The stages of development of a talk are generally predictable. The first is the invitation to speak — usually, by design, far enough in advance of the session so that it is easy to accept. After all, with a lead time of two to six months the prospective speaker is built into a feeling he has all the time in the world, which even frequent reminders from his secretary can not dispel. The next step is the receipt of a series of requests from the program chairman for a title, requests which become more frequent as the time to print the program approaches.

The concern of the program chairman for the success of his meeting is not alleged at all by having to explain to the uncomprehending person at the other end, "What talk?", he is asking about. But finally he gets a title — even though it has an uncomfortably familiar ring. The speaker has prepared at that point — a feeling that becomes a certainty when his request for an advance copy for printing or for publicity leads — or whatever other vicissitudes chairmen must go through, make of advance copies — meets with either with cold silence, or a series of
excerpts that wouldn't fool a four-year-old child. Suddenly the program chairman gives up and starts looking through his old speeches for an inspiration, convinced that he will be substituting at the last minute.

And the speaker, as the time wears on, his words with increasing desperation at the title which had seemed so apt the month before. What does it mean? On earth had he in mind when he chose that label for the remarks which were non-existent at the time? But gradually as the weekend before the talk wore on, it begins to take form, and the random impulse that inspired the title turns out to have been far more appropriate than either the speaker or the program chairman thought at first.

And that is the case today. Providence intervened last week.

19 months

J. R. Robertson

Recognition that we as a nation can not base our third opportunity on chance, the social development and economic growth
of this country has been slow coming. The implications of this for government and private structures alike are only being perceived. There are many disagreements across the country prompted by honest doubt and legitimate concern over the directions we have taken as a nation as legitimate concern for the respective roles of the private sector, government, state and local governments.

Nobody knows what pattern or patterns will emerge from all these discussions; certainly not I. But this is an exercise anyone can join — and should. It is one to be joined with an open, wide-open mind as possible, with your most cherished prejudices held in check at least until the neutral facts have been noted and your home work done.

The era that has closed forever is the one in which the citizen of Bettinean, hibote, Devils Lake — everywhere USA could afford to remain oblivious of what was taking place in the next town, the next county, the adjoining state, or another country. The simple approach of a resolution condemning the
encouragement of the federal government, the Twin Cities. The efforts of

made the community of Fargo, adopted once a year at the meeting of the chamber, is no longer enough. It now has to go through altered steps, which were known as standard service, and no longer does it even believe as much. The paradox is that we now can do something that can influence the direction of our society, if we are enough to become involved in the process, to do the homework that is essential for understanding the problem, and flexible enough to settle for the possible instead of our pre-conceived notion of the ideal.
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