

PHILOSOPHY

ANDRZEJ PAWLUCKI

University School of Physical Education in Wrocław (Poland)

Contact e-mail: asp48@wp.pl

Sport as an Equal Opportunities Utopia

Submission: 12.11.2015; acceptance: 22.11.2015

Key words: sport, morality, fairness, fair play, moral relativism

Abstract

Background. Relevance of the research. This paper attempts to consider fairness in athletes in the context of the philosophy of sport. It is a non-empirical study in which a causal model of the pursuance of sporting utopia is discussed. Recent cases where the ontic order of sport has been broken by sprinters and swimmers, and the current case of Russian athletes (who have violated the rules of proper conduct in their personal lives), show how easily the state of a sports anti-utopia can be reached. The aim of the study is to explain the key *rationis sufficientis* and *causa* to achieve a sports utopia.

Research methods and organization. By using regressive deduction, reaching back to primary metaphysical premises, it explains the key reasons for achieving a sports utopia.

Results and discussion. The applied regressive reasoning model reveals that the success of a sports utopia as a variety of social utopia, is determined by authoritative judges managing the common good of the sports family. There is a reason why the sporting community is referred to as the sports *family*. Maintaining familial relationships is, in itself a utopia, i.e. a daunting but feasible task. And although the hopes of every family, as with the "sports family", are its children, only the adult family members – capable of assuming responsibility for the common good – can maintain order in the family and render all its activities sensible. Similarly, the successful organization of competitions in the sports family, aiming at perfection according to the family's ideals, is only possible if competitive order is preserved by: a) judge-categorizers responsible for maintaining sexual-somatic equality; b) judge-classifiers responsible for ontic equality (extra-sexual physicality) of the gymnasium (gym) ascetics; c) judge-exposers responsible for revealing the ontic inequalities of doping abusers; and d) judge-moderators responsible for ensuring moral equality between competitors. In the discussed causal model I did not initially identify that a "new child" had entered the sports social system – a child born into a world of liberal usurpation, with whom the establishment of a familial relationship regarding freedom, morality, ideals and authority would be very difficult. I had not thought about this which it appears is key to understanding the cause of the failure of sports competition in humanistic terms, i.e. the cause of the deconstruction of the sports utopia.

Conclusion. If it had not been for these judges' authoritative enforcement of moral and ontic equality among athletes, (without diminishing athletes' contributions to the creation of fair competition) it could be assumed that liberally, relativistically and individualistically disposed athletes would not have been able to tackle their humanistic tasks by themselves.

Introduction

The recent cases of violation of the ontic order by sprinters, who deceived themselves, their opponents and the stadium community, and by swimmers, who are allegedly members of the Olympic family, and play "nice children from good families" in daylight, but then at night, show their true faces by attending houses of ill repute seeking filthy entertainment all show how easily the sports order can be destroyed. Those who are unfair in their personal life will not seek decency in their sports life, even if there were some authorized *code of fair conduct* setting out the pathway through the gate of agonistic competition, and threatening exclusion from the stadium community for misconduct.

These and many other cases of athletes' violation of the norms of self-respect (that are, in fact, more numerous than evidenced in official reports of anti-doping bodies and law enforcement agencies), raise a serious question about the moral validity of sports competition and about the prospects of sport as a utopia of social justice. Sport theorists, who seek sociological explanations for the achievement of the common good by the *stadium community*, must look into the nature of these developments. It is highly probable that athletes themselves, who have experienced the liberal vulgarity of social (dis)order in childhood, and succumbed to the temptation of breaking the norms of law, and mocking ideals and authorities, have no interest in such misconduct. In any case, their sporting achievements, i.e. achieving the sta-

tus of first among equals, do not depend directly on the athletes themselves. Who else stands behind this success? One may ask naively, how it is possible that these “mature children”, audacious in their liberal usurpations and betraying moral values, are granted the honor of taking part in the feast of the fair ones. No child is ever an emanation of moral evil. Evil is the deeds a child sees in adults. The expectation that joining the sports community would change the fixed moral habits of “children of liberal freedom” in pursuance of some rigor of sports law, finds no confirmation in the psychological laws of internalization of values and norms.

The sports community has always been highly conservative. It has been known from the various fields of confrontation between ideologues and ethicists that the most formidable enemy of conservative social orders are liberals who praise the superiority of individualized life without obligations or moral aspirations. The ideologues of liberal-democratic social systems do not have to encroach upon sport. All they can do is to arrange a space of unconstrained cavorting outside the stadium, and ensure that participants in “autonomic” life will reach eternal happiness without any responsibility for others.

In confronting the ideology of unconstrained celebration of difference and diversity, the conservative utopia of sports competition assuming rigorous moral equality for everyone may not persist. Who wishes to comply with the sports law of passage through the narrow gate of constraints of actions, when with the consent of managers of marketed fun one may pass through a much wider gate to an easy life [*cf.* Matthew 7: 13-14].

How can sport become a utopia of the fair ones, when the *liberals* in the stadium, who are unable even to control themselves intellectually in the sense of their sports destiny, may not contribute to sport *autopoiesis* following the principle of joint responsibility for the common good. The social system of sport culture is self-reproductive. It replicates norms, patterns and ideals, and it sustains itself through responsible moderators of cultural self-determination such as the intellectual and spiritual leaders of sport, scholars and scientists, experts and moralizers, activists and judges, trainers and tutors and finally sport educators and their students. All of them assume their designated roles and positions: competitors, organizers, volunteers and fans. In their roles and positions they fulfill their tasks properly by animating the social system of the stadium for themselves, realizing the stadium’s inherent good and experiencing their self-fulfillment. By contributing to the system, they contribute to the order inscribed in their collective memory as a thought about themselves, i.e. the culture of the stadium community. The *autopoietic* existence of the social system of sport culture is undoubtedly its metaphysical peculiarity or even a mystery. One may ask how the self-reconstruction of this social being is possible at all, following its inherent sense experienced by the system’s participants as the

attainment of the highest good measured with humanistic ideals. This question is a valid one since athletes, being the authors of their deeds, are unable (though not all of them) to achieve the personal potential of humanity while developing their physical being, i.e. the simplest way of training their natural potential. An individualist who is willing to elevate himself above others is not able, due to their selfishness, to attain the common good. Thus they may not take part in the mysteries of sport *autopoiesis*, following the rules of participation in the *stadium culture*.

