

THE REALITY OF TEACHING SELF-DEFENCE AS A DESIRED MODEL OF EDUCATION

Jan SŁOPECKI^{1(A,B,D,E,F,G)}, Peter BÖSCHEN^{2(B,D)}, Heinz MACAS^{3(B,D)},
Artur LITWINIUK^{4(B,F)}

1. Higher School of Education in Sport, Warsaw (Poland)

2. World Alliance of Martial Arts, Bremen (Germany)

3. Austrian Self-Defence Federation, Vienna (Austria)

4. J. Pilsudski University of Physical Education in Warsaw, Biala Podlaska Branch, Biala Podlaska (Poland)

Keywords:

- self-defence,
- self-defence skills,
- teaching,
- martial arts,
- real-life confrontation,
- *goshinjutsu*,
- *jūjutsu*.

Abstract:

From the perspective of humanistic theory of martial arts and the anthropology of martial arts [Cynarski 2006, 2012], a reflection has been undertaken on the selected reading materials focused on teaching an effective and real-life self-defence. It is characteristic of the ontogenesis on the way towards *budō*, that a learner, after decades of studying and gaining experience, reaches the level of mastery and becomes ready to teaching others, and to sharing his or her knowledge with others.

This is the stage of case studies. The authors perform an analysis of the selected pieces of literature on the subject. The additional source of information is provided by the authors, their own observation, experience and discussions with experts in the area of martial arts. A methodological standard of 'humanistic coefficient' developed by F. Znaniecki has also been taken into consideration.

In all the materials available on the subject of self-defence, there is a lack of deep analysis of the methodology of teaching self-defence whose effectiveness can be seen in various real-life situations. In most cases these materials cover the issue of moral and ethical actions taken in combat, but they do not discuss thoroughly the subject of teaching real-life skills. The reality of teaching self-defence is a subject that was not thoroughly covered by scholars in our country. In particular, the authors of this article deal with group attacks on a single person and they point to the possible threats of this kind of an unsporting confrontation. They encourage taking actions in order to change the law that governs this sort of attacks. They point out the effective ways of teaching real-life skills in self-defence.

INTRODUCTION

The spelling of Japanese terms and proper names in this article includes long sounds. The term „self-defence” (jap. *goshinjutsu*) refers to the modernized system of self-defence technique adjusted to various situations and circumstances, which is focused on effectiveness in combat.

The scheme for teaching real-life self-defence should be created in such a way so as to be both well-conceived and made up of a subsystem of a particular martial art or a set of skills in selected techniques, constantly improved and modified in order to attain cohesive and closed form as a system after several years of experience.

Real-life opinions, judgements and attitudes are characterized by realism and common sense [Inny Słownik Języka Polskiego PWN, 2000, p. 421]. Real-life self-defence abilities should be conditioned by the proper evaluation of actual behaviour during the attacks along with properly formed and defined educational conventions that teach tactical and technical components of combat, creating gradually the conditions as near as possible similar to a real-life and out-of-sport fight. Only then can a learner master the elements of combat to such an extent so as to be able to exploit them in real-life engagement. In order for a given set of skills to be effective, these skills have to be verified as effective in specific situations regarding tactical and technical solutions for dealing with out-of-sport confrontations. Otherwise, the teaching of effective self-defence may turn out to be something artificial, an illusion, or even a fantasy. There is an unclear and fine line between reality and fantasy, just like the opinions of theoreticians on the ways of teaching self-defence. Theoreticians are characterized by being rational and they tend to prefer speculation to empiricism, they refer to general regulations, they lack specific ways of teaching and handling difficult out-of-sport situations. It is well worth asking a question if a martial arts master has a right to teach skills that are effective and adjusted to real-life threats in self-defence. What should be the model of teaching real-life and modern self-defence?

The most basic condition of teaching self-defence consists in teaching the sort of behaviour that is effective, practical, wise and decent.

When describing real skills in self-defence, the focus is put here on the attack of a group of aggressors on a single person (group attacks). This sort of attack is organized and deliberate and it is becoming more and more common these days. It accounts for a vast majority of all attacks, and this fact should be the reason for deep thought on the manner of educating and a sign of sensitivity of those people who take their interest in the subject of educating and behaving during a widely comprehended out-of-sport confrontation. Most of the authors of publications issued on hand-to-hand fight or self-defence attempt at concealing the problem of group attacks or they evade it, because it is a difficult subject to consider in the field of the methodology of teaching, tactics and ethical aspects of such actions in combat. Most often they describe the out-of-sport confrontation and its tactical and technical actions as if it were combat sports, where in most cases there are two rivals. It is easier to evaluate both competitors in the context of the methodology of teaching or combat ethics if based on the regulations of a sport discipline.

