



# QUALITY OF JUDO WORLD CHAMPIONSHIPS IN RELATION TO JUSTICE THEORIES AND BEHAVIOR – A CASE STUDY OF THE 2017 WORLD JUDO CHAMPIONSHIPS IN BUDAPEST

Róbert G. Zimányi & Gábor Géczi



Published online: December 2018.

## To cite this article:

Róbert G. Zimányi & Gábor Géczi (2018). QUALITY OF JUDO WORLD CHAMPIONSHIPS IN RELATION TO JUSTICE THEORIES AND BEHAVIOR – A CASE STUDY OF THE 2017 WORLD JUDO CHAMPIONSHIPS IN BUDAPEST. International Journal of Wrestling Science, 8:2, 1-8.



**INTERNATIONAL NETWORK OF WRESTLING RESEARCHERS (INWR)**

*ADVANCING OUR SPORT THROUGH KNOWLEDGE*

*FAIRE PROGRESSER NOTRE SPORT PAR LA CONNAISSANCE*

*ПРОДВИЖЕНИЕ НАШЕГО СПОРТА ЧЕРЕЗ ЗНАНИЕ*

*PROGRESO PARA NUESTRO DEPORTE MEDIANTE CONOCIMIENTO*

# QUALITY OF JUDO WORLD CHAMPIONSHIPS IN RELATION TO JUSTICE THEORIES AND BEHAVIOR – A CASE STUDY OF THE 2017 WORLD JUDO CHAMPIONSHIPS IN BUDAPEST

Róbert G. Zimányi & Gábor Géczi

University of Physical Education, Budapest, Hungary

zimanyi.robert@evopro-sc.com

## ABSTRACT

The judo world championships are major sport events, where, as in any other area of life, we strive for justice. How can the competitor's list of judo world championships be evaluated as just? When is the seeding right? When can we talk about a fair draw? When is a competition system fair? How can the final result be just and fair? Does everyone think that the final result is just? To answer the questions correctly, first of all we need to clarify the telos of the specific sporting event. This study presents the justice theories and examines the evolutionist conceptions from Aristotle's justice theory, through meritocracy and egalitarianism, to positive discrimination. It analyses a sporting event, the World Judo Championships 2017, held in Budapest. In the study we examine the competitor's list, the seeding, the draw, the competition systems and the final results of this judo world championship. Parallel to the analysis of justice theories, we use the method of personal observation as well. The study is based on an interview with the Operational Director of the Hungarian Judo Federation. We conclude that many theories of justice appear in relation to the judo world championships. However, only those theories of justice can be accepted which are consistent with the telos, the ultimate object or aim, of the event. As a summary the competitor's list, the seeding, the draws, the competition system and the final result can be fair, but their acceptance depends on which theory of justice is applied. The research confirms that there are such theories of justice which do not meet the telos.

**Keywords:** judo, quality, telos, justice

## BACKGROUND

Today's big sporting events, especially the world championships, get serious attention from various media channels, even including live broadcasts. Judo world events, especially the judo world championships are high-priority sport events. According to the information from the Hungarian Judo Federation, 126 nations were represented with 731 athletes (including the 18-member Hungarian delegation) at the 2017 World Judo Championships in Budapest. The event enjoyed public attention (Nemzeti Sport Online, 2017) so we can talk about a social event as well. In the judo world championships any country of the world can be represented through its qualification system.

The success of sport events depends on how much their quality is appreciated at a specific event. Based on a virtue-based approach to quality, justice plays a key role (MacIntyre, 2007). The issue of justice is just as important in the world judo championships, as in other areas of life. Have you the right to be a competitor at a sport event? Is the seeding fair? Is the draw fair? What is a fair way to determine the competition system? Is the final result always just? Perhaps the latter is the most important issue. The study seeks to provide professional answers to these questions, utilizing justice theories. In addition, we analyzed (with the observation method and case studies) the 2017 World Judo Championships in Budapest. Furthermore, the operational director of the Hungarian Judo Federation, who was also a member of the organizing committee of the event, supported us by giving us professional interviews.

