

Between Partnership and Rivalry: Unpacking the Obama-Era Dual-Track Strategy toward China



^{1*}DZIRI Hassina, Prof. ^{2*}ABOUBOU Hachemi

¹University of Batna 2, Algeria

hassina.dziri@univ-alger2.dz

² University of Batna 2, Algeria

h.aboubou@univ-batna2.dz

Date of transmission: 25/09/ 2025, date of acceptance: 12/11/ 2025

Abstract:

The Obama administration institutionalized a dual-track approach toward China, expanding cooperation in areas of mutual interest while simultaneously hedging against Beijing's growing assertiveness through strengthened regional partnerships and a bolstered U.S. military presence in Asia. This article examines the origins, strategic rationale, and implementation of this approach, analyzing its manifestation across economic, diplomatic, and security domains. Drawing on official statements, policy documents, and scholarly analyses, the study argues that the dual-track policy was both a pragmatic adaptation to shifting geopolitical realities and a blueprint for subsequent U.S. administrations. It concludes that the approach's core logic—pursuing engagement and deterrence simultaneously—remains a defining feature of U.S.–China relations in the twenty-first century.

Keywords: U.S.–China relations - Obama administration - dual-track strategy - engagement and deterrence - foreign policy adaptation

*Hassina Dziri

Introduction

When Barack Obama assumed the presidency of the United States in 2009, he inherited a complex and evolving bilateral relationship with China. Rapid economic growth and expanding military capabilities had propelled China to a position of formidable global influence, challenging the unipolar dominance enjoyed by the United States following the Cold War. This transition necessitated a discerning U.S. strategic response that balanced the imperatives of cooperation and competition.

The Obama administration's answer to this challenge was a deliberate dual-track policy: to engage China constructively on global issues where interests converged, while simultaneously strengthening U.S. alliances and military presence in the Asia-Pacific to hedge against potential Chinese assertiveness (Campbell, 2016). This approach sought to manage the complexity of a relationship fraught with both mutual dependencies and strategic rivalry, avoiding a simplistic choice between containment and accommodation.

This paper explores the origins and strategic rationale behind the dual-track policy, examines its implementation across economic, diplomatic, and security domains, and evaluates its impact on bilateral relations and regional dynamics. By considering a broad array of sources—official documents, speeches, and scholarly analysis—it aims to illuminate how this policy framework shaped U.S.–China interaction during the Obama years and set a precedent for future U.S. administrations.

1- Background and Literature Review

Review prior U.S. China policy (containment, engagement)

The trajectory of U.S.–China relations swung between containment—using military interventions in Vietnam and the island-chain strategy—and engagement, as policymakers by the 1960s embraced “containment without isolation” to temper China’s revolutionary zeal (Turner, 2008). Nixon’s 1972 visit, exploiting the Sino–Soviet split, marked a pragmatic turn toward China as both rival and partner (Kissinger, 2007). Subsequent administrations solidified this rapprochement with formal diplomatic recognition in 1979 and China’s 2001 WTO accession, even as policy retained strategic caution over human rights, military modernization, and regional assertiveness (Teixeira, 2019). Under Obama, economic dialogue, climate negotiations, and nonproliferation efforts ran parallel to the “Pivot to Asia” military reassurance—embodying a realist drive to balance power and a liberal-institutionalist belief in cooperation through institutions (Campbell, 2016; Friedberg, 2011; Ikenberry, 2014).

Scholarship on Great Power Competition and Cooperation Dynamics

Great powers inherently balance competition and cooperation, vying for influence while forging trade, arms-control, and regulatory partnerships (Lynch, 2020). After U.S. unipolarity waned with the rise of China and Russia, competition reemerged in non-military arenas—technology races and influence operations—acknowledging power struggles yet permitting alliances (Lynch, 2020; Tammen et al., 2010). Neoliberal institutionalism holds that institutions, norms, and

Balancing Cooperation and Competition: The Obama Administration's Dual-Track Approach to U.S.–China Relations

interdependence lower conflict risks by boosting transparency and reducing transaction costs (Keohane, 1984). The U.S.–China relationship exemplifies “managed rivalry,” melding deep economic ties and shared global-governance roles with a costly “contest for supremacy” while avoiding direct war amid a security dilemma (Ikenberry, 2014; Friedberg, 2011). Constructivism reveals how identities and narratives frame states as rivals or partners, shaping future interactions (Wendt, 1999). Consequently, the United States and China deploy dual-track strategies—strategic deterrence alongside diplomatic and economic engagement—to manage their complex interdependence in a shifting global order.

