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Liberal Education (An Overview)

Abstract

**Book Summary:** Education is a field sometimes beset by theories-of-the-day and with easy panaceas that overpromise the degree to which they can alleviate pressing educational problems. The two-volume Encyclopedia of Educational Theory and Philosophy introduces readers to theories that have stood the test of time and those that have provided the historical foundation for the best of contemporary educational theory and practice. Drawing together a team of international scholars, this invaluable reference examines the global landscape of all the key theories and the theorists behind them and presents them in the context needed to understand their strengths and weaknesses. In addition to interpretations of long-established theories, this work offers essays on cutting-edge research and concise, to-the-point definitions of key concepts, ideas, schools, and figures.

**Chapter Summary:** Liberal education comprises a tradition of educational theory and practice that connects the intrinsic value of learning with the aim of living a cultures and flourishing life. First articulated by educators in ancient Greece and Rome, liberal education has been prominent and often dominant in Western schooling through the centuries. It has evolved from a type of education prescribed for male aristocrats to one that is frequently seen as fundamental, even essential, for everyone - and especially for responsible, democratic citizens. Despite its record as a wellspring of intellectual life and culture, both its meaning and its value have frequently been disputed; its history displays competing interpretations, a cluster of rationales, evolving curricula and pedagogy, and a diversity of educational programs mounted by a succession of institutional forms. After identifying potential conceptual confusions, this entry discusses various conceptions and criticisms of liberal education. [excerpt]
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In 1986, in Bethel School District No. 403 v. Fraser, the Supreme Court allowed a school to prohibit the use of offensive levv and indecent words in a student's personal expression. Two years later, in Hazelwood School District v. Kuhlmeier, the Court drew a distinction between independent and school-sponsored speech. Independent student speech may only be regulated in accordance with the Tinker test (1969), allowing schools to punish teachers for speaking on matters of public concern when the disruption caused by the speech outweighs the importance of the speech as public discourse. A large number of cases have concluded that when they are not at school or on duty, teachers generally have the right to engage in noncriminal behavior as they see fit even if the community or school board disapproves. The major exception is that school boards may punish teachers for out-of-school behaviors that have a significant negative effect on their ability to do their job. Courts have consistently sided with teachers claiming the right to behave as they wish while on duty or that academic freedom protects their right to teach as they wish. Courts have consistently stated that schools may insist that teachers teach whatever curriculum and in whatever manner the school administration requires. A 2006 Supreme Court case, Garcetti v. Ceballos, ruled that public employees do not have free-speech rights when speaking as part of their official duties.
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LIBERAL EDUCATION: OVERVIEW

Liberal education comprises a tradition of educational theory and practice that connects the intrinsic value of learning with the aim of living a cultured and flourishing life. First articulated by educators in ancient Greece and Rome, liberal education has been prominent and often dominant in Western schooling through the centuries. It has evolved from a modern education prescribed for male aristocrats to one that is frequently seen as fundamental, even essential, for everyone—and especially for responsible, democratic citizens. Despite its record as a wellspring of intellectual life and culture, both its meaning and its value have frequently been disputed; its history displays competing interpretations, a cluster of rationales, evolving curricula and pedagogy, and a diversity of educational programs mounted by a spectrum of institutional forms. After identifying potential conceptual confusions, this entry discusses various conceptions and criticisms of liberal education.

Liberal Education as a Type of Education

Theorists who seek to explicate education tout court often end up articulating a conception that closely resembles or features liberal education: Educational literature, both scholarly and popular, is often written with liberal education implicitly in mind. Advocates, and critics of education tout court. It is therefore misleading to identify either the term refers to the only genuine education. Yet liberal education is a distinctive type of education: One may, in principle, debate its value without questioning the value of education tout court or implications of different forms of education. It is therefore misleading to identify it either with education tout court or with a good education. Such confusions about the concept are common because liberal education has in fact been so preeminent, and because it has such holistic goals and broad educational focus: a good life, one's life as a whole. It is also a common temptation for theorists to blur the descriptive and normative analyses of a particular type of education into the judgment of good education into the very concept of liberal education and its instantiations precludes evaluative judgments, and it is fallacious to assume that education focused on the good life is necessarily a good education. Nor is it conceptually precise to confound liberal education with general education—a term that refers either to the nonspecialized portion of a degree program (which is usually intended to preserve some experience of liberal education) or to learning that is foundational to more specialized studies.

