

# “Excellence Without Snobs and Equality Without Slobs”: Harry S. Broudy’s Theory of General Education

**Jayson Evaniuck, Eastern New Mexico University**

## **Introduction**

Harry S. Broudy established himself as a prominent thinker, speaker, and writer within U.S. education during the 1950s–1980s. He cemented a powerful legacy championing a pathway toward general education excellence and equality for all learners in the face of relentless vocational pressures on U.S. general education. Like classical realists Socrates and Aristotle as well as pragmatist John Dewey, Broudy endeavored to bring equality to U.S. society by way of its public education system.

Broudy’s unique convergence of original philosophical thought and skilled oration resulted in high demand for his writing, presentation, and educational insight for over 30 years. Broudy was invited to deliver over 300 presentations, including the Annual John Dewey Society Lecture in 1977, which yielded his book *Truth and Credibility: The Citizen’s Dilemma*. Today, as with the approach of Isocrates in the classical era, the skilled orator is not necessarily a philosopher but, moreover, is the interpreter and communicator par excellence of extensive theoretical work from among contemporaries.

Within Broudy’s papers is an unsourced printout, “Reflections,” wherein the quotable Broudy states, “This my colleagues—B. Othanel Smith and Joe R. Burnett—and I...constructed a curriculum designed to produce excellence without snobs and equality without slobs” (Broudy, n.d.a.). Twenty-three years after publishing *Democracy and Excellence in American Secondary Education*, he emphasizes the phrase yet again in *The Role of Imagery in Learning*: “This country is caught between the ideals of excellence and equality. How to have excellence without snobs and equality without slobs is the perennial problem of an enlightened democracy” (1987, p. 48). If it is possible for a succinct quotation to capture an educational thinker’s weight, then “excellence without snobs and equality without slobs” captures Broudy’s tenor and commitment to general education within his philosophy of education.

Broudy's educational philosophy for a democratic society stands out amidst today's rampant college-and-career-readiness rhetoric. The idea of an excellent general education for all on the surface may lack unique appeal; however, the consistency and rigor of Broudy's articulations on the topic warrant further consideration. While Broudy's term "general education" may appear vague, I nevertheless use his term since it recurs through his philosophy of general education. To properly contextualize Broudy's philosophy, I highlight his understanding of his *Humanitas* in informing a liberal-arts-focused system of general education. Then, within the theme of *Humanitas*, I explicitly connect his adage "excellence without snobs and equality without slobes" to his theory of democratic general education, emphasizing the social foundations of his philosophy. I then evidence connections between Broudy's four ways of learning, which he regarded as his most persuasive argument for his philosophy of general education with Michael Polyani's tacit knowing. Finally, I compare Broudy's philosophy with W.E.B. Dubois' argument for a liberal arts education in the face of vocational pressures in order to demonstrate its timeless and timely qualities.

### **Background**

Educational philosopher Harry S. Broudy migrated to the U.S. from Poland at an early age. From a rabbinical family on his father's side, he attended a traditional Hebrew cheder school in Poland (Liora Bresler, personal communication, February 14, 2019). At the age of seven, Broudy, without knowledge of English, entered Massachusetts public schools. In his youth, after beginning studies in chemical engineering at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, he transferred to Boston University to study German literature and philosophy. Broudy's master's and Ph.D. were earned at Harvard; he studied philosophy under Ralph Barton Perry, William Hocking, John Wild, and Alfred North Whitehead (Broudy, 1974a). According to Broudy's close colleagues, it was Whitehead's influence which left the most substantive imprint on Broudy's work and thought (Bresler, 2001). Despite a prominent academic lineage in the field of philosophy, Broudy accepted a position at North Adams State Teachers College teaching psychology and philosophy of education. Years later, his widow, Dorothy Broudy, claims anti-semitism within ivy-league philosophy departments hindered Broudy's potential for tenure (Bresler, 2001; Liora Bresler, personal communication, February 14, 2019). Broudy lived his commitment to public education as a professor at North Adams Teachers College from 1937–1949, Framingham Teachers College from 1949–1957, and finally gaining notoriety at the University of Illinois Urbana–Champaign from 1957–1974. Broudy continued his productive career into the 1990s as professor emeritus.

