



- » JAAACS Home
- » Article Archive
- » Editorial Statement
- » Call for Manuscripts
- » Author Guidelines
- » Editorial Board
- » Review Board

- » Submit An Article
- » Contact JAAACS

Volume 6

February 2010

The Unfolding Inner Teacher: Applying Holistic Ideas from Kenneth Beittel & Henry Schaefer-Simmern

Sally Armstrong Gradle, Ed. D.
Southern Illinois University Carbondale
Carbondale, Illinois, USA

Barbara Bickel, Ph. D.¹
Southern Illinois University Carbondale
Carbondale, Illinois, USA

Historical art educators Kenneth Beittel's and Henry Schaefer-Simmern's teaching practices contribute much to our understanding of how one might nurture, develop and then teach from the inner teacher outward, thereby developing wholeness as a natural occurrence in students. To better compare holistic teaching in contemporary art education with these exemplars, we began by examining Parker Palmer's educative work on transformative teaching and wholeness. In *The Courage to Teach*, he writes, "The power of our mentors is not necessarily in the models of good teaching they gave us... their power is in their capacity to awaken a truth within us.... If we discover the teacher's heart in ourselves by meeting a great teacher, recalling that meeting may help us take heart in teaching once more" (1998, p. 21).

When we examined the teaching practices and theories of Schaefer-Simmern and Beittel, we discovered their passionate, although differing abilities to awaken heart—in the form of what Palmer refers to as the inner teacher or whole teacher. We define wholeness within this paper as an ever-evolving relationship between the many parts that make up a whole (Miller, R., 2000; Wilber, 1996). The characteristics of the whole teacher are; awareness of multiple perspectives, such as the intellectual, emotional, physical, social, aesthetic and spiritual (Miller, 2000); the ability to nurture and develop relationships between these perspectives in individuals and within groups; and the awareness of human connectivity with the Cosmos. The interior presence that a whole teacher carries is further cultivated through developing a deeper understanding the self, connecting with a domain of knowledge that one is passionate about, and weaving one's whole identity into a vocation. Through our research, we sought to clarify how two exemplars contributed to

the unfolding of the inner teacher-- whether this teacher-presence emerged in their students as the confident voice of an artist who explored new ideas, and/or surfaced as the reflective teacher who applied new understandings of the artistic process/experience.

Understanding Authenticity in Teaching

Parker Palmer explained in his interview with Sara Day Hatton (1998) that claiming authenticity as a teacher begins with connectedness. Good teachers weave their identity, their knowledge about students and subject to create a sense of wholeness. The opposite, *inauthentic teaching*, occurs when there is a disconnect and the teacher is no longer present in body, mind, and spirit working within the context and with the particular students so that the best possible “whole and integrated person appears as they address their work and their life work” (London, 2006, p. 8). The characteristics of a holistic curriculum seem to center around self-awakening, and the ongoing restoration of a spirit that moves toward integration of knowledge, the crossing and combining of disciplines, and deeper complexities of thinking (Miller, 2005).

What is holistic thinking? We believe that holistic thinking revives our sense of connection to the world in the following ways, which we will define experientially through the lives of these art educators. First, holistic encounters are relational, meaningful, and able to assist one in understanding a heritage that is rich with patterns, beauty and mystery (Miller, 2006). Each individual unfolds in awareness within these relationships—not through a prescribed sequence of curricular steps—but by supporting the actions and influences that clearly enable wholeness.

Second, as Nel Noddings indicated in *Critical Lessons* (2006) regarding the kinds of teaching theories that undergird American schooling, the method that appears to yield greater wholeness of the human being stems from intrinsic motivation and is heavily reliant on the instructor’s ability to listen to student’s needs and level of development. Jardine (2000) extends this when he writes, “Attention, devotion, care, worthiness, cherishing, fostering, renewal, hope...echo a deep sense of place, of remaining, of dwelling” (p.20) that we believe contribute to holistic teaching practices that are transformative.

Transformative learning theory deepens this definition of holistic learning and teaching, as Edmund O’Sullivan (2002) explains;

Transformative learning involves experiencing a deep, structural shift in basic premises of thought, feelings and actions. It is a shift in consciousness that dramatically and permanently alters our way of being in the world. Such a shift involves our understanding of ourselves and our self-locations, our relationships with human beings and the natural world; our understandings of relations of power in interlocking structures of class, race, gender; our body awarenesses; our visions of alternative approaches to living; and our sense of possibilities for social justice and peace and personal joy. (p. xvii)

Effort becomes light, ideas flow easily and rapidly, endurance and patience are extended, focus becomes more concentrated, time becomes extended, boundaries soften, definition becomes clearer and crisper, the ego retreats.... artistic behavior is the natural human behavior whenever there is a congruence of mind, body and spirit.” (2006, p. 13)

Perception shifts, as Fritjof Capra (2005) tells us, and holistic pedagogical content is more likely to consist of contextual knowledge, rather than objective knowledge; it may more readily contribute to qualitative understanding of problems and solutions; and the learner is then awakened through a process of renewal. The patterns of relationships that occur over and over again in our lives and art are “opportunities for deep levels of making meaning” as art teacher Stacey McKenna observed (2006, p. 58).

