

Original

Losing in Competition Against Oneself from the Perspective of Fair Play

Jun-Hyun KIM¹

¹Fixed-term Researcher, Nippon Sport Science University, Japan

Abstract: In modern sports, there are many doubtful phenomena in which wins and losses are not clear, such as a victory as the result of doping going unnoticed by others and victory without fair play. The matter of this phenomena is brought up from a philosophical perspective more than anything. Therefore, the purpose of this paper is to identify why wins acquired through questionable means are not true victories, but defeats from the viewpoint of competition against oneself by using two scenarios which are: first, victory in violation of a formal fair play despite going unnoticed by others, and second, victory in violation of informal fair play. This paper approaches its objective in the following manners: (1) this paper will review the concept of fair play in modern sports. (2) this paper will discuss why the two scenarios are not victories, but defeats, in which the limitation of victory without informal fair play will be revealed. (3) this paper will discuss the possibility of judgment for this limitation from a moral and ethical perspective, which is made by competing against oneself. (4) this paper will identify the meaning of informal fair play, as respecting the players themselves and their counterparts, which is reviewed through the examples of the Pierre de Coubertin Medal and examples of sports. And lastly, this paper will reveal why the second scenario is not a victory, but a defeat from self-negation based on negation associated with the two meanings of informal fair play. By its conclusion, this paper will suggest that self-negation based on negation associated with the two meanings of informal fair play exists in the sports world when judging victory and defeat based on competition against oneself, and that what the players need to pursue is not only victory based on the result of competition against others, but also to pursue one's own satisfaction without self-negation based on negation associated with the two meanings of informal fair play.

抄録: 現代スポーツには、勝利と敗北が明白ではない疑わしい現象が多く存在する。それは、他者に知られることなく行われたドーピングの結果としての勝利やフェアプレーを伴わない勝利といったものである。こうした現象に関する問題は、なによりも哲学的な観点から提起される。それゆえ、本稿の目的は、疑わしい方法によって得られた勝利がなぜ真の勝利ではなく敗北であるのかを、自己との競争の観点からある2つのシナリオを用いて明らかにすることである。第一のシナリオは、他者に気づかれることなく形式的フェアプレーに違反した勝利である。第二のシナリオは、非形式的フェアプレーに違反した勝利である。本稿は、以下の方法により上記の目的にアプローチする。(1) 本稿は、現代スポーツにおけるフェアプレーの概念を再検討する。(2) 本稿は、なぜ、2つのシナリオが勝利ではなく敗北であるのかを論じる。その中で、非形式的フェアプレーを伴わない勝利にかかわる限界が示される。(3) 自己との競争により構成される道徳的・倫理的な観点から、本稿はこの限界に対して判断の可能性を論じる。(4) 本稿は、選手自身と彼/彼女らの対戦相手を尊重する非形式的フェアプレーの意味を明らかにする。なお、この点は、ピエール・ド・クーベルタンメダルの事例やスポーツの事例を通じて示される。最終的に本稿は、なぜ2番目のシナリオが勝利ではなく、非形式的フェアプレーの2つの意味に関わる否定にもとづく自己否定による敗北なのかを明らかにする。この結論により、本稿は、自己との競争にもとづく勝利と敗北を判断するときに、スポーツの世界には非形式的フェアプレーの2つの意味に関わる否定にもとづく自己否定が存在することを提示する。加えて、選手たちが追従すべきは、他者との競争の結果にもとづく勝利であるのみならず、非形式的フェアプレーの2つの意味に関わる否定にもとづく自己否定が伴わない自ら自身の満足であることもまた提示する。

(Received: July 20, 2020 Accepted: September 13, 2020)

Key words: formal fair play, informal fair play, competing against oneself

キーワード: 形式的フェアプレー, 非形式的フェアプレー, 自己との競争

1. Introduction

Sung Min Kang (2013, 535) argued that “characteristics of modern sports are institutionalization, physicality, rules, and competition.” Sports are performed by physical competition based on the institutionalized rules. And then as a result, victories and defeats are

calculated through a series of procedures. Victories and defeats are determined by records and scores based on the institutionalized rules. In this respect, Sigmund Loland (2002, 2) argued that, “[c]onstitutive rules defined what it means to win a sports competition.” In this quotation, Loland describes the constitutive rules¹ as rules that inevitably constitute sports. For

example, soccer should consist of 11 players and use a soccer ball, not a baseball. From this point, we can draw out the following general facts: victories and defeats in sports are not only based on the quantitative results such as scores and records, but must be based on the constitutive rules that define sports. Also, Robert L Simon (2010, 18) argued that, “[s]ome philosophers of sports argue that cheaters can’t really win, since when they cheat they go outside the constitutive rules that define the game, and therefore they don’t even play the game.”