Is it then possible at all for the *sports stadium community* to persist in conviction about sports competition becoming a social utopia of the fair, if athletes who usurp their participation in this community are not able to meet the requirements of fair conduct? This is especially the case of those who adhere more to moral relativism than to the conservatism of good customs.

Hypothesis

In a confrontation with the ideology of unconstrained celebration of diversity, the conservative utopia of sports competition, rigorously assuming the moral equality of all, guards its good with the aid of judge-guardians of the ontic order (categorizers, classifiers and exposers) and of the moral order (moderators). Without judges sports competition is never an equal opportunities utopia.

Regressive deduction: knowing the causes of sports competition utopia

I intend to discuss the causes of sports competition utopia by way of regressive deduction. The assumed causal model of becoming a sports utopia is the explanation of the original metaphysical premises, i.e. the key reasons (X) for a utopia. What are these premises whose outcomes are an observable phenomenon called the sports competition utopia (Y)? The reasons for this phenomenon constitute its hypothetical explanation.

Sexual duality

The first premise is that natural heterosexuality is a determinant of the hetero-culturality of sport manifested by the independence of women’s and men’s sports. According to this premise the reason for a sports situation is a substantive, physical and sexual, difference between men and women. It is essential and imperturbable. In competition practice this difference determines the organization of two independent social orders, which despite their ontic variability, remain axiologically identical, i.e. are substantiated by the same ideal. Although

men and women possess the same nature, i.e. they are essentially identical as *similes*, and the same dignity, they possess different sex traits (chromosomal, genetic, gonadal, hormonal and somatic) and are quantitatively unequal. Due to these sexual-physical differences, called ontic differences, men and women create sports situations independently of each other, ensuring equal access to primacy in sport. The fair selection of male and female top athletes requires physical equality and thus sexual equality. Sports culture must divide the world of sport into feminine and masculine categories, each radically homogenous. Physical and sexual hybrids within each category render the competition unequal.

When sexuality is recognized somatically, but is altered through an arbitrary re-definition, a deception occurs in the world of sport. Sport as a contest between two unequal sex categories loses its humanistic value. Thus, if sport is to be fair, it must be conditioned by athletes' heterosexuality in both sex categories

Judge-categorizers: the guardian of equality of the sexes

The guardian of sexual equality is the judge-categorizer, who describes the somatic sex by establishing its qualitative denomination. The judge-categorizer uses the qualitative variable: man – woman. The judge-categorizer does not describe the genetic, gonadal, hormonal or psychical sex. The difference in somatic sex is the metaphysical reason for the duality of the sport community. Sport does not take place when its metaphysical reason is rejected. Without the categorizer, there is no sport.

Extra-sexual duality

Thus the categorical duality of the sexes is an ontic reason for sports competition. The duality also goes beyond sexual physicality, in which the *substantia corporea* is manifested differently in men and women.

The second premise is that the social system of the physical culture of sport with its bipolarity of categorical differences between male and female ascetics, makes both groups of gym participants ontically equal before they enter their roles of sport performers. All gym participants are equal in terms of their physical characteristics, as all of them, pursuant to sex category, are assigned procedures for bodily refinement, taking account of their ontogenetic age. The ontologically equal male and female ascetics of the gym acquire the same chances of access to the highest good of sport, i.e. victory, thanks to bipolarization as already mentioned. Ontic equality creates sports equality. Ontic equality signals sports fairness as it ensures everyone equal access to the most coveted sports good: the experience of reaching the top. When

all participants leave the gym, convinced of their ontic equality (by category), to enter sports competitions, the judge-moderator (as the highest guardian of stadium fairness) is entitled to announce that sport fairness has been potentially complied with, even though the sport competition has not begun yet.

Judge-categorizers establish the foundations of people's professions, before sport competitions. They give each participant an equal right to win. Before athletes are set at variance they take part in a parade of ontic equality. They are divided into categories and classes, to make themselves equal sexually both in terms of gender and substantively. They are also divided into categories of personal and performance development as well as into classes and subclasses of somatic deficits and motor dysfunctions. Knowingly or unknowingly, they have taken part in the creation of the order of sport fairness before they enter the competition. As ontical equals in competition, they can attain all good being their natural properties: spirituality, reason and physicality, and bring out all they have acquired and perfected in order to tower over this equality in possessing the exceptional status of top athlete, i.e. the first among equals.

Thanks to the categorizers, the extra-somatic bodies of ascetics also become ontically equal, which means that all the athletes enjoy equal chances of victory. Ontic equality generates sports equality and is a manifestation of sports fairness. Thanks to the judge-categorizers the requirement for fairness in sport is potentially satisfied.

These two premises precede the discussion of causes of sport as a utopian competition of equal opportunities. It is a utopia which is paradoxically a platform to celebrate diversity as well as to redress social inequalities, and in some other cases, for their reproduction and preservation. Although a sport competition is a mixture of highly explosive components, quite unexpectedly, the entire energy of competition relations is utilized in a self-developing system of fulfilling the humanistic ideal. When it appears that conflict in sport is inevitable and when the different and the unequal come to meet one another, there is peace. Sport as a system of living for the moment reaches its ideal: the different ones discover they are at least equal in their humanity, or rather assume they are those who respect their own moral dignity.

Both metaphysical premises enable regressive deduction. The first, assuming the indispensability of the heterosexual order in the practice of sport leads us to postulate (self) elimination of intra-sport homosexuality (of homosexual women in women's sport and homosexual men in men's sport) and to postulate inter-sport homosexuality (of women in men's sport and men in women's sport). If a sporting situation is to be fair athletes in both categories must be heterosexual. I should add here I am not aiming at any segregation or discrimination.