Theoretical Framework for Dual-Track Policies

International relations employ dual-track policy—simultaneous cooperation and competition—to manage rising powers without resorting to outright containment. The 1979 NATO dual-track decision paired European missile deployments with Soviet arms-control talks, paving the way for the 1987 INF Treaty (Wintour, 2019). Today, states use this method to deter threats while safeguarding autonomy and encouraging collaboration (Zhao, 2020). The strategy rests on three IR theories: neoliberal institutionalism, which argues that institutions lower transaction costs and build trust (Keohane, 1984); realism, which prioritizes military readiness and alliances to prevent aggression (Waltz, 1979); and constructivism, which shows how identities and norms shape whether dual-track moves yield peace or rivalry (Wendt, 1999).

Applied to U.S.–China relations, the Obama administration instituted climate, economic, and nonproliferation partnerships alongside an enhanced Indo-Pacific military presence—melding engagement with deterrence to manage their strategic competition (Campbell, 2016).

2- Origins and Strategic Rationale of the Dual-Track Approach

Geopolitical and Economic Factors

The Obama administration developed a dual-track policy for China because the changing international situation required new directions for U.S. foreign policy. China achieved global power status through its rapid economic growth and military development during the early 2000s which challenged US dominance after the Cold War (Hosseini, 2018). The new circumstances forced Washington to create a policy which combined diplomatic relations with military defense strategies.

China's actions in the South China Sea together with its defense spending growth and Belt and Road initiative projects made the United States more concerned about its security (Brookings Institution, 2016). The administration took steps to reassure allies and fight Chinese influence by increasing military presence and strengthening alliances in the Asia-Pacific region which moved away from its previous economic integration approach (Daggett, 2012). The “Pivot to Asia” emerged as a strategic move which focused on preserving regional stability while stopping any potential unilateral actions (Hosseini, 2018).

China became a vital part of global governance through its entry into worldwide supply networks and financial systems which control climate and trade issues (**World Economic Forum, 2016**). The Obama administration used the U.S.-China Strategic and Economic Dialogue as a platform to establish economic engagement while working to resolve issues about intellectual property theft and market access and trade imbalances (**Brookings Institution, 2016**).

The 2008 financial crisis made China-U.S. relations more crucial because China became the United States' leading trading nation. The political environment of employment reductions and market competition forced the government to create a policy which combined free trade principles with protective measures (**Campbell, 2016**).

The dual-track policy developed because of geopolitical and economic conditions which enabled China to expand its economy under U.S. strategic control. The Obama administration used engagement with hedging to decrease conflict risks while creating cooperation which formed the fundamental principle of its strategy.

Key Policymakers and Policy Speeches

The Obama administration used a dual-track policy for China through a small group of senior officials who used their public statements and diplomatic actions to preserve both diplomatic ties and strategic containment efforts. Central among them were President Barack Obama, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, Secretaries of Defense Robert Gates and Leon Panetta, and U.S. Ambassador to China Jon Huntsman Jr. Their contributions helped institutionalize a policy that acknowledged China's rise while safeguarding U.S. interests.

President Obama laid the conceptual foundation for the dual-track approach during his first trip to Asia in November 2009. During his major speech he accepted China's peaceful development path and stated his commitment to create a relationship which serves both nations' interests while maintaining mutual respect (**Obama, 2009**). The administration presented a dual approach through this speech by working to build alliances while maintaining military readiness.

