



The Asymmetric Advantage: How The Weak Can Win Competition

April 2026

Roberto Alvarez, Ph.D.
Entrepreneurship - Corporate Training

Introduction

Military theory and corporate strategy have historically operated under the premise that material advantage is the decisive factor for success. For entrepreneurs and small business owners, this “realist” view can seem discouraging, implying that the “strong” (established corporations) will inevitably overpower the “weak” (startups or small businesses).

However, Ivan Arreguín-Toft’s 2005 essay *How the Weak Win Wars: A Theory of Asymmetric Conflict* challenges this assumption with a compelling theoretical framework. His research suggests that success in competition *depends less on the quantity of resources and more on the quality of strategy planning and execution*, a crucial lesson for entrepreneurs and business leaders.

The Theoretical Foundation: Strategic Interaction


Arreguín-Toft’s central argument suggests that the outcome of a conflict is not merely a *function of power*, but of the **interaction of strategies** between the strong and the weak. He argues that when a strong actor and a weak actor employ the same strategic approach, the strong actor’s superior resources lead to a swift victory. Conversely, when the weak actor employs an opposite strategy, one that the strong actor is not prepared to counter, the weak actor gains a significant probability of winning.

For the entrepreneur, the “strong actor” is the market incumbent, typically characterized by extensive infrastructure and significant economies of scale, while the “weak actor” is the startup, often facing more evident limitations and constraints. Based on military strategy theory, Arreguín-Toft identifies two primary categories of engagement: **direct strategies**, which target the opponent’s physical capacity to resist, and **indirect strategies**, which target the opponent’s determination (*or will*) to continue the struggle. The distinction between direct and indirect strategies reflects a fundamental divergence in how a strategic actor seeks to impose its will upon an adversary.

Direct Strategy: Operation Desert Storm

A direct strategy is characterized by the application of force against the opponent’s military and material assets, seeking to achieve a decisive victory through the physical degradation of their capability to resist

A primary historical example of direct strategy can be found in the 1991 Persian Gulf War, specifically the coalition’s execution of **Operation Desert Storm**. In this conflict, the U.S.-led coalition forces engaged in a systematic campaign to destroy the physical components of the Iraqi military. The strategy focused on the destruction of command-and-control



centers, armored divisions, and logistical infrastructure. The coalition aimed to functionally and structurally decimate the Iraqi military by targeting its "center of gravity," which, in this context, was defined as the physical strength of the *Republican Guard*. The objective was not necessarily to persuade the leadership to change its mind, but to ensure that, regardless of its desires, the Iraqi state physically lacked the **materiel**, communication networks, and personnel necessary to maintain its occupation of Kuwait.

Indirect Strategy: The North Vietnamese Guerrilla Model

An indirect strategy prioritizes the psychological and political dimensions of conflict, aiming to undermine the opponent's resolve (*will*) and make the cost of continuing the struggle appear higher than the value of the objective.

The North Vietnamese strategy during the Vietnam War provides an interesting illustration of the indirect approach, focusing on the attrition of the opponent's "will to persevere" rather than the total destruction of their physical military capacity. Recognizing the overwhelming material and technological superiority of the United States, the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong forces used protracted **guerrilla warfare** and psychological operations to bypass the U.S. military's strengths. Their target was not the destruction of every American aircraft or naval vessel, but rather the erosion of American public and political support for the war. By ensuring that the conflict remained costly, indecisive, and socially divisive, the North Vietnamese successfully targeted the determination of the U.S. government. This strategy culminated in a scenario where, despite maintaining a vast physical capacity to fight, the United States lacked the domestic political mandate to continue the struggle.

Modern military strategy often acknowledges that the two approaches are rarely mutually exclusive. Contemporary conflicts usually feature a dual approach: physical assaults are employed to trigger psychological defeat, while psychological warfare is used to erode an adversary's physical defenses before a forceful attack. The direct strategy seeks a physical "knockout," whereas the indirect strategy seeks to convince the opponent that the fight is no longer worth the effort, thereby achieving victory through the collapse of the adversary's internal resolve (*will*).