## An "Excellent" General Education

### *Humanitas*

The egalitarian dimensions of Broudy's general education embodied in his phrase "excellence without snobs and equality without slob" are situated within Broudy's *Humanitas* (1972; 1973): a treatise on human nature and the cultivation of the self and a thematic underpinning of the entirety of Broudy's educational philosophy rooted in the study of philosophy, history, literature, and the arts. Self-cultivation is advanced through education, since "all human beings have capacities for intellectual, moral, and aesthetic experience that will not be fully developed without education" (1958, p. 996). Self-cultivation,

...through general education, or indeed by any other means, in our time is a moral enterprise, a test of moral strenuousness.... But it may well be that in the tightly organized, technologically interdependent web we live in this may be the last avenue of escape into individuality and freedom. (1974b, p. 50)

As a classical realist, Broudy connects freedom and fulfillment through learning to the Aristotelian conception of liberal education. Aristotle's model is often charged with founding educational elitism since, during Aristotle's time, only the wealthy had leisure time to pursue fulfillment through education. On the contrary, Broudy argues the U.S.' wealth and democracy mean the nation can and should facilitate an "elite" education for all (Broudy, Smith, & Burnett, 1964; Broudy, 1971), insisting the humanities offer a crucial window into democratic life. Like Aristotle, Broudy aligns self-cultivation through education with happiness, explaining:

I can find only one argument that seems persuasive. It is that if general studies are neglected in early youth, the road to self-cultivation in later years may be closed, and if perchance the happiness of the self-cultivated man (not pleasure of the moment) is worth having, many will never get a chance to experience it. (1974b, p. 49)

Broudy's notion of happiness connects human flourishing through freedom of the mind juxtaposed with vocational foci. A close graduate student and later colleague, Donald Vandenberg (1992), posits Broudy's humanities focus may appear elitist on the surface; however, he surmises Broudy's commitment to equal opportunity through a single-ladder education system is instead rooted in the natural, right assumption of universal human nature and Kant's moral imperative of humans' intrinsic value regardless of race, religion, or social class.

*Humanitas* helps explain why Broudy lacked popularity among some contemporary educational theorists. In the late 1960s and 1970s multicultural

education, vocational education, and elective-focused schooling meant more individualized educational approaches. Broudy rejects this trend towards schooling as a personalized encounter, discarding the Western educational tradition. He critiques the underlying philosophy as existential humanism or new humanism (Broudy, 1972), opposing traditional *humanis* and thereby inducting the young into an intellectual, moral, and aesthetic heritage through self-disciplined study (Broudy, 1973). While aligned with some aspects, “the thrust of the new humanism in education is justified and, on the whole, a healthy reminder of who we are, what we are, and what might become of us all” (p. 73); as a result he cautions against those reproofs and reminders charting the future of U.S. schooling. Within Broudy’s papers, an unpublished reflection paper provides perhaps the most erudite articulation of his theory on general education while hinting at such dissent among many in his profession:

Most of my professional troubles have stemmed from venturing to assert that all children in a modern democratic society should have the kind of general education in the disciplines that has been reserved for one kind of elite or another. On one flank, the elitists themselves have argued that *humanitas* was not suitable for mass education; on another flank, I have had scornful reminders that this is an age of pluralism in which an infinity of individual interests and cultural variations have a claim on the schools, and that true democracy entails giving equal weight to each claim. (Broudy, n.d.b.)

How the arts and sciences inform society and strengthen democracy emerge as a consistent theme. Rather than focus individuals’ education either in the arts or the sciences based on aptitude, he strenuously argues all public school students should pursue both the arts and the sciences (1977; 1979) so that knowledge informs an individual in three different capacities: the self, the social, and the material world (1953). Justice and natural rights inform the self and democratic society through arts and humanities as the sciences inform the material world, elevating science and technology, and revealing societal problems of our time (Broudy, 1966; Vandenberg, 1992), since general education should ultimately produce and inform a democratic society.

