

legacy removal and the market will not reward you for not playing that role.

In the first variant (product to product substitution) then as the CEO you're playing a second curve because it's the right context specific play. You're trying to build a new future given a possible substitution of your core product set and an impending future crisis point. You can often achieve this because you have the skills (i.e. capability), process and data to support such efforts. In the second variant (product to utility substitution) then as the CEO you should be playing some form of "sweating" game because it's the right context specific play. You're not trying to build a future, not trying to run a second curve but trying to extract as much value as possible before the system collapses. The nature of what you do, your role in the game, changes with context.

*"What if I want to build a future?", "I refuse to go quietly!", "What about the people!"* are often phrases I hear especially with founders when we discuss this. Well, you can't tell employees that the company has no future and so you probably need to play a bit of theatre and paint a picture of one.

*"That's dishonest! I want to build an actual future!"* are often common replies.

Well, there is an upside to playing the game. *"Probably none"* doesn't mean none and there is a path though it's not an easy one. The odds of you achieving a future position without exceptional situational awareness and a culture to match are not great but they are