PROBLEM? RELAX. YOU'VE GOT THIS!

I STARTED A COMPANY WITH A FRIEND, AND NOW WE NEED MORE THAN TRUST

How to Agree on Contributions, Roles, Decisions, and Exit Rules for a Shared Business, and Keep Conversations Between Owners Separate from Friendship Without Postponing Difficult Agreements Until the First Crisis



Max Paradox

I Started a Company with a Friend, and Now We Need More Than Trust

How to Agree on Contributions, Roles, Decisions, and Exit Rules for a Shared Business, and Keep Conversations Between Owners Separate from Friendship Without Postponing Difficult Agreements Until the First Crisis

Max Paradox

PROBLEM? RELAX. YOU'VE GOT THIS!

ISBN: 9788384839928

ALL-IN Rafał Płonkowski



CONTENTS

INTRO 5

Chapter 1 - Your Best Friend Is Not a Business Agreement 11

Chapter 2 - Fifty-Fifty Sounds Fair Until You Ask What Each Half Costs 20

Chapter 3 - Two Founders, Twelve Jobs, and Nobody in Charge 29

Chapter 4 - Two Equal Votes, One Decision, and an Expensive Silence 38

Chapter 5 - The Business Bank Account Is Not Your Shared Wallet 47

Chapter 6 - Business Partners at Work, Friends Off the Clock 56

Chapter 7 - The Uninvited Business Partners: Family, Friends, and Everyone with an Opinion 65

Chapter 8 - Your First Employee Is Not a Referee for Two Best Friends 74

Chapter 9 - Put It in Writing Before Your Memories Start Negotiating 83

Chapter 10 - How to Leave the Business Without Destroying the Friendship 92

Chapter 11 - My Friend Promised, My Business Partner Didn't Deliver 103

Chapter 12 - One Company, Two Futures: Agree on the Destination Before You Start Driving 113

Chapter 13 - The Password Is in My Co-Founder's Head, So Who Actually Controls the Company? 123

Chapter 14 - Is That Your Client or Our Client? The Relationship That Holds the Whole Business Hostage 132

Chapter 15 - The First Real Crisis: When Friendship Meets Reality Without a Discount 142

Chapter 16 - When Trust Breaks and an Apology Won't Put It Back Together 152

Chapter 17 - When Your Co-Founder Can't Keep Going and the Business Still Has to Run 162

Chapter 18 - The Partnership Check-Up: Catch the Problem Before It Starts Costing You the Friendship 172

Chapter 19 - Old Habits Have Spare Keys: How to Stop Your Partnership Slipping Backwards 182

Chapter 20 - Let the Company Stand on Its Own and the Friendship Breathe 191

INTRO

The trouble begins with 600 custom-printed cardboard boxes. They are beautiful boxes, admittedly. Thick material, elegant lettering, a tasteful logo, and a finish that suggests the contents are considerably more expensive than they actually are. There is just one problem: nobody agreed to buy them. Ben ordered the packaging because he wanted their new business to look professional. His best friend and co-founder, Oliver, discovers the purchase when the supplier sends an invoice. Ben insists that presentation matters. Oliver points out that they haven't sold enough products to fill even a quarter of the boxes. Ben calls it investing in the future. Oliver calls it spending money they don't have. Within fifteen minutes, two men who once shared a cramped apartment without a single serious argument are discussing whether one of them has always been irresponsible. The cardboard boxes, meanwhile, remain impressively neutral.

This is the peculiar magic of starting a company with a friend. You begin with enthusiasm, mutual respect, and the comforting belief that years of friendship have prepared you for virtually anything. You know each other's personalities, recognize each other's moods, and can probably predict who will complain about the restaurant bill. What you may not know is how your friend defines acceptable financial risk, how much authority they expect to have, or what they believe an equal partnership actually requires. Those questions rarely arise during ordinary friendship. They become remarkably important when your savings, professional reputation, and future income depend on the answers.

