

## **Offensive Intent**

Recently, I had the opportunity to witness offensive vs. defensive intent, or what some also call predator vs. prey psychology. Here at the school we train all senses for personal protection, including something that has been called your “Ethereic” sense. I primarily accomplish this type of training through sensory deprivation exercises where the senses of sight, sound, and touch are handicapped. The purpose of this training is to experience the “fog of combat” and learn to inoculate, adapt, overcome, and improvise to this tactical challenge

Through this type of training, offensive vs. defensive intent has become very evident in what I have called the “Blindfold Stalking Drill”. In this drill, two combatants are blindfolded (visual deprivation), music is turned up loud (auditory deprivation), and then students are moved throughout the school and turned (spun) dynamically (space/plain deprivation) by other students. Next, the word “fight” is yelled at which time both students need to locate and engage each other.

Of great interest is not necessarily the physical engagement upon contact, but rather the pre-contact stalking behaviour that has been consistently observed in the students; there is a clear difference observed between predatory behaviour (offensive intent) and prey behaviour (defensive intent). What has also been clearly observed in this drill is the fact that those students, who take on offensive intent, have a clear tactical advantage over those who adopt a defensive intent mindset.

Those students who take on a defensive intent mindset are more “reactive” than “pre-emptive”. These students have a tendency to wait for the physical engagement and then resist it, thus becoming “reactive” rather than “proactive”. Those students, however, with clear offensive intent, will hunt their prey and attack upon contact and overwhelm with surprise, speed, and violence of action through combative “initiative”. Those who adapt defensive intent, appear to only want to “survive” or “resist” the attack, where as those who adapt offensive intent, want to “dominate” and defeat the threat. This is very IMPORTANT attribute that needs to be honed in students of self protection.

One way to link this concept in our training is through our passive stance in the pre-contact phase. Here at the school I do not call the passive stance a “defensive” concept, BUT rather a “protective” concept designed to shield one against a surprise attack, or to launch a pre-emptive strike where appropriate and reasonable to do so. The passive stance is an “offensive intent” launch pad (designed to be

stealthy), that allows us to immediately launch a physical overwhelming shielding attack, via penetration and domination, through a first strike initiative or a reactive response to a surprise attack. The passive stance, unlike a castle wall that is rooted and built primarily for defence or to resist an attack, is more like the armour found on a M1 tank that offers a shield to fend off a surprise attack while remaining mobile for the purpose of “engaging” and defeating the enemy in an immediate and overwhelming offensive counter attack if and when needed. The passive stance offers protection while attacking (offensive intent), rather than protection while defending (defensive intent). The passive stance is a means to an end that is designed to offensively engage a threat either non-verbally, verbally, and or physically.

Darren

[www.personalprotectionsystems.ca](http://www.personalprotectionsystems.ca)