

## NEW WINE IN NEW BOTTLES

C. H. McCloy, (Published in the Journal of Physical Education,  
November, 1927)

While the principles, methods, and philosophy of general education have, in the past twenty years, been growing in definiteness and content, adding convolutions and general height of brow, the principles, practice, and philosophy of physical education have been an educational Island of Reil, buried at the bottom of the Fissure of Archaic Tradition, its function and educational connections more than dubious, and apparently all too-well protected from the external stimuli of research and experiment to be forced to progress except through the slow process of accidental contact with the overwash from the teachings of the more vigorous of the philosophers of general education. The fact that it possessed its share of the educational cortex was apparently almost overlooked. We shall endeavor, within the limits of a paper of this length, to uphold the thesis that there are sufficient bases at this time for the construction of a system of physical education which could be an integral and necessary part of the educational process, and to present briefly the more important fundamental principles involved in the formulation of such a system.

The older systems of physical education in current use are, in most cases, educational anachronisms - hangovers from the semi-military European systems of physical education; developed in nations constantly exposed on all sides to threats of war; invented by and for militarists, and impregnated throughout with the angular never-to-be-used-in-life movements devised by the orthodox military mind. Some of these systems were then elaborated by anatomists with no knowledge of the psychology of learning or of modern educational principles and who thought only in terms of anatomical parts, not in terms of living, dynamic man. These older systems were further complicated by teachers of gymnastics, few of whom were scholars, who too-often thought in terms of "stunts," of inventing new movements to do, most of which were of no conceivable educational value.

Since the development of the modern educational philosophy, there have been three general types of reactions on the part of physical educators: (1) A large group have stood pat, defiantly closing their minds to the demonstrated facts of modern educational science, and making changes only when forced to do so by a waning attendance upon voluntary activities. (2) A second group, who became imbued with the new wine of educational philosophy, tried to put it in the old bottles, patching up the old skins, and "adapting" until the old medieval warrior - to change the figure - became outwardly dressed in modern clothing and talked the modern educational jargon, but still retained the rigid soul and the inefficient educational outlook of the old, to largely sterilize the result. (3) A third group could see no other hope than to throw away everything formal and turn the physical educational period into anything which might carry the name of being "natural" - dancing games, athletics, - all-too-often poorly selected, and frequently the product of little constructive thought. Whatever faults might be found in the old systems, they