

**money
doesn't
change
everything.**

Money Doesn't Change Everything.

Capital expands what a company can attempt. It also changes the cost of changing its mind. The discipline is not spending less, but knowing what deserves to become difficult to reverse.

Concorde was magnificent. It crossed the Atlantic in little more than three hours, flew at twice the speed of sound and turned an aircraft into a cultural object. The needle nose, white delta wing and cabin at the edge of space looked like the future because, for a while, they were.

It was also an extraordinary concentration of capital. Britain and France agreed to develop the aircraft together in 1962, and by the time the airframe and engine development programmes were complete, manufacturers' development costs had reached £1.126 billion at the prices and exchange rates prevailing when the expenditure occurred. Only sixteen production aircraft were completed.

Calling Concorde a commercial failure is too easy. It carried passengers for 27 years, became an enduring symbol of British and French engineering and advanced technologies across materials, electronics, computer-aided design and manufacturing. The value created by something that ambitious does not fit neatly into an aircraft sales ledger.

That is precisely what makes it interesting. Enough money can make an extraordinary thing possible; it cannot make the economics of that thing inevitable. The distinction is easy to understand and surprisingly difficult to preserve once the money is yours.

When Money Becomes Organisation

A financing proves something important: somebody was prepared to finance a possible future. It does not prove that customers will behave as forecast, a market will develop on schedule or scale will produce attractive economics. Investors and customers are making different decisions. Investors accept uncertainty because of what the future might become; customers still have to decide whether something is worth paying for now.

Capital can blur that distinction because it makes progress visible. Headcount rises, pipeline grows, partnerships are announced, new markets open and services close product gaps. Any of these may be exactly what the business needs, but money can create activity faster than the market creates evidence.

Its more consequential effect happens inside the company, where an assumption that begins relatively weightless gradually acquires substance. Perhaps this product will work, this market will open or this acquisition will create value. Then capital arrives. The product gets a team, the market a country manager and the acquisition an integration programme. A forecast acquires a hiring plan, budget and quarterly target. The assumption has not necessarily become more true, but it has become more expensive to question.

Money gives hypotheses organisational mass.

I encountered the physical version early in my career at Ford, working across engineering, manufacturing and product development. An idea behaves differently while it remains a

design decision than it does once tooling, suppliers, production processes and launch plans begin forming around it. Software later made some decisions cheaper to reverse, but organisations did not. A strategy embodied in people, systems, incentives and expectations develops its own inertia.

Capital therefore expands a company's freedom to act while gradually converting some of that freedom into commitments. The important question is not simply how much to deploy, but how much future freedom each decision consumes.

The Price of Changing Your Mind

This makes the spreadsheet more interesting than the usual argument about forecasts being wrong.

Serious businesses need models. Demand, pricing, conversion, productivity, retention, margin and time need to be made explicit, and a spreadsheet forces assumptions into view. The danger is not that it contains guesses; every consequential decision involves a view of a future that has not happened. The danger is that numerical precision can make different kinds of uncertainty appear equally knowable when the consequences of getting them wrong are radically different.

A marketing experiment that fails can be stopped on Friday. A senior executive hire is harder to unwind, a new geography harder again, while an acquisition, factory or major technology migration may reshape the company for years. The evidence demanded before making those decisions should rise with the difficulty of reversing them.

A useful discipline follows: **buy uncertainty at the lowest level of irreversibility the problem permits.**

“Test cheaply before investing” only takes you so far, particularly in the physical world. You cannot discover everything important about a semiconductor fab, a new drug, an aircraft or an energy network with a prototype and a customer survey. Sometimes the only credible experiment is expensive because discovering whether the future works requires building part of it.

The objective is not to avoid irreversible bets. Great companies and inventions are full of them. It is to distinguish uncertainty that genuinely requires commitment from uncertainty being answered expensively simply because the company can afford to.

Intel's semiconductor investment in Ohio makes the tension visible in real time. Announced in 2022 as an investment initially exceeding \$20 billion, the project moved from presentation to physical reality as construction began and foundations went into the ground. In February 2025, Intel changed the timetable, pushing fab completion into the next decade and slowing construction while retaining the flexibility to accelerate according to customer demand.

We do not yet know whether the original investment or the revised timetable will prove economically right, which is precisely why the example matters. Capital allocation happens without the privilege of hindsight. Billions can already be committed and the intelligent response to new information may still be to change the sequence rather than defend the forecast.

Conviction includes the ability to change your mind.

What Money Leaves Behind

Not all spending leaves the same residue.

Spend £1 million testing a proposition and discover it does not work, and most of the loss may be visible. Spend the same amount establishing a function around it and something remains: roles, processes, objectives, technology, expectations and people reasonably trying to make their work succeed.

Capital has memory.

I saw another version of this working on post-merger integration earlier in my career. The transaction may dominate the headlines, but buying a company does not create the value imagined in the acquisition model. That value still has to survive contact with customers, operations, systems, talent, incentives and the awkward business of making two organisations work together. The cheque buys the asset; delivering the thesis is another matter.

