



MORAL/ETHICAL ANALYSIS OF PERFORMANCE ENHANCEMENT IN SPORTS

Sandra McCalla and Neil Shepherd

University of the West Indies, Jamaica

From as early as human memory can go, individuals in various cultures have engaged in various recreational and competitive activities. It is from these recreational, entertainment and competition activities that more organized and structured competitive games and sports were developed. The foundation of these competitive sports hinges on fairness and honesty but these ethical concepts are not always upheld. It is with this in mind that this paper seeks to offer a philosophical investigation into the use of performance enhancing drugs in competitive sports with a focus on the importance of ethics and fair play. We believe that the existing system of banning performance enhancement drugs and punishing athletes caught using same may be warranted in order to maintain the integrity of sports. In a quest to respond to the issues raised on fairness, our discussions will focus on an ethical framework. From this ethical perspective, we combine Jeremy Bentham's Utilitarian theory with Kant's Deontology theory to show how a combination of both theories can provide one possible response to the ethical actions of athletes in respect to the use of performance enhancers. We argue for a form of 'self duty' that all athletes should have to the ethical rules as is applied to honesty and integrity.

Keywords: Moral, Ethics, Cheating, Sports.

Introduction

In each sport there are regulative and constitutive rules that seek to govern how the various sports are played. Our focus will be on the regulatory rules specifically the ones regulating behaviour in relation to the use of performance enhancing drugs. The anti-doping rules form an ethical foundation upon which athletes should operate. These anti-doping rules seek to ensure that the values of fairness, honesty and integrity are maintained. Noncompliance with these rules is considered cheating and cheating imply a moral responsibility on the part of the offender. An activity that gives an athlete a competitive advantage by knowingly violating the rules is morally wrong.

We view the use of Performance Enhancement Drugs (PED's) by professional athletes as one way of cheating in sports and, as a result, the athletes who decide to use these enhancers act immorally and unethically, since they would have ignored the ethical value of honesty. The issue of non-compliance with rules tends to involve other non-ethical components and actions as well. We find in sports, for example, that discussions of some of the ethical issues that may arise may not be as clear cut ethical issues but may also be classified as medical as well as legal. This would also hold true for other ethical analysis in general. Our discussions on the place of performance enhancement drugs will focus on the issue of whether or not a centrally moral question is present or whether it is merely a medical or empirical

one. The empirical or medical questions concern both the effectiveness of drug use for training and competition and the possible harm such can have for the users.

Moral and Ethics

The moral questions will concern the appropriateness of the use of drugs in sports, especially when its' use is seen as a breach of the principles of fair play.¹ The athlete who uses performance enhancing drugs successfully would be awarded for performance that may not be had without the use of enhancers; it would therefore be unfair to others who train naturally. We believe that the doping problem will not be solved by making access to the drugs available to every performer. It would be unfair to expect an athlete to accept a second place medal, for example, when it is known that the athlete awarded the first place medal cheated. This unfair practice is therefore an unethical one. Although mention will be made of the empirical questions, the ethical/moral questions will take precedence. In a quest to respond adequately to the ethical issues, we would like to explore Immanuel Kant's ethical theory of deontology as well as the theory of utilitarianism, as put forward by Jeremy Bentham. We accept Kant's view that since moral rules are universally applicable to all human beings a duty is owed to obey these. We add to his views that the individual should also hold a self duty to observe moral rules since in observing these rules, the individual displays character and virtue that is necessary to the continued survival of the specie. In light of this, we will argue for a form of duty that all athletes should hold in obedience to the ethical rules. The duty that the athletes hold would be chiefly to the self. We maintain that the practice of ingesting performance enhancers by athletes is unethical since it imposes levels of unfairness on competitors.

Maurine Ford reported one notion of ethics which involves "an investigation not only of one's relationship to moral codes but a tracing of those standards or norms that shape one's actions and behaviour."² From time to time we find individuals deviating from the good values and intentions. This occurs in instances where individuals are faced with situations that cause them to act contrary to their commonly held beliefs. This is known as altruism. For example, an athlete may not believe that it is right to participate in illegal gambling but decides to participate anyway. All just rules are binding and obligatory which means acting outside of those rules would be acting contrary to the norm.

