

Interpreting Affect Between State Leaders: Assessing the Political Friendship Between Winston S. Churchill and Franklin D. Roosevelt

Yuri van Hoef

INTRODUCTION

Our friendship is the rock on which I build for the future of the world so long as I am one of the builders.

Churchill to Roosevelt, 17 March 1945 (Letter C-914 in: Kimball, 1984b, p. 574)

Within international relations (IR), the study of friendship has only recently gained traction (Koschut & Oelsner, 2014). However, the vast majority of friendship scholars are focused on theorizing friendly relations between states, rather than relations between individuals that could impact international relations (Berenskoetter, 2007, p. 653; Oelsner, 2007). Furthermore, friendship scholars have hereunto not dealt with the ‘affective turn’ within the social sciences: friendship as an emotional bond

Y. van Hoef (✉)

Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands

© The Author(s) 2018

M. Clément, E. Sangar (eds.), *Researching Emotions in International Relations*, Palgrave Studies in International Relations, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-65575-8_3

between individual political actors that influences their agency receives little to no attention, despite Byman and Pollack's famous appeal to bring 'the statesman back in' (Byman & Pollack, 2001). Analysing the role that friendship between state leaders plays offers an original contribution to the study of emotions, because emotions that result from personal encounters are neither completely individual nor a pure result of collective socialization. Furthermore, most research dealing with emotions has hitherto dealt with negative emotions (Löwenheim & Heimann, 2008; Sasley, 2011, pp. 453, 456; Scheff, 2000).

In addressing that gap in our understanding of IR, this chapter takes a distinctly interpretivist, anti-positivist approach. Therefore, this chapter is of particular interest to scholars who want to make sense of the role of personal relations in IR but find traditional IR theories and methods unsatisfactory. Friendship and the meaning and influence of it on and for individual political actors, cannot be measured by any traditional positivist methods. Because friendship has proven to be such an unfathomable phenomenon, the first section of this chapter offers a conceptualization of friendship that can be used by researchers who seek to study this bond. The following section shows how this theoretical framework can be practically applied by employing Mark Bevir and R. A. W. Rhodes' Interpretative Political Science (IPS) methodology as a tool for biographical analysis. Their antifoundational approach draws heavily upon various disciplines, including history, to offer an interpretivist toolkit for social scientists (Bevir & Rhodes, 2010). Most importantly, their methodology is not just compatible to my conceptualization of friendship, but it also adds additional intellectual depth. Finally, this methodology will be illustrated in the third section by applying it to the famous friendship between British Prime Minister Winston S. Churchill and US President Franklin D. Roosevelt (Meacham, 2003; Sainsbury, 1996). Applying my conceptualization of friendship in combination with IPS reveals that, in contrast to the prevailing sceptical view (Kimball, 1984a, pp. 4–5; Maney, 1992, pp. 190–191; Meacham, 2003), there (1) existed a genuine friendship between Churchill and Roosevelt and that (2) this friendship impacted international relations.

Crucially, the third section will discuss several weaknesses of IPS potentially hindering its practical use, as well as a number of challenges which come with studying emotional ties between actors. These include a number of traditional weaknesses of hermeneutics (Wachterhauser, 1986); further shortcomings that are revealed in the debate between interpretivism

and critical realism (McAnulla, 2006a); and, following Sasley, the extent to which emotions constrain political actors (Sasley, 2010). Although several of these flaws are inherent to an interpretivist approach, IPS' value lies in its potential to challenge established interpretations which fail to illuminate the impact of emotional ties on political actors. Accordingly, the final section poses relevant questions to scholars that are inclined to employ, or dismiss, IPS. This chapter, then, differentiates itself from the current state of the art both in the studies of emotions and friendship in IR, by offering an approach to study friendship at the intermediary level, rather than at the individual or the collective level.

The case study reveals that, though the friendship between Churchill and Roosevelt has been highly romanticized, their mutual emotional affection at crucial moments influenced the relations between Great Britain and the USA. Throughout the analysis, the value of IPS as an analytical tool is exemplified, especially its ability to make sense of the past and provide an outlook on potential future ramifications. I argue that the 1956 Suez crisis can be interpreted as an unintended consequence of the Churchill-Roosevelt friendship. Thus, this chapter not only illustrates the negative and positive ramifications of friendship on state leaders and their decision-making, but also demonstrates the profound influence individual friendships have on IR.

CONCEPTUALIZING FRIENDSHIP

'But when you talk about friendly relations in politics,
it's not the friendship of schoolmates.'
Mikhail Gorbachev (quoted in Heintz, 2004)

Friendship between state leaders shares a number of characteristics with friendships that ordinary citizens might have, but also differs in a number of important aspects. First, each and every friendship has a history, is a chronicle of a personal story between two or more individuals, and it therefore lends itself well to a more interpretive and historical approach. That means it consists out of the three elements of every story: a beginning, middle, and an end. Even a very specialized form of friendship such as the Special Relationship clearly 'describes and explains an end point' (Gardner Feldman, 2014, p. 124). Within the story there will be a foundational moment (Eznack & Koschut, 2014, pp. 74, 78–79), a pillar upon

which the structure of the friendship rests, such as the famous 2001 meeting of George W. Bush and Vladimir Putin in Ljubljana. This shared experience could be a ‘heroic act of reconciliation’ (Vion, 2014, p. 113), such as between Helmut Kohl and François Mitterrand at Verdun in 1984, which precipitated their countries growing closer.

An interpretative analysis will focus on the progress of the relationships, paying specific attention to first impressions (the beginning), the way the relationship developed (the middle), and, if applicable, how the relationship ended. To illustrate, consider that Churchill and Roosevelt took an immediate disliking to each other when they first met, or that we would expect a friendship, in contrast to a partnership (Van Hoef, 2014, pp. 68–69), to outlast the terms of office. An example of the latter is the friendship between Mikhail Gorbachev and George H. W. Bush, exemplified by Barbara Bush’s heartfelt eulogy for her dear friend Raisa Gorbacheva in *Time* Magazine in 1999 (Bush, 1999; Van Hoef, 2012b). These are very concise examples of how we can witness friendship between state leaders in the international arena.

