

Innovative agonology as a synonym for prophylactic and therapeutic agonology – the final impulse

Authors' Contribution:

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

Roman Maciej Kalina

¹ Editor-in-Chief *Archives of Budo*

² Gdansk University of Physical Education and Sport, Department of Combat Sports, Gdansk, Poland

Received: 28 November 2016; **Accepted:** 07 December 2016; **Published online:** 13 December 2016

AoBID: 11414

Abstract

Innovative agonology identify with the current stage of development of science about struggle. This science is the man *en bloc* extremely needed as never before. The main objective of this paper is an argumentation based on interdisciplinary knowledge, observation of social reality and personal experiences of author (empirically validated) associated with the creation of science about struggle in the global science space just in its most practical (preventive) dimension – *prophylactic and therapeutic agonology*.

Besides general ignorance of *agonology* (rules, methods, means etc.) one of the most important factors blocking the defence potential of modern man “against attack on any its goods” is associating the self-defence with a motor dimension (combat sports and martial arts). No wonder, because the defence effects (or lack of them) are immediately visible, because the action of the parties are directed towards the body of the fighting people. Proven effectiveness poses new adepts of training. From this perspective it is not matter whether and how long takes compensation for wrongs and get back the justice in the courts.

The man defending against institutional violence generally has little chance if the case does not catch media attention. Application of the rules and methods of *prophylactic and therapeutic agonology* ensured effective defence of the *Archives of Budo*, as an independent institution of science and culture, against the group of professors who since 2014 doggedly applied intellectual and institutional violence towards Editor-in-Chief, Deputy Editor, members of the Editorial Board and authors-experts of the science of martial arts, who published in the journal their articles and applied for an academic promotion. This violence (indirect purposes) is the only means of maintaining power over the system of scientific promotion. Independent scientific journal is an important obstacle. Usurping the right to arbitrarily deciding for oneself of whom to recommend, especially to the academic title of professor (instrumental treating the ethical standards and the relevant bodies of scholars), do not have the ability to influence on the crucial decisions of the editors – which manuscripts to qualify for publication, and which to reject. For these who have real power over the system of scientific promotions such a possibility might be a convenient way of camouflage the power and camouflage the violence before an inconvenient candidate submits an application for scientific promotion.

This argumentation based on indisputable empirical data implies two important issues. The first is needful re-definition of term “self-defence” and derivative activities of the methodological nature. The second – to define the two syndromes of power (creative and toxic), which is a prerequisite for the theoretical model of “struggles with oneself” as self-defence against the domination of their toxic syndrome of power.

Key words: institutional violence • intellectual violence • martial arts bibliotherapy • power syndrome • simple model the right of self-defiance • struggles with oneself

Copyright: © 2016 the Author. Published by Archives of Budo

Conflict of interest: Author has declared that no competing interest exists

Ethical approval: Not required

Ahimsa – is also referred to as nonviolence, and it applies to all living beings – including all animals – according to many Indian religions [19].

Bravery – means efficiency in good deeds, efficiency combined with estimable aspirations [6, 16].

Deontology or deontological ethics – (from Greek *δέω*, *deon*, “obligation, duty”) is the normative ethical position that judges the morality of an action based on the action’s adherence to a rule or rules.

Praxiology (praxeology) – science about good work. *A Treatise on Good Work*, a fundamental lecture of praxiology by T. Kotarbinski (the first edition in 1955) has been translated into majority of the so-called congress languages (English, German, Russian) and as well: Czech, Japanese, and Serbo-Croatian.

Moral strength of a unit or a team in an unarmed struggle is a deep emotional and rational conviction about the need of continuing the struggle – regardless of changing circumstances – and about the possibility of winning, irrespective of the enemy’s forces [7].

Dense social environment – people linked to each other with various technological information measures and in a high degree dependent on each other due to mutual connection of their interests; more precisely: impossibility of achieving satisfaction without participation of people from own family circle and even satisfaction of basic needs or their majority [7].

Assumption of general rule of a struggle – “fighting act so to achieve at a possibly shortest time and at the least own costs your direct main aim at given circumstances” [7, p. 24].

General rule of a struggle – “(...) at an action in which a material or surrounding all the action’s time is in independent motion from an acting one, creating simultaneously strong and various resistance; act this way to be able at any moment possibly change both a plan of action and its manner” [7, p. 25].

Universal assumption of self-defence training – “if you have learned to act effectively, wisely and nobly in a situation, in which the goal of someone’s actions would be harming or killing you, each different situation would be incomparably easier and you will certainly solve it” [35, p. 43].

Provenance & peer review: Commissioned, based on an idea from the author; not externally peer reviewed

Source of support: Departmental sources

Author’s address: Roman Maciej Kalina, Department of Sport, Faculty of Physical Education, University of Physical Education and Sports, K. Gorskiego 1, 80-336 Gdansk, Poland; e-mail: kom.kalina@op.pl

INTRODUCTION

I identify *innovative agonology* with current development stage of science about struggle, that is *prophylactic and therapeutic agonology*. Such science is *en bloc* needed by people as never before. This paper in the applied editorial form differs from an original article in empirical science. It involves necessary references to author’s autobiography.

This article elaborates on two most important threads which were discussed in the previous publications devoted to *agonology* [1–4]. The first one may be summed up in the following question: how much time is necessary so that a pessimistic hypothesis will be fulfilled due to the fact that global society is permanently shocked by electronic media with a struggle dominated by violence and aggression in extent that exceeds the capabilities of tolerating this negative phenomenon by an increasing number of people (micro scale), counteracting this phenomenon by countries’ governments (medium scale) up to a real risk of apocalypse (macro scale)?

I formulated this hypothesis (along with opposing optimistic hypothesis) in article entitled *Agonology – unknown science* [4]: “Selective, selfish and incompetent use of *agonology* can further strengthen our agonistic destructive nature, in extreme cases, either towards oneself or with a focus on destroying other people or a determination to combine both tendencies” [4, p. 234]. Permanent education to violence and aggression is probably the biggest social problem since the discovery that violence and aggression are most profitable business of film industry, electronic media, entertainment attracting attention of a large number of people at stadiums and halls which can seat several thousands of spectators, multiplied by television broadcast and by Internet. It is a kind of macro-pandemic of aggressiveness [1].

The second thread involves arguments which confirm the optimistic hypothesis: “If each individual, or even a multimillion-person team, explores

and responsibly uses this knowledge [*innovative agonology* – note added by RMK], they may achieve the ability to defend themselves in a non-violent way, whereas if an individual as an agonistic being supplements the knowledge with appropriate training, he/she may count on both the preventive effect (developing own bravery) and on the therapeutic effect (reducing potential susceptibility to self-destruction and destroying others)” [4, p. 234].

The main objective of this paper is an argumentation based on interdisciplinary knowledge, observation of social reality and personal experiences of the author (which are empirically validated) associated with development of science about struggle in the global science space just in its most practical (preventive) dimension – *prophylactic and therapeutic agonology*.

The final impulse and key terms „intellectual violence”, “institutional violence”

Current development stage of science about struggle was named as *prophylactic and therapeutic agonology* due to my experiences with the right to self-defence against intellectual violence and institutional violence which I have experienced since 1971 (when I took up my first professional work at the age of 22). Until I was 18 years old (before I started studying), I was lucky to grow up in environment with deep-rooted patriotic and libertarian traditions. I was born in post-war Poland enslaved with totalitarian system imposed by the Soviets. When I was 11 years old, I was very early absorbed with judo and when I was 16 years old I became fascinated as a secondary school student with praxeology developed by Tadeusz Kotarbiński [5]. Patriotic and libertarian traditions during my youth along with these two fascinations determined the choice of professional and scientific development. This long and bumpy road has brought me to a moment in which I felt competent enough to share my unique knowledge about struggle with any person responsible for oneself and others, who is sensitive to harm inflicted by another person. References

to autobiography – despite what it looks like – are essential in developing reliable rationale and assumptions of *innovative agonology* (that is: *prophylactic and therapeutic agonology*).

