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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION:
SPORT, MIND-BODY, AND TECHNOLOGY
IN WESTERN PHILOSOPHY

For thousands of years, people have been trying to understand their relationship to the rest of the universe. We have asked an infinite number of questions about ourselves and our world. Indeed, we can not deny that our eagerness to question "what it is" might be one of the ideological engines for human progress. In the name of progress, we have been faced with the rise of science and technology. Furthermore, we feel confident in the objectivity of scientific research when challenged by our mystical askings. Somehow, today's surprising developments in science and technology seem to have answers for all our questions. In an instructive remark, however, Seymour Kleinman suggested "we need to avoid the danger of believing that scientific reduction is the only means by which we come to understand reality."1 Why? Because, there still remain 1
the most fundamental of problems. In this study, I am going to address one of them. This dissertation explores the relationship between mind-body, technology, and ethics in sport. It looks at how ethics are sacrificed in competition and how the mind-body relationship affects and directs an athlete's ethical or unethical behavior. And this study will show how technology can help solve the ethical and mind-body problems in sport or how it may create even more problems than already exist.

Sport and Ethics in the West

Up until now, almost no works were written by important philosophers focusing on philosophic issues of sport. We can find only occasional remarks by philosophers such as Aristotle, Nietzsche, and Sartre, usually treating sport as a metaphor for a larger issue being addressed. In recent years, however, a growing number of thinkers have begun to turn their attention directly to sport as a theme for investigation. Nevertheless, few deny that sport almost always has played a significant role in culture. Many sport
scholars assert that sport provides a place where our ethical values are, time and again, exhibited, tested, and learned. It seems that virtually everyone agrees that sport does teach values. And, I believe this is why sport has been associated with our schools. The ethical state of athletics, however, is now in crisis. Fighting, cheating, and taking performance-enhancing drugs, all seem directly related to the deterioration of ethical behavior in contemporary sport. One day, I witnessed the comment from a high school female basketball player: "In sport, it's hard to tell right from wrong sometimes; you have to use game sense." What does she mean by "game sense"? What is the meaning she attached to it? Is there a difference between morality in sport and in everyday life? For example, violence is somewhat acceptable in contact sports, such as football and basketball, if it produce valuable result like winning. Today, many athletes, coaches, and even fans view an aggressive act of a player as "strategy" rather than violence in sport. They don't hesitate to hit and intimidate opponents. They believe that "to be good in sports, you have to be bad." There is a moral inconsistency in sport. Can we expect value education for
the young female player through playing basketball? Today, we do not have to read much sport commentary to recognize the "increasing attention to ethical issues." No field, of course, is without problems. However, anyone who reads the sport pages or watches sport news on television can easily become aware of the problem of values in contemporary sports. This was addressed by John Gibson, who asserted the following:

Today much of sport exists under a value system that recognizes the objectivity of the scoreboard as the only true assessment of worth, and denies the value of the subjective, experiential, and personal dimensions of sport. The concomitant emphasis on winning has come at the expense of the relationship of the athlete to his craft. This problem exists to a greater or lesser extent at all levels of sports, and can be detected from little leagues and intramural to professional leagues and internationals.

It is difficult to deny that we live in a culture, which emphasizes the importance and the value of objectivity in a highly competitive society. And today, many individual athletes who, imbued with the importance of winning and, themselves full of competitive spirit, are presented with difficult ethical choices. Contemporary athletic events are replete with examples of ethical dilemmas. Nearly everyone who has participated in competitive sports, from sand-lot
games through the more organized level of high school and college teams to professional athletics, has experienced situations in which competitive play compromises commonly accepted ethical beliefs. In fact, oftentimes inappropriate ways of thinking and acting are deemed acceptable in sports if they result in winning. In contemporary sport, there are no qualitative assessments of worth, only quantitative ones. The results of our actions are more important than the ways in which those results are achieved. Only a number of scoreboard has a value. Sport seems to exist under a value system which affirms that the ends justify the means. Therefore, it is hardly surprising that our sports of choice tend to be highly competitive and our efforts to win translate into a desire to beat someone. To cheat, to hurt others, to treat members of opposing teams not as fellow human beings and athletes, but as enemies—all these unethical behaviors are rampant in contemporary sport. While this is not new to sport, much of our concern is due to the fact that it has never before destroyed human dignity itself. In sport, the athlete is not a human being, he/she is just a machine in pursuit of winning.
These problematic situations have forced some radical scholars to conclude that we have to abolish the scoring system, which decides winners and losers in sport, in order to save all of us from the dehumanization in sport. But, "we can't burn the barn down to get rid of the mice." It is important to note that fundamental to sport is the process of determining who is best. It can be obviously the big question for someone who simply does not understand the agonizing struggle, which is an integral part of competitive sport experience. Thus, the problem of sport competition must begin with the recognition of the enormous appeal of sports to us where winning is at stake. In fact, we do not seem to have the character to solve the problem of winning by abolishing competitive sport. Our problem is not competition itself. The problem, rather, seems to be how to keep winning in proper perspective. Accordingly, the task of this study is to explore the proper role of competition in sport and what mode of moral conduct best fulfills the authentic objectives of sport. Also, I want to raise the fundamental question of "WHY?". More specifically, why there is such enthusiastic effort to win and why this objective
has such universal appeal? Whatever the response, we need to keep alive the issue of what it is about the ethical behavior of human beings. And this fundamental question of why, is one on which I wish to focus.

Considerations such as these lead us to a deep investigation of the relationship between sport and human beings. Unfortunately, much of the previous work in sport philosophy, dealing with values, has not dealt directly with human nature. Traditional western philosophy, which has explored the nature of human beings, has dealt only with metaphysical issues such as mind and body, and how they are related. Philosophy, for the most part, has focused on man's relationship with others descriptively. I believe, however, ethics is a normative or prescriptive discipline distinct from a descriptive one. In an attempt to explain the relationship of sport ethics to human nature, we need to be concerned not with how people actually act, but rather with how they ought to act within the context of sport.
Mind-Body and Ethics in Sport

Am I a mind? If not, am I just a complicated physical being? If not, am I both? If so, what is my mind and my body? What exactly is the relationship between the mind and the body? Am I a mind with a body or a body with a mind? Could I be an immaterial soul who which survives bodily death, or has that been ruled out by modern science? It is one of our peculiarities that we do not know what we are. But, it is most important to recognize that the question of who I am does not belong only to metaphysical doubt, it has ethical dimensions as well. Any philosophical belief about mind and body, whether it is inspired by religion or the natural sciences, decides our objectives, purposes, and goals of life. So "the mind-body problem" must begin with the recognition that the metaphysical solution plays a role in determining what kind of life is best as well as what sort of beings we are. In an attempt to identify the relationship of sport ethics to human nature, this study first will re-examine the major philosophic arguments of mind and body through a review of some of the classic positions of the Western intellectual tradition. Each philosopher deals with
a different solution to the mind-body problem. Some philosophers, such as Plato and Descartes, think we have both mental and physical characteristics. Some, such as George Berkeley, think we are immortal souls. Some, such as Thomas Hobbes, think that you and I are just complicated physical objects. Others, such as Sartre, think we are fundamentally neither mental nor physical. Some philosophers are inspired by religion, others by the natural sciences, and others again by sheer puzzlement about ourselves and the universe. Since Plato, who was one of the earliest dualists, divided man into mind and body as two distinct entities, we continue to ask what the mind is, what the body is, and what their relationship is? Unfortunately, we have failed to recognize that these questions already contain the assumption of dualism. In considering the nature of human beings, the assumption of a coexistence and relationship between opposites, mind and body, presents difficulties from the outset. Most attempts at solutions to the mind-body problem result in denying the existence of, or in some way downgrading the status of, one or the other (John Searle, 1985)⁴. Moreover, challenging and defending assumptions such
as these must affect obviously our view of the universe and man's place in it. Whether we believe in a monistic or dualistic view of man, our decisions profoundly influence man's way of being and living. Any answer to the mind-body problem affects our views of responsibilities, objectives, purposes, and goals (Keith Campbell, 1984)\(^5\). It is most important to note that the mind-body problem plays a role in determining what kind of life is best as well as what sort of beings we are. So, this study expects three different ethical results from the Western intellectual tradition of man in sport. Dualists, for example, believe man can make the nearest approach to knowledge when he/she has the least possible intercourse or communion with the body. Under this idealistic or religious concept of man, the body can not have esteem and value. This means the development of an asceticism for the body. As a result, there is no room for ethical development through sport. One of the major views challenging idealistic dualism came from the materialistic monists, who denied the existence of the mind because they can explain all phenomena in the universe by the cause-effect relationships of bodies in motion. At first glance,
this might seem to have a supportive implication for sport and athletics. However, the fact is that this materialistic and deterministic view of man hides the dehumanization of man in the world behind scientific objectivity. In this view, Carolyn Thomas asserted, "the body has become a machine to be used and measured objectively rather than the subject of life. And man has been taught and coached to respond to X stimulus with a Y response and not to question." In the end, there can never be any ethical consideration of our way of life because our life is already determined. Under the holistic concept, however, man can value his body as well as have his body. The major contrast to the idealistic and materialistic positions is to view the body as a subject rather than an object and to consider man as an end in himself rather than a means to an end. In this subjective mode, sport can achieve a sense of morality. As a result, there is some possibility of moral recovery for our ailing sports.
Although the mind-body problem has influenced significantly attitudes towards existence, we have not given adequate attention to its ethical implications. Since Descartes, who tried to explain everything in terms of causal relationships, except for God and the soul, the objectivity of science fueled by the explosion of rationality in philosophy has eclipsed any discussion of ethics in relation to the question. However, one of the great failings of the scientific method has been its inability to provide a verifiable basis for values and ethical behavior. For the most part, we come to accept objective knowledge as the only true assessment of worth. We tend to neglect or deny the value of the subjective, experiential, and personal dimensions of our lives, and, as result, we are faced with moral insensibility throughout a culture; in business, politics, education, and sport. Under the influence of science, we have ignored the ethical aspects of man. Because of this moral vacuum, it is important to examine this issue. In sport, for example, we may ask why humans play or why sport and athletics have such
universal and cultural appeal? It is generally contended that sport is freely chosen and freely engaged in, that rules are freely accepted, that it frees one from the everyday world and, most importantly, it frees one to be oneself. Most sport scholars assert that one basic reason why man engages in sport is the sense of freedom found there, that it is a place where we come to know ourselves. However, as emphasis on winning increases, the tendency is to shift from the subjective to objective. Competitive sport, thus, is transformed into a place where we can prove ourselves in a competitive society. I suggest this may result in an unjustifiable way of viewing human nature. The order of movement here seems to be as follows: First, the individual comes to be valued purely instrumentally. Second, the athlete comes to be considered as nothing more than a machine. In these circumstance, athletes are viewed as warriors, their opponents are enemies, rather than competitors, they view one another as means to their ends. Finally, athletes are exploited under the "win-at-any-cost" ethic fueled by this unjustified concept of man incontemporary sport, dehumanization of the athlete.
Sport Ethics and Holism

This study seeks to examine the relation of ethics to the mind-body problem. If possible, this study intends to search for an initial ethical basis for a new value system in sport. Therefore, our intention is not to be restricted to the questions, who am I and what is the nature of the mind and the body? The real questions are what should I be and what should my body or my mind become, and what should be the relation of my body to my mind? To find answers, I apply the holistic concept of man to sport. Holism is, in contrast to the idealistic and materialistic positions on the body which view the body as an object and a means to an end, a new approach to view the body as a subject and considers man as an end in himself. Francis Kew(1978) pointed out that phenomenology, like existentialism, has completely broken from the Cartesian dualism of mind and body. He asserted that "it operates from the point of view that the body is the primary self. The body is not an instrument of mind or a vehicle of directed sensation, it is the person." It is necessary, for the nature of this work, that dualistic and materialistic positions be rejected. The
notion of body-subject bestows value on the body for its own sake. The concept of a holistic being can be translated into educational and ethical beliefs with a conclusion that development of the whole person is important in itself, rather than as a means to other ends. The "whole person" view of sport and athletics can have moral outcomes. In this way, I will offer possibilities for a moral recovery in sport.

