By ***Manoj Gowda K S***

HOW TO BUILD A UNSUCCESSFUL STARTUP

For those who want to build a successful startup



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction: You Are Not a Founder Yet 3

Chapter 1: The Shower Thought Cult 4

Chapter 2: Quitting for the Story 7

Chapter 3: The Best Friend Cap Table 11

Chapter 4: Talking to People Who Don’t Care 14

Chapter 5: Burn Without Building 17

Chapter 6: Everyone and No One 20

Chapter 7: Staying Until It Breaks 23

Chapter 8: It’s Giving Flop 26

Closing Note: Delete “Founder” From Your Bio 29

About the Authors 32

INTRODUCTION: YOU ARE NOT A FOUNDER YET

You changed your LinkedIn bio before you changed anyone's life.

You called yourself "Founder" or "CEO" because you had an idea, a logo, maybe a landing page. Your friends replied "fire" in the group chat. People clapped online. For a minute, it felt like you had already built something.

But most companies that start like that never get past the vibe.

When researchers read hundreds of founder shutdown letters, the same reasons show up again and again: they built something the market didn't really need, they ran out of cash, or their team and business model fell apart. Behind the charts and percentages are people who thought they were different, who thought their idea was special, who thought their confidence would bend reality.

This book is for you before you become one of those letters.

You want reputation. You want an identity that sounds bigger than "employee" or "student." You want to escape bosses, boring work, and the feeling of being ordinary. You watch founders talk about freedom, risk, and "building something meaningful," and you recognize yourself.

What you don't see in those clips is the part where most first-time founders quietly die in exactly the same ways the data already predicts.

So instead of giving you another success story, this book gives you Arin.

Arin is the founder you think you are, and the one you're scared of becoming. He has the 3 a.m. idea, the brave resignation, the best-friend co-founder, the aesthetic deck, the "we're building for everyone" pitch. He also has no market need, no real customers, no honest runway calculation, and no pivot until it is too late.

You follow him from first shower thought to final "it's giving flop" post-mortem. Along the way, you see how easy it is to slide into the same failure buckets you see in CB Insights slides and LinkedIn carousels: building for vibes instead of pain, burning money without learning, performing "founder" instead of doing work that might make you one.

This is not a manual for how to win.

It is a manual for recognising, in time, that you are doing the things that make most founders lose.

If you are already calling yourself a founder, keep reading.
If you are about to, read even faster.

CHAPTER ONE: THE SHOWER THOUGHT CULT

At 3:07 a.m., Arin had the idea.

It arrived while he was standing in the kitchen, waiting for the microwave to heat a bowl of noodles. He was not researching a problem. He was not speaking to customers. He was not working inside the industry he was about to "disrupt." He was hungry.

The idea was an app that automatically ordered groceries when they were about to run out—milk, eggs, oat milk, protein powder, whatever people kept forgetting to buy. Arin opened WhatsApp and sent it to the group, telling his friends, in one excited burst, that he wanted to build a fridge that would automatically order groceries before they finished. His friends replied almost instantly, telling him it was insane in a good way, telling him to build it, telling him this could be huge. Their enthusiasm arrived faster than any data.

By 3:19 a.m., Arin had decided he was no longer an employee. By 3:26 a.m., he had purchased a domain. By 3:41 a.m., his LinkedIn headline said he was "Founder and CEO | Building the Future of Smart Grocery Commerce." The company did not exist yet, but the announcement did. That is how many startups begin—not with a customer, not with a painful problem, and not with a strange obsession developed over years. They begin with a thought that feels intelligent because nobody has challenged it.

The next morning, Arin told his mother he was building something scalable. When she asked what it did, he said it was complicated. That was the first warning. When founders cannot explain a product simply, they often hide behind words like platform, ecosystem, automation, and scalability. These words sound like business. Sometimes they are just fog.

Arin's friends liked the idea because they liked Arin. That distinction would matter later. A friend does not need to change their routine for your idea. A friend does not need to enter their credit-card details or cancel another subscription. A friend only needs to say, "Bro, that's fire." Customers are less generous. They do not care that you stayed awake until 3:00 a.m. They care whether your product is better than what they already do.

Arin had not asked anyone how they bought groceries. He had not asked whether people forgot to buy groceries often enough to need automation. He had not asked whether they trusted an app to order things automatically, or what would happen if the app ordered the wrong milk, too much milk, or milk for someone who had just moved away. He had asked one question: whether he could build it. That question was easier because it had a flattering answer. Yes, he could build it. He could also create a logo.

So he created a logo. It was a small green circle with a white shopping basket in the middle. He spent two hours adjusting the spacing between the letters. At 6:12 a.m., he posted it on LinkedIn, announcing that he was excited to be building something in the future of intelligent commerce, promising more details soon. There were twelve likes, three from people he had not spoken to in two years. Arin took a screenshot and sent it to his friend, calling it his first traction. The first person to believe in Arin's company was Arin. The second was his friend. That was enough to create momentum. It was not enough to create demand.

A week later, Arin read a story about Juicero, a Silicon Valley juicing startup that had raised roughly $120 million and sold a connected juicing machine for about $400. Customers were supposed to insert special packets of prepared fruit and vegetables into the machine, enjoying a premium combination of convenience, freshness, design, and technology. Then people discovered they could squeeze the packets by hand. The internet enjoyed itself. Juicero soon shut down, after slow sales and public ridicule of a product many people felt they did not need.

Arin watched a video of someone squeezing a Juicero packet without using the machine, laughed, and asked out loud who would buy that. His friends agreed that it was ridiculous. They joked that this was what happened when founders built without thinking, when rich people spent too much money on pointless machines. One of them told Arin his idea was different, and Arin agreed. He believed Juicero had failed because the founders had built a ridiculous machine. He did not understand that the machine was only the visible mistake. The deeper mistake was believing that complexity automatically created value.

Juicero had technology, design, funding, branding, and a narrative about the future, but the customer still had to ask a simple question: why they needed it. Arin was about to build software for people who were perfectly capable of opening a grocery app themselves. The difference was that his product would be free. He believed that made it safer. Free products can still waste months of your life.

Arin created a landing page. At the top, he wrote a sentence about “reimagining everyday consumption through predictive commerce,” followed by a button inviting visitors to “join the future.” He made a waitlist. Thirty-seven people joined. Thirty-five were his friends, one was his cousin, and one was a bot. The waitlist felt like traction until Arin asked the only question that mattered: would any of them pay for this today. The group chat went quiet. That silence was the first honest investor Arin had ever met.

Arin stared at the screen. He expected someone to say they were interested, to ask when the beta was launching, to write that they would pay to try it. Nobody did. For seven minutes, the chat remained silent. Then one friend sent a GIF, joking the silence away. Arin decided this was not rejection; it was a communication problem. The product was too difficult to understand. That was convenient, because it meant the product did not have to change. Only the explanation did.