Morality usually encompasses all aspects of life where moral questions can arise; questions such as, should I cheat when I play soccer to always secure a win? How ought I to respond if my teammate decides to persuade me to use drugs? Morality is seen by Tom Beauchamp as "a social institution with a code of learnable norms".³ Morality is then grounded in the practical affairs of social life. Although morality as a social institution serves to guide individual conduct, William Frankena was quick to point out that this does not necessarily mean that people merely act according to social norms and standards. According to Frankena, "society's moral system does indicate what is forbidden and what is permitted in many areas. However, we also learn to take an individual moral perspective on many distinct issues where society's rules may not be very helpful."⁴ From this we can argue that morality teaches one to understand how to apply standards from both a personal standpoint as well as from that of society at large. This means that in making moral decisions one may need to not only have an understanding of the self but also an understanding of where the 'other' falls in comparison to the self. This is considered as important since culture and personal taste could cause some to overlook the sameness that exists between individuals.

¹ W.M. Brown, "Paternalism, Drugs, and the Nature of Sports," in *Ethics in Sports*, William J. Morgan William J. et. al. (USA: Human Kinetics, 2001), 130.

² Maurine Ford, "A New Sport Ethics: Taking Konig Seriously," in *Sport Ethics in Context*, Debra Shogan (Toronto: Canadian Scholar's Press, 2007), 126.

³ Tom Beauchamp, "Moral Foundations," in *Ethics and epidemiology*, eds. Steven S. Coughlin and Tom L. Beauchamp (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 24.

⁴ William Frankena, "Ethics", in *Ethics and Morality in Sports Management*, Joy T. DeSensi and Danny Rosenberg (USA: Fitness Information Technology Inc., 2003), 31.

In other words, those who we consider to be ‘the other’ could adhere to, hold and accept the same moral views as us irrespective of cultures, personal tastes and choices.

It has been argued that ethical judgements contain a moral component as related to conduct or values, yet morals and ethics can differ. We acknowledge the work of Michel Foucault and others who have sought to offer distinctions between the concepts of ethics and morality. But, if we should consider the ethical concept of fairness, it describes a set of values expressed in individual actions, while at the same time operates as a moral rule that should be observed. The concept of fairness can either be right or wrong, good or bad, dependent on the context. With this in mind, a distinction between ethics and morality is not clearly drawn. Although we acknowledge the distinction made and respect the effort of Foucault and others, a distinction does not seriously impact our discussion on morality in sports. Therefore, in this paper, we will use the two terms interchangeably.

Analysis

Athletes, coaches and others involved in sports should observe and respect the regulative rules of the game. This respect may be linked to preserving the integrity of sports which would be futile if unfairness persists. On the one hand, fairness should not only be looked on as respect for the game but respect for the profession that the athlete chooses to hold and participate in, and on the other, respect for the other participants as selves with integrity that needs to be respected. If the game’s integrity is to be maintained, it cannot be marred by constant drug problems as individuals will lose respect for, and interest in that game as well as the players involved. This argument for fairness as respect for the game is “both moral and psychological. On the moral side it is argued that sport should be participated in for its own sake. Sport is only coherent if it is taken seriously on its own terms.”⁵ From this one can argue that if athletes are interested in the sport itself and not just winning, they will work hard to maintain the integrity of this sport by not cheating. From a psychological perspective, “not only do people typically come to sport for the intrinsic reasons, people who continue to play for intrinsic reasons have more fun.”⁶ It can be argued from this that if a spectator enjoys watching cricket he/she would also want to watch a game that is played fairly. They could also lose respect for athletes who have committed a doping offence and as a result will not enjoy watching that individual compete.

Some have questioned whether or not fairness can exist in sports competitions if all athletes are allowed to use enhancers. In response to this, Claudio Tamburrini argues that “if everyone were free to use whatever drugs he or she finds helpful, then the crucial test, the competition, would show who is most fit and the competition would then become fair.”⁷ He is asking for the doping ban to be lifted so that athletes can adequately prepare for competitions using whatever means they think is best. He based this conclusion on the notion that sports professions are like any other profession. From this he argues that it would then be unreasonable to submit sport practitioners to restrictions that are not found in other areas of professional life. Based on his line of reasoning, the doping ban is unreasonable as other professionals are not subjected to this kind of scrutiny. One needs to acknowledge though that other professionals do not compete in a similar way as athletes.

