

## **Philosophy of Sport in Belgium and the Netherlands: History and Characteristics**

**Ivo van Hilvoorde, Jan Vorstenbosch, and Ignaas Devisch**

For a few decades now, philosophy of sport has been an acknowledged area of philosophy. Several journals exist, and organizations and conferences are organized to discuss the numerous topics. Philosophy of sport is a lively discipline that debates a wide range of topics, including practical ethical questions such as doping and enhancement and questions regarding sport practices in society, as well as more abstract questions regarding internal values of sport, and the nature of sport itself.

Although internationally oriented, sport philosophical debates do sometimes differ from country to country, from region to region, depending on local embedding of issues and favorite sports. In the Low Countries—Belgium and the Netherlands—some specific themes have dominated the discussions, sometimes with far-reaching consequences for sport. It was, for instance, the arrest of the Belgian football player Bosman (in 1995), which set the world of football upside down.

The Netherlands and Belgium have many commonalities. As good neighbors, both Belgians and the Dutch are fond of cycling and football (“soccer” for North Americans). The Dutch are an acclaimed football nation ever since the 70’s and, being a “country of water,” have a long, dominating, and culturally important, tradition in skating, as well as swimming and sailing.

In this paper, we sketch the outlines of the development and debate in sport philosophy in the Low Countries over the last two decades: what is at stake, what are the main topics and publications and what is currently dominating the landscape of philosophy of sport? Since the Netherlands have a more active philosophy of sport community than Belgium, and since the former has more inspired the latter than the other way around, the recent history of philosophy of sport in the Netherlands makes up the bulk of this paper. The developments in Belgium will be described in general terms. We will conclude with an attempt to pin down the specific contribution of philosophy of sport in the Netherlands and Belgium to the international forum.

---

The authors <I.vanhilvoorde@fbw.vu.nl> are with the Faculty of Human Movement Sciences, Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam/School of Human Movement and Sports, Windesheim, Zwolle, The Netherlands, <Jan.Vorstenbosch@phil.uu.nl> with the Dept. of Philosophy, University of Utrecht, The Netherlands, and <Ignaas.Devisch@Ugent.be> with the Dept. of Philosophy of Medicine, Social Philosophy, and Ethics, Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium.

## The Case of the Netherlands

### The Pioneers

Following Winner (1), we would like to believe that there is such a thing as ‘Brilliant Orange’, something unique to the Netherlands than can be found not only in Dutch football, and in Dutch art, but in philosophy and sport in general as well. It certainly is tempting to draw comparisons between Johannes Vermeer, Johan Huizinga, Johan Cruyff, Ajax and the Dutch national soccer team during the 1970s (with two World Cup Finals in 1974 and 1978)<sup>1</sup>. Although it remains rather speculative to characterize a whole nation based upon a style of playing soccer (which has arguably become more of an ‘invented tradition’ than a historical reality), it is something of a challenge to argue that both sport and philosophy in the Netherlands have some typical characteristics. To say the same about the rather small area of sport philosophy in the Netherlands would however be too pretentious. Similarly, it would be too speculative to describe an entire nation as ‘playful’ thanks to one ‘brilliant orange’ book, *Homo Ludens* (1938) by Johan Huizinga.

On the other hand, Huizinga’s concept of play has had a strong influence on Dutch scientific and philosophical thinking about sport. These historical roots are important to understand the foundations of the philosophy of sport in the Netherlands. When sport sciences emerged, a strong demarcation developed, not only between natural sciences and social sciences, but also between the social sciences (sport sociology, sport pedagogy, sport psychology) itself. Huizinga’s rather normative concept of play has contributed to the polarization of social sciences in sport. Pedagogical and philosophical research related to sport and physical education moved away from, and even developed in strong opposition with the more empirical sciences, including sport psychology and sport sociology.

