

Common Ways the Earth Human Being Irrationally Uses Coercion, Pressure and Force

By Vivienne Legg 3rd December 2013

To use coercion, pressure and force in our dealings with ourselves and others is simply illogical, and it is the result of us presuming we can follow our own laws, independent of the Creation.

This following paragraph from Billy's article "Persönlichkeit und Höheres Selbst"^[1] (Personality and Higher Self) explains that, if, in our thinking, feeling and deeds, and in all our "other things", we are not aligned with Creation, then we inevitably offend against the principle of the great-oneness Creation. Because we are of the irrational assumption that we can run our lives, and live, according to our own laws and recommendations, instead of those of Creation, we also presume to irrationally view and regard our unlogic as logic. **Due to this high-handed irrationality we also then attempt to force our own endeavouring onto others, completely against their will.**

"Ist der Mensch in seinem Denken, Fühlen und Handeln und in allen seinen anderen Dingen nicht schöpfungsausgerichtet, dann verstösst er zwangsläufig gegen das Prinzip der Grosseinheit Schöpfung. Weil er der irren Annahme ist, er könne als Mensch nach eigenen Gestezen und Geboten schalten, walten und leben, darum erdreistet er sich auch, seine Unlogik irrenderweise als Logik zu betrachten. Aus dieser selbstherrlichen Irrung heraus versucht er dann auch, anderen Wesen, völlig entgegen deren Willen, sein eigenens Bestreben aufzuzwingen.

We try to force our own endeavouring onto someone else because, as a result of not following the Creational laws, we do not perceive, recognise and respect the fact that another human being must have his/her or her own perceptions, thoughts, cognitions and experiences about something at a very deep level for it to become his/her own knowledge and wisdom.

"Illogical" is a word that is repeatedly used in this "Teaching of the Life" to describe many aspects of Earth human thinking and behaviour. The advice given to us in this teaching of the prophets stems from the knowledge of how the creational laws work. It is not an arbitrary code of ethics imposed on us and disconnected from reality. That means that, given enough evolutionary time, every human being could eventually come to learn these things as a result of his or her own searching and striving and could, and can, discover the illogical nature of these abovementioned behaviours. Regarding the teaching concerning force, pressure and coercion, (which fall broadly under the term "Gewalt ") it can be confusing to try to determine what the correct behaviour is in each context of life, but I find it becomes much simpler when we remember that, in every case, **what distinguishes the right way to behave from the wrong way, is logic.**

So, we do need to consider this:

“It is not possible to completely avoid Gewalt in the human life, or the animal, plant or any other life on the Earth and in the universe.”

“Weder im menschlichen, tierischen, pflanzlichen noch jeglichem sonstigen Leben auf der Erde und in universeller Weite ist es möglich, Gewalt völlig zu vermeiden.“

This is explained in Billy's article, “Gewalt und gewaltlose Gewaltsamkeit”^[2] (p. 82. “Ein Quentchen Wissen Sinn und Weisheit”)

Billy explains further in this article that what we have to assess is whether it is the Gewalt which is bad and unlogical, or the good, logical Gewalt which is called gewaltsame Gewaltlosigkeit. Perhaps the easiest example of good, logical Gewalt for us to understand is in situations when we must apprehend another human being who is endangering the lives of others. We have to restrain that human being, and prevent him/her from causing more harm. But this has to be done in a logical manner which – if possible – allows that person the opportunity to do the necessary thinking and experiencing in order to gain the knowledge which would correct the erroneous behaviour. Killing that person unnecessarily would deny him/her that chance, and to deny him/her access to means for learning would also fail to serve the purpose. So we must consider where the boundaries of logical Gewalt are. In assessing the nature of the Gewalt being used – whether Gewalt or logical Gewalt – we need to remember that it is never the same in any two cases. Kinds of Gewalt vary in form and scope as much as situations do. There is a multiplicity of reasons for it, although the principle is the same in every single case.

Clarification about Gewalt:

To attempt to clarify the term “Gewalt”, here is the description from the glossary of “Goblet of the Truth”. “‘Gewalt’ is the brutal execution of elemental might and force, but it is far above all might and all force.” It exists in different forms. For instance, someone can have an attitude which expresses an inclination to act with Gewalt and which is expressed by the character, personality, thoughts, feelings and emotions.

Gewaltsame Gewaltlosigkeit (logical Gewalt) is described this way:

“Something that is achieved in rationality and logic represents a ‘Gewaltsamkeit’. Rationality and logic stand for rightness against the illogical/unright, which is being confronted mightfully; however, in a form that is not destructive but constructive, i.e. gewaltlos (without Gewalt).”