Also, ethical rules governing sports participation have nothing to do with who is most fit. Since using performance enhancers is ethical wrong, ingesting these enhancers should not be condoned by any means. The act of doping is ethically wrong because it imposes an unfair advantage on other athletes and in turn interferes with their autonomy. A competition that focuses on who is fitter should then do so under the guidelines of ethical rules. One also cannot logically argue that doping ban should be lifted in

⁵ A. Schneider and R. Butcher, “Fairness as Respect for the game,” in *Ethics in Sport*, William J. Morgan (Champaign, III: Human Kinetics, 2007), 137

⁶ Schneider and Butcher, “Fair play,” 138.

⁷ Claudio Tamburrini, “What is Wrong with Doping,” in *Values in Sport Elitism, Nationalism, Gender Equality and the Scientific Manufacturing of WinnerS*, eds. Claudio Tamburrini and Torbjorn Tannsjo (USA: Taylor and Francis, 2000), 18.

professional sports because these do not apply in other sports. This stems from the fact that the use of drugs is ethically wrong, no matter what sport we seek to investigate. It can be argued that although there is competition in all professions, the focus on doping is greater in sports because of the different levels of competition that sports may bring, as opposed to other professions. It would then not be unreasonable to apply stringent drug bans in sports but it could be unreasonable not to apply drug measures as seen fit in other professions. If everyone uses drugs, the competition in general would still not be fair as each person would perform at a rate that they would not have performed on a regular basis. This would especially not be fair for the sports that reward athletes based on endurance and speed, as raw natural talents may not be identified. We acknowledge that talents and skills have to be developed through various training regimens. It is expected that training and exercise is necessary to maintain as well as develop the skills needed to perform. All athletes have to train to maintain fitness and health. Performance enhancers are different from training regimens as these are used in some instances to add artificially to endurance levels. This can allow athletes to train harder than their competitors who have not taken these enhancers. Training regimens are necessarily needed to develop skills but performance enhancement drugs are not. Performance drugs are therefore additional boost agents that some athletes feel they need to gain an edge over competitors.

It is unavoidable for athletes in particular, and the general population at large, not to be confronted with ethical/moral issues on a regular basis. It is for this reason that “every society has its set of moral rules or guidelines that establish the boundaries of acceptable behaviour. Often these rules are about behaviour that might harm others (stealing, killing), behaviour that is concerned with the well being of others (helping those in need, responding to the suffering of others), or actions that touch on issues of respect for others.”⁸ These rules go on to form the moral code of particular societies. One can argue, however, that although each society has a set of moral rules that guide behaviour, these rules are not so different from those of other societies, as moral problems that arise in one society will arise in another. The interesting thing though is that each society formulates a unique way of dealing with those problems. In a similar way, the general sports body has established ways to address ethical issues as these arise. Context is therefore important when dealing with ethical issues. There are instances in which an ethical issue in one sport may be treated differently across sports depending on the constitutive rules. Ethical concepts also differ in sports. But what are these?

According to Graham McFee, “there are two very different sorts of ethical concepts (Bernard Williams calls them ‘thin’ ethical concepts), such as good and right, and more descriptive, less abstract concepts (Williams calls them ‘thick’ ethical concepts) such as cruel, pert, inconsiderate, and chaste.”⁹ In order to garner an understanding of the ‘thick’ ethical concepts, there needs to be an awareness of the ‘evaluative interests’ with which that term is connected. For example,

a discussion of the concept of fair play that we had earlier discussed, might need to address any differences between say, basketball (where there is the expectation of fouling) and other forms of sports where intentional fouls get the player sent off. Typically, sport has a stronger connection to the ethical than follows simply from the link between morality and human action, since ethical questions arise naturally from sport itself, from the inherent characteristics of typical sports. Sports are typically culturally valued and viewed as united (as one thing, sport); they typically have explicit rules (and therefore the contravention of those rules is possible; there is often the possibility of harm to participant (especially if rules are not followed); and the rhetoric of sport is replete with metaphors employed in general ethical discussion – the idea of ‘fair play’ or of a level playing field, for example.¹⁰

⁸ Lawrence M. Hinman, *Ethics: A Pluralistic Approach to Moral Theory*. [Belmont California: Cengage Learning, Inc., 2008], 4.

⁹ Graham McFee, “Are there philosophical issues with respect to sport (other than ethical ones)?” in *Ethics and Sports*, eds., M.J. McNamee and S.J. Parry (London: Routledge, 2002), 4-5

¹⁰ McFee, “Are there Philosophical Issues,”

We can gather from this view that the structure of sport is based on ethical principles, and, there are certain rules and value principles that should be followed when one becomes a member of a sports team. We find that sometimes the notion of fair play in sport need not be a general idea across sports as some rules in relation to how the game is played will differ. However, the nature of each sport and how these are all practiced is integral to ethical analysis.

