Abstract
This paper proposes the fundamental cognitive nature in “Sportology” as a new wisdom of total humanity by examining the conceptualization of it. First, the author discusses the viewpoint of the search for new studies, and suggests the necessity for the innovation of the paradigm in established modern sciences. Second, the author discusses the social situations of sport sciences and physical education studies and suggests its limitation and self-contradiction as modern sciences and as the practical intellectual too. Because they are destined to be despised as the second class one by their mother sciences and looked down as a worthless theoretical meddling by the practical world. In order to go beyond this limitation, sport sciences and physical education studies have to establish their own and peculiar subject and methodology in the relation of the human movement as the living body. Then, “Sportology” may not be constituted as the inter-disciplinary nor the multi-disciplinary, but the trans-disciplinary. The author suggests that this point of view is very important for the humanity protection in the future world in which the techno-sciences may reach the singular point and a Mother Computer may control all over our life. The last, the author discussed the Renaissance to explore the cognitive nature of “Sportology” as the innovation model for a new wisdom. He suggests that the first Renaissance for the liberation of the intellectual and the second Renaissance for the liberation of the emotional were limited because of separately liberation of each other. Therefore, the author concludes that the conceptualization of “Sportology” will support a flourishing paradigm for the prospect of the third Renaissance, which is the liberation of the human body.

The search for new studies and points for examination

“A big fish in a little barrel” is an aphorism for egocentricity in one’s understanding of the world. At the same time, needless to bring up “Seinsverbundenheit” (existential binding or connectedness) by Karl Mannheim—this aphorism has been applicable to study and science since it came into use in humanistic works. Since Karl H. Marx pointed out in his “Die Deutsche Ideologie” that substructure regulated superstructure, Potential for objectivity in recognition has been the most important theme in the fields of humanities and social sciences.

The reason why this theme expanded to instigate the large-scale controversy known as the “science wars”—which struggled for the propriety and validity of scientific research that required acquisition of supporting funds primarily from federal budgets—depends on “the structure of scientific revolution” by Thomas Kuhn. This theme was made applicable to science in general, and to the natural sciences by Kuhn. He revealed that scientific progress and development were achieved by a dynamic change in research methods rather than by the accumulation of intellectual products in specific areas. He pointed out that fundamental methods for scientific research depended on the paradigm shared among scientists of a given field, and that change in that paradigm was absolutely vital for development of the particular field. Since then,
changes in the cognitive paradigm have had a crucial meaning for innovation in study and science. A change in the "ways of recognition and reasoning" has been regarded as essential to new study and scientific framework, creation, and evolution.

Today, however, study, science and technology have become deeply intertwined and inquiries as to their effectiveness have been made. Requests for new study, science, creation, and development are not only moved by imminent epistemic change among the scientists attempting to further scientific progress, but are also driven by social and economic demands. Among these is the expectation for secular effectiveness, meaning, value, and function to engage in the solutions to real-world issues. A powerful vehicle for new study and science emerges when imminent epistemic change and social and economic demands are combined.

In this paper, the author points out the cognitive limitations of sports sciences and physical education studies, which are based on the paradigm of mother sciences and social futility through analysis of the structure of social dilemmas. To go beyond limitations and create a new paradigm, the author has postulated the concept of "Sportology" as a new study. Additionally, the author provides an ontological answer regarding the meaning of human existence in an era in which techno-science has reached unprecedented levels of development, approaching singularity in the near future as one of the possibilities of the paradigm.

Limitations of sports sciences and physical education studies: imminent self-contradiction in academism

In 1983, the Annual seminar of the International Society for Sociology of Sport was held in Paris. At that seminar, Pierre Bourdieu gave a speech entitled "Sports, social class and subculture" about how sports sociologists find themselves constrained in two ways. He described their situation as one of being looked down upon by sociologists and being disdained by sports practitioners. According to Bourdieu, sports sociologists were regarded as second-class researchers from the point of view of academism, whose mission is to produce knowledge. He also mentioned that from the practitioners' perspective, sociologists were merely worthless critics. However, this indication could be true not only for each sports sociologist, but for all researchers of sports and physical education. The reason for this is academic vulnerability, which has revealed that the vast membership of the Japan society of physical education, health and sports sciences has decreased due to the deregulation of university policies, making physical education a non-required subject. This is also due to the development of new products resulting from sports science's tendency to focus solely on sports consumerism.

This puts physical education and sports researchers in an unpleasant position best described as self-contradicting. As researchers attempt to increase the validity of their work, they are under simultaneous structural pressures from academic requests for intelligent contributions, and social requests for practical contributions.

Physical education and sports research began historically with practical requests aimed at maintaining health and increasing physical strength, mainly by medical means. However, the designation in post-war educational reforms of physical education as a required subject at universities led to the introduction of a vast number of physical education and sports researchers into the academic domain. Since the activities of these researchers were part of the general educational curriculum, the researchers were asked to compete with other colleagues who worked in various specialized fields in the sciences. Therefore, these researchers were evaluated according to the degree to which their research was scientific. Thus, physical education and sports researchers became actively accepted in the academic milieu as they struggled to make their research more "scientific" to meet academic requirements. In this way, postwar physical education and sports research became a structural academic component of the foundations of academic societies, with sports researchers taking seats in the Science Council of Japan and building a conferral system for academic degrees.