When discussing the subject of self-defence combat in out-of-sport confrontation in the situation of a group attack on a single person, we decided to draw from over 50-year experience of the first of the authors, from over 30 years of experience of the second and the third, and from the opinions, interviews, discussions with international experts in hand-to-hand fight and self-defence. The first of the authors has obtained the title of *hanshi*, the 10th Dan in *jūjutsu*, the 10th Dan in self-defence/*goshinjutsu* and the 3rd Dan in judo. The second one has the 5th Dan in Atemi Combat System (ACS), the 2nd Dan in Anti-Terror Kampf (ATK) and the 1st Dan in *jūjutsu*, the third one has obtained the 4th Dan in *jūjutsu* and the 4th Dan in self-defence/*goshinjutsu*.

When describing self-defence skills, we bear in mind a specific system of educating, which can be attributed to given combat sports or martial art, which has a developed and rationalized system of educating based on axiological and ethical values and is commonly acknowledged by the people of *budō*. In order to meet the above-mentioned assumptions, we decided to treat self-defence/*goshinjutsu* as a subsystem of *jūjutsu*.

Goshinjutsu self-defence is a subsystem of *jūjutsu*, a utilitarian skill based on learning hand-to-hand fight and self-defence in the situation of an attack with the use of various weapons, which takes into consideration the spiritual aspect of martial arts and develops a mental resilience, the ability to sense the opponent, the anticipation of the aggressor's actions

and which uses a wide range of *jūjutsu* combat techniques in real-life engagement and their various technical combinations. These techniques combined with a proper tactic in combat, when a real technique is supposed to respond to a real-life attack, allow for an effective defence against an attack of several opponents at once or in a confrontation with a single opponent [Słopecki 2013, p. 85-91].

That way the term of self-defence is defined as an independent field with a direct reference to the Far Eastern martial arts. Self-defence is a defensive system of hand-to-hand fight adjusted to various situations and circumstances, to the risk and an attack, and it should be combined with physical and moral education and should serve as a counter-measure against aggression [Cynarski 2003, p. 170-171]. Modern self-defence is based on scientific grounds: physics, biomechanics, physiology, psychology and education and on a reasonably devised methodology of educating, it draws from the experience and principles of the most effective sorts of Far Eastern types of martial arts and combat sports and most of all, *jūjutsu*. Therefore, in self-defence, apart from physical aspects, such as skill, agility, speed, strength and the technical abilities, also spiritual values, the mind, will and character play a significant part [Kondratowicz 1998].

A combat system (which should not be referred to as *martial arts system*), the term is associated with the new emerging methods oriented at effective self-defence, at modern systems. Most often they lack the ethical and educative aspects, but this is not always the case. The scheme of educating is most frequently based on the combat techniques that are borrowed from various styles, which aim at effective self-defence and the ability to control the behaviour of an opponent during the fight. A combat system is a subsystem of martial arts, but not every combat system is a martial art.

Today, martial arts are cultivated in such a way, that they reject brutal and dark side of the old *bushidō* [Ames 1980]. Today's *budo* is a humanized and humanitarian version of war paths interpreted etymologically as a non-violent way. Their moral aspect and educative function are emphasized. The path of a warrior of the 21st century, as a path of noble search of truth and higher values, is not conditional upon any religious tradition. It can be associated equally with Christianity or Zen Buddhism. All the more so because; it is of universal nature as a message to a widely comprehended perfection and a moral challenge. A universal sense of obligation, caring for reverence and dignity, for personal righteousness and trust to a given word is taught in the ways of *budō* comprehended more as a way of life and an art of living than a way of martial arts [Cynarski 2009, p. 256-257].

There are many theories within the area of prevention and counter-measures against social pathology, especially hooliganism and violence amongst youths, and also many suggested and not very effective ways of handling that problem. Moral ways of *budō* constitute here a unique suggestion for employing the way of thinking, philosophy and psychophysical exercise of Asian origin in our own culture as a counter-measure against violence. The effectiveness of these kinds of methods are confirmed in the publications of researchers from various countries [Richman 1986; Trulson 1986; Kalina 1997; Saldern 1998; Cynarski 2002; Yanar, Gouby 2002]. Ironically, *budō* with the elements of violence is the counter-measure against aggression and violence amongst youths, which is recommended by teachers. Counteracting violence is a common task and a long-term process, to which such a method should be applied so as to be a means of obtaining constant self-control and self-discipline for a lifetime [Cynarski 2006, p. 347].

Many veterans of sports and martial arts emphasize the issues of ethics of self-defence in their publications. Similarly, R.M. Kalina draws attention to the moral development of personality in the course of defence education by cultivating the art of self-defence. [Kalina 1997].

