

PHILOSOPHY

IRENA MARTINKOVA^{1(AEFG)}, JIM PARRY^{1(AEFG)}

Faculty of Physical Education and Sport, Charles University in Prague (Czech Republic)

Department of Kinanthropology and Humanities

Faculty of Physical Education and Sport, Charles University in Prague (Czech Republic)

Address for correspondence: martinkova@ftvs.cuni.cz

The paradox of martial arts – safe combat

Submission: 11.01.2016; acceptance: 15.04.2016

Key words: safe combat, dangerous combat, martial arts, close combat, ethics

Abstract

Background. Martial arts are safe educational activities popular in the Western world. Being called ‘martial’, they are associated with combat, and many people start practising martial arts because they want to learn to fight or to defend themselves.

Aims. Since martial arts are supposed to be safe educational activities, and yet combat itself is a dangerous kind of activity, it is necessary to explore the nature of the kind of combat that is taught within martial arts. This paper presents the reasons and strategies for the revision of dangerous real-life combat into safer and educational martial activities (such as, for example, martial arts), and it discusses the problems associated with safe combat.

Methods. Philosophical method of logical argumentation.

Results. For the creation of safe educational activities out of real-life dangerous combat, various strategies must be used. We shall call this process of making combat safe ‘safetification’, which can be brought about by the following strategies: defining the means and ends of martial arts; the introduction of rules; and the introduction of Codes of Conduct.

Conclusion. Safe combat fundamentally differs from real-life combat, and without an understanding of this difference, safe combat can become a danger to self, if used in real life-threatening situations. So, it is important to explore and expose the distinction between martial arts as safe educational activities and the nature of combat, so that potential martial arts participants can make realistic choices about what they are learning.

Introduction

Nowadays, in the Western world, we live in a relatively safe civil society, in which fighting is limited to a minimum and legitimate combat activities are mainly restricted to only certain designated citizens – those who are employed as soldiers, police officers, SWAT teams, etc. Apart from these occupations, citizens can usually live their whole lives without virtually any combat skills. Of course, anyone can happen to be accidentally involved in a street fighter to become a victim of an individual attack, but this is the exception rather than the rule, especially if one avoids potentially dangerous circumstances and surroundings.

This is only recently true, though. Even in the 19th century, a ‘gentleman’ would not be fully equipped to be at ease in society without some combat skills, including the use of weapons, for self-defence. This does not mean, however, that in ‘safetified’ civil societies there is

now no place for combat, and that it should disappear as an option for ordinary citizens. It is still possible, and often seen as desirable, for people to learn to engage in fighting, although in many cases the activity has been institutionalized and changed into a more civilised and educational kind of activity that is in line with modern Western values [Cynarski 2006; Cynarski, Litwiniuk 2011]. However, in order to perform such an ‘educational’ purpose, real-life dangerous combat must be modified to become safer, because we do not want our children or indeed ourselves to risk our lives in free-time educational activities that are supposed to be educational and safe [e.g. Russell 2007].

During the 20th century, many activities involving safe combat have been created that have been inspired by real-life combat and that are of an educational character – e.g. martial arts, martial paths, martial sports, etc. [Martinkova, Vagner 2010; Martinkova, Parry forthcoming]. This paper examines safe combat within one

kind of such safe educational martial activities – martial arts.¹ It draws on the differentiation of martial activities according to their purpose (and thus distinguishes between such martial activities as: close combat, warrior arts, martial arts, martial paths, martial sports, martial training, martial performances, etc.) [Martinkova, Parry forthcoming]. This categorization of martial arts points to a very important delineation within martial activities – it shows an important difference between the activities consisting of real-life dangerous combat situations (close combat and warrior arts) and those that offer a safer, educational, form of combat (e.g. martial arts, martial paths, martial sports, etc.). Since the ends of these two different modes of combat fundamentally differ, the actual combat then also differs, and the two should not be confused.

