

# Kōdōkan Jūdō's Elusive Tenth Kata: The Gō-no-kata – "Forms of Proper Use of Force" – Part 1

## Authors' Contribution:

- A** Study Design
- B** Data Collection
- C** Statistical Analysis
- D** Manuscript Preparation
- E** Funds Collection

Carl De Créé<sup>ABCDE</sup>, Llyr C. Jones<sup>ABCD</sup>

International Association of Judo Researchers, United Kingdom

**Source of support:** Self financing

**Received:** 21 January 2009; **Accepted:** 13 February 2009; **Published online:** 7 August 2009

## Abstract

### Background and Study Aim:

*Kōdōkan Jūdō* is a Japanese form of pedagogy created by Jigorō Kanō, based *inter alia* on neoconfucianist values, traditional Japanese martial arts, and modern Western principles developed by John Dewey, John Stuart Mill, and Herbert Spencer. It was Kanō's intention to educate both the mind and body. The practical study of *jūdō* includes *randori* (free exercise), nine different *kata* (predetermined and choreographed physical exercises), and *kōgi* (lectures). In recent years, *Gō-no-kata* ("Prearranged forms of correct use of force"), a generally considered obsolete and reclusive 'tenth' *kata* of *Kōdōkan jūdō*, has become the subject of some renewed interest. The purpose of the present paper is to provide a comprehensive study of this *kata* which once formed a part of the standard *jūdō* curriculum. We also aim to remove the confusion and mystery which surrounds the *gō-no-kata*.

### Material/Methods:

To achieve this, we offer a careful critical analysis of the available literature and rare source material on this *kata*.

### Results:

The name *gō-no-kata* sporadically appeared in some of early Western *jūdō* books. Flawed research methods, as well as the appearance of a true hoax presumably created with commercial intent, have led to widespread confusion and misinformation in the West about the contents of the elusive *gō-no-kata*.

### Conclusions:

The origin of the misinformation on *gō-no-kata* can be traced back to modern *jūdō* authors failing to recognize both important mistakes contained in early Western *jūdō* books and the fabrication in recent years of a bogus *gō-no-kata*.

### Key words:

*Gō-no-kata* • Jigorō Kanō • *jūdō* • *kata* • *Kōdōkan*

### Author's address:

Professor Carl De Créé, P.O. Box 125, B-2800 Malines, Belgium, e-mail: prof.cdecree@earthlink.net

## BACKGROUND

**Jūdō:** *Jūdō* is a Japanese form of pedagogy, created by Jigorō Kanō, based *inter alia* on neoconfucianist values, traditional Japanese martial arts, and modern Western principles developed by John Dewey, John Stuart Mill, and Herbert Spencer.

**Kata:** Predetermined and choreographed physical exercises, which together with free exercises (*randori*) and lectures (*kōgi*) form the three critical pillars of *Kōdōkan jūdō* education.

According to the founder of *jūdō*'s own words, the proper study of *jūdō* essentially has to involve both *randori* and *kata* [1–5] This important cohesion between these two building stones of *jūdō* virtually has been lost in modern times, partly because of the International Judo Federation's (IJF) and national governing bodies' emphasis on the sports-competitive aspects of *jūdō* and winning medals. *Kata* are intended and recognized as

a valuable training drill in most Japanese *gendai budō*<sup>1</sup> and *koryū*<sup>2</sup> arts. *Kata* represent the grammar of *jūdō*, and without properly mastering them, *jūdō* is often reduced to a crude conglomerate of isolated throws merely based on power, endurance, and athletic achievement. Finn [6] provides a particularly insightful definition of the subject:

*"Kata: Prearranged forms in Japanese martial arts that are like a living text book. They contain all the fundamental*

<sup>1</sup> *Gendai budō* 現代武道 are modern Japanese martial arts which were established after the Meiji Restoration (1866–1869). In that way they distinguish themselves from classical or traditional or old martial arts (*koryū*). *Gendai budō* often are rooted in *koryū*.

<sup>2</sup> *Koryū* 古流 is a Japanese term that is used in association with the ancient Japanese martial arts. The word literally translates as *old school* or *old tradition*. *Koryū* is a general term for Japanese schools of martial arts of which the creation predates the Meiji Restoration (1866–1869) which sparked major socio-political changes and led to the modernisation of Japan.

information in animate form, with which to perfect technique and understanding of the particular skill.” (...)

**Kōdōkan:** The specific name of the school and style of *budō* as given by the founder of *jūdō* Jigorō Kanō (1860–1938).

There are nine *kata* in **Kōdōkan jūdō** today, as accepted by the time-honored headquarters of the *jūdō* world, the *Kōdōkan Jūdō Institute* in Tōkyō, Japan [7–9]. These nine *kata* are named as follows [7–10]:

*Nage-no-kata* (Forms of Throwing);  
*Katame-no-kata* (Forms of Grappling or Holding);  
*Kime-no-kata* (Forms of Decisiveness);  
*Kōdōkan goshinjutsu* (*Kōdōkan* Forms of Self-Defense);  
*Jū-no-kata* (Forms of Gentleness & Flexibility);  
*Itsutsu-no-kata* (The Five Forms);  
*Koshiki-no-kata* (The Antique Forms);  
*Sei-ryoku-zen'yō Kokumin-Taiiku* (National Physical Education according to [the principle of] best use of energy);  
*Joshi goshinhō* (Methods of Self-Defense for Women).

Of those nine *kata* only seven are most commonly performed. Because of this reason one will often find more popular literature incorrectly claiming that there would be only seven or eight *Kōdōkan jūdō kata* [11,12]. With the exception of the *Kōdōkan goshinjutsu* and *Joshi goshinhō*, all the above *kata* are commonly attributed to the founder of *jūdō*, Dr. **Jigorō Kanō** (1860–1938) [12]. The *Kōdōkan goshinjutsu* was created by a panel of experts in 1956 (see the text *Kōdōkan Judo*<sup>3</sup> [13, pages 145–251] for full details about the first eight of the above *kata*). *Joshi goshinhō*, the ninth *kata*, though officially recognized by the *Kōdōkan*, has never gained great popularity, not in Japan and even less so abroad, and it is usually omitted from lists of *kata* or from *jūdō* textbooks. *Goshinhō* can be considered as the equivalent of *Kōdōkan goshinjutsu*, designed specifically for the female and taking into account the types of attacks of which females usually are the victim; the creation of this *kata* was ordered by Jirō Nangō, the second President of the *Kōdōkan* in the 1940's, and completed by a technical team of experts within the *Kōdōkan*. The *Itsutsu-no-kata*, though also officially attributed to Jigorō Kanō [13,14], according to recent research dealt with elsewhere, was not created by Kanō-*shihan* either [15,16], and neither was *Koshiki-no-kata* [7,9,15], the latter which consists of two series of forms directly taken from *Kitō-ryū jūjutsu*, more particularly, from its *Takenakaha*-style [15].

Two other *Kōdōkan kata* which are omitted from the above list, namely, *kime-shiki* and *jū-shiki*, today are considered

part of the *sei-ryoku-zen'yō kokumin-taiiku*. Thus, unlike in the pre-1930 period, *kime-shiki* and *jū-shiki* usually are no longer considered separate *kata*, and for this reason, generally no longer appear under their separate names in *Kōdōkan kata* lists<sup>4</sup> [15].

To provide context for some of the material that follows, it is useful to explain how the aforementioned nine *kata* are categorized according to purpose<sup>5</sup>. See Kotani, et al. [17] and Otaki and Draeger [18] for further details.

Together, the *nage-no-kata* and the *katame-no-kata* are known as *Randori-no-kata* (Forms of Free Exercise). The main purpose of these two *kata* is to facilitate the development of *randori* (“free practice”) skills. The *kime-no-kata* and the *Kōdōkan goshinjutsu*, but also the *joshi goshinhō*, are classified as *Shōbu-no-kata* (Forms of self-defense) – within these *kata* the central objective is to defeat an adversary and survive. The *jū-no-kata* and the *sei-ryoku-zen'yō kokumin-taiiku* are grouped as *Rentai-no-kata* (Forms of physical education), where the foremost objective is to educate the body to remain healthy. Finally, the *itsutsu-no-kata* and the *koshiki-no-kata* are grouped together as *Ri-no-kata* (Forms of theory) – their core purpose is to develop a higher understanding of the fundamental and deeper *goku'i* (極意 ‘essence’), perhaps even ‘esoteric’ principles (*okuden* 奥伝 or *shinō* 深奥) of *jūdō*.

Despite this well-structured and generally considered ‘complete’ curriculum, one must acknowledge that in addition to the aforementioned nine *kata*, other – *Kōdōkan* and non-*Kōdōkan* – *kata* exist in *jūdō*. Most of these *kata* are not well known outside Japan and are rarely taught or practiced [15,18,19].

The purpose of the present paper is to provide a comprehensive study of a *kata* that once formed part of the *Kōdōkan* curriculum, but no longer features, namely the **Gō-no-kata** 剛の形 (“Prearranged forms of correct use of force”). In recent years, this generally considered obsolete ‘tenth’ *kata* has become the subject of some renewed interest within *jūdō* circles. However, much of the information in circulation on *gō-no-kata*, is contradictory, ambiguous, and even blatantly erroneous; at best, its contents and even its existence has been the subject of considerable speculation. We aim to remove this confusion and mystery which surrounds the *gō-no-kata*.

Our research questions are as follows:

<sup>3</sup> Although Kanō is presented as author of this book, it is in fact a compilation by the *Kōdōkan* Institute that dates from long after Kanō had already passed away, in this way honoring *Jūdō kyōhon*, the only book on *jūdō* which Kanō ever wrote, and of which he was able to complete only the first part (1931) [4] before he passed away in 1938.

<sup>4</sup> Abe I. Personal communication, USJF National Judo Conference; 2004, July 5–7<sup>th</sup>; Honolulu, HI.

<sup>5</sup> Note that this categorization is not unique. For example, the *jū-no-kata* could equally be classified as a *Ri-no-kata* since it also illustrates the fundamental principles of attack and defence found in *jūdō*.

What is the veracity of various claims made by certain publications that what they propose as *gō-no-kata* truly represents the historic *gō-no-kata* ?

Does there exist a *gō-no-kata* in *Kōdōkan jūdō* ?

If a *gō-no-kata* exists, then what is its contents and theoretical foundation ?

If *gō-no-kata* exists, then who practices it and where can it be observed and learnt ?

The first part of this series of three papers will mainly focus on the first of those four main questions. To address these questions and achieve our purpose, we offer a critical evaluation of the available literature and source material on this *kata*. Rare material drawn from original and reliable sources will also be introduced to support the drawing of definitive conclusions. This paper offers an important contribution to our knowledge of *Kōdōkan jūdō*. It has implications for the current *jūdō* syllabus, and also represent the only critical scholarly study of this *kata* in both Western languages and Japanese.

### PROPER TRANSLATION OF THE NAME “GŌ-NO-KATA”

It is very difficult at times to translate words from one language to another without losing the intended usage of the word. *Gō* 剛 literally means ‘hard’ in the sense of opposite to *yawara* 柔 which means “pliable” or ‘soft’; the *kanji* 柔 is, of course, alternately pronounced ‘*jū*’ in terms like *jūdō*. Whilst the term ‘*yawara*’ is often also used to describe textiles or in some cases people with gentle personalities, ‘*gō*’ can be used describe a cold, callous feeling towards another or unyielding as a hardened piece of steel that will not dent as a result of a blow of a hammer.

*Gō-no-kata* is, therefore, very difficult to translate precisely, since ‘*gō*’ does not simply mean ‘strength’ in the sense of physical strength, or even ‘force’ in the sense of physical force. “Unyielding forms” would probably be the most accurate translation; however, this does not fully reflect the nature and purpose of the *kata* as intended by Kanō-*shihan*. In the *gō-no-kata*, ‘*gō*’ is used as the opposite to the “way-giving pliability” of *jū*. Thus, it implies some stiffness, but more so a ‘resistance’, or “resistive force”. After all, not all force is ‘re-

sistive’. Simultaneously, one could argue that *jūdō* is not devoid of force, as long as it is applied efficiently and with minimal effort. We will explain later how in the *gō-no-kata* it is shown that the brute *gō* of *uke* fails, but the refined *gō* of the *tori*, after first having applied *jū*, is successful. In other words, assuming that *gō-no-kata* simply condemns force is wrong. The *kata* accepts efficient force, but it rejects brute inefficient force. This is very, very hard to cover in a translated title. Taking these restrictions and concerns in mind, we propose the term “Forms of correct use of force” as an acceptable, defining English translation for *Kōdōkan jūdō*’s exercise known under the name *gō-no-kata*.

