

“Principles” is the beginning of “philosophy” : A viewpoint from Descartes and toward the future of “physical education philosophy”

Yosuke HAYASHI* and Seiji INOUE**

Abstract

This article attempts to clarify the conceptual difference between “principles” and “philosophy” from the viewpoint of Descartes and history of the discipline of the “Principles of Physical Education.” The conclusion of this paper will lead us to reconsider the mission of the discipline of “Physical Education Philosophy,” according to its fundamental academic character.

In the field of “Principles of Physical Education” in Japan, research has continued since the beginning of the twentieth century from the viewpoint of the *philosophical* method, whereas, in other countries, “Principles of Physical Education” consistently offers some *practical* knowledge, which is not necessarily philosophical. For a long time, most Japanese researchers have thought of the concepts of “principles” and “philosophy” as the same. However, using Descartes’ *Principles of Philosophy*, this paper will show that the concepts of “principles” and “philosophy” are totally different. It will become necessary to articulate a clear difference between these things, and to offer some basic academic character to the discipline of “Physical Education Philosophy,” which changed its name from “Principles of Physical Education” in 2005.

According to Descartes, principles are what we would see as the beginning point of philosophy. Philosophy has its root in principles and principles is a *part of* philosophy, but not the same as philosophy. Philosophy, for Descartes, also has utility for our everyday affairs. He argued that wisdom should be produced from philosophy as practical knowledge. He also presented examples of this in his own writings, such as *Dioptric*, *Meteorology*, and *Geometry*. If we follow Descartes’ view, the discipline of “Physical Education Philosophy” should change its academic character, because so far it has retained the academic character of the previous “Principles of Education.” Researchers of “Physical Education Philosophy” should produce their own output, not only offering some fundamental knowledge for those who engage in physical education and sport, but also offering wisdom as a practical knowledge to practitioners in order to direct their basic thinking.

This will lead to a more enlightened discussion. *Spiritual Exercises*, proposed by Pierre Hadot, presents a type of essence of wisdom as practical knowledge, which will lead us to reconsider the nature of wisdom in the context of physical education and sport.

Key words; Descartes, Wisdom, Principles of philosophy, Principles of physical Education

* Institute of health, physical education and sport science school of physical education Kokushikan University

** Faculty of Physical Education, Kokushikan University

1. Introduction

The purpose of this study is to reveal the conceptual difference between “principles” and “philosophy” in the context of physical education and sport. This paper also suggests a new mission for the discipline of “Physical Education Philosophy,” aided by René Descartes’ indications in his *Principles of Philosophy*.

Since 2005, the name of the discipline “Principles of Physical Education” has been changed to “Physical Education Philosophy.” The background of the change lies in an assumption that researchers in “Principles of Physical Education” have already done *philosophical* research. In fact, researchers into “Principles of Physical Education” have historically sought answers to problems that emerged in the field of physical education and sport from a *philosophical* perspective. So, concerning the historical background of the discipline, it seems natural to change the name of the discipline as above. But some problems still remain. As will be discussed below, the concepts of principles and philosophy are totally different. This must be noted, and their differences must be revealed in detail. Nevertheless, until now, researchers in the discipline of “Principles of Physical Education” have had few discussions about this question. Besides, some researchers have conflated the notions of principles and philosophy, as we will present below. This fact leads us to raise several questions: what is the essential difference between principles and philosophy? If the two concepts are so different, what should the mission of “Physical Education Philosophy” be from now on? Concerning these questions, this paper will reveal the difference between the concepts and the mission of the discipline of “Physical Education Philosophy” and “Principles of Physical Education.” The discussion will continue as follows. First, it will consider how researchers in “Principles of Physical Education” have historically viewed the relationship between the concepts of principles and philosophy. Second, what is the difference between these concepts? The discussion here will depend mainly on Descartes’ *Principles of Philosophy*, because he explicates the difference so rigorously that his remarks suggest the answer to this problem. Third, according to Descartes’ remarks, what is the mission of “Physical Education Philosophy”? The discussion will reflect on these questions in each chapter.