The elusive distinctiveness of liberal education is commonly denoted in contrast with other forms of education, such as vocational, religious, or professional education—and also with all varieties of training. In specifying what it is, rather than what it is not, however, educators have located the distinctive and definitive element of liberal education—what makes an education liberal—variously in its scope and aims, in its curricular content, in its pedagogy, and in its institutional forms.

Scope and Aims

The term liberal is not in this context a reference to the political viewpoint of contemporary liberalism; rather, it invokes the Latin word liber, meaning "free." Even in the modern world, the association with freedom was dual. From the viewpoint of educators, it designated the education that was suitable for those who are free (not enslaved), who have civic responsibilities, and who enjoy the leisure time to pursue activities of intrinsic value—typically men of property. From the viewpoint of the learner, it was characterized as learning that liberates the mind or soul, freeing the student from many forms of ignorance and prejudice. Both interpretations point toward the ultimate goal of living a good life, a life in which one may flourish.

Liberal education, it is claimed, provides the chief means to or excellence of a good life—perhaps entails activities that constitute the good life. Different conceptions of the good in a "good life," with different balances of intellectual and moral components, have led to further specifications of the aims of liberal education. These have included the transmission of cultural heritage and the cultivation of the life of the mind, self-actualization as the development of both competence and character, the understanding and contemplation of the world and the place of humanity within it, the preparation for informed and responsible citizenship and social service, and the acquisition of complex skills of learning and communication—critical thinking, information literacy in multiple formats, moral reasoning, and effective communication,
for example—which, along with a commitment to lifelong learning, enhance personal effectiveness. In all these apparently varying specifications, liberal education remains distinctive in connecting them with the concern for the good life and thus having broader scope and different aims from other forms of education.

The classic statement of the aims of liberal education, or at least the most influential and provocative in recent centuries, is Henry Newman’s The Idea of a University (1852). In its collected essays, Newman argues that liberal education is the purpose of a university, by which he means an education that cultivates the mind, that values learning for its own sake, and that is “philosophical” in presenting “a comprehensive view of truth in all its branches.” Such an education reveals the unity of knowledge (reflected in the term university). Newman’s account is, however, decidedly Victorian in both its claims and assumptions—such as its exclusive educational focus on “gentlemen” and acknowledging the production of “good members of society” as its single, reluctant concession to “practical” ends.

Curriculum

Another historically grounded approach is to characterize liberal education in terms of its distinctive curriculum: an education in the liberal arts. The Latin term artes liberales was employed by classical authors as a description of a “liberal life,” neither of which had ever been included in the Greek list, were dropped thereafter. The seven remaining were eventually organized into two divisions: the methods studies of the trivium, including logic, grammar, and rhetoric; and the third, the quadrivium, including arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music. “Music” here (from the Greek mousike) embraces those studies inspired by the Muses—roughly, the humanities and fine arts. This curriculum was ultimately completed by the capstone study of philosophy (dialectic or philosophical theology), which was seen as the quintessential liberal art. A chief architect of this scheme was Martianus Capella, who codified this list in his elaborately allegorical work, De nuptiis philosophiae et Mercurii (written between 410 and 429 CE). It portrayed the marriage of eloquence and wisdom, celebrated in the groom’s gifts of the seven liberal arts. This odd, allusive work was enormously influential, defining the liberal arts and inspiring its iconography for seven centuries, from the Middle Ages until the 12th-century stirrings of the Renaissance.

The rediscovery of ancient texts that energized the Renaissance stimulated a shift in prescribed curricular content. Scholars used the term studia humanitatis to describe the study of the human sciences, the text-based study of the "humanities" was given special emphasis as the core of liberal education.

From the Enlightenment to the present day, rapid changes in the scope and nature of knowledge have altered the curriculum. Natural philosophy spawned scientific disciplines—physics, chemistry, biology, and geology—as integral, empirical fields. In the 19th century, the social sciences (economics, sociology, and anthropology) along with psychology emerged from philosphy to become distinct disciplines. All claimed a place within liberal education; they could not be ignored in an education that aimed at a comprehensive understanding of the world and the human condition. Such scientific disciplines would of course present a challenge to a curriculum largely devoted to the study of classical humanities. During the same period, moreover, there arose internal challenges to the curricular mandate of classical texts and the requisite study of Latin and Greek. The humanities were modernized to include literature, philosophy, and history originally written in vernacular languages and focused on more recent periods.

