# MANAGING CHANGE: THE PRIMERICA EXPERIENCE

**REMARKS** 

BY

WILLIAM S. WOODSIDE

CHAIRMAN OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

PRIMERICA CORPORATION

A CASE STUDY IN INTERACTIVE STRATEGIC RESTRUCTURING ASSOCIATION FOR CORPORATE GROWTH THE KING EDWARD HOTEL TORONTO FRIDAY, OCTOBER 23, 1987

THANK YOU,
JIM, IT'S ALWAYS A PLEASURE TO SPEAK

ABOUT ONE OF MY FAVORITE TOPICS -- THE SUCCESSFUL

RESTRUCTURING OF AMERICAN CAN COMPANY, NOW

PRIMERICA. IT'S ALSO A PLEASURE TO BE HERE WITH

JERRY SCHWARTZ AND BRENT HALSEY. THEIR

RESTRUCTURING EXPERIENCES AND MINE ARE SOMEWHAT

INTERTWINED, AS I WILL EXPLAIN SHORTLY.

FIRST, THE AMERICAN CAN STORY .....

UNTIL THE LATE 70S, THE COMPANY KNOWN AS AMERICAN CAN WAS A TRADITIONAL "SMOKESTACK" BUSINESS. LIKE STEEL, RUBBER, AUTOMOBILES AND GLASS, IT WAS ONE OF THE INDUSTRIES THAT HELPED FUEL AMERICA'S ECONOMIC GROWTH FOR SOME 60 YEARS.

FORTUNE LISTED US AS ONE OF THE FIVE MAJOR

CORPORATIONS THAT HAD MADE 20TH CENTURY AMERICA

POSSIBLE. THE REASON -- THE ECONOMICAL, AND

READILY AVAILABLE SUPPLIES OF PRESERVED FOOD

ALLOWED THE EXPANSION AND URBANIZATION OF THIS

NATION.

WERE A SOLID, ALMOST SINGLE-PRODUCT MANUFACTURING COMPANY. WE WERE OLD LINE AND CASH RICH.
ALONG WITH ONE OTHER COMPANY, WE DOMINATED A STABLE
MARKET THAT WAS CHANGING SLOWLY ON THE SURFACE BUT
RAPIDLY UNDERNEATH.

WITHIN A DECADE, THOUGH, ALL THAT APPARENT STABILITY AND COMFORT WAS TO DISAPPEAR.

WITH THE SALE OF

AMERICAN CAN PACKAGING TO TRIANGLE INDUSTRIES IN NOVEMBER OF LAST YEAR. AMERICAN CAN BECAME A COMPANY WITH TWO PRINCIPAL BUSINESSES --FINANCIAL SERVICES AND SPECIALTY RETAILING --BUSINESSES THAT BEAR NO RELATIONSHIP OR LINK TO OUR PAST. AS A RESULT OF THAT SALE, EVEN THE FORMER NAME WENT TO TRIANGLE. IN APRIL OF THIS YEAR, WE CAPPED FIVE YEARS OF RESTRUCTURING WHEN WE CHANGED OUR NAME TO PRIMERICA CORPORATION. IN JUNE, AS PART OF OUR COMMITMENT TO ACQUIRE HIGHPERFORMING COMPANIES, WE BOUGHT SMITH BARNEY, ONE OF THE MOST RESPECTED OF INVESTMENT BANKS. AND IN JULY, WE ANNOUNCED OUR INTENTION TO DIVEST FINGERHUT -- A VERY FINE COMPANY IN THE DIRECT MAIL INDUSTRY -- IN ORDER TO MAINTAIN A STRONG BALANCE SHEET, WHICH WILL GIVE US ADDITIONAL FLEXIBILITY AS WE CONTINUE TO PURSUE OUR AGGRESSIVE GROWTH PLANS

OUR FUNDAMENTAL

RESTRUCTURING IS NOW ABOUT COMPLETE.

BY TODAY'S STANDARDS, THIS MUCH CHANGE MAY NOT BE UNIQUE, BUT IT IS STILL NOTEWORTHY IN A WORLD WHERE THERE IS SO MUCH FERMENT IN OUR ECONOMIC LIFE THAT IT SOMETIMES SEEMS THAT CHANGE IS THE ONLY CONSTANT.

ALTHOUGH THE

RESTRUCTURING HAS LARGELY BEEN A

QUESTION OF STRAIGHTFORWARD DIVESTITURES AND

ACQUISITIONS IT WAS, HOWEVER, COMPLEX IN THE

SENSE THAT WE RE-EXAMINED ALL OF OUR BUSINESSES IN

THEIR ENTIRITY. THAT INITIATIVE SPARED US THE FATE

OF SOME COMPANIES WHICH FACED RESTRUCTURING AT THE

HANDS OF A THIRD PARTY.

FORTUNATELY, THE COMPANY WAS ABLE TO MOVE RATHER SMOOTHLY FROM FIXED CAPITAL-INTENSIVE BUSINESSES TO A NEW FLEXIBLE, DIVERSIFIED SERVICE FIRM, POISED FOR RAPID GROWTH.

AND ALL THAT IN THE LAST FIVE YEARS.

