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Abstract

This paper centers on Harry Broudy, the scholar who was the first to argue, consistently and extensively, for aesthetics as a foundation for music education in American public schools. Broudy, considered by many as the major philosopher of education in the second part of the 20th century, was not a musician or music educator. His framing of the discipline of school music as aesthetic education evolved out of his philosophy of general education for citizenship, grounded within an ethical framework. In this paper, I examine Broudy's philosophy of music education within the larger context of his thinking, and its impact on music educators in the USA.
This paper centers on Harry Broudy, the scholar who was the first to argue, consistently and extensively, for aesthetics as a foundation for music education in American public schools.\(^1\) Broudy, considered by many as the major philosopher of education in the second part of the 20\(^{th}\) century, was not a musician or music educator. His framing of the discipline of school music as aesthetic education evolved out of his philosophy of general education for citizenship, grounded within an ethical framework. In the past few years the status of aesthetic education as a basis for music education has been questioned from several directions (Bowman, 1991: 1999/2000; Elliot, 1995, Jorgensen, 1991; see also Plummeridge, 1999). In this paper, I examine Broudy’s philosophy of music education within the larger context of his thinking, and its impact on music educators in the USA. The paper is based on his books, papers and presentations, integrating other scholars’ views of his work, including conversations with prominent people in music education—Charles Leonhard, Richard Colwell, Eunice Boardman, Michael Mark, and Wayne Bowman; colleagues from education—Rupert Evans, Gordon Hoke, Ralph Page, Lou Smith, Ralph Smith, and Robert Stake; and his widow, Dorothy Broudy.

Broudy (1905-1998) was born in Poland and emigrated with his family to Massachusetts in 1912. He received his B.A. in German literature and Philosophy from Boston University (1929), and his doctorate in Philosophy at Harvard (1935), where he studied with Whitehead (he was one of Whitehead’s last students), focusing on Kierkegaard, Bergson and William James. In the early 20\(^{th}\) century, Jews were not welcomed faculty in Ivy League universities, and Broudy accepted a position at North Adams State Teachers College (1937), teaching general psychology and philosophy of education. In 1957 he was recruited to the College of Education at the University of Illinois, where he spent the rest of his career. The move to Illinois proved both enjoyable and productive, as Broudy’s major works were written there. Broudy’s interest in philosophy of education developed into a deep commitment to public schooling, specifically addressing curriculum and instruction in secondary and tertiary levels, and placing the arts and aesthetics as applied to education as central to the general curriculum.
Music Education as Part of General Education: Democracy and Excellence

The arts when studied as general education should supply what no other discipline does: the strange and wonderful synthesis we call knowledgeful feeling and feelingful knowledge. (Broudy, 1980, p.7)

Cultivation of the virtues, that is, the excellences of the mind, of the will, of the senses, of the body, all are signs of perfecting and perfection. In other words, although music, structurally and qualitatively, is what it is apart from the listener, it takes a “tuned” man, that is, a man cultivated in music, to discern the goodness in the music. Therefore, the standard of both music and men is the connoisseur. (Broudy, 1958, p. 66)

As a child Broudy did not learn to play an instrument. His family, wealthy in Poland, struggled financially as new immigrants. He developed his music connoisseurship in later years, as he frequented concerts and read about music. His was an intellectual, rather than a passionate approach, motivated by a quest for understanding that was acquired and cultivated in later years.

Broudy’s rationale for music education can be traced directly to his view of general education, and specifically, to his concern with the implications of democracy for education. What knowledge, he questioned, belongs in secondary schools curriculum as they opened to the entire population? He distinguished between two questions: What is good knowledge? And what is knowledge good for? He delegated the first to specialists in the various disciplines, and focused on the second question (Vandenberg, 1992).

Broudy was a self-proclaimed classical realist (Neo-Aristotelianism can be already traced in his writings in North Adams State Teachers College and in his 1961 book Building a Philosophy of Education), with a strong interest in the problems raised by Existentialism. Realism, Broudy wrote, is based on the hypothesis that human nature is a pattern of striving for perfection. Accordingly, Broudy held that there is common knowledge, a set of key ideas and learning skills that everyone should possess. Broudy’s position of realism meant that he needed to maintain that judgements of worth were not merely personal preferences, but were rather “real”, grounded in concrete musical attributes. Thus, there is a strong difference between the statements “I like this music” and “this is good music” (the latter being the realist standpoint).
Broudy claimed that the acceptance of a principle of equal opportunity in education assumes there is a common human nature that should be developed in school (Broudy, 1981; also in Vandenberg, 1992). All students need a basic educational program in both science and humanities. Broudy observed that if the young of the poor and minority groups go into vocational training too early, they perpetuate their disadvantage, especially if it gives them a second-class education. Thus, he advocated arts education for all students, not just for those identified as those gifted or highly interested in art.

