



Scientific and philosophical theory of sports: real state and development prospects

UDC 796.01



Dr. Sc.Phil. **A.A. Mamedov**¹

PhD **M.V. Sherstyuk**¹

PhD **A.A. Zaitsev**¹

PhD **E.V. Gnezdilova**¹

¹Russian Timiryazev State Agrarian University, Moscow

Corresponding author: azermamedov@mail.ru

Received by the editorial office on 16.05.2024

Abstract

Objective of the study was to based on critical analysis, substantiate the development of a philosophical theory of physical culture and sports.

Methods and structure of the study. The arguments through which the evidentiary basis for the development of a philosophical theory of physical culture and sports are based are considered. The source base consists of scientific works devoted to the conceptual foundations of the development of philosophy and sports science.

Results and conclusions. In the need to develop a scientific and philosophical theory of physical culture and sport, the authors present arguments that consist in resolving such problems as the different understanding in Russian and foreign science of the subject of the philosophy of sport itself, the interpretation of the phenomenon of sport, the historical and philosophical presentation of modern science of sport, three theoretical dimensions sports, historical and philosophical falsification, consideration of the philosophy of sport as the philosophy of Olympism and its historical and philosophical falsification, logical and linguistic inconsistency of the profile thesaurus.

The authors conclude that, as a theoretical perspective, the design of a scientific and philosophical theory of sport is possible provided that all problematic issues considered in the study are systematically resolved. The structure of the model of scientific and philosophical theory presented in the article involves the development of a number of sections of philosophical applied knowledge in the fields of history, science, religion, politics, culture, and logical-linguistic analysis.

Keywords: *scientific and philosophical theory of physical culture and sports, problem analysis, prospects, conditions for creation, structural components.*

Introduction. One of the most important problems of Russian philosophy is the construction of a modern scientific and philosophical theory of physical culture and sport, capable of becoming a reliable ideological and methodological basis for applied science and state goals of developing public institutions [1, 7, 8].

Objective of the study was to based on a critical analysis, provide a well-reasoned justification for the development of a philosophical theory of physical culture and sport.

Methods and structure of the study. The arguments by which the evidentiary basis for the development of a philosophical theory of physical

culture and sport are based are considered. The source base consists of scientific works devoted to the conceptual foundations of the development of philosophy and sports science.

Results of the study and discussion. There are several arguments to support the need to develop a scientific and philosophical theory of physical culture and sport.

1. The problem of different understanding of the subject of philosophy of sport proper in Russian and foreign science. The problem of different interpretations of the subject and features of philosophy is superimposed on the features of applied knowledge positioned as philosophy of sport [1, 2, 7, 10, 13].



At the same time, philosophical developments in the USA and Western Europe differ from their Eastern European and Soviet-Russian analogues in the following main aspects:

- the lag of philosophical Eastern European and Soviet-Russian research behind Western European research initially by 45-50, and subsequently by 25-30 years, gradually reducing this gap;

- unlike Western European science, based on the results of empirical research interpreted in ontological and epistemological contexts, Eastern European and Soviet-Russian works often belonged to areas of axiology that do not have scientific and philosophical status in the West. It should be noted that in the last two decades, this difference has gradually been leveled with the dominance of the Western approach;

- the main directions and foundations of Western philosophy of sport until now have been tacitly positivism, neopositivism, postpositivism, structuralism, and explicit and actively positioned - pragmatism, existentialism, hermeneutics, modernism, symbolism. Neo-Marxism and orientalism were rejected as weak directions that did not deserve the right to be included in the World Anthology of Philosophy of Sport. Modern sports mythology is increasingly claiming the role of modern philosophical anthropology of sport in Western specialized literature. Until the end of the 20th century, Soviet-Russian materials on the philosophy of sport formally declared their commitment to dialectical materialism. In reality, they were increasingly inclined to pro-Western examples of specialized and applied philosophizing.

In general, all existing materials on the philosophy of sport can be conditionally divided into three levels:

- 1) the level of philosophical self-reflection;

- 2) the level of philosophical foundations of sports science;

- 3) the level of philosophical understanding of the real sports process.

It should be recognized that the majority of applied philosophical research, especially in the Eastern European and Soviet-Russian cluster of scientific research, belongs to the first level, which is not familiar with either sports science or the sports process, that is, it is very far from the real phenomenon of sports.

The second and third levels of Western philosophy of sports, on the contrary, are often very far from

the classical understanding of the subject of philosophy, but correspond to the European interpretation of philosophy as a theoretical or theoretical-empirical study. Therefore, such topics as a comparative analysis of doping tests of athletes are considered quite philosophical in the West and deserve the right to be placed on the pages of the World Anthology of Sports.

