

It is classic Koppel: tough-minded, eloquent, focused on world affairs and sometimes, it seems, conducting his own foreign policy. As he prepares to relinquish the helm of the ABC program he launched 26 years ago, when his focus was entirely on Iran and the Americans held hostage there, it is hard to avoid the end-of-an-era language that followed the departures of Tom Brokaw and Dan Rather and the death of Peter Jennings.

"This is easily perceived as the fourth 20-year-plus anchor stepping aside, and that's not the case," says Executive Producer Tom Bettag, who plans to launch a reporting venture with Koppel after they leave ABC. Perhaps their greatest accomplishment, Bettag says, is that the program will continue after Koppel's last night, Nov. 22, with an anchor triumvirate of Cynthia McFadden, Terry Moran and Martin Bashir. "A number of people said once Ted goes, there goes 'Nightline.'"

One thing that will be lost with the new incarnation's wide-ranging format is what Koppel, 65, always has boasted about: an in-depth look at one subject each night. Does that bother him? "I don't want to begin by prejudging what's going to be done, because it may be terrific," he says. "I don't want this to be interpreted as Ted saying the new approach ain't going to work."

Koppel announced his resignation in March after ABC News President David Westin decided he wanted "Nightline"—the ratings of which have been slipping in recent years—to be live at 11:35 p.m. Koppel had no desire to work such a schedule, and always has argued that the program is live when it needs to be live and otherwise there is no point in having guests wait around all evening.

"At some point, it would probably be time to pull out anyway," says Koppel, who served notice five years ago that he and Bettag wanted to phase themselves out gradually. Koppel had hoped that Chris Bury would succeed him as anchor—Bury and John Donvan will remain as correspondents, most likely joined by Vicki Mabrey from CBS—and that former producer Leroy Sievers would replace Bettag. But management, which hired British journalist James Goldston to run the program, had other ideas.

"It's their broadcast in the final analysis," Koppel says. "I've always taken the position it's our job to make the program as attractive to the audience as we could possibly make it, but there are limits. You don't bring on dancing girls."

That's not an entirely frivolous comment, given that Koppel's competition includes Jay Leno and David Letterman. In fact, ABC tried to junk the show three years ago by luring Letterman from CBS. Koppel fought back, criticizing ABC and parent company Disney in a New York Times op-ed.

"I never questioned the corporation's right to do that," he says. "This is an industry, it's a business. We exist to make money. We exist to put commercials on the air. The programming that is put on between those commercials is simply the bait we put in the mousetrap."

"If it is true that David Letterman can draw a lot more viewers than 'Nightline' and Ted Koppel, if you can make an extra \$30 million or \$50 million a year, I absolutely understand they not only have the right but the fiduciary obligation to do that. I just don't think they did it the best way in terms of the handling of it. We were among the last to learn about it. You just don't do that to people who have worked hard for you for a long time."

In his 42 years at ABC, and especially in his quarter-century at "Nightline," Koppel seemingly has conducted every kind of interview. He's talked to Nelson Mandela and Mu-

hammad Ali, Larry Flynt and Ginger Rogers, Chuck D and Buzz Aldrin. He famously quizzed Gary Hart about adultery, told Michael Dukakis he just didn't get it and swatted down the racial views of baseball executive Al Campanis, who lost his job over the interview.

He also has reported from around the world—a foray to South Africa in the 1980s made news worldwide—and, more recently, covered the 2003 Iraq war amid the tanks in the desert. Just last week, "Nightline" did a show on Zimbabwe ruler Robert Mugabe's devastating impact on his country—not the sort of thing other programs are clamoring to cover.

Television executives, Koppel says, "live under the misapprehension that Americans don't care about foreign news. They don't care about boring news. If you present it in a boring fashion, then they don't care about foreign news. What really dictates here is the cost of foreign news. At a time that we really have to worry about what's going on in the rest of the world, what people in other countries think of us, we are less well informed by television news than we have been in many years."