## Introduction: telos of the judo world championships

Sport events can be grouped and analysed in different ways. We can distinguish between competitive, leisure and corporate sport clubs, sport activities and sport events (Zimányi & Vermes, 2016). Judo world championships are definitely competitive sport events. If we want to know the telos of the judo world championships, we have to define first the concept of the telos. We can discover the concept of telos in Aristotle, who says that one must find the goal, the essential nature (Aristotle, 2011). Based on this idea: what can be the goal and essence, the telos of the judo world championships? Since it is a world competition, it is also necessary to comply with the telos of the competitive sport (which is easily accepted both by science and the general public): to win a competition under "equal initial conditions", while respecting the normative values of sport, values which will not be discussed in this study (Simon, Torres, & Hager, 2015). The aim is to defeat all the opponents (in a given weight group) and this way to be the best judo competitor (in that given weight group) in the world. This is a world championship title and if all previous conditions are met, the telos of the judo world championships also prevails. However, is every victory and world championship title fair? Is the list of

competitors fair? What about the seeding, the draws and the competition system? All in all, is a fair final result born? The answer is yes, but only if it is met as a prerequisite to the event's telos (in this case, the telos of the judo world championships). However, to better understand the truth, it is necessary to examine the possible theories of justice.

### **General theories of justice - with a focus on world judo**

What does the word "justice" mean? The answer is if we share the "most important things" correctly in the way we deserve (Sandel, 2009). However, the question arises: what do we deserve and why? It is important in terms of interpretation to approach the question from the moral side. Here are some theories of justice which may play a role at judo world championships. In the study, theories of justice are not analyzed in every detail because the study focuses on justice only in case of the judo world championships. Therefore, after listing the examined theories of justice, the aspects of the theories of justice relevant to the study will be specifically analyzed and explained: competitors, seeding, draw, competition system and final results.

Evolutionary justice can be interpreted as the adaptation of the theory of evolution to justice: adaptation to the external and internal conditions (Darwin, 2015) is of primary importance. At a judo world championship, we have to define our tactics and behaviour against a certain opponent so that we obtain an influencing role during the match (Chelladurai & Saleh, 1980). The goal, as always, is to win against our current and upcoming opponent. For Aristotle, justice is the supreme virtue. Aristotelian justice builds on excellence. According to Aristotle, justice can be interpreted as a cardinal virtue: give people what they deserve and it can be determined on the basis of excellence – while others are still in the best position (Aristotle, 2011). According to egalitarianism, we should strive for equality: "everyone is equal". As a contrast, meritocracy promotes a system and justice based on merit. Positive discrimination can also be a justice aspect, on the basis of which we positively discriminate somebody in a certain way: e.g. the promotion of diversity (Sandel, 2009). So, it could be adapted to sport area; the organizers, or the International Judo Federation for example give wild cards (WC) to "smaller judo nations". Or the applying of "domestic rights" of the organizing country: additional home competitors are allowed to enter the (home) tournament. Did the organizers of the 2017 World Judo Championships apply positive discrimination? We are also discussing this issue in our analysis. It is not closely related to the research but it is important to mention in relation to the discrimination that sport must reject all kinds of negative discrimination. In fact, sports have to act against it; the telos of sport also requires it. It is not possible to have any negative aspects of discrimination of the competitor list, seeding, draw and competition system on the final result.

Of course, there are other theories of justice which are not examined in the present study, because we do not consider it relevant to the research topic, the competitors' list, the seeding, the draw, the competition system and the final result. For example, the Kantian justice: Kant's views on morality, rationality and freedom. Or here is the theory of Rawls' on issue of fairness and handicap (Rawls, 1971; Sandel, 2009). The last one's modified version will be mentioned later. The latter may appear if there is a protected ranking (PR) that makes someone possible to compete, or if a competitor enters another weight group in order to suffer a "handicap" or to avoid his opponent. But these thoughts do not correspond to the competitive sports and to the telos of judo world championships. However, "modified fairness" exists; this is mentioned at a later stage of the study in relation to the justice of the competitors list.

There are more theories of justice, which may be relevant to certain aspects of the judo world championships – such as utilitarianism and libertarianism (Zimányi & Géczi, 2018), but in regard to the length of the study these issues are not discussed in the present essay. We only mention them for further consideration of the topic. According to utilitarianism, the beneficial principle is the point. Bentham was concerned with maximizing happiness. According to him pleasure must be greater than the pain (Bentham, 1996). Mill also defended utilitarianism against its critics; the focus of his ethics was on the comparison and reconciliation of individual freedoms and utilitarianism (Mill, 1979). People can do whatever they want, until they do not harm others and the state cannot restrict freedom (Mill, 1989). Mill's philosophy is that a higher degree of enjoyment (higher pleasures) is a key factor. He believes that differences between lower and higher level of pleasures should be distinguished. Higher pleasures can result in stronger, longer-lasting pleasures which lead to happiness. Representatives of libertarianism proclaim the "liberty" and unrestricted market, and the rejection of state intervention. In the name of human freedom, we can do anything freely since freedom is our basic right (Friedman, 1962). If we want to talk about a quality sport event, only those theories of justice can be applied, which correspond to the telos of the event. That is, there are some exclusionary theories, which have a legitimate interest in other areas, such as egalitarianism, which may be acceptable for a draw or for the competition system (the daily order of the game). In case of competitive sport, this egalitarian theory of justice cannot appear because competitive sport does not correspond to the previously defined telos.

