DOWNLOAD PDF REINVENTING THEMSELVES HOW CORPORATIONS EVOLVE

Chapter 1 : Reinventing the Law Firm for

A successful company is like a great white calendrierdelascience.com its prime, it chews up the competition, but if it dares to sit still for too long, it calendrierdelascience.com of the world's most profitable and enduring companies have achieved their long track record of success by constantly reinventing themselves.

Bosses need to be bossy and employees have duties. We have hidden beliefs like: I interviewed Ulf for issue 17 â€" accessible for paying members. Stuck in the system I remember a team of regional executives, part of a multinational publicly owned corporation. They were 15 bright people, working really hard, trying to motivate their reluctant employees, pushing to achieve their targets and follow the procedures that headquarters HQ kept piling up. They claimed to support each other â€" even though everyone kept looking over their shoulder to see if no one outperformed the others because, hey, they had barely survived a downsizing â€" so who could be nextâ€¦? They felt stuck in a tight box. And when push came to shove, they felt alone. Click To Tweet They used to be a team. But that was before the downsizing to cut costs in order to raise efficiency. That was before HQ increased quality control and dropped a phone book of procedures plus they centralized functions in a neat matrix structure. Headquarters was all over them. Their camaraderie was long gone. He was a gigantic man with a quick mind and charisma. He had been participating dutifully during the session â€" but he was getting energized now. I am held accountable for my own accomplishments. That goes for all of us. We love collaboration, in theory. They were demoralized, divided, exhausted. But every time they lifted their spirits and discussed some ideas â€" one of them would talk the team out of it. I could see their energy evaporating as if their balloon was losing its air. The corporate context weighed them down. I still see that gigantic man before me who must have been a real energizer, way back when he still had hope, professional autonomy and collegial support. These executives were no longer at eye-level. Too big to fail? I always contend for self-organizing teams in small to medium-sized businesses. But maybe larger organizations could self-organize in smaller teams? Meanwhile, we have to lift the yoke of shareholder value and limitless growth, strict hierarchies, and the suffering mindset. Many consultants, coaches, leaders and other professionals are working on it as we speak. They are wasting valuable ideas, energy, time and hope. People are used like resources, boxed in and controlled. No wonder that various surveys measure an alarming lack of employee engagementâ€¦ Large organizations have stabilized themselves with rational, logical management long time after their passionate, entrepreneurial start but they need to energize themselves again with leadership, professional freedom, passion, connections, face-to-face communication, trust and mutual support â€" to regain agility and change-responsiveness. Can we help them get unstuck and unfreeze their potential? Many consultants I meet share this vision and try to persuade their clients. External consultants and coaches are curious, open to new ideas and techniques. They want to change the world and workplace and try out Open Space Technology, dialog circles, provocative coaching, bodywork, business Tarot and they devour research books showing that organizations can self-organize and people can be happy at work. But many managers, executives and leaders of organizations seem hesitant to apply anything that loosens their idea of control. Ulf Brandes said to me: Tapping potential may require letting go of old certainties and comfortable positions. It means re-evaluating beliefs and being open to dissent, other views and it means change, maybe chaos, and entering the unknown â€" while they are busy enough as it is â€" with hardly any space, time and energy to reinvent themselves. They are too tired to ignite the spark â€" too busy to connect at eye-level. The biggest constraint to change is being overwhelmed with work and information â€" rooted in the fear to lose money, market share, position, status â€" the fear to lose control. But we need to upgrade our organizations to the 21st century. For the sake of people, organizations, and societies, in order to survive and to thrive. We need everyone to contribute their information and energy to overcome the challenges we are facing. We need to engage all employees, all people, in whatever role. Who encourage their employees to start moving and mingling â€" to exchange information and energy in an equal flow and be open to what emerges. Tapping

potential may require letting go of old comforts Click To Tweet Sure, sometimes we get impatient whether we are external or internal consultants, leaders, coaches or employees. The heroes are the ones who apply the new faith:

Chapter 2 : How corporations won their civil rights - CNN

Those are a lot of technology shifts to keep up with, and companies have had to evolve along with them. The companies that have survived are the ones that know this important lesson: Listen to.

