

6-23-2000

# Trends. No More Rogue Nations and the Power of Words: A Coup for IBPP?

Editor

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

 Part of the [American Politics Commons](#), [Cognition and Perception Commons](#), [Defense and Security Studies Commons](#), [International Relations Commons](#), [Other Political Science Commons](#), [Other Psychology Commons](#), [Social Influence and Political Communication Commons](#), and the [Social Psychology Commons](#)

## Recommended Citation

Editor (2000) "Trends. No More Rogue Nations and the Power of Words: A Coup for IBPP?" *International Bulletin of Political Psychology*: Vol. 8 : Iss. 21 , Article 4.

Available at: <https://commons.erau.edu/ibpp/vol8/iss21/4>

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](mailto:commons@erau.edu).

International Bulletin of Political Psychology

Title: Trends. No More Rogue Nations and the Power of Words: A Coup for IBPP?

Author: Editor

Volume: 8

Issue: 21

Date: 2000-06-23

Keywords: Political Language, Rogue Nation, Social Constructionist, States of Concern

Less than a week after IBPP described the political and semantic difficulties with the "rogue nation" concept, the United States (US) Secretary of State, Madeleine Albright, has stated that rogue nations are no more. Instead, there are states of concern. IBPP grudgingly admits that it might not have had everything to do with this abrupt change, although it does hope that the seemingly illusory nature of the correlation of article and announcement is itself illusory. In any case, going from "rogue" to "concern" may have several consequences.

The term "rogue nation" often suggests intractability of psychology and behavior of that which is labeled and feeds a self-fulfilling prophecy of the labeler and the labeled. Secretary Albright and her representatives claim that nation-states and non-state actors labeled as "states of concern" may possibly be more easily swayed by gentler or more nuanced American terms. In turn, this may bring more conceptual room to acknowledge desirable psychologies and behaviors of these states from a US perspective. As well, there may be more behavioral room for foreign policy initiatives of both the labeler and the labeled.

On the other hand, certain US foreign policy initiatives may need to be re-assessed. Of greatest contemporary visibility would be the push for a limited anti-ballistic missile defensive system to handle the putative, ballistic missile threat from rogue nations. No more rogues, no more defensive system? As well, no more rogues, even if there are rogues regardless of the social constructionist properties of language and perception? Perhaps the Secretary of State might consider that as flexibility via words can have positive consequences, it may have negative ones as well. (See Barclay, M. W. (1997). The metaphoric foundation of literal language: Towards a theory of the reification and meaning of psychological constructs. *Theory & Psychology*, 7, 355-372; Boreus, K. (1999). The significance of conceptual stability for ideological stability: The ideological shift to the right in the Swedish public debate as an example. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31, 1-24; Fabj, V. (1998). Intolerance, forgiveness and promise in the rhetoric of conversion: Italian women defy the Mafia. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 84, 190-208; Janney, Richard W. (1999). Words as gestures. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31, 953- 972; Marquis, C. (June 20, 2000). U.S. declares 'rogue nations' are now 'states of concern.' *The New York Times*, p. A8; The psychology of rogue nations, missile defense and self defense. (June 16, 2000). *IBPP*, 8(20).) (Keywords: Political Language, Rogue Nation, Social Constructionist, States of Concern.)