### **Democracy and General Education**

What Broudy terms “interpretive molar problem-solving” and perceives as dangers of choice among school programs connect his writings’ democratic themes. His arguments on general education and schooling advocate for the interpretive use of symbolic systems for the study of academic disciplines.

Developing readiness and competence for sharing in the economic, political, and moral values of the modern society entails two

important skills. One is the interpretive use of the basic academic disciplines for the understanding of societal problems.... The other skill entailed in developing competence for sharing in modern society, in addition to that of interdisciplinary thinking or the use of school learnings to interpret problems, is that of working with others in the act of collective problem-solving (1971, pp. 148–149)

Here Broudy articulates his middle-ground position in the subject-centered versus problem-solving curricular debate which emerges from progressive era reforms. Broudy's interdisciplinary problem-solving resembles John Dewey's complete act of thought given Broudy's emphasis on collective action addressing societal problems; however, Broudy declares the problem-solving method limited since technical knowledge in many disciplines, as well as in a cultivated imagination, prove indispensable for effective group problem-solving. Interpretive, discipline-specific, general education functions as precursor to the problem-solving method. The "molar problem-solving" approach (Brody et al., 1964) he advances as a method suitable for high school students. A molar problem is a multidimensional societal problem where the use of a single discipline's knowledge provides insufficient content or "funded knowledge" to solve the problem; rather, approaching the problem using knowledge from numerous disciplines is necessary.

The problems of the adult citizen that really matter are not solvable by the resources of common sense or common knowledge.... The generalizations or funded knowledge needed for serious problem-solving likewise are not available to solver without systematic study of the basic intellectual disciplines. (Broudy et al., 1964, p. 235)

Ultimately, studying societal problems democratically empowers students to work for the common good and moral imperative (Vandenberg, 1992).

Unlike Dewey's complete act of thought, in Broudy's philosophy students focus extensively on molar problem-solving in high school only. Broudy et al. (1964) advocate for a course devoted to molar problems during each of students' last two years of high school, designed to address only two to three multidimensional problems in each course, with examples including federal aid to schools and problems of urbanization. Responses to such societal problems are multidimensional, relying on numerous disciplines to interpret thoroughly. For example, studying urbanization draws from science, sociology, economics, and geography disciplines, at a minimum. Molar problems courses aim to provide high school students a glimpse of informed democratic citizenship in addressing societal issues, such as the impact of a pandemic when paired with systemic racial inequality.

Finally, in a diverse society, limiting choice might appear antidemocratic; however, in Broudy's philosophy of education he advocates for educational excellence and equality for all. He underscores how, most often, society's economically advantaged benefit while the powerless are given a substandard education. His apprehensions on educational choice boil down to recurring patterns he sees of the two-track system of schooling in its various forms within U.S. education. Broudy (1978) laments,

As occupations diversify and to the degree that occupational success depends on specialized training, school programs split into general studies for the development of mind, character, and background, and specialized study for vocational success. In other words, the formula has been and still is literary, scientific, theoretical, professional education for the classes and manual training, apprenticeship, rote learning of the basics, and moral conditioning for the masses. (p. 25)

Broudy remained committed within his writing to general education aimed at strengthening and preparing students for democratic life through a single-ladder education in U.S. schools. With an authoritative resolve, Broudy et al. (1964) state, "Common education is education for all of [the U.S.], normally educable youth in all of its great diversity. If this is a purely utopian ideal for a common education, then democracy in education is a farce" (p. 39). At a time when open enrollment, voucher initiatives, and charter schools are the subjects of vigorous choice-focused debate, a return to Broudy's philosophy offers perspective.