Acting under a charter sanctioned by the Dutch government, the Dutch East India Company defeated Portuguese forces and established itself in the Moluccan Islands in order to profit from the European demand for spices. Investors in the VOC were issued paper certificates as proof of share ownership, and were able to trade their shares on the original Amsterdam Stock Exchange. The best-known example, established in , was the East India Company of London. Queen Elizabeth I granted it the exclusive right to trade with all countries to the east of the Cape of Good Hope. Labeled by both contemporaries and historians as "the grandest society of merchants in the universe", the English East India Company would come to symbolize the dazzlingly rich potential of the corporation, as well as new methods of business that could be both brutal and exploitative. Subsequent stock offerings demonstrated just how lucrative the Company had become. The rapid inflation of the stock value in the s led to the Bubble Act , which restricted the establishment of companies without a royal charter. A similar chartered company , the South Sea Company , was established in to trade in the Spanish South American colonies, but met with less success. In fact the Spanish remained hostile and let only one ship a year enter. Unaware of the problems, investors in Britain, enticed by extravagant promises of profit from company promoters bought thousands of shares. By , the South Sea Company was so wealthy still having done no real business that it assumed the public debt of the British government. This accelerated the inflation of the share price further, as did the Bubble Act , which possibly with the motive of protecting the South Sea Company from competition prohibited the establishment of any companies without a Royal Charter. The share price rose so rapidly that people began buying shares merely in order to sell them at a higher price, which in turn led to higher share prices. As bankruptcies and recriminations ricocheted through government and high society, the mood against corporations and errant directors was bitter. In the late 18th century, Stewart Kyd , the author of the first treatise on corporate law in English, defined a corporation as: By this point, the Industrial Revolution had gathered pace, pressing for legal change to facilitate business activity. Without cohesive regulation, proverbial operations like the "Anglo-Bengalee Disinterested Loan and Life Assurance Company" were undercapitalised ventures promising no hope of success except for richly paid promoters. As a result, many businesses came to be operated as unincorporated associations with possibly thousands of members. Any consequent litigation had to be carried out in the joint names of all the members and was almost impossibly cumbersome. Though Parliament would sometimes grant a private act to allow an individual to represent the whole in legal proceedings, this was a narrow and necessarily costly expedient, allowed only to established companies. Then, in , William Gladstone became the chairman of a Parliamentary Committee on Joint Stock Companies, which led to the Joint Stock Companies Act , regarded as the first modern piece of company law. For the first time in history, it was possible for ordinary people through a simple registration procedure to incorporate. Limited liability[edit] However, there was still no limited liability and company members could still be held responsible for unlimited losses by the company. This allowed investors to limit their liability in the event of business failure to the amount they invested in the company â€" shareholders were still liable directly to creditors , but just for the unpaid portion of their shares. The principle that shareholders are liable to the corporation had been introduced in the Joint Stock Companies Act The Act allowed limited liability to companies of more than 25 members shareholders. Insurance companies were excluded from the act, though it was standard practice for insurance contracts to exclude action against individual members. Limited liability for insurance companies was allowed by the Companies Act This prompted the English periodical The Economist to write in that "never, perhaps, was a change so vehemently and generally demanded, of which the importance was so much overrated. In the later nineteenth century, depression took hold, and just as company numbers had boomed, many began to implode and fall into

