\odot Copyright 2010 by bradley J. steiner - all rights reserved. Sword and Pen – March 2010 Issue

> www.AmericanCombato.com www.SeattleCombatives.com

Sword and Pen

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

EDITORIAL

There Is No "Nice Way" to Defend Yourself

THERE are *effective* ways to deal with an extralegal physical aggressor, and there are effective ways to engage in and win hand-to-hand battles in a military or similar context, but there are no *pleasant*, *nice*, sporting and gentlemanly ways in which those objectives can be achieved. Idealistic "non destructive" methods of handling dangerous physical attackers may be entertaining to observe occasionally in the movies or on television, and in "martial arts demonstrations", etc.; and the practice of various skills that purport to enable those who master them to possess such a capacity to *actually replicate the application of such skills* against live, attacking enemies, may attract customers. However, the plain and simple truth is, physical violence is a dangerous activity. Those who initiate violence (as bullies, muggers, gang members, troublemakers, impulse-dominated savages, home invaders, rapists, etc.) pose what is *ALWAYS* potentially life-threatening harm to those against whom they act.

How often we hear that offensive bleat from some beast: "*Oh, I didn't mean to kill him!*" Or, "*Well, I was just angry. I didn't want to hurt him that badly*", etc. The gallows was and would still be the proper place to lead those out of control examples of human debris who "cannot help" but explode with violent fury against those whom they "don't like", "feel insulted by", or "believe need to be taught a lesson", ad nauseum. Quite mainstream news and TV magazine shows have presented stories about children who were crippled or killed — or who were driven to suicide — by their contemporaries. "I (or we) didn't mean it", means <u>nothing</u> after the fact

(and knowing how so many children are, we are inclined to believe that those who act as bullies or tormentors of their fellows **DO** and **DID** <u>mean it</u>, indeed. When not on camera or speaking with adult "authority figures" these miserable excuses for human beings *laugh* and *snicker* at having gotten away with their acts of evil. That these young bastards are not strapped in electric chairs after their conduct results in the death of an innocent child remains — as far as *we* are concerned — a <u>disgrace</u>.

One big problem in our society is that many have acquired a *recreational* view of violence. Most particularly today (during what many might identify as the end stage of Western Civilization, itself) we have the popularity of such bloodsports as cage fighting and related pastimes. Unlike what we personally see as legitimate martial sports (boxing, wrestling, judo, karate, fencing, kick boxing, etc.) the "challenge events", the so-called "anything goes" events, etc. are merely violent brawling contests in which individuals strive to win by injuring each other. And while we certainly believe that people must be left free to participate in whatever they wish to participate in (so long as the only individuals affected are consenting adults) we nevertheless have our personal *opinion* about that which they do. And "that which they do" in our opinion, is nothing short of stupid, mindless, adolescent, pointless violence. *That's our opinion*. We are perfectly content to see those who disagree with us continue to either applaud others who participate actively in these events, or to participate actively, themselves. **Personally, these people are no concern of ours**.

We bring up this point, however, because we believe that it helps to clarify the point that we are trying to make.

If you wish to be a sporting competitor then *be* a sporting competitor. Adopt, accept, abide by, and *live* the rules of fair play, good sportsmanship, gentlemanly conduct, courtesy, non aggressive, dignified, and suitably *civilized behavior*. Forget about the brazen aggressiveness, the "let's get it on, dude" attitude, the tattoos, the "tough guy" scowling, and the other assorted accouterments that have caught on in the unfortunately rapidly *decaying* world of competitive "martial arts". Those who have embraced this subcultural sewer-conduct are *NOT* practicing the martial virtues, and the physical skills with which they so enthusiastically pummel each other in the venues in which they perform, are *not* the best techniques for Mr. and Mrs. Typical Citizen (or for a typical soldier, sailor, or marine, for that matter!) to learn and to rely upon.

Preparing for self-defense is preparing for *WAR*. Perhaps it is not too surprising that many who feel the need for practical defense training fail to appreciate this fact; but *FACT* it is and fact it remains. And if anyone doubting that which we say will go to the trouble of speaking with someone who has suffered a home invasion, an attack by street scum, a mugging, a kidnap, a

rape, or being set upon by some psychopathic trouble making bully and his cohorts, he will quickly come around. There is no "game" when violence comes down for *real*.

We have known, admired, and enjoyed the company of some really outstanding martial arts competitors. *We have never met a single one who did not agree with us 100% about that which we say in regard to difference between that which wins contests, and that which saves lives.* This, despite the fact that legitimate judo, karate, wrestling, boxing, and kick boxing men are *all* able to adopt, to some degree, that which they are able to do, to an emergency. They know all too well, however, that *that which they compete with serves only to a degree* to prepare them for action in a real world crisis. These men are at least *aware* of the inherent shortcomings of their respective arts, and do not deceive themselves. When one hears one of the current crop of "ultimate" fighters speak with an air of braggadocio however, one can only wonder just what the outcome would be if he were jumped by a gang, confronted by a knife-wielding thug, mugged suddenly by a lunatic, from behind, or taken by surprise in some context where the last thing on his mind was "winning a match".

