

# Agonology – the prospect of an effective defence of peace and unrestricted freedom of scientists

Roman Maciej Kalina<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Gdansk University of Physical Education and Sport, Department of Combat Sports, Gdansk, Poland

<sup>2</sup> Editor-in-Chief *Archives of Budo*

**Received:** 05 December 2015; **Accepted:** 22 December 2015; **Published online:** 06 January 2016

**AoBID:** 10842

**Authors' Contribution:**

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

## Abstract

Permanent peace and scientific knowledge are the greatest common good. Nevertheless, people still cannot cope with the age-old problem – struggle with oneself. With their agonistic nature. The most explicit indicators of lost “struggles with oneself” involve invariably the unbridled expansion of power and the escalation of violence and aggression. A phenomenon which has been effectively hidden so far is the fact that scientists make their actions similar to the most destructive powerful people. Familiarising oneself with the reality is the supreme value and at the same time the main objective of science. Thus, it is possible to achieve it if fundamental ethical norms are obeyed. On the other hand, for those who have it, power is a goal itself. People in power treat all moral norms nearly always in instrumental way. Agonology (science about struggle) provides methodology and tools which allow to study such phenomena in theoretical and empirical manner, but also methods to effectively counteract destruction from micro to macro scale. Agonology remains however an unknown science. Agonology has been created by four Polish scientists and each of five detailed theories has been published in Polish.

If demoralization reaches so deeply into the social structures (academics take over the methods typical for the most destructive people in power), thus the only sensible question is to consider two issues: whether it is an isolated incident identified in one country, or rather more common phenomenon but with yet unknown scale and range, because it is effectively hidden from the public?

This two-stage settlement of the question is the main goal of cognitive cycle exhaustive study Editors Archives of Budo due to the possibility of intellectual, strictly merits and editorial is able to share in the global space science (competently, possibly the most carefully and promptly). Therefore, also educational mission of agonology will be completed towards the widest recipient possible, i.e. the major application objective of these studies.

**Key words:** cybernetic theory of struggle · theory of a non-armed struggle · theory of combat sports · theory of defensive struggle

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

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

**Ethical approval:** Not required

**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

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

**Comprehensive** – including all or almost all items, details, facts, information, etc., that may be concerned

**Complementary** (to something) – two people or things, that are complementary, are different but together they form a useful or attractive combination of skills, qualities or physical features; each complementary action is also complex, but not vice versa

**Counterproductive** – from praxeological perspective certain action can be: productive – non-productive – counterproductive – neutral. The action is **counterproductive** when a doer achieved goal opposite than intended [53, p. 220]

**Kata** – predetermined and choreographed physical exercises, which together with free exercises (*randori*), lectures (*kōgi*) and discussions (*mondō*) form the four critical pillars of *Kōdōkan jūdō* education [66]

**Kata** – prescribed patterns or sequences of techniques [30]

**Poomse (kata in karate)** – it is traditionally understood as the style of conduct which expresses directly or indirectly mental and physical refinements as well as the principles of offense and defence resulting from cultivation of taekwondo spirit and techniques. Nowadays, poomse is involved in competition in the taekwondo technique modality [67].

**Thick 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 to achieve satisfaction without participation of people from own family circle and even satisfaction of basic needs or their majority” [57, p.27].

**The chain of destruction** – is an ordered three: subject of destruction (a shooter), intermediary of destruction (medium), object of destruction (object) [54, p. 27-36].

## INTRODUCTION

In the sense of striving for universal wisdom – there are important and very important statements and although some of them may seem obvious, in certain circumstances refraining from an in-depth thought about on each of them can be disastrous, even on a global scale. Past 2015 year showed us in a particularly clear way that people still cannot cope with the age-old problem – **struggle with oneself**. With their **agonistic nature** [1-4].

This is not world-wide fashion for suicides. Vast number of negative effects of fights “lost with each other” can be seen in bare eye from micro to macro scale. The most explicit one involve invariably the unbridled expansion of power and the escalation of violence and aggression.

Every day, media transmit reports about: killing, raids, kidnapping, terrorism, intimidation, local wars, sophisticated intrigues, the collapse of manners and customs, the crisis of values, ruthless political and economic fights, manifestation of the vain domination, increasing the number of claimants for nuclear weapon, etc. Barbaric destruction of material culture products is in turn a cyclical return to events, from which humanity did not learn anything. This is, however, an ominous sign. There are alive witnesses of events which started in Europe from burning books and the main perpetrator of this crime is probably the biggest celebrity of our time. Every day, millions of fans watch him on *History* TV channel.

But in 2015, events took place which so far have been effectively camouflaged from the public, which must have terrified everyone who does not lack imagination, elementary social sensitivity and sense of responsibility. I have discovered this phenomenon in its full clarity only because it directly affects the Editorial Staff of *Archives of Budo*. Regardless of elementary deontology of scientists, a group of professors has attempted to destroy *Archives of Budo* as an independent institution and scientific body.

Elementary questions are thus borne: who are those people? why are they doing this? do they have any personal benefits? could science and ordinary people gain some benefits or lose from it?

Precise answers based on irrefutable facts and scientific knowledge, generally unknown but needed by everyone will be made available in works systematically

published starting from this year in *Archives of Budo* in section devoted to this unique science – *agonology* (science about struggle).

They will be published systematically because apart from cognitive value these works will also have educational and preventive mission. This case is too serious, when in a situation where formally there is peace and not war, some scholars consciously seek to destroy other scholars and tangible products of their creative work. There is no difficulty in pointing out other professional groups where such situations take place on a daily basis. All the more knowledge and ability to identify those people who may camouflage such violence and primarily ability to counteract such situations are needed by everyone. Also by the underage. Young people very often under the pressure to perform such activities exercised by their peers and adults.

Emotional speech of the editor of the *Archives of Budo* addresses this topic, because he is personally a subject of violence (discrimination, exclusion, defamation, etc.) committed by growing circle of new subjects, just like other members of the Editorial Board. Violence is committed not only by professors but also by people with lower scientific status but high position in the formal structures of state institutions.

