

**AMERICAN SPORT AND PHYSICAL
EDUCATION HISTORY (to 1975):
AN ANTHOLOGY**

**(Edited, with essays by)
EARLE F. ZEIGLER
Ph.D., LL.D., D.Sc., FAAKPE
The University of Western Ontario, Emeritus
(formerly of the University of Illinois, U-C,
and The University of Michigan)**

**ISBN 0-87563-087-1
Original Copyright 1975**

**Reissued by
TRAFFORD PUBLISHING
2009**

CHAPTER 24

THE IDEAS AND INFLUENCE OF McCLOY, NASH, AND WILLIAMS

Ellen W. Gerber
University of Massachusetts, Amherst

Editor's Note: The second essay in this final group was prepared through the courtesy of Professor Gerber. Dr. Gerber explains the particular interpretations given to physical education's role in education by three great leaders of the twentieth century: Charles H. McCloy, Jay B. Nash, and Jesse F. Williams. There seems to be little doubt, even though true perspective is difficult at this point, but that the greatness of their contributions will stand up over the years.

In order to provide a proper setting for me to discuss the ideas and influence of Charles Harold McCloy, Jay Bryan Nash, and Jesse Feiring Williams, it seems appropriate to explain the philosophical framework from which my research was conceived and executed and the specific impetus to be involved in this particular study. Individualism, and the attendant historical view exemplified by Carlyle's dictum that "the history of the world is the biography of great men," went out of favor soon after the start of the twentieth century. Historians of this century have primarily espoused the social theory of history, accepting the view that great social forces have structured the events of man. Their view of man as a somewhat helpless figure, haplessly moved by the surrounding currents, is, I think, beginning to change. Man is flexing his muscles and finding ways to choose his own directions despite the social tides. As someone whose philosophical position is grounded in existentialism, I, of course, am imbued with a deep-seated belief in the power of the individual to frame his own directions on the basis of intellectual commitments. I accept the fact that major social forces such as the industrial revolution, the depression, and most recently the Vietnam War, have been almost overpowering factors in directing the course of human events. However, I also accept as an equally powerful force the influence of such major thinkers as John Maynard Keynes, John Dewey, and even John F. Kennedy. (Perhaps there is some transcendental magic in the name John!) Thus I cling to the perhaps "refashionable" theory that the study of the intellectual ideas, as promulgated by various influential figures, is a valid—and necessary—approach to the study of historical events.

It is an interesting feature of this particular study that in the biographical data of the men whose ideas were examined, evidence was provided to support my approach to history. By coincidence, all three men were born in the exact same year, 1886, in the same state, Ohio. Each

received his baccalaureate degree from an Ohio institution, Nash and Williams from Oberlin and McCloy from Marietta College. All attended Columbia University, though only Williams and McCloy earned their terminal degrees there; Nash attended New York University, in the same city, for his degree. Although Williams earned an M.D., both McCloy and Nash were among the early physical educators to earn the Ph.D.

Their life parallels do not end there. As teachers, each served a single institution for more than twenty years, two of which were located in New York City. Within these universities each held primary responsibility for framing and developing that institution's first doctoral program in physical education. Each was an influential teacher and doctoral advisor, responsible for the work of numerous students who helped to extend his professional influence.

All three were prolific writers. McCloy's published works included twenty books, fourteen of which were in Chinese. He wrote twenty-seven articles for the *Research Quarterly*, twenty-four for the *Journal of Health and Physical Education*, as well as articles for other periodicals. Nash wrote nine books, edited a five-volume series, wrote seventeen articles for *JOHPER* and some for other publications. Williams' output can only be characterized as enormous. Between 1916 and 1964 forty-one different titles were published under his name, eight alone and thirty-three in co-authorship. Seven books were eventually published in multiple editions. He contributed eleven articles to the *Journal*, and two for the *Quarterly*, and wrote even more voluminously for other publications such as the *Teachers College Record* and *School and Society*.

Furthermore, they were all dedicated to the idea of professional service in various organizations. Each held the highest elective office, the presidency, of the American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, as well as in the relevant district association. Each was, in turn, awarded every major honor established by the profession.

And lastly, as I shall show in more detail later in this paper. Nash, McCloy, and Williams were in general agreement about the nature of man, holding fundamental assumptions congruent to the ideas of contemporary thinkers.

Given the fact that they functioned in the same point in time and their life circumstances were so remarkably similar, one might, if one were committed only to a social explanation of history, expect to find a uniformity of viewpoint about professional matters. But, in fact, this was not the case. These men were three individuals who operated within the same professional framework, shared similar *modus operandi*, experienced the same social forces, but responded differently to them. Each framed, as I intend to illustrate, a professional philosophy which was permeated by a

strong central theme. (Note: I have taken McCloy's viewpoints to be those expressed from approximately the late thirties. Prior to that time his writings did not exhibit a clarified or specific approach and some of his earlier statements were later contradicted.) They made different interpretations of their common beliefs, held a different hierarchy of values, placed emphases on different ideas, developed different concepts of programs, and, in sum, constructed different philosophies of physical education. Curiously enough, American physical educators did not choose among their contending viewpoints. As I intend to demonstrate in the final section of this paper, all three radically different viewpoints were accepted without any attempt to reconcile the contradictions.

