The Second Ledger

What Succession Plans Can't Say

Niles Howard

The Second Ledger

What Succession Plans Can't Say

Niles Howard

This monograph is set in EB Garamond, a revival by Georg Duffner of the types cut by Claude Garamont in sixteenth-century Paris, drawn from a specimen printed at Frankfurt in 1592. The romans are Garamont's; the italics follow those of his contemporary Robert Granjon.

First edition.

While we are postponing, life speeds by.

—*Seneca*

1

Silence That Broke a Family

What an unexplained decision cost

YEARS LATER, NO ONE remembered the paperwork. They remembered the silence.

Two brothers had spent forty years building a company together. They knew the factories, the debt, the customers, and each other's tempers. On the day the succession plan was signed, lawyers spread the documents across a farmhouse table, and by late afternoon the control question was settled.

One brother believed leadership should stay in his branch. Blood, in his view, carried its own claim. The other believed the next leader should be the most capable member of the rising generation, whichever branch produced him. Neither view was unreasonable. They came from different ideas of what the company was: an inheritance, or an institution.

The documents settled the decision. The disagreement remained.

Each branch left the farmhouse certain it had understood what happened. One saw honor. The other saw merit. The third generation, listening from the edges of the room, heard something simpler: someone had won, and someone had lost.

The chosen successor became CEO. The company grew. Customers never knew there had been a problem.

The family did.

The damage arrived slowly. Decisions took longer. Trust turned into negotiation. Directors spent more time managing old grievances than new opportunities. One cousin drifted away. Another sold his shares. Holiday gatherings grew smaller. The grandchildren inherited ownership—and competing stories about the day that leadership changed hands.

No single event caused it. It accumulated, one unexplained decision at a time.

Families rarely fracture over a disagreement. They fracture because no one explains it well enough for the people who lost to keep believing in the family.

The signatures settled leadership in an afternoon. The story no one told shaped the family for a generation.

2

The Second Ledger

The legitimacy question

EVERY FAMILY ENTERPRISE keeps two sets of books.

The first is visible. It records ownership, voting rights, taxes, governance, and cash flow. Professionals write it, review it, and defend it in court. Founders spend fortunes perfecting it, as they should. When it fails, the consequences are swift and measurable.

The second ledger never appears on a balance sheet. It records legitimacy. It answers the questions no shareholder agreement can touch: What is this business for? Whom does it serve? Why this successor? Why should the family accept a decision that does not favor them?

The first ledger transfers ownership. The second transfers the right to lead.

Most succession plans give the second ledger too little attention, and the oversight is understandable. The first has professionals, precedents, and enforcement. The second has none. No one is hired to keep it. No one audits it. It is written anyway—in dinner-table remarks, in who gets called for advice, in the stories each branch tells itself about sacrifice and merit. The only question is whether the founder writes it deliberately or the family writes it by accident.

If it is left blank, the family fills it in for itself. And it never fills it in the same way twice.

One branch writes loyalty. Another writes sacrifice. A third writes competence, or proximity, or what it believes the founder privately intended. Every version is sincere. Every version is partial. Within a generation, the family has several histories, and every governance dispute becomes a proxy war between them.

The argument is about a dividend policy or a board seat. It is really about whose version of the past is true. This is why so many succession failures look inexplicable from the outside. The estate plan was sound. The trusts were airtight. The tax work was elegant. Advisors inspect the documents and find nothing wrong, because nothing in them is wrong. The failure happened in the ledger nobody was keeping.

Lawyers transfer control. Accountants value the asset. Governance consultants design the structure. All of it matters. None of it is the subject of this paper.

What none of these professions can supply on their own is the one thing a successor needs on day one: a family that understands, even if it does not agree, why this leader was chosen. Agreement is negotiable. Understanding is not.

A cousin can live with a decision that went against him if he can explain it to his children without bitterness. He cannot live with silence.

3

When the Documents Are Right, but the Family Is Not

How founders lose the plot

EVERY CULTURE has a version of the same warning. Shirtsleeves to shirtsleeves in three generations. The third generation ruins the house. From one country to the next, the wording changes. The pattern does not.

