

Values in Top-level Sports

Hans Lenk

Abstract: Values are standardized interpretative constructs for describing, motivating, guiding, explaining and justifying actions, evaluations and orientations in general. That is true for all our lives as well as for sports and specifically for top-level athletics. - The paper discusses some central value concepts of/in sports like achievement/performance, fairness/fair play, competition and winning regarding their positive meaning, impacts and functions as well as the negative, exacerbating consequences and societal phenomena as cheating/doping, fouls and unfairness etc. Thus, e.g., the exaggeration of winning at any price and by using almost all means in antiquity and modern professionalized tough and extreme top-level athletics, singularly hailing the one and only victor (singular victor orientation) are discussed - primarily using examples from Olympic Games and World Champion sport. - The role of conflicts between the agents (athletes), the spectators, the public as well as the managers, officials, politicians and the media are analyzed. Some practical proposals are offered serving the slogans "in dubio pro athlete" and "in dubio pro humanitate concreta". - Especially, what I like to call "Eigenhandlung" (authentic actions and activity) and "**Eigenleistung**" (authentic and positively evaluated personal achievement, see my 1983, 2007) are among the most fitting characteristic traits of active humans - notably for athletes. Genuine life is personal, or even consciously autonomous and authentic acting and achieving. Authentic and autonomous personal acting is indeed important for a creative life. Therefore, amongst other creative activities, sport can and should be a genuine means of human creativity, a function of which philosophers of an active life like Ortega y Gasset had certainly thought. Ideally, an Olympic and top-level athlete indeed would serve here as a notable example, a paragon model visibly illustrating this symbolic meaning of an actively achieving and sporting life. The Olympic idea, the mentioned mottos of Homer and Coubertin, which are conveyed best in sport and athletics, is certainly incorporated, even incarnated, in the personal histories, roles, and symbolic function of the Olympic athletes - be they winning or losing participants. We should not - although we still often do - exaggerate, like the ancient Greeks, the idea of victory as well as that of the one and only winner and the all too widely spread orientation at *the unique* winner (singular winner orientation, Singulärsiegerorientierung as I had called and criticized it earlier). Indeed, to "have fought well" (Coubertin) and to have competed fairly, to have done one's best - this also seems to be a very important ethical value of the Olympic and sporting idea of *Eigenleistung*, i.e. of an authentic personal accomplishment.

Date of Submission: 09-09-2019

Date of Acceptance: 25-09-2019

I. INTRODUCTION:

What Are Values?

"Some sport for every day keeps the doctors away!" - Like an apple a day. Isn't it true? -

Yet, didn't Bert Brecht state already in 1928, —Great sport begins when it since long had finished being healthy! But, certainly, health **is** an important value - only an educational one? -

Is that equally valid for accomplishing a top athletic performance, achieving a remarkable jump, run, record or somersault? All these are highly valued and evaluated. This would not be possible without appreciating (i.e. valuing) and evaluating, too.

What are values in sport, notably in top level athletics?

As elsewhere, we here cannot do without invoking or attributing values.

*We can not **not** value and/or not evaluate. Humans are evaluating beings.*

But what are values in the last analysis? My theory is that values are interpretative constructs. They are necessarily dependent on and activated by *interpretation*. Values would only function by and in interpretations.

Indeed, they are to be analyzed as in part biological (if even inherited), but mostly socially/culturally *learned* functionalities. - Thus, we also **cannot not interpret** - by invoking, instantiating, using or at least meaning in a normative or descriptive manner, e.g. for explanation of actions and decisions etc. Interpretation/interpreting is unavoidable.

In my theory interpretation is in a rather wide sense conceived or bound to the activation of schemes or schemata, of conceptual and other forms, structures, patterns, models etc. I speak of *scheme-interpretation*. Therefore we also cannot **not** schematize¹.

What do we mean by the concepts of "values", "valuation" ("valuing") and "evaluations"? Values are often discussed from a more general and abstract point of view than that under which they are covered by being involved in constitutive processes of valuation. The main thesis to be established will be:

Values are essentially interpretative: they can, even must be interpreted. They can and should be understood as (somehow socially, institutionally or personally standardized) interpretative constructs of a specific kind and according to different types to be distinguished and classified within a hierarchical typology (i.e. in a value system).

There is a special connection between values and actions as well as a characteristic being relation in the form of their being ascribed to persons, goods, events etc. This connection is indeed covered, borne or carried out by schematic interpretation (see my 2003).

In addition, any ascription of a value concept or predicate whatsoever is dependent on a structure and hierarchy of normative and in part descriptive schemes of at times conventional and dispositional, to a certain degree even hereditary routines of schema activations which might be called *scheme-interpretations* or normative dispositions and routines of patterning according to fundamental neuronal, in part biological and physiological, however mostly cultural adaptive processes of structuring behavior and action, cultural learning, societal preferences etc. (In the last thirty years, the present author developed a whole methodology of interpretive constructs by schema(ta) interpretations and scheme-activations (see my 2000, 2003, 2007). This approach does not only cover descriptive interpretations of any kind but also normative interpretational constructs and respective schematic interpretations. Certainly it is important to clearly distinguish between descriptive or explanatory analytic interpretive constructs on the one hand and normative ones on the other.

Values function by understanding, categorizing, ordering and systematizing all our norms, wishes, expectations and normative or value judgments in a more or less hierarchical form - e.g. in a value system. Metaphorically or by interpretation we may say, values pervade, permeate, if not penetrate or at times even generate, almost all our life elements, notably actions and utterances - incl. very intrinsic ones. Values are essentially impregnated (or laden) by interpretation or even engendered or constituted/materialized by/in activation of schemes (or schemata) in normative (i.e. prescriptive or evaluation-bound) settings. . Indeed, we would use values - or, rather, value interpretations - either in a normative (prescriptive, deciding or evaluative) manner or descriptively from an observer's or (social) scientific point of view.

Telecracy and athlete's rights

In our age of television and "telecracy" the Olympic and World Champion sport show would fascinate roughly more than a billion spectators via direct color TV coverage to all countries. In this "telecratic" inspection system some of the athlete's personal and, at times, even human rights of his private personality, seem to be in danger of falling victim to a so to speak all-encompassing "televisor", to the mass media camera-eye of Big Brother. Olympic Games and World Cups of the future will increasingly be faced with such "telecratic" problems - not only in mass media and commercial respects. Commercial, political and public information needs will rather frequently conflict with the athlete's human rights. We have to develop - and this aspect implies philosophical work proper - a kind of protection program for the athlete to secure his rights against the managers, over-boarding tendencies and/or constraints of the public media including their manipulative and alienating effects. We need a human rights program for athletes. 'Telecracy', though, is and will remain, even grow, to be a major problem of the Olympics and top level athletics in the future. However, the postulated athlete's rights program has to pertain to his sovereignty and freedom of decision making as against autocratic officials and coaches. The athlete - as a person with his specific human rights has to be protected. Only this way he can really - in a humane sense of the word - fulfil his paragon function as an ideal model.