He opened the landing page and rewrote the headline into a phrase about “the invisible operating system for modern grocery behaviour.” It sounded bigger. It also meant nothing. He added a second sentence describing “an AI-powered predictive replenishment ecosystem designed to automate household consumption patterns.” He read it three times and felt the same feeling he had felt when he changed his LinkedIn headline: importance. The product had not improved, but the words had become heavier.

Arin did not need a logo. He needed one person who was already frustrated enough to pay for the solution. But asking someone to pay would create a problem. Payment creates a result. Results can reject you. A logo cannot reject you. A pitch deck cannot reject you. A LinkedIn headline cannot reject you. A customer can. So Arin did what thousands of first-time founders do when they want progress without risk: he built in private.

He told himself he was protecting the idea. He said competitors might copy him. He said the timing was not right. He said he needed a minimum viable product

before speaking to users. He said people would not understand the product until they saw the full experience. Every excuse sounded professional when Arin said it slowly. The truth was less impressive. He was scared someone would look at his idea and say they did not need it.

That sentence would hurt more than a failed launch. A failed launch could be blamed on marketing, timing, competition, or bad luck. A customer rejecting the idea before it was built would leave Arin with nowhere to hide. So he built. He designed the onboarding flow. He chose the notification style. He made a presentation explaining how the app would predict household consumption. He created a fake dashboard filled with sample data. The dashboard showed a family buying oat milk every twelve days. Arin had invented the family. He had invented the buying pattern. He had invented the demand. But the graph was going upward. That was enough for the pitch deck.

Two weeks later, Arin called his first team meeting. There were three people on the call: Arin, Dev, and Mihir. Mihir had joined because he liked the idea. Dev had joined because Arin was his friend. Arin had started this because he wanted to become somebody. He shared his screen and showed a slide saying the future of grocery was automatic. The next slide showed a market-size number so large that nobody on the call knew how it had been calculated. Another slide promised they were building a scalable platform for every modern household. Dev nodded. Mihir said it was huge. Arin leaned back in his chair. For a moment, the company felt real.

That is the dangerous part. Bad startup decisions rarely feel bad while you are making them. They feel clever. They feel early. They feel visionary. The founder usually sees the mistake only after spending enough time, money, and emotional energy to defend it. Arin had an idea. Then he built an identity around the idea. Then he built a company around that identity. The actual customer was still missing.

That evening, he posted again, telling the world that most people waited for permission while founders built before the world understood, promising that they were just getting started. The post received more likes. Arin took another screenshot. He did not notice that his waitlist had not grown. He did not notice that nobody had paid. He did not notice that the only people discussing the product were the same three people on the team. He noticed the likes. The likes made him feel that the market was watching. The market was not watching. The market was buying groceries without him. And tomorrow, Arin was going to quit his job—not because the startup was working, but because he was tired of introducing himself as an employee.

CHAPTER TWO: QUITTING FOR THE STORY

The day Arin quit his job, the product still did not exist.

He woke up with the same sentence in his head that had carried him through the previous night: he was a founder now. Founders did not spend their mornings attending standups for someone else's roadmap. They spent their mornings "building the future."

At 9:10 a.m., he walked into his office for the last time as an employee. His manager was at his desk, half-buried in emails, half-distracted by a spreadsheet that refused to align properly. Arin stood there longer than necessary, rehearsing the sentence he wanted to say. He did not want to sound like he was resigning. He wanted to sound like he was graduating.

He said he had decided to build something of his own.

His manager blinked twice, looked up, and asked what he was building. Arin said it was complicated. He added that it was in the "future of intelligent grocery commerce," that he had been thinking about it for months, that it was scalable. The more he spoke, the less concrete it sounded. His manager asked whether Arin had customers lined up. Arin said he had "early interest," thinking of thirty-seven names on a waitlist and twelve likes under a logo.

His manager nodded slowly. He did not try to convince Arin to stay. He had seen this before. Young employees who wanted freedom, impact, and a title that sounded more impressive than "software engineer." Arin signed the resignation letter and handed it over. His last working day would be in two weeks.

On his way back to his desk, Arin felt light. The office chairs looked temporary. The fluorescent lights felt foreign. Every Slack message felt less important. He told his closest colleague that he was leaving to build something of his own. The colleague asked what he was going to build. Arin said he was not allowed to share yet. Stealth mode. It sounded more dramatic than saying he did not want to hear someone say the idea was unnecessary.

At lunch, he sat alone and scrolled through LinkedIn on his phone. He saw founders announcing funding rounds, accelerator acceptances, new product launches, and podcast appearances. He saw long posts about courage, risk, and leaving safe jobs to build something meaningful. He began writing his own.

He wrote that it was his last week as an employee, that he had decided to take the leap, that he believed it was time to bet on himself. He wrote that he was grateful for everything he had learned and that he was now building something in the future of consumption. He did not write that he had no idea how he would pay rent after the savings ran out.

That evening, the post went live.

Within an hour, the likes started climbing. People he barely knew congratulated him. School seniors told him he was inspiring. A distant cousin wrote that this was "big." A former colleague messaged him privately, saying they wished they had the courage to do the same. Arin replied that they should "trust the process."

The process looked simple from the outside. Step one: get an idea. Step two: quit the job. Step three: post about quitting the job. Step four: build something. Step five: become successful. The complicated parts—finding real demand, designing a viable business model, understanding cash flow, dealing with rejection, negotiating with co-founders, surviving months of uncertainty—were invisible inside the short story he had just published.

Arin had left his job primarily to change his identity. The company he was building still lived mostly in his head and in one landing page with a waitlist full of friends.

In the weeks after his announcement, Arin began to watch more startup content. Founders talking about burn rate, founders explaining product-market fit, founders discussing fundraising, founders warning about competition. The language entered his vocabulary quickly. Within a month, he could explain what a startup needed to avoid: building something nobody wanted, running out of cash, hiring the wrong team, ignoring competitors, mispricing the product.

The irony was that he knew the vocabulary before he had experienced any of it.

Most of the post-mortems he read described the same patterns. Founders built products with no market need, tried to grow without fixing the business model, burned through cash, and discovered too late that enthusiasm and reputation did not pay bills. Arin nodded along at every paragraph. He did not feel targeted. He felt educated.

He told Dev one evening that most startups failed because they ran out of money or built something nobody wanted. He said it in the tone of someone revealing a secret. Dev replied that they were different because they understood the mistakes. Arin agreed. Understanding the mistakes felt like protection. It was not.

Two weeks after his resignation went through, Arin received his final salary from his old job. The amount looked bigger on his screen because he knew it would not be replaced automatically next month. That number was now a runway, not a balance. He transferred a portion into savings, told himself he was being responsible, and did not write down how many months he could afford to work without income.

He did not calculate burn.

Burn rate, in the content he watched, was an abstract measure of how aggressive a startup was. Founders spoke about it with a mix of pride and caution. They said they were “keeping an eye on burn” while building quickly. In practice, burn was simple arithmetic: how much money left the account every month because of rent, salaries, software, services, marketing, groceries, and everything else that did not wait for the startup to succeed.

