

MOJMIR HAJEK
SOCIOLOGY OF SPORT

University of Brno

The object of my article is to define, in rough features at least, the scope of sociology of sport. At the same time. I would like to contribute methodologically — to the prospective solution of its general problems. They are not only interesting but also still unsolved. I am fully aware of the wide international interconnections of sociology of sport and of its bibliography.¹ Intentionally I am concentrating on the problems of its development in our own country. I am going to include the following chapters:

1. Sociology of sport; what it is.
2. The characteristics of its development.
3. Sports as specific social activities.
4. The scientific approaches to sport and gymnastics. (Conceptual distinctions, sociological aspects of sporting activities and their functions.)
5. The method and epistemology.
6. The social significance of sport.
7. Prospects and conclusions.

1. *Sociology of sport as a branch of general sociology* arose in past decades in accordance with the penetration of social aspects even to the study of this part of social reality. In the traditional sociology it has already gained its position, in the marxist conception it is creating its necessary preconditions. The differentiated research in its various fields (the GDR, Poland, in our country, in particular, the work of the team led by Lecturer dr. Bořivoj Petrák²) proves it quite clearly. Sociology of sport concentrates its cognitive efforts on the conceptualization of the social phenomena called *sporting phenomena*.

They are social activities *characterized*, in particular, *by militancy and competitiveness* of their realizers connected usually with *the endeavour to perform an achievement, either individual or teamlike*. This is the result of the necessary previous training depending on the health, physical constitution, and the deve-

¹ Cf. the bibliography in B. Petrák, *Sociologie a tělesná výchova* (Sociology and Physical Education), Praha 1967, pp. 155—178.

² See the common efforts in this direction in the sociological commission of the "Československý svaz pro tělesnou výchovu a sport" (The Czechoslovak Union for Physical Education and Sport) and in regular symposiums held every year in April by the Pedagogical Faculty of the Palacký University in Olomouc.

lopment of motor ability of the sporting individual. The competition training has many forms, consisting nowadays usually of several phases, and includes maintaining, invigorating and harmonizing the physical condition with the competition calendar, which often leads to specialization.

The activity character of the sporting phenomena as social processes of a unique kind is based on institutions and organizations; it is hierarchy of various competitions graded according to the time and the territory. They are various championships with a set of rules enabling advances and descends of teams according to the achievements within certain periods. This plan of sporting competitions is realized on various levels, either on the top level (world, continental, international competitions) or in a narrower measure (all-country, land, regional, county competitions). They are differentiated and modified according to individual branches of sporting activities: football, ice-hockey, athletics, rowing, etc.

The specific manifestations of sporting processes are concretized by a number of indices. They can be included into our cognitive endeavour and the conclusions can be applied in practice.

The whole extent of sociology of sport³ is not exhausted by all this. The number of special problems in this science branch is constantly increasing. It is the problem of the proportion of sport in using the leisure time, the problem of the arising of new institutions, that of development changes causing re-organizations, corresponding with the trends in the development of our physical training. (E. g. the scope of the federalization of our government and its consequences in the organization of the Czechoslovak sport, in the pattern of the sporting competitions, the problems of the all-country representation, of international relations, etc.)

There are also other partial problems: the character of the sporting public, of the press, of other sources of mass information of the public, in particular the exploitation of radio broadcasting and television. The question of the extent of the sporting activity of the individual is also important (not only contesting and top sport, but also recreation sport and its relation to recreation). Symptomatic is also the back feed of sport on the form of public life and on the creation of the living style of active sportsmen, especially of the representing and top sportsmen. There are the questions of pursuing sport and physical training at school, of a specific form of it at the universities or in factories, the question of the relation of sport toward the young people, the extent of sporting activities in the Army, etc. A very delicate field, and also conspicuous from the viewpoint of sociology, are the mutual relations of the sectional sporting and training problems: the coaches' work and its evaluation, their social role and prestige, the public character of the functionaries' and voluntary coaches' work, the question of the preconditions of the sporting managerism in connection with the state representation, with the Olympic Games, etc. As a rule, these connections become conspicuous in broader social connections, viz. economical, political, and cultural.