In summary, the constitutive rules in sports define actions that are allowed and not allowed, and victories and defeats must be based on the constitutive rules. Therefore, unless athletes obey the constitutive rules of sports, not only can they not win, but they may also be considered not to have played the game at all. However, there are many cases in sports, in which it is unknown whether victory or defeat was acquired through fair and just means. For example:

1. Player A acquired victory as a result of an unnoticed violation of “formal fair play.”²
2. Player B acquired victory without “informal fair play.”³

In these two scenarios, can we judge that the victories are truly victories or defeats? Although at first glance we can say that the victories mentioned can be counted as victories based on the results and structures of the game, but it seems that the victories need to be considered from a philosophical approach which explains why they are not victories, but defeats. In addition, these types of shallow victories imply that we can’t clearly distinguish the winners and the losers from the perspective of fair play. For example, in relation to formal fair play, from October 1968 to September 2020, a total of 148 medals have been officially stripped by the IOC.⁴ These phenomena prove that we cannot clearly judge winners and losers only based on the final results of the sport and the view that we see the victories.

Therefore, this study will not develop a discussion based on the view that we see the victories that they achieved, but develop a discussion based on the view that the subject sees the victory that they achieved. From this position, the purpose of this paper is to identify why the victories mentioned above are not truly victories but defeats. This paper approaches the objective in the following manners: first, this paper re-

views the concept of fair play in modern sports. Second, this paper discusses why the two scenarios are not victories, but defeats in which the limitation of victory without the informal fair play will be revealed. Third, this paper discusses the possibility of judgment for this limitation through a moral and ethical perspective of competition against oneself. Fourth, this paper identifies two meanings of the informal fair play, to respect the players themselves and their counterparts, which is reviewed through the examples of the Pierre de Coubertin Medal and examples from sports. Lastly, this paper reveals why the second scenario is not victory but defeat from self-negation based on negation.

Before moving on to the next chapter, it is worth accurately mentioning the scope of this study. The intention of this study is not to identify losses based on the competition against others and the structure of sports games, but losing based on competition against oneself and the perspective of fair play which athletes must obey. And for this intention, methodologically, this paper is not targeting sport as a broad meaning that includes physical education, play, game, and leisure activities, but rather competitive sports that are intended to demonstrate their physical excellence on the basis of institutionalized rules, such as the Olympic Games and World Championships.

2. Fair play in modern sports

First, this chapter focuses on “The Declaration on Sport” by the International Council of Sport and Physical Education (ICSPE) and a book by Hans Lenk. It is thought that “The Declaration on Sport” is a document published by this internationally acknowledged institution. Furthermore, the reason why this study additionally reviewed the concept of fair play by Lenk is that he divided the concept of fair play into formal fair play and informal fair play, both of which are applied to concrete sports phenomena.

According to the preamble of “The Declaration on Sport” by ICSPE (1964, 9), the relation between sports and fair play is described. “If this activity involves competition, it must then always be performed with a spirit of sportsmanship. There can be no true sport without the idea of fair play.” This citation declared that fair play is essential to the realization of sports. And, “The Declaration on Sport” abstractly describes it as follows:

Fair Play is the essence, the *sine qua non*, of any game or sport that is worthy of the name. It is as essential in professional as in amateur sport. Fair play requires not only strict but also glad and willing adherence to the rules, both in the letter and in the spirit. It implies respect for one's opponent, and for oneself. Without fair play, a sporting contest can become a humiliating and a degrading experience. (1964, 7–8)

From this point of view, we can draw two components of fair play. First, fair play means to obey the rules in sports. Thus, it amounts to the fact that disobeying the rules is obviously breaking the fairness of sports. Lenk defined this "fair play related to rules" as the concept of formal fair play. And second, fair play is respect for one's opponent and for oneself. On this fair play, Lenk (1979, 152) pointed out as follows, "[a]n athlete can very well comply with the formal rule of fairness and, nevertheless, infringe on the informal fair play expectation for spirit of chivalrous sportsmanship." In this citation, the concept of informal fair play includes respect for one's opponent and for oneself. In order to accurately describe precisely the concept of informal fair play by Lenk, let us move on to the example of the Amsterdam Olympic Fencing match between Gaudin of France and Gaudini of Italy, which was mentioned briefly in his book.⁵