The strategy received operational support from Secretary Hillary Clinton. During her first foreign policy visit to Asia in early 2009 she presented China as a "responsible stakeholder" that needed to follow international norms (**Clinton, 2009**). She later stated at the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) summit that the administration would enhance its ties through trade agreements and environmental partnerships and military alliances and presence. The dual-track framework received its essential principles from her approach which combined diplomatic relations with strategic hedging methods.

Defense leadership under Secretaries Gates and Panetta reinforced the security dimension of the policy. Gates backed a fresh military approach for Asia which combined defensive measures with stability protection yet Panetta used public declarations to warn about Chinese military growth and to emphasize the need for U.S. military modernization and ongoing Indo-Pacific presence (**Daggett, 2012**).

Balancing Cooperation and Competition: The Obama Administration's Dual-Track Approach to U.S.–China Relations

Ambassador Jon Huntsman Jr., personally nominated by President Obama, served as a diplomatic bridge between Washington and Beijing. His time in office concentrated on keeping communication lines open while handling Taiwan and trade disputes and working to establish enduring peace. The public activities of the administration demonstrated their readiness to work together while maintaining their dedication to protect American values and interests (Huntsman, 2009).

The U.S.-China Strategic and Economic Dialogue (S&ED) became a major institutional achievement when it started in 2009 under the leadership of Clinton and Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner. The S&ED established a formal system for economic and strategic cooperation between China and the United States to handle increasing market competition (**State Department, 2009**).

During his presidency Obama used speeches and policy statements to promote partnership but he also required China to accept responsibilities that correspond to its status as a leading world power. The administration demonstrated its dual strategy through this strategic and rhetorical balance which involved working with China on common problems while protecting itself from strategic threats. The policymakers and their initiatives joined forces to develop a single method for dealing with the complex relationship between the United States and China. Their work established an institutional system which aimed to decrease conflict potential while fostering cooperation between nations because it understood the complex nature of modern great power relations.

Policy Documents Setting the Stage for Dual Tracks

The Obama administration implemented a dual-track policy of China engagement and hedging through official documents and public statements which detailed their balanced approach to handle the developing complex relationship with China. China's growing power base became a strategic advantage and competitive threat according to the documents which resulted in dual diplomatic efforts for international collaboration and defense of American national interests.

The strategy included President Obama's 2011 speech to the Australian Parliament when he declared the "Pivot to Asia" initiative. In this speech, he emphasized the Asia-Pacific's growing geopolitical and economic significance and declared, "The United States has been, and will remain, a Pacific power" (**Obama, 2011**). The initiative presented itself as a complete strategy which combined military operations with diplomatic methods and economic involvement to stop any country from gaining control of the region.

The 2009 establishment of the U.S.-China Strategic and Economic Dialogue (S&ED) under Secretary of State Hillary Clinton and Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner served as a strategic initiative to support this vision. The S&ED established a framework for senior officials to discuss trade and climate change and security and global governance issues which worked to enhance transparency and minimize mutual misunderstandings during rising competition (**State Department, 2009**).

The dual-track approach received additional security backing through the 2012 Defense Strategic Guidance which steered U.S. military resource distribution toward the Asia-Pacific region. The document recognized China's military transformation and unbalanced military capabilities as major strategic issues which required a proactive military approach to prevent coercion and strengthen alliances (**Department of Defense, 2012**).

The 2015 National Security Strategy built upon this framework through its focus on working with China to address worldwide issues including climate management and economic stability yet it maintained readiness to compete in areas of disagreement. The policy rejected basic approaches of containment or accommodation by supporting a flexible approach that would adjust to changing dynamics between the two nations (**The White House, 2015**).

The Obama administration presented evidence of this dual approach through its trade policy documents. The administration took two approaches to address Chinese unfair practices by enforcing laws against intellectual property theft and market barriers while working with China to establish global economic rules through the World Trade Organization (**USTR, 2015**). The Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) established high-standard trade rules in the region to counter China's expanding economic power despite China's absence from the agreement.