2. From the viewpoint of development, sociology of sport is in the same situation as general sociology now is in many respects. Exposed to a constant

³ Cf. the article by F. Gargela, *Sociologie sportu* (Sociology of Sport) in the journal *Tělesná výchova* (Physical Education), Vol. 1947, pp. 92-94.

influx of new information data about sporting facts, it classifies them in pieces of knowledge, interprets and evaluates them, thus creating out of them a constantly incomplete unity. Its extent is so much "open" that I find it more appropriate, from the methodic point of view, to speak rather of a specific subject-field of sociology of sport⁴ than of its special system. This has its consequences for epistemology and methodology.

The rise of sociology of sport is one of the conspicuous characteristics of the general trends of contemporary sociology. By differentiation and specialization of field sections of the social reality a whole set of branch sciences is dissected, e. g. sociology of labour, sociology of leisure time, sociology of journalism and of mass communication media, sociology of the Army, urban sociology, rural sociology, sociology of culture, of arts, of politics, sociology of small social groups, etc. I am mentioning only some of them by way of illustration, but not quite incidentally, since the subjects of the mentioned branch sciences refer somehow to the sporting happenings. They all influence also the sporting actions and form socially a very sensitive and resounding extra-sporting background, important for the realization of sporting processes.

The development of modern sports, as now represented (in their representative forms) is a typical feature of the contemporary industrial society.⁵ That is why man, intensively absorbed by the constantly increasing tempo in all spheres of life, (in particular, in industry by mechanization and automation, but also in agriculture and social services, viz. public life, education, health service, and also in science and in study) needs, with the increase of his leisure time, not only an adequate neuro-psychic relaxation, and a passive rest, including sleep, but also an active compensation of the one-sided influence of the prevailing working tempo. It includes the balance of the neurotic life frustration and insufficiently sensitive personal and social relations. In this situation an effective solution is tendered by a well-differentiated variety of modern sport. It is often done under the sacrifice of other relations and contingencies limiting the sporting activities of the contestant.

In a historical retrospection there appears also the relation to the Greek antique with its striving struggle for the harmony of the physical and musical component of its ideal of kalokagathia. This genetic counterpart is not to be ignored. The development of the modern Olympic Games bears persuasive witness of it. Yet the mass character of the contemporary trends in world sport becomes a typical feature of the modern industrial society. With the multitude of international sporting contacts the unifying universal features are increasing. The things are the same in the West as well as in the East. Of course, there are specific differences in the general conceptions in both domains. Each of them would be worth a deeper discussion.

These features of the dynamic development of the specific forms of modern

⁴ I tried to determine the scope and the methodology of the concept at the seminar *K metodologickej problematike dejin slovenskej sociologie* (The Problems of Methodology of the History of Sociology in Slovakia), held from Dec. 10 to 12, 1968, in Jasná pod Chopkom. It is to be published in the miscellany of this seminar.

⁵ See R. Richta, *Civilizace na rozcestí* (Civilization at the crossroads), 1st ed. Praha 1966; or J. Klofáč and V. Flustý, *Soudobá sociologie* (Contemporary Sociology), Praha, Part I, 1965, Part II, 1967; or G. Friedmann et al., *Sociológia práce* (Sociology of Labour), translated and selected by D. Slejška et al., Bratislava 1967.

sport are very significant and cannot be neglected. They may not be weakened even by the fact that not only our but also, to some extent, the world sociology has not yet at its disposal a sufficient amount of research material for an effective elaboration of its theory which would enable, by generalization of its findings, more unambiguous theoretical, methodological, and practical conclusions. It includes also social predictions.

The developing sociological determination of sport must include a wide number of social activities exerted more or less regularly by men. This conception is represented by Emanuel Chalupný, who was the first to deal with it in his *Sociologie*.⁶

3. The determination of the subject of sociology of sports leads methodically to the attempt to define sport more exactly as a specific kind of social activity. Essentially two conceptions are possible: a broader and a narrower one.

Sport, in a broad sense of the word, means any kind of mentally relaxing and regular human activity, mostly pursued in free time, to which active interest of an individual is attached. This conception was explained already in the preceding chapter.

