"EDUCATIONAL ASPECTS OF ASSOCIATION FOOTBALL"

by

L. C. Williams (Goldsmiths' 1923-25,
Carnegie 1938-9 (Principal Lecturer
and Head of Dept. of Physical Education
and Health Education, (retired), University
of London, Goldsmiths' College.

Paper read to the British Association of Sport and Medicine
at the Royal Society of Medicine on Saturday, 23rd July, 1966.

My qualifications to speak on so serious and important a topic are very modest. I speak as a retired amateur footballer, retired school-teacher of English and Physical Education and retired lecturer in Physical Education at a college for teachers. My views are amateur, naive and sentimental, rather than expert, modern and scientific. But as you have two speakers in the forefront of modern and scientific studies of football, perhaps you will accept my contribution as light relief to the more serious play of the morning.

I dared accept the honour and onus of addressing so informed an audience for three reasons; the great debt I owe personally to football in my own education - such as it is; the great regard I have for it as a game, and I must add, concern for its future; and my firm belief in its efficiency as a medium of education when properly (by which I mean platonically) taught and played by boys, youth and men.

I can think of no greater travesty of a game, of education and of femininity than football for girls and women, but I wish to state that in co-educational schools I have found headmistresses as headmasters for the most part, very aware of the importance of football to boys.

There was one woman in particular I tried to convince of the importance of football to my personal development and identity. She was my Mother. She was not entirely committed. My Mother who was a farm girl would say sorrowfully that her boys had "foot and mouth disease"; always kicking their boots off or eating their heads off.

My theme is "The Educational Values of the Game of Football" and it seems to have three entities needing examination; what constitutes educational values; what constitutes a game; and what constitutes football.

I propose to begin with the least controversial, - what constitutes a game. By a game is meant an organised form of competitive play with definite rules and scores to which the players voluntarily conform in letter and in spirit. For a game to begin to be physically educative it must entail vigour and endurance of body and spirit and motor skills. These criteria eliminate from discussion such games as bridge, ludo, bingo and darts. For a game to be educative in personal relations and attitudes as well as physically, it must involve co-operative and competitive play and behaviour. This eliminates singles games and individual sports and brings us to team games. But for a team game to satisfy these desiderata and at the same time to be capable of being played in viable and recognisable form, from the frozen ground of arctica and antartica to the torrid zones of the tropics; as far east and as far west as a relatively flat small patch of compacted earth, sand, gravel, pavement, coal dust, volcanic ash, furnace ash, or by the grace of nature, farmer, government sponsor or private enterprise, a precious rectangle of green grass can be borrowed, found, bought or made; by boys of seven upwards to men in the prime of their physical maturity; with or without boots or other impediments than a ball, for thousands of schoolboys and youths in undeveloped countries, or for a world cup team at a cost of half a nation's wealth, then these criteria eliminate every game save this game of kicking, heading, dribbling, trapping and tackling skills, this game of football, as having within its compass the power to sway the world as one. In what manner and degree this power is educational remains to be considered. But that this power arises from its being a wonderfully adaptable game, a fundamentally good game, a great game, a universally adopted and applicable game which for all its faults and fracas unites, rather than divides the classes and countries of the world, I believe is true.

If I may be allowed the liberty of bringing Shakespeare into this game of football and play him on our side:-

"It was always yet the trick of our English nation,
if they have a good thing, to make it too common".

I have stressed the social values of the cheapness and adaptability of the game. A further important factor in it being a great game as game and as spectacle, is the simplicity and rationale of its objective and the constant involvement of players and spectators in the whole pattern of play. Anybody seeing football for the first time, can see what it is all about. Any class or gang of little boys knows exactly how to play football; "Go after the ball all the time you have any breath left, and kick it in their goal". Anybody with a weak heart should avoid seeing football. It is a dangerous game to watch. It is not the goals that kill. They act as relief, catharsis. It is the vicarious participation in the drama, the Strum and Drang of the play.

