AmericanCombato.com & SeattleCombatives.com

Sword and Pen

Official Newsletter of the International Combat Martial Arts Federation (ICMAF) and the Academy of Self-Defense

EDITORIAL

Different "Schools Of Thought" Regarding Practical Close Combat Methods?

SIMPLY because people — even a lot of people — believe or feel that something is true does not mean that that which they believe is in fact true. Nor does the fact that many people might *want very much* for something to be true indicate anything at all about its truth or falsehood. One does not determine what is true or false by taking a poll — or by putting the matter up to a vote. Not only is it possible for the majority to be wrong, history has consistently shown that the majority nearly always is wrong.

Today we observe the overwhelming majority of those who participate in the martial arts following programs of instruction and practice that may be quite excellent for purposes of aesthetic satisfaction and the mastery of classical physical art, or for the enjoyment of vigorous competitive matches, yet which is <u>not</u> suitable for personal defense and hand-to-hand combat. The problem is this: *Many if not most of those who come to the martial arts do so for <u>self-defense</u>. They are only peripherally interested in Asian culture and tradition (if they are interested in it, at all), and the only reason they agree to practice competition skills and to engage in matches is because they have been led to believe that doing so will assure them the attainment of their objective, which is self-defense ability, and confidence.*

We have said this, and we will continue to repeat this message again, and again:

There is absolutely no correlation between matches, sparring, competitive "fighting", or sporting contests of any kind and <u>REAL COMBAT</u>. Nor is there more than a small percentage of classical/traditional martial arts that may be adapted — <u>by experts</u> — to serious, dangerous, anything goes hand-to-hand combat with determined, hardened physical attackers. Close combat and self-defense is a study and a discipline <u>unto itself</u>.

We do not say this as an attack on classical/traditional or sporting/competitive martial arts. They are fabulous activities, and so long as the individual understands precisely what the art that he is enrolling to study can and will ultimately give him, and so long as <u>that is what he wants</u>, everything is fine. But we believe that those whose purpose is the attainment of combat skill and the ability to defend themselves ought to know clearly that what *they* need is a **COMBAT/SELF-DEFENSE** system; they do <u>not</u> want classical/traditional or sporting/competitive doctrine.

Okay. If we can finally come to the realization that combat and contest are unrelated, and that each requires its own, unique, very specific approach when it comes to training and skills acquisition and development, we have taken Step #1. We are finally out of the woods, and we are no longer entertaining the nonsense that by excelling in any of the competitive venues we are thereby establishing hand-to-hand combat capabilities. Step #2 consists of determining which of the so-called *all combat*, or *"reality based"* systems of so-called *"martial art" make sense.* There are, after all, all sorts of points of disagreement amongst many who, realizing that self-defense/close combat is *not* the same as competition and contest, differ in regard to how real combative engagements ought properly to be handled.

For our readers' information, we would like to point out that *even amongst the (today) venerated "WWII instructors" there was some disagreement*. For example, Applegate (who was Fairbairn's protégé, at the outset of the two mens' relationship during WWII) vigorously disagreed with several of the throwing actions that Fairbairn initially introduced in his wartime system; and Applegate refused completely to teach the "bent arm hold" vs. a downward knife stab as a first option — preferring, as we do, to teach a much simpler parrying action; or better yet, a simple, fast sidestep.

Despite the differences between Fairbairn and Applegate, there were many more *similarities* . . . *precisely as there were between <u>all</u> of that era's truly knowledgeable* and experienced teachers.

Different teachers will inevitably tend to flavor their teachings with that which they, as individuals, personally have found to be the most practical and effective skills. However, if you are a prospective student and wish to have a clear understanding of what **genuine close combat and self-defense teachers** will *universally* teach and agree upon, it is this:

• Simplicity, destructiveness, adaptability, learnability, and retainability are always critical touchstones for assessing what is worth including in a combat system

- Absolute ruthlessness and savagery mark the quality tactics and skills of close combat
- No ground grappling!
- Blows, gouges, butting, biting, kicking those are the *best* techniques

• No force "continuums". When you are attacked you *EXPLODE* and destroy the enemy — you attack relentlessly - stopping *only* when you are no longer in danger

• Use anything at hand to assist yourself in destroying the enemy — preferably a fighting knife, handgun, or tomahawk. Use an improvised weapon, if you can get your hands on one. "Bare hands" are used only when bare hands is all you have

• No high kicks, and only *minimum* use of the clenched fists in punching (to soft targets, only)

- No preparatory "fighting" type stances
- No "one shot stops" follow up!

• Only a very few throws; and such throws as are worthwhile are those that cannot be safely employed with any force, even on a mat

• Expect **multiple attackers**, a **weapon**, any attack to be **potentially deadly**, and that your enemy will be your **physical superior**, and better skilled than yourself

• Frank acknowledgment of the value of physical strength, fitness, and hardihood

• Enormous emphasis on **mindset** and proper **psychological conditioning** for combat (*not* for "competition")

• Very little emphasis on "blocking" — almost all (**90% at least**) emphasis upon <u>*ATTACKING*</u> <u>*FEROCIOUSLY*</u> and by using the element of surprise, whenever possible

In reality, then, the "different schools of thought" that exist in the field of practical close combat and selfdefense are not so very different, after all. They all have the same "flavor" as it were.