At the beginning, discussing formal agreements can feel unnecessarily suspicious. Why would you need detailed arrangements with someone you've trusted for years? Surely contracts are for strangers, difficult investors, and people who

insist on referring to lunch as a networking opportunity. You and your friend are different. You understand each other. You'll make decisions together and resolve disagreements sensibly. And perhaps you will, most of the time. Unfortunately, "We'll work it out" becomes a considerably less impressive business strategy when both founders want different outcomes, neither has the authority to decide, and a customer needs an answer before five o'clock.

Friendship gives you valuable knowledge about another person, but it doesn't automatically create shared business expectations. Your friend might consider a successful company one that grows aggressively, attracts investors, and eventually becomes valuable enough to sell. You might imagine a profitable, manageable operation that provides financial independence without consuming every evening and weekend. Both ambitions are reasonable. Both can support a successful business. But they can also lead to contradictory choices about hiring, borrowing, expansion, and distributing profits. If nobody identifies the difference, every disagreement may begin to look like a character defect. Your cautious partner becomes unambitious. Your enthusiastic partner becomes reckless. Neither description helps you decide whether to open another location.

Money introduces another layer of confusion. One founder contributes most of the starting capital while the other supplies industry knowledge and does the daily work. Perhaps both own half the company. That arrangement might be entirely appropriate, provided both understand what they're agreeing to. Trouble develops when one believes their financial contribution deserves greater control, while the other expects their working hours to be rewarded separately. Ownership, compensation, financial contributions, and operational responsibilities are related, but they aren't interchangeable. Treating them as though they were can turn an ordinary discussion about pay into a competition over who has

sacrificed more. It's difficult to produce a sensible financial policy while simultaneously conducting a retrospective trial of your entire friendship.

The problem isn't necessarily dishonesty. Two decent people can reach an apparent agreement while privately imagining different details. When one says, "We'll both work hard," does that mean forty hours a week, whatever the business requires, or simply doing your agreed responsibilities well? When someone promises to put more money into the company if needed, what happens if their circumstances change? And when you agree that major decisions require approval from both founders, what qualifies as major? A purchase costing $500 might be routine for one company and financially disastrous for another. Unless you clarify the meaning, you haven't really established a rule. You've established a sentence that sounds reassuring.

Then there's the emotional complication. With an ordinary business partner, you might be willing to challenge a questionable decision directly. With a close friend, the same conversation feels personal. You worry that questioning an expense will sound like questioning their integrity. You hesitate to discuss missed deadlines because you know they're having difficulties at home. Sometimes you say nothing, hoping the irritation will disappear. Instead, it quietly accumulates until a relatively minor incident triggers an argument wildly disproportionate to what happened. You started discussing an overdue proposal and somehow ended up debating a disastrous holiday from eight years ago. The customer still hasn't received the proposal, but at least the historical record is now under review.

You also need room to be friends without conducting business every time you meet. A friendship that becomes a permanent management meeting can lose some of what made it enjoyable. Every dinner becomes an opportunity to discuss sales. Every weekend conversation develops an unexpected financial agenda.

Eventually, one person hesitates to answer the phone because they cannot tell whether the caller wants to catch up or explain why another supplier hasn't been paid. Separating personal time from business discussions doesn't mean becoming cold or formal. It means giving each relationship enough space to function on its own terms.

This book is for people considering a business with a friend, founders who have already started one, and partners who suspect that their cheerful early arrangements are beginning to show cracks. It will help you understand where friction comes from and develop practical ways to manage it. We'll examine how to make contributions and responsibilities clear, create workable decision rules, discuss money without turning every conversation into a personal referendum, and prepare for circumstances neither of you particularly wants to imagine. The aim isn't to make your company unnecessarily bureaucratic. It's to prevent important decisions from depending entirely on memory, assumptions, and whichever founder happens to be more persuasive that afternoon.

Some questions will require professional assistance. Legal structures, ownership rights, taxes, financial obligations, and exit arrangements vary depending on where and how a company operates. No general business guide can replace advice tailored to your circumstances. What you can develop, however, is the ability to recognize which agreements you need, what consequences you should consider, and what questions to take to an appropriate adviser. Arriving at a lawyer's office with two clearly explained objectives is considerably more productive than arriving with the statement, "We're completely agreed, apart from everything involving money, control, and what happens if somebody leaves."