### **Goal of the study: Justify the applicability of theories of justice. Applied research methodology**

Which of these defined and briefly outlined theories of justice should we follow and why? The application of which theories is justified in relation to the judo world championships. The question is: which theory or theories

should we follow? We have to follow such a theory of justice, which also corresponds to the telos of the event, this is an exclusion criterion. So, the theories listed above have to be structured and examined according to the purpose of the study. To be able to get a complete and realistic "picture", in addition to the examined theories of justice, semi-structured, deep interviews were conducted with the operational director of the Hungarian Judo Federation (who was also a member of the Organizing Committee of the 2017 World Judo Championships). The research included on-sight observation and case studies. In the following we describe the results of our research: the competitor's list, the seedling, the draw, the competition system and the final result. How did the interviewed member of the organizing committee evaluate and feel the justice of the event? Of course, every judo event and world championship are different. But as the world championships from year to year are held under the auspices of the International Judo Federation, the received results are not only true and valid for the 2017 World Judo Championships, but in general (with minor modifications and deviations) for the tendencies of current world championships as well. We are of course aware of the fact that changes can occur any time, so our research analyzed the current situation.

### **Justice of competitor's list**

Accepting the principle that all decisions can be fair, the list of competitors can also be fair. But on what basis? All justice theories can be applied in relation to the competitor's list of the judo world championships. Let's start at the beginning. How does qualification happen? Who can be a competitor in a world championship? This differs from country to country. During the interview we learned that nomination in Hungary is based on the accepted "Selection Principles," which the Competition Committee discusses, proposes, and then the Presidency adopts the policy for who can compete and in which weight group. As a theory of justice, we can mention the evolutionary approach: adaptation to the competition regulation must be the first. That is, the Hungarian competitors must first meet the "Selection Principles" of Hungary, then that of the Competition Committee, finally (but as the most important element of the decision) that of the Presidency. There may be an influencing role if someone draws attention to performance, which stands out from the rest of the competitors. This also means that the system is meritocratic as well: the nominations are based on the achieved results. In this study we assume that the competent units decide according to their best knowledge, keeping values of sport and fair-play always in mind. The achieved results can be assessed in several ways: having a 3<sup>rd</sup> place at the European Championship is not the same as being at the 3<sup>rd</sup> place at the World Championship. It is not even certain that the results can be compared. That is, the decision is not just meritocratic, there is a kind of Committee and Presidential Discretion (with individual discretion), which is largely the same, but may override the meritocratic justice principles, as there is a world ranking prepared by the International Judo Federation. This world ranking is based on the "recent" results (the system is meritocratic), which is also accepted by the national judo federations. However, it cannot be based on achieved and deserved world rankings. As it is revealed in the interview, nomination of the competitor for the judo world championship is the competence of the national federation. They decide who can compete in the weight groups. The Competition Committee of the Hungarian Judo Federation discusses it, then proposes, but the Presidency has the right of the final decision (most of the time the Presidency approves and accepts the Competition Committee's recommendation).

A meritocratic system is similar to the Aristotelian theory of justice, which is based on excellence. According to Aristotle, it should be distinguished on the basis of excellence (Aristotle, 2011). Competitors, who achieve a relatively better ("more excellent") result, have to be nominated in the weight groups, following this theory of justice. There are many ways to understand the competitor list meritocracy and the Aristotelian excellence-based discrimination. The essence of both nominations is based on merit. The performance before the world championships is important, but the performance in tournaments is more relevant, which are honoured by world ranking points. It can easily happen that world ranking is not in line with the current form and performance. The difference and the possible reasons for this are not investigated in the present study.

Positive discrimination justice theory may also arise for the competitors. During the interview we learned, that the wild card (WC), the positive discrimination by the International Judo Federation is not allowed. It means that it is not an option to promote diversity for the "smaller" nations' competitors. In our view, the latter could be important because it could be part of the learning and catching up process if a competitor of a region, which is from professional judo-perspective is less relevant, could participate in the world championships. Thus, not only the competitor, not only her/his country, but also the region could develop, and could be more connected to the global circulation of the judo sport. However, another aspect of positive discrimination may appear: prioritization of home competitors. During the interview, we learned that there is no minimum, but there is a maximum number of "home competitors": no more than 9 people from a country (by gender/sex) can compete; up to 2 competitors in one weight group (by gender/sex). Thus, this system is not entirely meritocratic: as a maximum of 9 people can compete from a "judo-power nation", just like from a less judo-relevant country. From this point of view, we can find an egalitarian element on the competitors list. But in this case, we can only talk about an initial equality, although this thesis is controversial as well: the possibility of access to "judo-resources" is not equal among the countries (we mean resources, which are needed by somebody to start at a judo world championship). There is no handicap in entries, as we previously described. But fairness may appear in some form as we learned