IMPORTANTLY, AS A RESULT OF RESTRUCTURING,
PRIMERICA HAS RECORDED DRAMATIC RESULTS. IN TERMS
OF OVERALL FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE, 1986 MARKED THE
FOURTH CONSECUTIVE YEAR OF SUBSTANTIAL INCREASES IN
OPERATING EARNINGS. BUSINESS OPERATING INCOME HAS
RISEN ALMOST SEVENFOLD SINCE 1982.

THIS MORNING, I WILL REVIEW THE BROAD **OUTLINES** OF THE RESTRUCTURING ACTIONS AND THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESSES THAT ACCOMPANIED THEM.

AND THEN SHARE MY THOUGHTS ON THE RESTRUCTURING PHENOMENA ITSELF.

WHAT WE LOOK
BACK ON AS A SMOOTH PROCESS, WAS IN

ACTUALITY, FULL OF TWISTS AND TURNS -- A JOURNEY
INTO UNFAMILIAR TERRITORY WITHOUT A ROADMAP. IN
FACT, WHEN WE EMBARKED UPON OUR OWN PROCESS OF
REORGANIZATION AND DIVERSIFICATION BACK IN 1981,
THERE WERE VERY FEW EXAMPLES OR GUIDELINES TO
FOLLOW.

WHEN ANY ORGANIZATION CHANGES AS MUCH AS WE HAVE,
THE OBVIOUS QUESTION IS: WAS THE TRIP REALLY
NECESSARY?

IN OUR CASE IT WAS.

TWO FACTORS
OVER WHICH WE HAD NO CONTROL MADE IT

CLEAR THAT OUR PAST WAS OVER AND OUR FUTURE LAY
ELSEWHERE.

FIRST WAS THE SLOW DECLINE OF MARKETS FOR

HEAT-PROCESSED FOOD, AS FROZEN AND MORE RECENTLY,

FRESH FOODS MADE ENORMOUS INROADS. DISGUISED BY

RAPID GROWTH IN THE BEER AND BEVERAGE CAN MARKETS,

THE INDUSTRY WAS CHARACTERIZED BY SALES GROWTH, BUT

RAZOR THIN MARGINS AND UNACCEPTABLE RETURNS ON

CAPITAL.

THE OTHER WAS

THE NEW SET OF UNUSUAL ECONOMIC

FACTORS THAT STARTED TO DOMINATE THE ECONOMY IN THE 1970S. THAT WAS, YOU RECALL, A TIME OF HIGH ENERGY PRICES, INCREASING INFLATION, SHARPLY RISING INTEREST RATES. IT WAS A TIME OF SLOW GROWTH IN THE GNP AND DECLINING PRODUCTIVITY IN THE ECONOMY

-- NOT GOOD OMENS FOR ANY BASIC MANUFACTURING COMPANY.

DESPITE ITS SIZE AND PRESTIGE, THE COMPANY'S FUTURE PROSPECTS NARROWED. COMPANIES LIKE AMERICAN CAN, WITH HIGH FIXED-CAPITAL REQUIREMENTS, WERE FACING DOUBLE-DIGIT INTEREST RATES AND VOLATILE INFLATION. BY 1980, IT BECAME CLEAR THAT THE COMPANY WAS NOT WELL POSITIONED FOR THE FUTURE.

SHAREHOLDERS WERE NOT BEING VERY WELL REWARDED
EITHER. IN THE EARLY 1980S, THE STOCK WAS SELLING
AT SEVEN TIMES EARNINGS AND ABOUT HALF ITS BOOK
VALUE.

THE HANDWRITING WAS ON THE WALL. AMERICAN CAN WAS COMPANY WITH TWO HEAVILY CAPITAL-INTENSIVE BUSINESSES, IN SLOW GROWTH INDUSTRIES WITH DECLINING MARGINS. TOGETHER, WE SIMPLY COULD NOT SURVIVE DOUBLE DIGIT INTEREST RATES AND SKY HIGH INFLATION.

THE BUSINESSES HARDLY COULD GENERATE ENOUGH CASH TO

REINVEST IN THEIR OWN OPERATIONS, LET ALONE SUPPLY
FUNDS FOR DIVERSIFICATION INTO OTHER BUSINESSES,
WHERE PROFITS WERE GROWING OR HAD TO CHANCE TO

GROW.

MAJOR INFUSIONS OF CAPITAL JUST TO STAY

COMPETITIVE, BUT ALL OUR CAPITAL WAS TIED UP IN

MACHINERY, EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTION. WE WERE 76TH

ON THE FORTUNE 500 LIST IN TERMS OF SALES, BUT

344TH IN TERMS OF AVERAGE TOTAL RETURN ON EQUITY.

THE RECESSION AND THE HIGH INTEREST RATES,

MEANWHILE, WERE CUTTING INTO NET INCOME BY 33

PERCENT.

THERE ARE MOMENTS IN THE HISTORY OF ANY ENTERPRISE

THAT ARE CRITICAL. MOMENTS THAT CAN TURN INTO CRISIS OR OPPORTUNITY. OUR COMPANY FACED SUCH A CRITICAL POINT IN THE EARLY 1980S. IT WAS CLEAR THAT NOTHING SHORT OF A RADICAL RESTRUCTURING WAS IN ORDER.