In the 20th century, disciplines morphed in method, explored in content, multiplied further, split into subdisciplines, and blended in interdisciplinary fields of study. In addition, where the content had been Eurocentric, it expanded to include the languages and cultures of other areas of the globe, as well as peoples previously marginalized within Western cultures. The traditional focus of study on artifacts of “high” culture was widened to include “popular” culture as well.

The impact of these developments produced two deep problems for the liberal education curriculum. The first was that the fissure between the humanities and the sciences, along with the sheer profusion of fields, challenged (pace Newman) the long-standing belief in the unity of knowledge. “Arts and sciences,” a clarifying term with increasing popularity, suggested both inclusion and division. The second was that, as the diversity and scope of knowledge exceeded reasonable curricular bounds, the touchstone of curricular comprehensiveness had to be replaced by a principle of selection. “Degrees in course,” in which all enrolled students were taught the same sequenced content, were replaced by programs that permitted alternative choices for elective and specialization.

As this brief sketch of curricular evolution suggests, it is problematic to define “liberal education” as study of a particular list of liberal arts disciplines. Theorists and advocates look to curricular content to have taught what one might expect to be core skills: to think critically, to use standard tools of analysis, to apply quantitative skills, and to have a democratic voice. Many programs have sought further ground from two other sources: a repository of shared humanistic ideals or deeper epistemological structures that underlie the disciplines. These shared values of the humanists—especially humane education—were a major component of the humanistic move, and the programmatic policies that were designed to serve that end.

Contemporary liberal education typically involves the following:

1. Required selective breadth of study distributed across forms of knowledge or linked to broad learning goals
2. The choice of a field for study in depth—the major
3. Elective studies
4. An array of experiential educational activities, such as service learning, internships, study abroad, research collaborations, and purposeful cocurricular activities

Pedagogy

Some educators prefer to call an education “liberal,” if it employs courses with this approach, a liberal education is less about what is taught and more about how it is taught; one might therefore claim that a subject like accounting is
for example—which, along with a commitment to lifelong learning, enhance personal effectiveness. In all these apparently varying specifications, liberal education remains distinctive in connecting them with the concern for the good life and thus having broader scope and different aims from other forms of education.

The classic statement of the aims of liberal education, or at least the most influential and provocative, is that of Henry Newman's *The Idea of a University* (1852). In its collected essays, Newman argues that liberal education is the purpose of a university, by which he means an education that cultivates the mind, that values learning for its own sake, and that is "philosophical" in presenting "a comprehensive view of truth in all its branches." Such an education reveals the unity of knowledge (reflected in the term *university*). Newman's account is, however, essentially Victorian in both its claims and assumptions—such as its exclusive educational focus on "gentlemen" and acknowledging the production of "good members of society" as its single, reluctant concession to "practical" ends.

**Curriculum**

Another historically grounded approach is to characterize liberal education in terms of its distinctive curriculum: an education in the liberal arts. The Latin term *artes liberales* was employed by classical authors as a way of describing a liberal education, neither of which had ever been included in the Greek list, were dropped thereafter. The remaining seven were eventually organized into two divisions: the methods studies of the *trivium*, including logic, grammar, and rhetoric; and the third, new, studies of the *quadrivium*, including arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music. "Music" here (from the Greek *mousike*) embraces those studies inspired by the Muses—roughly, the humanities and fine arts.

This curriculum was ultimately completed by the capstone study of philosophy (dialectic or philosophical theology), which was seen as the quintessential liberal art. A chief architect of this scheme was Martianus Capella, who codified this list in his *Theologiae sagratae libri sex*, written between 410 and 419 CE. It portrayed the marriage of eloquence and wisdom, celebrated in the groom's gifts of the seven liberal arts. This odd, allusive work was enormously influential, defining the liberal arts and inspiring its iconography for seven centuries, from the Middle Ages until the 12th-century stirrings of the Renaissance.