You don't need to transform your friendship into a collection of policies. Nor should you expect every disagreement to disappear once you have written something down. People change their minds, circumstances shift, and even carefully considered decisions

sometimes fail. The real benefit of clearer agreements is that they provide a starting point when life becomes complicated. You can disagree about a proposal without questioning the entire relationship. You can adjust responsibilities without treating every change as a betrayal. And you can recognize when an arrangement has stopped working rather than defending it indefinitely because it once seemed like a wonderful idea.

Before going further, consider one question: what important assumption about your business have you never actually checked with your friend? Perhaps you assume that both of you want to remain involved for at least ten years. Perhaps you believe profits will be reinvested until the company reaches a certain size. Maybe you're convinced that your partner would never want to bring in an outside investor. Choose one assumption and imagine discovering tomorrow that your friend believes the opposite. If the difference would affect an important decision, it deserves a proper conversation. You don't have to resolve it immediately, but you should stop treating your private expectation as a mutual agreement.

Starting a company with a friend can be an extraordinary opportunity. You already possess familiarity, shared experiences, and a foundation of goodwill that many business partnerships spend years trying to develop. Those advantages deserve protection, not romantic exaggeration. Trust can help you collaborate, but it shouldn't have to perform the duties of a financial controller, operations manager, legal adviser, and emergency dispute-resolution committee all at once. Give it some support. Establish the agreements that matter, learn to have the uncomfortable conversations, and build a business where friendship is an advantage rather than the only thing holding everything together.

Because the ultimate achievement isn't merely building a company that makes money. It's building one in which both

founders understand what they're responsible for, can make difficult decisions without unnecessary damage, and retain the freedom to be honest with each other. And if the business succeeds, you might even celebrate together without somebody producing an invoice halfway through dinner.

Chapter 1 - Your Best Friend Is Not a Business Agreement

At 9:17 on a Tuesday morning, Emily discovers that her business partner has promised a client an entirely new website design at no additional charge. The original project was supposed to be finished on Friday. The additional work will take at least another week, and the client is delighted. Emily is considerably less delighted, particularly because she is the person responsible for delivering it. Her partner, Ryan, explains that the customer seemed disappointed and he wanted to protect the relationship. Emily points out that protecting a customer relationship by giving away someone else's working week is an unusually generous form of charity. Ryan responds that she's overreacting. She reminds him that he's been making promises like this since they started the company. He says she's always been controlling, even when they were teenagers. The discussion has now travelled fifteen years backwards, while the unfinished website remains firmly in the present.

Starting a company with a close friend offers an extraordinary advantage: you already know each other. You've seen how the other person handles disappointment, celebrates success, and behaves when things don't go according to plan. You know whether they are naturally cautious or enthusiastic, organized or spontaneous, patient or inclined to make decisions before breakfast. That familiarity can make the beginning of a business partnership feel wonderfully easy. Unfortunately, knowing somebody's personality is different from knowing their expectations as a business owner. You might trust your friend completely and still have no idea whether they believe customer satisfaction justifies unlimited additional work. You can admire their generosity while wishing they would occasionally demonstrate it using their own resources.

Friendship and business operate under different expectations. In a friendship, flexibility is often a virtue. Someone changes plans, forgets an arrangement, or needs unexpected help, and you accommodate them because the relationship matters. Business obligations can be less forgiving. A missed deadline may affect a customer's operations. An unauthorized commitment can create costs that someone must absorb. A seemingly minor decision can influence employees, suppliers, or the company's ability to meet other obligations. None of this means friends should become cold, suspicious, or excessively formal when working together. It means the business requires clarity that ordinary friendship rarely demands. Affection can make somebody easier to forgive, but it cannot automatically make an impossible deadline achievable.