A golden rule for everyone is that teaching the skills of hand-to-hand fight without any consideration for the need of inherent nurturing young people could be the reason for many educational failures, growing aggression and generating social pathology. The system of teaching martial arts is not a tight model for studying and perfecting the so called technology of fighting alone and whoever thinks this way is wrong. Stretched in time, the system of teaching allows a learner to be prepared for different sorts of situations, ensures reality and effectiveness of his or her actions in out-of-sport confrontation, and it ensures teaching the skills of withholding one's aggression and controlling it.

Making negative opinions on martial arts by the people who do not practice this style or method and then making the very same opinion on the general system of educating martial arts is a big misunderstanding. Only a longstanding presence in a given community, "observation by participating", a whole-life training (at least 30-40 years), joining the group of experts gives a person the right to speak of a given martial art. If we decide to criticize, it should concern specific people who misrepresent the system of educating in a given martial art and not the entire community. Only then are such actions directed to specific events, specific individuals, and they would bear the hallmarks of a constructive criticisms in the fight for a common good.

COMMON SENSE AND ACTION AGAINST THE AGGRESSORS – OR ABANDONMENT AND FAILURE

Kalina defines physical aggression as a conscious use of one's body and means that do not belong to their body against particular people with every intention of hurting them or by taking away other people's lives, doing it in either a direct way (e.g. by hitting, drowning, hanging) or an indirect way (e.g. by poisoning the food and water) [Kalina 1997, p. 26-27].

The attack of a single person on a group of people should be considered by the law in the same way as the use of a dangerous weapon. Everyone realizes the danger to which the victim is exposed. Even a layperson that knows very little of hand-to-hand fight is well aware of possible results of such a confrontation. The authors of various publications who strongly emphasize the ethical aspect of an out-of-sport confrontation should form their opinions in such a way so as to bring about a change in the classification of such an assault. This is due to the fact that the knowledge they have allows them to evaluate accurately such a situation in a fight.

We are aware that this is a difficult subject for consideration, however, we suggest applying a golden rule that aggressors should be judged differently from the victims of an attack who are forced to fight and defend their dignity and life. It is often stated in various publications that "a victim of an attack who trains combat sports or martial arts should be judged by the law more strictly than a person who has no such training" [Translated by J. Słopecki]. We do not agree with such interpretation when the victims of an attack are judged as if they were responsible. Such judgements are made by "theoreticians", people who only possess a theoretical knowledge of the subject. There are several reasons that shed a different light on the out-of-sport confrontation.

Firstly, there is a question if an attacked person (a particular champion) caused a direct and intended attack. Secondly, a vast number of young people study or studied hand-to-hand fight unofficially, using a dangerous weapon in combat, testing their effectiveness in an out-of-sport confrontation without any rigour or regulations. Those people are not concerned about any tangible proof of their participation in training (licence, certificate, qualifications), but they are interested in gaining real-life skills in combat. Thirdly, people who practice combat sports or martial arts do not test their effectiveness in an out-of-sport confrontation. What is more, over 60% out of the general number of attacks are group attacks, about 80% of these attacks have a destructive effect on a person, because the attack is underhandedly and

purposefully directed on the head. We do not understand why we are told that it is not advisable to upset the attackers and that it is recommended to lower our hands in the first few moments of a planned attack.

Considering such advice and the reasons enumerated above, even a well-trained martial arts champion who did not undergo a specialist training and did not perfect his skills in a way that is required for an out-of-sport confrontation, does not stand a chance of defending himself successfully.

In an international forum of experts in martial arts, a certain question is frequently asked and it seems worthwhile submitting this question here for consideration of all interested in the effectiveness of teaching that would satisfy the needs of real-life self-defence. What are the chances of an effective defence put up by a common citizen or a martial arts champion against the attack of a group of aggressors?

According to the suggestions of some theoreticians, a victim of an attack “must quickly consider which technique he or she is supposed to use in combat so as to behave in accordance with ethics, then wait for the attack and choose an appropriate type of a self-defence technique” [translated by J. Słopecki] When we answer these questions and suggestions using the words of practitioners and experts of intelligence services, a common citizen can expect a miracle in this case, whereas a martial arts champion who has not learned effective ways of dealing with a fight, has little chances in a group attack.

Can the lives and dignity of the aggressors be placed above the dignity and the life of a victim? It is a great misunderstanding to judge someone morally and legally and condemn him or her simply for effective defence against a group attack. Judgements in such cases should be made by people with practical experience in such situations.

It is not easy to present a set of values characteristic of the culture of the Far West. To put it simple, it is all about the values connected with the tradition of the Western humanist tradition and Christian values [Stepnik 2009, p. 90].