Philosophy of physical education developed much earlier and rather distinct from the philosophy of sport. This is due to the fact that sport and physical education in the Netherlands have also developed in a rather distinct manner. Physical education in the Netherlands was highly influenced by the German *Turnkunst* (J.C. Gutsmuths, F. Jahn, A. Spiess, A. Maul) as well as Swedish (P.H. Ling) and Austrian (K. Gaulhofer, M. Streicher) systems of physical education. Schools for physical education were dominated by pedagogical and medical thinking and were often characterized by their resistance against sport because sport was seen as characterized by ‘unpedagogical’ elements such as competition and a too strong focus on the body-object and winning. This resistance within the Academies of Physical Education in the Netherlands, which we assume to be different from the much more competition-friendly approach in Anglo-Saxon countries, was highly influenced by both French and German Philosophy. Given the important role in this respect of F.J.J. Buytendijk (1887–1974) and C.C.F. Gordijn (1909–1998) on generations of scientists within the area of sport and physical education (and thus on those that laid the foundation for sport philosophy in the Netherlands), it is important here to sketch some of their influence and the context of their work.

The Dutch psychologist and philosopher Buytendijk was part of a broader phenomenological movement in interbellum and postbellum continental science and philosophy, covering roughly the years between 1925 and 1955, that took

philosophical anthropology to be the central issue of modern thinking. Important representatives of this movement were the Germans Arnold Gehlen and Helmuth Plessner and the French philosopher Maurice Merleau-Ponty. Characteristic of these thinkers was that they bridged the gap between science and philosophy by developing their thought from within a broader biological and psychological framework. Gehlen had strong roots in sociology, Plessner (with whom Buytendijk was befriended) in biology, and Merleau-Ponty in psychology and the study of human behavior. Buytendijk specifically developed an anthropological physiology that was built upon a creative and eclectic combination of biology, physiology, (experimental) psychology and philosophy (existential phenomenology).<sup>2</sup> He considered the human being as a unity and tried to bridge the gap between psychological and physiological approaches (2). His anthropologically oriented medicine was influenced by Victor von Weizsäcker, Erwin Strauss and the Swiss psychiatrist Ludwig Binswanger. He borrowed some of their main concepts, such as Von Weizsäcker's concept *Gestaltkreis* ('cycle of structure'), which had an impact on several scientific disciplines. Generations of students in biology, (sports) medicine, psychology and physiology were trained in the phenomenological and anthropological approach. According to Dekkers (2: p. 30), Buytendijk's significance lies primarily in his attempt to implement his philosophical conviction with a reasoned proposal for an alternative way of doing (medical) science and practicing medicine.

Around 1945 the influence shifted toward French philosophy, in particular that of Maurice Merleau-Ponty (with his core ideas of 'le corps-sujet' and 'être-au-monde') and Jean Paul Sartre. 'From a philosophical point of view Merleau-Ponty has gone from being Buytendijk's pupil to being his teacher' (2: p. 22). Buytendijk was strongly opposed to purely mechanistic explanations of human behavior and, following Merleau-Ponty, considered the body 'active as a preconscious disposition of our personal existence.' (2: p.24)

The work of Carl Gordijn can be understood as part of the same tradition, although he primarily focused on the implications for physical education. His work can be characterized by the resistance against the usefulness of anatomical and physiological paradigms within educational contexts. Gordijn was the founder (in 1947) and director of the Academy of Physical Education (Windesheim, Zwolle) as well as founder (in 1971) and first dean of the Inter Faculty of Physical Education at the Vrije Universiteit (VU) Amsterdam. His scientific and political work was crucial for the transformation of physical education from a medically and physiological oriented practice toward an anthropological and pedagogical (and some would say: ideological) oriented, educational practice. Bodies are not trained or educated, according to Gordijn and many of his followers, but pupils are instead being learned to move and play. Within this 'personalist concept', objectives are formulated in terms of the realization of a personal movement competence and identity (3). A whole generation of PE teachers still doesn't use the notion 'physical education' (because of its dualistic connotation) but rather talks about 'movement education'.

Under the influence of strong neo-positivistic, analytic and Marxist tendencies in philosophy and social sciences, the importance of the phenomenological approach succumbed in the sixties. These positivistic and analytical tendencies in physical education can be illustrated by the fact that the *Inter Faculty of Physical*

*Education* renamed itself in 1986 and became known as the *Faculty of Human Movement Sciences*. This is the same Faculty where Sport Philosophy was on the curriculum first.