Yes, the sporting fighters are tough. But their toughness relates to that which they are prepared for, willing to do, and experienced in doing <u>IN COMPETITIVE CONTEXTS, AND AGAINST</u> <u>OTHERS WITH WHOM THEY COMPETE, IN A SPORTING VENUE</u>. It's something like a commercial airline pilot whose training and experience is centered around flying 747's from city to city within the United States and occasionally overseas, and who possesses a perfect history of excellent flying in this venue, assuming that he therefore would have no problem getting into the cockpit of an F-35 Lightning II JSF, and flying it in air combat.

Real self-defense requires that you be prepared and willing, as Applegate said so perfectly in *KILL OR GET KILLED*, to "knock out, maim, or kill" when you close with your adversary. If you do not feel imminent danger to yourself or to a loved one, then it would be difficult to see how going into aggressive physical action against another human being could be justified.

"Aren't there situations when a good controlling grip or hold would be appropriate?" some might ask. *Certainly!* For police officers, security guards, and others who are specifically charged with the responsibility of keeping the peace, and perhaps arresting individuals who, while not "dangerous" per se, are nonetheless uncooperative. Self-defense is undertaken when one is in *DANGER*, and its goal is to efficiently and decisively **neutralize** that danger by rendering the attacker incapable of and unwilling to continue endangering his intended victim.

It is justifiable to use destructive force against a human being *ONLY* when it is so imperative that he be stopped immediately from doing that which he is doing that it literally does not matter if he is seriously injured.— even killed. This is the *correct*, *proper*, and *rational* view

that civilized human beings should be taught to take in regard to the employment of force against members of their own species.

Yes, predatory violence that is initiated by others is dangerous, evil, and <u>must be stopped</u>. That is precisely why <u>defensive</u> violence can never be "nice", "non-injurious", or "socially pleasant". It must be tough, brutal, savage, and dangerously destructive. Otherwise it's a game.

And self-defense is no "game". There's no nice way to "play" it.

Bradley J. Steiner

Expandable Batons, PR-24's, Etcetera

THE so-called "expandable batons" are popular with nearly every major law enforcement agency. And, as is so often the case with anything that garners widespread popularity, the expandable baton is <u>not</u> a very good idea. As a weapon to be employed by line police officers or others who are engaged in occupations that may require physical manhandling, we do <u>NOT</u> recommend this thing.

Private citizens who are looking for carry weapons with which they may protect themselves against street garbage are advised *not* to put their confidence in these flimsy and awkward "weapons". Expandable batons are popular with law enforcement agencies because our society has become wimpified. The cop on the beat, carrying a substantial hardwood baton is "too intimidating" and too "politically incorrect", in the eyes of the politically sensitive who are concerned only secondarily about cops being able to whip the tar out of violent street felons, and primarily worried about "not offending the sensibilities" of a senseless public.

Certainly police must be equipped with an *intermediate* weapon (ie something appropriate when the firearm is too much and hands are insufficient). That's what a stout, hardwood baton is for. **There is no substitute**. (You can toss the pepper spray, mace, and tear gas, as well. *Useless* against the types who the officer is likely to employ it against).

The expandable baton idea grew out of some idiot's assumption that the *spring cosh* (used by SOE and OSS operatives, and underground fighters whom they trained during WWII) could be modified into a *baton*, rather than the skull-cracking cosh which was utilized as a surprise attack weapon from concealment. A brass knob at the end of a series of compressed *springs* enabled terrific killing force to be placed behind the blow that was utilized with the spring cosh. *But the WWII weapon was not a "baton"*. The expandable design, well suited to the spring cosh, simply produces a structurally weak, clumsy, and complicated to use (compared to the hardwood stick) "weapon". Absolute junk, in our opinion.

PR-24's — once the rage — are (as they were when first introduced), pointlessly complex and clumsy weapons. The design comes from the Okinawan *TONFA* — which was a farm implement, used for grinding purposes. The Okinawans used farm implements to fight against Japanese occupation forces hundreds of years ago, when farm implements (and *karate* — or *Okinawa-te*) was all they had. Even the lowest budget four-man American law enforcement agencies can do better than that in 2010.

When made of poly carbonate the PR-24 is a 100% worthless piece of junk, in our opinion. It will last forever, and our only use for it *might* be as a large paperweight. When made of wood (if any are made of wood) its redeeming characteristic is that it can help during cold winter months by tossing it into the fireplace. (We have in our School — donated by a police officer who is one of our Black Belts — an absurd device that actually *combines* an expandable baton *with* the PR-24 side-handle grip! Whoever thought that this piece of crap is a good idea should not be allowed to even make suggestions to police officers about what to carry on patrol, let alone to design weapons for them!)