insolvency. Much strong academic, legislative and judicial opinion was opposed to the notion that businessmen could escape accountability for their role in the failing businesses. Further developments[edit] Lindley LJ was the leading expert on partnerships and company law in the Salomon v. The landmark case confirmed the distinct corporate identity of the company. This inspired other countries to introduce corporations of this kind. The last significant development in the history of companies was the decision of the House of Lords in Salomon v. In the United States , forming a corporation usually required an act of legislation until the late 19th century. State governments began to adopt more permissive corporate laws from the early 19th century, although these were all restrictive in design, often with the intention of preventing corporations for gaining too much wealth and power. Countries began enacting anti-trust laws to prevent anti-competitive practices and corporations were granted more legal rights and protections. The 20th century saw a proliferation of laws allowing for the creation of corporations by registration across the world, which helped to drive economic booms in many countries before and after World War I. Another major post World War I shift was toward the development of conglomerates , in which large corporations purchased smaller corporations to expand their industrial base. Deregulation reducing the regulation of corporate activity often accompanied privatization as part of a laissez-faire policy. Ownership and control[edit] A corporation is, at least in theory, owned and controlled by its members. In a joint-stock company the members are known as shareholders and each of their shares in the ownership, control, and profits of the corporation is determined by the portion of shares in the company that they own. Thus a person who owns a quarter of the shares of a joint-stock company owns a quarter of the company, is entitled to a quarter of the profit or at least a quarter of the profit given to shareholders as dividends and has a quarter of the votes capable of being cast at general meetings. Who a member is depends on what kind of corporation is involved. In a worker cooperative , the members are people who work for the cooperative. In a credit union , the members are people who have accounts with the credit union. In some cases, this will be a single individual but more commonly corporations are controlled by a committee or by committees. Broadly speaking, there are two kinds of committee structure. A single committee known as a board of directors is the method favored in most common law countries. Formation[edit] Historically, corporations were created by a charter granted by government. Today, corporations are usually registered with the state, province, or national government and regulated by the laws enacted by that government. The law sometimes requires the corporation to designate its principal address, as well as a registered agent a person or company designated to receive legal service of process. It may also be required to designate an agent or other legal representative of the corporation. If a corporation operates outside its home state, it is often required to register with other governments as a foreign corporation , and is almost always subject to laws of its host state pertaining to employment , crimes , contracts , civil actions , and the like. Historically, some corporations were named after their membership: Nowadays, corporations in most jurisdictions have a distinct name that does not need to make reference to their membership. In Canada, this possibility is taken to its logical extreme: In most countries, corporate names include a term or an abbreviation that denotes the corporate status of the entity for example, "Incorporated" or "Inc. These terms vary by jurisdiction and language. In some jurisdictions, they are mandatory, and in others they are not. Some jurisdictions do not allow the use of the word "company" alone to denote corporate status, since the word " company " may refer to a partnership or some other form of collective ownership in the United States it can be used by a sole proprietorship but this is not generally the case elsewhere. For example, a corporation can own property, and can sue or be sued. Corporations can exercise human rights against real individuals and the state, [41] [42] and they can themselves be responsible for human rights violations. Insolvency may result in a form of corporate failure, when creditors force the liquidation and dissolution of the corporation under court order, [44] but it most often results in a restructuring of corporate holdings. Corporations can even be convicted of criminal offenses, such as fraud and manslaughter. However, corporations are not considered living entities in the way that humans are.

DOWNLOAD PDF REINVENTING THEMSELVES HOW CORPORATIONS EVOLVE

Chapter 3 : Leaders Must Evolve With Their Businesses | Camana Bay

Based on three years of research, the book Reinventing Organizations describes the emergence of a new management paradigm, a radically more soulful, purposeful and powerful ways to structure and run businesses and non-profits, schools and hospitals.