A characteristic feature of the entire philosophy of sports is the uncritical mixture of philosophy, sociology, political science, cultural studies, psychology and pedagogy.

2. The problem of different interpretations of the phenomenon of sport. The concept of «sport», which has English, French, Spanish and other etymological versions that arose in the New Age, and perhaps earlier, in the 18th-19th centuries is already quite clearly associated with the verb "to have fun" and the noun «entertainment». The specifics of sports entertainment depended on the national and social class affiliation of those having fun, which certainly served as the basis for the formation of future sports. Most scientists are confident that any, even passive-contemplative, participation in physical (body-motor) recreational and entertaining activities, including outdoor recreation and a healthy lifestyle in general, which involves morning exercises with jogging or periodic visits to the gym, introduces to sport.

3. Problems of modern science about sport in the light of history and philosophy of science. The cluster of natural scientific knowledge was the first to develop in Europe in the following order: mathematics, physics, chemistry, biology. The first classical and non-classical hypothetico-deductive theories were created in it. With a lag of about 1.5 centuries in Europe, on the basis of natural scientific borrowings in the direction of creating hypothetico-deductive theories, social sciences also began to develop: political, political economy, economic, other social and, finally, sociological. In the second half of the 20th century, UNESCO positions the concept of so-called «breakthrough theories», which are understood as a synthesis of hypothetico-deductive theories and specific sociological research. It is recognized that only such a synthesis can provide reliable or, at least, highly probable knowledge [1]. Sports science, as an applied science, taking into account its tendency towards natural-scientific empiricism and/or social and humanitarian scholas-



ticism, still remains in the positions of descriptive theories and abstract theorizing, and is also still distinguished by a very weak connection with the main science, and in all directions [1].

The apotheosis of the development of sports science (mainly Soviet) are considered to be general and integrative theories: physical education, physical education, history of physical culture, physical culture and sports, history and theory of sports, sports training, sports training, sports competition.

4. The problem of three theoretical dimensions of sports. The real history of sports knows three main dimensions: socio-cultural, political, religious. Until recently, in the history and philosophy of sports, the decisive emphasis was placed on its socio-cultural dimension [2, 4, 9, 10]. Moreover, this dimension was considered almost exclusively in the context of the cultural and civilizational values of democracy, humanism, and tolerance accepted in Western society and formed in the second half of the 20th century.

The political dimension of sport was initially presented as a debatable issue requiring specific historical research, usually reduced to a tendentious selection of relevant facts [8, 10]. But bare, and even selective, facts, from the point of view of general subject-object knowledge of the most general laws, as is known, are of no significant importance.

At the same time, the religious dimension of sport in applied philosophy was not subjected to either historical or philosophical analysis [2-12, 14, 15].

5. Philosophy of sport and the problem of historical and philosophical falsification. Modern philosophy of sport, as well as social and humanitarian profile science, is full of historical and historical and philosophical falsifications, which include, in particular, the ideas about the general cultural nature of sport and Olympism; about their non-religious and non-political nature; about the social similarity or likeness of ancient sport and Olympism with their modern versions; about the unity and consistency of the cultural and civilizational role of sport and Olympism, even in the context of the philosophical problem of alienation.

Obviously, it is impossible to build a scientific and philosophical theory of sport on such an illusory philosophical and historical basis.

6. The problem of considering the philosophy of sport as the philosophy of Olympism. In foreign and domestic philosophy, there is a position, which has

its supporters, considering the philosophy of sport as the philosophy of Olympism. As such, this recognition is wishful thinking and, in particular, is based on the philosophical and pedagogical maxims of Pierre de Coubertin, which largely assumed the restoration or creation of a new Olympic religion [7, 12, 14, 15]; on the attempts of Hans Lenk to develop a "new philosophical anthropology of sport", which objectively serves as a prospect for the creation of a modern sports-Olympic mythology [2, 7].

7. The problem of the historical and philosophical falsification of Olympism. Philosophical speculations around Olympism have their own falsified historical and factual basis, traditionally passed off as the real history of Olympism. In this regard, practically all key points of the theory and history of Olympism are subject to certain correction, the inaccurate or incorrect interpretation of which purposefully turns Olympism into an illusory-mythological champion of Western market ideology [2-12].

8. The problem of logical-linguistic inconsistency of the specialized thesaurus. All the above-mentioned distortions, errors and shortcomings are reflected in the specialized-applied thesaurus of the philosophy of sport, which should also be substantially revised in order to form a basis for a consistent logical-linguistic analysis, immanent in any hypothetical-deductive theoretical model and program of specific sociological research [1].