The rediscovery of ancient texts that energized the Renaissance stimulated a shift in prescribed curricular content. Scholars used the term *studia humanitatis* to describe the study of the humane, a term used at the Middle Ages until the 12th-century stirrings of the Renaissance. The rediscovery of ancient texts that energized the Renaissance stimulated a shift in prescribed curricular content. Scholars used the term *studia humanitatis* to describe the study of the humane, a term used at the Middle Ages until the 12th-century stirrings of the Renaissance.

The redesign of ancient texts that energized the Renaissance stimulated a shift in prescribed curricular content. Scholars used the term *studia humanitatis* to describe the study of the humane, a term used at the Middle Ages until the 12th-century stirrings of the Renaissance. The redesign of ancient texts that energized the Renaissance stimulated a shift in prescribed curricular content. Scholars used the term *studia humanitatis* to describe the study of the humane, a term used at the Middle Ages until the 12th-century stirrings of the Renaissance.

As a brief sketch of curricular evolution suggests, it is problematic to define "liberal education" as study of a particular list of liberal arts disciplines. Theorists who use the rubric to culcultural curriculum often have sought firmer ground from two other sources: a treasury of endowed cultural artifacts or deeper epistemic structures that underlie the disciplines. Theorists who use the rubric to culcultural curriculum often have sought firmer ground from two other sources: a treasury of endowed cultural artifacts or deeper epistemic structures that underlie the disciplines. Theorists who use the rubric to culcultural curriculum often have sought firmer ground from two other sources: a treasury of endowed cultural artifacts or deeper epistemic structures that underlie the disciplines. Theorists who use the rubric to culcultural curriculum often have sought firmer ground from two other sources: a treasury of endowed cultural artifacts or deeper epistemic structures that underlie the disciplines. Theorists who use the rubric to culcultural curriculum often have sought firmer ground from two other sources: a treasury of endowed cultural artifacts or deeper epistemic structures that underlie the disciplines. Theorists who use the rubric to culcultural curriculum often have sought firmer ground from two other sources: a treasury of endowed cultural artifacts or deeper epistemic structures that underlie the disciplines. Theorists who use the rubric to culcultural curriculum often have sought firmer ground from two other sources: a treasury of endowed cultural artifacts or deeper epistemic structures that underlie the disciplines. Theorists who use the rubric to culcultural curriculum often have sought firmer ground from two other sources: a treasury of endowed cultural artifacts or deeper epistemic structures that underlie the disciplines. Theorists who use the rubric to culcultural curriculum often have sought firmer ground from two other sources: a treasury of endowed cultural artifacts or deeper epistemic structures that underlie the disciplines. Theorists who use the rubric to culcultural curriculum often have sought firmer ground from two other sources: a treasury of endowed cultural artifacts or deeper epistemic structures that underlie the disciplines. Theorists who use the rubric to culcultural curriculum often have sought firmer ground from two other sources: a treasury of endowed cultural artifacts or deeper epistemic structures that underlie the disciplines. Theorists who use the rubric to culcultural curriculum often have sought firmer ground from two other sources: a treasury of endowed cultural artifacts or deeper epistemic structures that underlie the disciplines. Theorists who use the rubric to culcultural curriculum often have sought firmer ground from two other sources: a treasury of endowed cultural artifacts or deeper epistemic structures that underlie the disciplines. Theorists who use the rubric to culcultural curriculum often have sought firmer ground from two other sources: a treasury of endowed cultural artifacts or deeper epistemic structures that underlie the disciplines. Theorists who use the rubric to culcultural curriculum often have sought firmer ground from two other sources: a treasury of endowed cultural artifacts or deeper epistemic structures that underlie the disciplines. Theorists who use the rubric to culcultural curriculum often have sought firmer ground from two other sources: a treasury of endowed cultural artifacts or deeper epistemic structures that underlie the disciplines. Theorists who use the rubric to culcultural curriculum often have sought firmer ground from two other sources: a treasury of endowed cultural artifacts or deeper epistemic structures that underlie the disciplines. Theorists who use the rubric to culcultural curriculum often have sought firmer ground from two other sources: a treasury of endowed cultural artifacts or deeper epistemic structures that underlie the disciplines. Theorists who use the rubric to culcultural curriculum often have sought firmer ground from two other sources: a treasury of endowed cultural artifacts or deeper epistemic structures that underlie the disciplines. Theorists who use the rubric to culcultural curriculum often have sought firmer ground from two other sources: a treasury of endowed cultural artifacts or deeper epistemic structures that underlie the disciplines. Theorists who use the rubric to culcultural curriculum often have sought firmer ground from two other sources: a treasury of endowed cultural artifacts or deeper epistemic structures that underlie the disciplines.
appropriately part of a liberal education provided it is taught "liberally."