2. What was “principles of physical education” in Japan?

At first, it should be noted that there is a complete difference between the concept of “Principles of Physical Education” in Japan and abroad. In Japan, the discipline of “Principles of Physical Education” takes up a philosophical inquiry in order to resolve various problems relating to physical education, bodily movement, and sport. On the contrary, the latter is “an assembly consisting in knowledge of health, PE, and sport science which is connected and oriented to the practice of Physical Education,”¹⁾ and “it is a kind of a *technical* discipline which serves to apply some *useful* knowledge produced by PE, health, and sport science to a school class of PE.”²⁾ So the discipline of “Principles of Physical Education” does not necessarily have to possess a philosophical method,

much less a philosophical approach, because viewed from its origin, it is the discipline that offers some practical knowledge for those who engage in sport, through adjusting its output in a way that is appropriate for school classes of PE and sport. On seeing the history of “Principles of Physical Education” in Japan, however, there is little connection with the meaning of “Principles of Physical Education” as understood elsewhere in the world. Instead, most of the output in the discipline of “Principles of Physical Education” in Japan has been almost *philosophical* from the outset of the twentieth century onward. In the book “*Principles of Physical Education*,” written by Takashima and published in 1904, the author explicates the necessity of physical education and its relation to economy, education, and our well-being.³⁾ In more detail, the discipline of “Principles of Physical Education” contains *philosophical* discussion dealing with research relating to the concept of physical education and social utility. In Takashima’s discussion, he describes “the purpose of Physical Education” and the “mind-body relationship in Physical Education”.⁴⁾ His work, *the Principles of Physical Education* also discusses topics relating to the history of philosophy, or the philosophy of education. This tendency can also be seen in other writings relating to the discipline of “Principles of Physical Education” in Japan.⁵⁾ So it seems that the discipline of “Principles Physical Education” in Japan, at least before World War II, possessed a philosophical character and adopted a philosophical approach.

This academic character of the discipline of “Principles of Physical Education” in Japan continued after World War II. Essentially, it was regarded as equal to “Physical Education Philosophy.” For example, a Japanese researcher into “Principles of Physical Education” describes its character as follows:

Just as education needs the philosophy of education at its base, it seems to me that physical education needs physical education philosophy at its base. While it is true that “Principles of Physical Education” was supported by facts that have been revealed through academic research on physical education, and that these facts needs to be integrated to the purpose of physical education and criticized for their utility, the discipline of “Principles of Physical Education” also possesses the role of developing physical education philosophy.⁶⁾

On the one hand, Kawamura examines the relationship between natural science and philosophy as a researcher of “Principles of Physical Education.” On the other hand, he also examines the purpose and meaning of physical education and the academic character of the discipline. According to him, the discipline of “Principles of Physical Education” needs to have contact with natural science; he also indicates, as seen above, that “Principles of Physical Education” is equal to “Physical Education Philosophy,” as we cited above. In addition, Maekawa Mineo, also a researcher of “Principles of Physical Education,” states that the discipline of “Principles of Physical Education” should deal with problems such as “the essence of physical education” or the “purpose of physical rducation.”⁷⁾ Concerning this interest and discussion of “philosophical investigation of the human body” and “definitions of physical education,” “Principles of Physical Education” is a discipline with a philosophical approach to problems, so it comes to consist of “Physical Education Philosophy.” In

conclusion, as has been indicated by Japanese researchers, from a historical perspective, “Principles of Physical Education” and “Physical Education Philosophy” had been regarded as the same in character, research objects, and essence. This means that researchers of “Principles of Physical Education” have regarded the concepts of “Principles” and “Philosophy” as the same: the discipline of “Principles of Physical Education” has historically included philosophical discussion within it, so it seems that researchers within this discipline would see the concept of “principles” as including the concept of “philosophy.”

