CHAPTER 4

COMPARISON

This chapter is devoted to a comparative study of the evolution theories of the two great philosophers, discussed in the foregoing chapters. The correlations between Aurobindo and Teilhard are so many and so close that a full-length study would be necessary for tracing their schemes of thought. Though Aurobindo and Teilhard were contemporaries and had read so extensively, it is surprising that we find hardly any indication of their mutual contact or influence. Teilhard’s life-long friend, Abbe Breuil, wrote to Aurobindo personally about Teilhard in the late 1950’s pointing out the similarities between the two thinkers. But unfortunately, this letter reached Pondicherry only after Sri Aurobindo’s death in December.¹

Many scholars have attempted in-depth studies of the theories of Aurobindo and Teilhard. The first serious and scholarly

article, comparing their visions, was published by Professor Ninian Smart in 1961. Smart says that though there are differences in method and approach between the two thinkers, the end-product of their thinking could very well be identified and important conclusions can be drawn.\(^2\) Andre Monsestier published a book in 1963, in which he devoted two chapters to the study of evolution and the future evolution of man, in Aurobindo and Teilhard. In his opinion, the emergence in the east of the epoch-making thought of Aurobindo, coinciding with the emergence in the west of the same epoch-making thought of Teilhard, will some day be considered to be the most important event of the century, in the pore of the spirit. For, in them, both oriental and occidental spiritualities meet. The religions of both east and west could finally have entered upon the phase of convergence. The thought of Aurobindo and Teilhard would prepare the way for a dialogue between Christianity and Hinduism.\(^3\) Professor Zachner's study is perhaps the most significant summary study to appear so far in the West, comparing

\(^2\) Ninan Smart, *Teilhard de Chardin, Sri Aurobindo and the History of Meaning*. (Pondicherry: Mother India, 1962)

\(^3\) Andre Monsestier, “Teilhard and Eastern Religions”, *Teilhard Review*. Vol. II (2) (Winter, 1967-68)
these two thinkers. This study was followed by another analytical and comparative study by J. Feys, a Belgian Jesuit, according to whom Teilhard’s man’s final fulfilment is his realisation in God; according to Aurobindo, it is man realising himself as God or God fulfilling himself in man. In a recent study in America, Beatrice Bruteau showed how striking is the similarity between Aurobindo and Teilhard. Both of them propose identical conditions for the progress in consciousness. Both have a deep-seated faith in evolution and matter. Ursula King made a similar study in U. K., which shows how the basic spiritualisation of matter is the base of the whole cosmos for both of them. The similarity between Aurobindo and Teilhard was observed not only by scholars in the west but also by some Indian scholars. K. D. Sethna, a disciple of Aurobindo, studied how Teilhardian intuitions and insights

---


amplified by the Aurobindonian revelations and affirmations would pave the way for a ‘Vedantic Christianity’.\textsuperscript{8}

Aurobindo, with his long stay in England and his complete English education, had a special love for France and French culture, and also had the impact of Mira Richard, the French lady. Teilhard was French by birth itself and upbringing. Thus, it is but logical that the French background was dominant in the thinking and moulding of outlook in both of them.

A study of the cosmic consciousness in Aurobindo and Teilhard shows striking similarities in the origin, progress and nature of their mystical experiences. Right from their childhood days, they felt a strong sense of unity and an acute aspiration to be one with the all. During Aurobindo’s early schooldays in Darjeeling, the regions of eternal snow and the Himalayan scenery had captivated his mind. It was during this period that he had the dream of a great darkness enveloping him and the whole universe

\textsuperscript{8} K. D. Sethna, \textit{Teilhard de Chardin and Sri Aurobindo – A note on their meeting point}. (Pondicherry: Mother India, 1968).
as well.\(^9\) Teilhard tells that at the age of six or seven, his religious act of adoration consisted in possessing ‘My God of Iron’.\(^{10}\) In his pre-yogic days, Aurobindo had several experiences in which he felt a presence, a power and a force that looks into us. In another experience, he had a realisation of a vacant infinite and felt in himself an invasion of the infinite. Teilhard’s sense of fullness, consummation and completion, his ‘Pleromic Sense’ and the ‘Reaching out for Absolute’ form the background-experience which gradually draws into his cosmic, human and christic experiences.\(^{11}\) Aurobindo’s pre-yogic experiences of the infinite and Teilhard’s pleromic sense symbolise alike their search for the Absolute.

The experiences of both Aurobindo and Teilhard were rooted in the original psychological disposition of fullness and universal unity. Both had a passion for totality and unity. They had a special love for their mother country and did serve her in one way or another. All their subsequent experiences have this mystical

\(^9\) ibid., p. 48-49

\(^{10}\) Thomas Aykara, Op. Cit., p.250

character. Aurobindo’s experience of the immense and the intense divine reality in the heart of everything, and Teilhard’s experience of the fusion with the elemental and the all that is underneath all things, are very similar indeed. The second mystical experience occurred in Aurobindo’s life in Alipore jail; this experience adds a new element to his original concept of quality-less Brahman. It was an experience of the universal divine in the form of Krisna. It was no longer the unutterable, the timeless, spaceless and vacant Infinite, but the living Lord Krishna, the Saguṇa Brahman.\(^{12}\)

Teilhard’s mystical experience came while he was at the forefront during the First World War; it was then that he felt the immense human presence. Man, in order to realise his full potential, must extend himself to the dimensions of the universe. Man must think that he is God Himself, or himself the artisan of the godhead. There is in Teilhard a progression from the elemental fusion and the cosmic absolute, to an experience and realisation of an absolute in human. The new element in this second experience of Teilhard is the combination of the divine and the human.\(^{13}\) The manner in

---


which the human element enters into the experience of both is not the same, and the personal aspect of Krishna is absent in Teilhard’s experience of the human, but there is a central similarity in accepting humanity as the medium of Absolute expression.

Aurobindo’s third experience took place in Chandernagore. It was a realisation of the supreme reality with the static and dynamic Brahman as its two essential aspects. It was a synthesis of the formless Absolute and the vision of the all-pervading Krisna. It was a vision of the Supreme Reality as a multiform unity, simultaneously static and dynamic. In this realisation Aurobindo found God-spirit meeting God-maker, which he calls the divine life in a body. To Teilhard, it was his experience of Christ as a lovable and adorable person. If the experience of the cosmic and the human was spontaneous in origin, the third one was brought about by education. Christ is, for Teilhard, the one who absorbs all things in Himself, consuming and consummating all of the believer’s love and adoration. This convergent Christ is not simply an abstract absorbing centre but the

---

person of Christ. Thus we find a combination and culmination of the last two experiences in his third christic one.