Direct impact – the final impulse – is made by circumstances and results of the right of self-defence against intellectual violence intensively cumulated from 2014, which was directed towards me and persons related to the scientific journal of *Archives of Budo* (independent scientific and cultural entity) by a group of professors who ignored elementary deontology of men of science. The nature of such violence was initially described in article entitled *Agonology – the prospect of an effective defence of peace and unrestricted freedom of scientists* [2].

In opposition to both forms of violence (also common violence or even physical aggression in some respects), first I filed complaints, notifications, etc. provided for in administrative law, which were addressed to relevant high public officers (two first on 2 January 1915). When I did not receive any response from the most important addressees and violence (aggression) escalated, I started promoting *agonology* in the global space of science. I realised that many people find themselves in such situation and there are no grounds to claim that they can effectively defend themselves. On the contrary – it is legitimate to assume that most of them are helpless.

The first manuscript of this series sent consecutively to three prestigious scientific journals edited outside of Poland did not attract the interest of potential publishers. The article was published in August 2016 in *Archives of Budo* [4]. Therefore, publications [1, 2] bear the note “in press” near references to articles entitled *Agonology – unknown science*.

Three cases of no interest in *agonology* shown by the editorial offices of scientific journals do not mean much. But if three editorial offices of reputable magazines do that, it is not the same. If we add two more significant observations, it is difficult to question the veracity of the following answer: the use of intellectual violence by people of science against another people of science is not an incidental phenomenon which is limited geographically; however, the fact that this phenomenon is not publicly popularised is the result of effective camouflage of such events by

perpetrators and favouring entities of the social environment, but also (or perhaps above all) of lack of specialists (i.e. agonologists) who are competent enough to identify, investigate and describe these phenomena.

First observation (documented by an official e-mail of the editorial office) allows us to conclude that negative response of the representative of the editorial board after three days since the manuscript was sent proves not only intellectual violence. Furthermore, it has the hallmarks of some form of unacceptable discrimination (see editorial note in [4]), which always constitutes violence towards the others. How else can we interpret the fact that an entity or collective ignored information about commonly unknown science if such decision is not substantively justified. The manuscript contains a message that five complete theories of *agonology* (between 1938 and 2000) were published only in Polish. Second observation – attempting to interest scientific community with the notion of *agonology* after two presentations made in the USA (AHFE 2015 [1] and AHFE 2016 [3]) confronted with the result of the first observation shows us to what extent one could depreciate cognitive and application mission of science, assuming such destructive actions undertaken by people of power (who exert i.a. intellectual violence and institutional violence).

Innovative agonology – after all, derives its key terms from precise language of praxeology [5] – it clearly defines the term “violence” and its particular types. Numerous psychologists, pedagogues, sociologists and political scientists (along with media workers) use interchangeably the terms „violence” and „aggression”. It is not surprising, because often drawing a line between violence and aggression is a very difficult task.

“Violence” in praxeology is defined as physical pressure (physical force) or use of chemical, electrical, or other stimuli, etc., which results in subject being thrown into undesired situation and becoming an object of somebody’s action [6, p.194]. It is defined even in a narrow sense by clear emphasis placed on “etc.” and it does not exclude the sole use of psychological stimuli. Jarosław Rudniański [7] refers to a broader understanding of violence while explaining both the nature of escalation and camouflage of violence and the relationship between camouflage of violence and camouflage of power as well as while

making a distinction between various types of violence, i.e. physical and psychological in a non-armed fight or overt, moral, organizational, structural [see also 8].

Intellectual violence means actions verbal or preserved in a text as well as symbolic actions (mimics, gestures, leaving a group in a demonstrational way to which an entity being subject of intellectual violence had joined, failure to reply the letter, letter, etc.) undertaken by a given person towards specified entity (individual or a group) which result in *ad hoc* or relatively long-term humiliation of an individual in social environment or causing that this entity experiences reasonable sense of harm, mental and/or emotional discomfort along with negative health effects.

An attacked entity experiences means (techniques) of intellectual violence as particularly afflictive and distressing. They involve expressions and gestures which are guying, cynical, degrading one's dignity, depreciating widely appreciated achievements, etc. An extreme case of intellectual violence involves clear breach of personal rights of an entity under attack.

A term "intellectual violence" appears in publications [9], but it is not explicitly defined. Lack of commonly approved definition enhances difficulties in identifying this phenomenon (although it is common), investigating it scientifically, describing it in an understandable way for people who do not have academic qualifications, but above all it is a serious obstacle to a widespread implementation of effective counteracting methods (defence).

Intellectual violence is not a one-way relationship. This means that intellectual violence is not exerted only by those whose formal education is greater than the one of entity being under attack. This explanation however does not abrogate a dilemma, e.g. whether calling a student "a dunce" by a teacher can be classified as intellectual violence or even verbal aggression. Intellectual violence is also exerted by people with lower education towards better educated persons when they have a feeling (or sometimes are confident that they have) an advantage related to specialists or general knowledge, certain skills (e.g. computer skills), knowledge of the customs and culture of environment in which they currently live, general social savvy, etc. Intellectual violence is also used e.g. by students towards a lecturer, when they deliberately communicate with

each other with a language which this lecturer does not understand.

Institutional violence is an action of at least one entity (an entity or a group which is a representative for a certain public administration, local government or another body, organisation, corporation, etc.) which using its privileged social or economic position (e.g. as a monopolist) undertakes actions towards certain entity (individual, group, institution, etc.), which are often perceived as unfriendly (exclusion, other forms of discrimination, excessive duration of affairs, etc.) or as inhuman (exploitation, isolating children from parents due to economic reasons, etc.), which results in certain material damage and/or mental or emotional harm along with damage to somatic, mental and social health. Institutional violence almost always involves elements of intellectual violence, and sometimes of physical violence (intervention of police, etc.).

Depending on circumstances, perpetrators of institutional violence, apply methods of non-arm struggle precisely identified and described by Jarosław Rudniański [7, 10]. These descriptions are partly available in the global space of science in my own [1-4] or co-authored [11, 12] publications written in English.

Grounds related to expansion of intellectual violence and institutional violence related to personality – toxic syndrome of power

Intellectual violence is used in micro scale often due to well-established belief in their own superiority by virtue of origin, education, accomplishments, membership in particular interest group, etc. There are, however, people who exert intellectual violence towards other people not only because of pleasure itself derived this way.

Analysis mainly of articles on agonology written by Tadeusz Kotarbiński [13] and Jarosław Rudniański [7, 10, 14, 15], long-term observation of social reality in terms of unarmed struggles, my personal experience with the right of self-defence against common violence and psychical aggression, intellectual violence and institutional violence make me assume that these shameful actions stem primarily from toxic syndrome of power which dominated in given individual over creative syndrome of power [4]. Therefore, intellectual violence is in turn one of the most important means of power expansion in toxic dimension.

According to general definition provided in *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*, "power is the ability to control people or things". Jarosław Rudniański adds also a third factor – nature and its elements [7, 10, 14]. If we narrow definition of power only to interpersonal relations, we assume that power has the one who decides what other should do and what they cannot do.