Definitions

Many of the problems raised in this study on society today focused on what we might call "areas of ethics in sport." To solve these problems, we need to ask what ethics is and what sport is.

Ethics and sport are not defined here in the traditional way. In this study, ethics and sport presuppose the freedom to act. Moral and sporting actions are self-determined rather than determined by outside factors. They are freely chosen, freely engaged in, and freely accepted. This is one reason why I reject the question of what they
are. When we define what ethics and sport are, I believe, the freedom to act is lost. There is the recognition that when we define what it is, then our actions in sport and ethics are coerced according to these definitions. There is no room where we can know ourselves. When we decide what sport and ethics are, then the place of sport and ethics becomes a place where we will prove ourselves.

2. What does the young player mean by "GAME SENSE"? What is the meaning she attaches to it? This ambiguous attitude leads us to a deep investigation of the nature of sport. I want to present some responses to that question, which I regard as plausible. They are certainly not the only one, and they may, of course, not even be the most correct ones. But I hope it will at least advance the issue somewhat, and serve to keep it before us. Understanding GAME SENSE, is most difficult, but a very fundamental question in any "philosophy of sport." This comment is quoted from Brenda Jo Bredemeier & David L Shields, "Values and Violence in Sports Today," Psychology Today [October 1985], p.26.


CHAPTER II

THE MIND-BODY PROBLEM AND THE WESTERN INTELLECT

We humans play sport. We do not know whether or not other living creatures to do so. But, I believe sport is quite a human activity reflective of human nature itself.

Modern men and women have become aware of the importance of sport. In the structure of modern life, the appeal of sport becomes more and more apparent. Contemporary literature and passionate interest in sport is evidence enough. Playfields and stadiums are in the original plans of new cities. Sporting goods are mass-produced. From the sandlot games, highly organized athletic events in different countries are brought to international competitions. Men and women of all nations have trained themselves to challenge the resistance of space and time with speed, endurance, strength, accuracy, and coordination necessary for various particular sports. In fact, almost everyone has taken part in sport and can speak of it from experience. It is hardly
necessary to explore the subject of scientific research to discover it and to disengage it from other phenomena. Each of us has been a player. Sport is universal.

However, whether we have reached a deep understanding of the nature of sport and its meaning to us is still in question.

Many attempted scholars have explored the nature of sport and have defined it. But, their account of sport seems to invite the need for fuller characterization of what it is about this event that relates to the nature and structure of human beings. Before an extended philosophical investigation can be conducted into the other concerns about human participation in sport, it is necessary to analyze and to attempt to comprehend man's embodied nature. Unfortunately, philosophical research efforts concerned with the problem of embodiment and sport have often produced expositions replete with imprecise statements, contestable assertions, and, at times, unsupported or simply erroneous conclusions. Thus, it appears appropriate to investigate anew the basis of contemporary perceptions of the ontological structure of man and, subsequently, to clarify some of the essential
components of man's engagement in sport in relation to the formulated parameters.

In this chapter I will begin by sketching the historical and philosophical tradition of the West concerning the nature of the human being and one's relation to sport. Then I will go on to explore why the mind-body problem is so important to understand sport.

The Indestructible Question

Sometimes when I wake from a dream, I am confused by what is real and what is a dream?

Philosophically, what is reality and what is mere appearance? Is this material thing, my desk which is located in front of me, real? Are the books on this desk real, the pens and papers? Are these sentences, which are now typed on the computer screen, real? Or is all this physical reality only the surface, only what appears to the senses, only an illusion, after all?

Somehow, today's surprising developments in science seem to have answers for all those questions. The dream is
only a dream, and our scientific experience should prove that my desk is real. And I believe it.

But, what about my own reality? Am I merely a material organism which avoids pain and seeks pleasure, a collection of atoms programmed to grow, to mature, and to self-destruct, a product of the genetic material I inherited from my parents and a product of the environment in which I have lived? Am I only a body? In an instructive remark, Kleinman suggests, "we need to avoid the danger of believing that scientific reduction is the only means by which we come to understand reality."¹ But if I refuse to regard myself as a material body, then what kind of reality do I have? Does my reality consist in my being a mind instead of body? If so, what is mind? What kind of reality is that and how can a mind inhabit a material body? What exactly is the relationship between the mind and the body? Am I a mind with a body or a body with a mind? I am looking out of my body now. Does that mean I am my body or does it mean I am inside my body, or neither? Could I be an immaterial soul which survives my bodily death, or has that been ruled out by modern science? What is true?
These metaphysical questions about reality—what is appearance and what is real? what kind of reality does the universe have? and what kind of reality do we have as a human being?—are the serried questions in the field of philosophic inquiry. And that is presumably one reason why the nature and relationship of the mind and body has been on-going for centuries. And it is important to note that it has had a significant impact on our attitude toward the value of the body and its activities.

Dualism

We have a philosophical tradition based upon dualism and dichotomies. There have been many examples of these dichotomies: the mental and the physical, reason and emotion, analytic and intuitive, being and becoming, value and fact, self and other, freedom and authority, education and physical education, work and play. Moreover, we have usually established hierarchical value to each of these. Among these dichotomies is the one that separates the mind and the body and gives credence to valuing the mind over the
body. Stephen Priest provided us an excellent definition of this dualism.

Dualism is the theory that two and only two kinds of substance exist: minds and physical objects. A mind is a purely mental, non-material or spiritual substance, and a physical object is a purely material, non-mental, spatially extended substance. It logically follows that no mind is a physical object and no physical object is a mind. A person, on the dualist account, comprises both a mind and a body, but most dualists maintain that a person is essentially his or her mind but only contingently his or her body or, to put it another way, a person is his or her mind but a person has or owns his or her body. It follows that if a person's body should cease to exist it is logically possible that that person should continue to exist; but if a person's mind should cease to exist, then that person necessarily ceases to exist. In principle, minds may exist without bodies and bodies may exist without minds.

One of the oldest views on this dualistic conception of the mind and the body was set out in early Greek philosophy. For example, the dualism present in the Pythagorean doctrine of the transmigration of the souls. Pythagoras taught,

first, that the soul is an immortal thing, and that it is transformed into other kinds of living things; further, that whatever comes into existence is born again in the revolutions of a certain cycle, nothing being absolutely new; and that all things that are born with life in them ought to be treated as kindred.

The Pythagorean seems to have a religious, rather than scientific, conviction that souls, at death, simply transmigrated from the now-dead body they had formally
occupied into a different body. Hyland pointed out two crucial convictions of Pythagorean thought:

First, the body and the soul are separable. Indeed, death gets defined by the Pythagorean as the separation of the soul from the body. Second, given this separability, the 'real' person is not the body but the soul; the soul is the crucial dimension in the 'personality' of the person.4

The Pythagorean made a clear distinction between two substances, the body and the soul. There was more to Plato's dualism than a simple distinction of mind and body. Plato set up an ethical tradition in the history of Western cultures. Plato probably learned from Socrates of the ethical problems, and tended to seek teleological rather than mechanical explanations of the world. In one of Plato's most important dialogues, the Phaedo, he presents his idea of man, who is both wise and good in the highest degree, and who is totally without fear of death. For Socrates, death is really the separation of the soul from body and the freeing of the soul from the body, so that it can ascend to the higher world of forms. Plato, in fact, has provided us with a point of departure:

When the soul and the body are united, then nature orders the soul to rule and govern, and the body to obey
and serve. Now which of these two functions is akin to the
divine? and which to the mortal? Does not the divine appear
to you to be that which naturally orders and rules, and the
mortal that which is subject and servant? 5

Descartes added emphasis to the dualistic view of human
beings in his effort to be looking for 'knowledge'.
Descartes decided that knowledge would be something that
could not be doubted. In one of his famous works,
Meditations, Descartes started by doubting everything. Using
the indubitability of doubt as his cornerstone, he asserted
that he could doubt that he had a body. But, he couldn't
doubt that someone or something had to be doing that
doubting. Thus, Descartes established the first principle
that he, a thinking being, must be distinct from his body.
He concluded,

...I rightly conclude that my essence consists in this
alone: that I am only a thing that thinks. Although perhaps
I have a body that is very closely joined to me,
nevertheless, because on the one hand I have a clear and
distinct idea of myself-insofar as I am a thing that thinks
and not an extended thing-and because on the other hand I
have a distinct idea of a body-insofar as it is merely an
extended thing, and not a thing that thinks-it is therefore
certain that I am truly distinct from my body, and that I am
exist without it. 6

Now, many philosophers who are concerned with mind-body
dualism used Descartes' idealism as their point of
departure. Descartes provided the foundation for mind-body dualism by speaking of two kinds of substances in the world: mental substance as that which thinks; and corporeal substance as that which has physical dimensions and is extended in space. This relationship of mind and body has been the fundamental reality upon which our profession and subdisciplines are based. The mind-body dichotomy and the valuing of the mind over the body contributed to justifying physical activity in terms of what it could do for the mind. In many of the dualistic conceptions, the person uses the body as a means to an end. The body is viewed as an instrument for acting on the environment. Mastery over the body is considered a goal of human life. Thus, it becomes the body as conceptualized in its objectivized mode of being-for-other. Jan Rintala pointed out the influence of dualistic tradition on our attitude toward participation in sport:

Derriving systems from an assumed dualism creates a difficulty when accounting for the coexistence and close relationship between two opposite. Particularly difficult instances have been the attempts to reconcile the relationship of mind and body. This has been a continuous difficulty in sport and physical education. Although our field requires bodily effort and movement and celebrates the human moving, our Western philosophical tradition has saddled us with a view of body as secondary, perhaps evil,
and certainly not source of Truth. Starting from a dualistic assumption that elevated the mind over the body, if sport and physical activity were to be studied, analyzed, or justified at all, the emphasis would be on contributions to the intellectual.7

Indeed, this dualistic tradition that arose from the Greeks over 2,500 years ago has influenced our way of structuring reality, validating experience, and valuing certain aspects of that experience. It is so pervasive that we often have difficulty even thinking or talking nondualistically. Considered further, this dichotomous tradition gave credence to valuing and trusting objective assessments and data over the information available through subjective assessments. In analyzing human movement, for example, we often focus on the body as an object, similar to many other objects of study. The performer is analyzed anatomically, biomechanically, physiologically, and psychologically. We focus exclusively on the body-as-object and are blind to the ontological difference between a human being and a mere object. This body-as-object is quite consistent with the dichotomous tradition from which the mind-body dualism arose. It permits us to focus objectively on the movement, but it can provide only a limited perspective of movement.
experience. A more complete understanding requires that we also include those aspects of the movement experience that are not objectively accessible. The danger comes if we continue to focus exclusively on the body-as-object and forget the human subject.