Though the personal aspect of Teilhard’s Christ has already appeared in Aurobindo’s previous experience of Krishna, the integral and convergent aspect of Teilhard’s Christ appears more clearly in Aurobindo’s third experience. The Absolute is transcendent as well as immanent; devoid of attributes, yet at the same time a personal deity with attributes; it is one and eternal but at the same time temporal and creating many. If we concentrate on the tri-dimensional role of Saccidananda in terms of the supermind and the convergent role of Christ in Teilhard’s thought, we can see the similarity very clearly. These experiences of an all-embracing and all-pervading absolute and Christ are the foundations on which both Aurobindo and Teilhard, respectively, developed their dynamic and directional mysticism.

During the First World War, the corporal stretcher-bearer Teilhard was composing inside the trenches of his regiment the broad outlines of *The Phenomenon of Man* and *The Divine*
Milieu\textsuperscript{15}, 10,000 kilometres away from the Indian revolutionary leader Aurobindo, who was developing in the same way, in the pages of the monthly review *Arya*, the essential ideas of his magnum opus, *The Life Divine*.\textsuperscript{16} Aurobindo’s eagerness to free India was divinised by the new aspiration to realise the whole of spiritual being and to free and transform the whole world. He retired to the French territory of Pondicherry to pursue this quest in seclusion, and there, he developed the basic position of his philosophy of evolutionary integral nondualism. Curiously enough, it was during this same period that the foundations of Teilhard’s own creative thought were laid in the midst of the battlefields of France.

Aurobindo and Teilhard were both dissatisfied with metaphysics and never claimed to be professional philosophers. Experiences and intuitions were for them two fundamental facts of experience, which were to be woven together into an integral and all-embracing world vision. Intuitions and insights based on

\textsuperscript{15} Teilhard de Chardin, *Writings in the Time of War*. Op. Cit.,

personal experiences play an important role in their thoughts. Aurobindo had turned to a divine life by intuition, and Teilhard by upbringing. Aurobindo faced bitter experiences while he was in politics; he was expelled from the country. Teilhard, towards the end of his life, was expelled from the church, for trying to intertwine religion and science.

Aurobindo and Teilhard confronted the same tremendous progress of science and technology and the consequent convergence of cultures; they both shared the original intuition of combining the East and the West. The thinking of Aurobindo, with his Integral Yoga, tried to synthesise both Eastern and Western elements; Teilhard, who spent many years in the Far East, expressed his desire to make East and West meet. In their own separate traditions, both represent something totally new in mystical religion. They accepted enthusiastically the theory of evolution and both were apparently influenced by Darwin's theory of survival of the fittest and Bergson's creative evolution. Both developed their supporting arguments based on their own respective scriptures. Both Aurobindo and Teilhard were deeply
dissatisfied with organised religion. Aurobindo argued that the passive and illusionist Vedanta must accept the reality of the external world and study it more seriously. Teilhard felt unhappy about the speculative theology and the excessively legal and dogmatic structure of Roman Catholic Christianity. According to Aurobindo, organised religions have served their purpose; but for Teilhard, who had such a deep and devout attachment to Christ and his Church, religions are always relevant.

Though both Aurobindo and Teilhard are situated in the spiritual traditions of the East and West, respectively, in developing their doctrines they are considerably influenced by other traditions and trends of their countries. In spite of the fact that Teilhard by nature seems to tend to be monist like Aurobindo, his interpretations and final conclusions are often theistic Christian mysticism. Though Aurobindo’s mysticism remains fundamentally monistic, a real and true monism as he calls it, he too gives directionality and a down-to-earth character to this mysticism. There are differences in the way in which this directionality affects their mysticism: but there is a central similarity in that both strive
for a comprehensive synthesis.\textsuperscript{17} Their systems try to accommodate a wide variety of facts within their principles. Their thoughts are intimately connected with life taken in its comprehensiveness. The fathers of the church suggested similar ideas and attempted at some synthesis; so did the Vedic seers and the \textit{Gītā} in the East. We believe that the Aurobindonian synthesis was ‘the fulfilment of Hinduism’ and the Teilhardian thought was a perfectly orthodox Christian doctrine, but they are uncritical to a certain extent.\textsuperscript{18} Teilhard’s fundamental tendency to see the nature of reality in a monistic way will hardly he accepted by Christian theologians as an orthodox doctrine. Though nothing can be said to be unorthodox in Hinduism – since it has no declared dogmas – nevertheless, the pure Vedantins may not accept his integral yoga without some reservations.

Both Aurobindo and Teilhard did introduce new terminologies and put forward powerful insights. But their central contribution consists in making a new synthesis that is

\textsuperscript{17} Thomas Aykara, Op. Cit., p. 262-263

\textsuperscript{18} ibid., p. 263
comprehensive and perspective, significant and timely; a synthesis in which science and religion, man and God, becoming and being are made complementary and correlative categories of existence. Their idea of an integral anthropology finally takes the shape of a comprehensive synthesis; their experience of cosmic consciousness as unity and inter-connectedness is expressed in the doctrinal form of a new synthesis. The fact that their synthesis appeared at a time when man's manhood and person was threatened by his own machines and power structures explains to a great extent why their writings, especially those of Teilhard in the West, had such a powerful appeal. Their theory of cosmic consciousness is not just a new significant synthesis of different aspects of a multi-dimensional man; it provides a solid foundation for new explorations in the real between the East and the West.

