PERIODIC REPORT ON NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO SUDAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 106–157)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c) and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA), 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), I transmit herewith a 6-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Sudan that was declared in Executive Order 13067 of November 3, 1997.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 5, 1999.*

TRIBUTE TO A.M. ROSENTHAL

(Mr. WOLF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express our appreciation for the service that has been given to our country and to the world by A.M. Rosenthal.

This past Friday was Mr. Rosenthal's last day at the New York Times. Mr. Rosenthal had a distinguished career at the New York Times beginning his tenure at the Times at age 21. He left his imprimatur on journalism and on the world through his opinion columns that exposed many cases of human rights violations and religious persecution.

Mr. Rosenthal was not afraid to speak truth to tyranny. He wrote unabashedly and boldly for those who suffered under egregious and appalling situations, while others remained silent.

Mr. Rosenthal addressed a wide spectrum of tyranny and never backed down. His wise words were the finest examples of speaking truth to abuses of power. His column spoke truth for the voiceless, freedom and liberty for the oppressed. His pen was truly mightier than the sword. Natan Sharansky, Harry Wu, Andrei Sakharov, and countless brave others have him to thank for stirring world opinion into forcing their freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following articles for the RECORD:

[From the New York Times, Nov. 5, 1999]

WRITER-EDITOR ENDS A 55-YEAR RUN

A FINAL COLUMN FOR THE TIMES, BUT DON'T SAY RETIREMENT

(By Clyde Haberman)

After 55 years as a reporter, foreign correspondent, editor and columnist, A.M. Rosenthal spent his last working day at The New York times yesterday packing up his memories the only way he knew how: by writing about them.

Mr. Rosenthal ended a run of nearly 13 years on the newspaper's Op-Ed page with a column that appears today, looking back on a career that made him one of the most influential figures in American journalism in the last half of this century.

''I've seen happier days,'' he acknowledged in an interview.

But there was one word that he said he would never use to describe his new status. Don't dare to whisper ''retirement,'' he said, recalling what Barbara Walters, an old friend, told him a few weeks ago when it became clear that his weekly column, ''On My Mind,'' was near an end.

''She said to me, 'But Abe, you're starting fresh,'" he said, ''And I suddenly realized, of course I was. Then I realized that I'm not going alone. I'm taking my head with me. I'm going to stay alive intellectually.''

Mr. Rosenthal, 77 and universally known as Abe, said he intended to continue ''writing journalistically,'' though at this point he had no specific plans. ''I want to remain a columnist,'' he said.

There was an unmistakable end-of-an-era feel to the announcement yesterday that Mr. Rosenthal would leave a newspaper that, family aside, had been his life. Indeed, during his 17 years as its chief editor, until he stepped down in 1986 with the title of executive editor, ''Rosenthal'' and ''The Times'' were pretty much synonyms for many readers—often, though not always, with their approval.

Abraham Michael Rosenthal brought raw intelligence and enormous passion to the job, qualities that were apparent from his first days at The Times, as a part-time campus correspondent at City College in the 1940's. The college was tuition-free in those days, and a good thing, too, said Mr. Rosenthal, who was born in Canada and grew up in poverty in the Bronx. ''Free tuition was more than I could afford,'' he said yesterday.

After becoming a full-time reporter in 1944, he covered the fledgling United Nations. Then, from 1954 to 1963, he was a foreign correspondent, based in India, Poland and Japan. Covering India was a personal high point. But it was in Poland, whose Communist rulers expelled him in 1959, that he won a Pulitzer Prize.

It was also where he wrote an article for The New York Times Magazine that, among the thousands he produced, contained a passage that some quote to this day. He had been to the Nazi death camp at Auschwitz.

''And so,'' he wrote, ''there is no news to report from Auschwitz. There is merely the compulsion to write something about it, a compulsion that grows out of a restless feeling that to have visited Auschwitz and then turned away without having said or written anything would be a most grievous act of discourtesy to those who died there.''

The passion in that paragraph carried into his time as editor.

On his watch, in 1971, The Times published the so-called Pentagon Papers, a secret government history of the Vietnam War. That led to a landmark Supreme Court decision upholding the primacy of the press over government attempts to impose ''prior restraint'' on what it may print.

Under Mr. Rosenthal, the once ponderous Times became a far livelier paper. Major innovations were quickly copied at other newspapers, notably special sections on lifestyles and science that were introduced in the 1970's. But his biggest accomplishment, in his view, was keeping ''the paper straight,'' which meant keeping the news columns free of writing that he felt stumbled into editorial judgment.