from the interviews. Protected ranking (PR) does not exist and it does not apply this kind of fairness and handicap. Additionally, the handicap per weight category cannot be accepted on the basis of the telos. For example, a competitor cannot start in a lower weight group just because he/she competed in the past in a lower weight group – or came back from an injury and would not correspond to its own weight group, etc... However, it may happen in our country (at the Hungarian Judo Federation) that if someone has 1st to 5th place in a weight group within two years in an adult world competition (Olympic Games, World championships, European championships), and at the same time other competitors have "no outstanding performance", this person can enjoy "protection". With presidential approval, he/she can compete at the world event and he/she is nominated by his/her country's judo federation (as in Hungary). In such cases, fairness may appear.

The national judo federations select the best competitor or competitors (in their opinion) by gender/sex and weight, corresponding to the telos of the judo world championships. The decision is based on meritocracy, evolutionist perception and on the Aristotelian excellence-based justice. The totally egalitarian system is not typical of competitive sport. It does not correspond to the telos of competitive sport, so it cannot be applied. Based on this theory, we cannot talk about justice in a competitive sport. It can be only partly equal, but egalitarian system (egalitarianism) is not present in many competitive sport departments, especially, where there is qualification and not a committee or presidency decides on the participation of competitors. For example, in the ATP Men's Tennis World, the entry of a tennis tournament is based on ranking (Association of Tennis Professionals, 2017). It is not maximized, how many people can represent a country (as an extra, organizers can give wild cards, enforcing the theory of the positive discrimination as well). So, this system (ATP) can be rightly called "more merit" based on merits achieved, i.e. "more meritocratic" (the limit is only the size of the main draw, and how many competitors would like to compete). There is another question: how real is a world ranking order? Is ranking based on real power? Is it absolutely fair? The question is: which theory of justice is applied? The research finds that the International Judo Federation's world ranking is based on the meritocratic and on the Aristotelian excellence-based theories of justice. As a summary: the judo world ranking list is based on the achieved results and it aims to show who performs better during the matches. Of course, world ranking may also change, which also corresponds to meritocracy and excellence-based discrimination, because the achieved and actual (recent year) results are counted.

At the 2017 World Judo Championships the hosting country, Hungary, was represented by the maximum 9 competitors in the possible 10 weight groups. In the female 63 kg and the male 66 kg weight groups Hungary was not represented. Why were these weight groups selected? Here you can explore the utilitarian theory of justice: the utilitarianism. According to this theory, the Competition Committee saw only the slightest chance of winning (or receiving medals, or points) in these two groups. Accordingly, domestic competitors were more likely to be involved in that weight group, where there was a greater expectation for better and more outstanding performance. According to the Hungarian Judo Federation leaders, there were more chances of achieving a better final place (and ranking position) on the basis of utilitarianism (Zimányi & Géczi, 2018). Ultimately, no domestic competitors won a medal at the 2017 World Judo Championships. During the interview we learned from the member of the organizing committee, that a sudden decision was made about the competitors' list (although the basis of the justice was not detailed). The interviewee stated as follows: *"With regard to the Hungarian team, I think the selection procedure was fair."* (C. Simon, personal communication, October 6, 2017 and March 1, 2018).

### **Justice of seeding and the draw**

When can a seeding and a draw be just? Aristotle's theory of justice and the meritocracy are handled together in this case. For the seeding at the world championships the Aristotelian excellence-based justice and the merit-based meritocracy are applied equally: the one, who is "more excellent", will be seeded based on their previously achieved results. During the interview we learned: the first 8 places in world ranking per weight groups will be seeded – the others are randomly assigned to one of the 4 branches. What about the evolutionary conception? This principle, as always, exists and is required to be met (also due to external factors). It is compulsory to adapt, only if it is fair according to this theory. What about the other players, who are ranked after the 8th place in the world ranking? This is the largest group by weight and they are randomly drawn to the straight knockout (main draw) table. In the elimination system, everyone will have an opponent, with an exception: if the number of competitors does not match the capacity of the main draw. In this case, there will be competitors (not just seeded) who will automatically proceed to the next round. If the non-seeded competitors are randomly drawn, then everyone has an equal chance – then the system is egalitarian. It can be called a controlled (lupus) alee-type game as well (Caillouis, 1961). So, a random draw, "Fortuna" will decide how strong (struggle) matches will be; who will fight with whom – except for the 8 seeded competitors. Nobody knows in advance, but it is probable, that there will not be the same strength fights even though we are talking about the same round. (They cannot be the same strength struggles, because of the nature of the human and sport.) But this is not the goal of the draw, the essence: the non-seeded competitors will receive the same chance – either they are staying in the 9th or in the 80th place in the world ranking (per weight groups). In terms of the draw, they are the same, they are not distinguished.