On the contrary. This is an impersonal factual diagnosis, because a particular group which may defend oneself is formed by scientists who apply for scientific promotion (post-doctoral or professor degree) and have papers published in *Archives of Budo* in their academic output. They are attacked in an unworthy manner by some professors appointed as reviewers of given procedure related to promotion. There are premises that these reviewers are in close relationships with certain social bodies and that they have common objectives. One of them is clear – to destroy the journal as an independent scientific body. Independent from those who in democratic country have control over scientific promotion system based on totalitarian methods. This is not a hypothesis but a discovered truth.

Over the past decade, a unique journal has been established which is able to effectively promote new sub-discipline, i.e. *science of martial arts* in global space of science. It is unique, because Thomson Reuters – the institution having greatest authority in the field of journals’ evaluation – included *Archives of Budo* in 2010 to three of its products

(*Science Citation Index Expanded*), *Journal Citation Reports/Science Edition, Focus On: Sports Science & Medicine*) with retroactive dating, i.e. from 2005 when the journal was established.

Perhaps the clearest indicator authenticating the sense of specialists from Thomson Reuters is a numerous group of scientists in Poland whose academic promotion to post-doctoral degree has been documented with publications in *Archives of Budo*. Thus, they have unique qualifications of a specialists in the *science of martial arts* – they have at least a doctoral degree and a black belt in martial arts (or coaching qualifications) or master class (boxing, fencing, self-defence, unfight, wrestling, etc.). Latest results of scientometric research provide empirical proof that scientists with this specialty belonged in the period 2009-2012 to the most creative group of Polish scientists. Data analyses were based on reported by 24 scientific units (faculties) of Polish physical education higher schools and related units (providing education in i.e. physiotherapy, recreation, sport) [5].

Thus, as far as cognitive value is concerned, an answer to the following question becomes the most interesting issue: why this sub-discipline of science which gains prestige as well as scientists and journal who create it in global space of science are subject to violence and aggression of other scientists with higher formal qualifications who are aware that they do not meet the criteria to be qualified as specialists in *science of martial arts*?

After all, science is indefinitely capacious; there is room for new disciplines and specialties and place for everyone who will scrape through multi-stage system of academic promotions, achieve required scientific independence (title or position of professor), is motivated and able to generate new knowledge. This is the sense, cognitive and social mission of science and the need for its continuing development. The one who remains opposed to those elementary values, unfortunately places himself behind scientific deontology.

Disclosure of truth or rather a crisis of confidence hardly imaginable in rational society to people with extraordinary social status – professors – cannot remain indifferent to scientists, politicians, lawyers, etc. It cannot be indifferent also to ordinary people due to established social awareness. Scientists are generally trusted because they are scientists. In opinion of a rationally thinking human, being

engaged in science is impossible without respecting fundamental moral norms.

If demoralisation reaches so deeply into the social structures (academics take over the methods typical for the most destructive people in power), the most urgent question is to consider two issues: whether it is an isolated incident identified in one country, or rather more common phenomenon but with yet unknown scale and range, because it is effectively hidden from the public.

This question is the major cognitive goal of the entire cycle of in-depth studies which may be made available in the global science in competent, careful and prompt manner by the Editors of *Archives of Budo* due to intellectual, educational and editorial possibilities. Therefore, also application objective of this research – educational mission of *agonology* will be completed towards the widest recipient possible.

### 1. Preliminary thoughts on important statements

*“Permanent peace and scientific knowledge are the greatest common good”.*

Thus

*“There is no better nor worse science – there is one science” (!).*

Therefore

*“Who discriminates even a single scholar or restricts their freedom in any other manner, poses threat to life on Planet Earth or even more”.*

Nowadays, it is a common knowledge that our world may be destroyed rapidly by using nuclear and/or biological weapon. On the other hand, this may also be done by toxic microorganisms accidentally released or mutated due to pure coincidence. Slow destruction may be caused by ideology of divestment of universal values which is permanently imposed on masses. We are also prepared for these circumstances – as *en bloc* people. The only thing to be done involves liberating media from public scrutiny and taking final step – their masters should be provided with lifelong anonymity. Media owners have mastered the technology of preventive censorship and the strategy to camouflage this policy. Therefore, the “truth” proclaimed by media and not by scientific journals

**Additive element** – in battles for life and death (destructive fights), opponents attempt to damage the heart, brain, etc.; it is applied while using *the method of dividing adversary's forces*

has the greatest impact on society. It may suppress even the most valuable scientific achievements – recommendations of social applications with hypothetically largest likelihood of desired changes so that the Earth survives.

Virtual Harry Potter has gained incredible popularity as he bravely opposed to the powerful forces of magic and evil. However, when mysterious spells, artefacts, bravery, determination, intelligence and physical fitness are not enough to overcome total annihilation, the most powerful people who are helpless in such situation ask scientists for help. In the world of artistic fiction, there is always a brave scientist, who finally saves the world. The triumph of science and vision of triumph due to qualified and brave scientists inspires creators, artists and sensitive, responsible people, e.g. very popular medical thriller *Contagion* (2011) directed by Steven Soderbergh.

In the real world it is not fiction, but an irrefutable fact. Only science ..., or to be precise: only people of science, i.e. certain scientists who have methodology and tools and in their absence they have intellectual potential to create such tool and overcome given threat.

Human mind is the most powerful tool and there are certain issues which may be effectively solved with its use. However, the effective way of using mind and body – in exactly such order – is familiar to masters of self-defence art [6-9]. It is the brain that controls the muscle work – not vice versa. Decisions to take actions or to consciously refrain from acting are born in the mind (according to *agonology* this is also an action subject to relevant analysis). I am not naive by suggesting that common self-defence training is the easiest way to peace in the world.

The questions are serious and answers are difficult:

What is the reason for the fact that although a struggle is an inherent human trait and still science about struggle – *agonology* – remains publicly unknown?