The first mistake many friends make is confusing mutual goodwill with mutual understanding. They agree to work hard, share responsibility, and make decisions together. These are admirable intentions, but each contains an impressive amount of unexplored territory. Does working hard mean maintaining agreed results or being available whenever the business needs you? Does sharing responsibility mean dividing duties or approving every action jointly? If one partner makes a mistake, does the other automatically step in? You can agree enthusiastically with every word while imagining a completely different working arrangement. At some point, reality asks for a specific answer. Unfortunately, reality has a habit of asking when an important customer is waiting, the company is short of money, and both founders have somewhere else they would rather be.

The company you each think you started

Imagine two friends opening a small business offering educational workshops to organizations. One wants to build a substantial company, hire instructors, and eventually expand into several regions. The other wants to remain personally involved in delivering workshops, earn a reliable income, and maintain enough

flexibility for family life. Both sincerely describe their ambition as building a successful business. Both consider the other enthusiastic about the idea. For several months, their expectations remain compatible because they are simply trying to win customers. Once orders become more frequent, however, their different ambitions begin influencing decisions. One proposes hiring a sales manager. The other believes the additional salary would create unnecessary pressure. Neither is being unreasonable. They have simply been operating under different definitions of success.

This distinction matters because disagreements are often interpreted as personality problems when they are actually differences in objectives. The founder who wants rapid expansion sees caution as a lack of ambition. The founder who prefers stability sees aggressive investment as recklessness. Once those labels appear, every discussion becomes harder. People stop examining individual proposals and start defending their identities. A more useful conversation begins by asking what each person wants the company to provide over the next few years. Income, independence, growth, professional satisfaction, eventual sale, or a manageable working life are all possible answers. You do not necessarily need identical priorities, but you need to understand how different priorities will affect the choices you make together.

Personal circumstances also shape business expectations in ways that friendship may never have exposed. One founder might have substantial savings and few financial commitments. Another may depend on the company for most of their household income. The first can afford to wait longer before drawing money from the business, while the second needs a more predictable arrangement. Neither should automatically be accused of greed or insufficient commitment. They face different constraints. Similar differences appear around working hours, travel, willingness to guarantee obligations, and the amount of uncertainty each person can tolerate. A fair partnership needs room for these realities rather

than assuming that friendship somehow produces identical financial circumstances.

You may also discover that familiarity creates an unhelpful division of roles. Perhaps your friend was always the confident one who organized social events, while you were the person who checked practical details. Those habits can follow you into business without any deliberate discussion. Your friend begins announcing decisions, and you quietly make them workable. Over time, the confident founder acquires informal authority while the practical founder inherits an expanding collection of invisible responsibilities. Both may consider this arrangement natural because it resembles how they have behaved for years. Yet the qualities that made a friendship enjoyable do not automatically produce an appropriate management structure. The person who chose restaurants brilliantly for a decade has not thereby qualified to approve every company investment.

The reverse problem is equally possible. You know that your friend has always been disorganized, so you start checking everything they do. Eventually, they feel watched and begin defending even sensible decisions. You interpret their defensiveness as further proof that they cannot be trusted to work independently. A habit that began as a practical precaution becomes a source of conflict. Instead of relying on old impressions, examine the specific responsibilities involved. What result is required? What information does the person need? How will completion be recognized? This approach gives both founders a better chance of being judged on their actual business performance rather than a personality assessment completed during their student years.

When a business disagreement feels like a personal betrayal

One reason disagreements between friends become unusually intense is that ordinary commercial questions carry additional emotional meaning. Asking a business partner to explain an

expense should be a normal part of responsible management. Asking a close friend can feel like accusing them of dishonesty. Refusing a proposal may be interpreted as rejecting the person who suggested it. Pointing out repeated delays can awaken years of irritation about unrelated behavior. The conversation stops being about a particular decision and becomes a referendum on loyalty. This rarely improves the quality of the final decision, although it can produce an impressive amount of material for future arguments.