What I am asseverating is that the game provides for the maturational levels of games' vigour skills and insights from seven to forty seven and for a Meredith or a Matthews, fifty years. No other great major game combines these qualities of greatest simplicity and sophistication of involvement for every player in every game from back street to Wembley.

I think it is essential to identify what is football and what is not football more precisely by a closer examination of the texture of the game to make sure that we are all looking at the same game, not only in name but nature. We have dismissed any confusion arising from the generic name football with those specific manipulative aberations, Union, League, American, Gaelic or Australian Rules Football. But we still have Association and F. I. F. A. football to reconcile. As you know there are some differences in rule and marked differences in interpretation. The vital difference, is in what constitutes a fair tackle. The tackle in football is the element in the game which chiefly determines the impact of the game on the person, and I suggest on the personality of the player. The great philosopher of education Plato, himself a fine athlete, noted 2,500 years ago.

"The conduct of a man in his exercise is a very important test of his character".

Let us look at football, past and future, Association and F. I. F. A. with special reference to that factor which so sustains or kills its spirit and values, physical and personality, challenge and contact.

Association football has, since I learned and watched the game many years ago,

"Suffered a sea change
into something rich and strange".

to quote Shakespeare again. "Sea-change" may readily be interpreted as 'overseas', "Rich" has several connotations ranging from being 'in the money' to being, 'of fine quality; and "Strange" may either refer to the wonderfully fluid play of modern football or conversely to its gimmicky gamesmanship. I learned my soccer after the no-hacking law true, but in the hey day of the shoulder charge and the slide tackle. For many decades the game was characterised by heavy shoulder challenge and charging and hard tackling on greasy or muddy pitches. The world, in doing us the honour of adopting the game and adapting it to hard fast pitches naturally introduced an idiom of its own and a pattern and tactic of close ball play and deft toe-tap interception tackle which culminated in the 1953 Hungarian team. I certainly do not advocate a return to the past, in law, tactics or line up, but I do very much regret and resent the "reffing away" of some of the past great challenges and tackles of the game.

There are two splendid old English tackles which are being "reffed" out of the game and which once gone, reduce the stature of the game and if not its educational value, its capacity to compel a player to think again about himself and the game. The first is a recovery tackle when the defender is patently beaten and men and ball are past him. There is sometimes one desperate, sporting, legitimate hope for the defender; to turn, fling himself flat onto his back and clip the ball on or sideways with his toe point, or even wrap his instep round the ball and claw it back from under the feet and the very nose of the man in possession and as he thinks in the clear. Given always the requisite speed of recovery and re-actiontime, this superb tackle can be fairly and gloriously executed. But with the threat of the first unwritten law of gamesmanship, when you lose the ball always fall over, and the dilemma facing modern referees of keeping pace with the tremendous tempo and the temptations of the modern game, the risks of this grand tackle incurring a free kick or a penalty are becoming too great, and our sons may never experience the wonderful thrill of seeing or making it.

The other tackle I would like to direct your attention and admiration towards, is that exquisitely timed strike at the ball by defender, when the accomplished ball player hesitatingly or tauntingly stands with or fiddles about with the ball at his feet. The strike of the tackler if he gets that ghost of a chance needed to make his move, must be precisely that fleeting tenth of a second when the man with the ball commits the

error of putting his weight on the foot nearest the ball. The tackler must necessarily sit or lie to reach the ball and must strike hard if the man in possession is not to ride the ball over the tackling foot. The ball is hit with all power and with the ball the foot of the man. There is neither time nor need here for the first law of gamesmanship. The man in possession is well and truly, in my judgement and my conception of what constitutes true football and some essence of its educational value, deservedly and fairly flung on his face. Neither of these two ground tackles is a slide tackle or dangerous play, and it makes my heart grieve to see them today fairly and gloriously executed, only to be penalised by referee or execrated by the biased and ignorant.