The active athlete is more troubled by "telecratic" necessities, which bother him, and other participants. At a time when tele-lenses are available, whizzing cameras sometimes irritate unduly the concentrated contestant. The sports show fascinates hundreds of millions of spectators since the mass media transmit direct color coverage of Olympic events to all countries. Through gigantic "telecratic" inspection the athlete's rights, his optimal action and preparation strategies, even his human intimacy and the preservation of his private personality, seem to be possessions of (or at least commanded by) the camera-eye of Big Brother. Future Olympic Games will be increasingly faced with difficult "telecratic" problems - not only in financial terms. It will not be easy to find an overall strategy which simultaneously covers the public's need for information and the athlete's rights. We have to develop - and this aspect would imply appropriate truly philosophical work - a

¹ All

kind of protection program for the athletes to secure their rights against the managers and constraints of the public media including their manipulative and alienating effects involved. "Telecracy" is and will remain, even grow, to be a major problem of the Olympic Games and top level athletics in the future.

In addition, the athlete's rights' Programme has to pertain to his or her sovereignty and freedom of decisionmaking as against autocratic officials and coaches. The athletes — as persons with their own human rights — have to be protected. Only in this way can they really - in a humane sense of the word - fulfil the exemplary function as an instantiation of an ideal model.

However, coping with media problems and political and commercial questions will certainly not suffice. Nor are the Olympic Games just an affair of symbols, the protocol and ceremonies like the Opening, closing and Victory Ceremonies. The Olympic idea and the Olympic spirit are much more and further-reaching than just external symbols. They should remain alive and have to be adapted to modern requirements, e.g. to the open-minded critical intellectuality of today's younger generation. Some outdated components of the idea as, for instance, exaggerated nationalism, winning at any price, compulsive manipulation, the totally autocratic style of coaching, the dictatorship of officials, other-directedness in motivation etc. have to be eliminated or at least mitigated - like the notorious doping problems. Ceremonial change by itself cannot bring about this necessary reform. In addition, we can hardly expect the new positive concepts, these enthusing and exciting goals, novel guidelines and ideals from an empirical scientist who is usually restricted to his discipline and only descriptive methods. By contrast, this intellectual reform of the Olympic movement and sports is basically primarily a philosophical task of value orientation, maintenance of Olympic values including fairness and a sort of humanization of the at times all-too stern top-level competitions.

Much intellectual and, particularly, philosophical work has still to be done. Philosophically speaking, the new version of the Olympic Idea still remains to be reborn or the extant conception has at least to be reformed. The most important Olympic reorientation is indeed a philosophical one and an honest recovery of value orientation. It has yet to be waited for, it has to be worked for. It should be a reform in philosophical foundation. Sport philosophers have to take seriously the fashionable criticism of the last decades against sport and achievement orientation (cf. the author's 1972). They should develop a new or, at least a better, more adequate, philosophical anthropology of both the creative process of achieving and the achieving personality and add a social philosophy. We should also apply this philosophic anthropology to sport, science, art, play and any creative action as well as to education. This is particularly true for the Olympic caliber and for other achieving activities of top level.

Homeric-Olympic values and philosophical anthropology

A philosophy and a philosophic anthropology of achievement and of the creative achieving human being seems to be of an utmost importance - particularly for future interpretations of top-level sports of all kinds, most notably however, for the Olympic realm. I would like to sketch some basic ideas of a philosophical anthropology along these lines.

Interestingly enough, it was in antiquity that our most influential anthropological ideas and concepts of *man* (i.e., correctly, *the human being*) was shaped. Greek philosophers, but also Greek mythology had a decisive influence on the development of Western anthropology with respect to three of four conceptions of man which in some sense are to be combined at present and in the future:

I mean the Promethean and "Faustean" (after Goethe's *Faust*) concept of man, rather, correctly speaking nowadays, the human being, as the being searching for knowledge and the extension of insight, striving to improve or even get closer to perfection, in the arts and sciences. The ancient "Know thyself" supplemented by "Know the world" and its internal lawful connections, causes, and systems may - besides the biological basis - become also a slogan of the anthropological picture of humankind.

The second equally important one is the Homeric-Olympic ideal of humans governed by the quest for the best in achievement. The Homeric "Always to become better and to excel as compared with others", "Always to be the very best, distinguished from everyone else" (Ilias VI, 205; XI, 794) would be the slogan of this picture of man. Peleus gave that slogan as a piece of advice to his son Achilles. That so-called Achilles Complex (as the *Love Story* author Segal therefore labeled it) is the most important and characteristic norm and standard of athletic competition at top level and of the Olympic contests, if not the most telling one of the Olympic Movement, although it is by no means the only characteristic feature. Like the first concept of humans it is an ideal concept, too. Both may be combined in the activist aspiration to achieve best knowledge, best achievements in any field, e. g. by personally engaging in feats of arts and sciences including performing arts like music, drama, and athletics.

Thirdly, also the Christian conception of humans has been deeply impregnated by Greek philosophy via Saint Paul, the Book of John etc. It certainly were the Sophists' and Socrates' discovery of the value of individual man which lead to the Christian commandment of "Love God in all fellow-men, particularly in your neighbors (i.e. those men with which you are in mutual interactive contact)!" Certainly, the one-dimensional orientation of history towards the fulfilment of God's plan towards an end of the Last Days and Judgement is basically Christian eschatological thinking. But humanistic individualism has its roots also in ethical Greek philosophy taking man himself (as a species as well as an individual) as a "measure of everything" (Protagoras).

It seems to be only the fourth conception of humans, namely the practical-technological one of experimenting agents manipulating world and nature which did not stem from the ancient Greek philosophers, which may be a modern offspring of the era of the Renaissance and/or Reformation. And it is particularly this conception of the human being which has most explicitly changed the world and our world-views. It might if unfettered even nowadays be considered a specific danger for mankind and nature, if not the other three worldviews of Antiquity would counterbalance a potentially unlimited escalating hubris of technological man.

In the fifth place, we nowadays learn that robots and digital and electronic systems pose great problems for a modern philosophical anthropology and the conceptions of humans and the role of their symbolic forms, sign worlds and notably for human creativity. The creative capacities of the human being, the arts, creative thinking and writing as well as Cassirer's living in the symbolic world/universal might figure as a sixth and seventh variant of humanity. The moral/ethical variant could count as an eighth one, the transcendence-orientation as a ninth version.

Perhaps we may even add a tenth one: human creatures as embedded in and being a part of nature adjusting to natural rhythms, systems, ecosystems etc.

We may have to consider all these ten conceptions of humankind as essential.