Gaudin reversed that outcome. He then faced Gaudini. With the score tied 2-2, Gaudini grazed Gaudin's jacket but the referee ruled "no touch". The Italians immediately protested but Gaudin walked over to the jury and magnanimously told them, "I was touched." Gaudini went ahead 4-2, but Gaudin came back to win the final three points, winning the match 5-4, and secure the gold medal. Gaudini also lost to Casmir, which gave the German the silver medal.⁶

In view of this, if Gaudin hadn't reported that Gaudini had grazed his jacket, Gaudin could have taken the advantage at 2 : 2, but instead he decided to uphold fair play to his own detriment. To this point, the informal fair play, which Lenk says was Gaudin's attitude, represented respect for his opponent and for himself. It was considered that he could have taken the round at an advantage if he hadn't reported the touch

to the jury. It seems that he purposely followed a fair attitude. Masami Sekine said as follows regarding this kind of attitude:

Fair play comes from the mindset that, although one has the opportunity to gain an advantage from a critical situation, they refrain from winning through this advantageous position. It is more important not to take malicious attitude when victory is at stake. Fair play is born in the context of pursuing winning as victory and defeat by the sword. (2013, 41)

From the above quotation we can draw the following conclusions: namely, fair play can be understood as a fair attitude based on our internal voice, and at the heart of this fair attitude we find respect for others. As stated in "The Declaration on Sport", fair play is essential and fundamental to sports. If we accept these sentences that sports should be built on the basis of fair play, how should we accept victory without fair play? These issues will be discussed in the next chapter.

3. Truths about two scenarios

This chapter continues to discuss why the two scenarios are not victories but defeats, in which a limitation of the second scenario of an informal fair play will emerge anew. Let's take some time to think about the following scenarios once again:

1. Player A acquired victory as a result of an unnoticed violation of "formal fair play."
2. Player B acquired victory without "informal fair play."

From the first scenario, we can elicit two conflicting interpretations. The first interpretation relates to the perspective from which we judge the phenomenon. Accordingly, everyone in attendance aside from the actual culprit will probably recognize the first scenario as a victory. Because none of the observers realize that player A broke the constitutive rules, they will assuredly consider player A as the clear victor. Then, on the contrary, how do the first scenario be perceived by player A?

It is worth mentioning that matters of the constitutive rules concerning the first scenario correspond with formal fair play. Thus, this could lead to the conclusion that breaking constitutive rules is violating formal fair play and fairness, and breaking formal fair

play ultimately results in a loss, as Simon (2010, 18) argued that, “cheaters can’t really win.” Therefore, even though we can’t judge exactly whether the victory of the first scenario is truly a victory or defeat, we would most likely consider the first scenario a victory, but if it is certain that player A has broken formal fair play, player A would consider it a defeat.

This approach is applicable to all phenomena. For example, in cases where the truth is unclear, such as criminal cases and lies, it can only be revealed by the offender and the person who lied. Therefore, in the cases of rule breakers, the reason their victories are in truth, defeats, is because they know they have broken the rules of formal fair play.

Then let’s turn our attention to the second scenario. We should consistently use the same perspective, and ask the offenders whether the second scenario is a victory or a defeat. However unfortunately, at the present stage, this study based on two directions presents the limitation of not being able to determine what it means to keep informal fair play and whether the second scenario is a victory or defeat. This limitation results in a matter of criteria for judging victory and defeat in modern sports. In other words, formal fair play exerts influence as an important criterion on victory and defeat in modern sports, but in contrast informal fair play exerts no influence on victory and defeat. If we set standards for each and every act of informal fair play that applies to victory and defeat, we can distinguish wins and losses on the basis of these standards. Without these standards, we can’t answer the question of whether victory obtained without the informal fair play should be considered victory or not.

This limitation can be very threatening to this study. If we accept this limitation, and if we accept that victories and defeats have nothing to do with informal fair play, we will find no ethic or morality in the world of sports. However, additionally this study will discuss one possibility of this limitation in the next chapter, and at the heart of this possibility lay ethical and moral judgments resulting from competition against oneself.

4. The possibility of judging the limitation

First, this chapter discusses the possibility of why fair play is subject to our judgment: here the act of being the subject of fair play includes both formal fair play and informal fair play.

