becoming adult. He thought that real Christianity will appear in the future (which is orthodoxy), and in letters to Abbe Gaudefroy he speaks of the 'Christ of the future' and 'neo-Christ'. But though he went to the limit, it's not possible to say that he went 'past' the limit. He lived in a no-man's-land."

Q: Did his integrity prevent him letting Authority stop his mind working?
A: "He was not a man who feared. And the Roman Catholics never succeeded in stifling him. As a

4. This may originally have been true, but UPN in this Thesis (Part 2) shows pantheist influences and a "physiologic" which rests on scientific data.

5. Not exactly. They are early attempts at finding executive concepts for his identity, full of concept displacement.

6. A misprint for 1902 and Jersey, or for 1908?
Roman Catholic he could "lie" but he had a deep inner obedience, and liberty. He could not turn back. He had a childish candour, and prayed on his rosary; but he typed and cyclostyled when told not to preach or talk or print or sell anything he wrote. From 1946-51 he pretended to be scientific, having been told to do no theological or philosophical essays. In my 1969 essay The Phenomenon of Teilhard in Realites, I speak of these things. In the Jesuit Order the Generals were not great; but the Provincials were his friends and did not transmit orders. While his immediate superiors were great friends who helped and protected him from others, and from himself."

**Notes:**
1. This may refer to 1898 or early 1914 rather than 1900.
2. According to Cuenot 10 Dec. 69, an "Asiatic illness". But on interview with Joseph. Cuenot later below talks of "Mal de Pott..."
3. These passed to her sister Alice, thence to B. de Solages. They are now safely in the family vaults.
ly, and it is certain that a paper on Original Sin was taken from a drawer and sent to Rome — also that other essays were sent from Shanghai — so he was forbidden to go back to Shanghai.

He had no love for money — he gave his inheritance to Fr. Licent. But he was careful for his expeditions, and not to lose dollars in the field. He was not ORNS director for money's sake; rather, he had a keen sense of his own scientific career and how to manage it; and he knew how to please. But this was not from his own personal ambition, but to further his scientific ideas. He didn't worry if others plagiarized his work (as de Terra did); and he wrote essays for the Chinese, which he didn't sign.

He paid no attention to the family estate.

He was rather poor about his clothes — didn't try to be a fashionable Jesuit — though he wanted to be neat, and got women to do his buttons, and so on.

Concerning knowledge — he was very strong on 'facts' (he admired the Anglo-Saxon on this), but had very 'large' 'synthetic' views. He liked the field, but didn't prepare his expeditions, just left them to luck. He read much in World War One, and Two. He was eclectic, reading what fell into his hands, and rejecting at once what didn't interest him. Others' thought was catalytic to him. His culture was rather good, but with the most extraordinary gaps: he never read Marx or Engels, never mentioned Shakespeare — the only Hegel he read was two pages in an anthology! Of course, he had not much time — always he was writing up memoirs of the field etc. How he learned was in fact directly, through conversation: he knew marxists, and people like Berdyev and Marcel; and he wanted to talk to people. He loved searching — but when he felt that something was not food for him, he dropped it coldly.

Beauty? He had no sense of the tragic, of the destruction of man. In fact, he was a born artist, very appreciative of natural beauty. But he rather despised it — it was no toy, to him — he didn't search for beauty, he used it, to express himself and his ideas. On the other hand, he did choose his women: he chose Ida Treat, then met Marthe Vaufrey, then dropped Treat and sat by Vaufrey at Boule's lectures. And Marguerite his cousin was quite nice-looking, and Zanta, very — though Treat and Swan not at all. With music, he liked it, had a radio, and played it.

---

4. To the central Jesuit offices.
5. Maybe. But UPN notes him reading Sterne, Balzac, Barbusse etc. in the trench rest-areas.
while I was there: but he had no time to make a musical culture. The theatre? Well, Jesuits are not allowed to go to this, for fear of pretty girls! He wasn’t at all interested in (art) museums: he liked simple lines, and had no time for complex Chinese architecture.

Though the world does not ‘converge’, and he sometimes wondered if his optimism was naive, T. was not conscious utopian. What he wanted to express was a ‘Blended intuition’: he saw himself as pointing out ‘landmarks’ (his word), for the very large frescoes that he perceived.

He in fact knew many particulars: but he dropped them so as to show the new things he had in his mind. (Thus, he was no ‘technician’ in theology.)

In a sense, he was a ‘bad’ R.C., because he didn’t conceal things, and always said what he really thought; and he was no (Jesuit) gangster at all! On the other hand, he was more of a Jesuit and more prudent than people think: he was very strict on divorce, and moral affairs.

Expressing a blended intuition, he was angry if called a genius; and this was the only time he ‘showed the door’ to people.

He got on very well with everybody, and had no sense of hatred or jealousy (professional or otherwise). Though there were some people he couldn’t bear. And, though he was very fond of his fellowsmen, he had no ‘charitable’ sense at all, no idea of e.g. giving away one’s shoes. So, he was very friendly, but very ‘distant’. He wanted to talk with people, to discuss, and he was kind and strong in his interpersonal relationships. But he was very ‘distant’, and liked to meet people and to discuss so as to make his ideas clearer. Very friendly but very distant.

With his superior clerics he was simple and direct, not shy at all, not timid. An aristocrat.

Teilhard in regard to sex was ‘pure but not innocent’. He loved women, was ‘affectively troubled’ by Ida T. and Lucille Swann (at least) and knew his charm intuitively: and women loved him. Women did ask him direct questions, and no doubt some asked him if he wanted to possess them physically. (One woman has said that she did at one time want to become his mistress, but recoiled from the idea because he was then too old. And another woman stimulated the 1934 Evoln Chastity essay.)

He was very fond of children, and kind with them. Very very fond of Rhoda de Terra’s daughter — he adored her — and also of Joseph’s daughter — and of Montfried’s youngest son. But he did not enjoy at all having to take a Chinese child on a four-day journey by train to Shanghai — it was so cumbersome — and a Jesuit has to be free of any obligation.

6. But Teilhard went to the Opera in New York on the Easter Day he died!
7. Again a humorous statement remembering the times of Pascal.
8. Not the woman who talks of “mistress” matters.
which might hinder the prompt carrying out of orders — mustn't have a natural or supernatural child, or a mistress etc. (as in any Church!).

Authority as such, and having power over people, held no interest for him. In fact the Original Sin essays ended all possibility of leadership in the Jesuit community.

After that he was always under strict control. But he had no 'cupido dominandi' — he was no Jesuit at all — and he wanted no disciple. 'Pas de disciple', he used to say.

He in fact wanted people to find their own way, and didn't try to convert anyone; indeed, he avoided talking religion. He converted only a few people — nor was Marguerite one of them. She was in love with him, but was a very moral woman, and T. tried to 're-direct' her, not convert her. He gave good spiritual direction — he was fond of Mme. Haardt (H's fiancee), and wrote consoling her when she was widowed; and helped her for rather a long time: and he continued letter-writing after he had sorted out an unfortunate wife's love-affair — so, all in all, he never dropped people brutally; and, 'sometimes, yes, he was really true to people'.

He wanted no leadership at all: he was not ambitious.

But — he was very keen for his scientific career, for this was a way to progress his ideas, which were his interest: and he knew how to make this career. Thus, he wanted to preach before groups of intellectuals, for instance at the St. Cloud Teachers Training College and the Ecole Normale Superieure — for his ideas' sake. And he sought some prestige for his ideas — to save the church. In a sense, thus, though he had no soul of a leader, he could animate a group — for truth's sake, for the sake of new discovery — not for his own sake.

He was never, never laying down the law (except on moral matters like divorce); he reckoned he was on the earth to wake people up spiritually. While asking questions and giving landmarks, he said: Go your own way.

On the other hand, he did support people, and did nurture and help the young. He helped Paterson, Movius, the Chinese scientists — discreetly.

T. wanted to work in scientific 'teams' (his word) and he could be the 'soul' of a team. But he did not want to try to play the role of being the 'soul'. He obeyed the orders of Black, Ting and Weidenreich; but in Young's expedition he went further than the orders said, by disobeying the Chinese in regard to this survey's route. He didn't mind when de Terra published all under his own name the results of Teilhard's expeditions to Burma and India: but on the other hand he advised von Koenigswald to keep to the facts, and only bring in theory at the end. Thus he really only wanted to be part of a team: but he was not always silent. He didn't

---

9. His enthusiasms in 1919-20, 1934 and 1937 (at least) might suggest otherwise.
understand the work of a museum, and wrote against Licent to his Superior, regarding the need for a change of spirit in the museum -- the obtrusive, interfering Jesuit appearing in T. against the rough, north-French Licent who would say to him, Get out. But he also interfered with Breuil, preventing him from publishing a radical essay about Chou Kou-tien implements, which might have scared off the American money backing their research. This was 'not quite fair'.

The Jesuit appearing.

Conversation 17 Jan. 1968 : Cuenot

Q : How did Teilhard feel towards his parents? was he really rather a detached person?
A : "Teilhard was somewhat cold to his father, and somewhat more attracted to his mother. He was always really far above. There was some antipathy vis-a-vis Joseph. But really, he was far above. He wasn't mumbo-jumbo, just far above."

Conversation 10 Dec. 1969 : Cuenot

A : "About those earlier conversations you had with me! On the whole your precis are exact. But remember some of its humorous! Some of what I wrote cannot be taken literally! It's my own personal humour! And then, for instance when I said he had a "strong memory", well, who can prove that he had a very strong memory?! And when I said that he could "lie", well the point is that he signed obedience to the Original Sin doctrine simply because Valensin told him that "you're not the prisoner of what you sign"! He showed a certain obedience here. "Lie" was the wrong word!"

Q : Would you please tell me about his education, Jersey, his courses, his friends, Marechal and so on?
A : "There's a big book about the Jesuits in Jersey by Deslattre. Ore Place was only scholastic theology -- no William James there! His friend Valensin had a rather good knowledge of German theology, and probably introduced Teilhard to Leibniz. Valensin had a reputation for knowing German philosophy. Teilhard was sure to read the Monadology and most likely read it rather soon there."

Q : Do you know who translated Comment Je Crois in Peking?
A : "No. It couldn't have been Lucile Swan. She knew no French, as much French as I know Russian!"

Q : You didn't mention about Maréchal, by the way.
A : "Teilhard knew Maréchal personally during his studies. Later Maréchal was a censor for Le Milieu Divin. He
appreciated Teilhard and his papers on Teilhard are favourable to him. Marechal was a fierce scholastic. He attacked Kant very fiercely.

Q: About Teilhard's "anguish" and illnesses. Was there a heart attack in 1936?
A: "The "anguishes" were "mystical" and probably began very soon. Not physiological, though he may have been weary after his travels. He had what was probably an Asiatic illness a few years before the war: it prevented him going to the Moscow conference. Then after the war in 1947+ he had a heart-valve blocked with rubbish (infarctus) (bouche), and of course he died of a heart attack. That day he said his own Mass, went to High Mass, went with Rhoda to the Opera and then for a walk in the Park. Then he was weary, said he felt tired and his heart failed.

Q: But what about the family T.B.?
A: "Well, Alberic died of T.B. at the family house. He was a few months there, though they probably pretended... Then he had a small sister who died of Meningitis, a T.B. brain-attack. And Marguerite-Marie had mal de Pott, the backbone vertebrae soft. Not only Teilhard was ill of T.B.

Q: Lastly, about Teilhard and woman?
A: "Well, your precis did one wrong translation! "Fleurt" means "fond of" not "flirt"! Well, Teilhard loved Marguerite his cousin all her life. She was a nun really. He discovered "The Feminine" in her in 1911. And The Heart of the Matter (1950) shows that he was also fond of Germaine Teillard-Chambon. Also of course he was very fond of Guiguite. Any women earlier than 1911? I once saw a photograph of Teilhard with a woman earlier than that, but I don't know who it was. The others? Ida: he had an affective tempest with her and her husband. Then Marthe Vaufrey loved him and he wrote The Evolution of Chastity for her. Ida and Vaufrey were both at Boule's 1924 lectures with him. Lucille Swan -- she was possessive. Rhoda -- he didn't love her. And with Claude Riviere it was a healthy friendship and nothing more.

1. Or later in Autumn 1912.
2. Teilhard's younger sister Marguerite.
Q: Was there a real development in T.'s thought?
A: "There were three periods. First, his mystical period, 1913-25. Second, after the big break, with his return to China meaning exile, the period of revolt, 1925-39. Here he was the gentleman, concealing the suffering, which was there nonetheless; concealing ideas; showing in his letters to Valensin his revolt against the injustice of exile. Third, 1939, onwards, when he was suffering peacefully. (I myself was in Peking 1938-46). I don't think that he has a major publication after 1946, except perhaps in Christology."

Q: What was his personality like?
A: "Certainly, his thought (like Einstein's) came after visualizations; it was intuitions first, with Teilhard. He was passionate, like St. Paul, especially for his 'dear ideas'. He used to say, 'the best way of going is mine, my gospel'; and he was so convinced that he himself by his writing, writing, writing. He very definitely thought that he was giving something new; 'if I don't write, I will be a traitor, to my special vocation', he said. He definitely realized he was seeing something 'new'; and so he must tell others, and lead them. But though his thought came after visualizations, he had biological structures behind his ideas. See the end of the Future of Man. And remember that he wrote the Phenomenon of Man while in daily contact with myself, who works in biological research. He was not separated from biological science at that time.

His needs? Well, he was refined in his feelings; and so they were complex. He was truly man, in all senses of the word; and, taking to humanism, he liked it. And his (religious) problems were not with Christ, or Man; but with the Church, and Humanism. He loved New Yorker jokes — there was one about the Roman skater who had to do the figure of VIII, not the figure of 8! He liked that. And he liked gay, good meals. But he was scrupulously attached to his job, and he couldn't tolerate someone who wouldn't work — that's why he didn't like the Chinese — 'they don't work' — and he used to say there was only one lad in Peking who worked. He said, Evolution cannot be performed if Man doesn't work.

Q: Who were his friends, and his really-real friends?
A: "He was a kind of adventurer, and he was great friends with adventurers: like Henri Montfried, really a brigand; and the great adventuress, Claude Riviere, who said No to husband, job and so on, aged 24, and went to Haiti. A great spiritual woman now, aged 87. She was very interested in Teilhard. And there was Maryse Choisy, who studied Freud — and was converted by..."
Teilhard. He didn't like the bourgeois, who didn't take any risk, and followed only straight lines. He was attracted by people outside the ordinary way of living. And as a boy in a conservative household, he once got hold of the bust of the Duke Pretender which was on the mantle-piece, and threw it through the window!

His really-real friends? Marguerite was one — very definitely in love with him. He was afraid of that — told me he didn't know what to do. But his Superior said, Carry on. Then there was Paul Raphael; a Jew, whose wife is still alive. And George Barbour. And his really-real religious friends were Valensin, Charles, D'Ouince — and myself, I think; he was very open to me, a very good friend, though the difference in ages was too big. (He had too many ideas, for me; he was very, very bright — and with too much charity, joy, goodness, and so on.) In Paris, Count Begouën was a real friend — I suppose that his really-real friends were Raphael, Barbour and Begouën — and perhaps myself.

Q: Did he often show aggression, with Licent for instance?
A: "I never saw him impolite or unwelcoming. He was gay, humouristic — very open, especially when there was the opportunity to talk of his philosophical ideas. Only once did I see him furious — when he met again a man who had abused him. But I never saw him bitter. He never showed aggression to Licent, though there was plenty of opportunity. He was a man of peace, hiding problems, very secretive. I spent 20 minutes every morning with him, and the only thing I ever learned about his family was that his brother had died. Nothing else, ever.

About his women, Rhoda de Terra was very attracted to him in Burma, and he saw her very, very often in New York and Paris. He was afraid of this, but she was not a really-real friend. Lucille was also very attracted and devoted to him.

Other things? He was very scrupulous, especially when he was young.

He used to say: 'I have to express myself, even if they don't understand me'.
He used to say: 'the world's greatest sin is...'
I forget what it was...
He had a gift of 'sympathy', to everybody.

(E) 23 Dec. 1968 : Pere D'Ouince

Q: What was his 'anguish'?
A: "As a child, he had moments of inquietude. He was scrupulous, desiring to do well and right. And after
(E) 23 Dec. 1968 : Pere D'Quince contd.

his heart-attack, tears would suddenly come, and he'd 1J
say he was 'triste -- je ne sais pas pourquoi'. He 1K
said, 'Je retrouve l'etat comme j'etais un enfant'
-- and one time in 1952, when his baggage hadn't turned
up at the station, he was preoccupied by this, just
like a child. It wasn't psychological really. But
when he was tired, his childhood anxiety came back.
Accomplir l'Homme shows him depressed in China in 1943;
and Brouvlio speaks of 'moments d'anxiete'. Medicine
healed it sometimes...accident in China...crises
in USA 1952-3."

Q : What do you think were his needs?
A : "He was 'un enfant tres heureux', and he was happy all
his life -- his childhood was all clear, all in place;
and he had a reserve of 'bonheur'. He used to say of
himself that he was 'un diable dans une boite', a
'Jack-in-the-box'. He was 'un caoutchoux', an
india-rubber: resilient in overcoming obstacles.