On that score, he did not lack for critics. With his passion came dark moods and a soaring temper. Mr. Rosenthal made many journalists' careers. But he also undid some. Even now, years after his editorship, his defenders and his attackers talk about him with equal vehemence.

Mr. Rosenthal agreed yesterday that people tended not to be neutral about him. Many will be saddened by his departure from The Times. ''And,'' he said, ''there'll be people dancing.''

His column on the Op-Ed page, which first appeared on Jan. 6, 1987, often stirred similar emotions among readers. Over the years, recurring themes emerged: Israel's security needs, human rights violations around the world, this country's uphill war against drugs.

He focused on those themes once more for his final column. Then he turned to the mundane task of packing up mementos as well as memories. Off the wall came a framed government document from the 1950's attesting that the Canadian had become an American. It was, he said with a cough to beat back rising emotions, among his most valuable possessions.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 5, 1999]

A.M. ROSENTHAL OF THE NEW YORK TIMES

The departure of a valued colleague from The New York Times is not, as a rule, occasion for editorial comment. But the appearance today of A.M. Rosenthal's last column on the Op-Ed page requires an exception. Mr. Rosenthal's life and that of this newspaper have been braided together over a remarkable span—from World War II to the turning of the millennium. His talent and passionate ambition carried him on a personal journey from City College correspondent to executive editor, and his equally passionate devotion to quality journalism made him one of the principal architects of the modern New York Times.

Abe Rosenthal began his career at The Times as a 21-year-old cub reporter scratching for space in the metropolitan report, and he ended it as an Op-Ed page columnist noted for his commitment to political and religious freedom. In between he served as a correspondent at the United Nations and was based in three foreign countries winning a Pulitzer Price in 1960 for his reporting from Poland. He came home in 1963 to be metropolitan editor. In that role and in higher positions, he became a tireless advocate of opening the paper to the kind of vigorous writing and deep reporting that characterized his own work. As managing editor and executive editor, Abe Rosenthal was in charge of The Times's news operations for a total of 17 years.

Of his many contributions as an editor, two immediately come to mind. One was his role in the publication of the Pentagon Papers, the official documents tracing a quarter-century of missteps that entangled America in the Vietnam War. Though hardly alone among Times editors, Mr. Rosenthal was instrumental in mustering the arguments that led to the decision by our then publisher, Arthur Ochs Sulzberger, to publish the archive. That fateful decision helped illustrate the futile duplicity of American policy in Vietnam, strengthened the press's First Amendment guarantees and reinforced The Times's reputation as a guardian of the public interest.

The second achievement, more institutional in nature, was Mr. Rosenthal's central role in transforming The times from a two-section to a four-section newspaper with the introduction of a separate business section and new themed sections like SportsMonday, Weekend and Science Times. Though a journalist of the old school, Abe Rosenthal grasped that such features were necessary to broaden the paper's universe of readers. He insisted only that the writing, editing and

article selection measure up to The Times's traditional standards.

By his own admission, Abe Rosenthal could be ferocious in his pursuit and enforcement of those standards. Sometimes, indeed, debate about his management style competed for attention with his journalistic achievements. But the scale of this man's editorial accomplishments has come more fully into focus since he left the newsroom in 1986. It is now clear that he seeded the place with talent and helped ensure that future generations of Times writers and editors would hew to the principles of quality journalism.

Born in Canada, Mr. Rosenthal developed a deep love for New York City and a fierce affection for the democratic values and civil liberties of his adopted country. For the last 13 years, his lifelong interest in foreign affairs and his compassion for victims of political, ethnic or religious oppression in Tibet, China, Iran, Africa and Eastern Europe formed the spine of his Op-Ed columns. His strong, individualistic views and his bedrock journalistic convictions have informed his work as reporter, editor and columnist. His voice will continue to be a force on the issues that engaged him. And his commitment to journalism as an essential element in a democratic society will abide as part of the living heritage of the newspaper he loved and served for more than 55 years.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 5, 1999]

ON MY MIND: A.M. ROSENTHAL

PLEASE READ THIS COLUMN!

On Jan. 6, 1987, when The New York Times printed my first column, the headline I had written was: ''Please Read This Column!'' It was not just one journalist's message of the day, but every writer's prayer—come know me.

Sometimes I wanted to use it again. But I was smitten by seizures of modesty and decided twice might be a bit showy. Now I have the personal and journalistic excuse to set it down one more time.