When conceptualizing friendship, it is crucial to differentiate between indicators for, and key components of, friendship. Owing to the highly individualized nature of friendship, indicators can be very diverse, and include shared character traits, values (Smith, 2014, p. 36), virtues, opinions, and political agendas. They provide the fertile ground for a friendship to grow. For example, two presidents might share a deep religiosity, and in that recognize each other, as George W. Bush and Vladimir Putin did in Ljubljana in 2001. Another indicator, especially in the international arena, is the dissemination of the relationship. Friendship is not limited to the two state leaders, but the friendship will disseminate and affect others that are close to the two friends. Their romantic partners become friends as well; the children play together; the families go on joint holidays; circles of acquaintances and colleagues intermingle, and so on:

Because friends [states] are embedded in a larger social environment—an international society—their world-building efforts not only create an exclusionary space that seals friends from criticism and creates bias, but also promote an idea of international order that affects others. (Berenskoetter, 2014, p. 67)

Yet indicators such as shared values and dissemination are present in other social relationships as well. Alone, they are not enough to differentiate friendship from relations such as that between client and supplier,

employee and employer, or that between pupil and teacher. There is an astonishing amount of friendship literature and conceptualizations of friendship are many and varied.¹ However, it is possible to identify a number of key components that are present in the extensive friendship literature and which are applicable to a political friendship between two state leaders. First, friendship is a reciprocal relationship made up out of equal partners (Gardner Feldman, 2014, pp. 139–140; Roshchin, 2014, p. 99). Furthermore, from the classical philosophers onward a virtuous friendship involves a joint task: to help each other strive for the good (Stern-Gillet, 1995, pp. 49–50). This ‘moral’ and ‘ethical task’ (Smith, 2007, pp. 187–188) is also found in the works of Johan Galtung, founding editor of the *Journal of Peace Research*, who in his vision of positive peace held that the great task of positive peace is the project of ‘human integration’ (Galtung, 1964). Another important element of friendship is the idea of strong moral obligations, such as personal sacrifices for the sake of the other (Schmitt, 2007, pp. 77–78; Smith, 2014, pp. 40–41). Finally, there is an element of critical realism’s emergent properties where the ‘emergent properties of an entity are properties possessed only by the entity as a whole, not by any of its components or the simple aggregation of the components [...]’ (Mingers, 2011, p. 306). Friendship is indeed, then, ‘a catalyst of change *in its own right* [my emphasis]’ (Koschut & Oelsner, 2014, p. 202). Identifying these five key components leads to the following working definition of friendship:

an (1) equal and (2) reciprocal bond between two or more individuals, which (3) imposes moral obligations upon them, has (4) emergent properties, and has at its foundation (5) a shared (grand) project.

With this definition, it is possible to study a political friendship, such as the famous friendship between Churchill and Roosevelt, while operationalizing it through the use of IPS adds an additional layer of analysis. This definition also strongly hints at the emotional level of friendship.

By approaching friendship as an affective emotional bond between political actors, studying friendship offers an interesting alternative to more traditional realist notions of self-interest (Berenskoetter and Van Hoef, 2017). It is no surprise that most research so far has focused upon negative emotions (Sasley, 2011, p. 456). Even though the study of friendship as a positive affective bond is on the rise, this traditional realist view can still be found in recent publications. Todd H. Hall has argued that emotions such as anger, sympathy, and guilt are strategi-

cally deployed by political actors as a means to an end (2015, pp. 2–3). Even though Hall is open to the possibility of friendship in politics, he remains sceptical because ‘for leaders and diplomats, enacting camaraderie with their counterparts is both a form of individual emotional labor and part of a larger corporate performance of emotional affinity’ (2015, pp. 188–189).

Friendship scholars in IR have been accused of making an ontological mistake in attributing an emotional bond such as friendship to nations, because states ‘are ontologically incapable of having feelings’ (Digeser, 2009, pp. 327–328; see also Keller, 2009). This argument has been countered by friendship scholars by positing that they ‘mean decision makers acting as the state’ when speaking of states being affectively attached to each other (Eznack, 2011, p. 242; see also Smith, 2014, pp. 38–40). Lucile Eznack has advocated a collective approach to studying emotions by holding that ‘affect exists in close allies’ relationships, under the form of affective attachment to the latter and to the group—in this case, the alliance—as a whole’ (2011, p. 241; see also Koschut, 2014).

In contrast, studying friendship between state leaders considers friendship at an intermediary level, in the space between political leaders. It is in this space, in their interactions and their outward displays of affection, that the bond becomes observable. Studying friendship at this level also sidesteps the ontological accusation of attributing feelings to non-human actors. Finally, following Sasley, by defining affects as ‘general valence feelings toward something’ (Sasley, 2010, p. 3), studying friendship between state leaders focuses on the positive affect political actors hold for each other and the extent to which this positive valence affects their policies.

INTERPRETIVE POLITICAL SCIENCE

[...] to understand actions, practices and institutions, we need to grasp the relevant meanings, beliefs and preferences of the people involved. (Rhodes, 2011, p. 202)

Mark Bevir and R. A. W. Rhodes’ interpretive political science (IPS) approach offers an interpretivist toolkit for social scientists. This section shows that their approach moves away from structural constraints that are

nowadays common in mainstream IR theory and gives centre stage to individual actors. Moving into IPS marks the next step in the development of my study of friendship, where I previously dabbled in positivism, but found fields such as Game Theory and Social Network Analysis wanting and incapable of studying the effects of friendship (Van Hoef, 2012a). Friendship, its meaning and influence on and for individual political actors, cannot be measured by any traditional positivist methods. Bevir and Rhodes offer a method that is especially appealing to those unimpressed by positivist efforts, deliberately choosing to base their approach not 'on modernist-empiricism but on hermeneutics and historicism; on Dilthey and Collingwood rather than Weber or Marx' (2010, p. 19). That is not to say that they deny the relevance of structures. On the contrary, although their 'procedural individualism asserts that meanings are always meanings for specific people', Bevir and Rhodes situate the agency of individual actors against these actors' backgrounds and traditions (2006, p. 399).