Everyone should be reminded that the culture of the Far West has the same roots and values as Christianity and most often legal and political systems along with certain people form their opinions on the basis of the culture derived from the Decalogue (The Bible). In order to illustrate the intention of doing harm to another person, we will use the quote from the Millennium Bible. In the Covenant Code, Chapter 21, verse 14 reads as follows: “But if a man willfully attacks another to kill him treacherously, from My altar you shall take him that he may die.” [original version contained in annotations by James B. Jordan in 'The Law of the Covenant' 1984: 96]. Is attacking a single person by a group of people not an insidious and purposeful act?

From a logical point of view, we consider the description of such events and behaviour during an out-of-sport confrontation to be general, as it informs us of every case of every sort or of every single attacked person, and how they are to act. Secondly, it does not refer to specific events, facts or people, it concerns our own grasp of events. In cases where this is not stipulated by legal regulations, it can always take a different form depending on the understanding of our own morality in our own way, as a part of the general law.

Let us focus on some publications that criticize certain defensive acts made by the people attacked in an out-of-sport confrontation. The descriptions that they provide and the norms of behaviour requiring the obedience to the will of the legislator towards the law come into conflict with the general norm (most often with religious beliefs), requiring loyalty to one's own beliefs originating from the divine right (God's right), which concerns self-defence, defending one's own dignity, health and life. One could say there is no contradiction between these norms; that the social law, the right of an aggressor, the right of a person defending itself, the divine rights are the laws above the others, and are ultimate good. Obviously, the claims are mutually exclusive in practice. Furthermore it does not have to be

that way that the sovereign of the law contributes to the reduction of aggression and these kinds of attacks. What the sovereign of the law wants will be beneficial for a fair description of the situation into which an attacked person was involved purposefully. After all, an uncritical attitude towards such dangers and trust in the present law system and that a situation will be judged fairly, should be based on the divine right, which says that our right to defend our own dignity and life will be respected by the aggressors and the sovereign of the law. Let us not forget that such an attitude of an uncritical trust in the present law system is often manifested by the aggressors who exploit such a law by presenting their own truth, by trying to justify their insidious attacks and often by putting the blame on the victim.

In each piece of work concerning self-defence and the defence of necessity some fine utterances can be found, e.g.: “each citizen has the right to defend his or her dignity, protect their health and lives and the legal system should defend the victim of an attack” (translated from Słopecki J. et al <<The Reality of Teaching...>> by J. Słopecki”). On the other hand, there is a lack of consistency and of honest presentation of a situation in which a common citizen has no chance of defending his or her dignity and life in a groups attack. It is very easy to indicate the manner of ethical conduct to other people in an out-of-sport confrontation. An important question can be asked if the authors of such remarks when attacked by several people (attacking at once) could be able to use their own advice, meaning “to think and choose proper tactical and technical action that will not harm the aggressors and that will allow them for an effective self-defence” [translated by J. Słopecki], with one reservation, namely that they have no possibility of escaping.

TEACHING REAL SKILLS IN SELF-DEFENCE

Kalina describes the ability of self-defence as a “disposable possibility to act, the strength, intellectual and manipulative ability, knowledge and willingness to consciously counteract physical violence or aggression from anyone” [translated from Kalina 1997, p. 32-33 by J. Słopecki].

The purpose and justification for teaching self-defence is teaching combat techniques that are effective in real-life attacks. Considering the fact that the attackers have the preponderance, or there is a single attacker, yet stronger and armed, the self-defence techniques should always be effective in each situation [Cynarski 2004, p. 226].

Hand-to-hand fight instructors state that self-defence is about settling the conflict with the first combat technique and if it does not work, we go into a fight. Learning how to fight in an out-of-sport confrontation requires versatility in both the knowledge of combat techniques in various distances, positions, tactical abilities to settle the fight in different situations. Modern self-defence/*goshinjutsu* must be effective in all sorts of attacks, therefore, applicable for confrontation with every opponent, also with a representative of different combat sports and martial arts. It has to address not the conventional, but a real-life attack and contain techniques of anticipation and taking over the initiative. Otherwise, learning self-defence is pointless.

Self-defence and hand-to-hand fight skills should include the knowledge of the techniques both possibly gentle and those more brutal. The first ones can be used in the situations requiring passive defence (controlling the distance, dodges, block, disengagement), whereas the other ones in a situation when our life and health or that of a third party is in direct danger (of an attack with the use of a weapon, by strangling, group attack, etc.). Self-defence that is commensurate to the extent of danger allows the attacked to use techniques that are dangerous to the attacker. With reference to the real situations of a group attack and to the imminent threat to our life when the attackers do not follow any rules, and if the self-defence or defensive fight is aimed to save the life of the attacked, then the defensive response (the combat technique) should be even more brutal than the attack and behaviour of the

aggressors. An important element of learning is an appropriate practising of the response to the real attack during the self-defence training. In other words, when the attack is conventional, a hit with a halted fist, taking a wide swipe, signalized hit etc.) such a well-trained technique does not work in the situation of an out-of sport confrontation [Cynarski 2004, p. 226].

