

demonstrated that he also has a unique and profound vision of the leadership needed for a new century of global peace, progress, and prosperity. I am submitting for the RECORD a portion of a speech made by Dr. Sekimoto calling for a world leadership summit:

CALLING WORLD LEADERS TO ACTION TO ADDRESS THE NEW ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE GLOBAL CORPORATION IN THE NEW CENTURY

As we approach the start of a new millennium, it is—I believe—time for those of us in positions of global stewardship to help illuminate the way to a new century of peace, progress, and prosperity for all.

GREAT CHANCE

During the half century that I have been in the information technology industry, I have been privileged to be an eye-witness to its creation of astounding change, perhaps the most dramatic of which has been the world's rapid advance toward a global society characterized by the accelerated movement of labor, goods, technology and capital across frontiers.

Some call this new episode the "Information Age". It is dramatically transforming—largely for the better—most aspects of daily life in most parts of the world. But perhaps even more important, it is leading to a new society that will be based on an ability to understand and respond to the need and wishes of individuals everywhere in the world.

ALSO GREAT CHALLENGES

With the expansion of this new global information economy and society will come radically new roles for our world institutions, including companies like mine. But what are these new roles going to be? How will they transform our multinational giants, the successful management of which challenges us greatly even today? What will this enterprise be like in the future? What should it be like?

By no means do I believe that I have a crystal-clear vision of the future. But I have begun trying to understand it and its urgent demands. And in my mind, the most compelling new responsibility of the 21st century global corporation is balancing economic growth—necessary in order to extend peace and prosperity throughout the world—with the protection of planet Earth's very fragile ecosystem.

More effective management of competition's chaotic expansion is the second most serious new responsibility that globalization is requiring us to assume. And I believe that cooperation at all levels—including those of global, regional, national, local and corporate—is the essential element here. World institutions will simply have to invent and engage in novel forms of collaboration at the same time they compete. In the business world we refer to this more contemporary and useful way of operating as the "complementarian" model where sometimes we compete, sometimes we cooperate, and more often we do both.

The third most serious challenge at the start of the next millennium is, in my view, figuring out how world institutions—including corporations—can most effectively manage their new roles and work together for the betterment of the global village. The perceptive business executive knows what his organization's "global citizenship" responsibilities are today. But who will they be in the decade ahead as globalization broadens and informs more and more aspects of our lives?

One answer is that the 21st century global corporation can no longer be parochial; its mission of service must encompass its entire

community because to paraphrase Adam Smith, it too—just like other world institutions—exists to serve and strengthen it societies.

So the multinational's notion of corporate stewardship will have to change—as it already has in some more enlightened U.S. companies. Increasingly, all of us business leaders are going to have to expand our philanthropy considerably beyond where we are accustomed to giving. If, for instance, our contributions have been exclusively economic, we might need to move into social, technical, and cultural spheres as well.

We may also have to shift the emphases of our corporate good-citizenship efforts in terms of both geography and services provided. Instead of staying inside our comfortable local communities and simply continuing our work to support disabled people, the arts, sports, and the like, we might have to look at transferring some of our attention to the globe's poorest nations and help them build farms and highways as well. The World Bank, with its recently-begun metamorphosis, may be showing us the way.

NEW MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES ARE ESSENTIAL

Despite these and other seriously demanding challenges—to which I have given decades of thought—I believe strongly in mankind's ability to successfully manage globalization and the resultant Information Age for the benefit of humanity, both our generation and the generations that follow us. Some multinational corporations have already started creating and employing different, more suitable management strategies for the future, and I am gratified to report that mine is one of them.

The highly complex nature of our business as a leading international IT supplier and multi-media pioneer has required us to learn how to operate much more efficiently and effectively. For instance, in recent decades we have successfully situated many corporate functions, including R&D and manufacturing, in what we consider the optimum location in the world. In like manner, we have bought and sold in the world's most suitable markets—wherever they are. And this concept, to which we refer simply as "mesh globalization", has given us a strong competitive edge.

In the process of deploying mesh globalization throughout our company—and puzzling over what the 21st century might require of us in terms of new management strategies—we were struck by the growing need to recognize both the needs of the group, or the whole, and the more personalized focus of the new era. But how to join the two seemingly divergent positions in compatible fashion. From the Greek words *holos*, meaning "whole", and *on*, signifying "individual", I coined the term "holonic" to indicate the need to harmonize the two.

So today we are successfully employing "holonic" management to assure the prosperity of the corporation as a whole while simultaneously respecting and honoring the sovereignty of the individual—whether that individual is a company subsidiary, a company employee, or a member of one of the hundreds of communities around the globe in which we operate. And this more sympathetic complementary strategy has become another competitive advantage for us.

Experience has taught us that one of the keys to employing it profitably is the sharing of information. Another is establishing and nurturing a culture—of the team or the subsidiary of the corporation—so that members have a meaningful concept around which to rally and with pride produce something they consider significant.