The concepts of traditions, dilemmas, practices and unintended consequences form the basis of their theory. The behaviour of actors can be interpreted by studying their specific traditions (their ideational background), dilemmas encountered by actors (experiences or ideas that conflict with their tradition), and finally their practices, a set of actions or patterns (Bevir & Rhodes, 2006, p. 400). These concepts allow friendship to be studied at an intermediate level, taking the power of statesmen as reflective active agents into account (cf. Vogler, 2016, p. 77). Especially revealing is the concept of dilemma, because it allows us to study moments of choice in a friendship where an actor has to decide between their ideational background and their friend. In other words, friendship has the power to force an individual to alter and/or challenge their individual tradition. Following our definition of friendship, for a political friendship to truly be considered a friendship, both reciprocity and equality should be a pattern in the relationship. There is one last interesting insight to be gained from Bevir and Rhodes, namely the concept of unintended consequences, which stems from systems theory (McAnulla, 2006b, p. 407).

Certain consequences might be unintended by an actor, but are nevertheless the result of their actions and form an emergent property of the actions of an actor. Note that our friendship definition also included the idea of emergent properties, 'the friendship being more than the sum of its parts'. Bevir and Rhodes illustrate this with the example of a great multitude of people who decide to cross the Golden Gate Bridge by car in the

morning so they can arrive early at work, which results in an unintended traffic jam (2006, p. 401). Consider the supposed friendship between François Mitterrand and Helmut Kohl which, arguably, led to German Reunification and further European integration. What if the German Reunification and the European integration were unintended consequences of their friendship? This short example shows the additional theoretical depth that can be added by invoking the interpretive theory of Bevir and Rhodes, rather than opting for historical analysis or process tracing.

In sum, Bevir and Rhodes' methodology is largely compatible with the view of friendship developed in the previous section and offers extra methodological depth when analysing a specific friendship. When developing the case studies, illustrated by the Churchill-Roosevelt friendship in this chapter, it is crucial to identify the traditions and ideational background of the political actors to determine whether there are any indicators for friendship. Owing to the highly individualized nature of friendship, indicators can be very diverse, and include shared character traits, values (Smith, 2014, p. 36), virtues, opinions, and political agendas. By studying memoirs, biographies and autobiographies of state leaders, and of their close associates, we can identify their ideational backgrounds to find common characteristics that could indicate their capacity and receptiveness to friendship. While the accounts found in these primary sources offer personal recollections of affects, the observations of the relationship in the accounts of friends, colleagues, and associates are just as vital. The latter offer the researcher the ability to verify and falsify the account of the actors themselves. However, even though these indicators are important, they can only suggest that two individuals were or were becoming friends.

For a political friendship to be present, the five key components (equality, reciprocity, moral obligations, emergent properties, and (grand) political projects) must be identified. Friendship then should be observable as a practice, with discernible patterns of reciprocity and equality. Moral obligations will be most readily observable in the dilemmas the actors face in their relationship. The bond becoming more than its parts, its dissemination and emergent properties can be found in IPS' unintended consequences. Table 3.1 illustrates how the four different elements of such a case study (Story; Challenges; Patterns; Unintended Consequences), correspond with the four components of IPS and the five key elements of friendship.

Table 3.1 Structure of the case studies

<i>Case study</i>	<i>IPS</i>	<i>Friendship</i>
1 The story	Ideological background	(5) Grand project
2 Challenges	Dilemmas	(3) Moral obligations
3 Patterns	Practices	(1) Equality and (2) reciprocity
4 Unintended consequences	Unintended consequences	(4) Emergent properties

The red thread running through the story, challenges, and patterns of the friendship is the presence of reciprocal emotional affection of the friends for each other. Some overlap between the key components is possible. It might well be, for instance, that the grand political project previously formed a dilemma between the two actors. Such was the case with the issue of German Reunification between Helmut Kohl and François Mitterrand, which first divided the two friends before bringing them closer together (Van Hoef, 2014, pp. 73–74). Meanwhile, when presenting the story of the friendship, the researcher will also encounter the other elements of the relationship. Therefore, it is important to analyse the challenges, patterns, and unintended consequences of the relationship after the story is presented. The final section of this chapter will illustrate this approach by applying it to the friendship between Churchill and Roosevelt.

CASE STUDY: ASSESSING THE CHURCHILL-ROOSEVELT RELATIONSHIP

I had a true affection for Franklin. (Churchill, 1964, p. 128)

This case study elaborates on a previous study of the Churchill-Roosevelt relationship (Van Hoef, 2010, pp. 25–34) and illustrates how the proposed conceptualization of friendship can be operationalized using Mark Bevir's and R. A. W. Rhodes' methodology of Interpretative Political Science (IPS). This analysis is divided into four parts: (1) the story, (2) challenges, (3) patterns, and (4) unintended consequences. Each of these sections corresponds to one of IPS' concepts: ideological background (the story), dilemmas (challenges), practices (patterns), and unintended consequences. Finally, as illustrated in Table 3.1 on the previous page, the four parts of the analysis also correspond to the five key components of

friendship. Within the story we look for indicators for friendship, but also for the presence of a grand project (5). Challenges call upon the moral obligations (3) friends have to each other. Reciprocity (2) and equality (1) can be observed as patterns, while the final part is devoted to the unintended consequences of the specific friendship.