The policy documents created a unified strategic framework which used institutional dialogue and economic ties to connect with China but maintained military preparedness and strengthened alliances and competitive trade systems as risk management measures. The dual-track framework demonstrated how the Obama administration managed both cooperative and competitive elements of international relations during the transformation of the global system.

3- Implementation of Dual-Track Strategy

Institutionalizing Economic Engagement: Strategic Dialogue, Climate Cooperation, and Trade Strategy in U.S.–China Relations

The Obama administration based its dual-track policy toward China on establishing formal economic ties through the U.S.-China Strategic and Economic Dialogue (S&ED) as its main institutional framework. Established in 2009 during President Obama's first meeting with Chinese President Hu Jintao, the S&ED unified previously separate strategic and economic tracks into a comprehensive framework for managing bilateral relations (**CSIS, 2011**). The S&ED established four essential pillars to guide its work which included bilateral relations and regional and global security and economic partnerships and solutions for worldwide challenges like climate change and health issues (**State Department, 2013**).

The S&ED took place twice a year in different national capitals to enable continuous official dialogue between senior representatives from various government departments. The organization established 1000 formal agreements between 2010 and 2016 which supported peaceful relations between the two nations during their economic expansion and rising strategic competition (**NCAFP, 2021**). The agreement brought value through its specific agreements while creating

Balancing Cooperation and Competition: The Obama Administration's Dual-Track Approach to U.S.–China Relations

“new habits of cooperation” which helped both parties solve disputes in a constructive manner (**The Diplomat, 2016**).

Climate change proved to be a highly successful field for joint work. Under the S&ED's Global Issues track, the two countries launched the Climate Change Working Group, recognizing their shared responsibility as the world's largest carbon emitters. The two countries reached their peak cooperation through a 2014 joint declaration which established particular emission reduction goals that later became the basis for the 2015 Paris Agreement (**Brookings Institution, 2016**). The partnership received worldwide approval because it enabled the development of climate change solutions across the globe.

Trade and investment were also central to the S&ED's agenda. The Obama administration used the forum to handle ongoing issues about intellectual property theft and industrial support programs and market entry restrictions (**USTR, 2015**). The highest levels of government frequently discussed these matters which led to Chinese promises about enhancing intellectual property protection and improving regulatory openness yet the execution of these promises proved inconsistent.

The administration worked on the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) as a multilateral trade agreement which established high-standard rules for Asia-Pacific business operations. China did not join the TPP but its strategic goal became evident because it worked to support U.S. economic dominance while creating standards which would influence Chinese conduct (**Campbell, 2016**). The TPP served as the main economic tool for implementing the dual-track strategy.

Taken together, these initiatives illustrate how the Obama administration pursued economic cooperation with China while simultaneously preparing for strategic competition. The S&ED provided a structured mechanism for engagement, while trade enforcement and regional agreements like the TPP reflected a cautious posture toward China's growing influence. This balance of integration and deterrence exemplified the dual-track approach—seeking mutual benefit without compromising national interests.

Diplomatic Efforts: Summitry, Strategic Messaging, and the Balance of Respect and Vigilance

The Obama administration used diplomacy as its main dual-track approach for China through summit meetings and public addresses and strategic communication to acknowledge Chinese development while protecting US strategic interests.

A defining moment in this diplomatic engagement was the 2013 Sunnylands Summit between President Barack Obama and Chinese President Xi Jinping. The summit between the U.S. and China leaders became one of the most important diplomatic events of the past forty years because they agreed to work together on climate change and cybersecurity and nuclear nonproliferation issues which affect the entire world (**The Diplomat, 2013**). The two countries worked together but their mutual agreement did not hide their disagreement about cyber

espionage and U.S. weapons shipments to Taiwan which proved that diplomats must stay alert during diplomatic meetings.

During his presidency Obama acknowledged China's expanding international power yet he continued to support global systems based on rules. He used speeches to convey that nations with significant power must use their strength to fulfill their duties to the world while following established rules (Obama, 2009). The message showed that Americans accepted Chinese expansion but they kept their positions firm about human rights and maritime limits and economic behavior.

