Hobby defends Johnson war action
Neu and Ambler re-evaluate U.S.
seeking beneficial change.

International Policeman?
The most impassioned answer came from the audience. A man who said he had come to this country from Spain, and who emphasized that he was not “anti-American,” asked why Americans felt they must intervene whenever “anything happened anywhere.”

He continued by pointing out that the war in Vietnam had been a civil war until our forces arrived and made it a matter of international concern. “It’s a pity,” he said, “you didn’t resolve the problem without Americanizing the war.”
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At the panel discussion of Senator J.W. Fulbright’s “The Arrogance of Power” held Tuesday night, William P. Hobby, editor of the Houston Post, said that the Johnson administration is doing all it can to end the war in Vietnam. After describing our involvement there as a completely inevitable result of the power vacuum left after the French withdrawal, he added that Johnson’s insistence that the North need meet no conditions before coming to the conference table with us shows that he has imposed fewer restrictions on such negotiations than Senator Fulbright has suggested.

Questionable Mission
Dr. Charles Neu of the history department supported Fulbright’s view on foreign policy; he agreed that America can’t do everything and that we will have to modify our sense of destiny and national mission.

Neu, however, took issue with Fulbright’s use of American history to support his thesis of the “two Americas”—the America of Lincoln and Stevenson versus that of Teddy Roosevelt and the modern superpatriots.

Neu said that this implies a comparison between Lyndon Johnson and Roosevelt when in actuality Roosevelt showed a shrewdness and sense of priorities that kept us out of situations like Vietnam.

Compromise and Coexistence
Dr. John Ambler of the political science department emphasized the correctness of Fulbright’s theory that peace is only attainable through compromise and coexistence.

Ambler continued by pointing out that American values were perhaps not desirable for the underdeveloped world, that American-style democracy may not be the best system for all countries, and that Communistic regimes may be nationalistic.

In support of this last point, Ambler pointed out that in Yugoslavia, China, and North Vietnam, three countries where communism was chosen rather than imposed from the outside, it had taken on the aspects of strong nationalism rather than international conquest.

Jerry Haffier, moderator of the panel, asked the opinion of the panelists on the thesis that America is “on the wrong side of history”; that is, that we are imposing our conservative standards of stability instead of