The Four Strategies of Market Competition

Drawing from the two previously described primary categories of engagement (direct and indirect strategies), Arreguín-Toft outlines four types of warfare scenarios applicable to business: conventional attack, barbarism, conventional defense, and guerrilla warfare

1. Conventional Attack

This is a *Direct-Direct interaction*. The strong actor uses its superior numbers, technology, and firepower to destroy the weak actor's armed forces in a head-on battle. The goal is a quick, decisive victory through physical destruction. In the business field, it can be considered as the **Incumbent's Direct Move** in which a market leader leverages its massive scale to crush a smaller competitor. This looks like a typical price war where the incumbent lowers prices below cost, or a massive marketing blitz that "out-shouts" the competitor across every channel. The goal is to make it physically impossible for the competitor to maintain market share.

The competition between Amazon and Quidsi (Diapers.com) illustrates how an incumbent can apply a direct strategy in a business environment. In 2010, Amazon initiated an aggressive predatory pricing campaign, systematically reducing the price of diapers by approximately thirty percent to undercut Quidsi's primary revenue stream. By leveraging its vast capital reserves and logistical scale, Amazon sustained these losses until Quidsi's financial viability was fundamentally compromised. This maneuver rendered it physically impossible for the smaller competitor to maintain market share, which ended up being acquired by Amazon.

2. Barbarism

This is a *Direct-Indirect interaction*. When a strong actor is unable or unwilling to engage in a swift, direct battle, it may turn to a strategy of 'barbarism, in which case, the focus shifts toward targeting the opponent's civilian population (non-combatants) to break their morale and political will.

In business, this can be defined as the **Incumbent's Indirect Move**. Instead of attacking the startup's product, the incumbent attacks its ability to function. This involves predatory tactics such as fueling negative public sentiment, supply chain sabotage, legal pressure to limit market access, or filing endless lawsuits intended to drain the startup's limited venture capital and distract the leadership team.

For example, Intel, as the dominant player, employed an indirect strategy against its rival, the semiconductor company AMD. Instead of focusing on product superiority, Intel aimed to undermine AMD's operational capacity and viability within the marketplace. This approach was two-fold: First, **Supply Chain Restrictions**: Intel used exclusivity rebates with major manufacturers, such as Dell, creating contractual obstacles that effectively blocked AMD from vital distribution channels and concealed access to the supply chain. Second, **Legal Distraction**: Intel initiated prolonged legal battles, compelling AMD to dedicate considerable financial resources and executive time to litigation. Through this coordinated effort, the incumbent demonstrated an ability to neutralize a competitor by attacking its

fundamental ability to function and maintain strategic focus, thereby eroding AMD's overall capacity.

3. Conventional Defense


This is an *Indirect-Direct interaction*. It occurs when a weaker actor attempts to defend territory against a much stronger force *using conventional, static methods*, a defensive strategy based on holding a specific, fixed piece of terrain through permanent or semi-permanent fortifications. Instead of using movement to outmaneuver an enemy, a static force relies on the strength of its position to absorb and repel attacks. While static methods can be highly effective for a powerful force looking to deny an area to an opponent, they often become a '*death sentence*' for a weaker actor because they lack the necessary resources to survive a direct confrontation of attrition

In the business arena, this is what we can call the **Startup's Error**, a common business pitfall in which a small company attempts to compete with a large incumbent on the giant's own established terms. This might involve a retailer trying to match Amazon's shipping speed or a new software company trying to outspend Microsoft on expensive traditional advertising. When a startup engages in this kind of fight, it exposes its lack of resources, which typically leads to swift failure.

The collapse of *Webvan* during the dot-com era serves as a clear example of a startup's strategic misstep: directly challenging established market incumbents by adopting a capital-intensive infrastructure strategy. As an online grocery business, Webvan filed for bankruptcy in 2001 after just three years of operation. The company poured over a billion dollars into automated warehouses, aiming to match the logistical scale of traditional grocery giants. This focus on rapid expansion and physical capacity meant confronting the incumbents on their core strengths, which failed to account for the startup's inherent lack of operational maturity and sustainable margins. Ultimately, this approach prematurely depleted Webvan's venture capital. The case illustrates that a resource-limited newcomer cannot win a war of attrition against market leaders whose established efficiencies and massive fixed costs define the competitive landscape.