June 27, Detect Your Fault Lines and Reinvent Your Business If you want your business to continue its forward momentum, it must constantly evolve and adapt to markets, customer expectations, new technologies and to the competition. There are some telltale fault lines proactive companies recognize, and they usually start when business is good and shareholders are happy. Companies that wait to change strategic direction until industry disruption is imminent or when business falls flat are often too late to survive, let alone thrive, after a reinvention. By identifying fault lines early, companies can get leadership buy-in for significant strategic change, prepare financially, and help employees, customers and strategic partners understand and work through the changes. Undergoing a dramatic strategic shift when the business situation is dire is just too late. While reinventing your business seems overwhelming to most established companies, adapting and reinventing in response to new input is precisely what we do every day in software development. For companies looking to change their business model, the ability to outsource software development to handle additional workload caused by reinventing your business makes financial sense. Nevertheless, to not change is riskier still. Here are the fault lines companies should pay attention to. Customers Since we know there would be no business without customers, the first place to look for a fault line is with your customer base. Then, check in with your existing customers to discover their pain points and unmet needs. This helps your organization determine where it might be vulnerable to current or future competition. What performance metrics are you tracking? If not, you need to recruit and properly onboard new team members. The exec team is not immune to this either. Consider what might need to change to propel your future vision including changes at the top and changes to your strategic partners who support your team with initiatives such as software development, customer service and other products and services. Industry Is there anything happening in the regulatory arena of your industry or with technology that could impact your business? Pay attention to the competitive landscape. Partners and suppliers may be making shifts to their business that make them a competitive threat. As described in the book Stall Points by Matthew S. Companies that are proactive in identifying fault lines, as well as adapt to customer demands and market realities are the ones who will thrive. Rest assured, all companies need to reinvent themselves sooner or later. One of our biggest priorities at Performance Software is to deliver reliable and innovative software solutions to meet the needs of our customers. As your needs and conditions evolve, our service-focused teams will respond quickly and effectively. We look forward to helping you succeed. How to Reinvent Your Businesshttps: Pinnacle Peak Road Suite

Chapter 4 : How to Reinvent Your Business - Performance Software

"They need to reinvent themselves." Relying on the managerial and technical tactics that brought success in the past will prove insufficient and inadequate, explained Nevins, adding that new and sophisticated strategic and interpersonal skills are needed to successfully manage one's self and team.

Why does it matter? Today, "digital transformation" refers to how companies are reinventing themselves for the digital world. Businesses have always had to disrupt themselves, but now, in order to revolutionize their industries, they must infuse their business with technology -- essentially becoming technology companies themselves. We encounter companies looking to make this transformation everyday. Some are established players trying to keep up with fast moving competitors; others are early digital leaders who see technology as a way to create new revenue streams, improve customer experience, and increase operational efficiencies. We see young companies determined to take down slow, year-old companies, and we see traditional companies building new products and applications that disrupt their industries, all while maintaining the highest levels of security. After a few years of playing around the edges of our lives, the Internet of Things IoT is becoming a reality. Connected, intelligent objects are all around -- on our wrists, in our cars, around our homes and offices, and in our factories. Flex , the "sketch-to-scale" solutions provider, and the largest electronics manufacturer in the United States, is at the epicenter of this proliferation. The company is now not only building, but also designing, innovating and scaling the connected world that we live in, and in the process aptly dubbed IoT the "Intelligence of Things. Almost years ago, Arthur Pitney invented the postage meter, introducing the concept of metered mail to the world and smoothing the path of commerce for the foreseeable future. Nowadays, shipping is just one aspect of the Pitney Bowes brand. Since building the Pitney Bowes Commerce Cloud, the company has become one of the largest software companies in the world, with customers relying on it for everything from location intelligence to global e-commerce and customer information management solutions. In order to evolve your business like Pitney Bowes has, you have to take advantage of your greatest asset: As a global media organization, News Corp is a poster child for digital innovation. A few years ago, News Corp separated into two distinct organizations: On the other side of the split under 21st Century Fox is 20th Century Fox , which leads an industry going through another dramatic evolution. The distribution of a major theatrical release can involve a team of hundreds of business partners -- and today entertainment companies rely on digital technologies for not only this distribution, but content creation as well. In an industry that continually reinvents itself, Fox is using cloud technologies such as Box, Salesforce and Okta to collaborate with partners to create and distribute award-winning movies. But Experian , the largest consumer credit reporting agency in the world, is successfully doing just that. Today, Experian helps business customers prevent fraud, offer on-the-spot credit to consumers and make data-driven marketing decisions. Gone are the days where our responsibility was to keep the lights on and keep financial systems operating," CIO Barry Libenson recently shared. Experian has successfully navigated its transformation by morphing into a strategic partner to the business. Climate change is forcing the energy industry to make dramatic changes. And ENGIE , an international purveyor of power, natural gas, and energy services, is leading the transition to a more sustainable, de-carbonized world. CEO Isabelle Kocher has called climate change "a fundamental and general invitation to every one of us Not only can the latest technology help you boost revenue and revolutionize your products, but it may be able to help you build a better, more sustainable world. Jan 12, More from Inc.