Conclusions. As a theoretical perspective, the design of a scientific and philosophical theory of sport is possible under the condition of a systematic resolution of all problematic issues considered in the study. The structure of the model of scientific and philosophical theory presented in the article assumes the development of a number of sections of philosophical applied knowledge in the fields of history, science, religion, politics, culture, logical and linguistic analysis.

References

1. Istoriya i filosofiya nauki, sotsiologiya i psikhologiya kak teoretiko-metodologicheskiye osnovaniya postroyeniya gipotetiko-deduktivnykh teoriy i provedeniya konkretno-sotsiologicheskikh issledovaniy v oblasti fizicheskoy kultury i sporta. Scientific monograph. A.A. Peredelskiy [ed.]. Orel: Kartush publ., 2022. 232 p.
2. Lenk G. Sport kak sovremennyy mif? Religiya.



- Magiya. Mif. Sovremennyye filosofskiyе issledovaniya. Moscow: «URSS», publ. 1997. pp. 56-179.
3. Matveev L.P. Obshchaya teoriya sporta i yeye prikladnyye aspekty. Textbook for universities of physical culture. 5th ed., rev., sup. Moscow: Sovetskiy sport publ., 2010. 340 p.
 4. Melnikova N.Yu., Treskin A.V. Istoriya fizicheskoy kulturey i sporta. Textbook. I.Yu. Melnikova [ed.]. 2nd ed., corr., sup. Moscow: Sport publ., 2017. 432 p.
 5. Nesterov P.V. Istoricheskiye formy olimpizma. Olimpiyskoye dvizheniye, fizicheskaya kultura i sport v sovremennom obshchestve. Proceedings national scientific-practical conference with international participation, November 12-13, 2020. Moskovskaya gosudarstvennaya akademiya fizicheskoy kulturey; Yu.A. Fomin, P.V. Nesterov [ed.]. Malakhovka, 2021. pp. 3-13.
 6. Nesterov P.V. Kulturno-istoricheskoye znacheniye i smysl Konstantinopolskogo edikta Feodosiya I Velikogo (393 g. n.e.) o «zaprete» Olimpiyskikh igr. Teoriya i praktika fizicheskoy kulturey. 2009. No. 2. pp. 29-37.
 7. Peredelskiy A.A. Dvulikiy Yanus. Sport kak sotsialnyy fenomen: sushchnost i ontologicheskiye osnovaniya. Monograph. Moscow: Sport publ., 2016. 312 p.
 8. Stolyarov V.I. Vzaimootnosheniye sporta i politiki (sotsialno-filosofskiy i metodologicheskiy analiz). Vzaimootnosheniye sporta i politiki s pozitsii gumanizma. Issue 3. Moscow, 2005. pp. 5-123.
 9. Stolyarov V.I. Olimpizm kak gumanisticheskaya filosofskaya kontseptsiya. Gumanisticheskaya teoriya i praktika sporta. Issue. 1. Moscow: «SpArt» RGAFK, publ. pp. 195-230.
 10. Stolyarov V.I. Sotsiologiya fizicheskoy kulturey i sporta. Textbook. Moscow: Flinta: Nauka publ., 2004. 400 p.
 11. Tokarev S.A. Religiya v istorii narodov mira. 4th ed., corr., sup. Moscow: Politizdat publ., 1986. 576 p.
 12. Coubertin Pierre de. Comment conçoit les Jeux Olympiques, par Fernand Lomazzi, «L'Auto». Jean-Marie Brohm. Le Mythe Olympique, 1946. 431 p.
 13. Fairchild David L. Review Essay (рецензия на книгу): Morgan William J., Meier Klaus V. Philosophic Inquiry in Sport. Champaign, IL.: Human Kinetics, 1988. Journal of the Philosophy of Sport. Vol. XIV. 1987. pp. 71-79.
 14. Peredelskiy A.A., Mamedov A.A.O., Kortunov V.V., Kotusov D.V., Zaitsev A.A. Social transformation of olympism from the position of historical analysis. Theory and Practice of Physical Culture. 2023. No. 3. pp. 112-114.
 15. Peredelskiy A.A., Mamedov A.A.O., Kortunov V.V., Kotusov D.V., Donskikh K.Yu. Time for change and the next tasks for restructuring the curricula of physical education and sports universities in Russia. Teoriya i praktika fizicheskoy kulturey. 2023. No. 12. pp. 108-110.