Conversely, and I must hasten on to my next plea to forestall your saying, "This fellow never scored a goal in his life, he's just a crude spoiler". I deplore the calculating cold blooded fouler, beaten by some magic dematerialisation of the close ball players who seems to go through the tackler's body and come out the other side with the ball, only to be chopped down, wrestled down or have his shirt pulled from behind. This is not the game under consideration. Much can be forgiven in the heat and flurry of a furious fight for the ball, but there is no forgiving the man, beaten fair and square by exquisite football, who responds by renting his spite on opponent and game or calculating the odds on betting his bonus against a free kick, or as the Greeks might have said, "yielding his virtue".

Let me say in my comparison of past and present soccer and in my concern to identify what constitutes the true game, I can offer little more than breathless wonder to the modern game. But there are some fundamentals which still hold whatever the mathematical permutations by which we confuse the enemy and the fans. If tackling across the man to block the ball always swing the second leg, the old one-two of this tackle, in case the man turns the ball back on your blind side. In that turning point of the game, England v. Hungary 1953, the great Harry Johnston neglected this elementary lesson and had the ball turned to his blind side for the shot that beat Merrick for the first Hungarian goal. Johnston made handsome amends a little later by a wonderful interception and swift sully upfield to give England her first goal, but the damage had been done, and Hungary knew that England was not impregnable.

Dare I say too that fabulous as are some of the chess board goals of today, power before placing in shooting still holds. My impression of the England v Uruguay no score was that Wilson missed the best chance coming up on the left like a thunder bolt to a gently rolled square pass in the area, about the 15th minute with plenty of time to think, he forgot this

maxim, - stopped the ball and tidied it up, only to chip it yards over the bar.

In the transition from past to present football there seems to me to have been four threats to the fair face of football, whereby it can be slashed and disfigured for life and become some grotesque caricature of itself, clearly devoid of any educational or social validity or international amity. It could be suffocated under the ill manners, ignorance and ill sportsmanship of its spectators; it could be strangled by mercenary or political strings. If these are to be the death or prostitution of its essential sporting spirit, I will join in booting and hooting its corpse out of the educational programme. But there are two further threats that come from within. Football could conceivably kick itself to death, by putting the boot into its own guts, by suicide that is. Or it could die the lingering death of cancer, the cancer of gimmicks of gamesmanship. If it should die as an educational medium in this manner, making a mockery of its own consummate skills and disciplines, then something will go out of the meaning of education and the meaning of many lives.

I began by saying my views were amateur and naive, but of course I know we all have got to face up to the problems of helping Football to sustain whatever educational and social values it has, under the tremendous international pressures of the modern world. This simple game, invented and persisted in by boys, taken up successively by schoolmasters, sporting men, national and international associations, big money and governments, has become a phenomenon and a force as great and ambivalent for good or ill in the modern world, as were the Olympic Games and stadia in the ancient world from whose zenith and nadir or achievement we have learned so much - and so little. Football has had an onerous worldwide responsibility for some degree of public behaviour and popular education thrust upon it, with which it is struggling manfully I believe, and in the present instance of the F. A. and World Cup series splendidly, apart perhaps from the Cup being 'hicked'. Certainly the British sporting public has enhanced its traditional reputation for always appreciating a gallant loser and a winning underdog, attitudes which I understand were entirely absent from the spectators at the ancient Olympic Games, although the British fan, certainly in the N. E. is not sure that he appreciates ca'canny football.