As a summary there are no advantages for the "better", if they are not in the world ranking Top 8 – despite, they struggled to have a better world ranking position. So, the world number 9 and the world number 10 can fight against each other in the first round. In the same phase, first round number 64 and 70 of the world ranking, if they are qualified, fight against each other. There are not equally "strong duels" on the basis of world ranking. It only depends on the random draw. Previous world champions can also meet in the first round – if they are not currently seeded based on their current world ranking. Egalitarianism is the draw-system of non-seeded competitors, as everybody (who has qualified) starts with equal chances. From the other point of view, the system is also egalitarian, as every non-seeded competitor has a chance to be in the next round – without opponent. If the knock-out main draw is not complete, not everyone has an opponent in the first round; some lucky competitors find themselves in the second round. This qualification for the next round is true, even if someone's opponent withdraws. Out of the theories of justice we cannot find fairness, handicap and positive discrimination in relation to the judo world championships' seeding and draw. Every person is different; you cannot fight, compete and make a good performance twice in the same way. Performance depends on the daily form and concentration – as well as on the own and on the opponent's momentary performance. How much can you put in from yourself? The sport is characterized by "results-turning" and uncertain final result – which can cause surprises (not the favourite wins). If we accept this principle, then match-pairs of the same strength will never take place.

During the interview it was also revealed that the seeding was fair. As a member of the Organizing Committee said: *"Seeding happened according to the world ranking, based on the achieved results and scores"*. In this case, the meritocratic and the Aristotelian excellence-based distinctive principle can be considered, - in addition to the evolutionary adaptation. He also told: *"A well-thought-out draw system works in judo"*. This suggests that it is also acceptable for the interviewed person to use the egalitarianism theory of justice by the draw (C. Simon, personal communication, October 6, 2017 and March 1, 2018).

### **Justice of the competition system**

Justice of the competition system is a relevant question as well, beside the competitors' list, the seeding and the draw. We understand the pre-announced conditions of competition, the rules, the schedules of the consecutive matches – and even the point: can a just qualification to the next round be born in accordance with the previously described conditions and with the competition regulation? Of course, the telos has to be met here as well. That is, all the basic conditions must be ensured: the telos of the sports and the telos of the judo world championships. Without this exclusion criterion, we cannot talk about a just and fair competition system. Telos also prevails at the competitors' list, at the seeding and at the draw. The case study analyzed the 2017 World Judo Championships matches on 1<sup>st</sup> September (two women events: 70 kg, 78 kg, and a male event: 90 kg).

In accordance with the evolutionary justice, adaptation to the conditions of the competition system is also a priority. The one, who can best adapt to weight groups (this is an internal factor, as opposed to a random draw), prevails and can beat the next opponent. First of all, it is necessary to adapt to the external factors and to the current opponent as well. What about the Aristotelian theory of justice? Is there a role for excellence? Yes, because seeded competitors cannot fight against other seeded competitors, until the quarter-finals (there are 8 seeded competitors per weight groups). The same is true for meritocracy.

During the competition system, the one who makes a better and "more excellent" performance in a current match qualifies for the next round. Of course, it is conceivable, that against someone else the same performance would not be enough. Here we refer back to the evolutionary approach, to adaptation. Accordingly, we always have to adapt to the current opponent. When less performance is enough to win, there is no need to do more for success. A tournament can be long, one can save energy (who can), who wants to participate in the fights for the final title or for the medals. Based on the research (which also included the on-site observation methodology) we can conclude that the competition system also follows the egalitarian theory of justice, that everyone is equal. We are thinking about the following point: schedule. The matches of the main draw were fought from top to bottom (irrespective of seeding). In addition, the course schedule was also prepared after the draw, according to the pre-defined and communicated conditions. What are the pre-defined and declared conditions and rules, which apply equally to all competitors? The research revealed: based on the competition regulation, according to the theory of equality, the following conditions were applied to everyone: duration of the match, access to the competitors' list, the draw, so everything can be planned: who with whom to fight in which round, etc...