My interest in these three men stemmed originally from an absorption with physical education in the period between 1930 and 1960. Atara Sherman, a doctoral candidate at the University of Southern California, had done a dissertation entitled "Theoretical Foundations of Physical Education in the United States: 1886-1930." In her study she examined the writings of professional leaders in an attempt to trace the significant concepts held by physical educators up to 1930, a time she characterized as the beginning of a new era in physical education. Other historians of the profession, including Mabel Lee and Bruce Bennett concurred with that judgment. The date 1960 also had significance in that it marked the seventy-fifth anniversary of the American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, an occasion used by the profession to make a general survey and summary of its accomplishments and directions. Furthermore, 1960 will, I believe, ultimately emerge as the end of an era in American thinking. The long period of intellectual stability and unity which this country had known since the depression, came, I think, to an end about this time, symbolically marked by the election of John F. Kennedy and his claim that "the torch has been passed to a new generation."

A cursory examination of the physical education literature of this period revealed three main themes. These were clearly paralleled by the writings of McCloy, Nash, and Williams which, by dint of sheer quantity, dominated the literature. Furthermore, it was apparent that the profession itself had recognized the particular influence of these three men. They had been elected to office, given the highest awards, and were singled out in the few brief historical analyses of the period in which they worked.

Therefore, it seemed appropriate for me to study physical education for the period 1930-1960, to approach it via a study of the intellectual commitments held by physical educators, and to select for analysis the ideas of Charles Harold McCloy, Jay Bryan Nash, and Jesse Feiring Williams on the assumption that they were the most influential leaders of the period.

Part I

A philosophy of physical education, i. e., a systematic, coherent set of

consciously held theories about physical education, is contingent upon relevant and underlying conceptions about the nature and needs of man. McCloy, Williams, and Nash, in tune with their times, frequently cited the works of G. Stanley Hall, John Mason Tyler, and Edward L. Thorndike to amplify and support their beliefs about the physiology and psychology of man. Superficially their ideas were similar, but an analysis of the manner in which they interpreted their theories, as evidenced by applications to physical education, shows clear divergence.

The Organic Unity of Man

Each man firmly believed in the organic unity of man; Cartesian dualism was emphatically rejected. Nevertheless, McCloy stated that “our organism is more body than mind, “ (McCloy, 1936, p. 302, italics deleted) and, therefore, urged physical education to “re-think the whole problem of our more purely physical objectives, and... emphasize them more. “ (McCloy, 1936, p. 303) Williams viewed “man as a unity of mind and body, with spirit or soul as an essential element of the whole” (Williams, 1922, p. 16), but, in direct contrast to McCloy, warned physical education that “too great a reliance on physiologic principles with resulting neglect of the social, moral, and spiritual elements in life produces the 'crude, vulgar, self-seeking individual' so obnoxious in human relationships and so dangerous to the state and nation. “ (Williams, 1922, p. 16) Nash was the only one of the three to refuse to fragmentize the whole man by placing a higher value on one particular aspect. In fact, his attempt to avoid the trap of speaking dualistically, while proclaiming unity, led him to develop special terminology. Noting that “the very words 'physical' and 'mental' confuse thinking, “ he stated that “therefore... the word 'organic' will be used in place of the word 'physical' and the words 'interpretive development' or 'thinking' will be used instead of 'mental. ' “ (Nash, 1948, pp. 94-95)

The Instinctive Drives of Man

Darwin's theory of evolution was published in 1859. Seventy years later, in the 1930s, the so-called instinctive drives of man were a subject of study and speculation. “Ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny,” a doctrine specified by Haeckel as early as 1868, and later popularized by G. Stanley Hall, was earnestly subscribed to by physical educators among others.

McCloy, Nash, and Williams all believed that the ancient need to hunt and engage in physical combat had instilled behavioral drives still present in contemporary man. But each used this so-called “fact” in a different way to support his theory about the role of physical activity.

