

MACP Fallacies

Per FM 3-25.150, Chapter 1, Part 2, the focus of the Modern Army Combatives Program (MACP) is:

- The culmination of a successful physical fitness program, enhancing individual and unit strength, flexibility, balance, and cardio-respiratory fitness.
- Building personal courage, self confidence, self-discipline, and esprit de corps.

The primary objective of a Military Combatives Program (MCP) should be to improve the combat-effectiveness of the Warfighter, specifically, to teach the Warfighter to become comfortable with the aggression required to kill enemy combatants and to preserve the lives of the Warfighter and the Warfighter's teammates.

Per FM 3-25.150, Chapter 2, Part 2, there is an emphasis on safety to the exclusion of providing effective combatives training, particularly when it comes to striking:

- Direction to MACP Instructors states "Stress that only simulated strikes to vital points, such as the head, neck, and groin area are to be executed. Soldiers may use light blows to other vulnerable areas; however, they must exercise caution at all times."
- Further direction to MACP Instructors states, "Ensure the training partner offers no resistance, but allows the maneuver to be freely executed during the learning stages and while perfecting the techniques".

No striking of any kind is allowed to head, neck, and groin though "light blows" are allowed to other areas.

The primary focus of a Military Combatives Program should be not be to prevent the maximum number of injuries during training but to prevent the maximum number of Warfighter deaths during combat operations.

URBAN MCP teaches students to perform light blows to the head, neck, and groin and somewhat harder blows to other areas with minimal injuries. Bumps and bruises do come with the territory when applying reality-based training. Unless you want Warfighters to experience false confidence, the only confidence worth obtaining in an MCP is achieved through successfully employing combat-effective movements, not grappling drills performed without resistance.

Per FM 3-25.150, Chapter 1, Part 4, without citation, the following is asserted, "Striking is an inefficient way to incapacitate an enemy".

Teaching ground-fighting and following rules of fair play is an absurd application in the combat environment where the Warfighter must wear on the order of 150 pounds of equipment and cumbersome protective gear. Striking is entirely more effective than ground-fighting in the combatives environment.

Per FM 3-25.150, Chapter 2, Part 3, there is a focus on defense. Almost every program task starts with "Defend against".

War does not imply defensive actions, but offensive actions. The reality is that the goal of the Warfighter is to kill. MACP employs a sport mentality.

Per Modern Combatives website at <http://www.moderncombatives.org/history.html>, the last line on the page indicates “In 2007 the (MACP) program was adopted by the US Air Force”.

In 2007, two Air Force personnel were allowed to attend the U.S. Army Combatives School for MACP Training. This training (1) was not adopted in its current capacity in any respect. Though the Air Force desires a combatives program, (2) it has no validating organization currently that act as an equivalent to the U.S. Army Combatives School. (3) An Air Force focus on ensuring its members receive accreditation has resulted in false claims that only “an accredited undergraduate school” can perform this function. Specifically, the reality is that only Army-validated MACP Instructors can perform training and certification for Level 1 and 2 MACP. Level 3 MACP can only be performed by a qualified Level 4 MACP Instructor, and certification for Level 3 can only occur through the U.S. Army Combatives School (or a Mobile Training Team from that school). Both training and certification for a Level 4 MACP Instructor can only occur through the U.S. Army Combatives School. Additionally, transferability codes are identified on Army personnel’s DD214s upon a service member’s release from active duty. These codes are able to be provided because the Army has already had the program examined, and Servicemembers Opportunity College (SOC) schools individually assess credits in accordance with this code as they do for every other school.