

HUMANIST VALUES OF SPORT AND THE PROBLEMS OF SOCIAL GLOBALIZATION

Lyubov SHEREMET

National Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of Ukraine

The article is dedicated to the consideration of sport activity under the perspective of social philosophy, with special attention given to core values of the contemporary sport manifested particularly by the Olympic movement. It is argued that the main intellectual source of the Olympism is the translation of liberal ideology into the sphere of sport, with the idea of dialogue as a norm of interpersonal relation serving as a pivotal in socio-cultural foundations of the contemporary Olympic movement. The current crisis of sport is described in the paper in terms of further commercialization and professionalization that corrupts its immanent original ideal used to manifest the humanistic and universal values of sport for all the humankind in general. The contemporary market economy is demonstrated as the one which has transformed sport into means for achieving business success, individualistic 'record' prestige and anthropological representation. It is stated that the denoted trend could be opposed by the humanization of sport, its main criterion being the role of the dialogue: sport is humane as far as it is discursive. The author argues that to preserve discourse in sport is to perform the task for humanism movement best defined by the principle 'sport for human person, and not human person for sport'.

Keywords: *sport, humanism, values of sport, philosophy of sport, Olympic movement.*

VALORILE UMANISTE ALE SPORTULUI ȘI PROBLEMELE GLOBALIZĂRII SOCIALE

Acest articol are ca subiect activitatea sportivă cercetată din perspectiva filosofiei sociale, o atenție deosebită fiind acordată valorilor de bază ale sportului contemporan manifestate, în special, în mișcarea olimpică. Se susține că sursa intelectuală de bază a olimpismului este ideologia liberală implementată în sfera sportului, promovând ideea că dialogul, ca o normă a relațiilor interpersonale, servește în calitate de fundație socioculturală a mișcării olimpice contemporane. Criza actuală a sportului este descrisă în lucrare în termeni de comercializare și profesionalizare continuă care corup ideea originală, imanentă, utilizată pentru manifestarea valorilor umaniste și universale ale sportului pentru umanitate în general. Actuala economie de piață este catalogată ca fiind responsabilă de transformarea sportului în mijloc de obținere a succesului în afaceri, a recordurilor individuale prestigioase și pentru reprezentarea antropologică.

Cuvinte-cheie: *sport, umanism, valori ale sportului, filosofia sportului, mișcare olimpică.*

The gradual transformation of sport into a global phenomenon, as well as its international institutionalization and its further socialization, including both its mass character and the growing interaction of nations and persons through sport activity, leads to the emergence of social and cultural sport movements of global status. The best example of them is the International Olympic movement established by Pierre de Coubertin. The Olympic movement was created, first of all, in order to unite the subjects of sport activity – those who consider its huge humanistic and social-cultural potential and strive to develop sport as an important component of human culture by achieving the most complete realization of universal human values and ideals in sport and by preventing its use with some antihuman purposes.

Still, if we would try to evaluate the activity of the contemporary Olympic movement basing on the denoted presumptions, quite a contradictory picture could be drawn. On the one hand, there are certain efforts being applied within the scope as to increase the role of sport in strengthening the peace and international understanding and in realizing other humanist cultural values. International Olympic Committee plays a powerful role in those efforts. For example, it does good job with initiating the work on Olympic education of children and youth and with fighting with doping and usage of drugs injurious to the athletes' health. Such efforts are being applied by national Olympic committees as well, and by their World organization and continental unions.

There are some organizational changes carried out in the IOC itself. Its structure has been renovated and expanded; more women have joined its staff; several commissions have been formed, like athletes' commission, 'Sport for everyone' commission, 'Apartheid and sport' commission. During the last twenty or thirty years, IOC has launched major efforts aimed at the prohibition of political and racial discrimination, particularly by deciding to allow hosting Olympic games only to the countries that would guarantee the participation of all Olympic committees. 'Olympic solidarity' program, for instance, is aimed at overcoming the gap between the rich countries and the developing countries [3].

Still, it is necessary to stress that that is only one side of the Olympic movement that manifests its reference to humanistic values reflected in the ideals of the Olympism. On the other hand, we should denote certain inconsistency in the policy of the Olympic movement as for the practical realization of the humanist cultural potential of sport, at least 'in corpore'.