This much may be counted upon, however" **There will never be** <u>*any*</u> **correlation suggested by any worthwhile close combat or self-defense teacher between combat and sport.** Whatever *else* — whatever *little* else! — really professional teachers may disagree on, they *all* understand, acknowledge, and agree that close combat and self-defense is a world apart from classical/traditional and sporting/competitive activities.

Bradley J. Steiner

Notes For Teachers

WE have <u>all</u> received way too much criticism during our lives. When teaching someone bear in mind that the *last* thing likely to reach a person productively is **criticism**. What human beings respond best to is **RESPECTFUL, BENEVOLENT CORRECTION**, so by all means correct your students when their errors require that you do so; but correct them *respectfully*. And correct them with the spirit of a loving parent, <u>not</u> with the venomous attitude of the frustrated public school hag who (somehow) managed to get a teacher's certificate, and who resents the smiling, laughing faces of children because she herself has given up on a human existence.

Enthusiastic and aggressive criticism of those who are, in whatever context, subordinate to him, is the sign of the pathetic egotist. A *teacher* who is worth the title would find it demeaning of himself, unprofessional,

shameful, and unmanly to lord it over a student who is struggling to learn, and compound that student's discomfort by daring to vent the contempt and malice that *criticism* always implies.

Make no mistake about it. "Criticism" does not originate in the well or benevolently intentioned mind. It seeps out of the toxic psyche of the malcontent. No one criticizes you in order to "help" you, in order to "guide" you, in order to "improve your performance". You know it, and everyone else knows it, too — albeit in many cases at the subconscious, unstated level. *People <u>feel</u> it when you spit out, under the guise of "teaching", whatever garbage you may permit yourself to spit out*. They may not say anything to you, but the resentment will be there — as it ought to be. Your students are paying you to **teach**; not to demean, belittle, scold, or berate them.

When we were a child in the prison of public school, we were treated daily to the incompetent blitherings, ravings, and rantings of miserable, evil old hags (in elementary school), and we saw early on how screeching critiques and malicious outpourings of venom masked *INCOMPETENCE*, *MEAN-SPIRITED HUMAN EVIL*, and the fact that these old hags *HAD NEITHER THE ABILITY NOR THE DESIRE TO TEACH*. Apparently, like so many who pollute the earth while garnering wages as "teachers" (and performing as anything-but-teachers), these egregious misfits delighted in being in an environment where they could rule over, dominate, and intimidate children.

Sadly, this same attitude is sometimes to be found in so-called "teachers" of the martial arts. One clown in Arizona whose self-promoting crap has appeared in numerous gun magazines, has had a reputation for belittling and demeaning those who attend his classes. *What in the world could make an adult subordinate himself to this outrage is beyond us!*

Several teachers of unarmed arts who are known to us have been guilty of physically injuring and of actually insulting(!) students, in their seminars and in their classes. As a boy we remember spending many hours in *ju-jutsu* being **UNNECESSARILY** roughed up, and occasionally insulted, by those who we were paying to teach us — until we finally smartened up and realized that these individuals were little more than punks with black belts, and that *good* teachers <u>TAUGHT</u>, they did not humiliate, injure, or otherwise take advantage of their position as teachers in order to lord it over those who came to them to learn. Admittedly, we did not begin to wise up until we were in our late teens, but as the saying goes: "Better late than never."

If you are a teacher of self-defense (in *any* basic form: combative, sporting, or classical), <u>be</u> a teacher. Remember that you are not doing any favor to anyone by instructing him. *That person whom you are instructing is paying you money to be* <u>taught</u>. So if you're half as good as you like to have others believe, <u>earn</u> <u>your money by teaching him</u>!

The most deadly techniques of close combat can and should be taught without injuring students. Our three finest teachers (Rex Applegate, Charles Nelson, and Maurice Geier) *never once* caused even the slightest injury to us when teaching. And the two best of those three — i.e. Applegate and Nelson — were inevitably relaxed, cordial, considerate, and always possessed of good humor and down-to-earthnesss at all times.

Unfortunately, with the advent of the "challenge fighting" phenomenon and its various venues, for participation of those who are so-inclined, the "toughguyism" (which is a *DISEASE*, and which quality martial arts of <u>all</u> kinds ought to be opposing) has made roughhouse teaching and the advocacy of "attitude" a kind of "in thing". But classical/traditionalists are just as much to blame here, and we make no bones about it. *If you deal with your students by physically abusing or intimidating them (under the guise of "toughening them up"), or/and you*

allow yourself to demean, insult, or in any way deliberately intimidate those whom you have been **HIRED** to teach, then you should be ashamed of yourself.

