

The Daily Telegraph, Sept. 26:

... Healey should examine his policies before he gets completely carried away by the excitement of his unaccustomed ranking as teacher's pet at the International Monetary Fund....We cannot be too often reminded that neither North Sea oil revenues, nor make-work programmes financed with those revenues, will do anything to secure a lasting improvement in our fortunes....any economic recovery boosted by "reflation" is going to be very shortlived. Mr. Healey would be well advised...to take the plaudits of his new-found IMF friends with a large pinch of salt....Boosting demand by increasing the government's deficit only debases the currency, leading to successively larger doses of unemployment."

Les Echos, Sept. 26:

Relaunching will again be the key word at the General Assembly of the International Monetary Fund, opening today in Washington. But if the industrialized countries are all aware of the problems they have to solve to get the world economy out of its slow asphyxiation, chances are they will only agree on band-aids. Obsessed by the problems of unemployment and the inflationary risk of a brutal boost, they will avoid dealing with the basic problems....There is, however, an explosive dossier which shows the scope of the economic challenges confronting the international community today in order to avoid scarcity: 40,000 billion dollars will have to be allocated between now and 2020 for the development of

energy resources. Dollars will not suffice. Such is the lesson of the Istanbul Conference (World Energy conference — ed.)

Münchener Merkur, Sept. 27:

Healey says that (the British and U.S. — ed.) \$25 billion deficit will help solve the economic problems of other countries, and that other countries should use this as an example. But there is not the slightest reason to follow this recommendation. America is no model for us, and Healey ought to know that....Precisely the same people who are now demanding that Bonn should get the runs instead of being constipated, only one year ago were bewailing the imminent ruin of national finances and were calling for extreme austerity.

The Financial Times, Sept. 29, "100 Finance Ministers Can Be Wrong":

There are people for whom the incitement to world "reflation" by the IMF — or more accurately its managing director, Dr. Johannes Witteveen — will clinch the argument. This applies to those who look at the IMF as a stage villain, taking a delight in the sufferings of his victim. For such people, it will be as if Baron Scarpia (the sadistic chief of police in Puccini's *Tosca*) has said that the torture had gone too far. Who then would want to argue to the contrary?...The real answer to Mssrs. Healey, Van Lennep of the OECD and the other demand expansionists is that the kind of boost they seek will not merely lead to a return of soaring inflation, but in the end will make unemployment worse...

Who Is Denis Healey?

When International Monetary Fund Director H. Johannes Witteveen paid tribute to the "really astonishing success" of Britain's economic stabilization policies over the past year, British Chancellor of the Exchequer Denis Healey "seemed barely able to contain his delight," according to the *Financial Times* of London. A man who thrives on praise from Wall Street and the City of London — whose interests he has served for well over 30 years — Healey was already concentrating on his next assignment for the Lazard-Rockefeller clique: to push a recalcitrant Europe into a destructive program of Schachtian hyperinflation.

In three short years as Chancellor of the Exchequer, Healey has succeeded in turning Britain into a "showcase of success" for IMF austerity policies by systematically gutting working class living standards, destroying the growth potential of industry and, most significantly, by cutting British Prime Minister James Callaghan off from his prodevelopment allies in Europe. It is largely due to Healey's monetarist pressure tactics — which have become the dominant motif in the British Cabinet since the death of Foreign Secretary Anthony Crosland last spring — that Callaghan has effectively renounced his former commitment to promoting Europe's industrial potential and has instead become a

virtual captive of the Lazard-London wrecking crew.

Healey never saw his role in purely domestic British terms. Put in charge of the Labour Party's tiny International Department in 1945 as an up-and-coming Member of Parliament, Healey immediately took on the task of reorganizing the Socialist International, which had then fallen into disuse. He did this with the help of Willy Brandt, another leading agent of British Intelligence whom Healey met in 1947. Healey was at that time London correspondent for the Norwegian Labour Party paper *Arbeider bladet*; Brandt was its German correspondent.