**Overcoming Dualism-Materialism**

There is a whole tradition of dualism in which the mind and the body are conceived as two distinct substances or entities. And then, philosophers began to establish their own theories which describe the relationship between the two that is the human being. But, the relationship between two dissimilar substances was difficult for many to accept. Hyland pointed out that:

There are fundamental problems with the dualist standpoint that have beset it almost since it was first formulated. Probably the most troublesome is how these two separate substances, mind or soul and body, the one material, the other presumably immaterial, can interact with such intimacy. My mind decides to type this sentence and my fingers obey its commands. Or I try to get my body to perform a difficult physical maneuver, say, a complex dive, and get psychologically frustrated at my failure. Perhaps I even suffer from a psychosomatic illness. In both positive
and negative senses, the mind and body interact in myriad ways which are notoriously difficult to explain on the assumption that it is a material body and an immaterial mind or soul doing the interacting.8

Dissatisfaction continued about the whole idea of causation and the premise that things as different as mental and physical could affect one another. Seeing causation as an impossibility, many began to be looking for some alternatives.

With the development of science, the dissatisfaction about anything with the Platonic and Cartesian dualisms have led thinkers to try to understand the human being in a different way, as entirely. Like the 17th century English philosopher, Thomas Hobbes, many modern men began to think that if something exists, then it is physical. They argued that everything that exists has the physical dimensions of size; that is, everything that exists has length, depth, and breadth. Also, everything that exists is composed of matter. They not only maintained that all our thoughts and sensations are caused by physical objects, they also maintained those very thoughts and sensations are themselves physical. This position is known as "materialism", or more
recently, "physicalism". The monistic view that human beings are part of physical nature is one which commends itself on many grounds. Madell provided a suggestion that we do not need to offer a special explanation of desire to establish a monistic view of the nature of the person. He argued that:

The current orthodoxy, both in philosophy and in fields such as those of Artificial Intelligence and Cognitive Science, is that what we call mind is something which is fully realized as a physical system; nothing about the mental requires the introduction of anything non-material into our ontology.

So-called 'mental' activity is nothing immaterial or the mysterious manifestation of a soul. Thinking is no different in principle from moving one's fingers across a keyboard. Both are the result of neurons firing, synapses being crossed, nerves being stimulated. Everything about us, including our thoughts, loves, and anxieties, are founded in the physical. Indeed, the central claim of contemporary materialism is that a complete account of mind can be given in terms of our present conception of the physical. Especially in an age dominated by 'science', most people have seen the development of some form of materialism as the only possible solution to the mind-body problem. Moreover,
on the basis of this assumption, everything about a human being is accessible to only scientific understanding. But materialism has been felt to be confronted with insuperable difficulties. It would be a serious mistake to think that the progress of modern science has disproved the existence of the mind or the soul. In fact, there are aspects of our experience which absolutely preclude any materialist analysis of mind. Before we accept the materialistic view on the human nature, we have to ask, "Can the materialist give any sort of account of the phenomenal quality of sensations?" Materialism seems to have a problem in accounting for the phenomenal quality of sensation itself, something which does not seem to be embraced by and description of the physical processes which are involved in such experience. This has led certain thinkers to understand human embodiment in a different way.

Embodiment and Phenomenology

Phenomenology is the attempt to produce presuppositionless descriptions of the contents of experience, without any
prior commitment to the objective reality of those contents. It is the practice of observing and characterizing the contents of experience just as they appear to consciousness, with a view to capturing their essential features.

Through this new philosophical method we can be faced with another possibility to understand and perhaps resolve the mind-body problem. The phenomenologist claims that the way we actually experience ourselves is neither dualistically, and as body and mind somehow mysteriously interacting, nor as a mere body, but as a unity of mental and physical activity, which phenomenologists call "the lived body." More than that, such thinkers insist that human activity can only be adequately understood by thinking of human experience as a unified whole. Jean-Paul Sartre pointed to our failure to resolve the fundamental question of the relationship between minds and bodies?:

The problem of the body and its relations with consciousness is often obscured by the fact that while the body is from the start posited as a certain thing having its own laws and capable of being defined from outside, consciousness is then reached by the type of inner intuition which is peculiar to it."10
Before we try to answer such dilemmas, we need to have a deep understanding of Sartre's suggestion that we must in succession examine the body first as being-for-itself and then as being-for-others. Sartre's distinction between the body as object and the body as subject provides a new way in trying to understand the nature of a human being. According to him, there are two perspectives by which the body can be viewed: as object and as subject. When others view or experience our bodies or when the individual views and analyzes his or her own body, then the body becomes an object, and the integration of mind and body is difficult. But when a person experiences his/her own body, it becomes the center of his/her experience and becomes a subject. The body in its subjective state is integrated with consciousness in what are called prereflective and reflective activities of the mind. Carolyn Thomas explained these two perspectives of body and their results:

In the objective mode, I have a body, I train it, I use it, and in this regard it can be viewed as separate from me. But this same body in the subjective mode means that I am my body and that my consciousness is embodied or integrated, in this subjectivity.\(^1\)
There is a belief among some phenomenologists that experience is knowledge, that the body is not an instrument of the mind but is a person's access to the world. Thus, the body is not to be thought of as an entity, which somehow mysteriously interacts with another qualitatively different entity. We should understand and describe our bodies as we experience them, as they are lived, as what we are. Indeed, our bodies are not something we have; we are our bodies.

In the context of this idea of body, we should know that the body is no longer viewed as the servant of the mind but rather as an integral part of a person's existence, or being. Logically, it follows that a person's physical being takes on a value for its own sake. The concept of a holistic being translates into the ethical belief that we must consider a human being as an end in himself and herself rather than as a means to an end.

Summary

Many of the attitudes our society has toward sport and players stem from attitudes that have developed about the
worth of the body and its activities (physical movement) in contrast to the worth of the mind and its activities (mental thought). Indeed, these metaphysical arguments about the nature and relationship of the mind and body have been ongoing for centuries. Many complex arguments support what are called the concepts of dualism (mind/body separation), materialism (body only), and embodiment (mind/body integration). According to dualism, the mind and the body are considered separate, the body is considered the enemy of reason and subsequently disparaged. On the other hand, materialists explained that everything in the world is an aggregate of corporeal bodies and anything which is not a body is not part of the universe. They convinced us that they can explain everything that happen in this world by the law of physics. In this view of humans, the body has become a machine to be used and measured objectively. People have been taught and coached to respond to X stimuli with Y responses and not to question. But, the phenomenologist claims that the way we actually experience ourselves is neither as a dualistic relation of mind to body, nor as a
mere material body, but as a unity of mental and physical activity which is often called the "lived body".

No doubt the role of sport in a society has been culturally determined based on this metaphysical mind-body argument. In the next chapter, I shall consider yet another dimension of understanding of ourselves in sport, the connection of sport and ethical themes, such as violence, cheating and dehumanization.
FOOTNOTES


In Chapter two, an attempt has been made to understand the nature of man in the Western intellectual tradition. This chapter shifts the focus from examination of man and nature to an examination of sport and morality. Sport plays a major, if sometimes unappreciated, role in the lives of our society. Although the vast majority of sports events take place at the informal level, millions of our modern people participate in competitive sports of one sort or another. Perhaps, today's attendance at sporting events around the world is in excess of millions of spectators everyday. If we add to that, an even a greater number of people who watch televised sports, we see that sport touches the lives of enormous numbers of people. No one denies that organized sport prevails virtually everywhere in our society. In contemporary American society, Benjamin G. Rader
pointed out the importance of sport in American culture in the 20th century:

It could be measured by the many hours that fans spend riveted to television screens, by the column inches in newspapers devoted to sports, and by samplings of cocktail conversations. Novelists, poets, and dramatists increasingly turned to sports for motifs, and scholars began to execute minute investigations of the psychological, philosophical, and social significance of sports.¹

An indicator of the importance of sport is the sheer amount of time people devote to it the world over. Indeed, most people in contemporary society, attend games, read the sports pages and sport magazines, watch televised sports, and discuss sports endlessly. It is plausible to conclude that nearly every man and woman is somehow involved in sports. Even though it is a vicarious experience for most, sports obviously play a significant role in the cultural life of contemporary society. In fact, it not only permeates most of our social life, but also becomes a part of life itself, in this society. Sport represents an important cultural phenomenon.

Today, however, many issues arise within the context of sport. Big time sport has corrupted academe. Coaches may engage in outrageous behaviors but if they win, they are
rewarded handsomely. Gratuitous violence is glorified in the media. Some athletes take drugs. Many, in their search for a competitive edge, cheat. In fact, sport is plagued with serious problems. These problems, violence, cheating, drug abuse, and spectator riots, result from a morally distorted sport world. We do not have to read much sports commentary these days to recognize these problems exist in sport today. Relative to the increased attention to the issue of violence in contemporary sport, Jay J. Coakley pointed out,

While violence is not new to sport, much of our recent concern is due to the fact that it has never before affected the safety and well-being of so many athletes and been witnessed by so many spectators. Our concern is also an outgrowth of our increased awareness of the senselessness of violence and the serious consequences it has in the realm of sport. ...The consequences of violence have not only been felt on the professional level. Athletes in youth leagues and interscholastic sport programs have also fallen victims to the escalation of violent body contact and the use of aggressive behavior to intimidate opponents.

Clearly, many of these crises point directly to questions of ethics and morality in sport. But, most of these ethical issues are not peculiar to sport; we know that we can also confront them again and again in our lives generally. Nevertheless, we have to recognize that they are
especially visible in the world of sport. In fact, sport, as many of us have experienced, is indeed an arena where one's ethical values are again and again exhibited, tested, and learned. Moreover, many youths first are confronted with powerful ethical issues in sport. Although there are not the specific ethical teachings available in sport, perhaps we can learn and exhibit publicly our own ethical standpoints in sport. Clearly, it means that the very structure of most sports includes an intense involvement not just of the body or the intellect but of the whole person. This is why I believe a study of the mind-body connection will help our understanding of ethics in sport.

Probably, this is also why sport has so long been associated with schools. In this present chapter I will focus on some of the crucial ethical issues that arise within the context of sport. Of course, some good work has been done on the ethics of sport. But, I argue, many philosophers of sport have moralized only in books. Although moralizing on paper could have considerable value, this has been the exception, rather than the rule. One of the
distinguished scholars in sport, Earle F. Zeigler, pointed that

Although philosophers have searched persistently throughout history for a normative ethical system on which people could and should base their conduct, there is still no single, non-controversial foundation on which the entire structure of ethics can be built.¹

Why? What is the main problem of ethics in general and sport in particular? I believe, sport moralists have too often ignored basic philosophical questions and that this negligence accounts for much of their inability to apply ethics to practice. These are questions of metaphysics; questions about what something is and how it works. The problem of sport philosophy is not so much that metaphysical analyses do not exist, or that they are lacking in quality, but that metaphysics and ethics have not been brought together. R. Scott Kretchmar argued that sport ethicists must have a clear understanding of what sport is before attempting to apply precepts of love, or of justice, or of whatever, to it. He said that

Metaphysical understanding must precede ethical prescription. Anyone who claims that it is wrong to break game rules intentionally, or mistreat an umpire, or gloat
over a game victory, must first know what a game is and also that rule breaking, umpire harassment, and victorious gloating are germane to that setting and potentially (or actually) harmful in that place.

