

## Forum

# Sport in the Peace Movement – A Challenge for the Sport Science

SVEN GÜLDENPFENNIG

Zentraleinrichtung Hochschulsport; Technische Universität Berlin; Straße des 17. Juni 135;  
D-1000 Berlin 12 (West), Fed. Rep. of Germany

### *Abstract*

Sport stands in ambivalent relation to war and peace. The actual peace movement has shown that, in its new dimensions, the total threat to mankind by nuclear armament requires a "Copernican turning point" in political thinking and acting in all social spheres. Some aspects of the responsibility of sport for peace are described. In sport politics and science this responsibility is discussed controversially between the concepts "proprium" and "political mandate" of sport. They reflect general obligations of sport science to political counselling. Peace-political and -pedagogical meanings and margins of action of sport are illustrated.

– "One has to bring the habitual terms into a new frame of reference. They have to be rethought with regard to the logic of political thinking in the nuclear age. In the history of science, revaluations of the whole terminology repeatedly took place. Each time, the transition to a new way of thinking, which extended over decades or centuries, was accompanied by a merciless struggle. But this time there is no time available to mankind. The logic of thinking in the nuclear age must be comprehended as quickly as possible." (G. Ch. Schachnasarow) –

## **Sport in the Peace Movement of the Federal Republic of Germany 1980-1984: A New Phenomenon**

"Sport and Peace" – this type of phrasing, like many "sport and ..." – formulas, has become an everyday occurrence. Nevertheless, this theme is very new. In the sport history of the Federal Republic of Germany, for example, one would search almost in vain for explicit reference points.

The discussion about sport and peace, indeed, got its decisive impulse from the general peace movement which, in its dynamic development since 1980, reached sport as well. This peace movement is also a seemingly new phenomenon; only during the last few years has it found a permanent and prominent place in the public consciousness.

Actually, however, war and peace are naturally an age-old theme of mankind. And, as such, justifications for war as well as for involvement for peace have a central place in the whole history of philosophy (Röhrs 1983, p. 12-44; Jakobs 1983; Scheler u.a. 1984). In this framework, the relations of physical culture and sport to war and peace have always played a role. Thus sport has turned out to be

an ambivalent phenomenon which, in principle, is open for use in connection with war and peace (Güldenpfennig 1984a; Güldenpfennig/Meyer 1983).

Nevertheless, the present peace movement in the Federal Republic (as well as worldwide) is characterized qualitatively by new aims and quantitatively by new dimensions of mass mobilization. The concrete starting point of this activation was the so-called NATO double track decision of 1979 in which, in connection with a negotiation offer (which then proved to be a pretext), the deployment of a technically new generation of nuclear weapons on West European soil was announced, with a corresponding installation of new rockets by the East Block.

The quickly increasing protest of the peace movement, especially against this decision, which seems to be only a partial problem in the politico-military development till now, is motivated by a special fear: Just these announced new weapons could initiate a development, in the course of which the nuclear armament escalation could get out of control (Bredthauer 1983; Bonk u.a. 1984). Therefore, the main aims of the peace movement are:

- complete and *serious comprehension* of the absolutely new quality of the threat to mankind from nuclear armament and of the historically unprecedented responsibility of the present and all future generations (Jonas 1983);
- *breaking off* of the nuclear armament race between the military alliances in West and East *before* its continuation on an even higher level<sup>1</sup>;
- *mobilization* of sufficient oppositional social power against any governmental security policy which contributes to more insecurity and enhanced danger of nuclear war;
- *outlining and realization* of forms of intra- and international conflict-mastery which make possible and promote the survival and the further humane unfolding of civilization.