McCloy reasoned that since physical activity was so primary in the human being, physical education should focus upon the physical as its first and fundamental concern. Thus he stated:

But there is another type of expression that is found in physical competition; the desire for mastery, for self-assertion, the desire to cooperate loyally with others of one's own group, to express one's ego in leading others, in adventuring, in sheer physical striving, in feeling physically adequate, and in the joy-out perfection of movement. One sees this in the carefree dancing of the self-forgetful girl, in the joy of achievement of making a perfect smash in tennis, the making of a tackle in football, or the execution of a graceful dive... .These physical cravings are deeply rooted in human nature and are more closely connected with those age-old urges which made for survival than are those of the more cultivated aesthetics. (McCloy, 1933, pp. 5-6)

Furthermore he saw hunting and fighting activities as a form of competition and, therefore, believed that competition *per se* was a *natural* human activity. This broad view of the ancient activities enabled him to state that sports were a natural outgrowth of man's biological inheritance—they were satisfying in themselves because they related to the inherited emotional drivers of the individual. In a rather poetic passage he established the cultural basis of sport competition and connected it to genetic inheritance:

In spite of the tendency of the modern cultural dilettante to belittle the physical side of life and to talk vaguely of the values of packing his intellectual attic foil of “cultural” second and—artistic and otherwise, only a hundredth of which he will ever use except as something to brag about—we are primarily the descendants of a race of higher apes and prehistoric men whose functions were 90 per cent physical. Even our instincts, our fundamental interests, and our passions originate from these pre-human strata... .Hence it seems to me that the first fundamental of physical education is that we should not get too far away from *the* physical itself. (McCloy, 1940, p. 96)

Williams, in recognizing these same sorts of drives, thought the activities they engendered inappropriate to modern man. Unlike McCloy, who thought that because of inherited tendencies modern man could find competitive physical activities satisfying, Williams urged that society's duty was to provide equivalent forms of activity which could better serve its own purpose. Thus Williams said that “necessity of providing an equivalent has been recognized... and physical education exists as a great constructive social force to guarantee to youth the fulfillment of these early adaptations.” (Williams, 1942, p. 211) The expressions of underlying predispositions may, “under proper guidance...be made to serve high causes and noble ends.” (Williams, 1927, p. 77)

Nash was closer to McCloy in accepting the urge to activity as a meaningful part of man's inheritance. "With this biological heredity as a base," he said, "we can mold these age-old activities into a social inheritance which can be passed on from generation to generation. As a means in this transportation *'the game's the thing.'*" (Nash, 1928, p. 48) He also used this construct to help build the theory of "felt needs" (which will be discussed later in this paper), noting that:

The basic drives of survival and belonging are so much a part of the subject matter of physical education that the natural motivation to participate in these activities is high... The right activity for the right age groups is enough incentive to participate. (Nash, 1951, p. 205)

Ideal of the Healthy Man

Consistent with their separate interpretations of a unified man impelled by certain primordial drives, they each delineated an ideal of the healthy man. As can be expected, McCloy's use of the term health was primarily in physical terms. He recalled that "from the earliest days of the profession, the physical educator has been interested in the health of the individual under his care," (McCloy, 1934, p. 51) and in urging his contemporaries to do likewise, detailed methods for appraising the physical health of the child.

Nash's view of the healthy man was consistent with his concept of the integrated man. He sought "a well adjusted, wholesome, self-directed individual meeting his responsibilities in the society in which he lives." (Nash, 1948, p. 225) Because of his broader view of health, he believed that:

Physical education has no monopoly on contributions to the health of the human organism.. .The very name, Department of Health and Physical Education carries some unfortunate connotations. One of them is that health and physical education are synonymous or, even worse, that physical education departments should take over the responsibility for the health of the school-age child. (Nash, 1948, p. 225)

Through a medical doctor and the author of numerous health books, Williams' view was closer to Nash's, with greater and more primary emphasis on the use to which good health was put, rather than on its achievement. In fact, he defined health as "that quality of life that enables the individual to live most and to serve best." (Williams, 1951, p. 6) He thought that "the emphasis upon health in education carries with it a fine idealism, a disciplining of self, a training of one's powers, a regimen of preparation for worthwhile causes." (Williams, 1933, p. 5)

Definition of Physical Education

In light of Williams', McCloy's and Nash's interpretations of the nature of man, it is interesting to observe how their definitions of physical education reflect their differing emphases. McCloy harks back to the inherited tendencies, which, you will remember, he characterized as deriving from functions which were 90 per cent physical. To him "physical education is an educational activity characterized by the doing of things of interest to individuals, most of which are based upon the individual's original tendencies and inherited types of emotions." (McCloy, 1940, p. 120) Nash, unable to separate physical and mental man, could not fragment man's daily life either. He asked:

How can a line be drawn between class time and the time spent in activity at noon, after school, or even during the long summer vacation? These are all times for physical education Physical education, as defined by time, is all the experiences children have in neuromuscular activities which are directed to the desired outcome. (Nash, 1951, p. 223)

Williams, in his definition, as usual placed primary emphasis on the educational outcomes of the activity, rather than the activity itself. To him

...physical education is the sum of man's physical activities selected as to kind, and conducted as to outcomes. Since physical education is to be considered as a means of education through physical activities rather than an education of the physical—how absurd the latter—the phrases selected as to kind and conducted as to outcomes assume considerable importance. (Williams, 1951, p. 10)

Objectives of Physical Education

In accordance with a definite and deliberate commitment to physical education as an educational endeavor with aims congruent to those of general education, each agreed in general terms that the broad, overall objectives of physical education related to organic power, mastery of skills, recreation or leisure-time participation, personality development, and democratic concepts. However, there were decided differences in the significance which they placed on each of these objectives. Each established a definite hierarchy of values which reflected his interpretation of the nature of man and the emphasis in his definition of physical education. The varying degrees of concern held for each objective can easily be demonstrated.