As mentioned above, the discipline of “Principles of Physical Education” has recently been changed into “Physical Education Philosophy.” The arguments of writers such as Kawamura and Maekawa have continued to be approved up until the present day. That means that output produced from the discipline of “Physical Education Philosophy,” which has developed from the discipline of “Principles of Physical Education,” has maintained its character in order to produce some fundamental knowledge similar to “Principles of Physical Education.” We may conclude that the academic character of the two disciplines has remained the same, even though the name of the discipline has changed. In more detail, we can see that the recent topics of the discipline of “Physical Education Philosophy” have been the same as the topics in “Principles of Physical Education,” including “how to build human character through physical education” and “what is the value of sports movement in the context of physical education and sport?”⁸⁾ On the other hand, problems in “mind-body relationships” in the context of physical education and sport activity has been discussed through the method of thought research originally developed by philosophers such as Descartes, Rousseau, and Plato.⁹⁾ It is true that researchers have continued their own research using a *philosophical* approach. On this point, since 2005, researchers of the discipline of “Principles of Physical Education” and “Physical Education Philosophy” have continued to produce the same output. On the one hand, a substantial amount of fundamental basic knowledge that profits those who engage in Physical Education and Sport has been produced by researchers in these disciplines. But the question will also arise: “Are philosophy and principles equal?” Concerning the history of the discipline of “Principles of Physical Education,” as we have seen above, researchers often regards both concepts as the same. It is true that the concepts of principles and philosophy have similarities. A Japanese researcher who majored in philosophy states as follows:

Philosophy was required to have principles at the outset. The search for principles is a philosophical activity. In ancient Greece, philosophy meant principles of politics, principles of sciences and principles of how we live. Through the tradition that “Philosophy is Principle,” politics and philosophy were bound tightly together until the first half of the nineteenth century. In those days, philosophy was also regarded as providing the principles of the sciences.¹⁰⁾

As we have seen above, philosophical investigation includes a search for principles. On the other hand, conducting philosophical investigation reveals the principles of nature, politics, and sciences. It could be concluded from the above that the concepts of principle and philosophy are the same at the

outset and that “*Principles of Physical Education*” and “*Physical Education Philosophy*” are the same. If we conclude this, however, some questions still remain. Have researchers of “Principles of Physical Education” really considered the difference between the concepts of “principles” and “philosophy” ? If the concept of philosophy is the same as the concept of principles, what profit does “Physical Education Philosophy” offer us today? As we will discuss below, according to Descartes, the concepts of principles and philosophy are completely different. Concerning Descartes’ remarks, we will have to reconsider the difference between the concepts of principles and philosophy, because in changing the name of the discipline from “principles” to “philosophy,” it seems that researchers of the new “Physical Education Philosophy” should have had some fundamental discussion about its academic character. So we will have to confront the questions about the differences between “principles” and “philosophy.” In terms of how we can solve this problem, as we have stated, it is appropriate to investigate René Descartes’ *Principles of Philosophy*; especially his *Preface to the French Edition*. This is because Descartes explicates the difference between the two concepts of principles and philosophy in detail, and explains their relationship. Concerning his remaining influence on our present sciences, including our research methods in mathematics and physics, Descartes’ remarks on the difference between the two concepts are worth examining. The next chapter will investigate these remarks and try to presents several helpful answers to the question of the difference between “Principles of Physical Education” and “Physical Education Philosophy.”