Both Aurobindo and Teilhard saw earth – history and human history in terms of evolution, the adventure pointing towards the ultimate divinisation of man; and like Aurobindo, Teilhard also saw evolution interlinked with involution. The spiritual fathers saw involution as the base for evolution. The
mystic sees the One in All and All in One. It is necessary to bridge the gap between the universal and the particular, the spiritual and the material. If evolution has any meaning, then it is through involution; it is the only way to reach God. This gap has been bridged twice, when God the father or the sat of Aurobindo’s Saccidananda made His spirit descend into matter at the time of creation of the world. The Hindu mythology of the avatar of Lord Krishna into the different walks of life is an evidence of Brahman evolving into matter. Even Teilhard was influenced by the avatar mythology. Teilhard uses the term ‘involution’ but he means a concentration, a convergence, a gathering inward, a folding back of something upon itself, which leads not to self-loss but to progress when the Holy Spirit, along with the Logos, veiled itself a second time in matter, this time in Mary’s womb (the new kṣetra). This gap between spirit and matter remains permanently bridged, for Christ is both the innermost and deathless centre of every individual. The visible and tangible bread and wine is His body and blood, and the exterior reality is the Catholic Church. The parts are inseparable from the whole; they live in and for the whole. The world scheme envisioned by Aurobindo and Teilhard will be
realised; matter and spirit will be reconciled, and the mystic freed to affirm the world of matter.\textsuperscript{19}

Aurobindo and Teilhard, "two thinkers of the greatest creative power of the present day, were both prophets of evolution, both 'volcanic' thinkers; for the Indian philosopher, man's destiny is to exceed himself and become the gnostic being; for the European Philosopher, the ultimate destiny of man ... is to be one with the life – current... to be identical with God".\textsuperscript{20}

Aurobindo and Teilhard were not mere mystics: they were firm believers in evolution as well. They combined mysticism and evolution; the central characteristic of their thought, namely, the cosmic consciousness as unity-in-diversity, becomes gradually clearer and more intense. Both Aurobindo and Teilhard often tried to remedy the one-sided importance of one or of many. Spirit becomes material and matter becomes spiritual, according to the analysis of both. This complimentary role of contraries in

\textsuperscript{19} R.C.Zachner, Op. Cit.,

\textsuperscript{20} K. R. Srinivasa Iyengar, Op. Cit, p. 423
understanding the nature of reality is the central perspective in which their thoughts were developed. They not only made spirit material but mysticism dynamic and directional. Involution is a seeking of its own self and, on the other, eternally self-possessed in a full manifestation beyond the evolutionary process. Evolution itself, then, would be the consequence of an interaction between the involved divinity pushing upward and the self-possessed divinity pressing downward. The double hypothesis of divine involution and divine self-possession would explain all the lengthy, difficult and devious history of evolution: of the higher evolving from the lower and of the ever-rising scale of organisation and consciousness, all the immortal longings that are the inalienable part of human history. (21, 22)

According to Aurobindo, evolution is the complexification of the less complex; the achievement of a godlike status is the most natural step of future evolution—a godlike status upon earth arising out of our chequered career, a divine perfection within the very


terms which seem its fallible opposite. An utterly transformed mentality, vitality and physicality—with a fulfilled soul, a liberated spirit, a realised unity-in-multiplicity: such is the goal awaiting us by the paradoxical logic inherent in evolution. The life divine, in the most literal sense, should be in prospect from the scientific discovery of an evolutionary process everywhere.\textsuperscript{23} Evolution, as Teilhard has rightly judged on a panoramic survey, is a continuous ascension in the scale of organisation and consciousness. ‘Continuous’ does not signify what is ordinarily dubbed ‘orthogenesis’. Evolution is not in a single direction or along one sole line: we have swirls and side-streams and even backflows, and we have many lines proceeding together and even competing with one another. Yet through the host of complications there persists, there continues, on the whole, an evolution of consciousness in more and more organised forms.\textsuperscript{24}

Both Aurobindo and Teilhard stress the integral aspect of evolution. Every thing in the Universe is the creation of the divine.

\textsuperscript{23} Sri Aurobindo, \textit{The Hour of God}. Op. Cit., p.15

\textsuperscript{24} Teilhard de Chardin, \textit{The Phenomenon of Man}. (Glasgow : Collins, 1959) p. 66
So, in the long run of evolution nothing is to be left behind; every
ting is to be carried till the end. They postulate the theory using the cone shape figure. At the apex they have God (Saccidānanda of Aurobindo, Omega of Teilhard), and at the base, the matter. The middle spaces are filled with life, mind, for Aurobindo; Geosphere, biosphere, noosphere for Teilhard. Life is not divorced from God, and God is never aloof from life. And the supposed irreconcilables, matter and spirit, are not really so irreconcilable, after all; matter links with life and mind, and spirit stretches across the manifested (saccidānanda or omega) towards mind; so, matter-to-spirit is a whole arc of unity. They insist their theories to be linear and horizontal rather than cyclical. And evolution has to take place in a fixed time and space. Aurobindo and Teilhard were influenced by science. Both did welcome the scientific world and technologies, but to the extent of their being slaves, and not masters of human being. (25, 26)

The ultimate criterion for the validity of their synthesis is their own personal experiences. They both look upon experiences


and intuitions as the basic facts of existence, which need to be woven together into a synthetic doctrine of the progression of consciousness. Experience and life are the basis of their thinking, and experience is of primary importance. Without denying the importance and the necessity of the empirical and impersonal character of truth, through their dynamic mysticism, they show how an experimental understanding of truth can better comprehend man, how an advance in our individual and corporate life requires a personalisation of our understanding of truth, a reintegration of objective rightness and an inward rightness. The systematisation and speculations of Aurobindo and Teilhard are based primarily on their personal experience and hence they are fundamentally mystics rather than theologians. They make mysticism dynamic and directional by combining it with an evolving experience in man. Their doctrines are mainly descriptions of their own experiences of unity and inter-connectedness and its gradual progression to a cosmic consciousness. It is their personal life and pre-predicative experiences that gave power and legitimacy to their thought. Though they have not written any systematic theological treatise, they have indicated the right way for a valid theology, a
right combination of *Theos* and *Logos*. An exaggerated emphasis on experience would destroy the objective validity and scientific character of theology. It is a mistake that mystics often make; and Aurobindo and Teilhard are not always immune from it. But their general orientation of founding theology on religious experience is the right and relevant direction that theologians can follow in creating a living theology.

As a spiritual philosopher of evolution, Aurobindo is scientific because he claims to give a philosophy of science or make science the foundation of his philosophy. But certain scientific observations get illuminated by his vision, and when concentrating on them, he is looking scientifically more than spiritually. Teilhard’s thought cannot be quite satisfactory to an Aurobindonian even in those aspects where the French Catholic and Sri Aurobindo have things in common. Besides the ‘Cosmic Sense’ at the back of the theory, its chief interest and value lie in the fact that it is worked out on a scientific basis with great insight and brilliance. But its real shortcomings appear when we look at aspects of Aurobindo’s philosophy which go far beyond anything
elucidated by the Jesuit Priest and Palaeontologist in his attempt to make a bridge between science and Christianity. Aurobindo’s concepts of supermind and transformation are jointly called for by a complete spiritual-scientific understanding of evolution. They are the heart of the Aurobindonian message and there is not the slightest glimmering of them in the Teilhardian weltanschauung.

