

The Postmodern Sentiment and Teaching Physical Education

後現代主義的觀感與體育教學

Arthur Chi Tak WONG

*Department of Education,
Hong Kong Baptist University, HONG KONG*

Lobo Hung Tak LOUIE

*Department of Physical Education Studies,
Hong Kong Baptist University, HONG KONG*

黃志德

香港浸會大學教育學系

雷雄德

香港浸會大學體育學系



Abstract

Man believed that the world was composed of man, the subject and non-human entities, the objects. Philosophy attempts to locate the nature of either subjects or objects, thus, the argument between subjectivism and objectivism. Such metaphysical arguments go on for thousands of years without coming to an agreement. Philosophers in the last century turn their attentions away from the subject – object argument. They focus on the bridge of the two - language, which is the focus of postmodernism. This paper tries to elaborate briefly the nature of post-modernity and its influence on current education practices, particularly on physical education. It is not meant to claim academic rigor in this short essay for the purpose of it is only to inform those, PE teachers in particularly, who are new to postmodern thoughts. It is only an alignment of some relevant writings gearing to this purpose.

摘要

哲學是探討應該如何活在世上、何種事物是存在的及此類事物的本質、什麼算是真的知識以及什麼是推理的正確原則的一門學科。哲學並不存在一個沒有爭議的定義，這個領域隨著時代轉變而不斷地擴張，且根據不同的時代對不同的問題也有改變。後現代主義把哲學定義為創造概念的學術，本文嘗試從哲學觀點探討後現代主義與體育教學的關係。

Introduction

“Today is 1 Jan 2008”. But man has already existed over a few thousands of years. Why only a record of two thousand years? Is there really a point of time labeled as 1 Jan 2008? “, wrote a journalist (Cheung, 2008). Kant suggested that man, as distinct from other

creatures on earth, had a sense of time and space. Man had a sense of history and causal relationship. But only when man developed a language system were these expressed in communicable forms. ”It was for the purpose of communication that man has to agree that the year Jesus Christ was born was the year BC 0001. By the same token, the directional system of east-west-north-south

was also a man made convention.” The afore mentioned journalist wrote this perhaps without knowing that this was a postmodern discourse or, most likely, he thought that postmodernism is no big deal, similar writings existed long time ago in western and oriental literatures. True is it that such thoughts were abundant in academic writings that dated far back in history. But only until the later half of the last century was the term postmodernism coined and took root. It is a collective term with a few core ideas:

There is not an essential nature that is common to all man. Man’s nature is shaped by their given languages, cultures, and the living environments.

That there is always one possible answer to one thing, and that a meta-theory or grand theory that explains everything are no longer plausible. There is probably not a single unifying Truth, but many versions of truth. Given that we accept that there is a unifying Truth, there bounds to be many interpretations of it expressed in different discourses.

Language is not a representation of the reality but language is the reality. It creates people’s reality through descriptions and re-descriptions. In other words, reality is not discovered but invented based on certain episteme or ideology. Subsequently, and most important of all, man has no privilege over other animals or creatures on earth in the interpretation of reality. We has no right to think that the reality as we see it with our sense organs are closer to the Truth than that sensed by the sound wave of the bat or the infra-red system of some snakes. On similar ground, no culture could be purported to be better than one another and, thus, the acceptance of a pluralistic society where dominance of ideological, religious, political, economical and cultural forms is absent.

This essence of postmodernism makes best sense when positioned against an earlier western cultural development which took shape during the seventeenth and eighteenth century, which we now called Modernism. We shall come back to this shortly in later paragraphs. Postmodern thoughts often expressed themselves in arenas such as feminist debates, environmental issues, conflicts in politics, cultures, religions, ideology, races, classes and genders, and through prevailing subjects such as:

Truth;
 Language and its relation to thought and to the world;
 Reason, science, and technology;
 Human nature and the self;
 The Other (an individual or group considered as different);
 Power and oppression; and ;
 Creativity and the aesthetic.