The main problem in contemporary Western society concerning martial arts is that this difference between dangerous real-life combat and safe combat is not highlighted and properly understood. This is one reason why participants (especially beginners) claim self-defence as one of the important reasons for practising martial arts [e.g. Twemlow, Lerma, Twemlow 1996; Cynarski *et al.* 2009; Ko, Kim, Valacich 2011]. However, it is important to emphasize that self-defence, being a form of real-life combat (since its purpose is to react adequately to real-life dangerous situations), belongs to the category of dangerous combat, rather than being an educative and safe martial art. This is just one example of an existing confusion within the area of martial activities, which this article wishes to clarify.

This is not to say that martial arts do not help participants to learn some combat skills. Obviously, a martial arts participant will probably eventually develop a better understanding and better combat skills than a person who has never practiced any martial activity. However, acquiring one or another kind of the existing martial arts is not a way towards effective combat, but rather mediates many other values while the participants learn a modified (and therefore not fully effective) kind of combat.

Difference between close combat/warrior arts and martial arts

The term ‘close combat’ demarcates the most basic function of combat, which serves our pragmatic needs. The purpose of close combat is to defeat opponents or defend oneself from them [Martinkova, Vagner 2010]. A more civilised form of close combat may be called ‘warrior arts’, which introduces a certain set of criteria for combat

(a certain style, ethos, etc.), which has nevertheless the same purpose [Martinkova, Parry forthcoming]. Both of these forms of combat are efficient, flexible, dangerous, and capable of bringing about a lethal outcome.

For various historical, social and technological reasons, these lethal forms of combat have changed into safer ones. Fencing, for example, is rarely carried out these days as a form of close combat, since the invention of the hand-gun – but it still survives as a martial art and a martial sport. There are also various practical reasons, for example, the necessity for soldiers to practice combat without lethal outcomes, before they enter into real-life dangerous situations, which might well have lethal consequences. The social reasons for change can be seen not only in the introduction of more efficient means of fighting (tanks, fighting air planes, nuclear weapons, guns, etc.) but also in the gradual formation of safer civil societies (in which death as an outcome of fighting is justified only in self-defence or war).

For the creation of martial arts, it is especially the social reasons that are relevant. This change happened at the end of 19th and during the 20th century – the close combat skills that were widely taught to citizens, who routinely carried defensive weapons, gradually became less necessary. At the same time, however, combat was still recognized as valuable, especially for various values it offered, that arise through personal development through the process of training and the acquisition of martial techniques. So combat found its place in both formal and informal education [Mor-Stabilini 2013; Cynarski, Lee-Barron 2014]. Currently, in present Western society, we can recognize many different kinds of safe educational combat suitable for civilians – martial arts, martial paths, martial sports, martial training, martial therapy, martial display, martial games, martial dance, etc. [Martinkova, Parry forthcoming]. Because these different forms of safe combat vary, this paper will focus only on one – martial arts.

Martial arts are educational activities practised for the purpose of self-development as well as for the improvement in fighting through the acquisition of martial techniques, whilst emphasising many humanistic values and moral principles [Cynarski 2014; Martinkova, Parry forthcoming]. Martial arts are supposed to enhance our quality of life, rather than ensuring the development of effective combat skills, and they are supposed to be more or less safe, since they are educational activities. As Donohue [2005: 10] suggests: “‘martial arts’ are rather ‘martially inspired arts’ with little or no realistic combat utility in the modern world.”

This is visible from the example of kendo and its ideological basis: “The concept of Kendo is to discipline the human character through the application of the principles of the Katana (sword)” [All Japan Kendo Federation 1998-2015]. And so:

¹ Mixed Martial Arts (MMA) are not included in this group, since they have a different character and purpose than martial arts and therefore cannot be counted among them – given their rules, they are borderline between martial arts, martial sports and close combat.