Is it possible to create interest in this science among the most powerful people and governments most powerful in the world?

and if so:

Should we egoistically expand and strengthen the power for our own use or rather share this

knowledge with others to maintain and defend the greatest common good?

Where does the difficulty lie? Are there people with high need to extend power who are able to see above their egoistic good (associated with power for power) elementary and objective truth and at the same time the greatest challenge of our times?

Survival alternative, and only it, is the truth. We will survive (and also people who are possessed by power, their relatives and other generations), if the most important authorities on the global world, regardless of hostility and alliances with various social entities, as well as all scientists without exceptions focus our attention on maintaining: **stable peace and freedom of science undisturbed by anyone.**

If necessary – through rational and responsible defence of the highest common good. Further divisions which is always related to expanding power of certain entity or entities and ignoring *agonology* (science about struggle) are the way to self-annihilation.

In fact, this is nothing new.

Pierre Teilhard de Chardin (1881-1955) – a Jesuit, who was unwelcomed by Church authorities – formulates the assumptions of “spiritual activation” in his vision of the world. Implicitly, as a condition for survival and development. In his opinion, this activation is necessary to balance and use physical power of humanity (and in my opinion – **power of destruction**) to enhance willingness to act, search and create. He concludes that “religion of evolution” is the most necessary to survive in everyday and spiritual life [10, p. 432].

On the other hand, the creators of *agonology* offer – in contrast to Teilhard de Chardin – not a new religion but a specific applied (empirical) science so that we could face this challenge from today’s perspective of survival as an alternative (because self-annihilation has never been so real). As many issues important for humanity, this one must be at first solved by people of science. However, looking at hostile activities directed at *Archives of Budo* in 2015, there is only one conclusion. This may be performed only by scientists free of toxic layer of the syndrome of power. That is by – it is a wonder that you have to add the adjective “real” – scientists whose main value and objective is not power

for power itself but knowledge of reality. Obtained scientific knowledge regardless of the subject it may pertain to should in the first place serve common good. Hence, there is a moral imperative of rational and responsible use of knowledge.

Toxic layer (or toxic element) of the syndrome of power requires however a separate discussion, which should also pertain to the phenomenon of creative layer (element) of this syndrome [3]. Both semantic categories are more precise than e.g. *ibido dominandi*, used by Antoni Kępiński (1918-1972) [11] or “Good” and “Evil” contrasted with each other many philosophical, scientific, religious messages, etc. [e.g. 1, 12-16]; or lower part of the soul with the higher one, natural instincts and the will, as interpreted by René Descartes (1596-1650) [17], or love and hatred according to Irenäus Eibl-Eibesfeldt (1928-) [18]; or three elements born of the matter (*gun*): *sattva*, *rajas*, *tamas* in Hinduism [19, p. 139-144]; or narration about permanent conflict in ourselves of Jiddu Krishnamurti (1895-1986) [20, 21] or Andrzej Grzegorzczak (1922-2014) [22]. There is also the concept of Konrad Lorenz (1903-1989) about the inner impuls to aggression and recommendation of the Nobel Prize winner about the need to direct to other paths or to extinguish in advance the true evil, i.e. primitive aggression expressed without rituals [23].

The terms “toxic-” and “creative layer of the syndrome of power” allow to formulate hypotheses which explain the issues related to human internal struggle with oneself by means of methodology used by *agonology*. The precise language of *agonology* can be used at the frontiers of science and thus to secondary analysis of works related to human inner struggle with oneself [1, 11-23 and many other]. Furthermore, it may be applied for strictly cognitive purposes: literary works describing the battles between people [24, 25], fights between animals and the fight between humans and animals. I would like to leave aside the visionary fights between people and robots or between machines. There was even new therapeutic concept established – *martial arts bibliotherapy* [26, 27].

## 2. General information about agonology

*Agonology* has been created by four Polish scientists and each of five detailed theories has been published in Polish [3, 25]. However, the history of *agonology* from today’s perspective of still

developing science about struggle, surprises with the symbolism of events and relations, originally with pragmatics and philosophy of *judo* [28, 29], and now *budo* [30, 31]. The creator of *judo*, a prominent Japanese professor Jigoro Kano (1860-1938) died in 1938, i.e. in exactly the same year in which professor Tadeusz Kotarbiński (1886-1981) published general theory of struggle, referring to it as *agonology* [32].

Both scientists did not personally know their works. The final message of Jigoro Kano and the greatest form of application of his martial art is “*judo in mind*” [29]. He reached this conclusion at the end of life starting at age 17 with *ju-jitsu*. Tadeusz Kotarbiński was in turn inspired by analysis of strategies and tactics of prominent leaders described in the history of war and civilization. When he formed the basics of contemporary *agonology*, he was already a mature man and similarly to Jigoro Kano he was also a scientist with recognised international activity, but he had never trained *martial arts*.

### General theory of struggle

Kotarbiński comes back to *agonology* in 1957 [33] and 1963 [34]. Earlier, in 1955, the first edition of *A Treatise on Good Work*, a fundamental lecture of *praxeology* (science about good work) written by T. Kotarbiński appeared, in which he affiliates to the theory of negative co-operation but he devotes a separate chapter only to a struggle technique [35]. *A Treatise on Good Work* has been translated into: English, German, Russian, Czech, Japanese and Serbo-Croatian. Theory of struggle (*agonology*) is – in other words – theory of negative co-operation is referred to by Kotarbiński as “a struggle” alternatively with “a negative co-operation” [35].

However, from historical perspective, by publishing information about science about struggle (*agonology*) in 1938 [32], Kotarbiński was ahead by 17 years of the announcement of science about good work (*praxeology*) – first edition of *A Treatise on Good Work* in 1955 [35]. Those who do not know the history of *agonology* and *praxeology* may be confused by the statement „praxeological theory of struggle“ used in some contemporary publications.

