

HISTORY

NIKOLA MIJATOV^{1(ABDEF)}, SANDRA S. RADENOVIC^{(BDEF)2}

1 ORCID: 0000-0002-6499-4484

Institute for Contemporary History, Belgrade (Serbia)

2 ORCID: 0000-0002-0979-421X

University of Belgrade - Faculty of sport and physical education (Serbia)

*Corresponding author: Nikola Mijatov, Institute for Contemporary History, Belgrade (Serbia), Contact: Trg Nikole Pasica 11, Belgrade, Serbia;

e-mail: nikola.mijatov@isi.co.rs

The Brutalisation of Aikido: The Case of Real Aikido

Submission: 6.05.2021; acceptance: 18.02.2022

Key words: aikido, real aikido, martial arts, ethics

Abstract

Background. In Yugoslavia, after World War II, a new form of martial arts emerged from the aikido master Ljubomir Ljuba Vracarevic, known as *real aikido*.

Problem and Aim. For Vracarevic, aikido was not enough, he wanted a martial art that was more realistic and unconcerned with the complex ethics of *aikido*. Thus, real aikido emerged as a new martial art and it gained numerous practitioners all over the world. Its masters spread real aikido with its highly applicable techniques combined with a questionable philosophy, resulting in them having a prominent role as security instructors for some of the top politicians around the world, such as Muammar al-Gaddafi and Robert Mugabe. However, even though real aikido emerged from aikido, it heavily vulgarised and brutalised its original techniques and ethics.

Method. With a critical analysis of the works of the founder of real aikido and its comparison with the works of aikido founder Morihei Ueshiba, the ethical imbalance between real aikido and aikido is perceived. Furthermore, with analysis of the individual techniques (*Irimi Nage*) that are used in both martial arts the technical, and most importantly ethical difference, is distinguished within the individual techniques.

Results and Conclusions. The differences between aikido and real aikido are extensive. In essence, real aikido invoked the dangerous techniques that Morihei Ueshiba forbid long ago. Thus, real aikido is a brutalised, vulgarised, and ethically ruined version of aikido. With the name aikido but without the ethical principles of aikido, real aikido produced a crisis in martial arts ethics, where the martial art and the philosophy of the founder, in this case aikido and Morihei Ueshiba, are misused and abused.

Introduction

If martial arts could be described as a process, the process would be considered ongoing. From its early beginnings, changes were constant and are still ongoing. Ever since, as the legend goes, Bodhidharma introduced his philosophy and his way of both practical fighting and fighting

ethics to China, which China later introduced to Japan, and martial arts have spread all over the world and are now a common heritage of humanity as a whole.

The twentieth century witnessed an enormous expansion of the modern forms of martial arts, whereas Japanese forms (*judo*, *karate* and *aikido*) had a prominent role and basically introduced the complex ideas of mar-

For citation – in IPA style:

Mijatov N., Radenovic S.S. (2023), *The Brutalisation of Aikido: The Case of Real Aikido*, “Ido Movement for Culture. Journal of Martial Arts Anthropology”, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 79–85; doi: 10.14589/ido.23.4.9.

In other standard – e.g.:

Mijatov, N., and Radenovic, S.S. The Brutalisation of Aikido: The Case of Real Aikido. *Ido Mov Cult J Martial Arts Anthropol*, 2023, 23 (4): 79–85 DOI: 10.14589/ido.23.4.9

tial arts to the world. For some, the teachings of Jigoro Kano, Gichin Funakoshi and Morihei Ueshiba were not enough and they founded their own martial arts based on the least technical aspects of these modern Japanese arts. One such a martial art was real *aikido*, introduced originally by Ljubomir Vracarevic in Yugoslavia, it soon spread across its borders to neighbouring regions. The realistic and spectacular techniques it introduced proved useful and even became an essential part of security guard training, resulting in the masters of real aikido travelling the world and spreading the philosophy of its founder Ljubomir Vracarevic. However, within real aikido there is an ethic that is far removed from aikido and to understand this change and the ethical crisis that follows it, we need to first look at the ethics of aikido and then compare it and confront it with the ethics of real aikido.