In particular, we have to recur to the old ideas of wisdom and a counterbalance of harmony between the different anthropological concepts. Self-idolization of man by means of his technological power must not run out of control, should be limited and checked as well as balanced by the other three, more humanistic ideals. There seems to be a system of check and balances also in anthropological conceptions. We have time and again to remind ourselves of this by reactivating, revitalizing, improving and developing these humanistic ideas of the human. Each of these ideals seems to be equally important. Each has its own heroes, paragon personalities and ideal types as well as its own inherent dangers. This is true for the concept of Homeric-Olympic man, too.

Olympians: top-level achievement orientation as a paragon model

The Olympic athlete, indeed, and athletes in general - whether top-level or not - can serve as an outstanding model and paragon example documenting the mentioned symbolic sense of an active achieving life. The Olympic idea - the "agonetic"/agonistic idea at top-level, expressed in Peleus' slogan - is certainly incorporated, nay, incarnated in the ideal type of an Olympic athlete - may he (or today she) be a winning or a losing contestant. "To have fought well" (Coubertin), to have achieved one's best - that seems to be the very core of the Olympic Idea. We should try to keep this educational idea relatively free from exaggeration to an inhumane extreme as well as from political and/or commercial distortion.

In order to achieve these goals it should be worthwhile and conducive to elaborate a new "Olympic philosophy". Ideas about a necessarily pluralistic and multi-faceted anthropology and about the multi-compatibility and multi-identifiability of the Olympic Idea and Olympic Movement have to tie in (see the author's 1964, 2012). The values and goals of the Olympic movement are those of a truly international and intercultural movement. They display a fascinating symbol of the potential unity of humankind in its higher aspirations for accomplishments and fairness. In this, even ambiguity and vagueness of many components within the Olympic Idea can and did lead to a *social gathering and uniting impact and toward a real social effect of multi-compatibility and multi-identifiability of the Olympic movement* and its values (cf. below and the author's 1964, in Engl. 1979, 2012). According to the goals of the founder of the modern Olympic Games, Pierre de Coubertin, as stated in the basic principles of the International Olympic Committee, the Games are intended to gather the world's youth at a great quadriennial sports festival to create international respect and goodwill and help build a better, more peaceful world - at least symbolically speaking. He already interpreted the Olympic tradition as being much more than mere organization of sport games or just a world-championship of all kinds of sport. Coubertin's main idea of an "alliance of the arts, the sciences and sports" in the Olympic Games might also influence some organizational parts of the Olympics. However, merely to reform of the Olympic protocol does not suffice.

The Olympic Games, therefore, undoubtedly have political² influence beyond special partisanship: They may have no *directly* effective peace mission as it is sometimes alleged but they constitute a symbol of a better and

²Generally

more human world, an understanding among the athletic youth crossing all national and cultural boundaries: All this furnishes the values and goals of the Olympic movement with the identity and union of a truly international and intercultural movement.

As a consequence of the multi-identification and of the gathering impact also an *intercultural* collective and/or integrating effect is a function of the unspecific character, generalizability, formality, functionality, impartiality and cultural tolerance of the Olympic value system (Lenk 1964, 14 ff et passim). Thus, its famous contribution to an "understanding among peoples" occurs *indirectly* through being an effective symbol - in particular in our TV age. Certainly, the Movement has and only has the strength of a great ideal (Brundage). Together with the fascination and the intercultural and international multi-compatibility that is quite an advantage and a real asset.

A somewhat more concise definition of the term "Olympic Idea" would have necessarily to comprise this pluralistic structure of values, norms and basic features of the Olympic movement. The values of tolerance, equal participation rights, equality of opportunities and qualifying as well as starting chances, respect of partners, competitors, and sport opponents, the idea of a symbolic unity of mankind, the achievement principle and the respective idea of an Olympic achieving elite are indeed values of such a formal character, functional norms so-to-speak which are compatible with many different cultural contents. All this is reflected already in the Olympic Charter, e.g. in § 6 and 3: regarding the autonomy of the Games, the Movement and the respective institutions, the National Olympic Committees and the IOC, rejection of any discrimination on political, racial, sexual or religious grounds etc. One should also look to Coubertin's explicitly "most important principle of today's Olympia": "*All games - all nations*" - and, to wit, *all cultures!* (Interestingly enough, all these topics do however not appear at all within the Olympic Charter.) The most famous Olympic slogan "*Citius, altius, fortius*" (§ 6) could and should be supplemented by "*pulchrius*" (more beautiful) and "*humanius*" (more human(e)) capturing the aesthetic and humanitarian aims of the Olympic Movement. Indeed, the Olympic philosophy has to be worked out according to an intellectual level of discussion up-to-date reflecting the far-reaching cultural and not only the sport components. The Olympics are in need of a more encompassing and concise description of the intellectual and philosophical content as well as of the Olympic conception of humans. The Olympic philosophy and the Olympic anthropology have to be developed in the future in order to be able to cope with external dangers cropping up from commercialism and nationalism and to successfully reflect the overriding impact of the Olympic idea an sports and active achieving life in general.

The Olympics and top-level sports offer extant public opportunities for young athletic representatives of different nations enabling them at least to meet and learn to know and in part understand each other. In this sense, the Olympic Games and, moreover, the Olympic Movement fulfil an important symbolic role and function as regards an ideal unity of humankind. The Olympic Movement has to remain aware of and consciously pursue the humanistic, educational and philosophic dimensions of its idea in order to live up to its honorable tradition even if in danger today as ever since. The Olympic Movement is too important a humanistic idea to get sacrificed or to fall victim in the jungle of commercialism, "telecracy" and nationalism or to leave it to the short-sighted pragmatic orientations and operations of political and sport officials and administrators only. This is all the more important for the non-sportive components, elements and guide-lines of the Olympic Movement as, e.g., its value systems as well as its humanistic, anthropological and philosophical foundation. If there are any - Olympic philosophers should step to the front! They should not only start thinking and working, they also should enjoy some kind of resonance on the side of the public and by the Olympic officials - who thus far for the most part, unfortunately, are opportunistically and technocratically minded - they apparently don't very often even read nor think very much by way of , say, digging deeper.

It is, however, inappropriate to overload the Olympic idea with the exorbitant demand of a substantial and significant peace mission and direct political functions. This allegation would perhaps even diminish its actual social effectiveness. Its contribution should be seen *indirectly* as an effective, exemplary symbol of political neutrality that develops an ubiquitously acceptable value system, which still would have and could render notable influences on a unity of internationally understood goals and traditions, and offer public opportunities for developing understanding among representatives of various peoples and cultures.