If one realizes what central importance military power and security needs have had in the relations between and, correspondingly, in the political thinking of peoples at all times; if, at the same time, one realizes the qualitative and quantitative level which the corresponding armament and wide-reaching politico-military strategies today have reached worldwide – then it becomes manifest what an immense revolution in the political thinking and acting of peoples, and of their political and social institutions, will be necessary to interrupt simple extrapolation of classical military and armament-political tendencies and to “turn them around” into true peace policies. All essential politico-philosophical thinkers on this theme emphasize the necessarily revolutionary character of this rethinking (Jaspers 1982; Weizsäcker 1980; Eppler 1981; Jonas 1983; Schell 1984; Schachnasarow 1984; Hocke/Scheler 1982). In this connection, the necessity of a “Copernican turning point” has even been spoken of (Holz/Sandkühler 1982; Güldenpfennig/Meyer 1983). Obviously, it can only succeed if it is actively sustained and supported by *all* social spheres.

In this sense, all social institutions bear common responsibility for the preservation and advancement of peace. That, in principle and unrestrictedly, also applies to sport and the organized sport movement. Correspondingly, the above-mentioned general targets of the peace movement found early assistance from sport: With resolutions, petitions, demonstrations and peace sport festivals, sportsmen, officials, physical education teachers and sport scientists support those general aims (Beck et al. 1983; Güldenpfennig 1984b; Güldenpfennig/

Wiewiorra 1984). Also, the specific ways in which sport is affected and its particular forms of expression always play an important role. In conferences, seminars and educative measures, in scientific and journalistic publications, the intellectual discussion of the basic problems in the relations between sport and peace has been initiated (Güldenpfennig/Meyer 1983; Gesellschaftliche Funktionen des Sports 1984; Sport und Frieden 1985; Olympische Spiele 1984). There are two reasons given for this involvement of sport in the peace movement: On the one hand, an "egoistic" motive, the particular vulnerability of sport to general political developments and especially to politico-military tension or détente, war or peace<sup>2</sup>; on the other hand, an "altruistic" motive, the above-mentioned general responsibility for developments relevant to peace policy.

Protest against such involvement arose early as well, especially from the great majority of the sport association leaders, who unquestionably could rely on the support of a large number of members of the sport organizations. For this point of view also, two other arguments are put forward: On the one hand, security policy should be the exclusive concern of government institutions, but not of social-cultural organizations like sport; on the other hand, (at least as could be implied from the relevant statements) the political position summarized in the NATO double track decision is justified for the defense of the "freedom of the West" and, consequently, worthy of support<sup>3</sup>.

Behind these two standpoints, advocated by the peace movement nation-wide and by the Deutscher Sportbund (more precisely, by a minority and a majority trend in the sport movement), are two fundamentally differing opinions about the general socio-political responsibility of sport:

- The majority trend explicitly or implicitly supports the concept of the "proprium" of sport (Herms 1985). Its substantial elements are presented as follows: Sport could only be politically effective *indirectly*, by creating its own specific forms of activity. Only individuals, but not the organizations of sport could form political opinions, and they could be represented legitimately only in *political* institutions. The strict general political neutrality claimed by the sport organizations is, in fact, permanently suspended in favor of support of the prevailing political trends in the Federal Republic.
- The peace movement in sport explicitly or implicitly supports the concept of a "political mandate" for sport (Güldenpfennig 1984c). These substantial elements are presented as follows: Sport should have an active and *direct* influence upon those social developments on which, according to historical experience, the development of sport itself crucially depends (social-cultural progress, democratization, promotion of peace). Today, the whole of society increasingly brings about and shares the responsibility for government action, even in international relations. In today's complex societies *each* large social institution ought to take part in the *transmission of the meaning* of the crucial problems to their members in order to keep those problems comprehensible and controllable. Sport organizations could not be politically neutral on principle and, if necessary, should be capable of opposition in the face of unreasonable government decisions.

What does the sport science say about this controversy?

## Possibilities and Obligation of Sport Science for Political Counselling on the Subject of Peace in Particular

Sport-policy decision-making of those bearing responsibility in the sport organizations of our country still is largely restricted to pragmatic weighing of actual opportunities. Critical scientific consultation and politico-ethical examination of sport-political action are hardly sought after. This pattern of behavior is based on the expectation that policy will simply continue to tread the traditional paths "as usual". To this expectation and to this seemingly small need for enlightenment corresponds a sport science which, in its main tendencies, has not yet perceived the fundamentally changed social facts and perspectives on development in the nuclear age, and has not seriously taken them into consideration with regard to its own work.