### THE GŌ-NO-KATA IN WESTERN AND TRANSLATED JŪDŌ LITERATURE THROUGHOUT HISTORY

According to the *Kōdōkan New Japanese-English Dictionary of Jūdō* [20, page 142] the *gō-no-kata* was established in 1887 (also the year that the *jū-no-kata* was formed and the *itsutsu-no-kata* is claimed to have been created). Note that this is the only mention made of the *gō-no-kata* in what is otherwise a fairly comprehensive *jūdō* glossary. It is not known for sure what source the editors used to support this date<sup>6</sup>, but no mention of this date is made for *gō-no-kata* by Sanzō Maruyama’s (1893–1984) otherwise exhaustive *jūdō* historical work [21]. As we will see later, this date is not beyond challenge.

For the rest, one can only find some rare cursory appearances of the name ‘*gō-no-kata*’ in a handful of *jūdō* books that have appeared in Western languages. For this and other associated reasons, the *gō-no-kata* has become thought of as the “lost or forgotten *kata* of *jūdō*”.

For example, Geoffrey Gleeson (1927–1994), the one-time national coach for the British Judo Association, and one of the *Kōdōkan*’s former research students (*kenshūsei* 研修生) back in the 1950’s, and known for his more intellectual and comprehensive approach to *jūdō*, writes:

“Unfortunately the *Go-no-kata* has been lost”. [22]

Gleeson’s viewpoint is understandable, and reflected the opinion of most Western *jūdōka*, including that of senior *kata* specialists, in both the West and Japan. We have already mentioned some of the reasons why, but the situation necessitates further reflection. A brief review of literature leads to the conclusion that no known

<sup>6</sup> The authors most likely literally interpreted a comment from Kanō that was published in his biography [14] where it reads in the relevant section about *kata* under the subheading *Jū-no-kata, gō-no-kata*: “I began studying it in the 20<sup>th</sup> year of Meiji...” (...) It is not clear though whether this date should be interpreted as referring to the creation of *gō-no-kata*. Kanō writes the above section after having introduced *jū-no-kata*, which more likely is the object of the above date. At the end of the section, Kanō writes: “In the 20<sup>th</sup> year of Meiji also this *kata* had 10 hon; that later on became 15”. (...) Only after this sentence to conclude the part on *jū-no-kata*, Kanō introduces *gō-no-kata*: “Then there is *gō-no-kata*, which is totally different from *jū-no-kata*”. (...) It is our opinion that the syntaxes of these sentences suggest that the year 1887 as date of creation only applies to *jū-no-kata*, not to *gō-no-kata*.

work commonly available to the general public by an author of stature, describes this *kata*.

Three historic authors who fulfilled a leading role in the development of *jūdō* in the West, and whose texts were published in Western languages, did mention the *gō-no-kata* in their books. These authors are Moshé Feldenkrais, Gunji Koizumi, and Mikonosuke Kawaishi. However, it must be pointed out that neither Gleeson, nor any of the above three authors are referenced or annotated, and the claims made are either unverifiable (they provide no details of the original primary<sup>7</sup> sources), or else, with a few notable exceptions, are based on uncorroborated oral accounts.

### **1944 – MOSHÉ FELDENKRAIS – JUDO: THE ART OF DEFENCE AND ATTACK [23]**

Writing in 1944 in his book *Judo: The Art of Defense and Attack* [23], Dr Moshé Feldenkrais<sup>8</sup> (1904–1984) includes the *gō-no-kata* in his list of most common *kata* as follows:

*The most common Katas are: "... (2) Go-No-Kata for developing strength..."* (...) [23, p. 176]

This is a rare reference to the *gō-no-kata* in a Western text. It is made rarer still in that it provides an accurate, if succinct summary of the *gō-no-kata*'s purpose. However, how or where precisely Feldenkrais obtained this information is not known, since no further details are given, nor original references provided. It is known though that Feldenkrais sent a copy of the manuscript to Kanō-*shihan* for approval. It is also known that Kanō had many deep concerns about the contents of the manuscript of which he thought, much was incorrect. Lack of time did not allow Kanō to completely edit the manuscript so he limited himself to providing a number of suggestions and selective corrections. It is thus plausible that the information came from Jigorō Kanō personally.

### **1948 – GUNJI KOIZUMI – BUDOKWAI QUARTERLY BULLETIN [24]**

Writing in 1948 in the *Budokwai*<sup>9</sup> *Quarterly Bulletin*, Gunji Koizumi (1885–1965) summarized his understanding of the *gō-no-kata* as follows:

*"Goh-no-kata (kata of forcefulness).*

*This kata was designed to develop muscular power. The opposite of ju-no-kata, force is used against force. Based on attack and defence, in a contest of strength, the more forceful gains the controlling position over the other.*

*There are fifteen exercises practiced in the same manner as ju-no-kata.*

*This kata has not been popular; probably because it is too much like gymnastic exercises. I am not familiar enough with it to give full details." (...)* [24, p. 8]

Koizumi's position is understandable. Together with Kawaishi he was probably the most senior *jūdōka* in Europe at that time, yet Koizumi's own education was not in *jūdō*, but in *jūjutsu*. By the time Koizumi ... 'converted' ... to *jūdō*, Jigorō Kanō had already ceased teaching *gō-no-kata*, and the *gō-no-kata* had already been in disuse in Japan for dozens of years. Therefore, Koizumi most likely never learnt it, hence his errors regarding the number of techniques in the *gō-no-kata* (fifteen, instead of, correctly, ten).

### **1957 – MIKONOSUKE KAWAISHI – THE COMPLETE 7 KATAS OF JUDO [25]**

The most commonly known reference for the *gō-no-kata* is the one found in the seminal book *The Complete 7 Katas of Judo* [25] by Mikonosuke Kawaishi (1899–1970).

*"There are... many other Judo Katas. I shall mention only a few that have fallen into disuetude:*

*The Shobu-no-Kata<sup>10</sup>, or Kata of Attack (more literally Contest);*

*The Go no Kata, or Kata of Force or of blows, more characteristic of Karate-do (the technique of the Artemis)." [25, p. 11]*

This extract is the only mention that Kawaishi makes of the *gō-no-kata* in his entire book. He does not provide any further technical details on the *kata*, nor any list of the techniques contained therein. To the best of our knowledge, it is in Kawaishi's book that the first mention of *gō-no-kata* containing striking techniques is made; it is also therein that the first association of *gō-no-kata* with *karate* is made. Accordingly, we opine that all other, later references of the *gō-no-kata* being a *kata* of blows, originate with Kawaishi as their original source.

<sup>7</sup> A primary source is an original manuscript, text or material relating to a particular subject.

<sup>8</sup> Dr. Moshé Feldenkrais was the founder of the Feldenkrais Method designed to improve human functioning by increasing self-awareness in movement.

<sup>9</sup> The *Budokwai* is believed to be the oldest *jūdō* club in Great Britain. It was founded in January 1918 by Gunji Koizumi who is known as the "Father of British *Jūdō*".

<sup>10</sup> The *Shōbu-no-kata* should not be confused with the *Shinken-shōbu-no-kata*, the latter which merely is another name for *Kime-no-kata*. The content of the original *Shōbu-no-kata* remains unknown to date [15].

Kawaishi's book was translated into English, from the original French by the veteran British journalist and *jūdōka* E.J. Harrison. It is unclear why Kawaishi expressed *gō-no-kata* in essentially two different ways *i.e.* "kata of force" and "kata of blows". One can only conjecture that either Kawaishi was unfamiliar with the *kata* himself and made a mistake, or else he was misunderstood. One possible explanation would be that at some point the *gō-no-kata* was confused with the *Gohō-ate* (Five-direction Strike) section of the *Tandoku-renshū* (Individual Exercises) component of *Sei-ryoku zen'yō kokumin taiiku*. What is certain, is that the error was not made by the English translator Harrison, as the original French language version of the text [26] refers to both "kata de la force" and "kata des atemis". Most likely, what applied (and what is explained above) to Koizumi, also applies to Kawaishi, that is, that both had their formal training in *jūjutsu* rather than *jūdō*, and that by the time they converted to *jūdō*, *gō-no-kata* had already disappeared from the *Kōdōkan's* curriculum for dozens of years, and was taught only sporadically and kept alive by just a handful of *jūdō* exponents in Japan.

So, where did Kawaishi get his information about *gō-no-kata* from? As you will see further, we argue that there is reason to believe that Kawaishi may have obtained this information from no one else but Yves Klein, who had just three years earlier published his book *Les fondements du judo* [27] – which was entirely devoted to *kata* – but, who was misread by Kawaishi.

For completeness, it is necessary to note that Geoffrey Gleeson presents a modern (self-styled) *gō-no-kata* in one of his texts – namely *The Complete Book of Judo* [28, p. 113–126]. However, Gleeson freely acknowledges that this *gō-no-kata* is his own original creation and makes no claim that it is in any way associated with the original. Accordingly, this variant will not be considered further. Instead, a web-based article that summarizes much of the available material on the *gō-no-kata* will be evaluated as a starting point to the detailed literature review proper. Also, since this article is featured on what currently (2008) probably is the most popular website on information about *jūdō* [29], it has some impact on the *jūdō* community.

### 2003/2008 – NEIL OHLENKAMP – *GŌ-NO-KATA* [29]

The most complete review of the *gō-no-kata* available in the West and in the English language, to date, was compiled by Neil Ohlenkamp and published on his *Judo Information Site*, a to the general public freely accessible Internet web-

site. In the article [29] a summary of the available material on the *gō-no-kata* is presented. Ohlenkamp acknowledges that several versions of the *kata* are in existence, but despite questioning the pedigree of some of these variants, he stops short of drawing definitive conclusions and presenting an authoritative definition of the *gō-no-kata*. Furthermore, in a personal communication, Ohlenkamp acknowledges that he simply collated some findings and reprinted claims made by others as well as their references, without him actually critically analyzing those claims or reading many of the references quoted by either those authors or by himself. Consequently, this particularly review article contains various inaccuracies and errors.

Ohlenkamp, for example, writes:

"According to Kodokan Professor Toshiro Daigo, the *Yuko no Katsudo* published by the Kodokan in November 1921 ... " (...) Ohlenkamp [29].

This claim precedes a detailed list of the techniques in the *gō-no-kata*. Ohlenkamp admitted not having personally checked this reference (which is very hard to find in the West, and entirely in Japanese). After verification of that particular reference [1], it can be stated here with certainty that a detailed description, such as that implied by Ohlenkamp, is not contained therein. Having inquired directly with Toshiro Daigo-sensei, the *Kōdōkan Jūdō Institute's* Chief-Instructor, about this statement during a conversation in August of 2005<sup>11</sup>, Daigo could not recall ever having made such a statement. Daigo also added not knowing (then) himself of any technical references on *gō-no-kata* in Japanese or other languages<sup>12</sup>, and also expressed that he was not knowledgeable in this *kata* himself. However, these errors do not detract significantly from what otherwise is a valuable contribution by Ohlenkamp's article to the state of knowledge on the *gō-no-kata*.

### THE ELUSIVE CHARACTER OF *GŌ-NO-KATA* TODAY

The scarce, yet conflicting literature data findings demonstrated in the paragraphs above, suffice to establish our case for conducting research into *gō-no-kata*. Recall that the *gō-no-kata* does not feature in the contemporary list of *Kōdōkan*-recognized *kata*. Furthermore, over the past couple of years, the *Kōdōkan Institute* itself has somewhat obfuscated the situation by invariably ignoring most requests for any information pertaining to *gō-no-kata* – on some occasions even having bluntly denied its very existence<sup>13</sup>. One can only imagine, that if at the world mec-

<sup>11</sup> Daigo T. Personal communication; 2005, August 3<sup>rd</sup>; Tōkyō: Kōdōkan Jūdō Institute.