Some may ask why professional codes of ethics are important. In answering this question a number of reasons present themselves. First, it is argued that

they offer apparent clarity and simplicity in a confusing world; secondly, they set out standards and criteria to evaluate provision and expectation in relationships which are consistent overtime. Thirdly, they offer a neutral framework for solving conflict or ambiguity to those under the authority of the organization. Finally, in constraining certain actions moral rules allow exclusion from that organization anyone who will not conform to the code.¹¹

One can garner from the above that all organizations need a code of ethic that guides the daily operations. These are necessary to solve conflicts and resolve issues which could arise. Thus, protection is offered to each member of the organization. If exclusion for noncompliance with the code is not made mandatory then the code could be deemed as useless, conflicts could also be harder to resolve, as individuals may feel that they are under no obligation to comply. The sum of rules and principles, both negative and positive, constitute “the moral code that is enshrined in rights, duties and obligations.”¹² Some have suggested that “the practice of positive moral values can lead toward a happy life; others have stressed a good will that might guide one’s moral decisions. Still others claim that morality serves to combat deteriorating social relationships.”¹³ We can argue that morality can be a combination of all three since one may feel happy participating in an act of goodwill whose outcome may result in mending and building relationships both within and outside of sports.

Although it has been argued that the practice of moral virtues can lead to a happy life, a moral person may very well have to sacrifice her happiness on many occasions in order to practice what is right. Practicing moral virtue and happiness may not necessarily work together, as one could be virtuous but not happy and vice versa. One can then add that positive moral values could be displayed simply because it is the correct thing to do. If displaying positive moral values is done for only subjective reasons such as an individual’s happiness, this can quickly deteriorate into immoral practices in order to achieve the end result of happiness. We believe that there are variations in happiness. An athlete can be happy with a second place medal, but will be happier with winning. It can also be argued that the practice of moral actions censures selfish and harmful acts towards others so we get along better in society. This may hold true as levels of violence, aggression and intolerance are reduced, which could lead to an overall benefit for all. This practice of acting morally is difficult, especially since sports are so commercialized.

As long as sport is treated as a commodity, ethical issues will arise at the level of players, coaches, doctors, managers etc., because while some try their best to observe the rules in order to maintain integrity and honesty, others seek to capitalize in any way they can. This would be in the form of illegal gambling, game fixing, using performance enhancers, etc., which are usually done at the expense of others. A moral code then becomes integral in all areas of an individual’s life, as it not only serves as a guide to conduct but emphasizes accountability for actions. This practice of treating sports as a commodity needs to be addressed and the moral code observed by all. The aim of competition is to win but the nature of sports stipulates that this be accomplished honestly (in accordance with the ethical rules), not by using performance enhancers.

¹¹ Mike, McNamee, *Ethics and Sport*, 151.

¹² McNamee, *Ethics and Sport*, 151

¹³ Joy T. DeSensi, Danny Rosenberg, *Ethics and Morality in Sports Management*. (USA: Fitness Information Technology Inc., 2003), 34.

Athletes “who decide to use performance enhancing drugs, such as anabolic steroids, believe that these substances will facilitate the stimulation of tissue growth which will lead to bigger and stronger muscles.”¹⁴ With this development of muscle strength “it is hoped that they will be able to endure more intense training which it is hoped, will give them that edge over their competitors. For example, Justin Gatlin and Marion Jones, American track and field stars, both tested positive for steroid use, a drug that is said to develop muscle strength.”¹⁵ These are examples in which individual moral/ethical values become subject to scrutiny since the actions of these athletes go against societal as well as group values and norms. The athletes’ actions are then judged based on the expected societal and or group values. We can argue that these athletes were not forced to use drugs by their peers, coaches, etc., but that they made a conscious decision to secure the possibility of an unfair advantage. In her own words, Marion Jones exclaimed, “Nobody forced me. At the end of the day, I was the one who made the decision to trust, not to ask questions, and then ultimately lie when confronted with the truth.”¹⁶ She knew her actions were wrong and in the end she was faced with the consequences of her actions.

