

The two statements which follow were received after the publication of the May, 1953, issue of the PHYSICAL EDUCATOR, and refer to the article by Dr. C. H. McCloy of the State University of Iowa, entitled "A Planned Physical Exercise Program, or 'What would you like to do today?'" In order to appreciate and evaluate the comments, it is suggested that each reader review the original article. Similarly well-written statements on any point of controversy are welcomed by the editor and the Editorial Board.

A Reply to Dr. McCloy

Jesse Feiring Williams

ALTHOUGH HE does not weigh the alternatives suggested by the title and never once mentions in his discussion the absurdities encountered in a "choice" program, Dr. McCloy's article should be answered because of the errors it contains. I have no desire to criticize the "guilt by association" notion through which he links his adverse criticism of certain physical education concepts with the "choice" philosophy although any careful reader might conclude that he sought to do so.

The particular point I wish to clarify is McCloy's discussion of the terms, "education of the physical" and "education through the physical." Since I was the first person, so far as I know, to make this precise distinction, I am interested in McCloy's failure to understand what it means. I think he might be able to comprehend the argument if he would bother to read the literature. I am surprised that McCloy, competent in statistical research, should condemn the phrase without a careful study of the original sources. He writes:

"Many present day physical educators, apparently believe that if we 'educate' our pupils 'through the physical', an all wise Providence will take care of the more purely physical aspects of our developmental process."

This is the kind of unjustified criticism that lacks data. This is the technique of "guilt by association" employed in the title. He avoids certainty by using the word "apparently" but the satirical reference to Providence is clear and the thoughtless reader is prejudiced by the slander. "How foolish," he may ask "can these education through the physical persons be?" If McCloy can produce one statement from a responsible physical educator who believes that the physical development of our people is the responsibility of Providence he would have a start in the course that he is trying to run.

After citing some French and Swedish authorities, he sets out on a course that takes him from the cradle to the grave. But it was not necessary to go to Europe because writers in this country advised long ago about the importance of pre-

school physical education and the keep fit idea for the whole of life. Still evading the implications of the "choice" program, he makes the old argument that facilities should determine, not what one must do at the moment but what kind of program physical education one should try to develop. Think a moment where that leads.

If physical education had retained, over the last 65 years, the planned exercise program that evolved from the Physical Training Conference at Boston in 1889, what facilities for sports, what playgrounds, what pools, what dance studios would we now have? *Facilities for all sorts of things arise in response to expressed needs.* Formerly schools were erected on small plots in congested areas. Today standards for school grounds run from 5 to 30 acres. Did these larger school grounds with games and sport facilities develop from "a planned exercise program" that could be taught in the classroom, basement, or hall? Or did they come in response to another idea?

Before closing his article McCloy offers a gratuitous insult to his professional colleagues by stating his "belief" that feelings of inferiority have led them to seek a kind of "respectability" by engaging in the purpose to educate the whole child. James Barrie in a talk to students at St. Andrews University said to them, "Never ascribe to an opponent motives meaner than your own."

Finally, I do not propose to expound here all the physiological, psychological, and philosophical facts and judgments that have led to the concept that the individual is a whole and cannot, even if we wished to do so, be separated into parts. The physical is a part of every experience even as the mental, emotional, and social are also. Is there anywhere in the literature a statement which says or even implies that "education through the physical" should neglect the physical, should be unplanned, or should be based on the "What Would You Like To Do Today" notion? And on the contrary, is it not true that every responsible discussion of this concept has stressed the importance of the physical?