In its metaphysical nature sport is a relational, one-sided, unequal being. When subjects in a sports relationship are not equal to each other, for example, in their level of fitness, a less fit or disabled person will be deprived of the chance of victory. When someone loses they either relinquish their participation in the competition or decide to seek opportunities to win among equals.¹ This is how sport for physically and intellectually disabled people was developed in parallel to sport for the able-bodied, i.e. in the metaphysical sense, athletes *compete* in their existence and function.

Why is this differentiation so important? It must be maintained to ensure the fairest selection of the best top athletes in their genetic category. Competitors must be physically and thus sexually equal to one another in the somatic, genetic, gonadal and hormonal sense. Female athletes must be genetically feminine, while male athletes must be genetically masculine. To do justice in sport, the culture of sport must involve the division of the world into radically homogenous feminine and masculine categories.

Heterosexual women's sport must be organized in a homogenous way (within its own category) as the "world of women's sport". In the same way men's sport must be organized in such a way as to affirm homogenous masculinity. Genetic hybrids within each of these categories, or permeating, by subterfuge or due to ignorance, into the world of the opposite sex, make the sport competition unequal (in terms of opportunities of victory) or even absurd. They themselves become exposed to moral stigmatization. One may not know

¹ This appears to be the hidden reason (explained only metaphysically) why homo-sexual athletes organize independent sports games and competitions within their own sex category. Is this not the reason why men who declare themselves homosexual take part in these competitions because only within their category can they find themselves among equals? In the radically masculine sport of heterosexual men, homosexual athletes might be unequal, or even worse in sport. This can be illustrated by a football tournament of homosexual players I witnessed during the Second World Congress of the International Sociology of Sport Association that took place on June 18-21, 2003 in Cologne, Germany. Other examples only seemingly refute this supposition. For instance, a homosexual man (in a gay relationship) wins a sport event against heterosexual competitors. In his relationship, however, he assumes the male sex. He is therefore a man type in a relationship with a man as a "woman". He possesses all recognized gonadal, hormonal and genetic properties of the male sex. Thus he meets the condition of heterosexuality in men's sport, although he defines his gender differently. His partner, i.e. the female type in the gay relationship, would not stand a chance in access to primacy in men's sport. Women do not compete against men, even when their primary sex traits may suggest they represent the male type.

that an individual may be a man or a woman (gonadally, genetically and hormonally) since the sex may not be manifested by somatic appendages recognized by the brain and the senses. However, when sexuality is recognized somatically, but is still falsified as it becomes re-defined, and a deception in the world of sport occurs, e.g. the case of Stanislaw Walasiewicz. Sport as a competition of unequal competitors (within the same genetic category) loses its humanistic significance². Genetic hybrids destroy the axio-normative order of the world of sport in the way physically disabled athletes, who are wrongly categorized by judges or who put themselves into a category they do not belong to, stake out their claim to primacy, often in a forceful and arrogant manner (e.g. Oscar Pistorius)³.

By assuming that a human being can be of female or male nature due to physical differences I would like to point to a particular fact, even though it sounds like a platitude. Without a society created by men and women, with its dual system of physical culture legitimizing the bodily values of men and women separately, there are no sociologists (of physical culture). Similarly, without carbon there are no physicists.⁴ Thanks to sociologists who reveal the existence of the system of physical culture we can accept this assumption. We know at the same time that sociologists themselves are unable to explain the origins of this system but must seek the assistance of metaphysicians. A sociologist would have never discovered sport (men's and women's) without a sport community as a relational entity preserved for generations thanks to parents of different sex and permanent socialization: primary (family) and secondary (school, stadium).

Why is this platitude so important? According to Heller, in 1961 Robert Dicke observed in his article in *Nature* "that carbon, as we know it today, is formed inside stars as a result of multiple burning of the nuclear fuel. When stars die, a human being, i.e. a *Homo sapiens*, emerges in a cycle of changes from carbon (and from other elements heavier than hydrogen and helium). Physicists and astrophysicists have discovered that carbon may have been formed 10⁴⁰ natural time units ago. Before that time we could not have existed since our building material had not been there yet". [Heller 2012: 106-107]

² On sports of gays and lesbians see: [Liponski 2012: 654-658].

³ The classifiers in the sports for the disabled do everything to ensure equal participation of individuals with all kinds of disabilities in the sport agon. When the creation of classes of physically equal athletes is not possible, than they take part in non-competitive contests in which each participant becomes the winner. This can be illustrated by the shot put event during the London Paralympics in 2012, when 17 gold medals were awarded to all the participants. One may say that each competitor at Paralympic Games wins, the ideal of sport family is fully accomplished in sports for the disabled.

⁴ Analogy after M. Heller.

As for sociologists a similar "platitude" can be stated: sociologists cannot be formed without a society that is "born" from humans of two sexes: men and women. Without the death of stars there is no carbon, and without carbon there are no humans. There is no offspring then without individuals with their "assigned" sexuality, i.e. without parental relations. And human offspring are always born from man and woman (mother and father), who are equal to each other in the origin of their physicality, but differ in their sexuality. Without generations of human beings, there is no society, i.e. a relational entity, self-conscious of its destiny and displaying the ability of cultural self-reproduction (*autopoiesis*). Without this self-determination due to heterosexual relations between man and woman, there is no society in which its heterogeneous members can experience cultural replications of patterns, norms and ideals being the sources of their personal and communal identity. Without the sexual differentiation of humans, society and culture (as self-aware entities) would have never been formed, and no self-conscious being would have acquired its identity. Without human sexual differentiation, humanity or society would not have developed in the universe. Each society starts from man and woman, and each society ceases to exist, if in an inter-generational perspective, for some reason, there is no father or mother or neither.

The heterosexuality of the human body is a metaphysical principle of social reality. If it is morally and legally protected (as a determinant of the creation of the common good thanks to which society can transfer its cultural values and content to future generations) it is recognized by society as the highest fundamental good. At the same time physicality and its inherent heterosexuality are substantive conditions of social life. The heterosexual human being, who is responsible for this common good and who respects the natural order and emphasizes its ontic significance in the *logos* of natural law, casts a cognitive anchor to secure their attachment to their cultural ideal. The self-control of the heterosexual being is on all accounts conservative as it involves responsibility for the good of others, from which a society, understood as a network of personal relations, can emerge. Thanks to this commitment to the common good, heterosexual people can transfer their being onto others and ensure their presence in cultural heritage. They can also assert that their successors will be safely anchored in this ideal. Moreover, the benefits of this self-controlled freedom (for the community) is momentous as, thanks to it, human beings can become good people thanks to the opening to the existential good of others. Those who live for the benefit of others become people and, by contributing to the common good, co-create society, i.e. a relational entity, which is sexually and thus physically polarized.