We are more interested in *sport in a narrower sense of the word*. Most frequently it is considered as *a kind of activity pursued intentionally, realized mostly in free time (with the exception of professionalism), and aimed at a conspicuous achievement in a certain event*: in light athletics, in football, ski-ing, in ice-hockey, in rugby, handball-, volley-ball, in chess, in fencing, in rowing, canoing, swimming, etc. For this narrower conception of sport as a system of activities is symptomatic a long-termed preparation, the seasonal culmination connected with exacting and systematic previous training, which is the necessary precondition of a successful achievement in any branch of sport.

The complex scope of sport includes a wide number of its specific forms. There are about 50 standard forms according to the Sports Pool ticket. This number is open and in the course of time it rather increases than decreases. When classifying the individual kinds of sport it is surprising that there have not been until now any serious attempts to unify the scientific classification. So far a rather practical and functional classification is prevailing. Thus the paper by J. Libenský and Z. Šprýmař, *The Theory and Method of Physical Training*,⁷ speaks symptomatically about the "classification of physical exercises" and not about an exhaustive classification of sports. It gives partial viewpoints of this classification: anatomic, physiologic, medical, methodical, pedagogical,

⁶ Sociological aspects of sport and of other social activities were paid a rather systematic attention by Emanuel Chalupný in his fivefold system *Sociologie* (Sociology), abridged in his: *Systém sociologie v náčrtku* (An Outline of a System of Sociology), Praha 1948, or in *Sociologie pro každého* (Sociology for Everybody), Praha 1948. He treats the problem more theoretically, from the viewpoint of the classification of individual phenomena within his system. I find Mr. Petrák's evaluation of this attempt of Chalupný's as "a typically speculative system" rather abrupt and one-sided (op. cit., p. 52). On the other hand he acknowledges Chalupný's contribution to sociology of sport (see pp. 52/64 and 83/111). This sociological contribution of Chalupný's to this field can be found in his *Práce a jiné sociální činnosti* (Work and Other Social Activities), Praha 1941.

⁷ Cf. J. Libenský and Z. Šprýmař, *Teorie a metodika tělesné výchovy* (The Theory and Methodology of Physical Education), Praha 1959.

aesthetical, and military. I do not think myself competent to judge the completeness of this classification. All the more so since they were not concerned with a sociological classification. But regarding the complex social character of modern sports and physical culture at all I find their attempt rather too static. The dynamic character of sports and their increasing social significance require that sociology of sport, in its attempt for a scientific classification of its forms, concentrates on their socially functional determination. The unity of theory and practice, completed methodically by aspects of co-operation between the individual branches, appears to be the most passable in such a situation. This scientific attitude towards sport and physical education was taken, some time ago, by F. Gargela in his double edition of the journal *Physical Education*.

The lack of systematic scientific classification aspects in the whole set of sports appears apparently also in the functional attitude towards them. It is reflected, in practice, in the determination of the basic kinds of sport at the Olympic Games. In everyday practice we can do with only a draft or orientation classification. It is fixed more clearly now in the social conscience of the public by the mass media. According to the criterion chosen, they are most frequently classified in a dichotomous and antithetical way. Thus e. g. individual and collective sport, summer and winter sports, hall and track sports, or finally men's, women's and mixed sports.

4. The question of the scientific knowledge of specific branches of sport remains still a little estimated aspect. Until recently it had been limited to traditional medical, physiological, and technical aspects; lately also to pedagogical or psychological. For the future it requires more and more urgently also the summarizing sociological aspect. It is necessary not only in the field of research, but it generalizes and completes the knowledge of the system of sociology of sport and of other related science branches. The confrontation of the conclusions of sociology of sport with the analogical knowledge both domestic and international, as well as the exploitation of sport in varied practice, pushes forward the problem of method as a common base for knowledge and application. The possibility of co-operation between the various science branches becomes constantly clearer for a number of sporting events.

The unclosed differentiation of kinds of sport shows quite clearly that in principle, there cannot be objections against the evaluation of sport as one of specific forms of physical education in general, viz. beside tourism, gymnastics, and a variety of games. I hope I shall not commit an offence against the scientific classification if I class with it, subject to a limitation, also scouting of the traditional type,⁸ including the various modifications such as camping, tramping, and watermanship. I do not find this conception casual in any way, but, on the contrary, sociologically quite justified.