Here's the rule: A stout, hardwood baton of full (26" to 28" or so) length, for **police officers**. A stout walking stick for **private citizens**.

"What about plainclothes officers?" The cylindrical, rather than the flat, <u>blackjack</u> is the thing. Note: "Sap gloves" aren't a bad idea, although police administrators would probably faint at the suggestion that their carry and use be made policy in today's "sensitive, socially aware" environment. We wouldn't hold our breath waiting for an enthusiastic acceptance of the lead-filled leather blackjack, either.

Personal weapons must be capable of speedily and efficiently inflicting *injury* and accompanying *pain*. That's what weapons are for: To enhance the individual's ability to physically stop and control a person who is unamenable to reason, and who must not be permitted to continue with whatever action he is taking. Cute, complex, socially palatable *toys* are not the answer here; and if the general public does not appreciate that some people must be

injured — sometimes even disabled or killed — in order to stop them, then the public needs either to be educated or ignored. One must not take the *feelings* of people who don't know what the hell they are talking about as a guideline for policies that determine how their uniformed protectors will arm themselves.

All too often the private citizen who *does* wish to arm himself and to be ready to defend himself, regards the police as a repository of vast stores of combat knowledge and sophistication. Not true. This leads these aware citizens to "arm" themselves with garbage. They want pepper spray "because that's what the cops carry". Or they want a taser because "the police use them". Or they think that expandable batons and PR-24s are good weapons because "cops use them".

Cops are armed as their administrators and department policies dictate. Rarely if ever do the administrators care about much more than their career status, and rarely if ever do department policies reflect *what needs to be done* in order to enable the police to conduct proper police efforts: *I.E. TO PROTECT AND TO SERVE THE PRIVATE CITIZENRY IN BOLSTERING PROTECTION AGAINST DANGEROUS, PREDATORY VIOLATORS OF INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS*.

When "click it or ticket", staking out motels and arresting johns and hookers, and arresting husbands for yelling at or shoving their wives is regarded as "*police work*", and when hunting down — and if necessary *shooting down* — armed, dangerous psychopaths is relegated to a back burner, then we get expandable batons, PR-24s, pepper spray, "verbal judo", *great* "community relations programs", and "dialogs" with known outlaws.

America has some wonderful people serving proudly and courageously in law enforcement. They need to be appropriately armed, trained, led, and left to do their proper job of helping to rid human society of its dregs.

And the private citizenry needs to be no less prepared to manage any violent crisis than are its uniformed protectors.

Don't fall for this **B.S.**

The Critical Moment

WE are an admirer of the late Sir Winston Churchill. Please consider the wisdom and counsel in his words:

"If you will not fight for right when you can easily win without blood shed; if you will not fight when your victory is sure and not too costly; you may come to the moment when you will have to fight with all the odds against you and only a precarious chance of survival. There may even be a worse case. You may have to fight when there is no hope of victory, because it is better to perish than to live as slaves". WINSTON CHURCHILL

Indeed, the great Statesman was speaking in the context of *war*; his words referred to the position that the allied powers needed to take in order to cope with the axis powers, in WWII. However, as we so often remind our students and readers, *self-defense is war in microcosm*. Those principles that sensibly guide and direct nations, generals, and armies in battle are as valid and valuable to *individuals* who seek to master the art of individual combat — for self-defense.

One problem that is either rarely if ever addressed, *or* that is addressed inadequately in training individuals for self-defense is the matter of knowing *exactly* **when to go into decisive action**. When is the "critical moment", and how can one make certain that, when it arrives, one will do that which needs doing?

The flip answer of course is, "Go into action when you are attacked." Yes, but it is not always clear just when that actually is, believe it or not. Unlike motion picture fight scenes or instances when giving a demonstration of self-defense techniques, the critical moment may go unnoticed in the real world, and a defender may waste precious seconds. By way of example, take self-defense situations as they pertain to females. A female is in serious danger the moment an unknown male (or a male that is known to her to have a history of violence) **blocks her path and prevents her from exiting an area that she wishes to leave**, or when **he puts a hand on her, making unwanted, unencouraged physical contact**. The disparity of physical size, strength, and usual fighting acumen makes it *imperative* that a female <u>take vicious, aggressive action, and take it then</u>! To delay is to permit a potentially serious threat to escalate.

"But suppose the guy who blocks a female from leaving a place, or who takes hold of her wrist or arm, or who places one or both hands on her has no real intention of hurting her?"

Our answer is this: No one is or ought to be expected to be a mind reader. Any male who is old enough to walk to school on his own and come home after school on his own should be

expected to have been taught unequivocally to <u>keep his hands off females whom he does not</u> <u>know, and NEVER to attempt to force his will in any way upon any female (or anyone at all, for that matter)</u>. In any instance where this fundamental component of civilized conduct has not been instilled in a male, he proceeds to "do as he pleases" at <u>HIS</u> peril; not at the peril of someone who may fear harm from him. *Certainly* no female should lose a fraction of a second wondering if this ape is or isn't intending to harm her, before — upon being given the evidence of his willingness to encroach upon her freedom of movement and her person — she ferociously neutralizes him.