<sup>12</sup> Only in his January 2009 article, Toshiro Daigo, now for the first time includes a reference (the one by Kuhara [30]) that details the techniques of *gō-no-kata*.

<sup>13</sup> Abe I. Personal communication, USJF National Judo Conference; 2004, July 5–7<sup>th</sup>; Honolulu, HI.

ca of *jūdō* indeed no *sensei* would supposedly know anything about *gō-no-kata*, then how and where would one be able to find a *sensei* that can demonstrate, let alone, actually *teach* this *kata*?

Consequently, for those *kata* enthusiasts, Japanese or other, who have expressed an interest in learning how to practice this *kata*, efforts to find a *sensei* competent in *gō-no-kata* invariably prove futile. None of the three current (as of 2006) *Kōdōkan* 10<sup>th</sup> *dan* holders (Ichirō Abe, Toshiro Daigo and Yoshimi Ōsawa) teach, nor have been known to practice *gō-no-kata*. Having asked Abe-*sensei* in summer 2004 if he personally knew about the *gō-no-kata*, he responded that “it did not exist” [*arimasen*]<sup>14</sup>. Though the Japanese word ‘*arimasen*’ is somewhat ambiguous, as in addition to expressing that something “does not exist”, it may also express that a person himself does not *have* the information or knows anything about it, without necessarily denying its actual (historic) existence. Knowing that Abe-*sensei* is a direct student of Hideichi Nagaoka-*sensei* (1876–1952), who in turn was himself a 10<sup>th</sup> *dan* and direct student of Kanō-*shihan*, and knowing (according to reliable documents, see *inter alia*, Kuhara [30]) that Nagaoka-*sensei* apparently knew how to perform *gō-no-kata*. Abe’s response was somewhat disappointing, yet not entirely unexpected. Thus, we probed further and asked Abe-*sensei* if he ever had seen Nagaoka-*sensei* perform *gō-no-kata*. Once more the response was negative<sup>15</sup>.

So we asked the same question a couple of months later to Keiko Fukuda, another world-renown *kata* expert and one of the longest active *jūdō* practitioners [she started *jūdō* in 1935] who had known Kanō-*shihan* personally, and who had trained under both Kyūzō Mifune-*sensei* (1883–1965) and Kaichirō Samura-*sensei* (1880–1964), both equally 10<sup>th</sup> *dan* holders. Fukuda-*sensei* responded she had never been taught *gō-no-kata*, and could not remember with certainty if a long time ago (before World war-II) she might have seen it being performed<sup>16</sup>. Others have claimed having asked similar questions to Naoki Murata-*sensei*, the present curator of the *Kōdōkan* museum and library, and having received similar responses.

Alternative options such as conducting a search on the Internet in Japanese on the *gō-no-kata*, do not yield a single relevant source, other than two or three that have a list with yearly historical events indicating the year of the *kata*’s creation. For the rest, false positives are returned a couple of times which relate to Okinawan *Gōjū-ryū karate*, within which a separate *gō-no-kata* or *gōjū-no-kata* may be found, that has no relationship to *jūdō* whatsoever.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>16</sup> Fukuda K. Personal communication. Sōkō Joshi Jūdō Club Monthly Kata Clinic; 2006, May 6<sup>th</sup>; San Francisco, CA.

Consequently, attempts to research or find out more about *gō-no-kata* quickly lead to considerable frustration. And yet, the *gō-no-kata* is not extinct – it is only extremely rare. Indeed, genuine sources are available and, provided one knows where to look, an expert teacher can be found. Unfortunately, instead of trying to locate such a teacher and consulting those genuine resources, the situation has now been complicated by the creation of fake *gō-no-kata* partly for the marketing purposes and ensuing financial gain, as will become clear from the next chapter.

## TWO CONFLICTING SCHOOLS OF THOUGHT

An examination of the literature and other media will reveal two conflicting schools of thought regarding the *gō-no-kata*’s development and content. These are as follows:

One, that the *gō-no-kata* was developed by Kanō as a complement to the *jū-no-kata*. The aim of the *kata* was to help the participants learn the basics of *jūdō* techniques, by first opposing each other with strength and later switching to a skilful yielding movement. As implied by its name, practice of *kata* also helped develop physical strength.

The other, that the *gō-no-kata* is a fusion of Kano’s *jūdō* and the *karate* of Gichin Funakoshi (1868–1957), and features primarily a blend of *jūdō* throwing techniques (*nage-waza*) and *karate* striking techniques (*ate-mi-waza*).

## GŌ-NO-KATA, A KATA OF BLOWS OR ATEMI-WAZA ?

Under this heading we critically evaluate in detail the literature and media that argue that the *gō-no-kata* is based on a synthesis of *jūdō* and *karate* techniques. All of the sources supporting this thesis are relatively modern. The major proponents responsible for distributing this vision, are Kawaishi [25], Parulski [31,32], Muilwijk [33–35] and Oettlin [36] will be critically evaluated. Particular scrutiny will be applied to the claims of Muilwijk, as his perspective on the *gō-no-kata* was gaining considerable momentum, especially in Europe.

As pointed previously, it is most likely Mikonosuke Kawaishi (1899–1970), at that time the senior *jūdō* teacher in France, who is originally responsible for distributing the view of *gō-no-kata*, as a *karate*-like exercise. Indeed, in his 1957 opus magnum *The Complete 7 Katas of Judo*, he literally writes [25, p. 11]: “*The Go no Kata*,

or *Kata of Force or of blows, more characteristic of Karate-do (the technique of the Atemis).*" (...).

Though Kawaishi does not further elaborate on this statement anywhere else in his entire written oeuvre, recent developments in the *jūdō* world show that this regrettable, erroneous statement has formed the doubtful bedrock of so-called "new discoveries". There is no evidence whatsoever that Kawaishi himself knew or had ever even seen *gō-no-kata* being performed. At the time when Kawaishi 'converted' to *jūdō*, *gō-no-kata* was already relatively elusive, and had officially disappeared from the *Kōdōkan* curriculum. Moreover, the *Butokukai* in Kyōto and its formal *budō* teacher school, the *Busen* (abbreviation for *Budō Senmongakkō* 武道専門学校), where most Japanese *budō* masters who came to Europe in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century found their origin, never had *gō-no-kata* in its official curriculum. Kawaishi unaware of the later consequences of his statement, in his book is simply trying to provide background for the various other *kata* that he does explain and for the concept of *kata* itself, by saying: "Look, *kata* is a form of training, and more *kata* exist and could be created in future". In doing so, Kawaishi, merely communicates the vision of Kanō, completely in line with what Mifune also states in his *Jūdō kōza* [37].

However, this explanation still does not clarify how Kawaishi came to link *jūdō* and *karate* through the *gō-no-kata*. We assert that Kawaishi did in fact not learn this information from any Japanese source, but from simply reading Yves Klein's 1954 book *Les fondements du judo* [27], which predates Kawaishi's book by three years, and which, interestingly, too was published in France. Klein<sup>17</sup> became fascinated with *jūdō* in the early 1950s and went to Japan for 15 months to study *jūdō*. Upon his return in 1954 as a 4th dan holder, he completed his book, entitled, *Les fondements du judo* [27].

What is very interesting for the purpose of this article is that in the same book, Klein writes:

"... Autrefois on pratiquait le Kata de 'Go' (dix techniques), qui était l'étude de la puissance, force physique, violence et contractions. Au Japon, on pratique encore aujourd'hui ce Kata assez étrange dans les dojos de 'Karate' (sorte de 'savate' japonaise)". (...) [27, p.18].

"... Formerly they used to practice 'Gō-no-kata' (ten techniques), which was the study of power, physical force, violence and contractions. In Japan, they still practise this rather strange *Kata* in 'Karate' (kind of Japanese 'French boxing') *dōjō* today." (...)].

<sup>17</sup> Yves Klein, today is mostly remembered as an avant-gardist Jewish-French artist who also authored ... and created an ultramarine-like color, officially patented as "Klein International Blue", which he abundantly used in some of his paintings.

One has to be careful here. Though Klein does say that *gō-no-kata* was apparently being practiced also in *karate dōjō*, Klein does nowhere say or even suggest that *gō-no-kata* would contain, or originate (partially) from, *karate*. Our interpretation of Klein's words is that *gō-no-kata* was used there as a structured warm-up exercise, and certainly not as a formal ceremonial exercise or as a type of *kihon* (basics). Any interpretation from Klein's description that *gō-no-kata* would even contain actual *karate* strikes is absolutely preposterous, and solely on account of the person misreading Klein.

The first person to be either misguided ... or ... "make use" of Kawaishi's error is George Parulski in his 1985 publication. What is certain, is that the error was not made by the English translator Harrison, as the original French language version of the text [26] refers to both "*kata de la force*" and "*kata des atemis*".

### 1985 – GEORGE PARULSKI – BLACK BELT JUDO [31]

In the book *Black Belt Judo* [31] published under the auspices of the now defunct American Society of Classical Judoka, George Parulski Jr. presents a description of the *gō-no-kata* (and the *shōbu-no-kata*) that paraphrases the one provided previously by Kawaishi:

"...there are *Shobu-no-kata*, or forms of attack (or contest), and *Go-no-kata*, or forms of force. The latter is more like a *kata* of *karate-do* than of *Judo* since it is a prearranged pattern of blocks, strikes and kicks done with power and focus (*kime*)." (...) [31, p. 72].

No reference to Kawaishi's work is made in Parulski's text and, like Kawaishi, Parulski provides no further details of the *gō-no-kata*. *Black Belt Judo* has to be viewed carefully, as there are many factual inaccuracies and Parulski's own interpretations to be found throughout the work. Additionally, the instructional text and photographs that describe how to perform the various *kata* therein often deviate significantly from the accepted *Kōdōkan* standard, and reflect considerable dilettantism. Particularly questionable, is the material associated with the more advanced *kata*.

### 1998 – GEORGE PARULSKI – ISAO OBATO'S LOST KATA OF JUDO – VOLUME I, HOAX #1 ?

Thirteen years later, in 1998, Parulski goes a step further in a CD-ROM-based film [32], entitled *Isao Obato's Lost Kata of Judo – Volume I* [38, p. 7]. On this CD-ROM, George Parulski claims that he would have re-discov-



ered and restored various obsolete *jūdō kata*, which he is now making available to the *jūdō* community to ... prevent them from falling subject to further extinction. Parulski demonstrates a self-styled *gō-no-kata* that clearly is a combination of contemporary *jūdō nage-waza* and *karate atemi-waza*. His assertion that this *kata* would be the genuine *gō-no-kata* will now be evaluated.

Parulski claims that he learnt the *kata* from his own *sensei*, Isao Obato, and asserts that Obato had direct lineages to both Mifune and Kanō:

*“The founder of the American Society of Classical Judoka, Isao Obato held the rank of 8<sup>th</sup> dan in judo with black belt certification in jo-jutsu, iai-do, aikido and jujutsu. Born in Osaka, Japan, Obato was a student of Kyuzo Mifune, a Kodokan 10<sup>th</sup> dan from whom Obato said to have learned 20 judo kata (pre-arranged forms). Many of these kata were not included or completed in the Kodokan syllabus. Still others were once there and are no longer taught.” (...)* [38, p. 3]

*“The author of this tape, Dr. George R. Parulski, Jr. was a direct student of Isao Obato. Obato sensei as a boy was a student of both Jigoro Kano, the founder of Judo and [Kyūzō] Mifune Sensei. Obato sensei devoted his life to teaching what he referred to as “classical judo” and taught complete judo up until his death in 1986.” (...)* [32]

When explaining the source ‘his’ *kata*, Parulski expands upon the description in his book [31] and claims that the *gō-no-kata* as demonstrated, represents a fusion of Kanō’s *jūdō* and Funakoshi’s *Shōtōkan karate*:

*“This video teaches Go-no-kata (forms of hardness) showing the link between Funakoshi’s karate-do and Kano’s Judo.” (...)* [38, p. 7].

