

Realism and Ipse Dixit: Prof. John J. Mearsheimer on China as US Adversary

By [Kim Petersen](#)

Global Research, July 04, 2024

Region: [Asia](#), [USA](#)
Theme: [Intelligence](#)

All Global Research articles can be read in 51 languages by activating the Translate Website button below the author's name (only available in desktop version).

To receive Global Research's Daily Newsletter (selected articles), [click here](#).

Click the share button above to email/forward this article to your friends and colleagues. Follow us on [Instagram](#) and [Twitter](#) and subscribe to our [Telegram Channel](#). Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

[Spread the Truth, Refer a Friend to Global Research](#)

In a [3 July interview](#), judge Andrew Napolitano asked the University of Chicago political scientist, John Mearsheimer: "Why would the United States be putting missiles in the Philippines but to be provocative toward China?"

Mearsheimer: "I don't think that the United States is trying to be provocative. I think what the United States is interested to do, doing is improving its deterrence capability in East Asia. The fact is that if you put the United States up against China in East Asia, and if you include the United States' allies with the United States, right, you are up against a very formidable adversary. China is effectively a giant aircraft carrier. It has thousands and thousands of missiles, and the United States feels that it is at something of a disadvantage, and for that reason it is increasing its missile capability and other capabilities in Asia as well."

If China were to put missiles in Cuba and Mexico, then that is not provocative? The US should have no problem because China is only improving its deterrence, yes? What is good for the goose is also good for the gander, no?

And why does Mearsheimer resort to using US government propaganda by referring to China as an "adversary"? Does China call the US an adversary? Is China looking for confrontation with the US?

If China is "effectively a giant aircraft carrier," then is not the US also effectively a giant aircraft carrier? It is obvious that Mearsheimer is taking a page from the US propaganda booklet on the threat of China, in this case a militaristic threat. Mearsheimer, however, avoids referring to China as a "[threat](#)."

From the FBI website: "[Chinese Government Poses 'Broad and Unrelenting' Threat to U.S. Critical Infrastructure, FBI Director Says.](#)" The drumbeat is effective. According to a [2023 Pew Research Center survey](#), half of Americans name China as the US's greatest threat.

The question raised by Mearsheimer and left unanswered is whether China is a militaristic adversary? China, for its part, publicly eschews militarism and seeks peaceful relations.

Mearsheimer: "We pushed the Russians and the Chinese closer together which makes no sense at all."

Even if there were no United States, it is extremely rational for Russia and China to form a friendly and close relationship. They are neighbors. They are well suited to be trade partners. It is a win-win relationship that China and Russia seek from trading partners. No push was needed from the US, although US belligerence assuredly was another point in favor of a deepening Russia-China rapprochement.

Mearsheimer: I am one of a number of people who would defend Taiwan if China attacked it because I think Taiwan is of great strategic importance.

Isn't the [US aircraft carrier known as Israel](#) considered of great strategic importance because of its location amid the Middle Eastern oil patch? Yet Mearsheimer says there is no geopolitical benefit from US support of Israel. In fact, the professor says Israel is an albatross around the US neck. What, then, is the great strategic importance Mearsheimer sees in Taiwan? It hardly seems sufficient to just state that his view is realist. In Mearsheimer's mind moralism does not factor in.

The US has signed on to the One China Policy. Ergo, realistically, Taiwan is de jure a province of one China.

*

When one comes across analysis expressed by personalities, whether they be professors, news anchors, or laypersons, one ought to consider how these persons support their views. *Iipse Dixit* refers to the logical fallacy of making unsubstantiated assertions. It is arguably more difficult to substantiate one's arguments in an interview, but to merely state that something is realist is hardly compelling, especially when that realism seems rooted in opinion. Question everything.

*

Note to readers: Please click the share button above. Follow us on Instagram and Twitter and subscribe to our Telegram Channel. Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

Kim Petersen is an independent writer. He can be emailed at: kimohp at [gmail.com](mailto:kimohp@gmail.com). He is a regular contributor to Global Research.

Featured image is a screenshot from the video

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Kim Petersen](#)

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca

www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca