

**(Political) friendship that is no friendship during peace that is no peace**

Assessing the political friendship between Eleanor Roosevelt and Josip Broz Tito, and its effect on the international relations between the United States of America and Yugoslavia during the Cold War in the 1960s

Student Name: Neila Bakija  
Student Number: 505764 (505764nb@student.eur.nl)

Supervisor: Yuri van Hoef  
Second reader: Sandra Manickam

Word count: 19.220

Master History  
Specialization Global History and International Relations  
Erasmus School of History, Culture and Communication  
Erasmus University Rotterdam

Master's Thesis Final  
*24 June 2024*

(Political) friendship that is no friendship during peace that is no peace: assessing the political friendship between Eleanor Roosevelt and Josip Broz Tito, and its effect on the international relations between the United States of America and Yugoslavia during the Cold War in the 1960s

### **ABSTRACT**

*This thesis analyses the diplomatic approach of Eleanor Roosevelt to Yugoslavia, through the political friendship between Roosevelt and Marshal Josip Broz Tito. It uncovers the effect of Roosevelt's diplomacy with Tito on the international relations between the United States of America and Yugoslavia during the Cold War in the 1960s. This is done by using Van Hoef's theoretical concept of political friendship to interpret the relationship between Roosevelt and Tito. It shows that there is no indication of a strong political friendship but more of a fellowship that fostered ground for positive peace. This research adds onto existing research on the economic and political implications of the cooperation between the US and Yugoslavia, especially during the Cold War period, where Yugoslavia was used by the Eisenhower administration in their 'wedge strategy'. By analyzing personal notes and letters of Roosevelt in the 1960s, as well as examining official government documents, it becomes clear how the personal diplomacy of Roosevelt influenced Tito and created a fellowship, which fostered ground for positive peace between the US and Yugoslavia in the 1960s.*

**KEYWORDS:** *Political friendship, positive peace, Eleanor Roosevelt, Josip Broz Tito, Cold War, wedge strategy, United States of America, Yugoslavia, Eisenhower, Truman*

## Table of Contents

<b>ABSTRACT .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>1. Theory and Method .....</b>	<b>8</b>
1.1 Theory .....	8
1.2 Method .....	12
1.3 Literature review .....	14
1.4 Primary source criticism .....	18
1.5 Conclusion .....	19
<b>2. Eleanor Roosevelt and Josip Broz Tito.....</b>	<b>21</b>
2.1 Historiography .....	21
2.2 Eleanor Roosevelt .....	24
2.3 Josip Broz Tito.....	26
2.4 Conclusion .....	28
<b>3. The political friendship between Eleaonor Roosevelt and Josip Broz Tito? .....</b>	<b>30</b>
3.1 Affect .....	30
3.2 Grand Project .....	31
3.3 Altruistic Reciprocity .....	34
3.4 Moral Obligations .....	35
3.5 Equality .....	37
3.6 Conclusion .....	38
<b>4. Positive Peace during the Cold War .....</b>	<b>41</b>
4.1 The Cold War.....	41
4.2 Positive/relational peace .....	42
4.3 Conclusion .....	46
<b>Conclusion.....</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>Bibliography .....</b>	<b>53</b>

## Introduction

The focus of this thesis is the approach to diplomacy of Eleanor Roosevelt in Yugoslavia, through the political friendship between Roosevelt<sup>1</sup> and Josip Broz Tito, and the effect of this relationship between Roosevelt and Tito on the bond between the United States of America (US) and Yugoslavia in the 1960s. Therefore, the main research question is “How did Eleanor Roosevelt’s approach to diplomacy and her political friendship with Josip Broz Tito impact the bond between the US and Yugoslavia in the 1960s?”. After Yugoslavia’s Marshal Josip Broz Tito historically said “no” to Soviet leader Jozef Stalin, Yugoslavia ruptured with the Soviets in 1948. Yugoslavia was an independent communist country and stayed neutral during the Cold War between the US and the Soviet Union.<sup>2</sup> This is mainly why the US was eager to befriend Yugoslavia. From the moment it broke free of the Soviet Union, the Eisenhower administration invoked the “wedge strategy”.<sup>3</sup> Yugoslavia was the perfect buffer and connection for the US, with the Soviet Union, and the rest of (Eastern) Europe.

The goal of the US was to create instability in the Soviet Union by connecting Yugoslavia, with her political, economic, and military institutions, to themselves. To achieve this goal, they had to “keep Tito afloat”.<sup>4</sup> There is much research done on mainly the economic and political implications of the cooperation between the two countries. Further research has been conducted on “how the US administration used Yugoslav openness to foreign countries in order to establish an extensive network of soft power channels implemented by public diplomacy agencies and agents”.<sup>5</sup> This thesis adds on to this research by tackling a more personal level of international relations and politics.

While several US officials were in contact with Tito, his relationship with Roosevelt stood out the most, as she had a different approach to diplomacy in which she tried to keep it more personal. This thesis shows that the relationship between US-officials and Tito was not always pleasant, as the US was not keen on listening to Tito and his wishes but rather wanted to apply their modern Western views and liberal ideas to Yugoslavia. Tito was expected to be grateful for all the aid he received from the Americans and join the West in their quest against

---

<sup>1</sup> To prevent any ambiguities, from this point forward in the thesis, the term “Roosevelt” will refer to Eleanor Roosevelt, while “FDR” will refer to her husband, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

<sup>2</sup> Katarina Palinic, “Josip Broz Tito: The Man Who Was Too Tough for Stalin,” *The Collector*, July 22, 2022.

<sup>3</sup> Carla Konta, “Eleanor Roosevelt in Yugoslavia Between Wedge Strategy and Cold War Internationalism,” in *Eleanor Roosevelt’s Views on Diplomacy and Democracy: The Global Citizen*, ed. Anya Luscombe and Dario Fazzi (Switzerland: Springer Nature, 2020): 66.

<sup>4</sup> Lorraine M. Lees, “Keeping Tito Afloat: The United States, Yugoslavia, and the Cold War” (Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2005), 88.

<sup>5</sup> Carla Konta, “Waging Public Diplomacy: The United States and the Yugoslav Experiment (1950-1972)” (PhD diss., University of Trieste, 2016).

the Soviet Union and their communist influence on other countries. Tito was not looking to become submissive to the US, and he did not like their approach. However, Roosevelt had a different approach to Tito and to the Yugoslav delegates at the United Nations. They were also the one to invite Roosevelt to come to Yugoslavia.<sup>6</sup> His warm welcome to Eleanor Roosevelt paved the way for more friendly relations between the US and Yugoslavia.

This thesis analyzes the effect of Roosevelt's approach to diplomacy with Marshal Josip Broz Tito on the bond between the US and Yugoslavia in the 1960s by applying Van Hoef's model of political friendship (the AGAME-theory) to the relationship between Roosevelt and Tito. This is done by analyzing their personal notes and letters from the 1960s, official government documents, and secondary literature. Van Hoef's AGAME-framework includes five characteristics of political friendship: (1) affect, (2) grand project, (3) altruistic reciprocity, (4) moral obligation, and (5) equality.<sup>7</sup> These characteristics are considered when assessing the relationship between Roosevelt and Tito. By reviewing how prominent the characteristics are, the conclusion is drawn that there was no strong political friendship. There was a form of affect and a grand project that ER and Tito shared, which made Tito willing to cooperate more with the US. The altruistic reciprocity and the moral obligations are hard to be found in this relationship, since there is not much documentation, except for the Autobiography and the "My Day" series of Roosevelt herself. Following from these writings, however, it can be concluded that there was an equal relationship between Roosevelt and Tito, even though it remains a question whether there would have been a different relationship if Roosevelt was still First Lady or (a male) President of the United States.

Despite there not being a strong political friendship, there was definitely a fellowship that fostered ground for positive peace. This had a great impact on the bond between the US and Yugoslavia. Roosevelt's approach to diplomacy was an important aspect of the positive peace that was established. Because of her soft and personal diplomacy, she was open to collaborate, listen, and understand Tito. In turn, Tito opened more towards the US. The effect of personal diplomacy and political friendships is particularly interesting in the light of current issues and wars. The war in Ukraine is being fought with support from other countries and perhaps friendships being formed with the Ukrainian president, Volodymyr Zelensky. However, there is no state between Russia and the West that is completely detached from both

---

<sup>6</sup> Geoffrey Swain, *Tito: a biography* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 2.

<sup>7</sup> Yuri van Hoef, "Modelling Friendship between Elite Political Actors: Interpreting the Relationships of Schmidt and Giscard d'Estaing, Kohl and Mitterrand, Thatcher and Reagan, and Bush and Major" (PhD diss., The University of Leeds, 2018), 129.

blocs and that can serve as a wedge between Russia and the West. It appears the diplomatic actions that are undertaken are not successful in fostering ground for positive peace. The same goes for the war in Gaza. There are diplomatic ties with Israel and there is contact with Palestine too, but it seems as though all other countries are afraid to form a new bloc that stands up to the horrors in all wars. There is much division in the several nations that are to do with this war.

Instead of fighting for positive peace, most states are waging a negative and thus violent way of trying to foster peace. Due to the globalizing world that we are currently living in, there is more connection on different levels with all nations across the globe including interesting political friendships being formed and being maintained. For example, the Dutch Geert Wilders has ties with leaders of illiberal democracies across Europe which may or may not cause tensions in Europe and perhaps outside of Europe as well. His changed position from opposition leader to frontman of the Dutch cabinet leads to an interesting new dynamic on the global world stage. The relationship between Roosevelt and Tito is not considered hostile, but some contemporary political friendships might be, which makes it even more important to research political friendships and their influence in international relations (IR).

By using the AGAME-framework to analyze the relationship between Roosevelt and Tito, and including it in the framework on relational peace, as introduced by Söderström, Åkebo, Jarstad (2021), this thesis shows how political friendship fosters ground for positive peace and can lead to stronger ties between nations. Söderström, Åkebo, Jarstad (2021) establish three components and their ideal type for relational peace: deliberation, non-domination and cooperation, mutual recognition and mutual trust, and fellowship or friendship.<sup>8</sup> By using this theory combined with the research method of Interpretive Political Science (IPS), as introduced by Bevir and Rhodes (2016), it is shown that there is no clear indication for a political friendship between Roosevelt and Tito. This does not mean that Roosevelt did not have an impact on Tito and the decisions he made for Yugoslavia. It is evident that Roosevelt's approach to diplomacy made Tito and other Yugoslav diplomats open to the collaboration between the US and Yugoslavia. By using a soft approach to diplomacy, Roosevelt managed to develop a friendly relationship with Tito and Yugoslav officials, fostering positive peace. This also meant that there was an improving bond developing between the US and Yugoslavia.