3. “Principle” and “philosophy” in Descartes

In his *Preface to the French edition of Principles of Philosophy*, Descartes scrutinized the difference between the concepts of “principle” and “philosophy” in detail. In his opening remarks, he states as follows:

First of all, I would have wished to explain what philosophy is, beginning with the most commonplace points. For example, the word “philosophy” means the study of wisdom, and by “wisdom” is meant not only prudence in our everyday affairs but also a perfect knowledge of all things that mankind is capable of knowing, both the conduct of life and for the preservation of health and the discovery of all manner of skills.¹¹⁾

According to Descartes, philosophy is the study of wisdom. The essence of wisdom includes not only prudence in our everyday affairs, but also all kinds of knowledge for conducting our lives. Concerning its finer details, philosophy leads to knowledge for conserving our health and for inventing various kinds of arts: the essence of wisdom.¹²⁾ From another point of view, wisdom can be defined as the fundamental knowledge on which we should depend in conducting our everyday lives. In terms of obtaining this kind of wisdom, Descartes said that knowledge as wisdom “must be deduced from first causes’ so, strictly speaking, he sees wisdom as being produced through the activity of philosophizing¹³⁾. Descartes’ remarks indicate that wisdom, in his view, contains a strong

practical character. As Descartes shows, the application of wisdom extends toward our everyday lives, preserving our health and directing our behavior. This means that philosophy always seeks to obtain wisdom that is useful for our everyday lives. According to Descartes, the search for wisdom is worthy of the name of philosophy. In other words, philosophy itself is the process of searching for wisdom, because philosophy accompanies rational reasoning, as Descartes shows in his *Principles of Philosophy*. In conclusion, philosophy can be defined as a process of searching for wisdom that is based on principles, which we will discuss below.

We can also see Descartes' views on the essence of principles in his *Preface to the French edition*. According to Descartes, practicing philosophy must begin with "the search for first causes or principles."¹⁴ Descartes indicates that these principles can be identified if two conditions are present.

First, "they [principles] must be so clear and so evident that human mind cannot doubt their truth when it attentively concentrates on them."¹⁵ Second, also according to Descartes, all other things are derived from these first principles. He stated that "the knowledge of other things must depend on them, in the sense that the principles must be capable of being known without knowledge of these other matters, but not *vice versa*."¹⁶ Therefore, it can be concluded that principles are situated at the beginning of the process of doing philosophy. According to Descartes, positioning principles in this way, "in deducing from these principles the knowledge of things which depend on them, we must try to ensure that everything in the entire chain of deductions which we draw is very manifest."¹⁷ Here Descartes has revealed the difference between principles and philosophy. But how we can find these principles, and what is utility for us of philosophy that is derived from principles? It is true that the difference between the concepts of principles and philosophy has now been shown, but we still have not shown the particular meaning (or significance) of principles for Descartes, what profit his principles have for him, and how we can apply his remarks to our issue of the difference between the concepts of "*Principles of Physical Education*" and "*Physical Education Philosophy*" ? In the following sections, we will discuss this problem in more detail.

4. Utility of principle and philosophy

In the first section of *Principles of Philosophy*, Descartes begins as follows:

Since we began life as infants, and made various judgements concerning the things that can be perceived by the senses before we had the full use of our reason, there are many preconceived opinions that keep us from knowledge of the truth. It seems that only way of freeing ourselves from these opinions is to make the effort, once in the course of life, to doubt everything which we find to contain even in the smallest suspicion of uncertainty.¹⁸

This text explains how we can and why we should establish principles. As Descartes stated above, we have made various judgments *before we had the full use of our reason*. From another angle, we should use our reason to its full extent when we can. Why should we do this? Remembering

Descartes' remarks in the *Preface to the French edition* that “the study of philosophy is more necessary for the regulation of our morals and our conduct in this life,”¹⁹⁾ using our reason fully will lead us to live based on philosophy, thus regulating our morals and improving our lives. According to Descartes, to use our reason fully, we need to establish principles, because philosophy starts from Principles, as we have seen the last chapter. So, at the end of the first part of his *Principles of Philosophy*, Descartes summarizes the principles that should be observed under the title of: “*Summary of the rules to be observed in order to philosophize correctly.*”

In order to philosophize seriously and search out the truth about all the things that are capable of being known, we must first of all lay aside all our preconceived opinions, or at least we must take the greatest care not to put our trust in any of the opinions accepted by us in the past until we have scrutinized them afresh and confirmed their truth. Next, we must give our attention in an orderly way to the notions that we have within us, and we must judge to be true all and only those whose truth we clearly and distinctly recognize when we attend to them in this way.²⁰⁾