WE CHOICES. WE COULD HANG ON, PRESERVE

OUR MANUFACTURING JOBS AS LONG AS POSSIBLE AND

GRADUALLY STRANGLE TO DEATH. WE COULD ENCOURAGE

SOMEONE ELSE TO TAKE US OVER AND RESTRUCTURE THE

CORPORATION INTO A MORE PROFITABLE VENTURE. OR, WE

COULD REORGANIZE OUR ASSET BASE AND CONTINUE TO

DIVERSIFY THE COMPANY OURSELVES.

WE CHOSE THE LATTER. WE DECIDED TO SELL OFF OUR

LARGEST BLOCK OF SALABLE ASSETS IN ORDER TO

GENERATE THE CASH THAT WOULD ALLOW US TO REORGANIZE

AND DIVERSIFY.

PLANNING TO RESTRUCTURE IS ONE THING, THE ACTUAL

PROCESS ANOTHER. AT THAT POINT, WE FACED THREE DIFFERENT SETS OF ISSUES:

- 0 WHAT KINDS OF BUSINESSES SHOULD WE BUY INTO?
- 0 WHAT KIND OF DECISION-MAKING PROCESS SHOULD WE ESTABLISH WITHIN THE COMPANY IN ORDER TO MAKE THOSE CHOICES?
- O AND, IN A MANAGEMENT SENSE, WHAT KIND OF COMPANY DID WE WANT TO BECOME ONCE THIS PROCESS WAS COMPLETE?

BEFORE DECIDING

WHAT KINDS OF BUSINESSES TO BUY

INTO, YOU NEED TO HAVE A FAIRLY SOUND SENSE OF THE

DIRECTION IN WHICH YOU THINK THE ECONOMY IS

HEADING,

OUR STRATEGIC PLANNING TOLD US THAT REAL ECONOMIC GROWTH WOULD REMAIN SLOW AND UNPREDICTABLE, WITH HEAVY PRESSURES ON MANUFACTURING COMPANIES CONTINUING FOR THE FORESEEABLE FUTURE.

ON THE OTHER HAND, SOME MAJOR SHIFTS WERE VISIBLE

WITH RESPECT TO CONSUMER DEMOGRAPHICS AND INCOME. A MUCH SHARPER, MORE SOPHISTICATED PATTERN OF CONSUMER DEMAND WAS EMERGING. THE MORE WE LOOKED AT THIS PATTERN THE MORE APPARENT IT BECAME THAT DISTRIBUTION COMBINED WITH SERVICE INDUSTRIES WAS THE WAVE OF THE FUTURE.

#### **ONE OBVIOUSLY**

## COULD NOT IGNORE MANUFACTURING OR

MARKETING COMPLETELY, BUT IN STRATEGIC TERMS THE AGE OF LOW TECHNOLOGY MANUFACTURING HAD PASSED AND SO TOO HAD THE AGE OF MARKETING, OR SO IT SEEMED TO US. WE WERE ON THE THRESHOLD OF AN ENTIRELY NEW AGE, ONE IN WHICH COMPANIES WOULD RISE AND FALL IN DIRECT RELATIONSHIP TO THE SKILL WITH WHICH THEY WERE ABLE TO IDENTIFY AND DEVELOP SPECIALIZED SYSTEMS OF DISTRIBUTION THAT WERE CONSISTENT WITH THE CHANGING INCOME AND LIFESTYLES OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE.

THAT IS WHY
WHEN YOU LOOK AT OUR ACQUISITIONS OVER
THE PAST TEN YEARS YOU FIND NOT SIMPLY COMPANIES
WITH LIQUID ASSETS. YOU FIND COMPANIES WHOSE
PRIMARY FOCUS IS DEVELOPING HIGHLY TARGETED AND
SOPHISTICATED DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS FOR THEIR
PRODUCTS OR SERVICES. YOU FIND SPECIALTY RETAILING
COMPANIES, AND YOU FIND COMPANIES INVOLVED IN
FINANCIAL SERVICES AND INSURANCE.

THESE TWO BUSINESS SECTORS DID NOT JUST POP INTO OUR HEADS ONE DAY. THEY WERE THE CONCLUSION OF A VERY DELIBERATE AND VERY LENGTHY SEARCH FOR THE RIGHT KIND OF BUSINESSES. WE SPENT A YEAR BETWEEN THE SPRING OF 1980 AND THE SPRING OF 1981 ANALYZING 120 DIFFERENT TYPES OF SERVICE BUSINESSES.

BUSINESSES THAT FOR THE MOST PART WERE
WORKING-CAPITAL INTENSIVE, NOT FIXED-CAPITAL
INTENSIVE LIKE CANS AND PAPER. WE WANTED
BUSINESSES THAT WOULD GROW RAPIDLY AND STEADILY.

IN THE END, WE PICKED FINANCIAL SERVICES -SPECIFICALLY INSURANCE -- TO START WITH, BECAUSE IT
HAD A STEADY INCOME GROWTH, IT WAS NON-CYCLICAL,
AND IT HAD AN INVESTABLE ASSET POOL. ALSO,
INSURANCE COMPANIES WERE UNDERVALUED AT THE TIME,
MAKING THEM EXCELLENT INVESTMENTS. THE TRICK,
HOWEVER, WAS FINDING THE RIGHT COMPANY TO ACQUIRE
IN THE LATE 70S.

