

There are now more voices in every market, and more competition for viewers and advertising dollars with these additional players. The competition for advertising dollars has been particularly formidable as cable systems increasingly cluster themselves over entire local markets, thus enabling them to offer advertisers the same buy as local broadcasters.

The sheer abundance of media outlets now available to consumers ensures that a relaxation of the duopoly rule to permit UHF-UHF and UHF-VHF combinations poses no threat to diversity and competition. Indeed, a revision of the duopoly rule will help preserve diversity and competition in local broadcasting markets.

Whether it is providing critical emergency information, as in the case of the recent North Dakota floods, or covering local sports teams, or reporting the local news, local stations serve a unique and vital role in their communities, all at no cost to the viewing public. But local programming is very expensive to produce. Duopoly rule revision will give stations flexibility to pool resources and provide more quality programs for their communities. At the same time, wireless broadcasters and Internet providers will still be competing with these broadcasters for consumers.

I strongly believe that this is good legislation, especially in light of the dramatic ownership changes already taking place in the field of telecommunications. Considering the Bell Atlantic-NYNEX merger, the MCI-BT announced merger, and the proposed AT&T-SBC merger, we are seeing clear consolidation in telephony. There is also multichannel ownership in cable services and cross-cable services, such as Viacom owning MTV, Nickelodeon, and other stations, as well as ABC owning 80 percent of ESPN.

The banning of ownership of two local broadcast stations is a glaring deficiency and unfair result of the Telecommunications Act. The multiple current instances in the industry of Local Marketing Agreements [LMA's], which allows two local broadcast stations to combine efforts and financial relationships in order to improve their stations' programming ability, reflect that such duopoly ownership could actually promote diversity in programming, as well as saving numerous local stations from bankruptcy enhancing the limited financial resources of many stations.

I am proud to sponsor this legislation and I look forward to the Federal Communications Commission supporting my legislation on duopoly reform through its forthcoming rule-making on this issue.

SUPPORT WWII ALLIED AIRMEN HELD AS POLITICAL PRISONERS

HON. DAVE WELDON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1997

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, 52 years is a long time to wait, but the Federal Government should finally recognize the bravery and sacrifice of a group of World War II airmen who were held as German political prisoners. These airmen were different from other Allied prisoners because they were held at Buchenwald, a Nazi concentration camp—and therefore not subject to the protections of the Geneva Convention.

Today I am submitting a bill that would give these airmen their long-overdue recognition, and I am proud to say that it has already garnered the bipartisan support of 21 of our House colleagues. Representative PETER DEUTSCH assisted me in this important effort, and I thank him for his early support of this bill. An identical bill will be introduced this week by Senators TIM HUTCHINSON and JOSEPH LIEBERMAN.

The Nazi concentration camps will forever occupy a ignominious place in our human history, and we have long recognized the bravery and daring of many prisoners who fought their Nazi oppressors and struggled to win political and religious freedom. But tragically, the United States has never formally recognized the service, sacrifice, and bravery of these American airmen while they were held as political prisoners at the Buchenwald Concentration Camp.

My bill, which is endorsed by the American Ex-Prisoners of War and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, would recognize these 82 American airmen and ask that the President issue a proclamation commending them, by name, for their service. I have also included a list of these airmen, by name, that I would ask be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I encourage all of my colleagues to join us in support of this important measure, so that those veterans still living, and the families and friends of those who have passed on, can fully realize the public recognition these brave men so surely deserve.

LIST OF WWII AMERICAN AIRMEN HELD AT BUCHENWALD CONCENTRATION CAMP

NOT LOCATED

Freeman, E.C.	Scharf, B.T.
Hanson, J.T.	Scott, G.W.
Horrigan, R.J.	