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first time that an explicit connection between these two great masters of different *budō* disciplines is claimed that would have resulted in the development of the *gō-no-kata*. Parulski’s statement is historically incorrect. Whilst Kanō-*shihan* and Funakoshi-*shihan* did meet and did have conversations (also, see further), and while Kanō-*shihan* was open to other *budō*, and towards the end of his life even opened up the *Kōdōkan* for the teaching of other *budō*, such as for example *jōjutsu* and *bōjutsu*, there is no evidence of any ongoing cooperation between Kanō and other *budō*-masters to further formalize *jūdō* techniques after the 1906

<sup>18</sup> Two *kata* that do not feature today are listed in the 1954 text [40] namely the *Fujoshi-Goshin-no-Kata*, “Forms of Self-Defence for Girls and Women” and the *Ippon-yō-Goshin-no-Kata*, “Forms of Self-Defence for Men”. These are not existing *kata*, however neither are they “lost *kata*”. The 1954 book was published when the *Goshinjutsu* Committee was still working to finalize what is now known as *Kōdōkan Goshinjutsu*. The *Ippon-yō-Goshin-no-kata* simply became *Kōdōkan goshinjutsu* as we know it today. The *Fujoshi-Goshin-no-kata* is what we know today as *Joshi (jūdō) goshinhō*. To allow a more free way of defending and attacking, in both the exercise for males and the one for females, the term *kata* was dropped, and in the one for females replaced by the word for ‘method’ – *hō* 法. See Kotani et al. [17] for a detailed description of the *Joshi (jūdō) goshinhō*.



**Figure 1.** Jigorō Kanō’s rare 1931 publication *Jūdō kyōhon* [A textbook of *jūdō*] [4], the only major textbook on *jūdō* written by its creator, and from which *gō-no-kata* has already been omitted.

establishment of the final form of *kime-no-kata* at the *Butokukai* [15,39].

Parulski, further claims that the *gō-no-kata* (and other so-called ‘lost’ *kata*) were contained in the original 1934 Japanese version of the book *Kodokan Judo* that is in common use today, and also in the more common 1954 edition which precedes the current 1986 one. Moreover, Parulski also claims that the 1934 edition would have been authored by Kanō-*shihan* himself:

*“In defense, all we can say is that the 1934 edition of Kodokan Judo (that is the Japanese version authored by Jigoro Kano the founder of Judo mentions) each of these kata. The 1954 edition of Illustrated Kodokan Judo, authored by the Kodokan, mentions some but not all of these kata, and the newest 1980s version mysteriously is devoid of any mention of these kata.” (...)* [32]

Parulski is correct in that the 1986 edition of *Kodokan Judo* [13] does not mention the *gō-no-kata*. However, the 1955 version entitled *Illustrated Kodokan Judo* [40] does not either. It does make reference to nine<sup>18</sup> kinds of *kata* taught at the Institute [40, p. 161]. As for the claims



**Table 1.** *Gō-no-kata*: "Forms of Hardness & Strength". From De Créé [42], by permission; data based on Parulski [32], using Shōtōkan karate terminology.

Omote		
1.	<i>Gyaku-tsuki</i>	Reverse thrust/strike
2.	<i>Oi-tsuki</i>	Stepping thrust/strike
3.	<i>Mae-geri (keage)</i>	Front snap kick
4.	<i>Ushiro-(hidari)-kata-dori</i>	(Left) Shoulder grab from behind
5.	<i>Katate-tekubi-dori</i>	Single hand wrist hold
6.	<i>Ushiro-ryōte-dori</i>	Two hand hold from behind
7.	<i>Oi-tsuki</i>	Stepping thrust/strike
8.	<i>Ushiro-kata-dori</i>	Shoulder grab from behind
9.	<i>Oi-tsuki</i>	Stepping thrust/strike
10.	<i>Mae-kubi-jime</i>	Front neck choke
11.	<i>Mae-kubi-jime</i>	Front neck choke
Tachi-ai		
12.	<i>Katate-tekubi-dori</i>	Single hand wrist hold
13.	<i>Oi-tsuki</i>	Stepping thrust/strike
14.	<i>Oi-tsuki</i>	Stepping thrust/strike
15.	<i>Oi-tsuki</i>	Stepping thrust/strike
16.	<i>Ushiro-jime</i>	Choke from Behind
17.	<i>Mae-kubi-jime</i>	Front Strangle
18.	<i>Oi-tsuki</i>	Stepping thrust/strike
19.	<i>Mawashi-tsuki</i>	Roundhouse punch
20.	<i>Yama-tsuki</i>	Mountain punch (Double hand punch)

pertaining to a 1934 text, no such 1934 edition of this book exists. The original edition of this book was indeed written by Kanō-shihan, but published in 1931, not in 1934, and was never reprinted in its original version [4] (Figure 1). In this book, the first volume (hence the suffix 'jōkan' 上巻) of what was clearly supposed to become a two-volume oeuvre, Kanō-shihan does not mention a word about *gō-no-kata*. Kanō-shihan never completed the manuscript for the subsequent volume ('gekan' 下巻). The book was completely reworked by the Kōdōkan after Kanō-shihan passed away in 1938, and was greatly expanded to bridge the virtually entire *jūdō* curriculum. It was finally published in 1955, first in Japanese [41], and subsequently in English [40] and French.

Parulski's *gō-no-kata*, contains twenty techniques. He does not provide a formal listing of the twenty techniques in his *kata*, although each technique is demonstrated consecutively. An effort to provide such a listing using the most appropriate *Shōtōkan karate* descriptor for each technique is made in Table 1.

A closer look at Parulski's exercise, for most *jūdō* scholars will immediately raise concerns. The number twen-

ty is peculiar, to say the least. All *jūdō kata* created by Kanō-shihan (*nage-no-kata*, *katame-no-kata*, *jū-no-kata*, and *shōbu-no-kata*) in their original form contained just ten techniques [39,21]. It would be somewhat curious, for *gō-no-kata*, created in 1887 or earlier (pre-1885), thus following the earlier ten-technique *nage-* and *katame-no-kata*, and chronologically in the same time period as *jū-no-kata*, to have a completely different number of techniques than any of the other *kata*. Note that *Nage*-, *katame*-, and *jū-no-kata* were then reworked over the next twenty years (for *jū-no-kata* even longer) until they consisted of fifteen techniques [21].

While it is correct that today's *kime-no-kata* and *Kōdōkan goshinjutsu* have twenty or even twenty-one techniques, respectively, their history and the situation is quite different from that of *gō-no-kata* or the other *Kōdōkan-specific kata*. Kanō's original *shōbu-no-kata* was greatly revamped and converted into a *shinken-shōbu-no-kata* and expanded to about thirteen or fourteen techniques [43], and it was not until the 1906 meeting of the *Butokukai* that by input of various masters from different *jūjutsu* schools, in particular *Tenjin shinyō-ryū*, *Yōshin-ryū*, and *Sōsuishitsu-ryū*, it resulted in the 20-technique *kime-no-*

*kata* we know today. However, *gō-no-kata* never went through such an evolution, and Kanō left it untouched from its original ten-technique form. [15]

It is obvious that there is no commonality between the “*gō-no-kata*” demonstrated by Parulski and *Kōdōkan jūdō’s gō-no-kata* form described elsewhere in this paper. The problems with “the Parulski version” do not stop at the unusual number of techniques which Parulski proposes. Parulski’s *kata* is divided into two sections: eleven *Omote* 表, (translated by him as “Front Fundamental Techniques”) and nine *Tachi-ai* 立合 (“Continuous Attacks”). It is apt to note that such a division is somewhat curious, and that contrasting a series called *Omote* with a series called *Tachi-ai* is highly inconsistent and nonsystematic. While the concept of *omote* is not typically used in *jūdō*, except for in *koshiki-no-kata*, which is originally a *jūjutsu* (*kumi-uchi*) exercise and which has been preserved from *Kitō-ryū*, it is typically contrasted with *ura*. The meaning of *omote* in *Kitō-ryū* also is not “front techniques” as the word is often translated into, for example, in *aikidō* [7,8]. *Tachi-ai* in *jūdō* refers to a standing position, to express contrast with a kneeling position, the latter which was the common formal position which a subject typically assumes when inside a building in the old Japan. Hence, it is in *jūdō* typically contrasted with *idori* 居取.

Whilst a detailed critique of Parulski’s actual performance goes beyond the purpose of this paper, it is useful to provide a summary evaluation of his alleged *gō-no-kata* display.

There is no doubt that what Parulski shows are effective, sometimes even spectacular movements. However, an overall lack of appropriate reaction and efficiency permeates the entire *kata*. For example, a basic, relatively innocent wrist grab is countered with disproportionate nerve strikes and a throwing technique. Overall, the exercise shown by Parulski more resembles *torite* than that it resembles *jūdō*, which is quite unlike what *Kōdōkan’s gō-no-kata* does, or was aiming for.

Careful study of the *kata* performance raises additional questions about Parulski’s overall *jūdō* education. It is evident that Parulski’s partner is inexperienced in *kata* and this undoubtedly contributes to the low quality of the performance, overall. However, the consistent errors in elementary formalities such as the *reiho* (bowing ceremony), order of moving the feet forwards or backwards,

sitting down or standing up with the wrong knee, no proper awareness of *tsugi-ashi* and a lack of coordination between *tori* and *uke*, to an expert, suggest that the performer has only a rudimentary knowledge of *jūdō kata*.

It is also necessary to indicate to the reader that there is considerable controversy about the credentials and even the actual existence of a person by the name of Isao Obato<sup>19</sup>. The reader interested in these reports can access the debates by performing a simple search at an internet resource for Japanese martial arts and culture – [www.e-budo.com](http://www.e-budo.com). A Google search on the Internet will yield dozens of disqualifying discussions of the many other claims made by Parulski.

Additionally, we note that Parulski himself provides a remarkable disclaimer for ‘his’ *gō-no-kata*, in which he seems refer to long-established *Kōdōkan* policies:

*“The viewer is warned that with the current state of judo politics making claims to teaching ‘lost katas’ might be met with great resistance and a degree of mistrust and doubtfulness on the part of many judo leaders. Even direct inquiries to the Kodokan are answered with statements such as ‘These Katas Never Existed’, or better still, ‘We have no records of an Isao Obato training with this Institution.’” (...)* [32]

It has already been explained in this paper how the *Kōdōkan* views the *gō-no-kata*. However, the Institution’s genuine reticence to embrace the *gō-no-kata* should in no way be used to add credence to Parulski’s *gō-no-kata* as being authentic, as all circumstantial evidence would indicate that it is not. The detailed evaluation of Jan Muilwijk’s *gō-no-kata* that follows later, will reinforce this point.

We also point out that there exists no such name as ‘Obato’ in Japanese. None of the native Japanese scholars we have consulted, has ever heard of such a name. Authoritative Japanese name reference works such as P.G. O’Neil’s<sup>20</sup> [44], do not contain an entry for the name ‘Obato’ as an existing Japanese surname, nor does such a name appear anywhere in their extensive glossaries. It is speculated that the name “Isao Obato” is a fabrication based on the person of “Isao Obata”, a known *Shōtōkan karate* master from Keio University (慶應義塾大学, *Keiō Gijyū Daigaku*) and first Chairman of the *Nihon Karate Kyōkai* or *Japan Karate Association (JKA)*.

The roots of the ‘real’ Obata in karate, as well as his links with Funakoshi, most likely fed Parulski’s other

<sup>19</sup> This Isao Obato should not be confused with someone with a known *karate-sensei* with a similar name, Isao Obata, the latter who is known to have trained under Nakayama-sensei, and Funakoshi-shihan, and who has taught karate in the US Air Force’s martial arts program together with other *sensei*, such as Tsuyoshi Satō (*jūdō*) and Kenji Tomiki (*aikidō*). In the US, Walter Todd, *jūdōka*, *karateka* and *aikidōka*, was one of his students.