The theory of meritocracy could be discovered in the schedule. On the basis of the achieved results, nobody received any advantage and (positive) distinction from the seeded ones. The seeded competitors also came to the judo tatami, as it was officially and publicly announced. According to the main draw, the matches were fought from top to bottom. This is another question, that the advance may be meritocratic: the one who has more points in the match against the opponent or has done more successful actions, deserves to be in the next

round. This issue was analyzed to determine the final result. No positive discrimination was represented in connection with the 2017 World Judo Championships. It wasn't easier for some to advance to the next round, than for others (and no one had more planned rest-time, which could be an advantage). The promotion of the diversity and the (positive) distinction of the domestic competitors were not applied by the organizers during the competition system. For some competitor qualifying for the next round was easier, but this was only due to the seeded status and to the random draw. The former used meritocratic and excellence-based principles and the latter, the equality principle.

In the examined topic and issue utilitarianism also appears as a theory of justice. Another possible aspect is the economic benefits of the organizers. This includes the rights of broadcasting, because the spectators like to watch the "judo-stars" during their matches. During their mediated match, according to the principle of supply and demand, more advertisements can be sold at a higher price. There is a mix of competitive sports and show-business. The goal is to get closer to the finals (per weight groups). The matches should be more exciting with turns and uncertain final results. This may be the interests of the competition as these are the elements that increase the number of viewers, and the economic benefits as well. This principle is supported by utilitarianism. However, this is only a secondary involvement in sports; the real value should not be forgotten: the telos and the value system of the competitive sport and of the judo world championships. During an interview, the member of the Competition Committee emphasized the importance of equality, in relation to the competition system. As he said: *"The competition system is well-proven, it has been formed for many years and it pay particular attention to every competitor to get the (same) time to regenerate between the bouts"* (C. Simon, personal communication, October 6, 2017 and March 1, 2018)

### **Justice of the final result**

The final result depends on the competitors, the team (coach, assistants, etc.) and on the external conditions as well. Competitors aim to reach the best possible results, winning as many matches as possible in the straight knockout system, but not everyone can succeed. Namely, in combat sports there is only one winner (per weight groups); therefore, it should be given the value to which the justice of the final result is a prerequisite. Of course, the telos must also be met; all basic conditions must be ensured to meet the telos of the sport and of the judo world championships. This is an exclusionary criterion, without that we cannot talk about a fair and just final result. The telos was the same in case of the competitor's list, the seeding, the draw and the competition system. Thus, the four cases corresponded to the goal and to the essence of the sport and of the judo world championships (including its mission and vision).

There are common signs of justice theories. According to the on-site observation and the official documents of the International Judo Federation, the 1<sup>st</sup> place can only be reached if someone is unbeaten. Here we can find the justice of the evolutionist approach. The judoka has to adapt him/herself to the (internal and external) circumstances, in order to reach the 1<sup>st</sup> place, every opponent must be defeated. The competitor, who can best adapt to the external and internal circumstances, deserves the victory. This theory is meritocratic as well, because the achieved results are the basis for winning; triumph over everyone. Only the performance on the tatami counts, in ludus, agon-type games (Caillois, 1961). Aristotle's theory of justice also appears here, in relation to the excellence-based distinction; a just decision should be made. Therefore, that competitor will be the champion, who is the "most excellent" in certain circumstances (in his/her own weight category). This competitor deserves the victory. A competitor cannot make any mistake if s/he wants to be a world champion (in our case: judo world champion). If that fails, the next possible goal is to gain a medal. In this case one defeat is not a problem yet. In case of combat (and other) sports there are consolation draws as well. Thus, with one defeat, a competitor is not knocked-out, it depends in which round of the main draw and against whom did he/she lose. In such cases, our destiny is no longer in our own hands. Reaching the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> places is only possible with one single defeat. It is typical of combat sports to have two 3<sup>rd</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> places – in contrast e.g. to the international tennis tournaments, where competitors are knocked-out with one defeat and cannot continue fighting. In the latter case, only the winner will go to the next round in the straight-line elimination system, without consolation draw, except the international tennis tournaments of nations (Davis Cup, Fed Cup, Hopman Cup), and round-robin competitions (ATP Finals, WTA Finals).