Both definitions do not attribute any negative or positive connotations to the notion of power. Power over a vehicle driven by a person (assuming that this vehicle is operational and circumstances are stable in sense of optimal conditions for moving) is a desired circumstance. Deliberate use of a vehicle to ram another vehicle, person, etc. apart from justified right of self-defence constitutes a shameful act (a crime) – for example terrorist attack in Nice, in the evening of 14 July 2016, a 19 tonne cargo truck. Similarly, intoxication of a river is contrasted with an effort made to treat its waters (two different forms of human power over water as element of nature).

As far as interpersonal relations are concerned, effective defence against aggression without making harm to aggressor is a positive example of the necessary power of man over man – *honourable self-defence* [16, 17] – in *ad hoc* and perspective sense. This example provides in the meanwhile the essence of the mission of *prophylactic and therapeutic agonology*.

This mission is referred to by Michael J. Gelb [18], although he does not study the phenomenon of struggle – he is an author and public speaker specializing in creativity and innovation. In a remark dedicated to Mahatma Gandhi, one of the ten people who in his opinion changed humanity, Gelb refers to the principle of *ahimsa* (do no harm, nonviolence [19]) and points towards Morihei Ueshiba (1883-1969), the creator of *aikido* as its exemplary use in a micro scale. Gelb claims that similar to Gandhi, Ueshiba adopted spiritual ideals of compassion, forgiveness and love with the difference that instead of applying them to international conflicts on a large scale, he used them to solve small conflicts between people. Gelb is not precise, claiming that this very effective self-defence art is based on the non-use of violence.

Almost every physical form of self-defence art is based on a specific form of controlled physical

violence – *aikido* on mild (for example a dodge) and relatively mild countermeasures, when necessary physical pressure is exerted directly on specific body part of an aggressor [17, 20-26]. Therefore, this part of actions in line with *ahimsa* which speaks of „do no harm” but does not exclude the use of physical force against the aggressor, should be connected with *aikido*. „Nonviolence” in self-defence art refers in turn to the use of verbal means to counteract aggression (persuasion, „alleviating” frustration, asking for mercy, recognition of dominance or a combination of both [27, p. 132-134]) or verbal and behavioural methods reduced in physical dimension to yield under attack which effectively may be combined with persuasion – dialogue with an aggressor [27, p. 136-137].

A simple model of the right of self-defence

It is sufficient to add to these premises the criteria of defensive struggle and we will end up with a simple model of the right of self-defence, which will help define the term “syndrome of power”, being of key importance for the analysis. In any scientific, theoretical or empirical studies, attention to detail is the primary criterion for clear reasoning. Therefore, methodological order requires explanation that each self-defence is some form of defence struggle but not vice versa.

There are the following criteria of defence struggle: lack of provocation, attack by an *aggressor* happened first, adequacy of counteracting methods and means [27].

At the core of self-defence, there is an assumption that a *defender* **d** actively opposes the *aggressor* **a**, whereas while creating the simplest model, I left aside defence against an aggressive animal. In the language of formal logic, *honourable self-defence* will be written down as an ordered pair: or. In this two-element set, *aggressor* is a protasis, whereas *defender* is an apodosis.

If $a \neq d$, then $\langle a, d \rangle \neq \langle d, a \rangle$.

Since defence struggle allows for defence in form of pre-emptive (preventive) attack as it takes place in anti-terrorist attacks, the model of defence struggle should be written down in form of disordered pair $\{aggressor, defender^*\}$ or $\{a, d^*\}$.

Defender^{*} (**d**^{*}) is an entity who in circumstances of unquestioned right of self-defence (eventually

authenticated *post factum*) attacks as first an identified and startled terrorist respecting the criteria of defence struggle. Such pre-emptive attack was supposed to involve capturing the terrorist who beyond doubt is a direct perpetrator of many acts of terror. The category of pre-emptive attacks includes capturing of potential *aggressor* (or his orderers) who had prepared a terrorist attack which is soon to take place.

In such circumstances, verbal and physical violence is justified, as long it is used in a controlled manner which excludes possible mistake. Only lack of effectiveness caused by a strong counter-attack of known or potential *aggressor* (which excludes the possibility of wrong identification of a terrorist) justifies strengthening of intervention measures (defensive struggle). Often dynamics of events taking place during justified intervention which precedes a terrorist attack is so high that very small amount of time elapses from active counteracting (capturing, arrest) to killing an aggressor (in line with adopted criteria of defence struggle).

Therefore, adequate formula of such ordered pair $\{a, d^s\} = \{k, s\}$ if and only $a = k$ and $d^s = s$, where **k** means a **killer sensu stricto** and **s** a **killer sensu largo** (in this context, when it comes to the situation with only one solution, because one failed to capture a killer and the only way of continued defence is to eliminate the aggressor, i.e. identified terrorist).

Situation, when a *defender* (d^s) exceeds the criteria of the right of self-defence can be described with the following formula:

$\{a, d^s\} = \{k, s\}$ always and only if $a = k$ and $d^s = s$, or $a = s$ and $d^s = k$.

In this simple model of the right of self-defence based on an example of an extreme emergency situation, one can notice the need to combine verbal counteracting means (defence) until physical elimination of the aggressor remains the only option.

However, in contrast to such situations, each day we may encounter disproportionately more interpersonal relations as well as relations between an individual and an institution, in which the only acceptable right of self-defence against intellectual and institutional violence and also psychological

aggression should be based on verbal methods, including the ones preserved on electronic and traditional media (newspapers, scientific journals, books, etc.).

The paradox of legal restrictions imposed on the right of self-defence sensu largo – Polish example of limited possibilities of defending oneself against entities which have actual power over the system of scientific promotion

International law recognizes the right of self-defence. Polish Civil Law (article 423) and the Penal Code (article 25, §1) almost identically state that “one does not commit a crime, who in self-defence acts against direct, unlawful attack on any good protected by law”. In practice, judicial decisions on self-defence are dominated by references to counteracting attacks on life, health or property, although the scope of the term “attack on any good” is very broad. International law refers to a broad understanding of “good” and the right to defend it in a following way: no one shall be subjected to arbitrary interference with one’s privacy, family, home or correspondence, nor to attacks upon one’s honour and reputation. Everyone has the right to be protected by the law against such interference or attacks [28, 29].

Both the state institutions responsible for compliance with the law (police, prosecutors, justice) as well as entities managing education do not keep pace with such a broad interpretation of an “attack on any good” and the right of self-defence *sensu largo*. And media mainly deepen this crisis. Technological leap, ease of escalation of psychological violence and aggression in an increasingly **dense social environment** (particularly in the web space), in spite of appearances, helps camouflage of violence and camouflage of power. Paradoxically, it is not difficult to identify direct perpetrators of these unlawful acts. Nevertheless only some may effectively defend themselves against intellectual violence and institutional violence. *Agonology* serves to increase this effectiveness.

Apart from common ignorance of *agonology* (principles, methods, means, etc.), associating self-defence with motor dimension (combat sports and martial arts) is one of the most important factors which blocks the defence potential of a modern man “against the attack on any good”.

It is not surprising, because defensive effects (or their lack) are immediately visible, because actions

of the parties are directed to bodies of persons struggling. Confirmed effectiveness attracts new trainees. From such perspective, it is not important whether and how long it will last to remedy harm and restore justice in the courts.

A person who defends oneself against institutional violence usually has little chance. Unless the case becomes known in media and media will attempt to support the party harmed. And what happens if the opponent is the government body responsible for advancements in science and art and decisive to grant individual faculties at universities and research institutes powers to award a doctor degree (of science or art) and later a post-doctoral degree, which is synonymous with the right to participate in the procedure for granting the title of professor (of science or art). Particular public officers of this institution (professors) and reviewers appointer by this institution (professors) have large possibilities of exerting intellectual violence. This stems from an official power over promotion of academic staff from a postdoctoral degree, which turns into an absolute power when an institution is allowed to confer the title of professor (formal act of appointment by the President of the State does not change the essence of things).