In her 2009 early statements Secretary of State Hillary Clinton declared that the United States aimed to support China's responsible engagement with the international system rather than work to contain China (Clinton, 2009). She made these declarations to provide reassurance to Americans who worry about Chinese power growth while also addressing Asian countries that worry about changing regional power structures.

The administration created institutional dialogue mechanisms through the U.S.–China Strategic and Economic Dialogue (S&ED) which established a formal platform for open discussions about both cooperative and disputed matters (State Department, 2013). The dual-track framework maintained support from these exchanges because it enabled ongoing dialogue and avoided strategic errors.

The government handled diplomatic communications with great care throughout periods of increased diplomatic pressure. The United States used U.S. arms sales to Taiwan and Freedom of Navigation Operations in the South China Sea while actively working to explain its actions and keep communication channels open. The administration used this measured approach to prevent escalation because it demonstrated their dedication to both strategic stability and crisis management (Brookings Institution, 2016).

The Obama administration used multiple diplomatic methods to acknowledge China's increasing power while safeguarding U.S. national interests. Through summit diplomacy, strategic messaging, and institutionalized dialogue, the administration advanced its dual-track policy by fostering cooperation on global challenges and maintaining vigilance in areas of strategic competition.

Security Hedging: The Pivot to Asia, Military Posture, and Strategic Partnerships

The security hedging dimension of the Obama administration's dual-track approach toward China was most visibly embodied in the "Pivot to Asia" policy—later termed the "Rebalance to Asia." The U.S. government announced its new strategic direction in 2011 which focused on the Asia-Pacific region to counter China's expanding regional power through strengthened military presence and alliance renewal and new partnership development across the Indo-Pacific area (Campbell, 2016).

Balancing Cooperation and Competition: The Obama Administration's Dual-Track Approach to U.S.–China Relations

Leaders created The Pivot because they recognized that the Asia-Pacific region had become the central arena for worldwide power competition during the twenty-first century. The United States needed to preserve its long-term strategic interests in this region because of its strong economy and volatile situation. In his 2011 address to the Australian Parliament, President Obama declared that the United States would “play a leadership role in the 21st century” to ensure peace and prosperity in the Indo-Pacific, affirming America’s enduring presence as a Pacific power (Obama, 2011).

A core component of the Pivot was the modernization and expansion of U.S. military capabilities in the region. The United States used rotational Marine deployments in northern Australia to enhance naval power and develop missile defense systems and cyber warfare capabilities for countering China's military expansion (Daggett, 2012). The administration dedicated efforts to building joint military exercises and interoperability with allies through its support of East Asia Summit and ASEAN Defense Ministers Meeting-Plus multilateral security platforms.

The Pivot strategy involved building alliances with Japan and South Korea and Australia while simultaneously creating strategic partnerships with India and strengthening ties with Southeast Asian countries. The security network functioned to stop single nation aggression while protecting the regional system based on international rules and standards (Hosseini, 2018).

The administration made containment their main strategic goal. The United States adopted a strategic method which recognized Chinese territorial growth yet maintained defensive capabilities to protect maritime freedom in disputed regions including the South China Sea. The main objective was to support Chinese economic growth through a structured system which followed predetermined rules (Obama, 2011).

The 2012 Defense Strategic Guidance established this strategic approach through its official documents which designated Asia-Pacific as the main priority and redirected resources to boost U.S. operational readiness in the region (Department of Defense, 2012). The guidance required the U.S. to develop new defensive capabilities which would maintain their deterrent power in the rapidly changing security environment. As part of the Obama administration’s dual-track strategy, this security hedging component complemented diplomatic and economic engagement with China. The United States created a complete strategy through the Pivot to Asia to build a regional framework which limited Chinese growth while protecting national sovereignty and maintaining stability and legal frameworks.