At the top of McCloy's hierarchy were the objectives relating to organic power. He pointed out that "we (man) can do something for our organs... that the clothier cannot do. We can improve them to a certain degree after having received them from our parental germ plasm." (McCloy, 1937, p. 459)

Therefore, he believed that the fundamental purpose of physical education was to assist the individual to develop his body, a position he stated in clear, certain terms:

We need better-developed muscular systems that the current literature in our profession is demanding... .Therefore, I should like to propose that as a profession we re-think the whole problem of our more purely physical objectives, and that we emphasize them more. I yield to no one in our profession in my belief in the educational importance of physical education when adequately organized and taught...But the basis of all physical education—developmental, educational, corrective, or any other aspect of our field—is the adequate training and development of the body itself. (McCloy, 1936, p. 303)

Furthermore, he regarded the development of the physical self to be an end in itself, a worthy objective for an individual or a profession because of its very naturalness to mankind. He said:

Most men want to be well developed. Down in their hearts they would like to be strong and healthy. Those who do not react to such a developmental program either have it badly presented to them or feel that they would not succeed. (McCloy, 1934, p. 53)

McCloy thought that strenuous muscular exercise had energy-recharging effects which helped to alleviate the stresses of modern life, that it had an important effect on body tissues, including their rejuvenation and prolongation of physiological youth, and that increased strength and flexibility could and should be developed.

Close to physical development on McCloy's hierarchy, was the development of skilled performance in physical activity. As with the objective of organic power, McCloy basically conceived of the mastery of skills as being satisfying in and for itself, stating that a skilled performance was cultural in the motor field in the same sense that any learning which occurs in other disciplines may be cultural. "I believe," he said, "that any worthwhile activity executed skillfully enough to give the doer exquisite sensory pleasure is cultural." (McCloy, 1938, p. 480, italics deleted) But he reminded his readers that "skills must be mastered to the point where in these and subsequent situations the pupil may perform with such joy and satisfaction as to get from the activity its maximum educational effect." (McCloy, 1933, p. 4) He also acknowledged that mastery of skills, besides being an end in itself, was useful for future participation in sport (McCloy, 1927, p. 46), a position very close to Nash's. But McCloy did not stress the recreational objective as being of great importance, and, in fact, tended to see recreation as a means for exercising. He thought that "while education and recreation are important, organic health is notably more so." (McCloy,

1940, p. 293) In his earlier writing he underscored the possibilities inherent in physical education for developing character traits, provided that the leadership worked toward that end (McCloy), and he developed a conception of the interrelationship of the individual and the group in a democratic society (McCloy, 1940, pp. 122-24); but in later years he rarely mentioned either facet. Articles entitled “How About Some Muscle?” and “The Forgotten Objectives of Physical Education” made clear that his chief concern was man's physical development.

No man could take a more opposite position to McCloy than Jesse Feiring Williams. His interest in the organic objectives of physical education resided in his belief that health was a duty of good citizenship. In fact, he objected to the concept of physical fitness both in principle, because of its dualistic connotations, and as an objective of physical education. In the fourth edition of “*The Principles*”, he swiped at McCloy in a section entitled “The Fallacy of the Back-to-the-Body Aim” and in a later edition he asserted that

Physical education is brought forward as a great corrective, palliative, remedial agency, removing waste products, strengthening foot arches and abdominal muscles, enlarging chest capacity, and increasing strength of grip...These values, however, should come as by-products of motor activity designed to serve more vital needs. (Williams, 1964, p. 190)

The idea of the development of the physical being as a worthy end in itself was particularly repugnant to Williams. In a strong comment he asked the question:

What then, is to be said of the efforts of certain persons to develop large and bulging muscles or to pursue certain odd skills that have no useful function in life ? The satisfactions derived from such exercises serve only whimsical values such as exhibitionism; at times they are outlets for maladjusted personalities. For example, the yoga devotee may finally acquire unilateral control over the rectus abdominus, but the evidence is lacking that this has in any way deepened spirituality. (Williams, 1964, pp. 186-87)

Williams supported the recreational objective of physical education by advocating the development of skills for future leisure-time pursuits, and for utilitarian use in the activities of daily living. (Williams, 1942, pp. 234-40) But, as he saw it, the primary objective of physical education related to character development. He believed that physical education activities were experiences through which children could learn the standards of conduct suitable to their democratic society. This is the basis of his famous statement that “physical education is education through the physical.”