How should we understand the teaching of an effective self-defence ? The practitioners of martial arts should be characterized by an empirical approach characterized by the focus put on the role of experience in the context of gaining and working out specific tactical and technical solutions, preferring systems that are open to new experience and solutions and being sceptical about the solutions that have not been tested empirically [Stępnik 2009, p. 234-235]. The best solutions in martial arts come from the observation of the effectiveness of various technical combinations in the reality of an out-of-sport confrontation and it is best to teach the tactical and technical components by creating the conditions as close as possible to the real fight. An apprentice will learn and master specific solutions to such an extent with a view to becoming able to use them in defence against aggression of a single person or a group of people. Realistic skills in self-defence should not comprise a specific and a closed collection of combat techniques, technical combinations. Real skills in self-defence cannot be a closed collection of principles and ideas regulating a training and combat, a lack of dogmas is the reason for openness and effectiveness in combat, most of all in an out-of-sport confrontation. Such an empirical and open concept of martial arts oriented towards reality and effectiveness does not contribute to the loss of the spiritual part of self-defence. The real and effective scheme of teaching self-defence is characterized by openness and acknowledging the concept of combat, the combat techniques and training methods that proved effective and combat techniques that are feasible in a specific tactical and technical situation of an out-of-sport confrontation.

Each martial art considered effective by the contemporary supporters of self-defence is characterized by the use of every sort of task-oriented combats and full fights (sparrings) in the course of teaching tactical and technical solutions. The teaching of combat techniques and their combinations should be performed in motion, dynamically, with the controlled resistance of the opponent and in the conditions as close as possible to the real conditions of an out-of-sport confrontation. To meet the needs of an effective defence against a group attack, tactical and technical solutions should be perfected, created for this sort of an attack that is much more complex than the combinations in a sports confrontation. The effective systems of teaching self-defence have to continuously confront their solutions with practical experience in an out-of-sport confrontation.

The research conducted by Słopecki [2009] shows that *jūjutsu* schools based on the traditional system of self-defence have a certain cognitive component in striving for their goals. Most often we are dealing with the modern approach and the combination of rational and empirical components, which is pointed out in this article [Stępnik 2009, p. 236]. James, the author of *Pragmatism*, points out, that in reality very rarely have we something to do with pure examples of empirical or rational attitudes and more often with attitudes being their combination [James 1998, p. 43-47; 2004, p. 19-20].

In the traditional view of martial arts it is necessary to have a rational attitude towards martial arts, and nothing new concerning the combat techniques alone was developed in the contemporary times. The attitude towards the process of training and teaching has changed along with the principles of the modern training. The process of rationalisation of specific combat techniques has to take place within the minds of the representatives of particular styles or combat methods. Those who claim to have created a new combat technique, are seriously mistaken. Only the ways of teaching combat techniques can be improved. In his book devoted to the subject of the methodology of teaching martial arts, the author

emphasizes many times that teaching combat techniques should be performed in motion, dynamically, in the conditions as close as possible to the real fight [Słopecki 2012, p. 62, 70, 107, 129, 148-152].

The process of rationalisation takes place in various types of martial arts. The progress of rationalization in *krav maga* is convincingly visible in the programme of teaching the elements of ground fighting derived from Brazilian *jiu-jitsu* [compare Levine, Whitman 2007].

The modification of combat techniques should follow the emerging needs. Self-defence is exactly the kind of domain which does not care about pure forms, but about a high utility in application. The goals and ideology are changing along with the ways of training and a technical image of martial arts. The technical side of karate, *jūjutsu*, synthetic systems and self-defence (*goshinjutsu*) is being constantly improved. Training methods are also being modified [Cynarski 2004, s 219].

The experts in the field of hand-to-hand combat, who gained their experience and made their observation during real-life dangers in an out-of-sport confrontations, claim that the most important moments of the attack are the first seconds during which the attackers' acts should be forestalled by the defensive actions of the attacked. Different sorts of fights should be introduced into the trainings in order to master their effectiveness in combat: fighting as a game, free fights, task-oriented fights, fights with selected technical combinations. The fights connected with evaluation of the effectiveness of the undertaken actions are a very important element of preparing an apprentice to an out-of-sport confrontation. 'The aim of such a training is to determine the type and effectiveness of specific actions in combat, which is immensely important to both an apprentice and the trainer, therefore, indirectly influencing the psychological and tactical type of apprentices. This of course, contributes to applying the rules of individualisation during a special training' [translated from Czajkowski 2010, p. 80 by J. Słopecki]. What matters most in gaining real skills in self-defence is identifying what actions should be taken in specific tactical situation, which of them are effective, what are the tactical inclinations of individual apprentices.