DECEASED

Alexander, William	Smith, J.W.
Beck, Levit C.	Vance, Ira E.
Crouch, M.E.	Wilson, P.J.
Duncan, James H.	Zeiser, J.
Heimerman, L.A.	Chapman, Park
MacLenahan, J.H.	Suddock, D.E.
Mauk, W.E.	Horwege, G.L.
Pecus, Steve	Edge, W.L.
Pennel, Sam	

STILL LIVING

Bauder, W.F.	Moser, J.F.
Bedford, R.L.	Pacha, A.M.
Bowen, C.E.	Paxton, S.K.
Brown, R.H.	Powell, W.
Carr, F.W.	Raynolds, N.L.
Chalot, J.A.	Richey, G.T. Sr.
Chessir, D.	Ritter, E.W.
Coats, B.A.	Roberson, C.W.
Cowan, F.K.	Ryherd, W.H.
Coffman, J.D.	Shearer, D.R.
Dauteul, D.F.	Straulka, P.A. Jr.
Denaro, Joe	Sypher, L.H.
Fore, J.W.	Thompson, W.A.
Hastin, J.D.	Vratney, Frank
Hilding, R.D.	Watson, J.P.
Hunter, H.F.	Ward, Robert
Johnson, R.T.	Williams, W.J.
King, Myles A.	Zander, A.E.
Larson, M.E.	Phelps, B.F.
Little, B.S.	Pelletier, A.J.
Ludwig, E.F.	Friel, Edward J.
McLaughlin, D.G.	Petrich, M.R.
Mitchell, G.E.	

ON CONDEMNING PALESTINIAN DEATH PENALTY FOR LAND SALES

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1997

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, today the House agreed to an amendment to H.R. 1757, the Foreign Policy Act, which condemns the use by the Palestinian Authority of the death penalty for any Palestinian who sells land to a Jew.

Indeed, the statements cited in the resolution offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAXON] cause great concern because those statements support a violent, divisive, and foolish policy which is based in prejudice and hatred. To condone, or worse yet promote, the execution of citizens for the sale of property to Israelis is wrong, and I support this body's assertion that this policy should be condemned.

I am troubled, however, Mr. Speaker, by the tone of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York, as well as by the accusations that this behavior represents a unique and unilateral breach of the Oslo accords. Most knowledgeable individuals and observers understand that the breakdown of the Middle East peace talks plays prominently in the background of policies on all sides which have stymied constructive peace negotiations.

Both Israel and the Palestinian Authority have undertaken activities which have led to charges that each side has violated the peace agreements signed on the South Lawn in 1993. Following the recent insistence by Israel that construction of settlements in Har Homa must go forward, there has been a break in the peace talks which has greatly concerned our Government. Secretary of State Albright has concluded that a trip to the region makes little sense until Israel and the Palestinians do more on their own to break the impasse and resume a constructive dialog.

Given these many problems, Mr. Speaker, I must express my reservations with the parts of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York which imply that only the Palestinian Authority must resume a responsible course. For when it comes time for the President to assure that the Palestinian Authority is meeting its commitments to Israel, will anyone be mindful of the commitments made by Israel to the Palestinians?

CLARIFYING THE TAX TREATMENT OF AVIATION MAINTENANCE COSTS—PREVENTING COST INCREASES OF AVIATION SAFETY

HON. MAC COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1997

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to introduce legislation that will clarify in the Internal Revenue Code what has historically been and should continue to be the tax treatment of expenses attributable to certain FAA-mandated aviation industry maintenance checks.

The IRS has attempted to change the historical tax treatment of certain aviation maintenance expenses by denying the industry's ability to deduct those that arise from ordinary and necessary maintenance and repair of aircraft. Instead, the IRS is requiring that these maintenance costs be treated as nondeductible capital improvements. Previously I joined with several of my colleagues and asked Secretary Robert Rubin to reverse the agency's position. Although I was assured the issue would be studied and I would receive a response, to date I have received no reply.

I strongly support a clarification of the tax treatment of these maintenance expenses so the aviation industry may continue to deduct these expenses. Doing so is important in order to prevent increasing the costs of aviation safety.