4- Analysis of Outcomes

Assessment of Successes and Limits

The Obama administration balanced engagement and deterrence, advancing cooperation on global issues while revealing persistent strategic rifts. The U.S.–China Strategic and Economic Dialogue institutionalized senior- level

talks that delivered progress on climate change, nonproliferation, and financial stability—the 2014 joint greenhouse- gas targets directly enabling the 2015 Paris Agreement (**Brookings Institution 2016**). Bilateral trade grew, but unresolved disputes over intellectual property theft, market access restrictions, and state subsidies—exacerbated by domestic political opposition—blocked BIT negotiations and exposed the limits of economic diplomacy (**NCAFP 2021**). Simultaneously, the Pivot to Asia reinforced regional deterrence through military deployments, alliance strengthening, and new partnerships, yet emerging South China Sea crises demanded robust crisis-management protocols (**Daggett 2012**). This dual-track strategy stabilized U.S.–China relations and demonstrated U.S. resolve but fell short of compelling major Chinese policy shifts on key issues.

Mutual Perceptions and Strategic Mistrust

Despite formal ties, U.S.–China strategic distrust—rooted in conflicting goals, political systems, and mutual perceptions of defensive moves like U.S. freedom- of- navigation patrols and Chinese island- building in the South China Sea—created a security dilemma that summit diplomacy and military exchanges could not resolve (**Lieberthal & Wang 2012; Brookings Institution 2016; RSIS 2023**). Cyberattacks, maritime clashes, and Taiwan standoffs further eroded trust, showing how mutual suspicion both limits cooperation on global challenges and drives competition for regional influence and normative leadership (**Dunya News 2015; CSIS 2023**).

Conclusion

This paper has critically examined the Obama administration’s dual-track approach to U.S.–China relations—a strategy that deftly balanced diplomatic engagement and economic cooperation with strategic hedging and alliance reinforcement. The analysis reveals that this multifaceted policy responded pragmatically to China’s rise, recognizing both the opportunities for collaboration on global challenges and the imperatives of managing competition and potential conflict in the Asia-Pacific.

A key institutional innovation was the U.S.–China Strategic and Economic Dialogue (S&ED), which formalized high-level exchanges and enabled cooperation in areas such as climate change, trade, and global governance. Notably, the joint emission reduction commitments forged under this framework were instrumental in securing the 2015 Paris Agreement, demonstrating the potential for constructive engagement even amid strategic rivalry. Simultaneously, the Pivot to Asia recalibrated U.S. military posture and revitalized regional alliances, reinforcing deterrence and reassuring partners in a shifting security environment. Together, these initiatives reflected an integrated strategy aimed at preserving a rules-based international order while accommodating the realities of power transition.

The enduring relevance of the dual-track approach lies in its nuanced understanding that U.S.–China relations are inherently dualistic—marked by simultaneous cooperation and competition. Neither rigid containment nor

Balancing Cooperation and Competition: The Obama Administration's Dual-Track Approach to U.S.–China Relations

unconditional accommodation offers a viable path forward. Instead, the Obama-era framework underscores the necessity of flexible, layered policies that combine strategic vigilance with respectful engagement. It also highlights the psychological dimension of diplomacy: managing mutual perceptions by balancing elements of fear and respect to prevent escalation and foster stability.

Looking ahead, the lessons of this approach remain instructive for policymakers grappling with an increasingly complex and contentious bilateral relationship. Strategic mistrust, economic friction, and regional security dilemmas persist, demanding continued pragmatism, transparent communication, and robust alliance networks. As the United States and China navigate their intertwined yet competitive roles on the global stage, the dual-track model offers a durable foundation—one that must be continuously adapted to the evolving contours of international politics.

Ultimately, the Obama administration's strategy represents a pivotal chapter in the modern history of U.S.–China relations. By blending realist caution with liberal engagement, it crafted a policy architecture that remains essential for managing great power dynamics in an era defined by uncertainty, interdependence, and strategic flux.

