

MEMORIAL RESOLUTION

ALFREDO CASTANEDA (1923 - 1981)

Alfredo Castaneda came to Stanford in 1972 as one of the first tenured Chicano faculty members. A native of San Francisco, he was educated in that city through the baccalaureate in Psychology at San Francisco State College. With the completion of his graduate study in Experimental Clinical Psychology at Ohio State University in 1952, he began a career characterized by scholarly productivity and dedicated service.

Professor Castaneda's initial efforts were in the rigorous domain of experimental psychology, to which he made significant contributions. During the next decade, his clinical instincts and training dominated his teaching, research and consulting agenda. The nature and stature of his work during that period are implied in some of the positions he held: Director of Clinical Psychology and Office of Child Research at the University of Texas; Director of the Research Division of the Jewish Board of Guardians of New York; Research Scientist at Mt. Sinai Hospital. Approximately a dozen years ago, Professor Castaneda began the work that was to bring him national recognition—a psychological integration of the concepts of personality, culture, democracy and diversity, finding the integration in what he termed "cultural democracy" and the "bicultural individual." He came to Stanford, to continue his analyses of those formulations and to generate their implications for teaching and for the relationship between schools and families. Alfredo Castaneda's professional and intellectual work have been consequential, his most recent contributions will continue to influence educational thought for years to come. Those who knew him well, however, are grateful also for the lessons learned from his personal commitments and style. These memories do not parse easily in abbreviation, but their major themes are clear and instructive.

Professor Castaneda understood the Jesuit distinction between combative and contemplative intelligence and preferred the latter—because, we suspect, his gentleness could not accommodate the assumption that one person can be largely right and others largely wrong. What was very important to him was the person and in a very personal way—a concern too complex and uncertain for easy translation into the structure of print or the format of programs. We like to think that he equated complexity with beauty and beauty with fragility—an equation he found inconsistent with presumptions of certainty or even of temporary closure. A fragment from Steven Bailey fits here: "Alas, I offer no blinding revelation, no new religious insight, no consciousness. I offer only a willingness to discuss, to probe, to ponder, to posit—these, and what Harlan Cleveland has called an 'unwarranted optimism,' a tentative affirmation, a possibly viable 'maybe.' "

Another theme in our memory of the man is best expressed in the language of Geoffrey Vickers, although we hear Alfredo Castaneda: "I believe that aesthetic judgment is the ruling passion of truly humankind, and I deliberately call judgment a passion. By aesthetic judgment I mean the passionate but patient struggle to bring significant form into being, whether what we have to shape is a city, an institution, a public policy, or a personal life, knowing that what makes the new form significant is

itself a product of time, that the standards by which it is judged will be changed even by being realized."

In his work and thought in the areas of the bicultural and multicultural, he understood, more than others, that conclusions and hypotheses should not be directed merely by the flow of adrenaline and he clearly saw that a process is truly enculturative when it is both transmissive and transformative. He was free of the rational extravagance of those who divorce ends and means—realizing that, in any situation, the means are what *is* happening, ends are what *will* happen, and that there is more than a coincidental relationship between the two. Of the many themes in our memory of Alfredo, another compels attention. He was, among other things, a scientist. He was trained in science, he understood and was competent in its techniques and paradigms, and he appreciated its rigor. At the same speed, however, he was also acutely—even painfully—aware that, in the social and behavioral sciences, each data matrix, each measure of central tendency, each coefficient of correlation, each score is about a human individual—one who loves and hates, laughs and cries, succeeds and fails, hopes and despairs. He understood, and would have us understand also, that the human object of science is more important than the science, that the person is more than the simplifications—without gainsaying the necessity and utility of the latter.

As we remember Alfredo Castaneda we think of such themes. He did not invent them, of course. His achievement was greater; he practiced them.

Arthur Coladarci, Chairman
Beatriz Arias
Robert Hess