It can be argued that unlike Marion Jones Justin Gatlin and others, some athletes may be forced and or pressured into the use of these drugs. This pressure may be derived from the frustration of always placing in a position other than first place, as some athletes are reminded by coaches that winning is the only thing. Others may be forced or coerced by coaches, doctors, etc., to use prohibited substances. Some athletes then use drugs, on the one hand, to cope with low self-esteem which is linked to the anger and frustration of losing or, on the other hand, to gain acceptance and recognition. For an athlete who usually dominates a particular sport, that pressure could be to remain in the winning position at all costs, hence the athlete may resort to the use of such drugs. Are these groups of athletes equally ethically and morally responsible for their actions? A possible response to this question could be yes, since one can argue that when one is faced with an ethical decision there is always an available choice apart from the decision made. This other choice, although an ethical one, may however not be in the best interest of the individual since it may not reap the desired results. An athlete has the right to choose actions that are desired but should be careful not to allow desires to override reason especially when the outcome of the choices can have negative effects on the person making the choice as well as on others.

From the above, one can deduce that when an athlete deliberately takes performance enhancing substance, the athlete is thinking about his or her own self-interest and not so much with the moral consequences that would flow from such an action for society and others who are affected. This athlete would then totally disregard respect for the ‘self’ as well as the duty to maintain fairness and integrity in sports. We would like to acknowledge that although ethical behaviours may be breached because of self-interests, sponsors and others also have much to gain from the ‘superhuman’ capabilities of athletes. The prospect of signing these athletes, such as Ben Johnson, Marion Jones, Lance Armstrong, is however shattered upon discovery of cheating. A choice that an athlete makes whether negative or positive will therefore benefit others.

It may not always be moral to act based on one’s own self-interest only, especially when one is participating in a team sport. The interest of the team should also be taken into consideration. There will be times however when the negative values of the team will conflict with positive individual values. For example, a cricketer can object to fixing a cricket match but his/her teammates might not consider match fixing as being unethical. Whose value system will prevail? Also, a decision to use performance enhancing substances is a negative value, but does one decide to use same because the entire team is using? No, and this is one major reason why moral codes in sports are important, as decisions are made based on the tenets of such a system. Although everyone does not have the same interest, the ethical codes in sports ought to be followed by all in order to avoid further decay relating to substance use.

¹⁴ William J. Morgan, Klaus V. Meier and Angela J. Schneider, eds. *Ethics in Sport* (USA: Human Kinetics, 2001), 119.

¹⁵ Fred C. Pampel, *Drugs and Sports* (New York NY: Facts on File, 2007), 29.

¹⁶ Marion Jones, with Maggie Greenwood-Robinson, *On the Right Track: from Olympic Downfall to finding Forgiveness and the strength to Overcome and Succeed* (USA: Simon and Schuster, 2010), 34.

Ethical Theories and PEDs

How do we begin to comprehend these moral issues in sports? We believe that Kant's deontological theory as well as Jeremy Bentham's Utilitarianism will both work to illuminate our understanding of the problem of PEDs and the morality of their use in sports. Utilitarianism focuses on the consequences of the action. Generally, utilitarian ethics require that "the moral judgement of an action should be based on the consequences of the action rather than on the disposition of the mind (as Kant argues) or the individual and social motives."¹⁷ Individuals adopting utilitarianism make ethical decisions based on what they think the anticipated short or long term consequences will be for most people. For this principle,

actions are right in proportions as they tend to promote happiness, wrong as they tend to produce the reverse of happiness. By happiness is intended pleasure and the absence of pain; by unhappiness, pain and the privation of pleasure.¹⁸

This principle is three fold. Firstly, it stipulates that human beings should act in such a way that the greatest balance of good over evil is promoted. That is, our actions should always depict goodness. Secondly, our actions should be such that the greatest balance of pleasure over pain is produced. Actions should be weighed to determine how the greatest pleasure can be attained. Thirdly, our actions should produce the greatest happiness for the greatest number of persons. With this tenet, it is the intention that happiness will be distributed as widely and equally as possible. The greatest good involves attainment of the greatest happiness for as many people as possible. Wrong actions would be those that end in unhappiness while right actions lead to happiness in favour of the majority. With this theory, human beings are bounded to a form of responsibility as, in acting, one should consider the number of persons that could be affected positively or negatively.