In this matter of taking responsibility for public behaviour, I offer a few modest suggestions to the powers that be. Is it not time that football associations and wealthy clubs appointed a psychologist P. R. O. as well as a pep-talker? If publicity agents can create a public image of socially well behaved smokers and drinkers, could not the same be done for football fans? Cannot the administration make more use of television,

film, photograph and poster in the education and discipline of players and spectators? Can the press not be persuaded to show not only toilet rolls but throwers of toilet rolls and should clubs have official camera men of their own for this purpose? As schoolmaster I accept my share of the shame of schoolboy and youth ill manners, but could not a little more imaginative use be made of the public address system, even asking the local heroes to say a word? I offer these rather weakly suggestions for trying to ameliorate the sillier aspects of football fan behaviour very diffidently, but I feel something must be done as misbehaviour of spectators tends to close the minds of the non-sporting public completely to the issue as to whether football has any educational or social value.

On the issues of dangerous play and gimmicky play which are such important factors in maintaining the integrity of the game and any educational values, I have no diffidence whatever about making suggestions. My impression of the World Cup games is that the F. A. has been most successful in its consultations with F. I. F. A. over the interpretation of the law governing foul play; the refereeing of the games seemed to me to be often wise, imaginative and close to the spirit of the game. I was very moved to see some return to that fine old unwritten law of soccer; when injured a player is expected to take himself off by limping or crawling if necessary, but play must go on. I do nevertheless except from this wisdom some automatic penalising of the shoulder charge and "foot up". I was thrilled to see some finely executed shoulder charging in the games and dismayed to see players who took the awkward ball well with the sole of the foot, penalised for the fair and safe use of this fine tackle.

The "refereeing" of the crowds over foul play I considered excellent when they were at issue with the officially appointed arbiter. The British public certainly knows its football if it is not too emotionally involved in the result. The grave silence directed at the first man sent off was an educated response.

Gamesmanship which for so long was a rare element, and merely consisted of a couple of hefty kicks of the ball, "off the island" during the last five minutes, has now penetrated the whole fibre of the game and threatens its vitals. The F. A. must examine closely all laws of the game with a view to containing this cancer. It was, in my judgement, the changing of the law limiting the shoulder charge which helped Sir Stanley evolve his surpassing play. Part of his greatness was his exciting "ploy" of taking the ball up to the men. This did not pay off under the old shoulder charge law as the defender, always supposing he was as well balanced as the attacker, would turn in with him, whichever way he went and even if he pushed the ball between defender's legs and nudge him with

his shoulder off the line of the ball. This change of law is fully endorsed in a development of play which gave us a Matthews, a Garrincha or a Gento. I have some views on the treatment of gamesmanship by law which I am grateful for the opportunity to put forward to students of the game. No one can seriously appraise the educational values of football without examining gamesmanship. It seems to be taking four main forms; gamesmanship within the letter of the law, such as tactical play and playing about; gamesmanship outside the law, as in time wasting out of play; gamesmanship against the law, as in fouling of policy whenever the penalty is less likely to lead to a goal than playing fair; and gaming the referee as in falling over or innocently mistaking all touch throws as free kicks. As a non-professional, I would not dare to presume to pass judgement on all forms, and I confine my remarks to what I see as a lover of the game and a student of its laws. I begin with the goalkeeper whose function and personality seems to have swollen prodigiously in the modern game. I have very great respect indeed for Mr. Kane's studies of football personality and the great contribution he is making to the more scientific aspects of football and Physical Education. But the normal standards of scientific validity and description seem to me quite inadequate to measure the gamesmanship and personality of a modern goalkeeper. A modern goalkeeper is an extroverted, frustrated "basket" ball player. The F.A. has consistently and patiently attempted to deal fairly with the goalkeeper under its laws, although it has always steadfastly refused to emasculate the game and remove the only curb it now has to the performing acts of goalkeepers all over the penalty area all over the world. It is now quite obvious that the safeguard law to the goalkeeper, that the opposition vacates the penalty area for a goalkick, has led to an entirely unforeseen and unsoccerlike development - and distortion - of the pattern of play, seen at its worst in the gamesmanship between 'keeper and backs'. They now play marbles and hopscotch with the ball, in the middle of a game of soccer, insulting game and spectators with impunity. We must change the laws. I suggest that, "from a goal kick, free kick or throw in, the ball may not be passed back into the penalty area until it has been played by the opposing side". It is from these three methods of restarting play in particular that the goalkeeper derives his main opportunities to withhold the ball from play and to distort and diminish the comely form and stature of the game. When are we going to see common again, the finely discriminated place kicks of the old time goalkeeper and backs? We saw them from backs in of all matches that most skilled, exhilarating and moving exposition of the game, Brazil v. Hungary, from Brazil of all teams, whose quickly taken goal kicks by backs added in no small measure to the infinite variety of that master match. I am quite confident that the restriction of the goalkeeper's rights spelt, "RITES" would give the game a new or renewed impetus. It would sort out the truly great minded goalkeepers from the miserably small minded; those who dominate their