---

<sup>8</sup> Johanna Söderström, Malin Åkebo, Anna K Jarstad, "Friends, Fellows, and Foes: A New Framework for Studying Relational Peace," *International Studies Review* 23, no. 3 (September 2021): 497.

To be able to answer the main research question, the theory and method must be introduced. This thesis uses the concept of political friendship by Van Hoef (2018) combined with the method of IPS to examine the effects of Roosevelt's diplomacy in Yugoslavia. Van Hoef uses a framework consisting of five key factors of political friendship, that is based on several other scholars that have researched friendship. To understand the framework and to be able to further develop the relationship between ER and Tito, the first sub-question is: "What is political friendship?". This question is answered in the first chapter.

It is necessary to take a closer look at the specific approach that Roosevelt had to diplomacy and why she became the diplomat that people remember her to be. At the same time, Tito's past, and the reasons why he became the strong leader of Yugoslavia, must be investigated, since the main actors in this research are Roosevelt and Tito. That leads to the second sub-question: "What shaped the life of Eleanor Roosevelt and Josip Broz Tito and how did they become the international actors that we know?". This question is answered in the second chapter.

After examining the individuals, we can move on to assessing their political friendship. It is important to note that there might not be a strong political friendship but there is still an indication of friendship, or at least fellowship. Certain critiques are also expressed and explained which deepen the understanding of the relationship between Roosevelt and Tito. Therefore, the next sub-question is "How can the political friendship between Eleanor Roosevelt and Josip Broz Tito be assessed?". This is discussed in the third chapter.

In line with the previous sub questions, it follows to ask what the relationship between the US and Yugoslavia was like in the 1960s, how it changed, and what Roosevelt's contribution regarding this was. This leads to the final research question being as follows: "What was the relationship between the US and Yugoslavia like in the 1960s?". This question is answered in the fourth and final chapter, after which a conclusion will follow. The conclusion offers an answer to the research question, as well as the possible ideas for future research.

# 1. Theory and Method

## 1.1 Theory

The main concept of this thesis is political friendship. To understand this concept and apply it to the relationship between Roosevelt and Tito, the theoretical AGAME-framework as developed by Yuri van Hoef (2018) is used.<sup>9</sup> He identifies 5 key characteristics of friendship, (1) affect, (2) grand project, (3) altruistic reciprocity, (4) moral obligations, and (5) equality. With this framework and by combining this theory with the method of Interpretive Political Science (IPS), a comprehensive understanding of the relationship between Roosevelt and Tito can be found.

The concept of political friendship has a long history that dates all the way back to ancient Greece. Based on Plato's works, Frisbee Sheffield (2011) has created a model which includes three types of friendship: pleasure-based, honor-based, and virtue-based, in which the latter is the ultimate type of friendship.<sup>10</sup> Like Plato, Aristotle differentiated between three forms of friendship: utility, pleasure, and virtue-friendship, where the latter is the highest form.<sup>11</sup> After the early Greek philosophers, there were many more trying to conceptualize friendship. Carl Schmitt (2007) has made a distinction between utilitarian and existential friendship, where he makes the connection with politics.<sup>12</sup> Van Hoef (2018) take this a step further and makes the concept and connection with politics more concrete. He argues that in political friendships, there must be a shared vision that comes to life in a project.<sup>13</sup> When talking about friendships in IR, the concept has not been used much in studies, until Felix Berenskotter (2007) urged to include the concept in IR readings.<sup>14</sup>

The reason for the lack of earlier incorporation of friendship in the field of IR can be found in an important era that is of great importance for this thesis, the Cold War period. During this time there was a great defense conundrum, where states would not trust each other and thus would not develop a relationship based on friendship. This leads to states not working together and focusing on protecting their own national security to be able to survive the

---

<sup>9</sup> Yuri van Hoef and Andrea Oelsner, "Friendship and Positive Peace: Conceptualizing Friendship in Politics and International Relations," *Politics and Governance* 6, no.4 (December 2018): 115-124.

<sup>10</sup> Frisbee C. C. Sheffield, "VIII—Beyond Eros: Friendship in the Phaedrus." *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 111, no. 2 (February 2011): 252.

<sup>11</sup> Sibyl Schwarzenbach, "A political reading of the reproductive soul in Aristotle," *History of Philosophy Quarterly* 9, no. 3 (1992): 245.

<sup>12</sup> Carl Schmitt, "The concept of the political." (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007).

<sup>13</sup> Yuri van Hoef, "Interpreting affect between state leaders. Assessing the Churchill–Roosevelt friendship," in *Researching emotions in IR: Methodological perspectives for a new paradigm*, ed. M. Clément & E. Sangar (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018), 55.

<sup>14</sup> Felix Berenskotter, "Friends, there are no friends? An intimate reframing of the international," *Millennium, Journal of International Studies* 35, no. 3 (September 2007), 642.



situation of systematic anarchy. This explanation stems from “the dominance of realist and neorealist theory”.<sup>15</sup> Interestingly enough, friendship can play quite a substantial role when it comes to IR and positive peace between nations. A big part of this is trust, since in the Cold War there was little trust between nations and thus few friendships. States can decide to stand alone or work with others, which can have different implications. On the one hand, there can be an “outward-looking friendship”, where states work together to eliminate a shared threat. On the other hand, states can have an “inward-directed friendship” where they want to improve their relationship with one another.<sup>16</sup> These friendships can contribute to positive peace between states, which is the second key concept in this thesis and is explained in the final chapter.

When speaking of states or state intentions, ultimately, they are the same as individuals and individual intentions, since individuals are the ones who make a state and think of the state intentions.<sup>17</sup> This theory can also be applied to the US and Yugoslavia. During the Cold War, it was the Eisenhower administration who imposed the wedge strategy, it was Roosevelt who traveled to Yugoslavia, it was Tito who rejected Jozef Stalin and accepted the aid from the US. All these individual decisions by people in power of a state make an impact on the whole nation and ultimately, on the global order. The impact of these decisions and effect on international relations, however, can only be studied when zooming in on the relationship between two influential individuals between states. That is what this thesis does, by studying Roosevelt and Tito. Van Hoef (2018) argues that “it is the affective element of friendship that makes it such a powerful bond”.<sup>18</sup> This aspect is considered as well, since the theory of Van Hoef (2018) is used to examine the political friendship between Roosevelt and Tito.

While Van Hoef (2018) mentions a solid list of characteristics of political friendship – (1) affect (2) a shared project (3) altruistic reciprocity (4) moral obligations and (5) equality – there are a few things that need to be considered. Firstly, while the concept of political friendship is intriguing, there is no concrete empirical evidence that can prove its impact on policy decisions or conflict resolution. To critically assess and validate the effects of political friendships, more rigorous research is needed. This thesis claims that a connection can indeed be found between the relationship between Roosevelt and Tito, and the actions of the US and Yugoslavia. At the same time, the question remains whether the relationship was the sole

---

<sup>15</sup> Van Hoef and Oelsner, “Friendship and Positive Peace,” 118.

<sup>16</sup> Arnold Wolfers, “Discord and collaboration: Essays on international politics,” (Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1962).

<sup>17</sup> Daniel L. Byman and Kenneth M. Pollack, “Let us now praise great men: Bringing the statesman back in,” *International Security* 25, no. 4, 114.

<sup>18</sup> Van Hoef and Oelsner, “Friendship and Positive Peace,” 117.

cause of these actions or perhaps a mere attribution and possibly only a method of the US to be able to achieve their goal.

Furthermore, there is a challenge of deciding how much indication of all five characteristics is enough. Van Hoef also stumbles upon this challenge when assessing the friendship between Winston Churchill and FDR. He states that “It is harder to discern the two state leaders acting on moral obligations towards each other.”<sup>19</sup> While there is no clear indication of the fulfilling of moral obligations, Van Hoef does conclude that Churchill and FDR were (political) friends. How is that possible? In his multiple analyses, Van Hoef usually highlights the *grand project* between two political friends as a starting point. From this characteristic, the others follow. It is obvious that not all friendships are the same, and perhaps a certain friendship is more obvious than another or contains more of one characteristic than another, but when using this model, it makes sense that a relationship has to at least meet all the five characteristics to a certain extent. Because if it doesn’t, why include all characteristics as a requirement? This critique will become evident in the assessment of the friendship between Eleanor Roosevelt and Josip Broz Tito, as there is not always enough indication for some of the characteristics.

Apart from the lack of concrete evidence and determination on the intensity of characteristics, there are certain characteristics – like humor – missing from the list. A friendship can be defined in many ways, yet it is sometimes hard to differentiate between friendships and more distant relationships. A friendship involves altruistic reciprocity according to Van Hoef. Friends don’t act for a reward but for the sake of friendship.<sup>20</sup> However, when considering friendships, not all of them are mutual. Research shows that “prosocial decisions for friends and selfish decisions for disliked peers” are involved in the same brain region. This means that the same part of the brain can contribute to forming healthy relationships, as well as unhealthy ones.<sup>21</sup> Social interactions usually form relationships like friendships over time, but it is unclear how this evolves. Therefore, it can be hard to determine certain relationships as friendships. This can be illustrated by Van Hoef’s examination of the friendship between Helmut Kohl and François Mitterrand.

Both Kohl and Mitterrand prove to be very practical politicians. Illustrative for this is their masterful use of the full political toolkit: Kohl orchestrated a vote of no confidence

---

<sup>19</sup> Van Hoef, “Modelling Friendship,” 97.

<sup>20</sup> Van Hoef and Oelsner, “Friendship and Positive Peace,” 118.

<sup>21</sup> Berna Guroğlu, “The power of friendship: The developmental significance of friendships from a neuroscience perspective,” *Child Development Perspectives* 16, no. 2 (June 2022): 112.

against himself to trigger new elections and gain a stronger majority, while Mitterrand succeeded in building a broad left-wing movement to carry him to the presidency.<sup>22</sup>

This quote shows how practicality is a shared value, which can indicate towards a friendship. However, this specific value can orchestrate problems in a friendship. Van Hoef mentions how the opposing views on German Reunification did exactly this. Kohl was determined to persuade Mitterrand to help him in his mission of German Reunification, so he visited Mitterrand and eventually won him over.<sup>23</sup> As there are no notes or information (other than the claim that it was highly emotional), it is difficult to understand whether this outcome was based on the political friendship between the two men or something else. Van Hoef claims that “the winning over of Mitterrand for the cause of German Reunification, can only be explained through their personal friendship.”<sup>24</sup> However, there is no knowledge on what they truly agreed on. It is possible that Kohl offered Mitterrand a deal that was appealing, which was the reason for him to stand by Kohl. This would possibly make their friendship a partnership, with a focus on *quid pro quo*.<sup>25</sup> At the same time, the emotional nature and description of the meeting can indicate that there was indeed a (healthy) political friendship between the men. Because Mitterrand died six years after this major happening, it is hard to determine whether there was a (un)healthy political friendship or partnership between the men.