<sup>20</sup> P.G. O’Neil’s *Japanese names. A comprehensive index by characters and readings* [44] is a standard reference work for Japanese name research used by Japanese studies scholars containing 13,500 surnames, 11,000 personal names, 6,800 literary, historical and artistic names, 4,400 place names, and 300 Japanese era names.

fabrication, namely that of an exercise that would combine *karate* and *jūdō*, and that supposedly would have been the fruit of a collaboration between Kanō-*shihan* and Funakoshi-*shihan*, and that would have culminated in *gō-no-kata*. In the evaluation of Jan Muilwijk's *gō-no-kata* further in this paper, particular attention will be paid to the claim that this *kata* would have been jointly developed by Kanō-*shihan* and Funakoshi-*shihan*.

## 2002 & 2003 – LINDA YIANNAKIS AND STEVEN CUNNINGHAM – THE KATA OF JUDO – PARTS I & II OF A SERIES [45,46]

Steven Cunningham<sup>21</sup> in an interview with Linda Yiannakis discusses the content and development of several *jūdō kata*. The interview is serialized as a two-part article in the journal of the United States Judo Association – *American Judo*, (45, p. 19–21; 46, p. 20–24). In the interview, Cunningham's thoughts on the origin and nature of many of the purported 'lost' *kata* of *jūdō* are presented as well as his theories as to why they are no longer widely known. Additionally, other *jūdō kata*, which are not currently recognized by the Kōdōkan, are discussed, and Cunningham does devote some attention to the *gō-no-kata*. Cunningham starts by correctly explaining the complementary relationship between *gō-* and the *jū-no-kata*:

*"The Go no Kata, for example, was the Kata of Hardness, which is the counterpart of the Ju no Kata, which is the Kata of Softness. Go and ju are the opposites of one another in the Japanese thinking." (...)* [46, p. 20]

Notwithstanding his considerable pedigree, Cunningham then proceeds to err significantly in his discussion of the *gō-no-kata*. In particular, he wrongly states that this *kata* contains *ate-mi-waza*. This suggests that Cunningham has no first-hand knowledge of the *gō-no-kata* either, and that he has researched it solely from sources (most likely Kawaishi and Parulski) that have subsequently been shown false.

As part of his flawed analysis, Cunningham does, however, critically evaluate the alleged Kanō-Funakoshi axis. In this analysis he correctly identifies the historical inconsistencies that negate the claims of others that Kanō and Funakoshi collaborated on *gō-no-kata*:

*"The kata was constructed right around the turn of the century. That's an important thing to recognize, because some people argue that he constructed the Go no Kata with a mind to*

*incorporating Okinawan karate into Japanese Judo and that he got the idea after becoming a close friend of Gichin Funakoshi, the founder of Shotokan karate. It is true that Kano and Funakoshi were good friends. Kano was instrumental in bringing Funakoshi to Japan. He took him under his wing; he showed him the ropes. They talked a lot about the future of martial art. The modern karate-do, as opposed to karate jutsu, is a result of Funakoshi recognizing that Kano's idea of taking Jujutsu and making it Judo was a good idea. In the modern era, with modern weapons and so on, it might not be as critically important to the military feudal state, which also no longer existed, to continue martial art training. But the value of martial art training had never changed. So karate ought to be continued to be practiced, but with a view to developing the individual. So Kano and Funakoshi were good friends; Shotokan was traditionally taught at the Kodokan, and Kano and Funakoshi discussed techniques and methods together. Kano even learned some of the karate kata. But all of this happened in the late nineteen teens and after. It did not happen before 1900. One has to realize that Funakoshi was quite a bit younger than Kano and that he would not be old enough to be instructing Kano at the time that Kano designed Go no Kata. The fact that there are a lot of atemi, as well as throws and other things in Go no Kata is not an indication that it comes from karate, but rather that there are a lot of karate-like elements in Jujutsu. In fact, when Funakoshi saw an exhibition of Jujutsu by Hironori Otsuka, who was menkyo kaiden of Shin no Shindo Ryu under Nakamura, Funakoshi supposedly ran out on the floor and said to Otsuka, 'You've studied Tode [the old name for karate] in Okinawa, haven't you!' And Otsuka said that no, he only practiced the Jujutsu. And so Funakoshi discovered that there were a lot of very common elements in the two arts. Otsuka became a student of Funakoshi and ultimately became the founder of Wado Ryu karate. Wado is the harmonizing way, and he was harmonizing or blending Jujutsu with karate. The atemi was very strong in Jujutsu, and in fact Tenshin Shinyo Ryu was one of the pre-eminent atemi schools. Kano had learned this since youth and it was appropriate to put it into the kata." (...)* [46, p. 20–21]

Cunningham then hypothesizes as to why the *gō-no-kata* became no longer taught. He presents an unreferenced thesis based on a growing Japanese nationalism and its impact on Kanō:

*"The kata like Go no kata were hidden away, though, in the pre-WW-II years, I'm told, because of the fears that Kano had about the Kodokan being used as a training ground for soldiers. By the 1920s the nationalistic fervor had gotten quite strong in Japan. Kano was quite concerned about it all. He began his All-Japan Cultural Movement in the 1920s trying to turn the tide and get people to take a more cosmopolitan view. He did not feel he was successful. He made some inroads, but he was*

<sup>21</sup> Dr. Cunningham is a respected academic and holder of a legitimate high-*dan* rank in *jūdō*. He is among a small group that has written about *jūdō* with proper referencing of sources, such as *Yūkō-no-katsudō* and other original material that the majority of Westerners are in total ignorance of. Through such work he has laid the foundations of proper scholarly research in the martial arts, and as such is following in the footsteps of Donn Draeger, work that is now being continued by others such as Diane and Meik Skoss, Serge Mol, and others.

not successful. He also made the mistake of making himself a target of the nationalists. They felt that he was a Western sympathizer and did not recognize the true strength and destiny of Japan. Some argue that that resulted in Kano's death. So, with all that in mind, Kano and the others sort of tucked away the *Go no Kata* and essentially 'obsoleted' it. They said there were problems with it and they would just no longer teach it. They stopped discussing it publicly." (...) [46, p. 21]

Whilst it is correct that an academic like Kanō was cautious with respect to the issue of Japanese nationalism, the real reason as to why the *gō-no-kata* stopped being taught, has nothing to do with what Cunningham suggests, as will be explained further down in this paper. What precisely motivated Cunningham to assert that these *kata* "were hidden away" we do not know. It seems though that he is suggesting that these *kata* would contain some type of secret, perhaps dangerous or lethal techniques that intentionally needed to be hidden away. Nothing could be further from the truth; there is nothing secret or lethal about *gō-no-kata*, which in fact is a *kata* that is suitable for relative novices in *jūdō*, for example, as a warm-up or resistance training exercise. True, like *jū-no-kata*, *gō-no-kata* does not only have physical education properties (meaning, it makes part of the subgroup of *Rentai-no-kata*), but either *kata* also is a theoretical *kata* (subgroup of *Ri-no-kata*) examining and reflecting on the fundamentals of the art of *jūdō*. While grasping this aspect, no doubt, is far more challenging than the warm-up component, it still does not make *gō-no-kata* in any way secretive or dangerous. Consequently, it would be nonsensical for any such reason to keep *gō-no-kata* in any way hidden or secretive from the general *jūdō* practitioner. Moreover, Kanō-*shihan* never intentionally put an *okuden* 奥伝 or *hiden* 秘伝 (secret or esoteric teachings) component into *jūdō*, *inter alia* precisely to distinguish his *jūdō* from classical *koryū jūjutsu*.

Cunningham, who usually is quite well informed, ended his exposé on *gō-no-kata* with another error:

"A sidenote is that Kyuzo Mifune, tenth dan, constructed a different *Go no Kata* during the WWII years. He intended it, I think, to replace the older one. Variants of Mifune's *Go no Kata*, probably reflecting different stages in the development of his form, appear periodically, adding to the confusion regarding *Go no Kata*." (...)

Truth is that Kyūzō Mifune never constructed a *gō-no-kata* (Forms of correct use of force) of his own, but a *goshinjutsu-(no-kata)*, thus a modern self-defense *kata*, with the 'go' 護 (meaning 'protection) of *goshinjutsu* 護身術 being an entirely different word from the 'gō' 剛 (meaning 'force') in *gō-no-kata* 剛の形. There are strong suggestions that Parulski, unaware that Cunningham errs, decides to capitalize on this error by coming up with the idea that he would have re-discovered this 'lost' *kata* as a privileged

student of the mysterious Isao Obato, who came and disappeared without leaving a single trail, and who has never been seen or met by any other martial artist. Other direct students of Mifune who are still alive, such as notably Kyoshi Kobayashi, 9<sup>th</sup> dan (Portugal), Jin Iizumi, 7<sup>th</sup> dan (USA), and Nobutaka Mizoguchi, 7<sup>th</sup> dan (Japan) indeed have never heard about either a student of Mifune by the name of Isao Obato, about any *gō-no-kata* which Mifune would have developed. Furthermore, while Mifune in the various books he wrote, amply talks about the *kata* he developed himself, there is no trace about any mythical *gō-no-kata* which he supposedly would have developed.

However, interestingly, less than a year after Cunningham in 2003 erroneously links *gō-no-kata* to Mifune, Parulski came up with his 're-discovery' of this (nonexistent) *gō-no-kata* via a so-called pupil of Mifune ... At the end of the day, it is thus Cunningham's rare mistake that exposes Parulski's 'gō-no-kata' exercise as a complete hoax.

### 2005 & 2006 – JAN MUILWIJK – GŌ-NO-KATA: RECONSTRUCTING THE FORGOTTEN KATA [33–35], ANOTHER HOAX?

On April 3<sup>rd</sup> of 2005, the Dutch martial artist Jan Muilwijk performed a self-styled *gō-no-kata* as part of his promotion examination for the *jūdō* rank of 6<sup>th</sup> dan. The examination was conducted under the auspices of *Judo Bond Nederland* (=the Dutch Judo Federation) whose regulations require that a candidate for such a promotion should produce a piece of original work.

Muilwijk's demonstration has been heralded as the first performance of the *gō-no-kata* in the Netherlands [33] and following the enthusiasm with which the demonstration was received, a well-illustrated instruction book was subsequently published – originally in Dutch [34] and subsequently in English [35].

It should be noted that the claim that Muilwijk had reintroduced the 'lost' *gō-no-kata* surprised many, as Muilwijk was not known to be an expert in any historical or heuristic technical aspects of *jūdō*. In particular the suggestion that he would have been able to present the *gō-no-kata* reconstructed from original sources that had eluded others was met with considerable disbelief by *jūdō* and *budō* scholars; indeed Muilwijk was not known to be either fluent in Japanese, particular *Meiji-jidai* Japanese, to have privileged access to archival sources, or to have access to an extensive network of relationships or experience in Japan that would be essential to unearth such non-mainstream material.

Nevertheless, to be fair, the rationale that Muilwijk [34,35, p. 7–9] presents to support his *gō-no-kata* must

first critically evaluated. Muilwijk [34,35, p. 7] does not claim that he constructed his *gō-no-kata* based on information from Kawaishi – rather, he became intrigued<sup>22</sup> simply because of Kawaishi's description of the *kata*. Recall:

*“The Go no Kata, or Kata of Force or of blows, more characteristic of Karate-do (the technique of the Atomis).” (...)* [25, p. 11]

Muilwijk [34,35, p. 7] proceeds to describe how he, like most others, was unable to discover much more about the *gō-no-kata*. He then provides a good account of his (flawed) research methodology, which rather than being time-consuming library-based work with extensive use of original sources, was instead based on the consultation of a limited number of (Western) books, interviews, technical discussions and Internet searches [34,35, p. 7,63]. In addition to the problem that Internet research is highly error-prone and can lead to the drawing of spurious conclusions, it is noticeable that the majority of Muilwijk's interviews were not with *jūdōka*, but rather with *karateka* with virtually no scholarly background or no *jūdō* or *koryū* historical knowledge. Moreover, included amongst Muilwijk's interviewees was George Parulski, whose contribution to the *gō-no-kata* question was discussed previously. Given that Parulski is based in the United States and Muilwijk in the Netherlands, and the two did not meet, the depth and extent of their dialogue can only be a matter of conjecture.