The point here is not that sport moralists must actually enter into a long metaphysical discourse prior to the identification of moral prescriptions. It is rather that they require a sound and practical knowledge of, and an unwavering attention to, the nature of sport. I strongly believe that this can dramatically affect progress in developing an ethic for sport. To see this, we shall first consider basic metaphysical facts as they arise in sport. And then, we will focus on some of the crucial ethical issues that arise within the context of sport. The discussion of ethics here will be limited to three issues which point directly to questions of metaphysics: first, the problem of winning; second, the problem of commercialization; and finally, the problem of human values in sport.
Why do human beings engage in sport? It is for fun, health, honor, friendship, or money. This question may have a lot of responses from individuals. I think, however, there can be no argument that the first objective of sport, from child's play to the professional event, is to play. Playing is the most important reason why man engages in sport, but it can not be the end. Here, we need to ask why people play sport. The answer is not simple. But I argue that winning is the first purpose of sport. For example, if players do not try to win in a game, it can never be sport because sport, by definition, is a human activity to decide who is the best in a limited condition. Thus, we must add the objective, winning, as a reason for engaging in sport. Finally, I strongly believe, there should be no other reason for sport other than playing and winning. And it is not easy to decide which is the more important, playing or winning. But, the most important issue is striking a balance between these two.

Today, however, there is unbalance. Anyone who reads the sports pages or watches sports news on television is
aware of the "over-emphasis on winning." This has long been an international concern, and remains an immense problem. Drew A. Hyland stated that the appeal of competitive sports with its emphasis on winning, is obvious in our competitive capitalist society. He pointed to the relative failure of certain sports to achieve popularity where winning is not stressed. He said that:

A few years ago, many liberal souls in an effort to combat what they regarded as the excessive emphasis on winning in our sports and in our society, developed a slew of non-competitive games where there was no issue of winning or losing: the so-called new games. Many of them, for example, emphasized the spirit of cooperation: see how long everyone involved could keep a large balloon like ball in the air. Or Frisbee, where a group of people just had fun throwing the Frisbee back and forth. For better or worse, most of these new games died as fast as they were born. In the ironic case of Frisbee, it was transformed into a highly competitive sport, ultimate Frisbee, which has achieved national popularity on college campuses.5

Here we can understand that the problem of winning must begin with the recognition of the enormous appeal to us of sports where winning is at stake. We must recognize that the over-emphasis on winning is not an accident. The vast majority of the sports that have achieved popularity are highly competitive ones, where the game ends with a winner and a loser, where winning counts. For example, placed in a
context where the game ends with the determination of winner and loser on scoreboard, it will always be tempting for a person immersed in the intensity and passion of that competitive situation to push the rules of the game, to cheat, to injure, and generally to do anything to win. This situation can be exacerbated when winning becomes not just an issue of pride in one's abilities but carries with it an extra import as well. Therefore, individual athletes, imbued with the importance of winning, and themselves full of competitive spirit, are presented often with difficult ethical choices. There is, it should be noted, an instructive remark at this ethical problem in Francis C. Kew's claim that the value of sport is the sense of freedom he finds there. He says

...when sport is used as a means to end outside the realm of the activity itself, then authentic involvement is diminished and individual freedom and initiative denied. Through this denial the true existence of sport is lost. ...Sport, in general, is freely accepted, one is free from the everyday world and, most important, one is free to be oneself-to actualize one's potential. The performer may gain many complex conceptions of himself and many complex sources of meaning.
Here, we can see and experience the desire to win in different ways. Viewed positively, the desire to win can lead one to try to do one's best, to hustle as much as possible. In doing so, and if successful, one realizes that sport becomes the place where our abilities are tested. Critics reply, however, that the effort not just to win but to beat someone can lead fundamentally to a negative and alienated one toward the team against which he or she is playing. As a result, our effort to win translates into the desire to beat someone. We must understand that such a desire generates some of the worst abuses through this emphasis on winning: a willingness to cheat, to hurt others, to treat members of the opposing team not as fellow human beings and athletes, but as enemies—as objects to be defeated without respect or regard for their rights as human beings. Thus, this attitude of the athlete bent on winning makes sport the place where one's ability is proved rather than tested.

But, we have noted that neither in our society at large nor in the sporting community do we seem disposed to abolish games which place a stake on winning. The issue therefore
seems to be, how can we put winning in a proper perspective? To do this, I argue that we must examine closely the system of deciding who the winner is in sport. In the case of basketball, for example, we should win a game if we can score a larger total number of points than the opponent within the regulations of basketball. Here, we can recognize that the nature of sport is a rule-defined competition. Thus, we need to examine carefully the rule function in sport. Warren Fraleigh pointed out,

> With respect to the contest, rules specify the goal-within-the-contest which all participants must necessarily pursue, the means all participants must use and are allowed to use in pursuing that goal, and the means all participants may not legally use to pursue the goal. These three kinds of rules function together, specifying what all participants in principle agree to when they enter a sport contest and what all participants know all other participants in principle agree to. The three functions of rules operate together to ensure that all participants face the same test mutually that is, that they are contesting.

Here, we must understand that sport is based on rules by agreement. Although we play a sand-lot baseball game, there must be rules by agreement. If we play a game without this agreement, we can never be a winner because it is not a sport. But we must note that to pursue winning in sport
under the rules is one of the essential elements which define sport.

Athletes as Commodities

Sport violence seems to be a part of the game in sport. In the case of contact sports, such as football and basketball, acts of aggression are seldom condemned, usually condoned, and often praised. In our competitive society, the prevailing view of athletics is the image of the athlete as warrior. Many athletes even take pride in their warrior images in the fields. For example, Mike Tyson, a former heavyweight champion of the world, reflected his love of warrior images, when he said,

"In my mind, everyone is against me. Some people may act like they respect me, but they don't. I'm in a business of phonies. I want to believe the whole world is against me. I love the smell of danger. ...I'm not an athlete, don't call me an athlete. How can you compare me with Billie Jean King or Magic Johnson? They're athletes. Athlete have careers. Athletes have to prepare. At any moment, I'm ready. ...I'm a warrior, a missionary. ...People say that's primitive, that I'm an animal. But then they pay $500 to see it."
Why is gratuitous violence glorified in sport? What's wrong? From Tyson's perception, we should note that there is a serious problem of ethics in sport. The problem is the loss of humanity in athletes. The point here is not that many athletes act like warriors; the real problem is that athletes are treated like fighting machines or as objects rather than as human beings or subjects. There is no single cause of the loss of humanity in the world of sport. Many believe that these problems exist because moral values are confused with dollar values and the win-at-any-price ethic controls the conduct in much of sport. John H. Gibson pointed out the situation where results are valued over performance in contemporary sport. He claimed,

This is an all to common example of the values of contemporary society. The victory is seen as being more important than the way in which it is achieved. Quality of performance is secondary to the cash values of winning."

This ethical idea perhaps is reflected in the common phrase: "Winning isn't everything, it's the only thing." Under this Lombardian ethic, the emphasis is purely on outcome; winning is the most important outcome and the end result justifies the means. In this ethical view, therefore,
Commodification refers to the social, psychological, and cultural uses of social structures for the commercial needs of monopolies. The commodification process views human beings as objects, or interchangeable parts, that can be manipulated. In the sports realm, team owners and administrators allow profit-maximizing decisions to take precedence over human considerations. Sports enterprises seek to produce what they can sell, and spectacular sports events attract customers. As a result, sports performance become activities of display. ...Violence is encouraged by sport administrators because it attracts spectators. ...Thus, players and franchises are purchased, bought, and sold for profit. Athletes are treated like machines or instruments that are used to produce victories and income. They are manipulated to produce maximum performance. 10

The social conditions resulting from the commodification of sport make winning the all-consuming goal, and athletes are judged exclusively in terms of their ability to achieve that goal. The unsuccessful athlete is eliminated or
replaced like the defective parts of a machine. In these circumstances, athletes are viewed as commodities, their opponents are enemies rather than competitors, and they view one another as obstacles to overcome in order to achieve to their ends. Finally, they themselves are exploited under the "win-at-any-cost" ethic. This is the ethical consequence of immoral practices in contemporary sport, the dehumanization of the athlete.

In order to gain better understanding of the commercialization of sport, we need to examine the process of modernization in sport history and its relationship to our social structure. Relative to the changing characteristic of sport from pre-modern to modern times in history, Dr. Melvin L. Adelman pointed out that modern sports.

1. ...include formal organization; institutionally differentiated at the local, regional, and national levels.

2. ...include formal, standardized, and written rules; rationally and pragmatically worked out and legitimated by organizational means.

3. ...include competition on national and international levels, superimposed on local contests; chance to establish national and international reputations.
4. ...include high role differentiation; emergence of specialists (professional) and strict distinctions between playing and spectating.

5. ...include public information that reported on a regular basis in local newspapers, as well as national sports journals; appearance of specialized magazines, guidebooks, etc.

6. ...include statistics and records that are kept and published on a regular basis; considered important measures of achievement; records sanctioned by national associations.

We should not fail to notice that all of these six characteristics of modern sports can be viewed as major stimuli to commercializing and politicizing sport in contemporary society. The emergence of formal organizations, standardized rules, national and international competitions, specialized roles, increasing public information, and statistics and records on a regular basis are summed up into the desire for a unified form of sport competition. And, it is enough to attract more people in the sport industry of contemporary society. Indeed, many business elite, mass media, and even political leaders recognize its potential for making huge profits in this society. Thus, they finally create more centralized and bureaucratized sport organizations in order to maximize their profits. Gibson claimed that:
Commodified sport is a capitalistic rationalization of sport in which the sport is administrated in such way as to maximize profits and capital accumulation. Thus sport become just another means to ends of capitalism and is no longer an area of intrinsic value.\footnote{12}

No one can deny that sport has tremendously changed and developed, but we have not paid adequate attention to it. The study of sport ethics has not been a major part of the social dialogue, in large part because we accept this ideology of change as progress. For this reason, we are accepting everything about the modernization of sport without reflecting on its value systems. This belief in “progress” has dominated our sport world and is a more powerful force than any other. Finally, it challenges the nature of sport today.

Values in Sport

No one can deny that sport today is part of a larger consumer culture in our society. Relative to the striking features of contemporary sport in American society, Eitzen pointed out,
The character of American sport has changed dramatically in the 20th century. Sport was once primarily engaged in by persons who sought the enjoyment of physical activity and competition. Although there are occasions for this level of sport now, sport for most part has become corrupted. The athlete's pleasure has been superseded by what brings pleasure to fans, parents, sports team owners, alumni, television, and the corporations that buy television advertising. Sport of power politics. This shift to what might be dubbed "corporate sport" is seen not only in the professional leagues but also in the Olympic Games, colleges, high schools, and even children's sports. What once was regarded as play has become work. Spontaneity has been replaced by bureaucracy. The goal of pleasure in the physical activity has been displaced by extrinsic rewards, especially money.  

From these critical remarks about contemporary sport in the 20th century America, we should recognize some of the trends in sports, especially the move away from the play-oriented activities toward the work-oriented activities in what he terms "corporate sport". In order to better understand this phenomenon, it may be helpful to see the analysis of terms, "play-work", by John Loy. He analyzed the logical relationship of the play-game-sport and the athletic-occupation-work in contemporary society:

...all sports are games but not all games are sport, and all games are play but not all forms of play are games. ...just as sport may be considered as subset of games and games a subset of play, athletics may be viewed as a subset of occupations, and occupations as a subset of work. Thus, while the play-game-sport sequence portrays an "ideal" scale of expressive activities, by juxtaposing it with the work-occupation-athletics sequence reflecting a scale of instrumental activities, we acknowledge that modern sport
may be best conceived as being located on a continuum between play and work. Moreover, we acknowledge that in our everyday work some degree of play permeates work and some elements of work are found in many forms of play.\textsuperscript{14}

From his analysis of sport, we should note that sport has become work and today's sport is valued as a means to reach external goals rather than being valued for its intrinsic worth. It is clearly supported by the critics of value in sport by John Gibson, who claims that:

Today much of sport exists under a value system that recognizes the objectivity of the scoreboard as the only true assessment of worth, and denies the value of the subjective, experiential, and personal dimensions of sport.\textsuperscript{15}

Perhaps this brief critique of value in sport will enable us to understand why the most common motto is, "Winning isn't everything, it's the only thing," at all levels of contemporary sports.