For Broudy, the principle of common knowledge and a set of ideas and skills took into account the need for a program that accommodated differences in students’ backgrounds, abilities and interests, while maintaining excellence. But how is excellence compatible with democracy? Broudy defined excellence as located in the quality of personal and social life, the quality of the society itself, rather than in the attainment by the individual of a higher order of cognitive, scientific or artistic achievement. He saw the aim of general education as the realization of selfhood: knowledge can serve as the means to the good life by promoting happiness through enabling self-realization. The arts fulfill an important role in contributing to self-realization. In this quest for refinement, the contribution of music education towards the goal of excellence is to make listeners more discriminating and sophisticated with respect to musical materials and musical forms (Broudy, 1958, 1990).

A key concern of aesthetic education is the refinement of the listener tastes and preferences. Broudy was concerned with how individuals form their tastes and whether education plays a role in changing those tastes. In one of his very first publications on the arts (Broudy, 1950) he examined the formation of the average mind and taste of which popular speech, thought and art are both the cause and expression. “Unless there is outside stimulation and help, growth in subtlety of insight and flexibility of thought ceases” (Broudy, 1950, p. 40). Broudy maintained that the disciplines of music and arts education consist of a body of knowledge based on expertise and scholarship, beyond exposure and self-expression. He argued that with study of serious art, students may be ‘better equipped to resist the pressure of the market place’ (1990, 435) which is the territory of popular art. Popular art is art that is widely accepted and that requires no special training for its appreciation; appreciating popular art is part of the general
socialization process (1972b, 111-113). Serious art, on the other hand, is “art produced by people whose primary concern is with aesthetic values”, (1972b, 93) art ‘that is thought worthy of study and cherishing as art by artists, critics, and historians of art” (ibid. 94). Serious art requires serious study to cultivate perception and creation. The arts, then, teach us aesthetic literacy, which is central to all aspects of life.

Broudy’s influence on music education was facilitated by interactions with leading music educators. His move to the University of Illinois, which had outstanding music and visual arts programs, was formative in focusing his interest on music and arts education. Charles Leonhard, a charismatic music educator with a deep commitment to pragmatic aesthetics—the development of aesthetic perception, sensitivity and responsiveness (see Leonhard and House, 1959), was in the process of building a leading music education doctoral program. He identified Broudy as a major scholar, and sent music students to his classes. Amongst them were future leaders in music education: Bennet Reimer and Wayne Bowman in philosophy of music education, Eunice Boardman in pedagogy and curriculum, and Marilyn Zimmerman in the psychology of music education. Bowman writes:

As I recall, when I took Harry's course he had recently retired; but Charlie Leonhard, ever-persuasive, convinced him to deliver just this one course. Charlie also promoted it heavily to Masters and Doctoral students, so initial enrolment was substantial. For many of us, the course was totally captivating. I think some of the more 'practically'-inclined music education folks, however, found this initial encounter with real philosophy a bit overwhelming. Something approaching half the class had 'bailed out' by midterm. The course was as demanding as it was captivating.

Working with Harry was a fascinating experience. He was extremely generous with his time while I was engaged in my doctoral work on Michael Polanyi. It was in Broudy's lectures I was first exposed to Polanyi, so he had a very solid understanding of the issues I was working with, and I was grateful for that. Harry was also a very demanding committee member: I sometimes think I might still be there trying to finish had it not been for Charlie's skills as a facilitator! Harry was a stickler for detail, and often focused on points that surprised me: some seemed picky and obscure to me at the time, but I have since come to recognize that was not at all the case, and he was usually right. For instance, when I wanted to use the word "implications" in my title, he objected that implications are formal logical structures and not really the kind of thing to which I wanted to commit myself. He was absolutely right, of course. I think one of the valuable things I learned from him was how crucially important words and their meanings are to philosophy. And I haven't the slightest doubt my current students find my obsession with precise expression as vexing as I sometimes found Harry's.