Within the frames of the Olympic movement, there is an approach becoming more and more prevailed, the one that considers the major value of the movement to be just sport itself, especially sport of higher achievements, and sport records, no matter what goals they are aimed at. That's why the attention zeroes in not on realizing the humanistic potential of sport but on all possible development of sport competitions and on encouragement of sport achievements, records, and winners. According to Jean Leiper, the Olympic ideal that revived the Games, is now but forgotten, and the current games are completely devoid of any philosophical basis, as the entertainment and the spectator side of Olympic games obfuscate their true philosophical meaning [4]. That opinion expressed many years ago could be but justified by the development of Olympic sport in the 21st century: the current crisis of the Olympic movement could be best described in terms of its much more further commercialization and professionalization that corrupts its immanent original ideal used to manifest the humanistic and universal values of sport for all the humankind in general.

We can ground that argument on many facts. For example, it would be sufficient just to remind ourselves of the official Olympic motto: *Citius. Altius. Fortius*, – it is evident that the goal here is higher achievements, and any propositions on replacing that motto with the one with more prominent humanistic orientations are being rejected. The latest *Olympic Charter* (in force as from 2 August 2015) lacks the paragraph present for the last time as long ago as in 1979:

The Olympic Games were not revived by the Baron de Coubertin merely to give contestants a chance to win medals and to break records, not to entertain the public, nor. to provide for the participants a steppingstone to a career in professional sport, nor certainly to demonstrate the superiority of one political system over another [6, p.109].

There are many premises that enable us talking about evaluating the Olympic movement in its roots as a liberal philosophical entity. The ideals of liberalism framed by John Locke, Charles-Louis de Montesquieu et al. during the Modern age and the Enlightenment, such as legal state, tolerance, personal freedom, and private property, were shifted from the sphere of theory into the social and economical practice of management. That's when international organizations started to establish themselves, from World Trade Fairs to the Red Cross and to the International Workingmen's Association. At the turn of the 20th century, as the industrialization process has found its way into the leading countries of the world, the emergent Olympic movement started to shape its spiritual basis where the principle of personal freedom – the constituent value of liberalism – has been embodied in the form of the idea of recurring international meetings organized in the image of Olympic games [5]. The translation of liberal ideology into the sphere of sport is the main intellectual source of the Olympism. In its major ideals and principles, – such as mutual understanding and friendship, good will and peace, exclusion of discrimination on racial, religious, or political reasons, competitive spirit between person and teams and not between nations, abidance by the rules of play, and the authority of referee, – one could easily recognize the corresponding fundamental values of the liberal Weltanschauung.

The Olympism is defined by Olympic Charter (2015) as 'philosophy of life, exalting and combining in a balanced whole the qualities of body, will and mind', which goal is 'to place sport at the service of the harmonious development of humankind, with a view to promoting a peaceful society concerned with the preservation of human dignity' [7, p.13]. That characteristic of the Olympism despite of all its pathos actually operates basic human existentials, which puts up a question of it lacking some definite inner essence.

Semantic vagueness of the Olympic philosophy ('Olympism without borders') issues the challenge of explicating the very notion of 'Olympism'. There are at least two aspects present in that notion. First of them is the inner-sporting context, when its definition is being carried out within the scope of sport terms: amateur sport, professional sport, sport competition, championship etc. The second one is meta-sporting: it is the result of its analysis in reference to the categories of culture (agonistics, play, dialogue etc). Taking into account the known conventionality of the proposed distinction, as well as considering the significance of the general sporting context, it would still be quite reasonable to transfer the explication problem into the social-cultural sphere, as those grounds of the Olympism connect sport to the universal process of culture. The thing is that domination of professional and particular norms over the universal values in the sphere of sport have been by

now shaped out into a specific sport subculture with its own ideology, norms, and values. As stated already by Johan Huizinga, in the social life of the 20th century, sport takes its place outside the cultural process:

Now, with the increasing systematization and regimentation of sport, something of the pure play-quality is inevitably lost... The spirit of the professional is no longer the true play-spirit; it is lacking in spontaneity and carelessness. This affects the amateur too, who begins to suffer from an inferiority complex. Between them they push sport further and further away from the play-sphere proper until it becomes a thing sui generis: neither play nor earnest. In modern social life sport occupies a place alongside and apart from the cultural process [2, p.197].