### The Formal Start of Philosophy of Sport

Philosophy of Sport was first taught within an academic context in the Netherlands in 1990 at the VU Amsterdam. At the Faculty of Human Movement Sciences one of Gordijn's first students, Jan Tamboer, took the initiative to introduce, together with a small group of students, Philosophy of Sport as an academic course, and for some years as an independent master's degree in the Netherlands.<sup>3</sup> Interest in the Anglo-Saxon pragmatist and analytical approaches to sport became more prominent in this course. The role of rules in sports as a human practice, influenced by Wittgenstein's *Philosophische Untersuchungen (Philosophical Investigations)* received the most attention.<sup>4</sup>

Although hermeneutical and phenomenological research in the field of sport was increasingly marginalized and empirical and experimental research became dominant, there was a short revival of a 'relational paradigm' (4) in the 1980s that has affinities with the phenomenological approach. Buytendijks's emphasis on the cyclical unity of perception and action nicely fitted into the modern psychology of that time, such as the ecological psychology of J.J. Gibson (and his theory of *affordances*), the work of Russian physiologist N.A. Bernstein and American psychologist such as M.T. Turvey and E.S. Reed. These—at that time promising—links between philosophy and psychology, however, have more or less disappeared by now.

In summary, it could be argued that in the 1970s and 1980s Dutch students had been educated in the philosophy of sport, but under a different label (such as 'Philosophy of physical education'). Moreover, the education within the phenomenological tradition was in the 1980s increasingly complemented with work that reflected on the history and meaning of sport in a broader context. In particular the work of David Best, Carolyn Thomas, William Morgan and German authors such as Henning Eichberg, Günter Gebauer, Ommo Grupe, Hans Lenk, Eckhard Meinberg and Elk Franke were studied during the 1980s and 1990s by students that were interested in the philosophy of human movement and sport.

The formal introduction of 'sport philosophy' is in some respect a continuation of a philosophical tradition that emphasized physicality, dualism, and play. That paradigmatic dominance manifested itself as well in the first Dutch contribution to the *Journal of the Philosophy of Sport* by Jan Tamboer in 1992. Based on his thesis, he focused primarily on the understanding and interpretation of 'physicality' within the broader philosophical discussion on sport, games and play. From Buytendijk, Gordijn and Merleau-Ponty, Tamboer had adopted a critical stance toward Cartesian thinking. In the sport philosophical literature, Tamboer recognized a self-evident, a solid point of agreement: the 'demonstration of physical skill' as a necessary component of all sports. Tamboer criticized the work of Meier, Osterhoudt, Paddick and Suits for not sufficiently discussing 'physical skill'. According to Tamboer, the 'consensus is so widespread, and has become so solidly rooted, that it certainly could be called the *hidden essentialism* in what people generally say and write about sport.' (4: p. 32)

In his reaction, Scott Kretchmar (5) responded that Tamboer's paper was prompted more by linguistic confusions. However, the resulting discussion in the *Journal of the Philosophy of Sport* clearly exposed an intellectual gap between two philosophical traditions, as well as differences in sport culture (5, 6, 7). It's beyond the scope of this paper to discuss these differences in detail, but it should be stressed here that certain concepts of sport are dominating within the Anglo-Saxon literature. Activities like chess and checkers are considered serious sports in many countries, with a rich tradition and many world champions in the Netherlands, as against Anglo-Saxon opinion.

The move toward 'philosophy of sport' also meant a restriction in focus, with regard to sport cultures as well as language. Many generations of Dutch scholars were able to study in English, German and also French. For many years, students studied both *Sportwissenschaft* (from Germany) and *The Journal of the Philosophy of Sport*, and were able to bridge gaps between German and English thinking on sport. Due to Anglo-Saxon dominance, this multilingual advantage has more or less disappeared. Within a few generations most Dutch students have lost the skills to study philosophy in original French and German.