This is the last column I will write for The Times and my last working day on the paper. I have no intention of stopping writing, journalistically or otherwise. And I am buoyed by the knowledge that I will be starting over.

Still, who could work his entire journalistic career—so far—for one paper and not leave with sadnesses, particularly when the paper is The Times? Our beloved, proud New York Times—ours, not mine or theirs, or yours, but ours, created by the talents and endeavor of its staff, the faithfulness of the publishing family and, as much as anything else, by the ethics and standards of its readers and their hunger for ever more information, of a range without limit.

Arrive in a foreign capital for the first time, call a government minister and give just your name. Ensues iciness. But add ''of the New York Times,'' and you expect to be invited right over and usually are; nice.

''Our proud New York Times''—sounds arrogant and is a little, why not? But the pride is individual as well as institutional. For members of the staff, news and business, the pride is in being important to the world's best paper—and hear?—and being able to stretch its creative reach. And there is pride knowing that even if we are not always honest enough with ourselves to achieve fairness, that is what we promise the readers, and the standard to which they must hold us.

I used to tell new reporters: The Times is far more flexible in writing styles than you might think, so don't button up your vest and go all stiff on us. But when it comes to the foundation—fairness—don't fool around with it, or we will come down on you.

Journalists often have to hurt people, just by reporting the facts. But they do not have to cause unnecessary cruelty, to run their rings across anybody's face for the pleasure of it—and that goes for critics, too.

When you finish a story, I would say, read it, substitute your name for the subject's. If you say, well, it would make me miserable, make my wife cry, but it has no innuendo, no unattributed pejorative remarks, no slap in the face for joy of slapping, it is news, not gutter gossip, and as a reporter I know the writer was fair, then give it to the copy desk. If not, try again—we don't want to be your cop.

Sometimes I have a nightmare that on a certain Wednesday—why Wednesday I don't know—The Times disappeared forever. I wake trembling; I know this paper could never be recreated. I will never tremble for the loss of any publication that has no enforced ethic of fairness.

Starting fresh—the idea frightened me. Then I realized I was not going alone. I would take my brain and decades of newspapering with me. And I understood many of us had done that on the paper—moving from one career to another.

First I was a stringer from City College, my most important career move. It got me inside a real paper and paid real money. Twelve dollars a week. at a time when City's free tuition was more than I could afford.

My second career was as a reporter in New York, with a police press pass, which cops were forever telling me to shove in my ear.

I got a two-week assignment at the brand-new United Nations, and stayed eight years, until got what I lusted for—a foreign post.

I served The Times in Communist Poland, for the first time encountering the suffocating intellectual blanket that is Communism's great weapon. In due time I was thrown out.

But mostly it was Asia. The four years in India excited me then and forever. Rosenthal, King of the Khyber Pass!

After nine years as a foreign correspondent, somebody decided I was too happy in Tokyo and nagged me into going home to be an editor. At first I did not like it, but I came to enjoy editing—once I became the top editor, Rosenthal, King of the Hill!

When I stepped down from that job, I started all over again as a Times Op-Ed columnist, paid to express my own opinions. If I had done that as a reporter or editor dealing with the news, I would have broken readers' trust that the news would be written and played straight.

Straight does not mean dull. It means straight. If you don't know what that means, you don't belong on this paper. Clear?

As a columnist, I discovered that there were passions in me I had not been aware of, lying under the smatterings of knowledge about everything that I had to collect as executive editor—including hockey and debentures, for heaven's sake.

Mostly the passions had to do with human rights, violations of—like African women having their genitals mutilated to keep them virgin, and Chinese and Tibetan political prisoners screaming their throats raw.

I wrote with anger at drug legitimizers and rationalizers, helping make criminals and destroying young minds, all the while with nauseating sanctimony.

As a correspondent, it was the Arab states, not Israel, that I wanted to cover. But they did not welcome resident Jewish correspondents. As a columnist, I felt fear for the whittling away of Israel strength by the Israelis, and still do.

I wrote about the persecution of Christians in China. When people, in astonishment, asked why, I replied, in astonishment, because it is happening, because the world, including American and European Christians and Jews, pays almost no attention, and that plain disgusts me.

The lassitude about Chinese Communist brutalities is part of the most nasty American reality of this past half-century. Never before have the U.S. government, business and public been willing, eager really, to praise and enrich tyranny, to crawl before it, to endanger our martial technology—and all of the hope (vain) of trade profit.

America is going through plump times. But economic strength is making us weaker in head and soul. We accept back without penalty a president who demeaned himself and us. We rain money on a Politburo that must rule by terror lest it lose its collective head.