The dividing line between the individual forms of physical education is not fixed sharply nor unsurmountably. It has rather a character of mutual transition, sometimes even of a merger. As evidence the relation between specific sport kinds may serve; they may be substituted reciprocally, e. g. basket-ball — athletics — volley-ball. Some other time it is required by the character of the sporting activities pursued and by the training encumbrance of the active pursuers, e. g.

⁸ These facts were mentioned in my article "Skauting a tělovýchova" (Scout Movement and Physical Education) in the journal *Tělesná výchova*, Vol. 1947, p. 33.

football — light athletics. Some other time again they are substituted reciprocally in dependence on the season, e. g. ski-ing — hiking — light athletics; gymnastics — light athletics, etc.

If any area of social reality is functioning under the pressure of its social norm, in the sense of its activity regulators, it is the same with the sports rules valid for the individual kinds of sport. The specific character of the contesting and competing sport activities, differentiated thus by the open scale of sports (their objective feature — sociological) and inseparably accompanied by their reflection in consciousness of the sporting individual or his team or club (their subjective feature — social-psychological)⁹ is quite persuasive from the viewpoint of sociology.

The development of modern sport, its temporal and spatial determinants, including the technical possibilities of its realization, join it quite closely with the other conditions, demographic and ecologic, in particular, however, social: above all economic, political, and cultural, but also with the social stratification structure and with its value patterns, where the problem of an adequate exploitation of the free time of the individual or the sporting group (team, club) takes more and more important place.

Thus the development of many areas of social life gives the motoric and physiologic, health-promoting and social-psychological human needs, including the individual's social position, a wide scope of adequate functional sporting realization. Understandingly it is accompanied by institutional features and includes forming the individual by social processes taking regularly place in his sporting arena. The wide scope of possible social relationships or interactions is strongly filtered in case of a sporting individual and sporting happenings. Between the opposed ends of social activities (viz. the work and profession, on the one hand, and the leisure time and the sporting activity, on the other hand), the social function of sport in the contemporary developing society receives new specific features and a new quality. They are, from the sociological point of view, all the more significant because they are in a close mutual relation with all the other areas of social life.

For the sociological conception of physical education, including all its concrete social forms, the concept of physical culture may be more appropriate. Even when the partial spheres of social reality (from hiking to sport or scouting) are not yet definitely determined in their mutual relationships. Therefore the concept of physical culture, not as a mechanical translation of the Russian term, but as a functional working determination with a wider significance: in the way as it is used in our country by B. Petrák.

A new scientifically complex (epistemological and methodological) approach to the problems of sociology of sport would be evidently more adequate. Until now only partial aspects have been elaborated, not their functional structure. In our scientific literature physical education takes physiological and psychological views.¹⁰ The papers representing this orientation are not without these aspects, but a specifically sociological approach is not their programme. In

⁹ Cf. I. A. Bláha, *Jak se sociologicky dívát na život* (How to View Life from the Sociological Point of View), Brno 1947.

¹⁰ See J. Libenský and Z. Sprýnar, *op. cit.*, and J. Macák, *Psychológia športu* (Psychology of Sport), Bratislava 1962.

theory, it is consequently applied in the sphere of sociology of sport and physical culture by the efforts of B. Petrák and his team (Sociology and Physical Culture). Not accidentally, it was positively accepted abroad. That is surely because he takes, besides the basic accessible foreign literature on the subject, into account also the domestic circumstances. Besides E. Chalupný, already mentioned, also I. A. Bláha; to a lesser extent J. L. Fischer. B. Petrák⁴¹ thinks through their initial suggestions in a critical way, specifies and elaborates them.

Sports in their extensive differentiation form only a special subsystem of their extrasporting social relationships. The mutual relationships, rather integrating than contradictory, are really worth mentioning. Sport as an institution and organization (ČSTVS), with its special controlling management, becomes an important factor of the development trends and their various reflections in culture. It integrates its influence in various spheres of life, receiving thus its differentiating character: factory sport and physical education, special sporting and physically educating activities in the Army, analogous activities at the Universities. The numerous sporting public with their diversified approaches, such as club patriotism, fanaticism, and their extremes; the mass media of communication, such as the press, in particular television and radio; and extensive non-sporting public are important factors. They are all the more important, if followed in the sphere so sensitive, explosive, and easily deviating, as it is represented by the psychic and biologic type of our teen-agers (pupils, apprentices, young industry and farm workers, students, and soldiers).