Do not bandy about the trophies that you may have won as evidence that you are a "teacher", and do not expect anyone to tolerate sprained wrists, constant bruising, a broken rib, and being treated as a dummy for demonstrations of techniques that you enjoy giving, just to show your class members how "great" you are. That is — to put it bluntly — **bullshit**. So just don't do it. Since the introduction of the challenge event type foolishness to Western martial arts, the martial arts has been going downhill at warp nine speed. Don't be a contributor to the downfall of what should be a powerful physical and psychological tool for educating, strengthening, and uplifting those who come to it.

It is quite bad enough that the public schools (ostensibly charged with the intellectual education of the populace) are inundated with sloppy, incompetent, uselessly indifferent, cowardly, generally <u>highly</u> neurotic not to mention, themselves <u>uneducated</u> — and often **destructive** — human elements who ought not be allowed entry into a pet shop, let alone into an institution where young people need to be taught. We do not need people who seek to learn and develop in the private sector, through their study of martial arts, to be recipients of similar crap — this time also administered physically no less than psychologically!

A good teacher is a great thing. **Be** a good teacher. *Teach*.

Two Giant Targets

VIRTUALLY every human being, regardless of strength and size has <u>two</u> very large, readily accessible, easily damaged, slow moving, unprotected targets that you should <u>specialize</u> in training to **DESTROY**, should an emergency see you in a position where you need to defend yourself or to protect another person.

No — we are *not* referring to the eyes and throat! (Not to suggest that those two targets are less than first rate, premier target points for you to go after in any life-threatening emergency! Certainly, *anyone* who trains for personal defense and hand-to-hand combat should focus on attacking an enemy's **eyes**, and/or on attacking the enemy's **throat**, whenever possible, at the first opportunity — and with strong natural weapons, and with merciless, all-out force!). We are referring to two entirely different targets.

Give up?

Okay. The two large, vulnerable, and highly desirable target areas that we are referring to are the sections of each of your enemy's *legs*, from the knee joint to the toes.

It is easy to break a man's knee. Just deliver a fast, powerful side kick into the front, inside, or outside of the knee joint. That should do it. But entirely aside from breaking the knee of some example of street bacteria, remember that the **SHIN BONES**, the **INSTEPS**, the **TOES**, and even — on occasion — the **HOCK** (back) of the knee joint, as well as the **ACHILLES TENDON** (back of the heel) are *all* excellent targets to be stomped into and crushed with ferocious kicking actions using the heel, or the inside or outside edges of the feet. Hell, the achilles tendon is also a great target to *slash* — if you've got a sharp fighting knife in your hand! And you need only imagine how it felt any time you accidentally bumped your shin on a piece of furniture to appreciate

how *great* a target is the knee/shin area for hard, whipping blows with a walking stick, police baton, or other stick-like implement.

Ever since reading the first copy of *Kill Or Get Killed* that we got our hands on (when we were barely twelve years of age, as we recall) we became enamored of the low side kick to the knee (referred to by Applegate as the "knee kick"). Too bad we didn't immediately have sense enough to abandon the high and flashy nonsense that we were simultaneously being instructed in at the same time, in ju-jutsu and — shortly thereafter — in taekwondo. However, **common sense and realism prevailed**! By the time we were 22 we had become completely convinced of the validity of *low, destructive kicks to the lower leg areas as THE kicks for real world self-defense*.

We hope that we can convince you.

As to how to attack the lower legs, the methods are simple. Low snapping side kicks ("flicking" kicks, as Fairbairn called it), side thrusting kicks, or inside-edge-of-the-foot stomping kicks are all easy-to-employ, versatile, very viable attack methods. With practice these kicks can be used against any foes in any direction, and even when seated, against a standing aggressor. They can be adopted to situations in which you must contend with an adversary who is hitting you, or who is grabbing or holding onto you.

Any time you are in possession of a stick you would be well advised to remember that unexpected blows to the knee or to the shinbone will either cause an attacker to stop — or, if he is determined and deadly, will set him up so that powerful blows to his face and head may be delivered, in order to drop him, unconscious.

The foolishness of training in high kicks is becoming more and more understood, even by more mainstream "martial artsy" types. And while acrobatics will always have a quite legitimate appeal to those whose objective is unrelated to combat, it is becoming increasingly obvious — even to those who don't want to understand — that *low, powerful kicks of the most simple kind <u>only</u>, are the proper types of kicks for use in actual hand-to-hand combat.*

The lower legs are perfect targets for every student of self-defense — especially beginners — to concentrate on. The lower legs will always be within range when one is under attack, they are very easy targets to hit, they move slowly, they support the weight of the opponent, one need not pinpoint where one directs the blow against them, and there are *TWO* of these targets to go after! Gee whiz! Anything more would make the whole thing *too* easy!

We'll conclude this little exposition by explaining how simply and effectively this information can be utilized against *multiple* attackers.

Let's assume that three or four bacteria seize you from different angles, up close. This little gang attack scenario lends itself to the use of *close in stomping kicks directed against the enemies' lower legs and feet*. Just start stomping down hard into the lower legs and feet of the several scum who are endeavoring to cluster about and to hold onto you. They can only avoid your scrape stomping kicks by letting you go and moving back. It's an almost foolproof "defense". Just be sure to follow up with head butting and open hand chopping as space and freedom of movement enables you to employ these other actions, too. If the scumbags attempt to shove you, great! Stomping assists in adding force to your kicks, and it helps you retain balance.