“The purpose of practising Kendo is:
 To mold the mind and body,
 To cultivate a vigorous spirit,
 And through correct and rigid training,
 To strive for improvement in the art of Kendo,
 To hold in esteem human courtesy and honour,
 To associate with others with sincerity,
 And to forever pursue the cultivation of oneself.
 This will make one be able:
 To love his/her country and society,
 To contribute to the development of culture
 And to promote peace and prosperity among all peoples.”
 [All Japan Kendo Federation 1998-2015]

This expression of the concept and purpose of kendo includes no aim to develop good, brave and effective fighters, able to defend themselves and their country. Rather, the purpose is, above all, to cultivate the self.

Since martial arts are not designed to be effective in real martial encounters, they are not tested in real combat situations, and so their form tends to stagnate and can become rigid and fossilised. Also, unlike in close combat, in which people usually learn more than one system, martial arts are codified systems, with an emphasis on mastering one system. This limits the practical possibilities for practitioners, making them less flexible and less ready for any dangerous unexpected real-life combat situations that might occur. Also, within education, martial techniques must be practiced without lethal consequences, i.e. in a safetified mode, which has an impact on the techniques permitted and employed.

The safetification of martial arts

For the creation of safe educational activities out of real-life dangerous combat, various strategies must be used. We shall call this process of making combat within martial arts activities safe ‘safetification’. The safetification of dangerous combat in close combat and warrior arts so that they can become educational martial arts can be brought about by the following strategies²:

- Defining the means and ends of martial arts
- Introduction of rules
- Introduction of Codes of Conduct.

Defining the means and ends of martial arts

The ends of an activity determine the character of the activity itself, and prescribe and/or proscribe legitimate means. Let us distinguish between the ends and means

of close combat and warrior arts on the one hand, and the ends of martial arts on the other.

The main purpose of close combat is to defeat opponents or defend oneself from them under the given circumstances, which may vary. The means should be as flexible as possible; the only constraints are presented by the legal system of the given society and also the general approach to human beings (ethos). In close combat, the activity is instrumental to some external end, i.e. to defeat or disable someone, not for the sake of killing or harming, but because of some higher end (e.g. preservation of one’s life from an attack in the street, or in the military context).

So, close combat is an efficient and flexible way of fighting, and as such it is inherently dangerous, sometimes intending (and resulting in) serious injury or death. Warrior arts techniques may be slightly restricted by style, but when one’s life is in question, the warrior usually quickly changes into close combat. The only rule in lethal fights is to be as efficient as possible – this is nicely described by Anglo [2000: 35] when talking about medieval knights: “The only rule that mattered was self-preservation. A man had to be ready to kill his adversary as quickly as possible.”

In contrast to close combat, martial arts are educational activities that enable humans to improve themselves. The end of the activity is to overcome the opponent in a direct fight, but not in such a way as to kill, harm or disable him, but rather to give him the opportunity to learn and strive to improve. Martial arts necessarily require this ‘con-testing’ (testing oneself against others – even if there is not an official contest, one needs an opponent) and therefore it would not make sense to kill or disable one’s opponents, since there would soon be no participants to combat with.

This end determines the means and thus also the overall character of martial arts in a fundamental way. To allow others to survive means making combat safe. In order for combat to be safe, combat has to become less efficient. In direct body combat in martial arts, to fight means that one might get hurt, but it should never aim to bring about harm (see the hurt/harm distinction in Parry [1998]).

The change from the aim of the pragmatic kind of combat to the educational one brings about a necessary overall change of attitude of the participants and their understanding of the ethos of the community and its values. In this context, the opponent is not an enemy (i.e. somebody who has to be defeated or even killed, because he or she is in the way of some other, more important cause), but is a friend or an acquaintance who has the same purpose as oneself – to improve himself or herself and grow into a better human being through the same kind of activity, be it karate, judo or aikido. This is a positive relationship (just as in sport – see Hyland [1988]), which is the basis of mutual respect.