AND, WE HAD PICKED SPECIALTY RETAILING BECAUSE THE ECONOMY WAS MOVING TOWARD SPECIALIZED PRODUCT LINES, WHAT WE CALLED "NICHE" MARKETS AND DIRECT MAIL BECAUSE OF RAPIDLY GROWING PERCENTAGE OF WOMEN IN THE WORK FORCE.

TO KEEP THE IDEAS FLOWING AND MAKE SURE WE
CONSIDERED ALL THE ALTERNATIVES, WE ESTABLISHED A
STRATEGIC WORK GROUP OF HALF A DOZEN OFFICERS WHICH
ET EACH WEEK. THIS GROUP ALSO BROUGHT ALL OF TOP MANAGEMENT INTO THE PROCESS. THAT PROCESS
CERTAINLY HELPED ME MAKE UP MY MIND. BUT ITS
PRIMARY BENEFIT WAS THAT ALL OUR SENIOR MANAGERS
PARTICIPATED IN OUR DECISIONS. WE MAY NOT HAVE
MADE DECISIONS EVERYONE AGREED WITH. BUT WE MADE
DECISIONS EVERYONE WAS WILLING TO CARRY OUT BECAUSE
THEIR CASE HAD BEEN HEARD.

THAT PROCESS HELPED US ARRIVE AT OUR DECISION TO SELL OUR PAPER OPERATIONS AS A WHOLE BUSINESS INSTEAD OF PIECEMEAL. THE FACTORS WHICH IDENTIFIED THIS BUSINESS FOR SALE INCLUDED:

- 1) IT WAS (PROFITABLE, WELL MANAGED AND]
  ATTRACTIVE TO PROSPECTIVE BUYERS;
- 2) IT WAS ESSENTIALLY A STAND-ALONE BUSINESS, SINCE IT WAS AN ACQUIRED BUSINESS ITSELF;
- 3) IT'S SALE WOULD GENERATE THE CASH WE WOULD NEED TO MOVE INTO FINANCIAL SERVICES AND DEVELOP OUR RETAILING OPERATIONS;
- 4) AND FINALLY, THE BUYER, JAMES RIVER WOULD RETAIN THE MAJORITY OF EMPLOYEES. WE WANTED TO PRESERVE AS MANY JOBS AS POSSIBLE.

INCIDENTALLY, AMERICAN CAN'S CANADIAN PACKAGING
OPERATIONS HAD SIMILAR ATTRIBUTES -- ATTRIBUTES
WHICH MADE THE BUSINESS ATTRACTIVE TO A QUALIFIED
BUYER, AND ALLOWED THE BUSINESS TO BE SOLD WITHOUT
DRAMATIC RESTRUCTURING PRIOR TO SALE. SEPARATELY,
CANADIAN NATIONALISM MADE IT EXPEDITIOUS FOR A U.S.
PARENT TO SELL ITS OPERATIONS ACROSS THE BORDER,
PLACING THOSE OPERATIONS UNDER CANADIAN OWNERSHIP.

WE WERE, OF COURSE, ABLE TO FIND EXCEPTIONALLY WELL
QUALIFIED BUYERS IN JAMES RIVER AND ONEX CAPITAL.

WE WERE ALSO ABLE TO BENEFIT FROM THEIR GROWTH AND
SUCCESS, BY OBTAINING IN THE FORM OF COMMON

STOCK POSITIONS IN EACH ORGANIZATION.

[INCIDENTALLY, IT IS ALSO MY PLEASURE TO SERVE ON
THE BOARDS OF EACH ORGANIZATION.]

WE HAD A SIMILAR SITUATION WITH THE SALE OF OUR REMAINING PACKAGING BUSINESS TO TRIANGLE INDUSTRIES LAST YEAR.

THE CASH ACQUIRED FROM THE SALE OF OUR U.S. PAPER OPERATIONS TO JAMES RIVER IN 1982 WAS USED LARGELY TO BEGIN BUILDING A FINANCIAL SERVICES SECTOR. BY 1984, THE COMPANY HAD ACQUIRED ASSOCIATED MADISION COMPANIES, AND WITH IT, JERRY TSAI JOINED THE FIRM.

WE OPERATED FIVE INSURANCE FIRMS -- PENNCORP
FINANCIAL AND ITS MILICO SUBSIDIARY WHICH IS TODAY
THE LARGEST SELLER OF INDIVIDUAL LIFE INSURANCE IN
THE WORLD; NATIONAL BENEFIT LIFE; TRIAD LIFE;
TRANPORT LIFE; AND THE VOYAGER GROUP.

WE HAD ALSO ACQUIRED AMERICAN CAPITAL MANGEMENT
AND RESEARCH, A TOP-RANKED MUTUAL FUND MANAGEMENT
AND MARKETING FIRM.

IN THE TWO YEARS THAT FOLLOWED, WE ADDED A LEADING MORTGAGE BANKING SUBSIDIARY, DEVELOPED A PARTNERSHIP WITH A LEADING ASSET MANAGEMENT FIRM, SOLD OUR REMAINING INTERESTS IN PACKAGING TO TRIANGLE INDUSTRIES AND ACQUIRED SMITH BARNEY.