(Williams) He declared that “physical education should identify at every opportunity the close relationship between the moral and the physical” (Williams, 1964, p. 151); that “physical education should gain increasing competence and expertness in guiding personality development” (Williams, 1964, p. 154); and that “physical education should help to establish the American Way of Life as a worthy ideal for all peoples.” (Williams, 1964, p. 129) In the latter regard he stated that:

Education must...show him (the citizen) how to apply in his whole life those moral principles of democracy that underlie the concept of government by free men.... Some of these concepts will arise and must be taught in physical education. Four of these, equality of opportunity, personal worth, individual responsibility, and self-achievement, relate directly to physical education. (Williams, 1964, p. 57)

In contrast to Williams' position that the goal of physical education was to teach the individual to serve society. Nash's constant theme was that concern should be evidenced for the whole individual's own well-being and happiness. Thus in his hierarchy of objectives, the concept that assumes governing importance was the development of the integrated being, meaning “the bringing together of all the traits and powers of an individual into one personality which responds as a whole to lofty group ideals....” (Nash, 1948, p. 265) Beliefs that “integration and normality are achieved through meaningful recreational activity” (Nash, 1953, p. 200) and that “games....offer great opportunities for emotional development” (Nash, 1948, p. 191) led him to advocate that physical educators could help to secure this state-of-being by preparing the child for a life of active participation in recreational activity.

Nash proceeded from the point of view that man's life could roughly be divided into two categories, play and work, or time devoted to earning a living and time devoted to leisure. He maintained that it was within the province of the school to train children for life, and, therefore, that “education has a responsibility to prepare youth for the enjoyment of leisure.” (Nash, 1953, p. 204)

Sports skills were an important element of physical education because “skills in youth are basic to the recreation patterns of later life.” (Nash, 1953, p. 187) “The development of a rhythmic pattern of movement of grace and symmetry and the ability to judge objects in the environment—both physical and human—are the responsibility of physical education.” (Nash, 1948, p. 184)

Nash did not stress the objective of organic power as being or primary importance, but he did include it as one of the few responsibilities of education to be achieved primarily in physical education. (Nash, 1948, p. 245)

He argued for a concept of fitness that extended to all aspects of the person, rather than merely considering the physical. (Nash, 1942, p. 380) He agreed with Williams' position that the physical education program was a natural laboratory for democracy and specifically called attention to the fact that this also included play and recreation. He noted that “the practice of choice in play and recreation [should] become the great rehearsal for choice in a democracy.” (Nash, 1953, p. 47)

It would be fair to say that all the previously cited objectives of physical education were embraced by Nash, inasmuch as they contributed to the ultimate well-being and happiness of *the* individual. He did not attempt to isolate any single one as having greatest importance to either the individual or the goals of education. However, he believed that preparation for the good use of leisure-time was the essential necessary to achieve well-being.

View of History

All three men reached back into history to find justification for their points of view. Their differing interpretations of history highlight their conceptions of physical education and serve as an adequate summary of their positions. It also serves to remind us of the many sided truths of history and that our biases influence our interpretations.

McCloy said:

From about 500 B.C. until about A.D. 1900 the objectives were reasonably simple, and the practice, while differing in detail, was fairly uniform as to the goals sought. These goals had to do largely with the development of strength, of an adequate physical development, and of appropriate skills. The literature of physical education of those days sang the praises of the physically competent, and individuals sought to emulate the harmonious bodily proportions of the classic Greek statues. (McCloy, 1937, p. 458)

Nash said:

Training, or “discipline of living,” has been acknowledged throughout *the* ages as being beneficial. The Greeks depended upon a system of gymnastics for the development of strength, agility, rhythm of movement and beauty. Greek leaders considered training as a definite basis for the worthy use of leisure. With training, leisure-time could be utilized for not only physical but also mental betterment. (Nash, 1948, p. 94)

Williams said:

The achievements of the ancient Greeks in physical education lead us to inquire into the thinking of the Greek philosophers about this and related problems of physical education...It is apparent that in Plato's conception of education, body and mind are not simple opposites. For both Plato and Aristotle the sum of physical education was not the education of the physical alone but rather the development of personality qualities through the physical. (Williams, 1964, p. 147)

Part II

As McCloy, Nash and Williams attempted to translate their views of the objectives of physical education into guidelines for educational programs, each dealt with the concepts of curriculum, method, and evaluation in his own way and with varying emphasis. There were several broad points of agreement among them, including the belief that activities should be selected with regard to objectives; that teaching methods should effectively bring about the fulfillment of these objectives; and that measurement was a tool that potentially could be used in evaluating the progress of the individual student.