Method

In order to compare ethics and its brutalisation within the two martial arts, first the development of the aikido ethics will be considered, both historically and philosophically. The teachings of Morihei Ueshiba will be dominantly put in the context of overcoming the opponent and the possible consequences that the opponent could suffer. Secondly, the development of real aikido ethics will also be considered, both historically and philosophically, in the same context. The teachings of its founders, Morihei Ueshiba and Ljubomir Vracarevic, will be compared and contrasted so that the analysis of their martial arts ethics can be perceived. Adding to this, similar techniques (*Irimi Nage*) of aikido and real aikido will be deconstructed in the light of the possible consequences for the opponent. Finally, all of this will be considered in the global context of the (re)brutalisation of martial arts in order to trace the reasons behind the brutalisation of aikido into real aikido.

Results

1. Aikido: A Child of the Meiji Reform

For centuries Japan was self-sufficient and enclosed inside its own borders, with its only path to the outside world firmly closed off [Fairbank *et al.* 1965: 179]. Japan was an island with an isolated society, built around the emperor and the moral code of Bushido. A fragile balance existed between confronted *daimyos*, nobles and the ever pauperised peasants, and was being controlled by the swords of samurais: “A theatre of military austerity” [Penge 2009: 206]. For this warrior class, the oath to serve one’s *daimyo* and the constant urge to perfect martial arts skills meant everything, and it was samurais that held Japan firmly within its boundaries, without the

interference of outside influences, even on a cultural level [Penge 2009: 212].

Martial arts were at the very core of this truly unique society. The chosen martial art of samurais was *kenjutsu*, the art of fighting with a sword (most commonly katana). As fights were brutal, so was the martial art of *kenjutsu* – with its sole purpose of beating an opponent in the most efficient manner. The well-being of the opponent was of no significance to samurais, the masters of *kenjutsu*. However, being proficient with a sword was not enough, what if in the midst of a battle the sword should fall from the hand, get lost or break? Samurais had to learn to use their own bare hands in order to keep fighting, and for that purpose, they practiced another martial art. This martial art emphasised bare hand fighting and overcoming the opponent by any means necessary, using any potential weapons that could be found or used in such a manner – *jujutsu*. As with *kenjutsu*, *jujutsu* was brutal as its goal was the same: neutralising or eliminating the opponent in the most efficient manner no matter what the consequences for the opponent. *Jujutsu* was for centuries in the shadow of *kenjutsu*, as samurais would pay extra attention not to lose or break their swords, as they were their primary weapons and *kenjutsu* their primary martial art. Only in situations where a sword and *kenjutsu* knowledge could not be used, did they utilise *jujutsu* as a second choice [Mijatov 2017: 90]. However, with the Meiji reform, it was all about to change.

The change was inevitable. Japan was falling behind other more modern countries and could have been easily colonised by imperialistic forces. Emperor Meiji conducted a comprehensive reform in 1868, where he aimed to make a new modern Japan that could keep its independence in the imperialistic world of the late nineteenth century. Modernisation was the foundation of the reform and each and every aspect of Japanese society was changed [Fairbank *et al.* 1965: 244-245]. When it comes to martial arts, the most important change was in the form of a ban, meaning that civilians were no longer allowed to carry swords, including samurais. Consequently, *kenjutsu* was no longer the primary martial art, and *jujutsu* came into the light [Mijatov 2017: 95]. However, it was not until Jigoro Kano came to the fore, that a fundamental change occurred in the world of martial arts. Kano was a *jujutsu* master and a supporter of the Meiji reform and he realised that in modern Japan, along with the modern world in general, there was no place for brutal martial arts such as *jujutsu*. In the spirit of Meiji, he reformed *jujutsu* and instead of using the suffix “jutsu”, which means usable or adaptable, he placed the suffix “do” and thus created “judo” in 1882 [Kano 2007: 25-26]. Kano used the term “do” to emphasise the other purpose of martial arts, as the term comes from Buddhism and means the “path” on which every individual is on. In martial arts’ terms it also means a path: from a beginner to a master, a profound philosophical and eth-

ical road that a judo practitioner is embraced on, from their first steps on a tatami mat [De Majo 2010: 96]. The focus of this new martial art was not on its applicability or efficiency, which is always followed by brutality, but on the “do” which transforms a practitioner into a more valuable member of society [Kano 2007: 101; Shishida, Flynn 2013: 31-32]. In essence, Kano fundamentally transformed the brutal martial art of samurais into a modern martial art that could be an integral part of education and a valuable part of every society as a whole, not just in Japan, but all over the world.