Let’s begin the discussion with the general facts: we judge whether fair play is observed or not by looking at the many actions that take place in sports competitions. Then, what is the basis on which we can make this judgment? From the claims of Sekine fair play comes from a mindset, and the case of Olympic Fencing by Gaudin mentioned in the previous chapter that he purposely followed a fair attitude, we can discuss the possibility of judgment in regards to this question. At the heart of this possibility of judgement, mental factors such as internal will, intention, and purpose lie. To this point, Nicholas Dixon persuasively said the following by referring to Immanuel Kant:

A venerable tradition associated with Kant holds that I am morally responsible only for what is within my control. I am not responsible for any consequences of my actions that I did not intend and had no reason to foresee. Strictly speaking, the only human actions that are subject to moral evaluation are our intentions, which, unlike the consequences of our control. (1999, 23)

Based on this view, it is confirmed that the basis by which we can judge the numerous acts of sports is because we act with mental factors such as the internal will, intention, and purpose. We prove ourselves through numerous acts in the world of sports. And these acts are not forced by others, but the results of our voluntary acts. Therefore, these acts can be subject to moral judgment because at the root of these acts there are mental factors such as our internal will, intention, and purpose. In addition, Lee Jong Wang (2006, 8) states that “since we are acting in the relationship between body and mind, and acts are manifested by the will, which is one of our spiritual elements, we can demand the ethic of the behavior.” From this view, it is considered that acts in sports are not simply physical acts, but intentional acts based on our spiritual elements, and those who participate in sports act based on these factors. However, what should be noted here is the limitation that on the basis of the direction we judge the phenomenon; we cannot accurately grasp these mental factors. For example, if someone breaks informal fair play, how can we judge them? In this case, we can not know their mental factors. Therefore, we again face the limitation of judgment regarding the informal fair play.

However, the story will be different from the offender's perspective. For example, if they intentionally violated informal fair play, or achieved victory by violating informal fair play, they will be able to make a moral judgment because only they can know their own precise mental factors. This is due to the general fact that our actions are not caused by others, but by our own mental factors. Accordingly, we can judge our own actions.

Leslie A. Howe explains the internal phenomena caused by mental factors such as the internal will, intention, and purpose as follows in terms of competition against oneself based on phenomenology.

I raise a number of problems against both criteria and argue that traditional and adventure sports do both involve self-competition on at least two levels: bettering one's previous performance and resisting the desire to quit. I argue that self-reflexive competition is not so much with one's self (which is philosophically absurd), but within one's self, between conflicting motivations and desires. (2008, 353)

"Competing against oneself," Howe states this based on the process of two levels. The first is related to the relation between the results of the present subject, and the results the subject is trying to achieve for the future. Also, even the relation between past results and future results is considered in the first level. Howe argues that the process of comparing previous and present records is dependent on competition against oneself, thereby players can improve records and performances.

The second level of "competing against oneself" is important to our paper and is related to internal struggle and conflict among the variety of desires and purposes that athletes must undergo to realize a new "self."⁷ On this point, Howe more precisely argued that competition isn't only about player A versus player B, it is also about player A versus player A, or more exactly, a certain desire of A versus another certain desire of A.⁸ In general, we think of competition in sports as competition against opposing rivals. Howe's position is that there is not only competition against others, but also competition against oneself, and that competition against oneself is formed through internal conflicts and struggles. Let us think about internal

struggle and conflict through the following examples: Runner A and runner B are about to cross the finish line without hope for a medal. Runner A has exhausted their energy reserves and runner B follows behind. In that moment runner A has to decide whether to put forth every ounce of their energy once more or to give up. If runner A gives up, runner A will consider oneself a quitter. On the other hand, if runner A doesn't give up, runner A will remember having put forth their own best effort. In addition, we can suppose that we can make a conscious decision to follow the rules properly or secretly break them to ensure evident victory without fair play.

As for the above examples, no one else can know and judge exactly what internal struggles and conflicts our actions are based on. However, we can look at ourselves precisely, and we can recognize that there is an internal arena which demands judgement. This judgement the athlete internally faces is a moral judgement which determines whether or not to obey fair play: e.g. on facing a crisis situation. And when athletes face several conflicts and try to decide by moral judgement, competing against oneself emerges in the mind of the athlete themselves. In this respect, we can say that intentional behaviors generated in several conflicts and subjective decisions arise as a result of competing against oneself because such intentional behavior is generated through one's internal struggles and conflicts including a variety of desires and purposes.

The discussions mentioned above show a relationship between fair play (especially informal fair play) and competing against oneself. Competing against oneself can lead one to conform to fair play and *vice versa*. One's moral judgement whether to obey informal fair play or not particularly depends on competing against oneself because moral judgments involving informal fair play arise from one's internal struggles and conflicts.