I strongly encourage my colleagues to join this effort by cosponsoring this legislation.

MFN

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1997

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, today, I received a copy of an excellent paper from Frank Gaffney with the William J. Casey Institute of the Center for Security Policy. The paper makes the excellent point that: "While MFN is a blunt instrument * * * it is also the only measure currently on the table that is remotely proportionate to the magnitude of the danger Beijing is creating, to a considerable degree with resources it is garnering from trade with the United States."

I ask that my colleagues read the paper and request that the full text be printed at this point in the RECORD:

NON-RENEWAL OF MFN FOR CHINA: A PROPORTIONATE RESPONSE TO BEIJING'S EMERGING, TRADE-SUBSIDIZED STRATEGIC THREAT

WASHINGTON, DC.—Congress is expected shortly to consider President Clinton's proposal to renew for an additional year China's Most Favored Nation (MFN) status. While there are many compelling reasons for opposing such a renewal, the William J. Casey Institute of the Center for Security Policy believes that there is one overarching factor that demands this step: Communist China is utilizing much of the huge trade surplus that it enjoys thanks to this privileged trading status to mount a strategic threat to the United States and its vital interests in Asia, the Middle East and beyond.

While MFN is a blunt instrument—affecting, if it is denied, millions of innocent Chinese workers, the economy of Hong Kong, U.S. jobs associated with exports to and imports from China, etc.—it is also the only measure currently on the table that is remotely proportionate to the magnitude of the danger Beijing is creating, to a considerable degree with resources it is garnering from trade with the United States.

CHINA'S OFFENSIVE STRATEGY

In the Summer 1994 edition of *Orbis*, Ross H. Munro reported that, in 1993, the West was afforded "an unprecedented—and at times disturbing—inside look at how important elements in China's armed forces view neighboring countries as well as the United States." This insight was obtained when a Western diplomat serendipitously obtained a copy of a book entitled "Can China's Armed

Forces Win the Next War?" that had been published by the People's Liberation Army (PLA) for internal consumption only.

According to Munro, this book provided "virtual confirmation of reports . . . that the Chinese leadership in general and the senior Chinese officer corps in particular view the United States as China's principal adversary now and for decades to come." This view has become even more entrenched during the intervening years. As Munro and co-author Richard Bernstein put it in their own, critically acclaimed book published earlier this year, "The Coming Conflict with China."

"China's harsh rhetoric and incidents like [a dangerous U.S.-Chinese naval encounter in October 1994] in the Yellow Sea are not so much temporary responses to a temporary situation but products of a fundamental change in the Chinese attitude toward the United States. The use of the words 'hegemonism,' 'subversion' and 'interference' with regard to the United States signals a change in China's strategic thinking. Before, Beijing saw American power as a strategic advantage for the PRC; now, it has decided that American power represents a threat, not just to China's security but to China's plans to grow stronger and to play a paramount role in the affairs of Asia.

"China, in short, has determined that the United States—despite the trade, the diplomatic contacts, the technology transfers, the numerous McDonald's and Kentucky Fried Chickens open in the People's Republic, despite even the limited amount of cooperation that still existed between the two countries—is its chief global rival."

The enormous impetus behind China's determined effort to acquire a modern military capable of decisively projecting power derives from this zero-sum view of the U.S.-PRC relationship.¹ The Chinese leadership believes, after all, that it must be able not only to dominate the nations of East Asia and the South China Sea. It sees China as having to exercise control over the Pacific out to what the Chinese call "the second island chain" (i.e., the Philippines, Japan and even the U.S. territory of Guam).² The larger purpose appears to be even more ambitious: to render the United States incapable of exercising influence in Asia that would compete with, let alone counter, Chinese hegemony in the region.

