

Olympic Education as an Intergenerational Relation of the Third Degree

Andrzej Pawłucki

University School of Physical Education in Wrocław, Poland

ABSTRACT

Olympic education is a more complex social reality than is commonly thought to be the case. Olympic education, understood as a social relation, is expressive when it takes place between the three generations, and when its axiological leader: the Olympic pedagogue, engages all subjects of the Academy.

Olympic education must be constructed in such a way as to include both the act and the thought about the sense of the act. It must include the act of participation and the culture of actions through Olympic practice and the cultural awareness of the act. It must account for the cognitive capabilities of the pupil. Olympic students must participate in the adults' thoughts about cultural acts and in cultural acts themselves. Olympic education, like any other kinds of education, should encourage students to participate in the thoughts about cultural acts and cultural acts themselves. Education based exclusively on thoughts is not effective, and education based exclusively on acts is incomplete.

It is easier to imagine and provide students with education through sport than with education through the culture of sport. In everyday school practice, sport education is provided only through actions, through *learning by doing*. This duality of education: through culture and through action, is demonstrated to the Olympic pedagogue by the concept of universal good, which grants every member of the Olympic family access to the truth about himself or herself, access to the knowledge about the meaning of one's destiny. This concept concerns each subject to education in each relationship it experiences. The discursive deficit of the Olympic good in one such relationship destroys education as an intergenerational transfer of self-knowledge.

KEYWORDS

Olympic education, Olympism, sport pedagogy

I return to the question of sense in sports acts every two years, in the summer and winter Olympic cycles. The former is expressed in Roman numerals, and the latter in Arabic numerals. I return to this question every time I notice with anxiety how Olympic commentators, who adhere to the postmodern ideology of unconstrained liberty, initiate and provoke debates about the legalization of sport doping. Each time I have the impression that sports commentators, undoubtedly acting in good faith and intending to improve the existing situation in sport, adhere to legitimization of the project of the liberated life of the athlete as a cheater. They remind me of a certain professor who once boldly claimed at an international conference that legalizing sports doping would bring justice to the athletics

community as all athletes would then stand equal chances.

The logic behind this kind of rhetoric scares me. I am terrified by its inherent deficit of moral reasoning about the Olympic act and by its discreditable ignorance of the axiological code of sports culture. I am amazed by the commentators' **ignorance of a field of knowledge** known as Olympism.

Few people realize that sport exists as an intellectual reality, that sport has its own culture, and that besides involving action sport is a subject capable of thinking about itself. Sport is not only action but also the culture of action, and each culture demands educational efforts.

I am scared by the social consequences of this ignorance. The debaters do not know what they are talking about. By claiming to be an authority on the subject, they do sound like authorities. The result is serious damage to the normative order in the Olympic family.

Deficit of humanistic education

When children who are educationally orphaned, deprived of humanistic discourse, and trained but not educated by the Olympic culture, are born into the Olympic family we understand that their reasoning will never reach the highest levels of self-knowledge. These children are not able to ask: *When are sports acts sensible?*

I suppose that educational orphanhood concerns all generations of children of sport. A few decades after the establishment of the common Olympic good the adults in the Olympic family started to experience some forms of collective cultural amnesia, i.e. ignorance of self-knowledge by those who dare pronounce their judgments publicly. I am making this assumption as a theorist of education who is aware of the indispensability of passing on the same cultural values to every future generation. I am aware that this passage is indispensable for the continuity of social life and maintenance of the culture's axio-normative order. It is like a line constantly delivered by the teacher; like a tune played by the organ of culture.

Educational negligence of just one generation or even one student leads to incompetence, i.e. inability to participate in the social practice. In conversations with athletes about the meaning of their life in the Olympic family or the meaning of the Olympic act, one can easily notice some blackouts experienced by these athletes. They talk about *winning*, not about *working towards the common good of peace*. They follow the logic of purpose, but rarely the logic of values. Can they learn axiologically sensible answers, if their teachers do not know whether a given Olympic act is sensible or not?