Chapter 5 : Corporation - Wikipedia

Corporations in Evolve have substantial resources and wealth, enough to employ large private militaries, fund fledgling colonies and science projects with budgets unheard of by independent groups, and rival the government of Hub itself.

Thus, the Farm Credit System, for example, exists to improve "the income and well-being of American farmers and ranchers by furnishing sound, adequate and constructive credit and closely related services. Proponents of small government may welcome the introduction of an element of private control into most realms of public administration as a means of preparing for the privatization of federal functions. Democratic socialists may view wholly or even partly owned government corporations as a means of capturing the rents and profits from public activities or natural monopolies for the benefit of the public fisc. Political Insulation Like independent agencies, FGCs allow Congress to insulate a program from the cabinet department that would normally have jurisdiction over it. Congress may feel that a small single-mission agency will be more zealous in furthering a given goal than a department in a multimission agency. Subsidy An FGC may be designed to create a captive agency for a constituency. The eight privately owned GSEs are a particularly effective means of delivering subsidies through the credit markets. Subterfuge FGCs classified as either mixed-ownership or private tend to be given "off budget" status. When Congress operates under spending caps or deficit reduction targets, pursuant to the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings budget reduction process for example, off-budget items are usually excluded from the official total "spent" by the government. Its status as a public or private body shapes the rights and remedies of any person who has a legal or commercial relationship with the corporation, whether she is employed by it, transacts with it, competes with it, makes a contract with it, is injured by it, or commits a fraud upon it. Because FGCs are federal, they are not subject to regulation by the states. Because they are governmental, and often have special powers or access to cheaper capital, they are largely immune from market forces. Because they are corporations, they are exempt from most constraints ordinarily applied to federal agencies. A self-funding, self- perpetuating, profit-making corporation enjoys a degree of potential, and perpetual, independence undreamed of in most agencies. Ordinary state-chartered corporations exist to further privately selected goals, often the quest for private profit. Their liberty to abuse their powers is curbed by market forces and by public and private laws enacted by both the state and federal governments. Ordinary federal agencies are established to further publicly selected goals, defined, in at least a general fashion, by Congress and the President. In practice, neither public nor private accountability mechanisms are necessarily effective when applied to many FGCs. Nor are there any visible limits on the powers that may be granted to private FGCs. The courts have had few occasions to consider whether private or public FGCs undermine the separation of powers or whether the Appointments Clause of the Constitution applies to directors of an FGC. Similarly, because no laws set out the duties of FGC directors appointed by the President, whether they have the same duties as FGC directors elected by shareholders is unclear. In practice, because both market discipline and federal regulatory activity are limited, many FGCs remain free to operate as they wish, regardless of how they are classified. These two cases, together with federal government practices before World War I, establish three clear principles concerning FGCs. First, the federal government may charter private corporations. Third, the federal government may give special advantages and powers, such as state and federal tax exemptions or control of the money supply, to a private federal corporation. No subsequent court decision has seriously questioned any of these general principles. National Railroad Passenger Corp. A corporation created for public purposes over which the government retains permanent control is a federal actor. If an FGC is considered public, then it shares a number of features with traditional agencies. A public FGC must be part of the executive branch of government. On the other hand, if an FGC is considered private, then the Constitution does not apply to most of its activities, unless Congress has exceeded its powers in creating the FGC. Otherwise, the Constitution applies as it would to any other private transaction. State, State Actor, or Private Actor? A congressional declaration that a body is an "agency" or a