His was 'une riche sensibilite' -- but in balance:
he was not more emotive than rational. His emotion
was for action, not for romanticism -- he was 'tres
tourne vers l'action'.

Did he have a Church or Dogmatic Superego? Pas du
tout. He was 'tres libre' -- loyal to the Church,
but no Superego concerning liturgy or dogma remained
with him after college, and when he entered the
religious life he had none at all. He accepted no
details. See the preface of Accomplir l'Homme.

He accepted persecution with 'liberte de l'esprit',
the authority of Church but not of Superego.

He used to mock the 'intgristes', the Roman
Catholic conservatives -- yet his prayers at retreats
were classic exercises, 'plutot classiques'; and he
was 'un religieux tres observant' -- every day at
chapel, with his breviary -- un home tres regulier;
libre et regulier -- he was of 'L'ecole tres vieille',
not at all like many modern Jesuits."

Q : Who were his friends, and how did he get on with people?
A : "He was interested in people, and very sociable. He
used books and people 'a seconder, developper ses
propres idees' -- he was no historian of ideas, and he
profited more for his own ideas than helped your own,
if he was talking to you. He didn't depend on others,
but was stimulated by them. So he never discussed
with people totally opposed to him -- he would be good
friends with them, 'mais discutaient jamais' -- that
would be a waste of time, so it didn't interest him.

He was very agreeable as a friend -- but on the
other hand did not search for 'une autre famille
d'esprit' -- he was in fact 'un conservateur' -- and
he neither accepted nor combatted.
His great friends were Valensin, Charles and Dalger — they were together for six intimate years, becoming Jesuits. And his feminine friends: Marguerite, Mme Begouën — he had no problem with sex — he was very simple, very free — his brother priests used to say 'Père, tu n'a pas de Peché Originel!' He was very transparent — and his friendships with women were very precious for his ideas — Marguerite was like a brother to him — 'les femmes sont plus receptives que les hommes'.

Q: Was Teilhard an aggressive man — with Licent for instance?
A: "Licent was a terrible man, impossible to live with, a maniac, L'autoritaire! Yet Teilhard a absolument jamais dit un seul mot' against him."

Q: Do you think that he really was interested in a new religion?
A: "He was in dialogue with another world — he was forming a new language to speak to atheists. And then he wanted to develop 'ce qui est a l'intérieur du Christianisme.' So he was joining transcendence and immanence, with the phylum of Christianity being the continuity.

What he wanted to do was to push Christianity to the maximum — to give a new presentation of it, so as to get 'plus de Christianisme'."

11 Dec. 1969: Pere D'Quince

Q: Would you please tell me about the years of college in Jersey?
A: "The scholasticat (seminary) of the Lyons/Paris provinces was moved to Jersey when times were difficult for the Jesuits in France. In Jersey they continued their licence in the Greek and Classics they had started at Laval. It was three years of very boring philosophy. But there was a very good physicist there — Teilhard was very interested in his work with him, for three years. We used to call him 'le patron', Père de Valois. Before 1914 there was little rapport with the English Jesuits, or with the English community. We were very generously welcomed in England, but told not to proselitise by the Cardinal of London. Bremond introduced us to Newman; but more than that, no. Teilhard was just a day at Oxford, and took no course there — he was an aristocrat, yes; but not at all Oxfordian. And in Jersey they never used to meet anyone from the outside world; though Pierre Teilhard may have a little, but this only through the local history society."

Q : Who were his teachers at Ore Place? And was Maréchal one of those taught there?

A : "In Theology there was A. Durand, St. Harent, M. Chossat, and Bouvier, he was killed in the war. Huby was a very good exegete, and wrote New Testament Commentaries. And Burdo and Rousselot you know. As for Pere Maréchal, he was not liked at all at Jersey. He was a Belgian Thomist. Teilhard spent only a day at Louvain and didn't know him at all."

Q : The period of 1905-8. Why was Teilhard sent to Egypt? Was there anything behind this?

A : "No, not at all. All our (Jesuit) schools and colleges (in France) had been confiscated; and Cairo was one of our nearest colleges to Lyons. After the war the Government's policy lapsed unofficially; and quite soon after, the law was lifted."

Q : How did Teilhard get to read Leibniz; and what about Le Roy?

A : "Teilhard was very interested in Leibniz. Leibniz was studied in College as a Course, with Descartes, Malebranche and so on; but Teilhard's use of the word 'monad' is in fact hiding a quite different meaning — Leibniz was only an "exterior". Le Roy was a half-disciple of Bergson — whom Teilhard had read in 1910-1 and he was of Exigence Idealiste (I have a note on how they influence one another). Teilhard used to see Le Roy every Tuesday in Paris for a long time."

Q : I wonder if Teilhard ever seemed ideologically certain of his ideas, or did he give the impression that they were hypotheses, and 'un tatonnement'?

A : "He had 'un grand intuition' that evolution was going towards spirit, and that Christ was the Centre of the Universe — he knew there was an option so was finalist not determinist. So although he gave some lines of research in the 1924 Mon Univers, this was from his intuition — he didn't hold too much to systems — he even upheld the possibility of taking back the idea of union creatrice. It was really that in his research he thought that the idea that evolution goes towards spirit and that this spiritual evolution is continuing in socialisation — that this idea was useful. He found his intuitions useful to him."

Q : Two questions, unconnected with what we've been talking about. Matters of fact. Do you know who translated Comment Je Crois into English in 1936? And what was the exact nature of the 1936-8 illnesses?

1. Probably "Hastings".
A: "The translation. Well, the colony in China was bilingual. Probably someone translated it and showed it to Teilhard. De Solages said to Teilhard that he was an idiot to do (allow) this, and that he'd get into trouble. The best chronology is in the Album. There's nothing there about a 1936 illness. It shows a fièvre de malte in 1937 — he'd stayed in France from April to (27) August. Otherwise, his cardiac was on 1 June 1947."

D'Ouince said Crespy's second book is one of the very best on Teilhard. "It is Teilhard". And he asked me what I thought was the importance of Teilhard. I replied that I feel that Teilhard will be one, or even the Christian paradigm for the new religion of fifty years from now: "the problems of Science and Religion will not go away", D'Ouince replied: "Exactement!"

(F) 13 Jan. 1969: Joseph Teilhard

Q: How do you think of your brother Pierre?
A: "Pierre converted many, many people — look at the engineer Louis Armand. When Cardinal Ottovanni asked himself if anyone had converted more people than Pierre Teilhard, he had to reply, 'only one, I'Archeveque Calvin'. Poor Pierre never wanted to contradict the Church: Pauvre Pierre. Pierre was very different in personal life, from his thesis. Mlle Mortier displeases me much, for publishing Tome 61, for Pierre is much too tentative in these essays. She should not have published them. And de Lubac should not have published the Zanta letters; nor Marguerite's. And Accomplir l'Homme well, you don't know — I think it's all been changed - what Pierre wrote."

Q: Do you think, then, that Pierre made some errors?
A: "He was in error in thinking that Evolution applies to everything. The truth of 2000 years does not change, and 'l'idée de jour' is not 'la verite'. The difficulties of existence, the everyday difficulties, Pierre just didn't see, and wasn't concerned with. He thought only of the end of the world, le Fin. He had 'une mefiance de lien'. To be quite honest, I think he thought that history is vanity."

Q: I am interested in his childhood. Can you tell me of his development as a person through life?
A: "Our father was a Chartist, with lands — the disfavoured class because towns were being favoured more than agriculture. And he read all the Chartist literature, and all the historical revues. But Pierre, never! He never read history, never read these revues. Only 1. Human Energy, Collins 1969. Perhaps Joseph's "tentative" here should be translated "speculative".
the science revues, only the history of the Earth.
'Le passe historique n'interessait aucunement'.

As a boy -- well, Pierre had a horror of society. In 1892-5 he never wanted or saw his cousins, never saw his school friends at home. He was taciturn, shy, timid. He just collected his entomology collection, now in the Clermond-Ferrand museum. But all this changed completely when he joined the Order -- he became 'ouvert, éclaté' -- and at Hastings met an elite of savants, some very remarkable young men.

When Alberique, who was on the Admiral's staff (1901-2) in the Far East and Constantinople, came home on leave^2 -- I suppose Turkey being Jesuit gave Pierre the idea of the East -- Pierre wouldn't go to the various parties with him! Alberique used to flirt; and so on; but Pierre, he wouldn't go. Pierre was 'tres pur, tres pur'. Pierre always had detachment. He never replied to me when our father or brothers died; just 'un mot' when we met. 'Ce déchirement, ce n'est pas une virile'. He always had this detachment."

Q : What about his years at school?
A : "He was very regular with his homework -- just as he was with his Offices. He was ill when he was doing his maths bacc., and at this time my room was next door to his, and the communication door was always open. (He had a maths master, who 'fired' him). In the evening he would sit down promptly to do his work, at the same time every evening, and every evening at 10 p.m. he would have his maths problems neatly finished. 8 to 10 sharp.

He started by studying mineralogy, then went on to his maths bacc., and the physics and geology came later.

His health? He had 'un mauvais disposition' all his life. All our family, mother and father, had the same type of (cardiac) trouble that came to him in 1936. This left him with his 'angoisse'. When he was at Sarcenat in 1950, he had considerable pain: I always had to ask him in the morning, Have

---

2. Sick leave during which he died of T.B.
you had a good night. But the only day of his life, perhaps, in which he felt fear, was in 1949, when I went with him to Professor Lenaigre. The professor began his diagnosis by saying, 'You are elderly... alone... religious... and I'll tell you all' — and the expression on Pierre's face was of the fear of death. But it was soon over, for Lenaigre continued, 'I think you have about nine years left, to live'. But when he was at Sarcenat in 1950 he wouldn't eat — because a letter about the Encyclical hadn't come for him! Life didn't suit him, so he wouldn't eat! He kept asking, What is the future of the Faith, and what methods must we use — and that what is needed is a Council of the Church. Well, Pierre thought like this, and his basic thought was that Christianity is too Oriental. Well, I think we need to become more Eastern.'

Q: What about Pierre and the War?
A: "It was his humility that made him refuse officer status", and join the colonial troops. But if you go to the monument of the 38th Colonial at Douaumont, you'll find his name there, in a very special way. Two farmers on our Auverne estates said afterwards that he had individually raised the morale of the regiment, and had himself, and given to them all, great confidence."

Q: What do you think are the most important writings of your brother Pierre?
A: "Well, he was called up in 1915, and began to write, behind the lines. And since he had done Greek and Latin in his novitiate, he knew the base of the French language; and so he wrote 'tres bien francaise'.

His best writing? 1916-8; 1926 (Milieu Divin) : 1936. That year (1936) he went on an expedition to Burma and India with de Terra; and it was there that he had his first cardiac accident — the family weakness. And from that time on, there was a huge change in style, in the way of writing, of his language. His expression now was 'moins claire'.

Where do I think the 'real' Pierre is to be found? In his letters to me. His was always 'le grand souci' — the daily difficulties of existence did not worry him. He never saw them. He was always detached."

Q: One last question: who were his women friends?
A: "Mme Couturier — she was the ex-wife of a Communist Deputy. And a very intelligent, blonde American, Mme de Terra. Neither of them please me very much."

2. See Teilhard Album.
For Pierre, my brother, all this belonged to the past, which held nothing of interest in his eyes. He did not even discern the first glimmerings of that great dawn, which, a little later, was to break through, as he gazed, over the future of his dreams; the past of the earth.

Pierre remained completely indifferent to my father's work. My father had great culture and gifts as a genealogist. We all admired him. Such experts as Arthur Longnon, Heron de Villefosse, Leopold Delisle and even the Home Secretary had recourse to him. We also admired his patience in the thankless administration of landed properties with which — by a questionable favour from heaven — he was overburdened. But our father was a naturalist too, and Pierre was soon and at a very early age, even before his sojourn at Mongre, extremely interested in the physical sciences (in the Greek sense) — those concerning the theory of pure science, concerning geology, entomology, botany and all forms of biology. Right up to the end of his life he used to talk readily about all that his father had taught him. He used to acknowledge that it was definitely his father who had opened up for him the limitless horizons in which he himself was to devote his imagination, his intelligence, and his very life.

Pierre was to learn from his mother — to put it briefly — the love of God. This was because his mother was a saint in a manner that he perhaps considered a little outdated — the sainthood practised by his grandfather, Louis FIEVET, "Le Saint de Lille", friend and frequent source of inspiration to the Vrau in their great schemes which were not fully completed; and which was to be found in the time of His Holiness Pope Pius IX. It was the manner of sainthood of the nuns of the Sacre Coeur in fact. Until 1936, when she died, Pierre carried on a lively spiritual correspondence with her; but the letters have not passed on to us, naturally enough.

I think I should distinguish two groups among the ten children brought up at SARCENAT. The first was the serious group and comprised Alberic, Francoise, Pierre, Marguerite, Gabriel and Olivier. The second group was Joseph-Astorg, Gonzague and Victor and was, I must admit, a little less conformist. This leaves out Louise who died at twelve, and whose place if she had lived would not have been in the second group.

ALBERTIC studied with extraordinary ease. At ten, he entered Mongre College in fourth place. His grandfather Dompierre D'Hornoy had been a naval officer. His great-uncle was an Admiral and Minister for Naval Affairs, Charles, the latter's son, likewise a naval officer. Trained in JERSEY by the renowned Père Gras, Alberic easily entered the Naval School and passed out from it second in
1895 as a senior officer, that is a staff officer; and he was destined through this rank for the stars of an Admiral. He spent two years in the Far East, attached to Admirals de Beaumont (his relation) and de la Bedoliere; he played an important part in the Spanish-American war for which he was thanked by Madrid; and two more years he was attached to our ambassador near the Port of Constantinople, Monsieur Constans — an old man, and the most wily of the Ministers of the Third Republic. Alberic was a favorite of M. Constans. But Alberic died in 1902, to the despair of my parents. He did not seem to me at any time to have had an influence on Pierre, with whom however he was very intimate. At all events he did not succeed in sending him to the Polytechnic. Pierre showed himself strongly opposed to this.

In 1903, Francoise entered the Order of the Little Sisters of the Poor. This, if the truth be told, was against my father's will and against that of several of her brothers including myself (who was her godson and had little say in the matter). She became Superior of the large Home in SHANG-HAI in 1909. She soon summed up the dimensions of her task among those vast yellow masses, where great poverty existed side by side with scandalous riches. How many were the homes she would have needed to construct and organize! She decided to increase the endowments, a task for which her upbringing had prepared her very badly. Curiously it was among the Chinese industrialists for mysterious reasons the very richest that she found the most support for her projects. But she died in 1911 as a result of an epidemic of small-pox which was very like the plague. Nothing has remained of her correspondence with Pierre, because on principle neither of them kept a single letter.

Marguerite, who had delicate health, lived until 1936. From 1927 she was President of the Catholic Union for the sick, founded in Switzerland about 1912. Its first President in France had been Madame De Ravine. Marguerite followed her as President and succeeded in greatly expanding this work which has comforted so many unfortunate people. She thought only through Pierre. Her closeness to him she found her most helpful source of encouragement from her early childhood. Her vast correspondence has been destroyed. Its main theme was a somewhat naive spirituality.

Next came Gabriel and Olivier. They had both thought of Naval School, but Gabriel was turned down because of ill-health and Olivier through bad eye-sight.

To my mind they were at least up to Pierre's standard, but more responsive to practical things, which made them prefer the Central to the Polytechnic. There again, Gabriel was ill, gave up work and retired to the Murol chateau on the banks of the Allier, where he played a useful
part in politics. He was a senior officer in the airforce, but his health could not withstand the hardships of the second world war and he died in 1941. He was pious and disciplined, and he never stopped preaching submission and patience to Pierre — much to my uncharitable glee.

OLIVIER left at the beginning of 1912 (and after his military service) to work in Mexican California in the Boleo mines. He soon became Director. "What a craving my children possess to leave us and to leave France" my mother used to remark sorrowfully. Against the orders of the Company, Monsieur JUSSERAND, the ambassador in Washington, and indeed that of the President of the Council in Paris, for he was suddenly preoccupied with our supply of basic materials, Olivier resolved to come back at the start of the war. He was killed in 1918, facing Mount Kemmel, as captain in command of a company on manoeuvres, after four years of brilliant campaigning. He was extremely gifted, hard to please, and original. Of all his brothers it was probably to Olivier that Pierre listened most willingly (despite himself) — to advice disguised beneath highly colourful paradox and aphorism.

GONZAGUE was killed near VIC-sur-Aisne at the beginning of the war.

VICTOR transferred from cavalry to infantry where he distinguished himself particularly on the Vesle in 1918. Paradoxically he did not suffer from any wound (this was like Pierre). But he was gassed, and this did much to cause his death in 1934. He was then a Staff Captain. Before he died in 1932 my father had seen all his sons decorated — whether it was with the Legion of Honour, the Military Medal or both. This was not enough to console him in his grief; far less my mother.

Pierre was eight years older than myself which means that I was not a witness of his childhood. But I know that like all the brothers and sisters classed in my first group he studied entirely without effort. My mother would add that he was amazingly well-behaved, although we all, at least in our early days, practised the little virtues grouped under this heading, such as application, obedience, quietness, even-temper.