Sports educators appear to know these truths but they fail to notice that they are under the illusion of knowing the truth, so characteristic of the people of non-Olympic sport. Sport understood as action is a daily routine for them, not subject to intensive self-cognition leading to deeper self-knowledge. Teachers of sport, including coaches, are not formally divided into Olympic and non-Olympic ones. However, the cultural gap between such two groups is significant. Realizing the subtlety of the comparison, this gap is like – *mutatis mutandis* – the gap between Roman Catholic and Orthodox religious education. These are two domains of the same matrix called Christian culture, but the teachers of religious instruction from both domains are never identified with each other. It seems easy, however, to identify teachers of Olympic sport with teachers of non-Olympic sport. In the popular social awareness the division into these two areas of intellectual reality has not been made. The different origins of the two groups of teachers as well as ontological and axiological differences between them have not been noticed.

Olympic culture is a variation on sports culture, but it is not identical with sports culture. One can be a sports teacher and not participate in Olympic education; however, an Olympic teacher must participate in sports culture. The asymmetry between these two roles results from the wider range of

the axiological field of Olympic culture replete with wisdom of universal humanism. The humanistic wisdom of popular sport, **merely** manifested by the fair-play ethics, is one component of Olympism. The ethics of Olympic sport is not just “something” more than the ethics of non-Olympic sport. It is a kind of humanistic wisdom which imposes the duty of sacralization on the members of the Olympic family. This duty derives from experiencing moral evil, i.e. moral inferno among people. The Olympic common good would not have been created had evil not been among people. The ethics of non-Olympic sport is remarkably different.

For teachers of non-Olympic sport everything is sport. They fail to notice that Olympic sport is similar to sport only in name. They fail to see the different conditions of origin and different ontic foundations of Olympic sport. The question of the sense of Olympic sport and popular sport must be considered in two different ways.

Track and field and football contests at the world championships are NOT track and field or football contests at the Olympic Games. Tug-of-war competitions used to be part of the Olympics; a few other play-acting competitions have also been currently included into the Olympic program. It does not matter what the contents of different competitions is, but what meanings have been assigned to these competitions *on the outside*. Many sports originated from folk and ludic games, but once they were provided with a new, Olympic, axiological setting, these sports became characters in another “play.” Sport competitions, although identical in their contents and behavioral expression, are axiologically different.

Only philosophers of sport realize that the same names can indicate two different contents. An ordinary football fan is not able to see the difference. A sports teacher, if he has not come into contact with a sports culture expert, sports pedagogue, sport ethicist or sport philosopher in his educational experience, will not pass on the sense of sport to his students.

Education through sports action is not complete if it is deprived of cultural self-knowledge and is confined to a form of physical agon without the intellectual dimension. Thoughtfulness coexists with thoughtlessness. A sport action is performed as a well-thought motor expression, a movement in space, but without the axiological contents.

This education is like life whose subject is not interested in its meaning. A certain Olympic discus thrower once asked me what discus-throwing had to do with peace among nations. He asked me in a flush of hunger for the meaning of his actions. I aroused this hunger in him when I directed his thoughts to the transitivity of his actions (called discus-throwing) versus the higher ethical *raison d’être* which justifies a completely unnecessary rotating movement of an athlete’s body. I am not sure if he understood me correctly. I had the impression that I evoked surprise in a *chess piece* at its relations with other *pieces* on the Olympic chessboard. It seemed as if I had awoken a sleeping discus thrower, watching his anger of incomprehension mount. The discus thrower initially dismissed my remark that no one, including the Olympic athlete, had the power to justify his actions by himself. Moreover, one could not justify one’s actions by the presence of his rival (the two of us do not make the Olympic family). He dismissed this remark as well, being surely concerned with a possible threat to his unconstrained liberty. He became really angry when I added that a selfish Olympic athlete cannot take part in the Olympic mission, cannot contribute to the common good of the Olympic family, and will not benefit from the nobleness of his sport expression in the dialectal movement “from oneself towards another, towards oneself, and for oneself.” I was worried that in seeking self-justification, he might commit a violation against himself by identifying the purpose with the sense, by considering himself a simple means to achieve an external goal, and by allowing using himself against himself.