Kano was not alone in his mission to modernise Japanese martial arts, he was soon followed by another prominent *jujutsu* master – Morihei Ueshiba. He mastered several *jujutsu* styles, while *Daito-ryu Aiki-jujutsu* of the master Sokaku Takeda was the most notable one [Ueshiba 2008a: 8, 140-141]. However, mastering the brutal art of *jujutsu* was not enough for Ueshiba: he transformed the art of war into the art of love. In the decade between the 1920s and the 1930s, he developed aikido, a unique martial art in which the roots are to be found in *jujutsu*. Following a similar path to Jigoro Kano, Ueshiba made a strict selection of brutal *jujutsu* techniques and adapted them to a modern concept of martial arts. The goal of aikido was not just to overcome the opponent, but to overcome him/her in such a manner that the opponent would come out of the conflict without serious injuries. While the epicentre of *jujutsu* was efficiency, the core of aikido was love [Ueshiba 2008b: 44]. In order to emphasise the difference, Ueshiba, like Kano, took the suffix “do” and in doing so, created a martial art that is a lifelong philosophical and ethical journey – a path (“do”) of harmonious and unifying (“ai”) energy/spirit (“ki”) – aikido. Thus, Ueshiba created a modern martial art that was based on the stream of ideas from the Meiji reform, and as such spread all over the world, as it was suitable for modern societies and enabled every practitioner to embark on a path (“do”) of love.

Ueshiba was very clear when it came to violence or hurting the opponent in self-defence. He himself tried to live without hurting any living creature, even including creatures such as flies [Ueshiba 2008b: 43]. He was well aware that there were “extremely aggressive martial arts” and he warned his pupils to avoid them [Ueshiba 2008a: 31]. He stated that on the path of the warrior throughout history, many mistakes were made and human lives were destroyed, while he created aikido in which “United energy is a lifesaver” [Ueshiba 2008a: 41]. For aikido as a whole, he was very clear: “Practicing *The Art of Peace* (aikido) is an act of faith, faith in the supreme power of non-violence” and “hurting the opponent means hurting oneself. Controlling the aggression without causing injuries is the essence of *The Art of Peace*” [Ueshiba 2008b: 56, 81]. In aikido there are no winners or losers, and he went even further when he defined the final goal of aikido as being a unification of the world as one family [Ueshiba

2008a: 42, 72, 83, 104]. He viewed fighting as an act of arrogance that only nourishes vanity and considered it one of the biggest sins alongside killing or hurting anyone, while aikido was not a “tool for expressing one’s ego” [Ueshiba 2008a: 146]. For his students he stated that the most needed trait for aikido is the “determination for non-violence” [Ueshiba 2008a: 57, 90, 106]. The only victory that could be achieved in aikido is self-victory [Bryant 2019: 27]. All in all, aikido, as Ueshiba saw it, is the “fulfilment of love” [Ueshiba 2008a: 136].

2. “Fulfilment of Love” for the Balkans

Ueshiba’s “fulfilment of love” soon spread across the world where his disciples carried on the philosophy of their sensei. In 1969 Ueshiba died, but aikido became a global phenomenon where numerous non-Japanese masters practiced and preached the message of their *Osensei* (Great Teacher). The foundations were firm and the Ueshiba concept of love through martial arts was clear and aikido distinguished itself as one of the most popular martial arts of the twentieth century.

Not everybody was satisfied with the teachings of Ueshiba however. In Yugoslavia, aikido found firm ground and gave birth to many Yugoslav practitioners and masters. However, for one master, aikido was not enough: Ljubomir Vracarevic got his black belt in 1971 and he had the opportunity to improve his aikido knowledge with masters such as Hiroshi Tada, Kiss-homaru Ueshiba, Tsutomu Chida, Kenji Shimizu and Gozo Shioda [Vracarevic 1996: 7-8, 17]. Nevertheless, the teachings of Ueshiba and his disciples were too “soft” for him, as Vracarevic regarded the profound philosophy and strict ethics of aikido as not suitable for his views on martial arts and he wanted something else, something that was more direct, more usable and more brutal. He regarded aikido as suitable for Japan but not for the Balkan mentality and Vracarevic reintroduced into the aikido techniques the efficient and brutal elements of *jujutsu* that Ueshiba had banned. As Vracarevic himself stated: “Simply, I have accepted those techniques that are, in my opinion, applicable in real life, real self-defence, neglecting the philosophical aspects of aikido” [Vracarevic 1995: 26-27]. Thus, Vracarevic in 1993 created a new martial art, real aikido, a “synthesis of the best from *jujutsu*, original *aikido* and practice” [Vracarevic 2005: 9]. He presented it as both revolutionary and as a distinguished style of aikido or as a “synthesis of all the best from *judo*, *jujutsu* and traditional *aikido*” [Vracarevic 1996: 8-9]. In fact, this new martial art was only a consequence of the brutalisation of aikido by invoking old *jujutsu* techniques that were well-known to all *jujutsu* practitioners.