"If the only time you cover foreign news is when you send someone, every foreign story is going to cost you a lot of money when you do it and likely to be less well informed than in the days when you had people who lived in the country for two, three, five, 10 years and understand the culture."

In a been-there-done-that media culture, Koppel relished the idea of returning to his signature issues again and again: the Middle East, South Africa, AIDS, racism, crime and punishment. Asked whether evening newscasts do the same thing, he says: "There's a huge difference between coming back to a story and devoting 2½ minutes to it, and the next time 1:45, and what we have done when we focused on an issue for two, three or four programs." Taking the show to such places as Congo—which Koppel says has "an invisible war which barely exists even in newspapers"—boosted the ratings and burnished the program's reputation. "But it's a very expensive thing to do and it's also thoroughly exhausting."

Koppel relishes the contrarian role. In 1996 he created a major stir by packing up and leaving the Republican National Convention in San Diego, saying no news was being committed there. "In the intervening years," he says, "guess what? Everyone's come to the conclusion that conventions really aren't worth covering, except on cable."

Last week Koppel committed news himself when he appeared to endorse Charlie Gibson, the "Good Morning America" co-host who has been doing part-time duty on the evening news, as ABC's next anchor. Koppel says he was just responding to a specific question about Gibson from a TV Guide reporter.

"I do think Charlie Gibson would make an absolutely splendid anchor," he says. But noting the rise of "GMA" under Gibson and Diane Sawyer, he says, "Those morning shows are moneymaking machines. Changing such a successful equation could cost you tens of millions of dollars."

Koppel and Bettag say they will not make a deal with another media outlet until their departure—although they have had talks with HBO—but say there is a vacuum in long-form reporting that they intend to fill. Still, they are leaving a very big stage.

"You can't help but have mixed feelings," Bettag says. "Trying to wean yourself away from the daily news adrenaline is no small thing. But this is something we've planned for a very long time. Ted is very much at peace with this."

Koppel plans to take a few months off, but "I'm not going to slide into semi-retire-

ment," he says. "Nothing lights my fire more than a big story out there and going out to cover it."

TRIBUTE TO ALAN A. REICH

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 9, 2005

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I announce to my colleagues in the House the sad news of the passing of one of our Nation's great leaders for rights of the disabled, my friend Alan A. Reich. I offer our heartfelt condolences to his family.

Mr. Speaker, my wife Annette and I consider ourselves blessed to count Alan among our good friends. He inspired both of us with his deep compassion, his energy and humor, as well as his determination to overcome obstacles no matter how insurmountable they appear. Alan was a true American visionary, a person who never let circumstance define or defy him. This perspective enabled him to implement a new understanding of disability rights and human rights, which included both and united them.

Mr. Speaker, only a few months ago, I informed my colleagues that Alan had retired as President of the National Organization on Disability (N.O.D.), which he founded. For the past 23 years, he provided extraordinary leadership as the head of N.O.D., one of the leading non-governmental organizations promoting disability rights in the United States and around the world. Alan Reich was an outstanding human rights and disability rights leader, whose courageous work has had an impact on people with disabilities around the world.

In recognition of his leadership, President George H.W. Bush awarded Alan the George Bush Medal, an award that recognizes leaders in the fight to fulfill the promise of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Alan certainly epitomized the ambitious goals of the ADA, and I cannot imagine a more fitting recipient of this award. In commenting on Alan's extraordinary leadership, former President Bush said: "As the Honorary Chairman of N.O.D. and its World Committee, I've observed first-hand Alan's tenacious commitment to providing hope and opportunity for millions of people with disabilities, not only in this country but also worldwide."