With the exception of Kawaishi, the other sources Muilwijk lists [34,35, p. 63] are totally devoid of any reference to the *gō-no-kata*. Moreover, Muilwijk only used these sources for writing an occasional sentence. For example, in Ichirō Abe's book *Judo* (published both in French and in Dutch), Abe writes that *jūdō* contains *nage-waza*, *katame-waza*, and *atemi-waza*. For Muilwijk this is a justification that a *gō-no-kata* in the sense of Parulski's version might very well have been developed by Kanō and Funakoshi – an entirely fallacious conclusion that will now be shown to lack both logic and credibility. Muilwijk's deduction is absurd, as Ichirō Abe, when asked about *gō-no-kata* even denied its existence. For those who know Abe-*sensei* personally, the idea that he would deviate even a millimeter from official *Kōdōkan* policy and syllabus, which in essence is what Muilwijk implies, would be entirely unimaginable.

At the outset, Muilwijk [34,35, p. 8] acknowledges the ambiguity pertaining to the *gō-no-kata* and states that there appear to be two *gō-no-kata* in circulation. Additionally, he provides a correct listing of the “variant” founded by Kanō in 1887. However, he subsequently gives no further consideration to this *kata* and

proceeds to present an unsubstantiated and unreferenced thesis for the lineage of the so-called *gō-no-kata* that features in his book.

Muilwijk [34,35, p. 8] writes:

*“I managed to lay my hands on some film footage from the United States. From the performance you can see that it concerns a very good mixture of judo and karatedo techniques. According to the performer G.R. Parulski, here we have a performance of Kyuzo Mifune (1883–1965), 10<sup>th</sup> dan, transferred to his pupil Isao Obato (8<sup>th</sup> dan), who, in turn taught Parulski. It is presented as a fusion between the SHOTOKAN karate of Gichin Funakoshi and the judo of Jigoro Kano. I have tried to follow this thread back to its source.” (...)*

Muilwijk describes how he ‘discovers’ that Funakoshi gave a demonstration at the *Butokukai* in 1917. He continues that Kanō would have invited Funakoshi to teach *karate* at the *Kōdōkan*, and adds that this “...went on for several years” [34,35, p. 8]. Muilwijk also states “that Kano and Funakoshi were together many times around 1921” and proceeds to speculate that it seems very reasonable to him that the two together “developed a completely new GO NO KATA” [34,35, p. 8].

Muilwijk does not present, and we do not know of, any references or evidence that substantiates the claim of the supposedly many years-long teaching of *karate* at the *Kōdōkan*. *Atemi-waza*, however, was taught at the *Kōdōkan*, but as part of a balanced *jūdō* syllabus. As taught by Kanō, the principal *atemi-waza* were punches to the glabella, elbows to the solar plexus, and front kicks to the testicles. Additional targets described in subsequent *Kōdōkan* publications include the soft spot on top of the head, mastoid process, temples, philtrum, chin, solar plexus, spleen, liver, and knees. Practical methods of striking these targets, however, do not seem to have been much studied. See, for example the text *Kodokan Judo* [13, p. 136–138].

Furthermore, classical weapons training, particularly *bōjutsu* and *jōjutsu* were at one point taught at the *Kōdōkan*<sup>23</sup> and are detailed in *Yūkō-no-katsudō* and *Jūdō*. Kanō had created in March of 1928 a new research department for *kobudō*, partly to emphatically counter a worrying evolution of *jūdō* into a competitive sport, and because towards the end of his life he increasingly started doubting whether *jūdō* alone would be truly able to realize his noble goals. His research group initially gathered at the *Otsuka Kaiunzaka dōjō*, next to his own house [47], and nurtured various *koryū* disciplines. Originally, the new *Kōdōkan* building was supposed to house multiple martial arts, and the fact that the *Kōdōkan* never

<sup>22</sup> Since Muilwijk is a *karateka* (as well as a *jūdōka*) this is understandable.

<sup>23</sup> Famous *sensei*, such as Tākeshi Shimizu were among these guest-instructors.

followed through with this idea after Kanō-*shihan* had passed away, likely because of Risei Kanō's lack of understanding and differing vision, caused considerable friction with the main sponsor of the new *Kōdōkan* building, Matsutarō Shoriki [47]. In effect, this evolution caused such turmoil that Shoriki-*sensei* would become a main force behind creating an entirely new building, partly out of protest, the later *Nippon Budōkan*.

As for karate, what is correct, is that about six years earlier (in 1922) Kanō-*shihan* witnessed Funakoshi giving a display of *Shorin-ryū karate* in Tōkyō. (Note that it was not yet *Shōtōkan karate*, since the term *Shōtōkan* was not to be invented for another decade.) It is also correct that Kanō asked for Funakoshi to give a demonstration at the *Kōdōkan* (then located at *Shimo-Tomisaka*):

*“When I visited the Kōdōkan three days later, Funakoshi later recalled, I found myself face to face with a select group of around a hundred judoka. I had no students with me, nor even anyone to assist me. Fortunately a young man by the name of Gima Shinkin, who had been a karate instructor in Okinawa, was in Tokyo at the time... Several kata, notably Kanku, seemed to be especially popular with the spectators, and we were asked to perform them several times. After the demonstration there were question and answer sessions, first with the younger men and then with the senior students. Later on, as we were having a pleasant chat, I was asked by Kano Sensei how long it would take to learn all the kata. When I replied that I thought it would take over a year, he said, ‘Well, I can’t impose on asking you to stay that long, but I wish you’d teach me at least two or three.’” (...)* [48, p. 11, 49, p. 26–27].

For completeness it is recorded that Kanō witnessed more *karate* in Okinawa in 1927:

*“Furthermore, in 1927, Kano attended a conference in Okinawa and while there witnessed more karate, this time performed by Chojun Miyagi and Kenwa Mabuni. The kind words he spoke to these men apparently helped convince these two men to subsequently introduce karate to Japan.” (...)* [50, p. 7–8].

Notwithstanding the extremely weak foundations for his conclusions so far, Muilwijk continues to speculate and believes he has more evidence to reinforce his arguments when he discovers that Kyūzō Mifune later was in contact with Hironori Ōtsuka (1892–1982), the creator and first Grandmaster of *Wadō-ryū* karate. Muilwijk adds:

*“Presumably, Mifune used his knowledge to change or adapt the GO NO KATA where necessary.” (...)* [35,8].

Muilwijk's implied conclusion therefore is that the original 1887 (or even older) *gō-no-kata* was nothing more than an early version. Accordingly, the version he himself has assim-

ilated via Parulski ... must then be Kanō's, Funakoshi's, Mifune's and Ōtsuka's revised version of the *kata* ... [35,9].

Consistent with his entire line of reasoning, Muilwijk's conclusion here is somewhat implausible. It is known that Kanō was already skeptical about Mifune's *Ura-waza kata*, and reacted equally dismissively when Gunji Koizumi during Kanō's 1933 visit to London showed some of his own 'innovations' to *jū-no-kata* [16]. So it is extremely unlikely that Jigorō Kanō would have cooperated with someone with no knowledge of *jūdō* like Funakoshi, when even an expert *jūdōka* such as Mifune appeared philosophically too far out of line with himself.

For the remainder of his book, Muilwijk provides an illustrated set of instructions as to how to perform 'his' self-styled *gō-no-kata*. For completeness, a list of these techniques is provided in Table 2.

Whilst Muilwijk stops short of admitting he merely acquired Parulski's CD-ROM [32] and wrote out the techniques, comparison of Tables 1 and 2 confirms that Parulski and Muilwijk are indeed describing identical *kata*, an obvious conclusion, since Parulski's own fantastic creation was Muilwijk's only practical source. Indeed, as will become clear later in this paper, only one historical source existed that actually depicted and provided a detailed description of the true *gō-no-kata*, a source not within reach of virtually anyone.

As a point of detail it should be noted that a lack of grammatical attention is evident in Muilwijk's naming of the techniques in the *kata*. Suspicions about Muilwijk's Japanese-illiteracy had already been surfacing when in an early section of his book [34,35, p. 10] he confuses *go* 五 (the number 'five') and *gō* 剛 (meaning 'force'). In his listing of the techniques Muilwijk has simply thrown together familiar terminology from *jūdō* and *karate* often in erroneous grammatical order resulting in rather nonsensical descriptors. In addition, Muilwijk does not provide succinct designations for each of the techniques – rather, he provides a lengthy descriptor for the attack by *uke* and the corresponding response from *tori*. Such an approach is contrary to the established highly efficient procedure for naming techniques in a *jūdō kata*, as described by Cornish [51, p. 3]

*“The Japanese names used for the techniques in the kata only describe parts of the attack. To use a comprehensive description of all the attack and the defence would make the name too long-winded and, for the non-Japanese, difficult to remember whereas these short names should prove no difficulty at all. The English,... is not meant to be a transcription of the Japanese names, like them it is meant only as a memory aid.”*

**Table 2.** Gō-no-kata: "Forms of Hardness & Strength", according to Jan Muilwijk [34].

<b>Omote (Front)</b>		
1.	<p><b>Migi chūdan gyaku tsuki*</b>  Migi chūdan gyaku uchi uke →  Hidari chūdan tsuki →  Hidari gedan hiza geri →  Hidari harai goshi</p>	<p><b>Right middle reverse thrust/strike*</b>  Right middle reverse inside block →  Left middle thrust/strike →  Left low knee kick →  Left hip sweep</p>
2.	<p><b>Migi chūdan jun tsuki*</b>  Migi chūdan gyaku uchi uke →  Shiko dachi →  Migi chūdan empi uchi →  Migi shihō nage →  Ude garami</p>	<p><b>Right middle lunging thrust/strike*</b>  Right middle reverse inside block →  Horse stance →  Right middle elbow strike →  Right four direction throw →  Entangled armlock</p>
3.	<p><b>Migi chūdan mae geri*</b>  Migi soto harai uke →  Migi gedan mae geri →  Hidari harai goshi</p>	<p><b>Right middle front kick*</b>  Right outside sweeping block →  Right low front kick →  Left hip sweep</p>
4.	<p><b>Ushiro kata dori*</b>  Hidari gedan ushiro geri →  Ude gatame →  Hidari hiza gatame</p>	<p><b>Shoulder hold from behind*</b>  Left low rear kick →  Arm armlock →  Left knee armlock</p>
5.	<p><b>Jun te dori*</b>  Migi gedan barai →  Hidari chūdan kage tsuki →  Migi jōdan mawashi empi uchi →  Ushiro eri dori →  Ushiro otoshi →  Migi gedan tate tsuki</p>	<p><b>Lunging hand hold*</b>  Right low sweep →  Left middle short hook strike →  Right high round elbow strike →  Collar hold from behind →  Rearward drop →  Right low straight thrust/strike</p>
6.	<p><b>Ushiro ryōte dori*</b>  Taisabaki →  Chudan morote tsuki</p>	<p><b>Two-hand hold from behind*</b>  Body shifting →  Middle two-handed thrust/strike</p>
7.	<p><b>Migi jōdan jun tsuki*</b>  Hidari te nagashi uke →  Migi jōdan haito uchi →  Ude kansetsu</p>	<p><b>Right high lunging thrust/strike*</b>  Left sweeping hand block →  Right high ridge hand strike →  Armlock</p>
8.	<p><b>Ushiro kata dori*</b>  Taisabaki →  Hidari gedan ura mawashi geri →  Kubi shime →  Migi ō-soto guruma →  Migi gedan gyaku tsuki</p>	<p><b>Rear hand hold*</b>  Body shifting →  Left low reverse round kick →  Neck strangle →  Right large outer wheel →  Right low reverse thrust/strike</p>
9.	<p><b>Migi jōdan jun tsuki*</b>  Hidari te nagashi uke →  Hidari chūdan teisho uchi →  Okuri eri shime</p>	<p><b>Right high lunging thrust/strike*</b>  Left hand sweeping arm block →  Left middle palm heel strike →  Sliding collar strangle</p>
10.	<p><b>Morote shime*</b>  Morote uke →  Migi chūdan tate tsuki →  Shutō uchi →  Migi gedan hiza geri →  Migi koshi guruma →  Migi gedan gyaku tsuki</p>	<p><b>Two-hand strangle/choke*</b>  Two-hand block →  Right middle straight thrust/strike →  Knife hand strike →  Right low knee kick →  Right hip wheel →  Right low reverse thrust/strike</p>
11.	<p><b>Morote shime*</b>  Morote uke →  Morote mawashi tsuki →  Shiko dachi →  Ryō ashi dori →  Gedan morote tsuki</p>	<p><b>Two-hand strangle/choke*</b>  Two-hand block →  Two-hand round thrust/strike →  Straddle leg stance →  Two-leg hold →  Two-hand low thrust/strike</p>

The reason that Muilwijk's terminology as mentioned in Table 2 is different from that used by De Créé in Table 1, though both are based on Parulski's CD-ROM, is because De Créé [42] used (linguistically correct) *Shōtōkan*

terminology, whereas Muilwijk having a *Wadō-ryū* background, relies on terminology typically used within this style of *karatedō*, terminology which he combines at random in an erratic and grammatically incorrect order.