Nearly unlimited freedom of intellectual violence is provided by making a candidate (or the scientific council of the faculty applying for the above-mentioned rights) dependent from discretionary assessments of secret reviewers – professors. Evaluations of overt reviewers – even the most positive ones – are only a stage of apparent democracy and independence of opinion. Appropriately selected secret reviewer (called a rapporteur for camouflage) is able to challenge the merits of those assessments. When a candidate appeals, another appropriately selected secret reviewer continues this shameful mission. Official members of relevant Section (more than 30 professors) which consider candidate's (or faculty's) request take a decision in a secret voting, which is substantially affected by a recommendation of the professor-rapporteur. Two or three appropriately selected professors are enough (as the entities have the right to appeal against the decision). A rapporteur who recommends the request in front of the Section obtains the expected verdict due to clever intellectual violence. Liability is borne by the council who takes a decision and not by certain two/three professors. Finally, determined

structure of mutual shameful benefits triumphs as its members effectively use institutional violence (as detailed figure of joined camouflage of violence and power) and a method of selected group. The majority of members of the Section has not idea that they were manipulated in a sophisticated way (effective use of camouflaged violence and power against them).

This shortly defined algorithm (mechanism) of maintaining and expanding power over the system of scientific promotion fits in one of the most general principles of *agonology* – “the principle of controlled environment” [7]. Adaptation of defensive action to this rule is *sine qua non* of effective prevention of pathologies defined above, and any other form of intellectual violence and institutional violence (e.g. media propaganda), but also defence against any form of physical aggression (self-defence *sensu stricto*). Perhaps the most difficult part of an effective defence against intellectual and institutional violence is flawless identification of major aggressor (the main perpetrator) – this is the primary dilemma of self-defence *sensu largo*. As far as self-defence *sensu stricto* is concerned, a prerequisite for effectiveness is to identify a direct perpetrator (defence against an orderer, i.e. a main perpetrator, *nolens volens*, must be postponed).

RESULTS

Effectiveness of actions which are in line with principles and methods of agonology verified in defence of Archives of Budo – empirical argumentation

Effectiveness of the algorithm defined above (in a negative sense, i.e. in terms of shameful actions) has been repeatedly verified since 15 December 1951, when the Central Qualifying Committee exercised power over academic promotion system in Poland due to the act introduced by henchmen of Stalin. Universities lost their ability to grant academic degrees on their own, whereas introduction of lifelong title of professor made it possible for selected groups to control the entire science, effectively avoiding competences of scientific bodies of various universities and research institutes, who participate in promotion procedures. The professorial title is linked with the most important lifelong reviewer's privileges: in promotion procedures in science or art; applications for research grants; reports of completed grants; applications for granting promotion powers to particular faculties.

These are not all privileges. Any professor may during his/her life be appointed as a member of expert teams which arbitrarily decide on: granting the final scientific category to particular faculties, research institutions, etc. according to the formula involving discretionary expert points; granting evaluation expert points to journals from “B” list maintained by the Polish Ministry of Science and High Education (PMSHE), which includes mainly national periodicals; edition of legal acts, etc.

These totalitarian traditions related to the principles and methods used are continued in Poland by the Central Commission for Academic Degrees and Titles (hereinafter: The Central Commission). An independent scientific journal (from authority of any institution, pressure groups, etc.) proves to be a significant obstacle. It disrupts reliability of these principles and methods. Professors who usurp the right to arbitrarily decide who to recommend especially for the title of professor (treating ethical standards and individual bodies of scholars in an instrumental way), cannot influence the major decisions taken by the Editorial Board of *Archives of Budo* – which manuscripts can be printed and which should be rejected (or in fact which authors should be rejected) regardless of substantive value of their work.

Professors who have real power over scientific promotion system would use such capacity as a convenient method of camouflaging this kind of power and violence before the candidate (who is unwanted from the point of view of these professors or the leader) submits the application for promotion. Independence of *Archives of Budo* deprives them also of another possibility – pressure on the Editor-in-Chief to publish as quickly and as many as possible articles written by candidates supported by them. As the profile of *Archives of Budo* limits the subjects to the science of martial arts and related to them, and sport science is very broad, it is an increasing number of promoted scientists with post-doctoral degree from this new sub-discipline who pose a real threat to the ones exercising actual power over scientific promotion system. Not only the Editor-in-Chief, but also authors of articles, in particular potential candidates who wish to obtain professorial title, and any member of Editorial Board from Poland, are cumbersome.

A disgraceful attack on the *Archives of Budo* was carried out by professors who form the core

structure of mutual shameful benefits (alternatively with the “chosen group”), maintain power over promotions in the discipline of sport science in Poland. While defending *Archives of Budo* since 2014 (and officially since 2015) in a worthy manner (myself as the Editor-in-Chief, deputy, members of Editorial Board and authors-experts of science of martial arts, who published their articles in the journal and applied for scientific promotion), I could personally identify the most important perpetrators, along with the rules, principles, methods and means of action.

Defence of the Editorial Board and authors may be qualified as a defence struggle, whereas I may be considered as a self-defender. The scope of both terms (as indicated above) overlap to a high degree, therefore naming them with such detail it particularly significant from a theoretical point of view. In both cases, the practice comes down to the need to respect the criteria of defence struggle – this is a canon of *prophylactic and therapeutic agonology*.

Transnational good of science generally requires that most important proofs are disclosed and justifies *a priori* a withdrawal of the accusation that the author of this article acts to the detriment of the image of his own country.

Indicators used to identify perpetrators and modus operandi

Assuming that they still remain undisclosed, all members of the „chosen group” have a common main objective – lifelong own share in power over scientific promotion system (in this example, based on facts – sports science). Almost all of them are consumed with envy that they has not established a similar independent scientific journal evaluated by Thomson Reuters with retrograde dating – as in the case of *Archives of Budo* – since its establishment (2005).

The real reasons helped identifying the main perpetrator (a master in applying the principles of “interfering by means of faked help” [1]) of this peculiar attack. I mean here a professor of sport science with most motivation among the ones forming „chosen group”, who is also a member of the 4th Section of Medical Sciences of the Central Commission of 8th term. His most important motive: involved offended ambitions, first in 2005 (despite many efforts he did not prevent from my nomination at the professor title), and then in

2006 (during a secret voting of my request to professor title held by the 4th Section of Medical Sciences of 6th term, when no member against).

However, the main perpetrator lacked *flexible (dispositional) feasibility* (a well-defined term used in praxeology and *agonology* [6, 30]) in order to stop implementing this shameful goal, despite the fact that I created his a possibility of honorary withdrawal in January 2015. His primary mental deficit consists in no “sufficient willingness to carry out given action”, i.e. to correct the objection planned and to stop shameful actions, which indicate that he had defected the third principle of doctoral oath. With determination, he undertakes more and more shameful actions to achieve his goal at any cost. The strength of this determination can be regarded as an important indicator that this person extremely experiences toxic syndrome of power, which makes his unable to undertake a **struggle with oneself**.