(Bowman, 2000, email communication)

This local audience of faculty and students provided the incentive (and in Leonhard’s case, the opportunities) for writing in music education publications. Broudy wrote three papers on music education, including “A Realistic Philosophy of Music Education” (1958, republished in 1994), initiated by
Leonhard, for the 57th National Society for the Study of Education Yearbook. Broudy became an important and visible figure in the music education scene, “the philosophical guru” (Colwell, 2000, email communication). He served on the editorial board of the *Music Educators Journal* (1966-68), gave talks on music education as well as on general educational conferences, was a member of the Advisory Board of the Central Midwestern Regional Laboratory (CEMREL) aesthetic education program (the most important project on aesthetic education and curriculum up to that time), served as a consultant on aesthetic education for the Educational Research Council of America, and as a member of the Advisory Board of the Terry Institute for Aesthetic Education, and as a consultant for the Aesthetic Eye.

His 1958 chapter “A Realistic Philosophy of Music Education” is concerned with how to ensure the proper place for music in general education. Broudy’s definition of music is based on concepts: “Whenever experience can be analyzed into patterns of melody, harmony, rhythm, and tonal color, we call it musical” (p. 62). He defines music education as

> All deliberately instituted procedures designed to shape the musical skill, knowledge, and taste of the learner- and only such procedures. To say that music ought to be part of general education is to say that all of us ought to be musically literate, that is, able to express ourselves in musical terms and to understand these terms when used by someone else. These might be called the skills of expression and impression. These skills would include the skills of listening, reading, composing, etc. as well as of musical performance. In formal education, educators strive to guide the behavior of learners into specific routes of value realization, selecting materials and methods according to some principle or theory. It is not just habit, not impulsive, imposing their taste on students. (Broudy, 1958, p. 67)

In the chapter, Broudy outlined Platonic and Aristotelian views of music education, underlying the distinction between musical/aesthetic standards and moral or intellectual ones:

> “The ancients recognized the difference between music that was good musically and that which was good morally or intellectually. Plato was adamant on this point: aesthetic experience had to be judged by its effects on the whole life of a person or a society as well as by artistic standards alone” (ibid., p.67)

The case for the inclusion of music as a necessary part of the curriculum rests on ethical grounds: “because of this relation between musical values and other modes of value realization, no further argument should be needed to justify music education as a part of general education” (ibid. 76). There is a
general consensus that Broudy’s ideas in this chapter established aesthetics as a basis for music education. Interestingly, Foster McMurray’s chapter “Pragmatism in Music Education” which preceeded Broudy’s in the same 1958 NSSE volume, (McMurray, 1958), and which adheres to Peircian philosophy, “never caught on”, whereas Broudy’s “struck a chord” (Colwell, 2000, email communication).

Aesthetics Education, Values and Imagination

In Aesthetic experience we perceive objects in order to grasp their sensuous characteristics and not primarily to further knowledge or useful enterprises. Aesthetic activity may accompany practical, moral, religious, intellectual, and social activity and enhance our enjoyment of them, but it is not to be confused with them. (Broudy, 1958, p. 69)

Broudy’s earlier works do not address the arts or aesthetic education. It was only in 1950 that he presented a paper at the annual meeting of the Philosophy of Education Society in which he highlighted the need for educational theory to account for aesthetics and indicated philosophical problems that aesthetic education raises for a general philosophy of education. Soon, Aesthetics became central to his writings, featured in discussions of general educational issues. In the 1970s and 80s Broudy wrote numerous papers and books advocating the centrality of arts education (with titles such as “How Basic is Aesthetic Education? Or is ‘RT the fourth R?’; “Arts Education, Necessary or Just Nice?”; “A Common Curriculum in Aesthetics and Fine Arts”) including the seminal Enlightened Cherishing (1972b), and the Getty publication The Role of Imagery (1987).

Broudy saw in aesthetic education a means by which value education could be approached and the need for standards established. Broudy labeled the struggle of music and art education to move from the periphery to the core of schooling as a tension between “nice” and “necessary” (see also DiBlasio, 1992). He tried to counteract the aspects of American culture that tended to marginalize aesthetics, tracing the marginalization to values stemming from work ethics, religion, and the inherited values of the American pioneer.