For the first time in the history of mankind the Apocalypse has become a *real* threat. And it will remain so for the rest of history, because nuclear and other mass-destruction weapons can never be "dis-invented". Henceforth the world is unavoidably in a pre-war situation before the last war (Sternberger 1983). Under these conditions it is not only the question of where the *crucial* decisions for the existential problems of the protection and advancement of peace are made that counts, but also the opposite: *Each* social sphere has to discover all its specific possibilities and to put them into practice in social disputes, no matter what amount of political influence each has. The Copernican turning point in political thinking and acting, to which we are forced by the nuclear threat if we want to survive and to continue developing as mankind, unconditionally demands this reversal of our point of view.

Sport is also not absolved of this responsibility. The science of sport, with few exceptions so far, has gone on "diving station" in the face of the task of enlightenment in that required mental and practical-political reversal. This also was so in the case of the "overture" to the actual controversy about this topic – at the purportedly peace-motivated, but in fact confrontative Olympia boycott of 1980. Some insights obtained on that occasion can be summarized as follows (Güldenpfennig 1981 and 1983):

Aside from the controversial questions in science theory – whether, on principle, a neutral or a biased status is attributed to science – the following can be considered unquestionable: Considering current political problems and conflicts and the corresponding necessity for decisions, the scientist can assume several roles and tasks (Heinemann 1980):

- He can supply relevant background knowledge about the political setting for a decision;
- He can outline concepts and patterns of interpretation for the evaluation of the conflict situation and offer alternatives for a reasonable choice;
- Afterwards, he can carry out longer-term systematic research projects on the actual conflict and its applicability;
- Based on a longer-term survey of political events already in progress, he can work out spontaneous analyses about current events which include special interests, strategic aims of, and measures taken by participants in the conflict;
- He can address the direct participants in the conflict or more or less directly concerned groups with analyses and commentaries, the form of communication

(expertise, planning paper or campaign program, popularizing commentary etc.) differing accordingly;

Finally, motivated by his scientifically based insight into the current conflict, he can himself actively intervene in the occurrence through political action – by appeals, petitions, participation in demonstrations etc. in case of perceived undesirable developments.

Thus the palette of possibilities for influence includes scientific research and scientific counselling of politics, as well as scientifically based personal political action. The degree of directness and effectivity of that influence, however, can vary greatly. It depends on the legitimation need and the assimilation capacities of the “receiving” political system, on the quality of the relevant contributions of the scientist, on his general acceptance in the particular political environment. The basis of *each* of these possibilities of influence, however, must be consideration of the criteria of scientific verification and verifiability of the influence-seeking statements, if he wants to make use of them *as a scientist*.

All these insights could and should be brought to bear on the sport-peace theme as well. In some of the treatises already mentioned, approaches to this can be found. But up to now the solely pragmatic, power-based “reason” for politico-institutional action in sport definitely still prevails. As in other social spheres, in consideration of the above-mentioned altered demands on sport, this is no longer adequate.

Not only should it be possible to submit sport in practice to ethical examination and justification<sup>4</sup>, but the policy acted upon by institutional representatives of the sport movement should also be theoretically substantiated and ethically justified. To this end a thorough, scientifically systematic study of the related problems is necessary, among other things. It must be removed from the context and the anti-differentiating habits of everyday thinking. Science must make a contribution to the working out of a common frame of reference for political disputes, a *common* basis for politically conflicting standpoints. Only in this way can the prevailing arbitrariness and the “bar-room” level of disputes over sport policy be overcome.

### **Significance of Sport in Policy and Education to Peace and its Margins of Activity**

For lack of space the available preliminary studies toward the scientific penetration of the problem area of sport and peace cannot be summarized and discussed here. The bibliography should be a stimulus to further reading. Only some further considerations can be presented.