In addition to the paragraph above, Descartes adds various principles, including: “we exist in so far as our nature consists in thinking,” “we shall simultaneously realize both that there is a God, and that we depend on him, and also that a consideration of his attributes enables us to investigate the truth of other things, since he is their cause,” and “we will see that besides the notions of God and of our mind, we have within us knowledge of many propositions which are eternally true, such as ‘Nothing comes from nothing.’”²¹⁾ According to Descartes, “these few instructions seem to me to contain the most important principles of human knowledge.”²²⁾ From his indication, principles need to be established in order to philosophize correctly, and if principles are correctly established, then philosophizing will also be undertaken in the correct way. Given that principles are correct, philosophy sets out from a clear and evident foundation. For Descartes, to philosophize in a correct and orderly way that the principles are correct and beyond doubt.

From the above, principles are necessary in order to philosophize in a correct and orderly way. So what is the utility of philosophy that is derived and deduced from principles? Descartes details this question in his *preface to the French edition*. He explicates the reasons for this as follows:

I will here point out the fruits which I am sure can be derived from my principles. The first is the satisfaction which will be felt in using them to discover many truths which have been unknown up till now... The second benefit is that the study of these principles will accustom people little by little to form better judgements about all the things they come across, and hence will make them wiser... The third benefit is that the truths contained in these principles, because they are very clear and very certain, will eliminate all ground for dispute, and so will dispose people's minds to gentleness and harmony... The last and greatest fruit of these principles is that they will enable those who develop them to discover many truths which I have not explained at all. Thus, moving little by little from one truth to the next, they may in time acquire a perfect

knowledge of all philosophy, and reach the highest level of wisdom. One sees in all the arts that although they are at first rough and imperfect, nevertheless, because they contain some element of truth, the effect of which is revealed by experience, they are gradually perfected by practice. So it is in philosophy...²³⁾

According to Descartes, all of the benefits that are derived from principles and philosophy contribute to our everyday lives. As he pointed out, philosophy seeks truth and gives us satisfaction when we live our everyday lives in agreement with it. He also stated that learning principles makes people accustomed to making wiser judgments. Furthermore, he stated that philosophy derived from principles make us mild and gentle and allows us to obtain wisdom. This benefits us in that philosophy suggests ways that we can live more comfortably and wisely. The philosophy that Descartes derived from principles was intended to produce *practical* wisdom for our everyday lives and he also presented its output in his writings. He initially indicated the utility of *Optics* followed by *Discourse on Method*, stating that his purpose in writing was “to show that one could make sufficient progress in philosophy to enable one to achieve knowledge of the arts which are beneficial for life.”²⁴⁾ It is evident that this philosophy was intended to contribute to our everyday lives based on his “earnest desire I have always had to render service to the public.”²⁵⁾ In addition to presenting his intent to write his *Meteorology* is to show that his philosophy is different from that of the past,²⁶⁾ and he stated that writing his *Geometry* is “to promote the belief that many more things may yet be discovered, in order to stimulate everyone to undertake the search for truth.”²⁷⁾ As we have seen, Descartes thought of his own philosophy as concrete and profitable for our everyday affairs.²⁸⁾ However, it needs to be rooted in principles²⁹⁾. This means that the concepts of philosophy and principles are different: philosophy must contribute to coping with our everyday affairs, and must be based upon principles. In terms of philosophy being profitable and promoting our cultural lives, Descartes summarized the utility of philosophy in the first half of his *Preface to the French edition* as follows:

I would have looked at the benefits of this philosophy and shown that it encompasses everything which the human mind is capable of knowing. Thus we should consider that it is this philosophy alone which distinguishes us from the most savage and barbarous peoples, and that a nation's civilization and refinement depends on the superiority of the philosophy which is practiced there. Here the greatest good that a state can enjoy is to possess true philosophers³⁰⁾.