4. Guerrilla Warfare

This is an *Indirect-Indirect interaction*. The weak actor avoids direct confrontation, instead using hit-and-run tactics, sabotage, and evasion. They do not try to "win" battles; they try to make the cost of the war too high for the strong actor to continue. In business, it can be defined as the **Startup's Asymmetric Move** in which the startup ignores the mass market and instead targets "unattended" niches, uses viral/organic marketing instead of paid ads, and iterates products faster than the incumbent's bureaucracy can approve a meeting. They stay agile, low-overhead, and focused on hyper-differentiation, making it too expensive or culturally difficult for the "big player" to follow them.



Discord, an American instant messaging and VoIP social platform company, illustrates how a startup can use an asymmetric strategy to outperform well-established incumbents such as *Skype* and *TeamSpeak*. Its integration of voice, text, and video, combined with free servers and an easy-to-use platform, eliminated the friction of temporary calls and complex configurations. Leveraging viral word-of-mouth growth within gaming communities and benefiting from a lean organizational structure, Discord rapidly iterated features and outpaced the slower bureaucratic cycles of larger rivals. This sharp *niche focus* generated strong network effects, enabling expansion into wider online communities, education, and professional collaboration spaces.

The Power of the Mismatch: Why "Opposite" Wins

The most profound insight for entrepreneurs and small business lies in what Arreguín-Toft describes as the **"opposite approach" advantage**: outcomes in asymmetric competition *depend less on absolute strength and more on the interaction of strategies*. When a strong actor adopts a direct strategy, leveraging scale, resources, and head-on competition, it implicitly assumes the existence of *visible, stable targets* such as physical assets, mass markets, or standardized operations. However, when a weak actor responds with an indirect strategy, characterized by flexibility, decentralization, and niche focus, *those targets effectively disappear*.

In other words, startups must avoid head-to-head competition with established companies based on the incumbent's existing strengths, such as price, scale, or distribution. Instead, the strategy should be to fundamentally *redefine* the competitive landscape. For example, startups can neutralize the traditional advantages of established companies by employing strategies like clear product differentiation or targeting highly specialized market niches. This strategic focus can transform the incumbent's scale from an asset into a structural constraint.

A clear illustration of this dynamic can be seen in the competition between **Netflix** and **Blockbuster**. As the dominant incumbent, Blockbuster relied on a direct strategy rooted in its extensive network of physical stores, inventory control, and late-fee revenue model. Netflix, initially a weaker entrant, adopted an indirect approach, first through mail-based rentals and later through digital streaming, thereby eliminating the need for physical presence and reshaping customer expectations around convenience and subscription pricing. When Blockbuster attempted to respond, its scale-based "heavy artillery" had no effective target: physical stores could not compete with a decentralized, low-marginal-cost streaming platform. Ultimately, Netflix did not defeat Blockbuster by outperforming it on traditional dimensions, but by making those dimensions obsolete.

For entrepreneurs, the lesson is clear: *competitive advantage emerges not from confronting incumbents directly, but from designing strategies that make their strengths strategically irrelevant.*

The Rising Success of the Weak

The research conducted by Arreguín-Toft reveals a significant transformation in the outcome of imbalanced power struggles: while dominant powers secured victory in roughly 90% of asymmetric engagements between 1800 and 1849, this success rate fell to approximately 50% by the end of the 1900s. This trend is reflected in today's business environment, where global supply chains, social media, and the accessibility of technology have provided smaller competitors with the tools to implement indirect strategies with greater impact.

The "*opposite approach*" benefit implies that strategic efficacy is determined by the interaction between opposing methods rather than just absolute power. For instance, established giants in the hospitality sector often utilize **direct strategies**, investing heavily in physical infrastructure, standardized operations, and massive economies of scale. These strengths are formidable on traditional ground; however, a newcomer trying to mirror these moves, by expanding physical footprint or cutting prices, is likely to collapse under resource limitations.