Latitude for interpretation and activity in peace policy are some aspects of the general relations between sport and politics. Thus scientifically founded statements are only possible if some basic elements of these general relations are clarified. However, scientific as well as everyday thinking are mostly characterized by oversimplification. As a result, the opinion that sport is “political” is often encountered in discussions along with the opinion that sport is “unpolitical”. And both viewpoints can give a number of examples from real life to support them. To resolve this apparent paradox, a theoretical concept is needed which includes both provable and apparently conflicting positions and shows that they are actually compatible (Güldenpfennig 1981, p. 15-41).

In the sport system two aspects can be differentiated: sport as an action system and sport as an organizational (or institutional) system. If the aspects of sport practice and action are regarded as the focal point, then sport is in essence to be considered *non-political*, as are all specific patterns of action beyond political action itself. Action in sport is carried out according to substantially non-political structural principles, *peculiar to its own world* (Franke 1978). Nevertheless, practical action in sport can also be a point of departure for politically relevant experiences, or a bearer of the symbolization of political circumstances (e.g., sports competition as a model of peaceful settlement of conflicts). If the institutional-organizational aspect are the focal point, then sport can be regarded as *political*, as can any other social sphere. The internal organizational decisions concerning practical action in sport and their prerequisites, as well as the mediating functions of the sport institutions between sport and society are in principle subject to the *general* mechanisms of political opinion-making and education, decision-making and implementation.

In *this* sense sport is thus political *as well as* non-political. Accordingly, there are, applied to the specific relations between sport and peace, *directly* as well as *indirectly* politically relevant aspects:

Directly politically relevant aspects of the relations between sport and peace are on the institutional-organizational level. They consist of the political dispute over the setting up of the *prerequisites* to practical action in sport – over the amount and provenance of material resources for the advancement of sport (e.g., ratio between the military and cultural budget of a given country), over the conditions in the political environment of sport (e.g., a climate of confrontation or cooperation in international relations), over social access to sport (e.g., racial segregation or non-discrimination), over the procedures for participation in sporting events (e.g., boycott) etc. In this, general political conditions are effectual in the development of sport, to which therefore the sport organizations themselves also have to take a political position. In this context, sport has a political mandate and thus basically also a mandate regarding peace policy. However, sport organizations should act on it under three conditions only:

- reasonable, non-sophist provability of sport's susceptibility to general political developments. This is clearly possible in consideration of the goals of the peace movement mentioned at the beginning of this article.
- the existence of an established intra-organizational tradition of opinion-making regarding the political aspects of sport. This often does not exist with regard to the current topic of peace. However, this cannot be used as a legitimation for inactivity or neutrality in this area. In view of the above-mentioned susceptibility of sport, it is rather a challenge calling for increased efforts to overcome the deficits in competence in sport-related everyday communication, in educational measures, and in the establishment of political counselling organs in sport organizations as well as in sport research.
- Possibilities of sport in political action. There are various types of political activity possible with peace as their goal, e.g., demonstrations, resolutions and the organization of topically oriented sport festivals, in which a position is taken to current politically relevant peace problems from the point of view of sport, whereby society's influence on related government decision-making processes is strengthened (Güldenpfennig 1984c).

Naturally, given the generally limited economic and political impact of sport, these possibilities for influence will likewise be limited for sport by itself. However, the possible demonstrative and symbolic effects should not be underestimated in consideration of the effect on the masses and the special attractiveness of sport, especially within the framework of other activities of the peace movement.

But there are also *indirect* political aspects of the relationship between sport and peace. They are on the practical level, especially in some of the specific structural characteristics of sport activity itself. Action in sport can be designed, interpreted and diffused as a model for peaceful competition, and beyond this as a model of the indispensable (in politics for peace) limitation of conflict, as an institution of encounter between different cultures and opposing social systems among many other things (Güldenpfennig 1984d). This potential for influence by sport in politics (and education) is comparatively weak in day-to-day political controversies. For it touches upon the political topics only in a general and symbolic way, and is not applicable as power politics. Still, it provides chances for a longer-term peace-promoting effect.

Sport can make use of its possibilities for peace in politics and education only if it is working on *both* levels simultaneously and to the same extent.