In line with his claim that there was a true political friendship between Kohl and Mitterrand, Van Hoef argues that the way they handled the issue of the possibility of German reunification, “illustrates how their personal friendship played an instrumental role in their striving for positive peace.”<sup>26</sup> He shows how the actions of friends in high political positions can have a significant impact on international relations. The characteristics of political friendship, as mentioned by Van Hoef, can be tested through moments like these. What can determine the survival of the friendship is the eagerness to work towards the shared grand project, which in this case was “building a reconciled and integrated Europe”.<sup>27</sup> In the situation between Kohl and Mitterrand, the outcome of the issue of German reunification led to an

---

<sup>22</sup> Van Hoef, “Modelling Friendship,” 129.

<sup>23</sup> Van Hoef, “Modelling Friendship,” 130-131.

<sup>24</sup> Van Hoef, “Modelling Friendship,” 131.

<sup>25</sup> Van Hoef, “Modelling Friendship,” 34.

<sup>26</sup> Van Hoef, “Positive Peace Through Personal Friendship: Franco-German Reconciliation (1974–1995),” in *The Palgrave Handbook of Positive Peace*, ed. Standish, K., Devere, H., Suazo, A., Rafferty, R. (Singapore: Palgrave Macmillan, 2022), 1046.

<sup>27</sup> Van Hoef, “Positive Peace,” 1046.

important next step in working on their shared grand project. This will also be shown in the political friendship between Roosevelt and Tito, as it was an important factor in establishing positive peace during the Cold War.

## 1.2 Method

In this thesis, the research method of Interpretive Political Science (IPS), as introduced by Bevir and Rhodes (2016), is used, which aligns perfectly with the AGAME-framework of Van Hoef (2018). By using search engines like Google Scholar and sEURch, primary and secondary sources are obtained. The most important key words being Eleanor Roosevelt, Josip Broz Tito, and political friendship. With this research method, all kinds of sources can be used. The primary sources – papers, books, and official governmental documents – are interpreted using secondary sources. IPS challenges conventional approaches to studying politics, and delves into meanings, context, and human agency, rather than solely relying on quantitative data and formal models.<sup>28</sup> It differs from other approaches like behavioralism, institutionalism, and rational choice theory in that IPS focuses on beliefs and intentions rather than just actions. Beliefs are seen as part of a wider web instead of isolated variables.<sup>29</sup> There are a few differences that should be further explained. Firstly, the opposition between IPS and positivism. In the field of political science, IPS prioritizes meanings and therefore contrasts scientism and positivism.<sup>30</sup> Next to positivism, IPS diverges from institutionalism, behavioralism, and rational choice, since they don't emphasize beliefs but just maybe include them in a way that does not contribute to the understanding of institutions and political culture. It is important to note that beliefs from people and beliefs about people can differ, which means that actions can be done consciously or unconsciously, because of other factors involved.

Especially when considering political friendship, the meanings, environments, cultures, and other similar factors of the people involved in the friendship should be taken into account. For example, Roosevelt grew up in a prominent and privileged environment and family. However, her family also knew hardship because of her father's alcoholism and death amongst others. Roosevelt was brought up to value community service and experienced great family losses in her young life.<sup>31</sup> This is taken into consideration when trying to understand

---

<sup>28</sup> Mark Bevir, and R. A. W. Rhodes, "Introduction," In *Interpretive Political Science: Mapping the Field*, ed. Mark Bevir, and R. A. W. Rhodes (London and New York: Routledge, 2016).

<sup>29</sup> Bevir and Rhodes, "Introduction," 7.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, 4.

<sup>31</sup> National Women's History Museum, "Eleanor Roosevelt," <https://stage.womenshistory.org/education-resources/biographies/eleanor-roosevelt>, accessed on 8 May 2024.

the political friendship between her and Josip Broz Tito. In his turn, Tito grew up in a peasant family in a rural setting, which had its own hardships. Later he was further exposed to socialist movements, which most likely further influenced his political trajectory.<sup>32</sup> These mere examples of Roosevelt's and Tito's backgrounds already hint on the consideration of historical roots in IPS. Historians analyze events by considering the motives, meanings, and beliefs of the involved actors.<sup>33</sup> Van Hoef follows up on the notion of Bevir and Rhodes that the background of actors should be considered when assessing a (political) friendship. This can for example be found in the second characteristic or foundation of political friendship; grand project. There must be a goal that both parties are striving towards. This goal is strongly connected to the beliefs and values of the actors, so analyzing the background of both parties is therefore highly important.<sup>34</sup>

It is interesting to analyze political relations and friendships that might not be too obvious. In this case, little research is conducted on the relationship between Roosevelt and Tito. Perhaps it would be even more logical to assess the friendship between Dwight D. Eisenhower and Tito instead of his relationship with Roosevelt because Eisenhower and Tito were both state leaders. But this thesis argues that Roosevelt had a big influence on Tito and thus on the relationship between the US and Yugoslavia. A lot of research has been done on the personal or private diplomacy of Roosevelt, which implies that she has been an important political actor globally, especially when it comes to human rights.<sup>35</sup> Finding links between a friendship and the shaping of a relationship between two nations does not, however, mean that there are no other factors involved. Interpreting the connection between Roosevelt and Tito adds on to possible subjective meanings and interpretations that underlie political actions involving the US and Yugoslavia. Oelsner (2014) argues that political elites can play a role in establishing positive peace between nations. They can do so by forming friendships.<sup>36</sup> Exploring this insight further is done by interpreting the connection between Roosevelt and Tito.

While IPS can be perfectly combined with the theory on political friendship as mentioned by Van Hoef, there are also several flaws to be found in this research method. Firstly, interpretivism can have a lack of objectivity. Critics argue that using interpretive

---

<sup>32</sup> Britannica, "Josip Broz Tito," <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Josip-Broz-Tito>, accessed on 8 May 2024.

<sup>33</sup> Bevir and Rhodes, "Introduction," 16.

<sup>34</sup> Van Hoef, "Modelling Friendship," 129.

<sup>35</sup> Anya Luscombe and Dario Fazzi, "Eleanor Roosevelt and Diplomacy in the Public Interest," *European journal of American studies* 12, no. 1 (March 2017): 1-5.

<sup>36</sup> Andrea Oelsner, "The construction of international friendship in South America," in S. Koschut & A. Oelsner (Eds.), *Friendship and international relations* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), 147.

research methods can have a lack of objectivity because they are often solely based on the subjective reasoning of the researcher. The meanings, interpretations and intentions rely mostly on the researcher.<sup>37</sup> This can be prevented by having multiple researchers look at the interpretations and intentions, as well as clearly stating the possible biases in the research. In the case of this thesis, the researcher might be influenced by her background, as both her parents are from former Yugoslavia. This could imply a more favorable view on Tito, and his partaking in the friendship with Roosevelt and the further relationship between the US and Yugoslavia. Next to objectivity, there might be challenges in generalization.<sup>38</sup> As most research using interpretive approaches is focused on specific instances and happenings, it can be difficult to extend the findings to more cases in history or in the future. This research is focused on the relationship between two individuals and the possible influence this relationship had on a state-level bond between two nations. While there can be significant findings and reasons for this link, it is hard to find an exact replica of this situation.

IPS is further criticized for not being as thorough as other political science approaches that are more conventional.<sup>39</sup> However, the respond to this criticism is that there are a lot of misconceptions about interpretive research. There is a wider web in which actions happen and should be understood and explained. This does not mean that interpretive research ignores all existing structures and methods. Methodological and structural critics to interpretive methods point out that IPS mostly focuses on individual beliefs and structures and thus do not address social structures and institutions.<sup>40</sup> In this research, because IPS is combined with the AGAME theory as introduced by Van Hoef, the concerns are taken into consideration and explained thoroughly through the text. The goal is to understand and (partially) explain the relationship between the US and Yugoslavia during the 1960s. It is shown that the political friendship between Roosevelt and Tito had an influence on the US-Yugoslavia bond and positive peace. By framing the intentions of this research, interpretive methods are the most obvious to use, especially considering the already existing research on the US-Yugoslavia relations, that do not take personal friendships or relationships into account.

### **1.3 Literature review**

When looking at the field of international relations, not many scholars consider the individual

---

<sup>37</sup> Funk K. "Making Interpretivism Visible: Reflections after a Decade of the Methods Café," *Political Science & Politics* 52, no. 3 (2019):465-469.

<sup>38</sup> Turnbull, N. "Interpretivism and practice in governance studies: The critique of methodological institutionalism," *Br Polit* 6 \*2011): 252–264.

<sup>39</sup> Rhodes, R. A. W., "On Interpretation," *Interpretive Political Science: Selected Essays II* (August 2017).

<sup>40</sup> Turnbull, "Interpretivism and practice in governance studies".

relationships between leaders or diplomatic figures in the countries of investigation. Van Hoef has given an extra dimension by conceptualizing friendship in politics and international relations. He has established AGAME, which stands for Affect, Grand project, Altruistic Reciprocity, Moral obligations, and Equality.<sup>41</sup> With this theorization, the friendship between political figures can be assessed. This research shows that there is more to international relations than merely overarching diplomatic ties. By using this theory and applying it to a relationship that has not yet been investigated, this thesis adds value to the study of (little-known) political friendships and special relationships. There are several aspects of political friendship where the link between Roosevelt and Tito is found, the research shows how the relationship between Roosevelt and Tito was special, yet not a pure political friendship. The relationship did influence the overall relationship between the US and Yugoslavia. Next to this conceptualization, other aspects of the connection between the countries is revealed. This is due to the time in which the friendship was formed, as the (Global) Cold War was waging between the US and the Soviet Union.

Studying emotion in global affairs is a newly thriving field in international relations. Todd Hall (2015) talks about emotional diplomacy and suggests that emotion can be a strategic tool in managing how a state is being perceived. He argues that emotion can be used by state actors to achieve outcomes that are also evoked interpersonally between people.<sup>42</sup> It is not only about gestures and other rhetoric, but also about substantive actions. In his study, Hall covers several case studies that display the use of emotional diplomacy. While the case studies have several successful examples, there should be more evidence about “internal decision-making processes”.<sup>43</sup> The model Hall suggests, is overall convincing and makes sense, since emotion is a big part of human behavior. In this thesis emotion plays a significant role as well. While it is not the only aspect of political friendship, it does play a role in relationships between political actors like Roosevelt and Tito. Emotion can become visible in many forms. Thus, it does not have to be about anger, sadness, or happiness. In political friendships, other emotions like respect, admiration, and hope should also be considered.