penalty areas from those who domineer in them; those who earn their right to bounce the ball and kick it from hand, by reading the run of the play, from those gimmicky goalkeepers who get possession and hold on to the ball by reading the rule book.

I robbed myself of some of the enjoyment of the Brazil v. Hungary match by putting the stop-watch on the amount of time the goalkeepers withheld the ball from play; that is the time taken after the ball had been put out of the penalty area from goal kicks only to go back in and play start all over again. As may be expected it was very small; for the losers 29 seconds and for the winners 72 seconds; that is we were deprived of 1 minute 41 seconds of that scintillating game, a sad loss. In the Portugal v. Brazil match - 3 minutes - every second of which was due to Portugal's 'keeper. Not one second wasted by Brazil's. England v. Argentine, - England 14 seconds, Argentine 87 apart from the ten minutes spent in arguing about the game.

The "throw in", in my concern for the game, also needs salutary treatment. I suggest "the referee shall have discretionary power, if in his opinion a player attempts to gain an unfair advantage by stealing ground or withholding the ball from play, to award the throw to the opposing side". And I would glory in the reputation as a referee, "Watch out for this 'basket' Williams; if you as much as slip half a yard, he will switch the ball".

Further, and this is soccer sacrilege, I would welcome a Rugby Union rule to soccer, "Withdraw ten yards immediately or else; you are committing a further infringement and the kick shall be re-awarded from the place where the referee decides the further infringement took place".

As you may now see for yourselves I have assuredly spoken one certain word of truth so far; I am a very amateur and naive footballer. But I have been asked to speak on the educational values of football and I do not think that gimmicks and gamesmanship have much educational value. I have been trying to identify what is soccer - "the true and blushful Hippocrene" - from what is not soccer. If we are to discover educational values then we must look for the eternal verities of the game, with which any educational value will lie, and distinguish them from meretricious accretions.

Earlier I spoke of football as physically and socially educative. But what are the criteria of a game if it to be education, not simply physically and in human relations, but in the sense that would satisfy a philosopher of education and I quote now not those ancient athletic men and philosophers,

Socrates or Plato, but a modern, Dr. R. S. Peters, Professor of Philosophy of Education in the University of London, from his inaugural lecture to the University Institute of Education entitled, "Education as Initiation", where he speaks of education as,

"Initiating others into activities and modes of conduct and thought which have standards written into them by reference to which it is possible to act, think and feel with varying degrees of skill, relevance and taste".

On the face of it, football does seem to satisfy if only in a very crude and modest way, some minor degree of the processes and references which this definition requires. The Professor will have none of it. He denies to education any contribution whatsoever from any form of Physical Education or as he prefers, Physical Training, - a change of term which he obviously considers a distinction without a difference, unless it be only the laminal thickness of a leaf. Professor Peters dismisses games as mere knacks. I humbly recall to his attention his most illuminating physiological, affective and cognitive homily on the nature of "kissing" for adults and ask whether I would be entirely irrelevant if it is applied to "kicking" for boys to who he must know, kicking has somewhat more relation to experience than has kissing. He is fully entitled to his opinion of games and P.E. as P.T. which cannot be gainsaid by any other professorial voice in the University, nor yet by some lesser mortal outside the pale, such as a Director of Physical Education of the University of London. But he is not entitled to base his opinions on the gratuitous assumption that teachers of Physical Education are a militant, status seeking minority in education institutions. We may well be mistaken in our foible that our work may properly be called Physical Education and not Physical Training. If Professor Peters must make assumptions, be they of materialism or of any other dialectic, about the professional motives of the menials in his field, we prefer them to be of our ignorance than of our venality. As Prof. Peters himself says of those who dare "ope" their lips and speak of education as a concept, I repeat in his words of Games and his concept of Physical Education,

