

ARTICLE APPEARED
ON PAGE 9A

WASHINGTON TIMES
24 May 1985

Casey needs current events lesson

There can be no question that CIA Director William Casey or his speech writer knows of current events. Ironically, while Mr. Casey may have meant to criticize Communist subversion throughout Central America and the world, he also succeeded in listing a substantial number of American military and foreign policy failures.

In turn, it is these failures, listed in geographical terms by Mr. Casey, that have given the Soviet Union and its partners the opportunity to gain influence. This is known fact, and yet Mr. Casey fails to mention this.

Dramatically, Mr. Casey attempts to force home the seriousness of the ever-present Communist menace by comparing a quote of Nikita Khrushchev with Adolf Hitler's *Mein Kampf* — two apocalyptic visions of the future. We may have been "reluctant to take Hitler seriously," and Mr. Casey implies that we viewed Khrushchev's threats differently.

The irony of this remark is that the party line of "wars of national liberation" espoused by Khrushchev

and quoted by Mr. Casey dates back prior to, or coinciding with, the period in which Hitler wrote *Mein Kampf*. Is this "reluctance," as Mr. Casey suggests in hindsight, or is it ignorance on the part of American policy makers?

The points outlined in Mr. Casey's speech are nothing new. These same concerns are conveyed in former President Nixon's book *The Real War*. While the same argument is parroted by the CIA director, he offers no solution. There is only Nixonian and Reaganite rhetoric.

Later in his text, Mr. Casey mentions the "Soviet blueprint" for world domination. This is an accurate assumption, and it is exemplified by Khrushchev's boast and is always present in Marxist-Leninist writings.

Without consciously stating it, Mr. Casey elucidates the fundamental differences between American and Soviet foreign policies. The Soviet Union has been adhering to a pre-conceived plan for the past several decades; our foreign policies change

with each administration. Giving life to the "Soviet blueprint" is the dedication of the Marxist-Leninist revolutionary. We lack such brazen dogmatism. The Soviet Union and her partners are not weighted down with the same code of ethics that restrict our ability to act decisively to protect our own interests.

Given these fundamental differences and our reluctance to see through the haze, is it really that surprising that the Soviet Union has been gaining the most?

CHRISTOPHER PHILLIPS
Washington



William Casey