Spring, Summer and Autumn were spent then at Sarcenat or at Murol, the winter at Clermont-Ferrand, in the Teilhard mansion in the square of Michael Hospital. This previously belonged to a family de Montaignac, and before that was a convent. The huge vaulted kitchens in the basement still indicated this. Numerous cousins, more or less distant, helped the short days of winter in that house to pass — gloomy ones for Pierre because during them he was confined inside. When he was not working he was only happy out of doors.
When I reached the age of first memories, in my case three years old, Pierre was already at Monre and subject to a regime which provided few holidays. Those winter holidays were spent in mineralogical and later geological research around Clermont. In this connection he was given support (as is shown in their works) by a number of lecturers at the University of Clermont, among them Monsieur Glangeaud. The summer holidays were spent at Sarcenat, again in mineralogical and above all entomological research. My mother, to get rid of me, sent me off after Pierre. Not that I have treasured the enchanting memory of our pausing in the burning heat at the pinewoods' edge in the tantalising pursuit of the elusive golden beetle - hard to follow with one's eyes when in flight, hard before this to make out against the tree trunks exposed to a sun which was never hot enough for those original coleopterus! or of investigations carried out on the earth's surface, in dead wood, by turning over rocks, beneath which both insects and aggressive vipers used to appear.

In those days Pierre showed much less liveliness and gaiety than when under the rule of the Jesuits. Those who livened up the household were Francoise and Alberic who endeavoured to sharpen the wits of us little ones by entertaining us, by taking us out for walks, and even by making us play charades (to my dismay). My elder brothers Gabriel and Olivier did things with more spark, Pierre resignedly. He was always thinking of something else, taking little part in general conversation. But he loved to talk with our governesses. These were Swiss, Alsation or Bavarian, because my father insisted that we learned a little German: "You will always know English" he would say. Those girls, chosen with care, very intelligent and strictly brought up, certainly understood Pierre better than we did.

My father, later, tried to make Pierre go shooting to distract him from his endless classification and research - by giving him a dog and a gun, like Alberic; but he did not succeed in inspiring him with that passion which the rest of his brothers had.

I can still see, in Autumn 1898 at Murol, on the banks of the Allier, the teals springing up in colourful sprays between Pierre's legs as he calmly missed. Alberic also missed - but with indignation! That happened in November. Pierre had passed his Baccalaureat in Philosophy with distinction in 1897 and had received at Monre the Prize of Honour awarded by a Former Pupils' Association after a competition. But because of his anaemia, our parents had decided to have him spend a year at home, where he prepared peacefully for the second part of the Baccalaureat, the Mathematics. To the amused surprise of the household and...
the utter astonishment of his Clermont teacher, Monsieur Croze, he failed in July. But he did pass in October.

This Monsieur Croze tried out a method on him; a course of lessons reduced to a minimum of twice a week with ten of the problems on the syllabus. And Pierre in July 1898, had left out one question in the syllabus.

I myself studied with Monsieur Croze. He was an elderly Zouave, bearded, ruddy, a fanatical bonapartist, lover of all forms of alcohol, gifted with a stentorian voice, the epitomy of Jupiter thundering. He was a very good mathematician and used to set problems for competitions in large schools and correct some of the papers at examination times.

All winter I had seen Pierre at grips with Monsieur Croze's problems. He had set himself to solve two every evening between eight and ten o'clock. At ten o'clock they were usually copied out. He did not go to bed until he had finished them, but this never kept him very late.

It is noteworthy too that he was rather unsociable and tried neither to increase his acquaintances nor to see his friends (although the house was always open to his friends from Mongre), not even his cousins who filled the old mansions of Clermont. He was not to understand until much later the meaning of "the charming but malicious customs of society" of which Pascal speaks.

I believe I never even saw him read a novel, a magazine, one of the numerous historical publications which loaded the drawing-room tables at Sarcenat, Clermont and Murol; but he used to read several articles from La Revue des Deux Mondes or the Correspondant; and he always used to read the university bulletins and those of the Clermont Academy which included scientific studies. Like Alberic, Franpoise (who used to remember word for word), Gabriel and Olivier, Pierre quite understood all that he read and never forgot it. He used to practise his religious exercises at regular times - prayer, reading and rosary. During his holidays with us at Moulins, fifty years later, he had not changed his rule in any way.

To us, to all who spoke with him, he expressed himself with the utmost simplicity. This simplicity I was to discover again twenty-five years later when he defended his thesis for the Doctorate of Sciences, in the simplicity of his lectures. This simplicity was undoubtedly of his very soul. But which of us would have dreamt that his essays, so clearly written, would one day be given expression, and would form a complete whole capable of turning human thought upside down!
Conversation 14 Dec. 1969: Dominique de Wespin (Georges Maggloire)

Q: I believe that Teilhard told you some memories he had about his childhood?
A: "Yes, you know his story of how "sorry" he was when the rose's petals fell, and when a lock of his hair burned to nothing... And then he said that at Sarcenat when he was five years old he couldn't sleep: so his nurse took him in her arms to the orchard and under a peach tree she asked him if he wanted one. Yes, he said, that biggest one... and he pointed to the moon which was up. He was always, he said, trying to have the impossible.

Q: I am interested in his personality: what was it really like?
A: "Well. I knew him because he used to come to my mother's house in Peking at about 5.40 every evening -- all his friends used to come to our house -- he lived just round the corner. I remember he was so kindhearted with the servants -- and he was joking all the time. He would laugh suddenly (like this) "Ha!" He was so gay and sweet. He was so good... but lightly so: he was never austerely good. And he never humiliated people. But one thing, he couldn't stand "bad" people, that is, if anyone said anything "hard" about another person (scientist or anyone else) -- anything -- he would at once look up at the sky -- he immediately looked up at the sky, stood up and went out.

But he was very lonely. His health, well, he was very nervous all the time but this was hidden -- you know the Chinese smile so as not to show troubles and so as not to make others unhappy, and Teilhard told his troubles with a joke only. He was very lonely, and no one understood what he said. Leroy was always objecting, Leroy used to talk of the light as being there also as well as the light. And Teilhard, he said never to look at the shadow: he wouldn't speak of the Devil. He said we are to go through the shadows to find the light: the light is everywhere. Yes, he would say, everything is hard now but this is blessing in disguise: we have to be, so we have to suffer: suffering is the price of being. But we didn't guess of his troubles: Leroy told us that he was crying often and was very unhappy. But he was self-controlled all the time, and very gay."

Q: Again about his health. Did you ever hear of a cardiac illness in 1936?
A: "No, I never heard that."
Q: What about dreams: did he ever tell you any that he had?
A: "Well, he was very very interested in dreams, but I don't know of any. But he once said that it was the 1903 or 4 Parish Exhibition that had started him thinking of exotic far-off country: it was his first shock, he said: "I dreamed then of the exotic". It was food, 'aliment', nourishment for dreams."

Q: A rather abrupt question, Did he ever lie?
A: "He never, never lied. He said "I never lied when I was young", when he was a child."

Q: Could you please tell me how he talked about his ideas? Was he academic? And what did he used to say about the book, The Phenomenon of Man, when he was writing it?
A: "Oh, he never never talked like a scholastic, and he never mentioned Thomas (Acquinas) or Aristotle. And about the book, he used to say "L'Homme avance bien! L'Homme marche bien" (Man's going, progressing well). And he used to say this to make people understand the world they're in. The Phenomenon of Man was the most important thing to him: but he would not speak much of it."

Q: I wonder if you would tell me about the more personal side of him, about what the feminine meant to him?
A: "Well, I once wrote a novel about him, but when I showed it to Leroy he said scrap it; and now I only say what was true.

To me at the time (I was a young woman then) he was just a scientist who came round to our house. He was like a father to me; and actually I preferred Leroy. But with the feminine he had no complexes at all. He was just gay; and he spoke more easily with men. But he liked young, gay, good-looking women. He once said in Paris, I remember, that there were only old ladies who were so ugly, only old ladies at his masses! and he continued "Mon Dieu, ou donc allez-vous chercher vos épouses?!" That was the way he joked! He was so transparent, so pure, with no complex at all: never, never anything shocking, never so far. He had the idea of the purity of love: he used to say "I see God in every person". (Perhaps he told his troubles to another, that is to Rhoda or Claude Rivière."
"I played around with Teilhard in China" - "he was the closest friend I ever had". "I introduced him to Henry Drummond - found the Ascent of Man for him at Union Theological Seminary one day. Forward and Upward - he used to say."

"Our friendship continued to grow - he gave me Comment Je Vois 1948 to do with superpersonal and transcendence."

Teilhard
(a) "wanted to replace the pessimism of the young" and to
(b) "relate what he found as a 'scientist' with his faith. This, with his 'digging' was his work". So he was really saying "work out your own salvation".
(c) "work out your own salvation."

Teilhard was "midway between the scientific and the theological milieu".

"Truth is one" made him say that either science or religion, at any one point, was the right one.

"He had a definitively new doctrine of progress, and made belief in progress intellectually respectable in France - as it had been already in Scotland via e.g. Drummond."

"He said in a letter of 2nd October 1948 that 'Christians should be the most truly human among us.'"

(Mrs. Barbour): "Teilhard felt very strongly concerning the fact that God is still a-making, that Time is of the essence of things and going forward, that Man must accelerate Evolution or retard, or destroy it. He was one of God's great spokesmen."

"In Africa Teilhard once said, looking at the Victoria Falls rainbow, "What energy it takes to make such beauty."

"He used to quote Termier: 'Tout ce qui arrive est adorable.'"

"I emphatically deny that he was not a good scientist. He was an excellent field worker - able to transfer his Chinese work, for instance, to S. Africa so well that some of his generalizations have proved almost prophetic. And he could spot a Mongolian palaeolithic implement 20 ft. away, while riding on a mule. Even at our house he was observant enough to know where keys, sheets, etc. were kept."

"Teilhard was a good scientist. He doubled the Sinanthropus date when brought in by me and was proved correct."

"There was only one Church for Teilhard, but he would have liked to have gone beyond what the Church taught him. He once responded (in jest) to Camp's
Conversations with (and tape of) George and Mrs. Barbour (1967-9) contd.

remarks about his (Camp's) new finds, 'Why don't we form a new religion then?!' And to a Scots woman he said, 'Go to your own Church and ancestral faith - it's all there,' (an incident excluded from the French edition of my book). He said he couldn't leave the Catholic Church without 'betraying something in myself.' 

"His mother was very Churchy."

"He didn't question many R.C. tenets; though concerning the Papal relaxation on the date of Adam, he said something like: 'Papa often nods, and then suddenly wakes up to the world around him.' He used to use that word 'Papa'; and 'nod' was his word too."

"He was an extremely human person - that's my impression of him in the field."

"He was very dependent on others - and for instance women fell for him, like Lucile Swan. And his little secretary Mlle. Mortier gave him eggs when he had pleurisy. He "sur-places" women, leading to "thinking". Probably How I Believe is for Lucile, thought the French MSS is different and he re-wrote things."

"Georges Maggloire" says she was his mistress but (Mrs. Barbour) "he was in love with many women, but didn't know it - probably he never even shook them by the hand; they were in love with him also - but with conscious thoughts. He never was with me, though! A woman knows all these things."

"He was rather na"ive about Young, and the brothel."

"He personally had a natural trust in human nature."

"He was a patrician Frenchman. He didn't even mention one colleague in his College d'Honneur presentation reply."

"He was entirely unmusical, uninterested in art in general; and with his sculptress he was more interested in how far he had developed mentally, in his talking with her."

"He had no Chinese language, too little English; a distrust of Germanic ideals."

"He had no objection to stealing a good idea. Truth is what matters." i.e. "He was the first person to report on Peking Man."

"MD and HU are OK. But 'God' does not appear in The Phenomenon of Man because he was hoping that Rome would OK it - they had told him not to write religion."

"Our discussions together, and letters, often were functional - some idea I put in comes out in his next letter changed, and as his idea!"

"Personally I often wonder about how my 'God'-concepts and images have come from my childhood experiences. He did too."
APPENDIX B.

Explanation of the coding system for the TOTA interpretations in Figures One, Two and Three.

Example: the first paragraph of Appendix A:

Here Teilhard is taken to be mainly "maintaining" (E) himself (1.). Women are his friends because in one case she meets the mystical part of his personality, and Rivière meets another - the adventurous element at least. But he did not let himself be caught by them: above all he needed them as friends (6E), and their sexuality was not a prime concern to him.

However, Teilhard was an unrepressed sexual being; and he enjoyed and maintained friendship with the beautiful (but much older) Zanta (7E), while he was strongly affected sexually by more than one other woman, which in value-vector terms becomes Expression of Sexuality (7F).

Thus this first paragraph is coded as 1E, 6E, 7E and 7F.

The reader may feel that he would code it differently, and this convinces us of the selectivity of the operation. But if he tries the various combinations of p.41, he may also find that he does not select too differently from the above codings.
APPENDIX C.

PASSAGES FROM UFN WHICH TRACE THE DEVELOPMENTS OF THOUGHT REFERRED TO IN CHAPTERS 17 AND 18 OF THIS THESIS.

1. Examples of TGTA-Naven elements:

Lived-in orders of Humanist, Jesuit and Scientific communities:

Je rentre de permission. 48 h. à Paris. J'ai vu Marg., Léonce, Boule... tous les milieux que je font vivre, qui nourrissent ma vie, qui alimentent mon effort. (UFN 3.26b).

Self-Ego:-

"Personnellement, il me semble que ma vocation, ma destinée est de célébrer, justifier, sanctifier les Énergies de l'Univers, actives et passives - et plus spécialement l'Effort Humain (former et lubrifier)... Le milieu de sainteté que je voudrais contribuer à créer autour des âmes de mon temps, c'est le culte du milieu évolutif qui les porte et qu'elles constituent par leur ensemble... Ainsi, dans un labeur d'apostolat direct, s'Utiliserait pour Dieu la préférence instinctive et naturelle que j'ai toujours eu pour les entités supra-personnelles, intersticielles, et cosmiques." (UFN 2.10a)

Sense-Sensitivity:-

N'est-ce pas exactement ma tournure d'esprit et ma méthode... Une proposition, un point de vue, me déplaisent, et je les fuis, tant que je n'arrive pas à les systématiser dans ma Weltanschaung. Après, je les adopte... Je donne donc plus d'importance à l'harmonisation des faits qu'aux faits eux-mêmes. Est-ce scientifique ou raisonnable... J'admet ce qui a pour moi un sens, cadre avec mes postulats, et mes idées chères. C'est dangereux et présomptueux peut-être... (UFN 1.71a)

Life:-

J'entrerai que ma mystique particulière est à "analogum princeps", à tendance, presque matérielle... Je ramène au tangible, au consistant, au palpable... (UFN 3.43a)

Science:-

Où diriger mon effort? où est le point sensible? l'étude du transformisme n'est-elle pas déflorée maintenant? établie dans ses grandes lignes ou à la merci d'une découverte de hazard?**

** cf. Rides Questions Scientifiques 1916 Certaines branches ont fait leur temps. L'embryologie historique n'a plus d'intérêt;
le transformisme est suffisamment prouvé. C'est le règne entre tout de l'embryologie expérimentale.