In art education, Karen Lee Carroll suggests that a holistic approach “reinforces the deep purposes of making art. It gives cause to a learner centered, domain-specific, and context sensitive approach” (2006, p. 25). Carroll posed reflective questions on art as a holistic teaching practice. She began by asking how we might best inspire and deepen the learning that leads to transformation, while increasing the complexity of art education’s relationship to all other domains of knowledge. Her questions provided further impetus for the authors to clarify holistic practices of Henry Schaefer-Simmern and Kenneth Beittel.

At the heart of this research is listening. First, to the stories of theory and practice blended from voices who knew these teachers well; and second, to our own study of Beittel’s and Schaefer-Simmern’s writings through a synoptic text analysis. According to curriculum theorist William Pinar, the use of synoptic text analysis in curriculum research not only paraphrases and returns us to the original text but it also attends;

to the “now” and,... the “there,” that is, both the subjective presence of our students and their social emplacement and the historical moment in which intellectual work is conducted.... synopsis does not simply repeat, but reconstructs, subjectively, socially, intellectually. (Pinar, 2006, p. 12)

In addition, we have entered William Doll's post-modern educational concept and practice of "recursion" in the unfolding of this paper. Recursion is one of four concepts – along with richness, relations and rigor that Doll offers as a relational interaction between a student, teacher and a field of study (Low, 2008, p. 150). Similar to Doll’s (1993) bridge-building in the field of curriculum studies between modernism and post-modernism, Beittel and Schaefer-Simmern were committed to integrating historical understandings of art and art making with current understandings of art and art making.

In this way we explore the teaching of two great art teachers, their influence on the artistic formation of their students, and the legacy of ideas—some still untapped--and offer them for future application. We also ponder the unexamined omission of these men in art education history and encourage a corrective view of the field that does not obliterate their unique approaches to art and teaching.

We offer a counter to assumptions about their ideas and a stronger knowledge base for informed decision-making. Karen Hamblen (1993) notes that omissions are like silences in our research publications: they often erase entire viewpoints, establish and prioritize agendas, and perpetuate biases within the field. Similarly, Graeme Chalmers (2006) reminds us to become “more historically conscious and increasingly find ways to come to know, embrace, query, and extend the work of those ancestors whose work undergirds our own. Our “new” movements and directions [he suggests] are not necessarily “new” (p. 292). By redressing historical omissions, we aim “to embolden the timid, and to light some silent, convoluted passageways” (Hamblen, 1993, p. 196) in art education.

While extensive theoretical edification on the universality of artistic unfolding of Schaefer-Simmern or the qualitative research techniques of Beittel are outside the parameter of this research, every attempt will be made to put these ideas into the contexts from which they sprang. In other words, while our goal is to unearth the inner teacher, on the way to excavation we found the theoretical attached to the heart of their practice, as inseparable from their identity as the body is from head or hands. We begin with an historical context for their work in order to situate these exemplars as part of a larger purview of art education practices.

Schaefer-Simmern’s Context

Throughout the 1930s, many intellectuals and artists left Europe due to Germany’s Third Reich. For example, art educators such as Viktor Lowenfeld, Rudolf Arnheim, and Henry Schaefer-Simmern found a welcome climate in the United States, where they pursued research. Lowenfeld, who emigrated in 1937 as did Schaefer-Simmern, argued that free expression was a necessity for the psychological health of the whole child. His work was unquestionably influential in the shaping of art teacher education in mid-century American schools (Fineberg, 2006). Rudolf Arnheim’s theory of visual perception explored how learners move from simple to complex forms, require visual order within their artwork, and use vision as a process of understanding structural patterns (1954/74). Arnheim considered Schaefer-Simmern a friend and colleague, someone who shared many common ideas about artistic formation and the pivotal role that art can have in shaping human identity. In the Introduction to his work *Art and Visual Perception*, Arnheim recognized that Schaefer-Simmern’s research “demonstrated that the capacity to deal with life artistically is not the privilege of a few gifted specialists but is available to every sane person whom nature has favored with a pair of eyes” (p. 6). Within Schaefer-Simmern’s work, as well as Arnheim’s and Lowenfeld’s, a similar undercurrent of ideological social reform and problem solving surfaced. In the 1930s, Arthur Efland tells us, “One can detect a shift in the language from a concern with art appreciation as a study of masterpieces to a concern with art in daily living” (1990, p. 210). As the free world braced itself for the possible demise of democracy during World War II, the emphasis on social reconstruction and the use of art education as a significant occupation that could mold social values and promote a healthy democracy was also prominent in the philosophies of educators like Sir Herbert Read (1958) and John Dewey (1934/1958).

John Dewey composed the Foreword in Schaefer-Simmern’s book *The Unfolding of Artistic Activity* (1948/61)—a notable fact since this is Dewey’s *only* endorsement of an educational work (Berta, 1994). In Dewey’s Foreword his progressive beliefs about

education meshed with Schaefer-Simmern's thoughts on the restorative nature of making art. Dewey wrote:

Because of this wholeness of artistic activity, because the entire personality comes into play, artistic activity which is art itself is not an indulgence but is refreshing and restorative, as is always the whole that is health... Hence, it is not something possessed by a few persons and setting them apart from the rest of mankind, but is the normal or natural human heritage (x).

