George Ball spells out Trilateral policies

George Ball, one of the most prominent members of the Trilateral Commission, told an interviewer this week that the effort to eliminate Third World populations, the principal policy commitment of his circles, would require a "totalitarian regime" in the United States to accomplish. When the astonished West Coast interviewer pressed the Trilateral spokesman on this statement, Ball added that, "within 5 to 10 years," a regimentation of the American labor force, beginning with worker identification cards, could be instituted to prevent "excess population" of Third World nations like Mexico from spilling across into the United States.

By establishing police-state methods of labor regimentation in America, non-American immigrants could be forced back to their nation of origin, imposing "enforced unemployment" in those countries that would ensure general depopulation. Mr. Ball himself did not use the word genocide. He restricted himself to describing the policy in those terms.

"Control over our own population cannot be separated from control over immigrants," stated Ball. "The Mexican population growth problem is like acid rain pollution; it floats across borders and can't be dealt with just in Mexico. Overpopulation is a form of pollution and we can't have ourselves destroyed by this influx.

"We are going to have to establish a rigid worker identification card system for all Americans. It won't work any other way. Every American will have to carry an identification card for labor identification . . . required by federal law to be able to assure their employers they are legally qualified to work in the United States.

"This will mean what some people would call a totalitarian regime. Americans will have to accept new limitations on what they are used to regarding as their freedom."

Ball declared that this would reduce Mexican population, for example, because deported aliens would "flood the Mexican job market, and force the government to deal with the problem.

Ball linked his depopulation strategy to Paul Volcker's high interest-rate policy and the related posture of the U.S. government at the July 20 Ottawa summit meeting, a posture developed by Meyer Rashish, whom Ball, a former undersecretary of state, first brought into the State Department in the 1960s.

The Europeans may complain about Volcker's industry-wrecking strategy, he said, "but the U.S. policy is firm. The Reagan administration does not control interest rates, the Federal Reserve controls interest rates, and they intend to maintain a firm monetary policy." Rashish, accordingly, "is concentrating on a new international trade consensus, which must be the major accomplishment at Ottawa. He is committed to . . . a return to the 19th-century liberal free-trade principles."

This, said Ball, had direct implications for world population levels. For the Third World, "it means a slowing of their rate of growth and consumption. Many of these countries are using protectionism to maintain artificially high levels of consumption and growth. We must slow the unbridled growth of industry in the Third World, which is more than many of these countries can handle. . . . Overpopulation results, and overpopulation in the Third World is the single most important strategic issue facing the United States today."

Ball is not known for talking "off the cuff." He is not only a Trilateral Commission policy-maker, but a partner in Lehman Brothers Kuhn, Loeb investment bank, a former high-ranking U.S. government official in several departments, and an intimate of the financially powerful "old families" of continental Europe and Britain, whose policies carry relatively greater weight with persons like himself, Mr. Rashish and Mr. Volcker than those of any mere head of state.

Ball expressed concern about one powerful force standing against the policy he enunciated: "the opposition of the Catholic Church."

"The Catholic Church," he stated, "is encouraging Mexico and the rest of Latin America in precisely the wrong direction. There is strong pressure from the Vatican to do nothing at all to encourage population control in Latin America. This is a real obstacle."

Ball did not mention the recent, failed attempt to kill Pope John Paul II, or the impact of scandalous repercussions on certain of his financial associates. He stated only: "There are some younger liberals in the Vatican who want a new policy, but they will get nowhere under the present Pope. This Pope is too strong; it's too hard to do anything at all with him. He is absolutely dead set against any sort of population control policy, and he is very powerful. . . . The Italians who know better don't have any influence with him at all. He's a Polish Pope, and he's a very independent fellow, and can't be budged on this question. . . . The situation in the Vatican is very bad, and as long as that prevails, there will be no action by Latin American governments."