### **Polanyi, Broudy, and Interpretive Learning**

Broudy's four ways of learning undergird a vital epistemological foundation to his notion of general education, critical to capturing his advocacy for educational excellence. He highlights replicative, applicative, associative, and interpretive learning, underscoring the necessity of all four within schooling, while emphasizing the interpretive and associative. Replicative learning mirrors only that content learned and therefore is closely aligned with assessment, while applicative learning applies disciplinary knowledge to practical problems (Broudy, 1974b). Associative learning draws upon images, ideas, and words within one's subconscious to heighten understanding, relying upon the aesthetic dimension within general education. Though associative and interpretive learning are hallmarks of excellence in Broudy's view, associative learning connects directly to arts education. When it comes to interpretive learning, Broudy surmises a student does not need to understand the disciplines as a specialist using "applicative" knowledge. To Broudy, replicative and applicative learning are inadequate for complete learning. Interpretive uses of learning in schools provide frames of explanation, cognitive maps, or stencils through which knowledge is received and processed (Broudy, 1988a). Highlighting interpretive learning in general education, Broudy argues,

The educated mind orders experience with the resources of the arts and the sciences. While there are informed sources of interpretation—common sense, common knowledge, common images—that may be acquired without tuition, the interpretive use of schooling according to the concepts and judgement of the “learned,” is its most distinctive contribution to the individual and society. (Broudy, 1988a, p. 20)

Broudy lauds prominent Hungarian chemist and philosopher Michael Polanyi's (1966) concept of tacit knowing. In short, tacit or subsidiary knowing is tied to the prominence of humans' contextual and peripheral knowledge. Broudy conceptualizes tacit knowing as an in-depth theoretical justification for the importance of interpretive and associative learning (1970). Letters exchanged between Polanyi and Broudy demonstrate the high regard these thinkers held for each other, as well as the novel philosophical insights of each. Polanyi wrote to Broudy after Polanyi read Broudy's work on aesthetic education. Given the date and the content of this exchange, it is likely Polanyi read Broudy's then-recently published book, *Enlightened Cherishing*, which connects Polanyi's tacit knowing to associative learning along aesthetic grounds (Broudy, 1972). Polanyi states,

I need not explain to you my interest in the way you are penetrating essential fields of consciousness. You have made this brilliantly clear yourself. I am writing mainly in acknowledgment of these matters, but my sense lies beyond this in the whole area in which we seem to share fundamental grounds. With this in mind, may I ask you at what places you have published more work on the grounds of thought[?] I would like to pick them up and complete my knowledge of your outlook.... But I must not press you, and be grateful to have your company, hoping our mutual thoughts may go on further developing together. (August 24, 1972)

Broudy's response underscores how critical Polanyi's theory of tacit knowing is at connecting interpretive uses of knowledge towards defending his articulations of general education within society.

As you may have already discerned, my use of your notion of “tacit knowing” is of broader scope than its application to aesthetic perception and aesthetic education. In short, I have argued that without the tacit knowing hypothesis it will be difficult, if not unlikely, that we can find a persuasive rationale for any sort of general education. In other words, if the criterion for learning X is the ability to replicate X on demand, then clearly much of what we urge as general education and indeed virtually all learning of theory is unsuccessful. For this reason I have proposed tacit knowing as the necessary and sufficient condition for the interpretive uses of knowledge and schooling. To do this, it has

been necessary to differentiate interpretive uses from others: replicative, associative, and applicative. (September 1, 1972)

Addressing Polanyi's request for additional publications, Broudy provided two previously cited papers. Broudy writes, "The two papers I am including illustrate the contortions through which I have to go to get my colleagues—who, for the most part, are oriented towards behavioristic psychology and positivistic philosophy to listen to my argument." Five years later, a letter written to a publication editor with a manuscript review connected with Polanyi's work demonstrates the magnitude of the tacit knowing hypotheses within Broudy's theory of general education. Broudy offers, "Strategically the tacit knowing hypotheses has been my most reliable (I don't know how effective) weapon in defending general education" (July 15, 1977).

