

FOR INFORMATION CONTACT: Bob Beyers
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
STANFORD —

Memorial Church officials abbreviated the concluding portion of Founders' Day services here Sunday, March 7, after a handful of persons stood and shouted at President Richard W. Lyman of Stanford.

Mid-way through his first sermon at the church, President Lyman noted that "dehumanization of oneself begins with dehumanization of others. To remain human oneself, to develop one's humanity and one's capacity to care, it is essential to recognize humanity in others, even—or especially—those whom one distrusts or fears or hates most."

At this point, a loud voice asked if that included "Stanford workers."

"Of course," President Lyman replied calmly.

When he finished his prepared remarks and began to step down from the pulpit, three or four persons stood and spoke, while others urged them to sit down. The President returned to the pulpit briefly, said this was not the time or place to discuss grievances, and then stepped down again.

A small group of young persons carrying leaflets moved toward the front of the church, but did not interfere as church officials skipped a final song by the choir and a closing prayer, starting the recessional hymn. Accompanied by faculty and student leaders, the President then left the church without incident.

Earlier in his talk, President Lyman noted that two enormous forces have engulfed humanity—"an ever accelerating technological revolution which not only devours its children but threatens to overwhelm its progenitors, and a seemingly inexorable spread of bureaucracy that transforms human relations into abstractions."

Some kick the machine and hope it will reform, others try to exist without it, and a third group sees the problem as being one of ownership of the machine, he observed. But probably the vast majority of Americans respond to the "technological and bureaucratic malaise of our time" by trying to ignore some parts of it, reform or remedy others, and learning to live with the rest, "partly by laughing at our own predicament."

Such a piecemeal approach "infuriates totalists of whatever persuasion," he continued. "And indeed it may well prove fatally inadequate."

Yet total rejection of the system also has its hazards, he observed. "All revolutions seek first to eliminate in one way or another their opponents. The dictatorship of Oliver Cromwell, the reign of terror of Robespierre, the suppression of all opposition by Lenin following the Bolshevik Revolution—all were justified by their perpetrators as necessary to safeguard the revolution itself.

"If one tries to imagine how the leaders of a late 20th century revolution would use the powers of advanced technology to accomplish the same end, once they had seized power, one may well wonder whether revolution has not, like war, become too dangerous a game for humanity to play.

"If it is bad—as it most certainly is—for the U.S. Army to start depositing us all in data banks, it is not likely to be a more merciful computerization of politics that follows from revolution."