Wolf Warrior Diplomacy

28 NOVEMBER 2025

Hugo Brady



3 Main Points

Main question: Has China's Wolf Warrior Diplomacy been an effective foreign policy strategy?Argument: Though it strengthens nationalism and attracts some anti-Western partners, it provokes backlash from Western states, fuels security alliances against China, and undermines China's soft power and global reputation.Conclusion: Wolf Warrior Diplomacy is largely ineffective; compared with China's earlier charm offensive, it harms China's long-term global influence more than it helps.

About the Author

British/Australian student studying in the UK at College level (1 year before university). Intends to study Politics and International Relations at university next year. No research focus yet, but highly interested in Diplomacy and Intergovernmental organisations. Relevant projects with other foreign policy groups. The Young Euroatlantic forum, as well as the UK Green Party Policy Working Group for Peace, Defence and Security. Aspiring to become a Diplomat for the UK or Australian government.

The change in approach: Where did it come from?

Over the past decade, China's tone on the world stage has changed dramatically. Gone are the days of quiet diplomacy and careful reassurance. Instead, some Chinese officials now often respond to criticism with sharp words, public attacks, and an unshakable defence of Beijing's position. This approach, known as Wolf Warrior Diplomacy, has made China seem tougher, louder, and more confrontational than ever before.

China's Wolf Warrior Diplomacy refers to a highly confrontational and nationalistic approach to foreign policy. Emerging in the mid 2010s alongside Xi Jinping's consolidation of power, this strategy marks a sharp departure from the earlier "charm offensive" diplomacy of the 1990s and 2000s. Rather than reassuring the international community, Chinese diplomats now openly challenge criticism and adopt unusually combative rhetoric. While this shift has bolstered domestic support and strengthened nationalist sentiment within China, its broader international effectiveness remains limited. This article argues that wolf warrior diplomacy has ultimately been ineffective, as it has severely damaged China's relationships with Western states and eroded its global soft power. In contrast, China's earlier charm offensive proved far more successful in expanding international acceptance and cooperation.

Effect on state relations: Pushing states towards the west

In some respects, Wolf Warrior Diplomacy has helped China build relationships with countries outside the Western sphere, though the extent of this success is limited. China's increasingly hostile stance toward Western liberal democracies – particularly the United States, European states, and Australia – has appealed to countries that share resentment toward Western dominance. For example, Russia has moved closer to China following its diplomatic isolation after invading Ukraine, viewing Beijing as a confident alternative power that openly challenges the Western international order. Similarly, Burkina Faso and the wider Sahel alliance, under President Ibrahim Traoré, have distanced themselves from France and other Western powers, instead deepening ties with China. Traoré has publicly supported the One China Principle, aligning his government with Beijing's core political stance.

This illustrates how Wolf Warrior Diplomacy has helped foster a broader anti-Western alignment, in which states disaffected with Western domi-

nance gravitate toward China as an alternative centre of power. However, these gains are outweighed by the deterioration of China's relations with major Western states and economic partners. The formation and strengthening of anti-China security groupings such as AUKUS, designed to counter Chinese influence in East Asia and the South China Sea, demonstrate the strategic backlash China has provoked. Furthermore, countries that were previously relatively neutral- such as Lithuania and India – have shifted closer to Western alliances due to China's abrasive diplomatic actions. India, for example, has strengthened its role in the Quad, a grouping that has become critical of China's regional behaviour, largely in response to growing tensions and distrust.

This stands in sharp contrast to the results of China's charm offensive diplomacy during the 1990s and 2000s, when China successfully reassured Western states of its peaceful rise. During this period, China participated in international peacekeeping, such as in Cambodia, and portrayed itself as a responsible global actor. This approach significantly improved relations and facilitated China's integration into the global economic and political system. By comparison, while Wolf Warrior Diplomacy has attracted some new partners, the relationships lost with powerful Western economies are far more damaging.

Effect on reputation: The bold voice of the global south

Wolf Warrior Diplomacy has also strengthened China's reputation as a bold and assertive global actor, but this reputational shift does not necessarily benefit China in practice. China's aggressive criticism of Western-led institutions, such as the International Monetary Fund, has resonated with developing nations that view these structures as unequal and biased. As a result, China has positioned itself as a leading voice of the Global South. This is evident through its prominent role within BRICS, where China accounts for around 70% of the group's total GDP, hosts the New Development Bank headquarters in Shanghai, and drives much of the organisation's narrative regarding the decline of Western dominance. Likewise, through platforms such as the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation, China reinforces its leadership role among developing and non-Western states.

However, beyond the Global South, China's reputation and soft power have declined sharply. Chinese companies like Huawei have faced bans and restrictions due to fears of espionage and national security threats, illustrating how mistrust has spread into economic and technological spheres. Public opinion data also highlights this shift: a CEIAS survey found that 68% of people in the UK reported more negative views of China over the past three years, while 62% stated that they held overall negative perceptions. This represents a stark contrast to the positive global attention China received during events like the 2008 Beijing Olympics, often described as China's "coming out" moment to the West.

Given that the G7 accounts for roughly 43% of global GDP, the erosion of trust and cooperation with the West carries enormous long-term conse-

quences for China. While Wolf Warrior Diplomacy may strengthen China's leadership within certain developing blocs, the damage done to its relations with advanced economies, global institutions, and international public opinion arguably outweighs these gains. The decline in China's soft power risks isolating it from technological cooperation, foreign investment, and broader global legitimacy.

In conclusion, although Wolf Warrior Diplomacy has provided some limited benefits- particularly in strengthening nationalist sentiment at home and aligning China with certain anti-Western partners- it has largely failed as an effective long-term diplomatic strategy. By alienating Western states, contributing to the formation of anti-China alliances, and undermining China's soft power, it has hindered rather than enhanced China's global ambitions. When compared to the cooperative and image-conscious charm offensive of the 1990s and 2000s, Wolf Warrior Diplomacy represents a strategic regression rather than an advancement in China's foreign policy effectiveness.

EPIS