### **"Excellence Without Snobs"**

With the *Humanitas* foundation, a commitment to democracy in general education, and the philosophical underpinning of interpretive learning, Broudy's recurring statement "excellence without snobs and equality without slobes" demonstrates his alarm at snobbish intrusions into general education, denoting a thematic concern seen throughout his career. In the 1940s and 1950s a resurgence among academic professionals in literature, history, philosophy, and education saw certain notable authors spearheading the renaissance of realism: Mortimer Adler, Mark Van Dorn, Robert Maynard Hutchins, and John Wild. Among those authors directly addressing education were Isaac Kandel, Jacques Maritain, Mortimer Smith, and Arthur Bestor. Broudy was known as a classical realist philosopher of education; however, during the postwar 1950s he lamented the elitism of educational realism. Caught up in the space race, suddenly education received generous funding and emphasis on its importance following the Soviet launch of Sputnik, particularly in mathematics and science. In "Realism in American Education," Broudy notes several concerning strains of Sputnik-influenced realism in U.S. education. Anti-educationists vehemently critiqued U.S. education during the era. Among such figures was the outspoken Admiral Hyman Rickover, whom Broudy (1959) references:

Right now, of course, the influential laymen are notably vociferous in their realism. They want "hard" subjects like science, mathematics, and languages in a prescribed curriculum and no coddling of either high or low I.Q.s. They want an intellectual elite in order to maintain leadership in war and peace. They are Realists not simply because they face "unpleasant reality" but also because, if hard pressed to justify their proposals, they might admit that they believe people who can learn hard subjects are "better" than those who cannot and that a society is bound to go to pot if it is not led by "such" people. (p. 11)

Next, Broudy (1959) turns his attention to realist liberal arts professors who directly address the field of education, noting writers such as Arthur Bestor and Mortimer Smith within this group. While affirming their commitment to realism within the liberal-arts tradition, Broudy posits liberal arts professors are often “naïve” about education for the non-college-bound. Additionally, Broudy (1959) notes their constant critique of “educationists” or education professors, clouds realists’ philosophical position.

This preoccupation with the alleged foibles of the Educationists obscures the merits of their own position and blinds them and their followers to the real problem of our times, viz., how can the intellectual disciplines be transformed into a program of general education in a democratic society[?] (p. 12)

Broudy is often critical of those in higher education who provide solutions for schooling while remaining practically out of touch with schooling, systematically addressing such concerns in *The Real World of the Public Schools* (1972). As a Harvard-trained philosopher who wrote a dissertation on Søren Kierkegaard and graduate degrees in general philosophy, it may seem odd that Broudy demonstrates a practical affinity for public schooling. Perhaps this currency owes to Broudy’s lengthy tenure at Massachusetts teacher’s colleges from 1937–1957, which connect his thinking to schooling’s practical challenges.

Too, Broudy argues against elitism within general art education. In the 1980s, while U.S. education was in the throes of a so-called “back-to-basics” movement, *A Nation at Risk* (1983) authors called for narrower curricular emphasis on mathematics, language arts, and science, with few or no electives. Humanities disciplines came under “practical” scrutiny and were eliminated, inspiring art educators to argue for their worth and very existence. By the 1980s Broudy was established as a thinker in aesthetics education and became known as a champion for arts education (Bresler, 2002; Greer, 1992); music educator Richard Colwell (1992) refers to Broudy as “our aristocrat” for music education (p. 37).

Broudy’s chief concern with *A Nation at Risk* recommendations was that arts education would continue among the elite while the masses foundered without arts education. Broudy (1977) persistently argues for arts education to be seen as just as common and practical a curricular subject as math or science. The fine arts, often associated with well-heeled, “finer” things and thereby the purview of the elite, Broudy claims must be extended to all students as part of a democratic general education program since the arts are essential for conveying human meaning, emotion, and experience via associative learning (Broudy, 1979). The arts uniquely have the power to create subconscious image stores and mental frames which furnish meaning and enhance moral judgment through the power of aesthetic association.