There are different types of Utilitarianism but for the purpose of this paper we will focus on Jeremy Bentham's view which falls under the hedonistic camp. Bentham claimed that "nature has placed mankind under the governance of two sovereign master, pain and pleasure, and referred to this as the principle of utility."¹⁹ What is meant by this is three-fold. In the first instance, pain is anything uncomfortable, which leads to some kind of suffering, and as such human beings avoid it as much as possible. Indeed, the avoidance of pain is critical to the capacity of the human being to thrive, and everything is done to minimize it; to that extent humans have created various resources and technologies to reduce the amount of suffering and pain that must be dealt with in the process of living. From medical efforts to environmental ones in cooling or heating our homes, pain is something that most humans avoid – except in the case of masochists who have some form of abnormality. In the second instance, human beings seek pleasure, because of the enjoyment and happiness such procure for the person. Many human beings take the gratification of their senses as the basis of happiness, while some would claim that such is a debasement of the intrinsic human ability to attain superior happiness through the engagement of the mind. While in the third instance, dubbing as utility the ethical dimension of human avoidance of pain and pursuit of pleasure leads to a kind of suggestion that the results – pain and pleasure – can be unitized and measured or weighed, to determine which is superior or inferior.

Bentham tried to quantify pleasures and pains under the following seven categories:

intensity, duration, certainty, propinquity (how soon experiences are felt), fecundity (the likelihood of future pleasurable experiences), purity (how free from pain are the experiences), and extent (the number of others who are affected). He believed one could calculate the goodness of an action by listing the pleasures associated with the action, applying a numerical value (say +1 to + 10) for each of these in terms of the above categories, and then finding the total. After one

¹⁷ A. E. Karin, *Culture, Sport and Physical Activity* (USA: Volkwein-Caplan Pub., 2004), 61.

¹⁸ Judith Boss, *Ethics for Life 3rd ed.* (USA: McGraw Hill, 2004), 266.

¹⁹ Jeremy Bentham, *A Fragment on Government and An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation* Edited with an Introduction by Wilfred Harrison (Great Britain: Basil Blackwell Oxford, 1948), 125.

does the same for any pains (say – 1 to – 10) associated with the action, then the resultant sum, either in favour of pleasures or of pains, would tell an individual what course of action to follow. A positive total would be good, and the behaviour ought to be carried out. A negative total would be bad, and the action ought to be avoided.²⁰

Here, Bentham is suggesting that pleasures and pain can be quantified. He is asking us to weigh all actions against all others before we act. From this we can say that his starting point is quantification, the end result is quality. For Bentham then, morality was not concerned only with quantity, but even more significantly with the quality of the pleasures, happiness of avoidance of pain involved in an action are the factors which determine whether an action is good or bad. With the calculus of pleasure over pain, it is sure that there will be an objective basis for morality, and we would be in a position whereby we can effectively tell persons what is right or wrong, good or bad, moral or immoral.

Having elicited this objective foundation for morality, he then held that any and all pleasures were equivalent.²¹ So whether one enjoys rowing boats, washing dishes, doing math, watching sports and so on, each activity is given the same status as a pleasure, it would mean that intrinsically no pleasure is superior to another. Although we agree to the quality of happiness that can be produced, we have a problem with the practicability of the quantification. There may be no way that any individual can logically and accurately calculate pleasure over pain when sometimes that which causes the most pain may also afford the greatest pleasure. For example, one could suffer drastic pain from the rigorous training that goes into preparation for a competition but one may derive pleasure from the winning that was gained through that tortuous regiment which confers superior advantage over opponents in a competition. But how does one measure the pleasure that is derived from the winning vis a vis the pain that goes into the preparation athletes must put in before the real competition?

The deontological views are unlike those purported by utilitarians. Like Utilitarianism, there are different types of deontological theories but we will focus on Immanuel Kant's views here.

Deontologists hold that the right is a more fundamental moral concept than the good. Rather than identifying the best possible results and telling us to perform whatever actions will lead to these results, deontological theories tell us that certain actions themselves are right and others are wrong regardless of the consequences. In essence, the ends do not justify the means, some actions are simply intrinsically wrong, and we ought not to perform them even in pursuit of the most noble or outstanding consequences.²²

Based on this view, the end results of actions are not important to moral analysis. What is important is that human beings are capable of rationalizing what the right action is without reflecting on the consequences. We are asked here, not to rely on consequences to guide us into a moral direction. The agent is to be guided through reason to perform actions that are right irrespective of consequences. Thus in choosing an action, the agent should not reflect on any goodness that can be derived from participation in such action but on whether or not that action is right. It is wrong for example to cheat, to steal, to inflict bodily harm on others whether or not doing so will make you rich, gain more power or garner more recognition.