But these findings must be relativized. It is a question of *possibilities*, not of actual facts. These can be left *untried*, also. Sport is an *ambivalent* phenomenon. It is, in principle, open and "free"; it contains the tendency to peace as well as to dissension. Thus, decisive significance is given to the free decisions of the supporters of sport and their appropriately designed influencing of the content and the social environment of sport activities and organization.

History shows that especially the peace-promoting possibilities of sport on the practical as well as political level are not automatically effective. But, in the current world situation, just these are significant. Sport and the science of sport must therefore accept the challenge offered by the threat to peace and by the peace movement.

It is scientifically, politically and pedagogically fruitless to idealize sport and make it appear to be an oasis of primeval peacefulness, as has often been done. Rather a "peace and conflict research in sport" must be developed. The ambivalence of sport in regard to peace must be seriously considered in this. On this basis, it must remind the sport world of its responsibility for the preservation and promotion of peace and illuminate its possibilities for action from all sides. Thus, the task of the science of sport is to outline and clarify the theoretical framework of possibilities and the margins for action for sport. On this backdrop of the hypothetically possible, the awareness of the perils and omissions of the possible can be increased. Therefore, through criticism and counselling, the science of sport can help to define and promote the role of sport in the peace movement.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> For the Federal Republic of Germany this, above all, is formulated in the so-called "Krefelder Appell": Bredthauer 1983. As an example for constructive ways out of the dilemma of the armament race: the proposals in the Palme-Report 1982 and in Schell 1984.

<sup>2</sup> This concernedness can exemplarily be read in the sport-related consequences of the two World-Wars of this century and in the boycott events of 1980 and 1984 (Güldenpfennig 1981 and 1984e).

<sup>3</sup> The decisive elements of this political thinking, which is orientated on the absolute priority of defending "freedom" against "totalitarianism", have already been exposed in detail by Jaspers 1982.

<sup>4</sup> See: Menschenwürde im Sport 1984. – The section Sociology of Sport, of the Deutsche Vereinigung für Sportwissenschaft, held its symposium in November 1984 under the theme "Sport and Ethics"

## References

- BECK, M./LANGKOPF, P./MEYER, H. (1983): Die Initiative "Sportler gegen Atomraketen – Sportler für den Frieden". Ein Beispiel für allgemeinpolitisches Engagement im Sport. In: Güldenpfennig/Meyer 1983
- BETZ, K./KAISER, A. (eds.) (1983): *Wissenschaft zwischen Krieg und Frieden*. Berlin (West), Verlag Ausbildung und Studium
- BONK, H./FRANKE, K./PFAFF, W. (1984): *Friedenssicherung und Abrüstung – zentrale Fragen des Kampfes im staatsmonopolistischen Kapitalismus*. Berlin (GDR), Dietz Verlag
- BREDTHAUER, K. D. (ed.), (1983): *Sage niemand, er habe es nicht wissen können*. Köln, Pahl-Rugenstein Verlag
- EPPLER, E. (1981): *Wege aus der Gefahr*. Reinbek, Rowohlt Verlag
- FRANKE, E. (1978): *Theorie und Bedeutung sportlicher Handlungen*. Schorndorf, Hofmann-Verlag
- Gesellschaftliche Funktionen des Sports* (1984): Schriftenreihe der Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung Band 206, Bonn
- GÜLDENPFENNIG, S. (1981): *Internationale Sportbeziehungen zwischen Entspannung und Konfrontation. Der Testfall 1980*. Köln, Pahl-Rugenstein Verlag
- (1983): Sprachlosigkeit und Einflußmöglichkeiten der Sportwissenschaft bei sportpolitischen Entscheidungsprozessen. Das Beispiel der Olympischen Spiele 1980. In: *hochschulsport*, Vol. X, Nr. 1
- (1984a): Philosophy of Relations between Sport and Peace. In: *Dialectics and Humanism*. The Polish Philosophical Quarterly, Vol. XI, Nr. 1
- (ed.) (1984b): *Sport und Frieden*. Beiträge zur Meinungsbildung innerhalb des Deutschen Sportbundes. Darmstadt, ADH-Dokumente zur Sportpolitik, Nr. 6
- (1984c): Friedensengagement in der Sportbewegung – ein Anwendungsfeld des politischen Mandats des Sports. In: *hochschulsport*, Vol. XI, Nr. 6
- (1984d): Friedensfördernde Werte des Sports. In: *Gesellschaftliche Funktionen des Sports* 1984
- (1984e): Stirbt Olympia? In: *Olympische Jugend*, Vol XXIX, Nr. 7
- GÜLDENPFENNIG, S./MEYER, H. (eds.), (1983): *Sportler für den Frieden*. Köln, Pahl-Rugenstein Verlag
- GÜLDENPFENNIG, S./WIEWIORRA, S. (ed.), (1984): *Sportler gegen Atomraketen – Sportler für den Frieden*. Dokumentation. Hamburg, Eigenverlag
- HEINEMANN, K. (1980): Wissenschaftliche Beratung in der Sportpolitik. In: *Sportwissenschaft*, Vol. X, Nr. 4
- HERMS, E. (1985): Die Grundlagen der Beziehung von Frieden und Sport. In: *Sport und Frieden* 1985