² These strategies are not restricted to martial arts only, but can be used for the creation of other safe martial activities too, e.g. martial sports.

In martial arts, the lessons constitute the activity and embody its end, and therefore they focus on the present and on the intrinsic values of the activity, even though these values may spread into the life of the participant and enrich it, possibly also in non-martial ways (e.g. constant awareness of the environment in daily life). Only within such an ‘intrinsic’ understanding can we talk about martial arts and respect for the rules within them. All the rules that are discussed in the next part of the paper make sense only within an environment that respects them and wilfully obeys their intrinsic values.

In contrast, in self-defence class, or in the training of soldiers, one trains for the possibly dangerous activity which arises outside of the classes – and so the practice is essentially a practice for a future possibility, and therefore future-looking, extrinsic and instrumental.

This presupposes a proper understanding of the ends and means and the overall character of the activity (and one’s intention in pursuing them). If a martial artist starts to perform close combat (i.e. if he practices a different kind of activity), it becomes dangerous for his opponents and it is likely the community will try to influence him to change this behaviour, and if this is not possible, to expel him. (A martial arts club is not a ‘Fight Club’³.)

Introduction of rules

The fact that some close combat forms were transformed into martial arts changed what were routine and customary practices into educational and/or free-time activities, performed only at a designed places and at set times. So, whereas a citizen in modern civil society might not be under threat of attack at anytime, he may nevertheless choose to attend martial arts classes, where he consents to being attacked under agreed conditions on a given occasion, given by the rules and the ethos. As such, they are restrictive systems of permitted techniques.

Since martial arts are artificial combat, they need constitutive rules to ensure their existence. The constitutive rules are the rules that define the activity – its objective and the means to achieve it. For overcoming an opponent, only permitted techniques in pre-defined circumstances can be used. So the rules transform the simplicity and flexibility of efficient fighting into a complex and stable (and therefore more or less inefficient) activity. And so, rather than learning to use the most efficient technique for the given circumstances to defeat an opponent, a martial artist learns to be effective only in a given restricted system under specific circumstances.

Further, regulative rules regulate the activity that has been set up by the constitutive rules and the regulative

rules can be seen as supporting the constitutive ones.⁴ Rules are to be obeyed by the participants, and this is reinforced by the martial arts community, but especially by masters (teachers), referees, judges, etc. Organization rules regulate how the activity will be accessible to the public, including the organization of contests.

In martial arts, the most important function of the constitutive rules is to ensure the restriction of the flexibility of close combat. So, the environment in which martial arts takes place (e.g. gymnasium) is restricted – the practitioners can fight only in a restricted area and it is designed to be safe, with a stable and homogeneous surface on which the contestants move without any potentially dangerous objects surrounding them. For contests in the open air a safe environment is also sought. Practice sessions and contests are also restricted by time, but even within the given span of time, the safety of the participants is of supreme importance. For example, a contest can be terminated before the end of the given time, if one fighter defeats the other, or if one of the fighters sustains a severe injury, or is certain to lose [Martinkova 2014].

The target to be hit and the techniques that can be used are also restricted. There are designated areas of the body where the blows or hits may (or may not) be placed. And so, if a participant does not expect blows to his head, he does not have to be aware of this body part, nor does he have to learn techniques for its protection. However, this could be dangerous in real-life combat, which is more unpredictable and in which any body part can be targeted.

Furthermore, there are technical restrictions: the rules ensure that fighters do not inflict serious injuries or lethal blows on each other – they can hurt, but not harm the opponent (see above). Only selected techniques can be used to hit the target, while certain very dangerous ones are prohibited (e.g. the rabbit punch in boxing) or safetified (e.g. stopping one’s blows at a safe distance) – and so the martial artist learns to react to certain techniques rather than being open to the use of any technique at all. However, if a martial art wants to retain certain of its dangerous techniques, then it has to limit them to the practising arena, and prohibit official contests that would allow them – such as is done, for example, in aikido [see: Alexander 2014].