In this sense, do not Olympic Games - as a symbol of peaceful unity of mankind and youth - reflect a positive and special quasi mythical role - even today, besides the fact that in ancient history they were founded on a religious myth? (To be sure, "ideal type" symbols do have an important, quasi-"mythical" effect, even in a rather sober modern world which lacks in enthralling and particularly world-wide goals.) If 'myth' can be understood in an extended secularized sense, then this is certainly the case. 'Myth' characterizes a model that illustrates a meaning and valuation, and would reflect these connotations in a symbolical guise. These interpretations of meaning have developed historically in cultural traditions. Their illustration is evident in typical, exemplary situations described dramatically. When by a dramatic staging and the visualization of well-

known concepts may create, circumscribe or define meaning for less well-known phenomena, myths develop and offer guidelines for meaning constituents and interpretations, both being typical and explanatory. (I called the theoretical description and modelling of these phenomena and the social philosophical interpretation a "mythological" approach which would figure in fact under the guideline of my methodology and philosophy of scheme-interpretationism (see, e.g., my 2003).) In sport, these modern quasi myths create and transfer meaning in a visible way that is usually more dramatic and dynamic and often more festive than events meanings of everyday life.

Symbolic quasi "mythical" role of the athlete

In competition a feeling and concept of *myth* is prevalent as a symbolic role of acting. Particularly in individual fighting events it's a myth of action and fight. The roles fit together in the simplest confrontation, in visible dynamics and drama. The dramatic presence of the event and the historical immutability of each action and decision under the judgement of an excited and enthusiastic public are notably effective. In the simplified confrontation of competitive athletics, this can be a microcosmical illustration of almost archetypical dynamics.

The dramatic and quasi mythical event of the Olympics, its experience and outstanding character if not uniqueness would explain both the symbolic role and also the athletes' and the spectators' fascination for the respective Olympic sports activities. This is especially stressed in the *historical uniqueness* of Olympic Games. Sports action, and especially participation in the Olympic Games, is neither normal life in a nutshell nor the focus of daily life. In quasi mythological symbolization and development, it results in a characteristically simple model of a vitally intensified, emphasized and contrasting mode of action in the form of role playing. The Olympic Games and the Olympic idea are distinguished from daily life by their tradition, the history of the ancient and modern Games, the intermingling with intellectual and artistic symbols and philosophical and pedagogical concepts. Top level sport - especially in the form of Olympic competition - symbolically and dramatically reflects the basic situation and the self-overwhelming and "active fighting accomplishment" of the athlete, who is - so to say - the Herculean man or woman (if that label may be allowed) of Western culture. The sports myth and its fascination are characterized by self-expression and self-confirmation in aspiring to achievement, the dream of mastering nature and acting rationally and under control with a minimum of equipment, enhanced vitality, the desire to cross and remove limits (Ortega y Gasset), risk taking, pressing for the lead or advantageous position, surpassing existing achievements, the restriction to technically unnecessary goals and unnecessarily limited means for achieving these goals, as well as the dramatically dynamic roleconfrontation during competition. Masterful strength, swiftness, ability, body-control and endurance symbolize human capabilities through a quasi-mythical interpretation of the human's fundamental situation. The fascination of sprint events, for example, cannot be completely explained rationally without referring to the symbolic "mythical" principle of the autonomous mobile human being, or to lost chances and experiences, or to the attractiveness of conquering spatial distance through personal strength, initiative and achievement motivation.

Ideally, the athlete would dare to enter a new field of human achievement behavior and endeavor, namely the field of a symbolic demonstration of strength, not only so much over others but equally also over her or himself. Athletic achievements also offer adventurous opportunities for gaining distinction in a basically uniform society, which nevertheless emphasizes individual values. The Olympic athlete thus illustrates the Herculean myth of a culturally exceptional achievement, i.e. an activity being essentially unnecessary for life's sustenance, that is nevertheless highly valued and arises from complete devotion to striving to attain a goal very difficult to reach. The memory of having proved oneself in athletic competition and systematically learning discipline in training and self-confidence does not only develop and gain from winning but also from honest participation in an Olympic or other outstanding athletic event. As a person, the athlete would/could build up personal self-esteem by knowing that (s)he has done her or his best (as Coubertin said: "The most important thing in life is not to have won, but to have fought well").

Looking back at these aspects, the athlete may establish personal stability and continuity of personal experience, confidence or even distinction within a tradition. He had devoted himself to an extraordinary task and stood the test in his own and others' eyes. Thus, Pythagoras (as quoted by Cicero³) was wrong in this matter: top level sport, especially Olympic athletics, does not only compactly reflect normal life, it is also a symbol of an emphasized and *exalted* vital life, of outstanding feats and devotion for extremely unusual achievements. Pythagoras forgot about the mythical interpretation that Olympic competition has for spectators and active athletes. His remark was undoubtedly aimed at the human habit of making myths too common an element of everyday life.

³ Cicero

When an athlete like the high jumper Fosbury in the later sixties of last century discovered a new and victorious jumping style through intelligent variation; when the gymnast Fujimoto in Montreal and the German gymnast Andreas Toba in Rio attempted their decisive exercise with a fractured bone or a knee ligament and completed their Olympic performances before they collapsed, one cannot claim that characterless, mechanical, systematized and manipulated muscle-machines only accomplished pre-programmed and planned exploits. Today as in the past such cases have shown that athletic achievement cannot dispense with, ignore or shove aside extraordinary motivation, initiative, effort, personality and dedication, even devotion. This is particularly true today for areas in which almost all sports disciplines at Olympic level require total involvement in pursuing the attainment of unusual results. A top grade *athletic achievement remains to be a real personal act requiring total involvement*. Within a societal support system it may be facilitated and promoted, but it cannot be precisely or mechanically generated. The feat is and will always be individually accountable. The athlete is not a characterless producer of records; he is a personality - with heights and depths and abundant interesting variations, even and especially when he loses.

Therefore, the outstanding personality as regards will-power, self-devotion, and almost total involvement in a goal-oriented activity is still primarily found in sports these days. The athlete is a convincing symbol of the human being as "the achieving being" (see below).

Nowadays, the Olympic Games have lost the old religious values integrated in them within the Greek culture. However is that the only fact that has enabled them to gain world-wide attention? Religious and mythical secularization and independence were a pre-requisite for their accommodation in so many cultures - hence their world-wide effect. Even a certain ambiguity and multi-compatibility have been a cause of the worldwide Olympic "gathering effect". The mythical factors seem to appear in the Olympic Games only indirectly, formally and functionally. But they are important for the future of the Games. These factors especially require institutional regulation that is externally evident in forms, signs and Symbols expressed in ceremonies and protocol. But exteriorization of symbols and institutionalization, even innovative reforms of the protocol and ceremonies themselves, are not enough. The Olympic spirit should remain alive and be adapted to modern requirements, e.g. to the open-minded critical intellectuality of today's younger generation. Some outdated components of the idea as, for instance, exaggerated nationalism, victory at any price, forced manipulation, the totally autocratic style of coaching, the dictatorship of officials, the other-directedness in motivation, have to be eliminated or at least mitigated. Ceremonial change alone cannot bring about this necessary reform. In addition, we can hardly expect the new positive concepts, these thrilling and exciting goals, novel guidelines and ideals from an *empirical* scientist who is usually restricted to the positions, methods and results of his discipline. This intellectual reform of the Olympic Movement and sports is also basically a philosophical task. This most important reorientation has yet to occur. It has to be a reform in the philosophical foundation, a renovation of the Olympic philosophy. Again: philosophers to the fore! We - as philosophers - have indeed to take seriously the fashionable and to a considerable degree justified criticism of the last half century launched against athletics and achievement orientation. We have to develop a new philosophy of unobstructed, freely chosen achievement actions and of the creative achieving being. In short, we have to delineate a new philosophical anthropology of both creative accomplishment and the achieving personality. We should also apply this philosophical anthropology to sports, science, art, play and any creative action, as well as to education.