"private" body may be entitled to great weight, but it cannot be the final word on the subject. Even if Congress can make a heretofore private activity public, it certainly cannot label a public agency private, thus taking it and its employees outside due process and other constitutional restraints. The Supreme Court has addressed the specific legal status of government corporations several times, starting with McCulloch and Osborn. Five years after Osborn, the Supreme Court confronted the following argument: A suit against a bank owned solely by a state government was, in fact, a suit against the state government itself and, therefore, forbidden by the Eleventh Amendment. In some cases it owes its funding to Congress as well. In other cases, some or all of its directors are appointed by the President. An FGC thus may fit the profile of "state"--not just "state actor"--much better than, say, a private parking lot operated on municipal property. Western Union Telegraph Co. The responsibilities of the federal directors are not different from those of the other directors--to operate Conrail at a profit for the benefit of its shareholders. Thus, Conrail will be basically a private, not a governmental, enterprise. In the Regional Rail Reorganization Act Cases, however, the government did far more than passively hold Conrail stock. The federal government created Conrail. It surely cannot be that government, state or federal, is able to evade the most solemn obligations imposed in the Constitution by simply resorting to the corporate form. On that thesis, Plessy v. Ferguson can be resurrected by the simple device of having the State of Louisiana operate segregated trains through a state-owned Amtrak. Lebron was actually an easier case than the Court made it seem. Lebron thus represents a missed opportunity to link FGC case law to the federal actor test. Unfortunately, not every case involving an FGC is likely to be as simple as Lebron. Neither the state action doctrine nor whatever principles that can be extracted from precedent provides a sufficiently clear standard for determining whether an FGC that is not wholly owned by the government is public or private. On one hand, Congress chooses the instruments that are necessary and proper to achieve valid ends. Because private enterprise is a valid means to valid ends, the fact that the government facilitates the creation of private enterprise does not render that enterprise either public or invalid. Indeed, any rule requiring FGCs to comply with the constitutional mandates applicable to federal agencies could easily extend to all other private corporations. If the state action doctrine means anything, it is surely that the government cannot contract out of the Constitution. Mixed-Ownership FGCs For the same reasons that a wholly owned corporation should be treated as a federal actor, both Lebron and the state action doctrine suggest that any mixed-ownership FGC in which the federal government owns more than half the shares should be treated as a federal actor for constitutional purposes. If shareholding is very dispersed, no group may have complete control of a mixed-ownership FGC. In such cases, coalitions may form and shift from issue to issue or year to year. These esoteric contingencies illustrate the difficulties that can result from the unclear status of mixed-ownership FGCs, but they are largely theoretical at present. As a result, although the government retains its statutory directors, it no longer has any shares in the large majority of "mixed-ownership" government corporations. Conversely, sometimes Congress designates a corporation as "mixed-ownership" even when there is no plan to sell any stock to private investors. These "public" directors sit alongside the private directors elected by the shareholders. Nondelegation of Public Powers to Private Groups If an FGC is a private body, its establishment can be viewed as a delegation of public power to a private group, much as authorizing an administrative agency to regulate is a delegation of legislative power. Viewed this way, it seems natural to ask whether there is a nondelegation doctrine for private groups akin to the nondelegation doctrine that prevents Congress from delegating standardless rule-making power to the executive branch. The agency version of the nondelegation doctrine limits delegations of legislative power; but the power of the agency to execute the laws is unquestioned. When a private body is the delegate, whether it has any right to exercise government power--legislative or executive-- is an issue. In Carter Coal, the Supreme Court struck down a statute authorizing coal producers and mine workers to vote on a regional basis to set hours and wages that would bind dissenters. Justice Sutherland described the statute as "legislative delegation in its most obnoxious form; for it is not even delegation to an official or an official body, presumptively disinterested, but to private persons whose interests may be and often are adverse to the interests of others in the same business.