**Table 2 continued.** *Gō-no-kata*: “Forms of Hardness & Strength”, according to Jan Muilwijk [34].

<b>Tachi-ai (Continuous Fight)</b>		
1.	<b>Jun te dori*</b> <i>Hidari soto fumikomi</i> → <i>Migi chūdan mawashi empi uchi</i> → <i>Kata ha otoshi</i>	<b>Lunging hand hold*</b> Left outer stamping kick → Right middle round elbow strike → Single-wing drop
2.	<b>Migi jōdan jun tsuki*</b> <i>Migi age uke</i> → <i>Migi chūdan ura tsuki</i> → <i>Ushiro eri otoshi</i>	<b>Right high lunging thrust/strike*</b> Right rising block → Right middle rear thrust/strike → Collar drop from behind
3.	<b>Migi jōdan jun tsuki*</b> <i>Hidari age uke</i> → <i>Migi chūdan ura tsuki</i> → <i>Gedan geri</i> → <i>Gyaku yoko tomoe nage</i>	<b>Right high lunging thrust/strike*</b> Left rising block → Right middle rear thrust/strike → Low kick → Reverse side circular throw
4.	<b>Migi jōdan jun tsuki*</b> <i>Hidari chūdan mawashi hiza geri</i> → <i>Migi yoko sutemi</i>	<b>Right high lunging thrust/strike*</b> Left middle round knee kick → Right side sacrifice
5.	<b>Ushiro kubi shime*</b> <i>Hidari ushiro empi uchi</i> → <i>Taisabaki</i> → <i>Ude hishigi</i> → <i>Hidari yoko wakare</i>	<b>Neck strangle/choke from behind*</b> Left rear elbow strike → Body shifting → Arm taking → Left side separation
6.	<b>Morote shime*</b> <i>Jōdan juji uke</i> → <i>Hidari jōdan haishu uchi</i> → <i>Migi chūdan ura tsuki</i> → <i>Migi jōdan ura tsuki</i> → <i>Migi koshi guruma</i> → <i>Migi gedan gyaku tsuki</i>	<b>Two-hand strangle/choke*</b> High cross block → Left high → Right middle rear thrust/strike → Right high rear thrust/strike → Right neck wheel → Right low reverse thrust/strike
7.	<b>Migi jōdan jun tsuki*</b> <i>Hidari te nagashi uke</i> → <i>Migi te shime tsuki</i> → <i>Migi yoko wakare</i>	<b>Right high lunging thrust/strike*</b> Left hand sweeping arm block → Right hand thrusting strangle → Right side separation
8.	<b>Jōdan mawashi tsuki*</b> <i>Migi chūdan gyaku Tate tsuki</i> → <i>Mune gatame</i> → <i>Hidari ude mune goshi</i>	<b>High round thrust/strike*</b> Right middle reverse straight thrust/strike → Chest hold → Left arm chest throw
9.	<b>Morote dori*</b> <i>Morote mawashi uke</i> → <i>Morote tsuki</i> → <i>Migi yoko sutemi</i>	<b>Two-hand hold*</b> Two hand round block → Two-hand thrust/strike → Right side sacrifice

\* Attack; → Defence.

Despite the fact that the ‘*gō-no-kata*’ as depicted in his book can be easily discredited because of the reasons explained above, we believe that Muilwijk has not set out to be intentionally misleading. An accomplished researcher Muilwijk is not, but he is generally honest though naive in his writing. He does not attempt to conceal how he came to his findings and admits that he simply took his source information from Parulski, unfortunately a doubtful source of many claims. Muilwijk also presents his *kata* as work in progress [34,35].

The numerous and basic errors within Muilwijk’s book are the natural consequences of flawed research, unsubstantiated contentions and speculation. In short, Muilwijk, in overenthusiastic but innocent ignorance, has become a victim of Parulski’s implausible claims. We suggest that Muilwijk would provide unambiguous clarification accom-

panying his exercise, which neither historically, nor practically has anything to do with Jigorō Kanō’s *Kōdōkan jūdō*. Muilwijk’s conclusions remain entirely uncorroborated. Instead, what he proposes is nothing but a 1990’s creation from the mind of Parulski, and a form of modern self-defense techniques. Whether such an exercise deserves a place in *jūdō*, the future will prove. Much confusion and worse consequences for Muilwijk’s somewhat naive epigonism towards Parulski, could be avoided by designating the exercise by a different name, rather than by the name of an existing, and entirely different *Kōdōkan* component.

### UNDATED – WOLFGANG OETTLIN – A LOST FORM: *GŌ-NO-KATA* [36]

In a further web-based article, Wolfgang Oettlin [36] outlines the Parulski ‘*gō-no-kata*’ and presents his own

**Table 3.** Gō-no-kata: “Forms of Hardness & Strength” according to Wolfgang Oettlin [36].

<b>Omote (Frontal Attacks)</b>		
1.	<b>Migi-gyaku-zuki*</b> Migi-soto-uke → Hidari-gyaku-zuki → Hidari-mae-hiza-geri → Harai-goshi	<b>Right reverse thrust/strike*</b> Right outside block → Left reverse thrust/strike → Left front knee kick → Hip sweep
2.	<b>Migi-oi-zuki*</b> Migi-soto-uke → Yoko-empi-uchi → Shihō-nage → Shihō-gatame	<b>Right stepping thrust/strike*</b> Right outer block → Side elbow strike → Four direction throw → Four direction lock
3.	<b>Migi-mae-geri*</b> Migi-sukui-uke → Juji-uke → Migi-mae-geri → Harai-goshi	<b>Right front kick*</b> Right scooping block → Cross block → Right front kick → Hip sweep
4.	<b>Ushiro-kata-tori*</b> Hidari-ushiro-geri → Hizi-maki-komi	<b>Shoulder hold from behind*</b> Left rear kick → Winding lever
5.	<b>Hidari-katate-tori*</b> Migi-gedan-barai → Hidari-kage-zuki → Migi mawashi empi uchi → Gyaku-ushiro-eri-daoshi → Migi-seiken-zuki	<b>Left one-hand wrist hold*</b> Right lower sweep → Left short hook strike → Right round elbow strike → Reverse rear collar drop → Right front fist strike
6.	<b>Ushiro-morote-tori*</b> Heikō-zuki	<b>Two hand hold from behind*</b> Parallel thrust/strike
7.	<b>Migi-oi-zuki*</b> Migi-haitō-uchi → Ude-daoshi → Ude-hishigi-gatame	<b>Right stepping thrust/strike*</b> Right backfist strike/thrust → Arm drop → Arm taking lock
8.	<b>Ushiro-kata-tori*</b> Hidari-ushiro-geri-keage → Hadaka-jime → Hidari-kuzure-ōsoto-gari → Seiken-zuki	<b>Shoulder hold from behind*</b> Foot impact right to the rear → Naked lock → Left modified large outer reap → Forward strike/thrust
9.	<b>Migi-oi-zuki*</b> Migi-teishō-uchi → Eri-daoshi → Okuri-eri-jime	<b>Right stepping thrust/strike*</b> Right palm strike → Collar drop → Sliding collar lock
10.	<b>Mae-kata-tori*</b> Kakiwake-uke → Migi-tate-zuki → Hidari-shutō-uchi → Migi-shutō-uchi → Hidari-shutō-uchi → Migi-shutō-uchi → Migi-age-hiza-geri → Koshi-guruma → Seiken-zuki	<b>Front shoulder hold*</b> Wedge block → Right straight thrust/strike → Left knife-hand strike → Right knife-hand strike → Left knife-hand strike → Hand edge impact right → Right rising knee kick → Hip wheel → Forward strike/thrust
11.	<b>Mae-kata-tori*</b> Kakiwake-uke → Hasami-zuki → Morote-gari → Heikō-zuki	<b>Front shoulder hold*</b> Wedge block → Scissors-punch → Two-hand reap → Parallel thrust/strike

listing of the techniques contained therein. Remember that Parulski's CD-ROM depicts and explains the exercise, but does not name the individual techniques. Oettlin writes (originally in German):

“... the operational sequence of the kata is written down by myself on the basis the CD-ROM “Isao Obato's The Lost Katas of Judo

– Go-No-Kata” developed by Dr. George Parulski. Whether that is now actually the original form, or one of the versions brought into circulation by Kyuzo Mifune, is beyond my knowledge...” (...).

The technique list as prepared by Oettlin is presented in Table 3. Naturally, it shows differences with both the lists composed by De Créé [42] in Table 1 and Muilwijk

**Table 3 continued.** *Gō-no-kata*: “Forms of Hardness & Strength” according to Wolfgang Oettlin [36].

<b>Tachi-ai (Beginning Combat)</b>		
1.	<b>Yoko katate tori*</b> <i>Hidari yoko geri kekomi</i> → <i>Migi mawashi empi uchi</i> → <i>Ude hishigi gatame</i>	<b>Side one-hand wrist hold*</b> Left side thrust kick → Right round elbow strike → Arm stretching lock
2.	<b>Migi-oi-zuki*</b> <i>Migi-age-uke</i> → <i>Migi-ura-zuki</i> → <i>Ushiro-eri-daoshi</i>	<b>Right stepping thrust/strike*</b> Right rising block → Right backfist strike → Rear collar drop
3.	<b>Migi-oi-zuki*</b> <i>Hidari-age-uke</i> → <i>Migi-gyaku-zuki</i> → <i>Haisoku-fumi-komi</i> → <i>Yoko-tomoe-nage</i>	<b>Right stepping thrust/strike*</b> Left rising block → Right reverse punch → Instep stamping kick → Side round throw
4.	<b>Migi oi zuki*</b> <i>Hidari-yoko-hiza-geri</i> → <i>Yoko-guruma</i>	<b>Right stepping thrust/strike*</b> Left side knee kick Side wheel
5.	<b>Migi-shime-tori*</b> <i>Hidari-ushiro-empi-uchi</i> → <i>Daki-wakare</i>	<b>Stranglehold right from the rear*</b> Left rear elbow strike → High separation
6.	<b>Mae-kata-tori*</b> <i>Morote-teisho-uke</i> → <i>Hidari-haisho-uchi</i> → <i>Migi-ura-zuki</i> → <i>Tsuki-age</i> → <i>Kuzure-koshi-guruma</i> → <i>Migi-gyaku-zuki</i>	<b>Shoulder grasp from the front*</b> Two hand palm-heel block → Left open hand strike → Right rear thrust/strike → Uppercut → Modified hip wheel → Left reverse thrust/strike
7.	<b>Migi-oi-zuki*</b> <i>Hidari-te-osae-uke</i> → <i>Migi-shuto-uke</i> → <i>Migi-kōtō-uchi</i> → <i>Kuzure yoko wakare</i>	<b>Right stepping thrust/strike*</b> Left hand pressing block → Right knife hand block → Right larynx strike → Modified side separation
8.	<b>Migi-mawashi-zuki*</b> <i>Migi-tate-zuki</i> → <i>Kuzure-ude-goshi</i>	<b>Right round thrust/strike*</b> Right straight thrust/strike → Modified-arm hip (throw)
9.	<b>Awase-zuki*</b> <i>Morote osae-uke</i> → <i>Awase-zuki</i> → <i>Kuzure-uki-waza</i>	<b>Combined punch (“U”-punch)*</b> Two hand pressing block → Combined punch (“U”-punch) → Modified floating drop

\* Attack; → Defence.