‘Real aikido’ was, at first, purely a Yugoslav phenomenon. Vracarevic had many disciples and founded his own school by giving himself the title of the founder,

10th dan – *soké*, and by doing so joined the “rat race” for the highest martial arts grades [Slopecki 2013: 35]. The popularity of this new Yugoslav martial art was immense, with Vracarevic appearing in movies and teaching real aikido to the army and police special forces. Soon it spread over the Yugoslavian borders and across the Balkan region, with the main trait of real aikido that Vracarevic emphasised greatly, its applicability and efficiency, and he advertised real aikido as a whole as a potentially dangerous weapon [Vracarevic 1996: 19-22].

Advertising real aikido as an efficient form of self-defence, Vracarevic and his masters established themselves as bodyguard instructors. From civilian bodyguards to military bodyguards, real aikido became a part of the arsenal of the modern warrior. In Serbia, instructors of real aikido cooperate with the Serbian army giving training to military personnel, while Vracarevic himself even trained the bodyguards of long term Libya ruler Muammar al-Gaddafi [Politika 2017; Vracarevic 1995: 5, 91]. Besides Ghaddafi, there was the opportunity to teach the techniques of real aikido to bodyguards in Zimbabwe, North Macedonia, Bosnia, Kazakhstan, Slovenia and Russia [Milosavljevic *et al.* 2014: 7]. Thus, real aikido established itself as an effective martial art that spanned across the borders of Yugoslavia and latter-day Serbia. According to data provided by Vracarevic himself, by the year 2005 over 120,000 students had tried or practiced this new martial art [Vracarevic 2005: 161]. By the time Vracarevic died in 2013, the school of real aikido was well-established and recognisable as a unique Serbian martial art. Even though the founder died, real aikido continued to grow and develop and is today part of the military training in the Serbian special forces [Ministry of Defence, Republic of Serbia, 2019].

We have to take into consideration the fact that aikido is not suitable for bodyguard and military training, and that Ueshiba himself was against such use, he was disappointed when he found out that the aikido techniques had started to become a part of army manuals. Personally, Ueshiba said he was disgusted with the violence as such [Ueshiba 2008b: 25]. Consequently, the difference between aikido and real aikido must be enormous. A closer look at techniques is necessary in order to discover evidence of the difference between these two martial arts and to perceive the roots of this phenomenon.

Discussion

First and foremost, the concept of aikido and real aikido is completely different. In real aikido the well-being of the opponent is of little or no significance, while in aikido it is essential. Thus, the essence of aikido has been changed. If we look at the classification of martial arts by [Martinkova, Perry 2016: 153] aikido and real

aikido stand even further apart from one another. Aikido could be described as a Martial Path as “Martial paths are understood as spiritual paths, leading towards education for the overall development of the whole human being – a kind of self-perfection and discovery of a profound meaning in one’s existence”. On the other hand, real aikido could not even be described as a martial art but a warrior art as “Warrior arts are focused on the learning of martial techniques for the purpose of real-life fighting with the aim of defending oneself or defeating an opponent according to approved techniques and ethical codes within established schools. To some extent, they also aim at educating the individual” [Martinkova, Perry 2016: 150].

Vracarevic basically took aikido techniques and brutalised them: “By dropping the unnecessary elements and by the modification of techniques, the functionality and efficiency of technique are improved”, “By combining elements to the needs of the current situation, an unlimited number of possibilities is given for the overcoming of the opponent”. Several hundred aikido techniques were modified and transformed into more brutal, more applicable techniques with the goal of the “fastest, most efficient and most economical way of overcoming the opponent” and these techniques are “utterly applicable in real situations” [Vracarevic 2005: 10, 17, 61]. With such emphasis on applicability, basically, Vracarevic made aikido into a *jujutsu* style that he called “real aikido”. Consequently, in real aikido anything is allowed, for example, producing “acute pain” in the opponent in order to conduct the wanted technique is common. The practitioner would use a “strike” in order to inflict pain and conduct the lever more efficiently as the pain “focuses the attention” of the attacker [Milosavljevic *et al.* 2014: 11-12]. The eventual consequences of such a strike for the opponent are of no interest in the real aikido philosophy as the complete focus is on the efficiency of the technique. *Atemi waza* (body-striking techniques) as a whole has a distinguished place in real aikido, especially strikes to vital points of the opponent’s body [Vracarevic 1996: 18].