The sleeping *chess piece* of the Olympic athlete, however, inquired about itself. It gave me – a sports pedagogue – some reasons for optimism. It was still not too late to begin the Olympic education of the discus thrower, although the *piece* pledged otherwise before. It appears that one can publicly and solemnly pledge something, without understanding it. I abandoned my intention of arousing the discus thrower's willingness to gain self-knowledge. Moreover I thought the time was right to use the athlete's developed cognitive abilities to form his self-awareness. The earlier educational efforts turned premature considering the student's cognitive immaturity.

The above led me to discover that the student can benefit from Olympic education through Olympic culture, i.e. through a teacher's application of the humanistic Olympic self-knowledge, especially in its scholarly version, after having reached a higher level of cognitive development. Scholarly humanistic education is indispensable in the education of sports teachers themselves, but it is also applicable in the education of sports students at the secondary and higher levels of their educational development. It might be also applied at earlier levels of education, providing that the teacher takes into account the characteristics of the student's anomic stage of cognitive development.

Here, a certain paradox of the Olympic and sports education can be observed. Athletes are very often adolescents or even children. They are expected to display their masterly physical abilities and, at the same time, their moral **maturity** in thinking and acting. Expecting moral maturity from a minor athlete is like expecting the level of physical fitness of an adolescent from a senior citizen. The ideal of the Olympic athlete appears not to account for the aforementioned observation. The question remains, however, how to make a child of Olympic sport, who rises to the medal-ranking heights, be wise and aware of itself. A theorist of education knows that no Olympic child, even an adolescent Olympic athlete, is able to fulfil this condition. A theorist of education knows understanding oneself in the universal sense may come naturally on reaching one's higher level of cognitive and spiritual development. In the Olympic practice it means that the Olympic educational program must include the cultural contents matching the student's cognitive abilities. The sense of the Olympic act supported by the commitment to the act itself will develop a desire for self-understanding in a mature athlete. This leads to an anthropological explanation that the Olympic athlete should be understood by way of a staged educational process and his personal act of self-development.

Does the athlete's self-development account for his desire to understand the sense of Olympic participation in life in general? Yes, if in his childhood the Olympic athlete experienced the presence of noble sports teachers whose acts were endorsed by wise discourse. If this is not the case, the Olympic athlete will remain latent like a *chess piece*, like the living (or dead?) discus thrower from my tale. Even though the discus thrower inquired about himself, he refused to accept the truth about himself. He remained faithful to the popular opinion about himself, considering it the real truth. I hope that one day he will inquire again about himself, like the wheel tapper from the London railway, who was always a reliable worker but deprived of self-knowledge, and who only inquired about the sense of his life on his deathbed. Or the discus thrower will never inquire about the sense of his life, living in ignorance of the objective self-knowledge, and will remain unaware of the axiological truth of his professional destiny.

The above example is food for thought for a theorist of education. Olympic education must be constructed in such a way as to include the act and the thought about the sense of the act. It must include the act of participation and the culture of actions through Olympic practice and the cultural awareness of the act. It must account for the cognitive capabilities of the pupil.

Olympic students must participate in the adults' thoughts about cultural acts and in cultural acts themselves. Olympic education like any other kinds of education should encourage students to participate in both the thoughts about cultural acts and the cultural acts themselves.

Education based exclusively on thoughts is not effective, and education based exclusively on acts is incomplete.

It is easier to imagine and provide students with education through sport than with education through culture of sport. In everyday school practice, sport education is provided only through actions, through *learning by doing*.

Also in education of sport teachers sport experience does not often reach the level of scholarly humanism. Students become familiar with different sports techniques, but they rarely learn from their masters about the axiological justification of sports acts.

This duality of education: through culture and through action, is demonstrated to the Olympic pedagogue by the concept of universal good which grants every member of the Olympic family access to the truth about himself or herself, access to the knowledge about the meaning of one's destiny. This concept concerns each subject to education in each relationship it experiences. The discursive deficit of the Olympic good in one such relationship destroys education as an intergenerational transfer of self-knowledge.