JUST TO GIVE YOU AN IDEA OF THE SCOPE AND PACE OF THE RESTRUCTURING: SINCE 1982, WE HAVE MADE APPROXIMATELY 15 ACQUISITIONS AND 30 DIVESTITURES WORTH IN AGGREGATE OVER \$3.5 BILLION. TEN YEARS AGO PRIMERICA WAS GENERATING NEARLY ALL OF ITS REVENUES FROM MANUFACTURING BUSINESSES. AND BY YEAR-END 1986, ALL OF PRIMERICA'S REVENUES CAME FROM SERVICE BUSINESSES. AT THE END OF 1986, WE DIDN'T OWN ONE BUSINESS THAT WE HAD TEN YEARS AGO.

ALSO INCLUDED AMONG THE DIVESTITURES WERE SALES OF THE COMPANY'S MANY NON-EARNING ASSETS -TIMBERLANDS AND OUR HEADQUARTERS BUILDING IN GREENWICH, CONNECTICUT.

AND THE ACTION CONTINUES...THE ACQUISITION OF SMITH BARNEY AND THE PENDING DIVESTMENT OF FINGERHUT -TWO MORE TRANSACTIONS IN THE COMPANY'S ONGOING RESTRUCTURING SCENARIO.

AS I MENTIONED, WE NOW HAVE A FAMILY OF
HIGH-PERFORMING COMPANIES IN FINANCIAL SERVICES AND
SPECIALTY RETAILING. WE ARE TODAY A MAJOR FORCE IN
INVESTMENT BANKING, INSURANCE, MUTUAL FUND AND
ASSET MANAGEMENT AND MORTGAGE BANKING.

ALTHOUGH WE ENTERED THE FINANCIAL SERVICES BUSINESS ONLY FIVE YEARS AGO, IN 1986 THE SECTOR ACCOUNTED FOR 70 PERCENT OF PRIMERICA'S PROFITS FROM ITS ONGOING OPERATIONS.

OUR SECOND INDUSTRY SEGMENT IS SPECIALTY RETAILING, WHICH LAST YEAR ACCOUNTED FOR APPROXIMATELY 30 PER CENT OF OUR INCOME FROM CONTINUING OPERATIONS.

THIS SECTOR HAS TWO COMPONENTS: SPECIALTY STORES, WHICH SELL MORE RECORDS, TAPES AND COMPACT DISCS THAN ANY SUCH SPECIALTY CHAIN IN THE U.S., AND FOR THE TIME BEING, DIRECT MAIL MARKETING COMPANIES, IN THE FINGERHUT GROUP.

IN SUMMARY, WE HAVE CREATED A BRAND NEW COMPANY.
WHAT WERE FOR US, NON-STRATEGIC BUSINESSES HAVE
BEEN SOLD. AND NEW BUSINESSES WITH EXCITING GROWTH
PROSPECTS HAVE BEEN ADDED. OUR EARNINGS AND RETURN
ON EQUITY HAVE IMPROVED DRAMATICALLY.

ONE MORE NOTE ABOUT THE RESTRUCTURING PROCESS....

TO ACCOMPLISH ALL OF THESE ACTIONS -- JUST ABOUT ONE SALE OR ACQUISITION A MONTH FOR THE PAST FIVE YEARS -- WE ALSO NEEDED A DIFFERENT KIND OF MANAGEMENT TEAM.

ONCE THE DIVESTING ASSETS WAS UNDERWAY, WE HAD TO GIVE SOME THOUGHT TO WHAT KIND OF COMPANY WE WOULD BECOME IN MANAGEMENT TERMS. AMERICAN CAN HAD BEEN A TRADITIONALLY MANAGED COMPANY. WE HAD A HIGHLY CENTRALIZED, DECISION-MAKING SYSTEM, NOT DISSIMILAR TO WHAT YOU MIGHT FIND IN A MILITARY ORGANIZATION. A FEW TOP PEOPLE MADE THE DECISIONS. AND EVERYONE ELSE CARRIED THEM OUT WITHOUT QUESTION. THAT STYLE WORKED IN THE 1940S AND POSSIBLY EVEN INTO THE FIFTIES AND SIXTIES. THOUGH I THINK WE WERE DECEIVING OURSELVES. IT HAD FLOUNDERED IN 70S -AND COULD NEVER WORK IN 80S.

WHY? BECAUSE PACE OF CHANGE HAD PICKED UP RAPIDLY.

TO SURVIVE IN THE MARKETPLACE OF THE EIGHTIES, A COMPANY WOULD NEED TO MOVE QUICKLY AND EFFECTIVELY. IT WOULD NEED TO BE FAST ON ITS FEET, SO TO SPEAK, AND POSSESS A SENSE OF PACE AND TIMING THAT THE OLD INDUSTRIAL COMPANIES RARELY HAD.

THIS MEANT THAT WE WOULD NOT ONLY HAVE TO CHANGE OUR BUSINESS MIX, BUT CHANGE THE VERY WAY WE

OPERATED. CORPORATE FUNCTIONS WERE TO BE PUSHED OUT TO THE BUSINESS-UNIT LEVEL. WE WOULD MOVE AWAY FROM THE OLD SCHOOL OF CENTRALIZED CORPORATE MANAGEMENT, TOWARDS A STRUCTURE IN WHICH DIVISIONS AND SUBSIDIARIES COULD OPERATE WITH GREATER AUTONOMY.