In line with the previously mentioned model, face-to-face diplomacy is a concept to be examined. It has several aspects to it and can be used to better understand international relations. In his book, Marcus Holmes (2018) mentions several aspects that must be investigated and can propose a challenge. For example, this form of diplomacy comes with

---

<sup>41</sup> Van Hoef and Oelsner, “Friendship and Positive Peace,” 115-124.

<sup>42</sup> Barbara Keys, “Emotional diplomacy: Official emotion on the international stage by Todd H. Hall,” *Journal of American History* 103, no.2 (September 2016): 532.

<sup>43</sup> Keys, “Emotional diplomacy,” 532.

considerations of philosophy, psychology, and neuroscience. They all have to do with political interactions between human beings. Holmes talks about the uniqueness of face-to-face interactions when it comes to human communication.<sup>44</sup> Because face-to-face diplomacy is not just about making a superficial connection, it is even harder to understand political friendships in the diplomatic world. In this thesis, the multidisciplinary nature of face-to-face diplomacy is considered when assessing the political friendship between Roosevelt and Tito. For instance, the visit of Roosevelt to Yugoslavia was the first face-to-face encounter between ER and Tito, which is why this moment has played a big role in the development of the relationship between Roosevelt and Tito, as well as the connection between the US and Yugoslavia.

The US has formed many friendships with countries all over the world. India is an example of this. While the ties have mostly formed out of military alliances, the article by Nalini Kant Jha (1994) suggests that the Indo-American friendship “must begin with strengthening economic ties”. This way, Jha argues, a new dimension could be generated to the relationship between the two countries.<sup>45</sup> In his article, the emphasis is mostly on the countries as an entity, and not on certain interpersonal relationships. Several happenings that have to do with individuals, like presidents, are being mentioned as important moments that have changed the friendship between the countries. However, the ties are more likely to strengthen or weaken when having face-to-face interactions and interpersonal friendships. This article is an example of studying friendships between countries in a certain world order but given the fact that it is the individuals who initially form connections, which then become connections between states, a big contribution is made when taking a deeper look into interpersonal friendships on the diplomatic field.

Like the above-mentioned article, Marvin R. Zahniser (1975) analyzes the relationship between two countries, the US and France. These countries have a long history of diplomatic relations. There is a lot of attention given to the interdependence of the two countries and the strategies that the nations have used in times of war or during dramatic changes in the world order. The problems that he mentions are about the misunderstandings of motives and interests of both nations.<sup>46</sup> While there can be spoken of a friendship, misunderstandings are mostly

---

<sup>44</sup> Marcus Holmes, *Face-to-face diplomacy. Social neuroscience and international relations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018), 3.

<sup>45</sup> Nalini Kant Jha, “Reviving US–India friendship in a changing international order,” *Asian Survey* 34, no. 12 (December 1994), 1037.

<sup>46</sup> Lawrence S. Kaplan, “Reviewed Work(s): Uncertain Friendship: American-French Diplomatic Relations Through the Cold War by Marvin R. Zahniser,” *The Journal of American History* 63, no. 2 (September 1976): 401-402.



the reason for failure between a trusting relationship between the US and France. This is where interpersonal affairs can lend a hand. It is commonly known that France and the US have a different culture and different approaches to certain matters. This does not take away the fact there it is perfectly possible to form a political friendship between the two nations. The article by Zahniser argues that both nations were befriended only superficially. The possibility of superficialness in friendship is an important fact that is considered when assessing the friendship between Roosevelt and Tito.

Given the above-mentioned articles and outline of this thesis, there is a lot of research done on influential individuals and friendships between nations on a state-level. In this thesis, there is a combined investigation of political friendships between nations through influential individuals. While many countries solely establish friendships for certain gains economically or strategic positioning in the global playing field, the individual actors that make these friendships happen must not be overlooked. Individuals and their relationship with each other greatly influence the relationship of an entire nation. The US and Yugoslavia had an interesting connection that has changed multiple times. The reasoning for this partially has to do with the approach to diplomacy and the political relationships that were formed.

Taking this a step further, this thesis states that political friendship can be an important factor in fostering ground for positive peace. Van Hoef argues that friendship and positive peace relate to each other greatly.<sup>47</sup> This thesis reiterates this and places the relationship between Roosevelt and Tito in a position where it contributes to positive peace. Violence is an important term to consider when discussing negative and positive peace. The latter understand conflict differently, more interconnected and encompassing. Negative peace focuses on violence, in the broad sense of the term. This can be direct violence or structural violence for example. Safety is an important term to consider herein, as negative peace maintain social structures where people cannot be free.<sup>48</sup> While positive peace does not mean it is free from violence, it does view conflict with more awareness. There is more understanding and inclusion with positive peace.

Another interesting view on peace is relational peace. This is a more nuanced term for positive peace. Söderström, Åkebo, and Jarstad (2021) have developed a framework to study relational peace. This framework aligns with the AGAME-model as mentioned by Van Hoef

---

<sup>47</sup> Van Hoef, "Positive Peace Through Personal Friendship," 53.

<sup>48</sup> Standish, K., Devere, H., Suazo, A., Rafferty, R. "Defining the Platform of Positive Peace," in *The Palgrave Handbook of Positive Peace*, ed. Standish, K., Devere, H., Suazo, A., Rafferty, R. (Singapore: Palgrave Macmillan, 2021).

and places friendship as the idea of relationship for the ideal type of relational peace. Apart from friendship, fellowship is also mentioned as a possibility for the ideal type of relational peace.<sup>49</sup> While there is no strong indication of a political friendship between Roosevelt and Tito, yet it still contributed to a stronger bond and positive peace, it is likely that their relationship was more of a fellowship. This is further investigated in the final chapter.

#### **1.4 Primary source criticism**

In this thesis, several primary sources are used. Most importantly the “My Day” writings, a series of columns written by Roosevelt, and her Autobiography.<sup>50</sup><sup>51</sup> She has written a lot about her life in public and in politics. The “My Day” series almost reads like a diary although it is not intended to be one. In this series, Roosevelt writes about factual happenings in her life, but also about her thoughts on the things she experiences. While these writings give a personal insight into Roosevelt’s life and persona, it is not objective and that can be problematic. Her point of view is most likely to be influenced by her social, political, or cultural context. This can affect the reliability of this research. Furthermore, this primary source offers a limited perspective on the events that Roosevelt writes about. Therefore, it can lack context and a broader understanding. In line with this limitation, the things Roosevelt writes about are not necessarily the most important events and will not include all the relevant information to answer the research question. For this reason, there will be secondary sources used where scholars have written about Roosevelt and her visit to Yugoslavia. Because this research is mainly focusing on political friendship, the personal notes, and interpretations – like in this primary source – are very important. However, just trying to interpret primary sources is not enough. In this thesis, primary sources are combined with secondary sources to better understand the context and answer the research question.

Next to the “My Day” series written by Roosevelt, this thesis dives into official governmental documents from Yugoslavia and the USA. As Tito has not written much himself, biographies that include some of his direct quotes in speeches and conversations with people are further investigated. This can pose a challenge, because documents that are not written by the person of research provide a different perspective on the person of interest. It will be hard to compare personal notes and interpretations to governmental releases, raw texts, and bureaucratic wording. Another challenge of investigating governmental documents is that

---

<sup>49</sup> Söderström, Åkebo, Jarstad, “Friends, Fellows, and Foes,” 486.

<sup>50</sup> Eleanor Roosevelt, 1953, “My Day” series, <https://erpapers.columbian.gwu.edu/my-day>, accessed on 27 April 2024.

<sup>51</sup> Eleanor Roosevelt, *The Autobiography of Eleanor Roosevelt* (New York: Harper Collins, 2014).

the documents released are only selective. Other documents that can be important or interesting for this research might be withheld. Next to this, the information can be incomplete and fragmented. As well as with the “My Day” series, and the Autobiography, there can be mistakes made in interpreting the words that are used by the authors. To combat these challenges, secondary sources that are to do with the primary sources will be examined. By combining personal notes, governmental documents, and secondary sources, most perspectives will be considered, which will make it possible to formulate an answer to the research question.

## **1.5 Conclusion**

In this chapter, the concept of political friendship was introduced. The conceptualization as mentioned by Van Hoef is used to interpret the relationship between Roosevelt and Tito and its effect on the US-Yugoslavia bond. The conceptualization adds a nuanced dimension to the study of international relations and focusses on personal relationships between political actors within nations. His AGAME framework, consisting out of Affect, Grand project, Altruistic Reciprocity, Moral obligations, and Equality, provides a structured method to better understand political friendships and their implications. This framework offers a way to assess friendships in international relations beyond traditional diplomatic ties. An addition to this framework is the framework on relational peace. There are some characteristics that Roosevelt and Tito do not immediately have, but that does not matter for the realization of positive peace.

The historiography part of this chapter shows how individual relationships between leaders have often been overlooked in international relations. This research underlines the significance of personal connections in shaping international politics, particularly in the context of the Cold War. Certain parts of friendship in international relations have been mentioned by numerous scholars. This chapter mentioned the term of emotional diplomacy, as discussed by Todd Hall, which emphasizes the strategic use of emotion in managing state perceptions. Emotion can be a powerful tool in shaping several outcomes, whether this is between (political) individuals or between states. Hall's model provides valuable insights but needs more evidence when it comes to internal decision-making processes. His research does show that emotion (as one of the aspects of political friendship) plays a crucial role in relationships between political actors like Roosevelt and Tito. Next to emotion, face-to-face diplomacy, as mentioned by Marcus Holmes, underscores the importance of human communication in international relations. Personal interactions, like Roosevelt's visit to Yugoslavia, can significantly influence political friendships and thus the diplomatic relations between nations. A clear example of this can be found in the case of the Indo-American

friendship, as discussed by Nalini Kant Jha. It illustrates how economic ties can be strengthened when bilateral relationships are being formed beyond military alliances.