References to the notion of „*agonology*“ appeared in scientific literature written in English while constructing a theory of conflict by Joan V. Bondurant [36], in the analysis of conflict in the Church by Speed B. Leas [37], also in books [38-42],

handbooks [43–45] periodicals [46–49] and privies author/co-authors publications [3, 25, 50].

Theory of conflict [36] and *agonology* (starting from Kotarbiński [32]) differ, regardless of similarities, in opposite methodological approach, especially as far as elementary premises and assumptions are concerned. The essentials of Kotarbiński's interests in struggle included the awareness of the fact that people develop the greatest amount of energy and smartness when they find themselves in constrained situations. Just in course of a struggle, an adversary does all his efforts to obstruct an action of the other side. There are plenty of such situations in various kinds of struggles.

It is this that methodological approach makes *agonology* initiate this science developed by Kotarbiński [32] and about the possibilities of prophylactics and therapeutics to help people with a tendency to violence and aggression. Furthermore, this methodological approach, created a chance to realize the vision of Konrad Lorenz consisting in directing true evil, i.e. primitive aggression expressed without rituals, to other paths [23]. This was confirmed by two experiments lasting for several months [51, 52].

The efficiency of all activities is the domain of *praxeology*, which formulates a efficiency assessment (also called praxeological ones) – „effective – ineffective” [53]. *Agonology* uses mixed assessments: „praxeological & ethical” („effective – ineffective” & “fair – shameful”). Four relationships are possible: „effective – fair”; „effective – shameful”; „ineffective – fair”; „ineffective – shameful” [3]. This system of mixed assessments is one of the basic methodological criteria to measure the effects to which the Nobel Prize winner Konrad Lorenz was referring [23]. It may be used in laboratory conditions and during direct participatory observation but also secondary multiple direct observation, which are today created by technical means of documenting the actions and behaviour of people.

#### *Cybernetic theory of struggle*

Colonel, Józef Koniczny (1936–1984), who had Ph.D. degree in philosophy, developed a cybernetic theory of struggle (1970 [54]). In fact, this is the theory of destruction. This sequence is not surprising, since military representatives are interested in each most recent scientific achievement. Before Koniczny published cybernetics struggle (in Polish: *Cybernetyka walki*) [54], he dealt with

theory of destruction (1968) [55] and mathematical theory of struggle (1969) [56].

#### *Theory of a non-armed struggle*

Professor Jarosław Rudniański (1921–2008) the author of the theory of non-armed struggle (1989) [57], a prisoner of Soviet gulag during the Second World War, after war the soldier of Anders Army participated in the Battle of Monte Cassino (1944) on the side of the Allied forces. He was a student and co-worker of Tadeusz Kotarbiński. His inspirations came from papers of Mahatma Gandhi. Rudniański, when developing a general theory of struggle, referred above all to its language (a conceptual apparatus). An elaboration of a complete theory of non-armed struggle as well as the theory of compromise are considered to be the biggest contribution of in this area of scientific exploration. An essential work: *A Compromise and a Struggle* [57] was written in would-be “two stages”. The general theory of struggle was published in 1983 during the Martial Law in Poland [1983] under a title *Elements of Praxeological Theory of Struggle. From Problems of a Negative Co-operation* [58]. Contents of these elements and problems were in fact precise allegations of the theory of a non-armed struggle. Although, the impression of 2,000 copies was legally edited by State Scientific Publishers (*Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe*) practically this book was not accessible.

During the Martial Law, professor Rudniański was teacher of the underground “Solidarity” leaders, taught the theory of struggle. Above all, he was teaching about the effective usage of methods applied during a non-armed struggle that were elaborated on and described. Not surprisingly, the authorities have hampered the popularisation of the work published in 1983.

#### *Theory of defensive struggle*

I am the student of Professor Rudniański (Figure 1), the last living creator of *agonology*. I'm the author the theory of defensive struggle (1991) [59] and theory of combat sports (2000) [60]. In the first books, I have formulated main assumptions of cognitive and behavioural therapy based on *agonology* (theoretical part) and martial arts (practical part).

#### *Prophylactic and therapeutic agonology*

I have developed probably the most useful for human dimension of science about struggle –*prophylactic and therapeutic agonology* for over a quarter



**Figure 1.** The author (on the right) together with Professor Jarosław Rudniański – Wrocław, Poland 5 June ,1992.

of a century. This is also the name of a new thematic section in the *Archives of Budo*.

This editorial procedure should, however, not confuse the readers, that *agonology* is the part of widely understood *budo* [30]. On the contrary. It is *agonology* which formulates the most general statements, principles and rules, methods and laws. It provides methodology of description, research and analysis of results. The language of *agonology* makes the conclusions, generalisations of theoretical and empirical studies related to all types of armed and un-armed fights become universal as well as allows to formulate hypotheses related to struggle with oneself. *Martial arts* are mainly a practical layer of widely understood *agonology*. *Agonology* is empirical science. The ability of complementary and comprehensive use of all detailed theories of *agonology* is a prerequisite necessary for effective prophylactics and therapy. But this ability is mainly necessary to effectively resolve any defensive fights.

In contrast to *The Complete Art of War* created by Sun Tzu [61], *agonology in prophylactic and therapeutic dimension*, does not tolerate purposeful destructive struggle (apart from necessary defence [7, 51, 59, 62]), retaliation and revenge. *Agonology* (an in fact people following the principles of *agonology*) shows the way out even to the

most determined enemy – repair the harm and together restore justice. However, for the record: the rules of non-violence are included in *agonology* and not vice versa.

### 3. Definition of a “struggle” and information about precise language agonology

In the widest understanding Kotarbiński defines “a struggle” as 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 [32-35].