Those who are engaging in philosophy will live more wisely because their own philosophy helps them to live, according to Descartes, in a very different way from that of the savage and barbarous people. From another point of view, wisdom, which was obtained from philosophy, enables us to deal with problems that we have to confront in our lives. In Descartes' *Passions of the Soul*, he indicates the utility of wisdom derived from his philosophy:

The chief use of wisdom lies in its teaching us to be masters of our passions and to control them with such skill that the evils which they cause are quite bearable, and even become a source of joy.³¹⁾

In his *Passions of the Soul*, Descartes explicates various passions that affect our thought and our lives, and tells us how to manage our inner passions through the use of our reason. Wisdom based upon this philosophy will help us to manage our everyday affairs. In this sense, Descartes confirms that his philosophy, rooted on his principles, will contribute to our lives.

As we have discussed above, the concepts and role of philosophy and principles are completely different, at least in Descartes' thought. The difference between these concepts can also provide some suggestions for our present problem: that is, the conceptual difference between “*Principles of Physical Education*” and “*Physical Education Philosophy*.” As we have pointed out through the case of Descartes, the *concept of principles is the starting point of philosophy and not the same as philosophy itself*. So it is clear that principles form part of philosophy, but they are not equal to philosophy. Based on the philosophy of Descartes, philosophy seeks wisdom and, we can see, intends *activity*. Again, Descartes states that philosophy is “more necessary for the regulation of our morals and our conduct in this life than is the use of our eyes to guide our steps.”³²⁾ Therefore, “*Physical Education Philosophy*” should transform its academic character as a discipline, moving beyond what was offered by the previous “*Principles of Physical Education*,” because as we can see in Descartes' revelation of the difference between the two concepts, “*Physical Education Philosophy*” should contribute to orienting the lives and thoughts of those who are engaged in physical education. From another point of view, “*Physical Education Philosophy*,” as derived from output previously by used “*Principles of Physical Education*” has to produce *practical* wisdom for those who are committed to physical education. In conclusion, philosophy based upon principles is a fundamental condition for practicing “*Physical Education Philosophy*.”

5. Conclusion

We can see some of the results of this thesis as follows. First, the discipline of “*Principles of Physical Education*” provided a fundamental basis for those who engage in physical education and sport when they are thinking about or reconsidering problems in physical education or sport.

Second, the concepts of “principle” and “philosophy” are not equal from the viewpoint of their origin. According to Descartes' *Principles of Philosophy*, philosophy means the study of wisdom that seeks for *practical* knowledge destined to profit our everyday lives. On the contrary, “principles” were a set of underlying ideas at the beginning of philosophy. That is, principles could be described as the beginning of philosophy. With this in mind, the discipline of “*Physical Education Philosophy*,” which has changed its name from “*Principles of Physical Education*” needs to transform its fundamental academic character. Of course, “*Physical Education Philosophy*” should not abandon its academic legacy. Rather, the discipline of “*Physical Education Philosophy*” should produce output

with reference to “Principles of Physical Education,” practical knowledge for those who engage in physical education and sport to direct their judgement and, even more, guidelines for a way of life. From the viewpoint of Descartes, philosophy is always directed to profit our everyday life and philosophy is based on principles. “Physical Education Philosophy” should follow these ideas, as Descartes has indicated some fundamental differences between the concepts of principles and philosophy, and his remarks suggest to us the differences between these two concepts.

Our next discussion will focus on the problem of “what is practical knowledge, or wisdom?”, because its substance or essence concerned the output of “Physical Education Philosophy.” The clue to addressing this issue is the thought of Pierre Hadot. His work “*Les Exercices Spirituels (Spiritual Exercise)*” presents a type of substance or essence of practical knowledge on philosophy. Hadot indicates that Descartes is one of the main figures within “*Les Exercices Spirituels*.”³³⁾ So our next task will be to research Hadot’s “*Les Exercices Spirituels*” in greater detail.