Bibliography

- Asian Development Bank (ADB). (2016). *Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) Free Trade Agreement*. <https://aric.adb.org/fta/trans-pacific-partnership-%28tpp%29>
- Bateman, S. (2020). *Freedoms of navigation in the Asia-Pacific region*. Routledge.
- Brookings Institution. (2016). *Addressing U.S.–China strategic distrust*. The Brookings Institution. <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/addressing-u-s-china-strategic-distrust/>
- Brookings Institution. (2016). *Managing tensions in U.S.–China relations: Strategic messaging and crisis diplomacy*. Brookings Foreign Policy Program.
- Brookings Institution. (2016). *U.S.-China climate cooperation and the road to Paris*. Brookings Foreign Policy Program.
- Brookings Institution. (2016). *U.S.-China Strategic and Economic Dialogue: Progress and prospects*. Brookings Foreign Policy Program.
- Campbell, K. M. (2016). *The pivot: The future of American statecraft in Asia*. Twelve.
- Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS). (2011). *U.S.-China Strategic and Economic Dialogue: Outcomes and implications*. CSIS Reports.
- Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS). (2024). *Taiwan and the U.S.–China strategic competition*. CSIS China Power Project. <https://www.csis.org/special-initiatives/on-china/taiwan>
- Clinton, H. R. (2009). Remarks on U.S. foreign policy in Asia. U.S. Department of State. <https://2009-2017.state.gov/secretary/20092013clinton/rm/2009a/02/117333.htm>
- Daggett, S. (2012). *Defense spending and the pivot to Asia*. Congressional Research Service.
- Department of Defense. (2012). *Sustaining U.S. global leadership: Priorities for 21st century defense*. https://archive.defense.gov/news/Defense_Strategic_Guidance.pdf
- Friedberg, A. L. (2011). *A contest for supremacy: China, America, and the struggle for mastery in Asia*. W. W. Norton & Company.

- Gao, S., & Durdu, J. (2024). Overcoming the security dilemma between China and the United States: A new security paradigm of holism. *Uluslararası Kriz ve Siyaset Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 8(2), 125–144.
- Gvosdev, N., Matsuda, T., Glasserman, A., Freedman, J., Cooke, T., & Salazar, C. (2025). Balancing acts: Deterrence and reassurance in US–China strategy. Foreign Policy Research Institute. <https://www.fpri.org/article/2025/06/balancing-acts-deterrence-and-reassurance-in-us-china-strategy/>
- Hosseini, S. A. (2018). *Containment, engagement, and continuity: China and the Obama-Trump foreign policy transition*. In S. A. Hosseini (Ed.), *The future of U.S.-China relations* (pp. 215–234). Springer.
- Huntsman, J. (2009). Remarks at Tsinghua University. U.S. Embassy in China. <https://china.usembassy-china.org.cn/remarks-by-ambassador-huntsman-at-tsinghua-university>
- Ikenberry, G. J. (2014). The illusion of geopolitics. *Foreign Affairs*, 93(3), 80–90.
- Ikenberry, G. J. (2014). *The rise of China and the future of the West: Can the liberal system survive?* In G. J. Ikenberry (Ed.), *Power, order, and change in world politics* (pp. 53–75). Cambridge University Press. <https://tusanafe.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/Ikenberry-The-Rise-of-China-and-the-Future-of-the-West.pdf>
- Keohane, R. O. (1984). *After hegemony: Cooperation and discord in the world political economy*. Princeton University Press.
- Kissinger, H. (2007). *On China*. Penguin Books.
- Lehdonvirta, V., Wú, B., & Hawkins, Z. (2025). Weaponised interdependence in a bipolar world: How economic forces and security interests shape the global reach of US and Chinese cloud data centres. *Review of International Political Economy*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09692290.2025.2489077>
- Lieberthal, K., & Wang, J. (2012). *Addressing U.S.–China strategic distrust*. The Brookings Institution. https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/0330_china_lieberthal.pdf
- Lowy Institute. (2022). *Southeast Asia's neglected navigational and overflight challenges*. <https://www.lowyinstitute.org/the-interpreter/southeast-asia-s-neglected-navigational-overflight-challenges>
- Lynch, T. (2020). *The return of great power competition: Navigating the strategic landscape*. National Defense University Press.
- Mirrlees, T. (2024). The US and China's digital tech war: A new rivalry within and beyond the US empire. *ResearchGate*. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/385077194>
- National Committee on American Foreign Policy (NCAFP). (2021). *U.S.-China relations: Strategic dialogue and future prospects*. NCAFP Briefing Paper.
- Obama, B. (2009). Remarks by President Obama at Suntory Hall. The White House Archives. <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/remarks-president-barack-obama-suntory-hall>
- Obama, B. (2011). Remarks by President Obama to the Australian Parliament. The White House Archives. <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2011/11/17/remarks-president-obama-australian-parliament>
- Rahman, M. R. (2024). Tech supremacy and economic warfare: The US–China trade battle in the 21st century. *ResearchGate*. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/391835669>

