I could go on and on in Telling others I my dear friend, Varia Educa. On nearly I can remember, we next in 1938 in 1959 He was a bright and onegstic art educate whose interests ranged for and will; trushing art, philosopy, alsthetics, and people! Will tougo a listing of trisastroles. as som as I could de Se, I twill thin to Teleph at Ohn State Umanty in 1960, David's interests and energy knew no much He lifted weight, drank teer, and popul is the telling of stones - exploits in the Korean War, adventines in bitch tuking accesse the United States, working in the mining industry day trying int for a part for a Holywood more: Joe Palooka. He and his frist wife, Glain were good friends for my wife, Flore and impress, Ofin's death was Tragic, a bicken of cancer in her mid thirties. Later, David met Willavene. They jointly omed an airplane. Oh, the Amis Dean Tell of their wordispel constatup, Davids morning to New York (he and I prined the Faculty at New York University in 1968), and this manning To Willarders . How wonderful for toth of them! I am so gene that the Ecker topp: Grey and J. J. refer to me as "Unch Jerry". For years and years, there was a closely tenix grouping of professional friends: manny Barken, Ellist Eiener, Dring Kanfman, Ed Feldman, Barid, and Impely, my rife, Flora, referred to us as "ant Edmations warp. David stoyed on at New york University, forwarm on this students, corting, flying, knife making, and the and from y the Institute for the advancement, Living traditions in art. Of our "closely kint grouping, manny Elliot, Dring, and now Dand all gone, I am To time tenne him in JERRY HAUSMAN

by Jerome J. Hausman

In general, history is made up of accounts and analyses that help us understand who we are and how we have come to where we are. Oftentimes, we speak of "the history of art educators," but there's no simple narrative that tells the full story. These are histories. When you come down to it, our history is made up of accounts of people and institutions—their actions and ideas. As the years go by, I frequently pause to think about individuals who've influenced me. These thoughts and memories serve as the basis for this series, "Art Teachers I Have Known."—J.J.H.

istory is made up of the stories we tell about people and events. Despite our best efforts to assemble these accounts, there is so much that is lost. I fear my tale of David W. Ecker will be one of many lost in the sands of time. He's currently living in New Hampshire, and maintaining an apartment in Greenwich Village, N.Y., with his wife, Willavene, who continues to teach at New York University. I continue to refer to him as "young David Ecker," even though he is now "retired" and clearly has achieved "senior-citizen" status.

Ecker grew up on Long Island, N.Y. After high school, he attended SUNY Farmingdale (State University of New York). During the Korean War, have him as a friend and colleague: robust and energetic, well grounded in philosophy and aesthetics, and a talented teacher! I consider his article, "The Artistic Process as Qualitative Problem Solving" (Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism, 1963), to be one of our most insightful statements bringing together philosophy and teaching practice at the time.

While on the faculty at OSU, Ecker worked on numerous projects. Perhaps most important was his participation in organizing the Seminar in Art Education for Research and Curriculum Development, held at Pennsylvania State University in 1966. Later that same year, he was

cus steel (co-directed with G.N. Pant of the National Museum, New Delhi, 1985); and he created the International Society for the Advancement of Living Traditions in Art (ISALTA).

As an advisor in NYU's doctoral program, Ecker worked with students from all over the world. His students have completed field research in Japan, Korea, China, Malaysia, Tibet, Jordan, Afghanistan, Nigeria, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Puerto Rico, Brazil and the



The "young David Ecker."

David W. Ecker

he served as a commanding officer of an Army intelligence unit, and was awarded a Bronze Star and two battle stars. I remember hearing his tales of combat on Pork Chop Hill.

He received his Bachelor of Science degree from SUNY and Albright Art School in Buffalo, and spent 1956 teaching at the American Community School in Asuncion, Paraguay, where he met and married his first wife, Gloria.

He was an art teacher at Babylon High School in New York (1957–58), and attended the University of Wisconsin, Madison, where he received a master's degree. Between 1959 and 1960 he was a part-time instructor teaching philosophy of education at Wayne State University. In 1960, he joined the faculty of the school of art at Ohio State University (OSU).