"not descriptive of it of someone engaged in the enterprise".

Some years ago a colleague and friend of mine, a Ph.D and a Recognised Teacher in Education of the University of London, Professor Peters' University, asked me to let him have a copy of the 'rules' of football. This request greatly astonished me, knowing he scarcely knew a ball from a bat, even more so, when he explained he wanted it for his son aged eight who seemed to be and I quote, "quite interested in football".

Father thought that his son should read up the rules to learn the game because that was how he had learned chess. With football, as with religion, one does have to experience it first to know what it feels like. I must now say in fairness to professors of education and too, because my next point is germane to my reply to Professor Peters, that at the time of this greatly treasured experience of mine, the immediate colleague of my Ph. D. friend, sharing with him the education lecturing and tutoring at the college, was also playing alongside me in the College first X1 soccer team, and a very able education lecturer and very rugged soccer player he was. He is now Principal of a College of Education.

It is this extraordinary paradox or if I may so misuse a term of Professor Peters', "paradigm" - of remarkable inflection of human conduct which these two seemingly like men, highly educated, of great acumen of mind, jointly responsible for the teaching of, one the principles of education and the other, the psychology of education - one, a perfect example of homo sapiens, sub species non-sporting, the other homo sapiens sub species sporting, that I hoped, interalia, to understand more clearly in the light of Professor Peters' criteria of education and how they might possibly apply to Physical Education and to games in particular, I regret to having to say I found no better understanding than my own of the paradox of paradigm, any more than I did of Professors Peters' great insights into the principles and practices of teaching in the classroom, alongside his prejudices in the gymnasium and playing field.

He says Education is not for ends outside itself, however big or even vital to survival the ends are. Education is concerned with the "processes and activities involved in it" and its intrinsic ends. In this sense may not games in some very crude way be a miniature or a simulator of education process? Games are concerned with the processes and activities involved in them and with their intrinsic end, that is all the mental-physical qualities demanded to win. Games must be played to win, otherwise they are activities for passing the time which is neither means nor ends. But the winning must be done as Prof. Peters says, "within the processes and activities involved in it" "which have standards written into them". That the winning may have extrinsic ends attached to it, cups or money, is a different issue which may enhance or destroy the values of the game. If the motivation of extrinsic end is high, so too may be the self and imposed disciplines. In some respects this seems to apply to education.

I once took a school eleven across London to play a cup semi-final and forbade the boys to leave the party while travelling. After crossing a busy road and entering a park, one boy was missing. He had gone to buy sweets and I put him out of the team, despite the strong pleas of his father who was there. This I believe was the correct thing to do educationally, but it was using the game for obvious extrinsic moral ends, which according to Prof. Peters' concept as I understand it, is not the essence of education. May I add a matter of no moment but great relief to me that we won the game. Perhaps Prof. Peters will allow that in so far as games are an initiation into activities and modes of conduct and I am aware he will not allow thought, but in its place I will put Plato's concept - exercise - "awakening the spirited element in human nature" - which have standards written into them and played for this intrinsic end their own sake, they might qualify for some very marginal or, as I see, simulation of education activity.