But explication just what it means to teach liberally is difficult. First, teaching methods change, so one must comprehend this evolution in any approach that is meant to transcend the methods of the moment. Second, there are several levels at which one could locate a distinctive pedagogy: from the reliance on specific teaching techniques to the fundamental assumptions and values manifested in teaching. For example, liberal education is often identified with the technique of Socratic dialogue, the give-and-take of proposal and critique in a conversation aimed at a clarifying and deepening the understanding of one's interlocutors. But one could also speak of teaching "liberally" as the sort of teaching that routinely requires students to go beyond remembering and comprehending to engage in "higher" activities such as evaluating, analyzing, integrating, and synthesizing or creating content. Finally, one may offer a holistic account of liberal pedagogy, describing it, for example, as teaching that respects the student's autonomy and critical faculties, as it embodies the love of learning. The latter generally refers to "the larger picture" of personal, social, and moral implications.

Critiques and Contemporary Issues

One popular genre of criticism faults current practice as failing to live up to the ideals of liberal education. Allan Bloom—philosopher, classicist, and author of "The Closing of the American Mind" (1987), which has spawned scores of imitations and refutations. Depending on the conception of liberal education endorsed by the author, these critiques may diagnose the causes of decline as curricular dilution and incoherence, technology or programmatic distractions to learning, and the adoption of content or utilitarian values. Faculty insensitivity to teaching,overspecialization, the research ethos, the failure to connect with human lives or to pose "big questions," or other alleged degradations.

Another genre of critiques targets the ideal of liberal education itself. The charges include perennial allegations that liberal education is essentially impractical and remote from the genuine issues of life, elite in practice and aristocratic in values, inappropriately academic as the required core of schooling, and resistant to assessment of its claims. Postmodern critics have added charges that liberal education is excessively rationalistic; indifferent to emotions, relationships, and family and professional responsibilities; and that it is a lofty ideal that masks sexism, elitism, and cultural imperialism or that anachronistically presumes a common culture. Such critiques, however, are usually directed, implicitly or explicitly, toward particular conceptions of liberal education.

Today, a declining portion of degrees earned in higher education are in the arts; many professional programs are nonexistent liberal education to be in peril. Yet it survives, is periodically renewed, and often thrives in many secondary schools in small, independent liberal arts colleges; in designated public liberal arts universities; in the arts and sciences divisions (or "university colleges") of many research universities; and in the resurgent educational institutions of numerous recently liberalized countries around the world.

Daniel R. DeNicola

See also Adler, Mortimer, and the Paideia Program; Cultural Literacy and Core KnowledgeSkills; Education, higher education of; Educational technology; Essentialism, Perennialism, and the "Tens" Approach; Knowledge, Structure of; From Aristotle to Bruner and Hirst; Liberalism; Oakshott, Michael

Further Readings


Liberalism

The meaning of liberalism, conveyed immediately by the word, implies a political philosophy centrally devoted to freedom. As with any grand political philosophy, however, the meaning of liberalism is deeply contested, so much so that it is perhaps easier to speak of varieties of liberalism rather than liberalism as such: classical and modern liberalism, comprehensive and political liberalism, neoliberalism, libertarianism, welfare liberalism, and so on.

John Locke, Adam Smith, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, John Stuart Mill, John Dewey, Isaiah Berlin, John Rawls, and Jürgen Habermas all are exponents of liberalism, but in their work can be found different interpretations of liberty, yielding different understandings of the boundary between the public and the private domains, the role and nature of education, the appropriate scope of toleration, and the conditions of legitimate state power. This entry examines the essential characteristics of any liberal philosophy, noting where differences in interpreting core concepts lead to different varieties of liberalism.