SO, WE MOVED QUICKLY AND PAINFULLY TO A DECENTRALIZED SYSTEM OF MANAGEMENT AND DECISION-MAKING IN WHICH OUR KEY EXECUTIVES AND MANAGERS HAD BOTH OPERATING AUTHORITY AND AUTONOMY. WE WERE MOVING INTO BUSINESSES THAT REQUIRED FASTER DECISIONS, AND WE DIDN'T WANT TO SPEND OUR TIME LOOKING OVER EVERYONE'S SHOULDER EVERY DAY. WE WANTED AN ENVIRONMENT IN WHICH PEOPLE WITH ENTREPRENEURIAL INSTINCTS WOULD BE COMFORTABLE AND IN WHICH THEY COULD FUNCTION EFFECTIVELY. WE WANTED THE HEADS OF THE INDIVIDUAL BUSINESSES TO TAKE CONTROL OF THEIR OPERATIONS. TO RECEIVE CREDIT WHEN THEY SUCCEEDED AND TO BE HELD ACCOUNTABLE IF THEY DIDN'T.

IMPORTANTLY, IN ALL OF OUR ACQUIRED BUSINESSES WE LOOKED FOR THE SAME CHARACTERISTICS IN MANAGEMENT - WE WEREN'T JUST BUYING ASSETS, BUT ONGOING BUSINESSES WITH STRONG MANAGEMENT AND GROWTH POTENTIAL.

I DON'T THINK THERE IS ANYTHING PARTICULARLY
UNUSUAL OR REMARKABLE ABOUT HOW AMERICAN CAN
RESPONDED TO CHANGE. THE PLAIN TRUTH IS THAT WE
FOUND OURSELVES IN A POSITION IN WHICH WE HAD FEW
OPTIONS, AND WE CHOSE THE OPTION THAT OFFERED US
THE BEST CHANCE TO SURVIVE AND PROSPER AS A
CORPORATION. WE MADE SOME GOOD DECISIONS, BUT IN
RETROSPECT THE PROCESS WAS NOT AS NEAT AND ORDERLY
AS IT NOW APPEARS.

IT CERTAINLY WAS NOT PAINLESS.

WHILE ON THE ONE HAND OUR STRATEGY CALLED FOR THE SALE OF "NON-STRATEGIC BUSINESSES," IT ALSO CALLED FOR A COMPLETE RESTRUCTURING AND STREAMLINING OF OUR PACKAGING BUSINESS AND CORPORATE STAFF TO MAKE IT MORE COMPETITIVE.

MANY, MANY PEOPLE LOST THEIR JOBS. SOME HAD GREAT DIFFICULTY FINDING OTHER JOBS, PARTICULARLY PACKAGING, BECAUSE WHEN PLANTS CLOSED THEY WERE UNABLE TO MOVE TO ANOTHER TOWN. PEOPLE WHO STILL HAD JOBS WONDERED HOW LONG THOSE WOULD LAST. THE ANXIETY WAS HIGH THROUGHOUT THE COMPANY. SO TOO, THE ANGER LEVEL. NOT UNEXPECTEDLY, MORALE OFTEN WAS LOW BECAUSE THE FUTURE LOOKED SO UNCERTAIN TO SO MANY PEOPLE.

THAT'S THE SIDE OF THE CHANGE STORY THAT DOESN'T OFTEN GET TALKED ABOUT IN THESE KINDS OF MEETINGS. BUT IT SHOULD BE. WE NEED SOMETIMES TO REMEMBER THAT THERE ALSO IS A DARK SIDE OF CHANGE. IT'S A PHENOMENA WE NEED TO ADDRESS BECAUSE THE MORE COMMONPLACE CHANGE BECOMES WITHIN CORPORATE AMERICA, THE MORE INCLINED WE SEEM TO ACCEPT IT WITHOUT QUESTION.

THE ANNOUNCED MOTIVES ARE CLEAR ENOUGH.

CORPORATIONS ARE CUTTING STAFFS, REORGANIZING AND RESTRUCTURING, DIVERSIFYING AND DOWNSIZING, THEY SAY, IN ORDER TO BE MORE COMPETITIVE IN WORLD MARKETS, TO STREAMLINE THEIR OWN MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS AND TO MAKE THEIR STOCK MORE ATTRACTIVE TO INVESTORS.

I CAN SYMPATHIZE WITH A CORPORATION MAKING MAJOR STRUCTURAL CHANGES WHEN ITS SURVIVAL IS AT STAKE.

LAND I <u>OBVIOUSLY</u> ALSO SYMPATHIZE WITH ORGANIZATIONS THAT GROW IN THEIR CHOSEN AREAS -- FOR THE LONG TERM -- VIA ACQUISITION. COMPANIES LIKE PRIMERICA, JAMES RIVER, ONEX CAPITAL, TO NAME THREE THAT COME TO MIND.]

BUT AS I WATCH THE FREQUENCY WITH WHICH CHANGE IS OCCURRING, I HAVE TO WONDER AT TIMES IF WE ARE NOW SEEING CHANGE FOR ITS OWN SAKE.