Facts described further prove this shameful use by main perpetrator of his privileged position in the Central Commission of 8th term. At first, he recommended himself (it does not matter whether in agreement with another two professors of sport science) as a secret reviewer-rapporteur as he was a candidate who received four positive opinions from four overt reviewers. As a secret reviewer-rapporteur (being aware that his specialty within sport science differs from the scientific profile of the candidate) refused to support the request. When another professor supported candidate's request during an appeal procedure, the main perpetrator did not give up. He recommended another secret reviewer (with specialty of sport science identical as his, but still differing from the scientific profile of the candidate), who also declined support. After the subsequent appeal lodged by the candidate, he carried out the same actions. He reached his goal, finally the request was dismissed and the candidate, the author of articles in *Archives of Budo* ceased to seek justice. This was however only preparation for final attack.

Main perpetrator focused his attack on two candidates with more vibrant relationship with *Archives of Budo*. The first one (C1), a member of Editorial Board, who applied for the title of professor in sport science, received four positive reviews from professors, being unquestionable authorities in their scientific specializations, who cover the main

areas of research conducted by C1. Inviolacy of the first secret reviewer whose identify has been until today kept secret with incredible determination by professors, the highest public functionaries of the Central Commission, is surprising. This secret reviewer questioned the reliability of overt reviewers regardless of official rules and disciplinary consequences. The principal allegations were based on the alleged unethical actions carried out by C1 together with Editor-in-Chief and deputy *Archives of Budo* (creating the so-called “cooperative” which “is involved in very large «scientific production», with very modest scientific creativity”). This means that he unlawfully questioned elementary freedom rights of scientists to create new, unique knowledge (since 2005, C1 has been a leader in a global space of science of martial arts [31]), to publish with anyone who is entitled to become a co-author in most prestigious journals, which correspond to profiles of scientific creativity. Such narration was continued by the second secret reviewer. While re-examining the request, on 14 December 2015 he made his name public – he is a professor, who lacks moral qualifications to participate as a consultant in promotion of academic staff, because before 1989 he had worked as a secret collaborator of the communist authorities [32].

The wife of this Communist agent of totalitarian system also took part in reviewing process (as an overt reviewer) of the second candidate (C2), who applied for a post-doctoral degree in sport science. The content of this review is merely a psychological aggression towards C2 and a member of his family because of the fact that he belongs to the Editorial Board *Archives of Budo*. She also personally attacked Editor-in-Chief and *en bloc* Editorial Board. For some time, this review is no longer available at the website of the Central Commission.

It is justified to assume that the choice of reviewers was not accidental and they are aware members of the „chosen group”, whose aim is to destruct *Archives of Budo* as an independent entity of science and culture. Their main method was to discredit Editor-in-Chief, Editorial Board and authors, along with candidates for post-doctoral and professorial title in sport science. Means used by them include intellectual violence, institutional violence, and common psychological aggression.

Analysed *structure of mutual shameful benefits* received significant support for destructive actions

against Editor-in-Chief of *Archives of Budo* on 30 June 2015. By effort of significantly larger number of professors, the “Favourite of the Central Commission” was ultimately awarded a professorial title in February 2016, as a perfect candidate to strengthen the „chosen group” in the future. Determination of perpetrators is indicated by incredible accumulation of shameful actions, in clear violation of the law, including the Chairperson of the 4th Section and even the Chairperson of the Central Commission. All events may be interpreted as a manifestation of an absolute power over the system of most significant scientific promotions in Poland. They used primitive methods (exclusion, discrimination) and primitive means (slanders, making false statements in writing, verbal manipulations, etc.) in a shameful manner and with no respect of morality and law.

I was one of four reviewers of the application filed by the “Favourite of the Central Commission”, but the only one who decline to support him. I have shown that the scientific achievements of the candidate were created in violation of copyright law, ethics and good practices in science. Against the law, I not have been invited to a session held by the Faculty Council to examine the application. My review has not been presented. Commission appointed by the Faculty Council reversed certain roles. Its members (finally with expected result) convinced the Council that I did not have the right to change my opinion about the candidate in the last decade; that I make ethical allegations without proofs (therefore the review, which contains them, was not presented); that it was a mistake that this Council appointed me as a reviewer, etc. Another reviewer selected by the Central Commission ultimately determined the result of the secret voting – he doubted my honesty and reliability as a man and as a scientist in public. Neither the Chairperson of the 4th Section of Medical Sciences nor the Chairperson of the Central Commission had until today responded to my complaints as well as launched explanatory and/or disciplinary actions required by the law or repeated the procedure, but they immediately recommended the President of the Republic of Poland to award their Favourite a professorial title. In the second month after this promotion (April 2016), it was a professor of sport science who undertook shameful actions and provided further proof that my review is reliable and honest.

Other evidence of effective (ineffective) actions which are always shameful as simple indicators used to identify perpetrators of destructive fights

Analysis of destructive fights used only by one party (even limited as in this example to psychological destruction) finds useful the conceptual apparatus and methodology of a cybernetic theory of struggle, i.e. the theory of destructing [33]. Józef Konieczny, the inventor of this theory, states that purposive destructing takes place in activity which is not an armed struggle [33, p. 24]. Kalina, who continued this reasoning states that sometimes people connected with a negative co-operation come to a destructing struggle even when starting a conflict had not intend to do it. Formulating these statements, he assumes that destructing a man in an intentional way can be done without tools other than own mind and body [27, pp. 25-26].

The simplest **the chain of destruction** consists of three elements: subject of destruction (a shooter), intermediary of destruction (medium), object of destruction (object) [33, p. 27-36].

Methods and tools also fall within a broad meaning of “medium”. Analysed relation of “destructive struggle used only by one party” is derived from a definition of “struggle” adopted in agonology: „any activity with participation of at least two subjects (assuming that a team can constitute a subject), whereas at least one of subjects hinders the other one” [5-7, 13].

First evidence

Shooter: members of the „chosen group” at the Central Commission of 8th term (2013-2016).

Medium: identity of the first secret reviewer hidden with determination for the past 24 months (he may be older than 80 years; according to objective scientometric indicators, he has less scientific achievements than C1; he has cooperated for the long time with the second secret reviewer in the same academic environment as well as they have collaborated in favour of the communist Polish authorities which collapsed in 1989).

In an official letter dated 13 May 2016, the Chairperson of the Central Commission misleads high public officer of the Chancellery of the Prime Minister with the following statements: 1) “complaints filed by the Editor-in-Chief of

Archives of Budo against the Central Commission have no actual or legal grounds”; 2) “numerous articles published by the Candidate C1 are mainly published in «Archives of Budo», which is of low substantive value.”

The same Chairperson constantly misleads public opinion in the report of 2015: “The Central Commission endeavours in its work to ensure that the procedures associated its competence were carried out in a transparent and efficient manner, following at the same time formal and substantive requirements for candidates for promotion.”

Object: Candidate C1, Editor-in-Chief of *Archives of Budo*.

Conclusion and remarks – this is evidence that perpetrators comprehensively used the following methods: accomplished facts; endangering (potentialization); concentration of own forces; depriving situation; strengthening the needs of expansion; canalization of ideals; intensification of fear; plot of interests; potentialization of scope and degree of authority; chosen group.

Second evidence

Shooter: The Presidium of the Central Commission of 8th term (11 out of 12 were present; this number includes 3 identified members of the „chosen group”).

Medium: statements which deprived the addressee of his dignity made in justification of the decision dated 27 June 2016, with 1 person abstaining (received by C1 on 15 October 2016, when election to the Central Commission of 9th term 2017-2020 were commenced): “The candidate has still a chance to apply for the academic title. Limitation of excessive emotion as well as reflection on the ethics of the work performed by an academic teacher would be favourable”.

Object: Candidate C1.

Conclusion and remarks – one abstaining person justifies the conclusion that identified members of the „chosen group” effectively manipulate the Presidium (91% of supporting votes, including my own). The passage quoted is a detailed mean of methods applied in a comprehensive manner: intensifying fear; strengthening the needs; potentialization of scope and degree of authority; canalization of ideals.