Postmodernism does not appear all at a sudden. It actually evolves along the development of modernism. Modernism took shape as a secular movement that crippled in people’s mind subsequent to a thousand years of Dark Age. The Renaissance (1440~1540) brought to the stage a new culture: capitalist in economy, classical in art and literature and scientific in the approach to nature. Renowned scientists like Copernicus (1473~1543), Galileo (1564~1642), to be followed by Thomas Hobbes (1588~1677), Isaac Newton (1642~1727), were the prelude to modernism. They brought to the public new descriptions of the universe which were once accountable only by religions. It is now commonly agreed that modernism emerged when Descartes, originally a mathematician, doubted everything and quested for certainty in the early seventeenth century. Descartes was thus regarded as a significant figure among the rationalists who believed that we should stick to “reasons’, and reasons alone, in the quest for truth. Descartes was accepted as the father of modern philosophy. However, he ended up with a metaphysical and transcendental dictum, the famous “I think, therefore I am” which is regarded as highly dualistic.

But the empiricists in the later seventeenth century, as heralded by Bacon (1561~1626), Hobbes (1588~1679), and Locke (1632~1704), fought against this view and suggested that “reason must be supplemented with experience” in claiming knowledge status. Rationalism and empiricism combined to promote, in parallel to the then prevailing scientific findings, the enlightenment project. In echo with Galileo’s earlier postulation that “the book of nature was written in the language of mathematics”, people believed mathematics and science were the key to truth. Nobody would doubt that “it was science which would lead human beings to the Promised Land.” It would be science that released man from ignorance, poverty, pain and oppression (Lynn, 1996) Science became the new God.

While modernism was getting strength with the support of the development of science, or rather when science was taking the place of religion, the seedling of postmodernism was planted. There were others who vowed differently. Among these deviants was Giambattista Vico (1688~1744). He had been totally ignored in his life time. His writings were widely quoted in Isaiah Berlin's writing (Berlin, 2003). He criticized Descartes's notions as too "reliant on mathematics, which was anyway constructed by Man." Regarding science, Vico beheld the principle that "We can only know for certain that which we have made or created" (implying that man can never be certain about things beyond artifacts). This point was picked up by Kant a hundred years later and Rorty, a few hundred years later. In humanity, Vico rejected "a fixed idea of man's nature". He heralded pluralism and argued that "the various aspects of a society formed a coherent, inter-related pattern." Vico also put much emphasis on language, myth, law, ritual and other cultural aspects in the shaping of society and, certainly, man as well (Osborne, 1992).

Back in the modernist camp, someone raised some ideas that were destructive to the foundation of its own teaching. Hume (1711~1776), a skeptic empiricist, argued that reason did not show us whether any of the following were true that

there was a self which stayed the same over time;
 there were necessary cause-and-effect relationships (say, between a flaming match and a burnt finger);
 the natural regularities observed so far would continue in the future (such as the sun rising in the morning);
 there existed either material or mental objects (atoms, God, individual minds); and
 any human act was morally right or wrong.

Hume's key arguments that nothing was certain, not even the rising of the sun the day after and that reason alone cannot prompt action were striking. Since "moral judgments do prompt action, they cannot be based on reason alone.....without feeling and passion there would be no moral behavior". These notions started to tear apart modernist's view that there was an essential nature of the reality which we were going to find out through science. And based on this knowledge we would be able to make the right moral judgments.

Kant (1724~1804), one of the greatest and respected modern philosophers, was probably aware of that our knowing is limited when he used the term "noumena" to mean things as they were and "phenomena" for things as they appeared to us. That is, Kant believed that "on the one hand there is what exists, independently of us and our capacity for experience; and on the other hand there is what we have the means of experiencing; and there could never be good reason for believing that these are the same." (Magee, 1998, p. 135). To Kant, the noumena are unknowable. He was singing the same tune as Vico.

Entering the nineteenth century, while another heavy weight German philosopher, Hegel (1770~1831) argued that "history has a purpose in that it is the march of reason towards freedom and a better way of life, with human societies inevitably moving forward toward increasingly rational social institutions and moral codes", more arguments against the modernist project were brought in by Darwin (1809~1882) and Nietzsche (1844~1900). Darwin was remembered in the biological world more than anywhere else. But his ideas, as suggested in his great work "On the Origin of Species", that "there is no rational universe to be discovered" and life evolved in a "blind and pointless struggle. The emergence of a new species of plant or animal has nothing to do with a rational unfolding of a preexisting plan; it is a consequence of nothing more than a series of contingent events, of a history of random mutations of accidents which happened to be selected by changing environmental conditions." So talking about being true to our nature or that history had a purpose was senseless. This again lent support to the postmodernist view that man, together with all other animals and creatures, is but a part of a harmonic matrix that no one was privileged over the other.