However, it is important to stress at the outset that the educational challenges presented by the various forms of liberalism that are described below are daunting and indeed are hotly contested—which perhaps explains why the literature focusing on liberalism in philosophy of education has been rapidly growing for several decades. Thus, among the questions addressed are the following: Should autonomy be cultivated in children, and if so, how? What civic virtues and skills are necessary, and what role ought the schoolhouse play in fostering them? Do parents have the right to control the nature of the education of their children, whether in homeschooling or in private or public schools? How is equality of educational opportunity to be understood, and how is it that ideal to be related to the liberty interests of parents and communities to construct educational opportunities for their children? Do communities or cultural groups have rights that, in educational contexts, outweigh the freedom of children to be self-determining? What rights in determining the nature of education are possessed by the state? What conditions need to be provided so that individuals become equal as citizens and are able to exercise their individual freedoms?

Preliminary Observations

At its most basic, liberalism describes a political philosophy in which liberty or freedom of the individual is central. Individual liberty is taken to be a default position, a starting presumption, and restrictions on liberty, especially those imposed by the state through coercive means, stand in need of justification. The foundational role of individual liberty delivers a limited government or restrained state that respects human conscience and religious diversity and that, in Jefferson's famous words, "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." The educational implications are nontrivial.

Historically, liberalism arose during the Enlightenment, when the advocates of many social orders—the divine right of kings and aristocratic privilege—were challenged and eventually uprooted in the American and French Revolutions. The first systematic expression of a liberal political philosophy can be found in the 17th-century philosopher Locke, who developed in his Two Treatises of Government and a Letter Concerning Toleration (Locke, 1689/2003), the idea of legitimate political order emerging from individuals in a state of nature who consent to be governed. Liberalism has since been associated with social contract theories of government, in which the legitimacy of government depends on the consent of the governed. Though school choice and charter schools argue that liberalism has some roots in antiquity, it is quintessentially a modern political philosophy.

Liberalism as a political ideology must not be confused with the frequent invocation of the term in ordinary politics, in which liberals are contrasted with conservatives, and where liberalism is a mark of political praise or condemnation. We may sensibly talk about liberals occupying space on the left and conservatives on the right of a political spectrum, but in many countries, both liberals and conservatives embrace liberalism as a political ideology. Most democracies today can be described as liberal democracies, committed to individual liberty, limited
appropriately part of a liberal education provided it is taught "liberally."

But explicating just what it means to teach lib-
ernally is difficult. First, teaching methods change,
so one must comprehend this evolution in any ap-
proach that is meant to transcend the methods of
the moment. Second, there are several areas at
which one could locate a distinctive pedagogy: from
the reliance on specific teaching techniques to the
fundamental assumptions and values manifested in
the curricula. For example, liberal education is often
identified with the technique of Socratic dialogue,
the give-and-take of proposal and critique in a con-
vocation aimed at clarifying and deepening the un-
derstanding of concepts or ideas. But one could
also speak of the boundary of teaching "liberally" as the
essence of that sort of teaching which requires students
not only to engage but also to go beyond remembering and
comprehending to engage in "higher" activities such as
evaluating, analyzing, integrating, and synthesizing or
creating content. Finally, one may offer a holistic ac-
count of liberal pedagogy, describing it, for example,
as teaching that respects the student's autonomy and
critical faculties. Liberal education, the implicitly re-
fers to "the larger picture" of personal, social, and moral implications.

Critiques and Contemporary Issues

One popular genre of criticism faults current prac-
tice as failing to live up to the ideals of liberal edu-
cation. Allan Bloom—philosopher, classicist, and
author of the influential Chicoan allegory of a "Great Books"
curriculum—virtually defined the genre in his widely
read jeremiad, The Closing of the American Mind (1987),
which has spawned scores of imitations and
refutations. Depending on the conception of liberal
education endorsed by the author, these critiques
may diagnose the causes of decline as curricular dis-
traction and incoherence, technology or programmatic
distractions to learning, subversive student culture,
the adoption of courses or curricular values, fa-
culty inattention to teaching, overspecialization,
the research ethos, the failure to connect with human
lives or to pose "big questions," or other alleged
degradations.