Balancing Cooperation and Competition: The Obama Administration's Dual-Track Approach to U.S.–China Relations

- Roosevelt, T. (1901). *Address at Minnesota State Fair*. Theodore Roosevelt Center. <https://www.theodorerooseveltcenter.org/Learn-About-TR/TR-Encyclopedia/Speeches-and-Quotes/Speak-Softly-and-Carry-a-Big-Stick>
- Shodhganga. (2024). *Obama administration's rebalancing policy toward Asia-Pacific: Strategic rigidity and global order*. <https://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/handle/10603/507120>
- SpringerOpen. (2017). *Economy-wide impact of TPP: New challenges to China*. *Journal of Economic Structures*, 6(1), 1–20. <https://journalofeconomicstructures.springeropen.com/articles/10.1186/s40008-017-0082-y>
- State Department. (2013). *Fifth round of the U.S.-China Strategic and Economic Dialogue*. U.S. Department of State Archives. <https://2009-2017.state.gov/r/pa/prs/ps/2013/07/211861.htm>
- State Department. (2016). *Obama administration policy in the Asia-Pacific*. <https://2009-2017.state.gov/s/d/2016d/256694.htm>
- Tammen, R. L., Kugler, J., Lemke, D., Alsharabati, C., Abdollahi, K., & Organski, A. F. K. (2010). *Power transitions: Strategies for the 21st century*. Chatham House Publishers.
- Teixeira, P. (2019). U.S. strategic ambiguity and China's assertiveness in the South China Sea. *Central European Journal of International and Security Studies*, 13(4), 56–74.
- The Diplomat. (2013). *Sunnylands Summit: A new model for U.S.–China relations?* <https://thediplomat.com/2013/06/sunnylands-summit-a-new-model-for-us-china-relations/>
- The Diplomat. (2016). *S&ED and the evolution of U.S.-China diplomacy*. <https://thediplomat.com/2016/06/us-china-strategic-and-economic-dialogue/>
- Turner, R. (2008). *Containment without isolation: U.S. China policy in the Cold War*. University Press.
- U.S. Department of Defense. (2015). *U.S.–China cyber agreement and strategic implications*. Defense Technical Information Center. <https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/citations/AD1053136>
- U.S. Department of State. (2009). *U.S.-China Strategic and Economic Dialogue: Overview and outcomes*. <https://2009-2017.state.gov/r/pa/prs/ps/2009/july/126592.htm>
- United States Trade Representative (USTR). (2015). *2015 Special 301 Report*. Office of the U.S. Trade Representative. <https://ustr.gov/sites/default/files/2015-Special-301-Report-FINAL.pdf>
- Waltz, K. N. (1979). *Theory of international politics*. McGraw-Hill.
- Wendt, A. (1999). *Social theory of international politics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Winkler, S. (2023). Strategic competition and US–China relations: A conceptual analysis. *The Chinese Journal of International Politics*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cjip/poad008>
- Wintour, P. (2019). NATO's 1979 dual-track decision: A model for strategic balance. *The Guardian*. <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2019/dec/02/nato-1979-dual-track-decision-model-strategic-balance>
- World Economic Forum. (2016). *China's role in global economic governance*. World Economic Forum Reports.
- Zhao, S. (2020). Hedging and balancing: China's dual-track strategy in a changing global order. *Journal of Contemporary China*, 29(123), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10670564.2020.1718743>