Nietzsche, greatly influenced by his predecessor, Arthur Schopenhauer (1788~1860) who believed that "we know the world of appearances through the operation of the will", maintained that human being were just wills to power. He was apparently the first western philosopher to stress that all thought was linguistic and that language imposed a shape on the way human beings think about the world. Unlike Hume, who argued that the individual imagination created the picture of reality, Nietzsche emphasized that the creator was the public language which had been internalized. He concluded that "the truth seeker cannot get to the original text of nature (but).... various 'interpretations,' i.e. subjective views of nature

rather than an objective copy". He told us that it was "time to abandon the modernist project, time to forget about original text (essence of nature or reality) and solid foundations."

Nietzsche's work was further strengthened by that of Saussure (1857~1913) and Wittgenstein (1889~1951), who argued that "words get their meaning not from their relation to objects in the world, but from the other words in the language game that they are a part of; it is the total linguistic system that determines the meaning of its individual parts, not their relation to something outside the system." Wittgenstein's later work denounced that "any language or description gives us an accurate picture of the world, no matter how logically precise or scientific." Their work also maintained that language was not a tool to express thought. Thought and language are interdependent. Organized thought is necessarily in form of a language and much so a public language. Thinking is basically a public rather than private activity and thus is subject to the examination or measurement of objective (external) references. Up to this point, the postmodern views that language creates one's reality and indeed the self; and that man, in Wittgenstein's words, is like the fly in the transparent bottle (language), come into shape and postmodernism began to sprout.

The subsequent development of Existentialism and Phenomenology on the continent, noticeably in German and France, after the two great wars and numerous holocausts contributed to the postmodern movement greatly. In fact, it all started with the work of Soren Kierkegaard (1813~1855), a Danish philosopher, who was greatly influenced by Nietzsche's writing. The subsequent labor of Husserl (1859~1938), Heidegger (1889~1976), Sartre (1905~1980) and Merleau-Ponty (1908~1961), all of them continental philosophers, made the branch of thoughts known to the world. Similar to postmodernism, there are many different focuses. They have little more in common than they are all philosophies of life. It bloomed against the despair that was the consequence of industrialization and the entailing rational but de-humanized sentiment. Man became subservient to machine and objectified. The traditional human values were not respected anymore. Tired in the hunt of Truth, they are more concerned with questions of human existence and how to face our predicament. They do not care much about the nature of reality or man like their predecessors did. They understand that the reality of the universe, the "rational" world, the objective society,

and the essence of man are subject to the interpretation of the "will" of human kind, which is irrational, and subject to man's sensations, emotions and feelings. They care more about how things come into being what they are. They are interested in the process of unfolding and becoming.

Some basic characteristics of this branch of thought are (Li, 1993): Existentialism is not a distant, indifferent and objective analysis of issue. It takes a passionate and committed attitude; Existentialism assumes the following differences between subject (man) and object (things):

Man has to live against the past, be responsible for the presence and decide his own future

Man is free and autonomous and can say "no" (Satre)

Man can rebel and transcend his own destiny (Camus)

Man is his own master and can set his own value judgment (Nietzsche)

Existentialists respected individuality, personal right and uniqueness more than man as a collective entity.

A fundamental principal here is important. Whereas Existentialists preached a wide variety of thoughts, there is one common line of all their teachings: Existence precedes essence. Essence is the perceived nature of things, the definition or ideas imposed on things by the perceiver. For artificial entities, essence often precedes existence. For example, we define (or think of the function of) a chair before we make it. We ask "what is it for?" and then decide its shape and structure. The same questions are not applicable on man or things that we don't make. We cannot ask what man is made for (unless one believes that there is a creator, God). Similarly, it is no point asking what the sun is for. "Existence is about the particular and the essence is about the general. The particular cannot be thought of (or subject to conceptual analysis) since to think about something is always to manipulate with the general of the object to be thought of." said Kierkegaard (Palmer, 1996). Up to this point, it is interesting to mention that it was said that Kierkegaard has in front of his working desk the Dao De Jin (Taoism) of Lao Tze.

Kierkegaard maintained that existing was a form of doing, not a form of thinking. The kind of thought that was essentially related to doing was what he called "subjective truth" which is about "how" as against the "Objective

truth” (we shall be wondering its existence now) which was about the “what”. In line with Hume, he maintained that knowing about certain objective truth would not change one’s behavior and no is (being /existence) implies an “ought” (essence).....Decision and action are motivated by values, not by facts.”

