

The stages of development of a talk are
fairly predictable - The first is the invitation
to speak - usually, by design, far enough
in advance of the occasion so that it is
easy to accept. After all with a lead
time of two to six months the prospective
speaker is ^{easily} lulled into a feeling he has all
the time in the world, which even frequent
reminders from his secretary can not
dispel. ~~then the~~ The next step is
the ^{first of a series of} requests from the program chairman
for a title, requests which become
frantic as the time to print the programs
approaches. The concern of the program
chairman for the success of his meeting
is not alleged at all by having to
^{each time} explain to the uncomprehending person
at the other end "what talk?" he is
asking about. But finally he gets
a title - even though he has an uncomfortable
feeling that is all the speaker has prepared
at that point - a feeling that becomes
a certainty when his requests for an
advance copy for printing or for publicity
leads - or whatever other use program chairman
make of advance copies - meets with either
with cold silence, or a series of

essions that wouldn't fool a four-year old child. Finally, the program chairman gives up and starts looking through his old speeches for an inspiration, ~~then~~ convinced that he ~~may~~ will be substituting at the last minute.

And the speaker — as the time narrows ^{and despair} he looks with increasing dissatisfaction at the title which had seemed so apt the month before. What ~~does it mean?~~ on earth had he in mind when ~~he chose~~ he chose that label for the rewards which were non-existent at the time? But gradually as the weekend before the talk wears 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~~ during those last few weeks.

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

19 months

for Robertson

Recognition that we as a nation can not leave to ~~the blind operators~~ chance the social development and economic growth

(3)

but is now a fact of general public acceptance.
of this country has been slow coming. ~~its~~
The implications of this for government and
private structures like are only dimly
perceived. There are many ^{uncharmed} dialogues across
the country prompted by honest doubt and
~~legitimate concern~~ over the directions ~~taken~~
~~the role~~ we have taken as a nation ~~as~~ a
legitimate concern for the respective roles
of the private sector, ^{and} ~~between~~ the federal
~~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 as wide
open a mind as possible, with your
most cherished prejudices held in leash
at least until the neutrile facts have
been noted and your homework done.
The era that has closed forever is the
one in which the citizen of Bottineau,
Minot, Devils Lake — everywhere USA
could afford 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 ~~the~~

(4)

encroachment of the federal government
the Twin Cities, the efforts of ~~B~~ town ^X ~~the~~
~~to steal ^{one of your} industries of ~~T~~ago~~, adopted once
a year at the meeting of the Chamber is no
longer enough - It never ~~did they good~~ altered
~~which we knew was so & the time~~
~~a thing~~ and no longer does it even ~~matter~~
~~those believe us much~~ The paradox is
that we now can ~~do something about~~
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 preconceived
notion of the ideal.

These speech notes contained extracts from a copyright protected journal which has been removed.

The citation for the original article is:

"One Nation, Divisible by 80,000 Governments," *Carnegie Quarterly* 14, no. 4 (Fall 1966): 4-5.