Broudy did not advocate “arts for arts sake”. He claimed that imagination cultivated through arts education provided essential support to other functions of the educated mind. The starting point of
aesthetic education is “the training of imaginative perception to enable the pupil to apprehend sensory content, formed into an image that expresses some feeling quality” (1972b, p. 57) Like Dewey, Broudy regarded “the aesthetically satisfying experience, as the opposite of the drab, meaningless, formless, pointless passage of time” (1972b, p.35). Aesthetic experiences, which are common for all members of the culture, penetrate the educational process, “intensifying and perhaps illuminating every other mode of experience” (1977, 139). In the aesthetic, all modes of experience are included and highlighted. Clearly, aesthetic experiences are as important as the experiences provided by other school subjects.

Unlike Dewey’s Pragmatism, Broudy’s Classical Realism highlighted a curriculum revolving around exemplary works, oriented towards students’ acquisition of knowledge rather than problem-solving. Dewey defines aesthetic experience in terms of the process, the interaction, which are heightened aspects of everyday experience, whereas Broudy defines aesthetic experience by characterizing the features of artwork that evoke aesthetic experience: an artwork empowers us to feel aesthetic experience (Choi, 1998). For Broudy, form is an arrangement of objective senses and sensory properties created by the artists. “The artist differs from the non artist in being able to give form to sensory materials or to see form in them where most of us do not” (1972b, 37).

Aesthetic education educates the imagination and the affective side of our lives. The quality of life, believed Broudy, is measured by the “repertory of feeling” (1972b, p. 58). Aesthetic education trains our feeling side of life just as other studies train the intellectual side. The cultivation of aesthetic experience serves to broaden and differentiate the repertoire of feelings and values, enlightening us about their nature. Broudy believed, after Langer, that “students should contemplate emotions, not have them” (Broudy, 1972b, p. 49). Broudy held that aesthetic emotion, emotion felt in listening to music, “emotion recalled in tranquility” demonstrated that the musical feeling was not an affair of arousal, not emotion like other emotions (Broudy, 1958, p. 74). The distinctiveness of musical emotion is such that, in comparison to ordinary emotion, it seems almost as if it were “unreal”, i.e. recalled in tranquility’. Furthermore, the education of the imagination means that students acquire images of art that function as associative and interpretive resources, supplying contexts that broaden and deepen comprehension. The arts, claimed
Broudy, fill a role similar to the humanities-- teaching values, enhancing beauty, reducing ugliness and hate.

**The Role of Music in Schooling and Curricular Implications**

When a society is ailing, its institutions ache, but when it is no longer aware of its ailments, it is very near death. Accordingly, while the barrage of criticism directed against the public schools in recent years can be construed as part of the general criticism to which all our institutions are being subjected, it is a good omen for the health of our schools that they are very conscious of the complaints voiced about them. (Broudy, 1972b, p. 38)

Rather than leaving his ideas on the abstract level, Broudy applied them consistently to the practical arena of schooling. He wrote extensively in defense of schooling in books such as the *Paradox and Promise* (1961a), *The Real World of Schooling* (1972a), *Truth and Credibility* (1981), and *The Uses of Schooling* (1988). His interest in the uses of schooling started in North Adams State Teachers College. In a 1943 paper “History without hysteria”, he responded to publication of results of a test of historical knowledge, claiming their low scores merely showed that the facts were not used in the daily life of the several thousand first-year university students tested. The objective of teaching history, wrote Broudy, was not fact retention but the “ability to use history for interpreting present problems”. He developed this issue in several of his books, including the last (1988), where he showed the limitations of replication/application aims of the schools, and highlighted the interpretive and associative uses of schooling. The interpretive/associative uses, wrote Broudy, function in everyday life as context building, typically hidden below the surface of awareness, representing the ability of the generalist to approximate the understanding of the specialist rather than the latter’s recall or problem-solving power.