Concepts of Program

McCloy revealed his deep-rooted bias toward a curriculum in which the development of organic power was foremost in the following comment about program organization:

I have seen too many times project types of organizations which, while possibly educational, certainly wasted a lot of valuable time. I have repeatedly timed many pupils in gymnasium programs who in the twenty-five or thirty minutes of so-called activity, engaged in no more than three or four minutes of vigorous muscular work. Biologically, at least, this is certainly a minor. Until we obtain more time than we have now, I think we should compromise with "education" and obtain a little more for biology. (McCloy, 1937, p. 512)

Also illuminating, is his comment that "personally, I believe that a P.F.I. (physical-fitness index) of 120 would, at the present stage of physical education and recreation in our country, be of more value to more people than would be the skill to shoot eighteen holes of golf in 72." (McCloy, 1937, p. 512)

Nevertheless, he urged the development of a curriculum based upon a carefully graded program of skills suitable for each age group. He believed

that “fundamental activities [such as running and throwing as found in track and field] should be stressed out of all apparent proportion to their direct values” (McCloy, 1927, p. 49) because they correlated with success in more complex sports. His main point though was that “a choice [should] be made of a few standard games and athletic sports.. .[and] these games [should] be thoroughly taught.” (McCloy, 1940, p. 124)

Consistent with this approach was his stress on teaching the skills as efficiently as possible, particularly through use of the drill method. He reminded the profession that

Good teachers concern themselves with the mastery of subject matter.... Stressing only the freedom of the child to develop tends to produce a large group of individuals who are badly educated and who possess little systemized knowledge.... (McCloy, 1940, p. 100)

The emphasis in McCloy's life work was certainly in measurement and evaluation; this was fundamental to all he advocated in terms of physical education programs and teaching. He believed that in order to promote the development of skill and strength, the educator had to know exactly what an individual child could and should be able to do. McCloy claimed that tests, properly administered, would yield information about the innate motor capacity and present motor ability of students, which in turn would aid in classification, grading, motivation, diagnosis of difficulties, and program evaluation. To further this work he developed an Athletic Quotient, Athletic Strength Index, and a General Strength Index, and he calculated formulas that yielded General Motor Capacity Scores and General Motor Achievement Scores. From these he derived a Motor Quotient which he claimed was “the motor analogue of the Intelligence Quotient in the mental field.” (McCloy, 1939, p. 126) His naive hope was that each teacher would become a practical researcher, using tests and measurements to effectively increase teaching performance. As a result of these tests, students would be grouped homogeneously, exercised to certain levels of strength, **flexibility**, and endurance, and drilled in fundamental skills and a selected number of more complex skills which could be used in activities performed during their adult life.

Nash's concept of curriculum also included a belief in the development of power and the learning of skills for later life. However, his emphasis, unlike McCloy's, was really not on skill per se, but on the activity as a whole. Nash stated that “the student is not taught about a skill; rather he is taught to do the activity.” (Nash, 1948, p. 55) He did a study which showed that “over 85 per cent of the recreational interests could be traced to

below the age of twelve,” (Nash, 1953, p. 187) and he urged that “future leisure-time needs should be a guide to curricular construction in our public school.” (Nash, 1932, p. 125) “Sufficient opportunity for experience in a number of individual and dual sports is equally important at the secondary level. This is particularly true in the later senior high grades because of the recreational, coeducational and carry-over values.” (Nash, 1928, p. 291)

Essential to a physical education program which was meant to insure effective participation throughout life was the child's interests or “felt needs”:

The real issue is neither that which the child needs nor that which he can do. Rather is it some felt need, some want “half-formed in the dawning of his consciousness” that is the basis of attitudes which, in turn, become the aU-determining factor. (Nash, 1928, p. 195)

The “felt needs” served both as motivators to learning and as guides to the kind of activities the child would later enjoy. Carrying this one step further, he said. “It becomes unnecessary to teach all children all of the traditional progression in the learning of motor skills, as many of these will have been acquired already because of a child's inherent interest in learning.” (Nash, 1951, p. 204)

Nash did not share McCloy's enthusiasm for testing because:

All types of testing encroach upon the too-limited time which is scheduled for activities. Few teachers at present have the educational background to conduct tests and to evaluate the results. To base conclusions about the whole physical education of an individual upon tests of one small aspect of physical efficiency is dangerous. (Nash, 1951, p. 181)

Throughout Nash's writings was an emphasis on the curricular relationship between physical education, recreation, and play. He envisioned a program largely determined by the child's interests or “felt needs,” consisting of whole activities which would be suitable for carry-over into lifelong leisure-time participation.

Williams' suggestions for the physical education curriculum are centered in a rejection of formal gymnastic drills as being inimical to the fulfillment of the objectives of a democratic society, and in the endorsement of a program of natural activities. In this respect he was beating a dead horse since even his earlier works were written long after Thomas Wood and Clark Hetherington laid the ghosts of European gymnastics to rest. In general,

Williams advocated a wide variety of activities in sports, games, dance, camping, fundamental skills, equitation, and aquatics. However, his obsession that “the focus of the individual should be in society, and not in his muscles,” (Williams, 1964, p. 363, boldface deleted) led him to recommend that “it is important to eliminate from the program all purely muscle-centered activities in favor of a program of functional activities.” (Williams, 1964, p. 352) He also stressed choosing activities that contributed to the personality development of the participant. For example, “athletic sports and games furnish very desirable material because of the instinctive appeal in such plays and the opportunities they present for the development of moral and social values.” (Williams, 1922, p. 61)