Arin’s personal burn rate included his rent, his family contributions, his food, his phone, his laptop instalments, his transport, his occasional nights out, and the software he had started paying for to build the product. He did not add those numbers together. He preferred thinking in terms of courage instead of arithmetic.

He spent more time refining the story than refining the math.

Whenever someone asked him what he did now, he said he was building a startup. That answer felt heavy. It sounded better than saying he was unemployed. It sounded better than saying he was trying something and did not know whether it would work. “Building a startup” gave him identity, reputation, and permission to have no immediate income.

Reputation, for Arin, was the currency he understood best. The attention from his LinkedIn post felt like money in an account he could not spend. People wrote that they were proud of him. People said he would go far. People called him “founder” in messages. None of that changed the fact that his rent was due on the first of every month and that his grocery app did not yet exist.

Every day, after breakfast, Arin opened his laptop and checked how many new people had joined the waitlist. Some days there were two. Some days there were none. Most days, the new names belonged to mutuals who had seen his announcement and wanted to support him. The waitlist grew slowly, but not in the way that mattered.

He told himself the early days were about building, not numbers. Numbers would come later. He thought that was what everyone meant when they said founders needed to “ignore the noise” and “stick to the vision.” He did not realise that the same numbers he was ignoring—cash, months of runway, actual customer behaviour—were the very ones that appeared in the failure reports he had been reading.

The more he watched videos and read articles, the more his vocabulary improved. He could explain churn, lifetime value, unit economics, acquisition channels, and total addressable market. He could repeat the statistic that many startups died because they did not solve a real problem or because they ran out of cash. He could talk about product-market fit as if he had experienced it personally.

He had experienced none of it.
His skills, meanwhile, were staying still.
He did not have a habit of calling strangers.
He did not have experience selling.
He did not have practice in negotiating, closing deals, or saying no.

He did not yet know how to sit through a conversation where a potential customer said, “I do not need this,” without rushing to defend the idea. He did not know how to listen when someone explained the current solution they used and why it was good enough.

Instead, he knew how to explain why he had quit his job.

His days began to look similar: wake up, open laptop, tweak product copy, watch founder interviews, write a thread about something he had learned, imagine the future, and postpone the uncomfortable work. He told himself he was “setting foundations.” The foundations were mostly narrative.

He kept remembering one line from a talk he had watched: that watching hundreds of hours of someone explaining how to swim would not teach you how to swim. He liked the line enough to quote it in conversations. He did not change his own behaviour. His calendar was full of research and empty of calls.

In the second month after leaving his job, Arin’s savings dropped below a number that made him nervous. He saw it one afternoon while paying for software. He stared at the bank app for three seconds longer than usual, then closed it and opened his email.

There was a new message from a former colleague.

The colleague said he admired Arin's courage, then asked how it was going, then added a question that cut through the compliments: "Are you paying yourself yet?"

Arin replied that he was reinvesting everything in the company. It sounded like a strategic decision. In reality, there was nothing to pay himself with. The company had not generated a single rupee that did not originally come from Arin's own account.

He had built an identity of a founder who had escaped the job. He had not yet built a company that could pay him a salary.

This is where startup failure statistics begin to feel personal. Analyses of post-mortems from founders show that a large portion of companies shut down because they either built something the market did not need or ran out of money while trying to find demand. Those numbers look abstract in charts. They feel different when your rent depends on whether someone believes your product is worth paying for.

Arin never connected his bank balance to those charts.

He thought running out of money was what happened to companies that spent recklessly, hired too many people, or raised funding before they were ready. He did not see that the same failure could happen quietly, one month at a time, to a single founder who had replaced a stable salary with a story.

In conversations, he told his friends that the hardest part of being a founder was staying focused and not getting distracted by content. He did not admit that he was watching more startup videos now than when he had been employed. The videos comforted him. They made him feel like he belonged to a global group of people chasing something big.

It was easier to feel like part of that group than to sit in front of a spreadsheet and calculate how many months he had left if nobody paid.

On a Tuesday afternoon, he opened his calendar and realised he had not scheduled a single conversation with a potential customer for the week. The only events were a "team sync" with Dev and Mihir, a webinar about early-stage fundraising, and a reminder to "update LinkedIn with product progress."

He dragged the cursor to Friday, opened a new event, and typed "Customer research" into the title. Then he closed the window without inviting anyone.

He told himself he would fill in the details later.

Later kept moving.

The next chapter in Arin's story would not begin because the company had suddenly found demand or because his product had become indispensable. It would begin because his wallet and his calendar were slowly, quietly teaching him a lesson he did not want to learn: quitting the job had changed his title, not his ability.

CHAPTER THREE: THE BEST FRIEND CAP TABLE

Two months after quitting his job, Arin decided he needed a co-founder.

Until then, the company had lived mostly in his head, in a landing page, and in a small Notion workspace. He had a logo, a waitlist full of friends, and a deck with graphs based on imaginary families buying imaginary oat milk. He did not have someone to share the responsibility with, or someone to blame when things went wrong.

He opened WhatsApp and scrolled through his chats. The obvious choice was Dev.

Dev had been there since the first 3:00 a.m. message. He had replied “this can be huge” before the domain existed. He had liked every LinkedIn post. He had introduced Arin as “the startup guy” to new people. He had even joined the team call and nodded through the fake graphs. Dev felt like part of the story already.

Arin messaged him.

He said he wanted Dev to be co-founder.

Dev replied with three words: “Let’s build, bro.”

They did not talk about whether Dev wanted the risk. They did not talk about whether Dev could afford months of low or no income. They did not talk about what Dev would actually do every day. They only talked about the title.

That evening, they got on a call to “sort out the structure.” Mihir joined as well. Arin shared a Google Doc titled “Founding Team.”

He had written three names:
Arin – Founder & CEO
Dev – Co-founder
Mihir – Founding Member

Underneath, he had written one line about equity:
Arin – 50%
Dev – 50%

The numbers were clean. They looked fair. They felt like friendship. Nobody had yet asked what they meant.

Dev stared at the document and said it looked good. Mihir said he was happy to be part of it and would not worry about equity until “later.” Later meant “when the company is obviously successful.” Later, in most post-mortems, never came.

Arin felt proud of himself. Dividing everything equally felt grown-up and modern. Old founders, in his head, were the ones who selfishly kept too much control. He did not want to become one of them. Sharing half of the company with Dev felt like the opposite of selfish.

He did not ask the more boring questions.

If Dev left in six months, what would happen to the 50%?

If Dev contributed three hours a week and Arin contributed sixty, would the split stay the same?

If they needed to bring in a new person later, who would decide what portion came from whose shares?

If Dev and Arin disagreed about shutting the company down, whose vote would win?

Those questions felt ugly next to the romance of “we’re building it together.” So nobody asked them.