In fact these two notions—the sharing of information and the development of mutu-

ally-engaging culture—have become so important, at least from our observation, that we have added them to the three resources we have historically identified and valued: People, property, and money.

MY CALL TO ACTION—A NEW DIALOGUE FOR THE NEW CENTURY

Now you know something of my thought about the expansion of globalization and my efforts to position my company and my country advantageously for it. This leads me to share with you my great interest in building on the wisdom of world leaders from essential disciplines by bringing us together to identify vastly more creative ways to help all people achieve their desired goals in the new century.

It used to be that the complementary and productive partnerships between and among business and financial leaders, elected politicians, and government officials—Japan's "Iron Triangle"—was sufficient to assure prosperity and peace. The now seriously-outdated nature of this limited collaboration has inspired us to consider an expansion—actually a doubling of the size of the groups to include distinguished heads of labor, academia, and the media as well.

I refer to this new alliance as the "neo-hexagon". And I am issuing invitations to neo-hexagon leaders throughout the world, in developing as well as developed countries, to join me in a dialogue—a global conference—focused on identifying best management practices for the 21st century and preparing our organizations and our societies for the better tomorrow that our grandchildren and their great grandchildren deserve. I look forward to welcoming you there.

HONORING THE IWO JIMA MEMORIAL, THE MARINE CORPS AND THE AIR FORCE

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 5, 1997

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, as all of you in the House know, I am proud of my years in the Marine Corps and of what that distinguished branch of the military has done throughout our history and what it has meant to me personally. At the same time, I would hope it is also recognized that I have always been a fierce supporter of each and every branch of the military and of our courageous veterans who put their lives in harms way for this great nation and all it stands for. In fact, those of us who have worn the uniform are becoming fewer and farther between in this Congress and it is imperative that we all bind together and continue to bolster our national defense and look out for our brothers and sisters who have served. That is so important.

And you know, Mr. Speaker, I have always been able to count on the camaraderie and loyalty among members of the military, regardless of whether they're Marines, Air Force, Army or Navy. That's because there is a mutual respect and honor for one another. And it's time for each of us to recognize that honor and solemn respect once again. This time it is in relation to the placement of a memorial and museum honoring the deserving members of the U.S. Air Force. I am an enthusiastic supporter of that memorial, having voted to allow its creation and having pledged my support to help raise funds to build it. The problem is, Mr.

Speaker, the Air Force Memorial Foundation, in large part because of flawed and fraudulent information and procedures related to placing this monument, has insisted on building this facility on the hand-picked hollowed ground that has been home to the Iwo Jima Monument for nearly fifty years. That monument has come to represent so much to so many people around this country and the world and in many ways, is one of the most famous monuments in our history. I would hope that those who have served in uniform and are in a position to impact the placement of the proposed Air Force Memorial would stand down and leave this site with honor and grace in respect to the Marine Corps, Marines, their loved ones, and all Americans who recognize the sanctity of this solemn memorial. I appeal to them to take heed of former Secretary of the Navy, James Webb, Jr.'s, advice and commend to everyone the following column that was printed in the Washington Post today. The eloquence and heartfelt manner in which Mr. Webb expressed himself is indeed powerful and sincere and constitutes the most compelling argument as to why this hallowed ground should be preserved as is that I have come across to date. His account is all you need read to understand the deep significance of this renowned monument to so many.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 5, 1997]

JAMES H. WEBB JR.—WRONG PLACE FOR THE AIR FORCE MEMORIAL

Earlier this year I had the sad honor of burying my father, Col. James H. Webb, Sr., U.S. Air Force (retired). His grave sits on a gentle hill in Section 51 of the Arlington National Cemetery, just next to the small park on which stands the nation's most famous military landmark, the Marine Corps War Memorial.

Between his grave and the sculpture of the Marines raising the flag at Mount Suribachi on Iwo Jima, the Air Force Memorial Foundation proposes to build a large and intrusive memorial of its own. It is deeply unfortunate that the location of this proposed memorial promises nothing but unending controversy. And I have no compunction in saying that the foundation's methods in lobbying for this site would have puzzled and offended my Air Force father, just as it does both of his Marine Corps-veteran sons.

Until late this summer, few among the general public even knew that this site, which is within 500 feet of the Iwo Jima statue, had been approved by the National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC). The Air Force's first choice had been a place near the Air and Space Museum, a logical spot that would provide the same dignity, synergy and visitor population that benefit the Navy Memorial's downtown Washington location. Later, deciding on Arlington Ridge, the Air Force during hearings erroneously maintained that the Marine Corps posed no objection to the erection of a memorial so near to its own. The Marine Corps had yet to take an official position, and no Marine Corps witnesses were called to discuss the potential impact.

Once the NCPC decision became publicly known, it was met with a wide array of protest, including that of citizen groups and a formal objection from the Marine Corps. Despite a lawsuit and several bills having been introduced in Congress to protect the site, the Air Force is persisting.