In the area of teaching methodology McCloy and Williams frequently seemed to be directly criticizing each other's viewpoint. Williams advocated the project method as most suitable for precisely the reason that McCloy came to reject it: because it was more suitable for developing individual character traits than for presenting subject matter. For instance, Williams favored an increase of discussion time, stating “the time is past when a physical education period is adjudged good or bad depending upon the amount of physical activity obtained during the period.” (Williams, 1932, p. 81) While McCloy found the drill method the most efficient means of teaching, Williams countered that:

The notion that formal drill was a good “discipline” for youth is correct if regimented persons who implicitly obey the order of the State are desired. But in a democracy, where initiative, self-discipline, and ability to take charge of oneself are educational goals, then formal drill for the general development of the citizen is a mistake and a waste of time. (Williams, 1964, pp. 62-63)

This paragraph was added in the last edition of *The Principles*, though even there he conceded that drill was a requisite for learning complex skills.

Like Nash, Williams was dubious about the use of testing. First, because “in the field of health, physical education, and recreation, there are a number of objectives.. .which do not lend themselves to the statistical approach” (Williams, 1964, p. 474), and, of course, this included the objectives in which he was most interested. Secondly, he noted that:

In the face of devoted efforts to secure measurable outcomes, such as speed in running or height in jumping, there is the tendency to neglect the social justifications for running and jumping.... Statistical averages or percentages may completely obscure standards of educational worth based on ideals. (Williams, 1942, p. 345)

However, he was willing to support a limited use of tests, especially for purposes of classification.

Williams' conception of a physical education program was one in which activities were selected which could best be used as tools through which the child might learn the socially approved values of his society, and to adjust his individual personality and desires to the group welfare. The physical educator's responsibility was to teach for optimal fulfillment of these goals by means of discussions or other methods.

Part III

McCloy, Nash, and Williams, in delineating fully developed and integrated concepts of physical education, influenced and guided members of the profession in their attempts to implement programs in accordance with newly stabilized professional goals. In 1938, with the addition of the term "recreation," the American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation assumed its present name. A year earlier the American Physical Education Association had become a department of the National Education Association and had added the term "health" to the title. Thus, by 1938 the major interests and objectives of the profession had symbolically been consolidated in the association's name and affiliation with the country's major educational organization. Though the origin of this state-of-being harked back to the work of men like Thomas Wood and Clark Hetherington, the work of McCloy, Nash, and Williams was essential in spelling out professional direction. They detailed a concept of the role of physical education within education. They provided physical educators with clear, logical arguments, bolstered by evidence from contemporary intellectual thought, to support the validity of their beliefs about the objectives of physical education. Furthermore, they constructed explicit curriculums, methodologies, and evaluative techniques in relation to the emphases in their objectives.

But a problem was created because the ideas of these men, as I set them forth in the preceding pages, were in some ways diametrically opposed. This point is very crucial when considering programs in relation to the time allotment for physical education. Each man's primary objective demanded a total program commitment to achieve its fulfillment. Sixty to ninety minutes a week is hardly enough time to increase muscular strength, cardio-vascular endurance, and flexibility as well as develop high level skilled performance in some activities. Any athlete or coach will testify to the need for at least two hours of work a day to develop excellent skills and peak physical condition. Sixty to ninety minutes a week is hardly enough time to be introduced to a significant number of activities and to learn them well enough to provide a basis for carry-over into adult leisure-time. Every semi-serious golfer, tennis player, fisherman, skier, surfer, or bowler can testify to the need for prolonged and concentrated practice before a sport becomes

pleasurable enough to be considered recreation. Sixty to ninety minutes a week is hardly enough time to effect changes in attitudes, inculcate social values and standards, and learn to subjugate one's desires for the welfare of the group, all while performing physical activities. Any psychologist or social worker will testify to the need for continuous and intensive counseling before an individual is willing and able to make basic changes in his beliefs and personality. Yet, physical educators have believed that in the duration of their programs, each of these aims could simultaneously be accomplished.

Nash, Williams, and McCloy knew better. By developing a hierarchy of objectives, each focused on a single belief that, in the words of Ortega, was "fundamental, decisive, sustaining and breathing life into all the others." (Ortega y Gasset, 1962, p. 168) Pointing out that programs had to be developed in keeping with objectives, they each advocated different programs. McCloy would have had students exercising, drilling on fundamental skills; Nash would have had students learning individual or carry-over sports according to their individual interests; Williams would have had students primarily playing team games and having group discussions. For the objectives to have even a remote chance of accomplishment, a student's entire school career in physical education would have had to be along a single program line.