IMPLEMENTING THE STRATEGY

The Chinese are pursuing a multifaceted campaign to accomplish these strategic objectives. The following are among the means the PRC is pursuing toward such ominous ends:

Strategic Force Modernization: The Washington Times recently reported that China is expected to begin deploying by the year 2000 an advanced intercontinental-range ballistic missile, designated the Dong Feng-31 (DF-31). This missile will give Beijing the ability to deliver nuclear warheads with great accuracy throughout the Pacific and parts of the western United States.

The DF-31 reportedly is benefitting from SS-18, SS-25 and Topol-M ICBM technology China is obtaining from Russia and/or Ukraine. Its lethality—and that of other Chinese strategic forces—will be greatly enhanced by supercomputers the United States has provided to Beijing's military-industrial complex.³ And the DF-31 is expected to be fielded on a mobile transporter-erector-launcher derived from Russian technology supplied by Belarus. The survivability afforded by this MAZ launcher, together with advances in Chinese ballistic missile-launching submarines capable of firing the DF-31, suggests that Beijing is intent on acquiring a formidable strategic nuclear capability

that cannot be preemptively destroyed and that will be capable of holding American cities and other targets credibly at risk.

A foretaste of the use to which China may be willing to put such a capability can be seen in a report published on the front-page of the New York Times on 24 January 1996. It described how a senior Chinese official had signaled Beijing's willingness to engage in "nuclear blackmail" against the United States by suggesting that American interference in China's coercion of Taiwan could result in an attack on Los Angeles. In the absence of any deployed U.S. ability to intercept a Chinese ballistic missile launched at Los Angeles—or any other target in the United States—such threats may well have the desired effect.

Build-up of Other Aspects of China's Military: Beijing is also pouring billions of dollars into what might be called a "Great Leap Forward" for other elements of the People's Liberation Army, notably its power-projection capabilities (long-range aircraft, blue-water naval units, precision-guided munitions and unconventional weapons). Such capabilities pose, most immediately, a danger that China will be able to control transit of the South China Sea and access to its energy and other strategic resources.⁴

China's drive to modernize the non-nuclear elements of its military is also benefitting hugely from imported technology. Thanks to advanced machine tools, computer-aided design capabilities, composite materials, chip-manufacturing technology and the other foreign dual-use technology like—whether acquired legally or illegally—together with its purchase of full-up military hardware or components,⁵ Beijing is now obtaining new generations of highly competitive jet fighters, cruise missiles, attack submarines and armored vehicles. The threat posed by such weaponry will not arise from China alone; given past Chinese practices, such equipment will shortly be available for purchase by rogue states from Iran to North Korea.

Espionage: The illegal acquisition of U.S. technology—especially that of the dual-use variety—is a priority assignment for the hundreds of People's Liberation Army-owned or -affiliated front companies operating in the United States.⁶ Together with large numbers of intelligence operatives, 40,000 graduate and undergraduate students and Overseas Chinese entrepreneurs doing business in this country or with its companies,⁷ America faces a literally unprecedented risk of penetration and espionage and, consequently, an immense counter-intelligence challenge. In his new book about economic espionage, "War by Other Means," John Fialka declares that China's prime intelligence agency, the Ministry of State Security, has "flooded the United States with spies, sending in far more than the Russians even at the height of the KGB's phenomenal campaign."

Not least is the danger that China's penetration of the computer and telecommunications industries will translate into a sophisticated, if not unique, Chinese capability to wage information warfare (IW) against the United States. This capability is especially sinister since the vulnerability of America's computer infrastructure to IW attacks offers Beijing a means to inflict grave harm on the U.S. economic and national security in a way that may enable the attacker to avoid detection, responsibility and retaliation.

Arming U.S. Gangs and Drug Lords: China has been caught shipping AK-47s and other lethal firepower to criminal elements in this country with the potential to sow mayhem in American society. PLA-affiliated companies have offered to sell undercover U.S. law enforcement officers posing as drug lords not only automatic weapons—whose lethal effects were evident when the streets of Los