I THINK THE TIME HAS COME WHEN CORPORATE AMERICA
MUST BEGIN TO ASK ITSELF WHETHER WE ARE PLACING TOO
MUCH WEIGHT ON CREATING SHORT-TERM VALUE FOR OUR
SHAREHOLDERS, AND WHETHER THIS SHORT-TERM EMPHASIS
IS DAMAGING TO OUR LONG-TERM ECONOMIC INTEREST BOTH
HERE AND IN WORLD MARKETS.

WE ARE NOW IN THE FIFTH YEAR OF THE LONGEST
BUSINESS RECOVERY SINCE WORLD WAR II. WE LOOK
PRETTY GOOD TO OURSELVES COMPARED WITH WHERE WE
WERE FIVE YEARS AGO. BUT HAS ALL THIS CHANGE MADE
US MORE COMPETITIVE? HAS IT STRENGTHENED OUR
ECONOMIC BASE? HAS IT LAID THE FOUNDATION FOR
ECONOMIC GROWTH

THERE IS NO QUESTION A LOT OF PEOPLE HAVE MADE A
LOT OF MONEY OFF THE CHANGE THAT HAS BEEN
OCCURRING, PARTICULARLY THE CHANGE ASSOCIATED WITH
ALL THE MERGERS, BUY-OUTS AND ACQUISITIONS OF THE
PAST SEVERAL YEARS. BUT ALL THIS SHORT-TERM
PROFIT-TAKING OBSCURES TWO FUNDAMENTAL PROBLEMS.

THE FIRST IS THAT MUCH OF THE CHANGE OCCURRING
WITHIN OUR ECONOMY MAY NOT BE PRODUCTIVE.IT

CERTAINLY CREATES PERSONAL WEALTH, BUT WE DO NOT
YET KNOW WHETHER OR NOT IT CREATES MARKETS, AND

CREATES JOBS. THERE IS NO PROOF YET THAT IT DOES
EITHER.

THE EMPHASIS IN THE AMERICAN ECONOMY NO LONGER IS ONE PROBLEM-SOLVING; IT IS ON PROBLEM-DUMPING.

PROBLEM-SOLVING USED TO BE THE MAJOR CONTRIBUTION
OF AMERICAN BUSINESS. THE CHALLENGE WAS TO SOLVE A
PROBLEM, CREATE ECONOMIC GROWTH, DEVELOP NEW
PRODUCTS, OPEN NEW MARKETS.

NO DOUBT THE 1980S IS THE ERA OF THE QUICK DEAL AND THE JUNK BOND. IF WE CAN'T SOLVE OUR PROBLEMS
QUICKLY, WE SELL THEM TO SOMEONE ELSE WHO IS
WILLING TO SOLVE THE PROBLEM. AND THERE'S ALWAYS A
THIRD PARTY OUT THERE TELLING US THAT IT'S THE BEST
WAY TO GO.

ROBERT REICH OF HARVARD'S JOHN F. KENNEDY SCHOOL OF GOVERNMENT ADDRESSED THIS PHENOMENA IN A RECENT NEWSPAPER INTERVIEW. THIS IS WHAT HE SAID:
"LOOK AT THE NEWSPAPERS TODAY. YOU DON'T SEE
STORIES ABOUT NEW PRODUCTS OR INNOVATIVE
BREAKTHROUGHS. YOU SEE STORIES ABOUT THE THRUSTS
AND PARRIES OF CORPORATE LAW AND FINANCE. THAT'S THE MOST INNOVATIVE PART OF OUR ECONOMY RIGHT NOW, AND THAT IN ESSENCE IS THE PROBLEM."

WHAT HAPPENS IN THESE TRANSACTIONS, AS REICH AND OTHERS HAVE POINTED OUT, IS THAT HUGE AMOUNTS OF MONEY ARE SHIFTED FROM ONE SEGMENT OF THE ECONOMY TO ANOTHER, AND THE TIME AND ATTENTION REQUIRED TO STAY ABREAST OF THESE ACTIVITIES DRAINS MANY COMPANIES OF THE TIME, PEOPLE, ENERGY AND MONEY THAT IS NEEDED TO DEVELOP NEW PRODUCTS AND SERVICES -- AT LEAST THEORETICALLY. OUR RECORD AS MANAGERS WAS NOT GREAT WHEN WE DIDN'T HAVE TO WORRY ABOUT TAKEOVERS. WE ARE FASCINATED BY APPARENT REALITY OF ALL PROS AND CONS -- BUT WITH AN UNPREDICTABLE END RESULT.

THE SECOND PROBLEM WE NEED TO CONSIDER IS THE IMPACT THIS SHORT-RANGE CHANGE MAY HAVE ON CORPORATIONS AS SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS. THIS MAKES ME A MAVERICK, I SUPPOSE, SINCE CURRENT PHILOSOPHY IS THAT CORPORATIONS' SOLE RESPONSIBILITY IS TO SHAREHOLDERS.

A MAJOR SHORTCOMING OF CORPORATE AMERICA THAT SEEMS TO BE GROWING BECAUSE OF THIS FOCUS ON SHAREHOLDERS IS OUR TENDENCY TO ISOLATE OURSELVES FROM THE REST OF SOCIETY. IT'S AS IF WE CONSTRUCT A BOX, PLACE OURSELVES IN IT AND THEN NEVER LOOK OUTSIDE OR BEYOND. OUR WHOLE OUTLOOK AT TIMES SEEMS TO BE SHAPED BY WHATEVER FACTS, VALUES AND IDEAS WE TOOK WITH US INTO THAT ISOLATION BOOTH.