Olympic education as an intergenerational relation

In regard to this ontological property of education as **intergenerational determination through culture**, the causal relationship between the *superteacher*, the teacher and the student must be reconsidered. I call this relationship the *triad of educational subjects* or *educational trinity*. **Generally, each kind of education, not only Olympic education, is a relation of the third degree:**

- Education of the first degree is the relation between the teacher and the student who is a candidate to become a member of the Olympic family.
- Education of the second degree is the relation between the *superteacher*, i.e. the Olympic pedagogue, and the student as a candidate for Olympic teacher.
- Education of the third degree is the relation between the *superteacher*, i.e. the Olympic pedagogue and the university lecturer as a candidate for *assistant superteacher* in their joint education of the Olympic teacher.

The relation between the teacher and the student is direct, whereas that between the *superteacher* and student is indirect.

Students never get to know their teacher's teacher. Students are unaware of such a relationship. In a similar manner a child experiences the presence of its grandparents through its parents. A student does not know who educated his teacher, who he was, what he thought, what knowledge he passed on to the teacher. A student does not reflect on this relationship. Yet, the teacher's ideas about the student's education and adulthood were formed outside the teacher in the cultural past of the student's *educational grandparents*. For students the *superteacher* is the cultural grandfather, who is the cultural parent to the teacher.

In order to convince the student of the Olympic idea, his teacher must be introduced to the same idea earlier during his education (pedagogical studies). But this alone is not enough. Even earlier the candidates for *assistant superteachers* must be introduced to the same idea. These candidates are various academic teachers whom the Olympic pedagogue wishes to include in the process of education of the teacher as his *assistant superteachers*. These candidates must incorporate into their syllabi a uniform pedeutological interpretation, and justification of the axio-normative order of the Olympic community.

All three subjects share the same common good, although their social positions are different. It would be more correct to state that the same idea of good must serve as **a link** in the triad of educational subjects. If the link is present, the intergenerational discourse is maintained. The three have their origins in the same culture, and the three make the student, directly or indirectly, participate in this culture maturely, according to the established axio-normative order. The *superteacher* and the teacher live their lives according to this order, whereas the candidate for teacher and the student, as a prospective adult, prepares himself to participate in this order. The student will become in the future a mature participant in this established axio-normative order. His teacher will undertake this cultural task with students of the following generations. The *superteacher* will undertake the educational task with the future generations of candidates for Olympic teachers.

A *superteacher* is **simply** the Olympic pedagogue, i.e. the teacher's teacher who:

- a) interprets the cultural reality of the Olympic community, by validating the established axiological order;
- b) formulates the objectives of his cultural and socializing actions towards the student in the latter's becoming a mature member of the axio-normative order of the Olympic community;
- c) follows the methodology of effective actions in his proceedings with the student at various levels of Olympic education, which involves a whole array of praxeological or organizational skills and techniques;
- d) demonstrates the Olympic teacher's competencies, considering in his pedagogy the Olympic teacher's personal traits as virtues necessary for completing Olympic education in an effective and sensible manner by following the established social order of the Olympic practice.

Education cannot exist socially just for itself; education only becomes identical with social reality when its existence is of service to life. Each teacher, as a member of two concurrent social orders: the culture of educational community and the culture of Olympic community, must testify to his place in both orders at the same time.

Who then should be a candidate for *assistant superteacher*? He appears in a **school's school**, i.e. an academic institution that educates future teachers of the Olympic sport. Generally, schools are divided into pedagogical institutions (educating teachers) and others. The school in question is called the Pedagogical Academy of Olympism; however, I realize there is no such school by this name. The ideological host of the academy is the Olympic pedagogue, who apart from his scholarly duties also takes part in the educational process of prospective sports teachers and the educational projects designed for other teachers of the Academy.

As an educator of the future sport teacher he plays the socially superior role of *superteacher*. At the same time, considering his relation with the student for whom the special relationship between the teacher and the superteacher has been established, the *superteacher* is the student's *educational grandfather* or an indirect cultural benefactor of Olympism. The student's direct benefactor will be the Olympic teacher undergoing the process of his professional education.