Go after those lower legs!!!

Kudos To Prof. Mark Bryans!

EVERY once in a while we will permit ourselves to boast — not about our self, but about our top Black Belt (Mark), another of our first-rate Black Belts, or one of our highly esteemed, sincere students.

"Tim" is one of Mark Bryans' students. The following is a communication from Tim to Mark, related after an incident in Phoenix when Tim — as he explains it — *reflexively* employed one of our basic kicks to break the leg of some street bacteria. (Tim is a firefighter).

"Hi Sensei (Mark),

"Thanks for the latest info.

"Saturday's class was cause for much reflection. After class I remembered how physically devastating Combato can be to an opponent. Also, that the focus of combat martial arts and most of the MA world is different, and should be, as long as one understands those differences. The point, (no pun intended) of knifework in Combato is to finish the job at hand, quickly and decisively, not to play around. Because I can only carry a folding knife at work and on a daily basis, I think I will get a Gerber AF Combat folder to provide the extra reach to "finish the job" if need be.

"I hope I wasn't too rough with Bill, I felt bad afterward. After I told my story of the effective use of a side-kick while on duty; a couple of things should have been reiterated in the class room setting: (1) this was the only time I used a Combato blow in the street in over a sixteen year period since my first lesson, while running over ten thousand calls, and dealing with many a rough customer. (2) The kick wasn't responsive, or even reactive, but reflexive, not even thinking about it till later. (3) I still felt some sympathy somewhere deep in my gut for the recipient, even though he was an ex-felon scumbag intent on hurting a police officer then attacking me. A mental conditioning of being one of the good guys and a civilized person. Ergo the need for the mental preparation Combato can give.

"It has been so long ago, but the thing I will always take away from Combato is the superior training of the mind, it's the best out there.

"Thanks again for the class, good stuff,

Tim"

Although we have never met Tim we are super proud of him; not only because he is a first class student, but also because he serves in one of the noblest callings in human society: *firefighting*. He reminds us of two of our own terrific students in the same profession: Jim Briggs (Black Belt, 3rd degree), and Marty Roberts (Brown Belt).

If You Duel You're A Fool

THE System of knifework that we developed many years ago derives from two key methods: Primarily, the Fairbairn/Applegate System, and *secondarily* the Biddle/Styers System. In addition, it contains a substantial amount of material that we personally originated (such as "neck traps", and certain other niceties). What it does *not* contain or include is an emphasis upon **knife vs. knife fighting**, or "dueling". Our students do learn how to handle a situation (very, very unlikely) in which — knife in hand — they confront an enemy who is also in possession of a knife in *his* hand; however, this sort of thing practically never actually happens. And attempts to prepare students to use a fighting knife in self-defense or hand-to-hand combat by having them square off and play "blade tag" with each other, is absurd.

The use of duels as a means of developing a high level of ability in the art of knife fighting is in our opinion (as it was in the opinions of Fairbairn, Applegate, Sykes, O'Neill, and others whose methods were war-based and produced as a result of actual combat studies and experiences) foolish. Unfortunately, with the exception only of a portion of the doctrine which it espoused, we must relegate the Biddle/Styers System to this category, as well. <u>Some</u> of Styers' material is excellent and makes perfect sense; but the whole idea that one may anticipate the likelihood of encountering a knife-wielding adversary against whom one will proceed to employ one's own knife is based more upon the influence of Anthony Biddle (a fencer, and Styers' mentor) and <u>NOT</u> upon reality. During WWII Biddle even introduced *bayoneted rifle dueling(!!!)* which — thank goodness — the USMC had the good sense to dispense with shortly after being exposed to it!

We remember, during one of our countless conversations with the late Col. Rex Applegate, discussing knifework and how it <u>really</u> goes down in a close combat encounter. "I have never heard of one single incident in all of WWII when a knife vs. knife fight occurred," he told us. "Fairbairn had the same view," he continued. "Knife vs. knife is for criminals who fight with each other in bars, and for the movies. Soldiers, police, and civilians who use knives in self-defense don't need to concern themselves with that sort of thing."

Okay. Years before even meeting Col. Applegate, we were a student of Charles Nelson. And while he never went into the matter at great length with us, he definitely expressed the same idea that Applegate did. Charlie had been a combat marine during WWII, had bunked with John Styers, and had learned ju-jutsu ("combat judo") under, among others, Col. Anthony Biddle. Nelson became a *combat judo* instructor, himself. "Nah," Charlie had told us, "ya ain't gonna see no knife 'fights'. All that happens is one guy attacks the other with a knife — and one of 'em gets killed during the fight."

And that is pretty much it.