Il y a quelques part un phylum nouveau, qui affleure, et dont l'exploitation fera rejoindre les prolongements de tous les autres?***

*** Le meilleure façon d'achever la solution d'un problème c'est de travailler par convergence: la bio-mécanique ou la botanique pourrait consolider et achever l'oeuvre anthropologue plus sûrement que beaucoup de fouilles ... (UPN 1.60)

Religion:—

"Quelques idées en dehors du Catholicisme:
1. Dieu se réalisant dans la somme des consciences
2. Les consciences retournant à la fusion, l'anéantissement en Dieu.
Dans ces deux conceptions, à la fin de l'Evolution, il ne reste plus que Dieu seul.
L'idée chrétienne tient le milieu Terna — des consciences capturées, captivées, assimilées; Divinisées." (UPN 1.71b)

Life, Sense-Sensitivity, Science, Religion and Self-Ego:—

"Théoriquement, on concevrait facilement, et on défendrait sans peine, l'idée d'un Monde surnaturel se construisant uniquement au moyen d'énergies détournées, ou sacrifiées du Progrès Humain:
La Terre Nouvelle serait un produit secondaire (parasitaire ou récupérateur) du Progrès de l'Évolution naturelle ...
Mais ceci, en fait, me répugne. Le Corps du Christ doit assimiler tout le perfectionnement de l'âme humaine ..." (UPN 1.71a)

2. The build-up to Creative Union (also relevant to development of the Universal—Christ—Omega)!:—

Quand au "divin" de l'influx; de la sève, courant dans la Tige ou, le Nisus ondulatoire, il réside surtout dans l'énergie de développement, et moins dans ses déterminations particulières, lesquelles sont la marque contingente des initiatives (plus ou moins inconscientes) des monades en voie de formation. (UPN 1.59a)

Le terme de l'effort cosmique étant la Conscience, le But du mouvement vital est sûrement l'âme individuelle, mais une à d'autres dans une Collectivité sociale = c'est à dire une Pléiade. (UPN 1.59a)

Quotation from Dr. Moreau by H.G. Wells, with comment by Teilhard:—

"C'est là, je crois, dans les éternelles et vastes lois de la Matière et non dans les socis, les crimes, et les tourments quotidiens des hommes que ce qu'il y a de plus animal en nous doit trouver sa consolation et son espoir."
= l'illusion du divin inférieur (amorphe, amoral, indéterminé, moins divin que le Supérieur... ) (L'organisation à outrance,
la seconde matière, ou le second organisme, et un danger, une tentation cosmique?) (UPN 1.60)

Quotation from Fontenay in Revue Hébdomadaire (8.7.16) 'Ode à la guerre':

"Est-ce moins beau de mourir pour la Loi de la Terre, pour les lois cosmiques qui décrètent la guerre, que de mourir pour l'humanité doman; ou bien n'est-ce pas tout à fait la même chose? Si la Terre continue, en quelque sorte, de s'élaborer parmis les désastres sans que nous ne puissions rien comprendre au sens de ces marées de sang qui la recouvrent périodiquement, n'est-ce pas qu'il lui faut parvenir, à la fois, parmi les étoiles? Et l'ordre divin n'est-il pas lisible en haut qu'en bas?..." (UPN 1.60)

Maintenant il faut "créer", "synthétiser", essayer les puissances mises entre nos mains. La manipulation de la matière inorganique reste la base privilégiée, parce qu'elle paraît la source la plus disciplinée, la plus profonde, la plus palpable ... Mais il y a sans doute d'autres créations à promouvoir dans l'ordre moral, dans l'ordre social - où les facteurs psychiques ou organiques... Je vois, ou bien, arriver à me rétablir la valeur de l'histoire (=Analyse dans le temps, dans le passé), ou me découvrir un voie d'effort synthétique ... La guerre, la vie religieuse, voilà deux grandes voies créatrices ... Diviniser, Moraliser le monde, ne serait-ce pas là le comble de l'effort second? ...
(UPN 1.60a)

Conversation avec Boussac

- Entre deux corps électrisés (vg. deux électrons) nous observons uniquement la transience, (car l'immanence nous échappe). Entre deux vivants, nous ne nous occupons, inversement, que de l'immanence, et des transcensions conscientes (parole, signes ...): mais n'y-a-t-il pas aussi entre les organismes, sur le terrain cosmique une transience (action directe, physique, déterminée) semblable à l'influx nerveux, suivant laquelle les individus en accord leur perfection immanente, s'imprennentment se font écho? ... Alors (Boussac) on pourrait arriver à faire l'analyse "spectrale" des psychismes lointains (parce qu'inférieurs ...) en captant leurs influences psycho-physiques ... Evidemment, l'ordre se réaliserait le suivant: La Passion met l'individu dans un état extérieur transient B, lequel se manifeste par une interaction C ... (UPN 1.62a)

L'action de Dieu en nous se trouve éminemment dans la création qui nous conserve sentants et pensants, animés d'une force vitale ascensionelle ... L'action formatrice résulte de la combinaison des actions individuelles, ainsi divinement entretenues, elle est divine, directement dans sa substance énergétique; en direction, elle porte plus immédiatement l'empreinte des monades morales ou amorales (qu'il s'agisse de déterminismes ou de libertés, le relais
existe, et l'action divine est également démarquée): néanmoins, l'influence divine se retrouve dans le jeu d'ensemble (coincidences ordre d'ensemble), dirigée par la science moyenne ou l'action thômiste (toute monade a un jeu spontané, et donc imprévisible sans quelque science moyenne ou quelque déterminisme de la Volonté divine)... 
Ex: dans l'éclat d'obus, ou la paroles, ou la malchance, qui me touchent, je rencontre de l'Energie immédiate demandée de la Volonté divine... 
A la base de la théorie de la Charité, il faut mettre l'immortalité de l'âme. C'est parce que les monades humaines, sens en excepter une seule, constituent les atomes de Kosmos nouveau, du Corps du Christ, qu'elles se doivent aider, secourir, et, en quelque sorte, préférence réciproque.
Le Monde, c'est le Corps du Christ en gestation, qui s'élabora par pureté, souplement cosmique, victoire sur l'égoïsme... Le Monde est combiné de telle sorte que les monades se perfectionnent dans leur activité morales (essentielles) en concourant à le faire mûrir, en aidant de le créer (par coopération avec Dieu). Titre: "Théorie cosmique de l'Amour (amour chasteté sexual et amour charité mutuel)." (UPN 1.63a)

La Volonté divine et l'action divine. Pour les découvrir et les analyser au sein du Kosmos, il faut distinguer en nous les énergies axiales et les énergies latérales. Les premières (énergies évolutives, végétatives ou conscientes, poussée ou aspiration) sont directement créatrices et divines au premier degré. Les autres (combinées à celles-ci: réactions, chocs, influences diverses ...) représentent, directement et singuliairement l'action des autres monades: mais leur résultante inéluctable, à un moment donné, sur un organisme donné, est divine, directement créatrice et formatrice. (UPN 1.66a)

Il faut traiter la Matière toujours comme une "potentia", ou comme une composante, mêlée à tout ce qui est et devient ...

"L'apparence de l'Evolution est ... de marcher par ligne brisée, chaque phrase du développement étant ... l'occasion d'un perfectionnement ultérieur qui se pose sur le déjà-acquis et en profite mais suivant sa finalité propre, absolument nouvelle (l'utilisation de la langue - les épiphytes, - le parasitisme de l'esprit ...
Dans bien des cas cette technique ... comme une expression de cette loi que rien ne se fait que par transformation de quelque
chose (de préparé, d'apte)...
"L'amour supérieur de Dieu ne peut être que dans la transformation
d'un amour inférieur (amour sexuel) ne lui-même de l'épuration
de quelque chimio-tactisme." (UPN 1,69)

"Formule fondamentale, nécessaire et suffisante pour expliquer
et fonder les transformismes:
"Rien ne se fait de rien" (Ce récent "rien" signifiant une chose
immédiatement adapté à son "avancement"). Rien n'est plus
scholastique ni plus moderne?
"Cette loi implique, morphologiquement et psychologiquement, le
pré-homme (l'erreur scholastique est de ne voir dans la matière
in potentiacy, qu'une entité existante, n'ayant jamais en
son existence propre antécédente ... Il faut donc préciser la
formule ci-dessus en disant: "Rien ne se fait sinon par
adaptation de quelque chose d'analogue préexistant (déjà réalisé).""
(UPN 1,69a)

La pensée est l'élargissement et la spiritualisation de la
perception instinctive et purement pratique de la conscience
inférieure ...
Il n'y a pas à proprement parler parasitisme, accaparement,
excentration, déplacement du centre de gravité de la monade par
dérive et entraînement, mais développement régulier et méthodique
de la courbe, par série de progressions tangentielles (cf. la
pétale et les organes floraux utilisant les forces ordonnées à
la construction de la feuille - cette dernière comparaison me
parait très lumineux ... chaque émission utilisant les forces
précédemment organisées.
Dans une planète ... "l'unité de mouvement doit se jouer à partir
du terme, du fruit".
"Homme = fleur". (UPN 1,69a)

Il me semble aussi que je devrais reprendre (par exemple sous
forme de Dialogue entre l'homme et N.S.) les principales de mes
idées du point de vue spécial de l'Union avec Dieu, de la Communion
avec Dieu, trouvé, saisi, ("créatisé") au sein du Monde, dans son
action créatrice (activités "axiales"), dans son action ordonna-
trice ou formatrice (énergies latérales ...) dans l'adhésion
morale à l'Evolution, dans l'extériorisation souffrante, dans
l'assimilation au Corps cosmique ( ... au prochain, ... à la
Vie bleue), dans l'influence et la domination sacrée du Corps
physique et réel ... (UPN 1,71)

Peut-être les Anges et Esprits ont-ils leur place "naturelle" dans
cette "masse" d'être conscientisé où se ségrege l'Être du Monde ...
Quelle est, maintenant, la nature de cet être du Monde, qui est
apté à se condenser en âmes individuelles et immortelles (par la
force créatrice de Dieu), et qui veut s'éclaircir dans nos
consciences?
Est-il seulement le symbole d'un Devenir? - Tout dépend de l'idée qu'il faut se faire de l'Évolutifion, et de la façon dont le Témoin est contenu dans le Germe. L'essential, en fait, est qu'il y soit continu, c'est que le Cosmos même à l'état infre-méablest, soit un engagement irrémédiable à l'apparition d'une âme immortelle. (UPN 3.3)

Instinctivement, je tend à cette conception panthéistique (contre laquelle il me faut réagir, en la corrigant) que toutes les monades ne sont que des centres divers (d'action et de conscience) naissant au sein d'une substance unique. (UPN 3.8b)

L'union de l'être crée avec l'être infini, par renoncement: voilà la démarche essentielle du Cosmos: ne l'oublions pas: N.S. est le Centre des Personnes, le centre de reconstitution du Kosmos ... (UPN 3.10a)

Je suis forcé de m'avouer que le Cosmos ne s'explique bien que par des injections d'être successive: manière brute, vie (vies?) pensée ... (UPN 3.11a)

La "condensation, la concentration, l'organisation" du spirituel ou du divin? en suspension dilué, amorphé, ce sont d'assez mauvaises figures creuses. La conscience apparaît par un mécanisme spécial de groupement, creusement, centration de la substance fondamentale ... (UPN 3.11a)

2/ La Peine de l'isolement; - la soif de l'union (le sens du charme de l'amour même charnel: la fascination de la matière, région où les monades peuvent se toucher, s'étendre, se pénétrer palpablement. (UPN 3.14a)

Ainsi nous nous refondons en toutes choses, en un seul bloc humain, sur le prolongement de l'organisation divine, en la bienheureuse unité organique du Christ. Le vrai matière = celle qui relie les monades en soi, en les laissant conscientes d'elles-mêmes, et les fond dans une unité de plus en plus complète = le Christ (il satisfait toutes nos aspirations, reportées illusoirement sur le monde inférieur). (UPN 3.16b)

Les charmes des "grands Homogènes" tient à leur continuité. Ils donnent l'impression de la fusion absolue de parties, sans vide, sans lacune ... Ce qui choque, dans l'état actuel des monades humaines, c'est leur isolement, leur liberté relative, la contingence
apparente de leurs relations et de leurs courses, leur
dispersion accidentelle ... Comment tout cela pourrait-il
former un Tout? (UPN 3.22a)

La discontinuité, l'éparpillement des monades dans l'espace se
course encore de leur éparpillement, de leur extériorité, de
leur contingence et indépendance mutuelle dans le temps ...
Comment les éléments aussi dispersés dans leur ontogénie
peuvent-ils constituer un ensemble cohérent et donc
intéressant? ... L'aspect général des monades est bien tel, en
première apparence: intéressantes suivant les filets, la
courbe de leur devenir (par leur sève ... elles sont dénuées
da'attract par le groupement des filets, leur individualité et
leurs groupements accidentels ... Les coupes S du monde suivant
l'espace semblent n'avoir aucun intérêt de la Matière, des
Homogènes ...) Et l'Univers est atteint dans sa constitution
essentiellement pluraliste et dans la vigueur de son devenir
(hésitation, amollissement, désagrégation ...) — (double
dissolution dans l'orgueil et la matière). Il y a une crise
spirituelle et morale de l'Evolution.
(= agrégation essentiellement contingent)

Ce qui compliqué, dans la figure qu'opère le pluralisma humain,
c'est que l'organisme Total se compose au dehors du temps ...,,
groupant les monades de tous les temps ...
Le pluralité des monades constitue réellement une sorte de matière
nouvelle: l'ensemble des connaissances, des idées, de la pensée,
constitue un ensemble plus consistant que les âmes qui passent ...
(UPN 3.23, 3.23a)

Autre Plan 1. L'émiéttement (organique, dynamique - coupable)
douloureux, ruineux.
2. La convergence (cohérence) — (tous les vrais
chrétiens en Jésus: expérimentalement.

(UPN 3.24)

Wells (les premiers hommes dans la lune). Idées intéressantes:
"... la spécialisation de sédiments à des fonctions intellectuelles,
par culture physiologique, — leur polymorphisme — l'accumulation
des acquisitions dans le cerveau du grand lunaire ... — les
asexués." (UPN 3.24a)

Le grand part de mes interrogations, en ce moment, est suspendu
à cette question de "la substance spirituelle".
Quelles sont ses attaches matérielles? ses accroissements? ...
J'entrevois une conception du genre de celle-ci: Le psychisme
seul est primaire. La Matière est essentiellement un phénomène secondaire, naissant du pluralisme des monades (Matière = liaison des monades, dans l'organisme, la collectif et le transcendent). (UPN 3.24a)

L'idée scholastique de forme substantielle isolée est très difficile à systématiser. Elle implique une sorte d'infusion nouvelle de substance cosmique très peu naturelle. La "création" de l'âme humain doit être conçue comme le terme d'une opération immanente au monde et à son mécanisme, suite naturelle du développement psychique animal...

La monade intellectuelle ou vivante est-elle le prolongement du mouvement qui a donné l'atome ou l'électron? ou en discordance, ou sur un plan différent? Et alors, quelles sont leurs connexions? (UPN 3.25)

Seraient-il plus facile à concevoir la Matière formée comme du négatif, du vide, où pénétrer et se préciser, de plus en plus, la seule vraie réalité, la pensée?... Alors, en quelque sorte, la Matière serait Tout primitivement, et l'être y pénétrerait par évidement (cf. un dessin fait à la gomme). (Tout plein).

Non. Cela n'a pas de sens -

Tout se passe comme si la Matière, en s'élaborant, faisait prendre conscience à une gamme de psychismes préexistants...

Matière = pluralité organique. Homme =

(UPN 3.25b)

Il ne sent presque de rien d'affirmer la Dualisme (Matière et Esprit, deux consistantes, deux Éléments fondamentaux). Non seulement il y a la difficulté métaphysique d'expliquer l'alliance de deux principes, mais il y a la difficulté historique d'interpréter la patente évolution du psychisme au sein de la matière, à partir de formes quasiment atomiques (micro-organismes).

Quelle réalité cosmique (connexion, arrangement, substance ...) y-a-t-il de plus dans un micro-organisme que dans une grosse molécule?...

(UPN 3.25a)

Tout ce que j'ai écrit ici est bien vague, et bien maladroit, et bien mal posé comme problème. Il faut en revenir à l'idée du pan-psychisme, et chercher la vraie consistante dans le conscient. La consistante de la matière inférieure représente une différence de vitesse dans la dissociation. Elle est relative. La vraie consistante se crée par l'union du multiple.

La matérialité étant le devenir à partir du multiple...

(Multiple, inconscient, "petit" (élémentaire) = sont sans doute les aspects d'une même réalité ou condition ontologique)...

La fonction du Nombre (épuiser le réel).

Étudier "l'union créatrice". (le prix, la valeur substantielle
de la volonté) quand la volonté est parfaitement soumise à Dieu, ce n'est pas seulement Dieu qui s'incarne en nous, mais c'est Lui, en quelque sorte, qui trouve une espèce de complément dans notre activité purifiée (cf. Sertillanges).

Le Christ aura sa plénitude quand toutes les puissances du Monde seront réalisées ...

On ne saurait dire, souvent, si l'amour de l'Objet-excitant ébranle l'amour cosmique, ou bien si c'est l'amour cosmique préexistant qui se concentre sur un objet privilégié. — Il y a, en tout cas, en présence, une faculté unifiante (par besoin de béatitude), et une Béatitude diffuse suréclatant un objet-excitant sur lequel se précipite, converge, se condense, le Bien universellement répandu = l'amour coloré Tout. —

Le cercle de l'assimilation (Mystique de l'amour) vie fusion des âmes) Jusqu'ici, dualisme. La divinisation de Tout se faisait à travers le cré (risquant de devenir "irréel"), par adhésion, union, condensation du Divin ...

See the Introduction to the chapter Creative Union for UPN 3.36 and 3.37.

Le Néant formel = est une tendance à la divergence ...
Le Néant concret = est une puissance de concentration ...
L'intensité, l'omnipotence de l'acte créateur se mesure à la surface enveloppée par l'acte créateur, c'çà, par le Nombre de Centres obtenus par concentration, c'çà, par leur densité ...
c'çà, par la Richesse de la Spiritualité terminale ...
Le Nombre par lui-même n'est point créateur ... Mais il est condition d'une supériorité plus haute de qualité, s'il est simplifiable (synthétisable) ... La spiritualité d'un Cosmos (sa puissance de spiritualité) est proportionnelle au Nombre d'unités synthétisables à un niveau donné ...