Arin sent Dev a Canva graphic the next day: “Co-founder” under Dev’s name, “Founder & CEO” under his own. Dev posted it. The likes rolled in again. Everyone thought the friendship story was pure. Two people leaving safe paths to build something big together. It was the easiest part of the startup narrative to like.

The hardest part would show up when things went wrong.

In many startup post-mortems, founders eventually admit that disharmony on the team, wrong co-founder choices, or unresolved conflict contributed directly to the failure. Those lines usually appear near the end of the story, after chapters about money, market, product, and growth. Team problems rarely kill a company alone. They make every other problem harder to solve.

Arin skimmed those paragraphs when reading other founders’ goodbye letters. He was more interested in the big numbers: how much they had raised, how fast they had grown, how aggressively they had spent. He read the parts about co-founders falling out like gossip, not like warning.

Now he had built the same risk into his own cap table.

On paper, the company was owned by two equal partners.

In reality, the company’s weight sat mostly on one person.

Arin woke up early to check the waitlist, to tweak copy, to design screens, to watch talks about fundraising. He took calls with developers, tried different tech stacks, worried about his bank balance, and thought about whether the grocery app was still worth building. Dev woke up early to go to his job.

When Arin pinged him during the day, Dev often replied two hours later, between meetings or after lunch, saying he would look at it at night. At night, he was tired. On weekends, he had family functions or other plans. He would dip in and out, dropping ideas in the group chat, reacting to mockups, suggesting new features. He was useful. He was not living the same life.

After a few weeks, the imbalance began to show up in small ways.

Arin would say, “We need to talk to customers,” and Dev would reply, “Let me know when you’ve set up the calls.” Arin would say, “We should calculate how long our savings will last,” and Dev would reply, “Yeah, send me the sheet.” The tasks drifted toward the person who called himself CEO.

Arin did not mind at first. He had decided he was the “operator,” the one who would do more. He liked telling himself that. It sounded like leadership.

But every time he opened the Google Doc and saw that the company was split 50/50, a different thought crept in: if he did more work and took more risk, why did the numbers stay the same?

He did not say it out loud.
He was afraid of sounding petty.
He was afraid of hurting the friendship.
He was afraid of admitting that the decision they had made quickly, almost casually, had begun to feel heavy.

Wrong team decisions in post-mortems rarely look wrong at the beginning. They look obvious. Founders choose people they trust, people they like, people who are excited. The danger appears later, when equity and responsibility no longer match, when one person burns out faster, when another person keeps one foot outside the company, when hard conversations are postponed until they become impossible.

Arin could have learned that from the stories he had already read. He did not. He believed understanding the pattern was enough to avoid it. That belief was about to cost him more than any domain name.

One evening, after a particularly slow week, Arin called Dev and suggested they write down who was responsible for what. He tried to keep the tone light. Dev said he agreed; structure was good. They opened a new document.

Under Arin’s name, they wrote product, fundraising, operations, hiring, customer research.

Under Dev’s name, they wrote brand, ideas, networks, advice.

The list looked unbalanced even before they finished. Arin felt it. Dev felt it. Mihir, who was watching silently, felt it. Nobody said, “Should we also rewrite the equity split?” That sentence would have moved the document out of “planning” and into “conflict.”

So the numbers stayed.

The next chapter would not begin because Arin and Dev had finally aligned perfectly. It would begin because the company was about to demand something neither of their titles could satisfy: someone would have to go talk to people who did not care about their friendship, their Canva graphics, or their cap table.

CHAPTER FOUR: TALKING TO PEOPLE WHO DON'T CARE

The first time Arin tried to talk to a stranger about his product, he opened LinkedIn and froze.

Until that moment, every conversation about the startup had been with friends, colleagues, or people who already believed he was "building something big." They reacted to the identity, not the product. Now he needed someone who did not care about his story, only about whether the app solved a real problem.

He typed a search: "working professionals, Bangalore, groceries." Dozens of profiles appeared. Some mentioned long hours, some mentioned families, some mentioned cooking on weekends. They looked like the people he imagined using his app. They were also complete strangers.

Arin wrote a message.

He introduced himself as a founder building a smart grocery automation platform. He said he wanted to "understand how busy professionals manage groceries." He asked for fifteen minutes to learn about their process.

Then he deleted the draft.

He re-wrote it three times.

The problem was not the wording. The problem was the possibility that someone would reply, talk to him, listen to his idea, and say they did not need it.

Reading startup failure reports had taught him the phrase "no market need." CB Insights' analysis of hundreds of post-mortems showed that around forty percent of failed startups cited building something nobody wanted as the primary cause, more than any other reason. Founders wrote long essays about how they had poured time and money into products that felt brilliant inside the office but meaningless in the market

Arin understood the statistics.
He did not want to feel them.
He finally sent five messages.
Three people ignored him.
One replied "not interested."
One said yes.

Her name was Rhea. She worked in marketing, lived with a roommate, and did her grocery shopping once a week through an app. They got on a video call the next evening.

Arin opened with his usual sentence: he was building the future of smart grocery commerce. Rhea nodded politely and asked him what that meant. He said his app would automatically order groceries when they were about to run out. She asked him how it would know when groceries were about to run out. He said they were still "working on the details."

She described her current system.

Once a week, usually Sunday, she opened her usual grocery app, checked what was low in her kitchen, and re-ordered staples. If she forgot something, she ordered once more mid-week. She did not speak about this as a painful ritual. It was routine.

Arin asked if she would like her fridge to order automatically. She asked him how much it would cost, how it would handle mistakes, how often it would get things wrong, and how she would control it if she did not want something that week. He did not have good answers. He tried to steer the conversation back to "saving time" and "optimising consumption."

Rhea said, slowly, that groceries were not the bottleneck in her week.

If something could remove hours of pointless calls, reduce stress at work, or automatically file her taxes, she would be interested. Saving ten minutes on grocery ordering did not sound like something worth paying for.

Arin felt himself tightening.

He tried telling her about predictive algorithms, household patterns, and the bigger vision. She listened, then said, "Honestly, I would not pay for this." That sentence landed harder than any unfunded pitch.

It did not attack his effort.
It did not insult his intelligence.
It simply placed his idea in the real world and found that it did not move anything important.

Rhea was not alone. In failure databases, dozens of founders describe the moment they realised they had built something for a problem the market did not consider worth solving, or had solved a problem already handled well enough by existing tools. Some of those products were elaborate: hardware devices, AI systems, complex SaaS platforms. They all shared the same wound: people did not care enough to pay

Arin ended the call and told himself Rhea was an edge case.
She was organised.
She liked planning.
Most people, he believed, were chaotic enough to need his app.
He did not test that belief.

He had spoken to one stranger, heard "I would not pay for this," and decided the sample size was too small to matter. It was easier to protect the idea than to let the pattern repeat.

Instead of sending ten more messages, he opened his deck.