## Sport Ethics

The first students who entered the Philosophy of Sport course in 1990 began by studying *Philosophic Inquiry in Sport* (1988), edited by William Morgan and Klaus Meier. The parts on sport ethics and social-political philosophy opened up a new and in the Netherlands a rather ignored territory.

The area of sport ethics in particular, opened up new academic ground and inspired several pioneering students to work on sport ethical subjects. Thanks to the first official appointments within the field (within a larger research project called *Values and norms in sport*), several scholars (Johan Steenbergen, Agnes Elling and Ivo van Hilvoorde) started publishing sport philosophical papers and on sport ethical issues such as fair play, gender and doping. Steenbergen and Van Hilvoorde first visited conferences of IAPS in 1995 (Tsukuba, Japan) and 1996 (Idaho, US), resulting in closer contacts with international scholars. Some of these co-operations also resulted in international publications, in particular within the developing area of sport, genetics and human enhancement (8; 9; 10) Some sport philosophical colleagues were invited to the Netherlands, such as Heather Sheridan and Andy Miah, who also contributed to a Dutch book on sport and genetics (11).

The relations that developed between sports ethics and sports philosophy set the historical origins of Dutch philosophy of sport in new light. Albeit in some respects strongly normatively, ideal-based oriented, the phenomenological orientation, as it was practiced by Buytendijk and others, developed no clear independent concept of moral philosophy. It is characteristic of the phenomenological method to draw no 'artificial' lines between normativity in general (including esthetical normativity), ethics and moral theory, as it became customary in post-war analytical moral philosophy. The consequence of the turn to a more analytical philosophy of sport, was that the ethical approach to sports became more in line with analytical conceptualization of morals and ethics as a separate field of philosophy. This consequence was strengthened by the fact that in the 1980s and 90's applied ethics was booming and a broad spectrum of 'areas of applied ethics' such

as bioethics, environmental ethics and sports ethics, developed along the lines of a paradigm of ‘applying general moral principles to specific fields’. This paradigm was increasingly criticized by philosophers and ethicists, who favored a more ‘comprehensive’ and substantial merging of moral philosophy with questions that British philosopher Bernard Williams, in his influential book *Ethics and the Limits of Philosophy* (12) had brought under the heading of the ‘Socratic question’ about the good life for human beings. Interestingly, if accepted, this Socratic question seems to bring the approach to ethical questions such as doping and fair play, nearer to the phenomenological approach described above. The Socratic question is a question about meaning and value in human life, not limiting this question to ‘moral acceptability’ or ‘moral obligation’ in a stricter sense. The phenomenological approach, too, stresses ‘meaning’ as a central issue in the understanding and valuation of human experience and phenomena.

The neo-Aristotelian philosopher Alasdair MacIntyre also had an influence on Dutch thinking about ethics and sports. A central part of his virtue-ethical critique of liberal moral philosophy was a conception of a practice that MacIntyre in his influential book *After Virtue* explained with reference to sports, chess in particular, as a paradigm of a practice. Especially the idea of a fundamental difference between external goods (such as money and power, and perhaps including morally validated external objectives such as sports contributing to social integration and greater equality) and goods that are internal to a practice such as football, was taken up by some Dutch philosophers in defense of an antidoping position based on the idea of fair play internal to sports practices (13).

## Public Debate

Stimulated by the interest of the media, Dutch philosophers of sport have attracted substantial attention for sport ethics, and for the doping issue in particular. The past few years there is also an increasing interest in opinions from sport philosophers in a variety of debates such as the enhancement of disabilities, (e.g., the so-called “blade runner” Oscar Pistorius), biotechnology and transhumanism (14; 15).

On the one hand, this public role reflects a rather limited view on sport philosophy. On the other hand, in an academic sense, philosophy of sport had opened up more toward historical, pedagogical and sociological issues. One particular issue that has become more prominent now that the Netherlands and Belgium are aiming to organize the Soccer World Cup in 2018 and the Netherlands is serious about organizing the Olympic Games in 2028 is the supposed relation between success in elite sport, national identity, and national pride. Given the importance of these events and the money that is involved, there is an increasing recognition of the importance of independent, critical reflection on sport and its supposed effects and meaning. Sport philosophy should, in combination with a more historical and sociological research, stimulate a critical debate on the presumptions that defend the policy to focus on elite sport, for example because it is thought to enhance national pride (16).