However, we know that contemporary attitudes, beliefs, and values regarding sport are not generated in an intellectual vacuum devoid of history. And, it is clear to nearly everyone that, in both the good and the bad sense, the values in sport are at least in part a reflection of the values of society in which the sport takes place. Thus, the
analysis of societal impact on sport cannot be neglected in
the inquiry of value in today's sport. Especially, we should
recognize that most modern sports and the values present in
the sport world have been developed in the West. It is a
plausible inference that sports can and do teach those
values to participants. Relative to the root of values in
Western society, Gibson argued that "the Enlightenment is
taken as the principle cataclysmic event that set Western
culture on its route to contemporary values."16 He strongly
asserted,

The root of contemporary emphasis on results lies in
the explosion of rationality and objectivity that
characterizes the Enlightenment. The power and achievement
of scientific method led to objectivity being seen as one of
the hallmarks of truth. The criteria of reason and
objectivity have been applied in a host of inappropriate
situations and contexts ever since. Instrumental values
dominate contemporary society and the values of things in
themselves has become an outdated concept.17

In fact, Gibson pointed out "the loss of morals"
through the Enlightenment in contemporary Western culture.
Science, for example, successfully deals with the world and
its existence, with what "is", but no product of science
could help with the realm of "ought" in contemporary
society. By the struggles of the Enlightenment period,
objectivity and rational thought have become the major tools of society in today's ideology of the West. In sport, finally, the results of games came to be valued over performance.

In this sense, we can have a possible explanation for why we only emphasize winning in sport and why we treat athletes as a commodity rather than as human beings. Gibson pointed out that, "Today in contemporary Western society we see cultures of Having" from the works of William Sadler's distinctions between Being, Becoming, Doing, and Having ideal cultural types in history. To make a long story short, there is a dramatic change of value in competition, "from process to product", between Being/Becoming and Doing/Having cultures. In a Being culture, there is no logical place for competition because the people of a Being culture tend to be fatalistic. On the other hand, the process of competition is a central focus in a Becoming culture because the people of a Becoming culture strive for excellence in the present. In a Doing culture, the future is seen as more important than the present. Productive hard work is seen as inherently valuable for the future. As a result, the product of
competition is more valuable than the process of competition. In a Having culture, its orientation shifts from production to consumption. Within a Having culture, competitive activities become commodities to be consumed as a form of entertainment. Although Sadler's four ideal types of cultures can be seen theoretically as pure models, this analysis is most helpful in understanding the development of Western culture and value in sport competition. Today, no one can deny that winning in sport attracts more consumers in general.

Summary

Sport was open, but sport has become closed. Sport was simple, but sport has become complex. Sport was easy, but sport has become serious. Yesterday, sport did belong in the world of play and leisure, but today, sport belongs in the world of business and politics. We have believed that we learned all the right ethical lessons from sport, but we can't deny that our enthusiastic efforts to win can exhibit unethical desires to beat someone else, to destroy someone,
to humiliate someone, or to kill our opponents. Our sports have tremendously changed and developed in shapes, but we did not pay them adequate attention. Only a small percentage of our population engages in the critical discussion and study of problems in sport ethics and its cumulative impact on our lives. Finally, we are faced with the problem of values in this huge world of sport. We cannot deny the instrumental value of today's sport over its intrinsic worth. From this transition of values in sport, the process of competition is secondary to an externally established product of competition. Winning in sports became more important than performance. With the emphasis on objectivity rather than subjectivity, the product of sport begins to justify the process of sport. Whether it is metaphysically correct or not, the numbers on the scoreboard are seen as the only true assessment of worth in contemporary sport. Finally, winning is considered the greatest outcome and the end result justifies the means of achieving that end. In this value system, the other player is viewed as an enemy, and concepts like "fair play" or "excellence" disappear in contemporary sport. Today, sport
becomes a place where we can prove ourselves rather than know ourselves.
FOOTNOTES


CHAPTER IV

THE MIND-BODY DEBATES AND SPORT ETHICS
IN WESTERN CULTURES

In the previous chapter, we discussed the problem of ethics in the world of sport and we could experience many moral inconsistencies present in this arena. But, some still argue that we can learn more about an individual's morality in the context of sport competition than in any other social situation, and every reason or motive for involvement in sport has moral significance. They claim that every action in sport is either morally right or morally wrong, never morally neutral. They believe that sport teaches values.

In the real practical field of sport today, however, the value system or moral reasoning is ignored by people. Violence, cheating, and drugs are rampant in all levels of athletic competition. Our sport today places more emphasis on the value of winning than the value of playing. Values are not taught in sport anymore. Finally, the ethical state
of athletics is now in a crisis for several reasons. And, many sociologists, psychologists, and philosophers have studied these reasons. However, they have emphasized the external factors, such as the influence of politics, economics, and education, rather than internal factors, such as our attitude toward sporting activities on human life. For example, if we believe that sport is only for physical development, there will be no expectation of the ethical development of man. But, if we consider sport as a human activity for both physical and mental development of a human being, then the development of values in sport is a vital part of our discipline. Thus, we need to pay attention to the relationship between the development of values and the changing attitude toward sport in human life.

This chapter will focus on the relation of the moral problem and the concept of mind and body in sport. To do this, we need to review the changing viewpoint of man in Western philosophy. And, we shall also examine the attitude toward physical education in school.
What is the Mind-Body Problem and Why is it a Problem?

What is meant by the phrase, "mind-body problem?" Is it the discordance of mind and body in human actions? If a fine golf player like Jack Nicklaus, usually adept at combining his mental and physical activity into outstanding play, for example, fails to hit a ball as accurately as he wishes, because he has an injured wrist or a mental problem, can we say he has a mind-body problem? In philosophy, the mind-body problem does not mean the disagreement of mind and body in human actions. It would not by itself imply a mind-body problem. Rather, it has to do with the relation between a person's mind and body. Relative to the mind-body problem in philosophy, Keith Campbell pointed out three fundamental questions involved in the mind-body problem:

The Mind-Body problem will be for us the problem of determining in what relation a human mind stands to a human body. It is clear that to get a firm grasp of even the problem, let alone its solution, we must also settle two further questions: What is a human body? What is a human mind? The three questions are thoroughly intermingled—a situation quite common in philosophy. View of what body and mind are help determine answers to the Mind-Body problem, and the troubles involved in some answers to the Mind-Body problem can in turn discredit some opinions about body and mind. Because the questions are so interconnected, when we tackle the Mind-Body problem we must at the same time also work toward answering the questions about mind and body. The mind-Body problem is three problems rolled into one.
From the definition of the mind-body problem in philosophy by Campbell, it is important to recognize that it has a close connection with philosophy's central concern: what is a human being? Therefore, the question of what the relationship is between the human mind and the human body became the first theme in philosophy. In fact, many philosophers and theorists have spent a lot of time trying to prove their truths related to the mind-body problem from the pre-Socratic times to the present. And, no one doubts that these metaphysical arguments about the nature and relationship of the mind and the body have had an impact on our education systems. I believe, therefore, before we extend philosophical investigation into the "mind-body problem", that it is necessary to analyze and attempt to comprehend the relationship between the concepts of mind-body and attitudes toward physical education throughout history. Relative to physical education, John R. Fairs mentioned that the role and status of physical education in Western society has been determined by the attitudes toward the relationship of mind and body. He asserted,
If the body and the mind are considered as separate and distinct entities, the body is considered in conflict with the mind or the enemy of reason. As a result, the body is disparaged and ridiculed, and physical education is non-existent. If the body is only accidentally and coincidentally linked with the mind, the body is made subservient to the mind in a master-servant relationship, and physical education will be given lower status and prestige than intellectual education in any hierarchy of education values. However, if the body is considered integrated with the mind in a psychosomatic relationship, the body will have value and esteem, and physical education will be harmoniously joined with intellectual education in the fullest development of man's unique capacities and potentialities.

In fact, we cannot deny that the attitudes, values, and beliefs that we hold about what a human being is, whether we think of our reality as separate substances—mind and body—or one substance—mind or body—or embodied substance, have made a vast difference in our view of physical activities. For this reason, Kleinman argued that the "mind-body problem is as crucial and relevant to the physical educator as it is for the philosopher." Therefore, the focus of this chapter will be to present and analyze three major philosophical positions on the mind-body problem and how they have influenced current attitudes and practices related to physical education.

For thousands of years, people have been trying to understand the relationship of mind and body, and many
philosophers have developed theories related to what a human being is. These complex debates are related to the nature and relationship of the mind and body and can be identified by three representative theories: "dualism" (mind/body separation), "monism" (mind or body), and "embodiment" (mind/body integration). Each philosophical position has suggested a possible solution for the mind-body problem. Nevertheless, the problems remain in sport. In this chapter, I am going to address some of them.

Mind/Body Separation

Relative to the mind-body problem in history, one of the earliest dualists was Plato, who argued that perfection and reality are known only by the mind and that the body often serves as an impediment to knowledge. His dualistic ideas, the separation of the mind from the body, was first formulated by ancient Greek idealists. The ancient idealists held to philosophical or religious convictions that the essential nature of reality lies in consciousness or reason of mind (or soul), and that these souls (or minds), at death,
simply transmigrated from the now-dead body, and that they
had formerly occupied a different body. In order to hold
this concept of reality and death, idealists had to make a
clear distinction between two substances, the mind and the
body. Indeed, Socrates, on the day of his death, argued that
death is nothing more than the separation of soul and body.
And, he continued his argument that truth such as justice,
beauty, and goodness, has never been perceived by the eyes,
ears, or other bodily senses. Anyone who aspires to a
knowledge of them in their highest purity must do so through
the mind alone, without the distraction of sight, sound, or
any other senses. Socrates concluded that a true philosopher
does not place the highest value on the pleasures of the
body and he is not afraid of death (The Phaedo 4). So, he
drank the poison in order to prove his belief that the
soul (mind) is immortal and the unique source of truth.

A second dualist, who greatly influenced our concept of
man, was Rene Descartes. Although Descartes was not an
educator concerned with the direction of education, his
ideas on the mind-body problem have served as the nucleus
for the formulation of educational objectives in Western
culture. Like Plato, Descartes viewed the mind and the body as separate and the mind as the primary means to knowledge, whereas the body is deceptive. He argued,

Whatever I had admitted until now as most true I took in either from the senses or through the senses; however, I noticed that they sometimes deceived me. And it is a mark of prudence never to trust wholly in those things which have once deceived us.  

