

DEATH PLOT?

1976. There, in 150 pages of detailed testimony, he exposed the Navy and CIA "Man in the Sea" program as a cover for dolphin and whale experiments designed to murder enemy frogmen, track Russian submarines, and spy inside Chinese and Cuban waters.

During one 15-month period beginning in 1971, Naval Intelligence placed six dolphins in Cam Ranh Bay, Vietnam, to guard U.S. ships stationed there. These dolphins, part of the Navy's "Swimmer Nullification Program," were housed in an elaborate flotation craft built in San Diego. This craft combined stables and transport for the dolphins with floating pens, a guardhouse and a support team of trainers and researchers on board.

A dolphin based on the craft would scan the water with its sonar. If the water was clear of scuba divers the dolphin would hit a "normal response" paddle. If the dolphin sensed an intruder it would hit a paddle that opened its pen gate. It would then run its snout into a cone placed in a water-level weapons rack. The cone's tip contained a heavy-gauge, hollow-point needle attached to a CO₂ cartridge. The dolphin would then swim out to the diver, plunging the needle into him. The CO₂ would explode the diver's organs from within, floating the corpse to the surface for recovery and identification.

A May 1977 *Penthouse* article claimed the Navy's dolphins in Vietnam killed 32 divers, including two Americans who strayed into restricted waters. James Fitzgerald, the former chief of the CIA's Office of Dolphin Research recently told *Parade* that the Navy's dolphins "blew up" some 60 North Vietnamese divers. The later figure is confirmed by a researcher who recently retired from the Navy Underseas Center in San Diego, but would not permit the use of his name because he feared, he said, that this information would "give a black eye to the Navy."

In a recent interview Sea Lab's Michael Greenwood, now a professor in Minnesota, said that at the end of the Vietnam War the Navy moved their porpoise system to Subic Bay in the Philippines, to guard nuclear submarines. Media sources in Scotland claim that porpoises are being used to guard nuclear subs stationed at Loch Long. The Navy denies using dolphins for physical security at any of its sub bases. The Navy also denies charges that it has sold "open-ocean weapons systems" (dolphins) to Mexico or trained dolphins to carry satchel charges of explosives for use against enemy shipping.

The history of the use of the dolphin as a "biological weapons system" goes back to the early '60s. In 1963, the CIA and the Navy began joint work on dol-

phins at the Point Magu Naval Air Station in California. Other work was started at the China Lake Ordinance Test Station near Pasadena, on San Clemente Island, and at the Navy's secret Kaneohe Bay Research Center in Hawaii. In 1965, the Navy kicked the CIA out of the program, forcing it to relocate in the East. In 1970, the Navy's Point Magu dolphin program was moved to the desalinization plant in San Diego while more classified work continued on San Clemente and at Kaneohe Bay.

Santini's on Marathon Key in Florida was one of the early porpoise training centers in the U.S. Santini, the proprietor, who perfected a method for capturing Atlantic Bottlenose dolphins, captured the dolphin that played the movie role of Flipper. Beginning in 1965, Santini provided cover for the CIA after the Navy rejected them from its programs.

In 1966, the CIA set up new offices on the Navy base in Key West, Fla. That was also the year they were reported to be experimenting with using remote-controlled sharks for attack. They attached electrodes to the corneas of sharks' eyes and attempted to guide their movements with electrical shock impulses, but the sharks' nervous systems apparently proved to be too underdeveloped.

Before its program ended in 1969, the CIA was reported to have trained dolphins to attach magnetic satchels to the hulls of ships and to plant and remove instruments from the hull of a Russian nuclear-powered ship in Havana harbor. The animals were also used to help locate a downed nuclear warhead off the coast of Puerto Rico in 1966, a job now done by California sea lions at the Inshore Underwater Warfare Group at the Amphibious Navy Base in Coronado.