Prof. Peters nextly considers education as being natural growth or development in a favourable environment, and the child centred self-directed and self-expression theories of education. He rejects them as procedural matters only and quotes Plato on the necessity for objective standards. Games teachers agree with Prof. Peters on this criteria of education as applied to games. Children do not learn games naturally but by initiation into their skills, disciplines and standards by imitation and keen appraisal. A very favourable chance coming together of like-minded boys may make some limited progress on their own, as Puskas - in his book on football - showed. But how avidly they attached themselves to the local grocer when he offered help! Unguided games play and practice leads to slovenly games and ill manners. At high level there are no natural players - only highly "educated" ones. Teachers of games in schools, good teachers that is, insist on learners of games "caring about what is worth while" in and of games, that is "the know-how" and "know thyself" of games.

The third and last of Prof. Peters' criteria of what constitutes education, is the cognitive content of any body of knowledge, by which its place in a coherent pattern of life can be seen. He says there is very little to know about games. - They are a matter of "knowing how" - rather than, "knowing that". Games he says are set apart from the main business of living and the supposed application to the wider area of life of many games is a myth perpetrated by schoolmasters. The plural many games is significant. It might almost seem as if Prof. Peters may not be as well informed about games and schoolmasters as his convictions warrant. The trouble with we schoolmasters has been that we persisted in saying only one game matters.

Apart from this slip we concur, Games have little cognitive content. This is why they are so called. This is the meaning of the word. The term came by way of royal and aristocratic prerogative to make "game" out of the very means of subsistence of the commoner, through the "paradigm" of the commoners making "game" out of the misery of the "main business of living". Games are devised out of the urgent need to engage the noncognitive nature of man. Their purpose and function is to make sense, order, coherence, indeed a cosmogony, out of the inherent and intrinsic sporting non-cognitive nature of man, which can well find its own outlets unguided.

I said we agreed with Prof. Peters but into his immediate argument on games he introduces rather glibly, the cognitive concept of the main Business of living". He does not qualify this in any way other than by sport having nothing to do with it. With respect, I was dismayed in not being very much more sure of the main business of living after reading his address than before. He does not consider that the concept of education is concerned with extrinsic ends, such as space travel, the socialising process, free expression or even obvious moral education, as I read, but I hasten to ascribe my confusion to my obtuseness and not to any obscurity.

I am quite clear about the premise on which is based his thesis. He lives "in the concrete problems of human nature and human conduct". Dare I recommend to his notice anew one such problem which has exercised history and his distinguished predecessors, the great humanists and educationists up to the time of his own high office? Dare I ask him to suggest a better model for the persistent obstrusive sporting nature of man than our misguided efforts to make it a medium of education? Prof. Peters knows far better than any history or games master what happened to it in history. With the Greeks, - music and gymnastic; with the church, - ascetism and monasticism; with mediaeval royalty - banned by law; with those who made the main business of life in the last century, an industrial revolution, - send the children to the mills, the chimneys and the mines where their surplus energy can be employed - not that I for one moment subscribe to that child bating surplus energy theory for the busy feet and pounding hearts of the young and swift; in the 20th century - Nazi Youth. I prefer Plato's, as does Professor Peters when it becomes his argument, the medium of the awakening of the

"spirited element in human nature".

The main business of life, if I as a fool muddled oaf dare rush in and attempt a layman's "synoptic directive of living" is to devise a school and a world which engages all the manifold attributes of human nature and conduct at the highest level which will work for all and we teachers who have to deal with that nature and conduct in embryo in a world which the "main business of living" seems to be work, war, want, classrooms, Newsom pupils, G. C. E. and competing for university places or for world cups - I intend no cognitive innuendo in the juxtaposition of the latter two - have discovered some mode of release of the spirit in the happy "knacks" of the lissom language of movement of the body, in function, in art and in sport.

I have tried in this address to discharge my duty to an audience and some of my debt to sport; in particular to the surpassing "know how" of games which if not education in abstract essence gives rise to some valued side effects which go with strenuous training in the warmly taught and freely accepted disciplines of all substantial subjects.