It is not surprising that the sport problems take their suggestive place also with the political representation, e. g. the reception of our sporting expedition by our government and party representatives before their departure to the Olympic Games. It is also acknowledged by the newly established Ministry of of Youth and Physical Education. The establishing sociology of sport cannot go past this situation of the development. The basic questions which it sets are: 1. What is the purpose and task of sport in our life, 2. What is the social function of sport.

The first question after the purpose and the task of sport in our life can be identified with the analogous solution of our physical education, viz. as "active influencing and many-sided development of physical activities". The prevailing emphasis on the individual's sporting achievement shifts this ultimate purpose in its social reception.

The second question after the determination of the social function of sport in our life is still more complicated and more important. It is the merit of J. L. Fischer's hierarchic model of social functions⁴² that the games have been classed in the triad of basic social functions, viz. beside the functions socially conserving with the economic dominant and the functions socially developing with the cultural dominant.

Also I. A. Bláha dealt with the social function of sport at various places. For the first time in his article "The Social Function of Sport" (1947)⁴³ and for the

⁴¹ See B. Petrák, *op. cit.*, pp. 55 and 78.

⁴² See his book *Krise demokracie* (The Crisis of Democracy), Part I and II, Brno 1933; in particular its Preface.

⁴³ In the journal *Tělesná výchova* (Physical Education), Vol. 1947, pp. 41-42.

second time in his system of sociology,¹⁴ where he made an attempt to characterize it from a synthetic point of view. Although the contents of my article allow me to mention Bláha's contribution only in passing — it was judged positively elsewhere¹⁵ — it is necessary to emphasize his suggestion in our sociology of sport. In his first contribution Bláha, besides the polarity of sport in its relation to entertainment and games, analyzes the development aspects of sport and the social stratification factors of its social function.

The author analyzes, first of all, the social functions of sport, the list of which, viz. the recreational, the educational, the pacifying and the emancipating ones, has been taken over for the final redaction of his *Sociologie*. If we add I. A. Bláha's attempt to determine the sphere of sports within "the institutions of entertainment" (which is, taken by itself, original, but no longer generally acceptable) and his endeavour to characterize, on this basis, the historical continuity of sport ("Like the Roman circenses were often given to turn away the people's attention from the misery of life, so nowadays sport is often a factor loosening individual and social tension". — *Sociologie*, p. 363) we can see the living actualness of I. A. Bláha's sociological heritage even in the study of this sphere of the social reality.

The importance of the sociological aspects in the work of Emanuel Chalupný stands out in his sphere of "social activities". It can be found also in another context of his system. Although it sounds like a paradox, E. Chalupný's attempt for an explicit systemization and classification of all social phenomena, including the sporting ones, diminishes their understanding in theory as well as in application.

Generally speaking, the significance of the social function of sport in the contemporary society, in particular in its industrial form, is one of principle. I think that the realization of this function implies also a number of its specific variants, even if my attempt at their outline has only an illustrative value, not a taxative one. With this reservation I should distinguish the following basic social functions of sport:

a) *The hygienic-physiologic function* — in rehabilitation after an injury, for strengthening health, for improving the training condition, etc.

b) *The compensation function* — in particular in the period of puberty counterbalancing, with success, the overpressure of physical and psychic dynamics. Later compensating the on-sided influence of the occupation, increasingly more and more dangerous in the modern industrial civilization.

c) *The social-psychic function*, as shown in delight of a succes, stimulating thus not only the sporting team but affecting also other social groups, like the young people, the staff of a business concern, etc.

d) *The fighting function*, socially transformed into a form of an acceptable duel, depending on the achievements within the limits of the rules of the specific kind of sport. Most frequently it is done under the control of the ethical principle Fair Play. This function is fulfilled, in the most adequate manner, in the

¹⁴ See his *Sociologie* (Sociology), Prague 1968. Sociology of sport is treated of in a separate chapter on pp. 362—364.