The Carter Coal doctrine is known as a nondelegation doctrine, but this name is misleading. Unlike the real nondelegation doctrine, which relies on the separation of powers to prevent Congress from making standardless delegations to administrative agencies, the Carter Coal doctrine is in fact a prohibition against self-interested regulation. The Carter Coal doctrine seeks to prevent private individuals from judging or regulating their own causes. If the President neither appoints nor removes private FGC directors, there is a strong argument, deriving from separation of powers cases, that FGCs cannot be given public powers. Settled constitutional principles prescribe that the only government agencies that may exercise executive powers are those in the executive branch. One way to read these cases, perhaps the most persuasive way, is to view them as concerned with the balance of power among the branches. Actions that weaken the President without transferring authority directly to Congress are less likely to be held unconstitutional. This view provides a simple way of reconciling Commodity Futures Trading Commission v. Although Morrison did not concern a delegation of power to a private group, Morrison asserts that there are core presidential powers with which Congress may not "interfere impermissibly," including the power to ensure the "faithful execution" of the laws. Second, the distinction between public and private functions is very vague. If either doctrine were made clearer, one side effect might be to reduce the sphere of action for FGCs. Assuming that the Carter Coal doctrine is still valid, nonetheless, it seems very unlikely that any existing FGC would be declared unconstitutional under it. Competition alone, even competition by an FGC powerful enough to set the market price, is not a constitutional violation. Modern FGCs do not legislate and do not ordinarily issue regulations binding anyone but themselves and their employees. Nor do most modern FGCs exercise powers traditionally reserved to the state. Limited Market Discipline FGCs are most commonly created to operate a self-sustaining bank, insurance, or other commercial activity. In either case, an FGC is usually created with the hope that it will be more efficient than a traditional government department. Although efficiency is a core justification for the existence of FGCs, in practice, FGCs are subject to a very limited degree of market discipline from bondholders, competitors, and shareholders. The absence of market discipline suggests that FGCs have little incentive to be efficient. As a result, FGCs are probably not as efficient as proponents hoped. Of course, this does not mean that FGCs are inevitably inefficient or that they could not become efficient if confronted with competitors. At one time or another proponents have claimed FGCs are appropriate for both commercial and noncommercial purposes, as the most efficient form of nationalization, and as preparation for eventual privatization. Truman summed up the received wisdom-- still current today--when he stated, "Experience indicates that the corporate form of organization is peculiarly adapted to the administration of governmental programs which are 1 predominantly of a commercial character; 2 are at least potentially self-sustaining; and 3 involve a large number of business- type transactions with the public. When Fannie Mae was established in it was the only truly national purchaser of home mortgages. Return on equity is perhaps the simplest crude measure, but its value is limited. Just because an FGC produces a high return does not mean that it is efficient. A fair comparison with the private sector must account for whether the FGC operates in a competitive market and whether it has comparable access to capital. The FGC may have been created to provide other social outputs, which are external to the FGC, or inherently hard to measure. Delivering is likely to be expensive; refusing to do so is likely to cause severe credit shortages in the relevant markets and to cause a great decline in confidence in the other FGCs in the credit markets.

Chapter 6 : Supreme Court limits suits against foreign corporations in the US - CNNPolitics

If you aren't convinced that "digital transformation" is more than just a buzzword, these organizations reinventing themselves with technology will change your mind.