If, for example, I have a knife in my hand, I am <u>NOT</u> going to give the other guy an opportunity to draw his (if we assume that he possesses one, and that I know about it). Nor will "the other guy" give *me* a chance to acquire my fighting knife, in any hand-to-hand situation where his knife is in his hands, and it is his objective to kill me. Possibly a complete *FOOL* will pause and caution his target-victim to draw a blade; but anyone with the brains that is possessed by a handful of gravel will not!

So why is knife *dueling* a part of many "knife fighting seminars", popularly taught courses, and DVDs? Why, also, are the utterly asinine histrionics that are inevitably taught to students of the *bali-song* folding knife offered as legitimate knife fighting fare? Very simply because it attracts and appeals to students who do not know any better; and it makes for an interesting and "fun" instructional period for teachers looking for a way to retain those students. It's dramatic, and it has all of the excitement and fun of *sparring* (something else that is absurd in close combat and self-defense training, but that is another story).

To become proficient in real world knifework what is required is, **first and foremost**, a mindset enabling you to *attack and to kill another human being with a sharp blade*. This is a hell of a lot harder for many people than one might at first believe. It is one thing to shoot a man at a distance with a firearm. *That* is, for some people, an agonizingly difficult thing to drive themselves to do; but it is, to a degree, "sanitized". One can shoot someone and not *feel him die*, so to speak, or "get your hands dirty" (read: **bloody**). Knifework is hand-to-hand stuff, and *very* personal. It takes a measure of physical strength in most cases (expecting your enemy to "let you do it" goes beyond optimism!), and you must go for the vital target areas with fierce determination and speed. Often, some basic unarmed combat must accompany the knife actions, in order to get to the enemy's vital points and dispatch him.

If we assume the right mindset, then *simple* technique is called for. We are not going to describe it here, but we will say that it bears no relation to the nonsense that is being vomited out by so-called "experts" in their dramatic seminar presentations. The only point we want to make — because we see that it is necessary to make it — is that proper knifework does <u>NOT</u> involve training to duel.

From the standpoint of *defending against knife attacks*, you can learn a great deal if you study realistic knifework, yourself. You will realize that a determined knife assailant is quite often impossible even for an expert to defend against. You will also learn why nearly every single "knife defense" that is taught amounts to little more than unusable nonsense.

The knife is a fabulous weapon in hand-to-hand combat. Learning its proper use should be high on your list of priorities. Respect the knife. No matter how expert you become, it is <u>NEVER</u> certain that you will be able to defend successfully against a knife attack. And for heaven's sake don't train in knife dueling. Not only will no

one be likely to give you the opportunity use that which you acquire; <u>you will be deluding yourself, and</u> <u>acquiring nonsense, instead of practical, viable skill in knifework</u>.

With the knife — as with the stick, as with the handgun, as with *any* hand-held weapon, or with no weapon at all — *ATTACK*. Leave all "duels" to the Three Musketeers.

Need An Attitude Adjustment?

THIS New Manual will help you achieve it!

"MENTAL CONDITIONING FOR CLOSE COMBAT AND SELF-DEFENSE"

is an exclusive, new 214 page book that we are offering on a quality CD. It explains not only all of the factors necessary for cultivating the proper degree of mental readiness for close combat and self-defense, *it describes and explains how you can do it*!

We have been a pioneer in the field of mental conditioning for close combat for more than 40 years now. We have been a State licensed hypnotherapist for more than 20 years, and we have been granted a *"Fellowship in Clinical Hypnotherapy"* in part for our work in the use of hypnosis in training people for effectiveness in the combat and survival arts. Our studies and researches into the mental aspects of violence and combat are *unparalleled*.

This Manual is **copyrighted** and is available **NOWHERE ELSE**. We offer it on CD in PDF format. It is easy and clear to read right on your computer screen, or you may print out hard copies.

This is not only an excellent self-training text for students, but also a terrific aid for professional instructors who teach close combat and self-defense. **Note:** There is <u>nothing</u> in this instructional Manual oriented toward "winning" and becoming a "champion". This is **100%** about *combat* and *personal defense*.

Cost is \$30 for the CD. *Also included* on the CD is PDF printable copy of COMBAT JUDO, by Robert Carlin, and DEFEND YOURSELF! by Jack Grover — two out-of-print and very hard to find classics of self-defense!

Send CASH or MONEY ORDER only to: Brad Steiner P.O. Box 15929 Seattle, WA. 98115 USA. Your orders shipped promptly.

Want Some Real World Information About How To Use Your Natural Weapons?

OUR new Reference text:

"The Most Effective Blows In Unarmed Combat"

THIS is a helpful little 46 Page Manual describing the SIXTEEN MOST RELIABLE, EFFECTIVE, and PRACTICAL natural weapon blows of unarmed close combat. It is **copyrighted** and available **from no other source**.

The descriptions and explanations are thorough and clear, and offer straight-from-the-shoulder descriptions of how each of these war-proven blows should be practiced and executed in a hand-to-hand encounter. Which vital points are best attacked using these blows.

Prepared primarily as a reference text for students of American Combato (Jen•Do•Tao), anyone with tenth grade reading skill should be able to easily use and benefit enormously from this presentation. If you train in judo, ju-jutsu, karate, or even if you're presently enrolled in another school where a modern, practical form of combatives is taught, this little Manual should prove of significant help in guiding you in the development of real world skill.