Consider Emily and Ryan again. Emily's immediate problem concerns additional work promised to a customer. She could begin by telling Ryan that he never thinks about consequences, which would almost certainly produce a detailed defense of his character. Alternatively, she could explain that the additional work requires several days, affects another commitment, and was accepted without checking delivery capacity. The distinction is important. The second explanation identifies the business consequences and creates room to discuss how similar requests should be handled. Ryan may still disagree, but the discussion has a recognizable subject. Nobody needs to establish which founder was the more responsible teenager.

It helps to distinguish three things that often become tangled together: the decision itself, the reason someone made it, and the effect it had. Ryan might have genuinely wanted to protect an important client relationship. That intention deserves to be understood, but it doesn't automatically make his decision appropriate. Emily might have every reason to feel frustrated, but her frustration alone doesn't establish the best solution. They need to determine what was promised, what it will cost, what obligations already exist, and how the company can respond. Only then can they sensibly discuss whether their expectations about customer commitments require adjustment. Understanding somebody's

intention does not mean accepting every consequence of their behavior.

The language you use can make this process easier or harder. Statements beginning with "You always" and "You never" invite the other person to search for exceptions rather than examine the current problem. "You never consult me" can turn into a lengthy debate about the occasions when consultation did occur. "You committed us to additional work on these two projects without checking the schedule" offers something concrete to discuss. It also allows the other person to challenge the facts if your understanding is incomplete. Precision doesn't remove emotion, but it prevents emotion from becoming the only evidence presented.

Find the assumptions before they become expensive

A useful early conversation doesn't require an elaborate retreat, a consultant, or an intimidating presentation entitled Our Shared Vision for Operational Excellence. Start by having each founder independently describe how they believe the company should function. Writing answers separately matters because people naturally adjust their statements when they hear someone else's position. If your friend confidently announces that every available dollar should be reinvested, you may hesitate to admit that you expect regular income. You might even convince yourself that the difference isn't important. Three months later, when your personal expenses remain stubbornly interested in being paid, it suddenly becomes extremely important.

Focus on practical expectations rather than general declarations of goodwill. Describe how much time you expect to contribute, the decisions you believe require joint approval, the level of financial exposure you are willing to accept, and the circumstances in which you would reconsider your involvement. Include what you expect from your friend and what you consider nonnegotiable. Some answers may be uncomfortable. That's useful information. The aim isn't to produce matching responses or identify which founder has

the more admirable attitude. It's to discover differences while you still have time to address them without an urgent business problem dictating the conversation.

When you compare your answers, resist the temptation to resolve everything immediately. First identify where you genuinely agree, where your language conceals different meanings, and where your preferences conflict. You might discover that both founders support hiring an employee, but one expects it within three months while the other considers it a possibility several years away. Or perhaps both support taking calculated risks, but one defines a calculated risk as potentially losing a small discretionary budget while the other is comfortable risking substantial savings. These differences deserve thoughtful discussion. An agreement reached because someone wants to finish the meeting is unlikely to become more convincing when money is involved.

Choose one important uncertainty and turn it into a workable agreement. Suppose the problem concerns promising customers additional services. You might establish that standard adjustments within an agreed scope can be approved by the person managing the client, while changes affecting delivery time or cost require confirmation from the person responsible for fulfilment. Decide how that confirmation will happen and what to do if an urgent request arrives. Record the outcome somewhere both founders can access. The result should be specific enough to guide future behavior, without becoming a complicated ritual that makes answering a customer unnecessarily difficult.

Some agreements will require proper legal documentation, especially where ownership rights, financial obligations, representation, or other legally significant matters are concerned. The appropriate form depends on the business structure and jurisdiction. A friendly message confirming what you discussed may help preserve clarity, but it does not necessarily create every legal effect you intend. Professional advice is worthwhile when the

consequences justify it. The essential first step, however, is knowing what you actually want to agree upon. A lawyer can help express and assess an arrangement; they cannot make two fundamentally different expectations compatible merely by placing them in attractive paragraphs.