La durée n'est pas davantage une somme d'états ... De quel droit opposer ces états et chercher une source à leur différence? ... Ne font-ils pas un? ... N'y aurait-il pas quelque avantage à considérer tout mouvement (passage d'acte) comme du à une union?
Les éléments de l'être étant dispersés spacialement, sa réalisation est forcément distendue dans le temps. Par ailleurs, on ne voit pas bien quel recours à un moteur extrinsèque est requis, si l'aptitude à l'Union est dispersée dans les Éléments? ... Ce moteur serait nécessaire s'il y avait un Progrès global du Cosmos, ou si la seule prolongation dans l'être pouvait de prouver être hors des capacités de l'immanence cosmique?
Mais comment établir ceci ou cela? ... Il semble qu'un seul déclenchemen (λ - ) dans la Multitude suffit à amorcer de proche en proche le mouvement d'union créatrice?...
(UFN 3.38a)

Or, il faut nécessairement un Absolu ... ou bien rien ne serait. En somme, le fondement de cette preuve est:
1. la transcendance du spirituel sur le multiple ...
2. la contingence radicafe de ce multiple à se concentrer parmi les mauvaises chances.
(c'est en somme, l'indépendance du Cercle inférieur de l'être vis à vis du cercle supérieur ...) (pour franchir chaque cercle inférieur, il faut un coup de Providence qui coïncide avec l'acte créateur, avec le surcroît venant à l'actori).
(UFN 3.39a)

La Création "ex nihilo subjecti". Faut-il réellement concevoir Dieu comme pouvant créer le Monde à une phrase quelconque de son développement? ... ou bien le devenir à partir d'un (ex fere nihilo sui) est-il indispensable (auquel cas le processus évolutif du Kosmos serait, non seulement une condition d'expérience historique, mais une loi ontologique absolue ...)?
Il est certainement curieux que le pas "ex nihilo subjecti" se fasse sous la forme d'une créature à son minimum d'existence, de perfection ...
(UFN 3.40a)

Priorité de l'Esprit = est ontologique, non historique. Il faut reprendre basse dans la matière et le naturel ... De plus la matière, à ces niveaux, garde sa vertu spécialement coercitive ...
(UFN 3.41a)

Aucune "clé" du monde sans doute ne pourra me permettre d'aller plus loin dans ce sens que l'idée de l'"Union créatrice". Le point délicat de cette théorie est de poser à l'origine un "Désuni absolu", qui semble un Néant positif, une Puissance Ombre de Dieu ... La Création ex nihilo subjecti semble escamotée. Mais ne l'est-elle pas, historiquement, le monde semblant commencer sur un ensemble de consistence, d'union, et de conscience? Y aurait-il une loi ontologique suivant laquelle l'apparition de l'être participé (subjectum) ne peut se faire qu'à partir de 0? ...
À la descente de l'attaque, si Dieu me garde, il faudra que je redige l'"Union créatrice".
1. Le Loi de récurrence apparente.
2. sa portée ontologique (relativement à la création)
3. valeur de la Matière, impuissance, et cependant nécessité initiale du Contact
4. transience et immanence
5. valeur plasmatique de la morale
6. la signification cosmique de l'Incarnation. (UPN 3.44)

L'ivresse de l'union sexuelle tient sans doute à ceci qu'elle est une des rares voies par lequel les êtres peuvent se toucher ...
(UPN 3.44)

**Union créatrice.** C'est sans doute une fausse conception qui divise en quelque sorte la création en deux temps:
1. création d'un support (noyau, nébuleuse ontologique)
   (d'un subjectum initial)
2. puis création de transformation, par élaboration du noyau ou de nébuleuse Cosmique.
Si on admet que la transformation évolutrice est vraiment créatrice, il ne se passe rien de moins à chaque degré d'élévation (d'union) des choses, qu'à l'instant initial.
L'union (évolution) est à chaque instant constitutrice de quelque chose de nouveau, d'absolument nouveau ...

* L'union fait quelque chose. (UPN 3.44)

La difficulté, pour nos esprits, est que nous n'arrivons pas à concevoir une action qui crée son objet, absolument. Tout ou moins historiquement, nous voulons voir une base du ajoutée par la durée, à chaque instant. L'Union (comme toute forme d'action) est une loi de recurrence qui semble rejeter à l'en arrière ... L'union doit unir quelque chose ...
Sans doute, il faut renoncer à nous affranchir de cette perspective d'indéfini ontologique. Mais il faut la corriger:
1. en comprenant que les états inférieurs nébuleux ne sont pas tout le Kosmos, mais une phrase, une ébauche, un commencement de création du Kosmos (l'acte créateur se poursuit, homogène quant au mécanisme, à travers toute la durée
2. en remarquant que le mécanisme de l'union explique (analyse) un peu la fonction transcendantale qui relie l'Être a se et l'être participé. Il semble que l'Être a se (= absolument Un) entraîne, par sa présence, l'opposition virtuelle du multiple, du plural a se ...
La Création semble être un réduction de cette "opposition abs extra" ...
Il est bien remarquable, en effet, que l'Evolution universelle n'aboutit pas à une absorption du créé par Dieu - mais à une Union respectant le Multiple, le synthétisant dans l'Unité physique du Christ. (UPN 3.44a)

J'abandonne donc de plus en plus cette idée que l'Evolution serait une simple "catégorie" ou "forme" de l'expérience, conditionnant les êtres dans leurs rapports externes ...
L'Evolution conditionne les êtres dans leur apparition ontologique. Il ne faut pas se représenter l'"esse existentia".
comme une substance pouvant se couler, à un moment quelconque
dans le moule évolutif des devenirs possibles.

La création semble devoir commencer sur l'.

N.B. Difficulté 1. pour les Anges
2. pour la cute originelle.

Le théorie de l''auguillage'' sur un nouveau monde est moins
compréhensible. Il faudrait revenir à la Faute diffuse, et
au Paradis futurible...

Comparer la lassitude et l'émoisement de la sensation avec
les cristallisations de l'être. (UNI 3.44a)

Ébauche de Plan pour l'Union Créatrice.
La vision fondamentale: le devenir cosmique s'effectue par
une réduction de la Multiplicité.
Prueve: l'Esprit (= terme le plus absolu du Monde) fleurit
au summum de la complication...
Objections apparentes:
1. la multiplication, par génération, des vivants.
2. la divergence (dispersion) phylétique.
3. l'isolement des monades pensantes ...

Ces apparences peuvent se démarquer facilement: la multi-
plication des vivants = propagation d'un mouvement de
"condensation": leur dispersion = marche convergente les
monades éléments d'une plus haute union, c.(d. d'un plus pur
Esprit (c.(d. d'un être plus synthétique). L'union =
paramètre de l'esse se.
Conclusion = l'aspect de l'Univers n'est pas le jaillissement
divergent à partir d'un centre commun de répulsion, mais la
convergence à partir d'une surface infiniment diffuse, vers
un centre de confluence, d'attraction. (UNI 3.45)

Nature de la base impalpable des choses.
J'ai longtemps pensé que l'émittement des êtres, à l'infini,
en arrière, était une "catégorie" ou une "forme" de l'expérience
(les séries temporelles et spatiales ...). Dieu aurait pu
réaliser la série évolutif à une phase quelconque de son
devenir.
Ceci est arbitraire. - Si nous voyons la création commencer
sur un ensemble, c'est sans doute qu'il y a une raison
absolue, ontologique à cela. - Erreur de distinguer la
création d'une et de formes. L'est une augmentation
continuelle: car la fusion des éléments les accroit - leur
union crée un supplément de . Evidemment, à l'origine
absolue, il faut admettre quelque chose qui s'unit.**

** 2 sens ontologiques de la petitesse.

Mais ce quelque chose peut-être infiniment réduit ...
= sorte
d'ivresse de l'Unité Divine ...
La forme du M Méant = la multiple.
Dieu semble avoir du partir de ce moule pour crer. (UNI 3.45a)
Nat. synth. de l’Esprit. Trois postulats fondamentaux.

1. L’Univers est soumis à l’Évolution (ensemble est inachevé) de telle sorte que tout ce qui apparaît vient d’un analogue préexistant (cf. infra la théorie renouvelée, céd. adaptée, de l’acte, et de la puissance)

2. L’Esprit est le Terme le plus parfait et donc le plus absolu, de l’Univers.

3. Or, chose remarquable, insuffisamment expliquée ou remarquée par les philosophes spiritualistes, l’esprit coïncide avec le maximum (et l’instabilité maxima) de la complexité matérielle.

Cette constatation expérimentale suggère et justifie cette vue (ultérieurement stabilisée et prouvée par ses développements) que la Loi de l’Évolution est la synthèse d’un multiple, préexistant ... (= Loi de génése de l’Esprit). L’Esprit suppose, pour sa génése, une , constitué par un éparpillement indéfini des monades matérielles ... Peu à peu, les monades se constitue par agrégation - chaque agrégation s’accompagne d’un Progrès vrai (= nature nouvelle caractérisée par un accroissement de conscience). Au voisinage de la Pensée, fragilité maxima. (UPN 3.46)

Qualité et Quantité. L’"Union créatrice" établit un lien précis entre la qualité et la quantité.
L’Esprit est fonction (du moins partielle ...) du Nombre, de la multitude ...
L’Esprit exige, pour une élaboration, un certain Espace ...
L’Univers représente une certaine puissance d’Esprit - céd. est capable d’aboutir à une spiritualité plus ou moins élevée, à proportion de la multitude (quantitative ... et sans doute aussi qualitative) englobée, comme base par le flux créateur = Plus esse = plur uniri a pluribus. (UPN 3.47)

D’abord, la "puissance" cesse d’être une entité plus ou moins métaphysique *
* = La "matière prime" a existé –
indiscernable du sujet en évolution ...
Toute transformation (causalité) suppose la rencontre d’entités préexistantes distinctes, aptes à s’unir. (UPN 3.47)

3. Passages which show metaphor-displacements which were producing Universal-Christ:-

Il semble vraiment que quelque chose doit devant nous (une Présence, un secret, une Promesse, une Issue) lorsque nous plaçons en face de l’ensemble des Choses, considéré comme formant un Tout (ni segmenté par fragmentation, ni appauvri par analyse isolement des énergies) ...
Et puis, quand nous essayons de préciser cette Figure, elle s’évanouit sous nos mains.
(UPN 3.12)
Ce serait insuffisant et systématique de vouloir ramener l'action rédemptrice du Christ à une simple "cohération" du jet vital. Il le cohère non seulement organiquement, par union en Lui, - mais dynamiquement, par la coopération à un même effort (dans l'élaboration d'un même organisme supérieur).

Il y a transformation substantielle des monades par la grâce, mais aussi par l'épuration morale (l"esse supernaturel" est de l"esse morale" transformé, comme celui-ci est de l"esse animale (psychique)" transformé ...) (UPN 3.17a)

"L'incommunicable nuance de chaque âme (sertillange) se retrouve parfaitement dans le Christ; car le Christ ... dans son organisme mystique, est la plénitude et la figure du Kosmos élu; si bien que les beautés particulières ne prennent leur sens définitif que comme des traits ou des touches composant la Céleste et Totale Physionomie ...

(UPN 3.21)

Les substances radio-actives ne seraient-elles pas, au lieu de la manifestation d'une propriété générale de la matière actuelle, un vestige - quelque chose comme ces paquets de glace encore non fondu après plusieurs jours de printemps? ... Un tort des gens d'Eglise, avec l'extrinsécisme, a été le fixisme: croire que la Révélation, et surtout N.S., avait stabilisé, cristallisé, le Monde. Jésus est au contraire un principe d'inquiétude, de développement ultérieur "ut vitam abundantius habeant", tous les ordres ...

(UPN 3.28a)

Figure de Dieu = une Présence diffuse. (UPN 3.30)

Figure générale du développement du Milieu mystique : -
Un ponctiforme (sensation, sentiment) envahit l'Univers, se précise, se personnalise, redevient un ponctiforme (personne du Christ) riche de tout l'Univers (immanente, actu et potentia), qui se re-déploie en cet Univers par irradiation (infusion de vie, centre d'attraction, de purification, de ségragation ...)
Du mouvement des particules dans un milieu solide? ... recristalisation? ... ségragation? ... (UPN 3.33b)

Etudier: "la Consistence de l'Esprit". (dans la solidité ontologique, dans l'intensité de l'union ...)
Une synthèse ultérieure de ma vie, de mes idées mystiques pourrait peut-être s'effectuer autour de la notion suivante:
"L'action divinisatrice", - ou l"action génératrice du Christ", -
ou l'"action morphogénique du Christ".

** Action vitale du Christ. Toute force traduit l'emprise de l'Organisme du Christ in fieri.**

C'est la dernière formule, peu satisfaisante encore dans sa forme, qui me plaît le plus. Il s'agit d'exprimer une vision du Réel où tout s'anime de manière de devenir l'action divino-humaine organisante du Christ incarné. Il faudrait de nouveau exprimer le sens organique, profond — nullement plaqué, ni conventionnel — de la morale chrétienne (Charité-pureté-souffrance-mort = facteur de dés-individualisme et spiritualisme supérieur) — s'alliant avec une prolongation essentielle et loyale de l'effort naturel humain (développement de la pensée et du cœur). Plus on y pense, plus on voit que l'économie du salut se rend à un simple agrandissement de l'amour naturel, reporté sur un centre supérieur et spiritualisant (par convergence). — (UPN 3.36a)

Chaque homme fait indiscutablement corps avec le Cosmos. Donc, le corps mystique du Christ (somme organique de tous les élus) fait corps avec le Cosmos, suivant toute la partie élu de ce dernier (= centre de concentration de ce qu'il y a de durable dans le Cosmos).

Le Corps mystique de Christ est donc nécessairement un Corps Cosmique, ipso facto. (UPN 3.37a)

Le Monde = vaste ségrégation le Christ ...
Tout le substantiel du Kosmos s'organise en N.S...
Dieu est dans chaque chose comme le terme de leur devenir, leur centre à atteindre.
La consistance du Futur ... est une des caractéristiques du nouveau point de vue. (UPN 3.45)

**Propriétés du Centre attractif.** Dieu. Nature paradoxal de ce mode de devenir: le plus réel, le plus absolu, est le plus aléatoire, le plus contingent ... L'esprit ne naît pas par un effort organique total du Cosmos. Il apparaît grâce à des chances favorables, toujours menacé de déstruktion.
Si l'on ne tient compte que du présent et du passé, l'esprit est essentiellement fragile et contingent.
S'il est absolu, c'est par un effet d'avenir, de futur. (à moins de chercher l'infaillibilité de la réussite dans la multitude des essais ... mais alors, si on tient compte des innombrables degrés du devenir, on arrive à une infinité d'improbabilités ... Le monde progresse misu positivo).
(Seule conciliation du primat de l'esprit et de la contingence du devenir = Existence réelle du Centre attractif, dirigeant de dehors, ab ante, les immanences, à travers les cas défavorables (la contingence est l'envers de l'infaillibilité de finalité)). (UPN 3.45a)
La Mystique. La pleine signification de l'Union créatrice se trouve dans la Doctrine du Corps du Christ = Christianisme = Rédemption d'Union (Réalisation absolue de l'Union de Dieu et du Kosmos).

+ Centre matériel et Cosmique de la spiritualisation des êtres. Evidemment c'est un couronnement surnaturel du Kosmos.

Mais, où est le naturel pur, dans nos facultés ou dans l'expérience? ... Dans la foi au Christ, seule, même l'individualité contingente trouve un intérêt absolu à se développer, puisque toute âme est destinée à réussir ...

Dieu apparaît dès lors comme le Centre de convergence universelle,

pour l'individu et tous les groupements supérieurs ...

= ainsi, une même conception guide toute notre vie intellectuelle, amoureuse, religieuse ... (URN 3.48)

4. Some results of the Creative-Union, Universal-Christ Gestalten:-

a) Christianity:-

Autre expression de ma "vocation": réhabiliter le Tache, l'effort humain, son efficacité, et son prix ... Comme je l'écrivais il y a quelques jours, le Progrès est l'axe (un des axes) du Règne de Dieu ... Le grand danger du Christianisme, le grand soupçon qu'il éveille, c'est celui d'éteindre en ses adeptes l'ardeur à cultiver le Monde, de remplacer la Science par la Théologie, l'effort par la Prière, la Lutte par l'Adhésion, de déflorer l'intérêt du Monde en limitant l'horizon des recherches et la sphère des énergies ... (UPN 1.64)

P. de m'a dit qu'il lui semblait que l'Effort humain, même chez un chrétien, pouvait être alimenté par le seul intérêt, ou la seule curiosité ... Je ne pense pas. Au fond, il y a davantage; et on s'en rendra compte de plus en plus. Je pense que le grand fait religieux actuel est l'éveil d'une Rédemption naturelle qui fait, petit à petit, adorer le Monde, et qui est indispensable à l'Humanité pour qu'elle continue à travailler.

Il est donc capital que nous montrions le christianisme comme capable de "diviniser" en quelque sorte, le "misur" et l"opus" naturel ...

Milieu mystique. Il naît physiquement, objectivement, pro porte, de la fusion des âmes. (UPN 3.41)

b) Theology:-

Je découvre une importance toujours grandissante au principe "de la recherche obligatoire". Ce n'est pas seulement, donc, l'enthousiasme pour le Cosmos qui doit m'entrainer à la poursuite de Progrès (justifié, reconnu saint ou du moins
Il existe une loi naturelle primaria, assujetissant, en conscience, l'homme raisonnable à explorer jusqu'au bout la domaine de ses connaissances et de sa puissance, pour s'assurer qu'il n'omet aucune moyen de savoir qu'il est, où il va, ce qu'il doit faire - aucune ressource pour s'accroître et s'améliorer sa situation. — Il est inadmissible que la Révélation soit un gage donné à la paresse, déflorant la recherche ou en dispensant. Non seulement, je dois rassurer les incroyants sincères en leur apprenant le "divin" sous-jacent à leurs idoles — mais il me faut suivant mes petits forces, découvrir la commode et égoïste torpeur des croyants suffisants et satisfaits. — Il y aurait, au moins en conclusion, un diptyque à tracer: "À ceux qui croient". "À ceux qui ne croient pas".