**Curriculum.** In the late 50’s and 60’s there was an increased attention to the disciplines, triggered by the Russian launch of Sputnik and the American anxiety about being left behind in the technological cold war race. Broudy described ironically the general agitation over Sputnik in *Paradox and Promise*:

> Although it would be officially denied, Russia must have a ministry devoted exclusively to upsetting Americans, and inasmuch as we are up-set by nearly everything the Russians
do, it must be concluded that this ministry is unusually successful. When the minister who had charge of upsetting Americans in the fall of 1957 regales his grandchildren with his exploits, L’affaire Sputnik will be near the top of his list. That orbiting a satellite would infect us with rocket fever could have been expected, but the controversy about public schools that it set off came as a surprise. (Broudy, 1961a, p.3)

One of the outcomes of the controversy about public schools was that the individual disciplines were required to justify their inclusion in the curriculum in terms of their contribution to the total enterprise of education. The arts were not exempt from such requirements. Broudy, albeit his whimsical tone regarding the American concern over Sputnik, rose to the task, reflecting on how the intellectual disciplines can be transformed into a program of general education in a democratic society (1959). He acknowledged that each discipline has its own methods of investigation (1961a), and that “each domain develops an internal logic, modes of inquiry, and canons of evidence” (1981, 47). His rationale for music and art as part of general education was based on aesthetic literacy as integral to life, based on the aesthetic experience, and epitomized in music and arts education (1958, 1972b). He maintained that aesthetic literacy can be cultivated through arts appreciation, through scanning as a mode of inquiry.

It was within this framework that Broudy’s philosophical base for music curriculum, specifically, using the “best” music, proved important to the music education profession. Given the emphasis on excellence, selection of materials is key to the educational experience, where materials should approximate the perfection of the model or ideal that exists in our mind. Broudy, with J. R. Burnett and B. Othanel (“Bunny”) Smith, and later in his other writings, set the study of exemplars including seminal, summarizing, and anticipatory exemplars, as the major vehicle for the attainment of these values (Broudy, Burnett and Smith, 1964). Broudy maintained that his notion of connoisseurship did not conflict with cultural pluralism as he did not restrict exemplary works to Western art (Broudy, 1975). He thought it was wrong to let people refuse to participate in the common culture and the intellectual and artistic achievements of the human race (Broudy, 1972b; Vandenberg, 1992).

Broudy acknowledged that “A work of art should communicate, of whatever it is the image, without footnotes or explanations, but some serious art does not” (1977, p. 4). This happens when the work of art uses images with which we are not familiar, when there are changes of artistic languages and
abrupt changes of style. Communicating with arts requires a language that enables the pupil and teacher to communicate with artworks and with each other. Aesthetic perception is more analogous to “reading a text where the text is an image or a set of images” (1987, 49). It is skills of perception, more than explorations for self-expression that enhance production. Since production depends on the ability to appreciate works of art, Broudy highlights dialogic relationship between production and appreciation, educating children to be perceptive to music through the perception of patterns. The skills of impression (i.e. perception) are much more easily and efficiently developed and refined than the skills of expression, a position that, as pointed by Wayne Bowman (2000, email communication), orients aesthetic education subtly away from the doing of music. To these skills of perceiving and making Broudy added a complement of knowledge about art, specifically about the history of art and its philosophical bases, and knowledge of the principles of criticism.

Training of imaginative perception to enable students to communicate with artwork, is done by “scanning”, a strategy that Broudy developed for the visual arts, focusing on the sensory, formal, technical and expressive properties perceived in the aesthetic object. Scanning has been translated and implemented in music curricula by Carol Holden.

Unlike Dewey, Broudy did not believe in progressive education with its strong emphasis of child-centered curriculum, which he regarded as a bold but futile effort to recapture the qualities of small-town life in America (Vandenberg, 1992). He did not regard original creation or problem solving as a primary means of acquiring knowledge. Composition did not feature highly on Broudy’s goals. Accordingly, his curriculum emphasizes “fine” art (i.e. classical music), rather than “child art/music” --children’s original creations-- or “art for children” --art created by adults for children for didactic purposes (Bresler, 1998). Serious, fine art, wrote Broudy, explores possibilities of feeling that extend far beyond the routinized experience of everyday life in a highly refined and concentrated way. Popular art (e.g., popular music, soap operas) portrays the feelings large numbers share: Serious art, on the other hand, creates images of feeling that we may have not yet brought to consciousness, sometimes by making the strange familiar, sometimes by making the familiar strange. Broudy held that there was no need to
study that which we can learn informally “nor are special programs of formal instruction necessary for the
perception of everyday aesthetic objects such as scenery, facilitate expressions, modes of speech and
dress, landscaping, and interior decoration. We learn informally the standard images of luxury,
expressiveness, elegance and their opposites. How our emotions are supposed to be expressed
conventionally in speech, music, and gesture are also learned informally” (1977, 3).