Adding to this, if we take a closer look at a specific technique, *Irimi Nage*, that is a part of both real aikido and aikido, there is a marked difference. In aikido the technique finishes with a throw and the *Uke* (receiver) falls backwards (*Ushiro Ukemi*) and remains safe. However, in real aikido the *Uke* is far from safe: his head is locked at the beginning of the technique, during the throw the lock is on the opponent’s forearm and “by performing the simultaneous pressing of the Uke’s spine by the forearm and the interior rotation of the right arm shoulder joint, the *Tori* (executor of the technique) upsets the Uke’s balance and forces him into a very awkward position”. The *Uke* falls ‘over the *Tori*’s upper leg’ and onto the ground and is not in full control as his shoulder is locked with the *Tori* knee on it [Burazerovic 2015: 118-120].

Brutalisation is an essential part of real aikido from the yellow belt level all the way through to black belt level. The well-being of the opponent is not an issue for the real aikido practitioner if we look directly at the techniques. For the yellow belt technique “Defence from the grip to shoulder, lapel or chest” recommends hitting the opponent with a fist in the nape while he/she is already on the ground. For the blue belt level brutalisation goes even further, stating that at the end of the technique when the opponent is on the ground, the fixation is made with a firm finger grip of the opponent’s eyes with a simultaneous fist press of the opponent’s back [Vracarevic 2005: 99, 127]. Usage of weak points in the opponent’s body, such as eyes, is surely uncommon for aikido as it assumes a possibility of serious damage to the sight of the opponent or even total blindness. For a blue belt in real aikido, an attack on the eyes is not considered controversial or brutal, just an integral part of its martial art.

On the other hand, Vracarevic in his works stated that self-defence in real aikido must be in such a manner that the opponent would come out of the conflict uninjured. The aggressiveness of the opponent is regarded as temporary, a product of a “blind urge” and should be isolated from the whole personality of the attacker. A master of real aikido confronted with such a “blind urge” should use real aikido techniques to overcome the opponent and to cleanse him from aggressiveness [Vracarevic 1996: 38]. However, if we take an even closer look at the real aikido techniques it is unclear just how exactly the opponent would come out from the conflict uninjured. For example, the technique “Defence of a hit from above to the head” (*Shomenuchi Kirikaeshi*) is finished with a grievous punch to the head of the opponent who is already lying on the ground, and already overwhelmed [Vracarevic 1996: 137]. Vracarevic made an imperative not to hurt the opponent but invoked brutal techniques elements that could be used “in case of need”, and as a “very dangerous weapon” [Vracarevic 2005: 10, 19, 27]. All of this should be regarded with seriousness as philosophies of martial arts have their pedagogical consequences [Cynarski, Lee-Barron 2014: 11-19].

In order to understand the motives behind Vracarevic’s real aikido and its brutalisation of aikido, we need to take a look at the brutalisation of martial arts as a whole. This can be considered on the following two levels: the level of a specific society and the macro-global level.

Regarding the level of a specific society, in the period of the emergence of real aikido in Yugoslavia during the decade of the 90s in the twentieth century, sociologists noticed the strengthening of the so-called process of normalisation of violence [Radenovic, Turza 2009: 249-262]. The process of normalisation of violence can be recognised in the promotion of violence, more precisely, in the aggressive and violent forms of behaviour as the dominant, accepted, common, normal and desirable form of behaviour. Let us recall the fact that the

notion of normalisation began to be used in numerous debates after World War II in the West German public, to indicate those opinions according to which Nazi crimes were normalised, more precisely, justified as normal, because they were supposedly forced by war [Radenovic, Turza 2009: 259]. In the mentioned period of the 90s of the twentieth century, more precisely in 1993, when real aikido was created, sociologists agree that this is a period characterised by the consequences of the bloody disintegration of Yugoslavia, robbery of citizens by private and state banks, famine, poverty, absence of basic health care, a large number of dismissals, inability to find employment, etc., i.e. all those phenomena that have contributed to the further reproduction of the normalisation of various forms of violent behaviour [Radenovic, Turza 2009: 258; Gordy 1999: 1-19]. Such an environment was a suitable breeding ground for strengthening the process of the brutalisation of martial arts regarding the aim of effective self-defence.