Men's and women's gyms

Human beings are not only male or female, as manifested by their biological traits. They also affirm their sexuality in their reproductive fitness to enhance their vitality, health and reproductive purity. In this way human beings establish a diverse pattern of physical culture accounting for the nature of the male and female sexes and thus, for male and female physicality. They establish two different norms for the same, biotic, vital (health-providing) pattern of physicality accounting for physical differences between men and women. In the gymnasium of biotic-vital fitness they establish programmes of male and female physical culture, which are inspired and developed at school in co-educational or, more often, single-sex classes. In the practice of biotic fitness, men and women take part in educational programmes independently of each other, which has not yet led to a special spatial identification of separate male and female gyms. Although men and women are equal in their human nature, because of their natural differences they must master their biotic and vital fitness in different ways in order to develop their vitality and health. This differentiation leads to a division of many social roles into "feminine" and "masculine" and, in particular, to a division of competition roles in which different physical competences determine sports victory. When the competitor's physical competences are recognized (somatically, gonadally, genetically and hormonally) and categorized into male and female, the ontic requirement of differentiation of training and competitive sport into masculine and feminine is fulfilled.

Certainly, the very fact of being a man or a woman does not impose the necessity of having two categories of heterosexual sport. Sport is a product of culture, not nature. The sexual nature of competitors is the ontic determinant of the cultural existence of sport, but never its cause. Thus when sport emerges as a) a ludic event, i.e. recreation for the working community; or b) a redeeming event, i.e. as the Olympic movement of the global community against evil and for the good of peace and love, it must be split into two sexual categories. In fact, two worlds of sport must emerge: women's sport and men's sport. And, even if we had only had sport for men (as desired by Pierre de Coubertin) emancipated women demanding equal rights and defying the world of male tyranny would have led to the development of sport for women. They could not break into men's sport in the past, not only because the gates of the stadium were shut to them (in ancient Greece with its male homosexual tyranny, and in England and France with their haughty, patriarchal aristocrats being the sole "owners" of social order). Even if they had managed to crash the gates open they would have been in a losing position in any competition against men. The competition in which physicality determines the result of the social relation between the two sides, demands categorical equality

from both sides. And since men and women are not equal to each other within the same category as physical beings, they cannot enter the sport competition in a bilateral, mutual relationship because they cannot meet the demand successfully. No goodwill act will ever change the ontic status of competitors representing different categories. In the chess competition while it is non-physical qualities of the competitors which decide victory, and this bilateral relationship may be possible, in the *gymnic agon* (to use a more appropriate ancient Greek term) this is unacceptable. Women do not challenge men to compete with them in sport, while men should not express their hubris to demand satisfaction in a competition with women. A man should know that physical competition against a person of a different sex category (one may say weaker, category) will never prove his primacy among others. When others do not count as they do not equal with the top one (as well as represent another category), and provided the top one does not suffer from delusions about his greatness, he will not find respect in his self-perception. An competitor of sound mind will seek confirmation of his aspirations to primacy by entering an equal relation with others within his category: men among men, and women among women. When a *sport* relationship takes place between a man and a woman, e.g. the famous tennis Battle of the Sexes between Billie Jean King and Bobby Riggs won by the woman, it is for non-sporting reasons [cf. Liponski 2012: 684-685]. That tennis match was a scene of symbolic humiliation for the arrogant male part of the human race, when in front of a stadium audience – enlarged by the television broadcast – a desperate defence of woman's dignity took place in a non-lethal duel. By its nature, sport cannot stand a *sex mix*. This should not be confused with tennis mixed doubles competitions in which sexuality (as a media variable of the causal model of the competition) becomes ontically neutralized. When sport becomes a relationship between two unequal subjects, i.e. a man and a woman unequal in their natural physical fitness, it is made through some extra-sport force which makes both sides first confront each other and then leads to the victory of the weak one over the stronger one.

Manipulation of the sexes: a sports deception

A different case is homosexual or transsexual individuals, who have experienced a deficit of reproductive fitness for some reason, and who profess themselves to be men, women, or both. When due to the cultural “bewitchment” of one's sexuality or due to its bio-technical inversion, a homosexual human being enters a heterosexual sport circle in his or her category (a woman entering a women's sport, a man entering a men's sport) or the category of the opposite sex (a woman entering a men's sport, a man entering a women's sport), they make himself/

herself ontically unequal to a heterosexual competitor and therefore violate the principle of equality of opportunities which are fundamental to the causal model of sport competition. It is not really important whether a homosexual female competitor who fights for predominance in the world of women's sport, starts competing from a losing position at her own request; while a man who impersonates femininity and “sneaks into” women's heterosexual sport can proclaim his victory at the very start of the competition. In both cases the moral order of sport competition is violated, i.e. the axiological situation of sport becomes destroyed. When there is deception, i.e. sex manipulation, sport is no longer fair. Sport is, in fact, a simple normative system in which morally equal competitors (equalized earlier by judge-classifiers into their respective sex and age categories) compete against one another for victory in a game for primacy among equals. Individuals who cause *sex* inequality, spoil the fun of the game. Disillusioned spectators would condemn them for their deception, while judge-classifiers – being the guardians of equal access to the common good of sport – would *arbitrarily* exclude the deceivers from the community of fair competitors.

