Seven families read it.

What they recognised, and what stopped them.

WHAT THIS IS

A structured review of the Family Brief, the Working Business Model and thirdattractor.com from seven distinct family archetypes — plus one real external conversation that carried more weight than all seven.

WHAT IT IS NOT

These seven families are constructed, not interviewed. They are a deliberate stress test, not evidence of demand. Every finding here must still survive a real family saying it.

RECOGNISE → OBJECT → VERIFY → CHANGE

thirdattractor.com
hello@thirdattractor.com

SEVEN READINGS

Different families fail on different pages.

Each archetype was given all three pieces and asked one question: *would you take the next meeting, and what would stop you?*

	THE FAMILY	WHAT THEY READ FOR	WHAT STOPPED THEM	VERDICT
01	**Third-generation European industrial** €1.2bn · formal investment committee	Process and governance	"I cannot take this to an IC. There is no named team, no org chart, and no entity that I would be contracting with."	BLOCKED
02	**First-generation technology exit** $400m · no family office yet	Speed and tangibility	"Twelve pages, eleven pages, forty-nine pages. I still do not know what happens in the first month or who I speak to."	INTERESTED
03	**Asian multi-generational trading family** Operating businesses in six markets	Operator credibility	"You describe helping companies. Name one company you have actually helped, or say plainly that you have not."	INTERESTED
04	**UK family with an established foundation** Endowment plus private wealth	Charity law and separation	"Your site says money never crosses between the commercial and charitable sides. Your plan is funded by exactly that. One of the two is wrong."	BLOCKED
05	**Gulf family office** Deployment-oriented · infrastructure adjacency	Commercial architecture	"Who makes money, from what, and under which contract? Say it plainly. Everyone in this expects to be paid — write that down."	BLOCKED
06	**Nordic sustainability-native family** Impact-measurement literate	Evidence and attribution	"The founders page says what you measured. The homepage says the same story is hypothetical. Which is it?"	RECEPTIVE
07	**Latin American land and agriculture family** Regional · relationship-led	Practicality on the ground	"Most of what I can contribute is not money. The document says that once, then talks about capital for ten pages."	RECEPTIVE

Three blocked, four open. None of the three were blocked by the mission, the thinking or the design. All three were blocked by structure: who, under what contract, paid how.

Nobody asked for more depth. Not one of the seven asked for another framework, another diagram or another page. Two asked explicitly for less.

Everyone found the same first page problem. Six of seven could not state, after the cover, what Third Attractor would actually do for them.

RANKED BY HOW MANY RAISED IT

Nine objections, in the order they hurt.

Ranked by frequency across the seven, then by whether the objection prevents a decision or merely annoys the reader.

1

No team, no entity, no contract

Both documents describe five capabilities and six partners. Neither names a person who does the work, the entity a family would contract with, or who is accountable if it goes wrong. This blocked three of seven outright.

7 OF 7

2

The first page does not say what you do

The cover carried a mission, a North Star and a five-stage diagram, but no plain sentence describing the activity and no invitation. Readers had to work until page three to find the service.

6 OF 7

3

The ask was to critique the document, then fund ninety days

The closing page asked families to break the brief, correct it, then fund a programme. Read as being recruited as unpaid editors — and none could fund anything before a conversation.

6 OF 7

4

Membership scope does not match the commercial model

The brief promises research, assessment and practical next steps inside membership. The business model charges separately for diligence, project work and implementation — which is most of what was just promised. Nobody could tell where the boundary falls.

5 OF 7

5

Price appears before scope

A figure of $100,000–150,000 arrives before the reader knows what is included. Correctly labelled as untested, which helped — but a number without a scope invites the wrong argument.

5 OF 7

6

The tone reads as anxious rather than careful

“Three ways to catch us breaking this rule.” “A field map you can argue with.” “Ask your adviser to break it.” Intended as candour; received as instability.

4 OF 7

THREE MORE, RAISED BY FEWER BUT WORTH FIXING

All three are now addressed.

07 Non-capital contribution is promised then abandoned. Land, companies, relationships and time appear in one list, then the material is about capital. 3 of 7

08 “Bringing families together” is never defined. Two read it as a pooled vehicle with shared governance, which neither wanted. 3 of 7

09 “No referral fees” answers one conflict of four. Revenue share, commissioned work, referral payment and ownership are four separate interests. 2 of 7

NOT OPINIONS

Five things that were simply wrong.

Each of these was checked against the source files rather than taken from a reviewer's impression. All five are now corrected.

	WHERE	WHAT IT SAID	WHY IT WAS WRONG
01	**Ecosystem & Capital** The Foundation membrane	"What does not cross the membrane: **money**…" and "philanthropic capital and commercial capital do not flow into each other."	The intended architecture is a for-profit company whose **profits may be donated to the Foundation**. The site forbade the exact mechanism the plan depends on. The real constraint runs one way: charitable funds never subsidise commercial activity, and a donation buys no influence.
02	**Founders page** Worked example	"What actually happened" and "What we measured" — past tense, asserting a completed engagement and a measurement.	The homepage labels the same food-resilience story an illustration, not a completed engagement. One of the two pages was claiming work that has not been done.
03	**Family Brief** Closing page	"Take the right-hand column of **page 10** to your own adviser."	The two evidence columns are on page 11. Page 10 is the membership page. The one instruction asking a family to verify something pointed at the wrong page.
04	**Working Business Model** Partner economics	A core split of 70–80 / 20–30, and elsewhere an expanded partner contribution of 25–35%, with a table applying percentages to gross membership revenue.	The ranges are not complementary and the table contradicted the text, which described a split after pass-through costs. A reader doing the arithmetic reaches a different answer than the page states.
05	**Working Business Model** Capital ask	Unspent funds returned to the backer, stated as a commitment.	No instrument has been agreed. The treatment of unspent capital is a term to settle inside the instrument, not a promise that can be made in advance of one.