Extrinséisme (tendance à décider théologiquement de tout le réel) = suffisance + paresse. (UPN 1.63a)

Il est curieux que la Méditation de Saint Ignace "ad amorem" nous présente beaucoup plus l'Univers comme un Cadeau de Dieu, preuve de son amour, rayon nous attirant à sa Source, que comme un intermédiaire d'union ... (UPN 3.35a)

Une méthode de prouver la relativisme des Dogmes serait de montrer qu'ils contiennent des fragments de conceptions liées à des idées certainement caduques, vg. en jurisprudence ... etc.

Il faut se prémunir là-contre. Une apparence de cette caducité s'observe peut-être dans l'idée de la femme dans le x* siècle. Malgré la place très noble qui lui est faite, la femme est une inférieure (vg. pour le sacerdoce ...): n'est-ce pas là une trace décidée juive ou romaine? C'est une chose de temporaire, c'est non universel dans les conceptions humaines? Quand on y pense, c'est quelque chose d'extrêmement dur à admettre: une discipline valable pour tous les siècles!

Vraisemblablement, l'Évolution du Dogme en même temps qu'elle précisera certains points "in vérifiables", fera encore tomber beaucoup de ces éléments caduques ... (UPN 3.35a)

c) Discipleship:

Il me semble que le résumé pratique de l'ascèse cosmique est celui-ci: il faut aller à Dieu de tout notre cœur, non seulement de notre cœur — puissance d’aimer, mais de notre cœur en tant que remplis d'amours concrets. Il faut conserver nos passions pour des objets déterminés (ceux qui sollicitent vers le haut les puissances de tout homme), mais en les subordonnant à la marche du Règne de Dieu en nous et dans le monde.

Notre conversation à Dieu ne consiste pas à vider notre cœur et à mettre Dieu à sa place de tous les objets aimés (l'amour est-il réellement séparable de ses objets)
Fonction organique de la Morale. (Social = édition des collectivités) (chrétienne). Le morale, dans l'hypothèse de l'union créatrice, revêt une signification morphogénique très nette.

La Chasteté représente un effort de concentration interne, en même temps dans l'individu que dans les groupes ...

La charité opère la fusion ultérieure des monades dans la mesure de leur purification par la chasteté ...

(Le Phénomène de la Répulsion).

Le renoncement représente la peine de rupture des monades assujetties à entrer dans les combinaisons d'ordre (de spiritualité) supérieure. (UFN 3.48)

Le Prêtre, ce serait la forme concrète d'une étude, plus théorique, sur "les deux phases du devenir de l'Eglise" cf. 17 février). L'origine de l'Eglise est caractérisée par une forme "intrusive". Dans le dogme, dans la forme politique (pouvoir temporel), dans un certain accaparément des sciences, dans l'extrinsécisme intellectuel, dans la doctrine ascétique, dans la conception monastique et claustrale, l'orientation mystique, le xin tend à s'isoler, à dédaigner ou à accaparer, à fuir, à restreindre ... Ceci était nécessaire, sans doute, à individuation de l'Eglise. Maintenant, l'Eglise, tout en restant elle-même, semble devenir surtout une âme. Le catholique aperçoit que Dieu s'attête à travers du laboureur humain. Le Monde, de plus en plus exigeant, attire de plus en plus nécessairement des vrais vivants et leurs efforts?

Ceux-là subsistent et comptent qui vivent intensément la vie de leur existence toujours plus, au travail de lavie dans le Monde — de la vie sincère, loyale, profonde, totale.

Il faut que par ma vie, par mes écrits, je célèbre et je manifeste de travail créateur par lequel Dieu, aidé de l'homme, poursuit l'élaboration de l'esprit au sein du Monde ... La lecture du Feu, de Barbusse, où passe un souffle si poignant et si passionné de douleur et d'espérance humaine, mêlé d'une si désolante incompréhension du xme, m'a été un coup de fouet. 0 Jésus donnez nous donc enfin de ces xns, de ces prêtres, véritablement humains comme vous, qui souffrent régulièrement de la souffrance de la Terre, qui vibrent sincèrement des espérances de leur temps et de leur Monde!...

Le Prêtre, voilà bien la figure que je voudrais tracer, dans une étude, une confession, ou un roman, n'importe comment, pourvu que mon cœur, gros de désirs et de regrets, arrive à s'apaiser et à se faire entendre! —

Le Prêtre, ce n'est pas celui qui se drape dans les rites, ni se confine dans l'Eglise et l'administration des sacrements, ni s'absorbe dans les œuvres.

C'est le modèle et le premier des hommes, le premier à
attaquer le Réel pour le faire plier et l'améliorer
(le science, la femme, la terre ...)
Oui, là encore, la critique (injuste au fond, mais non
dénuee de toute apparente) de Barbusse m'a frappé au cœur.
Le prêtre peut donc encore passer pour celui qui dit aux
souffrants "Baissez la tête et attendez le Paradis!", pour
celui qui s'esquive devant le plus lourd de la tâche, pour
celui qui passe temps. Le xxe sera donc, de par son xme,
le plus vivant et le plus convaincu des hommes. À son
regard Dieu transparaîtra au fond du labeur humain; et
c'est là, au cœur de l'action, mieux que dans tous les
Déserts, qu'il ira le poursuivre et le trouver. La surface
des choses s'évanouissant à ses yeux, il vivra la vie de
tous, plus réellement que tous, et cependant comme perdu
dans un rêve ou une vision – la vision de Dieu qui opère et
qui crée au sein de l'Univers distrait, hostile ou païen ...
Une mystique nouvelle naît à nos yeux ... Prendre la vie
avec toutes ses espérances et tout son poids ...
(UFN 3.27a)
APPENDIX D.

Examples of strange texts of Teilhard:

1. de Lubac, op. cit., p. 244 omits the phrase which in the UL version of this Fontoymant letter runs "(pour opérer leur souffrante et sanctifiante ségrégation)..." (There are other differences).

2. de Solages, op. cit., when using the Journal mis-dates entries (e.g. p. 331, 18 June should be 16 June), fails to underline, changes capital letters to small and - according to UPN - changes the text, e.g. on p. 318 "stricto sensu" was "stricte", and on p. 318 "concept" should be "conceptions". More seriously his rendering of 31 July 1916 omits a whole phrase concerning mission: "le précept d'y collaborer pour vivre"; and in 4 Jan. 1919 he has "fascisme" instead of "fixisme". (Many other differences appear.)

3. Rideau, op. cit., p. 522, in the 21 Dec. 1919 Valensin letter, adds an interpretation by changing "the bases" to "the significance of the bases".

4. The published letter of Teilhard (to Marguerite) of 4 Oct. 1917 (MM, p. 207, GP, p. 269) has the addition of "à nous aider" to the end of the bracket - a total of twenty-three words more than in Teilhard's copy of part of this letter in UPN 3.43a.

5. Also: a strange translation in 1969:
   How I Believe (Teilhard's own translation, 1936, Peking):--
   "... I believe that the Spirit achieves itself in the Personal
   I believe that the Personal Supreme is the Universal Christ."
   How I Believe (Collins translation, 1969, London):--
   "... I believe that spirit is fully realised in a form of personality
   I believe that the supremely personal is the Universal Christ."
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appears close enough (and this is what vocation means) for him to serve, directly and immediately, as the sustaining force for the soul’s ascent’ (Father Desreumaux), the stage of human love may be reduced to the single profound sensitization already described, and may be superseded by the love of God before it culminates in physical contact, which is its normal outcome. The striking examples of Francis of Assisi, Theresa of Avila and Teilhard himself tend to show that the union of man with God, without passing through carnal love, can be more personalizing and more fruitful for a few chosen mystics, called by their vocation to this supreme adventure, than is the total union of man with woman.

These lines of inquiry reach far beyond the modest aims of this sketch. They are set down in this epilogue in order not to exclude from the account given of Father Teilhard’s vision the mystical dimensions which properly form part of it and to which he himself was so deeply attached.

Neither is it within the writer’s scope to take part in the controversies which Teilhard’s genius and the boldness of his views may occasion among Christians. The writer would only say, speaking as a specialist in the study of such texts, that to interpret the evolution of chastity and other writings of Teilhard concerning love as a denial, whether open or implied, of the basic principles of Christian or ecclesiastical morality would be a misunderstanding of the very meaning of Teilhard’s writings and of his whole life.
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Model of a Man-with-a-Model
A suggested interpretative model for Teilhard


NEED FOR A MORE FRUITFUL, AND SEMI-OBJECTIVE BASIS, TO REPLACE MEDAWAR AND METAPHYSICS

Many workers in the sciences, who were previously unaware of Sir Peter Medawar’s article in Mind, will more recently have made the acquaintance of Teilhard de Chardin through the reprint that appears in Medawar’s The Art of the Soluble. Such acquaintance (as I know from friends) has often resulted in strict disengagement. It is a perplexing anomaly, however, that Britain’s doyen of rational aesthetics has not prevented Teilhard’s influence from being felt in this country, both in sociologically-verifiable groupings, and in individuals who take their place within the rational community of scientists. It is not enough to decide that the latter individuals are simply humanist or religious, wrongly engaging in matters outside their professional concern and ethos; nor that the former have minds that are over-educated for their ability, or are members of a daft cult. Neither a Freudian reduction nor an analytic reduction of a reified Teilhard and of those influenced by him can be said to do justice to the sociological position of Teilhardians, and to the personality-processes involved.

What Medawar has in fact done—and it should not go unnoticed—is to reify† the most modern scientific paradigms,‡ and the critical ethos of both the scientific and the philosophical communities, so that a pure science with a hard reasoning can become an ultimate perspective; in other words, a metaphysic. Judgements concerning what is profound, concerning old paradigms such as general evolution and the like, combine to make sure that pious rant and supernatural religion, and Teilhard’s use of old paradigms, are given their deserts. This is not even a usual method of literary criticism, and it might be surmised that Teilhard is being used as a peg on which to hang certain well-known arguments against all religion.

It may, however, be questioned (in the light of Kuhn) whether such reification of present paradigms and ethos and method and hard reasoning is itself scientific. Religion is fruitfully being studied within the broader (softer?) sciences of sociology, anthropology, psychology (comparative religion, and even biology): but no use of such specific studies is made by Medawar. Rather, he succeeds in denying, by one-dimensional metaphysics, the validity (existential integrity) of Teilhard as anthropological, sociological and psychological fact; and the utilitarianism which is so valued by Medawar concerning science is rejected arbitrarily by him when it is social fact,

* See Notes at the end of this article.
† Reify: taking for the really-real reality what is in fact our way of thinking of it, i.e. a model or a concept.
‡ Paradigm: the absolute presuppositions basic to a community of scientists (or theologians) for their work. Text-book themes—though text books are sometimes out of date, i.e. physics without Newton is unthinkable; as is religion without holy books, or biology without Crick. Also, a paradigm is an accepted new solution to old problems, and itself now produces a train of new problems and anomalies, on which a new set of workers set to work solve (to solve).
psychological and religious fact which are in question. In attacking what he thinks is paper-philosophy, he simplifies Teilhard into a structure and system which Teilhard never was. This he reifies; and here he misses the significance of Teilhard, and of much religion.

From his vantage-point within hard and reified science, Medawar rejects Teilhard's language, logic, attempts at demonstration, out-of-date science, mis-used science, methods, findings, and indeed aims. Much of this is valuable when the metaphysical truth-questions are being asked (and it helps Medawar's pre-selected answers). But by his agreement with Huxley that Teilhard's aim is to reconcile the supernatural elements of Christianity with the facts and implications of evolution, Medawar is choosing for his target a gross and distorting simplification, of the type which he (often justly) criticizes violently when he finds them in Teilhard's writings. Scientific ruthlessness is deemed to make detail and argumentation from within social and psychological fact unnecessary; and the basic premise concerning what the man Teilhard was trying to do is quietly assumed, without analysis of his lived-in order, social behaviour, psychological processes, valuesystem, or even needs. (Medawar's explanation of Omega exemplifies this: he might have surmised that displacement-processes and gestalts* might be involved; but he prefers his metaphysical selections, and dubs a fruitful motivational concept 'pious rant'.)

It is indeed only reasonable to point out that much that passes for hard reasoning, outside the laboratory at least, hides a selected world-view, personal needs and values, and the background complex of a man's life and personality and work—and Sir Peter is no exception. There may indeed be no relationship between any religious pattern or vision and really-reality: yet though his article stands on its own feet as a necessary tool for religious self-criticism, and as a humorous tour-de-force, he succeeds only in forcing life and truth and reality into his own selected, one-dimensional slot, and in making a straw-man of Teilhard; and this is hardly good literature or good science.

Mistaking his own metaphysic for science, Medawar also mistakes metaphysics for religion. The equation of experimental realities with Reality, as we know, is a very reasonable and commonly-held judgement. As a metaphysical judgement, it is one that Teilhard also makes, with additions concerning Providence and concerning human life as a laboratory. But he also waged a life-long and specific protest against paper-philosophy and traditional metaphysics—which means that Medawar's equation of experimental reality with Reality, his dominant judgement concerning the value of (hard) science and what science discovers and his direct and negative judgement of religion from there, are inadequate bases for an attack on Teilhard since they are identical at that point. Medawar, perhaps deliberately, does not understand that experimental religion is not Metaphysic. That Medawar should misjudge the nature of the processes by which Teilhard's ideas were formed should not surprise us if it is the hidden metaphysical battle that really interests him: be that as it may, the failure of Medawar to use even one psychological or sociological or anthropological concept or method in his article removes its claim to be scientific (and it may be doubted further whether it will do as aesthetic reason or art, for his literary scissors cut too flat a form): for he loses the individual and social realities. This forcing of living religion and religious experiment into a paper-metaphysic denies him status as a serious analyst of religion.

This is not to beg the really-truth truth-questions in the man Teilhard. It is to demand that a more scientific approach be made to Teilhard and his reasoning, and to Medawar and his reasoning; for the latter is quite fruitless in relation to Teilhard, and sublimely irrelevant to a scientific understanding of religion.

It is correct, then, I think, to see Medawar as doing a considerable disservice to science by lending his authority to the rejection of the psychological, sociological and anthropological validity

* Gestalt: the 'pattern' which gives 'form' to a cluster of meaningless or amorphous entities. To see a 'face' in a page full of dots, or in a mountain-side is a Gestalt. This is selection by mind-processes, but an unconscious one.
of religion, through his reification of paradigm and person and method, through his hidden meta-
physical judgements, and through his neglect of experimental processes in human phenomena,
and the sciences studying them, in his essay on Teilhard. Perhaps more seriously, the disservice to
religion may be that the type of questioning and searching that Teilhard indulged in may have been
prematurely ended within religion itself—at any rate in Britain—which is a state of affairs often
enough known in the past, to the detriment of both society and religion.

By bringing into the open the metaphysical underpinnings through the concept of reification,
however, I feel that I can relativize both Teilhard and Medawar, and in this way at least allow the
explorations to continue. And this is not to make mysteries! It is simply to refuse to close reality
prematurely, while remaining within the experimental ethos of today’s sciences.

A SUGGESTED METHOD FOR TEILHARD STUDIES

The framework which I suggest for study of Teilhard is found mainly in Kluckholm and Murray in
Towards a General Theory of Action, in Levi-Strauss in Anthropology Today, and in Donald Schon’s
The Displacement of Concepts.6

There have been so many interpretations of him that we really must make the attempt to find
some sort of semi-objective theoretical background system through which to view him. For
whether it is Rideau with his aristotelianism, Lubac with his jesuit spirituality, or Medawar with
his conquistador love of his own mind, the interpretation of Teilhard always turns out to be the
various pre-suppositions involved.7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>lived-in order</th>
<th>new concept formation</th>
<th>value-vector model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. breakdown of belief-system, rules, roles, relationships, expectations, conscious and unconscious ethos of a community</td>
<td>well-tried concepts projected into new situations, synthesis of continuity and discovery. Results in Gestalt existential synthesis in Teilhard’s case. Related to tensions between two different paradigm-clusters, it is one of the mind’s ways of producing new concepts to meet the needs of an ever-more complex mental or physical environment</td>
<td>a. measurement of a human personality’s values and directions of action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. lived in model: individual’s personal cluster of motivating ideas within but distinct from those of the community includes ‘search images’ and conceptual ‘filters’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am aware, therefore, that my selection of a Kluckholm-Murray-Levi-Strauss-Schon framework
involves assumptions and limitations which make any results tentative, and much less than
reality. As an interpretative model it does however provide opportunity for a type of measurement;
and when viewed specifically as model, it consciously becomes relativized—something uncommon
in Teilhard studies, and in religion generally. This relativization of interpretation, further, allows
for future experimental studies, and helps to prevent the reification of interpretation into myth—
and in this case, into scientific myth. Results of such an interpretation may communicate more
readily to interested people in the scientific communities and outside, since no ideological pressure
is brought to bear; and insofar as modern (broad) science is reckoned by many to take us nearer to
‘truth’ or ‘reality’, the resulting picture of Teilhard may indeed be more fruitful and useful, as
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science is generally reckoned to be. The future of religion also might profit from a semi-objective, non-ideological, scientific interpretation of him, and this might be of constructive importance.