When it comes to the history of friendship, we should go back to the ancient philosophical concepts, as mentioned by Plato and Aristotle amongst others, and take them into account when considering contemporary frameworks proposed by scholars like Carl Schmitt and Felix Berenskotter. While Van Hoef's AGAME framework provides a comprehensive understanding of political friendship, further empirical research is needed to validate the impact of political friendships on policy decisions and conflict resolution. By combining the AGAME framework with IPS, meanings, context, and human agency can be studied successfully. IPS challenges conventional approaches to studying politics, it differs from positivism and institutionalism by emphasizing beliefs and intentions rather than just actions. When applied to political friendship, IPS considers the historical roots, cultural environments, and personal backgrounds of individual actors involved. Despite criticisms of objectivity, generalizability, the methodology and structuralism, IPS offers a nuanced understanding of political relationships and their implications for international relations.

In conclusion, the study of political friendship adds another dimension to understanding international relations and positive peace through highlighting personal connections and emotions in shaping diplomatic interactions. By combining the theoretical AGAME framework with IPS, the complexities of political friendships and their impact on state-level relationships can be analyzed.

## 2. Eleanor Roosevelt and Josip Broz Tito

### 2.1 Historiography

The relationship between the US and Yugoslavia during the Cold War and their respective foreign policies have been studied by many scholars, each focusing on a different perspective. For example, the Truman administration as well as the Eisenhower administration were popular fields of interest. The interpersonal relationship between the two respective presidents has also been mentioned by for instance Thomas Bruscino (2017), but this is not the case for interpersonal relationships between the states.<sup>52</sup> Other scholars mention that the interest of the US in befriending or connecting with Yugoslavia was because it was an important asset for them. Yugoslavia was the most fragile of the Western democracies, it was the only country who was non-aligned and thus could stop the Soviet Union from spreading their influence across the rest of the European countries. The strategic position next to many seas was also an important factor to be considered.

However, due to the many religions and ethnicities, Yugoslavia was highly sensitive as things could escalate quickly from a disruption in the country to a greater threat to world peace.<sup>53</sup> These investigations are not based on the interpersonal relationships between US officials and Tito but on external factors. This makes it harder to examine whether there was also a friendship forming between political actors of both respective states or whether it was merely a strategic “quid pro quo business-like partnership between two nations”.<sup>54</sup> This possibility is also taken into account when considering the relationship between Roosevelt and Tito. By examining an interpersonal relationship between political actors as an attribute to the bond between the US and Yugoslavia, this thesis adds another layer to the already existing research.

Apart from these considerations being studied, the fact that Tito as a leader was a strong character for the US has been researched as well. His independence made him interesting to the US on the one hand, but on the other hand, this was a challenge for them. Truman and Eisenhower both provided Tito with financial and military aid during the Cold War. They hoped this would get Tito on their side and that he would operate as a wedge for the US to eliminate the chances for the Soviets influencing Eastern Europe.<sup>55</sup> However, as

---

<sup>52</sup> Thomas Bruscino, “Eisenhower and the onset of the Cold War, 1945–1949,” in *A Companion To Dwight D. Eisenhower*, ed. C.J. Pach (New Jersey: Wiley Blackwell, 2017): 57-72.

<sup>53</sup> Ismail Köse, “The premiere of the post-cold war crisis in Balkans: CIA documents on the disintegration of former Yugoslavia (1989-1992),” *Codrul Cosminului* 23, no. 2 (January 2017): 429.

<sup>54</sup> Van Hoef and Oelsner, “Friendship and Positive Peace,” 117.

<sup>55</sup> Alena N. Eskridge-Kosmach, “Yugoslavia and US Foreign Policy in the 1960–1970s of the 20th Century,” *Journal of Slavic Military Studies* 22, no. 1 (2009): 383.

Tito was strong enough to stand up to Stalin, he was also strong enough to stand his ground with the US administrations. The US-Yugoslavia relationship was tense, Tito wanted to resist Stalin and receive aid from the US, but he would never “beg” for aid for the sole reason that the US was dissatisfied with his policies.<sup>56</sup> It has not yet been studied whether a different, more personal approach would have perhaps made connections between the US and Yugoslavia stronger or more amicable. The different state-level approaches of Truman and Eisenhower have been studied but did not seem to have a greatly different impact on the relationship with Tito.<sup>57</sup>

There are several scholars who have been examining Roosevelt, her approach to diplomacy, and her position in a larger historical context. Joseph Lash (1973, 1982) wrote a two-volume biography on ER and used his personal relationship and her papers at the Roosevelt Library in Hyde Park, New York to do so. Mary Atwell (1979) takes on a different approach and tries to define “Eleanor Roosevelt's responses to the developing consensus that characterized American foreign policy during the Cold War”.<sup>58</sup> She uses several official documents and articles to try and understand how Roosevelt worked. In the end, she concludes by mentioning the significance of Roosevelt’s view on fellow human beings and humanity. Her views the human element as the consideration that is most important, so she accepted some of the US policies in the Cold War and rejected others.<sup>59</sup> In her article<sup>60</sup>, Atwell presents a clear way of researching the view of Roosevelt on Cold War policies from the US, which can be linked to the personal relationship between Roosevelt and Tito. Furthermore, the focus on humanity is something that both Roosevelt and Tito value. On the one hand, Roosevelt finds that the human element is the most important and shows this through her work for the US.<sup>61</sup> On the other hand, Tito wanted to connect with other countries through the Nonaligned Movement (NAM).<sup>62</sup> This shared value is analyzed further in this thesis as it also contributed to the fostering ground for positive peace.

In line with the importance of humanity for Roosevelt, scholars describe her diplomacy as serving the public interest. She considers both the cultural and social aspects, next to political and diplomatic encounters when researching the interconnections between Europe

---

<sup>56</sup> Lees, “Keeping Tito Afloat,” 88.

<sup>57</sup> Eskridge-Kosmach, “Yugoslavia and US Foreign Policy.”

<sup>58</sup> Mary W. Atwell, “Eleanor Roosevelt and the Cold War Consensus,” *Diplomatic History* 3, no. 1 (Winter 1979): 100.

<sup>59</sup> Atwell, “Eleanor Roosevelt,”: 99-113.

<sup>60</sup> Atwell, “Eleanor Roosevelt,”: 99-113.

<sup>61</sup> Atwell, “Eleanor Roosevelt,”: 99-113.

<sup>62</sup> Svetozar Rajak, “Nonalignment at the Crossroads: ‘Castro Is a Brother, Nasser Is a Teacher but Tito Is an Example’\*,” *The International History Review* 45, no. 4. (March 2023), 662.

and the USA. Following from this, scholars conclude that Roosevelt has played a significant role in serving the public interest.<sup>63</sup> Many scholars, as well as government officials have praised her efforts for connecting the US with European countries. As she made several trips to countries in Europe, as well as outside of Europe, Roosevelt was well-known and usually warmly welcomed. Her time at the United Nations (UN) also led to her having several connections all over the world. Anya Luscombe and Dario Fazzi (2017) argue that Roosevelt left a mark on transatlantic relations, because of her considerations for the many human aspects of connecting different countries with each other.<sup>64</sup> The many studies on Roosevelt prove that she has a different approach to connecting with other nations, as compared to other US officials. Therefore, her relationship with Tito was not comparable to his relationships with other Americans. This thesis adds on to the study of Luscombe and Fazzi (2017) by considering the specific individual nature of both Roosevelt and Tito. After which these individual personalities are connected to each other through the AGAME theory.

Apart from Roosevelt's diplomacy, there are several scholars who have researched Tito and his "Titoism", which was a unique name referring to the political and economic principles associated with Tito. By many scholars, he has been called a strong leader, who was not afraid to take difficult decisions that would have great impact on the global world order. An example of this is his "no" to Stalin and the rupture that followed from the Soviet Union. Things like these probably would have never happened if it wasn't for Tito. Yugoslavia's trajectory is therefore called Titoism.<sup>65</sup> While Tito has been researched as a person a lot, there have not been many scholars who used the term "political friendship" to consider his relationship with (officials from) the US. While Tito had several influential friends all over the world, the relationship with Roosevelt has been underexposed. By taking Roosevelt's and Tito's positioning into account, an extra dimension is discovered in the relationship between the US and Yugoslavia. By investigating Roosevelt, it becomes clear how her background inspired her to become the humanitarian and diplomat she became. Because of Tito's background and upbringing, he grew up to be the strong leader he was to Yugoslavia. Their interaction in 1953 has been meaningful because while at first there may not be many similarities, it becomes clear that Roosevelt and Tito have been fighting for at least one shared cause; stopping the Soviet communist influence.

---

<sup>63</sup> Luscombe and Fazzi, "Eleanor Roosevelt and Diplomacy in the Public Interest," 1-5.

<sup>64</sup> Luscombe and Fazzi, "Eleanor Roosevelt and Diplomacy in the Public Interest," 1-5.

<sup>65</sup> John C. Campbell, "Tito: The Achievement and the Legacy," *Foreign Affairs* 58, no. 5 (Summer, 1980): 1046.

Although there was not much research done on the relationship between Roosevelt and Yugoslavia, there are some scholars who have investigated parts of the connection. For example, by considering the visit of Roosevelt to Yugoslavia in 1953. Carla Konta (2020) identifies two interesting points: the visit being an “affirmation of the new US partnership with Yugoslavia” and Roosevelt’s good understanding of several communist paths and the importance of communication. Konta’s research investigates the representation of the personal diplomacy of Roosevelt, as well as her visit being a proactive wedge strategy.<sup>66</sup> While these are good points to consider, there is no distinctive theory used to investigate the personal relationship between Roosevelt and Tito. In this thesis, their relationship is considered the main topic of research, mostly based on Roosevelt’s personal diplomacy and strategy, and additionally Tito’s leadership and positioning in the global world order that together led to positive peace. It gives an extra dimension to the international relationship between the US and Yugoslavia in the 1960s. Konta’s research uses the personal papers of Roosevelt and Tito, which are also used in this thesis.

## **2.2 Eleanor Roosevelt**

As mentioned, Roosevelt and Tito both come from a different background, yet there are similarities to be found. Roosevelt was born into a wealthy family that was politically prominent. She had to deal with the deaths of her parents and one of her brothers. In her memoirs, Roosevelt writes that she found her mother “one of the most beautiful women” she has ever seen.<sup>67</sup> This is telling for the relationship she had with her mother, Anna, since Roosevelt grew up feeling insecure due to her mother being a socialite who was disappointed with her appearance. Their relationship remained unfinished as her mother, died when Roosevelt was just eight years old.<sup>68</sup>

Unlike her mother, Roosevelt’s father, Elliot, was a significant emotional support for her, despite his alcoholism and self-destruction. Roosevelt idealized her father and believed that we were “born to be used”. She did not mind being used by people who needed support, help or encouragement in any way.<sup>69</sup> Her father’s influence further encouraged her to be active and not idle, like her mother and her aunts. Just before Roosevelt turned ten, she was told that her father had died. Because her grandmother decided that Elliot’s children should not attend the funeral, Roosevelt writes that she “had no tangible thing to make death real to me.” She

---

<sup>66</sup> Konta, “Eleanor Roosevelt in Yugoslavia,” 65-82.