Broudy was central in the aesthetic education movement with its unifying concern for all of the
arts and its attention to the broad spectrum of aesthetic experience, and his ideas were the backbone of the
CEMREL project.

Broudy’s views of the music curricula required expert music specialists in education teachers
who were familiar with the compositions of the great masters, and who had tools for music analysis and
background music history, (though in his writing he also considered classroom teachers teaching the arts).
The need for teacher as expert provided a legitimation to the music education profession. However,
Broudy’s advocacy of knowledge about (rather than of) music and his relegation of the traditional band
and choruses performances to extracurricular activities did not fit with the customs and cherishing of
music educators. His views that students’ art is not necessarily good art, (he lamented in Enlightened
Cherishing, “the unspoiled spontaneity of childhood and the uninhibited ignorance of the tyro are more
highly regarded than trained maturity” 1972b, 102) and thus cannot be expected to meet the objectives of
aesthetic education, neither in studio/performance, nor in composition, were radical for music educators,
and even more to visual art educators. His emphasis on connoisseurship rather than performance, (which
caused many to characterize him as elitist) and the centrality of aesthetic education as the core of the
music curriculum, rather than musicianship (which was central to both Mursell and Leonhard’s writing)
were problematic for many music educators. Most troublesome, perhaps, was the subordination of music
education goals to the goals of general education. It went against not only the enculturation of secondary
music specialists, but also against the culture of high schools (cf. Bresler, 1997).
The Impact of Broudy’s Philosophy

Broudy's fame had been rising since 1957 as the only accessible spokesperson for philosophy of music education and throughout the 70s was more influential than Reimer. He was the Elliott Eisner of his day as he had audiences in music and in education. Music Education has had relatively few philosophers of its own, and Harry's interest in and willingness to write on matters related to music education went a long way to getting that generation of music education scholars thinking in ways that were genuinely philosophical. (Colwell, email communication, 2000)

Broudy’s broad philosophical base for music education provided the first articulate philosophy of music education in the USA. Although there were certainly intellectual figures who contemplated music education matters prior to the 1950s, North America had no community of theorists and researchers before Allan Britton founded the Journal of Research in Music Education in 1953. The journal made it possible for an intellectual community to develop through the publication of papers and exchange of ideas. This community developed slowly throughout the 1950s, and burgeoned in the 1960s, in great part because of Broudy's work (Mark, 2000, email communication).

Broudy’s philosophical base for using the “best” music, at a time where school disciplines needed a stronger definition and solid rationale, was forceful and influential. His rejection of relativism, whether it is moral, intellectual, cultural, or aesthetic, was an attractive argument for the universal qualities of music (cf. Colwell, 1992, p. 46). His Basic Concepts chapter (1958) and Leonhard and House's Foundations of Music Education (1959) represented a turning point in the philosophy of music education. As Colwell put it: “The 1958 idea that music education should have a philosophy stunned the profession.” (Colwell, 1992, p. 44). Colwell:

It could be that we were "turning" and these two publications just happened to come out but prior to that time we didn't talk about aesthetics as a reason for music education. (Colwell, email communication, 2000)

Ideas travel through various routes: teaching and advising are important ones. Broudy served on the doctoral committees of the two foremost philosophers of music education in North America, Bennett Reimer and Wayne Bowman. There are important connections between Broudy and Reimer’s development of the notion of aesthetic education for music education in his book Philosophy for Music
Reimer, like Broudy, regards music as a basic mode of cognition and conceives of music as primarily perceptual, including constructs of form, rhythm, orchestration, etc. Like Broudy, Reimer advocates music education for all, not just the gifted or the interested, grounding it in his belief that musical intelligence exists to some degree in all young people and is capable of development and must be developed if all are to be as fully intelligent as they can be (Reimer, 1989). Reimer states that all students should have equal opportunity to be engaged in the development of broad musical literacy, through a systematic, mandated general music program, from grades 1-12 (Reimer, 1989).

Reimer’s curriculum, too, centers on the great masterpieces, (i.e. exemplars), focusing on their sensory, formal, technical and expressive qualities, and attending to the search of criteria for curricular choices. Reimer lists four criteria for assessing the quality of any art work, and its performance: (1) craftsmanship, (2), sensitivity, (3) imagination, and (4) authenticity. These criteria of goodness aim to apply to musics of every sort, in order to provide music educators a basis for inclusion of good examples. The four criteria of craftsmanship, sensitivity, imagination and authenticity are expected to be applied within the expectation system of diverse musics, rather than the western classical music (Reimer, 2000, email communication). The emphasis on diversity of musics and styles can be traced to the multi-cultural movement and the increased globalization of the 80s and the 90s.