Dwayne Greer (1992), a colleague of Broudy's and former director of The Getty Institutes for Educators on the Visual Arts, argues arts education is indispensable in language association and imagination. In one of his last publications on art education, Broudy (1988b) reiterates a common theme over his previous 30 years while articulating, yet again:

Briefly, educated exposure to fine arts should (a) refine and (b) intensify emotional life. If we take the stand that all the children are entitled to an "educated mind," then "popular" art, like "popular" science is not enough. To put it inelegantly, the American public has to construe its mandate as quality without snobs and equality without slobs. (pp. 42–43)

Broudy generally expresses concern with any general education designed to provide an excellent education to one class or group of students while depriving another.

### **"Equality Without Slobs"**

In his philosophy of education Broudy demonstrates a pre-Civil Rights-era awareness for engineered racial inequalities and oppressed students. His upbringing as a Jewish Polish immigrant in the early twentieth century likely affected his conception of societal inequality. Concern for inequality permeates his writing, particularly his deep appreciation for Gunnar Myrdal's (1944) influential study, *An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy*; Broudy regularly connects his ideas to Myrdal's concept of "American creed."

In the 1960s, James Bryant Conant's (1961) Carnegie Foundation-funded study, *Slums and Suburbs*, brought attention to national-level U.S. racial inequality. Consequently, some schools took a more significant role in ensuring equality of educational opportunity for underserved students. One approach emerging during the 1960s was specialized curricula aligned with multicultural teaching strategies, vocational emphases within schooling, or both. While Broudy addresses both curricular approaches, vocational programs aimed at urban students and other underserved populations most warranted his advocacy for "equality without slobs." Broudy views vocational tracking as the path to a second-rate public education.

I agree with those who hold that the most mortal insult one can proffer a human being is to demand less from him than from his fellows. The Negro and other victims of cultural deprivation should not be tempted to settle for a second-rate set of expectations from themselves. (Broudy, 1965, p. 17)

In *Democracy and Excellence in American Secondary Education*, Broudy et al. (1964) present a threefold argument against the specialized and vocationally focused curriculum for underresourced, underserved children, pointing out the educational and economic shortcomings as well as equity deficiencies

in ideals. The authors argue vocational schooling for those underserved and at-risk represents a short-term “fix” with long-term, negative societal consequences.

The dropout who gets a job immediately is going to be a social problem by the time he is in his late twenties or thirties, because he will not have the base in knowledge and skills needed for the job mobility and quick retraining in a labor market which is demanding greater and greater intellectual acuteness. (p. 12)

Broudy et al. (1964) argue that vocational schooling tracks focus on political, economic, and social expediency, but are out of touch with democratic ideals and decidedly *not* a path to the overall aims of schooling: a good life and human flourishing.

### **W.E.B. Dubois and Broudy Compared**

Broudy's arguments for liberal arts-focused general education, as opposed to vocational schooling for underserved students, are strikingly similar to those posed by W.E.B. Dubois at the turn of the twentieth century in the infamous Washington–Dubois debate. In a 1930 Howard University commencement address, W.E.B. Dubois retrospectively addresses the early 1900s controversy with Booker T. Washington, emphatically characterizing the controversy between the two educational approaches as still not solved and still imperative (1932). Dubois states,

Therefore, schoolwork for farming, carpentry, bricklaying, plastering and painting, metal work and blacksmithing, shoemaking, sewing and cooking was introduced and taught.... Machines and new industrial organizations have remade the economic world and ousted these trades either from their old technique or their economic significance. (p. 66)

Dubois' comments refer to U.S. industrialization during the late 1800s and early 1900s, calling for complete liberal arts educational curricula at all grade levels. In the 1960s when the U.S. began to witness post-industrialization and the corresponding growth of the service sector, Broudy (1965) communicates a similar concern with reliance on vocational education.