Extra-sexual physicality in sport

The *geneonomic* purity of femininity and masculinity is an ontic condition of competition, in the world of men's and women's sport, independently. It is not, however, the only condition “directed” by the *logos* of the causal model of sport towards the physicality of male and female competitors. This condition also applies to extra-sexual physicality, in which the *substantia corporea* is manifested differently in men and women by its substantive qualities (osteoarticular, muscular, cardiopulmonary systems) and functional qualities (biochemical and physiological states and processes, and motor fitness). Corporeal masculinity and femininity are manifested fully by primary sexual traits, but they are mostly visible and recognized dimorphically in internal states (different habitus) and actions (operational habitus). The extra-sexual physicality of both categories differs naturally and is equally susceptible to external changes resulting from intentionally repeated self-actions aimed at the development of the capabilities of the mind and the body. Here I specifically mean sports training, i.e. the constant perfecting by competitors of their existence and performance, and by optimally loaded exercises leading to the transformation of muscles, bones, and joints and to the perfection of tissues, cells and the functioning of all bodily systems, in particular cardiovascular and respiratory capacities. All this leads to the extreme masculinization (often pathological degeneration) of the male competitor's body and, in some sports, to a pathological decomposition of the female competitor's body, e.g. in male and female body

builders. Despite these deformations observable in both genders, there is no "equalizing" or sexual homogenization between sport masculinity and sport femininity. Thus in circumstances in which the sports training culture features enormous strength of body transformation at the genetic, cellular, tissue, organic, morphological and motor levels, it is nature that decides about the indispensability of both categories in sport. It also turns out that when the scientific technologies of sports training are confined to the transformation of natural physicality, then despite the existence of the enormous loads to the male and female body, they will not lead to the development of a new, refined competitor. There is no force in the culture of sports training that can transform (essentially) a man or a woman into their ontic opposites, or – as some usurpers of technological power over humankind think – into the "new athlete". If this were to happen, for example, by way of technological manipulation of the male or female genome (or both at the same time), the monstrous creation of such new athletes would lead to the establishment of a humanistic post-sport as an alternative social movement to the bi-categorical humanistic world of men's and women's sport. Those who dared to activate such biotechnological production of post-athletes, would also have to establish a constant scheme of control over these fake competitors in order to comply with the principle of fair selection of *in vitro* bred competitors. Otherwise, the race by biotechnologists to attain the superiority of their methods in the post-sport practice would have no sense, and post-athletes, eager for victory themselves, regardless of any cost or damage would lose their humanity. Sport, or a sport body, is always male and female separately, being a cultural affirmation and concurrent preservation of the dual human nature. By sealing the heterosexuality of human nature, sport culture also derives ontic persistence from human nature to be, despite its sexual duality, axiologically uniform. Sport as a manifestation of social life would have never existed, if it had not been for its sexually bipolar nature. Also society as an inter-generational, relational entity would have not been there, if individuals of two different sexes did not pass their sexuality onto their offspring, assuming responsibility for the common good.

Judge-classifiers: guardians of ontic equality

Pursuant to the principle of equal access to the sport community, more complex criteria of categorization of competitors has had to be developed that would account for individual, physical and intellectual shortcomings. To comply with the mentioned rule of equality in both sex categories, male and female competitors have had to be divided by judge-classifiers into at least six classes of physical disability with a number of subclasses of deficit and defect. In this way sport organizers have

established a division into various categories and classes of sport. The competitors have been divided into men and women, boys and girls, juniors and seniors and able-bodied and disabled. The realization of sport as a utopian competition of equal opportunities is only possible within these categories and classes. They consist of members with comparable intra-category and intra-class developmental abilities, conventionally indicated by their calendar age.⁵ Once this ontic differentiation is respected and rigorous rules of access to membership in these classes and categories are followed, the common effort among different sport "subfamilies" towards the same axiological ideal becomes possible. Each participant is different, yet all of them in their respective sport classes and categories are similar to one another. Because of these rules, individuals become similar to one another, but never identical. There are simply no ontically identical individuals. Even identical twins are not identical in their physicality. Some may accuse the classifiers of maintaining an ontic fiction. Some may add that it is not enough to attain complete ontic equality, and that the resulting classifications and categorizations are merely approximate, especially when considering human qualitative genetic traits, which calls up associations of racial discrimination.

The fiction of equality in sport: between ontic individualization and generalization

Since the achievement of an ideal state of ontic equality is impossible among participants in sports competitions, the competitions become fiction themselves, since they fail to meet the requirement of equal access to victory. A white sprinter might say *I don't stand a fair chance of victory because I differ genetically from my black opponent. I have trained myself the same way as others, but I have not become ontically equal to my opponents or the other*

⁵ Age categories in sport are separated by 12-month intervals. This may lead to the violation of the rule of equal access in sport, especially in sport for children. In the Canadian junior hockey league boys who were born late in a calendar year have smaller chances of advancing to the youth category (at the age of 9) than their counterparts born in the early months of a year. The rule of equality was violated for many years in the case of those boys born later, while boys born in the first quarter of the calendar year were promoted. Trainers could not understand why boys born in the same year differed biologically, i.e. did not attain the same performance level in sport as their peers they trained together. The younger boys were recognized by trainers as "untalented" and were eliminated, while their older peers, who were allegedly more talented, advanced to further stages of hockey training. Scientists pointed to the trainers that their procedures were routine and unreflective. See more in: [Gladwell 2009: 29-45].

competitors. Similarly, a European long-distance runner may compare himself with his East African counterpart; or a disabled runner who realized he lost a race because his opponent with shorter thigh stumps had used longer artificial limbs (Oliveira vs. Pistorius).

Can judge-classifiers meet this challenge to equality of opportunity, when they know that individual athletes, classified into cohorts and clusters, still differ qualitatively or quantitatively? They differ until the procedure of equalizing opportunity is completed, i.e. until the moment when there are only two athletes in the same sport. And then it would turn out that strict adherence to the logic of maintaining equal opportunity in sport makes the classifiers invalidate the established two-athlete clusters since they would differ, for example, in eyesight acuity (in shooting), hair length (in sprinting) or foot length (in swimming). The ultimate solution would lead to the individualization of each male and female athlete in every sport. Each athlete would only compete against himself or herself. As a result everybody would be satisfied with the possibility of equal access to victory over themselves, but no one could claim any primacy. The first ones in the competition would become the last ones. A sporting victory would simultaneously be a failure. Justice would be done, but it would be justice with a bitter victory tasting like a failure. It would not be a sports victory since that could only be attained as a result of an established social relation. Sport is a game for primacy. When there are two or more individuals, sport becomes a social fact, i.e. an intergenerational relational entity.