In the process of the teacher's education a number of *assistant superteachers* must participate. The teacher must be competent in different academic fields. The Olympic *superteacher* is not able to educate the Olympic teacher by himself, on a one-to-one basis. A number of educational relations must be established between the candidate for sport teacher and the *superteachers*. I call these relations *educational simultaneous plays*, in which the leading superteacher, as an Olympic pedagogue, together with the assistant superteachers develop a number of educational relations with the prospective sport teacher (these relations are commonly known as the process of the teacher's education).

An academic lecturer who shares his specialist knowledge with a student is not simply a teacher of the prospective Olympic teacher. When he shares his knowledge with the student he tacitly assumes that this knowledge will be of some use to the student. If there is a special academic course in that knowledge taught by respective lecturers, one can assume that such a course is indispensable in the process of a student's education. Actually, the lecturers never question that.

In my academic career as a sport pedagogue I have never encountered a lecturer in human anatomy, biology, physiology, sociology, psychology or philosophy who would inquire about the educational sense of their work at a pedagogical university. None of these *rank and file* lecturers asks about this sense because, in my opinion, they are not aware of their participation in the common educational project. These lecturers are not aware of their secondary designation as *superteachers* of the Olympic sport. They fail to see the place of the following three parties in the common educational project:

- a) first, the student, who is destined to take part in the axio-normative order of the Olympic community (being part of the educational relation of the first degree);
- b) second, the prospective Olympic teacher (being part of the educational relation of the second degree);
- c) **third, the academic lecturer**, regarded by the Olympic pedagogue as his assistant, i.e. an assistant superteacher (but **not being part** of the educational relation of the third degree).

University lecturer in the educational relation of the second degree

In fact, the weakest link in the above intergenerational educational relation is the university lecturer. He teaches *his own stuff*, perceiving the student in the didactic context of his own scholarly specialization, not in the context of the student's becoming a prospective Olympic teacher, as envisioned by the Olympic pedagogue. One can say that the academic lecturer is not part of the educational relation of the second degree. This is manifested by the fact that the student fails to recognize the lecturer as his *superteacher*, and the Olympic pedagogue fails to recognize the lecturer as his educational assistant. This weak link in the educational relation can be strengthened, but this requires a certain adjustment on the side of the Olympic pedagogue. The Olympic pedagogue must assume the role of **axiological leader** in the process of education of the prospective Olympic teacher. Willingly or unwillingly, the Olympic pedagogue must cease to be a *rank and file* academic lecturer. His getting out of line is not an act of didactic lawlessness; however, it can be perceived as unjustified usurpation of power. The academic lecturer does not often realize that the *educational elevation* of the Olympic pedagogue can be sociologically explained as being a superior social relation which is ontologically objective. It must be so. If the causal relations in education are to be satisfied, the prospective Olympic teacher must acknowledge the Olympic pedagogue's superiority and thus accept his own position as socially inferior. The academic lecturer would have to go the same way, i.e. accept the inferiority of his role, just as if the Olympic pedagogue had included him in the educational relation of the second degree. Once positioned in this relation, the lecturer, as a *co-teacher* of the prospective teacher, would assume an superior role to the prospective teacher and an inferior role in the relation with the Olympic pedagogue.

The mentioned adjustment of the Olympic pedagogue is connected with the educational relation of the third degree. The academic lecturer would have to accept his role as a student, learning his prospective role of *assistant superteacher*. He would have to accept the condition that the didactic contents should be processed by him, considering their significance in the educational relation of the second degree. All academic lecturers would have to display educational unity, whose axiological effectiveness would be justified by the idea of the Olympic good included in the Olympic self-

knowledge.

Why should a lecturer learn the role of *superteacher*?

The above question concerns any lecturer at any pedagogical school, i.e. any school educating prospective teachers. The answer to this question must account for the position of the student and his participation in Olympic culture (as well as in any culture represented by his pedagogical school).