This is what we would teach our daughter. This is what we'd teach *your* daughter. This is what **you** should teach her. This is what every female should be taught, in our opinion. And males ought properly to be made well aware of the fact that this is exactly what they <u>are</u> being taught.

And, while perhaps *slightly* different for males, essentially the same concept should be instilled in them, and instilled at an early age: *Whenever anyone makes it clear that it is his intention to interfere physically with you, or/and to actually initiate violent physical action against you,* <u>neutralize him</u>! We only wish that, as a child, *we* had been taught this. We learned it, however; and thank God that we did. But we'd have better better off (and some putrid human scum would have been adequately dealt with) had we learned it before reaching our late teens).

In training and in preparing mentally for self-defense, the elimination of all of those blocks that might interfere with the split second decision to "*GO*!" when the critical moment arrives, must be a priority mission. **Simplicity** and **clarity** is what facilitates the accomplishment of the task.

Simply put: In any self-defense situation it is the intended victim of the attack, or the person who is acting on behalf of that intended victim so as to protect him, who is the *"authority figure"* and — in a manner of speaking — the "field commander". *He*, and no one else, is the one who must make the decision to trip the wire. Outside command elements do not exist. In military combat situations the decision and the command to attack comes from the person who is in charge. In an emergency that involves a direct threat to you or to yours, <u>YOU</u> are in charge. *Act like it!*

Having a **MADE UP MIND** and establishing well ahead of time that violence directed against you will trigger terrifying, overwhelming, mercilessly brutal and ferociously destructive violence *immediately* is what you need. Do not kid yourself. Trying to weigh and measure every nuance and degree of the "intended threat level" that some extralegal punk-bastard intends to pose will *not* work. Whether a bully, a gang member, a mugger, a troublemaker, a kidnapper, a home invader, or *whatever you care to posit as the threat*, the answer — *once it*

becomes physical aggression — is fierce and relentless retaliatory violence, until the danger to your or yours is neutralized.

Keep it **simple**, please. There is too much depending upon you tripping the wire in time, and in adequate measure to do the job for you to complicate matters! Every fraction of a second that you delay driving into your attacker and finishing him is a fraction of a second longer that he has to beat, torture, rape, kidnap, stomp, or murder you — or to do that to someone you love.

Be clear about what you must do — *before* you need to actually do it. Trying to "control" or to "arrest" is the responsibility of the police officer. *Your* responsibility is only to avoid trouble insofar as you are able to do so, not to agree to fight with anyone, never to initiate any hostile action, and — if and when given no choice but to act in self-defense — to **do so**; to do so with decisive, adequate violence so that whoever has chosen to attack you is rendered <u>incapable</u> and <u>unwilling</u> to continue on his evil course.

Only simple and direct actions — destructive and injurious actions — will reliably enable you to accomplish the task before you in a dangerous emergency. This means techniques that are intended for \underline{WAR} , not for contests. It means savaging the attacker's most vital target areas, and continuing to do so with every ounce of strength, viciousness, and relentless, driving aggression you are capable of mustering.

DO IT RIGHT AWAY! You will get no second chance, and there is neither a "round two" or a rematch during which you may have a chance to compensate for having failed to drop your enemy straight away! This is the real world. This is what you must learn, practice and, if necessary, *apply* in a dangerous self-defense emergency.

If we again use the analogy of **war**:

Look at the methodology and philosophy of most so-called "self-defense" methods as being analogous to the Vietnam War. Look at the methodology and philosophy that *we* espouse as being analogous to the Six Day War.

The moment that Israel knew that a threat existed the forces of that Nation were unleashed *totally*, and there was an immediate plan and effort to completely eliminate the threat — *NOW!* The disgraceful leadership (or lack, thereof) that treated the greatest and the best of America's young people as sacrificial pawns in Southeast Asia during the Vietnam War resulted in our Nation failing to win a conflict that, *had the proper leadership and command, coupled with the appropriate military tactical methodology been in force*, would have been rather easily won within a year — if not within a month or two.

Having the knowledge and the power to do battle will avail you nothing if you lack both the *WILL* and the *DECISIVENESS* to use it fully, when necessary.

You must set this *ahead of time*. Establish that it will be the perception of **imminent danger**, manifesting in an overtly aggressive action by anyone possessing the apparent ability, the intention, and the opportunity to injure you, that will cause you to explode into action. All of this can be perceived within a fraction of a second, and — once it *is* perceived — may be acted upon with similar speed and decisiveness. *See that you are prepared at all times to do this!*

So many people train in the martial arts expecting that their increasing ability to do kata, to spar, to compete, to drill, to acquire encyclopedic technical repertoires, etc. will produce for them the confidence and the ability to <u>do that which an emergency calls for</u> if and when an emergency strikes. But these people are way off track!