Related to this is another important current debate on talent identification and the political pressure to replace physical education by ‘sport education’, legitimized by the argument that we should use the educational context to identify tal-

ents earlier and to contribute to the widespread ambition in the Netherland to become a structural part of the top ten in sport worldwide (measured in Olympic medals and other indexes) (17). With these issues, some of the older debates on physical education, as has been put forward by Buytendijk and Gordijn, become prominent again.

## The Case of Belgium

### Sports in Belgium

In Belgium, sports are seldom the main focus of ethicists and philosophers. This is quite remarkable because sport is very important for Belgians, in particular football and cycling. People can hardly wait for the start of a new cycling season each year in the spring, and although the international success of Belgian football has downsized seriously the last decades, it is still very popular among all levels of society.

Considering the publications on philosophy of sport from the last two decades, one must conclude that only in the last years is the interest increasing. The first document that spoke about ethics in sport was published in 1991 (18). The book, *Ethische aspecten van medische tussenkomsten in de competitiesport* (Ethical Aspects of Medical Interventions in Competition Sports), a report of conferences and seminars of the society for ethics and moral in Belgium, discussed the framework of medical interventions in sports.

In the meantime, at the Catholic University of Leuven (KUL), a few academics held courses and lectures on sports and ethics. Frans de Wachter, working at the department of philosophy, held philosophy courses for students in physical education (19) and therapy and Yves van den Auweele developed research on ethics and children in sports, in particular on child abuse (20; 21) He also supervised many master theses on this topic. Both De Wachter and Vanden Auweele were pioneers in Belgium. In the eighties, occasionally, some articles were published on violence or abuse in sports, but not on a systematic basis (20).

Also at Ghent University, the work of Marc Maes and Jan Tolleneer began to focus increasingly on sport and ethics. Recently, Marc Maes founded the ICES, International Centre for Ethics in Sports.<sup>5</sup> More and more, sports organizations ask them and other people for workshops, practical guidelines or reflection upon ethics in sports. At the same time, several people from the University of Leuven founded a new research group on ethics and sports, besides the expansion of research activities at the Research Centre for the History of Sport and Kinesiology. Obviously, the academic scene has an increasing interest for philosophy of sport and ethics.

Notwithstanding this increase of interest, philosophers of sports are not numerous and the appreciation of their work is rather marginal. The reasons for this are diverse. First of all, philosophy of sport is as such a new discipline and not visible at university departments. At Belgian universities, the division between health and sports departments on the one hand, and philosophy or ethics departments on the other hand, is quite substantial. If people are doing research on philosophy of sport, most of the time this is despite the university framework they are working within and because of it. We have sport managers and sport economists,

but not particularly philosophers of sport. Universities are at least not facilitating research in this area. Despite these limits, the last decade, several articles were published on ethics and sports but rather of a very diverse content which makes it hard to discuss them in a few lines or as illustrations of just one topic (21; 22; 23; 24)

## Scandals and Affairs

During the first decade of the 21st century, ethics and sports became also widely discussed in Belgium society. More and more, philosophers of sport are asked for contributions in public debates over various public sporting scandals controversies (25; 26) And one must say, at a certain moment there were more cases than we could handle. In particular in football, many scandals or affairs have occurred. First of all, in 2005 the Zheyun Ye bribery affair had infected several teams, coaches and players which received money for tampering with matches and to influence the results of football games for the profit of betting companies in China. Many people were arrested and some teams relegated to a lower league. Fans were complaining that they had seen nothing more than a fake theater and not a football game.