In their attempt to arrive at a synthetic and all-embracing understanding of reality, Aurobindo analysed mainly the strata of consciousness, while Teilhard, being a biologist, concentrated on empirical phenomena. Yet both studied the dynamic and processual aspects of reality, but using different aspects of the same phenomenological methodology. Both were phenomenologists, particularly because they concentrated more on the phenomena becoming aspects of reality, and attached central importance to the stream and stages of consciousness. As Aurobindo insisted more on the cit-śakti(consciousness-force) of reality and tried to integrate individual, universal and transcendent aspects of reality, his integral phenomenology was more of an apriori and deductive
nature. Teilhard’s method was more empirical and aposteriori, his phenomenology is called inductive phenomenology. Thus, though both Sri Aurobindo and Teilhard used a similar phenomenological method. And only the ways in which they used it were different.

Increasing complexity of form and increasing intensity of consciousness are the most general characteristics of nature in both Aurobindo’s and Teilhard’s theories of evolution. In the words of Aurobindo, “There is in the scale of terrestrial existence ... a progressively complex ... organisation of matter ... of consciousness in living matter ... the better organised the form, the more it is capable of housing ... a more developed ... consciousness.” Teilhard attributes ‘consciousness’ even to the lowliest of beings. Consciousness exists in grades, each of which becomes dominant in turn. Aurobindo compares this movement by similar images to Teilhard’s ‘Pressure’, ‘Change of state’ and ‘doubling’ back to attain a new sphere. This process involves an increasing of consciousness, a taking up of the lower levels and a

27 ibid.,p.58
new formation of existence in terms of the dominant being. Like Teilhard, again, Aurobindo holds that both complexity and consciousness have evolved, but that at the level of humanity their relative importance has shifted. The balance is reversed, Teilhard says, as consciousness now takes the initiative in arranging the complexity of matter.29

An increasing complexity of form and an increasing intensity of consciousness are the most general characteristics of nature and matter in both Teilhard’s and Aurobindo’s theories of evolution. Aurobindo’s matter, life and mind and Teilhard’s views of matter, life and thought as essentially one, or at least intensely interconnected. Aurobindo and Teilhard tried to demonstrate their organic coherence.

Previously, according to Aurobindo, nature’s first care had been physical organisation for the sake of change of consciousness. But in man, a reversal occurs, for it is through his consciousness and not through a new bodily organism. Teilhard holds that

evolution is essentially an evolution of consciousness. A change of consciousness was always the major fact; it was only the balance of the physical and the psychic that needed to be righted.

Teilhard and Aurobindo maintained that the progressive growth in consciousness involves not only a 'heightening' but a 'widening' of consciousness as well. A harmonised collectivity of consciousness, equivalent to a sort of super-consciousness, is how Teilhard envisages humanity at the finality of its evolution. Like Aurobindo, Teilhard regards evolution as incomplete, still heading for a future fulfilment. The tendency of both men to view evolution in terms of the collective is already evident in their organisation of its levels into unified spheres: matter, life, mind, supermind and Christ – as shown in the study on the progression of cosmic consciousness at different levels. Both of them see the same one great thing forming through nature's slow and groping process. This one great thing is the collective nature of consciousness as the goal of the progressive evolution that is still incomplete.

According to Aurobindo and Teilhard, there are three ways of matter reaching to the highest level. For Aurobindo, it is through
heightening, widening and integration. And Teilhard describes three ways of evolutionary mutation like dispersion, radiation and canalisation.

For Aurobindo and Teilhard this world is a play of force. Everything in this world has got the hands of God behind it. God manifested Himself into different layers of matter—geosphere, life—biosphere, mind—noosphere, supermind - christosphere. According to them, spirit is the soul of matter and matter is the body of spirit. Life is universal, all—pervading and imperishable. Mind is consciousness which measures, limits and cuts the forms of things from the indivisible whole and contains them as if each were a separate integer. Man is the connective link between the world and God. Man is considered by both as the spearhead of evolution. He is the representative of God in this world. Both Aurobindo and Teilhard were phenomenologists. Aurobindo was a neo—Vedantin and Teilhard, a neo- humanist.

Man can, Teilhard thought, no longer be able to see himself as entirely unrelated to life, nor life unrelated to the universe.
Teilhard insists that life is the link between different stages of evolution, it is consciousness, even more than life, which organically links pre-life to life itself, and that to Thought. This universally present consciousness Teilhard calls the ‘Within’ of the reality. Teilhard distinguished the ‘Within’ from the ‘Without’ and defined it. “The Within, consciousness and spontaneity are the three expressions for the same things.” This psychic aspect is present in every level, however much the materials envelop may obscure its manifestation. The ‘Within’ and ‘Without’ are co-extensive for Teilhard. He reached this primacy of consciousness through the primacy of life, for his method was scientific and empirical. Aurobindo presented the fundamental and omnipresent nature of consciousness as psyche, consciousness and spirit. He discovered this fundamental character of consciousness primarily through his personal realisation. He does not demonstrate this underlying consciousness on every level but rather describes his adventure and explorations in consciousness. He ascribes it to the supreme consciousness, which inheres the involution and the evolutionary force. Aurobindo describes this progressive evolution of consciousness as even ‘doubling back’ to attain a ‘new sphere’.
It is here that Aurobindo and Teilhard meet more seriously, and this is rather surprising. For, if the former was bound to affirm the priority and primacy of consciousness – as this was his very field of investigation—it was somewhat extra-ordinary that he would recognise it as the material world of evolution which might not have been his central concern as a yogi and mystic. Teilhard, on the contrary, influenced by the scientific prejudices of his age, may have been tempted to explain evolution in terms of energy and matter, but not psyche, consciousness or spirit. Yet both, singled out consciousness as the golden thread running through evolution. The ultimate reason for this strange similarity, we think, is the more fundamental and original similarity in their experiences of the cosmic consciousness, their experiences of the unseen unity and the inherent interconnectedness of things.

The true person or what Aurobindo calls the psychic entity must be distinguished from mere individuality. The psychic entity is free of the world or he does not possess a desiring soul. Teilhard makes a difference between personality and individuality, showing that the sense of individuality gives a sense of separateness from
others, and tries to separate itself as much as possible from others whereas personality tries to build associations with others.