With this evident foundation of restorative health as the heritage of all populations, Schaefer-Simmern advanced a point of view that suggested the inner struggle to bring an image into form was a universal characteristic of humankind that could be further developed with the kind of art instruction that he advocated. Through several case studies with diverse groups of non-artists, Schaefer-Simmern developed his view that artistic activity begins with the desire to make visual sense of intuited images, and this process is refined through revisions in the work. His view as noted by Dewey and himself in the introduction was not shared by all educators in the arts who were proponents of self-expression, art as free play or those who viewed art as a solely cognitive operation. While his theories have been misunderstood and/or overlooked in the subsequent decades, it is of interest to the authors that his work was received positively by some scholars of the arts during his time; for example Victor D'Amico, Rudolf Arnheim, Stanley Madeja, and Sir Herbert Read, (Abrahamson, 1980). Art educator Kenneth Beittel (1973) whose historical context will be examined next, acknowledged the enormous contributions of both Schaefer-Simmern and Lowenfeld as early pioneers of research in art education and who awakened what Parker Palmer referred to earlier as *the inner teacher*.

Beittel's Context

Kenneth Beittel was mentored as a graduate student and later hired by Viktor Lowenfeld. Beittel was a very astute scientist (experimental researcher), as his early work in the 1950-60s and early 70s exemplifies (e.g., Beittel, 1953; Beittel and Burkhart, 1963; and a summary in Beittel, 1972). However, as early as 1959 he critiqued science and its too often "unwarranted scientism" (p. 26) and "methodolatry" (Beittel, 1973). In the late 1950s he was also a critic of artists and art educators, who wanted to dismiss the value of scientific research initiatives in art education, as insensitive to and incapable of understanding what artists and art teachers do.

Canadian curriculum theorist and educator Ted Aoki, whose work is a "complex interdisciplinary configuration of phenomenology, poststructuralism, and multiculturalism" (Pinar & Irwin, 2005, p. 1) and, who has had a large impact on reconceptualist curriculum thinking, has acknowledged the significant influence of Beittel's thought on his own thinking (Pinar & Irwin, 2005, p. 92). In Aoki's 1978 article entitled *Towards a Curriculum Inquiry in a New Key*, Aoki cites Kenneth Beittel and Elliot Eisner as two of the rare educators who called for the "probing into the deep structure of underlying curriculum research thought" (Pinar & Irwin, 2005, p. 92). Eisner and Beittel can be seen to represent the two distinct sides of the "fork in the road" of art education. Unfortunately, Beittel's work, unlike Eisner's, has become a marginalized voice within the field of art education and has not been picked up in the larger field of

education (Fisher & Bickel, 2006). Beittel in his 1997 essay entitled *Fateful Fork in the Road: The 1965 Red Book*, wrote of his decision to stay close,

... to ground zero in the discipline... creating and responding to art in a present, personal, deeply and playfully experiential way, in a way that can affect one's life...where the absolute freedom of the creative imagination is believed and lived. (p. 537)

He observed that the fork that occurred in the road of art education expanded the discipline to a “pluralism of emphasis and a widening of freedoms” (p. 538) yet it lost the direct contact with the “perennial measure” (p. 538) of art itself and the direct learning that can come from the art itself. His decision to stay close to the ground of art making as a practicing artist, researcher and teacher foreshadows some current art educational research trends (Sullivan, 2005; Springgay et al, 2008) which call for commitment to an art, researching and teaching practice.

The late art educator Marilyn Zurmuehlen, a former student and colleague of Beittel, described him as “[A] distinguished scholar, researcher, and teacher” (Zurmuehlen, 1991, p. 1), an artist-philosopher grounded in “Langer’s philosophy of art as presentational symbol... as well [as in] the praxis philosophies of existentialism and phenomenology [later hermeneutics and poetics], and through them to art as presence (Zurmuehlen, 1991, p. 18). His interests included, yet transcended, institutional art education, delving into the holistic and spiritual dimensions of life and the evolution of human consciousness through art. He had an active professional art practice and exhibited his pottery internationally throughout his career.

Schaefer-Simmern also had a productive career as an artist, art theorist, and teacher in Europe, but his energy became channeled entirely into research on artistic growth when he came to the United States. Strongly aligned with Dewey’s sense of pragmatism, and Dewey’s admonitions against laissez-faire, and self-expressive education, Schaefer-Simmern believed that art education could contribute to the shape of democracy through the development of individual’s formation of visual ideas. As we probed these educators’ teaching practices more thoroughly, there appears to be a greater good than the pleasurable actions of making, doing, and expressing—it is the learning outcome that shapes the entire human being through the process.