In fact, his ideas on the mind-body problem were developed from the belief that all is false until rationally proven true (method of doubt). In one of his famous works, Meditations, he started to doubt everything he could doubt. He doubted his sense of experience, his body, and his knowledge in order to escape from the deceiver and reach the truth (Meditation One). However, he recognized that he couldn't doubt or deny the fact that he was doubting. Therefore, the famous statement "I think (doubt) therefore I am (exist)" was born (Meditation Two). But, he knew only that he existed. For this reason, he tried to prove the existence of God (Meditation Three, Four, and Five), in order to prove the existence of others like material things (Meditation Six). Descartes tried to explain the relationship of the mind and body as that of a seaman in a ship. He believed
that he has a body that is very closely joined to him, but it is merely an extended thing, and not a thing that thinks. Therefore, he concluded he is a being, whose whole essence or nature is to think in his mind; his body, on the contrary, is part of the extended divisible world of matter which can have no part in his essence as a thinking being. For dualists like Plato and Descartes, thus, the body cannot be essential. Reality is lodged in the mind. Physical experience is meaningless, and will not discover the truth, nor prove the basis for existence.

This dualistic view of man has dominated philosophical understanding of what man is in our educational system. Since the mind and the body are separable, and since the mind is more important than the body, the education of the mind became a direct objective in our culture. Finally, physical education is one of the first subjects that are cut in times of economic difficulty.

Why should physical educators claim that physical education is "the education through the physical" in contemporary society? Although Socrates took poison and Descartes could doubt everything, I believe, there are
fundamental problems with the dualistic concept of man. Why and how can these two separate things, the mind and the body, the one presumably immaterial and immortal, the other material and mortal, conjoin with such intimacy? For Descartes, the unextended mind and the extended body are joined at "the pineal gland"! If we are satisfied with this explanation, I believe that physical education will disappear in the future. Are there any other alternatives to "education through the physical"?

One Substance: Mind Or Body

The solution of Plato and Descartes on the mind-body problem, the separation of mind and body, was challenged by some philosophers like Thomas Hobbes and George Berkeley, who believed all reality is one, either body or mind. Although they held different positions, materialist or idealist, we called them monists, because they denied the separation of mind and body. Indeed, the problem of a connection between two separate substances, since the dualistic view of man was formulated, remains. So, as an
opposing theory to dualism, they formulate monistic views of mind and body in philosophy. First of all, the most challenged reaction against dualism was the monistic position of metaphysical materialism, which attempted to explain physical reality in terms of the material, "cause-effect relationships." One of the most famous modern materialists, Thomas Hobbes, denied the existence of the mind. He argued that it made no sense to say something can come from nothing, but there is a causal relationship for all phenomena. He explained mental phenomena such as ideas, emotions, and motivations as forms of matter, because all of these things result in behavior which is observable and predictable. Therefore, he believed that the universe is totally a bodily thing, and that all things are considered matter in motion. His materialistic and deterministic positions on the mind-body problem are well revealed in his denial of man's free will:

I conceive that nothing taketh beginning from itself, but from the action of some other immediate agent without itself. Therefore, when a man hath an appetite or will to something, to which before he had no appetite or will, the cause of his will is not the will itself but something else not in his own disposing.
Many of Hobbes's ideas or solutions on the mind-body problem ended up by denying that there are such things as minds, the way dualists ordinarily think of them. For him, everything in the world is reduced to corporeal bodies and anything which is not a body does not belong in the universe. And, all these bodily phenomena can be explained by causal relationships. Although Hobbes could explain everything through causal relationships, his materialistic and deterministic nature of man still remains a serious problem. If there is no effect without cause, what is the first cause? If our life is determined, why is there a difference between your life and my life? And, if everything is matter, what is number? How do I know it? These problems are not be solved by eliminating minds.

Since Descartes, therefore, there were other attempted solutions to the mind-body problem in philosophy. Against materialism, idealists also denied the existence of the body. As a pure idealist, Berkeley argued that there is no material substance and that things, such as stones and tables, are collections of ideas or sensations, which can
exist only in minds and for so long as they are perceived.

Against the existence of material things, he argued,

But, though it were possible that solid, figured, movable substances may exist without the mind, corresponding to the ideas we have of bodies, yet how is it possible for us to know this? Either we must know it by Sense or by Reason. -As for our senses, by them we have the knowledge only of our sensations, ideas, or those things that are immediately perceived by sense, call them what you will: but they do not inform us that things exist without the mind, or unperceived, like to those which are perceived. ...it is possible we might be affected with all ideas we have now, though there were no bodies existing without resembling them. Hence, it is evident the supposition of external bodies is not necessary for the producing our ideas; since it is granted they are produced sometimes, and might possibly be produced always in the same order we see them in at present, without their concurrence.

This is why Berkeley is against materialism. However, this approach also remains a problem. If all things exist only in the mind as long as they are perceived, why do we perceive them? And, who perceives you? These questions are also problematic. For most physical educators, Hobbes' ideas about the nature of man as body would seem to be a "great terminator" who can save physical education from the sufferings of lower status in our educational systems. I believe, however, we should reconsider his approach to solve the mind-body problem. Hobbes argued that our life is determined, and we act upon many continuous causal motions
without choice. This means that we are machines like a computer. In-put an X command into every human body, and they produce a Y out-put without question. The body becomes a machine to be used and measured objectively. There are no subjective aspects of man such as emotions, ideas, motivations, etc. Under this environment, no one can deny that physical education becomes a deterministic, mechanized, nonvalued, and meaningless experience. If we can't deny that our belief about ourselves decides our attitude toward our ends and purposes in life, the mind-body problem can't be limited to the metaphysical problem, but might belong to the problem of ethics. So, if we believe that our bodies are a machine to be used and measured objectively, it could be the beginning of a moral vacuum in our society.

Mind/Body Integration

Whether we eliminate the body or the mind in order to solve the problem of mind and body, the unsolved problem remains. This has led certain thinkers or philosophers to understand the nature of man in a different way. A new
approach is the integration of mind and body. This holistic view of man, embodiment, took its root in the philosophies of pragmatism, existentialism, and phenomenology in the 20th century. Against the view of absolute truths proposed by the early rationalists and idealists, pragmatism is based on a criterion of utility, and pragmatists like William James and John Dewey, held that experience as the source of truth is the only reality. In fact, their philosophical base for the reality relied heavily on the empiricist's attitude toward the world, and they promulgated the integration of mind and body against dualism. James pointed out the importance of practicality when we search for the truth:

What difference would it practically make to any one if this notion rather than that notion were true? If no practical difference whatever can be traced, then the alternatives mean practically the same thing, and all dispute is idle. Whenever a dispute is serious, we ought to be able to show some practical difference that must follow from one side or the other's being right."

This is why pragmatists argued that dualism was a meaningless view, because it made little practical difference whether the mind and the body were separate. There is no reason to accept the notions, the separation of the mind and the body, or the denying of the existence of
one from these two types of things, as long as it does not make a practical difference. For these reasons, their effort to interpret each notion by tracing its respective practical consequence stimulated the importance of experience on searching the truth. Under this philosophical circumstance, finally, pragmatists started to argue that the mind and the body are bound together in homogeneity: the mind is present in all of the body, so they are embodied. Relative to the mind-body problem, Dewey suggested,

Now this gives one alternative: Either there is absolutely no connection between the body and soul at any point whatever, or else the soul is, through the nerves, present to all the body. This means that the psychical is imminent in the physical.

Although the philosophical root was different, the emphasis on human experience by pragmatism was quite similar to the fundamental basis of the philosophical method, phenomenology. Drew A. Hyland points out the basic philosophical notion of phenomenology:

According to the phenomenologist, what needs to be explained is not some abstract notion of what a given phenomenon is in itself, but precisely the given phenomenon as it experienced, or as it appears.
Against the flow of human objectivity by scientific behaviorism since the emergence of materialism, phenomenologists and existentialists began to claim that man can be viewed as a subject rather than an object, and the body as being access to the world. They argued that experience is knowledge, experience takes on meaning and qualities which can't be explained by sensory data or by pure application of reason. For these reasons, they see the body as it appears, and they accept the body subject as it is experienced. This means that you are a being as an integration of your body and mind. This new insight for the mind-body problem could be a major philosophical foundation to argue that physical education is not a means to an end, but a being for itself. But the problem still remains. How can we prove our subjective experiences, objectively?

We cannot deny that objectivity has power in this society. If there is no justification of objectivity, a theory cannot be acceptable as a fact. This means, although we argue that physical education and sport is for the promotion of total educational values, our society sees physical education as a second class citizen in education,
until we can justify its objectivity. How can we overcome this situation? We don't have to blame this society because we are responsible for it. I believe that sport can be a possible medium to solve the mind-body problem practically, because it is not just pure physical and mental experience. We know, and we say that "sport is a mental activity" is an overstatement, but I strongly assert, to say that it is "a mindless physical activity" is probably an exaggeration of a truth. I believe that sport is a vivid and explicit combination of mental and physical activity as it is experienced. Thus, we can expect some moral education through sport. For these reasons, many physical educators usually supported the concept of "education through the physical" in physical education classes, but it still contains the specter of dualism.

Education Through the Physical

Since the emergence of the term "physical education", there have been two historical debates in this field: "Is physical education the education of the physical?" or "Is
physical education an education through the physical?" And, many physical educators are in agreement that the former concept is based on a dualistic view of mind and body, whereas the latter is based on a holistic view of man.

Perhaps, the first attack against our concept of physical education, "education of the physical", under the dualistic view of man, was launched by Jesse Feiring Williams, who suggested "education through the physical" is correct view. He argued, education that is simply "of the physical", or has a goal that focuses on only the physical aspects of education, is too limited in scope to be considered truly physical education. Rather, physical education is the biologic unity of mind and body. With the influence of pragmatism on the nature of human experience and its education, he attacked the old scholastic doctrine that separated mind from body:

Every human experience is a magnificent mixture. ...Experience is an interaction of the whole organism with its environment, ...experience cannot be purely physical or purely mental. Only the need for identification breaks experience into categories such as spiritual, mental, social, moral, intellectual, or physical. These are term of convenience and largely without reality."
Under this influence of pragmatism as a new attitude toward human nature, Williams could try to attack the traditional rank order that places the mental at the top and the physical at the bottom. This philosophy and concept of physical education has gradually gained acceptance and support among many physical educators that followed. But, the commitment to pragmatism's holistic view of man by physical educators did not result in its being put into practice. And, this was the beginning of the serious problem that we face today in this area.

Under the notion of "education through the physical," the first impression is that physical education became the means rather than the end. If physical education and sport experiences make no contribution to social and psychological needs, it should never be placed in our educational system. Thus, the goals of physical education and sport can be different by various social desires from group to group. It means that physical education and sport can be easy to exploit for ends other rather than its own sake. Christopher Lash argued that contemporary sport is being degraded and trivialized precisely by being turned into a vehicle for
education, the enhancement of business, and entertainment.