Existentialism insights are “subjective truth” in that there are no objective criteria to establish their validity, and, to be made valid, they must be appropriated by the individual, internalized, and reflected in one’s decisions and actions. Subjective truths are not pieces of knowledge; rather they are ways of arranging knowledge and activating it. These “truths” are grounded not in some facts about the external world, but in the discovery of the evasiveness, the tenuousness, and the uncertainty of life.

The more current position of postmodernism is consolidated by the work of a group of Paris based philosophers such as J F Lyotard (1924~1998) who laid down the foundational tone of postmodernism in his book “The Postmodern Condition”. M Foucault (1926~1984), and Derrida J (1930~) are also the better known extensive writers of this group. These people’s work was, built on the previous labor of Saussure and Wittgenstein, developed into two fashionable branches of thoughts during the 60s to the 90s of the last century, structuralism and post-structuralism. Structuralism, put at its simplest, is “the view that any discourse of any kind, philosophical or otherwise, is a structure in language and that is all.” The argument that the text carries nothing beyond the language game entails a subsequent movement to interpret “texts primarily in terms of rules governing the various uses of language- to see them as about discourse, language, communication and so on” (Magee, 1998). This critical approach is known as post-structuralism or better as “deconstructionism” after Derrida’s much promotion. Deconstructionism “involves demystifying a text, tearing it apart to reveal its internal hierarchies and its presuppositions (the act of deconstruction takes place within the terms that have shaped the text; it does not stand outside of the text but unfolds within the position being discussed in the text itself.)...It lays out the flaws and the latent metaphysical structures of a text...A deconstructive reading of a text seeks to discover its ambivalence, blindness, logocentricity...examines what is left out of a text, what is unnamed, what is excluded and what is concealed.... Quite simply, there is nothing more to interpretations than the endless plays of words” (Schwandt, 1997).

On the other hand, Foucault’s extensive writing in “Madness and Civilization”, “The order of things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences”, “The Archaeology of Knowledge”, “The Birth of the Clinic: An Archaeology of Medical Perception”, “Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison” and so on, expresses the view that every discourse is an attempt on the part of its user to exercise power over others. He criticizes the dominant’s oppressions imposed on the weak or minor groups. He accuses modernity being rational but de-humanized. Regarding truth, he suggests that we can never know the Truth because we can see things only through human sense organs and by the aids of man-made instruments under certain theory loaded framework. But we can approximate truth and try to bracket it. As such, the more critically and logically formed descriptions of the reality, the closer we are to truth though we will never know even if we have already grasped reality as it is.

The academic world may therefore be, analogically, regarded as a club joined by licensed hunters whose mission is to hunt an unknown creature called “Truth”. Knowing not what the creature looks like, these hunters can only agree to the methods and procedures of the game. They will show each other at regular meetings their progressions and open to other hunters of the club for scrutiny whatever hunted so far.

But these and other postmodern writers, partly due to the deviant ideology they beheld and partly due to their dense, intricate and opaque writing style, are derided by the more traditional camps including the positivists from the Vienna Circle, and the more recent Frankfurt School, as nihilistic. When postmodern writing are subject to serious examinations, “they often turned out to be rhetorically hollow, saying something only vaguely focused, or perhaps saying nothing at all, or else something trivial, or false, or self-contradictory.” (Magee, 1998, p. 219). Contemporary writers in the traditional camp like Terry Eagleton (1996), Christopher Norris (2000), and Habermas (1983) from the critical school are of course aware of the limitation of the current theory on epistemology. But they refrain from accepting postmodernism claiming that modernism is an unfinished project. It still has a long way to go. Perhaps, like Howard Gardner (2000) has put it, the most common counter argument against postmodernism would be that: “One cannot take a position that stresses the relativity of all knowledge and yet at the same time claim the right to be listened to and taken seriously.” However, my account in defending

postmodernism is two fold. First, this counter argument is transcendental in nature and shows the limitation or weaknesses of our language system. The statement "Nothing is absolute." claims to be absolute. One may ask if the saying that "Things are relative." covers itself. Secondly, we do not think that the key point being made by postmodernists is "relativity of all knowledge". Rather, it is plurality. Except some radical ones, postmodernists do believe that there is a truth that is worth arguing. Otherwise, they don't bother to argue at all. But that truth is subject to different versions of interpretation or description.