[34] in Table 2. Since Oettlin does not claim any originality and admits that he simply transcribed Parulski's creation, his input does not further necessitate any attention in the present discourse.

The question that remains after critically analyzing all of the above Western sources and concluding that they are either erroneous or worse, is: so, what is the true *gō-no-kata*? What does it contain, where can it be found, and who is knowledgeable in teaching it? These questions will be addressed in the subsequent sections.

## CONCLUSIONS

Serious research into the *gō-no-kata* is a very difficult endeavor. There is a dearth of major written sources on the *kata*, and what is commonly available is often unverifiable, incomplete, ambiguous or factually in error.

While research into this area remains ongoing, there exists sufficient and even ample evidence that indicates that the *gō-no-kata* is not, nor in any form has ever been a *kata* of blows, but an exercise examining the principle of efficient use of force and resistance. The literature indicates that the movements within the *kata* focused on the direct resistance of force (with force) right up until the very last moment when the force is overcome by skill, strategy and body movement. For this and other reasons, including methodological as well as the complete absence of any sources substantiating their claims, we firmly would dismiss as false any claim by Parulski [31,32], Muilwijk [34,35] and others that the *gō-no-kata* is even remotely based on a blend of *jūdō* and *karate*, and that it supposedly would have been composed jointly by Jigorō Kanō and Gichin Funakoshi. Moreover the series of exercises as presented by Parulski [31,32] and copied by Muilwijk [33–

35] must be classified as a contemporary hoax lacking any historic substance or roots in either Jigorō Kanō or any of the other great *jūdō* masters of the past, or ... even in any *jūdō*-specific principle.

Finally, we applaud Toshiro Daigo-sensei's recent paper [9] in which he included *gō-no-kata* as a legitimate and existing *Kōdōkan kata*. We hope that *gō-no-kata* will soon be reintroduced in the *Kōdōkan's* formal teaching curriculum of *kata*.

## Notes:

Japanese names in this paper are listed by given name first and family name second, instead of traditional Japanese usage which places the family name first.

For absolute rigor, long Japanese vowel sounds have been approximated using macrons (e.g. *Kōdōkan*) in order to indicate their Japanese pronunciation as closely as possible. However, when referring to or quoting from the literature, the relevant text or author is cited exactly as per the original source, with macrons used or omitted as appropriate.

## REFERENCES:

- Kanō J: Ichiban shūgyōsha ni kata no renshū wo susumeru. [General recommendations to the judo disciple for the study of kata]. *Yūkō-no-Katsudō*, 1921; 7(11): 1-6 [in Japanese]
- Kanō J: Kata randori renshū no mokuteki wo roku - 1 [The meaning of kata and randori practice - Part 1]. *Judo*, 1930; 1(2): 2-3 [in Japanese]
- Kanō J: Kata randori renshū no mokuteki wo roku - 2 [The meaning of kata and randori practice - Part 1]. *Judo*, 1930; 1(3): 2-4 [in Japanese]
- Kanō J: Jūdō kyōhon jōkan [A textbook of jūdō]. Tōkyō: Shushiki Kaisha; 1931; 1-127 [in Japanese]
- Murata N: What is kata? The congratulatory address to the 1st Kodokan Judo Kata International Tournament. In: Program Brochure of the 1st Kodokan Judo Kata International Tournament, 2007; 27-28 October. Tōkyō: Kōdōkan, pp. 26-27
- Finn M: Martial Arts: A Complete Illustrated History. Leicester, UK: Blitz Editions; 1991
- Daigo T: Koshiki-no-kata. Unpublished lecture as part of the Kōdōkan Kata Kaki Kōshūkai (Kōdōkan Summer Kata Course); 2007; July 16<sup>th</sup>; Tōkyō: Kōdōkan Jūdō Institute [in Japanese]
- Daigo T: Kōdōkan jūdō no kata [The kata of Kōdōkan jūdō]. Unpublished lecture as part of the Kōdōkan Kata Kaki Kōshūkai (Kōdōkan Summer Kata Course), Tōkyō: Kōdōkan Jūdō Institute; 2008; July 29<sup>th</sup>; this same article is currently being reprinted in three parts in *Jūdō* 2008; 79 (10, 11 & 12) [in Japanese]
- Daigo T: Kōdōkan jūdō kata ni tsuite [About the kata of Kōdōkan jūdō]. *Jūdō*, 2009; 80(1): 17-22 [in Japanese]
- Kanō Y, Kawamura T, Nakamura R et al (eds.): *Jūdō Daijiten*. Tōkyō: Athene Shobō, 1999; 139 & 463 [in Japanese]
- Kodokan. Kata and Randori. [homepage on the Internet]. n.d. [cited 2007; Apr 10<sup>th</sup>]. Available from: The Kōdōkan Judo Institute Homepage, URL: [http://www.Kodokan.org/e\\_basic/kata.html](http://www.Kodokan.org/e_basic/kata.html)
- Kanō J: Kōdōkan jūdō no kata [The kata of Kōdōkan jūdō]. Tōkyō: Kōdōkan Hakkō [Kōdōkan Publications], Nunoi shubō saisoku; reprinted for the Kōdōkan Kata Kaki Kōshūkai (Kōdōkan Summer Kata Course), Daigo T (ed.). 1964; July 29<sup>th</sup>; Tōkyō: Kōdōkan Jūdō Institute [in Japanese]
- Kanō J: Kodokan Judo. Kodansha International, Tōkyō, 1986
- Kanō J: Kōdōkan jūdō no kata ni tsuite [About the kata of Kōdōkan jūdō]. In: Ed. Kanō-sensei Denki Hensankai [Committee for the compilation of the biography of Master Kanō], Tōkyō: Satsuki Shobo; 1983 [in Japanese]
- De Créé C: Ryū-sestu. Jūdō no musha shugyō - As snow on a willow. A pilgrimage in jūdō. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press [in preparation]; 2010
- Leggett TP: Memories of Jigorō Kano's Visit to the London Budokwai in August 1933 (Reprint). *Journal of Combative Sport* 2000 (Electronic publication, no volume, issue or page numbers)
- Kotani S, Ōsawa Y, Hirose Y: Kata of Kodokan Judo. Kōbe, Japan: Koyano Bussan Kaisha Ltd., 1968
- Otaki T, Draeger DF : Judo Formal Techniques. Tōkyō: Charles E. Tuttle Company Inc., 1983
- Jones LC: Competition Kata and the Art of Judo. *Journal of Asian Martial Arts*, 2005; 14(3): 72-85
- Kawamura T, Daigo T (eds.): Kōdōkan New Japanese-English Dictionary of Judo. Tōkyō: Kōdōkan Institute, 2000
- Maruyama S: Dai Nihon Judo Shi [Complete History of Japanese Judo]. Tōkyō: Kōdōkan; 1939; 1170 [in Japanese]
- Gleeson GR: Judo Inside Out: A Cultural Reconciliation. Wakefield, UK: Lepus Books, 1983
- Feldenkrais M: Judo: The Art of Defence and Attack. London: Frederick Warne & Co. Ltd., 1944
- Koizumi G: Goh-no-Kata (Kata of Forcefulness). *Budokwai Quarterly Bulletin* (Budokwai, London), 1949; 5(1): 8
- Kawaiishi M: The Complete 7 Katas of Judo. Harrison EJ, translator. London: W. Foulsham & Co. Ltd., 1957
- Kawaiishi M: Les 7 Katas Complets du Judo. Paris: Édition Privée; 1952 [in French]
- Klein Y: Les fondements du judo. Reprint of the 1954 Grasset edition. Paris: Éditions Dilecta, 2006; 1-208; 2006 [in French]
- Gleeson GR: The Complete Book of Judo. Toronto, Canada: Coles Publishing Company, 1976
- Ohlenkamp N: Go no Kata - Forms of Hardness / Strength. [article online] (2003/2008) [cited Apr 2007]. Available from: Judo Information Site, URL: <http://judoinfo.com/gonokata.htm>
- Kuhara Y: Jūdō mizu nagare. Tōkyō: Shūdōkan Kuhara Dōjō; 1976 [in Japanese]
- Parulski GR: Black Belt Judo. Chicago: Contemporary Books, Inc., 1985
- Parulski GR: Isao Obato's Lost katas of judo - vol. 1 (#V-LKJ-04). CD-ROM and CD. Webster, New York: Kobushi Multimedia, 1998
- Muilwijk JT: Jan Muilwijk introduceert Go no Kata (Jan Muilwijk introduces Go no Kata) (In Dutch) [article online] (2005) [cited 2007], Available online from: Sportschool Muilwijk Website, URL: <http://www.sportschoolmuilwijk.nl/Go-no-kata/>
- Muilwijk JT: Go-no-Kata: Reconstructie van een vergeten kata. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Bookexpress.infos; 2005 [in Dutch]
- Muilwijk JT: Go-no-Kata: Reconstructing the forgotten kata. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Bookexpress.infos; 2006
- Oettlin W: Eine verlorene Form: Go no kata (A lost form: Gō-no-kata), Kodokan Freiburg Judoschule e.V. [article online] (n.d.) [cited 2007, Apr]. Available from: URL: <http://www.kodokan-freiburg.de/GoNoKata.htm>
- Mifune K, Kudō K, Matsumoto Y (eds.): Jūdō Kōza [Course of jūdō]. Vol. 1-5. Tōkyō: Shiromizu-sha; 1955-56 [in Japanese]
- Kobushi Multimedia. Interactive Martial Arts Products - Available Titles Fall 2006 / Winter 2007. Kobushi, Ltd. Webster, New York, USA. [Commercial multimedia product catalogue online] [2007]. Available from: URL: <http://www.kobushimedia.com/pdfs/km-catalogue.pdf>
- Kanō J: Kanō Jigorō jūdōka - 12. [Jigorō Kanō, the jūdōka - Part 12]. *Sakkō*, 1927; 6(12): 86-92 (15-21) [in Japanese]
- Kōdōkan (eds.), Illustrated Kodokan Judo. Tōkyō: Kodansha; 1955
- Kōdōkan (eds.), Kōdōkan jūdō shashin kaisetsu. Tōkyō: Kodansha; 1956 [in Japanese]
- De Créé C: Gō-no-kata. Inventory of techniques from G.R. Parulski's 1998 CD-ROM "The Lost Katas of Judo - Volume 1", published by Kobushi Multimedia, Webster, New York. Unpublished research file. Malines; 2003, March 8th
- Oimatsu S: Kaitei shinpan jūdō hyakunen (Brand new revised edition of Hundred Years of Jūdō). Satō K, editor. Tōkyō: Tokimune Tsushinsha; 1976; 40-53 [in Japanese]
- O'Neil PG: Japanese Names. A comprehensive index by characters and readings. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. New York & Tōkyō: Weatherhill, Inc., 1993
- Yiannakis L, Cunningham S: The Kata of Judo - Part I of a Series. *American Judo - A Journal of the United States Judo Association* Fall, 2002; 19-21
- Yiannakis L, Cunningham S: The Kata of Judo - Part II of a Series. *American Judo - A Journal of the United States Judo Association* Fall, 2003; 2004
- Mochizuki M: Theory of the essence of judo. *Aiki News*, 1984; 65
- Funakoshi G: Karate-Do Kyohan - The Master Text. Ōshima T., translator. Tōkyō: Kodansha International Ltd., 1973
- Funakoshi G: Karate-Do Nyumon - The Master Introductory Text. Ōshima T., translator. Tōkyō: Kodansha International Ltd., 1998
- Noble G: Master Funakoshi's Karate: The History & Development of the Empty Hand Art, *Dragon Times*, 1995; 4: 7-8
- Cornish JP (n.d.): Go-Shin-Jutsu - Judo Self Defence Kata. For the British Judo Association by FJR Publishing, UK