<sup>67</sup> Blanche Wiesen Cook, *Eleanor Roosevelt, Volume One, 1884-1933* (New York: Penguin Group US, 1993), 38.

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>69</sup> Cook, “Eleanor Roosevelt,” 22.



mentioned how from that moment on, she “lived with him more closely, probably, than I had when he was alive.”<sup>70</sup> This implicates that Roosevelt never felt closure with the fact that her parents had died when she was so young. At the same time, it has shaped her to become the diplomat, humanitarian, and political figure as people remember her.

Following the advice of her great teacher, Marie Souvestre, Roosevelt chose to be “assertive, independent, and bold.”<sup>71</sup> Marie Souvestre was the French headmistress of the Allenswood, the girls’ boarding school Roosevelt attended. The headmistress took a special interest in her (partly because she had strong ties to her late parents), which encouraged her to become as confident and independent as her. Souvestre was a feminist and “a passionate humanist committed to social justice.”<sup>72</sup> Considering Roosevelt was heavily influenced by Souvestre, it comes as no surprise that she adopted some of her thoughts and ideas. They kept in contact until Souvestre passed away.<sup>73</sup> The rest of her life, Roosevelt took action in advocating for civil rights and racial justice. For example, she joined the world of post-suffrage feminist activists and became an activist for antiracism. She befriended many prominent figures like Mary McCleod Bethune, Walter White, Lillian Smith, and Pauli Murray, who influenced her to take a more active role in the civil rights struggle. Regardless of race or gender, Roosevelt worked to transform the world. She stood for greater dignity and security for all.<sup>74</sup>

Roosevelt had great influence on her husband, FDR, during his four terms in office. She was also the longest serving First Lady. While FDR was known for leading the US well through the Great Depression, Roosevelt was known for her work in civil rights and women’s rights. She played a key role during the creation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, after FDR had passed away and Roosevelt became a delegate to the United Nations.<sup>75</sup> Both FDR and Roosevelt had a great impact on American politics and society. In her autobiography, Roosevelt writes about the several journeys she has made overseas, like for example her experiences in India, where she encountered the effect of Communist influence, particularly on students. She underlines the importance of communicating the concept of freedom to young Indians and the challenges that came with it. The students prioritized basic needs like food over the notion of freedom, which was quite abstract. Communism seemed to be the solution

---

<sup>70</sup> Eleanor Roosevelt, *The Autobiography of Eleanor Roosevelt* (New York: Harper Collins, 2014), 24.

<sup>71</sup> Cook, “Eleanor Roosevelt,” 23.

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid.*, 111-112.

<sup>73</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>74</sup> *Ibid.*, 25.

<sup>75</sup> *Ibid.*, 33-34.

to most of the Indians problems.<sup>76</sup> Roosevelt recognized the problems when it came to the communication and understanding between Indians and Americans, with the difference in values in particular. This observation is an important part of positive peace as well. Americans prioritized material success, unlike Indians, who prioritized spiritual values. As Roosevelt was able to observe these fundamental differences, she was also able to take a different approach and emphasize shared spiritual values. Values like equality, justice, faith, love, and charity could be shares with Indians, which made a better understanding and connection between cultures possible.<sup>77</sup> Her trip to Yugoslavia was also an important part to her diplomacy and connection to Tito but this is discussed later.

### **2.3 Josip Broz Tito**

Unlike Roosevelt, Tito has never written any memoirs. However, there are many pieces written about him and his speeches, also based on conversations he has had with people.<sup>78</sup> Tito was born in the village where the family of his father, Franjo Broz, had lived for three centuries. His mother, Marija, came from a village in Slovenia. At the time, what is now Croatia was part of Hungary, which was part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. In the years Tito grew up, Croats and Slovenes were identifying more and more with the Serbs, all parties were keen on establishing a Slav state, becoming independent from other Empires. By the time Tito became a teenager, a new (Yugo) Empire was joining the international stage.<sup>79</sup> Tito mostly grew up with his maternal grandparents, working at the farm. His family believed that farm work was more important than education, which led to Tito being absent from school often and eventually leaving school. His political career or education, however, started early on in Tito's life. When the village of Zagorje started revolting against increased taxes, opposing the Hungarian government, Tito was impressed.<sup>80</sup>

During apprenticing as a locksmith, Tito was starting to be exposed to political ideas. He began with reading and selling the socialist newspaper *Slobodna Reč* during May Day 1909, after which he joined the Metal Workers' Union in Zagreb in 1910 and became involved in labor demonstrations and union activities.<sup>81</sup> In 1913 Tito was called to the military, where he became the youngest sergeant-major in the regiment. During the beginning of the First World War, Tito had threatened to join the Russians, which was later explained as the result

---

<sup>76</sup> Roosevelt, "The Autobiography," 367.

<sup>77</sup> Ibid.

<sup>78</sup> Swain, *Tito: a biography*, 2.

<sup>79</sup> Ibid, 18.

<sup>80</sup> Ibid.

<sup>81</sup> Ibid, 19.

of a misunderstanding.<sup>82</sup> Tito wrote about his experience and described it as successful because he “took care of my men, saw to it that they were not cheated on their food rations, that they had shoes and the best possible sleeping accommodation.”<sup>83</sup> Communism was a big part of Tito, mostly because the Communist ideas were later a big fundament of the new state that was being formed, which consisted out of Serbia, Croatia and Slovenia. Tito wrote a proclamation in which he emphasized Lenin’s thought as the guiding principle for revolution in capitalist countries. He distinguished the difference between Leninism and Stalinism where the importance of Stalin’s ideas were mostly for the Soviet proletariat and Lenin’s ideas for workers in capitalist countries.<sup>84</sup> Tito’s activities reflect his deep engagement with communist ideology and his role in advocating for workers’ rights and socialist principles.

Tito’s leadership was endorsed by the Comintern, also known as the Communist International. The Comintern existed to unite national communist parties and support the common goal of international revolution. According to them, Yugoslavia was facing issues because of capitalism. Some of these issues were the unresolved national and agrarian problems, as well as exploitation by imperialists. Tito, as the leader of the Yugoslav Communist Party, could mobilize a revolution, in line with Lenin’s ideas prior to the First World War.<sup>85</sup> Tito’s party served as a model for other parties, since the Spanish Republic was defeated, and French communists were suppressed. By combining legal and illegal party work, Tito believed that mass support could be evoked. This strategy was particularly proven to be successful during the Second World War, where working-class unrest rose and made governments repress communist-influenced labor unions.<sup>86</sup>

A much-discussed topic around Tito is the conflict with Stalin. Tito claimed his authority by eliminating non-communists from his government and managing fraudulent elections to abolish the monarchy. By doing this, he could establish the Federal People’s Republic of Yugoslavia under a new constitution in November 1945.<sup>87</sup> Originally, the government and policies of Yugoslavia were much like the Soviet Union, almost to the irritation of Moscow. However, as Tito followed an independent course and made certain foreign policy decisions that were not in line with those of Moscow, Stalin tried to eliminate Tito and his leadership all together.<sup>88</sup> These instances showed how strong-willed and perhaps

---

<sup>82</sup> Ibid.

<sup>83</sup> Vladimir Dedijer, *Tito* (Arno Press: New York, 1972), 34.

<sup>84</sup> Swain, *Tito*, 26.

<sup>85</sup> Ibid.

<sup>86</sup> Ibid.

<sup>87</sup> Ibid, 159.

<sup>88</sup> Ibid.

stubborn Tito really was, as his response to Stalin's threats was not fear or defeat, but mockery almost. This began to strain relations with Stalin and ultimately led to Yugoslavia isolating themselves from the Soviet Union and its allies, moving closer to the West, and distancing themselves from the communist ideology as dictated by the Soviet Union.<sup>89</sup> After the split with the Eastern block and not really belonging to the Western countries either, Tito proceeded to form a new block with the Non-Alignment Movement. He found like-minded statesmen in developing countries like India, and Egypt, with whom he also became friends.<sup>90</sup> This is further explored in following chapters.

## **2.4 Conclusion**

In conclusion, the interesting relationship between the United States and Yugoslavia during the Cold War era, specifically from the perspective of Roosevelt and Tito, offers a complex study of international diplomacy. As was mentioned in the historiography, there were several strategic interests and personal dynamics involved in building and maintaining the connection between the US and Yugoslavia. The US mostly tried to leverage Yugoslavia's unique non-aligned position to repress further influence of the Soviet Union and its communist ideology. In this attempt at driving a wedge between the Soviets and the rest of Eastern Europe, the US found themselves in a difficult position as Tito was a stubborn and fierce leader. His strong leadership and independent policies were not always appreciated, neither by the Soviet Union, nor the United States. While there were several officials who had to deal with Tito and who met with him, Roosevelt's visit and influence was different.

Roosevelt's diplomacy, characterized by her emphasis on humanity and public interest, stands in contrast to the more transactional approach often associated with state-level interactions. Her personal relationship with Tito, although this is not extensively researched, suggests a nuanced understanding of the political landscape and a commitment to fostering connections based on shared values. This is where Roosevelt and Tito could find each other. Although coming from different backgrounds and sometimes having contradictory beliefs, the passage above suggests that Roosevelt and Tito still can find similarities, for example in their advocacy for civil rights and having the best interest for people.

Tito's "Titoism," which reflects his adherence to communist ideology and his resistance against Stalin, shaped Yugoslavia's course, and its role in the global order. His leadership, while attracting Western support, maintained a delicate balance between resisting Soviet

---

<sup>89</sup> Ibid, 173-195.

<sup>90</sup> Ibid, 268.

control and asserting Yugoslavia's sovereignty. The thesis puts forward that examining the personal relationship between Roosevelt and Tito adds a new dimension to the common understanding of US-Yugoslavian relations. Despite having a different upbringing, Tito and Roosevelt both had some key moments in their lives that shaped them. Roosevelt had great admiration for her father, as did Tito. It appears they both somewhat followed the drive of their fathers. Furthermore, both Tito and Roosevelt were driven by the need for equality and justice. Roosevelt advocated for civil rights, women's rights, and human rights in general, not focusing on race or gender. Tito had a strong will to make sure Yugoslavia was a sovereign state with basic needs for everyone in the state, with particular attention to the workers. While Tito was driven by communism and Roosevelt was mostly acting from the American liberal thought, in the end they shared certain values, which now will be further explored.