When people talk about the oppressed, they usually refer to groups like racial minorities or gays and lesbians. But a new book shows how corporations successfully staged their own freedom movement by employing tactics associated with civil rights struggles: That decision was widely criticized, but questions over corporate power in politics persist. Facebook has been accused of swaying a presidential election. In another victory for corporations, the Supreme Court said this week that companies could block workers from banding together to fight legal disputes in employment arbitration agreements. Read More Supreme Court sides with employers in class action arbitration cases In an accessible and engaging read, Winkler shows how corporations took their cries for freedom, not to the streets but to the Supreme Court to become "the most powerful players in American politics. And they engaged in civil disobedience by refusing to pay what they considered unlawful taxes, deliberately breaking the law to send test cases to court. This interview has been lightly edited for brevity and clarity: We think of the courts as being a place of equal justice, of Lady Justice being blind to the relative finances of the parties. But the court system is also uniquely designed for those with money to take advantage. And corporations, unlike civil rights organizations, have had the resources to hire the best, most creative and most experienced lawyers in the country to represent their interests in court. Corporations have the resources and the willingness to think of litigation as just the cost of doing business. It takes money to bring lawsuits, and they have the money to bring the lawsuits. How did the 14th Amendment become this weapon to benefit the powerful? Corporations have been able to turn progressive reforms into reforms that help business and capital. Lawyers successfully argued that corporations, like slaves, were victims of oppression. The perfect example is the 14th Amendment, adopted after the Civil War to protect the rights of the newly freed slaves. But the Southern Pacific Railroad company 15 years later went to the Supreme Court and said this provision protects corporations, too. And eventually the Supreme Court would agree. In , there was a study of Supreme Court cases under the 14th Amendment, and it discovered that the Supreme Court had, over the past half a century, heard 28 14th Amendment cases on the rights of African-Americans -- most of them ruling against African-Americans. And at the same time the court heard cases on the right of business corporations, with corporations winning many of those cases. The 14th Amendment was adopted for the dispossessed and the outcast. But it was used more vigorously and successfully by the forces of capital. Why was the court so deferential to corporate power and less vigorous enforcing the rights of African-Americans? Part of the reason is that we misunderstand the Supreme Court. We think of it in terms of left vs. I think that reflects our political process, the influence that corporations have in getting their presidents elected and presidents who support business. So corporations are by necessity pretty powerful. What are the potential consequences in America if corporate power continues to grow unchecked? We have such a complicated relationship with corporate politics. We criticize corporations for spending money on elections in the wake of Citizens United. We have a complicated relationship with business and politics. In its Hobby Lobby decision, the Supreme Court for the first time explicitly recognized that corporations have religious freedom, author Adam Winkler says. We have to remember when corporations are empowered that they are always going to be directed by that profit motive. You talk about a time when the courts were more suspicious of corporate power in politics. There was a huge scandal between and It showed that Teddy Roosevelt, who had created this public image as a trust buster who was going against corporations, was really in the pocket of big business. He had won an election in with a vast majority of financing coming from corporations. This led to a huge scandal. There were investigations into how corporations were getting involved in politics. People asked, how could we stop corporations from exerting this kind of power. And we saw the rise of campaign finance laws in response to this scandal. So there was the attitude that people recognized that corporations were important, but

that they were important for business and making money. Valeo decision and the principle of equality that is basic in law. One reason why campaign finance laws keep getting struck down by the Supreme Court is because it says there is no legitimate government interest to promote equality in the political process. Roscoe Conkling, a 19th-pcentury lawyer, used deception to win for corporations rights that were added to the Constitution for freed slaves, author Adam Winkler says. This is a very odd statement about politics. Equality is such an important principle in American politics. Everyone gets one vote. Even the contest of speech around elections, we have a principle of equality. If we have a debate we have two candidates -- they get equal time to argue their positions. For a long time we even had equal time rules for the big three broadcasters. Even in oral arguments in the Supreme Court, each side gets equal time. If corporate power keeps expanding, where does America end up? But they rule in a lot of things. In those issues, like the [Trump] tax bill, corporations do really well. I do think we are moving into a world where corporations are gaining more power, and gaining more rights that are troublesome: At the same time, we are seeing people trying to use corporations to do good. We have to make corporations serve us better.

Chapter 7 : Reinventing the Government Corporation

America's labor unions need to reinvent themselves for the modern economy. By John Burnett, Contributor May 26, By John Burnett, Contributor May 26, , at p.m.

Chapter 8 : Reinvent | Define Reinvent at calendrierdelascience.com

Reinventing is a common and necessary practice to be successful." For many entrepreneurs, one of the biggest challenges to growth and remaining viable is a resistance to change. "When you're too in love with your product or plan, you lose the ability to make objective decisions, which can spell disaster," Tannan says.

Chapter 9 : Article Nov, | Co-in - Yokogawa Electric Corporation

And as our transition into this new era continues, it's only natural that businesses are actively reinventing themselvesâ€”many corporations are morphing from purveyors of simple products and maintenance services into providers of comprehensive solutions crafted to directly address customer pain points.