The rules also restrict the effectiveness of weapons and proscribe or prescribe what equipment can be used. For example, only rebated weapons are used (e.g. the introduction of flexible materials for fencing, removal of sharp edges, etc.). Also, the participants are not allowed to wear chains and pendants, while they are allowed to wear only specific types of clothing.

Martial arts are theoretically accessible for everyone. However, not everyone can take part in an actual competition – only equal competitors are permitted to

³ As per the movie ‘Fight Club’ [1999], based on the novel by Palahniuk [2005], in which a club is depicted, dedicated to extreme violence and unregulated fighting.

⁴ This is how rules are generally described in sport [Gleaves 2014], but this description can be used in martial arts as well.

fight against each other, e.g. this can mean the introduction of weight categories to make sure that equally sized fighters fight against each other and that the fight is more or less equal. Initiation, preparation and ranking requirements may also be in force, to ensure that participants are qualified and of an adequate standard (e.g. belt gradings). Sometimes, medical approval or a health declaration prior to a contest may be required, to certify that the participant is eligible to fight.

Introduction of Codes of Conduct

The origin of martial arts in lethal martial activities is one reason why martial arts tend to exhibit higher respect amongst participants than some other educational and free-time movement activities (e.g. sports). Since the activity is antagonistic, demanding (in most cases) direct body contact, with the effort to overcome the opponent by using selected modified martial techniques, it can easily become dangerous. So, special awareness and responsibility is expected and required. Thus, in martial arts, high moral standards are of great importance.

The high moral standards that are expected within the martial arts community are often explicitly formulated through Codes of Conduct that regulate the conduct of participants, directing them and motivating them to fight in a moral (and safe) way. Sometimes, Codes of Conduct bring sanctions if they are not followed.

This is not to say that there are not moral problems in martial arts [e.g. see: Lawlor 2015], but rather that they need to be attended to regularly, whilst reinforcing good practice, so that the activity maintains its educative character and does not turn into close combat.

Suggested solutions to the problem of safe combat in martial arts

It is important to emphasize that the change of pragmatically oriented and dangerous real-life fighting into these safer forms brings about a change in the combat itself – combat here is supposed to be more educative, based on voluntary participation, and much safer. And so it is not a surprise that a study on injuries in martial arts training [Zetaruk, Violan, Zurakowski, Micheli 2005: 32] “... suggests that martial arts training in general appears to be a relatively safe form of physical activity for youths.” And while there occur more injuries in tournaments, there is usually a set of recommendations for their prevention (e.g. by using protective gear and/or by limiting contact [Jaffe, Minkoff 1988; Pieter 2005]). Of course, this does not mean that a participant cannot become injured. Because of the direct interaction of opponents, injuries can happen, even in safe martial arts. However, within martial arts, an injury is not the purpose of the activity

(as it often is in close combat) but rather an accident.

However, given this change, participants end up doing something else than engaging in real-life dangerous combat. Take the example of kendo, as described by Donohue [2005: 10]: “Although popularly understood as the art of Japanese fencing, kendo is not the same art that was practiced by the feudal swordsmen of Japan, the *bushi* or *samurai*. It is a modern system which developed out of the arts of these feudal warriors, but it is very different. Kendo has rules, combat does not. The restriction of kendo blows to eight areas has made a noticeable change in *kendo bogu* (armour) when compared to the war armour of the samurai. The *shinai*, the bamboo foil utilized in kendo, is used differently from a real sword, is shaped and balanced differently from the *katana*, and is (a most important consideration) not a lethal weapon. Kendo’s stance and movements have been conditioned by the fact that *kendoka* (kendo practitioners) typically train indoors on a hardwood floor. Feudal warriors fought on battlefields.”