The theory of egalitarianism does not correspond to the telos of the competitive sport's final result, which also applies to the judo world championships. Although the idea can be welcomed that everyone starts on equal terms, but this is not always possible, as we discussed previously in this study. Not everyone has the same access to the "judo-resources". Namely, on the basis of the principle of equality, it is not possible to determine the final result of a competitive sport. We have to distinguish the winner, based on something positive. Not everyone will be equal during the emergence of the final result. They can only be equal, if the competitors achieve the same results. It depends on their current performance. In combat sports there can be only one winner (in some other sports equality/tie/dead heat can be declared). Positive discrimination does not exist, because in performance-based competitive sport the achieved results and optimal adaptation can only lead to the just final result. There is no way for anyone to reach better results, to promote diversity. We cannot give any



advantage for the home competitors. The results must be achieved on the tatami, not at the "green table". The handicap does not match the telos of the competitive sport. It is not possible to accept an equitable result in competitive sport, if one of the opponents is deliberately (without any reason) is in a disadvantageous situation. For example, could the final result be fair if an opponent (due to injury) were just defending himself through a match without any action? Or would it be enough for somebody to do a minor (smaller value) action for a victory? Or do the opponents have to take extra weight on during the fights? Of course, this does not correspond to the telos of competitive sport, thus besides egalitarianism and positive discrimination, the handicap also cannot be interpreted. It cannot play a role in the final result of a competitive sport event, also not at the final result of the judo world championships. These theories did not appear in the final result at the event of the 2017 World Judo Championships.

During the interview, we asked the member of the organizing committee, what does he think: has a just and fair final result been created? The interviewee talked about the minimization of the refereeing errors: *"The goal is that the refereeing errors do not affect the result..."* (C. Simon, personal communication, October 6, 2017 and March 1, 2018). For the result this is really important. As we learned, the arsenal of possible actions has narrowed down. Coaching and refereeing discussions were introduced (to avoid disputes and problematic decisions). A video-referee was also introduced as a control, which replaced the two referee-assistants. In doubtful cases, the referee has to ask the video-referee and they have to look back the disputed decision. It is a key issue in terms of justice: realistic decisions can be born and at the same time can minimize the refereeing errors. The interviewee therefore highlighted this element in connection with the just final results, because the principle of the meritocratic and the excellence-based discrimination is just and fair (in agreement with the national and international judo federations). The goal is to evaluate the real and executed actions, the current performance and the achieved "excellent" results which allow one to rise above the opponent.

### **Conclusions: justice exists**

We can conclude that the 2017 World Judo Championships was a quality sport event. The issue of the justice was examined from quality aspect (as Aristotelian supreme virtue). There have been numerous questions of justice in relation to the competitor list, the seeding, the draw and the final result of the judo world championships. The question was: which theory of justice can be accepted, and why do we follow that theory when examining a topic? The study states: we have found justice in relation to the competitor list, the seeding, the draw and the final result as well, it just depends on the applied theory of justice. During the study we pointed out in which case which area was examined, and which are the most appropriate theories of justice. How do these appear, and what are the ones that should be excluded due to "non-compliance" with the defined telos.

Not every theory of justice can be observed in each aspect. Because of the final result, it cannot be a competitive sport-specific truth or justice, if the applied theory of justice system is egalitarian or positively discriminative. Fairness also does not appear everywhere, because in case of competitors (as we learnt from the interview), the Competition Committee of the Hungarian Judo Federation can nominate competitors, even on the basis of previous results (not based only on meritocratic principles). This decision may be approved by the Presidency; however, fairness cannot be applied when determining the final result of the tournament, thus undermining the telos of the competitive sport (and the telos of the judo world championships). There may also be differences in the examined factors. For example, seeding per weight groups (before the draw) cannot be egalitarian – rather meritocratic or Aristotelian excellence-based justice, because of the seeding of the top 8 world ranking. However, the non-seeded competitors' draw can be random (we refer to full equality between the non-seeded ones). In the latter case the luck can be changed; "in front of Fortuna everybody is equal".

Summarizing our research, if we want to talk about quality, the telos must be met in all cases (in this current study we talk about the telos of the competitive sport and the telos of the judo world championships). Based on the literature we proved, that the basic principle of evolution: adaptation to the situations (and to the competition regulation as well), must be fulfilled under all circumstances. When determining the seeding and the final result the meritocratic and the Aristotelian excellence-based theory of justice can be acceptable. The winner is the one, who achieves better results, who is "more excellent". It is important that during the fights only the performance and the achieved results must be considered. So, the final result of the competitive sport can be best explained by these theories of justice – since the above mentioned also correspond to the telos of competitive sport (Zimányi & Vermes, 2016). Simultaneously, the system and the process of judo world championships are not entirely meritocratic and Aristotelian excellence-based: neither the competitors' list, nor the draw and the competition system. In many cases egalitarianism can be observed (in case of the draw and the competition system), as principle of positive discrimination and fairness. There are also some excluding theories of justice, which do not correspond to the case of the examined study and they cannot be inserted, such as the issue of the handicap. The used and described theories in the study, during the interview and the practice also confirmed which theories and practice complies fully with the telos of the competitive sport.