Several sources have suggested that one of the aims of the CIA dolphin program was the murder of well-known skin-diving enthusiast Fidel Castro. This idea becomes more credible when it is considered among other CIA plots to assassinate Castro. Testimony before the Church committee related how two CIA death plots involved impregnating Castro's wet suit with poison and planting a booby-trapped conch shell in an area where he dived in the hope that he would detonate it as he picked it up off the sea bed.

The Navy's "swimmer nullification" program is not so much more bizarre than many other programs in the larger pattern of "defense." The Pentagon alone spends \$15-20 billion a year on research and development, much of it on sole source contracting. Competitive bidding is abandoned within the "national security" rationale. The potential for corrup-

tion and bureaucratic intrigue goes almost entirely unchecked. The indictment of four former employees of the Naval Electronics Lab (a component of NOSC) and the former director of a local think tank in late November for stealing over \$500,000 out of a \$1.5 million contract is an example. "That's only the tip of the iceberg," insists a worker presently employed at the Ocean Systems Center.

"They spent over \$200 million on just that one stupid dolphin project," says Michael Greenwood. "The Navy will only admit to about \$20 million, but then they know they can get away with that. I think if there is any justice in the world the Naval Underseas Center will be shut down. They've done more to damn and undermine democracy than they will ever admit."

"Dolphins have no interest in politics," says Robert Pidgeon of the Greenpeace Foundation in San Diego. "Dolphins live in harmony with their environment. Humans would do well to imitate the dolphins and not train them to imitate us."

interest in politics," says Robert Pidgeon of the Greenpeace Foundation in San Diego. "Dolphins live in harmony with their environment. Humans would do well to imitate the dolphins and not train them to imitate us."

EDITORIAL

U.S. looks for bang from China boom

Since John Hay's Open Door Notes of 1899-1900, top American business and political leaders have seen China as the key to American, and world capitalist, prosperity.

China's development, so the thinking went, would provide so huge an outlet for surplus goods and capital as to ease competitive rivalries among the great capitalist powers for markets and investment spheres in Europe, the Mideast, Latin America, southeast Asia, and Africa. It would guarantee sustained growth and full employment at home for decades to come, thereby calming class conflict and obviating social revolution. China's development, in short, would make possible economic expansion without war among the capitalist powers.

In this sense, American corporate leaders could believe that the failure to "open" China was a basic, if indirect, cause of two world wars. And it was in this sense that former President Nixon viewed his mission to Peking in 1972 as representing the best hope for lasting world peace.

That hope has been rekindled by the current China trade and investment boom, now that the capitalist world once again suffers from an acute congestion propelling it toward renewed trade rivalries, monetary instability, rising unemployment and recession.

America's political and corporate leadership had always assumed that as the largest capitalist economy, the U.S. would play the leading role in China's development while leaving plenty of opportunities to the other capitalist nations. Great power rivalries and aggression, and Chinese civil war, kept China's door scarcely ajar from 1900 to the 1940s. At the end of World War II, with all its rivals economically depleted, the U.S. was poised at last to take the lead in China, only to see the door "closed" again by China's unification under the leadership of an anti-imperialist Communist Party.

The ensuing two decades of American hysteria over "who lost China" expressed the deeper trauma over the threat of losing America's—and capitalism's—future without an "open door" in China.

As we now know from State Department documents released in recent years, Mao Tse-tung and Chou En-lai just after World War II invited the U.S. to aid China's reconstruction, to give China the technology it needed and leverage with the Soviets.

But in the cold war years, American capitalists could not conceive that a communist country might offer a suitable investment and trade environment for "free enterprise."

It was also inconceivable, especially with the onset of the Korean war, that the U.S. should help and thereby lend prestige to communist development and the "monolithic world communist conspiracy." Besides, the rebuilding of western Europe and Japan after the colossal devastation of the world war, gave the U.S. enough to do.