For Kant, ethics has nothing to do with satisfying some identifiable end. In fact, if one could demonstrate that an act was carried out to arrive at some desirable outcome; this would disqualify the act as an ethical behaviour. For him,

nothing in the world can possibly be conceived which could be called good without qualification except a goodwill. A good will is good not because of what it performs or effects, not by its

²⁰ Bentham, Jeremy, *A Fragment on Government*, 151.

²¹ Bentham, *A Fragment of Government*, 155.

²² Heimir Geirsson and Margaret R. Holmgren eds., *Ethical Theory A Concise Anthology* (USA: Broadview Press, 2000), 109.

aptness for the attainment of some proposed end, but simply by virtue of the volition – that is, it is good in itself, and considered by itself is to be esteemed much higher than all that can be brought about by it in favour of any inclination.²³

Morality in this sense is not dependent on the agent's desires or any other inclinations. This does not mean that Kant wants human beings to be deprived of pleasure and happiness. What his theory shows is that the foundation of morality is not grounded on what each individual accepts to be right or wrong when faced with moral dilemmas. Morality is absolute and therefore objective of each individual's will. The basic premise of Kantian ethics is that moral decisions arise out of a sense of duty rather than to produce a desired result. He claims, "duty is the necessity of acting from respect for the law."²⁴ His argument is that human beings operate based on a "Categorical Imperative" or a command. This means that each action is based on a duty to obey the right actions based on laws. The imperative becomes paramount because first, it commands the individual to do a particular action, and second, it commands that individual to not place a condition on the action. Because the agents' actions are duties, the agents are under obligations to act based on these duties. From Kant's arguments one could argue that human beings garner what is right from various media within society such as socialization, numerous laws and norms and so on. The way human beings react to these moral laws/duties will depend on who they are as individuals or the kind of character they possess.

Someone with good character behaves morally from a pure sense of duty and not from a consideration of the results of actions. From a Kantian point of view then, if an athlete does not lie or cheat, and always obeys the rules but in doing so this athlete is thinking about the advantages and gratifications that can be derived from such actions; these actions are no longer ethical. This would be so because there are motives that are attached to the actions. This action should then only be performed for its own sake. Kant tried to demonstrate the soundness of this basic tenet by relying on one's ability to reason clearly. Actions should be independent of any desire or influence.

Both Deontology and Utilitarianism can work effectively in analyzing moral actions within sports. The athlete who uses performance enhancing drugs often does this to derive some form of happiness that comes with winning, recognition and so on. But Bentham cautions us that quantification of actions should not only be used for the sake of happiness. There is a condition, and this reflects the quality of the end product. Although happiness is the end product, this happiness can be further quantified so that an ultimate form is derived. An athlete for example will be elated about winning a race but this happiness could multiply if he contributed to a new world record. We agree with Bentham that pleasure and happiness can be attained but we add to his views that this comes through self determination especially since there are so many things that could interfere with happiness.

Kant's views are also applicable as athletes ought to act out of duty to the moral rules as these apply to their organization. We accept Kant's views that since moral rules are universally applicable to all human beings a duty is owed to obey these. We add to his views that the individual should also hold a self duty to observe moral rules since in observing these rules, the individual displays character and virtue that is necessary to the continued survival of the specie. Athletes should then act based on a duty to the self which is extended to a responsibility to the moral code that sports stipulate. This duty is directed toward the self because without a subjective determination to uphold the universal moral rights, the moral decay that exists will continue. Human beings and not organizations are the tools in correcting a decaying moral system that they consciously or unconsciously created. One should follow the ethical guidelines simply because they owe it to themselves to do so irrespective of the 'short or long term' happiness that they might gain. Moral rules should not be observed in order to gain something. These should be observed because it is each individual's duty to obey moral law and avoid anarchy and chaos. Happiness is maintained by performing the right action. If happiness is the end result for some athletes, how one attains

²³ Immanuel Kant, "Selections from the Foundations of the Metaphysics of Morals," in *Ethical Theory A Concise Anthology*, eds. Heimir Geirsson and Margeret Holgren (USA: Broadview Press, 2000), 114.

²⁴ Kant, "Selections," 116.

this should be rationalized in such a way that happiness is maintained. Athletes can only be truly happy for the achievements that were gained before doping. A duty to ensure honesty is important as this will reduce most of the issues arising from duly feeling the pleasure and happiness that should accompany winning. Only each athlete can make this possible through 'self duty'.