Third evidence

Shooter: The Chairperson of the Central Commission of 8th term.

Medium: In the official letter referred to above (first evidence) dated 13 May 2016 to high public officer of the Chancellery of the Prime Minister, the Chairperson of the Central Committee furthermore states: 3) that Editor-in-Chief of *Archives of Budo* implied that there were **supposed irregularities** in the proceedings before the Faculty Council related to nomination of the “Favourite of the Central Commission” to received professorial title.

Object: Editor-in-Chief of *Archives of Budo*.

Conclusion and remarks – at its website, the Central Commission contradicts the practice which was used while granting the professorial title to the “Favourite of the Central Commission” (detailed information are provided in the last paragraph of the previous section): “Proper invitation of the reviewers to the meeting of the faculty council which adopts resolutions provided for by law in the proceedings to grant degree or professorial title, is an obligation of the council conducting such proceedings (...) failure to fulfil this obligation provides the basis to challenge the relevant resolutions adopted in these proceedings, which is confirmed i.a. by the case law of administrative courts (...)”. <http://www.ck.gov.pl/articles/id/20.html>

The simplest observational data as indicators for verification of defence struggle and self-defence criteria met (defined above)

For the purposes of this analysis, I formulated a **reversed chain of defence**: defender, medium of defence, aggressor. This simple model may be found useful for reporting purposes, including – as in this case – scientific analyses and application recommendations. Following the criteria of defence struggle and self-defence (apart from situation {**a**, **d^s**}), it becomes obvious that a person who did not provoke the aggressor is defending oneself and the aggressor is a person who started the attack due to reasons only known to him and often puts a defender in a situation with only one way out. The term “aggressor” is used in a broad sense, hence it pertains also to those exert any form of psychological violence.

Synthetic example is limited to the core of defence against the „chosen group” lead by the

Chairperson of the Central Commission in circumstances which agonology defined as „a decisive moment”.

Defender: Editor-in-Chief of *Archives of Budo*.

Medium of defence: methods often used since 02 January 2015 which involved: cunctation; potentialization; surprise; accomplished facts as well as master holds (which will for now remain my secret). The means of comprehensively used methods in a decisive moment include the following argumentation which was at first shared with the international scientific community:

The Chairperson of the Central Commission of 9th term has an ungrateful mission ahead – as required by “i.a. case law made by the administrative courts” (*op. cit.*) – which will involve challenging the resolutions adopted by: the Faculty Council, which endorsed the application of the “Favourite of the Central Commission”; The 4th Section of Medical Sciences; The Presidium of the Central Commission; as well as formulating a request to the President of the Republic of Poland for repealing the decision to grant a professorial title to the “Favourite of the Central Commission”.

A serious dilemma not only for the Central Commission would be constituted by re-election of a professor for the Chairperson for the 9th term (he was re-elected due to highest number of votes in his scientific specialty) who in a shameful manner manifested during the 8th term his absolute power over promotion of professors, which to say the least has put even the President of Poland in a difficult situation.

Circumstances related to granting a professorial title to the “Favourite of the Central Commission” and a shameful role of the Chairperson of the Central Commission appointed to protect the rules of law and ethics in scientific promotion procedures, must be horrifying due to the amount of pathology and a perspective of it being preserved. They may terrify not only the scientists – those at the beginning and at the end of their scientific carrier. If a corporation of professor resembling the identified „chosen group” was established anywhere in the world, a professorial title would become only but also a necessary mean for obtaining a lifelong power in science and – horror of horrors – eliminating the ones who

are predestined to fulfil the mission of scientists among those to seek for the truth. Science cannot exist without morality and ethics. True scientists would have to do it in conspiracy.

I trust that the international group of true scientists cannot become corrupted. Consent of scientists to the identified practices of the Central Commission and its Chairperson, which include shameful destruction of an independent scientific journal and authors only because they publish their articles therein, would be equivalent to a tragic eclipse of the science we know.

Aggressor: „chosen group” with a leading of the Chairperson of the Central Commission.

DISCUSSION

”Truth defends itself” is a principle which with the passivity of abused people is usually verified by historians

The main difference between the history and *prophylactic and therapeutic agonology* lies in the fact that the second one is an empirical science and is applicable during ongoing events. However, application and development of *innovative agonology* would not be possible if we ignore history as in the case of many other specialized sciences.

During the escalation of violence against the *Archives of Budo* reflected by personal attacks on the Editor-in-Chief, members of the Editorial Board and almost all candidates who applied for a post-doctoral or professorial degree (2013-2015), who published their articles in *Archives of Budo*, its *Impact Factor* steadily increased in 2013 (0.839), 2014 (1.238), 2015 (1.310). It consistently remains the highest among 3 *sport science* journals edited in Poland. This results in the highest result for this category of periodicals in the history of evaluation of scientific journals in Poland. It is expressed in points (20, whereas other two have 15 points) on the list “A” maintained by PMSHE, i.e. evaluated in the *Web of Science*. Furthermore, since 2015 the lists of the *Web of Science* has included also two another outputs of the independent institution of science and culture *Archives of Budo*, which is constantly developed by an international team of scientists with unique qualifications: *Archives of Budo Science of Martial Arts and Extreme Sports* (ISSN 2300 8822) and *Archives of Budo Conference Proceedings* (ISSN 2450-2650).

Polish Ministry of Science and High Education announced the latest list of journals in December 2016. If the Editor-in-Chief has not attempted since 02 January 2015 to officially defend the honour and dignity of the Editorial Board and authors who are experts in science of martial arts, who published their articles in the *Archives of Budo* and applied/apply for scientific promotion, it is highly likely that: *Archives of Budo* would be excluded from the PMSHE list of journals which would be justified by the fact that its Editor-in-Chief personally participates in unethical editorial practices and as a dishonest reviewer he strived to eliminate a potential competitor (“Favourite of the Central Commission”).

Active defence undertaken by the Editor-in-Chief stopped this conclusion from being made by professors of the Central Commission of the 8th term who represent the „chosen group” as well as evidence that they violated the law, ethics, good practices and customs in science from being hidden. Presented hypothesis will, luckily, remain a substantial argument during probabilistic reasoning, while considering the need of defence of not only science as a common good against any pathologies but also universal values in general. The facts are indisputable. Power is such a strong passion that even professors who should be most resistant are submitted to it. Professorial title means a special obligation to undertake effective and glorious actions for the benefit of all mankind.

The term „syndrome of power” in creative and toxic approach as well as re-definition of „self-defence” for the purposes of innovative agonology

Revealed empirical data (hence the title contains the phrase **the final impulse**) form the basis for establishing initial definition of the following terms: „creative syndrome of power” and „toxic syndrome of power”. The word „syndrome” used in the following phrases means: “a set of features typical for a person, who experienced given phenomenon” [34].

Creative syndrome of power is an elementary innate cognitive-behavioural predisposition of a human being which is to a greater or lesser extent determined by a talent to a specific intellectual, motor or intellectual and motor activity which constitutes the basis for an individual to adapt to social environment, natural and artificial environment, building interpersonal relations in

line with universal values and undertaking such activities in a conscious manner which will ensure possibly most comprehensive development of personality and all personal predispositions for the benefit of the common good.

Toxic syndrome of power is a need experienced by an individual which is related to obtaining egoistic power over possibly greatest or specific number of people, objects and/or nature elements. In order to satisfy it, an individual is not able to refrain even from extreme destructive actions, treating ethical standards, rules of social coexistence and other people in an instrumental manner.