¹⁵ See B. Petrák, *op. cit.*, pp. 98, 109 or 64.

modern modification of the antique Olympic Games, which are a social, peaceful and cultural manifestation of universal human values in the sphere of sport and its wider social area. It is done, with a view to the prospective development of the whole mankind, without respect to origin, race, religion, nationality, political or any other convictions. From the viewpoint of the prospective trends in the development of human society, only scientific actions of a universal extent may compete effectively with sport. The mass and emotional character of sporting actions is, of course, much more extensive.

e) *The aesthetical function*, in mass reception competing with the traditional forms of arts, viz. theatre, music, ballet, etc. The choice of aesthetical emotions is infinitely poorer and more conventional than in case of the displays of fine arts. It stimulates aesthetical sensitivity even where it would not otherwise come into existence. Not incidentally the conception of the modern Olympic Games, from the genetic point of view referring to the unity of both these aspects, tries to take them fully into consideration. A number of sport branches combines effectively the beauty of the sporting achievement with its difficulty, e. g. figure skating, diving, gymnastics, ski-jumping, etc. Callisthenics, harmonized in colours, captivating the fancy and rapid in succession, is of special appeal and aesthetical efficacy in mass reception, as well as other displays of mass character, e. g. the traditional Sokol festivals and the subsequent Spartakiades. Their pioneer significance is nowadays world-wide.

f) *The integrating function* operates in the socially unifying sense, removing the barriers of work, of political interest, generations, ideology, etc. It seems that this function of sport is a new quality of synthesized preceding functions. It has its own, socially eufunctional determination, although it is not possible to neglect and disregard the sporting displays socially deviating or disfunctional.

5. In accordance with what has been said above I will try to outline the methodology of sociology of sport as a variation of a possible epistemological approach to its problems. As a starting-point can be used an outline of the subject-field of sociology of sport, including both its primary and secondary sections.

The primary sections include its factual problems, the theory and the research; further the history of sociology of sport and, finally, an extensive border region, where sociology of sport borders upon the sciences dealing with other regions of physical culture and also with other aspects of its, in particular social psychology, psychology, and pedagogy. Finally, the list of the primary sections of sociology of sport is concluded by sociology of the working-time, of the free time, of industries, of entertainment, of culture, of medicine. And, of course, the reflection of sporting events in the development trends of the whole society.

The secondary sections would include the problem of institutionalization of sport, the problem of the social significance of sport, and finally the problems of its functional incorporation, as well as the life situation of the professional sports experts and their qualification.

Although lying outside the specific field of sociology of sport, but methodically not negligible, there appears even the specific problem of the terminology of this science branch, pointing out, at the same time, the internationally integrating function of sport. It would be necessary to elaborate this partial terminology of

sociology of sport¹⁶ in connection with the formation of our terminology in the course of development.

6. Now I have to mention, at least quite briefly, the problem of the social significance of sport. Its increasing high evaluation is quite evident. Sport is becoming, in many respects, synonymous with the modern industrial society and their prevailing development trends. Its social significance is very likely to increase in future and this is the reason why I am going to discuss it here. Some partial restrictions and shifts of the trends are not excluded. That is why unambiguous predictions are difficult.

The social significance of sport issues, as a matter of course, from its competitive character. It may be supposed that it will increase and strengthen. The dimensions of this process can hardly be defined now. Apparently it will be a process not only complex and complicated, but also differentiated in many respects and highly actual. It would be doubtful to give up the attempt to determine it socially. It is becoming an important integrating factor of the whole human society.

The focus of social forces and the development trends of sport are the modern Olympic Games. The importance of sport for the world was stressed again by these held in 1968, in Grenoble and Mexico City. In particular, the Summer Games held in Mexico were very significant from our point of view. The high record achievements, surely conditioned by the high elevation above the sea level, make the import of the Olympic Games more and more evident for the whole society. The sporting start of the Black Continent and of the developing countries at all, the successful achievements of Australian sportsmen, the partial and conspicuous sporting superiority of the U. S. A., the narrow development of the Soviet Union, the shifts in the Olympic representation and in the record tables of the representatives of the rest of Europe, set questions of a new social quality. Their significance is not only a sporting one, although it is the most evident.