A key criterion for the identification of a struggle is the word “hindering” and its synonyms. Such application of the Ockham’s razor is of great methodological importance. This simplifies the interpretation of “a struggle” in the broadest meaning of the term. In the language of *praxeology* “helping” means “positive co-operation”. Often feigned help in armed struggle is the most effective method to achieve one’s goals, minimising the costs – “hindering through helping” (obviously through feigned help). This is why people of science may become dangerous if they are dominated by a toxic layer of the syndrome of power. This potential toxicity dominated by creative layer is not dangerous. This means that a person is spiritually developing, is morally strong, resistant to tempting situations (this potential is only suppressed for a certain

time). Rudniański has defined the notion of “moral strength” [57, 58], but this term is not subject to analysis in this paper.

The higher level of professional qualifications people of science have, the more likelihood that their possibilities of “hindering through helping” will become greater. They know scientific methods. Thus, regardless of scientific field and specialty they represent, they should know the basic methodology and this is a part of science. Theoretically, they are able to learn the following methods: “camouflage of violence”, „camouflage of authority”, „canalization of ideals”, „intensification of fear”, etc. as well as the „principle of a controlled surrounding” faster than others. If scientists listed are listed at the top of rankings related to social trust, it is easier for them to become experts in using these methods.

This issue very clear in the broader context of effective implementation especially of “camouflage of violence” has been described by Jarosław Rudniański. He concluded that many people of science possess very valuable ability: they can practically use previously identified laws and relationships to achieve their goals [57, p. 166-167].

Professor Rudniański also developed the language and methodology of a non-armed struggle [57]. On the other hand, Kotarbiński established three-stage classification of struggles. On “the basement”, Kotarbiński placed a military struggle (an armed one). To the “intermediate level” of the generalisation stage, he qualified the following kind of struggles: sport, in debates of politicians and lawyers, business competition, partly in education, etc. On the “highest level”, he placed of the general theory of the deed (praxeology), which includes the theory of struggle [33]. Kotarbiński included *agonology* (understood as theory and not separate science!) to *praxeology* (science about good work). If this division is modified so that *agonology* will be on the highest stage, it will become similar to the classification of *judo* in approach of Jigoro Kano [3, 28-31, 50]. This is also a subject to be discussed in separate paper.

As the fight may be conducted in accordance with the principle „hindering through hindering”, thus it does not automatically mean that *agonology* and broadly understood rule of theory of destruction related only to physical destruction and may be

applied only on “the basement”. The creator of *cybernetic theory of struggle* even established the “chain of destruction” [63], but this does not disallow for using methodology developed to analyse cases involving psychological destruction of the opponent. This is the form of destruction used systemically against *Archives of Budo* (destroying its “additive elements” – this is a term applied by *agonology* – undermines the entire institution.

There are also relationships between “hindering” and “helping” to be discussed. The relation (rule) “helping through hindering” is a model for self-defence training. The basic condition to learn defence methods include exercises with at least one partner who will simulate different variants of physical aggression. While sticking the sense of this rule, it is clear that due to no concentration on offensive activities of the partner (although hindering is subject to the clause of conventionality) and on own movements, one may experience the unpleasant consequences of ineffective defence, like during actual situation in which self-defence is necessary. Looking from a different didactic and educational perspective, these simulations are also a form of help in achieving adaptation objectives. However, when Kotarbiński rightly points out that the elements of a fight (or hindering) may only partially be associated with the process of learning and educating, he certainly did not have in mind learning of self-defence.

Training and tournament fights in combat sports, but according to the criteria of hand-to-hand fighting training fights are subject to „hindering through hindering” rule. The element of positive co-operation applies to respecting the rules of struggle (i.e. ethical principles) by participating parties. Exercises of motor forms individually are not subject to this analysis – specificity of many *martial arts*.

So may this category of *martial art* exercises subject to analysis based on methodological criteria of *agonology*?

The definition of struggle is decisive. Such analysis is excluded by objective lack of at least one person who either could be a hindering party (regardless of conventionality discussed above) or vice versa. Individual exercises of *martial arts* (*kata*, *poomse*, etc.) are somewhat different when analysed in terms of *agonology* as measures (exercises) necessary at least during the preparation stage to future fight.

Should the relation (principle) related to at least two persons who are “helping through helping” be applied in *agonology* as it certainly is in *praxeology*?

Definition of struggle addresses this issue even more clearly and similar justification is related to notions of *agonology* associated with preparation procedures to future fight. It would be impossible to develop effective or any strategy, tactics, methodology to prepare to fight with certain opponent in future without analysis of data about him/her, methods or techniques used, etc. Preparation to different fights is a separate issue addressed by *agonology*. Regardless of universal rules, principles, right of *agonology* which may be applied in any fight and at any level of the generalisation, the issues related to preparation to fights of separate categories are subject to different methodological procedures. Hence, the answer why detailed theories of *agonology* have been distinguished in this order – *cybernetic* (theory of destruction); *non-armed struggle*; *defensive struggle*, *combat sports*.

#### 4. “The scientist, ruler without power” – relationships between people of science and people of power

Jarosław Rudniański devoted a large part of *A Compromise and a Struggle* [57] to relationships between people of science and people of power. For nearly 45 years, he had been studying the following issue: how do people during totalitarian power fight to maintain it and what methods do they use?

The second side of this struggle, enslaved society (after armed resistance of patriots who did not accept the post-Yalta order in Europe after the end of World War II, was suppressed – Poland was condemned to Soviet sphere of influence) found itself in a worrying situation with only one option. The only method left was resistance, i.e. non-violence method. Fortunately, structures of effectively functioning underground state remained during German (1939-1944) and Soviet (1939-1941) occupation. Having re-entered to Polish territory (1944), Soviets ruthlessly destroyed these structures.

Rudniański discovered (which was not so difficult) that totalitarian power need support of as large group of scientists as possible to authenticate this power. However, his greatest discovery and invaluable input in development of *agonology* include the following: firstly, precise identification

of ways, methods and techniques used by people of totalitarian power to keep it (they did not have to fight for it by means of democratic methods, because they won it with terror); secondly, description of these phenomena with very precise language; thirdly and most importantly formulation of the principles for effective conduct of all kinds of fights.