There are endless examples in life where we irrationally use Gewalt and which provide much food for thought. But, a very encouraging fact is that once we have learned a lesson from this “Teaching of the Spirit” in one context, we find that the result of our learning shows benefits in many other areas of our lives as well. I find that this is the case with the teaching about the use of logical Gewalt, in contrast to the use of Gewalt. Below I have drawn together a few relatively clear examples in every day life, where we have to make decisions concerning force, pressure, coercion, and so on. These areas are:

- 1) in raising children
- 2) in personal or professional relationships (and relationships between countries)
- 3) in providing the teaching for others
- 4) in matters of love
- 5), in striving for the truth
- 6) in meditation practise

1) raising children

On p.227 of his book, "*Erziehung der Kinder, Jugendlichen und Erwachsenen*"^[3] (Raising/educating children, youth and grown-ups) Billy explains that reward, punishment, Gewalt and coercion, are wrong methods of upbringing and teaching. He contrasts these things with intelligence, rationality and logic. In relation to getting children to carry out duties which are required of them, we should try to find a logical way to solve it, for example, by bringing about a conversation with the child in which, for instance, there is a discussion of how the task can be done together.

"In this wise, no authoritative bearing is assumed, rather both parties are put on the same level of equal worth and equal rights. It is thereby possible that suggestions from both sides can be brought forth, considered and discussed until finally an appropriate solution is found."

"In dieser Weise, mit dem 'was zusammen getan werden kann' wird keine autoritäre Haltung eingenommen, sondern es werden beide Parteien auf die gleiche Stufe der Gleichwertigkeit und Gleichberechtigung gestellt. Dadurch wird es möglich, dass gegenseitig Vorschläge eingebracht, überlegt und diskutiert werden können, bis letztlich eine angemessene Lösung gefunden wird."

No pressure should be exercised because that means Gewalt and Zwang, which cause the free decisions of the child and the free volition to be oppressed. Even a mild form of pressure constitutes Gewalt and Zwang. These factors – Gewalt and coercion – bring about rebellion, not just with children, but with grown human beings who have had a good upbringing. Billy clearly says that only methods of upbringing and teaching that are without pressure - gewaltlos and zwanglos methods - lead to results.

2) personal or professional relationships

On p.61.28, *Gesetze und Gebote des Verhaltens*^[4] (Laws and Recommendations of the Behaviour) Billy deals with the need to accept the way another human being is. It doesn't mean that we have to agree with, support or like that behaviour, but that we cannot change it through a non-acceptance. It is no good to try to change someone. It makes no sense to use compulsion to try to change someone's actions or opinion to the way we think it should be. We should not exercise either mildness or hardness to try to change someone or their opinion.

“If you exercise Zwang and other Gewalt towards another human being then he/she simply adapts because, in his/her powerlessness and weakness he/she has no choice or he/she gives up his/her free will and becomes subordinate to yours.”

“Übst du Zwang und sonstige Gewalt auf einen Menschen aus, dann fügt er sich einfach, weil ihm nichts anderes übrigbleibt in seiner Kraftlosigkeit und Schwachheit, oder er wird dir hörig in demütiger Ergebenheit, so er sich dir unterwirft und seinen eigenen Willen aufgibt.”

This applies whether the thing you do not accept about another person is good or bad. The principle remains the same in either case. Our task is to teach the other human being using intelligence, rationality and logic and by showing, in a sensitive, refined way, what is right and wrong. It must not come across dictatorial or didactic, rather relaxed, free and such that it is motivation for a conversation.

3) providing the teaching for others

In “Goblet of the Truth”, 21:107, we read (with my bolding added),

“...the true prophets namely may only teach you, but not **urge** you to accept their teaching, because this would be the equivalent of a coercion to the belief, **and through a coercion to the belief you would learn nothing and not find the truth in yourselves, rather you would only become the pattern (Schablone) of a new belief, without finding the truthly truth of all truth in yourselves...**”

“...die wahrlichen Propheten nämlich dürfen euch nur belehren, jedoch nicht dazu drängen, ihre Lehre anzunehmen, weil dies einem Zwang zum Glauben gleichkäme, und durch einen Zwang zum Glauben würdet ihr nichts lernen und nicht in euch selbst die Wahrheit finden, sondern ihr würdet nur zur Schablone eines neuen Glaubens”

In “Goblet of the Truth”, 2: 288, Billy writes, (my bolding)

“...;and, for the sake of the truth, always carry out everything in honesty and equitableness (fairness) and **instruct (teach) your next ones without encouraging and without coercing** them in the words of truth and in the laws and recommendations of the primal wellspring (Creation) ...”