Reimer’s writings refer performance, when used as an end in itself, as merely “skill training”, criticizing the notion that “performance should be an essential component of schooling, publicly supported and equally available to all”, (Reimer, 1989, 185), and relegating performances as extra curricular activities.” “Many performance programs are, in fact, primarily training grounds for the talented, with little if any genuine concern for the musical learnings of the majority of participating students.” (Reimer, ibid., pp.184-5). In an email communication (2000), Reimer emphasized that he does not argue that performance, in and of itself, is merely skill training -- it is the abuse of performance which treats it as that. When performance programs are primarily training grounds for the talented then these programs do not deserve to be available to all. Reimer sees in production a necessary, valid, and important mode of musical experience which all children must be introduced to so that they can "know"
music through the creative act as well as being receivers of that act. This emphasis on production as a mode of knowledge reflects the unfolding of ideas in aesthetic education in general, and music education in particular.

Broudy’s influence on Wayne Bowman was, according to Bowman, more “in spirit” than in content. Wayne Bowman:

It was from Harry that I got my first substantial introduction to philosophical dispositions, tendencies, and propensities. Obviously, that introduction had a profound and durable effect. Broudy and Leonhard are the most significant influences I can identify, personally -- though what I think I take forward may be more the spirit of their work than its substance. I can think of no better examples of what Michael Polanyi calls the "intellectual passions." (Wayne Bowman, email communication, 2000).

In contrast to his impact on the philosophy of music education, Broudy’s ideas seem to have less of an impact on music education practice. Colwell has noted:

We like his product, but are distrustful of the process. We like the immutability of the great composers and their work, but we are comfortable with our performance programs. We are reluctant to give up general music, which is our preparatory and screening program for later performance, for the sake of aesthetic education. (Colwell, 1992, p. 46)

Indeed, in studies of ordinary and exemplary programs of music education in the United States (see Bresler, 1996, 1997; Stake, Bresler and Mabry, 1991) we found references to music history and appreciation, but these were scarce and sporadic. Interviews with teachers indicated that even those who taught the more academic aspects of music usually felt it was not as important and relevant to students, often commenting that they will teach less of it in future. The teaching of music education is shaped by a variety of contexts and academic is negotiated with structural thinking and institutional contexts, as well as the customs and cherishing of a society.

Impact on Visual Arts

“Whether art should become part of general education depends on our becoming fully aware of the role of imagery, imagination and art in every form of human experience.” (Broudy, 1987, p.44)
Broudy’s views were more radical to visual arts education than they were to music, and, in a paradoxical way, that may be why they were embraced more readily by scholars in visual art. In general, music education in the US has never focused on compositions by students. In contrast, visual art has been centered on “child art” with such “soft” ideals as creativity and self-expression (which, at least in popular interpretation, were not perceived to need instruction) permeating the discourse of visual arts education in both theory and practice. Broudy’s impact on visual arts can be explained by its timeliness, in these times of pendulum swing, where passive exposure and self-expression did not fit an educational climate that demanded higher accountability of school disciplines and “back to basics”.

The times were right for a rigorous philosophy of visual arts education that could be respected by “hard core” academics. Broudy’s writings on art, grounded in general education and in a broad philosophical basis, are embedded in the visual, explicitly addressing visual imagination and visual images. Clearly more at home with visual arts rather than music, Broudy’s examples were often drawn from visual arts and film, his instructional strategy of scanning, although it can be applied to other arts, focuses on the visual.

Broudy’s influence on the field of arts education thrived in the 70s and especially the 80s, through his extensive interactions with the Getty Center for Education in the Arts, which was established in 1982 (cf. Greer, 1992). The Getty Center for the Arts aimed to establish arts history, criticism and aesthetics on equal footing with studio work. It drew upon Broudy’s advocacy of these disciplines, and the necessity and centrality of arts education in the core curriculum. Broudy’s promotion of academic respectability for the arts, based on a sophisticated body of knowledge and exemplary artworks, sat well with the Getty’s commitment to fine arts and the institution of museums. So did the marginalization of art as exposure and self-expression. The Getty Center charged, aided by extensive financial support and political clout, drawing extensively on Broudy’s ideas, along with those of Elliot Eisner. In the 1980s and early 1990s, Broudy’s and Eisner’s ideas were translated as Discipline Based Arts Education, through books and curricular guideline. These ideas signaled an avowedly modernistic philosophy and curricular
framework of arts education, marked by its demarcation from and criticism of the romantic self-expression as the raison d’etre of arts education.\textsuperscript{xiii}