He pointed out;

Games quickly lose their charm when forced into the service of education, character development, or social improvement. Today the official view of the beneficial, wholesome effects of sport, which has placed the various utilitarian ideologies of the past, stresses their contribution to health, fitness, and hence to the national well-being, considered as the sum of the nation's human resources.¹²

Here, we should note that sport and physical education can be ruined when it becomes a vehicle for other social needs rather than its value in itself for its own sake. Dr. Lawrence F. Locke pointed,

We have used sport as an agent for less than noble motives. We have used sport as an agency of social control, cooling the hot urban ghettos in the summers of discontent. We have used sport as an instrument of chauvinistic national policy, extolling the virtues of free capitalism or democratic socialism. We have used sport as a vehicle for vacuous, moralizing pedagogy: boxing to build cooperative spirit; team games to build cooperative spirit; push-ups to build mythical muscle tone. We have used sport to bend children to the habits of conformity to rules and acquiescence to adult authority.¹³

We should recognize that people do not always agree, because each individual may have a different system of values. In some sport situations, for example, the value of playing by the rules often conflicts with the value of winning. It may cause difficulty in teaching moral values in
sport and physical education classes today. It is most important to recognize that when sport and physical education are used as a means to an end outside the realm of the activity itself, then authentic involvement is diminished and individual freedom and initiative denied. Through this denial the true existence of sport and ethics are lost. However, our dualistic and materialistic views of human nature forces us to understand sport and physical education as "a process through which an individual obtains optimal physical, mental, and social skills and fitness through physical activity." It has been established upon certain assumptions regarding the valuing of the end over the means. I don't argue that the definition of sport by dualists and materialists is morally wrong, I argue that their tradition gave credence to valuing and trusting only objective assessments and data over the information available through subjective assessments. And, I believe this tradition creates ethical difficulties as well as immorality in this society. Under the belief of "through the physical", we cannot expect that people could have a persistent, constant moral reasoning system, and we can
the responsibility of the recent immoral and unethical situation.

Summary

Sport philosophers seek answers for the questions of what sport is and why we should participate in sport. And, they have tried to get solutions from external factors rather than sport in itself. It created an ethical problem. When we decide what sport is, the true existence of sport is lost. So, today, many sport scholars insist on the importance of morality and spirituality in human beings within the sporting context. This does not mean a separate dichotomy of mind and body; rather, it means a metaphysical consideration of sport. Sport has value in itself for its own sake.
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CHAPTER V

TECHNOLOGY

AND

ITS CHALLENGE TO THE NATURE OF MAN AND SPORT

"In the morning, my alarm clock crows instead of the cock. And, my coffee maker and microwave oven start to prepare my breakfast. I don't have to go to the well, my shower helps me to recover from my last-night's fatigue. ...I don't have to spend a lot of time to work, my computer system finishes up my task in an hour. So, I go to the green to play golf with my friends. My graphite driver improves my tee shot and reduces the distance between second shot and the first hole. ...In the evening, my wife prepares a great dinner for me and my friends; and she doesn't worry about cleaning many dishes, because the dish washer runs good. ...I don't read a book to fall asleep, I take a sleeping pill every nights."

In fact, I don't know what technology is. I have never thought about the impact of technology on my life. When I
use the term "technology", I mean tools, machinery, or material systems. But, I can't live without technology, because technology is not just a material thing, it is a new type of culture. Nobody can deny that we live in a scientific and technological age. We believe that technology and science have played a major role in shaping our modern world. Only a few centuries ago, we (except for the native American) could not know the existence of this continent, America. Today, however, we can go anywhere in the world in only a few hours. We can go to other planets if we wanted to. Our technology and science creates a new world that we could never have experienced or imagined in the past. Moreover, our technology is advancing so quickly that often we are unaware of what we can do today. Now, no one leaves home without it.

Although science and technology have tremendously influenced the development of our modern world, we did not give them adequate attention. Dr. William D. Taylor pointed out our inadequate attitude toward the technological change in his article:
...Only a small percentage of our population engages in the critical discussion and study of technological change and its cumulative impact on our lives. The study of technological change has not been major part of the social dialogue, in large part because Americans accept this ideology of change as 'progress'. What drives our eagerness to transmute change into progress? One of the ideological engines is affluence: over the past two centuries the material abundance flowing from the technological cornucopia has eclipsed discussion of technology's dark side.

In fact, we equate technological change with human progress. For this reason, we accept everything in our technological changes, without reflecting on any value system. Finally, we believe in the notion that technology is value-free. This view of technology has dominated our modern society; and also, in modern sport, this tendency has a more powerful position than any other ideologies. Our society today, for example, has placed more emphasis on the development of technology and science, than on developing total human beings. Sport under societal influence becomes solely concentrated on the objectified treadmill images. This image is predominantly centered on the development and achievement of physical strength, power, motor skills, and technical efficiency, which are often called the scientific aspects of disciplines. Thus, it challenges the nature of sport, today.
In this chapter, I will analyze how technology influences moral values in sport, how technology creates ethical and dualistic problems in sport, and emphasizes the necessity for sport values in itself in order to understand what sport is and why we should participate in sport.

Technology and Its Relationship to Sport

Historically, many sports scholars did not mention the dark side of technology in the development of sports. They were always busy praising the contribution of technology to the development of modern sports. However, I believe that they have not adequately clarified the connection between the changing nature of technology and the changing nature of sport. They just examine the technological changes in the context of its end-products rather than 'process'. Hence, their works illustrate parallel developments-as technology became increasingly complex and developed, so did sport—but the causal relationships with our values are missing. For this reason, their studies about the relationship between sport and technology are more descriptions of what occurred
than a coherent explanation of how and why it occurred, or what it means. Many sport scholars, for example, have believed that our technology has reduced working hours, because human labor can be replaced with the appearance of robots. Therefore, sport scholars argue that technology increases free time so that workers can spend their leisure time on sport. In theory, this is true. But, we know that there is no difference in working hours between the past and the present. If there is a difference, we can say that the quality of work is changed. We don't have to dig a tunnel with hand tools, but we must control an excavator. The machine faster than man, but it doesn't reduce his working hours. So, we can reject the theory between the reduced working hour (an end-product of technology) and sport. I believe we need to see technological changes as processes in our values, in order to grasp a possible explanation for further research about the relationship between technology and sports.
Technology and Value

Before we discuss the effect of technology on modern sport, we have to consider whether or not technology is value-free. If our technology can not be limited by our value system, our further discussion may be meaningless. Philip L. Bereano argued that technology is inextricably connected with social values. He defined,

...Technology is for use. And every project, every enterprise in technology, has constantly to be judged in terms of the needs, and goals and aspirations of society.²

These relationships are not limited to modern society; their interrelationships go far back in our human history; even, to prehistoric times. Melvin Kranzberg states,

...for our human species probably could not have evolved or survived without the tools of technology. Our prehuman forebears were too weak and puny to fight nature with only their hands and teeth.³

In fact, if there were no human curiosity about the world and no desire to make it better, we could never see the sunlight today. Therefore, we can be aware that technology and our values have a long history that are intermeshed with one another, influencing our lives in many
different ways. Unfortunately, we fail to recognize these historical relationships and we give up our control to technology. We didn't reflect on our values and technological changes, but we are easily affected by the specter of technology. Dr. Philip L. Smith, in a critical responses to Kelly's technological sport world, warns us,

...it employs technology apart from vision and values. It assumes that the only important conditions of life are material, and that if we want revolution or 'progress' all we need do is find the right instruments. But technology only gives us the tools of revolt.

Sport and the Challenge of Technology

Although a serious warning about our obedient attitude toward technological change is raised by some, modern sports are eroded by technological affluence under the name of efficiency. William H. Freeman describes the situations of today's and tomorrow's young athletes:

The athletes may have their growth stimulated with steroids and human growth hormones, or they have their maturation retarded with other hormones in sports where smaller bodies are an advantage, such as women's gymnastics. The electrical muscle patterns of champion athletes will be recorded and used to stimulate the motor patterns of developing young athletes. Electrical stimulation will
enhance their muscular strength while they rest and as they train."

In fact, most athletes depend on technological innovations when they are participating in competitions. Instead of traditional practicing, they want to utilize more advanced technological instruments in their competitions and training. Today, more advanced technological instruments in sport guarantee their superiority in the races, because they are more efficient.

What is sport? In general, we have known that one of the most fundamental characters in our sport are the competitions between humans or humans and nature. And, player skills, powers, and strategies have been the central controlling factors in the outcome of competitions. This means, sports is a human activity. Nowadays, however, it cannot belong to competitions between humans or humans and nature, anymore. Rather, it falls under the game of technology. For example, we can picture the game of cycling: is it the race of humans or technology? After the invention of the disc-wheel in the cycling competition, there is no more human winner, the winner is only our technological
change. Technology makes the player passive and surrenders to a destiny where the outcome of the competition is beyond the control of the player. Finally, our unconditional acceptance of technology changes the nature of sport, from competition among humans to that among machines. Now, we must decide what the essential purpose of athletic contest is. Is it the measure of the best in human performance or the best use of technology under the stress of human competition? Furthermore, we have to make sure of why we participate in sports. I believe it is not just to prove our superiorities. There is something (enjoyment, friendship, humanity, self-achievement, and embodiment of mind/body, ... more than that). Winning is not everything, winning is just one of the fundamental experiences, along with losing, in sports. Under the search for efficiency by technology, however, our sports pursue only the winning. There is no losing. It does not mean there is no loser, it means the losing is nothing under the name of efficiency. Now, we have wonderful technological sports equipments and facilities, but we have lost sports, itself.
There is another challenge to the nature of sport. It is the change of the concept about mind and body in modern sports by our technological changes. We know how important the influence of the concept of mind/body on the development of sport is. And, the role and status of sport in our society has been culturally determined by the mind/body relationship. Now, many sports scholars believe that our technology offers an escape from the specter of Platonic dualism, because our technology seems to define the mind as the mass of nerve tissue (the brain). Thus, they argue that the body is considered to be integrated with the mind: it has value and esteem, and physical education and sports are harmoniously joined with intellectual activities in the fullest development of man's unique capacities and potentialities. But, our technology does not consider the relationship between the mind and the body as a unity. We are our bodies; there are no minds in our technology. Technology does not try to integrate the mind and the body as a whole; it deals with the human as one of corporeal
things in the world. Our technology explains that everything in the world is an aggregate of corporeal bodies, and anything which is not a body is not part of the universe. Our technology considers mental phenomena such as ideas, emotions, and motivations as a form of matter, because all of these things result in behavior which is observable and predictable. In short, man becomes a machine an object rather than a subject. Technology believes the body to be supreme; it seems to have a supportive implication for physical education and sports. I believe, however, we have become a machine to be used and measured objectively in sports. We have been taught and coached to respond to X stimuli with Y responses and not to question. In fact, our technology does overcome metaphysical dualism, it does destroy the hierarchy of the mind and body. However, technology also eliminates subjectivity. In spite of many scholars' expectations of the advocative role of technology in the development of sport, I believe that modern sport has become deterministic, mechanized, nonvalued, and in many respects, devoid of meaning.
Summary

We know that sport is indeed an arena where our ethical values are again and again exhibited, tested, and learned. This may be why sport (physical education) has so long been located in our schools. However, sport does not fulfill its educational objectives on our society in this technological age. Racism, sexism, the problem of over-emphasizing winning, and the abuse of drugs, all of these ethical issues are raised in sports. Particularly, the problem of abusing performance-enhancing drugs (technology) is a crucial issue in today's sport arena. Drew A. Hyland, sport philosopher, pointed out this ethically problematic situation related to the use of drugs in sport:

If there was universal agreement about the legitimacy of banning the use of performance-enhancing drugs, there would not be a serious ethical problem. ...The ethical problem arises because a number of voices have been raised against the legitimacy of banning their use. It has been argued that their banning is an unjust incursion into the right of athletes to do everything they can to enhance their ability.7

The problem is raised from the debate on the concept of fairness and the character of natural a athlete in sport. The "bannists" point out that the performance-enhances give
users an unfair advantage over non-users, who no longer have an equal chance to do well. Moreover, the use of performance-enhancing drugs changes the nature of the athlete and so disobeys the ideal of the sports competitions. A fair athletic contest is supposed to be among athletes who have naturally conditioned themselves to do their best. In short, they argue that drug users are not naturally, but artificially developed, and that changes the whole nature of the sport competition. However, there is also an objection of the ban. Some scholars argue that a game is fair if everyone involved follows the rules. If we extend the notion of fairness to include equality or even equal steps taken to train, things become ludicrous. They ask what a natural person and the ideal of a sports contest is. They point out athletes, especially world-class, are already abnormal, and that the very idea of most games is to test inequalities.