While considering both forms of **syndrome of power** subjectively (as existing in each of us), with such use of the Ockham’s razor, we encounter possible internal analysis of **struggles with oneself** on the basis of *innovative agonology*. This uneasy cognitive and methodological challenge requires separate in-depth studies and scientific justifications.

Meanwhile, empirical evidence analysed in this article should make the importance of this science in counteracting all forms of violence and aggression apparent even to persons who do not know the basics of *agonology*. Therefore, necessary redefinition of the term “self-defence” should not be surprising.

Innovative self-defence involves using verbal and/or behavioural methods and means along with available items in counteracting each attack on any good of an individual (honour, dignity, life, health, property, etc.), whereas a defender submits his/her actions to the criteria of prophylactic and therapeutic *agonology*, considering the most general directive of efficient leading of any struggles [7] and also universal assumption of self-defence training [35] as absolutely paramount.

Unfortunately, the editorial frame of this article limits the possibility of elaborating on this issue.

CONCLUSION

Well-documented case of the main perpetrator who carried out an attack on the *Archives of Budo* may in the future constitute a reference point for clinical verification of the possibilities related to *prophylactic and therapeutic agonology* – whether

it meets *therapeutic* aspect in relation to an individual. However, there are no completely reliable methods. The struggle with oneself – *ex definitione* – must be undertaken by given person oneself. Whoever he or she may be and whatever harm this person has already done or plans to do.

This matter is not finished with this article. Extensive parts are included and developed in a monograph which will be published before the constitution of the authorities of the Central Commission of the 9th term (2017-2020). This is a part of a project and implementation of *innovative agonology* at first in society, who in its long and glorious history, unfortunately, constantly struggles with individuals and large teams (inside and outside the country) overcome with toxic syndrome of power.

An equally important goal of the project is to promote: knowledge on such people in internal (personal) sense, but with the highest official qualifications confirmed by the professorial academic title; knowledge on shameful manners and methods of actions, of which even professors are capable; knowledge on effective defence in a way which does not diminish honour and dignity of an aggressor, whoever he or she was.

Only **brave** people, whose greatest advantages include **moral power** and openness to continual development can defend themselves in such manner. It will be the social effect achieved in the future which will verify the capabilities of *prophylactic agonology*. Indicators – reduced number of followers of the „chosen group“; objective increase in empathy among academic community and in interpersonal relations at all degrees of social hierarchy; renewed spirit of *Solidarity*, etc. These are as well social health indicators which can be estimated.

People subject to toxic syndrome of power consider theory and practice of *innovative agonology* as inconvenient. Main perpetrator of the attack on the *Archives of Budo* testified that such people think of science and culture not as joint transnational good. Incidentally, any critic who claims that science is an inherent part of culture, will be right. Perhaps main perpetrator and member of the “chosen group” were in fact terrified as they became aware that scientists related with *Archives of Budo* effectively overcome rigid paradigms of science and culture tied by institutions,

if its leaders could not stop the pathology of neogladitorialship [36]. As we can see, contemporary science and culture is affected not only by the Cold War and Iron Curtain [37].

Perhaps the key to the therapy of the main perpetrators of the attack on the *Archives of Budo* and other professors from the “chosen group” is to answer the following questions which have been rhetorical so far: a) “and perhaps – insert the addressee’s name – we have evidence for another struggle between two generations of scientists (and it is not about the age but the order of promotion), when one party is allowed to use unworthy methods? b) or perhaps it is true that scientific level of these secret reviewers (known at least by you) matches ethics whose unreliability was proved but somehow it was not noticed by most members of the 4th Section? Could their usefulness be more important, because frustration defined in the letter applies to a much wider circle?”.

I included these questions in the letter to the main perpetrator of the attack on the *Archives of Budo* dated 02 January 2015. He has not responded until today, not had the remaining public officers of the Central Commission answered to official letters regarding this matter.

Perhaps reports and in-depth analyses of this defence of *Archives of Budo* commenced on 02 January 2015, which still was not completed by means of formal decisions would be the prophylactic key in the interests of future generations of scientists, politicians, representatives of media and any other mind subject to toxic syndrome of power. Formal decisions could include remedy of any harm done to any entities by the “chosen group” (which consists not only of professors) and restoration of justice. The expected prophylactic effect should involve such state of mind and *en bloc* organisation of society to effectively counteract implementation of idea which deprive people of freedom to conduct research and publish the results in a manner which will ensure their optimal use for the benefit of certain individuals and humanity.

Perhaps enslaved people should explicitly hear that *Archives of Budo*, as an institution, the international Editorial Board in particular, promotes underestimated healthy values of martial arts, in the global space of science, at the same time

being opposed to pathology and neogladiatorship. *Czestochowa Declarations 2015*: HMA against MMA [36] still awaits for implementation. Furthermore, founder of the journal did not took the term “budo” for themselves, which is the legacy of Japanese culture [38, 39] and do not interfere with this good in any aspect. Transnational mission of science and culture is only emphasised by the most recognizable symbol of possible development and personal fulfilment in global scale by means of martial arts (every combat sport is martial arts but not vice versa [40]). In fact, *Archives of Budo* promotes any national or proprietary system of martial arts, placing equal emphasis on health, utilitarian, ethical, aesthetic and other values as well as originality and motor attractiveness.

The term *innovative agonology* comprises all known or forgotten martial arts and self-defence arts, as well as detailed theories and proprietary exercise systems to be developed. *Martial arts bibliotherapy* [11, 41, 42], whose methodology is under development, may provide a great assistance in re-orienting social perception of martial arts. People responsible for revival of bloody fights of men, women and children in cages in our supposedly democratic time, which also include Olympic champions should not be looked for among the

founders of the best-known systems of martial arts and combat sports and among filmmakers (film constituting an inherent part of culture as science and sport) and who were first to film gladiators games.

Innovative agonology is *en bloc* opportunity for society which should not be thrown away by the threat of dehumanization through neogladiatorship. If such a high number of professor, who act only in a micro scale, assume ideals and objectives of people in power and is able to effectively camouflage violence towards anyone, who bothers them, we should imagine how dangerous they will become, when they reach the macro scale. Professors have officially the highest qualifications related to the establishment and use of knowledge in a comprehensive manner [2]. Soon *martial arts bibliotherapy* may turn out to become a simple and attractive methods used to facilitate education of elites, i.e. units which are able to identify people subject to toxic syndrome of power, and those who emanate creative syndrome of power in their closest and the furthest social environment.

Perhaps, the word “elite” will in the future be associated solely with people listed in the previous sentence in secondarily. Hopefully as soon as possible.