Pythagoras, therefore, was totally right when he was looking for philosophers asking them to "scan closely the nature of things" at Olympia including those connected with (Olympic) athletic events. The most important functions of sport were not just sport. They were and still remain nowadays educational, social, societal, and philosophical. Pythagoras - as an alleged Olympic athlete himself (in pugilism/boxing)- apparently understood well some of the basic problems of top level sport. A well-founded philosophy of sport and creative achieving action is of vital necessity - not only for athletics. Pythagoras was right in implying this.

Towards an anthropology of the acting being

I shall not dwell any longer on the athletic life and success of ancient philosophers, but rather point to another topic related to the intricate relationship of sports action and proper active life. Real life is personal acting, proper, i.e. authentic, actions - and sport is a very convenient way or means to act/to live in the original sense of the word. Authenticity of acting is the epitome of athletic top level sports. Thus it seems that sport in a world of institutions shaped by administrations, delegations, red tape, etc. is one of the few reservations of authentic actions, personal performance and genuine active life. Creative arts and leisure, love and sex, dance as well as philosophizing may be other realms of this kind, i.e. vehicles of genuine experience, action and performance for humans. They may even figure at times as performing arts.

The human being is not only - as European philosophical anthropology once stressed - "the acting being" (Schütz, Gehlen) or "the tool-making being" (Franklin) or "the (polymorphically) cultural being" (Gehlen). Nor does it suffice to characterize it as just — the rational animal, or as "zoon politikonl, i. e. the

social being (Aristotle). The definitions turned out to be almost as insufficient as Plato's ironic definition of man as the —featherless biped. Also, characterizations of humans as the "decision-making beings" (Jaspers), "condemned to freedom" (Sartre), the working (Marx) or speaking animals etc. - or the beings who know of and have to organize life under the recognition that they must die (according to Heidegger) or the permanently endangered beings, will not serve to capture the essence of the human. The same is true for the characteristic properties of the being who is not yet ascertained, not yet assured and not yet determined ("noch nicht festgestellt", in the consciously ambiguous wording by of Nietzsche), of the "eccentric being" — the only one capable of laughing and weeping, or indeed and most characteristically, smiling (Plessner). We should not forget the well-known biological characterization of the being which is born prematurely and lacks many a natural instinctive disposition and determination (Portmann, after Herder). That however can render the human being the most unspecialized and flexible being, during all of its life remaining dependent on self-perfection, supplementation, culture as well as institutions (Gehlen) and securing sustenance. The human being was also considered the being always obliged to compensate for its notorious insufficiencies, its sufferings as well as dissatisfaction: it is the being which seems always to be still in the making and who has yet to make itself what it is or wants to become (Goethe, Sartre).

One could add some such telling characterizations of humans as the beings capable of humor, irony and - probably with the exception of most philosophers and politicians - of not taking themselves too seriously. Certainly, the human being is characterized by *all* these essential traits: (s)he is at the same time *homo faber*, *Homo cogitans*, *homo agens*, *homo loquens*, *homo ludens* (Huizinga), *homo laborans*, *homo creator*, *homo compensator*, or even *homo competens* (the competitive being) alias *homo sportivus* or *athleticus* or *the achieving being* (see below). All these characteristic features seem to encompass more or less necessary conditions, but no single one offers a sufficient condition or even uniquely characterizing criterion of what humans really are and should and can be and become.

Indeed, any monolithic definition as any one-factor theory of the human seems to be doomed to oneness. A definition can by itself certainly not replace a whole theory referring to a very complicated species and realm. requiring an appropriately complexity of description. A philosophical anthropology has therefore to go beyond a single-factor theory, it has to develop a multi-factor model (see my 2010, 2013). It should and could also not only summarize results of the empirical human sciences. But it has necessarily to include normative and what we can call "idealtypical" (after Max Weber) characterizations. To note, some such normative functions regarding ideal traits of what humans *should* be or become under the auspices of their permanent orientation towards the good, or the better, towards goals and tasks, hopes and life plans as well as values.

Any of the mentioned factors can only emphasize one facet of the total realm of what is to be considered human, even "all too human" (Nietzsche).

Homo performer: The achieving being as a climax of intensity of life

More important for our present topic is it to pay attention to another rather characteristic trait or feature of humans not yet mentioned: They are not only acting beings (Schütz, Gehlen) (i.e. the being consciously orienting themselves towards goals, plans, and some other overriding objectives), but (s)he is more specifically the being who tries to materialize goals *better and better* by acting, conceiving, and deciding. (S)he is at the same time the personally acting, planning, thinking, judging, and performing being. Humans are the achieving beings par excellence. Authentic and autonomous action, creative personal performance and accomplishment are the necessary ideal traits of a real human being. "*Eigenhandlung*" (authentic actions and activity) and "*Eigenleistung*" (authentic and positively evaluated personal achievement) are among some most fitting characteristic traits of humans. Genuine life is personal, authentic or even consciously autonomous acting and achieving⁴.

Without pushing up this trait of the achieving being to the status of *the* would-be one and only characteristic of humans, I would like to relate it - which is easy enough to do, after all - specifically to sports and athletics.

Let me first try to play with a bit of pseudo-etymology: with the notion of the *homo performers*, or , for that, *homo performer*. The achieving being is - as the interpreting being (see my 2003, 2007, 2017) - obliged to use patterns, shapes , and structures in order to create and to orient her or himself or to act in meaningful ways. It has to pertain towards *form*, to *apply and conceive of forms*.. (S)he can only achieve by utilizing and/or creating identifiable patterns or structures, i. e. *per formas*, *by forms*. Thus, (s)he depends on this and is even committed to exteriorize some form of forms, to project intentions, to achieve external products etc. Only creative product- and even self-exteriorization allows self-reflection. Self-perfection is only possible

⁴ Achievement ".
5Merkur, 1978, 378.

by performing, i.e. via personal achievement. This would include most activities of goal-oriented, even systematic, well-trained acting and performing - also in the sense of the word in the performing arts. Everybody performs parts, takes roles in the theatre of everyday life. In some sense, we are all actors/agents playing in the drama of our lives (Goffman (1959. By the very way of forms - by and in using forms and forming her or himself - *homo performer* comes to understand and yet to make her or himself.

