THE TROUBLE WITH A PERFECT VILLAIN

Writing opposition that gives the protagonist a real problem

Published 1 November 2026 · 10 min read

Read online: fogbottom.com/learn/the-trouble-with-a-perfect-villain/



The villain had everything on the list. A remarkable coat. A private office. An unfortunate laugh. He wanted power, disliked happiness and had arranged for several important documents to be kept in a drawer marked SECRET.

He was also waiting patiently for the hero to arrive so he could explain himself.

There are stories in which an extravagant villain is exactly the pleasure being offered. But even the most theatrical opposition needs a working relationship with the story. An impressive entrance cannot do the job of a motive, a method and the ability to make life difficult for someone else.

An antagonist is a person or force that opposes a protagonist's pursuit. That opposition can be cruel, reasonable, mistaken, affectionate or entirely indifferent. Before deciding how alarming the coat should be, work out what is actually getting in the protagonist's way.

START WITH THE COLLISION

A useful antagonist creates a specific conflict with the protagonist's aim. They do not have to oppose every ambition the protagonist has ever held.

Mara wants to turn an unused municipal building into an artists' workshop. The property manager, Ellis, wants the building cleared and sold. Their goals cannot both proceed unchanged.

That gives the story a practical collision. They need not immediately hate one another. Ellis might admire Mara's work and still believe her proposal is unrealistic. Mara might understand the maintenance problem while refusing to accept his solution.

Write both goals in plain language. Then identify the point where one person's success obstructs the other's.

If the connection is vague, the antagonist may be creating general unpleasantness rather than a developing problem. A person who insults Mara's shoes is irritating. A person who controls access to the building can affect her next move.

Connect the opposition to the story's central pursuit.

SEPARATE ANTAGONISM FROM EVIL

A romantic rival, cautious parent, competing explorer or colleague can function as an antagonist without being a moral monster. Even a well-intentioned person can obstruct something the protagonist values.

Conversely, a villain may be morally harmful without serving as the principal obstacle in every part of a story. Role and moral character are related questions, but they are not identical.

This distinction gives you more possibilities. Ellis might be right about some of the building's problems and wrong about what the community needs. Mara might be right about the value of the workshop and careless about the people expected to maintain it.

You do not have to make every dispute evenly balanced. Some stories involve clear exploitation or cruelty. The aim is to understand what the opposition does and why it has force, rather than assuming a label will supply the necessary complexity.

A reasonable obstacle can generate difficult choices. An unreasonable one still needs to operate convincingly within the story.

GIVE THE OPPOSING PERSON A LIFE BEYOND THE CONFRONTATION

Ellis should want something that he could describe without saying, "I would like Mara to be unhappy."

Perhaps he wants to finish a difficult property review without leaving more expensive problems for his successor. Perhaps he has previously supported a community project that failed and left volunteers paying its debts. Perhaps he wants a promotion and sees an uncomplicated sale as evidence of efficiency.

Choose motives that fit the book. You do not need a hidden tragedy to justify every unsympathetic decision.

Ask what Ellis believes would happen if Mara succeeds. If he expects the workshop to fail, what evidence does he think supports that view? If he knows it might work and blocks it anyway, what does he value more?

Also consider what occupies him when Mara is absent. He may have other responsibilities, loyalties and pressures. Their presence can explain delays, priorities and vulnerabilities without turning every scene into a tour of his private life.

MATCH METHOD TO CHARACTER AND POWER

An antagonist needs means suited to their position. Ellis can delay access, challenge a budget or insist on documentation. He probably cannot order the weather to become discouraging.

Those ordinary powers can create substantial trouble when the protagonist has limited time or resources. A missing signature may matter more than a threatening speech.

Decide what the person can actually control, what they can influence and what lies beyond them. This prevents an opposition figure from becoming impossibly powerful whenever the plot needs another setback.

Then choose methods consistent with their habits. Ellis might prefer procedure because it lets him avoid personal conflict. Another antagonist might use charm, secrecy, intimidation or the selective sharing of information.

