

12-10-1999

Trends. Defenses of Anti-Ballistic Missile Defenses

Editor

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.erau.edu/ibpp>

 Part of the [Other Political Science Commons](#), and the [Other Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Editor (1999) "Trends. Defenses of Anti-Ballistic Missile Defenses," *International Bulletin of Political Psychology*: Vol. 7 : Iss. 21 , Article 5.

Available at: <https://commons.erau.edu/ibpp/vol7/iss21/5>

This Trends is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in International Bulletin of Political Psychology by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact commons@erau.edu.

International Bulletin of Political Psychology

Title: Trends. Defenses of Anti-Ballistic Missile Defenses

Author: Editor

Volume: 7

Issue: 21

Date: 1999-12-10

Keywords: ABM, Nuclear Weapons, Political Psychology

Opponents of developing new and improved anti-ballistic missile (ABM) defenses state that such a change may risk a new nuclear weapons arms race. At times, the underlying rationale for this position is that change inherently must be destabilizing. At other times the rationale is that more defense ineluctably elicits more offense in an automatic attempt to surmount a defense that then must be further improved in ever more vicious and lethal circles. Yet change may have no effect or even a salutary effect on the global balance of terror. Moreover, more defense may certainly not only deter attack but even lead to a reduction in offensive assets because said assets become perceived as less valuable.

In actuality, there is little in the way of empirical data to validate conceptual attacks against new and improved ABM defenses or to support such change. Behind the smoke and mirrors of argumentative certainty are but ideologies and other beliefs about the world that are based on faith. These faith-based beliefs about ABM defenses are in all likelihood founded on yet other defenses of a psychodynamic kind. Given that the latter defenses are allegedly unconscious to their bearers, one ends up confronting a life-and-death conflict that is known but based on unknown conflict. Is this an operational definition of insanity? (See Frank, J.D. (1983). Nuclear arms and pre-nuclear leaders: Sociopsychological aspects of the nuclear arms race. *Political Psychology*, 4, 393-408; Hunt, H.T. (1998). "Triumph of the will": Heidegger's Nazism as spiritual pathology. *Journal of Mind and Behavior*, 19, 379-414; Lasswell, H. (1930). *Psychopathology and politics*. University of Chicago Press; Protocol to the Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems. (July 3, 1974). <http://www.acq.osd.mil/acic/treaties/abm/74/protocol/htm>; Welchman, K. (1996). The personal as paradigm for the political. *Psychodynamic Counseling*, 2, 179-194.) (Keywords: ABM, Nuclear Weapons, Political Psychology.)