It will be noted at once that what I shall call my TGTA framework pushes through Freudian reduction and Comfortian punch-card religion,* accepting religion as a complex of realities with many particular possible elements, without demanding a metaphysical answer to the question whether religion is correct in assuming an Ultimate Reality—a judgement which eg. Comfort and Crick, if not Medawar, do make.

Working within this more limited, and more scientific, field we may approach religion with a clear conscience, and without perpetually looking round at the metaphysical superegos of either a Lubac or a Crick, which lurk waiting for those whose nerves make them attempt to foreclose realities.

My TGTA model has two main elements: a value-vector model, based on Murray's, through which to measure the values and directions of a human personality; and in relation to this I adjust Levi Strauss’s concept of lived-in order to that of lived-in model (a function of lived-in order). And second, the model which Schon makes, which opens up the processes which take part in the formation of new concepts, when old concepts are projected into new situations, bringing both continuity and discovery.

In other words, taking a human being as animal interrelating with environment (which includes community), but concentrating on the individual, I suggest that within the lived-in order of the community, the individual lives in an individual order (which I call a lived-in model) closely related to the community lived-in order, but more readily observable by means of a value-vector personality-model. For example we could with, say, Lubac, trace the lived-in order of one of Teilhard’s environments (in his Jesuit one): but equation of individual and community lived-in order is denied—in Teilhard’s case by his value-vector model and the tensions traceable within his life, vis-à-vis his Church and Order; and in scientific circles, by biological, psychological, sociological and anthropological research.

This concept of lived-in model maintains interpretation of a man within the scientific paradigms, but without reductionism. This method leaves the way open for interpretation through conscious and unconscious phenomena, basic need and physiology, motivation, search image, selection and thought-process, as well as through tension-stimulus produced by the interrelation of the individual with his community and his physical environment. His priority values, measured by their intensity, give evidence of a person’s value-system and help to give a lived-in model parallel to the social fact of the lived-in order of communities. Thus, as a method, it lies within the scientific paradigms, but is not reductionist.

I am aware that using the TGTA model, suitably selected, is a method not previously seen in the Teilhardian field. I am also aware that the anthropological community might not easily accept my shifting of the lived-in order concept out of its original and paradigm situations. Nor might the scientific community as a whole accept my arbitrary choices, and the idea of experimenting on the living-beingness of someone long dead. Nevertheless Schon makes clear that such displacement of concepts has been important, perhaps necessary, in the past for increasing understanding even, or especially, within the scientific communities: theory or model choosing is not an automatic growth out of current paradigms of method and content of science: while Freud-Bullitt-type analysis, the study of personal writings and interviews with people who knew the person in question, might produce a viable model of an ex-living being.

I therefore ask that the following interpretation of Teilhard be judged on such usual grounds as fruitfulness, coherence, reasonableness, experimental verifiability, and perhaps simplicity. Adjustment and re-working can follow—but not after a priori rejection.

* Punch-card religion: religion as part of human technology, something produced by the human species to help them to survive life, to form social cohesion, to under-write laws etc. Cf. Desmond Morris as well as Comfort.
If this suggested framework were allowed for experiment on Teilhard, we might—because it is a model of personality, individual and environment, as a whole—expect answers to anomalies which appear because of their relation to the life-processes, and to personality development. One such anomaly is that the man thought that he was a scientist, but his results seem very unscientific. He might, arbitrarily, be said to be just daft, or in a young science, or to mistake the nature of science, or to indulge in scientific myth. Such considerations are important. But he was conscious of all these things, and yet he still believed that what he was doing was important scientifically, and was being formed scientifically.

Simply, in my model, his value-system might reveal his methodology, and thus any continuity there might be between his personality-processes and his results.

Such a suggested TSTA framework may, further, throw light on the truth-questions which arise in his religion, or his approach to the question of truth in his ideas; and in providing an example (model) of one man who had a particular lived-in model, it may be fruitful in relation to the general question of religion, and to the specific question of what is happening within Christianity (specifically) today.

SOME COMPONENTS OF A LIVED-IN MODEL IN TEILHARD: DOMINANT VALUE-VECTORS

If a lived-in model is constructed from Teilhard's 1934 essay, Comment Je Crois, two of the most intense value-vectors will be:

1. Love of the earth, which includes complete acceptance of science, in that this tests and discovers earth-reality (at least).

2. Love of religion, which includes complete acceptance of the reality of the Presence of God, and the search which is part of religion's attempt to discover God.

By isolating these two elements in the unconscious and conscious action-system making up the man, a start is made to explaining various anomalies. The one mentioned in (b) above, concerning Teilhard the scientist, is seen to be related to the fact that he just loved science-content. Geology was for him discovering reality, from his early boyhood: his early letters show that his first reaction to anything was to search for the scientific paradigm to explain and describe it; at the end of his life he was desperate to be with a cyclotron! It was indeed unconscious pressure that made him want to chip rocks, draw specimens, measure fossils, count elements and make graphs. And since all this was endemic to the scientific communities and to their norm culture as he knew them, there was no other way for him to think of himself than as a scientist—and that by nature, before he was trained.

Rereading the PHENOMENON OF MAN, we might now begin to understand how (in the French original) so many mathematical models (displaced metaphors) are used by him to describe what he means. His mind really is full of scientific paradigms. In the APPARITION OF MAN, similarly, the graph made to describe the concept of ‘complexity-consciousness’—while wide-open to Medawarian criticism as to the truth-question aroused by a too-facile understanding of complexity or consciousness—shows the value given by Teilhard to the scientific community’s critical and mathematical ethos. This is apparent in all his books and letters. It is one unconscious base to his methods, this intense valuation which he gives to science in its methods and its ethos and its contents and paradigms; and it means that Medawar's view that he stands for ‘anti-science’ has no root in study of Teilhard, and could as well be directed at Mendel, Copernicus and even Newton—though this does not make Teilhard an important scientist.

The second value-vector, with the first, helps to explain the anomaly of his remaining both a priest and a scientist. The ‘presence of God’ was an unconscious given from his earliest days, and
became an acceptance of 'Revelation' through the searching-and-learning, reinforcement and reorganization processes which are part of our development. (Any reduction of God or religion, here, will falsify interpretation.) So, with these two value-vectors allowed to develop freely throughout his life, through normal stimulus-response-type processes—he rejected a 'spiritual life' in a monastery, and he rejected pressure to leave his Order (actually he had a psychological 'need' to be a priest)—what is anomaly at a later stage is seen to go back to earlier psychological tension; and this, through the development processes, through his particular mind's need to search, and through displacement of concepts from each main value-vector's concept-cluster, brought into being his series of idiosyncratic ideas and theories, which in turn produced more anomalies with their attendant tensions.

That is to say, the two separate commitments or value-vectors—love-of-earth and love-of-religion—had priority positions within the reality-testing movements of mind-process as the environment and the community and his own personality were continuously tested for reality (ie. 'first' reality, not 'Ultimate Reality'). Feedback processes, 'cybernetic' reactions, concept-displacements—these (I suggest) should be ascribed to Teilhard as part of his (mainly) unconscious reality-testing processes; and then should be taken to be his actual method of thinking—albeit as model.

His scientific colleagues noted his major ability to form, very quickly, a comparative perspective within which to place new material. This is, in fact, his swift unconscious workings resulting in Gestalt. It is a very distinctive mark of his letters, and, I suggest, his religious writings. Without entering here on the truth-questions concerning the eventual validity of these Gestalts—Teilhard was quite clear that it was for later research to find out whether there is truth in them; he in no sense by-passed this—I wish to concentrate simply on what happened when his mind was active; and for this, the most fruitful model of his methods is the above, which pictures him as mainly an emotional and unconscious thinker, and not an analytic reasoner. On the other hand, when concepts became conscious, in answer to some need, he did reason critically from within the thought-clusters of his environment, in response to the new situation produced by new concepts emerging into a lived-in and a thought-of order (ie. this was self-regulating, self-adjusting feedback). This is evidenced by his tentativeness in his religious schemes and by his conservatism concerning geological and palaeontological theories.

What we have then is this: a Teilhard with physiological and psychological realities and processes, which include (unconsciously and consciously) two specific commitments, and a mind-process which comes quickly to a Gestalt; and the process which binds the commitments very often to the Gestalt is that of the displacement of concepts. The two value-vectors produce concepts from their underlying realities, these are projected into each other and this produces the Gestalt. This result is also, in T GTA terms, an existential synthesis. And it is my suggestion that in Teilhard's case his Gestalts, as existential syntheses produced through tension and need, were then lived-with, in the sense that they were experimentally tested in his actual day-to-day life and thought, reality-tested in Freud's sense, and reality-tested in the more biological sense of whether or not they helped the organism to cope with, meet the challenges of, and even change for its own survival-advantage the environment.

It might be, therefore, that what appears to be uncritical acceptance by him of scientific myth is the result neither of lack of brain, nor lack of contact with a critical community, but of the fact that as existential syntheses his Gestalts were parts of his lived-in model, and therefore to be tested within the lived-in orders and realities in which he found himself, as well as within the concepts and analyses of present and historical human (and paper-) thought. In other words, he was judging his ideas by their fruitfulness and utility in relation to his own motivations, needs, tensions, problems, anomalies, survival, searchings and hopes—both concerning religion, and in relation to his scientific work and environment—and it is from this basis of reality-testing that he
is able to have confidence in the relevance of his ideas for other people, and to insistently renew his commitment to the value-vectors because of the utility of their products. This process of selection goes towards explaining the evenness of development which is apparent during his long life—and also to how he is so uncritical of his scientific knowledge, and perhaps of his religious knowledge, at certain points (which is selective inattention). His Gestalts concerning general evolution and cosmic Christ, for instance, as ‘real’ resultants of real value-vectors in his personality, were real commitments, and therefore real selecting concepts thereafter: they were re-organizations, perceptions of patterns of realities, and they made enough sense of the realities he met in his life for his personality and being to be able to be fully committed in future to them. It was as though he was unconsciously and continuously scanning mental and physical environments for what specifically was needed for his survival, with these theory-fact realities (like evolution being perceived as the specific search-image). Thereafter their reality was known to him, allowed and needed as a vector in his mind processes.11

His article on early man in Anthropology Today (final paragraphs) serves to intimate some of the fruitfulness of his ideas within a scientific field: they deny a foreclosed perspective, and reflect his attempt in his last years to make anthropology base itself confidently in biology12 (his scientific value-vector trying to bring hard science into a young pre-science): while his religious value-vector kept his mind open concerning the questions of meaning, value-of-life, and the significance of man—metaphysical questions certainly, but questions answered with no uncertainty by Medawar-Crick-Comfort from their metaphysics—which reminds us that they are important ones which cannot be by-passed even by non-metaphysicians. Teilhard keeps the tension there, hesitantly putting forward his own existential synthesis on the basis of its utility; and refuses to scientific paradigm the Ultimate Reality, and to scientists an Ultimate Metaphysic.

There are many examples of concept-displacement in his letters and writings, and often they reflect the continuing development resulting from an active mind meeting a life of stimuli. That is to say, what seems a static concept if we look at it at a moment of time, is really something biologically useful and with a past and future in a development-process; so that isolating a concept carries the danger of reification. With that in mind, we can see in a process-view how love-of-earth and love-of-religion might become love-of-evolution and love-of-Christ. Then, if we displace evolution into Christ, we might well turn up a concept looking like Teilhard’s Omega-Point, or Omega-Christ, or (his least reified and most coherent ‘final’ resultant value-vector) Universal-Christ. The stark titles of the last should change any views that Teilhard was trying to bring Christ in by a back door—as should my value-vector model and Tgta framework. For Teilhard does not reify Omega-Christ: it is not a static concept, but envisages a ‘coincidence’ which may take place in a world-cosmos-environment which is at no time not changing and developing in some way or another. A tentative concept like this—being formed through the feedback processes, reality-testing, and changes and developments over (a life-) time (of a person), might further be expected to change and develop. This is what we do find concerning Omega: at different times Teilhard says that any extrapolation is impossible, that there will be a concrete happening of historical ‘coincidence’ as Omega, that one or two million years ahead, for such a cosmic happening is a possibility.13 Since it is a concept-displacement from Christian revelation, he also maintains that it is already happening (realized eschatology), and on that basis also a hypothesis.

Two points end this section. First, such random numbers and extrapolation disclose, not inconsistent and uncritical and a-scientific thinking, but tentative experimental concept-displacements over periods of time. Second, these displacements like Omega are not reifications brandished about with final authority and ideological demand: they are not, strictly speaking, intellectual synthesis. They are inquiring thought-experiment, feedback process, experimental model, the
paradigm-shift feeding the human need after value-vector scanning of the environment; and as such, they are personal and existential, no intellectual and reifiable synthesis.

THE TEILHARDIAN PARADIGM-SHIFT: SOME POSSIBLE VALUE TO THE RELIGIOUS COMMUNITY

If it is fruitful to interpret Teilhard through value-vector system, displacement-process and lived-in order and model, it may also be fruitful to see religion generally in this way. Without entering on the metaphysical truth-questions, we can see that individuals and communities live through value-systems, from their own unconscious and conscious orders and models which are lived-in, and to a lesser extent carry out displacement-processes in their conceptual searchings and existential syntheses—which may or may not be reified, in tradition or in individual minds or in group orders or ideologies.

Now, concerning the reality-testing processes which I have been ascribing to Teilhard, it is probable that he is no different from anyone else: less mentally alive than some, more mentally alive than others, no doubt. His interest does not lie in his ability to write prolifically, or to produce imaginative concepts: nor in his charismatic personality. We can find hundreds of people who can be said to 'do' these things, and do them better and with clearer self-criticism.

His interest and significance lie elsewhere: few people leave so many documents behind, in the hands of interested people, which deal, consistently and over a life-time, with the specific tension between science and religion which arises because of total commitment to both; and which show concept displacement (as a method), feedback process, Gestalt and existential synthesis so clearly, from a basis in two different, well-known, well-loved and dominantly-valued environments, such as the worlds of the paradigm-clusters of science and religion. Few people approach religion and science from so firm a (predominantly unconscious) position (and commitment) within the paradigms of both.

This may turn out to be his real importance: the method-processes and methodology revealed in the writings of a man searching-to-survive within specific tensions and in a specific mental and physical environment. This does not make him unique: volumes like Ian Barbour's SCIENCE AND RELIGION testify to this. It simply allows us to look at him for one interpretative model through which to understand (and perhaps to live) today's life, and perhaps today's religion. We may, I think, generalize to some extent from him.

Looking at his value-vector model again, we might surmise that the basis of his attraction to many people is that his two main value-vectors are main value-vectors of a number of western people, and perhaps the majority of western religious individuals. That is to say, he was not a man alone at all: science is now accepted, in emotion and intellect, unconsciously and consciously, by most societies in the world, and by most individuals who make up western society, and by most religious people. (Individuals may still parrot by-gone superego-demands, for censuses, fear or self-interest: but they still give priority-value to science in their actions, and will not deny its utility and efficacy, as choices from stretched-polymer to missiles testify.)

My point is that there has been, in individuals and societies, a major paradigm-change within the lived-in models involved. Science is now a very strong value-vector in the individual's value-system, whether or not this change is always conscious, or consciously accepted. In this situation individuals produce their own personal existential syntheses to deal with the needs and tensions involved, some allowing a new metaphysic to give science total authority in their value-system, others allowing some other value-vector like humanism or religion to remain—the latter case perhaps becoming less common, since the tensions arising from it are great, and double-think or
complete separation of paradigm-clusters are both only short-term responses, psychologically and philosophically, and have limited survival-value.

But though individuals have generally accepted and welcomed science, the situation with the religious institutions, with their conscious, reinforced-in-tradition, and reiterated belief-systems, is quite different. Institutional religion does use science-product, and it gives in with regularity over time to scientific paradigm-changes. But neither science content nor science methods are consciously accepted as of positive value for its belief-system; and consequently little positive value for its people can be given to science by the religious institution.

It is in this situation of (especially institutional) religion's isolation from science-content and science-methods that the man Teilhard is psychologically and sociologically relevant. He experienced them both as of positive value to religion, and he produced a belief-system that he could live-with, which gave positive value to both.

Briefly, my Tgta model shows what happens in Teilhard, and the question is, will any religious institution itself follow and value his methodology of belief. He accepts science-content/contemporary paradigm unreservedly (his basic personality). He advised the use of science-methods in analysing and fulfilling religion (the intensity of his value vector is indeed that of conviction). He carried out a life-time process of displacing the scientific paradigms of the time into the religious paradigms (again, of the time). Yet his two dominant value-vectors were continuously held in tension: less and less did he operate just one on its own; and since (his personal) experience was his main verifying principle (i.e., a type of experiment), and this was a function of his own personality, his valuations never allowed a watery synthesis to appear; but only concept-displacement, on the analogy of biological synthesis. The Gestalt came from a building reaction, not a mixture: and the constant process of displacements from science into religion, and from religion into science measure his conviction, and the dominant-priority value given, in tension, to both.