Thus, the mentioned second scenario (Player B acquired victory without informal fair play) should be discussed from the viewpoint of competing against oneself. The meaning of this victory without informal fair play is difficult to interpret correctly by us. From our viewpoint, the victory without informal fair play is just a victory. On the other hand, from the subject's viewpoint, another interpretative framework can be possible. The interpretative framework is not a judgement whether to win against a competitor, but a

judgement whether to win against oneself. The interpretative framework is none other than the viewpoint of competition against oneself, which can create a scope of interpretation that differs from our viewpoints. Howe's concept of competing against oneself, hence, helps this paper to discuss the second scenario. Based on this understanding, this paper finally identifies why the victory of the second scenario is not victory but defeat.

But, before moving to discuss the second scenario, it seems that we need to re-examine the term "informal fair play" more precisely because we merely have examined some ostensible meanings of informal fair play. So, preferentially the next chapter re-examines two meanings of informal fair play through famous sports examples before discussing the second scenario.

5. Two meanings of informal fair play

The purpose of this chapter is to reveal two meanings of informal fair play, to respect their counterparts and for the players to respect themselves, which are reviewed through the examples of the Pierre de Coubertin Medal and other sports.

Let's look at the following examples to see the meaning of respect for others. In the 1964 Winter Olympics, Italian man Eugenio Monti got a golden opportunity in the four man bobsled, which was hosted by Austria. But in that instant, "a bolt from Great Britain's team's sled was broken, and they asked for help from other countries, and were rejected. But Monti pulled out a bolt from his own team's sled without hesitation and gave it to Great Britain's team. The result was ironically that Great Britain's team got the gold medal and the Italian team got the bronze medal. Moreover, Monti made his own team's mechanic repair the axle on the Canadian team's sled when it broke in the following race."⁹ After that, to the press, Monti said about Anthony Nash, a member of Great Britain's team, that, "[n]ash didn't win because I gave him the bolt. He won because he had the fastest run."¹⁰ In response to this incident, IOC gave the Pierre de Coubertin Medal to Monti who embodied and pursued true sportsmanship. Sometimes we can see this kind of phenomenon to help our own opponent in the sports world.

Another example comes from a female fencing match. "[a]t Los Angeles in 1932, Judy Guinness was initially declared the winner of the final duel. Howev-

er, she herself stated that the judge had wrongly counted twice in her favor, and that she had thus lost the bout against Ellen Preis from Austria. The jury listened to her allegations and awarded the Gold Medal to Preis."¹¹ Although Guinness had been awarded with the gold medal at first, she became the silver medalist by confessing to having been struck.

From these two praiseworthy examples, what kind of meaning can we draw with respect for others? And, how would it be appropriate to interpret these two examples? In response to these questions, this paper strongly supports that "mutual quest for excellence" by Simon, (2010, 35) already widely known in the realm of sports philosophy, would be most appropriate. Simon (2010, 35) said that, "Competition in sport conceived along lines of a mutual quest for excellence is a paradigm case of an activity in which the participants treat each other as equal. The good competitor does not see the opponent merely as an obstacle to be overcome but as a person whose activity calls for an appropriate response." In addition, Jan Boxill (2003, 115), in the same vein, explains as follows: "Competition when viewed as mutual challenge to achieve excellence, no matter the field, leads to progress, to respect for others, to friendships, and to excellence. This is the essence of competition."

From these viewpoints, we can make the following rational guesses: if Monti' and Guinness' competition was not based on a mutual quest for excellence, and if they had considered their opponent to be an enemy they had to defeat and to destroy, Monti wouldn't have lent his own sled's bolt, and Guinness wouldn't have intentionally admitted to being struck. However, they acted contrary to our conjecture. From this point, it is considered that not respecting rivals in sports means seeing them as enemies to bring down, not as equal competitors with a mutual quest for excellence.

Then, let's turn our attention to the question of what it means to respect ourselves by looking at two examples. On the last day of the marathon of the Athens Olympics in 2004, Brazilian runner Vanderlei de Lima was in first place as one of the heavy favorites until the point of 37 km, but "suddenly one of the spectators jumped out of the crowd, grabbed Rima and pushed him off the track."¹² For this reason, Rima couldn't move for a few seconds, and therefore lost his pace. Nevertheless, Rima was awarded with the bronze medal, and his face was bright when crossing the fin-

ish line. He said, in an interview following the race, that “the color of a medal is not important. I kept my promise to get a medal and practiced great Olympic spirit. I forgive the audience member who pushed me.”¹³ IOC awarded the Pierre de Coubertin Medal to Rima who had run without giving up in the race. In addition to that, there is another great example of perseverance. Abebe Bikila won marathons two times in a row with bare feet. Unfortunately, he became paralyzed from the waist down due to a traffic accident. However, his famous saying in the book *Sports, Never Ending Story: The Cheers Song of Life Echoing over the Stadium* is important in the development of this study. “I don’t have legs to run anymore, but I have two arms... he won the gold medal at the Paralympics in Norway... I always think about overcoming my own pain rather than competing against others and winning. It led to victory when I ran to the end through pain and suffering” (2018, 74).