On the other hand, an excessive ontic generalization that ultimately blurs even sex differences in the sport community, would lead to the invalidation of the rule of equal access to victory. In this case injustice would be done. If all take part in the same competition, regardless of sex (men with women), age (juniors with seniors), physical abilities (disabled with able-bodied) or of any other physical, somatic or fitness differences – the top athlete - (a man, I assume) would nevertheless have to be compared against a more or less ontically equal opponent to be able to gloat over the identity of the first among equals. Still, even in an “ontically generalized” marathon race, for example, it is the judge-classifiers – rendering the competition humanistically sensible by respecting the principle of equal access to the sport good – who divide the competitors into heterosexual gender categories, classes and subclasses in which all are considered ontically equal. As a result everyone wins in his or her category, class or subclass.

Both these aforementioned situations involve a degree of the absurd. The former leads to the annihilation of sport as a social relational entity; in the latter (which does make sport a social phenomenon) the classifier destroys its human sense by ignoring the principle of equal access to the same good. It is a logical challenge.

We know that sport has never been ontically individualized or generalized in order to destroy itself as an interplay of ontically and morally equal competitors.

Ontic medium of equal opportunity: male trainers for men, female trainers for women

As mentioned earlier, the second assumption of regressive analysis refers to the indispensability of the independent development of the physical and sexual fitness of male and female athletes. Both sex categories in sport must develop physically in two independent systems of physical culture through their own actions, since the constituent traits in each sport category - youth, junior, senior - (different in their sexual and extra-sexual physicality) force modern trainers to adopt two types of projective and normative rationality: “only for women” and “only for men”. In consequence, a split of *paidotribes* and *gymnastes* into male and female social roles takes place. Modern sports trainers have faced this division in social gym practice, but they have not necessarily had to divide themselves in their own community (of the same social roles of trainers) into sex categories of trainers of female physicality and trainers of male physicality, i.e. male trainers for men and female trainers for women. In gym practice, the model of a male trainer of women has been well established, but not the model of a female trainer for men. It is not only a conscious departure from the principle of equal opportunities but an arbitrary and involuntary infringement of the model of trainer for all. It was embedded into the social mentality of the gym in its pre-emancipation stage, by its dominant male part as a sort of relic of the habitus of sport trainer for men and women alike. However, the rigorous rule of equal opportunities in the sport competition the respecting of which makes male and female athletes equal ontically in their respective categories, imposes on the *logos* of the gym the division of *gymnastes* into male trainers for men and female trainers for women. A male trainer in a women’s sport does not aid potential top athletes more than a female trainer in a women’s sport. A male trainer does not create more opportunities for victory for female athletes than a female trainer. The question remains whether the hypothesis about the “superiority” of male trainers over female trainers has ever been examined. Without a doubt, the infiltration of the world of women’s sport by trainers of the opposite gender brings about unequal access to the sporting good, i.e. to the potential distinction of being first among equals. Potential top female athletes do not become equal to one another in terms of their physical, but also mental and emotional, characteristics when a man (and only occasionally a woman) becomes the trainer in their gym. It does not matter what sports results would be attained by female athletes trained by women. What is most important is

the rigorous application of the rule of equal opportunities, i.e. that primacy could be potentially gained by every female athlete.

It is also significant that the guardians of the ontic equality of female athletes become men, similar, by way of the "heritage of tradition", whereby men become gynaecologists more often than women. Should there be female classifiers for female gym ascetics, and male classifiers for male gym ascetics? Although there are no empirical arguments justifying the indispensability of this division, by way of the regressive deduction used here, this division is logical.

X-factor as a self-moderator of moral equality hiding in sports conscience

Thus, only after acknowledging sports categories, classes and subclasses can one refer to sport as a utopian competition of equal opportunity. Certainly, in each ontic variety of sport the ideal is realized independently. But there is always a question why, despite the fulfillment of the condition of "ontic equality", the practice of sport fails to attain the ideal or even defies it. Why is the axiological ideal of sport of equal competitors so arduously attained? Why is its humanistic content destroyed long after the ideal has been reached (see the cases of the famous cyclist or sprinters who had abused doping substances)?

Can the logic of regressive thinking now lead to a finding of some non-ontic reasons explaining the validity of sport as a competitive utopia and causes of sport failure? Should we perhaps focus on ascetics as participants in gym training and then on their transformed character as participants in the stadium? In both roles the same social persons may add much to their ontic characteristics and states (not only in terms of their physicality, but also their spirituality, intellect, prudence, volition or emotionality), and to their sporting activity as a transgressive expression of agonistic force – subject or not - to normative conscientious regulation, i.e. moral assessment of one's actions.

Thus the two premises of the regressive analysis are: 1) the indispensability of the division of sport into men's and women's; and 2) the division of gym ascetics into categories, classes and subclasses ensuring the ontic equality of future competitors. Using both premises we can now *briefly* consider the subjectivity of sport as a reason explaining the final result of competition, and the realization of competition as a utopia of fairness. We should consider it *briefly* because the science about reasons for sports results, commonly known as sport theory, has already contributed much to the causal model in question.

Therefore we must accept a simple anthropological assumption (we cannot do anything else in the light of

irrefutable metaphysics) that a sports person is rational, internally free, and capable of perfecting each level of its being: material, physical, fitness but also spiritual, intellectual and psychical. We must assume that a sports person is a dynamic case of a person of free will, who is able to increase his or her ontic resources of physicality and constantly improve themselves. Athletes are, first of all, people, i.e. they consciously contribute ontically to their individuality. They simply acknowledge that becoming first among equals (as recognized initially by the judge-classifier) depends on their ontic primacy over the opponent in the gym, before the competition.