This is why transformation plans can become dangerous even when every individual initiative sounds sensible. New leadership, technology, pricing, markets, products and an operating model may all belong in the destination, but funding them simultaneously can create so much motion that it becomes difficult to know what is actually changing the economics.

Scarcity once imposed that choice brutally. Ten ideas competing for one engineer forced a decision; after funding, all ten can have engineers. Capital solves the resource constraint without solving the judgement problem.

There is nothing virtuous about keeping a business artificially poor. Scarcity kills good companies and exhausts good people. The discipline worth preserving is the discrimination scarcity imposed: remaining strategically unwilling to do everything even when you become financially capable of doing almost anything.

AI makes that distinction more important because, in parts of software and knowledge work, it is lowering the resources required to research an opportunity, interrogate data, explore alternatives, create an early product or test a proposition. The effects vary substantially by task and context, and none of this makes factories, clinical trials or power stations cheap. But wherever the cost of credible learning falls, the economics of commitment change with it.

Questions that once required teams may sometimes be answered by a few people, while ideas that needed months of development can encounter reality earlier. The company can know more before the hypothesis needs a department. In that sense, AI may change the **minimum efficient size of a bet**.

Companies can use that advantage to resolve more uncertainty before making difficult-to-reverse commitments, or use the same technology to generate more initiatives and institutionalise more of them because creation has become easier. The latter would be an exquisitely modern mistake: reducing the cost of learning only to increase the cost of being wrong.

When Success Becomes Too Small

Capital also changes the size of success a company can afford to care about.

Imagine a genuinely attractive £50 million opportunity. For one business it could define the next decade; for another, capitalised and valued around expectations of enormous growth, it may barely move the enterprise. Nothing about the opportunity has changed. The company has.

Large financings and high valuations can therefore narrow the range of futures that count as success. More capital creates strategic capacity, but the expectations attached to it can raise the minimum scale of outcome capable of justifying the organisation built around that future.

This is why valuation is more than a scoreboard. A high valuation can lower the effective cost of equity, strengthen acquisition currency, attract talent and expand strategic options, but it also places a price on an expectation of what the company will become. Management can eventually find itself rejecting opportunities not because they are unattractive, but because they are no longer large enough to support the future embedded in the price.

A company can become better financed while its range of satisfactory outcomes becomes smaller. Money has expanded its options and simultaneously raised the consequences of choosing among them.

Pixar's early history offers an illuminating counterpoint because hindsight makes the company look far more inevitable than it was. When Steve Jobs bought the computer division from George Lucas in 1986 and established Pixar as an independent company, it had about 40 employees. The business that would eventually transform animated film spent its early years selling graphics technology, developing RenderMan, making short films and producing commercials.

That commercial work developed experience in pitching, storytelling, working with clients and refining the production pipeline. Disney and Pixar agreed in 1991 to make and distribute a computer-generated feature, and four years later *Toy Story* opened at number one and went on to gross \$362 million worldwide. Pixar floated days after its release.

Retelling those years as evidence that Jobs always knew exactly what Pixar would become makes the story cleaner and less useful. Pixar changed while it learned. Hardware mattered until it didn't; software endured; commercial work paid bills and developed capability; shorts advanced the craft; the relationship with Disney created another path. Eventually technology, storytelling, production capability and market evidence converged around a different kind of company.

Capital did not remove uncertainty. It allowed Pixar to survive long enough to discover which parts of itself deserved permanence.

That is a profoundly different thing.

What Deserves to Become Permanent

The usual debate about capital is strangely binary: raise more or bootstrap, invest or cut, move aggressively or remain disciplined. The more consequential decisions sit underneath those choices.

What uncertainty are we paying to resolve? What becomes harder to reverse afterwards? Are we removing a constraint the business has actually encountered, or building capacity for a future that still lives mainly in the model? If the investment succeeds, what becomes structurally better rather than merely larger?

These questions matter because capital is extraordinary when concentrated behind reality. It can compress time, attract talent, build factories, widen distribution, fund research, transform companies and pursue ambitions impossible through incrementalism alone. Concorde itself is evidence of that. Whatever judgement history makes about its economics, capital enabled engineers to push commercial aviation somewhere it had never been before.

What capital cannot do is abolish the distinction between possibility and truth. Once money becomes organisation, infrastructure, expectations and identity, discovering that distinction late becomes progressively more expensive.

The deepest discipline of capital allocation is therefore not austerity, but preserving the ability to learn before every assumption becomes something the organisation must defend. Money gives a company extraordinary power to move; wisdom lies in knowing which possibilities have earned the right to become commitments, because once enough capital has turned an idea into reality, changing direction may become the most expensive investment of all.

Roy Sharples

August 2026

Roy Sharples is the founder of Lucan Ventures, where he builds and reinvents businesses through product innovation, go-to-market and operating model design.

lucanventures.com | hello@lucanventures.com

© 2026 Lucan Ventures. All rights reserved.