In the last few years the football scene in Belgium have been characterized by several brutal fouls on football players. The most well-known is the Witsel-Wasilewski affair (2009) by which the first player from Standard de Liège attacked the latter player from Anderlecht so heavily, that after almost a year, he is still recovering from his injuries. The player was suspended for eight weeks, but the victim did not claim a civil juridical procedure against his aggressor, as has sometimes been the case in other countries such as The Netherlands. In the Netherlands football player Bouazazan was prosecuted after an invalidating charge on an opponent, both under criminal justice as well as by civil action. In both procedures he was convicted. There now runs an action, involving a much larger sum, on the substance of the case to elicit a principled judgment of the Dutch court. What was interesting—and ironic—about the intense debate on Witsel's foul was that it was strongly morally of character. The media and the public made him out to be a public enemy, and he reportedly received death threats. But that was it. There only was a short and intense debate about moral values in football game and when few weeks later several other similar fouls were committed with only one difference that the injuries of the players were less serious, no one seemed to care any longer, except from a few philosophers of sport (26). We should also mention that the former president of the Belgian Football Association, Michel D'Hooghe, held a public plea to stop the increasing violence in football games.

Since the outburst of this affair in 2009, almost every weekend, referee decisions are discussed publicly. On the one hand, many people think referees should be more consequent with the rules and ask for more yellow and red cards; on the other hand, players are complaining that almost every tackle is punished by officials and that they are no longer able to play football. At a more abstract level, this debate is of course about the crucial notion of fair play in sports and in football in particular. Time and again, spectators and players are reminded of this crucial value in sports. Of course, football has changed a lot in the last decades—pulling and pushing to get the ball, verbal intimidation, the enormous circulation of



money round about the game, et cetera—and players are playing a different game now compared with earlier times.

Belgians are also very passionate about cycling. If a young person does not play football, at least he has a bike to identify himself with, and also great Belgian cyclists, such as Eddy Merckx, Johan Museeuw, Tom Boonen, Frederik Meirhaeghe, to mention only a few of them. All four of them are national heroes but they also had their troubles with doping or drugs. In particular Johan Museeuw, ‘the lion of Flanders’, as cyclist relentlessly popular, fell off his clouds when it got public he doped himself the last years of his career. How could he deceive the public for so long? People were really upset that ‘their’ hero has cheated upon them. All of a sudden, Museeuw was a bad guy in the good world of fair sportsmanship.

This public discussion on doping in cyclism developed was analogously to the academic discussion on enhancement in sports and the explosion of biotechnological means for enhancement of the sporting body and psyche. Since biotechnology and genetics offer sportsmen many new strategies to enhance their physical possibilities, and since every sportsman tries to transgress his limits, every sportsperson will be interested in this. The situation we are in today differs from the past. While in earlier times it was rather the question how to look for good ways and means to improve performances, today the question is: what kind of already existing enhancement techniques do we allow? The last few years, these questions are at the forefront in the debates in Belgium (27).

## Summary and Conclusions

In trying to state what the message of philosophical thinking about sports is to the world in the Lower Countries, perhaps we should notice that philosophy in general in the Netherlands and Belgium of the 20th century is often traditionally seen as a mediator between Continental and Anglo-Saxon philosophy. The phenomenologist Buytendijk is an interesting example of how this position can stimulate a creative contribution to the international discussion. Buytendijk was influenced by German and French thinking (Plessner, Merleau-Ponty) but developed an international fame of its own. Against this general background we can point out that Dutch and Belgian philosophers in several respects may be of interest as suggesting counterpoints to Anglo/American analytical thinking on sports, particularly as it has been influenced by a Wittgensteinian rule-based paradigm. Based on the description in this contribution, we will conclude with three general statements that expand on this claim.

First, in reminding sport philosophers of the methodological tools and theoretical ideas that the phenomenological movement in philosophy developed, and keeping the debate on the pro’s and con’s of this approach alive, the Lower Countries may expand and deepen international inquiry into philosophy of sport.

Second, given the slight academic opportunities to occupy themselves on a full-time basis with philosophy of sport, philosophers in the lower Countries may turn this need to a virtue, by creating bridges between general philosophy and the philosophy of sport, and between philosophy and ethics of sports. We think about the extension of the sometimes rather narrow (normatively liberal and method-

ologically analytical) paradigms in which sports philosophy is embedded, to an approach that links sports as a practice to philosophical questions concerning action in general, the structure of social practices, conceptions of the good life and morality as a broader phenomenon. Some examples have been suggested in this contribution.