According to Aurobindo, it is an ego striving against other egos, but for Teilhard, in so doing, it becomes retrograde and seeks to drag the world backwards towards plurality and into matter. The true person, on the other hand, recognises that unity, mutuality and harmony are the inescapable law of collective life for Aurobindo, and that the aim of our originality is not our individuality but our personality, by which we find people uniting together. But collective egoism, with its most destructive expression, war, must also be abolished. In a world community composed of true persons, war could have no grounds for existence, says Aurobindo; it would be eliminated as its source in our heart, says Teilhard.

Modern scientific trends like Teilhard’s double pointer take cognisance of Aurobindonian possibilities. Then he may stop short, as most scientists do, of a life-force and a mind-force independent of matter though at present conditioned by it, and he may regard with cautious scepticism the idea of a ‘superconscience’ at either pole of reality. Though there is an
essential similarity in the centrality of the consciousness in the progression from matter to spirit, we can observe also some dissimilarities. While Teilhard insists on drawing a dividing line between ‘thought’ and other manifestations of consciousness, the step from matter and life to thought is not simply a difference of gradation but a change of nature, as far as he is concerned. Aurobindo emphatically affirms the essential identity of consciousness. He sees it as a graded progression of which mind is the middle term. Mind is by no means the highest stage for Aurobindo; but thought, according to Teilhard, makes man capable of infinitely transcending himself. The more fundamental reason why they differ lies in the different ways of understanding Mind and Thought. While Mind is the root of division and limitation for Aurobindo, Thought is the medium of self-transcending for Teilhard. Teilhard insists on the positive possibility of thought; Aurobindo, on the contrary, insists on the limiting aspect of mind. But behind this limiting mind and self-transcending thought we discern the same universal presence of consciousness. We might even venture to go a step further and suggest that the ultimate reason for their respective attachment to division and difference, to
the total mutation and the progressive gradation, is to be found in their general background, the West and the East: namely, the lurking layers of dualism and monism.\(^{30}\)

Aurobindo, on the basis of evolution, advocates a special kind of ‘inconscience’, which would be all that materialism could ask for and at the same time all that spiritual philosophy should need. For Aurobindo, the inconscience is apparently the utter absence of sensation and feeling and thinking, leave aside whatever we may associate with a divine existence, and yet it conceals a veritable ‘superconscience’ – a ‘superconscience’ denying itself as if in a colossal wager with its own plane of ever-manifest divinity to evolve out of the stark opposite of that plane its original perfection. The stark opposite is the physical field of scientific study, where nothing appears operative at first except random change and fortuitous survival and large-scale wastage. This riot of chance is quite in keeping with an initial negation of the deific, the perfect. But, because the negation is a deliberate dungeoning, as it were, of the deific, the perfect, there is always a thrust upward, and

\(^{30}\) K.D.Sethna, Op. Cit., p. 32
from beyond the imprisonment a thrust downward of the free divinity to help the release. Naturally, then, though to no small amazement of conventional science, we see outbreaking from the brute blindness of the physical field a sentient vitality and a mind looking before and after, within and without, below and above.\textsuperscript{31} Purposive activity would be there as part of – to use Teilhard’s language - a ‘psychism’ co-extensive with the universe, a within to every without. This unity in diversity is both for Aurobindo and Teilhard, a unity between heaven and earth, within and without. It is the hope of the kingdom of heaven within us and the city of God upon earth; and, for Teilhard, it is in promoting in equal measure the mastery of the world and the kingdom of God. Both thought the two should go hand in hand.

The whole progression of cosmic consciousness, according to Aurobindo and Teilhard, consists in a magnificent meeting of God and man, that takes place in the very heart of human consciousness. The descending and ascending consciousness meet in human self-consciousness. It is in human

consciousness, which is potentially a divine consciousness either in its final form of participation or in its mode of identity, that the vertical and the horizontal directions of evolution come together. They take their immediate origin from man because he is fundamentally a spiritual being and hence infinitely dynamic. Though these vertical and horizontal directions of evolution and the consequent growth in consciousness are apparently different, it is in essence one and the same integrating and unifying act. Whether by the hidden but ever-manifesting power of the Supermind or by the constant and constitutive pull of the Omega-Christ, it is always in man's partial self-transparency and in his consequent self-consciousness that the progress in evolution will take place. Man, left to him, is neither the origin of this evolution nor its final goal. He – being an incarnate Spirit – is only to bridge between heaven and earth, spirit and matter. The very structure of man is transcendental in nature and contains manifold psychosomatic categories. He is a transcendental subject, who is the entire person: and the person is a single but unified being, a living relatedness.
Man, understood in terms of a growing cosmic consciousness, is the centre of the subject-object encounter in which neither Spirit nor Matter, neither God nor man, is absorbed by the other. Aurobindo and Teilhard both consider man as the powerful stream of consciousness that combines the human and the divine, matter and spirit, sacred and secular. Man is not a fractional being: he is an intensely interrelated and profoundly powerful being. With the help of their dynamic mysticism they turn the ever attractive humanism into a never-complete growth toward divinity, and make the other-worldly Absolute into this-worldly and time-bound spirit. Their idea of cosmic consciousness— as a unity of the spirit in diverse forms of matter— brings out well the integral structure of man and indicates a solid basis for a relevant integral anthropology that would make religion more meaningful and man’s vision more synthetic. The unity and diversity have their origin in the finite but dynamic structure of man; this unity realises itself in man and by man, and culminates in his transformation into a christic or mystical and supramental stage. It is in man that the inductive phenomenology or scientific theory of evolution, and the deductive phenomenology or spiritual theories of evolution, finally
meet. The lived-theology and mystical metaphysics meet in an integral anthropology. Man is the sacrament of \textit{Saccidananda} and the living symbol of Christ. The central similarity between Aurobindo and Teilhard consists in their idea of consciousness; it progresses to a collective stage in the process of which man becomes the centre of focus. Man’s manhood is to reach God.

Aurobindo talks of two hemispheres, the \textit{parārdha} and \textit{aparārdha}, which divided the material from the spiritual level. In the same way Teilhard takes into account the two types of energy-tangential and radial. One is connected with the mechanical, and the other with the spiritual. The lower is the step for the higher to ascend to the supreme points.

The collective consciousness they envisaged is neither a forced totalisation nor any mere mechanisation. Both denounce the apparent appearance of a collective consciousness that has practically done away with the freedom and identity of human persons. The communal ego is realised as the psyche of the nation, the race, the community. It is the individual’s development in his
unique personhood which will enable the community to be the higher-level being that Teilhard proposes. Aurobindo often argued that the human soul's individual liberty must be the primary object of Yoga. There is considerable similarity not only in their insistence on the identity of an individual person, but even in their definition of the nature of this identity of the person.