As Martin J. Dougherty (2010) claims, today most of the people do not have a chance for a long-period study of various types of martial arts in order to be able to determine which of their elements can be used in a real-life out-of-sport confrontation and which of them cannot, on the basis of their own experience. Determining the effectiveness of learned combat techniques by both the apprentices and the champions in standard conditions is very difficult (in *dōjō*) as the training conditions do not have to be adequate to the conditions of an out-of-sport fight. As a result, most of the martial arts masters do not attempt at verifying their training.

It rarely happens that a given master states in his teachings that a real fighting technique is supposed to respond to the real attack [Cynarski 2009, p. 242]. The effectiveness of given combat techniques to meet the needs of self-defence should be verified in the conditions of an out-of-sport combat. In *dōjō*, similar situations to those of street conditions should be created, rehearsed and modified. In order to be able to defend itself effectively, one needs to comprehend the idea of a threat, instead of relying on various descriptions of events formed by theoreticians or by the media. In the situation of a real-life threat to our life, when we are convinced we are going to be attacked regardless of our behaviour, engaging in a fight becomes recommended and necessary. Quite often our behaviour out in the street is inappropriate, it creates dangerous situations, our attention is drawn to the call or we are listening to music, and we are not perceiving the impending danger.

An insidious attack by surprise is a very difficult situation for people defending themselves, it is difficult to cope with this kind of a situation. It is hard to switch the mind and body to taking an immediate defensive position when we are hurt or surprised. It is necessary to teach the immediate awakening of our aggression in self-defence, just like during the

military training. Such aggression should be controlled and directed, there is no reason for chaotic hits [Dougherty 2010, p. 17-21]. The most important thing is to stay calm so as not to get involved into an escalating confrontation, not to realize the plan of the fight against an opponent and not to let aggressive people anywhere near. The position with the hands spread is a classic example of an opponent's aggression, one should immediately position oneself at a distance to keep him away. Over 80% of injuries resulting from the street violence are the ones occurred as a result of the hit in the head. In that case, the person being attacked does not stand a chance of defending himself or herself, if he or she does not keep the distance away from the attacker and does not take an appropriate defensive position. It is even better if he or she might anticipate what the attacker wants to do and could hit him in an effective way. Most of the attacks in the street take the form of a group attack on a single person and they consist in the right choice of a victim, winning domination by taking the proper positions and threats and finally moving on to hitting the victim when the attackers are confident of succeeding.

In an out-of-sport confrontation we must remember that we are not on the field of a battle and we should obey the rules of the law, which define the principles for using violence against other people.

A good self-defence training allows the apprentices to master the skills of coping with all the possible sorts of danger. It should focus on a given number of combat techniques applicable in many situations, on the universality of fighting techniques, and not on the numerous and complex self-defence techniques. Such a system of teaching self-defence should be characterized by well-developed situational realism, which allows the participants to stimulate stress and fear that is triggered during the attack. The skills necessary in the conditions of a real-life out-of-sport fight are practised in the situations similar to the real ones as much as possible in order that the person attacked might not panic under the influence of stress and might not forget what did he or she learn in the simulated situations of a real fight [Dougherty 2010, p. 25].

Research done by J. Słopecki [2009] shows that all the examined programmes of teaching martial arts *jūjutsu* contain the elements of self-defence. This educational part is well and vastly situated within the system of practical teaching of self-defence. In most of the programs the authors lack the so called 'self-defence technique kit', real and selected combat techniques, not very numerous, universal with highly developed realism, not very complex, and flexible in its operational sense. They should also be adjusted to various possibilities of the apprentice in such a way that the selected components of fighting techniques could be effectively taught to meet the needs of a real self-defence. The selected self-defence techniques should account for the necessary requirements during the technical exam, tested in different ways and performances, next to a set of self-defence techniques. Our observation does not exclude the validity of teaching a wide range of combat techniques. It points out, however, that amongst a large number of combat techniques we know, real and universal solutions have to be selected, adjusted to the possibilities of an apprentice, rehearsed and perfected.