Setting your mind so that, when the critical moment arrives — *and not one fiftieth of a second later!* — you go after your enemy like a ferocious, attack-trained guard dog, is the key! With a handful of good, battle-proven techniques you will almost always be able to wreak havoc on any adversary, *so long as <u>this mindset and decision</u> is solidly in place*.

See to it that it is.

"Blind Him!"

Note, Warning, and Disclaimer: We assume no responsibility whatever for anyone's use, misuse, or abuse of anything we describe in this article or in this Newsletter. The reader assumes 100% liability for his actions and behavior. We urge that those techniques we describe be employed ONLY in unavoidable self-defense, to prevent serious injury or death at the hands of a dangerous attacker.

ONE of the most decisive and effective unarmed combat actions that anyone can employ in a serious confrontation is a swift, powerful attack directed into the adversary's eyes.

Obviously, such an action is extremely dangerous and is justifiable <u>ONLY</u> in legitimate selfdefense. When you simply cannot avoid someone who is bent upon harming you or someone about whom your care, and when it is obvious that *unless you take decisive action* you may end up crippled or worse, then **attacking the eyes** should always be born in mind as a terrific counterattacking or preemptive move. It is here in the advocacy of such techniques as will be the subject of this brief piece of instruction, that only the dishonest and/or the stupid can fail to see the complete difference between *contest* and *combat*. In no form of sporting contest is attacking the opponent's eyes permitted, and it **never ought to be**. Such would be absolute madness, and those advocating or participating in such "competitive events" as did allow eye attacks, would be incredible fools or utter savages and barbaric thugs. (Let us hope that the sporting/competitive martial arts in this Country do not deteriorate even farther than they already have, and that we *never* witness lunacy such as eye attacks being regarded as "acceptable" in some variant of moronic "cage fighting" or "mixed martial arts", etc.).

On the other hand let us be forthright in our espousal of *that which works decisively* in real world self-defense. We see not the slightest reason to care about *anyone* who unjustifiably attempts to impose physical harm upon another — for whatever reason. Whether bully or gang member or mugger or rapist or home invader or car jacker or armed thug or "tough guy" or plain troublemaker, *or you name it*! Once someone decides that he will physically endanger, abuse, humiliate, torment, or otherwise violate another, *HE HAS SIGNED HIS RESIGNATION FROM THE HUMAN RACE, AND DESERVES TO BE DISPOSED OF AS EFFICIENTLY AS POSSIBLE*.

We took a long time (too damn long a time, in fact) to arrive at this decision, and to formulate what is today our "martial philosophy". And we paid for being a "nice" person. It was a good number of years *after* our exposure to *Kill Or Get Killed* and *Get Tough!*, and other of the WWII classics before our studies (including those with Charlie Nelson) *finally* overrode the bullshit that *ju-jutsu* and *karate* and other "*self-defense*" training that we had been immersed in, had imposed upon us. By the age of 20 we had finally adopted the proper mindset and the *kill or get killed attitude*. Prior to that we thought like a "martial artist" (and, in consequence, were hard put to really defend our self well). Here's an example:

When we were sixteen years of age and a high school student we had the experience — during what we thought at the time was a friendly conversation with a small gorup outside the apartment building where we lived — of being suddenly seized and thrown to the sidewalk by a scumbag (first name "Chuck") with whom we had had previous trouble. This scumbag was a **bully**. Much larger and stronger than our self — and some years older — this miserable excuse for a human being never liked us and (convenient as we were as a younger, weaker, smaller individual to victimize) this piece of s—t invariably enjoyed inflating his ego by endeavoring to push us around and intimidate us whenever he saw us.

Our "martial arts" training had taught us nothing about such surprise attacks, and we simply were thrown. Today, in a similar situation, we would almost certainly kill anyone who attempted to attack us in such a manner. First, because we have been drilling, conditioning, and training <u>PROPERLY</u> for decades since that unfortunate incident. Second, because we appreciate the potential lethality of being thrown to the ground and we are 100% uninhibited about resorting to <u>lethal</u> force when such is directed against us. We don't {play" with violence. We are no longer brainwashed to the point of believing that we are obliged to "respond in kind" when attacked, using only similar measures as may have been used against us, and in a similar manner. Third, because once closed with a larger individual whose intention it is to throw us or to apply some submission hold, we would instantly bite a chunk out of his face, rip off his ears, jab into and — hopefully — gouge out his eyes, and KEEP ON ATTACKING HIM until he was absolutely and completely harmless to us, thereafter.