Symbolic and real actions in a codified world

We certainly live in a world of encompassing administration, institutions and mediation (by media and other mediating mechanisms - e.g. delegation, signatures, vicarious activities and responsibilities and liabilities for other people or institutions etc.). Communication, though almost universal in scope now and well-nigh ubiquitous in world-wide coverage, are by now mediated and *virtual* or virtually abstracted on a higher level of operational, formal or functional make-up or provenance. Action has almost been replaced by symbolic or virtual activity. A signature is an action but hardly a real one directly changing the world - it is a symbolic action. In addition, many sorts of actions have grown rather anonymous as regards addressees and the people reached. Moreover, television, films and movies, photography, and recently computer graphics and computer imaging and the respective redoing as well as pictograms and comics have turned much of our world into pictorial preserves so to speak: a picture and imaging pseudo world more and more taking over characteristics of socialized reality (think also of so-called Reality TV) apt primarily for passive consumption. The world only nowadays tends to become the notorious "world as phantom and matrix" (as G. Anders had already predicted more than half a century ago). Life in this codified world somehow does "not mean *acting* any more" (Flusser⁵). That mediation and the almost all-encompassing grip of media coverage on an intercontinental, even at times trans-planetary scale, favors a strong fascination, tendency, and effective trend toward passive arousal, vicarious pseudo experiences in the forms of artificially enlivened movies and film reports mistaken for real life literally ending up in a notorious reduction to consumerism. All that amounts to a very seductive reduction in the form of artificial imagery-making with its progressive tendency towards only vicarious living and experience as well as passivism. The seducing force and grip seems to have particularly impacts in youngsters and little children. To be sure, they need pictures and images as well as the arousal of their capacity for imagery; but they need even more the active involvement of bodies and selves-as-yet-to-develop in order to really profit from the offered moving world and color pictures which so easily seduce and don't really present a bodily or actively engaging or even strenuous action, which they so dearly need for their development and well-being requiring true actions! Instead, already then, in childish make-up, already all the manipulative practices and procedures of catching and capturing the young flexible minds by precarious vicarious templates in the form of effectively, yet passively arousing moving pictures, colors, fabricated events and stories would seduce the youngsters, who are by nature keen on running and moving, towards the life of a couch potato in front of the TV screen. Later, in their adolescent and adult lives, all the well-known mechanisms of alienation and manipulation within the "administrated world" tie in: institutionalization, bureaucracy (red tape), functionalization, segmentation, symbolization, vicarious representation and virtualization, delegation, organizationism and even what we can call "progressive publicitis" (Big Brother and Reality shows or the mania of outing oneself in public or on the screen, in the papers etc. – without any underlying authentic achievement, effort, or really active bodily and mental engagement). Showing off and boasting, just pretending or even faking to have accomplished something remarkable without one having really done so, has unfortunately become a wide-spread strategy in our trump(l)ing society (think of Trumpian Fake News) honoring rather the public image of seeming successful than really achieved hard work or strenuous endeavours and efforts. *Esse quam videri*⁶ read the Latin proverb of old: Real/authentic being (active) instead of mere appearances.

The trend towards a totally prefabricated and vicariously replayed pseudo world seems to have almost displaced any proper personal and authentic, not to speak of autonomous, psycho-physical action towards remote quasi ecological niches. Personal acting in the genuine sense tends to become a sort of leisure hobby for the proverbial common man or woman. In serious life, they hardly act any more, being condemned to only functioning.

By contradistinction, to be human, to act and stay alive means indeed to be active and creative - to be and remain *homo actor, performer, and creator*. Humans are only really alive as humans when they act and move (physically as well as psychically as well as mentally). We can extend Schiller's famous statement "Man... is only completely a man when he plays"(!) into the slogan "*Human beings ... are only completely human when they achieve freely*", i.e., according to their own choice and determination without being dominated only by, e. g., the necessities of sustenance, orders, etc. Personal and authentic, autonomous or well-adapted free action is a criterion of real and truly personal life for the achieving being⁷. Only (s)he who acts, achieves and moves

(something and her or himself) is really alive in the deeper, humanistic, sense. Life in its emphatic authentic understanding is goal-oriented action, personal achievement, authentic commitment and performance.

Total involvement: the top athlete

It is easy to apply these anthropological insights to sports and athletics. Both have been and remain to be realms of bodily activity in which genuine personal involvement and engagement are required. This is true in the original sense, even as a paradigm of bodily and psychological involvement. Sports actions and achievement cannot be easily, pretended or obtained surreptitiously, vicariously achieved, or even delegated. In this sense, sporting achievements are accomplished by personal endeavour and effort. They consist, ideally speaking, in genuine and honest actions resulting in an adequate assessment of performance and output. Sports actions and performance would require personal - at least usually nowadays in top level athletics - almost total devotion and commitment. To use Paul Weiss's (1969) nice phrase - "Concern for bodily excellence" - and mental strength, I would like to add - is nothing to play at or with loosely or to be ridiculed. Athletic action and achievement require spontaneity, serious commitment and extraordinary self-discipline. Even leisure sports and games depend on such personal effort, bodily as well as psycho-physically active involvement. Personal freedom means here to consciously and deliberately to agree with and abide by the rules.⁸ As a chance, it is somehow expressed in the changing situations as also in the vicissitudes and unpredictability of a competition event. Finally, a feeling and experience of personal freedom may typically result and be gained, if you really have symbolically achieved a victory over yourself or a real one over an opponent or metaphorically speaking against nature, say a mountain or storm or distance, e. g.: think of the experience of overcoming the notorious weakness after twenty miles of a marathon.⁹ - Adorno was certainly wrong in judging that sport would "essentially be a realm of non-freedom, wherever it is organized".

It is true though, in top level athletics there are indeed at times instances of manipulation, alienation or even compulsion and domination exerted on athletes by officials, authoritarian coaches, the notorious public pressures for and expectations of spectacular records, pressure of the media, journalists, etc. But these are external phenomena that do not necessarily touch the essentially voluntary action of a free athlete. Only an athlete who autonomously devotes her or himself to a strenuous regimen of training will be at times capable of extraordinary authentic accomplishments: you can command somebody to march, but not to establish a world record or, say, to climb Mount Everest without additional oxygen intake.