Gaining primacy in the gym

When the ontically equal gym ascetics start their training aimed at their natural and physical development, they abandon the equality imposed on them by the judge-classifier. They enter a race for diversity, metaphorically compared to an "arms race" (by arming themselves with competition competences) or even applying some political ideology to their physicality, e.g. in the gyms of authoritarian states, and wage a "technological war" among the boards of designers, advisors and experts. Depending on the degree and scope of rationalization of training methods, especially on their scientific optimization, gym ascetics engage in the race by default with an earnest of victory in the future stadium race. They have their workers' right to perfect their physicality, provided they abide by the *logos* of natural law. Since they work discretely, unknown to their opponents, no one (neither the judge-classifier nor even the trainer) knows in what ways, either natural (i.e. complying with natural laws) or artificial (i.e. defying natural laws) they will acquire their ontic prominence. When the actions of ascetics do not infringe their natural physicality and they are actions maintaining their personal dignity; they are praiseworthy (workers can praise themselves) as training in the gym allows ascetics to enjoy their personal dignity. This is how the workers in the gym respect their physicality and, by training, ennoble it with new additions. In no way do they transgress its nature; but rather they affirm it and admire it. Ascetics are therefore worthy of themselves as they are fair to themselves. As being part of their own personal dignity, fair ascetics have the right to expect their stadium competitors to act in the same way. Their intensive work and training would have no sense, if their opponents were to perfect their ontic characteristics by violating human natural traits and ignoring natural laws. When the ontic equality imposed by the judge-classifier, which is a guarantee of equal access to the ultimate agonistic good, is perfected by breaching natural law, sports competition becomes absurd. It does not matter whether the violator of their

own physicality loses or wins. He or she may declare: *No problem, I haven't won, I haven't taken anything from anyone, I haven't deprived anyone of the chance of gaining primacy.* It really does not matter at all. One's personal dignity, regardless of one's role: actor, athlete, doctor, mother, is one's ability to obey natural law: the athlete does not even consider transformation of the genome, the doctor does not consider euthanasia, and the mother does not consider abortion. The rogue athlete would consider ways to refuse to obey natural law.

Judge-exposers

Athletes who alter their natural physicality do moral evil since they transgress their personal dignity, and deny their opponents potential and real self-realization in their sporting dignity. They do evil to themselves and others, although no one apart from the originator of moral indignity, realizes this disobedience. They do not know, but they can learn about this deception resulting in an infringement of the rule of equal opportunities in the process of gaining primacy. They can learn about it from the judge-exposer (an anti-doping law enforcer), an ally to the judge-classifier, who makes sure by using all means available to him that the development of a person's ontic resources does not violate their natural physicality. In fact, the judge-exposer, who signals a breach of the natural order, i.e. the existence of unacceptable ontic inequality between competitors, declares an infringement of the moral order. Although he usually files secret reports on "doping in sport", in fact, his narrative encompasses a hidden message about the deception, i.e. about an insidious acquisition of ontic good and the diminishing of the opponent's chances of gaining primacy. The deceiver will be disqualified and excluded from the sports community. The judge-exposer will inform the stadium community that there is no place for violators of the established order of ontic equality among fair competitors. Thus the judge-exposer announces a breach of the natural order, i.e. the existence of ontic inequality and therefore, a breach of the moral order.

The common good of the stadium is then determined by the fair conduct of gym ascetics at the precompetitive training stage. Before they enter the sports competition, we will know whether they fulfill the requirement of moral equality of competitors and thus equal access to victory. Fair and morally equal gym ascetics enter the competition being worthy of one another, despite the fact that they differ ontically. This is another *factor* in the discussed causal model of sport, which can be found in the sports conscience of ascetics. It is pure conscience, i.e. obeying natural law, which defines the phenomenon of utopian sports competition. This phenomenon takes place when gym ascetics respect their personal dignity

in all their activities, maximizing the potential of their physicality, before they enter the competition.

Finally, I would like to mention one more reason explaining the phenomenon of utopian competition. It can also be found in one's conscience and it can be called – in the language of methodology – the moderator of social change towards fulfillment of a sports utopia. This moderator is a competitor, who in his role as an actor craving for victory, benefits from his own personal properties and allows his opponents to externalize all their competences.

Judge-moderators: guardians of moral equality

The judge-moderator is not merely a referee, who makes sure the relationship between competitors is fair, but is first and foremost an athlete himself/herself who respects the opponent, i.e. realizes the premise of moral purity. The morally equal and fair ascetics who leave the gym for the stadium still act fairly (respect each other's dignity) and allow their opponents to be fair as well. When, for some reason, they cannot conform to the norm of fair acts and make it difficult for others, they must succumb to the regulative power of the external moderator. Judge-moderators make sure the competitors are morally identical through their equality in fairness. They thus contribute enormously to the realization of a sports utopia. To an extent they enforce equality between athletes and order them into a formation of polite competitors bowing down to the vanquished. This contribution is significant in that the stadium is also inhabited by anomic athletes gloating about the habitus of their lawless promiscuity (like those Olympic swimmers of dual morality who frequented houses of ill repute after the competition). The judge-moderator becomes an X-factor – a reason explaining the competition as a utopia. It may happen that athletes are found to be dissimilar, qualitatively and quantitatively non-identical and unequal during the competition. In such cases the judge-moderator substitutes for the judge-classifier, and at the same time, exposes the deceptions of those violators of ontic inequality who fall into pride and vanity. Thus moderating is called to order by "muckrakers" who explain the essence of the sport competition.

The moderators are often external judges who call athletes to moral order from the position of critic, publicist, author, poet or public opinion. Moreover, a judge-moderator is also a scholar-humanist, who deduces operative propositions constituting some kind of athlete's code based on natural law or universal ethics, and justifies the moral sense of the athlete's action as the highest good. Thanks to the judge-moderator the stadium community can learn via educational channels that the internal good of the sports act is justified by external good of the highest axiological rank.