On the other hand, let us consider the brutalisation of martial arts on a global level, from the perspective of film art. Film theorists believe that the so-called ultra-violent films in which the stylisation of explicit violence can be seen, begin their history with the films of Akira Kurosawa in Japan in the mid-1940s, and continue to survive into the era of modern cinematography, primarily in the American film industry [Masirevic 2008: 8; Prince 1999: 3-66]. Hence, the representation of violence is one of the central points of contemporary cinematography, recalling the fact that the first films in the early twentieth century contained scenes of violence that fascinated the audience [Masirevic 2008: 178; Prince 2003: 205-251]. That is why the satisfaction obtained by visibly and vividly describing violence is one of the main reasons for including the violence in films. Respected director Francis Ford Coppola stated that the moment he works on scenes of violence, everyone in the studio stops their activities and gathers to watch the recording of those scenes [Masirevic 2008: 178-179]. Regarding that, it is quite justified to state that people are obviously attracted to watching or participating in scenes of violence, regardless of whether they are real or hypothetical scenes of violence represented within the framework of film art. Vracarevic was a part of this process in cinema as he starred in two movies as a “ninja instructor” in *Kako je propao rokenrol* and as a “real aikido instructor” in *Sejtanov ratnik*. His roles were not protagonist ones, he made just short appearances, but in both of those appearances he engaged in fights and violence [Kako je propao rokenrol, 1989; Sejtanov ratnik, 2006]. As such, Vracarevic’s film engagement had little to do with complex aikido ethics but had a lot more to do with the appealing power of violence in film.

Finally, related to the above, it should be noted that sports philosophers point out that violence can also be a means of expression in sports and art, emphasising the qualities of the athlete or artist regarding an aesthetic

and ethical significance and regarding certain limits and rules [Angelova-Igova 2018: 334-342]. Keeping in mind that point of view, certain sports philosophers point out that sports rules legitimise violence and make it “beautiful” [Angelova-Igova 2018: 334]. Just how “beautiful” real aikido is in comparison to aikido, should be left to the “the eye of the beholder”.

Nevertheless, it is wrong to consider real aikido only through its ethics and its relation to aikido, or even in context to the overwhelming brutalisation of martial arts. Real aikido has many benefits that transform its practitioners from beginners to truly respectful martial artists. It is a suitable recreation for all ages and it contributes to motoric development and overall physique and mental health of real aikido devotees. For example, there is evidence in papers that prove that regular practice of real aikido significantly improves balance through specific real aikido techniques [Milosavljevic *et al.* 2013: 36]. Besides that, real aikido training is also perfect as a platform for specific real aikido games, such as Kneeling Aikidokas, Semi-circular Grab, Pushing, and Rolling Race, that have proven to be beneficial for early school-age children [Matavulj *et al.* 2014: 21-22]. Adding to this, these games play a significant role in the process of mastering real aikido, from yellow belt to black belt levels [Spasovic *et al.* 2015: 28]. However, all of these beneficial exercises resemble the ones used in aikido, but in real aikido they have a different purpose, to build a formidable martial arts master who will be ready to eliminate the opponent no matter what the cost to that opponent. Still, real aikido has its place in martial arts and contributes to the enrichment of this aspect of human culture as a whole. Nevertheless, the question of its ethics and its brutalisation, especially in relation to its name, still remains.

Conclusion

As an ongoing process, martial arts have, and are still going through tremendous changes. New martial arts, brutal or not, are being formed constantly by various masters all around the world. Real aikido is one of them, but stands out from others with its questionable approach.

First and foremost, the problem is in its name, real aikido. Aikido itself is formed from three kanji letters (合 – *ai* – harmony, unifying; 気 – *ki* – energy, spirit; 道 – *do* – way, path) and its often translated as a “the way of unifying (with) life energy” or as “the way of harmonious spirit”. *Osensei*, Morihei Ueshiba himself stated that “aikido” is not a word but “cleansing” [Ueshiba 2008a: 47]. Nevertheless, “cleansing” or not, aikido stands for a martial art that is far from “real”. With its emphasis on complex ethics, aikido techniques are first and foremost friendly towards the opponent as they are a product of aikido’s profound philosophy in which “friendliness”

takes a central place. The reality of these techniques or their applicability in real situations is of secondary value, as aikido as its purpose holds a higher philosophical and ethical meaning than the mere physical conflict.