The next part of this paper focuses solely on bringing closer and interpreting of these rules, principles and methods of *non-armed struggle* (values universal for *agonology* will be assigned to some of them), which are related to the major objectives of this paper – cognitive, educational and applied (in the broad sense, to use knowledge and methods of *agonology* for the purposes of prevention).

Rudniański [57, p. 169-175] starts his fundamental analysis of relationships between people of science and people of power and the issue of leading people of science by recalling most elementary ideal of the scientist in relation to all entities in social environment – “the scientist, ruler without power”. This is the main reason why science cannot remain indifferent to the authorities (man of power). In totalitarian system, practical implementation of this ideal by a unit or a group of scientists may by at any time destroyed by authorities. Preventive censorship is an effective method.

The “*principle of controlled environment*” is applicable here (this is the most general rule of non-armed struggle in **thick social environment** conducted with indirect methods [57, p. 73-80, 64]). There are scientific discoveries whose hiding would become counterproductive activity for country’s image. However, science classified as social and humanistic science has already been strictly rationed to society. As was for example *Elements of Praxiological Theory of Struggle. From Problems of a Negative Co-operation* [58] – Rudniański’s book was printed by was left at its publisher until the end of Martial Law in Poland. Before 1988 in Poland, certain books, e.g. the one of Arnold J. Toybee *Civilization on Trial*, translated into Polish by Wojciech Madej [65], could only be read in the so-called underground edition.

Thus, authority had to cover with surveillance the entire scientific community. The ideal of “the scientist, ruler without power” was left alone, but ambitions, aspirations, awakened needs for higher education as well as weakness of character, etc. are

the areas in which the officers of the totalitarian regime enter very effectively using – paradoxically – scientific achievements (in particular knowledge about manipulation of units and large groups).

Earlier, Rudniański explains three fundamental differences between science and power (to be precise between people of science and people of power) [57, p.164-169]. **Cognition is the fundamental criterion of science** as well as the ideal. Power is the ideal of power, thus the main value is not cognition but **power**. All other values in relation to it are treated instrumentally. Thus, people of power in principle treat people of science in instrumental manner. If scientists who act in academic environment or the one related only to research take over the methods applied by people of power, this means that they treat other scientists in instrumental manner. If this occurs in the area of academic promotions, there are no words for reasonable interpretation. This denies and defeats the truth about the ideal of “the scientist, ruler without power” – **the unworthy stop the worthy ones!** If this happens, the utmost worry of “the scientist, ruler without power” – I believe that most of them belong to this group – is to do everything so that this precedent does not become a rule.

This is the first difference between people of science and people of power identified and clearly visible in particular on macro scale. Its implications in the context of destroying people of science related to *Archives of Budo* by people of science who are hostile to this environment, are to highlight the cognitive, applied and educational value of *agonology*.

Rudniański [57] describes also two very significant differences between both entities. People in power, while acting on micro scale, treat all moral norms nearly always in instrumental way. Not just in many or most cases. People of science either respect or try to respect more important moral norms. In studies involving people, the tool enforcing the respect of moral norms is the necessary approval of relevant Bioethics Committee.

The third difference – according to Rudniański [57] – consists in the fact that in science cognition of reality may obviously constitute the primary objective and at the same time major value. Further, he explains that cognition of reality (which is always related to its certain part) is to serve either change

of certain a particular state of affairs in given respect or to maintain it without changes. On the other hand, especially for those who have it, power is a goal itself. Over a quarter of a century ago, he observed that such state was perceived as so normal and consistent with the reality that the goal of each side was to keep power in the contemporary strategic games. I do not follow the phenomenon of strategic games, so it is difficult to correct this opinion.

This analysis is concluded by Rudniański as follows: units in power desire to stay in power, thus for them power is mainly a most important value in contrast to cognition which is often the measure to keep the power [57, p. 164].

This generalisation is crucial to explain the motives of the majority of professors who seek to destroy independent entity such as *Archives of Budo*. Power is probably the most important value if they are aware that the journal functions in the global space of science and is independent, and despite of these facts it is being destroyed without scruples. Independent mainly from them. They have no power over it but this is the greatest profit for the authors, who in *Archives of Budo* publish their papers, being aware that they take part in establishment of new knowledge in an unhindered manner. The unrestrained freedom of research, possibility of sharing results and knowledge with everyone who desire such knowledge may and must be limited only by deontological ethics applicable in science. Nothing and no one else.

This issue is, however, more complex than it has so far been presented. Destruction of *Archives of Budo* is only the mean in realising more ambitious goal. At the beginning of this publication, I have only mentioned about an entity. These are people who in democratic country have control over scientific promotion system based on totalitarian methods. For some, this may be the main objective (and probably is) to satisfy their need for power. As far as others are concerned, it is all probably about larger power.

Thus, we deal here with already partially known “*structure of mutual benefits among the unworthy ones*” who uses the “*method of chosen group*”. Both terms of *agonology* (introduced by Rudniański [57] when he created *non-armed struggle*) are so clear that they do not require detailed definitions. Instead of the first term, sociological, political and historical

science, etc. use terms such as a “group of interest”, “lobby”, etc. Only from the context, it may be deducted whether their actions are positive or negative, although usually these terms are used to emphasise the socially undesirable behaviour.

Whoever uses the term “*method of selected group*” to describe the phenomenon of power and understands the main objective of people of power, there are no grounds to attribute negative meaning to it. It is the analysis of methods and means used by people seeking to maintain or gain power layer determines the moral effects of a “selected group”. No one would deny that power is needed not only to ensure a smooth and fair functioning of the state.

## CONCLUSIONS

The creator of the *theory of non-armed struggle* would undoubtedly be surprised that after only two decades since his work has been published, so many people of science adopted goals and methods of people of power in their professional activity related to science. There is, however, no reverse relationship. Among people of power, there are many people with academic degrees and professorial title who behave in similar way or even exhibit more aggression than many people of power with exceptionally destructive behaviour (mainly to stay in power).