Introduction

Winston S. Churchill (1874–1975) certainly had a capacity for making friends, with several studies having been devoted to his friendships alone (Meacham, 2003; Young, 1966). His friendship with US President Franklin Delano Roosevelt (1882–1945) is the stuff of legends. Warren F. Kimball, editor of the monumental *Churchill & Roosevelt: The Complete Correspondence*, identified five phases in their relationship but Churchill and Roosevelt only met intensively in the period from 1940 to the summer of 1943 (Kimball, 1984a, pp. 6–18). Following Kimball, one would expect to find signs of friendship mostly within that period. However, my analysis reveals that the history of their relationship both preceded and outlasted this period.

The Story

Famously, Roosevelt and Churchill did not get along when they first met in 1918, many years before they would both reach the pinnacle of political office (Meacham, 2003, p. 5). Roosevelt's dislike would waver when the two statesmen found themselves in the minority concerned about the rise of Nazi Germany. In 1938, Roosevelt predicted 'an inevitable conflict within five years' and started corresponding with Churchill, who had impressed him with his stalwart opposition to Germany (Black, 2003, pp. 480–481). Roosevelt saw a potential ally in Churchill: 'I'm giving him attention now because there is a strong possibility that he will become the prime minister and I want to get my hand in now' (Berthon, 2001, p. 25).

This was clearly a partnership then (Van Hoef, 2010, p. 69), born out of opposing a mutual adversary. It was not until Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941 that the USA joined the war. The instrumentality of the partnership is revealed in Churchill's responses to the attack: 'This certainly simplifies things' (Meacham, 2003, p. 130), and, when one of his advisors cautioned him to maintain consistency in his diplomatic approach: 'Oh! That is the way we talked to her [America] while we were wooing

her; now that she is in the harem, we talk to her quite differently!’ (Kimball, 1984a, p. 289).

Now that the USA was fully part of the war, a series of personal meetings between the two leaders took place in which they grew attached to each other. This worried their advisors: the Americans feared the impressive Churchill was gaining too much influence on Roosevelt, while the British feared that Churchill worshipped Roosevelt as a living hero (Black, 2003, p. 695). These meetings led to unprecedented historical decisions, such as British and US forces under a single commander (Kimball, 1984a, p. 9).

However, near the end of the war, the Soviet Union had supplanted Britain as the USA’s most important strategical partner, while Churchill found himself increasingly at odds with Roosevelt on geopolitical and post-war visions. Churchill wanted Great Britain to play a leading role in a post-war world in which colonial powers would provide stability. Roosevelt advocated self-determination for the colonies (Meacham, 2003, p. 118). Edward Stettinius, US foreign Secretary at the time, mentions that Roosevelt’s ‘early fascination with [Churchill] had declined, and there was an increasing divergence in their desires for the postwar world’ (Black, 2003, p. 1085; See also: Sainsbury, 1996, pp. 3–4).

Their diverging worldviews might have come into play but that question has become purely academic since Roosevelt died two months after the Yalta Conference, on April 12, 1945. Churchill had been very worried about Roosevelt’s health and had requested Foreign Affairs to alleviate his workload because he worried it cost his friend too much energy (Charmley, 1993, p. 630). Churchill reflected upon the last time he saw Roosevelt: ‘The president seemed placid and frail. I felt that he had a slender contract with life. I was not to see him again. We bade affectionate farewells’ (Black, 2003, p. 1085).

One of the great mysteries surrounding the Churchill-Roosevelt relationship is that Churchill did not attend his friend’s funeral. He seemed to intend to but came up with the rather weak excuse that too many British ministers were abroad at that time (Churchill, 1964, pp. 132–133). It seems more likely that Churchill feared to be too emotional at a public funeral: he cried at a later memorial service and reflected that he was ‘overpowered by a sense of deep and irreparable loss’ (Churchill, 1964, p. 137). A visit to America would not only have allowed him to pay his respects to a valued partner, and, by his own words, a dear friend, but would have also

allowed him to meet Roosevelt's successor: postponing this meeting cost Churchill valuable diplomatic time (Black, 2003, p. 1115). Churchill reflected upon his affection for Roosevelt in letters sent to Eleanor Roosevelt and Harry Hopkins, Roosevelt's adjutant (Churchill, 1964, p. 128).

Born out of political necessity, the Churchill-Roosevelt friendship began as a partnership *pure sang*. Both recognized the threat of Nazi Germany and therefore sought each other out. Instrumentality was at the core of their early relationship, which is clearly evidenced by the way Churchill described the early stages of the relationship: the USA was not a friend, but a partner to be seduced. It is also clear that both state leaders held very different worldviews. Yet, though instrumentality was at the core of their nascent friendship, they sought each other out for a shared grand project, i.e. defeating Nazi Germany. They also show clear affection towards each other during their personal encounters, as evidenced in their letters, by the worries of their advisors that they are becoming too impressed by each other, and, finally, by Churchill's absence at Roosevelt's funeral, his crying at a later memorial service, and his heartfelt letters of condolences.

Challenges

There are two dilemmas in the 1941–1943 period that are intriguing. First, in a letter dated February 25, 1942, Churchill revealed to Roosevelt that British intelligence succeeded in decrypting codes used by US diplomats. This is a strange revelation, especially considering the way Churchill delivered the message: he had the British ambassador bring it himself 'by hand, to be delivered into yours personally' and requested that Roosevelt burned the letter after reading it, which indicates the highly confidential nature of the message (Letter C32/1 in: Kimball, 1984a, p. 371). Although it is possible that Churchill worried that the Americans would inevitably find out and that this would hurt bilateral relations, or that he was genuinely concerned there was a security risk (Letter C32/1 in: Kimball, 1984a, p. 371), this does not explain why Churchill chose to reveal very sensitive information to Roosevelt in such a delicate and personal manner.