Third, in developing interdisciplinary projects involving sociologists, anthropologists, legal scientists and philosophers—a tradition that goes back to Huizinga and Buytendijk—and linking these projects to culturally specific favorite sports such as football, cycling and skating, philosophers in the Lower Countries are contributing to the development of an interesting new paradigm of comparative philosophy of sport. The general idea of this paradigm would be to examine to what extent conceptualization, theorizing as well as normative positions taken by philosophers from various countries concerning sports are predicated on historically and societally context-bound specific sport practices. The question whether in different national law systems severe and invalidating physical violence in sports matches (such as the Bouazazan and Witsel-cases in football) are actually treated different, or would be treated different if brought to court, would be an interesting case study for this research paradigm.

## Notes

At the moment of finishing this paper, the Netherlands just reached the finals of the World Cup Soccer 2010 in South-Africa. The style of playing (with an extreme focus on results) has been characterized by many as 'non-Dutch'. According to *The Independent*: 'It is hardly the stuff of David Winner's "Brilliant Orange" we are describing here; nothing like the totaalvoetbal perfected by Johan Cruyff under Rinus Michel's leadership in 1974 in which all the Dutch players were so completely gifted that they could interchange positions in the 4-3-3 formation which the side displayed to the world.' (July 4, 2010)

Buytendijk published on a wide variety of subjects and is translated in many languages. He published, for example on 'play' (in 1932) before Huizinga did and wrote essays on sport and football. Important works are *Prolegomena To An Anthropological Physiology* (1965) and *General Theory of Human Posture and Movement* (1948), which has been studied up to the 1980s by generations of students of Physical Education and Human Movement Science.

In the Netherlands the Amsterdam Faculty is the only place where philosophy of sport is studied and taught as an autonomous academic discipline. Van Hilvoorde took over the position of Tamboer in 2006 and is now teaching Philosophy of Sport (Bachelor) and Sport & Society (Master). There is no existing program for training and supervising Ph.D students in sport philosophy.

Testimony to this more analytical, conceptual orientation is Steenbergen's Ph.D-thesis (2004) about the definition of sport (cosupervised by Jan Tamboer and Mike McNamee)

<http://www.ethicsandsport.com>

## References

1. Winner, D. *Brilliant Orange: The Neurotic Genius of Dutch Football*. London: Bloomsbury, 2000.
2. Dekkers, W.J. "F.J.J. Buytendijk's Concept of an anthropological Physiology." *Theoretical Medicine and Bioethics*, 16, 1, 1995, 15-39.