In addition to describing the blows and how to train and develop them you will learn exactly why every close combat expert (men like Fairbairn, Applegate, O'Neill, Brown, Martone, and others) invariably emphasized that BLOWS DELIVERED BY THE HANDS AND FEET MUST CONSTITUTE THE CORE OF REALWORLD, NO-NONSENSE, BATTLEFIELD-RELIABLE HAND-TO-HAND COMBAT. It is clearly set forth, defined, and lucidly explained.

But primarily this is a no frills, simple training guide, a practical Manual for student and teacher reference — similar, but considerably more extensive than, those prepared during the second world war by William E. Fairbairn and Dermot ("Pat") O'Neill for special use by advanced commando trainees, secret operatives, and their teachers in the British SOE and in the American OSS.

The Manual comes to you in PDF format on a quality CD disc, enabling you to read the Manual on your computer screen, or print out however many hard copies you may wish to have. Cost is \$13.

Send CASH or MONEY ORDER only to: Brad Steiner P.O. Box 15929 Seattle, WA. 98115 USA. Your orders shipped promptly.

MAXIMS FOR THE MODERN, RATIONAL STUDENT OF CLOSE COMBAT AND SELF-DEFENSE

ONE of the most annoying and irritating things that we recall from the "classical/traditional" aspects of our martial arts training many years ago was the interminable "philosophical mouthings" of people who were essentially horses' asses *trying* to sound profound, "deep", and important.

Americans pretending that they are Chinese, Japanese, or Korean sages, and affecting (or doing a miserable acting job in their *attempts* to perfect) the mannerisms and idiosyncrasies of "ancient Asian martial arts masters" is of course laughable bullshit — to **rational, mature, serious-minded adults**. Unfortunately, there are some people in the martial arts who are, ahem, somewhat removed from that desirable position on the evolutionary scale. The more bullshit you present to them, the more they believe that they are initiates into some "secret world of fighting mysteries".

We were thinking about this the other day and realized that there are a lot of sensible, practical, justice- and lifeserving concepts — **reasonable** concepts, and **lucid**, **intelligible** concepts — that we routinely espouse and remind our personal pupils of, and that visitors to this site might find worth considering, themselves. Most of these would be regarded as politically incorrect, or "socially unpalatable", etc. About that we could not care less. What we do care about is that we know from well over four decades of teaching that these ideas are *RIGHT*, that they help people who come to understand, accept, and live by them to live more effectively and securely, and that they amount to a refreshing breath of clean, wholesome fresh air where, unfortunately, there is more often than not, a huge deluge of psychologically toxic crap.

Consider the thoughts and precepts that we live, and teach, by:

• I do not believe in using non-injurious force, because violent offenders do not concern themselves with trying not to injure those whom they choose to attack.

• I do not believe in mercy because violent offenders do not demonstrate mercy.

• I will not hesitate to use a weapon to defend myself or those I love, because violent offenders use weapons. And I shall always endeavor to be *better armed* than the violent filth who would prey upon me.

• I do not care at all about how badly my attacker is injured, because my attacker does not care about how badly he injures me.

• I do not have any respect for my attacker's life since, by attacking me, he has demonstrated that he has no respect for mine. *AND MY LIFE IS MORE IMPORTANT THAN HIS!*

• I do not care at all about the age of my attacker; whether he is very young, or very old. If he is young, then he is agile, lithe, without a fully formed mind, and hence *deadly dangerous*. If he is old, then he has experience, knowledge, guile, and cunning. And, he ought to know better. So he is *deadly dangerous*. But in all cases, when he attacks he is merely "an enemy to be stopped", and *nothing* more, regardless of his age.

• I fear only that "post traumatic stress disorder" that might come from losing a desperate battle with a deadly enemy. To my way of thinking, anyone who experiences stress after neutralizing a felon, <u>because</u> he has neutralized that felon — perhaps lethally — has rocks in his head.

• I will offer no violent home invader the opportunity to surrender. Any criminal offender violently breaking into my home will be met with deadly force. The **only** way that one or more home invaders will leave my home is in a body bag.

• If I am armed with a handgun or shoulder weapon I will fire "warning shots" into the kill zone of my attacker. I will waste no ammunition firing into the ground or into space — nor do I wish to "*warn*" anyone bent upon my murder or the murder of those I love. And ammunition is too expensive to waste.

• I will <u>ALWAYS</u> call the police if it is feasible to do so, and let *them* handle any violent situation. However, realistically, I do not expect to be given the opportunity to call **911** in a street attack, home invasion, mugging, gang assault, attempted kidnapping, rape, or other atrocious act of violence that I may one day need to confront. So I remain prepared always to decisively neutralize <u>whomever</u> I must, <u>whenever</u> I must, and <u>however</u> I must.

• My loved ones constitute my top priority. Threaten them with injury, harm, or death, and I will die killing you, if need be, in order to stop you.

• My "rule book" is very short. It's single page upon which appears but one word: WIN.