If professor Rudniański had the facts, he would be less surprised but more disappointed. Nowadays, professors who were agents in the past (collaborators of the special services of a totalitarian system) prevent their peers from obtaining professorial title on whom they reported to officers of these services during their studies. For another quarter of a century, they still provide opinions on promotion applications of many candidates according to discretionary criteria of the “selected group”: who deserves to be promoted (even if does not meet the required reliability and ethics); who should definitely be stopped (despite that meets the criteria of reliability and ethics). This is the reason for potential disappointment.

The empirical evidence of such a practice will be provided in audit of proceeding applications of two candidates for the title of professor of sport sciences soon to be published which will be based on objective scientometric indicators, codified principles of ethics applying to people of science and formal legal requirements. This is not a separate case. Therefore, global society has the right to know the truth about this phenomenon. In 21 c. in the centre of Europe, a group of professors fights for power over people who aspire to well-deserved academic promotion (in order to stop them). On the other hand, power open the way for promotion for candidates who do not meet required criteria of fairness and ethics (this was a way to recruit potential employees to “selected group” to keep the power which was proven to be effective in totalitarian regimes). The indirect aim (i.e. mean to achieve the main objective) involves destroying *Archives of Budo* so that it would be easier to make charges against candidates associated with the journal who at the same time are not candidates of the “selected group”. The mystery of why they are not the candidates of the “selected group” is one of the following: membership in the Editorial Board of *Archives of Budo*; large number of papers published in this journal which means that they represent a new sub-discipline – *science of martial arts*; both relations mentioned.

Fight (as any other) for truth and ethics in science, fight with pathology in science, defence of independent scientific entity, such as specialised journal, etc. – these are the issues lying within interests of *agonology*. As this is unknown science, the analysis of so many events (which take place in the reality) according to the criteria science about struggle may soon bring many cognitive and educational benefits as well as it may help many people to defend themselves against violence and aggression which directly affects them or their relatives (fulfilling the preventive mission of *agonology* – applied science).

## REFERENCES

1. Hobbes T. Leviathan. Amsterdam; 1668
2. Edison JR. Homo symbolans agonisticus: Geertz's 'agonistic' vision and its implications for historical anthropology. *Focal: European Journal of Anthropology* 1996; 26/27: 109-123
3. Kalina RM. Agonology as a deeply esoteric science – an introduction to martial arts therapy on a global scale. *Procedia Manufacturing*; 2015; 3: 1195-1202
4. Kalina RM. Agonology – the unknown science (in print)
5. Barczyński BJ. Ranking of the scientific units Polish physical education higher schools based on citations from Web of Knowledge for the period of 2009-2012 indexed by the Polish Ministry of Science and Higher Education – focus on specialists science of martial arts. *Arch Budo* 2015; 11: 371-382
6. Harasymowicz J, Kalina RM. Training of psychomotor adaptation – a key factor in teaching self-defence. *Arch Budo* 2005; 1(1): 19-26
7. Harasymowicz J, Kalina RM. Honourable self-defence – the theoretical and methodological basis of training. Wydawnictwo Novum, Płock; 2006
8. Shishida F. Judo's techniques performed from a distance: The origin of Jigoro Kano's concept and its actualization by Kenji Tomiki. *Arch Budo* 2010; 6(4): 165-171
9. 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
10. Teilhard de Chardin P. *Moja wizja świata i inne pisma*. Wybrał i przełożył Tazbir M. Instytut Wydawniczy PAX. Warszawa 1987 [in Polish]
11. Kępiński A. Lęk. Rozdział *Demonologia lęku* napisał Jan Mitrarski. Wstępem opatrzył Marcin Czerwiński. Wydanie III. Sagittarius. Kraków; 1992 [in Polish]
12. Platon. *Państwo*. Przeł. Witwicki W. PWN. Warszawa 1958; t.1 ks. II: 368E-372A [in Polish]
13. Hobbes T. *De cive*. Amsterdam; 1668
14. Gandhi MK. *An Autobiography, or the Story of My Experiments with Truth*. 1929
15. Rudniański J. *Między Dobrem a Złem*. Wydanie trzecie (rozszerzone). Nasza Księgarnia. Warszawa; 1989 [in Polish]
16. Tatariewicz W. *Dobro i oczywistość*. Pisma etyczne pod redakcją Pawła J. Smoczyńskiego. Wydawnictwo Lubelskie. Lublin; 1989 [in Polish]
17. Descartes R. *Les passions de l'âme*. Vrin Bibliothèque des Textes Philosophiques Poche 1994 [in France]
18. Eibl-Eibesfeldt I. *Lebe und Haß*. R. Piper & Co. Verlag. München; 1970 [in German]
19. Bhagawadgita czyli Pieśń Pana. Biblioteka Narodowa. Zakład Narodowy im. Osolińskich. Przekład z sanskrytu i przypisy. Sachse J. Wstęp Wałkowska H. Wrocław – Łódź; 1988 [in Polish]
20. Krishnamurti J. *Freedom From the Known*. Publish by Victor Gollancz Ltd. London; 1969
21. Krishnamurti J. *The Urgency of Change*. First published by Victor Gollancz Ltd. London; 1971
22. Grzegorzczak A. *Etyka w doświadczeniu wewnętrznym*. Instytut Wydawniczy Pax. Warszawa. 1987 [in Polish]
23. Lorenz K. *Das sogenannte böse naturgeschichte der aggression*. Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag. Munich/Germany; 1983 [in German]
24. Krzemieniecki LA. *Literacki agon w świetle teorii walki* (E. Hemingway *Stary człowiek i morze*). *Biuletyn Informacyjny Polskiego Towarzystwa Biblioterapeutycznego*. *Biblioterapeuta* 2010; 3(52): 1-6 [in Polish]
25. 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: 255-265
26. 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
27. 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: 393-399
28. Kano J. *The Contribution of Judo to Education*. *Journal of Health and Physical Education* 1932; 58/3: 37-40 (originally a lecture given at the University of Southern California on the occasion of the 10th Olympiad)
29. Jigoro Kano and the Kodokan. *An Innovative Response to Modernisation*. Compile by the Kanō Sensei Biographic Editorial Committee. Edited and Translated by Alex Bennett. Kodōkan Judo Institute; 2009
30. Budō. *The Martial Ways of Japan*. Nippon Budokan Foundation; 2009
31. Kalina RM. *Philosophy and pragmatism of Budo as unique area of application the empirical theory of combat sports*, 2013 International Budo Conference by the Japanese Academy of Budo. University of Tsukuba. Abstracts, September 10-12, 2013: 44
32. Kotarbiński T. *Z zagadnień ogólnej teorii walki*. Sekcja Psychologiczna Towarzystwa Wiedzy Wojskowej. Warszawa; 1938 [in Polish]
33. Kotarbiński T. *Z zagadnień ogólnej teorii walki*. In: *Wybór pism*, tom 1, Warszawa, 1957: 549 [in Polish]
34. Kotarbiński T. *Problematyka ogólnej teorii walki*. Skrypt Akademii Sztabu Generalnego, Warszawa; 1963 [in Polish]
35. Kotarbiński T. *Traktat o dobrej robocie*. Łódź: Ossolineum; 1955 [in Polish]
36. Bondurant JV. *Conflict: Violence and Nonviolence*. Transaction Publishers, New Brunswick, New Jersey; 1971
37. Leas SB. *Moving Your Church through Conflict*. An Alban Institute Publication; 1985
38. Mackenzie WJM. *Power, violence, decision*. Penguin; 1975
39. Falk RA, Kim SS. *The War System: An Interdisciplinary Approach*. Westview Press; 1980
40. Sturm D. *Solidarity and Suffering: Toward a Politics of Relationality*. State University of New York Pres. Albany; 1998
41. Douglas F. *The Life and Thought of Aurel Kolnai*. Aldershot: Ashgate; 2001
42. Blain M. *Power, Discourse and Victimhood Ritual in the War on Terror*. Ashgate Publishing Company. Burlington; 2012
43. Caffentzis G. In *Letters of Blood and Fire: Work, Machines, and the Crisis of Capitalism*. PM Press, Oakland; 2013
44. Burger HG, editor. *The word tree: a transitive cladistics for solving physical & social problems: the dictionary that analyzes a quarter-million word-listings by their processes, branches them binarily to pinpoint the concepts, thus sequentially tracing causes to their effects, to produce a handbook of physical and social engineering*. Wordtree: 1984: 66, 196
45. Posner R, editor. *Semiotik/Semiotics*. 1. Teilband Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft /Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science/ (HSK). Walter de Gruyter; 1997: 661
46. *Praxiologie* 1983; 3: 1-3, 116
47. *Revue Roumaine Des Sciences Sociales: Série de philosophie et logique* 1988; 32-33
48. *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 1997; 127: 389
49. *International Journal of Contemporary Sociology* 2001; 38:108
50. 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
51. Kalina RM. *Sporty walki i trening samoobrony w edukacji obronnej młodzieży*, PTNKF. Tom 2. Warszawa; 1997 [in Polish]
52. Syska JR. *Psychomotoryczne efekty uprawiania przez kobiety nowoczesnych form gimnastyczno-tanecznych z elementami samoobrony*. PhD thesis. Akademia Wychowania Fizycznego: Warszawa; 2005 [in Polish]
53. Pszczołowski T. *Mała encyklopedia prakseologii i teorii organizacji*. Zakład Narodowy imienia Ossolińskich. Wydawnictwo, Wrocław-Gdańsk; 1978 [in Polish]
54. Konieczny J. *Cybernetyka walki*. Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe: Warszawa; 1970 [in Polish]
55. Konieczny J. *Zarys aksjomatycznej teorii niszczenia*. *Prace Zespołu Teorii Walki*. Zeszyt 1. Wojskowa Akademia Techniczna. Warszawa 1968 [in Polish]
56. Konieczny J. *Zarys matematycznej teorii walki*.