As part of his job of determining who were the "true democratic socialists" after World War II, Healey cultivated an extensive network of contacts in Eastern Europe — many of whom later turned up as British agents working to undermine Soviet influence. He appealed to Social Democrats in Hungary, Romania, Czechoslovakia, and Bulgaria to reject collaboration with the pro-Moscow Communist Parties of those countries, warning that by failing to do so, they "would have connived at their own destruction." In 1950, he helped draft the founding charter of the "new" Socialist International, used to this day as a tool of the Rockefellers to destabilize European governments that

stray from the monetarist fold.

“Basically I was an Atlantic Community man from about 1948,” Healey says immodestly. From about that point on, he was fully committed to a U.S.-supported NATO arms buildup in Europe to contain the threat of Soviet expansion. In the 1952 *New Fabian Essays* and in several books and Labour Party documents that played a key role in the party’s postwar foreign policy, Healey argued that there was an “organic unity” between all noncommunist forces against the USSR and its allies and called for an expenditure of ten percent of Britain’s gross national product on the defense of Europe against Soviet “imperialism.”

Healey’s anticommunism and pro-NATO position did not prevent him from sympathizing with the “ban-the-bomb” movement of Fabian agent Bertrand Russell, which demanded that Britain renounce its independent nuclear deterrent and future technological capability. Healey welcomed the excuse to sacrifice the deterrent and thereby wed Britain more closely to U.S. defense policy, while concentrating on the buildup of conventional arms. In March 1957, Healey attended a meeting of a small group of friends, including writer Kingsley Martin, J.B. Priestly, Canon John Collins, and George Kennan to discuss nuclear problems. Out of this the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND) was born; Healey described it as “the precursor of the hippie movement, and the antipolitical movement among the young.” Bertrand Russell became the movement’s ideologue. Healey and Kennan discretely did not join.

Healey’s reputation as a “defense intellectual” who could out-argue the party’s policymakers with his strategic thinking developed through the 1950s and 1960s while the Labour Party was in the opposition. When Healey became Defence Minister following Labour’s victory in the 1964 election, he immediately got to work revamping Britain’s entire defense program to bring it more into line with the “flexible response” strategy announced by then U.S. Defense Secretary Robert McNamara — another of Rockefeller’s protégés. Healey collaborated with several other defense analysts to produce the book, *On Limiting Nuclear War*, which

spelled out the necessity for a policy of graduated response as an alternative to all-out nuclear war. Such efforts prompted the Soviet newspaper *Pravda* to dub him: “Horrible Healey ... the atomic maniac.”

To the chagrin of old-timers in NATO, Healey also wound down Britain’s military commitments east of Suez and in the Far East on the basis of “cost-benefit analysis” — a euphemism for Britain’s declining economic fortunes. But Healey had definite plans for Britain’s armed forces as a specialized counterinsurgency force in sophisticated internal security operations. As a member of the top secret Northern Ireland Cabinet Committee during the bloody Ulster confrontations of 1967, Healey had a chance to try out his ideas first-hand, deploying British Army troops to the province. It was through this deployment that Ireland was turned into a laboratory of social control — with Healey’s “special” army units actually training and controlling both IRA and Protestant terrorists.

Many of Healey’s ideas about defense and international politics were shaped through various international meetings he attended, such as the notorious Bilderberg gathering, which provided a forum for discussion among top Rockefeller and Lazard policy planners and their lackeys from Europe, Canada, and the U.S. At a 1957 Bilderberg meeting in Fiuggi, Italy, Healey first floated the idea of a London-based center for strategic studies and approached an influential member of the Ford Foundation for funding. By the end of the next year, the International Institute for Strategic Studies, a think tank specializing in military and defense matters had been set up with the Ford Foundation giving a three-year \$150,000 grant. The widely read strategic analyses published by the IISS amount to only about 10 percent of its work. The other 90 percent — which involves direct input by Lazard Freres and Rockefeller-linked Council on Foreign Relations personnel — is devoted to profiles of European countries for the purpose of keeping those nations in the firm grip of Wall Street and the City of London.

— Marla Minnicino