On a more fundamental level, Broudy’s work aimed to in reconnect the split between ethics and aesthetics, that dominated Aesthetic thinking for nearly 200 years (Bowman, 1998). Drawing on Plato and Aristotle’s’ moral views of the roles of art, Broudy’s ethical rationale of aesthetics challenged the independent, and isolated realm of the arts, the “Art for Arts Sake”. The interdependence between aesthetics and ethics reemerges in the writing of such people as Wayne Bowman (1998, 1999/2000) in music, Suzi Gablik (1991) in visual arts, and aesthetic environment writers. In the emerging pendulum swing of post post-modernism, this may signal a shift from deconstruction to a renewed sense of purpose and meaning in aesthetic education. It is, indeed, up to the next decade or two to judge if this interdependence reflects isolated scholarly writings, or if it establishes a new way of thinking and reconceptualizing the field of music education.

\textit{Note:} I am indebted to Eunice Boardman, Wayne Bowman, Eve Harwood, Charles Leonhard, Michael Mark, and Bennett Reimer for their careful reading of this manuscript and insightful comments and suggestions. Many thanks to Eunju Yun for her excellent secretarial support.
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i Earlier, James Mursell, the prominent Australian-born psychologist, discussed the development of aesthetic responsiveness through concentration on the aesthetic qualities of musical works (1934, 1936, 1948). Mursell addressed the characteristics and rhythm of musical growth and the development of experience in music education, focusing on growth in musical awareness, musical initiative, musical discrimination, musical insight and musical skill, rather than on schooling.


iii CEMREL was one of the federally funded regional educational labs, active in curriculum development, and responsible for conferences with leading scholars on arts and cognition (cf. Madeja, 1978.) Broudy was a key figure in CEMREL, and his ideas formed the backbones of its evaluation project (Smith and Schumacher, 1972).

iv For an account on Broudy’s work in the Aesthetic Eye, and Broudy’s impact on artists, classroom generalists and art specialists, see Greer (1992).

v I am indebted for highlighting this point to Wayne Bowman (2000, email communication).

vi These ideas can be traced to Michael Polanyi’s tacit knowing thesis. Polanyi argued that the knowledge we know and can articulate, explicit knowledge, is the tip of the cognitive iceberg: that our immense fund of tacit knowledge is what makes interpretation possible, and it’s what makes discovery possible as well, since it is the detection of new possibilities and promising directions that is a function of tacit knowing. In other words, details learned and ‘forgotten’ are not really forgotten, since they form the fabric of our tacit interpretive frameworks from which we attend to and make sense of all subsequent experience (Bowman, 2000, email communication).

vii Broudy did not discuss the notion that connoisseurship rooted in receptivity and contemplative appreciation is culturally-specific understanding (a notion highlighted by Bowman, 1999, and Chernoff, 1979, among others). It was mostly in the 80s and 90s that music educators have emphasized that every musical style or genre has developed its own detailed and sophisticated criteria of aesthetic values. That, as has been commented by an anonymous reviewer of this paper, is in fact a prerequisite and definition of musical style. What characterizes the connoisseur of every form of music is that (s)he has more or less captured the variation, and different ways of expression, within that style.

viii As well as in architecture by Michelle Olsen and in art education by Nancy Roucher.

ix With the publication of A Philosophy of Music Education in 1970, Reimer became the central voice for aesthetic education in music, and until the mid 90s, aesthetics seems to be widely accepted as a strong basis for music education.

x Which, as one of the anonymous reviewers of this paper pointed out, has been the practice in music education in most countries outside the USA: “the USA is alone in having performance as the actual class content in music education”.

xi which he published mostly in scholarly journals, but also in journals for arts specialists like Music Educator Journal and Art Education

xii And Manuel Barkan who came up with the different disciplines in his Penn State Conference presentation (1965).

xiii The romantic goals, however, continued to be central in teachers’ perceived curriculum, and present in the operational curriculum (cf. Stake, Bresler and Mabry, 1991).