Each lecturer must ask the question of what kind of knowledge an Olympic teacher needs to enter the educational relation of the first degree, and to what extent his scholarly specialization would make a prospective teacher legitimate.

A lecturer in a given field of knowledge would have to identify his role as a *superteacher*, also if transferred from one pedagogical school to another, e.g. from a sports school to a music school and entering the educational relation of the second degree with a prospective music teacher. For example, a lecturer in physiology or sociology, representing the humanities in general, would have to explain to a student of music why the latter would need the knowledge of physiology or sociology in his education as a prospective teacher of music. As a *superteacher* of music the lecturer would have to consider the cultural context in which his knowledge of man (anatomic, sociological, etc.) can be utilized, and explain why a prospective teacher of music would need this knowledge. It is unacceptable that a lecturer in any field, who works in a school educating sport teachers, would teach his students in his own subjective way without any academic supervision. A lecturer in bioengineering who is obsessed with dinosaur biomechanics, or a historian preoccupied with heraldry, should keep their fascinations to themselves, otherwise in the context of education of sport teachers these hobbies might be regarded by the supervisory authorities as didactic violations.

A lecturer at a pedagogical school is someone who enters the educational relation of the third degree; who, for some time, would play the role of student of the Olympic pedagogue to enter the educational relation of the second degree with the prospective sport teacher as an *assistant superteacher*. Thanks to such internal transformation, called the reform of the educational subject, the contents of lecturers' knowledge becomes the knowledge of the Olympic teacher.

Similar transformations must also affect other academic lecturers commonly known as *instructors of practical subjects*. In a pedagogical school of sport teachers these instructors are usually former athletes with coaching experience. They take part in students' education in two ways:

- a) by familiarizing students with sports actions, from mastering simple movement techniques to acquiring complex sports skills;
- b) by developing in students competitive mastery of a given sport.

A student is forced to take part in a peculiar multi-discipline competition, and in each discipline the student recognizes himself or herself as a trained athlete rather than an educated sport teacher. Students must be expert in shot-put, discus and javelin, short- and long-distance running, hurdle races, triple jump, long jump, high jump, pole vault, swimming (all strokes), all types of ball games, judo, skiing, sailing, and – above all – gymnastics. In each sport or competition, a student must show extraordinary skills assessed then by his trainer-instructor.

A trained student is not aware that he has been cast in a wrong part, especially if the student in question is not an athlete at the same time. Feeling a sense of injustice, the student manifests his aversion to the instructors who assess him using sports measurements, not educational indices. The student cannot see what the Olympic pedagogue can. The student's relation with the instructor contradicts the student's destiny of becoming a prospective teacher of Olympic sport

The instructor does not comprehend that his duty is to enter the educational relation of the second degree with the student that would make him participate in a *pandidactic* mission of affirmation of the Olympic good. **No instructor is simultaneously a *superteacher* of sport because he or she has been employed by a pedagogical school of sport.** One can be an instructor in a sports club, but in a pedagogical academy of sport one can only be a superteacher. Anyone entering a pedagogical academy of sport must assume the role of *teacher of a sports teacher*, using their coaching experience in the educational relation of the second degree.

The role of instructor is not identical with the role of sports *superteacher*. The instructor's job description in a pedagogical school educating teachers of sport is not that of a tutor who teaches the students to coexist socially and to act morally. In the social relation *the sports instructor as a tutor* is similar to the teacher of sport in the relation of the first degree (teacher-student) in the justification of the students' decent actions. An instructor, even if he so wishes, cannot expand his educational role because his primary duty as a sports instructor is to train students to be future athletes.

The instructor's entry into the space of pedagogical school must entail an immediate revision of his role. He must ask himself a question: What is it that the axiological leader of the pedagogical academy expects of me?

The pedagogue does not expect the impossible. The instructor does not have time to develop new competencies and skills. What can be done about it, then? The instructor should, first of all, introduce the student into his sport according to the Olympic normative order. Secondly, the instructor should stop simply training the student and adjust his sports methodology in such a way as to make the student use it effectively in his prospective career as an Olympic teacher.