Wholeness: Thoughts and Visions Based on Practice

In Schaefer-Simmern’s discussion of his case studies in *The Unfolding of Artistic Activity* (1948/1961), all of the individuals he taught were non-artist populations. They were business professionals, community members, mentally challenged, or incarcerated youths from all walks of life. He believed that art should contribute to the whole human being as a healthy mental, emotional and physical synthesis, and that this could be demonstrated most effectively with anyone, given that the individual was interested and able to learn. For example, in one location of Schaefer-Simmern’s research the Southbury Training School where residents with limited cognitive functioning passed their days in occupational tasks such as making potholders, he proposed a course that would engage the

learners in decision making, allow for personal choice in subject matter, and develop their ideas over time to the best of their ability. The effective problem solving that emerged individually and collaboratively suggested that remarkable changes occurred in individuals' art ability, behavior, and overall health and well being. Schaefer-Simmern recognized that the cooperative effort of problem solving in group settings gave each individual "a community spirit, which in turn gives to the participating individual the feeling of human worth, the consciousness of being recognized as a decisive factor in the group and community" (Schaefer-Simmern, 1948/1961, p. 187). He noted that "feelings of inferiority slowly retreated from their minds; faith and self-respect became more dominant" (p. 193). Changes were observed by one of Schaefer-Simmern's former art education students, Dr. Roy Abrahamson, who was amazed that in Schaefer-Simmern's students, the transformations went well beyond the change in the artistic work, and extended to the individual's physical appearance as well (Gradle, 2009).

In reflection on how Schaefer-Simmern felt about such changes, Abrahamson recalled that his mentor was never particularly surprised by transformations, saying only, "Forms form." Simply put, Schaefer-Simmern believed that "the self manifests something of extreme importance from the deepest level of personal existence that was previously hidden, mysterious, or unknown" (Berta, 1994, p. 217) in the unfolding of artistic development. This belief, however, has to be translated into exemplary practices for an art education of wholeness, ideas that Schaefer-Simmern only hinted at in his work when he stated that art education would have to "find a new orientation and determine the conditions under which it can fulfill its task" (p. 8).

Similar to Schaefer-Simmern, Beittel (e.g., 1985/2003) held an ideal and ethical vision of the power of art in assisting the development of holistic awareness in all humans. This vision was supported by his own experience of learning, growth and transformation through his life-long practice as an artist supported by his research and teaching at Penn State, and being mentored within an ancient Japanese pottery tradition by a hereditary Japanese pottery master during four sabbaticals from The Pennsylvania State University beginning in 1959.

In 1967 Beittel was significantly influenced by his study of "deep tradition" with his teacher in Japan. He wrote;

I was exposed to the Zen attitudinal commitment and spirit that pervades his traditional way. I learned methods that were echoes of discoveries centuries old from China and Korea. And I developed a view of planetary traditions as my own contribution: How by standing within a local tradition one is readied for an inter-traditional view. I see now as well that it is by standing within a local religious tradition that one is grounded and able to engage in a planetary inter-spirituality, one of the great needs of our time. There is one summit with many paths. (2002, p. 3)

Beittel's spiritual philosophy pervaded his art and teaching practices. His understanding of art as a spiritual discipline that can lead to self-actualization was foundational in his art and teaching practices. His spiritual philosophy coupled with his charismatic teaching and

leadership style (Wilson, 2001, p. 4) led to Beittel becoming known by some as a mystic in the field of art education (Lanier, 1977). A blanket of silence developed around the spiritual guru archetype Beittel embodied in the academic field of art education. This paper attempts to shed light on some of the historical silences by offering a holistic perspective on Beittel's teaching philosophy. Beittel's philosophy can thus contribute to the work of the newly formed Caucus on the Spiritual in Art Education in the National Association of Art Education with its challenge, as voiced by Peter London (2009), to "a practice of teaching art that has been more involved with the making of beautiful objects and knowledge concerning beautiful objects over the centuries, than it has with exploring the spiritual intentions and the spiritual powers of artistic processes that create those very objects" (p. 16).

Beittel's research at Penn State in his Drawing Lab for 16 years actively focused on the creative process of "artists" and the transformation of those that engaged the serial art making process reflectively. The foundational method that emerged from the Drawing Lab, Beittel called "*the art of qualitative thinking*"-- where an in-depth inter-relational dialogue is entered into with the artist through the art. In this method he drew from, and expanded upon Dewey's writing in *Art as Experience* and the concept of "qualitative thinking." Beittel and Beittel (1991) explained this theoretical linkage with Dewey:

While all experience might not be thought of as art, what Dewey called *an* experience, organizes itself as art does and remains the model for a vital conceptualization of art itself. In like manner, all experiencing might not be thought of as expressing, but qualitative experiencing is meant to be the equivalent to Dewey's usage and in addition to connote that it provide us, through expression, with an invaluable text for understanding the deeper meaning of that experience itself. This is what I refer to as an *art of qualitative thinking*. (p. 138)

They go on to explain,

The overarching purpose of the art of qualitative thinking is to express, describe, and lead to epiphany, so that through its hermeneutic-expressive cycle consciousness becomes self-conscious of its expansion and can evolve. It moves from one expression to a still deeper one. The purpose of its cycle, as one large art process, is to extend qualitative time, to extend depth interpretation, to extend expression. (p. 149)

The art of qualitative thinking challenged what Beittel (1985/2003) called the "broken art," that he witnessed in the art education field, which divided the process of making art from the spirit of art. In contrast, his vision was "a hermeneutic cycle which revealed the phenomenon and the interpreter's hidden motivation as one" (p. 43). Within Beittel's 1985 article "Art for a new age" he prophesized for the next millennium which we are now living. He situates prophecy as unfinished and transhistorical (p. 40) and suggests that artists are "natural lightning rods for prophecy and revelation" (p. 41). He privileges the role of the artist but at the same

time encourages all people to engage a creative practice and to be artists. His is a holistic vision where the active imagination is the mediator between intellect and matter, shifting into a Great Tradition of “planetary scope” that is “transcultural, transhistorical, and transpersonal” (p. 44). In this Great Tradition the artist moves through time from Being (autobiographical) to Becoming (universal). Schaefer-Simmern, too, as Abrahamson (1990) noted, was convinced that the holistic structures (gestalt formations that lead to a unified whole in a work) can be found in art across time by those of various ages, mental capacities, gender, and ethnicities. The unfolding of artistic consciousness occurs in a process when “the intuitive, the felt, and the aesthetic live harmoniously,” as complexity theorist William Doll posits (retrieved 4/04/09). James Joyce refers to this as “epiphanies of the ordinary” (Doll, 2001, p. 15) where we gain insight into ourselves, our culture, and the cosmos.