- HOCKE, E./SCHELER, W. (1982): *Die Einheit von Sozialismus und Frieden. Zu philosophischen Problemen von Krieg und Frieden in der Gegenwart*. Berlin (GDR) Dietz Verlag
- HOLZ, H.-H./SANDKÜHLER, J. (ed.), (1982): *Für den Frieden – Aufgaben der Philosophie und der Wissenschaften*. Köln, Pahl-Rugenstein Verlag
- JAKOBS, K.-H. (ed.), (1983): *Das große Lesebuch vom Frieden*. Frankfurt/Main. Robinson-Verlag
- JASPERS, K. (1982): *Die Atombombe und die Zukunft des Menschen*. München/Zürich, Piper-Verlag (first edition 1958)
- JONAS, Hans (1983): *Das Prinzip Verantwortung*. Versuch einer Ethik für die technologische Zivilisation. Frankfurt/Main, Insel-Verlag
- Menschenwürde im Sport*. Symposium Januar 1982 (1984): Akademieschrift der FVA des Deutschen Sportbundes, Nr. 19, Berlin (West)
- Olympische Spiele in Los Angeles – ein Beitrag des Sports in der internationalen Friedensarbeit? (1984): Tagung März 1984. Protokolldienst, Nr. 19, Bad Boll
- Palme-Report (1983): *"Common Security"*. Report of the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues. London. Pan Books Ltd.
- RÖHRS, H. (1983): *Frieden – eine pädagogische Aufgabe*. Braunschweig, Westermann-Verlag Agentur Pedersen
- SCHACHNASAROW, G. Ch. (1984): Die politische Logik des Nuklearzeitalters. In: *Blätter für deutsche und internationale Politik*, Vol. XXIX, Nr. 11
- SCHELER, W. (1984): *Die Philosophie des Friedens im Kampf gegen die Ideologie des Krieges*. Berlin (GDR), Dietz-Verlag
- SCHELL, J. (1984): *The Abolition*. New York, Alfred A. Knopf Publ.
- Sport und Frieden* (1985): Akademiegespräch November 1983. Akademieschrift der FVA des Deutschen Sportbundes, Nr. 24, Berlin (West)
- STERNBERGER, D. (1983): Wir leben im Unkrieg. Der Friede ist der letzte Sinn der Politik. In: *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 18.11.1983, p. 7
- WEIZSÄCKER, C. F. von (1980): *Der Garten des Menschlichen. Beiträge zur geschichtlichen Anthropologie*. Frankfurt/Main, Fischer-Verlag

### **Le sport dans le mouvement pacifique – Un défi pour les sciences du sport.**

#### *Résumé*

Le sport a des rapports ambivalents avec la guerre et la paix. Le mouvement pacifique actuel a démontré cette corrélation dans ses nouvelles dimensions: la menace totale de l'humanité à l'époque nucléaire réquiert un "retournement copernicain" de la pensée et de l'action politique dans tous les domaines sociaux. Quelques aspects de la responsabilité collective du sport en faveur de la paix sont décrits. Dans la politique du sport et les sciences sportives, cette responsabilité collective est discutée de manière controversée entre les concepts "proprium" et "mandat politique" du sport. Ces concepts reflètent l'obligation générale des sciences du sport envers la consultation politique. L'importance et le champ d'action de la politique et la pédagogie pacifiques du sport sont illustrés à l'aide d'une description théorique du caractère politique du sport.