The hardest part may be accepting that a disagreement doesn't necessarily reveal a defect in either person. Your friend can be generous, loyal, intelligent, and still have business priorities that conflict with yours. You can be an excellent friend while setting limits on your financial involvement or declining a proposed expansion. Sometimes the differences can be accommodated through clearer responsibilities and appropriate decision rules. Sometimes they expose a genuine incompatibility that deserves serious consideration. Discovering that incompatibility early is not an attack on the friendship. Concealing it until both of you have made substantial commitments is far more likely to cause lasting damage.

A healthy partnership leaves room for both professional disagreement and ordinary friendship. You should be able to question an expense without apologizing for caring about the company's finances. Your friend should be able to explain a different perspective without being treated as disloyal. Neither person needs to surrender every preference in the name of harmony. What matters is whether the two of you can convert your familiarity into honest, workable expectations rather than relying on familiarity to excuse the absence of them.

Trust is a wonderful reason to consider starting a company with somebody. It helps you take the first risk, face uncertainty, and believe that difficult conversations are worth having. It is considerably less useful as the only operating agreement your business possesses. The goal is to remain the sort of friends who can share a laugh after a difficult meeting, not the sort who must pretend every decision is excellent to avoid an argument. Your

friendship has already survived plenty of ordinary disagreements. Give your business a structure that doesn't require it to survive an extraordinary number of unnecessary ones.

Chapter 2 - Fifty-Fifty Sounds Fair Until You Ask What Each Half Costs

The first ownership negotiation between Camila and Jordan lasts approximately four minutes. They are starting a mobile bicycle repair business. Camila has savings available for the service van, tools, and initial expenses. Jordan has extensive mechanical experience, relationships with cycling clubs, and a willingness to leave his current job to run the operation full-time. Neither wants their friendship reduced to an awkward discussion about percentages. So they agree to split the company equally. Fifty percent each. It feels generous, modern, and admirably uncomplicated. Six months later, Jordan wants a regular salary because he is working almost every day. Camila points out that she contributed $35,000 and hasn't received anything back. Jordan replies that without him, the equipment would simply be an expensive collection of metal objects. Camila agrees, but suggests that without the equipment, Jordan would be repairing bicycles using enthusiasm and a particularly determined expression.

Their disagreement is understandable because they never established what their equal ownership was supposed to represent. Camila thought she was accepting substantial financial risk in exchange for a long-term share of the business. Jordan assumed his ongoing work would be recognized separately once the company began earning revenue. Both expectations could potentially fit within a sensible arrangement. The trouble is that neither had been explained clearly, and both founders interpreted the equal split as evidence that the important questions had already been settled. Fifty-fifty answered one question about ownership. It did not answer how their work would be compensated, how additional money would be provided, or how their responsibilities might change.

An ownership percentage isn't a universal measurement of effort, fairness, competence, or sacrifice. Its precise legal and financial meaning depends on the company's structure, governing documents, and applicable law. It may influence economic entitlements and decision-making rights, but you cannot safely assume that every right or obligation follows automatically from the percentage alone. Two founders can hold equal interests while performing very different jobs and receiving different compensation for those jobs under appropriate arrangements. Conversely, someone who contributes more working hours doesn't necessarily acquire additional ownership simply by staying late. Treating these separate issues as one calculation creates confusion that becomes increasingly expensive as the business grows.

Contributions come in different currencies

Money is the easiest contribution to identify, although even cash needs a proper explanation. Camila can show precisely what she paid for the van, equipment, and other start-up expenses. But was that money contributed as equity, provided as a loan, or spent under another agreed arrangement? Different choices can create different rights and consequences. A founder who expects repayment may be disappointed to discover that the other understood the money as a permanent contribution in exchange for ownership. Before any significant funds are transferred, you need clarity about their legal and financial character. A bank statement proves that money moved. It doesn't necessarily establish what everyone agreed the movement meant.

Time is less straightforward. Jordan may work fifty hours a week, but counting hours alone doesn't establish the commercial value of his contribution. Some of his work directly generates revenue. Some involves necessary maintenance, administration, and customer service. Other hours might be spent developing ideas that never become viable. None of these activities should be dismissed, yet they cannot all be valued by simply multiplying the