Changing the lethal form of close combat or warrior arts into the safer form of martial arts brings with it serious consequences. Firstly, and most importantly, safe combat is different from real-life combat – actually, it is in contradiction to what real-life combat fundamentally is – efficient and dangerous. However, in martial arts we still talk about ‘combat’ and ‘fighting’, which can be confusing, such that participants may not easily recognize the (at least partial) inefficiency and inflexibility of martial arts. The word ‘martial’ in martial arts does not help to highlight this distinction, either.

So, the a problem for martial arts is the possible failure to *distinguish* it from dangerous and *fully* efficient close combat, i.e. misunderstanding the means and ends of martial arts (as educational and as self-developmental) and misunderstanding the (at least partial) inefficiency of martial arts skills and techniques for combat purposes. That is not to say that safe combat might not contribute to combat at all but, since it is limited, it is not as efficient as it might be, which might prove fatal in a fight against somebody who is trained in close combat, or whose fighting is not restricted by any means.

So, for example, martial arts are fundamentally different from self-defence. In self-defence classes, participants learn to defend themselves in practice-situations that mimic real-life situations that can occur in the streets, and to be able to fight with whatever object is to hand. In martial arts, rather, participants learn to acquire a pre-given modified ‘martial’ system. As a result, self-defence lessons are quite different from martial arts classes.

There are at least two ways of addressing this problem:

1st option- Partially Dangerous Combat

We could emphasize that close combat, being the most basic kind of combat, is the basis of all the safer kinds of combat, and that some level of danger must remain. So, any change of rules must be done with caution, so that martial arts keep a certain level of danger,

in order that the martial aspect is retained, whilst not presenting too much risk and danger to participants.

Participants (and coaches and parents, etc.) should then be aware of two things:

i. that, in partially dangerous combat, they are consenting to the possibility of a certain degree of risk and danger. [See also: Martinkova 2014]

ii. still, participants should realise that this kind of combat is not fully combat-efficient.

For this purpose, certain strategies may be employed to retain the similarity to real-life combat, such as, for example, a certain re-traditionalization, so that some important values that have been lost can be redressed. For example, there could be an effort to connect the martial arts to their source - e.g. to the experience of real-life fighting in warrior arts. And so, for example, the *kata* might be seen as not just a movement, but a "... non-lethal re-enactment of battlefield experience" [see: Donohue 2005: 15]. This re-enactment of battlefield experience could be expressed in martial arts, for example, as an effort to be constantly aware of dangerous surroundings, especially after a successfully completed sequence of movements, such as is done in kendo [see: Oda, Kondo 2014: 8-9].

However, this may cause more confusion between close combat and martial arts. After all, if one wants to engage with real-life combat (i.e. to be able to defend oneself), it is more advisable to learn a system that teaches it (e.g. self-defence), and leave martial arts to those who want to engage in safe combat and self-improvement. And so the second option is more clear-cut:

2nd option - Martially Inspired Arts

Different martial arts systems have different levels of efficiency for real-life defensive use. The second option is to diminish the dangerousness of all martial arts to the level of any other contact activity (e.g. contact sports such as football or rugby). In this case, however, to avoid confusion, it would be necessary to modify the term 'martial' in martial arts, and refer to these activities in a way that describes their character more appropriately, e.g. as 'martially inspired arts' [see Donohue 2005]. Despite its clumsy expression in English, it gives a much more accurate representation of what 'martial arts' are really about. An appropriate label would then help to mediate a more appropriate understanding of these activities.

For 'martially inspired arts', we might suggest a new acronym: MIA.

Conclusion

We tried to show that it is important to distinguish dangerous-and-efficient fighting from safe-and-inefficient fighting, so that practitioners can easily understand what kind of activity they are engaging with, and can have realistic expectations about the effectiveness of it. The whole martial arts community should be clear about this, so that

if a participant finds himself in a really dangerous situation, he or she should remember that the opponent(s) will not necessarily adhere to the rules of some martial art, and that in a dangerous situation their approach should change from the one within martial arts. Then participants in various kinds of activities will not be confused, so that there will be fewer disappointed martial arts beginners (who were expecting to learn fighting skills, not the disciplines of the art), and fewer risks in real-life fighting (for those who think that their martial arts skills are appropriate for street-fighting).