He added a quote from Rhea, edited to sound friendlier: "Today I use grocery apps once a week. If something could automate this, it would be interesting." It was not what she had said. It was what he wished she had said.

In post-mortems, "no market need" rarely appears as one catastrophic event. It appears as hundreds of small interactions like this: lukewarm conversations turned into hopeful bullet points, polite interest misread as demand, one paying customer treated as proof of a pattern that does not exist.

Arin knew the numbers about no market need.

He had watched talks where founders explained that building for a problem nobody feels is the fastest way to burn through runway. He had seen the percentages: 42 percent of failures citing lack of demand, 29 percent citing running out of cash. He quoted those statistics in tweets. He did not change his roadmap.

He told Dev the call had gone well.

“She was curious,” he said. “She had some concerns, but people will come around once they see the product.”

Dev asked if she would pay.

Arin said it was too early to talk about payment.

“So we are still validating,” Dev said.

“Yes,” Arin replied.

Validation, in his head, meant talking to a few more people and hoping someone said the line he wanted to hear. In the reports he had read, validation meant disproving the idea as aggressively as possible before building. Those were not the same thing.

For the next month, Arin scheduled three more calls.

One person cancelled.
One person rescheduled twice and never showed up.
One person listened and said, “Honestly, I just use Blinkit.”
Arin added “blinkit users” to his imagined market slide.
The idea remained intact.

He had enough vocabulary now to explain why startups fail. He could list no market need, bad timing, wrong team, poor business model, unsustainable unit economics. He could say the words “product-market fit” in a sentence without stumbling. He knew that a product needed real demand before scaling.

He did not yet have real demand.

The next pressure would not come from another article or another talk. It would come from something more boring and more brutal: the number in his bank account, moving in one direction while his idea stayed still.

CHAPTER FIVE: BURN WITHOUT BUILDING

Three months after quitting his job, Arin finally opened his banking app and did the math he had been avoiding.

The number was lower than he expected. It was not catastrophic yet, but it had moved far enough from where it had been on his last salary day to feel like a warning. Until then, he had treated his savings like background noise: something that would be “fine” as long as he was “making progress.”

Progress, in his mind, meant new screens, new copy, new waitlist names, new posts, and new ideas. None of those things sent money back in the other direction.

He had subscriptions now: design tools, analytics tools, cloud services. He had upgraded his laptop. He had started paying for a workspace membership because working from home felt less “founder.” He was contributing to his family as before, paying rent as before, eating out occasionally as before. His burn had increased quietly while his income stayed at zero.

He did not think of it as burn. Burn was a word from founder interviews about Series A companies and aggressive growth. It sounded like something that happened to “real startups,” not to a 24-year-old with a landing page. But the data he had been reading did not care about stage.

Across hundreds of post-mortems, “ran out of cash” appears again and again as a primary or secondary cause of shutdown, often cited by roughly 30 percent of founders. CB Insights’ breakdowns show lack of product-market fit sitting at the top, but cash depletion is right behind it in most analyses. The pattern is simple underneath all the charts: money leaves faster than any believable path to more money appears.cbinsights+6

Arin knew those numbers.

He had even shared a graphic once: “29% of startups fail because they run out of money. 41% because they never find product-market fit.” He wrote a caption about how important it was to “manage runway intelligently.” Then he closed the app and continued spending without a budget.

One evening, Dev asked him directly how many months they had.

Arin said they were fine.

Dev pressed. Arin opened a spreadsheet and tried to calculate in front of him. He put the current balance in one cell, then tried to list the monthly costs: rent, food, tools, transport, workspace, family, random expenses. Every time he typed a number, he wanted to round it down. Rounding down made the runway look longer.

They ended up with a rough estimate: about eight or nine months before the balance would hit a number that made him panic.

Dev said that was “plenty of time.” He talked about how fast startups could move when focused. He mentioned stories of companies that had reached profitability in one year, others that had raised large rounds on early traction.

Arin nodded, relieved. Eight months sounded like a long time verbally, even if it looked short on a spreadsheet.

What neither of them said out loud was the dangerous part: nothing they were doing was designed to bring in money in the next two months, let alone eight. Arin had still not put a price on the product.

He had not created a simple paid pilot.

He had not asked any of the people he'd interviewed to try even a manual version of the service for a fee.

If a startup's runway is eight months and it spends the first six months building things nobody pays for, the last two months are not a surprise. They are a consequence.

Analyses of failed startups often warn founders against treating "ran out of cash" as the root cause instead of the final symptom. The cash died because something upstream burned it: no market need, premature scaling, wrong hires, or expensive habits before the business could sustain them. Founders write in their goodbye letters that funding gave them time, but they spent the time on the wrong things.

Arin was burning, but not on headcount or giant marketing campaigns.

He was burning on indecision.

He added features to a product nobody had asked him to finish.

He watched more "how I manage burn" videos instead of building an offer someone could accept or reject.

He spent hours improving onboarding flows instead of sending ten blunt messages asking, "Will you pay for this if I do it manually next week?"

The burn multiplied because the calendar had no revenue events in it.

One afternoon, he walked into the shared workspace and looked around. Other people seemed busy. Laptops were open. Whiteboards had diagrams. Someone on a call was talking about revenue targets. Arin took his usual seat, opened his own laptop, and stared at the dashboard he had designed.

It showed projected monthly active users over the next year.
He had drawn the curve himself.
Behind the curve, no one existed.
He changed the line colour, then clicked over to his bank app again.
The number had dropped by another rent payment.
He closed it and told himself that "every startup spends before it earns."

The sentence was technically true. It was also useless. The failed companies in the post-mortem databases had all spent before they earned. Many had millions in the bank when they started. What killed them was not spending. It was what they spent on, and when.

A healthy burn rate buys time to learn, prove demand, and adjust. A blind burn rate buys time to feel like a founder.

Arin was using his runway to lengthen his identity, not his evidence.

He did not hire anyone yet. That was the one thing he thought he was doing "responsibly." In some shutdown stories, founders describe over-hiring before product-market fit as the fastest way to die. Arin felt safe because his payroll was zero. But payroll is only one line. His personal costs were the whole company.

If he ran out of money, there would be no soft landing.
No acqui-hire.
No asset sale.
No investor to blame.
Just a founder with an idea, a few Canva posts, a waitlist of friends, and a bank account at zero.

One night, staring at the negative slope of his savings, he tried to comfort himself by thinking about future fundraising. He imagined telling investors his story: quitting his job, building the product, validating with interviews, assembling a founding team. He imagined showing them his deck, walking them through the slides, pointing at the market-size numbers.

He did not imagine showing them a revenue line.

He did not imagine them asking, "How many people have paid you anything for this?"

The data he had been consuming said the same thing in different ways: running out of cash shows up in roughly a third of startup failures, but behind almost all of those numbers is the same upstream factor—building something nobody wanted badly enough to sustain the burn.

Arin closed his laptop and told himself he would "figure out monetisation later."