On the other hand, in Yugoslavia and latter-day Serbia, “real aikido” emerged. A new martial art with a name that is basically an oxymoron, as aikido cannot be “real” in such a sense as the founder of real aikido Ljubomir Vracarevic imagined. With the brutalisation of *aikido* techniques, Vracarevic basically made a new style of *jujutsu*, which is not surprising as new styles of *jujutsu* are being founded continually. With new styles, *jujutsu* as a martial art grows and evolves. However, by naming his martial art “real aikido”, Vracarevic made an ethical crisis in martial arts where he took not just the name, but the essence of techniques and parts of philosophy from aikido and made a martial art that is, in its core, the negation or even vulgarisation of aikido itself.

Thus, real aikido created an ethical crisis in the world of martial arts as it emerged as a new martial art, but took the name of an already existing aikido only adding “real” in front of it. With such a name and brutalised approach, real aikido basically vulgarised aikido, its techniques and in essence its philosophy. Brutalisation has its profound place in martial arts and has gained in dynamic through the twentieth and twenty-first century. Real aikido is an integral part of that dynamic and even stands out as a specific figurehead as it brutalised one of the most peaceful martial arts and basically gained its name through the negation of aikido and its principles.

Sources

1. *Kako je propao rokenrol* (1989), Retrieved from: <https://www.imdb.com/title/tt0158610/characters/nm6106789>, 16.03.2021.
2. Kano J. (2007), *Put mekoce*, Liber. Beograd [in Serbian].
3. Minister Vulin: The Armed Forces are one with the people and the guardian of the highest values, “Ministry of Defence Republic of Serbia”, 14.12. (2019), Retrieved from: <http://www.mod.gov.rs/eng/14814/ministar-vulin-vojska-je-deo-naroda-i-cuvar-najvisih-vrednosti-14814>
4. *Sejtanov ratnik*, (2006), Retrieved from: <https://www.imdb.com/title/tt0430582/characters/nm6106789>, 16.03.2021.
5. Ujesiba M. (2008b), *Umece mira*, Babun, Beograd.
6. Ueshiba M. (2008a), *Aikido: Teachings of Morihei Ueshiba*, Liber, Belgrade [in Serbian].
7. *Vojni specijalci na tenderu dobili ucitelje aikida*, “Politika”, 15.05.2017.
8. Vracarevic Lj. (1995), *I have trained bodyguards: from Mugabe and Gaddafi to emperor palace in Tokyo*, Lj. Vracarevic, Belgrade [in Serbian].
9. Vracarevic Lj. (1996), *Real Aikido*, Lj. Vracarevic, Belgrade [in Serbian].
10. Vracarevic Lj. (2005), *Realni aikido*, MLS, Beograd.