The tools have improved. Trusts are better. Tax planning is better. Governance is better. Yet conflict over succession remains stubbornly familiar. That is a clue. Part of the failure must live where the instruments cannot reach.

It does.

One family announces a successor but never explains the choice. The siblings comply—the documents leave them no choice—but compliance is not belief. The new chief executive spends her first years running the company and defending her legitimacy at every family gathering.

Another founder writes a letter that says almost nothing. Wanting to be fair, he writes about integrity, stewardship, and family harmony. No one can disagree with those words, which is the problem. They settle nothing. After the funeral, each child reads the letter and finds confirmation of what he already believed.

Another founder assumes the children understand because they were near the business. "They watched me build it," he says. But they watched from the kitchen, from boarding school, from the far end of a dinner table where the business arrived only as fatigue. They know what the company cost. No one told them what it was for.

Then there is the fight that is said to be about money. Two branches spend years and millions disputing a buyout formula. The formula was sound. What could not be settled was what the formula meant. Was one branch being paid out, or pushed out? The lawyers were asked to resolve a valuation. The family needed to resolve a story.

And there is the third generation, so often blamed for decline. They are usually miscast. They did not squander the legacy. They never really received it. They inherited shares in a company whose founding logic reached them as anecdote, and they made the rational choice of anyone who owns something he does not understand: they diversified.

In every case, the first ledger was in order. The documents were fine. The failure stemmed from a different task: producing an account of the enterprise persuasive enough that those it disappointed could still find their place within it.

For most families, that task never becomes anybody's job—until it becomes everyone's problem.

4

More Than a Memoir

Four ways to preserve the founder's logic

THE WORD MEMOIR frightens founders, and for good reason. A memoir is public. It asks to be judged. Most founders hear the word and quietly leave the room.

But the second ledger does not require a book. It requires a vessel: a deliberate form in which the founder's account of the enterprise is set down while he or she is still alive to be questioned about it.

There are four useful forms.

The founder's letter answers why. Three to five thousand words, written to the family or to the enterprise itself, can explain what the business is for, what it must never become, and why leadership passes to whom it passes. It takes days, not years. It is the simplest way to put the logic of succession into the founder's own voice.

The ethical will answers what matters. This is a short private document, often read at moments of consequence, that sets down values rather than events:

what the wealth is meant to protect, what it should never buy, what the family owes the places that helped create it. It is brief, but it can carry real weight.

Recorded history answers what happened. Structured conversations capture the founding story before it turns into family mythology: why this city, why that partner, what the near-failure in the third year felt like from inside. The transcripts become a record the family can return to when the stories start to split.

The memoir answers who. This is the full account of a life, with the business inside it rather than the reverse. It is the right form when the founder is inseparable from the institution—when the company's culture is so tied to character that it cannot be passed on without passing on the person.

The forms build on one another. A recorded history often becomes the raw material for a letter. A letter sometimes grows into a memoir. What cannot be repeated is time. Each form depends on the same thing: a living founder with memory and candor intact.

The brothers at the farmhouse table had forty years to write a letter. One week would have been enough. The family spent a generation paying for the week they did not take.

5

Remembering Is Not Explaining

How the narrative is shaped

THE OBVIOUS QUESTION is why any of this needs structure. The founder lived the story. Surely the founder can write the letter alone.

Often, that is exactly where the work should begin. Some founders write it themselves. Others use a trusted interviewer, writer, family-office leader, or advisor to help draw out the account. What matters is not the method; it is whether the resulting narrative explains rather than merely remembers.

When founders try to set it down, they often produce a document that says the right things and reveals almost nothing. The problem is not talent. It is distance.

The first reason is simple: founders are too close to the material. The logic of the business is so familiar to them that they cannot see what needs explaining. Ask why the company never took outside capital and the answer may be, "We didn't need it." True—but incomplete. Beneath that answer may be a father who lost a business to a bank, or one bad meeting that changed everything. The founder cannot always see that layer because he has never had to.