A contemporary philosopher tries to bridge the gap between the traditional camp and the postmodern camp. If truth is meant to be a belief or description of the world that corresponds to the way the world actually is, Rorty, alongside his postmodern alliances, reiterates that "it is impossible to determine if a belief or description accurately represents the world as it exists independent of thought." He even goes further to emphasize that "we have no reason to think that the language of modern science is somehow unique when it comes to corresponding to the world....Why should we ever infer that a language (scientific discourses included) we made can accurately describe a nature that we don't make?" The work of Thomas Kuhn (1970) also lends its support to Rorty. Kuhn argues forcefully that even scientific truths are changeable according to the change in epistemes or a shift in the paradigms. The evolution of science has shown how the reality of nature is re-described time after time. As regard to the self, Rorty maintain that there is no reason to suppose that an introspecting human being has a direct view into her self. For whenever one introspects and thinks about what one really is, one directly encounters nothing but descriptions of what one is. The so called the "real self" is nothing more than a particular description that one prefers (Lynn, 1996, pp.34-48). To this end, Rorty is as nihilistic as his postmodern friends. But he is an American pragmatic. While acknowledging the limitation of human kind to know Rorty insists that there is no inference from "one cannot give a theory-independent description of a thing" to "there are no theory-independent things". Equally so there is no inference from "there is no way to know a thing except under a particular description" to "there is no way to know that that thing exists (and act) independently of its particular description (and descriptions in general)" (Rorty, 1980, p.279).

Inspired by his predecessor John Dewy, he shifts his attention to what works for the interest of mankind. He beholds that "it is true because it works". Whatever language games that we play, and whatever discourses we construct; it is truth if it serves to the ultimate human goals. For Rorty, the ultimate human goals are free and autonomous people living in a democratic society which is immune from cruelty and holocausts.

For education professionals like us, whether modernism or postmodernism is right seems not to our immediate concern. We may notice that they are in fact not mutually exclusive in some sense. First, it seems that modernism is more focus on the so called objective world while postmodernism on man and his/her environment. In this sense, postmodernism is more in line with oriental philosophies, particularly those developed in China. Second, while modernism rejects postmodernism, it has not yet disproved substantively postmodernist's argument about truth. On the other hand, postmodernism is accommodative to modernism. For whatever conflicts between the two, modernism is after all but one of the many discourses, another version of truth. "To put it another way: if different theories are like so many yardsticks for measuring nature – and the more accurate the yardstick the better the measurement – then (when it comes to comparing theories) it is obviously illogical to turn the relationship around and use 'nature itself' as the 'measure' of each theory's accuracy" (McHoul and Grace, 1993, p.10). Third, modern sciences do triumph many successes in making human live better in many ways. The many negative blames on sciences such as wars, genetics melancholy, new diseases, etc, do not rest on sciences but the scientists or other vicious persons who use sciences to the wrong ends. Modernism is about a general Truth whereas postmodernism is about some particular truths which are specific to some persons and under certain context. It is also on such sentiments that qualitative research grounds its validity. To this token, one may argue that to be scientific is to reason according to some agreed forms or procedures, and that both qualitative and quantitative works could tell an aspect of the Truth. Education research in particular has to take an integrated approach.

The above is just a very brief account of postmodernism. It may not be sufficiently comprehensive. But we believe that enough has been said to highlight its key points. If readers are interested in knowing more, a little book by W T Anderson (1995) "The Truth about the Truth: De-confusing and Re-constructing the Postmodern World" has a collection of many postmodern scripts produced by renowned writers. So much is said about postmodernism. Let us return to the characteristics of modernism.

Modernity and Education

As afore said, rationalism married with empiricism to push forward the Enlightenment project. The Enlightenment project entails the emergence of MODERNITY. Modernity enshrines the spirit of enlightenment, secular reasoning. Developments in the natural sciences and the analytical philosophies, among them positivism is skeletal, work hand in hand to lay a firm foundation. However, it is very controversial to define modernity. Rather, the following are some descriptions to provide a boundary for this concept:

Started to take shape during the 17th-18th century
Rejection of the classic and characterized by a strong belief of science and progress

Modernity may be considered as the consciousness of new horizons in epistemic structures and moral awareness rather than an epoch in time