References

1. Anglova-Igova B. (2018), *When Violence Became Beautiful*, "The Philosophical Journal of Conflict and Violence", vol. II, no. 2, pp. 334-342; doi: 10.22618/tp.pjcv.20182.2.437008.
2. Bryant R.S. (2019), *Fighting With No One: Reflections on Education, Aikido, and Peace*, "Ido Movement for Culture. Journal of Martial Arts Anthropology", vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 21-28; doi: 10.14589/ido.19.2.4.
3. Burazerovic M. (2015), *Similarities and differences between various aikido and real aikido techniques*, "SPORT – Science & Practice", vol. 5, no. 1 & 2, pp. 115-123.
4. 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; doi: 10.14589/ido.14.1.2.
5. De Majo A. (2010), *Budo: put drevne mudrosti: izabrani tekstovi*, Bibliografsko izdanje, Beograd [in Serbian].
6. Fairbank J., Reischauer E., Craig A. (1965), *East Asia: The Modern Transformation*, George Allen & Unwin LTD, London.
7. Gordy E.D. (1999), *The Culture of Power in Serbia: nationalism and the destruction of alternatives*, Pennsylvania State University Press, Pennsylvania State University.
8. Marinkova I., Perry J. (2016), *Martial Categories: Clarification and Classification*, "Journal of the Philosophy of Sport", vol. 43, no. 1, pp. 143-162.
9. Matavulj D., Milosavljevic S., Lazarevic P., Ivanovski A. (2014), *Implementation potential of specific real aikido games in recreation of early school-age children*, "SPORT – Science & Practice", vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 15-23.
10. Masirevic Lj. (2008), *Film i nasilje*, Gradska narodna biblioteka "Zarko Zrenjanin", Zrenjanin [in Serbian].
11. Mijatov N. (2017), *The Historical Development of The Ethical Principle of Non-Injuring the Opponent in Japanese Martial Arts*, "SPORT – Science & Practice", vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 87-101.
12. Milosavljevic S., Matavulj D., Lazarevic P. (2014), *Producing acute pain by means of a strike as a relevant prerequisite for a successful realization of the lever technique in real aikido*, "SPORT – Science & Practice", vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 5-13.
13. Milosavljevic S., Matavulj D., Trunic N. (2013), *Implementation potential of real aikido techniques on balance improvement among the recreational population*, "SPORT – Science & Practice", vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 29-37.
14. Penge M. (2009), *Voluntary death in Japan*, Sremski Karlovci, Izdavačka knjizarnica Zorana Stojanovica, Novi Sad [in Serbian].
15. Prince S. (2003), *Classical Film Violence: Designing and Regulating Brutality in Hollywood Cinema, 1930-1968*, New Brunswick, New Jersey and London, Rutgers University Press.
16. Prince S. (1999), *The Warrior's Camera: The Cinema of Akira Kurosawa – Revised and Expanded Edition*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey.
17. Radenovic S., Karel T. (2009), *Bioetika i politika – kontekst savremene Srbije*, Velimir Valjan (prir.) "Integrativna bioetika i interkulturalnost – Zbornik radova Drugog međunarodnog bioetičkog simpozija u Bosni i Hercegovini (Sarajevo, od 23. do 24. svibnja 2008.)", Bioetičko društvo u BiH, Sarajevo, pp. 249-262.
18. Shishida F., Flynn S.M. (2013), *How does the philosophy of martial arts manifest itself? Insight from Japanese martial arts*, "Ido Movement for Culture. Journal of Martial Arts Anthropology", vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 29-36; doi: 10.14589/ido.13.3.5.
19. Slopecki J. (2013), *Race for the highest martial arts grades, its glamour and shadows*, "Ido Movement for Culture. Journal of Martial Arts Anthropology", vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 35-44.
20. Spasovic J., Spasovic J., Spasovic R. (2015), *The importance of play in real aikido for preschool children*, "SPORT– Science & Practice", vol. 5, no. 1 & 2, pp. 19-30.

Brutalizacija Aikido: Przepadek *Real Aikido*

Słowa kluczowe: *aikido*, *real aikido*, sztuki walki, etyka

Streszczenie

Tło. W Jugosławii po II wojnie światowej powstała nowa forma sztuk walki, stworzona przez mistrza *aikido* Ljubomira Ljubę Vracarevicia, znana jako *real aikido*.

Problem i Cel. Dla Vracarevicia *aikido* było niewystarczające, pragnął stworzyć sztukę walki bardziej realistyczną i niezwiązaną z złożoną etyką *aikido*. W ten sposób powstało *real aikido* jako nowa sztuka walki, zdobywając wielu praktyków na całym świecie. Jego mistrzowie rozpowszechnili *real aikido* z jego wysoce stosownymi technikami połączonymi z wątpliwą filozofią, w wyniku czego odegrali znaczącą rolę jako instruktorzy ds. bezpieczeństwa dla niektórych czołowych polityków na całym świecie, takich jak Muammar al-Kaddafi i Robert Mugabe. Jednak mimo, że *real aikido* wywodzi się z *aikido*, w dużym stopniu upraszcza i brutalizuje jego pierwotne techniki i etykę.

Metoda. Dzięki krytycznej analizie dzieł założyciela *real aikido* i porównaniu ich z dziełami założyciela *aikido* Morihei Ueshiby, dostrzegana jest etyczna nierównowaga między *real aikido* a *aikido*. Ponadto, poprzez analizę poszczególnych technik (Irimi Nage), które są stosowane w obu sztukach walki, wyróżnia się różnice techniczne, a przede wszystkim etyczne, między tymi technikami.

Wyniki i wnioski. Różnice między *aikido* a *real aikido* są rozległe. W istocie, *real aikido* stosuje niebezpieczne techniki, których Morihei Ueshiba zakazał już dawno temu. *Real aikido* jest zatem brutalizowaną, uproszczoną i etycznie zniszczoną wersją *aikido*. Posiadając nazwę *aikido*, ale nie przestrzegając zasad etycznych *aikido*, *real aikido* wywołało kryzys w etyce sztuk walki, gdzie sztuka walki i filozofia twórcy, w tym przypadku *aikido* i Morihei Ueshiba, są nadużywane i wykorzystywane.