Given these two examples with the perspective of respecting oneself, it is considered that Rima and Abebe experienced unfortunate accidents: Rima had difficulty finishing the race and Abebe can’t run anymore, but they never gave up during the middle of the race and fought until end in order to do their best. It is suggested that these kinds of attitudes can’t be present without respect for oneself. And in the sports world, there is the famous saying, “[i]t ain’t over till it’s over”¹⁴ from American baseball legend Yogi Berra. The moment you decide that it’s over, the infinite possibilities are gone. But as long as we believe and strive for that infinite possibility, it will become infinite. Therefore, in this respect, this paper suggests that not respecting oneself is giving up one’s own infinite possibilities before it is over.

So far, what this chapter has reviewed has been that informal fair play has two implied meanings. One is to respect others (competitors), and the other is to respect oneself (players themselves). These two meanings of informal fair play produced from some examples have taught us important lessons based on respecting others and ourselves.

6. Why is the second scenario not a victory, but a defeat?

For the final purpose of this paper, why is the victory of the second scenario without informal fair play

not a victory, but a defeat based on competition against oneself? first, this chapter introduces inevitable self-negations, which are caused by competition against oneself based on the two meanings of informal fair play mentioned above.

As I mentioned earlier, competing against oneself is an internal phenomenon that the subject has to undergo in order to become a new subject. Howe said, “[t]his attempt to integrate oneself as a self is an attempt at coherence; the unity so attained is never final or immutable, since one continues to live and act and desire” (2008, 356). On this point, many sports philosophers like Paul Weiss (1969, 36) and Hazel E. Barnes (1995, 110), who translated *Being and Nothingness* by Jean-Paul Sartre, commonly say that sports provide us with the possibility of proving a new self beyond our limits and discovering a new self. In other words, even if the subject becomes a new subject by choosing the desires, motivations, and projects they have, the subject continuously wants to be a new subject based on other desires, motivations, and projects. These repetitive processes of becoming a new subject will continue endlessly for as long as we live, act, and desire. And in these repetitive processes of becoming a new subject, the important point is that self-negation is inevitable.

Let’s look at inevitable self-negation from general facts. Players want even higher records after breaking a previous record based on fair play in sports. On this point, Weiss (1969, 14) said that “[t]he excellence that the athlete wants to attain is an excellence greater than that attained before. He wants to do better than he did... This is a truth that will surely hold as long as men compete with one another.” All players constantly train themselves based on their desire to do their best and to set a world record, and they eventually discover themselves achieving their own best and a world record. At this point, the study argues that players inevitably have to experience self-negation based on their new desires. This is because the moment players achieve their best and set new world records, players negate themselves having achieved their best and setting new world records, and they imagine a new self in the future based on their new desires for even higher records. This inevitable self-negation will continue as long as we live, act, and desire, as Howe puts it. From this point of view, this study defines this form of self-negation as self-negation based on affirmation. Here the affirmation means temporarily affirming the exist-

tence of achieving one's own best and setting new world records with fair play (it can be used to mean satisfying one's own existence as a result of achieving one's own existence in the general sense), and at the end of this affirmation, the players inevitably negate themselves based on their new desires and begin challenges for their new future existence and records.

Given the four cases again in the previous chapter, it is considered that their decisions (that Monti helped competitors, Guinness confessed to having been struck about the meaning of respect for others, and Rima and Abebe did their best for infinite possibilities without giving up on the meaning of respect for oneself) become the cornerstone for the affirmation, which eventually leads to self-negations again because Monti negated his own possible existence that didn't help his competitors, Guinness negated her own possible existence that didn't confess to having been struck, and Rima and Abebe negated their own possible existences that gave up infinite possibilities.

On the contrary, however, this study appeals to the existence of other forms of self-negation, and this form of self-negation is self-negation based on negation. Let's develop the story in the opposite situations of the four cases mentioned in the previous chapter. The opposite situations are as follows: Monti ignored the help of his competitors and got a gold medal, Guinness did not confess to having been struck and got a gold medal, and Rima and Abebe gave up. In these cases, it is certain that they should've recognize their existence as those who won gold medals in defiance of the help of their rival teams, those who won gold medals in favor of biased judges, and those who eventually gave up. This is because we can't fool ourselves by what we did, and they acted on the basis of their desires. Nevertheless, this study does not support that all of these perceptions lead to self-negation based on negation because, even in these cases, one can affirm one's existence without helping the rival team, one can affirm one's existence by biased judgment, and one can affirm one's existence without exercising infinite possibilities. Rather, this form of self-negation is considered to be self-negation based on affirmation.