I cannot promise to change all that. But I can say that I will keep trying and that I thank God for (a) making me an American citizen, (b) giving me that college-boy job on The Times, and (c) handing me the opportunity to make other columnists kick themselves when they see what I am writing, in this fresh start of my life.

BOSTON UNIVERSITY,
Boston, MA, January 14, 1999.

THE PULITZER PRIZE BOARD,
Columbia University, New York, NY.

DEAR SIRS: we respectfully nominate A.M Rosenthal for the 1998 Pultizer Prize for commentary, based on his columns dealing with the persecution of religious minorities around the world. We believe that such an award would be particularly fitting, coming as it would on the 50th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

The Rosenthal columns were the first, remain the dominate, and until recently, were the singular media voices on the subject of worldwide religious persecution. They were instrumental in redefining the human rights agenda to include the interests of religious believers in general and vulnerable Christian communities in particular. They energized a broad interfaith movement previously lacking in knowledge about or confidence in their ability to speak up for the rights of persecuted religious minorities. They built bridges of trust between religious and secular human rights organizations, between Tibetan Buddhist, Baha'i, Jewish, Catholic, Evangelical and Mainline Protestant groups. They powerfully expanded the reach of America's human rights policies.

The Rosenthal columns or religious persecution began in 1997, but their culminating impact occurred during this year. The first and last 1998 columns, ''Feeling Clean Again'' (February 6), ''Gift for Americans'' (November 27), and ''Keeping the Spotlight'' (December 25), broadly validated the moral and political premises of the movement against religious persecution, and defined its agenda. Such 1998 Rosenthal columns as ''A Tour of China'' (March 13) and ''Judgment of Beijing'' (July 3), forced the U.S.-China summit meeting to deal with the persecution of house church Christians and Tibetan Buddhists to a far greater degree than either government wished. The outrage expressed by Mr. Rosenthal in his May 1 column, ''Clinton's Fudge Factory,'' leveraged the story of New York Times correspondent Elaine Sciolino into a reshaped, reenergized political debate over religious persecution legislation. See also his April 24 column, ''Clinton Policies Explained.'' Mr. Rosenthal's May 12 column, ''The Simple Question,'' framed the House debate on the Freedom From Religious Persecution Act and played an instrumental role in the overwhelming House vote that adopted it. His August 7 and October 2 columns, ''Freedom From Religious Persecution: The Struggle Continues'' and ''They Will Find Out,'' played key roles in rescuing the Senate version of the legislation from a demise that

had been confidently predicted by the Administration and the business community.

We respectfully submit that the Rosenthal columns on religious persecution merit a Pulitzer Prize for Commentary if only because they broke new ground on an important subject, and did so with accuracy, forcefulness and passion. We also believe that related and perhaps even stronger grounds exist for the award to be granted.

First, the Rosenthal columns enhanced the institutional credibility of the press with many religious believers who had seen the mainline press as patronizing if not hostile. They were read and cherished by millions, not only in the New York Times, but also through mass recirculation in denominational newsletters, religious broadcasts and actual worship services. They educated many to the power and virtue of a free press.

Next, the columns played a central role in the enactment of major, potentially historic legislation. As nothing else, they galvanized and sustained the remarkable interfaith movement that supported the legislation, and ensured Congressional attentiveness to the issue. It can be categorically stated: Without the Rosenthal columns, the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 would not have become law.

Finally, we believe that the Rosenthal columns legitimated today's increasing coverage of anti-Christian persecutions in countries like India, Pakistan and Indonesia, and generated new perspectives on the coverage of countries ranging from China to Egypt, from Sudan to Vietnam. Until the Rosenthal columns, the notion of Christians as victims rather than victimizers didn't seem quite plausible to many editors and reporters. The fact that it now does is a powerful tribute to what the columns have done.

Seldom in our experience has a single voice been so instrumental in raising public consciousness on an issue of such major importance. The passion and integrity of the Rosenthal columns on religious persecution have transformed American policies and institutions, and religious liberty throughout the world. American journalism has long been honored by Mr. Rosenthal's work, but never more so than by his pathbreaking columns on a subject that he, often alone, moved a nation to care about and to act.

Very truly yours,

Elie Wiesel, Virgil C. Dechant, Rabbi Norman Lamm, John Cardinal O'Connor, Rabbi Alexander Schindler, R. Lamar Vest, Wei Jingsheng, William Bennett, Lodi G. Gyari, Bette Bao Lord, Paige Patterson, James M. Stanton, Commissioner Robert A. Watson.