Achievement in its wider sense is more general than just individual competition (although competition is one of the best means to improve achievement). The characteristic Homeric slogan mentioned above of athletic and Olympic contests ("Always to be the best, distinguished from everyone else", Homer Iliad VI, 205; XI, 794), this so-called "Achilles complex" (Segal) of the ancient Greek agonistic culture - is certainly not the only norm of the best possible achievement, although it is rather significant and characteristic for the very Olympic tradition and culture of achievement. The Olympic idea, thus, is mainly characterized by a specific principle of achievement, namely the agonistic or competitive one.

However, even in the Olympic Movement, the harsh ideal norm of being the one and only victor is - or at least should be, ideally! - mitigated or put into a somewhat more restricted perspective, as shown by Coubertin's well-known phrase "The most important thing in the Olympic Games is not to win but to take part". Educationally speaking, it is indeed more important to perform at one's personal best, to achieve the best possible personal result, to be able to participate in the Games of the sports elite and to fight fairly. Indeed, most of the conducive effects and impacts of a rigorous athletic training and of a genuine top level achievement motivation can be gained without being the eventual, say Olympic, champion. Sometimes, it is rather an educational challenge to stand defeat, though nowadays even an Olympic victory seems to be a special test for the athlete's personality to see whether (s)he can come out of the public and commercial aftermath uncorrupted¹⁰

The victorious athlete, thus to speak, also has to pass a test of personal maturity in our publicity-afflicted society.

The ideal models of the "sovereignty of the autonomous and enlightened athlete" and of the so-called "democratic" (i.e., actively participating or participatory) style of coaching were once established and elaborated in the practice of coaching crews at Ratzeburg/Northern Germany during the fifties and sixties - n. b. with my cooperation as a member of one Olympic champion eight and, later, as an amateur coach of a World Champion eight oar shell (1966). Then, in a speech on the occasion of the German Rowing Championship in 1965,

⁶North Carolina has this slogan as its state motto.

⁷ I even proposed *ahuman right* for anyone to have opportunities and access to such free and notably creative and *re-creative* activities.

⁸ Some such

⁹ In purely playful leisure sports

I had already then summed up conclusions from my practical experience in rowing and coaching. I talked about the ideal standard and model of an "autonomous" and "enlightened" or "sovereign" ("mündiger") athlete. The results regarding the so-called "democratic" style of coaching were also based on the late Karl Adam's experience, the most successful and (scientifically and philosophically) erudite rowing coach ever who had revolutionized coaching methods in world rowing at the time.

Sport as genuine, "creative life"

As regards the role and function of personal autonomy in athletics, of authentic action and personal achievement the model seems indeed to have a paragon function for an active and autonomous achieving life in general, particularly in terms of personal authenticity.

Life is dynamic (dynamic movement, as Plato said). Human life consists mainly of goal-attaining actions - at least regarding its essential meaning, though not necessarily most of the time. Life is creative action, achievement of performance. *Homo creator* and *homo performer* - both are necessarily connected with each another. Creative or active life is indeed in the last analysis personal achieving activity (at least in the wider sense of the term 'achievement'). If creative life in its deepest roots is authentic and personal activity and achievement, then, active sport activities, remain to be a distinct (or even distinguished) element, vehicle, and means of an engaged active life in the original sense of "*Eigenhandlung*" (authentic personal action). Thus sport is active, genuine, i.e. creative life. To state this is by no means trivial in the overwhelming grip of the administrated and virtual world of signs and information manipulations. Indeed - and again - active sport has remained genuine action in a world of prevailing institutions and codifications. Thus far, we may follow Ortega's approach. We cannot, however, accept Ortega's inverse inference that all life is sport in its deepest sense. This would mean illegitimately to extend the concept of sport beyond any identification and delineation which would no longer have and confer any sense on the word - and it would turn out to be very misleading. There are other realms of creative living and achieving, too!

Also, there is no single-factor theory of life and sport that can be considered valid. Complex phenomena require intricate and differentiated theories as we saw above in connection with philosophical anthropology.

Since meaningful life in its deepest sense is genuinely based on authentic and autonomous, or sovereign, personal activity, the ideas of freely chosen, authentic and autonomous achievement, action, and performance would really attain a specific philosophical and educational significance. These ideas certainly relate to all realms of creative personal and team activity, sport being but one variant. Arts, music, science, production, active recreation, leisure, love - and sport (including nature sport, e.g. hiking) are only examples of these sorts of creative activity. Their communicative and social significance is certainly beyond any doubts and essentially lies in active self-involvement and engagement. Indeed, there is still a *creative* principle of achievement or, rather, a principle of creative accomplishments and the respective processes, or, rather personal actions, of achieving. The traditional discussion thus far was too much related to the once fashionable social criticism in the philosophy and sociology of achievement, the performance principle and the "achieving society". One should not only interpret the comprehensive achieving principle in but a crude economical way. Besides the economic and sociological achievement principles, we have at least a socio-psychological one - and a socio-philosophical one, too. The socio-philosophical aspect would mean that the human being is (amongst other necessary traits) indeed the achieving being par excellence: One has to distinguish clearly between freely chosen, self-motivated achievements and secondarily motivated or even obtruded achievements. Philosophically and also social psychologically speaking, they are really very different. It is the first-mentioned kind of achieving activity and achievement motivation including the too often forgotten pleasure of achieving and being personally active and/or productive which I think, would really be creative, being characteristic for *homo performer* and *homo creator* at the same time. This kind of social philosophical - and personally experienced - achievement principle which has still to be further elaborated in philosophical terms is far from being outdated. (This is also true for the other variants of the achieving principle, even if we do not live in a strict or pure "achieving society" as McClelland thinks: cf. my 1979, 2012.)

Educationally speaking, it is necessary to provide plenty of opportunities for creative achieving actions (in the narrower competitive sense, and in the top level as well as in the wider sense). Every man and woman, in particular every youngster, has a human right to have access to creative activities. Creativity, primary motivation, personal commitment and devotion, a plurality of creative activities in a personal combination (multi-sidedness) - in short: any opportunity for creative achieving activity has to be provided and fostered by families, elementary and high schools, colleges, universities and most certainly and effectively by sport teams, clubs, boys' and girls' scout groups as well as by other rather official institutions and voluntary organizations. The liberal and democratic state has to emphasize and support these tendencies and should provide plenty of such opportunities to foster and further such activities, initiatives, and motivations. It seems necessary - at least

in Europe - to develop and support as well as honour a new positive culture of creative achievements - of the creative achievement and performance principle (compare the subtitle and gist of the author's 1983).

Achievement being a cultural and social phenomenon and ideal value - is not purely just a natural process or phenomenon. It is at the same time a psycho-physical, social psychological, cultural and also, in some sense, spiritual – and basically even an important philosophical topic - even more so if and insofar as it is pertaining to symbolic results, processes, methods and mediating procedures. It is a fundamental anthropological model, if not a category, and an effective vehicle of self-understanding and self-development, as well as of social identification, judgement and appreciation.