A second interesting dilemma was the fall of Tobruk on June 21, 1942, where twenty five thousand allied soldiers were taken captive, which resulted in a vote of no confidence (easily defeated) in Churchill, and which led Roosevelt to send him one of his shortest letters: 'Good for you.

Roosevelt' (Letter R-160 in: Kimball, 1984a, p. 517). Roosevelt went much further though than just offering verbal support, he provided Churchill with 300 tanks and 100 pieces of artillery (Freidel, 1990, pp. 450–451). This was no empty gesture and it left a lasting impression upon Churchill (Letter C-146 in: Kimball, 1984a, p. 592). In a letter dated March 17, 1945, Churchill reflects on their friendship and refers to Tobruk as well:

[...] Our friendship is the rock on which I build for the future of the world so long as I am one of the builders. I always think of those tremendous days when you devised Lend-Lease, when we met at Argentia, when you decided with my heartfelt agreement to launch the invasion of Africa, and when you comforted me for the loss of Tobruk by giving me the 300 Shermans of subsequent Alamein fame. I remember the part our personal relations have played in the advance of the world cause now nearing its first military goal. (Letter C-914 in Kimball, 1984b, p. 574)

Both the cracking of the US diplomatic codes (25 February 1942) and Roosevelt's aid after the fall of Tobruk (21 June 1942) illustrate Churchill's personal affection for Roosevelt. Both are clear instances of a moral obligation being fulfilled: Churchill warning Roosevelt, and Roosevelt offering military aid. It is only by discarding their emotions that it is possible to offer a more sceptical realist account: Churchill might have feared the potential backlash had the USA found out that their British allies had cracked their codes and it does not take much of imagination to posit that the USA had much to gain from providing Churchill with military material after Tobruk. Note that there were two potential future challenges: Britain becoming the junior member in the alliance and Churchill and Roosevelt's diverging worldviews. Roosevelt's early death prevents from speculating further on these matters. After all, a potential obstacle is not an actual obstacle.

Patterns

Throughout the friendship there are three patterns that are worth further consideration. Churchill consciously playing the part of the wooer is a recurring pattern. As noted above, Churchill's (assumed) romanticizing of the relationship has led scholars, including Warren F. Kimball, to be highly sceptical of the friendship. Second, there is also a pattern

of the diminishing importance of the relationship, the cause being the Soviet Union's growing importance to the alliance, which hints at a possible future inequality between the friends. Finally, there is a pattern of mutual appreciation, even fondness, between the two state leaders, evidenced by their letters and the observations of their close associates.

Unintended Consequences

As noted above, the post-war world and how to approach it would have formed a major obstacle not just between the two countries but between Churchill and Roosevelt themselves. The friendship between Churchill and Roosevelt heralds the Special Relationship between Great Britain and the USA and the Special Relationship itself might be the most obvious of the unintended consequences of their wartime partnership. Though their diverging worldviews did not lead to a conflict during Roosevelt's lifetime, these diverging worldviews most clearly came to the front in the 1956 Suez Crisis. As one might wonder whether the Churchill-Roosevelt friendship would have outlived their post-war worldviews, one might also wonder if an earlier clash would have prevented the Suez Crisis from happening. Interpreting the Suez Crisis as an unintended consequence remains a tentative suggestion here, but this idea certainly merits future research. Others have interpreted the Suez Crisis as an example of friends simply disagreeing (Eznack, 2011, p. 254).

Conclusion

Kimball soberly argues that '[...] the Churchill-Roosevelt relationship has been much over-romanticized by historians, largely through Winston Churchill's own efforts' (Kimball, 1984a, pp. 4–5). An ulterior letter to Eisenhower reveals as much (Van Hoef, 2010, p. 64).

My analysis shows that there is a clear instrumentality to their early relationship, more akin to a partnership than a friendship (Van Hoef, 2014, p. 69). As the USA gets drawn into the war, the relationship intensified and the two state leaders were also drawn to each other. They enjoyed a reciprocal and equal bond, which focused upon a grand project (defeating Nazi Germany). The friendship also contained emergent properties: the story of their friendship became a legend on its own and heralded the Special Relationship. The letter from Churchill to Eisenhower shows how keen

Churchill was to maintain the unique bond that had developed between the two countries. This is an effect of the Churchill-Roosevelt friendship. The fifth key component, their moral obligations, is hardest to pinpoint.

Here, IPS' concept of dilemmas proves enlightening. First, there is Roosevelt's offer of assistance after Tobruk. Churchill's professed gratitude, at multiple occasions, shows that for him this was a seminal gesture on Roosevelt's part. The most interesting dilemma is the moment Churchill went out of his way to reveal the decryption of the US diplomatic service to Roosevelt, a move potentially harmful to British intelligence services. Churchill's careful phrasing in the letter, hand delivered by the British ambassador to Roosevelt, implied that he was aware of the sensitivity of the situation. This is a further example of a moral obligation being fulfilled for a friend. Since each of the five key components of our conceptualization of friendship are present in the Churchill-Roosevelt relationship, the claim that their friendship has been romanticized is unfounded (Table 3.2).

It is in their different ideological backgrounds that the seeds for future conflict can be found. The (unverifiable) claim that their friendship would not have survived World War II is connected to their divergent views on what the post-war world would have to look like. Clearly, Churchill's imperialism would have found itself at odds with Roosevelt's ideal of self-determination for the colonies. In this regard, the idea of the Suez Crisis as an unintended consequence of the Churchill-Roosevelt relationship sheds an interesting light on the possible ramifications of close relations between state leaders. The story of a political friendship does not end with the friendship itself; the possible ramifications the unintended consequences of such relationships offer an exciting field for future research.