Olympism has emerged and existed as a play. The whole number of problems experienced by the Olympic movement (like the noted crises of fair-play principle and the correlation between amateur and professional sport) are caused by the need to preserve the play as the attribute of Olympism. If Olympism is a model of sport, then it is only because of the fair-play principle. And the fair-play principle, according to Johan Huizinga, is nothing else but the equivalent of decency expressed in terms of play.

In our opinion, agonistics and game play are connected in Olympism in the form of dialogue. It is the idea of dialogue as a norm of interpersonal relation that is included into socio-cultural foundations for the contemporary Olympic movement.

If in the Antique Olympic Games it was not a person but a personified will of gods that used to achieve victory, and then maybe the victory in the Olympic games in the 20th and 21st centuries is interpreted as not just a personal victory but rather the triumph of a nation, of a political system, or that of an ideology? While accepting some form of super-personal status in sport competition, an athlete thereby gets depersonalized, is deprived of his or her personal character. That's the way sport dialogue is distorted on all stages of civilization development, so that the problem of overcoming the distortion in question is probably condemned to eternal urgency.

And that's where one of the major issues of humanization of sport dialogue is concealed. A dialogue is a peer-to-peer communication. However, the situation in the contemporary sport features an indispensable intention on the demolition of the peer equality in question. A good example is the doping problem: it is well known that analeptics are quite harmful and that they oppose the ideals of sport that presuppose healthy and cohesive corporality and spirituality. What forces some athletes to run risks? There are many reasons. But the biggest of them is the ability to get some compensation (either in money, social prestige, or in ideological recognition) for the damage caused to their physical and mental health.

Thus, sport dialogue as the goal of the competition becomes means for compensating the lack of prestige or status in the spheres that lie outside sport activities. Here we should talk not just about certain drawbacks, but about the dehumanization of sport in general. It is not communication that becomes its pivotal point but a technology of achieving the result. Instead of thinking based on dialogue and humanism, there is a technocratic way of thinking establishing itself in sport, especially in sport of higher achievements.

Here we face the dependency of sport communication on discourse possibilities in other social spheres. If there is no dialogue in politics, then sport dialogue is unstable as well – it could be destroyed by compensatory tasks any minute. Of course, the ideal of absolute sovereignty of sport discourse is surely a utopia. However, the perspective of the humanization of sport should constantly put on social agenda a question of the acceptable measure of such compensatory values in sport, as in other case, without any limits set for it, we would be forced to certify the destruction of any humanistic foundation of sport movement and its humanistic ideology based on discourse.

If we refer to international sport, then overcoming compensatory deformations could be possible there, according to our opinion, within the frames of the emerging global dialogization of social relations, through the assertion of discourse imperative in non-violent world of peers. That's why realizing profound ideas of the Olympism is so important: through sport to the world without violence. Thus, sport communication freed from any pressure from compensations of any kind should become a certain model, orientation or even an international ethical norm (from sport without violence – to the world without violence) for the discourse paradigm emerging in other spheres (politics, economics, law, mass-media). Because the most simple (and the most dangerous) way of dehumanizing sport is to transform it into a subordinate part (means) of politics, ideology, business, militarism, state and so on.

That's why dialogue as a humanistic value of sport is at the same time its eternal problem. To preserve discourse in sport is the task for humanism movement: sport for human person, and not human person for sport. Dialogue is also a criterion of sport humanization: sport is humane as far as it is discursive.

During the Cold War and the arms race, in the time of 'the competition' between 'socialism' and 'capitalism', sport as a social system had been subject to ideologization: 'who is the better'. With the worsening of political relation between the powers there were cases of neglecting Olympic Games (but not participating in them) taken places from that or another side. There were cases of terrorist attacks on athletes as well, like in Munich in 1972 when Palestinian terrorists shot athletes from Israel.

The historical problem is that in capitalist countries, sport have been transformed into professional activity (by formula of 'goods – money – goods'), while in the countries of socialism sport was considered as 'amateur' although it had been financed by the state through trade unions and army clubs. Thus, in different 'camps' there were different sources for sport financing, and different ideals for sport motivation, in both moral and material encouragements.

After the dissolution of the USSR, in contemporary Ukraine, sport obtained professional status according to the Law of Ukraine 'On Physical Culture and Sport' (1994) [8]. After that, Ukrainian sport started to adapt to the norms accepted in the capitalist world, to forms of competitive individualism and collective competition with more or less adequate (actual and potential) pecuniary-market stimulation.