Notes

- 1) Sato Tomihiko. “Taiiku Tetsugaku no Kadai (Perspectives for Philosophy of Physical Education).” *Journal of Philosophy and Physical Education and Sport*, 28 (1), p.1, 2006. Translation is mine.
- 2) Ibid., p.1.
- 3) cf. Takashima Heizaburo. “*Taiiku Genri (Principles of Physical Education)*”, 1982, pp.1-2.
- 4) Ibid., pp.1-2.
- 5) The tendency of the discipline of “Principles of Physical Education” in Japan to deal with problems on Physical Education *philosophically* also had been confirmed in other books. Cf. Iizuka Shozan, et al. “*Taiiku-Genri (Principles of Physical Education)*” *Nihon-Taiikukai*, 1930.
- 6) Kawamura Hideo. “*Taiiku-Genri (Principles of Physical Education)*” (3rd. edition), p.7, Taiiku no Kagakusha publishing, 1964. Translation is mine.
- 7) c.f., Maekawa Mineo. “*Taiiku-Genri (Principles of Physical Education)*” pp.4-7, 15-23, 66-72, Taishukan Publishing, 1972. Translation is mine.
- 8) c.f., Kubo Masaaki, “The critical essay upon the issue of ‘character formation (Menchenformung) in physical education’: The physically significant experience.” *Journal of Physical Education Philosophy*, Vol. 20, pp.1-9, 2008. Kubo Masaaki, “The value of the experience of sports movements as “semantic generation.” *Japan J. Phys. Educ. Hlth. Sport Sci.* 54 (1), pp. 183-196, 2009.
- 9) c.f., Hayashi Yosuke, “*Fundamental Study of René Descartes’ mind-body theory in the context of physical education: Reconsideration of traditional criticisms.*” *Japan J. Phys. Educ. Hlth. Sport Sci.* 56 (2), pp. 271-286, 2011. Sasaki Kyu, “‘*Physique*’ and education with reference to Rousseau’s *Émile*.” *Japan J. Phys. Educ. Hlth. Sport Sci.* 57 (2), pp. 399-414, 2012. Kiniwa Kohki, “*The fundamental characters of soma in Plato’s philosophy.*” *Japan J. Phys. Educ. Hlth. Sport Sci.* 48 (5), pp. 555-572, 2003.
- 10) Sakamoto Kenzo. “Significance of doing philosophy in contemporary Japan” in *New Lectures on Philosophy*, Ohmori Shozo, et al. (eds.), Iwanami Shoten Publishing, 1986, p. 303. Translation is mine.
- 11) IX-B, 2. CSM-1, 179. On citing on Descartes’ remarks, I will refer to the following textbooks: René Descartes “*Œuvres de Descartes*”, Adam, Charles et Tannery, Paul (eds.) Vrin, 1996 (AT) and René Descartes “*The Philosophical Writings of Descartes Volume I.*” Cambridge University Press, 2007 (CSM-1). I will cite the number of volumes and pages on each of AT (first), CSM-1 (next),
- 12) Descartes’ remarks are confirmed in his other writings. For example, in *Discourse on Method*, when he refers that we can possibly be ‘the lords and masters of nature’, he stated as follows: “This is desirable not only for the invention of innumerable devices which would facilitate our enjoyment of the fruits of the earth and all the goods we find there, and most importantly, for the maintenance of health, which is undoubtedly the chief good and the foundation of all other goods in this life.” (VI, 62. CSM-1, 143.)
- 13) IX-B, 2. CSM-1, 179.