Table 3.2 Results of the case study

<i>Case study</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Friendship?</i>
1 The story	Diverging views; defeating Nazi Germany	• Grand project
2 Challenges	Tobruk; cracked codes	• Obligations fulfilled
3 Patterns	Equality; reciprocity; mutual fondness	• Equal and reciprocal
4 Unintended consequences	Suez Crisis; Special Relationship	• Emergent properties

IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Affective attachments [...] order priorities for leaders. (Sasley, 2010, p. 7)

The Churchill-Roosevelt case study brings several advantages and disadvantages of IPS to light. These include a number of traditional weaknesses of hermeneutics (Wachterhauser, 1986), further shortcomings that are revealed in the debate between interpretivism and critical realism (McAnulla, 2006a), and, following Sasley, the extent to which emotions constrain political actors (Sasley, 2010). This section will outline some of the lessons that can be learned from the latter two. The friendship definition proposed in the first part of this chapter contains the concept of emergent properties, which is found in critical realism, while Sasley's findings on the role that emotions play serve to further deepen the analysis of emotions in this chapter.

Bevir and Rhodes' interpretivism shares critical realism's critique of a fully positivist empirical approach to our field of study and both focus on the role actors have. However, critical realism does not share the crucial role that IPS lends to actors and stresses how social structures can both impede and allow for the agency of actors (McAnulla, 2006a, pp. 135–136). In an IPS perspective, Churchill and Roosevelt's different post-war world-views are part of their traditions and their differences form a dilemma, to either be overcome (one or both change their ideological backgrounds) or to be an obstacle. As seen in the preceding part, an IPS analysis stresses the agency of the actors to effect change, while critical realism would stress the inhibiting role of their backgrounds. Adopting IPS therefore amounts to take position in the agency-structure debate. For those researchers that wish to focus in on the role of social structures, critical realism offers a different, yet akin approach. The case study showed how the relationship eventually disseminated and came to mean much more than just the bond between two individual state leaders. The extent to which the friendship between Churchill and Roosevelt came to have meaning for their successors, in both the immediate and distant future, illustrates the theoretical depth that Bevir and Rhodes' approach offers.

One of the main criticism that can be addressed to IPS is its neglect of the actions of preceding actors - and their influence - on present actors, thereby forgetting that 'current activity and acts of reflexivity always take place within a pre-structured context' (McAnulla, 2006a, p. 121). I have answered that critique by making critical realism's concept of emergent

properties one of the five key elements of friendship. Assigning emergent properties to the actions of past and present actors gives them a form of agency that is lacking in IPS' tradition (McAnulla, 2006a, p. 121), which assigns all agency to the actors (Bevir & Rhodes, 2003, p. 2). That friendship is more than the sum of its parts is mirrored in the concept of emergent properties, because friendship is a social system and as such: 'involves interactive, coordinative, and synergistic dynamics that create emergent group-level properties not reducible solely to individual attributes' (Bandura, 2006, p. 166). Following from Albert Bandura's social cognitive theory of triadic reciprocal causation, 'personal agency and social structure operate independently' and 'human agency operates generatively and proactively on social systems, not just reactively' (Bandura, 2000, p. 77).

By focusing on the role of individual state leaders, this chapter took an approach which bears resemblance to Foreign Policy Analysis.² However, analysing the role of friendships of individual state leaders contributes, more importantly, to understanding the role emotions play at the intermediate level in IR. Both Roosevelt offering material aid to Britain after Tobruk and Churchill revealing to Roosevelt that US diplomatic codes were deciphered are instances of political action being taken out of personal affect for the other. While most research focuses on negative emotions (Sasley, 2011, p. 456), a study of friendship focuses on the positive affects that actors have for each other and the extent to which these affect their policies (Sasley, 2010, p. 3). Furthermore, by considering friendship at the intermediary level, an additional layer of analysis is offered next to the individual (cognitive) and the collective (national/transnational) level that has so far been left unexplored. While this case study's main concern was the question whether a friendship existed between Churchill and Roosevelt and whether it had an effect on the relations between the USA and Great Britain, the analysis contains examples of clear expressions of affect. Future studies focusing solely on the different ways state leaders express affect, as well as towards which objects (cf. Wissenburg, 2014), could further account for the role friendship plays in IR. Finally, while the idea of friendship in IR has been gaining traction (Koschut & Oelsner, 2014), its opposite, enmity between state leaders, is an unexplored field altogether.

Studying friendship connects to a number of current research projects in IR. It is a particularly enticing field because at the heart of its subject

matter is something that has an important and different meaning to each and every one of us. By carefully conceptualizing friendship, scholars do not only contribute to the growing scholarship on emotions on IR, but also engage with a subject that can count upon societal interest.

CONCLUSION

By conceptualizing friendship and operationalizing it through the use of Bevir and Rhodes' Interpretive Political Science (IPS), this chapter makes a case for studying the extent to which friendship between state leaders matters to international relations. This is an emotional bond present at the intermediary level, i.e. between the individual and collective level. Friendship is defined as a reciprocal, equal bond between two or more individuals sharing a (grand) project. It is a bond that is more than the sum of its parts, because it disseminates and affects others outside the relationship, and it carries with it important moral obligations, such as the ideal of self-sacrifice for the sake of the friend. In other words, friendship holds both promises and threats to international order. It brings to the fore important questions such as whether friends might privilege their friendship over the states they represent.

Bevir and Rhodes' IPS offers a fruitful framework for the analysis of relationships between actors because the key concepts of their method, and the philosophies underlying their approach, form a natural structure for researching the history of a relationship. Their approach offers additional depth compared to a process tracing or traditional historical analysis. This is especially evident when considering their concept of unintended consequences in a relationship and the ramifications those might have on the international order.