Methods reveal character. Someone who refuses a meeting openly behaves differently from someone who agrees warmly and repeatedly schedules it after the deadline.

Let the protagonist learn how the opposition works, and consider how that knowledge changes the next attempt.

FIND THE BELIEF THAT MAKES THE METHOD SEEM ACCEPTABLE

People often explain their actions to themselves in ways that preserve a workable self-image. An antagonist can have a justification without the story accepting it.

Ellis may tell himself that consistency is fairness. Making an exception for Mara would encourage everyone to demand one. This belief can support a useful principle in one situation and conceal inflexibility in another.

A more harmful character may describe control as protection or exploitation as deserved reward. Show the relationship between the claim and the behaviour. Readers can recognize the gap without a narrator holding up a sign.

Avoid treating explanation as absolution. Understanding why someone acts does not remove the effects of their actions or require the protagonist to forgive them.

You also do not need to provide an exhaustive psychological account. A few well-chosen decisions, repeated under different pressures, can establish a convincing pattern.

The aim is coherence: readers should be able to understand how this person arrives at the next choice.

LET THE ANTAGONIST EXPOSE A REAL WEAKNESS

Opposition becomes especially useful when it finds something the protagonist would prefer not to face.

Mara believes enthusiasm can solve a practical problem. Ellis asks who will pay the heating bill. It is an unwelcome question, but it is also a necessary one.

If Mara can answer only because Ellis becomes suddenly foolish, the story loses a chance to develop her. Give the objection enough strength that she must improve the proposal, seek help or reconsider an assumption.

A manipulative antagonist may identify a genuine insecurity and use it unfairly. Distinguish the truth of a vulnerability from the legitimacy of the attack.

Ask what the protagonist can learn through the conflict without accepting the antagonist's entire worldview. Mara might become a better organizer while remaining committed to the workshop. She need not conclude that creative work is irresponsible simply because her first

budget was inadequate.

Good opposition puts pressure on both the plan and the person pursuing it.

ALLOW THE OPPOSITION TO RESPOND

An antagonist who waits for each new plan and then repeats the same objection can feel like a gate with dialogue.

Let Ellis observe what Mara does and adapt. If she finds volunteers, he examines the operating costs. If she obtains funding, he questions whether the arrangement can last. These objections should develop a coherent position, not become an endless supply of unrelated excuses.

He can also make his own moves. He may bring forward a review meeting, offer another building or seek support for the sale. Mara then has to respond to an active situation.

Changes need consequences on both sides. If Ellis breaks a promise, colleagues may become less willing to trust him. If Mara misrepresents his concern publicly, he may become less cooperative for a believable reason.

The conflict becomes an exchange of choices rather than a series of obstacles installed by an invisible author overnight.

USE RELATIONSHIPS TO COMPLICATE THE ROLE

Opposition is often more interesting when it exists alongside another relationship. Ellis could be Mara's former teacher, her sister's partner or the person who once encouraged her to apply for a grant.

You do not need to connect everyone through a secret family tree. One meaningful prior connection can alter the emotional cost of a practical disagreement.

Mara may interpret his refusal as betrayal because his earlier support mattered. Ellis may expect gratitude and feel unfairly cast as an enemy. Their history affects how they hear each other.

A supportive relationship can also become antagonistic for a period. A friend may oppose a risky decision because they fear its consequences. The friend has not necessarily changed personalities; the circumstances have brought conflicting values into contact.

Consider what each person thinks the relationship entitles them to ask. This can produce tension beyond the stated argument about money, space or permission.

KEEP INFORMATION AND COMPETENCE CONSISTENT

An antagonist cannot react to a plan they have no way of discovering unless the story provides a credible source. Track who knows what and when.

Similarly, a capable opponent should not forget obvious precautions solely to make the ending easier. If Ellis is meticulous about paperwork, a decisive oversight needs preparation, pressure or a believable blind spot.