MY CONCERN IS THAT THE SHORT-TERM INCENTIVES IN TODAY'S ECONOMY THAT PREVENT US FROM DEVOTING OUR TIME AND ENERGY TO DEVELOPING NEW IDEAS AND NEW MARKETS ARE ALSO PUSHING US DEEPER INTO THAT ISOLATION BOOTH, CUTTING US OFF EVEN MORE FROM THE REST OF SOCIETY.

ON ONE LEVEL, I CAN UNDERSTAND WHY THIS IS
HAPPENING. WE ONCE HAD DECADES TO ANTICIPATE AND
RESPOND TO CHANGE. NOW WE HAVE INSTANT AND
UNPREDICTABLE CHANGE. WE ONCE HAD PLENTY OF ROOM
FOR ERROR AND PLENTY OF TIME TO CORRECT OUR
MISTAKES. NOW THE CONSEQUENCES OF A SINGLE MISTAKE
CAN BE DEVASTATING.

I AM NOT ARGUING AGAINST THE IDEA THAT CORPORATIONS
ARE PRIVATE ENTITIES. NOR AM I ARGUING AGAINST
NECESSARY CHANGE. I AM NOT EVEN ARGUING THAT
TODAY'S CORPORATE EXECUTIVES ARE NOT UNDER POWERFUL
PRESSURES TO MAXIMIZE SHORT-TERM RESULTS.

THE POINT I WANT TO MAKE -- THE POINT THAT I

BELIEVE MUST BE MADE IN ORDER TO BRING SOME

PERSPECTIVE TO THIS PROCESS OF MANAGING CHANGE -
IS THAT THE PRIVATE DECISIONS OF CORPORATIONS HAVE

A PUBLIC IMPACT. THEY AFFECT THE PEOPLE WHO WORK

FOR US, THE COMMUNITIES IN WHICH WE ARE LOCATED,

AND ON A MORE GENERAL LEVEL, THE OVERALL SOCIAL AND

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE.

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF A BUSINESS IN THE PROCESS OF CHANGE DOES NOT BEGIN AND END SOLELY WITH ITS SHAREHOLDERS AND ITS OFFICERS. IT ALSO INCLUDES ITS EMPLOYEES, THEIR FAMILIES AND LOCAL AND REGIONAL ECONOMIES. AND, IT INVOLVES A WHOLE RANGE OF IMPORTANT ISSUES INCLUDING BUSINESS ETHICS.

THAT MEANS THAT IN ORDER TO MANAGE CHANGE SUCCESSFULLY WE WILL HAVE TO DO A BETTER JOB OF ANTICIPATING CHANGE AND A MORE THOROUGH JOB OF EXPLORING ALL THE OPTIONS BEFORE US. IT MEANS WORKING WITH OTHERS, SUCH AS UNIONS AND CITY AND STATE GOVERNMENTS, IN ORDER TO SAVE JOBS, STEM THE FLOW OF CAPITAL. DEVELOP NEW PARTNERSHIPS AND GENERALLY MINIMIZE THE HARMFUL IMPACT OF CHANGE. IT MEANS BEING AWARE OF THE WORLD OUTSIDE OUR DOOR. IT MEANS MAKING DECISIONS THAT TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THOSE WHO HAVE DEPENDED ON US AND UPON WHOM WE HAVE DEPENDED AS WELL. ABOVE ALL & MEANS THE CONSTANT REVITALIZATION OF MANAGEMENT. LOSS OF PRODUCTIVITY OF THE WORKFORCE IS LOSS OF MANAGEMENT PRODUCTIVITY, FLEXIBILITY, CREATIVENESS. WE MUST FIND SOMEWAY SHORT OF CRISIS FOR RENEWING OURSELVES.

WE OFTEN SPEAK ABOUT HOW THE UNITED STATES IS A PLURALISTIC NATION, REFLECTING MANY DIFFERENT COMPONENT PARTS AND POINTS OF VIEW. BUT IT ALSO IS AN INTER-DEPENDENT NATION. AND AN INTER-DEPENDENT NATION, NO MATTER HOW STRONG, SECURE OR SUCCESSFUL IT FEELS AT A GIVEN MOMENT, CANNOT FUNCTION IN THE LONG RUN IF ITS INSTITUTIONS START GOING THEIR SEPARATE WAYS, IF THEY FAIL TO SEE THE GOALS THEY SHARE IN COMMON WITH THE REST OF SOCIETY, IF THEY FAIL TO MEET THEIR PUBLIC RESPONSIBILITIES AND OBLIGATIONS.

THAT IS A DIFFERENT KIND OF MESSAGE THAN BUSINESS USUALLY HEARS. BUT IT'S THE KIND OF MESSAGE WE NEED TO HEAR TO EXPLORE AND TO UNDERSTAND IF WE ARE GOING TO SUCCEED AT THIS NEW AND GROWING BUSINESS OF MANAGING CHANGE.

THANK YOU.