- 14) Ibid. IX-B, 2. CSM-1, 179.
- 15) Ibid. IX-B, 2. CSM-1, 179.
- 16) IX-B, 2. CSM-1, 179-180.
- 17) IX-B, 2. CSM-1, 180.
- 18) VIII-A, 5. CSM-1, 193.
- 19) IX-B, 3. CSM-1, 180.
- 20) VIII-A, 38. CSM-1, 221.
- 21) Ibid. VIII-A, 38. CSM-1, 221. He describes his principles relating to corporeal things as follows: “We have knowledge both of a corporeal or extended nature which is divisible, movable, and so on, and also of certain sensations which affect us, such as the sensations of pain, colours, tastes and so on.”
- 22) VIII-A, 39. CSM-1, 221.
- 23) IX-B, 17-18. CSM-1, 188-189.
- 24) IX-B, 15. CSM-1, 187.
- 25) IX-B, 15. CSM-1, 186.
- 26) IX-B, 15. CSM-1, 187.
- 27) Ibid. IX-B, 15. CSM-1, 187.
- 28) IX-B, 2. CSM-1, 179.
- 29) IX-B, 10f. CSM-1, 184f.
- 30) IX-B, 3. CSM-1, 180.
- 31) XI, 488. CSM-1, 404.
- 32) VIII-B, 3. CSM-1, 180.
- 33) Pierre Hadot, “*Exercices Spirituels et la Philosophie antique*,” Albin Michel, 2002, pp. 299, 301.

References

- 1) Descartes, René. “*Œuvres de Descartes*”, Adam Carl, Tannery Paul (eds.), Vrin, 1996.
- 2) Descartes, René. “*The Philosophical Writings of Descartes Vol. I*”, Cottingham John, Stoothoff Rudolph, Murdoch, Dugald. (eds.), Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- 3) Hadot, Pierre. “*Exercices Spirituels et la Philosophie antique*,” Albin Michel, 2002.
- 4) Hayashi Yosuke, “*Fundamental Study of René Descartes’ mind-body theory in the context of physical education: Reconsideration of traditional criticisms.*” Japan J. Phys. Educ. Hlth. Sport Sci. 56 (2), 271-286, 2011.
- 5) Iizuka Shozan, et al. “*Taiiku-Genri (Principles of Physical Education)*,” Nihon-Taiikukai, 1930.
- 6) Kawamura Hideo, “*Taiiku-Genri (Principles of Physical Education)* (3rd. edition),” 7, Taiiku no Kagakusha publishing, 1964.
- 7) Kiniwa Kohki, “*The fundamental characters of soma in Plato’s philosophy.*” Japan J. Phys. Educ. Hlth. Sport Sci. 48 (5), 555-572, 2003.
- 8) Kubo Masaaki, “The critical essay upon the issue of ‘character formation (Menchenformung) in physical education ‘6: The physically significant experience.” *Journal of Physical Education Philosophy*, 20, 1-9, 2008.
- 9) Kubo Masaaki, “The value of the experience of sports movements as “semantic generation.” Japan J. Phys. Educ. Hlth. Sport Sci. 54 (1), 183-196, 2009.
- 10) Maekawa Mineo, “*Taiiku-Genri (Principles of Physical Education)*,” Taishukan Publishing, 1972.
- 11) Sakamoto Kenzo. “Significance of doing philosophy in contemporary Japan.” in *New Lectures on Philosophy*, Vol.1. Ohmori Shozo, et al (eds.), 303, Iwanami Shoten Publishing, 1986.
- 12) Sasaki Kyu, “‘*Physique*’ and education with reference to Rousseau’s *Émile*.” Japan J. Phys. Educ. Hlth. Sport Sci. 57 (2), 399-414, 2012.
- 13) Sato Tomihiko. “*Taiiku Tetsugaku no Kadai (Perspectives for Philosophy of Physical Education)*,” *Journal of Philosophy of Physical Education and Sport*, 28 (1), 1-10, 2006.
- 14) Takashima Heizaburo. “*Taiiku Genri (Principles of Physical Education)*,” Ohba Kazuyoshi (ed.), Kindai Taiiku Bunken Shusei (Assembly of bibliographies on modern Physical Education) Vol.4, 1-2, Nihon Toshō Center, 1982.