### Future research areas

These justice-related questions (competitor's list, seeding, draw and competition system) could be used in other sports as well. For example, what is different and what is similar to a wrestling world championships? The question has special relevance, because Budapest, Hungary will host the Wrestling World Championships in 2018. It can be the primary goal of the international and national wrestling organization as well to fulfil the telos of the event: to organize just and fair world championships (in relation to the participating competitors, the seeding, the draw, the competition system but most importantly to the final result).

The justice of other areas can also be examined, for example how did the competitors and their coaches evaluate the justice of world championships? How did the competitors and their coaches behave in case of unjust decisions? Did they just suppose that there were unjust decisions? How was accommodation of the competitors selected? Which media has the right to broadcast world championships? Who get seats in the VIP Boxes? Which theory of justice should be applied and followed to answer the listed questions?

### REFERENCES

- [1] Nemzeti Sport Online (NSO). Retrieved November 12, 2017, from [http://www.nemzetisport.hu/egyeb\\_egyen/cselgancs-a-budapesti-vb-jo-reklamja-volt-a-sportagnak-2590271](http://www.nemzetisport.hu/egyeb_egyen/cselgancs-a-budapesti-vb-jo-reklamja-volt-a-sportagnak-2590271)
- [2],[3],[4] Suzuki World Judo Championships Budapest 2017. Retrieved November 2, 2017, from <http://worldjudo2017.hu/>
- [5] International Judo Federation (IJF). Retrieved November 3, 2017, from <https://www.ijf.org/ijf/documents>
- [6] Csaba Simon, operative director of the Hungarian Judo Association and member of the Organizing Committee of World Judo Championships – Budapest 2017 (October 6, 2017 and March 1, 2018)
- [7] Association of Tennis Professionals (ATP). Retrieved November 14, 2017, from <http://www.itftennis.com/officiating/rulebooks/grand-slams.aspx>
- Aristotle, Bartlett, R. C., & Collins, S. D. (2011). Aristotle's Nicomachean ethics. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bentham, J. (1996). Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation, Oxford: University Press.
- Caillois, R. (1961). Man, Play and Games, New York: *Free Press of Glencoe*.
- Chelladurai P., Saleh, S. D. (1980). Dimensions of Leader Behavior in Sports: Development of a Leadership Scale. *Human Kinetics Journals, Volume 2 Issue 1, April, Pages: 34-45*.
- Darwin, C. (2015). A fajok eredete, Origin of species Budapest: Typotex.
- Friedman, M. (1962). Capitalism and Freedom, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- International Judo Federation (IJF). Audit Reports Retrieved November 7, 2017, from <https://www.ijf.org/ijf/documents/4>
- International Judo Federation (IJF). Retrieved November 7, 2017, Ranking Events from [http://99e89a50309ad79ff91d-082b8fd5551e97bc65e327988b444396.r14.cf3.rackcdn.com/up/2017/01/IJF\\_WRL\\_Events\\_2017-2020\\_Point-1483967512.pdf](http://99e89a50309ad79ff91d-082b8fd5551e97bc65e327988b444396.r14.cf3.rackcdn.com/up/2017/01/IJF_WRL_Events_2017-2020_Point-1483967512.pdf)
- International Judo Federation (IJF). Ethics Report Retrieved November 7, 2017, from International Judo Federation (IJF). Retrieved November 9, 2017, from <https://www.ijf.org/ijf/documents/14>
- MacIntyre, A. (2007). After virtue (3rd ed.), Notre Dame, Indiana, University of Notre Dame Press.
- Mill, J.S. (1989). On Liberty, Cambridge: University Press.
- Mill, J.S. (1979). Utilitarianism, George Sher, ed. Hackett Publishing.
- Rawls, J. (1971). A Theory of Justice, Cambridge, Mass.: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Sandel, M.J. (2009). Justice. What's the Right Things to Do? New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Simon, R.L., Torres, C.R., Hager, P.F (2015). Fair play the ethics of sport (4th ed.), Colorado: Westview Press.
- Zimányi R. G., Géczi G. (2018). Justice at Sport Clubs According to the Theory of Utilitarianism and Libertarianism. *PHYSICAL CULTURE AND SPORT STUDIES AND RESEARCH* 77:(1) pp. 55-60.
- Zimányi, R., Vermes, K. (2016). Happy Sport Clubs. A. Gál, J. Kosiewicz & T. Sterbenz (Eds), *Sport and Social Sciences with Reflection on Practice*. Warsaw: AWF-ISSSS, pp. 117-128.