In a way that piece of s—t who bullied us when we were sixteen is fortunate. We can only hope, however, that if he is still alive today he lives in an iron lung or in a wheelchair, and that he needs to be fed and cared for by a keeper. *Hopefully*, he has suffered horrific punishment from someone else whom he chose to bully. We have never seen this bacteria's face since our teenage years, so we can only hope. *And we do!*

Do not wait to be set upon before *you* learn. *GO FOR THE EYES!* This is as close to a "sure thing" in unarmed combat as you can get. You can do this immediately upon realizing that serious danger is imminent. Just open your hand, extending your fingers *without* tensing them, and stab them ferociously into the adversary's eyes. It's that simple. And it works. Followup by doing whatever is appropriate or necessary at the time. This may be escaping the scene, or it may be further devastating your would-be tormentor. A man who is momentarily blinded is a wonderful target for powerful kicks that smash into his testicles or that break his knee. He also may be shoved into traffic, smashed down a flight of stairs, punched in the sternum or solar plexus, or hit with an object-at-hand. *Write your own ticket! Just be certain that you immediately take advantage of the opportunity you have given yourself when your opponent has been blinded by your eye attack!*

"Suppose my arm or wrist is seized when I thrust at his eyes?"

If you train yourself to execute a *straight-to-the-target UNTELEGRAPHED eye thrust* it is nearly impossible for your action to be thwarted. Like a boxer's untelegraphed left jab. If the opponent is within range he *is* going to get hit by the jab. However, if your wrist or arm is grabbed or deflected, then that is because it has caused the adversary to *NOTICE* and *REACT* to it. Fine. Break his knee with a side kick as he reacts defensively to your fingertips thrust!

Unfortunately, a straight, extended finger to the eyes thrust is not likely to result in your adversary being permanently blinded. It is a great technique, but this is one of its limitations.

For more permanent results the eyes can be attacked by deliberate, up close *gouging*. Drive the thumbs into the *inside corners* of your enemy's eyes (it often helps to insert your *middle fingers* into his ears if you are able, when doing this, as it "locks" your gouging thumbs into place). Dig *IN* and rip *OUTWARD* with your thumbs. Your assailant will be completely neutralized. Note that when your thumbs are ripping into his eyes a knee to the testicles will snap his head more powerfully forward, *deepening* the thumb gouge. Also, when your thumbs enter the inside corners of his eyes, a powerful straight thrust *forward*, using your body weight and the push of both arms, will likely damage both of his eyes — or worse.

One thumb may be employed against one eye, with or without the opposite hand seizing the enemy's head or neck or collar for stability.

The magnificent *"Tiger's Claw Thrust"* as taught by Fairbairn is another terrific way to go after an enemy's eyes. Again, however, permanent blindness is, unfortunately, an unlikely outcome.

Form the weapon by positioning the hand as for a chinjab smash. Now direct the open, clawed hand *forward*, and thrust the finger tips into the enemy's face. Upon fingertips impact with his eyes and nose, the *heelpalm of the hand* "collapses" in a blow to the enemy's face. If sufficient thrust has not been generated in a tiger's claw attack, then simply *CLAW* and *RIP* into the enemy's eyes and face with the hand — just like a wild animal might do.

The end of an umbrella can be thrust into an attacker's eye (or at least thrust *at* his eyes, which sets him up for a kick, etc.). Any beverage can be used effectively as a distraction by tossing it into an assailant's face. A handful of gravel, sand, small change, a handkerchief, food, sunglasses, etc. — virtually *anything* that cannot be used as a weapon — can be thrown into an enemy's eyes and will momentarily disorient him.

The eye is a great target for any of those "legal size" (ie less than four-inch blade length, in most jurisdictions) lock blade folding knives.

A woman who is being targeted for sexual assault can often maneuver effectively — via the use of deception — into a position where she avoids being beaten by feigning compliance, and *"gently embrace"* her would-be rapist's face as if to kiss him, then <u>suddenly and without</u>

warning drives both thumbs into his eyes, proceeding with the gouging technique previously described.

Do not dismiss this advice and instruction lightly. Unlike what you may have been taught (or are being taught) at your local "dojo", "kwoon", or "dojang", *this stuff works*.

And, once you master it, to paraphrase the old saw, "THE EYE'S THE LIMIT !!"

More On Bullies

WE appreciate that some of our Site's visitors have questions regarding how to teach their children (or where to send their children to be taught) self-defense. We almost never train children, our self. Our colleague Mark Bryans is an excellent teacher of children, and has conducted extremely successful children's' courses in the past. We frankly have little patience for children, and prefer adults only. Still, we are *more than sympathetic* with the problems that children have with troublemakers and bullies, and we believe wholeheartedly in parents preparing the little ones to protect themselves adequately, when and if necessary.

For whatever it's worth, these are our thoughts on training children how to defend themselves against bullies:

• First, children should be taught unequivocally that bullies are <u>scum</u>, and that they (i.e. the intended victims of bullies) have every right on earth to defend themselves against these creatures, and to do so *WITHOUT MERCY*. This is, we know, unacceptable thinking for many "parents", who prefer fantasy and illusion rather than reality in their child-rearing endeavors. However, children who are bullied are being *terrorized* — and terrorism deserves *MERCILESS* retaliatory action.