The first task would, contrary to all appearances, require overcoming the instructor's biotechnical pragmatism combined with moral utilitarianism, as well as arousing the instructor's conviction of the humanistic sense of Olympic participation. It is not an easy task, considering the fact that the sports instructor – as a participant in a sports spectacle – is guided by the ethos of commercial calculation. Let us not forget that the instructor is **given** a mission in the community of the Olympic *sacrum*, out of service in the community of sport *profanum*. One is an Olympic instructor on special occasions, whereas a sports instructor holds this position every day. The instructor's participation in Olympic pedagogy imposes the duty of affirmation of the Olympic *holy* order, in Pierre de Coubertin's understanding of the term, which is radically humanistic. However, there are grounds for fearing that a lay instructor might consider his participation in Olympic pedagogy to be utopian and naïve. It could also be supposed that the blatant violations committed by the athletes – who are also **given** the humanistic mission – and investigated by the anti-doping Olympic law enforcers, derive from the cult of stardom, fame and money well-acknowledged in the sport *profanum*. It might even be assumed that in the end these violations are justified by some critical sociological theory, being direct consequences of educational negligence in the area of Olympic morality.

Thus, the fear regarding the instructors' and athletes' incapability of internal transformation brings us back to the starting point of the triad of educational subjects mentioned above in the context of the deficit of humanistic education. Moral Olympic education – as an educational relation of the first degree – can be effective thanks to a teacher of sport who understands the humanistic sense of Olympic action. Preparation of the teacher for accomplishing this task, i.e. the educational relation of the second degree, requires creating proper educational conditions in the pedagogical academy, i.e. forming the educational relation of the third degree, thanks to which the *superteachers* will be able to educate sports teachers by following the Olympic ideal.

Finally, the Olympic pedagogue's projects of the third degree aimed at developing in lecturers

and instructors the awareness of the humanistic sense of their superteacher identity must also concern school teachers and teacher-training supervisors. **A pedagogical academy is not a self-sufficient institution, i.e. it does not accommodate a training school and is not an educational institution that can arrange all relations of the first degree, from Olympic initiation to sports education at different levels.** Notwithstanding this, a student preparing himself for the role of Olympic teacher must exercise establishing the Olympic order in conditions close to the original.

In general, it can be stated that a teacher's preparation for his participation in the cultural praxis is bound by the methodological requirements to learn his role by action ("through action to action") that respects the axio-normative order familiar to him from the pedagogue's holistic justifications and individual justifications of the assistant superteachers from his school. In the final stage of his education of the second degree, a prospective teacher must descend from the higher school of education to the lower school of training, where in his practice with students he learns to know how to depict the world, as well as what depiction methods to use, **already** as a teacher or **almost** as a teacher. The venue for his *dress rehearsal* is the school designated by the Olympic pedagogue, with its pedagogically and ideologically supervised teachers of sport. The student's teacher can be a director of a **training school**, who is the advocate of the same cultural order validated by the mentioned axiological leader of the academy. An educational employee of the sports training school must be faithful to his superior's ideals in order to fully implement them in the life of members of the Olympic family. When a sports teacher fails to fulfil this condition, the pedagogue fails to cooperate with him. There is no educational relation of the third degree to "call" the teacher's thoughts and actions to Olympic order. A teacher cannot be re-taught his role; a sports teacher should follow the contents of Olympic pedagogy. Only then does the academy pedagogue affect the training process in his school, incorporating it into the triad of educational affirmation of the Olympic good. In this way the intergenerational circuit of educational relations becomes complete.

Conclusion

The above deliberations show that Olympic education is a more complex social reality than it is commonly thought to be. Olympic education, understood as a social relation, is expressive when it takes place between the three generations, and when its axiological leader: the Olympic pedagogue, engages all subjects of the Academy. The second part of the discussion will concentrate on the cultural contents of Olympism conveyed by the established educational circuit.

The second part presents the contents of Olympic culture, with particular consideration of the issue of Olympic good, in the ontological context of moral evil and indispensability of its atonement.