Certainly, the human interest in personal authentic and autonomous acting, the respective concern for excellence by achieving and accomplishing something by one's personal efforts and endeavors, is, methodologically and philosophically speaking, an ideal with a normative hue and a convincing appeal, a demanding symbol, an expression of our eternal orientation towards the better. Achieving and —winning], though, by contrast to the notorious slogan by Tatum and Lombardi, is not “everything” nor “the only thing”, but without achieving, the performing human being, *homo performer* and *creator*, could not make much sense of her or his life, and their higher life aspirations. Without creative human achievements and initiatives, higher civilization and even our material culture would not have been possible at all. *The cultural being* (dependent on culture) *is the achieving being*. And the top athlete is ideally a quasi mythical symbol of a cultural accomplishment. -

Let us retain and keep clean this paragon symbol of an *athleta semper humanus!*

NOTES

¹ All these activities and activations of schemes-interpretations come in different types, levels, hierarchies, value systems etc.(see below in the text).

²Generally speaking the IOC and the Ifs should more actively and more politically serve super-nationality and internationality of the movement by using political means in order to guarantee a relative political non-partisanship neutrality. This cannot be obtained by preaching ideals only, but by courageously using political means. This seems to be all the more promising since the Olympics and FIFA Cups are by now really prestigious international enterprises on a planetary scale. Though the Olympic movement cannot bring about world peace as a direct consequence as would have been alleged sometimes, it can yet certainly serve an *indirect* mission in getting some athletes and the TV spectators the peoples to understand and respect each other better in a rather benevolent way using

.the top-level championships as symbols of a more peaceful and better world and for an ideal and symbolic unity of humankind. The Olympic movement has to remain aware of and consciously pursue the humanistic, educational and philosophic dimensions of its idea in order to live up to its honorable tradition. The Olympic movement is too important a humanistic idea to get sacrificed or to fall victim in the jungle of commercialism, “telecracy” and nationalism still soaring in young developing countries.

³ Cicero wrote (Tusc. Disp. V. III 9): "Pythagoras [...] replied that the life of man seemed to him to resemble the festival* which was celebrated with most magnificent games before a concourse collected from the whole of Greece; for at this festival some men whose bodies had been trained sought to win the glorious distinction of a crown, others were attracted by the prospect of making gain by buying or selling, whilst there was on the other hand a certain class - the best type of free-born man - who looked neither for applause nor gain, but came for the sake of the spectacle and closely watched what was done and how it was done. So also we, as though we had come from some city to a kind of crowded festival, leaving in like fashion another life and nature of being, entered upon this life, and some were slaves of ambition, some of money; there were a special few who, counting all else as nothing, closely scanned the nature of things; these men gave themselves the name of lovers of wisdom (for that is the meaning of the word philosopher); and just as at the games the men of truest breeding looked on without any self-seeking, so in life the contemplation and discovery of nature far surpassed all other pursuits." –

Thus spoke Pythagoras - in my favorite quotation regarding the naming of that special “breed called” after that and still today “philosophers”; it is interesting for sport philosophers that their characterizing label was once introduced in connection with the Olympic Games of antiquity!

4 Achievement and achieving here may also be understood in a wider sense. However, it can also be interpreted in an even narrower sense, in a more specific cultural way, i.e. in the connotation and meaning of an everimproving quantifiable or measurable performance and accomplishment. Thus far, we have no really comprehensive and encompassing philosophic-anthropological work about "the achieving being" (cf. the author's 1983). The philosophy of achievement is so to speak still in its infancy, though we have some social psychological and sociological treatises on "the achieving society" (MacClelland), "the achievement motive" and the dynamics of "achievement motivation" (Atkinson, Heckhausen and others) as well as plenty books about the so-called "achievement principle" in society, economics, and sociology.

5 Merkur, Munich, 1978, no. 32, 378.

6 "Being rather than seeming (only)". - Interestingly enough, an American state (North Carolina) still has this telling slogan as its state motto.

7 I even proposed (in my 1985, p. 182 ff) to install an official *human right* for anyone to have opportunities and access to such free and notably creative and *re-creative* activities.

8 Some such freedom is to be found in the free variations of action and planning strategies within the framework and limits of the rules and standards.

9 In purely playful leisure sports the very establishing and changing of the rules as we go along provides an additional means of ex-pressing and constituting a freedom of action – you may think here even of a Wittgensteinian interpretation of "following a rule"!

10 Even in antiquity, again Pythagoras (according to Bowra) said, though it would be important to take part in the Panhellenic Games like the Olympic ones, it would as well be essential also for the athlete *not* to win – because of the dangers of being seduced and corrupted by the aftermaths of, say, an Olympic or Isthmian victory!^o

LITERATURE

- [1]. Lenk, H.: Werte, Ziele, Wirklichkeit der modernen Olympischen Spiele. Schorndorf: Hofmann 1964, 2nd Ed. 1972.
- [2]. id.: Leistungssport - Ideologie oder Mythos? Stuttgart: Kohlhammer 1972.
- [3]. Id. (Ed.): Topical Problems of Sport Philosophy. Schorndorf: Hofmann 1973.
- [4]. id.: Team Dynamics, Champaign, IL: Stipes 1977.
- [5]. id.: Social Philosophy of Athletics, Champaign, IL: Stipes 1979.
- [6]. id.: Eigenleistung. Osnabrück-Zurich: Interfrom 1983.
- [7]. id.: Die achte Kunst: Leistungssport – Breitensport. Osnabrück-Zurich: Interfrom 1985.
- [8]. id.: Erfolg oder Fairness? Münster: LIT 2002, 2nd Ed. 2010.
- [9]. id.: Grasping Reality. Singapore (World Scientific) 2003.
- [10]. id.: Global TechnoScience and Responsibility. Berlin: LIT 2007
- [11]. id.: Sporting enthusiasm and authentic achievement. In: Philosophy now 62, no. 7 (2007), 26-30
- [12]. id.: Das flexible Vielfachwesen. Weilerswist/German: Velbrück 2010, 2nd Ed. 2011
- [13]. id.: S.O.S. Save Olympic Spirit. Toward a Social Philosophy of the Olympics. Kassel: Agon 2012. id.: Kreative Pluralität. Bochum - Freiburg: Projektverlag 2013 [15].id.: H.: Scheme Dynamics. Bochum - Freiburg: Projektverlag 2017.
- [14]. Lenk, H. - Pilz, G.A.: Das Prinzip Fairness. Zürich: Interfrom 1989
- [15]. Ortega y Gasset, J.: El origen del estado (1930). In: id. Obras completas. Madrid 1950.
- [16]. Weiss, P.: Sport- A Philosophic Inquiry. Carbondale-Edwardsville: Southern Illinois U:P 1969.

Hans Lenk. " Values in Top-level Sports." IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS). vol. 24 no. 09, 2019, pp. 22-34.