Acknowledgement

This paper was written with the institutional support PRVOUK P39.

References

1. Alexander D. (2014), *Aikido and competition*. Available at: <http://www.dragon-tsunami.org/Dtimes/Pages/articlei.htm>
2. All Japan Kendo Federation (1998-2015), *The Concept of Kendo*. Available at: <http://www.kendo-fik.org/english-page/english-page2/concept-of-Kendo.htm>
3. Anglo S. (2000), *The Martial Arts of Renaissance Europe*, Yale University Press.
4. Cynarski W.J. (2006), *The institutionalization of martial arts*, "European Journal for Sport and Society", vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 55-61.
5. Cynarski W.J. (2014), *Moral values, and the people of the noble way of martial arts*, "Ido Movement for Culture. Journal of Martial Arts Anthropology", vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 1-10.
6. Cynarski W.J., Lee-Barron J. (2014), *Philosophies of martial arts and their pedagogical consequences*, "Ido Movement for Culture. Journal of Martial Arts Anthropology", vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 11-19.
7. Cynarski W.J., Litwiniuk A. (2011), *Exemplification of the institutionalization process of martial arts: the new development*, "Journal of Combat Sports and Martial Arts", vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 49-52.
8. Cynarski J., Sieber L., Obodyski K., Duricek M., Krol O., Rzepko M. (2009), *Factors of development of far eastern martial arts in Central Europe*, "Journal of Human Kinetics", vol. 22, pp. 69-76.
9. Donohue J.J. (2005), *Modern Educational Theories and Traditional Japanese Martial Arts Training Methods*, "Journal of Asian Martial Arts", vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 8-29.
10. Gleaves J. (2014), *Rules* [in:] C.R. Torres [ed.], *The Bloomsbury Companion to the Philosophy of Sport*, Bloomsbury, London, pp. 368-369.
11. Hyland D.A. (1988), *Competition and Friendship* [in:] W. Morgan, K. Meier [eds.], *Philosophic inquiry in sport*, Human Kinetics, Champaign, Ill., pp. 231-239.
12. Jaffe L., Minkoff J. (1988), *Martial arts: a perspective on*

their evolution, injuries, and training formats, “Orthopaedic review”, vol. 17, pp. 208–21.

13. Ko J., Kim K., Valacich J. (2011), *Martial arts participation: consumer motivation*, “International Journal of Sports Marketing and Sponsorship”, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 105–123.
14. Lawlor R. (2015), *Belt whippings in Brazilian Jiu Jitsu*, “Acta Universitatis Carolinae – Kinanthropologica”, vol. 51, no. 1, pp. 5–14.
15. Martinkova I. (2014), *The Problem of Safety in Martial Arts and Martial Sports* [in:] L. Flemr, J. Nemec, K. Kudlackova [eds.], *Physical Activity in Science and Practice*, Karolinum Press, Prague, pp. 11–19.
16. Martinkova I., Parry J. (forthcoming), *Martial Arts Categories – Clarification and classification*, “Journal of the Philosophy of Sport”, doi:10.1080/00948705.2015.1038829.
17. Martinkova I., Vagner M. (2010), *Terminologické vymezení bojových aktivit v oblasti kinantropologie*, “Česká kinantropologie”, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 29–38.
18. Mor-Stabilini S. (2013), *The Essence of Karate-do: Sankido Example*, “Ido Movement for Culture. Journal of Martial Arts Anthropology”, vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 45–48.
19. Oda Y., Kondo Y. (2014), *The Concept of Yuko-Datotsu in Kendo: Interpreted from the Aesthetics of Zanshin*, “Sport, Ethics and Philosophy”, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 3–15.
20. Palahniuk C. (2005), *Fight Club*, New York, WW Norton.
21. Parry J. (1998), *Aggression and Violence in Sport* [in:] M. McNamee, J. Parry [eds.], *Ethics and Sport*, London, Routledge, pp. 205–224.
22. Pieter W. (2005), *Martial Arts Injuries* [in:] D.J. Caine, N. Maffulli [eds.], *Epidemiology of Pediatric Sports Injuries. Individual Sports*, Basel, Karger, pp. 59–73.
23. Russell J.S. (2007), *Children and Dangerous Sport and Recreation*, “Journal of the Philosophy of Sport”, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 176–193.
24. Twemlow S.W., Lerma B.H., Twemlow S.W. (1996), *An Analysis of Students’ Reasons For Studying Martial Arts*, “Perceptual and Motor Skills”, vol. 83, pp. 99–103.
25. Zetaruk M.N., Violan M.A., Zurakowski D., Micheli L.J. (2005), *Injuries in martial arts: a comparison of five styles*, “British Journal of Sports Medicine”, vol. 39, pp. 29–33.

