March 12, 1971

Until I saw the SDS flyer denouncing me (along with other members of the Center for International Studies) for co-authoring Controlling Small Wars - A Strategy for the 1970's, I had assumed that MIT-SDS members, however destructive their tactics, were sincere, extremely (in both senses) concerned students at least some of whom studied the facts before they acted. The present "charge" is so ludicrous, however, that it suggests I was wrong: at least some SDS members do not bother to get the facts at all, but respond to demagogy like Pavlov's dog, believing anyone who tells them someone is an "imperialist." Since few if any of them evidently have read the book they condemn, let me note just a few samples:

> "Today, we surely know that social change in developing societies, though it often looks like instability, may, in the long run, be the only sure road to stability."(p. xii)
>
> "A policy aimed at avoiding conflict must stimulate and encourage economic, social, and political reforms in the developing countries. For conflicts in the developing regions, there is no question that internal reform is a central element in a conflict-control strategy." (p. 408)
>
> "... a theoretical argument can always be made that the United States, as the chief beneficiary of the established political, economic, and social orders in the world, has a kind of natural mission to use its power and resources wherever conflict emerges for the express purpose of shoring up that particular segment of the status quo. But this would always put the United States on the side of existing systems, always against revolution - scarcely a viable, not to say intelligent, policy." (p. 413)