

served by the millions in uniform and who put up trillions—trillions—of dollars to fight the cold war; by the citizens of NATO and other allied nations who made similar sacrifices of blood and treasure; by many of their fellow countrymen who over many years kept small fires of freedom burning in their hearts for the day when the wall would come down; and, at critical moments, by great leaders.

Joseph Shattan, a former White House speech writer and, now, a Bradley Fellow at the Heritage Foundation, has chronicled this leadership in his book "Architects of Victory: Six Heroes of Cold War," published by Heritage, and excerpted recently in essay form in the Washington Times. He describes how six remarkable individuals—Winston Churchill, Harry Truman, Knorad Adenauer, Alexander Solzhenitsyn, Pope John Paul II, and Ronald Reagan—seized their own moment in the cause of freedom.

Mr. President, as Americans, we should on this day take special note of the two American Presidents—one Democrat, one Republican, who played such vital roles in bringing about the fall of the Berlin Wall ten years ago. Here is Shattan on Harry Truman:

Underlying Truman's policies was the conviction that Soviet totalitarianism was no different than Nazi totalitarianism. In his view, both the Nazis and the communists violated human rights at home and sought to expand their empires abroad. To secure a world where democratic values might flourish, Truman believed the United States had to contain Soviet expansionism—through economic and military aid if possible, through force of arms if necessary. Over the long run, a successful policy of containment would cause Soviet leaders to lose their faith in the inevitability of a global communist triumph. Only then could negotiations with Moscow contribute to a safer, more peaceful world.

Because the Truman administration's policy of containment set the course for U.S. foreign policy over the next 35 years, it seems in retrospect to have been a natural, even inevitable, response to Soviet aggressiveness. But it was nothing of the sort. Truman's predecessor, Franklin Roosevelt, had taken a markedly different approach toward Moscow—one aimed at cementing an enduring U.S.-Soviet friendship—and when Truman became president, he was determined to follow in FDR's footsteps, even if it meant ignoring his own instincts. But Truman gradually worked his way out from under FDR's long shadow and placed his own indelible stamp on U.S. foreign policy.

Truman's decisive break with FDR's foreign policy came in a historic speech delivered before a joint session of Congress on March 12, 1947. "I believe it must be the policy of the United States," he declared, "to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures." Alonzo Hamby, one of Truman's biographers, rightly called this speech "the decisive step in what would soon be called the Cold War."

Harry Truman's steadfast commitment to "free peoples" assured that the Iron Curtain would encroach no further on freedom. But it took another President to push the Wall over. Here again is Shattan on Ronald Reagan:

But while liberals frequently disparaged Mr. Reagan's intellect, the fact was that he

subscribed wholeheartedly to one major truth that many of his intellectually sophisticated critics either never knew or had forgotten: Societies that encourage freedom and creativity tend to flourish, while societies that suppress liberty tend to stagnate. This was the central truth around which Ronald Reagan fashioned his political career. This was the crucial insight that he articulated with passion and eloquence and pursued with iron resolve. And this was the basis of his Soviet strategy.

Underlying Mr. Reagan's approach to the Soviet Union was his profound (his critics would say "childlike" or "simplistic") faith in freedom. Mr. Reagan simply knew that there was no way a closed society like the Soviet Union could prevail against an open society like the United States once the open society made up its mind to win. And Mr. Reagan, years before he became president, decided that the United States would win the Cold War . . . The military buildup, the support of anti-communist movements worldwide (better known as the "Reagan Doctrine"), the Strategic Defense Initiative, the covert assistance to the Polish trade union Solidarity, the economic sanctions against Moscow—all were meant to force an already shaky Soviet system to embark on a course of radical reform. These reforms (perestroika, glasnost) soon acquired a momentum of their own, and eventually brought down the Soviet Union.

Mr. Reagan's approach to foreign policy was unprecedented. The traditional U.S. strategy was to seek to contain Soviet power and hope that, at some unspecified point in the future, containment would convince the communist ruling class to abandon its expansionist course. By contrast, Mr. Reagan sought not merely to contain the Soviets but to overwhelm them with demonstrations of U.S. power and resolve that left them with no alternative but to accept the choice he offered them: Change or face defeat.

His success proved that great leadership does not depend on intellectual or historical sophistication. What is needed, above all, is the right set of convictions and the courage to stand by them. Mr. Reagan's beliefs about freedom and tyranny were uniquely rooted in the American experience, and his courage reflected the quiet self-confidence of the American heartland. His was truly a U.S. presidency that changed the world.

Much has changed in 10 years. Yes, we still have walls to tear down—on the Demilitarized Zone in Korea, around the island of Cuba, and everywhere that people around the globe still struggle for peace and freedom. But the Cold War is over. Freedom won. As we watch the many celebrations underway today—in Berlin, all over Europe, and elsewhere in the world—let us honor Cold War heroes, and rededicate ourselves to the cause of freedom they championed. And, my colleagues, as we conduct the people's business, let us seek to renew an abiding reverence for the freedom that brings us here.

#### THE INTERSTATE TRANSPORTATION OF DANGEROUS CRIMINALS ACT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the recent escape of convicted child murderer Kyle Bell from a private prison transport bus should serve as a wake-up call, to the Congress and to the country. Kyle Bell slipped off a TransCorp America bus on October 13, while the bus was stopped in New Mex-

ico for gas. Apparently, he picked the locks on his handcuffs and leg irons, pushed his way out of a rooftop vent, hid out of sight of the guards who traveled with the bus, and then slipped to the ground as it pulled away. He was wearing his own street clothes and shoes. The TransCorp guards did not notice that Bell was missing until nine hours later, and then delayed in notifying New Mexico authorities. Bell is still at large.

Kyle Bell's escape is not an isolated case. In recent years, there have been several escapes by violent criminals when vans broke down or guards fell asleep on duty. There have also been an alarming number of traffic accidents in which prisoners were seriously injured or killed because drivers were tired, inattentive, or poorly trained.

Privatization of prisons and prisoner transportation services may be cost efficient, but public safety must come first. The Interstate Transportation of Dangerous Criminals Act requires the Attorney General to set minimum standards for private prison transport companies, including standards on employee training and restrictions on the number of hours that employees can be on duty during a given time period. A violation is punishable by a \$10,000 fine, plus restitution for the cost of recapturing any violent prisoner who escapes as the result of such violation. This should create a healthy incentive for companies to abide by the regulations and operate responsibly.

I commend Senator DORGAN for his leadership on this legislation and urge its speedy passage.

#### NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE REPORT

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, a report on the National Missile Defense program has been completed and will be released shortly by a panel of experts which is chaired by retired Air Force General Larry Welch. The director of the Defense Department's Ballistic Missile Defense Organization requested this report which examines the National Missile Defense program and makes several recommendations for improvement.

Many will remember that General Welch and his panel issued a previous report last year which examined aspects of both the National Missile Defense program and several Theater Missile Defense programs.

Generally speaking, the newest Welch Report is a helpful critique of the National Missile Defense Program. Given the importance of this program, additional knowledge of its inherent risks will help BMDO to structure and run the best program possible.

In particular, I support the report's emphasis on giving the BMDO program manager, as well as the Lead Systems Integrator, increased authority in running this program.