• I am <u>not</u> dismayed at the prospect of killing someone or of maiming someone who needs to be killed or maimed in order to stop him from carrying out his horrific course of action. Some people need to be maimed or killed or they will maim and kill others.

• I believe only in the rights of the *VICTIM*. The moment another person begins to act as a predator he has signed his resignation from the human race, has <u>NO</u> rights as far as I am concerned; and will be treated with the same mercy afforded an infectious disease.

• I believe only in compassion for the *VICTIM*. History has proven that the greatest aid civilized man can give the dangerous, predatory psychopath and similar types is to treat him with "understanding", "compassion", and "mercy". *To bloody hell with that!*

• Do not speak to me of of how much force I "may" use in defending myself. <u>*I*</u> will be the judge of what I need to do when I am forced to defend myself, and the last thing I need is someone or some system stepping in after the fact and prattling to me about how I hurt the poor bastard who intended to kill me, "too much".

• It is the violent bully, troublemaker, mugger, terrorist, home invader, tough guy, kidnapper, rapist, or youname-it who is responsible for whatever damage occurs as a result of his actions — <u>including whatever</u> <u>damage HE may suffer, himself</u>!

• My children have my permission — my <u>encouragement</u> — to defend themselves if set upon and bullied. Your school policy of "zero tolerance for violence" will bring a lawsuit against you, the school, and every stinking administrator in the city, if my child is expelled or reprimanded for defending himself. (Attitude to be expressed

to any school teacher in one of the modern public prison centers where the law requires children to remain for indoctrination and weakening of their characters and souls, until age eighteen).

• Save your bullshit, your words, your speeches, your damn lectures and all of your stinking social theories. *I WILL* <u>NOT</u> *BE* ANOTHER'S VICTIM. Period.

Now we are certainly not suggesting that the foregoing will be accepted by (or acceptable to) the majority of those who fancy themselves "martial artists". Remember: we are concerned only with *rational* students of the combat arts, who live in the modern, 21st century. This certainly eliminates the vast majority of those who are present-day participants in one or another of the numerous "martial arts" that are out there — whether these individuals be participants at the student, teacher, or professional level. It also eliminates the sporting/competitive people — not because sportsmen and competitors wouldn't "get it", but because within the parameters of sport and competition that which we present is irrelevant.

Nor is it our intention to suggest or to imply that we believe in, advocate, espouse, or otherwise condone *anything* that is questionable from the standpoint of the law. We always advocate obedience to the law. We are simply presenting that which, in our humble opinion, constitutes what we regard as a sensible or "ideal" creed for the modern proponent and teacher of those so-called *martial arts* that are geared solely to the demands of close combat and self-defense.

When To Defend Against Armed Attackers

RECENT news stories brought to our attention by students have reported individuals being murdered by armed scum *after complying with the felons' demands*, surrendering their money or other property, and offering no resistance. Regrettably, this is nothing new. There exists — as there always has existed — an element of the so-called "human" species who revel in the taking of human life; homo sapien bacterial filth that, in a reasonable world, would be snuffed out of existence the moment it made its propensities for predation known. Unfortunately, today's deteriorated social milieu sees academically credentialed morons standing firm as *apologists* for these unconscionable pieces of s—t, spewing their advocacies of "tolerance", "forgiveness", "mercy", and "understanding" from ivory towers. Ivory towers which, in our opinion, ought to be toppled, when you consider the subversive garbage that emanates from them today.

If you doubt that the very concept of *justice* is no longer regarded as important or as being a necessary guide for that body of codified custom which we refer to as the "law" in our society, then think about this: **MARTHA STEWART HAS DONE MORE HARD TIME THAN USAMA BIN LADEN**.

In any case, armed, violent felons abound. This is the age of the psychopath. Psychopaths comprise that collection of sewage that are regarded by the mentally challenged as our "national leaders", and they are in that class which in a better time might have been referred to as constituting "the dregs of society". The only hope for your protection, security, and defense, and for the protection, security, and defense of those you love, is *YOU*. Never before in the history of this Nation — and Western Europe — has the private citizen needed the ability to defend himself and fight back against dangerous predators as badly and desperately as he needs it *today*.

The question arises: "If you ever find yourself facing an armed adversary, how do you decide whether to take defensive, counterattacking action, or simply comply with his demands?"

First of all, let us dismiss the matter of how one must deal with an *outright attack*. That is, a situation where there is no "threat" per se, during which the armed criminal employs his weapon so as to intimidate you into surrendering your money, car keys, etc.; but where the criminal <u>forthrightly attempts to use the weapon to</u> <u>injure or to kill you</u>. Obviously, if running away is possible, <u>that</u> is what you should do. IF YOU CANNOT RUN AWAY, AND IF YOU FIND YOURSELF CONFRONTING SOMEONE WHO IS EMPLOYING A DEADLY WEAPON (OR AN IMPROVISED ITEM AS A DEADLY WEAPON — WITH LETHAL INTENT — THEN YOU FOLLOW THE PROPER TWO-STEP COUNTERMEASURE:

1. DODGE, EVADE, PARRY, BLOCK ASIDE, OR OTHERWISE REMOVE YOURSELF FROM THE IMMEDIATE PATH OF THE WEAPON, AND THEN ...

2. USE EVERY MEANS AT YOUR DISPOSAL TO NEUTRALIZE YOUR ATTACKER, <u>LETHALLY</u>. SHOW NO MERCY, HAVE NO RESTRAINT, DO NOT RELENT UNTIL IT IS OBVIOUS TO YOU THAT YOUR WOULD-BE MURDERER IS UNCONSCIOUS. (WHETHER HE IS ACTUALLY DEAD OR NOT IS IRRELEVANT).