The development of Olympic movement in Ukraine, reorganization of its National Olympic Committee and sport federations clearly manifested the contradiction of the Ukrainian Olympic education as well. The problem is worsened by the general situation in the sphere of education and by specific social contest of the national crisis. Still, in spite of many difficulties, the Olympic education finds its certain propagation. Moreover, the becoming of the Olympic education in Ukraine takes place in new forms supplementary to traditional ones, both in special sport education on all levels and in universal education in schools and colleges, i.e. with the due respect to the national customs.

At the same time, major humanistic ideals of the Olympic movement 'Sport for peace and cooperation' come into contradiction with the liberal model of the market economy. Transnational corporations do not accept borders of national sovereignty and exert growing influence over world politics while becoming major players on the 'world chess board' alongside the national states. Sport now takes part in that play as well, in the person of its international organizations under UN patronage and under the support of nations – participants of the Olympic movement.

Market economy of the 21st century features marketing strategies combined with advertisement and PR. Global network marketing tends to engage all products of cultural industry, including sport, as well as other 'ideal goods' (like drugs, dietary supplements etc). There are 'four big Ps' of marketing known – Product + Price + Place + Promotion. Contemporary sport finds itself in this marketing net as well, asserting the unity of professionalism, public demonstrations (in the subspace of market economy) and sales – by satisfying the demands of mass consumers. Show-business (in the arts) and show-sport create informational virtual space of the contemporary mass culture, with its axiological interpretation being degenerated into utilitarian market prices.

One can argue that the contemporary professional usage of athletes' skills is enabled by the change in social values, by transforming sport into business. It is important to stress once again that liberal axiology imposes the discourse of economical development that implies that economical history of all countries follows one and only way of development – coming to the same result in different times and with different pace. Still, that theory does not take into account that economies of the so called developed countries are defined not only by qualitative features or their inner structure, but – which is even more important – by their leading position in the world system. As demonstrated, for instance, by such philosophers as Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, the American model of economical development is not without the alternatives, and 'highly developed' are the countries that have exploited their colonial system, And considering the inequality of the status-quo, 'developing' countries could in no way attain the success of 'those who go ahead' [1].

Of course, it would be inappropriate to compare the situation in economics to that of wrestlers on the mat, where the strongest wins. As any athlete could be 'the strongest', even the one from a 'poorly developed' or a 'developing' country. In the old times, the victory of a 'Soviet wrestler' over an 'American wrestler' would not mean the victory of 'socialism' over 'capitalism'. And today, athletes from Ukraine could just well get ahead in their sport achievements, as well as all other competitors from any other country.

In the very act of sport, be it jumping, running, swimming, boxing or anything else, there is no ideological content, as there is no such content in true works of literature or the arts. However, the attitude towards sport result as towards a 'victory' becomes ideological, prestigious, and quite significant, especially in the case of international performance under the flag of that or another country. Sport is indeed 'national' in many nations.

As for the problems related not to national politics but to economics, they are rather more complex. 'Victory at any price' and 'competitions of drug-makers' indeed belong to a class of business deals in network marketing (and to the compromises with one's consciousness in relation to individual athletes). Sports are included into the system of nonmaterial production, into entertainment industry, into the anthropology of cyberspace that, according to Hardt and Negri, "is really recognition of the new human condition" [1, p.291]. In post-industrial society, sports widen its social communicative sphere for presentation and representation. Continuous dialogue of 'I' (an athlete) and 'The Other' (yet another athlete) is presented by media as reality and hyper reality, as a show replicated for the whole world – and at that, the one that divide that world into those who existentially worry for that or another athlete or a team, and even for whole countries with their defeats and victories. The very sport competition (Olympic games, World and European championships etc.) have been transformed into a kind of visual information commodity. Existential dimension of sport becomes but its latent sense, its hidden ontological core.

Through the sport competition, we can even build a model of the Modernity on humanistic principles, by adhering to universal rules in play, in judging, in interaction that happens afterwards. In contrast to the cruelty of competition that could lead up to world wars, sport is intended for 'soft', humane detente of competition, for 'a handshake' between different athletes and different nations. Such an approach would enable realizing the model of co-existence in sport (and in international relations in general) basing on humanist principles of peer equality.