We thank him for his commitment to the people.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair, without it being considered a precedent for changing the proper sequence of Special Orders, and pursuant to the unanimous consent request of the majority leader, will recognize the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) for 1 hour without prejudice to the resumption of 5-minute Special Orders.

TRIBUTE TO LATE HON. GEORGE BROWN

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the consideration given to this special order.

As my colleagues have heard, the legislature is coming to an end. And it would be a very sad end if we did not pay tribute to one of the most distinguished California citizens to ever serve in the United States Congress, our beloved George Brown, who passed away this year as a Member of the House.

So tonight, surrounded by his family and friends, Members of the California delegation and other States have come forward and would like to express their feelings and sympathies for the great life of a great man who served longer in the United States Congress than any other Member in California history.

I am very pleased to be able to share this hour of colloquy, hour of memorial resolutions with the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), my esteemed colleague and very close friend of George Brown and his neighbor.

I would like to call upon the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) first. And then we are going to be sharing, as Members want to express their concerns and try to keep their remarks to several minutes. Because we can see there are many people here that want to speak.

Mr. Speaker, "I believe in human dignity as the source of national purpose, human liberty as the source of national action, the human heart as the source of national compassion, and in the human mind as the source of our invention and our ideas." JFK quote.

He was a great man and a distinguished public servant; 45 years of public service; 36 years in the House, the longest serving Congress member in California history.

Won first election—as Monterey Park city councilman and became mayor one year later. Member of the California State Legislature. First elected to U.S. Congress in 1962. Unlike other politicians, he did not read the polls—No other member of Congress cast more "unsafe" votes—and live to tell the tale.

Best known for his work on science and technology: "With his passing, science and technology lost its most knowledgeable advocate, he embraced the future by articulating a vision that includes harnessing science and technology to achieve sustainable development."

George Brown quote from NY Times interview: "From my earliest days, I was fascinated by science. I was fascinated by a utopian vision of what the world could be like. I've thought that science could be the basis for a better world, and that's what I've been trying to do all these years."

He had the foresight to champion the creation of the Environmental Protection Agency, the Office of Technology Assessment, and the Office of Science and Technology Policy. Recognized leader in forming the institutional framework for science and technology in the Federal Government. Led effort to move the National Science Foundation into more active roles in engineering, science, education and the development of advanced technologies.

Had the vision, courage and integrity to have remained ahead of the mainstream: In the California Assembly authored first bill in the nation to ban lead in gasoline. Recognized, early on: the environmental hazards of burning fossil fuels; the destructive effect of freon; the importance of keeping space development under civilian control; and the necessity of monitoring global climate change. In due time, Congress adopted these issues as legislation.

Style of argument: Brown cultivated a polite and courtly style of argument. His reliance on reason coupled with the respect he showed his opponents made him a very effective advocate and enabled him to form alliances with people of all political parties.

Human qualities: Cigar chomping, rumpled suit, pacifist, social democrat, fierce idealist, a maverick. At UCLA, he helped create some of the first cooperative student housing and was first to integrate campus housing by rooming with Tom Bradley—the future Mayor of Los Angeles. Joined the Army despite his pacifist leanings in order to serve the country.

Inspiration to California Democrats: The current California Democratic party is replete with individuals who worked on Brown's several campaigns, including Senator Boxer. Dean of the California Congressional Delegation. He was our hero, and our inspiration to continue championing good and fighting evil.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), my colleague and esteemed friend, the chair of the Republican delegation from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am wondering, let me ask my colleague a question if I can by way of procedure. I know there are Members on both sides who are asking for time, etcetera, and I have made a list and so on. Should we kind of divide this time in a way that I can distribute time and ask the Chair for unanimous consent for that?

Mr. FARR of California. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the procedures of this Special Order, the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) controls the time and distributes the time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. If he yields half of it to me, then can I distribute it?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There is an hour on the clock, which is reserved to designees of the Leadership; and the Chair will not recognize for subdivisions of that hour.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate any colleague yielding.

Let me say that I intend to make the bulk of my remarks at the end of this session. But let us begin by indicating to the body that oft times, especially with the advent of C-SPAN, the public very often sees only the confrontation between the two sides of the aisle, debate swirling around very important issues that sometimes takes us to the extreme of expression and confrontations that is the presumed norm.

I must say that, over the years, I have had great pleasure in the fact that George Brown and I found working together that we had so much more in common than our people who watch us on the football team of politics in our home district territory would ever realize.