

---

## EDITORS' FOREWORD

---

The global landscape has shifted considerably since the end of the Cold War, but one fact stands out: a relative handful of small to mid-sized states have carved out a potent role for themselves by confounding the American inspired international order. By virtually any measure, this group of “rogue states” has commanded a disproportionate amount of attention from the United States and its allies.

Managing the post-Cold War order has proven to be a tricky and treacherous business. Each “rogue” has its own unique history and presents an equally unique set of contemporary challenges. Accordingly, each requires a coherent and exact policy response. For the last decade, Washington has sought to ensure American security and global stability by veering between policies of isolation and engagement.

Deciding which states deserve inclusion in the rogue category is highly subjective. The United States has been the driving force in determining the vocabulary that defines such states. Yet Washington's domination in defining “rogues” has resulted in neither a rigorous definition nor an effective policy to change those states' behaviors.

The very notion that the US State Department can declare its foreign policy lexicon cleansed of the term “rogue states” and substitute the more benign “states of concern” is an indication of the policymaking conundrum that goes far beyond semantic niceties.

This issue of the *Journal of International Affairs* offers a framework for examining and hopefully better understanding rogue states. The first essay, by Thomas Henriksen, traces the historical evolution of rogue states. The second, written by Robert Litwak, looks at changes in US foreign policy terminology regarding these polities.

Leader profiles examine the characters of four unusual men who have imposed their will upon their respective populations, exerted their influence on neighboring countries and made themselves players on the world stage.

*Journal of International Affairs*

Country case studies cover several states associated with the rogue label. Even though the United States has at various times shunned three countries—Iran, North Korea and Serbia—now it seems to be engaging each of them.

Afghanistan, Burma and China are explored within the context of US policy approaches. China is a special case. While it typically escapes the “rogue state” designation due to its sheer size and growing economic and political clout, it nonetheless aspires to a unique role in the post-Cold War era, namely that of pariah state patron. China has intensified its collaboration with and support for a group of states—including North Korea, Iran and Iraq and, until recently, Serbia—that are opposed to the preeminent role the US plays in world affairs.

Currently, a debate rages over the impact of sanctions on Iraq. Nobel Peace Prize nominee Kathy Kelly takes issue with the US-UN sanctions policy against Iraq in an exclusive interview with the *Journal*.

The included essays leave at least one distinct impression: that precisely what constitutes a “rogue” is in the eye of the beholder. As there is no firm agreement on definitions, some readers will take issue with the selection of the case studies that appear in this issue. We welcome and encourage the debate.