### **3. The political friendship between Eleanor Roosevelt and Josip Broz Tito?**

#### **3.1 Affect**

An affective bond is the first key component of friendship. In International Relations, the role of emotions has been neglected for a long time, but friendship scholars have become more aware of the possibility of affect playing a role in friendships between individuals, as well as between states.<sup>91</sup> In the case of Eleanor Roosevelt and Josip Broz Tito, most of the indications of an affective bond must be drawn from their first in person encounter in Yugoslavia in 1953. They met in New York City as well in 1960, but little is known about their encounter there. In her autobiography, Roosevelt writes about Tito:

He has great charm and a strong personality. His jaw juts out and he speaks in the manner of a man who gives orders and expects them to be obeyed. But he had a sense of humor, he was pleasant to me, and he conveyed the impression of speaking frankly and honestly.<sup>92</sup>

This indicates that she felt at ease with Tito and appreciated his manners and honesty. She writes about the fact that Tito spoke little English and a bit of German, which meant they mostly talked through a translator. This is important to consider since language can make a great difference in friendships. It will never be certain whether the translator understood everything correctly. This observation can also imply that a fake friendship might have been established. Having researched the many writings of Roosevelt and the research on Roosevelt and Yugoslavia afterwards, there is no reason to believe that, yet it must be considered. Roosevelt writes the following about her leaving Yugoslavia:

I felt, too, that as yet there were inconsistencies in the development of his theories of government. But I left him with the opinion that this was a powerful leader and an honest one, with some kind of long-range concept of self-government by the people. And I thought that much of the future would depend on the United States and how well we could prove that our democracy is concerned about and benefits the people as a whole.

The notion that she “left him with the opinion that this was a powerful leader and an honest one” can be seen two ways. On the one hand, Roosevelt seems to execute her personal diplomacy by not stepping into a conflict or contradicting Tito. On the other hand, she lets

---

<sup>91</sup> Van Hoef, “Modelling Friendship between Elite Political Actors,” 62.

<sup>92</sup> Roosevelt, “The Autobiography,” 384.

Tito believe something that she did not completely agree with. The next question that arises is: how important is honesty in friendship? Some feelings that come to mind when talking about friendship are honesty, truth, and trust.<sup>93</sup> However, there are several examples to be found in friendship of any kind, where people were not completely honest with one another and in most cases, once the truth comes out, dishonesty leads to conflict.

Alexandra Guisinger and Alastair Smith (2002) conducted research on diplomacy and its link to honesty. In their study, they model the success and failure of diplomacy in which they distinguish between two environments: one in which a country's reputation is represented as a whole and another in which reputation has to do with individual leaders.<sup>94</sup> One of the important factors when it comes to successful diplomacy is reputation. When a country or a leader (for example a statesman or a diplomat) has a good reputation, honesty in diplomatic communications is possible, and this is crucial for avoiding unnecessary wars.<sup>95</sup> Of course, diplomatic ties and political friendships are not the same. However, friendships in politics can have a major impact on wars that happen or do not happen. In the case of Tito and Roosevelt, she also mentions her appreciation for (her impression of) Tito's honesty. This indicates that honesty is important to Roosevelt in diplomacy and in friendship. The conclusion to draw is that honesty can be a big part of a political friendship.

Coming back to Roosevelt's notion of letting Tito believe something that she did not truly feel (dishonesty), could have had a great impact on the development of the relationship between the US and Yugoslavia. Because Tito has probably never registered this thought of Roosevelt, her "white lie" was nullified.

### **3.2 Grand Project**

The second key component of friendship is a grand project. Van Hoef argues that "the grand project is almost exclusively the zone of elite actors." He states that "by virtue of their position and their ambitions elite political actors are in a unique position to initiate, maintain, and fullbring great political projects."<sup>96</sup> In the case of Roosevelt and Tito, there might not be a clear shared grand project, as the nature of the cause they are fighting for differs greatly. However, as the Tito-Stalin split happened in 1948, Yugoslavia moved closer to the West, and thus closer to the US. This opened the pathway for Roosevelt and Tito to find a common cause. The split between Tito and Stalin was a significant event in the early phase of the Cold War,

---

<sup>93</sup> Van Hoef, "Modelling Friendship between Elite Political Actors," 22.

<sup>94</sup> A. Guisinger, and A. Smith, "Honest Threats: The Interaction of Reputation and Political Institutions in International Crises," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 46, no. 2 (2002): 175-200.

<sup>95</sup> Ibid, 184.

<sup>96</sup> Van Hoef, "Modelling Friendship between Elite Political Actors," 66.

where Yugoslavia departed from the Soviet Union's influence. The reason for this conflict was said to be an ideological dispute, but it also involved struggles in the Balkans geopolitically. When Eisenhower became president, Roosevelt started volunteering at the American Association for the United Nations as she resigned from the United Nations' Commission of Human Rights as the US representative. She began a world trip in June 1953, which is when she met Tito.<sup>97</sup> While visiting Yugoslavia, Roosevelt was also working on advocating for minorities, children, workers, and women. On the international field, her focus shifted to non-aligned countries such as Yugoslavia. In the US, she was trying to create a more positive stance on these countries.<sup>98</sup> An interesting thought here is why Roosevelt was so keen on establishing a friendlier approach to the non-aligned countries. Overall, since she was an advocate for human rights, it can be assumed that she was promoting peace. With her background, it is easy to believe Roosevelt wanted to establish harmony and respect in the world.

Tito played a crucial role in the creation of a new block with the non-aligned movement. It started when Yugoslavia wanted to be independent from the West and East blocs. At first, Tito was not keen on finding allies in the Third World. Yugoslav diplomats began to have more interest in Asia, after they split from the Soviet Union, who had strengthen their bond with China. That is when Yugoslav diplomats started befriending the Indians, who also joined the Security Council and voted on important challenges like the Korean War. Josip Djerda, the first Yugoslav ambassador, did not want to become close to the local communists in India, since they were captivated by Moscow's ideology. Instead, he tried to get in touch with the ruling Congress Party and the socialists. Jawaharlal Nehru, the Prime Minister of India had the thought to create a "third force" between both the West and the East blocs. When a prestigious Chronicle in India published an article underlining the strength and independence of Yugoslavia, the idea of a third force became more interesting to Djerda.<sup>99</sup> Tito only paid more attention to India and their policy in later years when Nehru's policy was looking to make a connection between Asia and Africa's former colonies. Tito realized this project could have a great impact on the international world order. With his previous resistance to Stalin and Hitler, he could be the leading man in the Third World, that participated and discussed with the great powers about war, peace, and the distribution of resources.<sup>100</sup> This too, is an interesting development as Tito originally was not keen on establishing stronger ties with the

---

<sup>97</sup> Konta, "Eleanor Roosevelt in Yugoslavia," 66.

<sup>98</sup> Ibid.

<sup>99</sup> Swain, *Tito*, 266.

<sup>100</sup> Ibid.



Third World. However, when an opportunity for more influence arose, he changed his mind. Despite the initial reason for becoming more friendly with each other, Tito developed a personal political friendship with Nehru.<sup>101</sup>

The US have also formed a friendship with India, this time it was not based on a military alliance, but it began with strengthening economic ties.<sup>102</sup> Roosevelt played a part in this when she visited India. She writes about her visit:

It was at Allahabad, where I received an honorary degree, that I encountered the effect of Communist influence on the students. It is almost always difficult for us to realize why the Communist philosophy is easier for young Indians to accept than our own. We overlook the two major factors: they rarely know what we are talking about when we speak of freedom in the abstract; their most pressing problem, from birth to death, now as it has always been, is hunger. Freedom to eat is one of the most important freedoms; and it is what the Communists are promising the people of India.<sup>103</sup>

This indicates that Roosevelt was also on a mission to minimize the communist influence from the Soviets in India (and other states). The US was working on keeping the Soviets from spreading their influence and becoming more powerful. In this quest, they could align with Tito, as he split from the Soviets and wanted to develop a more socialist type of communism. However, Roosevelt was surprised when she learned that Yugoslavia was (party) fighting the same battle as the US.

After dinner that night I talked to the minister of interior, who was one of the guests, about the number of political prisoners. "There are not really many political prisoners," he asserted. "Well, how many?" I persisted. "Would you say that as many as twenty-five political prisoners were arrested in a month? Or fifty? Or seventy-five?" "Less than seventy-five," he finally replied. "What is the reason for most of the arrests?" "The major reason," he replied, "is for infiltrating Soviet ideas into Yugoslavia." This answer struck me as amusing, because that seemed to be the main thing feared by anti-Communist investigators in the United States!<sup>104</sup>

This is where she learned that she and Tito were more aligned than initially thought, and this is also where their grand project becomes obvious. Although the US was actively trying to

---

<sup>101</sup> Nataša Mišković, "Between idealism and pragmatism: Tito, Nehru and the Hungarian crisis, 1956" in *The Non-Aligned Movement and the Cold War*, ed. Nataša Mišković, Harald Fischer-Tiné, Nada Boškowska (New York: Routledge, 2014), 118.

<sup>102</sup> Jha, "Reviving US-India friendship," 1037.

<sup>103</sup> Roosevelt, "The Autobiography," 367.

<sup>104</sup> *Ibid*, 385.

minimize the Soviet communist influence, Tito was working on building an own movement, and was overall less interested in what the Soviets were doing. Despite being more focused on his own movement, Tito was cautious and aware of the fact that the Soviets might still be a threat to him.

### **3.3 Altruistic Reciprocity**

The third key factor of friendship is altruistic reciprocity. Van Hoef argues that a *quid pro quo* relationship is based on some form of advantage for both parties. He states that “friendship’s altruistic reciprocity is unconditional and asks nothing in return.”<sup>105</sup> Friendship is individual, but when it comes to the relationship between Eleanor Roosevelt and Josip Broz Tito, unfortunately there is not much information on their interpersonal correspondence. Based on ER’s documentation, they were friendly and diplomatic with each other, but there were no specific indications of a friendship. They might have been fond and pleasant with each other, based on the friendly communication, even though this is not a clear indication of altruistic reciprocity and is more an indication of affect. Thus, altruistic reciprocity cannot be clearly shown between Roosevelt and Tito.

Despite there not being clear indication of altruistic reciprocity, Roosevelt actively promoted a friendly attitude toward both the Balkans and Yugoslavia. Her visit to Yugoslavia served the purpose of affirming the partnership between the US and Yugoslavia, emphasizing cooperation and diplomatic ties. It also was an act of personal and public diplomacy because Roosevelt recognized the importance of engaging with different communist paths, including the Yugoslav socialist experiment.<sup>106</sup> She tried to understand the several approaches to communism and other ideologies in Yugoslavia.