A hope for progress toward freedom and better life in a more just society

Creative expressions in all forms of cultural life including art and politics

Promote fragmentation rather than wholeness

Modernity can be perceived as positivistic, technocratic, and rationalistic

It can be identified with the belief in linear progress, absolute truths, the rational planning of ideal social orders and the standardization of knowledge and production

The triumph of purposive-instrumental rationality that led to the "iron cage" (Marx Weber's terms)

Certainly, modernity improves human predicament tremendously. But then things are organized more on efficiency and instrumental reasons. Technical knowledge lays the ground for most everything rather than political

and moral principles. The "iron cage" imprisons humanity. Apart from its merits, modernity is also suffocating or strangling human freedom and creativity. Under these modernist sentiments, some kind of pedagogy was gradually developed in education with the following characteristics:

The teacher teaches and the students are taught
The teacher knows everything and the students know nothing

The teacher thinks and the students are thought about

The teacher talks and the students listen – meekly

The teacher disciplines and the students are disciplined

The teacher chooses and enforces his choices, and the students comply

The teacher acts and the students have the illusion of acting through the action of the teacher

The teacher chooses the program content, and the students (who were not consulted) adapt to it

The teacher confuses the authority of knowledge with his/her own professional authority, which he/she sets in opposition to the freedom of the students

The teachers is the Subject of the learning process, while the pupils are mere Objects

The Postmodern Sentiment

With the earlier discussion on postmodernism in mind, we can precipitate the following characteristics out of the postmodern sentiment:

Stresses that subjective truth is as true as objective truth and perhaps there is no objective truth at all

See things in context, as a whole and not in fragmentation

Celebrate differences and emphasize on equality and justice and thus object dominance and oppression of any kind

Promote freedom and individuality

Disregard meta-narratives and grand history

Emancipation from oppression and alienation

The ultimate quests of education are therefore to:

Re-humanize human beings

- ◆ Empowerment
- ◆ Emancipation
- ◆ Communication
- ◆ Develop a just society
- ◆ Equality and equity
- ◆ Mutual respect
- ◆ Inclusive

(Built on Freire, 2000, Pedagogy of the Oppressed)

Implications for Physical Education

A marked phenomenon of modernity is the objectification of the subject. Our body is treated as a machine "in which the self lived, the site of an animal nature which required conscious regulation." "The body was resolved into a complex of different biomechanical systems, conceived in thermodynamic terms. Other technologies were applied to it: drugs, inoculation, electricity; as well as various external regimes designed to improve its make-up, shape, and the flow of energies through it" (Armstrong 1998, p. 2). Our body is open to subjugation of both external (social) and internal (psychological) regulations.

To contribute to the development of technical rationality, a strong nation in the form of a state, and productive citizens in terms of military and economy, PE pedagogy at this time emphasized the building of a strong body that are disciplined, obedient and efficient. Gymnastics drills, a range of regulative and normative practices aiming at schooling a docile body, were just the perfect invention toward this end in the UK and many other western countries.

On the other hand, games, which were considered disciplined and control of another kind, were popular in the private schools in Britain for the upper class. Whereas gymnastics was some kind of discipline and control imposed on the pupils of the ordinary class, games were some kind of self inflicted discipline and control for the development of leadership and desirable characters for the up rising middle class which were grasping great influence in both politics and economy. It is again a docile body, but this time brought about by introjects, values that are internalized. In Giulianotti's words (2005), who borrows on Foucault, drills and gymnastics were for the shaping

of the docile bodies of the lower class whereas games were for the molding of the confessional bodies who helped to sustain middle class values and ideology.

With the above understanding, let us ask ourselves some questions:

What is the essence (nature, or perceived definition) of sports?

What is the essence of PE?

Does sport's existence precede its essence?

Does PE's existence precede its essence?

Is the current trend of PE/sports on the conceptual analysis of movement or the participation of movement? Or, what should it be?

Does understanding (the pursuit of sports sciences) promote participation?

What should be the nature of our PE curriculum?

How should we teach PE in school?

It has been part of our culture to include PE and sport in education, or rather, schooling. PE and sports have to contribute to re-humanizing people and the development of a just society. To this ends, professionals in the field should think seriously the principles that follow:

Do not accept science and systems on face value; scientism is different from being scientific. No science and system are value free.

No size fit all system.

Content and instructional strategy selections are value loaded. All contents and instructional strategies carry with them an ideology.

Individualize programs and instruction whenever possible.

Diversified curriculum and a variety of strategies are desirable.