A good way of studying combat techniques should not contain striking blows in the air only, because an apprentice will not learn how to feel the distance and will not be able to use his strength in the form of a hit. He or she will not learn these skills during the training and will not have faith in his or her own strength of hits. He or she has to know how a given hit affects the opponent so as to be confident in the course of a real fight. One's safety cannot be based on some technique that was not performed during the training. In an out-of-sport confrontation simple techniques prove to be useful, whereas complex combinations fail under stress. A good trainer emphasizes simple and infallible combat techniques in self-defence. Effective combat techniques are simple and real to perform, real in every situation. During the

training, there has to be real setting, one cannot win a fight without it. The participants have to be convinced what the purpose of a given technique is, a blow also has to strike an opponent down to cause a temporary inability to continue fighting.

Excessive formalisation, carefully ordered combat techniques, which teach a firm programmed plan of solving situations in a combat, do not teach flexible arrangements of adjusting to the changing conditions during a real fight. Complex teaching schemes for many years give a chance to rebuilt an apprentice's personality, they prepare him or her for various life situations, they improve health, physical stamina, they teach the multitude and the variety of combat techniques. With such a rich and various technical scheme, as is with the martial arts of *jūjutsu*, it would be prudent to select out of these schemes and such techniques that are simple and effective defensive techniques. They should be selected as appropriate for most combat tactical situations and should be characterized by a universal ability to modifications according to the conditions of an out-of-sport combat that are full of stress and fear.

During the teaching of a technical scheme designed to meet the needs of self-defence, a situational awareness should also be developed. This is a very important element of self-defence. We must teach the awareness of the environment and the assessment of the situation. During a training, various arrangements should be discussed (what the opponent looks like, how he behaves, how he positions himself, what he is holding, which combat techniques were used etc.). Then, an apprentice should be asked to describe that image in detail. Combining various situations with a possible scenario of attackers' behaviour allows us to prepare a tactical plan of a fight. The ability to look at the potential threats taking into account the behaviour of the attackers and the necessity to remain aware of the environment, is a learned skill. Despite the fact that we already have a formed plan of defence, we must always be ready for a change of our goals during a confrontation. We must not focus our attention on what we are doing at the moment to such an extent so as not to be aware of what is going on around us. Situational awareness is the key, which includes observation, orientation and a proper decision and action. If, as a result of observation, we notice and assess that there is a potential threat and we know we are going to be attacked, a basic plan of action should be created in our minds. That includes the anticipation of an aggressor's attack and the selection of an effective defence [Dougherty 2010, p. 25].

During a quarrel or aggressor's movements, a distance should be controlled and the opponent should not be allowed to come dangerously close. We should gesticulate and have both hands in front of us so as to keep the distance. Keeping the distance should not put our mind at rest and abandon the fighting plan as long as we are not sure that the danger is over, due to the fact that switching from the offensive position to the defensive one (a dodge, moving out of the attack, making a block or making a technique forestalling the move of the opponent) can be done quickly [Dougherty 2010, p. 25].

In the situation when a person defending himself is not as strong as the attacker, or when there is a group attack, then, there is a chance consisting in the elements of surprise of defensive techniques that are not anticipated by the attackers. Then, the wisest thing to do is using the *atemi* techniques, meaning the hitting in the sensitive points on the body, dynamic and directed hits, throws and groundings. The system of teaching self-defence contains a lot of technical elements of *jūjutsu*. The main component of teaching in this specialization is the knowledge of *jintai kyūshō*, meaning the vital points (e.g. the places with main arteries, plexuses) to which the attacks are directed (*atemi*) or squeezes that are used in order to control the opponent (*osae-waza*) [Kogel 2008].

REFERENCES

1. Ames R. (1980), *Bushido – Mode or Ethic?*, "Traditions", no. 10, pp. 59-79.
2. Corizzi T. (1997), *Classical Jujutsu and Its modern forms*, "Inside Karate", Nov. (no. 11).