The supreme focus of energy which generates that powerful field of external attraction is, for Aurobindo, something he calls supermind\textsuperscript{32}; for Teilhard, of course, it is Omega.\textsuperscript{33} In his system it is the link between the Absolute Being, consciousness, and bliss and the present world of matter, life and mind. It is a principle of unity which grounds all the multiplicity of the world, the supreme consciousness transcending all particular forms which can be objects of consciousness. It is, further, the animating principle of all the particular beings inferior to it, yet contained within it, vitalising by its reciprocal presence within them the whole evolutionary movement. And finally, its full expression in


\textsuperscript{33} Teilhard de Chardin, \textit{Phenomenon of Man}. Op. Cit, p.300
the completely evolved world is also the goal of Nature’s restless seeking and striving, the ultimate perfection of the recurrent pattern of diversification and union. Aurobindo agrees that this supermind pervades all the forms as an indwelling presence. Teilhard holds that in order to fulfil its function, Omega must be ‘real and present’ diffusing its presence within each smallest advance of evolution. But Teilhard goes one step further: Omega must be personal if it is to be the energy focus for human beings. This can be seen from the nature of persons. Persons have their whole being as dynamic interchanges of consciousness-energy with other persons. And it comes out from its most remote chamber only in response to the summons of the Supreme Person. For Teilhard, Omega is the Supreme Person; it is Christ. But Aurobindo has something functionally similar.34

Teilhard finds the root of this separating individual in the original sin, following his Christian tradition. Aurobindo’s limiting mind of an individual is rooted in ignorance (avidya).35 But both

34 Beatrice Bruteau, Op. Cit., p. 165
believe that we have now reached the point in the progression of consciousness at which human society is sufficiently secure and that we may turn our attention to removing the unnecessary veils over our vision and the walls around our concern which correspond to our previous need to establish ourselves and may give ourselves without fear to the new level of collective consciousness. Both insist that the collective consciousness finds its complement in particular individuals and persons and at the same time the particular person has to transcend his limitation and universalise himself. It has to be a harmony and a unity-in-diversity.

If convergence was the key-concept of Teilhard in explaining the future evolution of man, it was integration that summarized the whole thought of Aurobindo. It was this unity-in-diversity dimension of reality that both Teilhard and Aurobindo experienced in their mystic stages of cosmic consciousness. We do not think that this unity that they both advocated can be said to be a strict pantheism; it is more in the nature of a pan-en-henism (all-in-one-ism). Here we can observe the strong similarity between the Christian doctrine of Trinity and the Hindu concept of
Saccidananda, which both advocate an identity with difference. Though Teilhard does not speak much about the Trinity, Aurobindo constantly does. It is Saccidananda that is the beginning, the middle and the end of evolution. As Teilhard’s doctrine of evolution is predominantly christocentric, its Trinitarian dimension is seen only indirectly. But his insistence on the identity of person and centrality of love in evolution makes him affirm, almost always, a union that differentiates and a unity that is mixed with diversity.

Man is not simply the result of sheer chance and mere mechanical combinations. It is paradoxical that in spite of the fact that man creates divisive sects and contending classes, he is the most important non-sectarian and universal symbol. He is the symbol of a self-manifesting spirit, as Christ is the Eternal Logos of the Father. Though man is a universal symbol, he is by no means an abstract symbol devoid of life and concreteness. The craving to create a universal man is bound to end in failure because man is a universal symbol of the omnipresent spirit to the extent that he is a self-conscious being. He is a ‘concrete universal’ symbol that has
a sacramental power in its very constitution. Though man can be understood as the sacrament of *Saccidananda* in the *vedāntic* tradition, he can be considered more meaningfully as the sacrament of Christ in the Christian tradition. In this tradition, man’s sacramental nature stems from Christ, who is the sacrament of The Father. But, in the context of a growing dialogue among world religions, we are inclined to think that it is more appropriate to call this basis of man’s sacramental structure the dimension of the Incarnate Spirit. This dimension is naturally Christic for the Christians, who see Christ as the eternal and ever-perfect sacrament of God. We are not at all suggesting here that man on this planet is the only possible form of the God’s manifestation. The central importance given to man derives from his being in essence an incarnate-spirit, and especially from the event that God in Jesus Christ became the true and authentic man. Therefore, the idea of man as sacrament is better suited in the context of Christian Revelation and becomes more significant when man’s nature is seen as Christic. In Christ, it is God’s love that is manifested primarily, and not merely an immanent Spirit of God.
In contemporary sacramental theology, a sacrament is a corporeal gesture in which the person of Christ manifests His love for man. It is the embodiment of Christ’s loving, personal attitude in matter. It is by the power of Christ’s sacramental structure that man and matter alike are ‘incorporated’ into the very Body of Christ Himself. Thus, sacrament implies not only an external expression but an ‘incorporation’, an integration and a progressive realisation. This realising of the transforming character of the sacrament is abundantly evident in the Christian Eucharist, when understood in its depth, in its mystical, mythical and ecclesial dimensions. It is necessary to recall the importance Teilhard attached to the sacrament of the Eucharist, the way in which he saw the whole cosmos in the Host. The Eucharist, for Teilhard, is not just the celebration of Christ’s love: the Eucharist celebrates the sanctification, the transformation, the consecration, indeed the very Christification of man and matter. The same Christogenesis is the goal of man’s everyday life. Aurobindo sees this goal as the gradual and everyday realization of Saccidananda. It is man, through his everyday activities, who transforms the whole cosmos into a Divine temple. As the absolute Divine Being is represented
in the Divine Logos, man is 'represented' – not merely a representative – of this Divine Logos. The more he becomes similar to this Incarnate-Spirit, the better is his self-transparency and representation.