• Second, whenever and wherever those worthless bums who pass themselves off as "school administrators", "teachers", and "school officials" *forbid* a child fighting back when bullied, parents should organize and confront the administration of that school facility and let it be known that *their children have their permission to defend themselves*. Those licensed child-abusers who would forbid children defending themselves — even penalize such action if and when it was undertaken — should be put on notice that they will *personally* be sued and held accountable by the parents if they dare to attempt to stop their children from acting in legitimate self-defense, when necessary. Forbidding a child to defend himself is like forbidding him to eat when he is hungry, get a drink of water when he is thirsty, or see a physician when he

is ill. <u>*This is child abuse!*</u> And punishing a child as though he were equal in responsibility to his tormentor *after* defending himself against a bully, <u>for the mere fact of having defended himself</u> is nothing less than **EVIL**.

• Third, children should be taught no-nonsense **boxing** and **judo**-based self-defense skills. (Combato would be too severe, unless we are talking about gang type attacks and violent offenses such as those perpetrated by some middle and high school sociopaths who aspire to rise as gangbangers. In that *type of predicament we have not the slightest problem with children learning battlefield skills*. But we realize that there is almost no chance of persuading anyone else of the validity of our position).

• Fourth, children should be conditioned in the proper <u>mindset</u>. They must learn that there are times in life when violence, and only violence, will suffice to quell interpersonal problems. And *whenever* a child is set upon by a physical troublemaker from whom he cannot disengage without being attacked, <u>THAT</u> is one of those times. In such instances, the child must be taught, <u>anything goes</u>; and he is justified in dispatching his tormentor however he is able.

• Fifth, the child should be protected aggressively against the disgusting assertions made by those "adults" that fighting back is wrong, and he ought to be thus protected by having a proper dignity and warrior-spirit instilled in him. (A "warrior" in the noble sense and meaning of that designation is <u>never</u> a violent or troublesome person. He is a gentleman and a respecter of others' rights and property. *However*, he is also the "first to fight" when and if threatened with unavoidable violence; and he stands up to evil and opposes it.)

• Sixth, as part of his moral education, every child should be taught to be gentle and kind to those weaker than himself, to those who are helpless, and to those who lack the capacity to protect themselves. He should be taught, as part of his moral and martial education, that it is the lowest act of unmanly cowardice to push others around, to bully, to start trouble, or to otherwise endeavor to lord it over other people. He should be taught to despise bullying, and bullies. He should be taught to respect and to admire strength and fighting ability *that is properly controlled and utilized for the protection of those who are innocent and good*.

We realize that we are a dinosaur. We also do not give a damn.

Children, just like adults, have every right to live free of the interference of predatory human garbage. When those adults who are responsible for their welfare and protection default on that responsibility it is reasonable and right that the children themselves should have the means of self-defense. Those who prey upon children — whether contemporaries or older scum —

deserve no consideration or concern whatever. Innocent children deserve <u>every</u> consideration and all our concern.

In answer to the question, then, of what to teach children about defending against bullies, we say: Teach them **first** of all that they have an absolute **RIGHT** to defend themselves — and to do so ferociously — whenever anyone attempts to bully them. Then, train them thoroughly in no-nonsense fighting skills that enable them to do just that.

Check Our Other Web Site!

We post new material in one or more sections of <u>www.seattlecombatives.com</u> <u>at least once a</u> <u>month.</u>

We have added a book review of one of the great wartime classics: *V-5 HAND-TO-HAND COMBAT*. This book, first published in 1943, was reprinted in the 1950's, and then went out of print. It remains one of the *indispensable* reference works of close combat and self-defense for those who are practical, real world oriented teachers and students.

We receive a lot of e-mails ad calls from individuals asking us to recommend books that they can use for self-teaching and/or to supplement whatever classical/traditional martial arts training they are engaged in. **This is one of the books that we recommend.** We also have a series of book reviews on that site that discuss other worthwhile texts you will doubtless be interested in learning about.

ALSO — check the "monthly instruction" section of the site for a new article describing how you can reliably select and evaluate quality combat techniques for your personal repertoire.

Effective Self-Defense In A Nutshell

REAL self-defense techniques are not only *simple* — there are not too many of them. Not, at least, when compared to the thousands upon thousands of techniques that fill the curriculum of the numerous martial arts and ways.

We offer, for those unable to attend classes with us on a normal course basis, intensive, shortterm courses for out-of-towners, and for people who come here from other countries to learn our methods. In ten hours of private lessons we can provide *infinitely* more than most classical/traditional martial arts stylists learn about real world self-defense and close combat in

<u>decades</u> of formalized, traditional study. In 20 private lessons we can teach a person all that he or she will ever need to know about unarmed close combat and personal defense — on the condition that he or she will put some serious practice time into that which we teach. Our intensive 20-lesson course for out-of-town students (which we have been offering for more than 20 years) contains material that can and should take *years* to perfect — but that will, within **months**, equip the pupil far better than black belt expertise in a classical/traditional system could equip him, for actual hand-to-hand combat.