3. Crum, B.J. "A Critical Review of Competing Physical Education Concepts." In *Sport Sciences in Europe 1993 - Current and Future Perspectives*, J. Mester (Ed.). Aachen: Meyer & Meyer, 1994, pp. 516–533.
4. Tamboer, J.W.I. "Sport and motor actions." *Journal of the Philosophy of Sport*, XIX, 1992, 31–45.
5. Kretchmar, S.R. "Reactions to Tamboer's 'Sport and Motor Actions'." *Journal of the Philosophy of Sport*, XIX, 1992, 47–53.
6. Tamboer, J.W.I. "On the contingent Relation between Motor Actions and Sport: a reaction to Kretchmar." *Journal of the Philosophy of Sport*, XX-XXI, 1993-94, 82–90.
7. Osterhoudt, R.G. "Tamboer, Kretchmar, and Loland: Sacred Texts for an Unholy Critique." *Journal of the Philosophy of Sport*, XX-XXI, 1993-94, 91–101.
8. Sheridan, H., B. Pasveer & I. van Hilvoorde "Gene-talk and sport-talk: A view from the radical middle ground". *European Journal of Sport Science*, 6, 4, 2006, 223-230.
9. van Hilvoorde, I., Vos, R., and de Wert, G. "Flopping, Klapping and Gene Doping; Dichotomies between 'natural' and 'artificial' in elite sport." *Social Studies of Science*, 37(2), April 2007, 173–200.
10. McNamee, M., Müller, A., van Hilvoorde, I. & S. Holm "Genetic testing and Sports Medicine Ethics." *Sports Medicine*, 39, 5, 2009, 339-344.
11. Hilvoorde, I. van & Pasveer, B. (red.) *Beter dan Goed. Over Genetica en de toekomst van Topsport* (Better than well. On genetics and the future of elite sports. Diemen/Den Haag: Veen Magazines/Rathenau Instituut, 2006.
12. Williams, B. *Ethics and the limits of philosophy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1985.
13. Vorstenbosch, J. "Drogredenen over doping: Een pleidooi tegen legalisatie van dopinggebruik in de sport" (Fallacies about doping: a plea against the legalization of performance-enhancing substances in sports). *Filosofie en Praktijk*, 19, 9, 1998, 169 – 183.
14. Hilvoorde, I. van & Landeweerd, L. "Disability or extraordinary talent; Francesco Lentini (3 legs) versus Oscar Pistorius (no legs)". *Sport, Ethics & Philosophy*, 2, 2, 2008, 97-111.
15. Hilvoorde, I. van & Landeweerd, L. "Enhancing disabilities: Transhumanism under the veil of inclusion?" *Disability & Rehabilitation* (posted online on June 7th 2010).
16. van Hilvoorde, I., Elling, A., and Stokvis, R. "How to Influence National Pride? The Olympic Medal Index as a Unifying Narrative." *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 45(1), XXX, 87–102.
17. de Bosscher, V., Bingham, J., Shibli, S., van Bottenburg, M., and de Knop, P. *The Global Sporting Arms Race: An International Comparative Study on Sports Policy Factors Leading to International Sporting Success*. Oxford: Meyer & Meyer Sport, 2008.
18. Belgische Vereniging voor Medische Ethiek and Société Belge d'éthique et de Morale. *Ethische aspecten van medische Tussenkomsten in de Competitiesport* (Ethical Aspects of Medical Interventions in Competition Sports). Belgische vereniging voor medische ethiek en moraal, 1991.
19. De Wachter, F. *Wijsbegeerte van de Lichamelijke Opvoeding (Philosophy of Physical Education)*. Acco, 1989.
20. Vanden Auweele, Y. *Ethics in Youth Sport: Analyses and Recommendations*. LanooCampus, 2004.
21. Vanden Auweele, Y. *Kwetsbare kinderen (Vulnerable Children)*. Leuven, 2005.
22. Bulté S. et al *Een sociopolitieke Analyse van het Sportbeleid in Vlaanderen: de impact van het strategisch plan voor sportend Vlaanderen* (A sociopolitical Analysis of Sports Policy in Flanders: the Impact of a strategic Plan for sporting Flanders). K.U. Leuven. Faculteit Bewegings- en revalidatiewetenschappen, 2009.
23. Loridon, P., and Meganck, J. *Help, mijn kind sport! (Help, my child is Sporting)*. Lampadaire, 2009.

24. Pans, J. et al Sport, doping en ethiek. *De zaak Filip Meirhaeghe en de zaak Rutger Beke: inhoudsanalyse van egodocumenten en persverslagen* (Sports, Doping and Ethics: A Content Analysis of Egodocuments and Press Releases). K.U. Leuven. Faculteit Bewegings- en revalidatiewetenschappen, 2009.
25. Devisch, I. ““En toen zat er een enkel onder mijn voet”” (‘And then there was an enckle underneath my foot), <http://www.sporza.be/permalink//1.644060>, 2009.
26. Devisch, I. “*Imagoschade, de passe-partout van de Tourbazen*” (*Image, wonderlamp of the Tourmanagers*). De Morgen, 2009.
27. Belmans, J. et al, *Sport, Posthumaniteit en Bio-ethiek: een terreinverkennde Studie* (Sports, Posthumanity and Bio-ethics: a preliminary Study). K.U. Leuven. Faculteit Bewegings- en revalidatiewetenschappen, 2009.