Analysing the friendship between Winston S. Churchill and Franklin D. Roosevelt served as an illustrative case study of using IPS. In contrast to many historical analyses of their relationship, which hold their friendship to be idealized and romanticized, this analysis showed that their friendship adheres to each of the key components of friendship we have identified. Two findings stand out. First, there are multiple instances of Roosevelt and Churchill fulfilling moral obligations towards each other, which further validates their relationship being a true friendship. Second, there are multiple instances of their friendship being more than the sum of its parts. There are both positive and negative examples of this dissemination, of which the Special Relationship and the Suez Crisis form the most

vivid examples. Finally, throughout their friendship there were multiple instances of clear emotional affection. These are most prominently displayed by Churchill, both in contemporary letters and observations by his advisors.

This chapter offered an approach for studying friendship between political actors. There is room for future studies that delve more deeply into the ways state leaders express ties of affection and to what extent they describe personal friends and foes differently. Future research could also tap into ties of enmity between actors. Finally, this case study offered a Western conceptualization of friendship: non-Western conceptualizations of friendship are still very much unexplored (Devere, 2014, pp. 194–195) and offer fruitful ground for future research to further conceptualize friendship.

Acknowledgement I am grateful for the guidance of the editors, Maéva Clément and Eric Sangar, and the feedback provided by two anonymous reviewers. Further valuable comments on this chapter were provided to me by participants of the CEEISA-ISA 2016 Joint International Conference at the University of Ljubljana, particularly Brent J. Steele, Jelena Subotic, and Felix Berenskoetter. Finally, this chapter would not have existed at all without Katharina Höne inviting me to her expertly organized workshop *IR's feelings* at the 2015 EISA Pan-European Conference at the University of Catania, where I received treasurable feedback that allowed me to explore the role of emotions on an entirely new level.

NOTES

1. In-depth overviews can be found in Simon Koschut and Andrea Oelsner's (Koschut & Oelsner, 2014) *Friendship in International Relations* and Barbara (Caine, 2014) *Friendship: A History*.
2. For an analysis of the role of friendship in Foreign Policy Analysis, see: Berenskoetter and Van Hoef, 2017.

REFERENCES

- Bandura, A. (2000). Exercise of Human Agency Through Collective Efficacy. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 9(3), 75–78. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8721.00064>.
- Bandura, A. (2006). Toward a Psychology of Human Agency. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 1(2), 164–180. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6916.2006.00011.x>.