The main obstacle for its realization and for the lack of 'peace' in 'peaceful' sport model is in our opinion not individual egotism of athletes (as in Hobbesian *bellum omnium contra omnes*), but mostly the market model of sport and its cooptation in nonmaterial production due to the private property, including that of human body. As stated by Hardt and Negri:

"Today we are witnessing a competition among transnational corporations to establish and consolidate quasi-monopolies over the new information infrastructure. The various telecommunication corporations, computer hardware and software manufacturers, and information and entertainment corporations are merging and expanding their operations, scrambling to partition and control the new continents of productive networks" [1, p.300].

That universal communication network system, a kind of netocracy (power of networks) expands itself over sport production, its information and advertisement as well. Sport goods, sport clothing and behavior style, private life of sport superstars, their participation in politics and in different 'gala ceremonies' shapes out corporative capital, 'invisible' owners and managers of the world of sport – and the world in general. Philosophical consideration of global problems should really take into account its sport component, which is transnational by its scale but still quite strictly structured according to proprietorial economical interests.

Contemporary transnationalism in sport is manifested, for instance, in 'foreign' athletes coming to play in club teams in other countries, including Ukraine, for greater fees, while having nothing in common with those countries neither ethnically, nor culturally. Athletes become cosmopolitans, which can in turn decrease social and psychological tone expressed by the supporters by transforming them into purely network information structure, into virtual space of consumers. They travel the world as fans, following their beloved teams and spending huge sums on entertainment in this model of hedonist consumerism.

Transcendent power of private property tends to appropriate any social achievements. The crisis of private (not personal!) property in today's world does not mean a reduction of its significance. It just undergoes specific transformations by rejecting the principle of national territoriality and realizing itself in transnational communities of shareholders, in corporate club teams. In the literal and in a figurative sense, sport as an example of post-modern embodiment of private property became a sphere of power struggle within the administration of sport organizations.

Nevertheless, we think that social nature of sport is inevitable and will be prevalent once again, as well as humanist values that lie at the very core of sport activity. Sport is included into the universal system of social and cultural globalization, and only through the humanistic standard of sociality we can try to solve the contradictions of the current global crisis of human civilization in all its aspects.

Thus, we can make the following conclusions based on the investigation conducted in this paper.

In the age of industrialization and scientific civilization, sport became global social and cultural phenomenon and professional activity alongside other kinds of human activity. The dialogue form of sport communication has led to the emergence and to the development of the Olympic movement as a form of universal humanist trend aimed at peace and cooperation. However, market economy based on the principle of private property and atonal individualism has transformed sport into cultural goods, into means for achieving business success, individualistic 'record' prestige and anthropological representation. Objective inevitability of globalization processes in the contemporary world caused social and cultural globalization as well, including the one we see in the sphere of sport, attaching transnational features to that globalization. Still, social philosophy tends to include sport into social and cultural discourse, overcoming 'record individualization' of sport by referring to its agonistics and to the ecology of human being in order to obtain the humane existence of a person and an athlete, to give him or her senses of being while preventing 'the death of the subject'.

References:

1. HARDT, M. and NEGRI, A. *Empire*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000.
2. HUIZINGA, J. *Homo ludens* / Transl. from German. London, Boston and Henley: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1949.
3. LANDRY, F. Olympic Education and International Understanding: Educational Challenge or Cultural Hegemony. In: *International Olympic Academy. Report of the twenty-fifth session, 4th-19th July 1985*. Ancient Olympia, 1985, p.139-155.
4. LEIPER, J. M. The Olympic ideal – is it valid today as a philosophical basis of the Olympic game. In: *Review, Int. Council of Sport and Physical Education*, Iss.3, 1980, p.27-28.
5. LÉVI-STRAUSS, C. *Structural Anthropology* / Transl. from French. New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1967.
6. *Olympic Charter* (1979): http://www.olympic.org/Documents/Olympic%20Charter/OlympicCharterthrough_time/1979-Olympic_Charter.pdf.
7. *Olympic Charter* (2015): http://www.olympic.org/Documents/olympic_charter_en.pdf.
8. The Law of Ukraine "On Physical Culture and Sport" (1994) – In: *Bulletin of the Verkhocna Rada of Ukraine*, Iss.14, art.80 (In Ukrainian). <http://zakon3.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/3808-12>.

Prezentat la 17.11.2015