But is there an even simpler way to prepare for self-defense? Is there something that one can learn in, say, an hour or two, that will give one a fighting chance in a serious, anything-goes emergency? *YES*.

If we were pressed and found our self forced to prepare a reasonably fit, serious-minded individual to handle a close-combat situation, we would boil the curriculum down to three core actions:

• ATTACK THE EYES

• ATTACK THE THROAT

• BREAK THE KNEE

We would of course add: <u>"Attack with relentless fury and do not stop attacking until the</u> <u>enemy is neutralized decisively. Be certain to explode with absolute, murderous rage and</u> <u>hatred, and block out concerns about injury (you will be injured) and pain (combat always</u> <u>hurts). GIVE NO WARNING (I.E. DO NOT TELEGRAPH BEFORE ATTACKING) and</u> <u>growl like a wild animal when you go into action. Strive to whip yourself into a killing rage,</u> <u>emulating a shark in a feeding frenzy. KEEP ON ATTACKING with the attitude that, if</u> <u>worse comes to worse, YOU WILL DIE KILLING YOUR ENEMY!</u>"

If any of our visitors need some help in speedily preparing to learn how to save their lives in a deadly attack situation, we recommend focusing on the three aforementioned concepts, and work at readying themselves to *implement* those concepts by training to . . .

— DRIVE EXTENDED FINGERS INTO AN ATTACKER'S EYES / DRIVE A TIGER'S CLAW THRUST TO THE ENEMY'S FACE / GOUGE THE EYES WITH THE THUMBS / SPIT INTO THE OPPONENT'S EYES -OR- THROW SOMETHING INTO THE OPPONENT'S EYES

— SNAP A HALF-FIST KNUCKLE JAB INTO THE ATTACKER'S THROAT / THRUST EXTENDED FINGERS INTO THE ATTACKER'S THROAT / SEIZE THE ATTACKER'S WINDPIPE WITH A THROAT-LOCK AND RIP OUT / CHOP WITH A HANDAXE BLOW TO THE ADVERSARY'S THROAT

- LASH OUT WITH A SIDE KICK TO THE ENEMY'S KNEE

Is that a comprehensive system of close combat? *Absolutely not*. However, if you need to speedily acquire <u>something</u> that you can reply upon <u>**RIGHT NOW**</u> and you have no opportunity to study, practice, and train for months, then zero in on what we've just presented — perhaps teach it to your wife or other loved one. It's better than nothing.

We might inject one other tip: *BITE INTO ANY PART OF THE ENEMY'S FACE AND RIP A PIECE OF IT OFF* if you possibly can.

Fighting Knives

WE blame no one for loving knives. They are handy, beautiful tools, and we have always been fond of well made, intelligently designed combat and survival knives. However, after perusing a friend's copy of a popular knife magazine, we realize that an enormous degree of confusion is possible for anyone wanting to decide upon a knife for close combat. *There are many different, new, and "innovative" so-called fighting knives. How can one decide upon one, for oneself?*

What follows in no sense is intended to deride any particular knife designs, knife designers, or knife collectors. We would simply like to present useful information for the close combat/self-defense student who is <u>not</u> a knife aficionado or collector.

If you want an excellent fighting knife, purchase one of the **Fairbairn-Sykes NATO issued** commando fighting knives, an **Applegate-Fairbairn Fighting Knife**, an **Ek Commando Knife**, or a **Randall-Made Fighting Knife**.

You want an English-made (Sheffield) commando knife, not a lookalike.

You want the Applegate-Fairbairn <u>*without*</u> the ridiculous-added serrations. You want the *original* A-F.

You can select virtually any of the superb Ek Fighting Knives (google "Ek Commando Knives") and you'll have a winner.

You'd want one of the Randall "Military" type knives (google "Randall Made Knives").

That's all you need to know. There are other excellent fighting knives, and there are other survival knives that can serve admirably as combat knives, if necessary; but if you want a simple primer on what you can obtain, at relatively low cost, you now have it.

Above all — and please get this — the crucial thing is to be **mentally** set to *use* your knife in combat, and to use it unhesitantly, and lethally, against a living, breathing human being. The physical skill of knifework is important — but it can be taught and developed within two or three hours to any fit, serious man who wants to learn it. With the right *mindset* and the simple, basic skill, you can make even a simple kitchen knife serve you in an emergency. Without mindset and skill even the finest fighting knife ever designed will be useless to you.

Well, we again come to the conclusion of another edition of SWORD & PEN.

We wish you success in your training and development, hope you'll visit <u>www.seattlecombatives.com</u>, and that you'll tell others about our sites. Until next month then,

STAY COMBAT READY!

Prof. Bradley J. Steiner

www.americancombato.com www.seattlecombatives.com

— E N D —