We are inclined to think that these triple fundamental dimensions of God and of man are meaningful only if they are taken in their correlation. Transcendence becomes meaningful only when it is considered in its manifold terms, just as the relation between the Father and the Son is mutually constitutive in the trinity. In the field or stream of the Divine *Cit* (consciousness), there are three correlative and constitutive currents of one and the same *śakti* (Force), Divine love. Here the apparent contraries of Being and Becoming are real complementarities. The whole progression of cosmic consciousness consists essentially in this transition from the stage of our existence in contraries to an existence in complementaries. In this final stage of cosmic consciousness, spirit and matter become one and many simultaneously. It is the spiritual material that man aspires for. The ultimate source and the final realisation of this cosmic
consciousness are found in its concrete form in Christ, the word
divine made flesh, the spirit-incarnate. The gradual progression in
cosmic consciousness is always a discovery of this incarnate-spirit,
and a gradual realisation of man’s sacramental function that
consists in seeing everything in the field of the same incarnate-
spirit. The perfection and the power of the Divine existence in the
Trinity and in *Saccidananda* consist in the harmonious and
complementary relationship. Each person of the Trinity as well as
each dimensions of *Saccidananda* has existence only in relation to
the other. Knowledge and love form the field of this Trinitarian
relationship. It is through the eternal self-knowledge and self-
giving love manifested in and through the Divine Logos that the
Father reaches man and man’s cosmos. Hence, Christ is the
sacrament of the Father. Man reaches the same eternal Father
always in and through this Divine sacrament whose Christian
dimension is essentially embedded in His very human nature. As
God’s perfect relationship between the persons realise itself
through knowledge and love, so, too, man’s realisation of God
takes place in and through contemplation (prayerful knowledge)
and self-less love. Divine Logos finds His ultimate origin and final
perfection of knowledge and love in the Eternal Father; man finds them in Christ, the Divine Logos made flesh, and the whole cosmos finds them in man.

Aurobindo and Teilhard reached the conclusion that their systems were a lived-theology and a mystical metaphysics, respectively. Both of them insisted, to a great extent, on the dynamic aspect of being; they studied man as a ‘Phenomenon’ and a ‘life-divine’. We might say that it is an anthropological theology and theological or divine anthropology. We find in both Aurobindo and Teilhard, a profound and progressively manifesting fusion of God and Man. Their synthetic doctrine of unity in multiplicity was based on their mystical experience. Teilhard integrates his own experience of the elemental into the drama of Christogenesis, while Aurobindo integrates his personal realisations of the vacant and immense infinite into the creative and integrating supermind, concentrated more on the mystical and life-aspects of their doctrine of convergence and integration.

In the general religious tradition of India, it is in cit (consciousness) that the Divine and the human meet. Revelation
does not consist in a mere collection of words contained either in Śruti or in Smṛti. Though they are the divine utterances for a Hindu, they are only signs and symbols in the ultimate analysis. As the Divine Logos stands for the Spoken-essence of Divine consciousness, these scriptural utterances ultimately stand for the same Speaking-divine-Logos, who is manifested in the interiority of man’s consciousness. It is in fact a simultaneous manifestation and discovery, a manifestation on the part of God and a personal discovery on the part of man. From God’s side this manifesting act passes across the external symbols towards the interior core of man; and from man’s side it passes further, crossing the layers of his concrete humanity towards his interior kośa (sheath). We call this innermost field the Divine consciousness of man, wherefrom all religions ultimately stem and in which all religions can effectively meet – the final stage of a growing cosmic consciousness into a realm of dialogue of religions.

In so far as Aurobindo and Teilhard share the experience of unity and cosmic consciousness, they are clearly in the mystical tradition. But, to the extent they accept the difference between God
and man, they are in the theistic tradition. We believe that their idea of cosmic consciousness is predominantly in the mystical tradition: however, Teilhard’s idea of personalisation and Aurobindo’s doctrine of three poises or dimensions of Saccidananda do not altogether exclude the ultimate transcendence, and hence, the theistic trend in their mysticism. Therefore, in the final stage of cosmic consciousness, it is not simply an absolute identity between God and man, but a unity in diversity, a mystical and integral unity. It is a relationship that is similar to the structure of the Christian Trinity and the original Saccidananda, which think primarily of God in relation to man. Finite and related as we are, we cannot think of God except in terms of relationships. This, we think, is the primary category of God: His presence through relationships, His ‘divine milieu’ and His ‘omnipresence’. This primary category would explain better the Trinitarian existence of God in both Christian and Vedantic traditions. This anthropocentrism is unavoidable, because it is man who thinks of God. The religion of man that Aurobindo and Teilhard indirectly indicate demands an organic unity between heaven and earth. In spite of this unity, heaven is not going to be
here on earth for Teilhard, while Aurobindo clearly advocates a
heaven here, on earth. Though they slightly differ on the question
of its relation on earth, they argue that heaven and earth are to be
realized in man existentially. The final goal of their relation is
man’s realization of God: it is not man who by himself becomes
God, but it is God who, in and through man, becomes human.

We find a similarity between Aurobindo and Teilhard not
only in the nature and growth of collective consciousness but in its
final goal and ultimate centre as well. The supreme focus of energy
which generates ‘the powerful field of internal attraction’ in
collective consciousness is, for Teilhard, the Christ-Omega. It is
supermind, the creative and executive power of Saccidānanda that
is, according to Aurobindo, responsible for the whole progression
of consciousness from material to the supramental level. But, once
again, in spite of this similarity, we find dissimilarity between
Christ-Omega and the supermind. While the former stands for the
person of Christ, at least in the later development of Teilhard’s
thought, the latter in Aurobindo connotes more a principle of unity.
Though Aurobindo’s mysticism is directional and time-bound, it
does not seem to have reached the ‘concrete universal’ person as Teilhard’s did. Though both Aurobindo and Teilhard attach great importance to the immanent character of this final and supreme centre, they do not altogether disregard, we are inclined to think, the transcendence of this centre. Thus we can constitute that, just as their idea of collective and cosmic consciousness is a unity-in-diversity, so too, the similarity we find between them is certainly not a unity and diversity, but a unity in diversity.

Aurobindo holding the Supramental Light in himself shows to others the path to the same divine dynamism – a practical method of self-development by self-surrender to the Supreme. He designates his method the ‘Integral Yoga’, the yoga of the supermind, the yoga of transformation. Teilhard speaks of love as the energy that would little by little flood the world and some day sweep together all men in a unique spiritual unity. No doubt, love is a great unifying force. Even Sri Aurobindo favours love as the base. He says that a love charged with spiritual knowledge and power and beauty is an inherent harmony of the Eternal Being, in which the one is the many and the many are the one, and all move
towards ever new formulations of the perfect. Aurobindo and Teilhard assign a high role for love in the collective consciousness. Love, says Aurobindo, is “the desire to give oneself to others and to receive others in exchange; it is a commerce between being and being”.\(^{36}\) In the ideal collective, according to Teilhard, “since it is a question of achieving a synthesis of centres (persons), it is centre to centre that they must take contact ... Intercentric energies are wanted, and that means love”.\(^{37}\) Aurobindo says that the human is superior to others because of his power of reasoning and intuition. In the same way, Teilhard says that it is the reflection power that distinguishes man from other animals.