Competence does not mean perfection. A person can understand budgets and misread people. They can prepare carefully and still make a poor choice when angry. Let limitations emerge from the established character and situation.

Be cautious with physical shorthand. A scar, disability, unusual appearance or manner of speaking does not establish harmful intent. If the character is dangerous, show the conduct that creates the danger.

You can use vivid presentation without asking appearance to perform all the moral work. The unsettling detail might be how calmly someone dismisses the consequences for other people, rather than what their face looks like.

WHEN THE OPPOSITION IS A SYSTEM OR CIRCUMSTANCE

Not every story needs a central human antagonist. Weather, isolation, scarcity, institutional rules or incompatible responsibilities can resist a character's pursuit.

Make the force specific enough to shape action. "Society is against her" provides less usable material than a clearly established barrier, the people affected and the decisions it requires.

If people represent an institution, give them positions and limits. One employee may understand the problem but lack authority to change the rule. Another may benefit from it. A third may be trying to challenge it from within.

This prevents a complex system from becoming a row of interchangeable sneering officials. It also creates choices for the protagonist: negotiate, organize, find an alternative, refuse or accept a cost.

For impersonal opposition, keep the conditions coherent. A storm should not become selectively inconvenient whenever the plot needs a delay. Establish what the environment allows and what the character understands about it.

BUILD THE CONFRONTATION AROUND WHAT MATTERS

The decisive encounter should bring the central conflict into focus. It need not include a speech about every disagreement in the book.

Mara may arrive at the final meeting with a workable proposal and discover that approval requires a compromise she dislikes. Ellis may have to decide whether his commitment to procedure includes acknowledging that she has met his stated conditions.

Now both have a meaningful choice. The confrontation tests what the story has developed rather than introducing a new argument at the last minute.

If the antagonist is defeated, show how that outcome follows from the protagonist's actions, preparation or changed understanding. If they reach agreement, make the agreement address the real conflict rather than dissolve it through sudden mutual admiration.

An antagonist can remain unconvinced while losing the practical argument. A protagonist can win permission while recognizing a cost. An ending does not require everyone to become pleasant company at the same lunch table.

DECIDE WHETHER THE OPPOSITION CHANGES

An antagonist may reconsider, harden their position, lose influence or remain much the same. Choose the development that fits the story's concerns.

A change of mind should have causes. Ellis might observe evidence that challenges his assumptions, experience a consequence of his own method or recognize an outcome he values in Mara's plan.

An apology alone does not undo damage. If reconciliation matters, consider what action demonstrates a different approach and whether the affected person is willing to accept it.

Some stories gain strength from an opponent who does not change. The protagonist may have to stop seeking their approval or find a way forward beyond their control.

Others reveal that the apparent enemy was never the deepest obstacle. If you use that shift, prepare it through the developing conflict so it feels like discovery rather than an announcement that the previous chapters were a misunderstanding.

TRY A TWO-SIDED SCENE PLAN

Choose one encounter and write a private paragraph for each participant. Include what they want, what they fear, what they believe the other person misunderstands and what they are unwilling to concede.

Then identify each person's available power. Mara can bring evidence, supporters and a revised plan. Ellis can question, delay or recommend an outcome. Neither can simply decide what everyone else believes.

Write the scene with both people attempting something. Let a response affect the next move. Include at least one point where the protagonist must answer a strong objection or recognize an uncomfortable fact.

Afterwards, summarize what changed. Did the encounter alter the practical situation, the relationship or the protagonist's understanding? If everyone leaves holding precisely the same position with no new consequences, the scene may need a sharper decision.

You can ask a reader whether they understood the opposing position without agreeing with it. That distinction is useful. Credibility does not require making every antagonist sympathetic, and sympathy does not require excusing their behaviour.

Begin with the collision, give it people and methods, and follow the consequences. The remarkable coat can remain. It will simply have someone more interesting inside it.

From Fogbottom: practical writing guidance and free creative software for independent authors. The original article, with any updates, is at fogbottom.com/learn/the-trouble-with-a-perfect-villain/.