Okay. That is the procedure to follow (using the best techniques you know and have command of) when the attack is outright. Now, let's address the matter of a "threat"; a threat in which *the armed felon expresses a demand for property, and says or implies that if you comply you will not be injured.* What then?

The answer is that *IT IS ENTIRELY UP TO YOUR JUDGMENT AT THE TIME*/ With a deadly weapon pointed at you, you *have every right to use deadly force to defend yourself*. It makes no difference whatever what the criminal says. He has given up any right to forbearance on your part the moment he leveled the weapon against you.

No one — not even the most highly qualified teacher of close combat — can make your decision for you, ahead of time. *You need to decide*.

Our personal advice is: If you believe — really are convinced — that by giving the scum your money or your vehicle, etc., he will leave and injure neither yourself nor any other innocent person, then give him what he wants. *Not* because it would be wrong, for instance, to kill him. **It would not be. It would doing a great public service, and acting in a reasonable, moral, and** — **assuming you felt that your life was at stake** — **it would in our lay person's opinion also be acting in a** *lawful* **manner.** (Note: Check with a lawyer for any actual legal advice, or for a reliable statement of how the law might regard any action that you take).

The reason we would suggest the possibility of complying as an option is because *you must use deadly force when defending against a deadly weapon*, and once you begin to counter the armed scumbag you *will* use that level of force, and it will be you or him. This will entail risk for yourself; and we'd rather not see a decent human being risk his own life when he needn't do so — even if there is a good chance of his eliminating an element of subhuman trash from the social landscape.

If you have any slight doubt or "hunch" about what an armed individual truly intends to do; i.e. if you do <u>not</u> feel 100% convinced that his intention is robbery *only*, but that he will kill yourself or another innocent person, *THEN ACT FAST AND KILL HIM FIRST*!

That's it, people. Like how we put it or not, we are giving you the scoop, and we are not perfuming it for those with sensitive ears.

Concern Number One is *protecting innocent life and limb*. You want to crush or rip apart the armed enemy's throat, gouge his eyes, smash him in the carotid artery/break his knee/or strike him in one or another of his **vital points**, in order to drop him to the deck, eliminate his ability to use his weapon, and then set him so that you *keep on attacking him with kicks, downward blows of the knees, heel palms, handaxe chops, etc., until he is absolutely, clearly, and positively NO LONGER A THREAT*. If at any point you can *safely* run away and escape, we recommend doing that.

Tips:—

- Never allow yourself to be tied up
- Do not permit yourself to be locked in the truck of a car
- Never submit to being handcuffed
- Do not enter a closet, cell, or other area of apparent inescapable confinement
- Do not allow yourself to be "proned out" (except in a bank robbery scenario)
- Do not allow yourself to be taken away in a vehicle of any kind, from the scene where the threat originates
- Do not get down on your knees

Feign compliance in all of the above instances, then ATTACK LETHALLY. YOU WILL BE FIGHTING FOR YOUR LIFE, AND POSSIBLY FOR THE LIVES OF THOSE YOU LOVE.

Be Sure To Visit Our Other Site!

<u>WWW.SEATTLECOMBATIVES.COM</u> has many informative articles, book reviews, commentary pieces, and instructional segments that you're sure to benefit from. If you are serious about no-nonsense, practical self-defense and real close combat doctrine, this site will be a treat for you! NEW MATERIAL added at least once every month.

We also hope that you'll tell others about our two web sites, and that you'll continue to visit — and benefit from — each one, yourself.

Obviously, it is our objective to earn a living and make money through the promotion and sale of our wares. However, of *EQUAL IMPORTANCE TO US*, since our work is our passion and our life, is the propagation of **serious, no-nonsense, reliable, authentic, practically usable** information, instruction, and guidance for the self-defense seeking public. There are no lies, no false claims, no exaggerated promises, and no allusions to mysteries or to secrets — just good, solid, authentic and reliable, war-proven *teachings*.

And whether you train at a quality school of combatives or on your own, we offer publications that will help your progress. Our materials are daily referenced and utilized by professionals in law enforcement, the military, and the intelligence community. *We want as many decent people as possible to benefit from that which we offer.*

We shall be back on 1 September with the next edition of *SWORD & PEN*. Until then, we wish you training success, personal success, and good health!

Always yours in the combat arts,

Prof. Bradley J. Steiner

AmericanCombato.com & SeattleCombatives.com

— E N D —