3. Cynarski W.J. (2000), *Martial Arts budo in Western Culture*, Wydawnictwo Wyższej Szkoły Pedagogicznej, Rzeszów [in Polish].
4. Cynarski W.J. (2002), *Uprawianie dalekowschodnich sztuk walki jako forma przeciwdziałania społecznym patologiom* [in:] E. Moczuk [ed.], *Czy patologie społeczne...*, Rzeszów University Press, Rzeszów, pp. 207-212.
5. Cynarski W.J. (2004), *Teoria i praktyka dalekowschodnich sztuk walki w perspektywie europejskiej*, Rzeszów University Press, Rzeszów.
6. Cynarski W.J. (2009), *Martial Arts – Idō & Idōkan*, IPA, Rzeszów.
7. Cynarski W.J., Buchhold M. (2006), *Complete budō systems*, "Ido – Ruch dla Kultury / Movement for Culture", vol. 6, pp. 83-91.
8. Cynarski W.J., Obodyński K. [eds.] (2003), *Humanistic Theory of Martial Arts and Combat Sports: Conceptions and Problems*, Rzeszów University Press, Rzeszów.
9. Cynarski W.J., Sieber L. (2006), *Fighter of cheerfulness*, "Ido – Ruch dla Kultury / Movement for Culture", vol. 6, pp. 345-348.
10. Czajkowski Z. (2010), *Various Kinds of Training Bouts and their Importance in Fencing*, "Ido - Ruch dla Kultury / Movement for Culture", vol. 10, pp. 78-84.
11. Dougherty M.J. (2010), *Sztuka Samoobrony. Na podstawie Technik Walki Wręcz Stosowanych przez Żołnierzy Elitarnych Sił Specjalnych*, Mak Verlag, Bremen.
12. Draeger D.F. (1973), *Martial Arts and Ways of Japan. Vol. 3*, New York.
13. Echanis M.D. (1997), *Techniki specjalne w walce wręcz. Samoobrona przed nożem*, Ohara Publ., Santa Clarita, CA.
14. Harasymowicz J., Kalina R.M. (2007), *Godziwa Samoobrona*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe Novum, Płock.
15. *Inny Słownik Języka Polskiego*, PWN, Warszawa 2000.
16. James W. (1998), *Pragmatyzm* (trans. M. Szczubiałka), KR, Warsaw.
17. James W. (2004), *Z wybranych problemów filozofii* (trans. M. Filipczuk), Zielona Sowa, Kraków.
18. Kalina R.M. (1997), *Sporty walki i trening samoobrony w edukacji obronnej młodzieży*, PTNKF, Warszawa.
19. Kalina R.M. (2000), *Theory of Combat Sports*, COS, Warsaw [in Polish].
20. Kogel H. (2008), „*Bubishi*” – *the secret records of Okinawa*, "Ido – Ruch dla Kultury / Movement for Culture", vol. 8, pp. 104-117.
21. Kondratowicz K. (1998), [in:] Kaczmarek A., Kuświak M., Zasiadły S., Zimoch Z., *Samoobrona; Podstawy obronnej walki wręcz dla potrzeb służby więziennej*, Kalisz, pp. 5-6.
22. Kuśnierz C. (2011), *Metodyka nauczania podstawowych technik samoobrony*, OW, Opole [in Polish].
23. Levine D., Whitman J. (2007), *Krav maga* (trans. M. Filipczuk), Zielona Sowa, Kraków.
24. Mol S. (2001), *Classical Fighting Arts of Japan; A Complete Guide to Koryū Jūjutsu*, Kodansha International.
25. *Pismo Święte Starego i Nowego Testamentu, Biblia Tysiąclecia*, wydanie trzecie poprawione, Ks. Dynarski K. [ed.], Wydawnictwo Pallotinum, Poznań – Warszawa 1980.
26. Raczkowski K. (2008), *Sztuka walki i samoobrony w aspekcie historycznym, prawnym, psychologicznym*, Delfin, Warszawa.
27. Richman Ch.L. (1986), *The development of self-esteem through the martial arts*, "International Journal of Sports Psychology", vol. 17.
28. Saldern M. von [red.] (1998), *Budō w dzisiejszych czasach*, Verlag der Universität Lüneburg, Lüneburg [in German].
29. Słopecki J. (2006), *The modern self-defence system ATK*, "Ido – Ruch dla Kultury / Movement for Culture", vol. 6, pp. 104-107.

30. Słopecki J. (2009), *Ocena programów edukacyjnych w Polsce*, praca doktorska, AWF Warszawa.
31. Słopecki J. (2012), *Wprowadzenie do Teorii i Metodyki nauczania sztuk walki, na podstawie systemów jūjutsu*, Międzynarodowa Federacja Modern Ju-Jitsu, Głogów.
32. Słopecki J. (2013), *The of Advancing Development of the Modern ACS System*, "Ido Movement for Culture. Journal of Martial Art Anthropology", vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 85-91.
33. Stępnik A. (2009), *Martial Arts – Purposes, Methods, Attitudes*, "Ido – Ruch dla Kultury / Movement for Culture", vol. 9, pp. 231-239.
34. Trulson M.E. (1986), *Martial Arts Training: A novel "Cure" for Juvenile Delinquency*, "Human Relations", vol. 12 (39), pp. 1131-1140.
35. Yanar O., Gouby A. (2002), *Judo jako terapia i środek prewencji przeciwko przemocy. Opcja programu sportowego* [in:] G.A. Pilz, H. Bömer [eds.], *Dostrzeganie-ruchu–zmiany. Wkład do teorii i praktyki sportu ciała oraz powiązań ruchu społecznego z pracą*, Hannover, pp. 291-314 [in German].