Effectiveness of teaching refers not only to technical efficiency (thus be careful in using systematic observation systems) but higher level of moral conducts such as:

Freedom and just

Fairness

Equity and equality between sex, ethnicities, abilities, classes

Respect of the environment
 Respect and be compassionate with the Others
 Virtues such as honesty, bravery, loyalty,
 perseverance etc.

What we should do in the near future? What should we do-perhaps what must we do-to ensure that our profession will move more decisively and rapidly in the direction of what might be called true professional status? Granting that the various social forces will impact upon us willy-nilly, what can we do collectively in the years immediately ahead? These positive steps should be actions that will effect a workable consolidation of purposeful accomplishments on the part of those men and women who have a concern for the future of developmental physical activity as a valuable component of human life from birth to death (Zeibler, 2005).

Conclusion

If so far readers are impressed that modernity is bad and postmodernism is good, we would offer our apology here. Not quite so. Seemingly opposite to one another, modernism and postmodernism in fact are the two sides of the same coin. One attends to the objective world and the other the subjective world. This is not new. Except the insight on language and its relationship to reality and the self, many postmodern thoughts would appear familiar to someone like us who read a bit of Chinese philosophy such as Taoism, Confucian's teaching, and Buddhism. Postmodernism does carries a lot of thoughts similar to these oriental ancient thoughts. The authors would see the two schools complementary to each other in making a more complete system rather than contradictory. To this regard, educational practices biased by either school should be seen as different rather than rivalry. Some situations may warrant modernistic education whereas some other times postmodernist teaching works better. If modernity is overwhelmingly negative, why is the kind of highly de-humanized military training camps for young people so popular nowadays? Perhaps there is a subtle difference between "inhuman" and "de-human". The "de-humanizing" character of modernism may be relevant sometimes and somewhere as means to certain ends. Moreover, one must not be confused by people who practice authoritarianism or pedagogy of an oppressive nature under the umbrella of modernism. We do not agree that modernity is inherently an "iron cage" for human nature. But exercised

to the extreme, technical rationality does become a straight jacket for human development. But so does everything in excess. Knowing the strengths and weaknesses of each school will enable teachers to make relevant and adequate pedagogical choices. Teachers have to bear in mind that all medicines are drugs and all drugs could cure some diseases while dangerous if administered wrongly. The key is when and how to use what.

References

- Anderson, W. T. (1995). *The Truth about the Truth: De-confusing and Re-constructing the Postmodern World*. New York: Jeremy P Tarcher/Putnam.
- Armstrong, T. (1998). *Modernism, technology and the body*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Berlin, I. (2003). *The Crooked Timber of Humanity: chapters in the history of ideas*. Pimlico.
- Cheung, L. (2008). Musing over time and space. *Hong Kong Economic Journal*. P. 8.
- Eagleton, T. (1996). *The Illusion of Postmodernism*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Gardener, H. (2000). *The disciplined mind*. London: Penguin Books.
- Giulianotti, R. (2005). *Sport: A critical sociology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Habermas, J. (1983). Modernity: an incomplete project in *The Anti-aesthetics: Essays on Postmodern Culture*. In Ed. Hal Foster, pp. 3-15. Port Townsend, Washington: Bay Press.
- Kuhn, T. (1970). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Li, T. M. (1993). *Introduction to Existentialism, (6th ed)*, Taiwan: Student Publisher.

Magee, B. (1998). *The Story of Philosophy*. Montreal.: The Reader's Digest Association (Canada) Ltd.

McHoul, A., & Grace, W. (2000). *A Foucault Primer: Discourse, power and the subject*. New York University Press.

Norris C. (2000). *Deconstructionism and the 'Unfinished Project of Modernity'*. London: The Athlone Press.

Osborne, R. (1992). *Philosophy for Beginners. Beginners Documentary Comic Books*.

Palmer, D. D. (1996). *Kiekeggard for Beginners*. New York: Writers and Readers Publishing.

Schwandt, T. A. (1997). *Qualitative Inquiry: A Dictionary of Terms*. London: SAGE.

Rorty, R. (1980). *Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Zeigler, E. (2005). *History and status of American physical education and educational sport*. Victoria, BC, Canada: Trafford.

Correspondence:

Arthur Wong
Department of Education,
Faculty of Social Science,
Hong Kong Baptist University,
Kowloon Tong, Hong Kong.
Email: arthurtwong@hotmail.com