But physical educators adopted all three modes and believed they could effectively conduct all three types of program simultaneously. Although there were vague ideas advanced which suggested that in the lowest grades body development and fundamental skills should be the basis of curriculum, followed in the middle school years by games and team sports, and culminating in individual activities, in actual practice a little of everything was done at almost every level. As the fifties drew to a close, generally even the colleges still required that each student take some courses in fundamental activities or body development, plus one team sport, one individual sport, and perhaps a class in dance or aquatics.

Admittedly, during the course of this time period there were subtle practical variations. During times of national stress, such as that occasioned by World War II, or the findings of Kraus-Weber which, according to their standards, suggested that American children were physically inferior to others around the world, the profession veered toward placing greater emphasis on physical development. In later years, with a push from commercial sporting interests, always present in abundance at conventions, and with sufficient national wealth to allow many school systems larger investments in facilities and equipment, greater emphasis was directed toward lifetime sports. But through all this the socializing objective was never diluted in intent.

It is my belief that physical educators attempted the analytically and existentially impossible task of achieving all three aims in any single

program. As a result, physical education projected itself into the anomalous situation of holding classes in accord with McCloy's suggestions, of advocating the activities urged by Nash, and of committing itself to accomplishing the social goals delineated by Williams. McCloy, Nash, and Williams deliberately attempted to influence the direction of physical education in their time. It must be assumed that each hoped his "truth" would prevail. But an analysis of the period from 1930-1960 shows that what prevailed was an amalgamation of their three, somewhat incongruent theories.

References

1. Gerber, EllenW. *Innovators and Institutions in Physical Education*. (Philadelphia: Lea & Febiger, 1971).
2. McCloy, Charles Harold. "The Case for Physical Education," *Journal of Health and Physical Education*, IV (April, 1933), pp. 3-6, 62-63.
3. McCloy, Charles Harold. "Forgotten Objectives of Physical Education," *Journal of Health and Physical Education*, VHI (October, 1937), pp. 458-61, 512-13.
4. McCloy, Charles Harold. "How About Some Muscle ?" *Journal of Health and Physical Education*, VU (May, 1936), pp. 302-303, 355.
5. McCloy, Charles Harold. "In Quest of Skills." *Journal of Health and Physical Education*. IX (October, 1938), pp. 478-80, 524-25.
6. McCloy, Charles Harold. *The Measurement of Athletic Power*. (New York: A. S. Barnes, 1932).
7. McCloy, Charles Harold. "New Wine in New Bottles," *Journal of Physical Education*, XXV (October, 1927), pp. 43-52.
8. McCloy, Charles Harold. *Philosophical Bases for Physical Education*. (New York: F. S. Crofts, 1940).
9. McCloy, Charles, Harold. "Some Applications of Psychology to the Teaching of Physical Activities," *Journal of Physical Education*, XXXI (March, 1934), pp. 51-54.
10. McCloy, Charles Harold. *Tests and Measurements in Health and Physical Education*. (New York: F. S. Crofts, 1939).
11. McCloy, Charles Harold and Young, Norma Dorothy. *Tests and Measurements in Health and Physical Education*. Third edition. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1954.
12. Nash, Jay Bryan. *The Administration of Physical Education*. (New York: A. S. Barnes, 1932).

13. Nash, Jay Bryan. "Call to Service," *Journal of Health and Physical Education*, XIX (September, 1942), pp. 379-81.
14. Nash, Jay Bryan. *The Organization and Administration of Playgrounds and Recreation*. (New York: A. S. Barnes, 1928).
15. Nash, Jay Bryan. *Philosophy of Recreation and Leisure*. (St. Louis: C. V. Mosby, 1953).
16. Nash, Jay Bryan. *Physical Education: Its Interpretations and Objectives*. (New York: A. S. Barnes, 1948).
17. Nash, Jay Bryan, Moench, Francis J. and Saurborn, Jeanette B. *Physical Education: Organization and Administration*. (New York: A. S. Barnes, 1951).
18. Ortega y Gasset, Jose.. *History as a System*. (New York: W. W. Norton, 1962).
19. Williams, Jesse Feiring. "Education Through the Physical," *Journal of Higher Education*, I (May, 1930), pp. 279-82.
20. Williams, Jesse Feiring. "Health, An Objective of Education," *Journal of Health and Physical Education*, IV (March, 1933), pp. 5-6.
21. Williams, Jesse Feiring. *The Organization and Administration of Physical Education*. (New York: Macmillan, 1922).
22. Williams, Jesse Feiring. *The Principles of Physical Education*. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders, 1927.
23. Williams, Jesse Feiring. *The Principles of Physical Education*. Fourth edition. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders, 1942. Fourth edition.
24. Williams, Jesse Feiring. *The Principles of Physical Education*, Eighth edition. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders, 1964.
25. Williams, Jesse Feiring and Brownell, Clifford Lee. *The Administration of Health Education and Physical Education*..Fourth edition. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders, 1951
26. Williams, Jesse Feiring, Dambach, John I., and Schwendener, Norma. *Methods in Physical Education*. (Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders, 1932).