### **Sport in der Friedensbewegung – Eine Herausforderung für die Sportwissenschaft**

#### *Zusammenfassung*

Der Sport steht in ambivalenten Beziehungen zu Krieg und Frieden. Die aktuelle Friedensbewegung hat diese Zusammenhänge in ihren neuen Dimensionen gezeigt: Die totale Bedrohung der Menschheit im Nuklearzeitalter erfordert eine „kopernikanische Wende“ im politischen Denken und Handeln aller gesellschaftlichen Bereiche. Einige Aspekte der Mit-

verantwortung des Sports für den Frieden werden beschrieben. In Sportpolitik und Sportwissenschaft wird diese Mitverantwortung kontrovers diskutiert zwischen den Konzepten „proprium“ und „politisches Mandat“ des Sports. Diese Konzepte stehen im Rahmen der allgemeinen Verpflichtungen der Sportwissenschaft zur Politikberatung. Mit Hilfe einer theoretischen Beschreibung des politischen Charakters des Sports werden friedenspolitische und -pädagogische Bedeutungen und Handlungsspielräume des Sports erläutert.

## El Deporte en el Movimiento Pacifista – un Reto para la Ciencia del Deporte

### Resumen

El deporte se encuentra en una relación ambivalente con respecto a guerra y paz. El movimiento pacifista actual ha demostrado que, en sus nuevas dimensiones, la amenaza total de la humanidad en la era nuclear exige un “punto coperniano” en el pensar y actuar políticos en todos los sectores sociales. Se describen algunos aspectos de la responsabilidad del deporte para la paz. En la política y ciencias del deporte se discute de forma controversial esta responsabilidad entre los conceptos “proprium” y “mandato político” del deporte. Estos conceptos se sitúan en el marco de las obligaciones generales de la ciencia política para el asesoramiento político. Se describen significados político y pedagógico-pacifistas y márgenes de acción del deporte.

スヴェン・グールデンフェニッグ： 平和運動におけるスポーツ — スポーツ科学への挑

### 戦

#### <抄録>

スポーツは、戦争と平和に関してアンビヴァレントな位置にある。実際の平和運動は、その新しい展開において、核軍備の人類に対する全体的脅威があらゆる社会状況における政治的思考と行動における“コペルニクス的な転換”を必要としていることを示している。平和に対するスポーツの責任について述べられている。この責任については、スポーツをめぐる政治とスポーツ科学の分野において、スポーツの“本質的特性”と“政治的統治”という概念をめぐる論争されている。この論争は、スポーツ科学の一般的義務から政治的なカウンセリングの問題までを反映している。また、平和の政治的、教育的意味とスポーツをめぐる行動の限界について説明されている。

Спорт и движение сторонников мира – вызов науке о спорте.

Резюме:

Спорт находится в двусторонних отношениях к миру и к войне. Эту связь и зависимость особенно остро показало современное движение за мир : тотальная угроза человечеству в атомном веке требует "переворота Коперника" политической мысли и деятельности во всех общественных областях. Далее описываются некоторые аспекты роли спорта в коллективной ответственности за мир. В политике спорта и в науке о спорте разработаны спорные концепции о так называемом "проприум" т. е. свойственном спорту и "политическом мандате" спорта. Эти концепции вписываются в общую обязанность науки о спорте советовать политике по определённым вопросам. При помощи теоретического описания политического характера спорта показаны его значение как фактора борьбы за мир в педагогике и политике и его возможности практических действий.