But on the contrary, even in the same situation, there is also a different perception of one's own existence and of the decisions one has made. That is, it is the negation of one's existence (it can be used to mean not satisfying one's own existence as a result of achiev-

ing one's own existence in the general sense), this negation inevitably leads to self-negation of a new future being. When they negate their existence because they won a gold medal by ignoring the help of their rivals, and their existence that they have won in favor of biased judges, and their existence without doing their best to the end, it is considered that the first negation occurs. In addition, based on the first negation of their existence, those who recognized others as an enemy to destroy for victory even though they could have recognized others as equal people on the basis of their mutual quest for excellence, and who did not do their best even though they could discover their infinite possibilities, experience inevitable self-negation through the yearning of new future beings, who win with the perception that they are not enemies to destroy for victory, while all exercising infinite possibilities.

From these points of view, this study concludes that the reason why the victory of the second scenario is actually a defeat is because of self-negation based on negation associated with the two meanings of informal fair play. And this study suggests that there is losing in the sports world that cannot be explained from competition against others. We can't judge losing in competition against oneself correctly, but it can be judged by the actual subjects participating in sports. Accordingly, this study suggests that even if it is a victory in a competition against others, if one cannot affirm one's existence and the victory one has won, it should be left to be judged by the players themselves from self-negation based on negation in competition against oneself.

7. Conclusion

As a citation from "The Declaration on Sport" states, there can be no true sports without the idea of fair play, and fair play in sports must be based on formal and informal fair play. If winning and losing in sports existed regardless of formal and informal fair play, it would lead to winning at all costs, the potential danger that athletes would never care about informal fair play when in pursuit of winning, and that we couldn't find morality and ethic in the world of sports. On this issue, by using the examples of various competitions in the sports world, this paper tried to identify doubtful victories on formal fair play and informal fair play stated at the beginning and reviewed until now.

Consequently, this paper suggested the possibility

that there is not only losing based on the results, competition against others and the structure of the game, but also losing from self-negation based on negation, which is made by competing against oneself.

Lastly, this conclusion places a heavy responsibility, for the morality and ethic of the sports world, on each of those who participate in sports activities where winning at all costs prevails. Additionally, this conclusion is expected to be an initial step toward not only emphasizing the results of competition with others, but also gradually progressing through the change in perception of losing by competing against oneself in the setting of physical education.

Notes

- ¹ He explains the constitutive rules as follows: "Constitutive rules stipulate a goal and the means, through prescriptions and proscriptions, by which this goal can be attained. In sport, the stipulated goal is usually given in terms of definitions of specific states of affairs to be attained, such as getting a particular kind of ball over a line drawn between two poles on a grass field, hitting another kind of ball over a net with a racket and making it bounce within certain lines drawn on a smooth surface, or jumping from a platform ten metres high into a pool while performing certain movements." See Sigmund Loland. 2002, pp. 21–22.
- ² Lenk explains formal fair play as follows: "On the other hand, the formal fair play is a "must-norm" enforced and sanctioned by the rules, a norm with which a competitor in principle must comply." See Hans Lenk 1979, p. 152.
- ³ Lenk explains informal fair play as follows: "...an informal fair play encompassing the chivalrous respectfulness Coubertin had in mind." See Hans Lenk 1979, p. 152.
- ⁴ The list of stripped Olympic medals was quoted in the Wikipedia: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_stripped_Olympic_medals, (6 July 2020).
- ⁵ The story is briefly mentioned in Lenk's book. See Hans Lenk 1979, p. 153.
- ⁶ This article was quoted in the *Sports Reference*. Fencing at the 1928 Amsterdam Summer Games: Men's Foil, Individual, <https://www.sports-reference.com/olympics/summer/1928/FEN/mens-foil-individual.html>, (26 November 2018).
- ⁷ In terms of competing against oneself, Howe explains as follows: "The account of self-competition I shall give here depends heavily on a specific theory about the structure of the self. Without going deeply into details, this theory rejects the concept of an atomistic in favour of a complex self, one that must continually be put together, constituted as a self, in activity. Selves are selves

because we make them be selves. A self is a (self-)construction out of its many and various constituents, not all of which are inherently compatible. To be a self is to be engaged in some level of self-struggle: that of integrating one's heterogeneous components (desires, motivations, projects etc.) and of making sense of one's past, present and projected future. In part, this is an attempt to build a coherent self-narrative; in part, it is an attempt to negotiate or legislate a condition of manageable self-existence, which for any given individual may lie anywhere between equanimity and barely contained chaos. This attempt to integrate oneself as a self is an attempt at coherence; the unity so attained is never final or immutable, since one continues to live and act and desire. But a degree of unity or self-consolidation is necessary if our lives are to make sense to ourselves or to others." See Howe 2008, p. 356.