Another genre of critiques targets the ideal of
liberal education itself. The charges include peren-
ial allegations that liberal education is essentially
impractical and remote from the genuine issues of
life, sterile in practice and aristocratic in values,
inappropriately academic as the required core of
schooling, and resistant to assessment of its claims.
Postmodern critics have added charges that liberal
education is excessively rationalistic; indifferent to
emotions, relationships, and family and professional
responsibilities; and that it is a lofty ideal that masks
sexism, elitism, and cultural imperialism, so
anachronistically preys upon a common culture. Such
critiques, however, are usually directed, implicitly or
explicitly, toward particular conceptions of liberal
education.

Today, a declining portion of degrees earned in
higher education are in the liberal arts many pro-
nounce liberal education to be in peril. Yet it survives,
periodically renewed, and often thrives in many
secondary educational institutions, in small, independent liberal arts
colleges; in designated public liberal arts universi-
ties; in the arts and sciences divisions (or "university
colleges") of many research universities; and in the
resurgent educational institutions of numerous recently liberalized countries around the world.
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Liberalism

The meaning of liberalism, conveyed immediately by the "liberal" term, involves a political philosophy centrally devoted to the protection of individual liberty. In common with any grand political philosophy, however, the meaning of liberalism is deeply contested, so much so that it is perhaps easier to speak of varieties of liberalism than liberal as such: classical and modern liberalism, comprehensive and political liberalism, neoliberalism, libertarianism, welfare liberalism, and so on. John Locke, Adam Smith, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, John Stuart Mill, John Dewey, Isaiah Berlin, John Rawls, and Jürgen Habermas all are exponents of liberalism, but in our work can be found different interpretations of liberty, yielding different understandings of the boundary between the public and the private domains, the role and nature of education, the appropriate scope of toleration, and the conditions of legitimate state power. This entry examines the essential characteristics of any liberal political philosophy, noting where differences in interpreting core concepts lead to different varieties of liberalism.

However, it is important to stress at the outset that the educational challenges presented by the various forms of liberalism that are described below are daunting and indeed are hotly contested—which perhaps explains why the literature focusing on liberal philosophy of education has been rapidly growing for several decades. Thus, among the questions addressed are the following: Should autonomy be cultivated in children, and if so, how? What civic virtues and skills are necessary, and what role ought the schoolhouse play in fostering them? Do parents have the right to control the nature of the education of their children, whether in homeschooling or in private or public schools? How is equality of educational opportunity to be understood, and how is it that ideal to be related to the liberty interests of parents and communities to construct educational opportunities for their children? Do communities or cultural groups have rights that, in educational contexts, outweigh the freedom of children to be self-determining? What rights in determining the nature of education are possessed by the state? What conditions need to be provided so that individuals become equal as citizens and are able to exercise their individual freedoms?

 Preliminary Observations

At its most basic, liberalism describes a political phil-
osophy in which liberty or freedom of the individual is
central. Individual liberty is taken to be a default
position, a starting presumption, and restrictions on
freedom, especially those imposed by the state through
coercive means, stand in need of justification. The
foundational role of individual liberty delivers a
limited government or restrained state that respects
human conscience and religious diversity and that,
according to liberals, is the true home of liberty.

Historically, liberalism arose during the Enlighten,
ment, when the growing ranks of many social orders—the
divine right of kings and aristocratic privilege—were
challenged and eventually uprooted in the American and
French Revolutions. The first systematic expression of
a liberal political philosophy can be found in the
17th-century philosopher Locke, who developed in his
Two Treatises of Government and a Letter Concerning Toleration (Locke, 1689/2003), the idea of legitimate authority emerging from individuals in a state of nature who consent to be
governed. Liberalism has since been associated with
social contract theories of government, in which the
legitimacy of government depends on the consent of the
government. Though scholars often argue that liberalism has some roots in antiquity, it is quintessentially a modern political philosophy.

Liberalism as a political ideology must not be
confused with the frequent invocation of the term in
ordinary politics, in which liberals are contrasted with
conservatives, and where liberalism is a mark of
political praise or condemnation. We may sensi-
tively talk about liberals occupying space on the
left and conservatives on the right in a political spec-
trum, but in many countries, both liberals and con-
servatives embrace liberalism as a political ideology.

Most democracies today can be described as liberal
democracies, committed to individual liberty, limited