Mr. Speaker, Alan Reich joined the disability community over 40 years ago as a result of a swimming accident, and he has used a wheelchair since that time, but he refused to permit his disability to constrain his boundless energy and commitment to worthy causes. Alan has been at the center of progress on disability issues, including public awareness, disability programs and promoting important legislation, and he has made groundbreaking contributions toward uniting and engaging the community of people with disabilities. His outstanding abilities to move disability rights issues forward first became apparent as the founder of the U.S. Council for the International Year of Disabled Persons in 1981. He was the first wheelchair user to address the United Nations General Assembly when he called on the international organization to declare 1981 the U.N. International Year of Disabled Persons.

While President of N.O.D., Alan built the coalition of disability groups that successfully fought for the inclusion of a statue of former United States President Franklin Delano Roosevelt in his wheelchair at the FDR Memorial in Washington, DC. He also spearheaded the critical survey research with Harris Poll Surveys that tracks the progress of Americans with disabilities in key areas of life.

In addition, Alan is the founder and Chairman of the World Committee on Disability, the international arm of N.O.D., which further underscores the worldwide reach of his contributions. He is a founder of the World Committee's Franklin D. Roosevelt International Disability Award, which recognizes nations for progress toward the United Nations' goals for disabled persons. I should add, Mr. Speaker, that my wife Annette and I are honored to be members of the World Committee on Disability.

A graduate of Dartmouth College, Alan has also had a distinguished career in both private business and government. Alan served as Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs. In this position, he developed international exchange programs to further mutual understanding. He also served as Deputy Assistant Secretary of Commerce for East-West Trade and Director of the Bureau of East-West Trade, where he was credited with the expansion of U.S. commercial relations with the People's Republic of China, the Soviet Union and the countries of Eastern Europe. Prior to his outstanding career as a public servant, Alan was an executive in manufacturing management and corporate long-range planning with Polaroid Corporation.

Mr. Speaker, in many ways, Alan has changed the world's attitude and approach to disability issues and made groundbreaking contributions to uniting the disability movement. Our entire Nation is profoundly saddened at the loss of this outstanding leader. We join in expressing our deep condolences to Alan's family, and express our sincere gratitude for his outstanding achievements.

ABUSE OF PRESIDENTIAL POWER:
THE WAR ON TORTURE

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 9, 2005

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to raise my voice against the use of torture by the United States of America against any human being for any reason. I believe torture in any form, including cruel and inhuman and degrading interrogation of human beings in the custody of the United States of America violates everything we stand for as Americans.

The Senate recently passed the McCain amendment to a military appropriation bill by a vote of 90 to 9. The McCain amendment is very telling in terms of whether the United States has been battling terrorism or fighting the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan in lawful ways. The McCain amendment bans "cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment of persons under the custody or control of the United States Government." This amendment has passed the Senate twice; the first vote was 90 to 9. The second time it

passed was after the disclosure of the secret CIA prisons. Senator McCain made a strong anti-torture speech. He said the CIA should not be running prisons. The second time the McCain amendment passed the Senate it did so by a voice vote.

I support the McCain amendment and will vote for it when it reaches the House of Representatives for a vote.

I find it unbelievable that the President in a speech today, November 8, 2005, in Panama City, Panama stated: "We do not torture." The evidence of torture in Abu Ghraib and the prison at Guantanamo Bay in Cuba has been documented by the International Committee of the Red Cross, Amnesty International, eyewitness testimony of American Military officers and photographs and tapes, some of which the Department of Defense is still attempting to keep from the public.

This should not be shocking to me, but still it shocks. The statements of President Bush are a natural outgrowth of the unnatural power he was given by his lawyers and Justice department lawyers because of their willingness to overlook or disregard the United States Constitution on the grounds that this war and this enemy was "special." Congress was lied to, about the reasons for the war; but Congress gave away its Constitutional Power under Article 1, Section 8 when it authorized the President to declare war, a power reserved solely to the Congress by the Constitution.

Less well known and just as ignored is that Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution, gives Congress and only Congress the decision of how to treat prisoners.