In contrast, an **indirect approach** reimagines the competitive framework. By utilizing decentralized supply, digital platforms, and *user-generated value*, a startup can develop a scalable, agile ecosystem without the burden of heavy capital expenditure. This strategy effectively eliminates the fixed targets that larger incumbents aim to strike. Accordingly, the core takeaway is that while established firms focus on maximizing efficiency within current systems, smaller players can overhaul the systems themselves, moving the competitive focus from ownership to accessibility and from centralized authority to distributed involvement.

This dynamic is clearly illustrated in the rise of **Airbnb** in contrast to the traditional **hotel industry**, represented by global players such as Marriott International and Hilton Worldwide. These incumbents built their dominance through direct strategies: owning or franchising physical properties, ensuring consistent service standards, and leveraging brand reputation across global markets. Airbnb, by contrast, adopted an indirect strategy by creating a digital marketplace that connects hosts and travelers without owning any real estate. This decentralized, asset-light model allowed Airbnb to scale rapidly across cities and countries without the financial and operational burdens faced by traditional hotels. When incumbents attempted to respond, their core strengths, real estate portfolios, standardized operations, and regulatory experience, offered limited leverage against a platform that operated outside those constraints. They could not easily replicate Airbnb's

flexibility without undermining their own business model. As a result, Airbnb did not defeat the hotel industry by building better hotels, but by rendering the traditional basis of competition less relevant.

The key insight is that *incumbents are optimized for efficiency within an existing model, while startups can redefine the model itself*, shifting the basis of competition from ownership to access, standardization to personalization, and centralized control to distributed participation. For entrepreneurs, this reinforces a critical strategic lesson: sustainable advantage often comes not from incremental improvements within an existing system, but from designing a fundamentally different one where incumbents' strengths no longer apply.

A Strategic Framework for Entrepreneurs

To leverage Arreguín-Toft's findings, entrepreneurs must conduct a rigorous audit of their strategic alignment:

- **Avoid Symmetry:** If your competitor is competing on price and scale, do not lower your prices. This is a conventional defense and will lead to resource exhaustion. Instead, compete on differentiation, values, or hyper-specialization (Indirect Strategy).
- **Target the "Will (Determination)," Not the "Capacity":** Do not try to out-produce an incumbent. Instead, target underserved customers, or their internal bureaucracy. If an incumbent is slow to change due to their existing business structure, your speed and willingness to disrupt that model is your "guerrilla" advantage.
- **Expect the "Barbarism":** Be prepared for incumbents to use their size to influence regulations or engage in legal battles. Arreguín-Toft suggests that the way to survive this is through resilience and maintaining the "moral high ground" with your consumer base, which serves as your noncombatant support.

Conclusion

Ivan Arreguín-Toft's *How the Weak Win Wars* serves as a vital reminder that in the business environment, as in the war scenario, power is a relative concept. The entrepreneur's greatest vulnerability is the temptation to mirror the incumbent's behavior. By embracing an asymmetric and indirect strategy that emphasizes agility, niche specialization, and disruptive innovation over pure scale, entrepreneurs and small business owners are able to

effectively address the complexities of today's market environment. Historical evidence demonstrates that the “weak” can achieve success when they maintain the discipline to operate according to their own strategic priorities.

References

Arreguín-Toft, I. (2001). How the weak win wars: A theory of asymmetric conflict. *International Security*, 26(1), 93–128. <https://doi.org/10.1162/016228801753399733>

Arreguín-Toft, I. (2005). *How the weak win wars: A theory of asymmetric conflict*. Cambridge University Press.

Christensen, C. M. (1997). *The innovator's dilemma: When new technologies cause great firms to fail*. Harvard Business Review Press.

Guttentag, D. (2015). Airbnb: Disruptive innovation and the rise of the informal tourism accommodation sector. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 18(12), 1192–1217. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2013.827159>

Satell, G. (2014, September 5). A look back at how Netflix smashed Blockbuster. *Forbes*. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/gregsatell/2014/09/05/a-look-back-at-how-netflix-smashed-blockbuster/>