Conclusions

The sports act, realized in the ambitious postulation of a utopia of fair redistribution of access to the good of victory, can be explained by a number of reasons. It may seem that the sociological theory of sport supported by many auxiliary sciences has explained this phenomenon sufficiently. I also thought I trusted that the moral empowerment of athletes would determine their real (not just potential or normative) attainment of this ideal. I thought that polite and decent athletes would enter into competition respecting their own and others dignity, and that the sports utopia would be fulfilled in its own secret *autopoiesis* (as supposed by experts in theories of social systems) despite external adversities from centres of political power, or internal hardships associated with corrupt sport *managers*. I have never thought that each subsequent generation of *children of sport*, participating in the life of the gym, would manifest itself by a different understanding of freedom. This understanding would be characteristic of adults, and would be associated with the time when they could not choose for themselves. Sport assumes some ascetic work and moral rigor. It therefore assumes a double limitation to freedom as well as physical constraints imposed by training loads and programmes. Under this assumption sport involves little fun and even less freedom, but much sacrifice, unlike in extra-sport life when everybody is promised an easy, obligation-free way to happiness.

In the discussed causal model I did not initially see that a "new child" had entered the social system of sport – a child born in a world of liberal usurpations, with whom the establishment of familial relationships regarding freedom, morality, ideals and authority would be very difficult. I did not think about this reason, which is key to understanding the cause of the humanistic failure of sports competition, i.e. the cause of the deconstruction of a sports utopia.

The applied regressive analysis model reveals that the success of a sports utopia, being a variety of social utopia, is determined by authoritative judges managing the common good of the sports family. There is a reason why the sports community is referred to as the sports *family*. Maintaining familial relationships is a utopia itself, i.e. a daunting but feasible task. And although the hopes of each family, also of the "sports family" is its children, only the adult family members – capable of assuming responsibility for the common good – can maintain order in the family and render all its activities sensible. Similarly, the successful organization of competitions in a sports family, aimed at perfection according to the family's ideals is only possible if competitive order is preserved by: a) judge-categorizers responsible for maintaining sexual-somatic equality; b) judge-classifiers responsible for the ontic equality (extra-sexual physicality) of the gym ascetics; c) judge-exposers responsible

for revealing the ontic inequalities of doping abusers; and d) judge-moderators responsible for moral equality between competitors.

Therefore, sport as a utopian competition of equal opportunities can be achieved if athletes are: 1) categorized – which does not exclude their discrete self-categorization that would ensure equality of the genders; 2) classified – which does not exclude their discrete self-classification that would ensure their extra-sexual physical equality; 3) moderated – which does not exclude their discrete self-moderation ensuring their moral equality; and 4) exposed – which does not assume their self-exposition. The actions of judges provide sports competitors (ontically, quantitatively and qualitatively, and morally equal) with a possibility of gaining primacy. Their opportunities are equal, which is fair, since all those equal to one another gain access to the great and good among the top athletes. Gaining primacy among unequal ones (quantitatively) and dissimilar ones (qualitatively) is unjust.

If it was not for these judges' authoritative enforcement of moral and ontic equality among athletes, then (without diminishing the athletes' contribution to the creation of fair competition), it could be assumed that the liberally, relativistically and individualistically disposed athletes would not be able to tackle their humanistic tasks by themselves. Athletes cannot be the judges in their own cause. Without judges they will never survive their first sports competition.

References

1. Gladwell M. (2009), *Outliers. The Story of Success*, Znak, Cracow [in Polish].
2. Heller M. (2012), *The Universe is only the way*, Copernicus Center Press, Cracow [in Polish].
3. Lipiec J. (1999), *The Philosophy of Olympism*, Sprint, Warsaw [in Polish].
4. Liponski W. (2012), *History of Sport*, PWN, Warsaw [in Polish].
5. Pawlucki A. (2013a), *Sport as utopia ...* [in:] Z. Dziubinski, M. Lenartowicz [eds.], *Physical Culture and Social Differences*, AWF, SALOS RP, Warsaw [in Polish], pp. 249-269.
6. Pawlucki A. (2013b), *Sciences of Physical Culture*, AWF, Wrocław [in Polish].

Sport jako utopia rywalizacji równych szans

Słowa kluczowe: sport, moralność, sprawiedliwość sportowa, fair play, moralny relatywizm

Abstrakt

W eseju przedstawiam model przyczynowy zajścia ku utopii sportowej, tłumacząc – w rozumowaniu regresywnym, idąc

cym wstecz, ku najpierwsiemu, metafizycznemu przesłankom – kluczowe racje (X) jej spełniania. Ostatnie przypadki łamania porządku równości ontycznej przez sprinterów, czy pływaków – naruszających normę dobrego obyczaju w życiu osobistym, pokazują, jak łatwo można wytworzyć stan antyutopii. Zastosowany model rozumowania regresywnego pokazuje, że o pomyślności utopii sportowej, jako odmianie utopii społecznej, decyduje **starszyzna sędziowska**, zdolna do autorytatywnego zarządzania dobrem sportowej rodziny. Jest jakaś racja w tym, że społeczność sportową nazywa się *rodziną*. Czy trwanie w relacjach rodzinnych nie jest zadaniem utopijnym, a więc poniekąd trudnym, a jednak ostatecznie wykonalnym. I choć nadzieją rodziny są dzieci, także „rodziny sportowej”, to nie one, tylko dorośli jej członkowie – zdolni do przyjęcia odpowiedzialności za dobro wspólne – strzegą w niej ładu oraz nadają wszystkim poczynaniom sens. Podobnie, pomyślne przeprow-

adzenie konkursów w rodzinie sportowej, idące ku spełnieniu się w jej ideale, jest o tyle możliwe, o ile porządku doglądają w niej: a) sędziowie kategoryzatorzy – odpowiedzialni za stan równości płciowo-somatycznej, b) sędziowie-klasyfikatorzy – odpowiedzialni za stan równości ontycznej (poza-płciowej cielesności) ascetek i ascetów gimnazjonu, c) sędziowie-demaskatorzy – ukazujący nierówności ontyczne dopingowych oszustów oraz d) sędziowie-moderatorzy – odpowiedzialni za stan równości moralnej konkurentek i konkurentów. Gdyby nie udział starszyny sędziowskiej w autorytatywnym wymuszaniu na sportowcach paradowania w szyku równości moralnej oraz równości ontycznej, to nie ujmując samym sportowcom udziału w podmiotowym tworzeniu konkursu sprawiedliwych można przypuszczać, że wolnościowo, relatywistycznie, indywidualistycznie i egoistycznie usposobieni sportowcy nie podołaliby sami humanistycznemu zadaniu.