It was around this time I came to know David Ecker. His article, "Toward a Philosophy of Art Education," was published in the NAEA Research Yearbook that I edited. What a treat to the project director for "Improving the Teaching of Art Appreciation," a U.S. Office of Education Cooperative Research Project in 1966. Together with Elliot Eisner he edited "Readings in Art Education." Along with Manuel Barkan and myself, he helped guide the development of what was to become the Aesthetic Education Project under the auspices of the Central Midwestern Educational Laboratory. He was a key player in the first phase of deliberations on the conceptual basics for the project, with work done in Aspen, Colo., in 1968.

In 1968, Ecker and I joined the faculty of NYU. So much more might be written of his exploits in New York City. He married Willavene Wolf, an educational psychologist, whom he knew at Ohio State. David's interests roamed far and wide: he took courses in cooking (Chinese and Armenian, studying with James Beard); his field research as an artist-blacksmith in India resulted in an international symposium on Damas-

U.S. No wonder he's been a leader in preserving and nurturing those arts in danger of being lost. He has been at the forefront of promoting multicultural art education in both third-world and industrialized societies.

Today, David Ecker spends most of his time in Moultonborough, N.H. I fear that he has lost interest and enthusiasm with much that is now happening in American art education. What a loss! His insights are needed more now than ever.

Jerome J. Hausman is a visiting professor at The School of The Art Institute of Chicago and serves on the Arts & Activities Editorial Advisory Board.

ARTICLE SELECTION

Ecker, D. (1963). Some Inadequate Doctrines in Art Education and Proposed Resolution. Studies in Art Education, 5(1), 71-81.

Jerome Hausman

Editor, 1959-1961

Tow many times have we heard it said: "it's all a matter of timing"? Each of us has seen instances when an individual is "carried forward" by the tides of circumstance. George Kubler (1962) observed:

good or bad entrances are more than matters of position in the sequence. They also depend upon the union of temperamental endowments with specific positions. Every position is keyed, as it were, to the action of a certain range of temperaments.

When a specific temperament interlocks with a favorable position, the fortunate individual can extract from the situation a wealth of previously unimagined consequences. (p. 7)

My "entrance" to the field of art education, more than 50 years ago, was one in which I encountered prevailing doctrines as identified by David Ecker: (a) we believed in developing the full potentials of the child; (b) we believed in educating the whole child; (c) we believed the art teacher understands and meets the needs of the child; (d) we believed in teaching according to developmental levels; and (e) we believed in promoting creativity through art.At the time, I thrived on these beliefs. However, Ecker's article begins by pointing out that these relatively unquestioned assumptions have at least one feature in common: "they confuse facts and values."

With the passage of time, we can see clearly that intervening factors have radically altered the context in which 'art' is being created, experi-

enced by others, and taught. The larger context of art education is in flux. The very notion of 'art' is now seen as an essentially contested concept. New media and technologies have made possible radically different forms. Our social, cultural, and economic circumstances have made possible new and expanded roles for artists in community settings.

Such circumstances and events exert forces that alter our notions of art and art education. We need to continually examine prevailing doctrines for teaching of art. Ecker's article illustrates this by shifting emphasis from Lowenfeldian doctrine to the idea of

Jerome Hausman, the first editor of Studies in Art Education, was Director of the School of Art, Ohio State University, He was Professor at New York University and Consultant to the JDR3rd Fund's Arts in Education Program from 1968 to 1975. Between 1975 and 1982, he was the President of the Minneapolis College of Art and Design. Hausman edited numerous NAEA publications: The Journal of the NAEA; NAEA Yearbook (1959), Research in Art Education; Report of the Commission on Art Education (1965), and the Report on the Conference on Art Criticism and Art Education (1970) with D. Ecker and I. Sandler.

"qualitative intelligence." He points out that "qualitative ordering is not confined to painting, sculpture, and drawing activities." The "doors of possibility" are open to many forms and eventualities. Of course, art teachers will continue to instruct in methods, materials, and techniques, but the end-in-view is not limited to particular outcomes. As Ecker stated, we seek "general formulations as prescriptions for directing qualitative intelligence."The outcomes resulting from such instruction will be as varied as the people and contexts involved. After all, quality can be manifested in many ways. As art educators, we should welcome the possibilities afforded by diverse media and ideas. Ecker's conclusion is straightforward and open-ended:"We believe art education ought to play a major role in the development of that qualitative intelligence which is engaged in refining itself, even as it extends its bounty for the refinement of others."

Reference

Kubler, G. (1962). The shape of time: Remarks on the history of things. New Haven: Yale University Press.