- Berenskoetter, F. (2007). Friends, There Are No Friends? An Intimate Reframing of the International. *Millennium – Journal of International Studies*, 35(3), 647–676. <https://doi.org/10.1177/03058298070350031501>.
- Berenskoetter, F. (2014). Friendship, Security, and Power. In S. Koschut & A. Oelsner (Eds.), *Friendship and International Relations* (pp. 51–71). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Berthon, S. (2001). *Allies at War: The Bitter Rivalry Among Churchill, Roosevelt, and De Gaulle* (1st Carroll & Graf ed.). New York: Carroll & Graf Publishers Inc.
- Bevir, M., & Rhodes, R. A. W. (2003). *Interpreting British Governance*. London: Psychology Press.
- Bevir, M., & Rhodes, R. A. W. (2006). Disaggregating Structures as an Agenda for Critical Realism: A Reply to McAnulla. *British Politics*, 1(3), 397–403. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.bp.4200019>.
- Bevir, M., & Rhodes, R. A. W. (2010). *The State as Cultural Practice*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Black, C. (2003). *Franklin Delano Roosevelt: Champion of Freedom* (New ed.). New York: PublicAffairs.
- Bush, B. (1999). Eulogy. Raisa Gorbachev. *Time Magazine*, 154(14), 43.
- Byman, D. L., & Pollack, K. M. (2001). Let Us Now Praise Great Men: Bringing the Statesman Back In. *International Security*, 25(4), 107–146.
- Caine, B. (Ed.). (2014). *Friendship: A History*. London. Oakville, CT: Routledge.
- Charmley, J. (1993). *Churchill: The End of Glory: A Political Biography* (1st US ed.). New York: Harcourt.
- Churchill, W. S. (1964). *The Second World War. Part 12: Triumph and Tragedy*. London: Cassell.
- Devere, H. (2014). Friendship in International Treaties. In S. Koschut & A. Oelsner (Eds.), *Friendship and International Relations* (pp. 182–198). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Digester, P. E. (2009). Friendship Between States. *British Journal of Political Science*, 39(2), 323–344. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0007123408000525>.
- Eznack, L. (2011). Crises as Signals of Strength: The Significance of Affect in Close Allies' Relationships. *Security Studies*, 20(2), 238–265. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09636412.2011.572687>.
- Eznack, L., & Koschut, S. (2014). The Sources of Affect in Interstate Friendship. In S. Koschut & A. Oelsner (Eds.), *Friendship and International Relations* (pp. 72–88). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Freidel, F. (1990). *Franklin D. Roosevelt: A Rendezvous with Destiny* (1st ed.). Boston: Little, Brown.
- Galtung, J. (1964). An Editorial. *Journal of Peace Research*, 1(1), 1–4.
- Gardner Feldman, L. (2014). German-Polish Ties: Special Relationship, Friendship, or Reconciliation? In S. Koschut & A. Oelsner (Eds.), *Friendship and International Relations* (pp. 123–143). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Hall, T. H. (2015). *Emotional Diplomacy: Official Emotion on the International Stage*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Heintz, J. (2004, July 6). Gorbachev Recalls a Friend Who “Loved Life.” *The Boston Globe*. Retrieved from http://www.boston.com/news/nation/articles/2004/06/07/gorbachev_recalls_a_friend_who_loved_life/?camp=pm
- Keller, S. (2009). Against Friendship Between Countries. *Journal of International Political Theory*, 5(1), 59–74. <https://doi.org/10.3366/E1755088209000329>.
- Kimball, W. F. (Ed.). (1984a). *Churchill & Roosevelt: The Complete Correspondence I: Alliance Emerging: October 1933–November 1942*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Kimball, W. F. (Ed.). (1984b). *Churchill & Roosevelt: The Complete Correspondence II: Alliance Forged: November 1942–February 1944*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Koschut, S. (2014). Emotional (Security) Communities: The Significance of Emotion Norms in Inter-allied Conflict Management. *Review of International Studies*, 40(3), 533–558. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210513000375>.
- Koschut, S., & Oelsner, A. (Eds.). (2014). *Friendship and International Relations*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Löwenheim, O., & Heimann, G. (2008). Revenge in International Politics. *Security Studies*, 17(4), 685–724. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09636410802508055>.
- Maney, P. J. (1992). *The Roosevelt Presence: A Biography of Franklin Delano Roosevelt*. New York: Twayne [u.a.].
- McAnulla, S. (2006a). Challenging the New Interpretivist Approach: Towards a Critical Realist Alternative. *British Politics*, 1(1), 113–138. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.bp.4200013>.
- McAnulla, S. (2006b). Critical Realism, Social Structure and Political Analysis: A Reply to Bevir and Rhodes. *British Politics*, 1(3), 404–412. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.bp.4200029>.
- Meacham, J. (2003). *Franklin and Winston: An Intimate Portrait of an Epic Friendship* (1st ed.). New York: Random House.
- Mingers, J. (2011). The Contribution of Systemic Thought to Critical Realism. *Journal of Critical Realism*, 10(3), 303–330. <https://doi.org/10.1558/jcr.v10i3.303>.
- Oelsner, A. (2007). Friendship, Mutual Trust and the Evolution of Regional Peace in the International System. *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy*, 10(2), 257–279. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13698230701208061>.
- Rhodes, R. A. W. (2011). Thinking On: A Career in Public Administration. *Public Administration*, 89(1), 196–212. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9299.2011.01898.x>.
- Roshchin, E. (2014). Friendship and International Order: An Ambiguous Liaison. In S. Koschut & A. Oelsner (Eds.), *Friendship and International Relations* (pp. 89–106). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Sainsbury, K. (1996). *Churchill and Roosevelt at War: The War They Fought and the Peace They Hoped to Make* (Reprinted with Alterations). Houndmills [u.a.]: Macmillan.
- Sasley, B. E. (2010). Affective Attachments and Foreign Policy: Israel and the 1993 Oslo Accords. *European Journal of International Relations*, 16(4), 687–709. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354066110366055>.
- Sasley, B. E. (2011). Theorizing States' Emotions. *International Studies Review*, 13(3), 452–476. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2486.2011.01049.x>.
- Scheff, T. J. (2000). *Bloody Revenge: Emotions, Nationalism and War* (Reprint). Lincoln, NE: Authors Guild Backinprint.com Ed.
- Schmitt, C. (2007). *Theory of the Partisan: Intermediate Commentary on the Concept of the Political*. New York: Telos Press Publishing.
- Smith, G. M. (2007). Kierkegaard: Responsibility to the Other. *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy*, 10(2), 181–197. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13698230701207964>.
- Smith, G. M. (2014). Friendship, State, and Nation. In S. Koschut & A. Oelsner (Eds.), *Friendship and International Relations* (pp. 35–50). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Stern-Gillet, S. (1995). *Aristotle's Philosophy of Friendship*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Van Hoef, Y. (2010). *Friendship or Partnership? A Theory to Interpret the Role of Friendship Between Heads of State. With a Closer Look at the Relationships Between Churchill and Roosevelt, Kohl and Mitterrand, and Bush and Putin*. Thesis, University of Groningen, Groningen.
- Van Hoef, Y. (2012a). *The Friendship Factor: An Investigation into the Potential of Social Network Analysis and Game Theory to Assess the Influence of Friendship in Politics on Historical Actors*. Thesis, University of Groningen, Groningen.
- Van Hoef, Y. (2012b). Vriendschap en vijandschap. De relaties tussen Amerikaanse en Russische staatshoofden. In S. de Hoop (Ed.), *Erfenis van het verleden, geopolitiek en nieuwe dreigingen* (pp. 43–64). Groningen: Instituut voor Noord- en Oost-Europese Studies.
- Van Hoef, Y. (2014). Friendship in World Politics: Assessing the Personal Relationships Between Kohl and Mitterrand, and Bush and Gorbachev. *AMITY: The Journal of Friendship Studies*, 2(1), 62–82.
- Vion, A. (2014). Franco-German Friendship: A Dynamic Perspective. In S. Koschut & A. Oelsner (Eds.), *Friendship and International Relations* (pp. 109–122). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Vogler, G. (2016). Power Between Habitus and Reflexivity – Introducing Margaret Archer to the Power Debate. *Journal of Political Power*, 9(1), 65–82. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2158379X.2016.1149309>.
- Wachterhauser, B. R. (1986). *Hermeneutics and Modern Philosophy*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

- Wissenburg, M. (2014). Human-Animal Amity and Reciprocity. *AMITY: The Journal of Friendship Studies*, 1(2), 4–17.
- Young, K. (1966). *Churchill and Beaverbrook. A Study in Friendship and Politics*. London: Eyre & Spottiswoode.

Yuri van Hoef is a lecturer of International Relations at the Department of History at Utrecht University, and a doctoral researcher at the University of Leeds. Previously, he held a lectureship in International Relations at the University of Groningen. His research examines the role of friendship in politics. Several of his publications deal with this subject, including ‘Friendship in world politics: Assessing the personal relationships between Kohl and Mitterrand, and Bush and Gorbachev’ for *AMITY: The Journal of Friendship Studies* (2014), and, co-authored with Felix Berenskoetter, ‘*Friendship and Foreign Policy*’, edited by Cameron Thies, for the *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Foreign Policy Analysis* (Oxford University Press 2017).