A Caring Methodology and Teaching Practices

Our questions continued as we looked for specific instances in a methodology of applied wholeness, one that seemed centered on caring, harmony, and indirect teaching in both of these exemplars. In Schaefer-Simmern and Beittel's work we find a rich abundance of relational teaching strategies that enhance the dialogue between the student, their art-making process, and the teacher. Although each had a unique teaching style and personality their work held common threads of restoration, experimentation, participation and community-based learning that assisted personal growth in awareness of art and artistic ability in their students. Beittel's art teaching methods became the focus of some of his graduate student's research² such as Mary Stokrocki (1981). Her dissertation describes Beittel's teaching as an apprenticeship model that included five kinds of learning: “technical, attitudinal, understanding, extra-structural, and creative... modeled after Dr. B's teaching strategy of “right practice, right attitude, and right understanding”” (p. 135). By modeling the discovery practice of the artist-craftsman-teacher, Beittel assisted students in learning to *be* (p. 156). Students were often observed modeling inspirational teaching, as artist-craftsman-teacher, within the class setting. Stokrocki described the class experience she witnessed and participated in during her study as the development of “*communitas*”.³ The communal structure of Beittel's classroom involved teamwork, a combination of structured activity leading towards anti-structural activity. All of which were supported with loving care by Beittel. Beittel described his classes as an “implicit community of workers of hand and wheel.... a community of initiates on a path of self-transformation, of consciousness expansion” (Beittel, 1989/92, p. ix).

Raymond Berta (1994) describes Schaefer-Simmern's model of instruction as having the components of: 1) the freedom to explore meaningful imagery, 2) the struggle to bring a visually conceived image into a form, 3) the empowerment of arriving at solutions independently, and 4) the development of self-knowledge that allowed for personal closure of an idea. Dr. Roy Abrahamson (personal communication, 2007), explained the process he experienced working under Schaefer-Simmern's direction—which others have also verified (Berta, 1994). Abrahamson recounts that Schaefer-Simmern never told anyone what to pursue as an idea, nor did he dictate the medium. After a period of working, he would dialogue with a student individually, and class members were not encouraged to join in the discussion, but to listen. His questions followed a similar pattern with everyone, and he listened attentively:

'What do you like about your work? What could you do better? What do you need to do to make it better?' Students were encouraged to revise, find their way back to the image that they perceived or begin again, and take ownership of a transformational process that led toward wholeness in the art, and in the person. Abrahamson recalled observing a student in one of Schaefer-Simmern's classes at his Institute of Art Education in California who was so empowered by the change of direction in her work that her appearance and demeanor altered as well. This was not an unusual occurrence; and Schaefer-Simmern was never really surprised by this transformation, saying only that "As you form the work, the work forms you" (Gradle, 2009). Schaefer-Simmern championed divergent thinking as students explored ideas, whether as individuals or in groups. He also promoted convergent thinking: the capacity to see one's own art work as a whole, and view it in relation to a greater connection with art (Abrahamson, 1980). When I asked Abrahamson if Schaefer-Simmern showed works of art from various eras prior to students' visual ideas, as is sometimes the case in art instruction, Abrahamson replied that Schaefer-Simmern only showed historical works after the idea took on a visual form. This seems apparent in Schaefer-Simmern's case studies, in which a student he called "Miss E,"--who had not seen Pesellino's work (School of Florence, 1422-1457) in Schaefer-Simmern's class--was strongly attracted to this work during a museum visit. She wrote about her realization that this viewing was connected to her own work:

As I stared at it [the painting] for the second time, some rocks in the foreground of that picture suddenly awakened an interest in me. They looked familiar. I leaned closer and saw that they were painted in a similar way to mine.... It is strange that this could excite me to the extent that it did but it was as if I had experienced an insight into the mind of an artist living over five hundred years ago (p. 166).

Schaefer-Simmern uses Miss E's articulate self-awareness to make two important points. First, she was not attempting to analyze the painting's content, its color or composition, but was relating to and appreciating the artistic problem solving of a fellow artist. Second, as her comments continue, the reader recognizes that Miss E is finding future problems to solve. Both of these findings have productive implications for how any individual might relate artistic perception to their own lived experience. The incentive for growth, according to Schaefer-Simmern, "lies in the creator's innermost compulsion to proceed to a clearer and richer visual cognition by independent visual judgment of his work" (p. 198). Defining what Schaefer-Simmern means by a decisive awareness of the progression of one's work has to be understood within the context of his theory of visual conceiving.