This is not simply a Marine Corps issue or a mere interservice argument. Nor is it a question of whether the Air Force should have a memorial. Rather, it is a matter of the proper use of public land, just as impor-

tant to our heritage as are environmental concerns. We have witnessed an explosion of monuments and memorials in our nation's capital over the past two decades. New additions should receive careful scrutiny. Their placement, propriety and artistic impact concern all Americans, particularly those who care about public art, through which continuing generations will gain an understanding of the nation's journey.

The mood around the heavily visited "Iwo" is by design contemplative, deliberately serene. The site was selected personally just after World War II by Marine Commandant Gen. Lemuel C. Shepherd Jr., who was concerned that the statute required "a large open area around it for proper display." Dozens of full-dress official ceremonies take place each year at the base of the hallowed sculpture. Even casual ballplaying is forbidden on the parkland near it. It is, for many Americans, truly sacred ground.

To put it simply, the proposed Air Force memorial would pollute Arlington Ridge, forever changing its context.

The main argument in favor of this location—that it is within a mile of Fort Myer, where the first-ever military flight occurred in 1908—is weak, as all the services have extensive aviation capabilities that might be traced to that flight. The Air Force also argues that since the "above-ground" aspect of its memorial would be 28 feet lower than the top of the flagpole on the Iwo Jima statue, it will not interfere with the grandeur of the Marine Corps memorial. What Air Force officials take pains to avoid discussing is that if one discounts the flagpole, their memorial would actually be higher, wider and far deeper. Some 20,000 square feet of below-the-ground museums and interactive displays are planned, enough floor space for 10 average-sized homes.

The Air Force plan for an extensive three-story museum and virtual-reality complex at its proposed memorial is a clear departure in context from this quiet place. During the period leading up to America's bicentennial commemoration, the Marine Corps itself considered constructing a visitor center and museum on the land adjacent to the Iwo Jima memorial. It abandoned this plan because such facilities would be inconsistent with the purpose and the impact of the monument itself. It is not without irony that the land the Marine Corps deliberately left open is now being pursued by the Air Force for the very purpose that was earlier rejected.

Existing federal law precludes this sort of intrusion. Title 40 of the U.S. Code states in section 1907 that "a commemorative work shall be so located as to prevent interference with, or encroachment upon, any existing commemorative work and to protect, to the maximum extent possible, open space and existing public use." There can be no clearer example of the intentions of such law than the case of the Marine Corps War Memorial.

The puzzling question is why the Air Force leadership argues so vociferously that its memorial will not negatively affect the Iwo Jima memorial.

I grew up in the presence of some of the finest leaders our Air Force has ever produced, leaders who would never have considered dissembling before a political body about whether the Marine Corps concurred in a proposal that might diminish the impact of its most cherished memorial—leaders who in this situation would have shown the public, and particularly the Marine Corps, great deference, knowing that its open support was vital. Indeed, leaders who remembered that the very mission in the battle of Iwo Jima, carried out at a cost of 1,000 dead Marines for every square mile of territory taken, was to eliminate enemy fighter attacks on Air

Force bombers passing overhead and to provide emergency runways for Air Force pilots who had flown in harm's way.

It is now up to Congress to enforce the law and assist the Air Force in finding a memorial site that will honor its own without taking away from the dignity of others.

APALACHICOLA-CHATTAHOOCHEE-FLINT RIVER BASIN COMPACT

SPEECH OF

HON. GEORGE W. GEKAS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1997

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to unanimous consent granted on November 4, 1997 during debate on House Joint Resolution 91, I introduce the report on that joint resolution from the Congressional Budget Office which was not available at the time of the filing of the committee report:

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, November 4, 1997.

Hon. HENRY J. HYDE,
*Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for H.J. Res. 91, a joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the Apalachicola-Chattahoochee-Flint River Basin Compact.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Gary Brown, who can be reached at 226-2860.

Sincerely,

JUNE E. O'NEILL.

Enclosure

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE SUMMARY

H.J. Res. 91 would grant congressional consent to the Apalachicola-Chattahoochee-Flint River Basin (ACF Basin) Compact. The compact would establish the ACF Basin Commission, which would determine an allocation formula for apportioning the surface waters of the ACF basin among the states of Alabama, Florida, and Georgia. The commission would consist of state and federal representatives.

Provisions in the compact that could have an impact on the federal budget include: an authorization of appropriations for a federal commissioner to attend meetings of the commission and for employment of personnel by the commissioner, an authorization for federal agencies to conduct studies and monitoring programs in cooperation with the commission, and a requirement that the federal government comply with the water allocation formula once it has been adopted by the commission (to the extent that doing so would not conflict with other federal laws).

CBO estimates that enacting H.J. Res. 91 would result in new discretionary spending of less than \$500,000 in fiscal year 1998, and about \$12 million over the 1982-2002 period, assuming appropriations consistent with its provisions. The compact also would increase direct spending; hence, pay-as-you-go procedures would apply to the legislation. But CBO estimates that enacting H.J. Res. 91 would increase direct spending by less than \$500,000 a year, beginning in fiscal year 1999.

The resolution does not contain any intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as