BOOK PREVIEW

SELECTED EXCERPTS

THE FRONTIER EXPANDER

Why Some Companies and Careers Pull Away—and What the Best Leaders Do Differently

KARL McDONNELL

PREVIEW EDITION

THE PREMISE

A company is a theory

Ask ten people what a company is and you'll get ten reasonable answers. A legal entity. A collection of assets. A group of employees, a producer of goods and services, an investment. All of them are true. None of them captures what a company actually is.

At its core, a company is a theory.

It is a theory about who the customer is. A theory about what problem matters. A theory about how value will be created. And, most important, a theory about why this company can win where others cannot.

Every company begins as a theory. Some are distinctive. Most are not, and the market has a remarkable way of telling them apart.

If every company is a theory, the market is the experiment.

Unlike the theories argued in classrooms, business theories are tested in public and tested continuously. Customers vote with their wallets, competitors respond, and capital flows toward success and away from failure. Talent migrates, margins expand or contract, and every day the market renders its verdict. Some companies compound for decades. Most do not, and many disappear entirely. The question is why.

But economic laws do not create companies. People do. If a company is a theory, someone has to author it. And if powerful forces determine which theories survive, then some people must be far better than others at creating theories capable of surviving them. That brings us to leadership.

Every company that has ever existed began as a theory in someone's mind: a hypothesis about how value could be created, a belief about the future, a conviction that the world could work differently than it does today. Some of those theories became Amazon. Some became Apple. Most disappeared without a trace.

THE TRAP

The perpetual turnaround

A company can genuinely recover, again and again, and never escape - a treadmill with good days.

This is the shape of a perpetual turnaround, and it is one of the most common shapes in business. It is not a story of steady decline; decline at least has the mercy of a clear ending. It is something stranger and more durable: a company that genuinely recovers, again and again, and never escapes. The good days are not the exception to the pattern. They are the engine of it, because they are what persuade everyone, every time, that this time is different.

The defining property is worth stating plainly: **a perpetual turnaround is the absence of a durable trend despite an abundance of real motion.** The peaks are not illusions. What is missing is accumulation. Nothing compounds. The company's imagined strategy changes constantly - a new plan, a new leader, a new deck every few years - while its revealed strategy oscillates around a line that does not move. The company is always busy and never further ahead.

This is the mechanism of the perpetual turnaround, stated as plainly as I can: no amount of perfecting the operational bets can fix a flaw in the first one. If the theory is distinctive, operational excellence compounds it. But if the theory is familiar, operational excellence makes the company a more efficient version of a commodity, and the market competes the gains away as fast as they appear. The better you run a familiar business, the faster the treadmill spins. You are not standing still because you are doing it badly. You are standing still because you are doing the wrong thing well.

So what would it take? The honest answer is that a perpetual turnaround ends in only two ways, and the one everyone keeps attempting is not among them. The first true ending is to reopen the first bet: to do the hard, identity-threatening work of building a theory that is actually distinctive, so the gains finally rest on something a competitor cannot copy. The second is to stop pretending and take the honest exit. The only path that never ends the loop is the one the loop is made of: another operational turnaround.

THE DECIDING FORCE

The team determines the fate

The strength of a company's management team determines its fate. Full stop.

Not its strategy, not its market, not its technology - or rather all of those, but downstream of the team, because the team is what produces the strategy, reads the market, and wields the technology. Every other meta-skill in this book is executed by people; the team is the multiplier on all of them. A company is, in the end, the sum of the judgment sitting in its key seats.

And here is the paradox that ought to astonish anyone who takes that claim seriously. Of all the inputs to a business, talent is the one a company controls completely. You cannot control the market, the interest rate, the regulator, or the next technological wave. Whom you hire, whom you promote, and whom you place in each critical seat, however, is entirely, totally, unambiguously yours. It is the single most controllable lever a leader holds, and it is, almost everywhere you look, the one most badly underused.

An elite team does not merely execute more efficiently than a good one. It multiplies the impact of every other resource, initiative, and investment the company makes. Strategy gets sharper, because better minds are making it. Execution gets faster, because fewer things have to be redone. Culture gets stronger, because the standard is set by the people everyone is watching. Replace one mediocre player with an exceptional one in a key seat and you do not just get a better result in that function; you raise the game of everyone they touch.

Commercialization is not performed by a leader alone. It is performed by a team, and the quality of that team sets a hard ceiling on how much of any distinctive idea is even possible. The team is not one input among many. It is the multiplier that determines whether a company authors a new first bet, escapes the perpetual turnaround, and expands its frontier - or continues running the loop.

THE NEW TARGET

The Frontier Expander

The leadership-development industry was designed for a bell-curve world. Its implicit aim is symmetry: move managers toward a consensus center of broad competence, smoothing weaknesses and producing reliable, well-rounded, interchangeable executives. It is a machine for manufacturing the competent middle.

A model optimized for symmetry cannot produce an asymmetric outcome. You do not arrive at a distinctive, frontier-expanding leader by averaging away the very edges that make a person distinctive. The era does not need a better program for producing competent managers. **It needs a different target altogether.**

That target is the Frontier Expander. Strip away biography, luck, and survivorship, and the same small set of capabilities keeps appearing. They are not personality traits or the line items of a competency model. They are five meta-skills:

- I **Creative and Strategic Ideation**
- II **Opportunity Commercialization**
- III **Elite Talent Curation**
- IV **Elegantly Simple Process Engineering**
- V **Professional Threshold Power**

Together they answer the only three ways an attempt to expand a frontier can fail: the idea was not good enough, the execution fell short, or the leader quit before it compounded. For a company, this reframes strategy as a problem of talent: the durable advantage is a concentration of people who can expand frontiers, and the central task is finding them, developing them, and refusing to lose them.

END OF PREVIEW

Selected from the Introduction and Chapters Two, Eight, and Eleven.
Forthcoming Fall 2026