7. **Conclusions.** The social activity of the contemporary world sport is shifting its gravity centre more and more from the sphere of the specialized sporting events to the sphere of its extra-sporting social background. The original sporting sphere is now exposed very intensively to the back-influence of its wider social context and its rapid development. The questions of amateurism, of concealed professionalism, of half-professionalism, and real professionalism in pursuing sport, are a part of it as well as the struggle for a more democratic character of the International Olympic Committee in their relation to the national Olympic committees, the question of the amateur statutes for the Olympic competitors, the question of the youth sport and other associated sections of physical education.

The social aspects of sport and its development cease to be only a narrow concern of the sportsmen and are becoming more and more an urgent matter concerning the whole of society. Its partial aspects, military, educational, and in particular ethical, confirm it. It is not only a statement, but a prospective evaluation, socially very significant, if we take into account the immense possibilities and consequences of the increasing free time, as they are predicted for the

¹⁶ These problems have been until now neglected in our sociology, although they are considered as urgent.

period of the scientific and technical revolution¹⁷ by the French sociologists, Dumazedier or Fourastié.¹⁸

The point is that sport should be becoming, and finally should become, an integral part of our life in the modern industrial society. In connection with its influence and in harmony with other accompanying sections of social reality it should help to create a new type of life activity and a creative style of life in general. For a human individual as the supreme realizer of the development trends in all spheres of life, sport shows all its specific features: competitiveness, fighting spirit, selectiveness, systematization and, in particular, fair play. In its complex social consequences sport is becoming, at the same time, a self-realization of man. Besides the expansion of the varied sporting events it is another, not less characteristic, feature of sport in relation to social reality.

The social significance of sport in its complexity is not incidental. Its prospects are positive where the development trends of sport in the world are analogous in their consequences with the trends of the development of human society. A deeper analysis of our sporting events cannot be neglected by sociology of sport. They appear in full accordance with the continuance of our humanitarian, democratic, and cultural traditions in the past. It appears to be identical with the new quality of progress.

Analogically the determination of sociology of sport implies, besides specific sporting indicators, a differentiated set of further social factors: economical, political, educational, entertainment, and in particular cultural. In our functional and adequate cognizing efforts they are not without relevance.

K SOCIOLOGII SPORTU

Autor se pokouší svým článkem přispět k bližšímu vymezení předmětu sociologie sportu jako výrazné odvětvové sociologie moderní industriální společnosti. Svě hledisko omezuje na domácí bilanci této disciplíny: tradičně sociologickou (I. A. Bláha, E. M. Chalupný, J. L. Fischer aj.) i odborně specifickou (Fr. Gargela, Boř. Petrák aj.).

Předmětný rozsah sociologie sportu určuje konkrétní její pracovní tématické okruhy: vymezení sociologie sportu, její vývojovou charakteristiku, specificky činnostní ráz sportu, pokus o snímkování problematiky dané disciplíny, její styčné vztahy s tělovýchovnou praxí atp. Článek je blíže analyzuje, hodnotí i interpreтуje.

V závěru svého příspěvku autor dovozuje, že sociologické aspekty sportu přestávají být vývojově jen zájmovou záležitostí sportovců samých. Přesouvají se stále zřetelněji v naléhavou skutečnost celospolečenského dosahu, zvláště významnou při vytváření nového typu sociální aktivity i životního slohu. Sport se tak výhledově stává významným, a proto i nezanedbatelným faktorem silící integrace globální lidské společnosti vůbec. (Olympijské hry.)

¹⁷ Cf. R. Richta et al., *op. cit.*, p. 88 ff, and his essay "Vědeckotechnická revoluce a alternativy moderní civilizace", (The Scientific and Technical Revolution and the Alternatives of Modern Civilization), *Sociologický časopis*, Vol. IV (1968), pp. 523/539.

¹⁸ Cf. Jean Fourastié, *Die 40.000 Stunden, Aufgaben und Chancen der sozialen Evolution*. Translated into German by Hildegard Krage. Wien 1966.