Our technology creates these ethically problematic situations in sports. Now, I recall, some scholars argue that technology is a branch of moral philosophy, not of science. Who can give up his Gold medal? I believe we can
never answer this ethical issue until we give up our technology. But, "everyone lampoons modern technological society but no one is prepared to give up his refrigerator."8
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CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION:
THE ETHICAL RESPONSIBILITIES OF SPORT IN SOCIETY

Many of the problems identified in the previous chapters on sport focused on what we might call "areas of ethics and morality." Clearly, many of these crises point directly to questions of values in this society, because the values in sport are at least in part a reflection of the values of society in which sport takes place. Drew A. Hyland, for example, says that

A sport culture which emphasizes such values as teamwork, self-discipline, willingness to sacrifice personal glory for the benefit of the team, or the importance of sustained training, clearly tells us something about the cultural values, the cultural needs, of the society in which those sports take place. But this is no less true if the sport values include unquestioning obedience to authority, willingness to hurt others in pursuit of a goal, to lie, cheat, intimidate, and to risk the ruin of one's physical health.

Here, we can get a confident answer to the question, "What is the importance of sports in contemporary society
Many sport scholars have argued that sport always plays a significant role in the cultural life of most societies. Nevertheless, one could not completely answer why this is. But if the values present in the sport world are a reflection of the values of society, it is plausible to infer that sports can and do teach those values to their participants. This means that sports have a strong responsibility for ethics in this society. Thus, the present chapter will focus on the relationship between the morality of sport and the values in society; How do they relate? What is the inner logic forced into contemporary sport?

**Competitive Sports and Society**

The first theme we will take up bears directly on the relationship between the values of sport and that of society. As indicated earlier, it is clear to nearly everyone that, in both a good and bad sense, the values in sport are at least in part a reflection of the values of the society in which the sports take place. Sport sociologist,
D. Stanley Eitzen, suggests that we can understand societies by the sports they play. He says:

Sport is a microcosm of society. If we know how sport is organized, the type of games played, the way winners and losers are treated, the type and amount of compensation given the participants, and the way rules are enforced, then we surely also know a great deal about the larger society in which it exists. Conversely, if we know the values of a society, the type of economy, the way minority groups are treated, and the political structure, then we would also have important clues about how sport in that society would be organized.

As a result of this argument, there emerges the simple view that sport is a reflection or mirror of society. The United States of America, for example, is a capitalistic society. Competition is an essential and irreducible character of capitalism. Sports are a reflection of the values inherent in a given society. So, competitive sports are praised in American society. The order of movement here seems to be as follows: First, sport is a reflection of the values in society. That is, the values that sports exhibit are not inherent in sport as sport, but are reflections of values that originate in society. Second, sports teach those values, not their own values. Through the sporting context, those values are carried back into the society from which
they originate. This view of sports, are often supported by enthusiasts who praise sports for their capacity to teach the values of teamwork, self-discipline, and fair play, will be useful in the context of life itself. The exact same structure, however, is assumed by the harshest critics of competitive sport. This approach to analyze the relationship between sport and society cannot avoid the Marxian critique of competitive sport. Drew A. Hyland pointed out,

The Marxian critique of sport is founded on the argument, crucial to their analysis of capitalism, that competition is inherently alienating, that competition is an essential and irreducible component of capitalism, and therefore that to get rid of alienation one must abolish capitalism. On this argument, the competitive aspect of sport makes it inherently alienating. There is no way to save competitive sport from its alienating consequence, and the only way to resolve the problem is to abolish competitive sport.

But, the appeal of competitive sports, and of the emphasis on winning, is obvious in our most competitive capitalist societies. Today, who can imagine non-competitive games, where there is no issue of winning or losing? Many liberal scholars have tried to develop a new style of non-competitive sports that emphasized the spirit of cooperation. For better or worse, however, most of these new
Games died as fast as they were born. Moreover, they were transformed into a highly competitive form. We know that there is a problem of alienation in competitive athletics and that those values in sport somehow originate in society. Yet we also know that we seem to have no will to solve the problem of alienation by eliminating competitive sport. This is made clear by their failure to achieve great popularity when winning is not an issue. If so, how can we handle the problem of competitive sports today? I believe, first of all, we need to get rid of a simple view of sport, that it is a reflection of society. Christopher Lasch argued that the values in sport are not just a reflection of society, and has also intrinsic values of its own. He said,

The mirror theory of sport, like all reductionist interpretations of culture, makes no allowance for the autonomy of cultural traditions. In sport, these traditions come down from one generation of players to others, and although athletics do reflect social values, they can never be assimilated to those values. Indeed they resist assimilation more effectively than many other activities, since games learned in youth exert their own demands and inspire loyalty to the game itself, rather than to the programs ideologues seek to impose on them.

It is very important to recognize that the values of sport cannot be completely assimilated to those of society.
This means that change in sport is not just a natural by-product of societal change. For example, there are some fundamental differences between competition in sport and that of life in society. First, sport competition is limited by time and place. But in society, it is limitless. In the case of basketball, the goal is made by players only during the playing time and place. But the sale of computers is possible anytime and anywhere. Second, competitive sport is based on equality, but society is not. Every game starts, zero to zero, but life in society does not. Lastly, competitive sport can be defined by its rules, but the laws cannot define society. We can understand baseball by its rules, but it is most difficult to know society by its laws. We can expect to know how athletes play baseball through the rule book, but we cannot imagine how people act in society by its code of laws. This means that competition in sport is possible to control but that in society it is difficult. Competition in sport does not mean the struggle of society, it is more rules defined and implies a greater degree of equality between willing opponents. In competitive sport, the desire to win can lead one to try to do one's best. In
so doing, one realizes that a consequence will be that one's opponent will lose. But that is a derivative phenomenon of trying to do one's best. Sport does not cause alienation; it decides just the winner and loser, and both are all essential components of competitive sport. Alienation is caused when winning becomes not just an issue of pride in one's ability, but carries with it some reflections of society. It should be noted that sport obviously contains some values which are not merely derived from society, and its own ideology of sport is ruined when sport is forced into the service of societal reflection. This means that sport can be affected by certain values derived from society, but since these defects are not inherent to sport itself, they could be eliminated from sport, thus not only preserving but enhancing sport itself. Therefore, we don't have to abolish competitive sport in contemporary society, although we live in a highly competitive society. If there is a problem, we can reform it. If so, how can we handle the challenge of technology in sport today?
Society has changed considerably in recent decades with the tremendous development of science and technology. Moreover, we celebrate the advance of technology and science insofar as they progressively release us from the burden of labor and open us to a free and potentially joyous life of play. But as indicated earlier, this may be one reason why many sport scholars have not adequately clarified the connection between the changing nature of society within the development of technology and the changing nature of sport. We need to see the inner logic and pattern of how technology and science affects the change of sport in contemporary society.

No one can deny that a great deal of human capital is spent daily on sport in modern society. The significance of sport lies in the change in the nature of work patterns in social relations with the development of technology and science. Max Horkheimer emphasized the change of daily work in discussing why the importance of sport is increased in modern society. He said:
...one reason lies in the change of daily work: industrialization, motorization, automatization demand of the average man more preciseness, more trustworthiness, more ability to change from one assignment to another, more patience, but less spontaneity, less personal interest, less physical effort. 

In fact, the importance of sport in this technological society lies so much in its value as a means of recreation, education, and physical fitness. But why? More specifically, what is there about human beings, which views sport as having significant value? This is not a simple question. Before we answer it, we need first to study how technology impacts on the changing view of man in this society.

There are two main streams of technological influence on the changing view of man in modern sport. First, one has a direct relationship between technology and man in sport. The other has influenced the nature of man indirectly in sport. In the case of direct relations, technology breaks the traditional importance of individuals' identity in society. A technological society forces individuals to have a feeling that they can be interchangeable with each other. Through the standardized ways of life by technology, every man and woman has been educated under the same code. People are assimilated into the same work patterns with big
factories, and they are faced with the same information. In the technological culture, man as well as goods have been standardized. The technological and scientific process views human beings as objects, or interchangeable parts, that can be manipulated. Under this materialistic interpretation of human beings, finally, we can't avoid to allow product-maximizing decisions to take precedence over human considerations in the sport realm. So, athletes are treated like machines or instruments that are used to produce victories. Perhaps, the unsuccessful players might be eliminated or replaced like the defective parts of a machine. Individual athletes, imbued with the technological image of man, are often presented with difficult ethical choices in competitive sport. They often see themselves as warriors, and their effort to win translates into the desire to beat someone. They treat members of the opposing team not as fellow human beings and athletes, but as enemies— as objects to be defeated without respect or regard for their right as human beings. It is hardly surprising that such an unethical desire generates some of the worst images of man in technological sport. As our athletic rhetoric so often
puts it, "to destroy them, to humiliate them, and to kill our opponents." This is the beginning of unethical consequences in technological sport today, the "dehumanization of athletes".

Second, the relationship between technology and sport is more complex. On the anthropological consequences of scientific sport, John M. Hoberman emphasized the performance principle of sport through the ideology of science and technology. He pointed out:

First, the fantastic success of modern sport as a form of culture and, second, the inner logic that constitutes its driving force, which Mr. von Weizacker equates with the Olympic motto "citius, fortius, altius." This inner law of sport, he states, this constant comparative process, constitutes the dynamic and fascination of sport. It is an expression of the dynamic character of Western civilization which, through science and technology, has given shape to world civilization as we know it. The fundamental law of this civilization is the performance principle, which is linked in turn to the idea of virtually endless progress. The charisma of sport grows directly out of its promise of limitless performance, and here is where the trouble begins.

The problem is that, whereas science and technology can be progressively transformed, the human body cannot. In this technological society, however, modern high-performance sport demands bigger, faster, and stronger athletes. Despite the sacrosanctity of human limits, athletes, as a machine,
have been increasingly shaped by a technological order over the conflict with our most basic ideas of what a human being should be. It is not surprising that specific body-types are developed for specific sports by chemical or even genetic manipulations. Under this materialistic interpretation of human beings, athletes have become laboratory specimens whose structure and potential can often be measured in precise quantitative terms. Finally, the pursuit of limitless performance comes into conflict with the dignity of man. Indeed, we can deny that the inner logic of science and technology might be one of the ideological engines for the fantastic success of modern sports but its worldwide success does not release sport from the obligation to examine its own deepest moral premises. It should be noted that technology has not taken athletes as human beings. And today, athletes are to exist only as a machine.
Sport, Man, and Ethics

It is true that the changes in the characterization of the nature of man has been an influence on ethics in sport. And, since we have studied those relations, we fail to examine how sport influences the ethics of man. We have to recognize the ethical responsibilities of sport in society. Sport seems sometimes to fail us, not because of what it is, but because of what we have asked it to become. Sport has its roots in man, not in body or mind. Sport is not a tool or an instrument, a vehicle to expropriate for ends. The question of what it is, is irrelevant because sport is human experience. Sporting experiences can give a new insight into man and ethics. We must keep man in sport as a human being, not as a machine.
FOOTNOTES
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