It is thus not at all a question of a 'genius' having 'true' Gestalten. My Tgta model views him in a relativizing way. Value-vector and lived-in model include realization of his personal needs. It is a stimulus-response situation that we meet in him. And it is the series of anomalies which come from the tension-juxtaposition of his own value-vectors and those of his church and environment, which he especially has a need to answer to survive: the basic anomaly being, perhaps, that the church is uninterested in God's earth.19 A series flows from this, if you relate a love-of-the-earth value and vector to much religious doctrine and the apparent behaviour of many religious people. Simply to exist as an integrated personality he had to keep producing concepts with which to test these anomalies and realities (as he saw them) that he met, and with which he could continue to live without going under to the superego. He had to remain free; and he had to produce a theology which allowed him to be free—will any religious institution emulate him in this?

This is religion as open-ended search, engaging with environment in such a way that personal existential synthesis is produced—which is by no means the 'illusion' beloved of older interpreters, but the 'myth' which modern anthropology knows as of the 'thought-of-order', and which corresponds, at some level, and at any rate by symbolic relation, to the 'lived-in order' realities of the environment in which people find themselves. In the modern environment further, the Teilhard myth—because it is existential synthesis and has to be verifiable in some sense in experience (even if only as of useful motivating value or as not contravening scientific paradigm)—is less a scientific myth than a thought-of model for living, for those particular people who love the earth as much as religion, and religion as much as the earth. It demonstrates by lived-in experiment one specific way in which a religious person can be earthly fulfilled and creative in work, and in individual and social life—when recent paradigm-changes in science (and religion and anything else) are totally accepted and given dominant value-vector intensity. It even suggests that one may be more
fruitful in religion and more fruitful in science if the value-vectors are given more individual intensity while still being held together and in tension.

It is, thus, in the sense of him being a possible experimental methodological model for any individual or community which has parallel and equally intense value-vectors—whether they are religious or idealist humanist, for instance—that he may be put forward as of importance for future testing. He is already a paradigm Christian thinker for Christian-Marxist relations, and a formative influence in more recent humanist communism, in American theology today, and in humanist theology generally.

He himself thought, however, that his significance lay in the area of religion’s isolation from science generally; and this situation still remains. His answers as to how two paradigm-fields may be held together to produce a fruitful tension lies in the intensity of his commitment to both, and so in the process of concept-displacement which he continuously carried out between them. That is to say, he held a very intense pluralist position (despite his desire for ‘the whole’), but with a ‘cybernetic’ link process between them. The separate paradigm-fields gained their full force and integrity by being kept in the productive tension arising from separateness and displacement; because in this way each was allowed to develop its own fruitfulness.

Thus commitment to science and commitment to religion were not allowed to replace one another; nor was there a process of progressive watering down of both to a consensus mythology. He did (could) not reify his new concepts, because behind all his thought—as behind all thought—was a metaphysic, in his case the total acceptance of Ultimate Reality. But he was also in no doubt that science deals with realities, and in some sense signposts or even mediates Ultimate Reality. (His tentativeness concerning Omega-Christ reflects this, as do his Christian pantheism and his theology based in scientific reality.)

Now this is not the typical description of science and religion as being concerned with different realities, nor is it a confusion of reality, with both looking at the same reality in a different way. Teilhard is holding back any committing reification which may close future mind, and leaving the search in tension. The scientific paradigms are realized to be of substantive importance and positive value for religion, for (‘the presence’ of) ‘God’ is in the world (-processes) and dogma must be on the basis of the realities science discovers, and never against them: whereas the paradigms of religion produce the concepts of meaning and value, which science can transmute into technology, but which it cannot discover, yet which it needs itself, to be itself. In their mythologies, indeed, they may both give sign-posts to the metaphysical realities in the world-process.

Today, the scientific community demands its integrity and freedom; and the religious community refuses to give up experience and thought-of orders which are based in personal value-vector systems, search-images and experimental lived-in models, which test some realities at any rate, and are not fruitless (unless there really are no values at all by which to judge world-life) in terms of action, motivation, and indeed happiness. In this situation, my interpretation of Teilhard becomes, for communities, the suggestion that if pluralist conviction is allowed to fulfill itself, yet with the link and tension maintained by concept-displacement, experiment with the displaced concept in its new position as synthetic model may indeed be fruitful. The displacement of values, or the choosing of values towards which science and technology should build the earth, has been suggested by Marcuse. But Christian theology has always displaced concepts, to produce more fruitful models (or myths) through which its devotees can live. Prayer has as one aspect of it the displacement of paradigm-concepts into the will or wish concerning change in realities in the environment; and Teilhard’s prayers and language often demonstrate this. Discipleship has always been the question of displacement of purpose-concepts into existential realities, with a total commitment both to the situation and to the concepts producing both tension and a specific resultant value-vector. The movement of Christian aid, in its total commitment to the social
meaning of Jesus of Nazareth, allied to its total use and acceptance of scientific discovery and know-how, may well reflect the same type of parallel pluralist tension and conviction as in Teilhard's—the value-vectors kept separate and used to the full—with the result a very clear discipleship, in its intensity.

The religious communities may find in Teilhard, then, one model of a modern man whose own lived-in model may be of use to them, to elucidate and develop what already happens in many examples of discipleship, often without self-understanding or church-understanding. Since discipleship is, sociologically speaking, a utilitarian question, his use and value will only be answered in history by his value to paradigm disciples and religion. But already a variety of individuals and groups have found value in him, some as stimulus, some as reinforcement, some as re-organizing factor—men as different as Dobzhansky, Pasternak, Senghor, Kennedy and Hammarskjold—a name-dropping list, perhaps, but a group socially and historically significant. His lived-in model is relevant in particular cases, for motivation, value-vector and action.

The metaphysical truth-question, on the other hand, has a utilitarian aspect only if there is indeed a relation between Ultimate Reality and historical processes. Teilhard's ideas such as God pulling man from in front into a future of higher consciousness will be tested over the duration of the world's future history, some critics say quite soon. That there is no Ultimate Reality, or that it has no relation to historical processes, is a question to some extent to be tackled by professional philosophy: but, like any meta-physical or Metaphysical question, the answer will depend on basic assumption and a faith.

RELIGIOUS PARADIGM-SHIFT, FUTURE RELIGION, AND SCIENTIFIC UNDERSTANDING OF RELIGION

In pressing for the interpretation of Teilhard as existential synthesis, lived-in model, value-vector model, and displacement process, and in demanding verification of his model in utilitarian, sociological, and psychological and historical terms, rather than by metaphysical judgement—in other words, that he should be judged through discipleship-potential and historical usefulness to humanity, rather than through theology, metaphysical selection and paper-philosophy—I am relativising him (and his interpreters), while looking closely at him for the question of a methodology of religion.

His significance was that he was inclined to psychological introspection—and this from within the paradigms of the scientists and thinkers of his day, who included Freud, W. James, H. G. Wells, Bergson and Durkheim, if not Marx. Religion, very briefly, is not usually so open to scientific scrutiny: nor is theology: nor is the tension of some scientists. As a human specimen who happened to live during and be involved in some important paradigm-changes concerning the concepts of evolution and energy, he should not be overlooked. He may even hold clues as to what will help to 'make men tick' as the paradigm-changes continue in many fields. He thought of himself in that way. But if that is too ambitious a thought, he may nevertheless give clues as to what is happening within religion today, and not only religion.

It is one of the ironies of Medawar's article that the writer reifies his own reasoning and Teilhard's concepts. Mistaking experimental displacement for reified Metaphysics, he produces from Teilhard a static religion, which he demands to be fully rationally-structured, which means that religion must fit into the scientific paradigms in a selected reified state. Or else religion must be ruthlessly discarded.

Modern religion is, however, quite otherwise in aim. Today it is in process, severely pruning whole paradigm-clusters, and often not replacing discarded systems at all. Cult as well as belief-system is being questioned, illusions and pretensions ridiculed, action and being called forth. In
this situation, religion is behaving as search-process and model-for-experiment, within realities and for Reality: static religion and authoritarian demand are reckoned false-religion, and prayed to disappear, 1969 reaction not withstanding.

Without any doubt, Teilhard takes his place within this modern movement. While his love-of-religion value-vector never diminished and he always held strict (superego?) views on such matters as divorce, he early abhorred pious illusion and sublimation, had critical views on his Church’s belief-system and cult, and wrote from the heart such essays as THE EVOLUTION OF CHASTITY. All through his life his unconscious reasonings and searchings and displacements were most experimental.

His place within modern religion, and the fruitfulness of my interpretation of him, are shown in this area of religion today-and-tomorrow. His attitude to the future of religion is a distressing anomaly to traditional religionists within his denomination and others: he envisaged a future cosmic religion for mankind, which will be born from today’s Christianity, but which goes beyond it because the latter does not love the earth, and therefore is inadequate. A static view might say that his denomination was not satisfying him, or that Marxism nearly was, or that God’s presence was palling, or pantheistic. This would be to pay no attention to the underlying processes, of which concept-displacement and value-vectors were a part. By my interpretation, with two main value-vectors arising with self-confidence from valid psychological experience, Teilhard—faced with a religion which seeks other worlds and denies human effort, and with a science which refuses to reality meaning, purpose and Ultimate Reality; but committed to both science and religion—would be expected to feel intensely the anomaly, and to need a new religion to equilibrate the system and satisfy his needs.

This is exactly what we do find in his psychological autobiography and personal writings especially: it underlies all that he wrote. By displaced concept, the new religion of the Universal Christ, in which love-of-the-earth and love-of-God, love-of-the-earth-development and love-of-religion-development, love of evolution (+upward) and love-of-Christ (+fulfilment), provided a model-to-live-in which satisfied him fully over a long period of life. Human effort, evolution, and Christ-Revelation were held together in a tension of complete commitment to the science that he knew, and the religion that he knew. The religion he now knew gave value now to the life that he knew and that the world experiences: and this through his commitment to science.

Medawar’s reifying of this model, and of his own metaphysical underpinnings to science, loses the basic element of personal need and search in Teilhard, and denies to a scientist the validity of a tension arising from non-scientific paradigms, and its results in displacement. His is certainly a very valuable attack on static and reified, perhaps paper-religion. But the deeper bases of religion and Teilhard are not touched by him: he simply tells a man with both scientific and religious value-vectors that the latter give false information and must be terminated. Psychological, sociological and anthropological study today suggest that this is an inadequate approach, in which particular realities are being missed, which are significant for particular parts of human life. Science itself is unable to create its own values, provide motivation, and satisfy certain human needs in individual and group.

What Teilhard sought to spread was not a ‘system’—and perhaps the PHENOMENON OF MAN was academically, though not existentially a mistake, giving a falsely reifiable picture of what was essentially an existential synthesis and motivating-model. (But anything on paper can be reified.) Teilhard says, himself, that it was a ‘spirit’, not a ‘system’ that he had to give: and I suggest that underneath his words and efforts and concepts, the content of this ‘spirit’ was his (unconscious) method of experimental displacement with which to explore and perhaps answer and at least fulfill the needs arising from the anomalies and tensions of life and of his own personality as he experienced them. This ‘spirit’ or mental process finds and uses the Omega-Universal-Christ as an
experimental model and a real search-image, and as part of the process of his lived-in model—useful to him if certain specific anomalies were there in the lived-in order; and useful perhaps to others (including communities) if similar anomalies exist in their life. It is a displacement from evolution to Revelation—and its relevance and relationship to existential despair is that of experimental fruitfulness, and not of offspring!

SUMMARY
The above interpretation of Teilhard—as a man-with-a-model who can be fruitfully experimented on by a Tgta model—is not intended to answer ultimate questions. The complex processes of concept-displacement and paradigm-change which Schon and Kuhn explore do bring into relief the selectivities and community-craddles of both science and religion, and lead us to beware Ultimate answers. But they do not deny to religion its reality as lived-in model: they emphasize that it is part of a perpetually-changing continuum of processes. This may be studied by the social sciences for social fact, and the myth may become more clearly seen as model. I suggest that Teilhard be closely studied with this in mind. It may be that his myth (which was a model of Reality, and which was an experimental model in that it was given vector-value among his mind-processes, to select and experience and adapt reality), while fruitful concerning the realities of life may also have some relation to Reality—though only if religion itself has some relation and reality-testing generally. But while raising these questions, the Tgta framework has as its task the low-abstraction one of trying to produce a semi-objective model of the man Teilhard.

This interpretation I deem more helpful than the authoritarian and ideological demands made by one-value-vector ed personal or religious or scientific (metaphysical) selections. Making use of current scientific paradigms, it is well on the way to letting Teilhard be himself, and to making him a fruitful contributor to future religion, and to scientific study of religion.
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In trying to explain one direction in which the study of Teilhard's works should lead, it is necessary for me to start with a personal experience for it contains an essential parable.

On a Saturday evening in September 1961 I came, in the course of a wandering holiday, to Boston in Lincolnshire, a town I had never previously visited and did not expect to see again. I knew nobody there and was to move on the next day. On the Sunday morning I attended the early Communion service in the great church there, as anonymous as one may be. After the administration of the sacramental wine I waited, as is customary, for my neighbour on the left, of unknown identity, sex and age, to finish. At this moment I received a fleeting extension of sight. The priest was within the area of my ordinary vision but my neighbour, shoulder to shoulder with me, was not. Nevertheless I saw, through my left side, as in an X-ray photograph, greyly and with some indistinctness, the spiritual form of my neighbour, from head to toe, receiving the Blood of Christ. The figure of the priest, in his white surplice, was material, the chalice was visible; on the other side of the chalice the form of the communicant was other-dimensional. I glanced at my neighbour as we returned to our places; the outer form was not recognizable from the inner. During the period of meditation incidental to the rather lengthy performance of the Anglican rites I was given to see, as if for instruction and explanation, a mental picture of several great polygonal prisms of light, amber-coloured, slowly revolving through each other, interpenetrating and yet distinct. I took this to be a diagram of the consubsistence and interdependence of the several modes of reality. Throughout, I had no feeling of the numinous and was in no state of emotional tension.

A further explanation came to me as a result of the intervention of Sir George Trevelyan at the Second Annual Conference of the Teilhard Association in 1967. Sir George explained something of the teaching of Rudolf Steiner and later referred me to A SCIENTIST OF THE INVISIBLE (Hodder and Stoughton, 1964), an introduction to his work by Canon Shepherd. What I had seen was apparently what Steiner called the astral body of an individual. Of Steiner's 'etheric body', the moulder of the physical, I had by this time some knowledge, for my very effective family doctor is trained to see his patient's 'aura' and can, for example, tell his general state of health at a glance by reference to the aura's condition. Having experimental evidence of the material, etheric and astral bodies described by Steiner I could hardly, if I wished, deny the existence of his fourth body, the ego or soul.

This leads to the question of those aspects of being which may be called collectively 'the invisible', an enormous realm not yet reduced to any categories acknowledgeable by science. It contains many distinct elements. To list some of them, one may mention the soul, the life after death and before birth, 'spiritualism', ghosts, heavenly and demonic entities, miracles, extrasensory perception and, to come to Teilhard, collective consciousness.

There is among many people, perhaps the majority, a reluctance to consider these matters.
THE ASSOCIATION

Awareness of Teilhard's thought and its sphere of influence is spreading. Associations have been formed in France, Germany, Belgium, the U.S.A. and other countries, and the Association of Great Britain and Ireland maintains close liaison with these groups. Through its activities (which are summarised in the Supplement at the centre of The Teilhard Review) the Association hopes to make Teilhard's thought more widely accessible and more readily understood.

These activities include:

— the organization of study groups on selected books
— the establishment of a library and reading room
— the organization of meetings, conferences and symposia
— the promotion of books, films and television and radio broadcasts
— the publication of The Teilhard Review, free to members, and The Teilhard Study Library, the first four volumes in which are now published.

A large membership is required to advance more effectively the work of the Association. All interested in supporting these activities and in participating in the development of Teilhard's thought are invited to become members.

There are three types of membership:

Full membership *Two Guineas per annum (or more)*
Group membership (religious communities only) *Five Guineas per annum*
Student membership (full-time students) *One Guinea per annum*

Further information is available from the Honorary Secretary, The Pierre Teilhard de Chardin Association of Great Britain and Ireland, 3 Cromwell Place, London S.W.7 (Telephone: 01.584 7734/5).
A lucidly written and sensitive investigation, with much original research, into the central notion of 'unity' in Teilhard's work. Donald Gray concentrates primarily on Teilhard's early period, roughly 1916–1927, the period climaxed by the writing of Le Milieu Divin. This period is vital to Teilhard's development and yet has not received the necessary study. Altogether an excellent and original expository study of Teilhard's thought and in particular of his key 'theory of creative union'.

With more and more people studying Teilhard in detail and as part of a syllabus, The One and the Many should be stocked by all important libraries and bookshops.
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