At a time when even well-trained craftsmen are in danger of becoming displaced by automation or the obsolescence of their job skills, does it make sense to mount a massive educational effort that will place a whole generation of culturally deprived people into the lowest level of jobs? ... Only if the children we rescue master a basic program of general education in the sciences and the humanities is there any hope of getting all segments of our society operating under their own power. (p. 17)

Broudy pens this statement amid considerable attention paid to U.S. urban schooling in light of the Civil Rights movement and preceding Great

Society legislation, at which time vocational schooling receives increased attention as a plan to bring about greater societal equality, in line with findings of the *Coleman Report* (1965). Broudy et al. (1964) argue that an emphasis on vocational preparation in current technology may set the stage for significant unemployment 10–15 years after graduation due to students' lack of preparation in scientific and technological change. Both thinkers provide stark warnings of the dangers of vocational education alone due to technological innovation and resulting replacement in the labor force.

Broudy and Dubois both articulate the purpose of education as preparing humans to thrive. In the education of African-American college students, DuBois does not call for the elimination of vocational schooling. Rather he argues education is essential to the formation of the person. Dubois (1932) states, "We need then, first, training as human beings in general knowledge and experience; then technical training to guide and do a specific part of the world's work" (p. 71). Provocatively, "the object of education [is] not to make men carpenters, but to make carpenters men" (p. 61). To Dubois, education for vocation alone limits human capacity. His theory raises the value of educating to become fully human rather than education to create specialized workers. Broudy et al. (1964) state,

As long as the ideals of citizenship and self-cultivation are valid for American public education, any curriculum which limits students' role conceptions merely to the character of job or educational openings at a given time is a fraud with respect to those ideals. (p. 18)

## Conclusion

The term "general education" inspires many approaches and meanings depending on context. Foundational to Harry S. Broudy's theory of general education is *Humanitas* or cultivation of the self through the study of exemplars. At the forefront of Broudy's philosophy is the unbreakable relation between democracy and schooling, a symbiotic relationship evident in his persistent emphasis on quality education for all students regardless of race or socioeconomic status. Broudy challenges educational elitism and posits concern with movement toward Sputnik-inspired, traditional-discipline-centered curricula aimed at elevating science and mathematics to elite status in a time of manufactured crisis. He decries second-rate expectations for the underserved "masses" as snobbish intrusions into general education.

Broudy's concerns with replacing high-quality general education studies in secondary schools with vocational tracks for the social and economic underclass harken to arguments made over 60 years earlier by W.E.B. Dubois. Within a short Phi Delta Kappa booklet entitled *General Education: The Search for a Rationale*, Broudy (1974b) provides a concluding defense for his general education philosophy, stating,

If, on the other hand, we make general education itself one of the alternatives which some parts of the community may reject for their children, then there is little doubt that the distinction between the classes and masses will be sharpened rather than softened. This will not only smooth the way for a managed elitist society, but will also make a shambles of our rhetoric about a free society and equal educational opportunity. (p. 50)

His statement demonstrates a recurring theme in his educational philosophy supporting a liberal, democratic general education, aspiring to “excellence without snobs and equality without slob.” Broudy’s considerable body of work in philosophy of education demonstrates his lengthy legacy championing general education for all students.

### Acknowledgment

I wish to thank Alan Garrett for his continued feedback and guidance and for enhancing my own tacit understanding through conversations on curriculum theory and historical approaches. I also wish to thank Liora Bresler for taking time to share first-hand insights of Harry S. Broudy as well as providing a manuscript overview for accuracy.

### References

- Bresler, L. (2001). Harry Broudy. In J. Palmer, D. E. Cooper, & L. Bresler (Eds.), *Fifty modern thinkers on education: From Piaget to the present*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Bresler, L. (2002). Harry Broudy on the cognitive merits of music education: Implications for research and practice of arts curriculum. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 103(3), 17–27.
- Broudy, H. S. (n.d.a.). *Autobiographical reflection*. Harry S. Broudy Papers, University of Illinois Archives (Box 6, biography & vita folder), Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Urbana–Champaign.
- Broudy, H. S. (n.d.b.). *Unpublished reflection paper*. Harry S. Broudy Papers, University of Illinois Archives (Box 6, research and teacher education folder), Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Urbana–Champaign.
- Broudy, H. S. (1953). Realism and the philosophy of education. In J. Wild (Ed.), *The return to reason*. Chicago, IL: Henry Regnery.
- Broudy, H. S. (1958). The educational claims of the humanities. *Journal of Philosophy*, 55(23), 987–997.