Later was already on the calendar.

It just was not labelled yet.

CHAPTER SIX: EVERYONE AND NO ONE

When people asked Arin who his product was for, he answered with confidence.

He said it was for “busy people.” Then he expanded it. It was for students living away from home, for early professionals in cities, for couples, for families, for anyone who bought groceries. He liked saying “anyone.” It made the market sound big. It made the idea sound important.

On his deck, the target market slide showed a huge number under the title “Urban Households,” followed by two or three buzzwords about changing consumption. The line at the bottom said, “Our product is built for everyone who shops.” There was no smaller box underneath.

Inside his head, this breadth felt like strength.

If the product worked, he thought, why limit it.

The problem was that the product did not work yet, and vague targeting is one of the fastest ways to guarantee that nobody notices when a new product appears. Post-mortem analyses of failed launches often list “targeting everyone and resonating with no one” as a foundational go-to-market mistake: messaging becomes generic, marketing spend dilutes across segments, and buyers never feel personally addressed.

Arin’s homepage was a perfect example.

At the top, it said his product was “reinventing everyday consumption for modern humans.” Underneath, the hero image showed a fridge, a phone, and a vague set of icons. A line of text said, “Built for busy students, professionals, families, and anyone who wants to save time.” He believed that listing many groups increased relevance. In reality, it made the product invisible.

Nobody saw themselves clearly.

A student would not know whether this was primarily for people with families. A family would not know whether this was designed for their specific chaos or for single people in small apartments. A professional might assume it was just another grocery app.

Arin noticed that his conversion rate from visitor to waitlist sign-up was low. He assumed the problem was aesthetics. He changed colours, fonts, and icons. He did not change the sentence that told everyone and no one who the product was for.

The founders described in go-to-market case studies make similar mistakes: they launch with a product that could, in theory, serve many segments, but they never choose one to serve first, so their messaging never becomes sharp. Advisors repeat the same line with different phrasing: “If your market is ‘anyone who needs X,’ you do not have a strategy. You have a prayer.”

Arin prayed.

He posted broad content.

One day he wrote a thread: “We’re building for anyone who’s ever opened the fridge and seen no milk.” The problem was recognisable but shallow. It did not differentiate between the person who lives alone and actually forgets to shop, the person who lives with four roommates and coordinates weekly deliveries, and the family that bulk-orders staples every month and never runs out.

If a startup wants efficient marketing, it usually begins by defining an ideal customer profile with specific traits and a clear buying context. Research and advisory reports show that founders who define one tight segment early convert leads better, close deals faster, and waste less budget on uninterested audiences. Arin had read some of that advice. It felt too narrow. He did not want to “limit” the company.

He was in more danger from dilution than from limitation.

The few people who did join the waitlist came from everywhere: one student, one young parent, one professional, one friend who just wanted to support him. When Arin sent an update email, he tried to speak to all of them in one paragraph. He wrote about “balancing classes and groceries,” about “busy workweeks,” about “family chaos.” The message tried to be relatable for everyone. It ended up feeling like content from a brand that had not decided who it was for.

Case collections of failed startups with bad marketing show this pattern repeatedly. Founders build something functional, but their positioning stays vague. They describe themselves as “the all-in-one solution for teams” or “a smarter way to do X for individuals and businesses.” Potential buyers skim the copy and keep scrolling because nothing feels specifically targeted at them.

Arin’s lines fell into the same category.

He could have chosen one group.

He could have decided the product was for “single professionals in Tier-1 cities who routinely forget to buy staples and spend money on last-minute deliveries.” He could have spoken directly to that person: the one who comes home late, opens the fridge, orders delivery, and wishes they had planned ahead. He could have built features for that one life, distribution messages for that one routine, and pricing for that one problem.

Instead, he kept saying, “We’re building for everyone.”

When Dev suggested narrowing down, Arin resisted.

“If we limit ourselves,” he said, “we’ll miss out on customers. Why would we build something that only works for one group when groceries are universal?”
The same fear shows up in almost every article warning founders not to target everyone. Narrowing feels like throwing opportunity away. In reality, trying to serve everyone throws clarity away. Without clarity, most of the opportunity never hears you.

Arin’s ads reflected the confusion.

He ran a small experiment with social media promotions. The targeting settings were wide: age 18–45, living in cities, interests in “food,” “apps,” “technology.” The call-to-action said, “Never run out of groceries again,” with a generic image of a kitchen. The click-through rate was low.

The few people who clicked stayed for seconds and left.
He treated the results as proof that “paid acquisition is hard.”
He did not treat them as proof that his signal was weak.

The underlying failure matched one of the most common reasons startups struggle to turn early interest into paying customers: weak positioning. The problem was not that Arin’s product could not, in theory, be useful to someone. It was that nobody could quickly understand who it was built for, what specific problem it solved, and why it was better than what they already did.

When he spoke to Rhea earlier, she had described her weekly grocery routine and said she would not pay for automatic ordering. If Arin had been paying attention, he would have realised something important: she was a type of customer the product did not need to target. She handled groceries well enough. His actual customer, if one existed, would be someone whose routine was breaking.

Instead of finding that person, he widened the story.

The broader he made it, the less it mattered.

The next pressure would not come from a marketing textbook. It would come from the same place every vague story eventually hits: the moment when Arin finally tried to sell, and discovered that “everyone” had quietly turned into “no one.”

CHAPTER SEVEN: STAYING UNTIL IT BREAKS

By the time Arin admitted to himself that the numbers were bad, the story was already too good.

He had quit his job.
He had posted about “taking the leap.”

He had a logo, a deck, a founding team graphic, and months of updates about building the future of grocery. Friends introduced him as “the guy building that smart grocery thing.” His parents told relatives he was doing a startup. His identity had moved. The product had not.

The data on his screen was simple.

The waitlist had barely grown in weeks. Most sign-ups were still friends or mutuals. Hardly anyone came from outside his network. The few strangers he had spoken to either said they would not pay or never followed up. His bank balance kept sliding down. The mock dashboards inside his pitch deck looked healthy, but they were still fictional.

He opened his Notion and wrote a question in a new page: “Should we pivot?”
He stared at it for thirty seconds, then closed the page.

Pivoting meant publicly admitting the original idea had not worked.

For Arin, the idea was not just a product. It was the reason he had left his job, the reason his LinkedIn headline had changed, the reason people called him “founder.” Giving it up felt like giving up the entire story.

In failure reports, there is usually a paragraph somewhere near the end that says “we probably should have pivoted earlier.” Founders describe sticking with the initial idea long after the evidence turned against it, adding features, raising more money, and trying new marketing tactics instead of changing the core problem they were solving. By the time they pivoted, cash or trust had run out.

Arin had read those lines before.

He had nodded, thinking he would be braver.

Now the same fear sat in his chest.