Visual Conceiving: Giving the Image Form

Simply put, Schaefer-Simmern theorized that there were three steps—not always sequential—before an image moves from the realm of intuitive thought to a visual presentation. First, an idea makes a deep, lasting impression in one's mind, one that must be slowly savored in order to be fully developed. As the student or artist begins to work with materials, the image is transformed. It is not an exact replica of what was in the mind, but emerges with a life of its own

through the process. By taking what the artist or student knows intuitively about the image, and the knowledge of working with materials, the problem is slowly resolved into a complete visual form. Schaefer-Simmern hypothesized that the majority of individuals have the innate ability to perceive their experiences, and given tools and materials, humans throughout history have found ways to present their ideas visually. As the visual conceptions become more unified through revision, the organization of the work seems to simultaneously invoke the transformation of the art maker, leading to greater integration of the person. Schaefer-Simmern, along with his lifelong friend, Rudolf Arnheim (e.g., 1997), expressed the belief that these conceptions unfolded or progressed with greater complexity as an orderly, unified perceptual process. We also see in Beittel's work unity emerging from the complex dialogue between the artist, the art and the art making process.

Paradox of Tradition and Freedom of Expression

Bringing the best of science and mysticism as inquiry and teachings from the East and West together was of great interest to Beittel. In 1959 he wrote, "While feeling that nothing is sacred in the sense that it cannot be studied, I have maintained that there is an area of proper mysticism associated with research in art or art education" (p. 26). Beittel (1997) would be quick to acknowledge his philosophical and intellectual work as limited, that at times took him away from "ground zero," and, thus, he would try and integrate that with his "transcendelic or numinous and poetic part, since that is the real end which is my beginning, and always has been..." (p. 533). He acknowledged that his insights did not come from philosophy but from direct engagement with the art making process and the art making process of unique individuals (Beittel, 1972a, p. 26).

Disciplined spontaneity was both Beittel's solution and his commitment to living and being in/with paradox. He was skillful in being able to delve into "either the depth of tradition or the freedom of expression" (Zurmuehlen, 1991, p. 5). He understood that "Holistic participation of the body-mind, then, means this dispersion, this gathering of many fragments into one unity, just as much as it means the fullness of each present act as it rises and falls within time" (Beittel, 1989/92, p. 41).

In addition, Beittel envisioned a Great Tradition as the place "where inspiration and mastery can co-exist" (1983, p. 13). His methods were, in part, that of a structuralist, in contrast to a totally committed poststructuralist. Beittel embraced tradition, deconstructed the tradition, and reconstructed it anew—making his work postmodern, but not constrained by postmodernist's attack on spiritual holistic development. He was not limited by structure nor thrown off by anti-structure. He wrote;

Once I had been exposed to 'deep tradition,' I found structure friendly, not constraining. I saw the truth in the saying that freedom is not a resting place, but the zero point between constraint on the one hand and commitment on the other. (Beittel, 2002, p.8)

The Great Tradition, Beittel taught, is entered through one's commitment to a disciplined art practice. He wrote, "We imitate our masters only because we are not yet masters ourselves, and only because in doing so, we learn the truth about what cannot be

imitated” (1989, p. 4). When we enter the art making process through the art medium we are entering a relationship with those who have come before us. He included art works as teachers in the Great Tradition. To study and contemplate a historical piece of art brings us into contact with all past artists and teachers.

Expanding the Vision

In *Teaching by Heart (2005)*, Sara Day Hatton compiled a list of characteristics of sound teaching practice which appear to share some of the energy, caring, and respect for the process that are also evident in Schaefer-Simmern’s and Beittel’s work with students, exemplified in their writing, and in the memories of their former students. Among the core teaching practices that Hatton saw as holistic and necessary, we found connections to the inner teacher present in Beittel and Schaefer-Simmern. These qualities are: encouraging learner choice and revision, active inquiry, connection with one’s surroundings/work, reflection, and new ideas which “spiral gracefully out of the old” (pp.140-141). As Beittel and Schaefer-Simmern drew forth an intuitive awareness from their students and gave them encouragement to revise, begin again and connect with the process, students’ observations of their growth contributed to wholeness.

Educators Davis and Sumara (2006) describe learning as something that *triggers*, rather than *causes* a transformation in the learner. This requires a teacher who can facilitate a reflective response that deepens the relationships among the student, their art, their community, and their inner dialogue as well. Schaefer-Simmern noted in the concluding chapter of his case studies that when the students revised their work to show their visual idea, they often were aware of the importance of their own results, the impact the work had on others, and were much more likely to give and receive advice. This communion of artistry could not have been achieved without the encouragement to stay with an idea until it was realized. As Schaefer-Simmern observed the students integrating their work, giving up the ideas that did not work well with the whole, he saw that one of the major impacts of artistic activity is that it cultivates ethics, a dedication “of self to the realization of the artistic form” (1948/1961, p. 193).