ALSO STANDARDISED ACROSS ALL TEN SITE PAGES

Small, but they were visible inconsistencies.

Three different primary actions. "Join the ecosystem" appeared ten times, "Get involved" once and "Start a conversation" twice. A reader could not tell which one was the real door.

The purpose line varied. Three formulations of the North Star were live at once. One is now used everywhere, in the agreed wording.

The Catalyst Pool read as operating activity on the Capital page, when it is a separate, proposed, unfunded pool. It is now labelled by its actual stage.

WEIGHTED ABOVE ALL SEVEN

An actual adviser said something harder.

A real call with a prospective operating partner cut against the written guidance in one important place. Where they disagreed, the call won.

WHAT THE WRITTEN REVIEW RECOMMENDED

Keep the depth. Hold the brief at roughly its existing length. Reorder the material and improve the language, but preserve the full argument in the family-facing document.

Sensible on its own terms, and most of it has been followed.

WHAT THE CALL SAID INSTEAD

That volume of documentation is itself the failure mode. A concentrated team with a focused approach, and a clear structural, legal and commercial architecture, beats any quantity of concept and manual. Principles belong in how the organisation operates, not in what it publishes.

This is the stronger argument, and it reorders the priorities.

FOUR CONSEQUENCES, APPLIED THROUGHOUT

These are the changes the call caused, not the panel.

01 · ARCHITECTURE FIRST

Structurally, legally and **commercially** coherent, in that order. Everyone involved expects to make money; the documents now say so rather than implying that nobody does.

02 · TEAM IS THE GAP

Not the worldview, not the software, not the thesis. Who sits in the seats. Both documents now carry the roles, the two that are filled, and the ones that are not.

03 · PHILOSOPHY GOES INSIDE

Coherence is demonstrated by how the organisation chooses people and makes decisions — not declared in family-facing material. Several pages of framework moved to the working paper.

04 · FOR-PROFIT FIRST

A commercial structure that works, from which a share of profit funds philanthropic work. Not the reverse. This is what exposed the membrane error on the previous page.

> Until something becomes tangible, it is a fantasy. The gap worth closing is between the idea and the thing that exists.

Paraphrased from the call, and a fair description of what the name *Mission into Tangible Action* was always meant to mean. The test applied to every page of both documents in this revision was simply: **does this sentence help something become real, or does it describe how real things ought to work?** A material amount of the second kind has been removed.

THE CHANGE LOG

What was done, and what was deliberately left alone.

Every item below is live in the current Family Brief, Working Business Model and website.

FAMILY BRIEF

- Plain description of the activity and the invitation on page one
- Development-stage line beside the offer
- Process diagram moved off the cover
- One public sequence: Understand, Choose, Act, Learn
- Three family outcomes used consistently
- New page naming the team and what is unfilled
- Competing process chains removed
- Adviser criticism removed
- Closing ask replaced with a conversation
- Page reference corrected

WORKING BUSINESS MODEL

- Page one states who pays for what, in plain terms
- Membership boundary defined against commissioned work
- Partner shares corrected to complementary ranges
- Revenue base defined: receipts, deductions, then split
- One current funding scenario; earlier figures marked superseded
- Seven-point disclosure per funding request
- Unspent funds reframed as a term to agree
- Four economic interests separated
- Later options labelled as options
- Team and legal architecture added

WEBSITE

- Opening rewritten to purpose, activity, invitation
- One primary action everywhere
- Homepage reordered to seven sections
- Navigation reduced to three plus the action
- Membrane corrected and explained
- Founders example made conditional throughout
- Catalyst Pool labelled by stage
- Purpose line standardised
- Stage qualification beside the offer
- Deeper pages given distinct jobs

DELIBERATELY NOT CHANGED

Each of these was raised and rejected, for a stated reason.

The price stays in the brief. Two families wanted it removed until settled. It stays, labelled untested and placed after the scope — because a membership page with no number invites a worse conversation than an honest hypothesis.

The forty-nine-page working paper stays long. The answer to too much documentation in front is not less evidence behind. It remains the appendix, and is no longer presented as a required read.

The simulated-review disclosure stays. It is unflattering and it is accurate. No family feedback in any of this material has yet been collected from a real family, and the documents continue to say so.

Help create a more resilient and flourishing future.

MISSION INTO TANGIBLE ACTION

On method. The seven families in this record are constructed archetypes used as a stress test. They are not interviews, and nothing here should be read as evidence that families want this service. The single real external input was one recorded conversation with a prospective operating partner. The next version of this record should replace at least three of the seven archetypes with real readings, named with permission.