Conclusion

Overall, we believe that everyone is responsible for ethical and unethical behaviours in sport. One can argue that ethics is not optional, a condition that thus places the responsibility on all those associated with the sport industry, including all spectators and fans. "Sometimes it is difficult to separate the responsibilities of the players, fans, media personnel, coach, sport manager, sport director, sport businesses and so forth."²⁵ Although each individual or organization contributes something different to the sport setting, the moral expectations of each situation should be the same in terms of professional and ethical behaviour.²⁶ In essence, we believe that there ought to be set moral principles that guide behaviour and action; principles that clearly state their basic expectations. A duty to 'self' and respect for others should guide these behaviours. A focus on what the right actions should be, not only as a means to help curb the ethical dilemma that already exists but aim to eliminate the potential ethical dilemmas that could arise from inaction. There already exists such a code yet the problems continue to exist. What is needed is to put in practice what the code already stipulates. If coaches and managers know that their athletes are using performance enhancers and do nothing to stop the practice they would have acted contrary to the code. These denizens of the sports industry should be held equally morally responsible as they would have withheld information that is a clear breach of the existing moral code. Individuals in the sporting world need then to be more proactive in addressing the problem. This may need to be done by starting with a look into the nature of sports itself, how the structure, rules etc may add to ethical problems then move to individual levels starting with those in charge of sports programs with a trickledown effect to athletes. Since we have established that there may be a moral decay in sports, everyone involved needs to assess the areas in which this decay persists and seek to develop same. If this is not done, the decay will only increase.

Bibliography

1. Beauchamp, Tom. "Moral Foundations." In *Ethics and epidemiology*. Edited by Steven S. Coughlin and Tom L. Beauchamp. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.
2. Bentham, Jeremy. *A Fragment on Government and An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation*. Edited with an Introduction by Wilfred Harrison. Great Britain: Basil Blackwell Oxford, 1948.
3. Boss, Judith. *Ethics for Life, 3rd ed.* USA: McGraw Hill, 2004.
4. Brown, W.M. "Paternalism, Drugs, and the Nature of Sports." In *Ethics in Sports*. eds. William J. Morgan et al. USA: Human Kinetics, 2001.
5. DeSensi, Joy T. and Danny Rosenberg. *Ethics and Morality in Sports Management*. USA: Fitness Information Technology Inc., 2003.
6. Ford, Maurine. "A New Sport Ethics: Taking Konig Seriously." In, *Sport Ethics in Context*. Debra Shogan. Toronto: Canadian Scholar's Press, 2007.
7. Geirsson, Heimir and Margaret R. Holmgren eds., *Ethical Theory A Concise Anthology*. USA: Broadview Press, 2000.
8. Hinman, Lawrence M. *Ethics: A Pluralistic Approach to Moral Theory*. Belmont California: Cengage Learning, Inc., 2008.

²⁵ DeSensi and Rosenberg, *Ethics and Morality*, 111.

²⁶ Desensi and Rosenberg, 111

9. Jones, Marion with Maggie Greenwood-Robinson. *On the Right Track: from Olympic Downfall to finding Forgiveness and the strength to Overcome and Succeed*. USA: Simon and Schuster, 2010.
10. Kant, Immanuel. "Selections from the Foundations of the Metaphysics of Morals." In *Ethical Theory A Concise Anthology*. Eds. Heimir Geirsson and Margeret Holgren. USA: Broadview Press, 2000.
11. Karin, A. E. *Culture, Sport and Physical Activity*. USA: Volkwein-Caplan Pub., 2004. Graham
12. McFee, Graham. "Are there philosophical issues with respect to sport (other than ethical ones)?" In, *Ethics and Sports*. Edited by M.J. McNamee and S.J. Parry. London: Routledge, 2002.
13. McNamee, M.J. and S.J. Parry, *Ethics and Sport*. London, GBR: Routledge, 1998.
14. Morgan, William J. Klaus V. Meier and Angela J. Schneider, eds. *Ethics in Sport*. USA: Human Kinetics, 2001.
15. Pampel, Fred C. *Drugs and Sports*. New York NY: Facts on File, 2007.
16. Schneider, A. and R. Butcher. "Fairness as Respect for the game." In *Ethics in Sport*, William J. Morgan (Champaign, III: Human Kinetics, 2007).
17. Tamburrini, Claudio. "What is wrong with Doping?" In *Values in Sport Elitism, Nationalism, Gender Equality and the Scientific Manufacturing of Winners*. Eds. Claudio Tamburrini and Torbjorn Tannsjo. USA: Taylor and Francis, 2000.