Second, as this appreciation of the transformed self flourishes, the student-artist reaches toward what is part of a cultural tradition that the arts always provide: the appreciation of others’ ideas, tolerance and greater respect for alternative opinions, faith in one’s self, and greater integration into the community. Even the temporary suspension of artistic activity—taking a step back, and reflecting on the work-- often aids the visual outcome. In the Reggio Emilia schools in Italy, we see a similar emphasis on Schaefer-Simmern’s thoughtful approach to waiting for the form to emerge and in Beittel’s art of qualitative thinking. Reggio authors Veia Vecchi and Claudia Guidici (2004) tell us that it is “the processes involved in the creative act, such as synthesis, exploratory tension, the intense relationship with things, symbolic invention, metaphor, evocation and analogy, and cultural courage” (p. 15) that allow the whole self to emerge and flourish in art making. As we explored contemporary holistic practices, Reggio schools seemed quite closely aligned with artistic formation and able to offer the “inner preparation for attainment of a visual conception [which] is obviously too much neglected in the practice of art education” (Schaefer-Simmern, 1948/1961, p. 196). Beittel advocated for a direct relationship between art and the artist--

understanding the practice of art making as a spiritual discipline that could shift the direction of human consciousness "away from the mental, egoistic, toward more spiritual ways of being and knowing.... To practice thus is to work at self-transformation of one's entire being —not by increments, but by a quantum leap. This [he suggested] is an art for a new age" (Beittel, 1989/92, p. ix).

Both Schaefer-Simmern and Beittel have paved the way for others to consider how one unfolds: as a teacher, as an artist, as an individual or as part of a greater whole in education. We have revisited the thinking of Schaeffer-Simmern and Beittel as a way to glean new meaning from creative thinkers/artists/teachers that have paved the way for alternative educational ways of being and doing. The unfolding of the artist and the art process, and the evolution of consciousness through art that was envisioned by these art educators offer an emergent space for future generations of artists and teachers and from which we feel we have benefited from in our own art and teaching practices. While there are no clear alternatives to the increasing technological advances that Western culture affords us, we can take research results from these exemplars and pursue *an art education of purpose* that affords us more than self-expression, or passive recognition of visual ideas prominent in our culture. Through the words of Schaefer-Simmern we invoke a practice of art education that acknowledges,

artistic activity as a general attribute of human nature and that aims at the unfolding and developing of [hu]man's latent creative abilities will then contribute its share to the great task which faces all of us, the resurrection of a humanized world" (p. 201)

Curriculum theorists, such as Pinar (2004) and Slattery (2005) advocate for an understanding of curriculum in a post-modern era through aesthetic text and arts-based educational research. Slattery, like Schaefer-Simmern and Beittel, positions the arts at the "heart and soul of teaching, pedagogy and human growth" (p. 243). We limit ourselves if we continue to overlook the historical legacies of these two art educators. We have much to learn from their arts-based philosophies, which hold cosmological underpinnings essential in the development of a whole student and whole teacher. Beittel in his teaching of the "Great Tradition" and Schaefer-Simmern in his indirect teaching of social and historical awareness which did not separate parts from the whole, or past from present and future, exemplify what we now refer to as holistic education.

Endnotes

¹ This article has been co-written by the authors with equal input into the research and writing.

² Forty five doctoral studies on Beittel's teaching of pottery have been written. Retrieved from <http://www.public.asu.edu/~ifmls/artinculturalcontextsfolder/qualintermeth.html>

³ Turner describes the phenomenon of *communitas* as the highest point of liminality "The point of inertia, the state of being 'betwixt and between.'" (Turner, Note 3, p. 61). "[T]he bonds of *communitas* are anti-structural, undifferentiated, equalitarian, direct, nonrational,

existential, I-thou relationships. Communitas is spontaneous [self-generating], immediate, concrete, not shaped by norms" (Turner, p. 279). [cited in Stockrocki, M. (1981)]

References

Abrahamson, R. E. (1980). The teaching approach of Henry Schaefer-Simmern. *Studies in Art Education*, 22 (1), 42-50.

Beittel, Kenneth, R. (1953). *Some experimental approaches to the aesthetic attitudes of college students*. (Unpublished Ed. D. dissertation. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University).

Beittel, K. R. (1972). *Mind and context in the art of drawing: An empirical and speculative account of the drawing process and the drawing series and of the contexts in which they occur*. NY: Holt Rinehart and Winston.

Beittel, K. R., & Burkhart, R. C. (1963). Strategies of spontaneous, divergent and academic art students. *Studies in Art Education*, 5(1), 20-41.

Beittel, K. (1973). *Alternatives for art education research*. Dubuque, IA: Wm C. Brown.

Beittel, K. R., & Beittel, J. (1991). *A celebration of art and consciousness*. State College, PA: Happy Valley Healing Arts.

Beittel, K. R. (1997). Fateful fork in the road: The 1965 Red Book. In A. Anderson, & P.

Beittel, K.R. (2002). My days on the Varsity. Retrieved 7/2/05 from <http://www.sva.psu.edu/arted/program/historical/beittel.htm>

Beittel, K. R. (2003). Art for a new age. *Visual Arts Research*, 29 (57), 39-53. [Reprinted from the original in *Visual Arts Research*, 11 (1), 90-104, 1985]

Berta, R. (1994). *His figure and his ground: An art educational biography of Henry Schaefer-Simmern. Volumes I and II* (Doctoral Dissertation, Stanford University, 1994, obtained from UMI No. 9508322).

Bolin (Eds.), *History of Art Education Proceedings of the Third Penn State International Symposium*, October 12-15, 1995, (533-538). University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University.