Just as the President declared a preemptive war on a country not involved in the attacks of 9/11, this President and Vice President decided how prisoners, even those "suspected" of being terrorists, were to be treated. This President has abused his power, ignored the Constitution and misled the American people.

The policies on treatment of prisoners which have included torture and interrogation techniques that are "cruel, inhuman, and degrading" were born with the Bush Administration. President Bush asked his Justice Department, then run by John Ashcroft and a man of ideas named John Woo; his trusted Counsel, Alberto Gonzales who gave him the answers he liked when President Bush was Governor of Texas. President Bush asked these lawyers for guidance on whether the United States had to afford protections of the Geneva Accords to Taliban and al Qaeda prisoners. He also asked his civilian advisor in the Pentagon, Secretary Donald Rumsfeld, how far American military and intelligence personnel could go in questioning these prisoners. The answer from these civilians, people who had never served in the military, was the prisoners did not need to be afforded any of the protections of the Geneva Conventions. John Woo, who worked directly for John Ashcroft took the position that the President could do anything he wanted. This was a very popular position and the one Alberto Gonzales passed on to the President.

Within the Bush administration, the advisor who knew the most about the Military, Colin Powell was against these policies. President Bush decided the military advice was not what he wanted to hear or follow. The professional military people who disagreed with the "war president" found themselves silenced or "retired."

On November 7, 2005, the Washington Post reported "Over the past year, Vice President Cheney has waged an intense and largely unpublicized campaign to stop Congress, the Pentagon and the State Department from imposing more restrictive rules on handling terrorist suspects." Before the news of Vice President's secret CIA prison system was disclosed by the Washington Post, Mr. CHENEY had offered a "deal" to Senator MCCAIN. He would stop opposing the McCain amendment the amendment did not include the CIA from torturing non-Americans. Senator MCCAIN turned the Vice President down. In light of what we now know about America's secret CIA prisons and Vice President CHENEY's insistence that the CIA should be exempt from any ban on torture, I am very concerned about what has happened and is still happening to prisoners in the custody of the CIA.

I doubt whether anyone who has experienced war would have to be convinced to support an anti-war amendment proposed by my noble friend JOHN MCCAIN, a veteran subjected to torture for more than five years in a North Vietnamese prison. So I take issue with Vice President CHENEY, a man who received five deferments during the Vietnam War, who has lobbied fiercely and shamelessly against the McCain amendment.

I take issue with President Bush that because we have an enemy he thinks "lurks and plots and plans and want to hurt America again," we can disregard the concerns of the human rights organizations, the European Union and the millions of Muslims who view Americans through the lens of Abu Ghraib, Guantanamo Bay and the Hooded Man attached to electric wires.

The practices approved by the President, the Vice President, Porter Goss and whom ever knew in the Senate and the House; anyone complicit in the torture of prisoners in the custody of the United States has shamed us all. Richard Cohen got it right when he said in an opinion piece in the Washington Post today entitled "Torture, Shaming Us All." We in the United States not only have our torture and humiliating interrogation practices on the internet, but we have had to reassert 200 years of U.S. principles. The real shame is that the President of the United States has threatened to use his veto for the first time if the McCain amendment comes to his desk as part of a bill.

There are compelling reasons to support the McCain amendment. The first is that torture results in bad intelligence; second it endangers our troops; and third; it is causing us to lose the war of ideas. According to President Bush and his supporters in Congress, this war in Iraq is about bringing democracy and freedom to Iraq. Muslims around the world see handcuffed naked men at Abu Ghraib and the orange jump suit hooded men of Guantanamo Bay, Cuba when they see the United States. This abuse of Muslims is what they see of "democracy" American style.

The people throughout the world know that prisoners in the custody of the United States have been tortured even if President Bush denies it. As Richard Cohen points out, many countries torture prisoners but none admit to the practice. The United States has never had to consider a ban on torture before because this country has never tortured prisoners as a matter of policy. The Uniform Code of Military Justice is clear about how prisoners in the