- Prace Zespołu Teorii Walki. Zeszyt 2. Wojskowa Akademia Techniczna: Warszawa; 1969 [in Polish]
57. Rudniański J. Kompromis i walka. Sprawność i etyka kooperacji pozytywnej i negatywnej w gęstym otoczeniu społecznym. Instytut Wydawniczy Pax. Warszawa; 1989 [in Polish]
58. Rudniański J. Elementy prakseologicznej teorii walki. Z zagadnień kooperacji negatywnej. PWN: Warszawa; 1983 [in Polish]
59. Kalina RM. Przeciwdziałanie agresji. Wykorzystanie sportu do zmniejszania agresywności. PTHP: Warszawa; 1991 [in Polish]
60. Kalina RM. Teoria sportów walki. COS: Warszawa; 2000 [in Polish]
61. Sun Tzu. The Complete Art of War. Westview Press, A Subsidiary of Perseus Books L.L.C.; 1996
62. Kotarbiński T. Instynkt walki. Opiekun spolegliwy. In: Kotarbiński T. Pisma etyczne. Warszawa-Łódź; 1987: 375-380 [in Polish]
63. Konieczny J. Prawa walki zbrojnej – łańcuch niszczenia. Myśl Wojskowa 1969; 3 [in Polish]
64. Rudniański J. Between Efficiency and Ethics: Methods of Environment Control in Non-armed Struggle. Praxiology 1980: 1
65. Toynbee AJ. Cywilizacja w czasie próby. Tłumaczenie Wojciech Madej. Wydawnictwo Przedświt, seria Biblioteka Aletheia: Warszawa; 1988
66. De Créé C. 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: 93-123
67. Estevan I, Falco C, Elvira JLL et al. Trunk and lower limb muscle activation in linear, circular and spin back kicks. Arch Budo 2015; 11: 243-250

**Cite this article as:** Kalina RM. Agonology – the prospect of an effective defence of peace and unrestricted freedom of scientists. Arch Budo 2016; 12: 1-13