However, although the academic structuring of physical education and sports research was effective in proving and confirming the validity of its existence as an academic field, sports research had to reduce its "identity" as an intellectual work. Ac-
academic structuring means that the hierarchy of authority based on academic judgment is institutionalized. The core of academic judgment is “scientific nature,” which is built on a model of natural science. It is an intellectual work that provides with corrective and objective explanations for various relationships and processes in objective phenomena in the natural world. This means that the research has to follow certain rules, standards, and the paradigm of the field of mother sciences, while still meeting academic requirements. This movement toward making research more scientific is an attempt at self-justification by means of scientific judgments, and at unconsciously reifying “human movement” and “the living body” by following “scientific frameworks.” Consequently, the higher the profile of physical education and sports research becomes, the higher is the suspicion of their scientific nature. Moreover, the higher the scientific nature, the wider the gap between actual research and the practical requests for contributions toward solutions to real-world problems.

Structural pressure on physical education and sports research created by social requests is still strong today, with social needs symbolized by the contribution of its research to national health development and the pursuit of medals in sports competitions. In other words, the need for the research is only acknowledged socially by its contribution toward solving real-world problems. This structural pressure is linked to political, economical, and cultural interests through media coverage of various levels and layers of physical education and sports organizations. This pressure has a complex influence on the vision and ideology of physical education and sports. The way that physical education and sports research can get out of this double-bind situation is to create a new paradigm that goes beyond the tasked scientific nature, by dismantling the current model in which sports sciences are dependent on the mother sciences, upon whose methods their research is based.

The possibilities for sportology: a view of the third Renaissance

The paradigm discussed in this paper should be one that recognizes “human movement” and “the living body” as unique subjects of intellectual work. This recognition is neither interdisciplinary nor multidisciplinary, because whether it is interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary is of no importance. As long as the research is disciplinary, the requirement for science will remain dominant and will be based on the scientific method. After all, disciplinary studies trivialize “human movement,” which is a unique subject of sportology, into a physical phenomenon, and “the living body” into an objective one. In this sense, the paradigm of sportology should be one of transdisciplinary intellectual work. This paradigm, which attempts to exceed scientific knowledge, seems to be a framework necessary for our culture and civilization to avoid the process of “the singularity,” which de-legitimizes all intellectual works and leads to self-validation. The world in the foreseeable near future, which will be built on the development of scientific knowledge in areas such as nanotech, gene manipulation and biocomputers is undoubtedly “the scientific world,” with its ultimate point of singularity lying in the creation of a Mother Computer with the abilities to regenerate, learn, and cooperate. Sportology adopts standpoint opposing this dehumanizing process of “scientification,” and focuses instead on “human movement” and “the living body” and deepening and expanding their recognition as a whole.

However, through what kind of paradigm does transdisciplinary intellectual work proceed? The answer can be found by discussing a mechanism of creating new knowledge and human ontology. We know that scientific knowledge, which has a strong hegemony on intellectual works in the contemporary world, was born out of intelligence re-leashed from the fetters of religion by the human liberation that took place in the first Renaissance.

The first Renaissance created an opportunity for study independent from the teachings of the Catholic Church. By separating nature and the world from God, free thinking and objectivity of cognition, which are the foundations of scientific intelligence, were cultivated. However, this intelligence led only to reorganization of the world, thus securing pure objectivity that rejects the possibility of any human intervention—this is God’s intervention in intelligence. Intelligence has structured the
modern world based on this paradigm. In that sense, it is inevitable that theory and practice conflict with each other. When the framework of the world has been established by scientific intelligence—in short, when singularity is achieved—conflict may disappear.

The second Renaissance, which followed the liberation of intelligence, refers to the reduction of intelligence or its limitation, leading to the cultural independence of art by emotional liberation. Emotional self-enjoyment, such as the joy of sound and formativeness, became separated from religious music and paintings created to glorify God. However, limitations of emotion separated from intelligence were also found in the challenges and struggles of modern art. These two human liberations—liberation of intelligence and liberation of emotions—in the early modern era developed into the paradigm of modern civilization and contributed somewhat to the development of humanity. However, they could not lead to total human liberation, as these two liberations have become separated at the individual level.

Now is the dawn of a new era of “body liberation,” which the first and second Renaissances could not achieve. The body has not been considered a topic for a Renaissance, even though it is the most specific foundation of human existence. In fact, the root word of “topic,” “topos,” integrates intelligence and emotion. This is because the body has been structured historically and socially as a foundation of a productive force, a base for exploitation, and a ground for control. Consequently, the liberation of the human body seeks to make the body a stage to integrate intelligence and emotion. This stage is the unique epistemological basis of sportology, because sports should be defined as the act of independent evolution of bodily abilities," as a part of the quest for and development of physical freedom for physical health and happiness. Sportology is an instrument that realizes physical liberation as a part of an intellectual framework. In this sense, a conceptualization of sportology will support a flourishing paradigm for the prospect of the third Renaissance, which is the liberation of the human body.
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