But by the late '60s, the Soviets and Chinese had split, and only imbeciles and Birchers could still believe in "monolithic" communism. The capitalist world for its part was moving into deepening economic troubles. Communist countries, with stable currencies, hard-working labor forces, and government guarantees, had proved to be good business partners. The China market beckoned with renewed urgency.



Late in coming, the China market is no myth. The myth lies in the unreal hopes placed on the "open door."

Nixon closed the gold window in 1971, and with the West and Japan awash in a huge dollar glut, the great anti-communist cold warrior learned how to dine with chop-sticks and went to Peking.

Internal Chinese and U.S. politics impeded China's "opening" for awhile. But remember that Nixon's initiative came while Mao was still alive and the "gang of four" still in power. The past few months have seen the China boom move into full gear.

The Chinese government has committed itself to what the business press labels an "astounding" \$350 billion development program within the next decade. The 120 major projects the Chinese are planning include ten steel plants, nine non-ferrous metals complexes, 30 power plants, five harbors, six trunk railways, eight coal complexes, and ten oil and gas fields.

The Chinese have entered a \$20 billion, eight-year trade agreement with the Japanese; a similar one for \$13.6 billion with the French; a \$14.5 billion steel and \$4 billion coal deal with the Germans. They have arranged for loans from British (\$1.2 billion), French (\$6.8 billion), and German (over \$4 billion) banks at lower than market interest rates, and are reported to be negotiating with Japanese banks for another multi-billion dollar loan.

American corporations and banks are handicapped by the lack of normal dip-

lomatic relations between the U.S. and Chinese governments. China's deals with the Europeans and Japanese, along with its conciliatory statements about Taiwan, may be just the lubricant needed to speed up the establishment of normal ties. But even without them, U.S. Steel, Bethlehem Steel, IBM, Boeing, Coastal States Gas, Hyatt and other American firms are negotiating or have already made agreements with the Chinese. American Cabinet secretaries, business executives, scientists and engineers have been going to China.

In its negotiations with the Europeans and Japanese, the Chinese, *Business Week* reports (Nov. 6), are "adamant on one point"—they want the loans and repayment in American dollars, if not in full, then in good part. If that proves to be the case, and the Chinese development program proceeds on schedule, it holds the promise of restoring the dollar as the stable international monetary unit it once was, while rejuvenating an American-led multilateral system of investment and trade.

It would appear that the Chinese strategy is to draw upon Western Europe, Japan and eventually the U.S. for accelerated industrial development, while helping to buttress American economic primacy in the West. Communist China appears to have become the new hope of the capitalist world—and especially of American capitalism.

China's industrial development will

undoubtedly raise demand for western and Japanese capital, goods, and labor. If the Chinese want such development it is all to the good that the industrial nations help them in a mutually beneficial and nonpredatory way. It is one of the admirable achievements of the Chinese revolution that it put China in the position to define and choose its own options and to get aid from the industrial nations on beneficial terms.

But China never was and never will be the "solution" to world capitalism's troubles. Iran's case suggests China's development cannot be so rapid, smooth and sustained as to "save" the capitalist world from recessions, inflation, and unemployment, or as to "save" the dollar. When its new productive capacity comes on stream world markets will become more crowded than before.

The China market is no myth. It is just late in coming. It is the extravagant hopes attached to it by Americans (and others) that comprises its mythical component. It is all the more fanciful to conjure a socialist China into the guarantor of a capitalist utopia of peace and prosperity. Those American socialists who have attached to China their own utopian hopes have only embraced a left-wing version of the prevalent China myth.

If China's development becomes an ideological surrogate for social change in the industrial capitalist countries, leaving intact those conditions that produce recessions, monetary instability, trade rivalries and national antagonisms, the China boom will lead not to world peace and prosperity but continuing economic disarray and international belligerency if not war. The danger would be as great for China as for the people of the industrial capitalist nations.

Wats happening? Holiday gift subscriptions to
In These Times. Call (800) 247-2160