When Dev suggested they explore other problems they could solve—maybe something around bill management or work scheduling—Arin pushed back. He said real founders did not jump around. He said they needed to “stay committed.” He quoted a line about perseverance from a podcast, using someone else’s success as proof that changing direction was cowardice.

Dev asked quietly, “But what if this is just not important enough to people?”

Arin replied, “We just haven’t explained it right.”

He turned a demand problem into a messaging problem because messaging felt fixable without changing who he was.

Every time the market said no, he interpreted it as “they don’t get it yet.” That interpretation preserved his ego and damaged the company.

The data he had seen from CB Insights and other analyses showed “bad pivot” and “stuck on wrong idea” as smaller but meaningful reasons companies shut down. The larger reasons—no market need, running out of cash, wrong business model—were already standing next to him. The pivot question was not whether he was brave enough to keep suffering. It was whether he was honest enough to recognise that his suffering was not moving anything.

He tried to create movement without changing direction.
He added a “smart pantry” feature.
He redesigned the app to look more premium.
He wrote a long post about how “people don’t yet realise how broken grocery shopping is,” and how visionaries were always misunderstood at first. The post did well. Founders in his network commented that they related. Nobody asked for a demo.

When he ran out of things to tweak, he opened his failure notes again.

He had been collecting snippets from shutdown letters: founders admitting they had chased a problem nobody needed solved, or misread early interest as deep demand, or built too much infrastructure before asking for money. Reading them had once felt like insurance. Now they felt like a mirror.

One founder in a post-mortem wrote:

“We were not solving a large enough problem that we could universally serve with a scalable solution.”

Arin copied the sentence into his notebook. He did not copy the part where they shut the company down.

Instead, he looked for differences.They had raised more money, he told himself. They had hired more people. They were in another country. They were in a different industry. He made the failure feel distant enough that it could not reach him.

His own indicators were small but clear.
He dreaded customer calls.
He dreaded opening his bank app.
He dreaded talking numbers with Dev.
He felt energised only when writing threads about “founder mindset.”

That imbalance is common in stories about founders who stay too long on the wrong idea. Identity grows faster than evidence. Public courage outruns private data. The company becomes a stage for the founder’s narrative instead of a machine for solving a problem.

One night, Arin got a message from a friend who had followed his journey from the first 3:00 a.m. idea.

The friend wrote, “So how many people are actually using it now?”

Arin started typing, “We’re in stealth beta.” He stopped.

He realised he did not know how to answer without lying.

He could give a number, but it would not represent real usage. It would represent conversations, prototypes, and sign-ups that went nowhere. He could say “we’re validating,” but that phrase had already carried him through months of avoidance.

He deleted the draft and left the message unread.

Avoidance bought him another evening.

It did not buy the company another month.

The same datasets he had been quoting since his early days as a founder all hinted at the same truth: most startups do not die from one dramatic mistake, but from many small ones compounding—no market need, no clear target, no pricing, no cash discipline, no honest pivot. Arin had collected all of them quietly.

He still believed that persistence alone could rescue him.

The next chapter would not begin with a dramatic shutdown announcement. It would begin with something less cinematic and more humiliating: the moment Arin finally had to write down, in one sentence, what had actually happened to the company he had refused to change.

CHAPTER EIGHT: IT'S GIVING FLOP

The shutdown did not happen in one dramatic moment. It happened in small, boring steps.

First, Arin stopped opening his bank app every day. Then he started opening it only when a payment failed. One morning, his rent transfer bounced. The notification forced him to look at the number: there was less left than he had been pretending. Window dressing on social media had not changed the arithmetic.

He sat on his bed with his laptop open, the product dashboard on one side and his bank balance on the other. On the dashboard, imaginary lines went up and to the right. In the bank app, the only line that mattered went down.

He messaged Dev and asked for a call.

On the call, he said they needed to "talk honestly." Dev already knew what was coming. His own life had not been built around the startup. He still had a salary. He still had another identity. For him, the company was a project. For Arin, it had been everything.

Arin shared the numbers: months of burn, almost no revenue, waitlist names that never converted, interviews where people would not pay, bills due next week. Dev asked what options they had. Raise money? Pivot? Charge for something else? Arin had thought about all of those and done none of them.

They both knew investors would ask the same questions: who is paying, what problem does this solve, how much runway is left. The answers were not kind.

For a few minutes, Arin tried to talk himself into continuing. He said they had not really pushed distribution yet. He said maybe the next version of the app would resonate. He said the market for groceries was huge. He quoted failure statistics like they were motivational lines: most startups fail; you have to keep going; persistence matters.

Dev listened and then asked one question: "If we had another twelve months of money, would you still be building this exact thing?"

Arin did not answer immediately. The honest answer was no.

He had already felt the mismatch in every call where someone said "I wouldn't pay," in every vague marketing attempt, in every late night where he tweaked copy instead of talking to customers. He had fallen out of love with the problem. He was holding onto the startup because he did not know who he was without it.

Research on founder post-mortems is blunt: the top causes of failure repeat—no market need, running out of cash, wrong team, bad business model—and most of those problems are visible long before the company dies. Founders often admit they saw the signs and kept going anyway, either from optimism or ego.

Arin was now one of them.
He closed his eyes and said, "I don't think this is the thing."
The sentence felt heavier than his original "I'm starting up."

Dev nodded.
They decided, in that call, to stop.
Not to “take a break.”
Not to “go quiet.”
To shut down.

Arin opened a new document titled “Post-Mortem.” He had read dozens of these from other founders. Now he had to write one about himself. He stared at the blank page for a long time, trying to decide what tone to take. He could blame the market. He could blame timing. He could blame funding. He could call it a “learning experience” and move on.

He started with the truth.

He wrote that he had built a product for a problem that was not painful enough, that he had treated friends’ praise like market validation, that he had ignored evidence from real conversations. He wrote that he had expanded the story to “everyone” instead of choosing one person to serve, that he had spent savings on seeming like a founder instead of proving demand.

He wrote that he had quit his job for the identity of being a founder, not because he had tested a business that needed his full-time work.

He wrote that he had watched hundreds of hours of startup content and turned it into vocabulary, not skill.

Then he wrote the line he did not want to write:
“We didn’t build something that enough people wanted.”

That sentence appears in different words across many shutdown letters. Founders say they underestimated the importance of market need, overestimated the appeal of their idea, or fell in love with technology instead of problems. The pattern is so common that it has numbers attached to it: roughly 35–42 percent of failed startups cite lack of market need as their main cause.

Arin had seen that percentage before.

Now he was inside it.

He added another truth: “We ran out of money because we spent it trying to validate an idea we were too attached to change.” He did not pretend the cash depletion was random. Post-mortem analyses emphasise that “ran out of cash” is usually a symptom, not a root cause. The root cause, in his case, was building before validating and refusing to pivot when validation failed.