That is why the work benefits from real conversation over time—not a questionnaire or a one-hour call, but patient inquiry that listens for what has not yet been said.

The second reason is candor. A useful vessel has to hold contradiction: the failed acquisition, the brother bought out badly, the decade the founder was not home. Families can spot a polished account immediately, and it usually makes them less trusting, not more. The aim is not confession. It is an account sturdy enough to contain the truth.

The third reason is voice. A succession document written in corporate English is dead on arrival. The family knows within a paragraph that the founder did not write it. The job is not to write "well" in a generic sense. It is to preserve the founder's cadence, bluntness, specific turns of phrase, even the jokes, so a daughter reading the letter twenty years later hears her father, not his lawyer.

This work is not therapy, arbitration, or estate planning. It settles no disputes. It does something earlier and more useful: it produces the account against which disputes can be honestly had.

The founder's part is smaller than most fear. The essential task is to tell the story plainly, answer the difficult questions, and leave enough time for the real answer to emerge. The only deadline that matters is the one the previous section named.

6

Begin Here

A starting point for the founder's letter

BEFORE THE SUCCESSION documents are final, a founder can sit down with five questions:

- What is this enterprise for, beyond producing wealth?
- What did the family sacrifice to build it—and what must never be forgotten about that cost?
- Why is this person the right leader for the next chapter, and what would I say to the relatives who hoped for a different answer?
- What must the family's wealth protect, and what must it never buy?
- Which two difficult decisions in the company's history best explain how we came to these convictions?

The first drafts will be thin. Nearly everyone's are. A founder who answers the third question in two sentences has not answered it; he has restated the org chart. That is not failure—it is the discovery of how much lies beneath the rehearsed answers, and how much work the honest version requires.

But the questions are the beginning of every vessel on the ladder. Answered fully—in the founder's own voice, with the contradictions left in—they become a letter. Sat with longer, they become more.

The plan still needs the first ledger. The family needs the second.

7

A Note for Advisors

The conversation only you can start

If you advise enterprising families—as counsel, wealth strategist, or family-office leader—you have seen some version of this before. You may also have noticed the problem: the second ledger is not formally assigned to anyone. It falls outside the engagement letter. It can feel like stepping beyond the boundary of your role. So the subject waits, and waiting is the one thing this work cannot survive.

Yet you are often the only person in a position to raise it. Founders do not wake up wanting to examine their own legitimacy. The subject usually arrives through someone they already trust.

Raise it when the documents are nearly done, not when they are signed. That is the moment of greatest leverage. Earlier, the subject is abstract. Later, it is damage control. The best openings are usually the founder's own hesitations: the long pause over a beneficiary clause, the remark that a son is not ready, the third revision of a letter of intent.

Frame the idea as completion, not correction. The wrong approach is, "The documents are not enough." That sounds like an insult to work the founder has already paid for. The better approach is, "The documents answer the legal questions. The family will still want to know why." A trust works better when its beneficiaries understand its purpose. A board works better when the family shares one story instead of three.

Expect hesitation. Founders often say, "My family already knows this," or "I'll write something myself," or "Maybe after the closing." These are usually not refusals. The subject is close to the bone, and the deadline is not transactional. A quiet follow-up weeks later is often more effective than a hard push in the first meeting.

When families fight over meaning, routine governance questions can become proxies for older wounds. An early, well-timed conversation can help keep a board seat, dividend policy, or buyout from carrying more symbolic weight than it should.

Go back, one last time, to the farmhouse table. Every professional in the room did the work asked of them. The documents were flawless. Forty years of work transferred without a dollar of leakage. And the family was still broken, because the one thing no one had been asked to produce was the explanation.

The lawyers packed their briefcases. The brothers shook hands. And in the silence everyone remembered, a generation of grievance took its seat at the table.

Structure transfers wealth. Narrative transfers everything else.

NILES HOWARD
For private inquiries
nh@nileshoward.com