Capra, F. (2005). Speaking nature's language: Principles for sustainability. In M. K. Stone & Z. Barlow, (Eds), *Ecological literacy: Educating our children for a sustainable world*, 18-29, San Francisco: Sierra Club.

Carroll, K. L. (2006). Development and learning in art: Moving in the direction of a holistic paradigm for art education, *Visual Arts Research*. 32 (1), 16-28.

Chalmers, F. G. (2005). *Art practice as research: Inquiry in the visual arts*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Chalmers, F. G. (1993). Commentary: "Doing" histories of art education, *Studies in Art Education*, 34 (4), 254-256.

Davis, B. & Sumara, D. (2006). *Complexity and education: Inquiries into learning, teaching and research*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence

Erlbaum.

Dewey, J. (1934/1958). *Art as experience*. New York: Capricorn.

Doll, W. (1993). *A post-modern perspective on curriculum*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Doll, W. (N.D). *The spirit of education*. Retrieved on April 5, 2009 at http://www.lsu.edu/faculty/wdoll/mypapers_new.htm

Efland, A. D. (1990). *A history of art education*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Fineberg, J. (Ed). (2006). Children's art: An annotated chronology (Jonathan Fineberg, Olga Ivashkevich, & Mysoon Rizk, Eds.). *When we were young: New perspectives on the art of the child*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Fisher, R. M. & Bickel, B. (2006). The mystery of Dr. Who?: On a road less traveled in art education. *The Journal of Social Theory in Art Education*, 26, 28-57.

Gradle, S. (2009). Another look at holistic art education: Exploring the legacy of Henry Schaefer-Simmern. *International Journal of Education in the Arts* (<http://ijea.ed.uiuc.edu/v10n1/index.html>).

Hamblen, K. (1993). Editorial: Collected silences: audible and unheard. *Studies in Art Education* 34 (4), 195-198.

Hamblen, K. (1993). Editorial: Why have there been...great art educators? *Studies in Art Education* 34 (2), 67-69.

Hatton, S. D. (2005). *Teaching by heart: The Foxfire interviews*. New York: Teachers College, pp. 72-80.

Jardine, D. (2000). Under the tough old start: Ecopedagogical essays. Brandon, VT: Foundation for Educational Renewal

Lanier, V. (1977). The five faces of art education. *Studies in Art Education*, 18 (2), 7-21.

London, P. (2006). Toward a holistic paradigm of art education: Art Education: Mind, body, spirit. *Visual arts research*. 32 (1), 8-15.

London, P. (2009). *Caucus on the Spiritual in Art Education (CSAE)*. NAEA News. 51 (2). p. 16.

Low, K. (2008). Holy ground of teaching and learning. *Complicity: An International Journal of Complexity and Education*. 1(5), 149-154.

McKenna, S. (2006). (2006). Art is possible. *Visual arts research*. 32 (1), 53-63.

Miller, J. (2005). Introduction. In J. Miller, S. Karsten, D. Denton, d. Orr, & I. Kates (Eds), *Holistic learning and spirituality in education* (1-6). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Miller, R. (2000). *Caring for new life: Essays on holistic education*. Brandon, VT: Foundation for Educational Review.

Miller, R. (2006). Making connections to the world: Some thoughts

on holistic curriculum. *Encounter 19 (3)*. Retrieved 9/28/09 from:

http://www.pathsoflearning.org/articles_Making_Connections.php

Noddings, N. (2006). *What critical lessons our schools should teach*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

O'Sullivan, E. (2002). The project and vision of transformative learning: Integral transformative learning. In E. O'Sullivan, A. Morell & M. A. O'Connor (Eds.), *Expanding the boundaries of transformative learning: Essays on theory and praxis (1-12)*. New York: Palgrave.

Palmer, P. (1998). *The courage to teach: Exploring the inner landscape of a teacher's life*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Pinar, William F., Reynolds, William M., Slattery, Patrick, & Taubman, Peter M. (Eds.) (1995/2004), *Understanding curriculum*. NY: Peter Lang.

Pinar, W. F. (2006). *The synoptic text and other essays*. New York: Peter Lang.

Pinar, W. F., & Irwin, R. L. (Eds.) (2005). *Curriculum in a new key: The collected works of Ted T. Aoki*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Read, H. (1958). *Education through art*. London: Faber & Faber.

Slattery, Patrick. (2006). *Curriculum development in the postmodern era*. New York: Routledge.

Springgay, S., Irwin, R. L., C. Leggo, & P. Gouzouasis (Eds.). (2008). *Being with a/r/tography*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Stokrocki, M. (1981). *Spheres of meaning: A qualitative description and interpretation of an art learning environment*. (The Pennsylvania State University, 1981, obtained from UMI No. 8129223).

Vecchi, V. & Guidici, C. (Eds.) (2004). *Children, art, artists*. Reggio Emilia, Italy: Reggio.

Wilber, Ken (1996). *A brief history of everything*. Boston: MA: Shambhala.

Wilson, B. (2001). Mentors and models: Doctoral study in art education at Penn State. Retrieved July 1, 2005 from http://www.sva.psu.edu/arted/program/historical/bw_doc_study.htm

Zurmuehlen, M. (1991). Kenneth Beittel: A re-interpreting presence in art and art education. *Visual Arts Research*, 17(1), 1-11.