“;und belehrt (unterrichtet) eure Nächsten **ohne Drängen und ohne Zwang** in den Worten der Wahrheit und in den Gesetzen und Geboten der Urquelle (Schöpfung)...”

4) matters of love

We can't make someone love us, or force ourselves to love someone. We might be able to compel someone to develop a false form of love for us. The reason that would be possible is because false love forms are not based on a true perception of reality, so the human being concerned does not need to have his/her own perception, cognition, experience and wisdom in relation to it but can have it imposed on him/her from outside, for example, in the form of suggestion and persuasion. False forms thrive in absence of the attentiveness required by adherence to the Creational Laws and Recommendations. False forms of love are based on delusion and belief. This is the type of love religions teach. “Goblet of the Truth”, 28:215

says that we must liberate ourselves from all dogmatic restrictions. We must turn to the creational laws and recommendations and follow them in a strictly logical manner.

” ...it is alone by fulfilling them [the creational laws and recommendations] that you are able to find and build up the true love in you; **be always conscious that true love is no coercion, but must be created and become reality from out of your own free will.**”

“...denn allein in Erfüllung derselben vermögt ihr auch die wahre Liebe in euch zu finden und aufzubauen; seid euch stets bewusst, dass wahre Liebe kein Zwang ist, sondern aus eurem freien Willen heraus erschaffen und zur Wirklichkeit werden muss”.

5) striving for the truth

“Goblet of the Truth” 25:288 says,

“When searching for and fathoming the truth, guard yourselves against crampfully directing your thoughts and feelings in a fighting wise against the untruth of the time-immemorial and against the untruth of the religious, ...fighting against the untruth does not mean to go in quarrelsomeness against it, rather taking up a defensive position in accordance with the gewaltsame Gewaltlosigkeit, ...if you do not act in this wise, you force yourselves again into distinct lines and further your unfreedom...**your striving becomes a ridiculous imposture and coercion and shows no lasting value, because nothing is learnt and the great effect of a permanence never comes**; fight-based strivings mean Gewalt and coercion, and such bring no advantage but only great disadvantage,”

“Hütet euch beim Suchen und Ergründen der Wahrheit davor, krampfhaft eure Gedanken und Gefühle kampfässig gegen die Unwahrheit des Altherkömmlichen und des religiösen, ideologischen oder philosophischen Glaubens zu richten; Kampf wider die Unwahrheit bedeutet nicht, in Streitbarkeit dagegen anzugehen, sondern eine Abwehrhaltung einzunehmen gemäss der gewaltsamen Gewaltlosigkeit ...wodurch euer Bemühen zur lächerlichen Gaukelei und zum Zwang wird und keinen bleibenden Wert aufweist, weil wahrheitlich nichts gelernt wird und niemals die grosse Wirkung einer Beständigkeit eintritt; kampfässige Bemühungen bedeuten Gewalt und Zwang, und solche bringen keinen Nutzen, sondern nur sehr grossen Schaden...”

This verse goes on to explain that we must extend our hands to the real truth - willingly and without aggression - against the untruth and “bring everything untruthly to a standstill”.

6) meditation practise

In the context of meditation, force is also completely out of place. While practising concentrating our focus on one thing - be it our breathing, an external object, our own consciousness – the efficient and logical way to correct our focus and still our thoughts again, once they have wandered off, is to simply turn once more to the task. Force only creates a disturbance and distraction and the seeming need for it would indicate that the thoughts in favour of the practise are not adequately aligned. And so they must simply be appropriately, logically aligned.

So, the main points I am drawing together in this article are:

To understand the incorrectness of the use of force, pressure, coercion and similar things, we need to consider whether it is logical.

We cannot function without force altogether. But it must be logical force, *or gewaltsam Gewaltlosigkeit.*

To pressure someone else to act in a certain way – to force our endeavours upon someone else – is to work against the creational laws, and thus to think we can operate independently of the very thing that is at the core of our being.

To pressure someone else to act in a certain way misunderstands the necessity of the other person having the will and the learning and experience for themselves in order to make the knowledge real and effective for them.

The results of pressuring someone to think a certain way will be destructive and any seemingly positive outcome will only be short-lived.

.....

1. Meier, 1979/1980/1991, "Einführung in die Meditation", Wassermanzeit Verlag
2. Meier, 2000, "Ein Quentchen Wissen Sinn und Weisheit" Wassermanzeit Verlag
3. Meier, 2010, "Erziehung der Kinder, Jugendlichen und Erwachsenen", Wassermanzeit Verlag
4. Meier, 2013, "Gesetze und Gebote des Verhaltens", Wassermanzeit Verlag