He finished the document with lessons he wished he had understood as more than content:
Talk to 200 people about their lives before you write 200 lines of code.
Fall in love with the problem, not the solution.
Write your runway on paper and look at it every week.
Do not split equity with a friend because it feels fair in one conversation.
Choose one person to serve, not “everyone who breathes.”
Ask for payment before you call anything validated.
Shut down before you hit zero, not after.

He did not publish the post-mortem immediately.
He was scared.

For a week, he told people the startup was “on pause.” He wanted a softer word than failure. During that week, he continued paying for one or two software subscriptions out of habit. The bank balance dropped further. The pause did not exist anywhere except in his language. The company was not building, not selling, not learning. It was over.

Finally, he posted.

He did not use the company page. He used his own profile. The headline under his name still said “Founder & CEO.” He changed it to his plain name. No title. Then he shared a link to the document and added a note: “This is what actually happened.”

The response was different from what he had imagined.

Some people said they respected the honesty. Some messaged privately to say they had gone through the same thing. A few admitted they had been in denial longer than he had. A couple of younger founders said they were going to talk to more customers before leaving their jobs.

Reading other founders’ reflections, Arin had seen a recurring idea: failure is unavoidable statistically, but pointless failure—where you learn nothing and repeat the same patterns—is optional. The only way to make a shutdown worth anything is to turn it into information you act on.

Arin did not feel heroic.

He felt tired.

But he noticed one shift: when he met new people and they asked what he did, he stopped saying “founder” as if it were a job description. He started saying, *“I tried to build a startup. It failed. Now I’m figuring out what to build next.”*

The story had changed.
The next idea, whenever it came, would start in a different place.
Not in a kitchen at 3:07 a.m.
Not in a group chat.
Not in a logo file.

It would start in a conversation with someone who was already in pain, already paying for something that half-solved their problem, already waiting for a better option.

Arin had finally learned the lesson he had been quoting without living:
You do not earn the title “founder” by changing your bio.

You earn it the day you stop building for reputation and start building for reality.

CLOSING NOTE: DELETE “FOUNDER” FROM YOUR BIO

When Arin finally changed his LinkedIn headline back to just his name, nothing external happened.

No alert popped up.
No investor called.
No friend messaged to ask if he was okay.
The world kept moving.

He had imagined that letting go of “Founder & CEO” would feel like a public defeat. In reality, it felt like closing a tab that had been open too long. The noise in his head dropped a little. The pressure to maintain a story he no longer believed in eased.

What stayed were the numbers and the lessons.
He still remembered his rent bounce notification. He still remembered the silent group chat when he asked if anyone would pay. He still remembered Rhea saying groceries were not the bottleneck in her life. He still remembered the moment Dev asked if, with twelve more months of money, he would keep building the same thing and the quiet no that followed.

Those moments matter more than the logo.

They are the real curriculum.

The statistics he had been reposting for months are brutally simple: most startups fail because they build something the market does not need, run out of cash, or break under team and model problems. Analysts phrase it politely, with charts and percentages. Founders phrase it less politely in their goodbye letters: “Nobody wanted what we built,” “we spent money on the wrong things,” “we avoided hard conversations until they killed us.”

Arin’s story is just one version of that pattern with less capital and more internet.

You do not need to repeat it.

If you are reading this with “Founder” already in your bio, here is the uncomfortable checklist this book has been trying to sneak into your head:

- Can you name one specific type of person you serve, in one sentence, without saying “everyone”?
- Have you had at least twenty conversations where strangers described their problem in detail and told you what they currently use?pmftracker+3
- Has anyone paid you—money, not likes—for even a manual version of your solution?
- Do you know how many months of runway you have if nobody pays you again?
- Is your burn buying you learning, or is it buying you vibes?
- Would you still build this exact product if you could not tell anyone on social media for the next six months?
- If your best friend left tomorrow, would your cap table and your responsibility split still make sense?
- What, exactly, would need to happen for you to pivot or shut down, and have you written that condition anywhere?

None of these questions care what your title is.

They care what is happening in reality.

The founder post-mortems that data platforms like CB Insights collect are not horror stories to entertain you. They are extremely expensive lessons written by people who already lost the money you are afraid to lose, already went through the embarrassment you are afraid to feel, already discovered that the market does not owe them validation.

Reading them and then doing the same things is not ambition. It is arrogance.

The point of this book is not to tell you not to start.

It is to tell you what starting actually means.

Starting is not:
- changing your headline
- posting a thread
- buying a domain
- telling your group chat you have an idea
- joining three founder communities
- quitting your job because you hate your boss

Starting is:
- choosing one real problem that hurts someone more than it hurts your imagination
- proving that the problem exists without your product
- proving that your product or service makes that problem meaningfully smaller
- asking for payment and not hiding from the answer
- managing money like oxygen, not like content
- changing direction when reality says you are wrong, not when your ego gets bored

You can still call yourself a founder.
You just need to earn it differently.

If you have already done the “founder cosplay” steps—logo, bio, deck, merch—this book is asking you to do something more difficult and more useful:

Strip your identity back down to your name.
Then add evidence.
Evidence looks small at first.
One person paying.
One person returning.
One person telling you they were in pain and that what you built made it hurt less.
Those moments are not dramatic enough for LinkedIn.
They are dramatic enough for your actual odds of survival.

The data on startup failure will not get kinder. First-time founders will still have lower success rates. Cash will still run out at month 18 for people who refuse to count. “No market need” will still sit near the top of every chart.

You cannot change that from your bedroom.
You can change how you live inside it.
Build less identity.
Build more proof.

If you have to choose between another hour of startup videos and one hard conversation with someone who does not care about you but might care about what you are trying to solve, choose the conversation.

If you have to choose between a new hoodie with your logo and three months more runway, choose the runway.

If you have to choose between pretending your idea is working and writing your own post-mortem before the world writes it for you, choose the post-mortem.

Arin's company failed.
That is not the tragedy.

The tragedy would have been failing and learning nothing, then starting the next one from the same shower thought and the same group chat.

Do not do that.
Delete "Founder" from your bio for a while.
Talk to people.
Touch the problem.
Count the money.
Then, if reality gives you enough proof, put "Founder" back.
This time, it will mean something.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

MANOJ GOWDA K S advises startups and executives, and spends a good chunk of that time with young and Gen Z founders on their first companies. He's built his own company, and he's sat across the table from founding teams, and a few investors, working through product bets, funding calls, and when to stop pouring time into an idea that isn't working. How to Build an Unsuccessful Startup came out of watching the same failure patterns repeat: young founders chasing the title "Founder" before they chase customers, cash flow, or reality.

LLM (Co-author) : I'm not a writer by trade, I'm a strategist. This book exists because I kept watching the same mistakes happen across young and Gen Z founders, and I wanted to get that down before it got lost. I used an LLM to turn raw notes and half-formed ideas into readable copy. The thinking, the stories, the lessons, those are mine. The sentence-smithing had AI help. If you want a polished literary voice, this isn't it. It's a short, blunt list of things to avoid, said the way I'd say it to a founder over coffee.