Creation is an art of God. According to Aurobindo, God did create the world out of mental joy or \textit{līlā}. God is the creator, destroyer and sustainer of this world. For Teilhard, God created the world and behind this creation there is a purpose. For both Aurobindo and Teilhard, man’s work is to be free from desire for the fruit. When we do a deed, it should be for mental pleasure and

\(^{36}\) Beatrice Bruteau, \textit{Op. Cit.}, p. 163

\(^{37}\) ibid
not for reward. If we are rewarded for an action, then there is no use of that action. We must do it for our fellow-beings, thus indirectly for God. As God said, “When you do something for your fellowmen, you do it for me”.

The meeting of religions is not merely an intellectual endeavour or simply a practical problem. It is in itself a religious act in which men seek to find the ultimate ground and the final goal of their life. Both Aurobindonian and Teilhardian dynamic mysticism would suggest an interior dialogue in a contemplative spirit as the effective method of a fruitful meeting of religions. In the synthetic idea of cosmic consciousness in Aurobindo and Teilhard we can find an effective dialogue between Semitic and Indian traditions. In Christianity the utterly transcendent becomes Emmanuel, the God in us and among us, while in the Gīta the ever-immanent God of the Upaniṣads manifests Himself as the purely transcendent to whom man must surrender his will. Thus, Christ and Krishna stand for the incarnate-spirit, who is behind every being as the ultimate spiritual presence. This incarnate-spirit is the basis of both unity and diversity. The Divine Logos is made a real
man in Christ. His becoming flesh and entering into history has introduced a new logic into man’s thinking. ‘The Logic of the Infinite’ is to be interpreted in terms of this Incarnate-spirit. Hence, a logic based on the Christic dimension is the true basis for an effective dialogue of Spiritualities. Though Aurobindo and Teilhard, following the traditions and tastes of mystics, insist more on the identity of being in the eternal realm, they have not failed to emphasise the temporal and dynamic dimension of this unity. The Incarnate nature of the spirit makes it not only a unity but a plurality as well. Aurobindo turned his eyes outward to see the world without, while Teilhard ‘turned his eyes inward’ to see God within. Both found that the ‘within’ and the ‘without’ are two dimensions of the same reality, an identity in difference. This identity in difference is the characteristic of their cosmic consciousness. It is the primary category of the Incarnate-spirit. If the ultimate basis of religions is this Incarnate-spirit, its primary category of identity in difference should be the essential nature, a real dialogue of religions.

Religious truth does not lie primarily in propositions; it is to be realized as a property of persons. Experience and expression
should go hand in hand in a living religion, as *dhyāna* (contemplation) and *bhakti* (worship or devotion) are the complementary constituents of religious experience. If these two are not combined together, religion either falls into mere abstractions or dwindles into shallow anthropomorphism. The idea of cosmic consciousness as a unity in diversity is the ideal form of a relevant religion. It is not absolute identity of man with God nor is it a separate existence of man from God. It is God becoming man, and in him many. The perfect state of cosmic consciousness is found in Christ, the real God-man. In Him, we find the perfection of the Teilhardian ‘Mystical Body’ and the Aurobindonian ‘Gnostic Being’. In him *dhyāna* and *bhakti* are perfectly combined. For, he is the perfect contemplation of the Father and at the same time the loyal and loving Son. He is the eternal exemplar for the existentially estranged man. The involved spirit of Aurobindo and the immanent Omega of Teilhard meet in this perfect incarnate-spirit or *avatār*. He is the final goal that every finite human being is striving for. He is at the same time the ultimate constitutive dimension of every religion, not necessarily for all as an ‘unknown Christ’ but essentially as an immanent
spiritual presence of an eternal person. The acceptance of this ultimate basis could serve as a starting-point for an effective encounter of religions.

If the meeting of religions is to become effective and meaningful through complementarity and co-operation, then no single religion is self-sufficient. A religion that is for it, that wants to stand only on itself, is a religion of the past. Rebirth is an inevitable factor in the eyes of both the philosophers, for a more polished life.

According to Aurobindo the incidence of evil is inseparable from the evolutionary process; the same assumption is inherent in Teilhard’s treatment of the problem of pain and individual human suffering. God possessed attributes for both of these thinkers. For Aurobindo passive and active are the two attributes of God. According to Teilhard, autonomy, actuality, irreversibility and finally transcendence are the four attributes of Omega.
Both Aurobindo\textsuperscript{38} and Teilhard\textsuperscript{39} were concerned not only with individual salvation or individual liberation, but with the collective salvation of mankind. They were both in sympathy with Marxist socialism. They both hoped that the unity in diversity – the type of cosmic consciousness they shared – would one day be reflected in a socialised and free society: in an organic type of existing in the mystical Body of Christ for Teilhard, and a Gnostic society for Aurobindo in which the supra-mental transformation and the final integration in diversity would take place. Both were prophets of matter and ambassadors of the spirit.

The conclusion we draw from the central idea of the double world – order of both Aurobindo and Teilhard is that the higher world sets the standard for the lower. But, however poor an imitation (of the higher world) it may be, the lower world is not a world of shadows, but has a real status. Both Aurobindo and Teilhard took the material world as seriously as they did the spirit. The importance given to man by them is worth mentioning. For the


\textsuperscript{39} George Appleton, et. al., Op. Cit., p. 103
Indian philosopher, man’s destiny is to exceed himself and to become the gnostic being; for the western philosopher, man has to be with the Omega.

The study on cosmic consciousness in Aurobindo and Teilhard is the great importance they attach to love and brotherhood in the real life of religion. The personalizing love in Teilhard and the unseen brotherhood in Aurobindo stem directly from the power of the spirit. Love and brotherhood are the media through which man and God actually meet and find their final meaning and existential fulfilment. Though both Aurobindo and Teilhard clearly express the dynamic nature of this love-force and śakti (consciousness-force), their emphasis is apparently more on its ‘within’ and ‘individual’ aspect. The spirit, as love and śakti, is the eternal and central controlling power. The spirit and love-force is a field of energy – a comprehensive field in which is the origin, centre and the final goal. There is certainly a vital connection between their spirit in terms of love and śakti, and their Omega-Christ and Supermind.