REFERENCES

1. Kalina RM. Agonology as a deeply esoteric science – an introduction to martial arts therapy on a global scale. *Procedia Manufacturing* 2015; 3: 1195-1202
2. Kalina RM. Agonology – the prospect of an effective defence of peace and unrestricted freedom of scientists. *Arch Budo* 2016; 12: 1-13
3. Kalina RM. Cognitive and application barriers to the use of “Agonology in Preventive and Therapeutic dimension”. In: Salmon P, Macquet AC, editors. *Advances in Human Factors in Sports and Outdoor Recreation. Proceedings of the HFE 2016 International Conference on Human Factors in Sports and Outdoor Recreation*; 2016 Jul 27-31; Walt Disney World, Florida, USA: Series: *Advances in Intelligent Systems and Computing* 2016; 496: 25-35
4. Kalina RM. Agonology – the unknown science. *Arch Budo* 2016; 12: 231-237
5. Kotarbiński T. *Traktat o dobrej robocie*. Łódź: Ossolineum; 1955 [in Polish]
6. Pszczołowski T. *Mała encyklopedia prakseologii i teorii organizacji*. Wrocław-Gdańsk: Zakład Narodowy imienia Ossolińskich Wydawnictwo; 1978 [in Polish; the indices of terms: English, French, German, Russian]
7. Rudniański J. *Kompromis i walka. Sprawność i etyka kooperacji pozytywnej i negatywnej w gęstym otoczeniu społecznym*. Warszawa: Instytut Wydawniczy Pax; 1989 [in Polish]
8. Klimczak J, Podstawski R, Dobosz D. The association of sport and violence, aggression and aggressiveness – prospects for education about non-aggression and reduction of aggressiveness. *Arch Budo* 2014; 10: 273-286
9. Błędowski P. Uniwersytet opresywny. *Forum Akademickie* 2007; 7-8 [in Polish]
10. Rudniański J. Elementy prakseologicznej teorii walki. *Z zagadnień kooperacji negatywnej*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe; 1983 [in Polish]
11. Krzemieniecki LA, Kalina RM. Agon – a term connecting the theory of struggle with belles-lettres. A perspective of inter-disciplinary research. *Arch Budo* 2011; 7(4): 255-265
12. Barczyński BJ, Kalina RM. Science of martial arts – Example of the dilemma in classifying new interdisciplinary sciences in the global systems of the science evaluation and the social consequences of courageous decisions. *Procedia Manufacturing* 2015; 3: 1203-1210
13. Kotarbiński T. *Z zagadnień ogólnej teorii walki*. In: *Wybór pism. Part 1*. Warszawa: PWN; 1957: 549 [in Polish]
14. Rudniański J. *Homo cogitans. O myśleniu twórczym i kryteriach wartości*. Wydanie drugie rozszerzone. Warszawa: Wiedza Powszechna; 1981 [in Polish]
15. Rudniański J. *Between Efficiency and Ethics: Methods of Environment Control in Non-armed Struggle*. Praxiology 1980: 1
16. Kotarbiński T. *Pisma etyczne*. Wrocław-Łódź: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich; 1987 [in Polish]
17. Harasymowicz J, Kalina RM. Honourable self-defence – the theoretical and methodological basis of training. Płock: Wydawnictwo Novum; 2006
18. Gelb MJ. *Discover Your Genius: How to Think Like History's Ten Most Revolutionary Minds*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers, Inc.; 2002
19. Mayton DM, Burrows CA. *Psychology of Nonviolence, The Encyclopedia of Peace Psychology*. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell 2012; 1: 713-716 and 720-723
20. Harasymowicz J, Kalina RM. Training of psychomotor adaptation – a key factor in teaching self-defence. *Arch Budo* 2005; 1(1): 19-26
21. Shishida F. Counter techniques against Judo: the process of forming Aikido in 1930s. *Arch Budo* 2008; 4(4): 4-8

22. De Créé C, Jones LC. Kōdōkan Jūdō's Three Orphaned Forms of Counter Techniques – Part 1: The Gonosen-no-kata – “Forms of Post-Attack Initiative Counter Throws”. *Arch Budo* 2015; 11: 93-12
23. De Créé C. Kōdōkan Jūdō's Three Orphaned Forms of Counter Techniques – Part 2: The Nage-waza ura-no-kata — “Forms of Reversing Throwing Techniques”. *Arch Budo* 2015; 11: 125-154
24. De Créé C. Kōdōkan Jūdō's. Three Orphaned Forms of Counter Techniques – Part 3: The Katame-waza ura-no-kata – “Forms of Reversing Controlling Techniques”. *Arch Budo* 2015; 11: 155-171
25. Jagiełło W, Kalina RM, Klimczak J et al. Fun forms of martial arts in positive enhancement of all dimensions of health and survival abilities. In: Kalina RM (ed.) *Proceedings of the 1st World Congress on Health and Martial Arts in Interdisciplinary Approach*, HMA 2015, 17–19 September 2015, Czestochowa, Poland. Warsaw: Archives of Budo; 2015: 32-39
26. Shishida F. Why can a little lady throw down a strong man using only a finger? The mechanism of soft *atemi-waza*. In: Kalina RM (ed.) *Proceedings of the 1st World Congress on Health and Martial Arts in Interdisciplinary Approach*, HMA 2015, 17–19 September 2015, Czestochowa, Poland. Warsaw: Archives of Budo; 2015: 49-58
27. Kalina RM. Przeciwdziałanie agresji. Wykorzystanie sportu do zmniejszenia agresywności. Warszawa: PTHP; 1991 [in Polish]
28. Baker DJ. *Glanville Williams' Textbook of Criminal Law*. London: Sweet & Maxwell; 2012
29. Kaplan J, Weisberg R, Binder G, editors. *Criminal Law Cases and Materials*. 7th ed. New York: Wolters Kluwer Law & Business; 2012
30. Kalina RM, Barczyński BJ. From “physical fitness” through “motor competence” to the “possibility of action”. *Arch Budo* 2008; 4(4): 106-109
31. Peset F, Villamón M, Ferrer-Sapena A, González LM et al. Scientific literature analysis of Judo in Web of Science. *Arch Budo* 2013; 9(2): 81-91
32. Szczepańska EA. *Zanim wybaczę. Pamiętnik walki i zdrady*. Zakrzewo: Wydawnictwo Replika; 2009: [in Polish]
33. Konieczny J. *Cybernetyka walki*. Warszawa: PWN; 1970 [in Polish]
34. *Słownik Języka Polskiego PWN* [Internet]. Warszawa: PWN; 2016 [accessed 2016 Nov 22]. Available from: URL:<http://sjp.pwn.pl/> [in Polish]
35. Kalina RM. *Sporty walki i trening samoobrony w edukacji obronnej młodzieży*. Vol 2. Warszawa: PTNKF; 1977 [in Polish]
36. Kalina RM, Barczyński BJ. Long way to the Czestochowa Declarations 2015: HMA against MMA. In: Kalina RM (ed.) *Proceedings of the 1st World Congress on Health and Martial Arts in Interdisciplinary Approach*, HMA 2015, 17–19 September 2015, Czestochowa, Poland. Warsaw: Archives of Budo; 2015: 179-181
37. Barczyński BJ, Graczyński M, Kalina RM. Restricting the Free Dissemination of Scientific Achievements: Own Experiences in Crossing Walls and Bridges. *J Hum Kinet* 2009; 22(22): 7-14
38. *Budō: The Martial Ways of Japan*. Tokyo: Nippon Budokan Foundation; 2009
39. Kalina RM, Barczyński BJ. *Archives of Budo Science of Martial Arts and Extreme Sports – A reason for this new branch journal*. *Arch Budo Sci Martial Art Extreme Sport* 2013; 9: 1-9
40. Kalina RM. *Teoria sportów walki*. Warszawa: COS; 2000 [in Polish]
41. Klimczak J, Krzemieniecki LA, Mosler D. Martial arts bibliotherapy – the possibility of compensating the negative effects of the continuous education for aggression by electronic media and the aggressive interpersonal relationship of children and adults. *Arch Budo* 2015; 11: 395-40
42. Klimczak J, Krzemieniecki LA, Mosler D et al. Martial arts bibliotherapy – the prospect of support of Aggressiveness therapy based on cognitive-behavioural methods. In: Kalina RM (ed.) *Proceedings of the 1st World Congress on Health and Martial Arts in Interdisciplinary Approach*, HMA 2015, 17–19 September 2015, Czestochowa, Poland. Warsaw: Archives of Budo; 2015: 179-181

Cite this article as: Kalina RM. Innovative agonology as a synonym for prophylactic and therapeutic agonology – the final impulse. *Arch Budo* 2016; 12: 329-344