- Broudy, H. S. (1959). Realism in American education. *School and Society*, 87(2145), 11–14.
- Broudy, H. S. (1965). Schooling for the culturally deprived. *The Teachers College Journal*, 37(1), 4–14.
- Broudy, H. S. (1970). On knowing with. In *Proceedings of the 26th Annual Meeting of the Philosophy of Education Society* (pp. 89–104). Philosophy of Education Society.
- Broudy, H. S. (1971). Democratic values and educational goals. *The Curriculum: Retrospect and Prospect: Seventieth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*. Chicago, IL: National Society for the Study of Education.
- Broudy, H. S. (1972, September 1). [Letter to Michael Polanyi]. Harry S. Broudy Papers (Box 2, file folder P), University of Illinois Archives, University of Illinois Urbana–Champaign.
- Broudy, H. S. (1972). *The real world of the public schools*. New York, NY: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Broudy, H. S. (1973). Humanism in education. *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 7(2), 67–77.
- Broudy, H. S. (1974a). Unfinishable business. In P. A. Bertocci (Ed.), *Mid-twentieth century American philosophy: Personal statements*. Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press.
- Broudy, H. S. (1974b). *General education: The search for a rationale*. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.
- Broudy, H. S. (1977, July 15). [Letter to Harry Prosch]. Harry S. Broudy Papers (Box 5, file folder P), University of Illinois Archives, University of Illinois Urbana–Champaign.
- Broudy, H. S. (1977). How basic is aesthetic education? or is 'Rt the fourth R? *Language Arts*, 54(6), 631–637.
- Broudy, H. S. (1978). Conflicts in school programs. *Today's Education*, 67(2), 24–28.
- Broudy, H. S. (1979). Arts education: Necessary or just nice? *The Phi Delta Kappan*, 60(5), 347–350.
- Broudy, H. S. (1987). *The role of imagery in learning* (occasional paper 1). Los Angeles, CA: The Getty Education Institute for the Arts.
- Broudy, H. S. (1988a). *The uses of schooling*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Broudy, H. S. (1988b). Arts education—praise may not be enough. In C. B. Fowler (Ed.), *The crane symposium: Toward an understanding of the teaching and learning of musical performance*. Potsdam, NY: Potsdam College of New York.

- Broudy, H. S., Smith, B. O., & Burnett, J. R. (1964). *Democracy and excellence in American secondary education: A study in curriculum theory*. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
- Coleman, J. S. (1968). *Equality of educational opportunity*. *Integrated Education*, 6(5), 19–28.
- Colwell, R. (1992). Goodness and greatness: Broudy on music education. *The Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 26(4), 37–48.
- Conant, J. B. (1961). *Slums and suburbs: A commentary on schools in metropolitan areas*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.
- Dubois, W. E. B. (1932). Education and work. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 1(1), 60–74.
- Greer, W. D. (1992). Harry Broudy and discipline-based art education (DBAE). *The Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 26(4), 49–60.
- Polanyi, M. (1966). *The tacit dimension*. Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith.
- Polanyi, M. (1972, August 24). [Letter to Harry S. Broudy]. Harry S. Broudy Papers (Box 2, file folder P), University of Illinois Archives, University of Illinois Urbana–Champaign.
- Vandenberg, D. (1992). Harry Broudy and education for a democratic society. *The Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 26(4), 5–19.

**JOURNAL OF  
PHILOSOPHY &  
HISTORY  
OF EDUCATION**



2020

---

The Journal of the Society of Philosophy & History of Education