- ⁸ For the development of this study, her original text was adapted. Her original quote is as follows: "Competition isn't only about A versus B it is also about A versus A, or more exactly, part of A versus another part of A." See Leslie A. Howe 2008, p. 360.
- ⁹ This article was quoted in the *Gyeongnamdomin Sinmun*: "Column—A Citizen Rival in the River", <http://www.gndomin.com/news/articleView.html?idxno=147358#0BNb>, (29 August, 2018).
- ¹⁰ This article was quoted in the *Japan Times*: "Olympic Champ Really was the Full Monti," <https://www.japantimes.co.jp/sports/2003/12/21/general/olympic-champ-really-was-the-full-monti/#.XbbeHJMzY1J>, (29 August, 2018).
- ¹¹ This article was quoted in the *Sports Reference*, Olympics/athletes/gu/judy-guinness-penn-hughes, <https://www.sports-reference.com/olympics/athletes/gu/judy-guinness-penn-hughes-1.html>, (29 August, 2018).
- ¹² This article was quoted in the *Irish Times*: "We Owe Debt to Brazilian Runner Denied Glory by Irishman," <https://www.irishtimes.com/opinion/we-owe-debt-to-brazilian-runner-denied-glory-by-irishman-1.2751383>, (2 August, 2016).
- ¹³ This article was quoted in the *TV Daily*: "TV on air 'Surprise' Rima, a Valuable Bronze Medal of the Ill-Fated Marathoner," <http://tvdaily.asiae.co.kr/read.php3?aid=14729557931155133002>, (29 August, 2018).
- ¹⁴ This famous saying was quoted in the *BBS News*: "How people started saying 'It ain't over till it's over'," <https://www.bbc.com/news/magazine-34324865>, (1 July, 2020).

References

- Boxill, J. (2003). The Ethics of Competition. In: Jan Boxill (ed), *Sports Ethics; An Anthology* (pp. 107–116). Blackwell Publishing.
- Dixon, N. (1999). On Winning and Athletic Superiority. *Journal of the Philosophy of Sport*, **26**, 10–26.
- Howe, L. A. (2008). On competing against oneself, Or 'I need

- to get a different voice in my head.' *Sport, Ethics and Philosophy*, **2**, 353–366.
- Hwang, Yong-Pil (2018). *Sports, Never Ending Story: The Cheers Song of Life Echoing over the Stadium*, Korean Studies Information: Idam Books.
- International Council of Sport and Physical Education, Welttrat für Sport und Leibeserziehung (1964) *Declaration on Sport*, https://www.icsspe.org/sites/default/files/Declaration%20on%20Sport_english.pdf, (29 November 2018).
- Kang, Sung-Min (2013). The Nature of the Elements of Sport. *Korean Journal of Sport Science*, **24**, 531–547.
- Lee, Jong-Wang (2006). How is sport ethics possible? *Philosophy of Movement. Journal of the Korean Society for the Philosophy of Sport, Dance & Martial*, **14**, 1–18.
- Lenk, H. (1979). *Social Philosophy of Athletics*. Illinois: Stipes Publishing Company.
- Loland, S. (2002). *Fair Play in Sport: A Moral Norm System*, Milton: Taylor & Francis.
- Sekine, M. (2013). A hotbed of corporal punishments: cracks between fair play and win at all costs, *Taiikukakyouiku: TAISHUKAN Publishing*, **61**(11), 38–41.
- Sartre, J. P. (1995). Play and Sport. In: William J, Morgan, and Klaus V, Meier (eds), *Philosophic Inquiry in Sport* (pp. 110–113). Human Kinetics.
- Simon, R. L. (2010). *Fair Play: The Ethics of Sports*. Colorado: Westview Press.
- Weiss, P. (1969). *Sport: A philosophic inquiry*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
-
- Corresponding author: Jun-Hyun KIM
Address: City court 1–215, 4–49–1, Kizuki, Nakahara-ku, Kawasaki-shi, Kanagawa, Japan
E-mail address: 272748@naver.com