Paradoks sztuk walki - walki bezpieczne

Słowa kluczowe: bezpieczna walka, niebezpieczna walka, sztuki walki, walka wręcz, etyka

Abstrakt

Tłó. Sztuki walki są bezpiecznym rodzajem aktywności edukacyjnej popularnej w świecie zachodnim. Ich nazwa jest kojarzona z walką, a wiele osób zaczyna uprawianie sztuk walki, ponieważ chce nauczyć się walczyć i bronić. Głównym problemem we współczesnym społeczeństwie zachodnim dotyczącym sztuk walki jest to, że różnica między niebezpieczną walką w realnym świecie i bezpieczną walką nie jest dostatecznie pokreślona i właściwie zrozumiana.

Cele. Jako, że sztuki walki mają być bezpiecznymi zajęciami edukacyjnymi, ale sama walka jest niebezpiecznym rodzajem aktywności, należy zbadać charakter tego rodzaju walki, która jest nauczana w obrębie sztuk walki. W pracy przedstawiono przyczyny i strategię służące zrewidowaniu niebezpiecznej walki w prawdziwym życiu oraz odniesieniu jej do bezpiecznych i edukacyjnych działań w obrębie sztuk walki; omówiono też problemy związane z bezpieczną walką.

Metody. Filozoficzna metoda logicznej argumentacji.

Wyniki. Dla stworzenia bezpiecznych zajęć edukacyjnych w obrębie niebezpiecznych sytuacji w czasie rzeczywistej walki, należy stosować różne strategię. Proces ten został nazwany przez autorów „safetification” (działanie na rzecz bezpieczeństwa), gdy niebezpieczne sytuacje w walce kontaktowej i sztukach walki mogą nabywać walorów edukacyjnych poprzez wprowadzenie następujących strategii: definiowanie środków i celów sztuk walki; wprowadzenie zasad i kodeksów postępowania. Zmiana orientacji pragmatycznych i niebezpiecznej walki w rzeczywistości w walkę bezpieczną, wprowadza zmiany w samej walce i, biorąc pod uwagę tę zmianę, jej uczestnicy nie angażują się w niebezpieczną walkę w prawdziwym życiu.

Wniosek. Bezpieczne walki fundamentalnie różnią się od walki w rzeczywistym życiu, a bez zrozumienia tej różnicy, bezpieczna walka może stać się zagrożeniem, jeżeli jest stosowana w rzeczywistych sytuacjach zagrażających życiu. Dlatego ważne jest, aby zbadać i podkreślić różnicę pomiędzy sztukami walki, jako bezpiecznymi zajęć edukacyjnymi oraz rodzajem walki tak, aby potencjalni uczestnicy sztuki walki mogli podejmować realistyczne decyzje dotyczące swojej nauki.