I asked if he considered that his country was practicing Communism. “Communism,” he answered, “exists nowhere, least of all in the Soviet Union. Communism is an ideal that can be achieved only when people cease to be selfish and greedy and when everyone receives according to his needs from communal production. But that is a long way off.” He said that Yugoslavia was developing a Socialist state that was one step toward the distant aim of Communism. “I suppose,” he added, “that I might call myself a Social Democrat.” Marshal Tito does not want what is being developed in Yugoslavia to be called Communism, and he also objects to the use of the term “Titoism.” Every country should develop according to its own needs, he continued, and he does not want Yugoslavia to be held up as an example for

---

<sup>105</sup> Van Hoef, “Modelling Friendship between Elite Political Actors,” 67.

<sup>106</sup> Konta, “Eleanor Roosevelt in Yugoslavia,” 65.

others, since Yugoslavia's system might not meet the needs of any other country.<sup>107</sup>

This indicates that Roosevelt had the willingness to listen to what Tito had to say and not just judge a book by its cover. Many of the US diplomats and leaders were not keen on listening to Tito and merely were interested in the non-alignment and strategic position next to many seas, which meant Yugoslavia could stop the Soviet Union from spreading their influence across the rest of the European countries.<sup>108</sup> However, this shows what kind of character Eleanor Roosevelt was and not how she was ready to support Tito as an individual. At the same time, Tito's acts after his encounter with Roosevelt showed a more friendly approach to the US in later years.

Tito's positive comments and diplomatic relations with the US contributed to the strong foundations of the relations between the US and Yugoslavia during a pivotal era. There is no direct indication that his friendly approach towards the US had to do with his relationship with Eleanor Roosevelt, but considering the importance of interpersonal communication in diplomacy, there is reason to believe that Eleanor Roosevelt's open attitude towards Tito contributed to positive peace and a better relationship between the US and Yugoslavia, which is discussed in the final chapter.

### **3.4 Moral Obligations**

The third key factor as identified by Van Hoef is moral obligations. He states that this factor overlaps with altruistic reciprocity but is a more active appeal.<sup>109</sup> When speaking of moral obligations in the political sphere, it can become dangerous because acts done by powerful individuals impact their states directly. In the political arena, decisions must be made by individuals and these decisions are not always made based on the facts of the situation and the ideology of a certain party. When friends call upon each other it does not have to mean they agree on certain matters. On a global level, this could have huge implications for international relations.<sup>110</sup> In the case of Roosevelt and Tito, there are again no clear examples of moments where they called upon each other. There are only indications that their shared activism could have influenced global decision-making. For example, Roosevelt and Tito shared a vision on disarmament issues which deepened their relationship.

The UN framework made an interesting relationship between Roosevelt and Tito possible. Roosevelt maintained friendly relationships with the representatives of Yugoslavia

---

<sup>107</sup> Roosevelt, "The Autobiography," 386.

<sup>108</sup> Köse, "The premiere of the post-cold war crisis in Balkans," 429.

<sup>109</sup> Van Hoef, "Modelling Friendship between Elite Political Actors," 70.

<sup>110</sup> Ibid.

and was aware of the power the UN had to include Yugoslavia into the international field.<sup>111</sup> She states that “the people of Yugoslavia know the value of the United Nations far better than do the people of the US. [...] if Yugoslavia had stayed under Soviet domination, it would have seriously weakened the US in its struggle against Soviet Communism.”<sup>112</sup> This can indicate a few things. Firstly, it exhibits Roosevelt’s admiration for Tito, which was never exposed this way by other important US figures. Secondly, she recognizes the importance of Yugoslavia as an important ally and not an enemy that has to be molded into the US framework.

Roosevelt shared the belief in peace and disarmament with Yugoslav officials. A Yugoslav delegate, Milan Bartoš, stated: “Peace, the right for self-determination of all nations, respect for the [human] rights,” was the vision that Yugoslavia had of the mission of the UN, despite the possibility that “great powers disagreed on the implementation of mutual cooperation.”<sup>113</sup> When it comes to the US’s plans on nuclear weapons, Yugoslavia disagreed on many points. For example, when the US wanted to impose the 1946 Baruch Plan, where the US proposed regulations on atomic weapons.<sup>114</sup> Aleš Bebler, a Yugoslav delegate, stated that the American project was “completely incompatible with the UN Charter and its core principles”, and that it “required the sacrifice of national sovereignty”.<sup>115</sup> Roosevelt was disappointed in the approach from the US and agreed with most of the Yugoslav positions. A shared vision of Roosevelt and Yugoslavia was on nuclear weapons. At the UN Human Rights Commission, Yugoslavia advocated for (nuclear) disarmament. Tito stated, “this is not only a question about the ban on atomic weapons but an issue of disarmament as well.”<sup>116</sup> This all happened before Roosevelt’s visit to Yugoslavia.

Apart from the fact that there were many shared visions between Yugoslavia and Roosevelt, there is no clear indication of moral obligations between Roosevelt and Tito. Roosevelt was open and tolerant towards Tito, and it appears Tito showed openness to the US as well, welcoming Roosevelt to Yugoslavia. This has certainly impacted the bond between the US and Yugoslavia, but apart from Roosevelt referring to some Yugoslav diplomats as “old friends from the UN,”<sup>117</sup> there was no indication that Roosevelt and Tito were close enough to ask for moral obligations.

---

<sup>111</sup> Konta, “Eleanor Roosevelt in Yugoslavia,” 74.

<sup>112</sup> Roosevelt, *My Day*, 20 July 1953.

<sup>113</sup> Jadranka Jovanović. “Jugoslavija u Organizaciji Ujedinjenih Nacija (1945.-1953.)” *Institut za savremenu istoriju* 19 (1985).

<sup>114</sup> Konta, “Eleanor Roosevelt in Yugoslavia,” 70.

<sup>115</sup> Jovanović, 167.

<sup>116</sup> Jovanović, 174.

<sup>117</sup> Roosevelt, *My Day*, 26 July 1953.

### 3.5 Equality

The fifth and final key factor of friendship is equality. Van Hoef argues that in terms of power, actors do not have to be equal. It is the “social context in which they meet” where they are equal to one another. Because of sovereign authority, actors can develop political friendships and in order to become friends they have to be “taking each other seriously and in confidence.”<sup>118</sup> Both Roosevelt and Tito seemed to be quite fond of each other, having serious and equal conversations. They might not, however, confided in one another fully. As can be found in the following text from Roosevelt’s Autobiography:

I commented on the American aid that had come to Yugoslavia. “I have been favorably impressed by the appreciation and gratitude of the people here for that assistance,” I said. “But mere gratitude, important as it is, does not convince us that the government will not swing back to the Russian system when it has reached a point where American help is no longer needed or no longer important.” “I am ready to repeat what I told your ambassador,” he said. “Regardless of whether the United States gives us help or not, the attitude of Yugoslavia toward the United States will not change.”<sup>119</sup>

This passage suggests that Tito and Roosevelt were having an open and serious conversation but considering Tito’s statement about repeating what he said to the US ambassador, there is no indication that he was ready to share more of his thoughts on the matter with Roosevelt or be influenced by her idea on this topic. Apart from the conversation between Tito and Roosevelt, there is another aspect of equality that is interesting to consider. Yugoslavia has declared itself disconnected from the Soviet Union and other blocs, Yugoslavia also identified as a sovereign state and was recognized as it by many other states. The question is whether this friendly visit and connection between Roosevelt and Tito would have emerged if this was not the case. The US has a history of trying to “save” other nations from the Soviet influence and help them see the positive impact of the American way of liberal thought. In her texts, it can be found that Roosevelt had similar thoughts, although perhaps being more open to other lines of thought.

She writes “And I thought that much of the future would depend on the United States and how well we could prove that our democracy is concerned about and benefits the people as a whole.”<sup>120</sup> The concern about the people and the benefits of the democracy as in the US, show that Roosevelt was convinced of the US way of working was the most beneficial for all.

---

<sup>118</sup> Van Hoef, “Modelling Friendship between Elite Political Actors,” 80.

<sup>119</sup> Roosevelt, “The Autobiography,” 387.

<sup>120</sup> Roosevelt, “The Autobiography,” 387.

Tito on the other hand believed that there was no such thing as an ideal model for all nations. As he says, “Every country should develop according to its own needs, he continued, and he does not want Yugoslavia to be held up as an example for others, since Yugoslavia’s system might not meet the needs of any other country.”<sup>121</sup> Roosevelt concluded from this that Tito’s approach was different from what the US has been doing, but that “it did not seem impossible for our type of political philosophy to live and co-operate with the system that appeared to be developing in Yugoslavia.”<sup>122</sup> Which implies that she wanted to cooperate with Yugoslavia but still have somewhat of an American influence.

Another aspect that is important to consider is the fact that Roosevelt resigned from her post in the United States Delegation to the United Nations before visiting Tito. After leaving her UN role, she did continue her commitment to humanitarian work and volunteered with the American Association for the UN, but she was not a US or UN official anymore. The capacity in which she came to Yugoslavia was as an informal and personal ambassador. The goal was to affirm the partnership between the US and Yugoslavia and further evoking the wedge strategy.<sup>123</sup> Roosevelt came with a goal but did not have a title. This is an interesting factor when determining whether they were equals. Based on what he said about repeating what his words to the US ambassador, Tito did not view Roosevelt any differently. However, it is interesting to consider whether there would be a different analysis if President Eisenhower came to visit instead of Roosevelt. Further research could investigate this.

### 3.6 Conclusion

When applying the AGAME-model to the relationship between Roosevelt and Tito, it appears they might have had a form of a political friendship but not an obvious one. When summarizing all the above, we can conclude the following table:

**Table 1 Political Friendship of Roosevelt and Tito**

<i>Characteristics</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Friendship</i>
<i>Affect</i>	Pleasant and friendly atmosphere	Partially
<i>Grand project</i>	Fighting Soviet communist influence	Yes
<i>Altruistic reciprocity</i>	Similar views on topics like (nuclear) disarmament	Partially

<sup>121</sup> Ibid.

<sup>122</sup> Ibid.

<sup>123</sup> Konta, “Eleanor Roosevelt in Yugoslavia,” 66.

<i>Moral obligations</i>	No undertaken action in change of policies	None
<i>Equality</i>	Roosevelt's position as a volunteer with the American Association for the UN prevents certainty	Unclear

While ER and Tito seemed to be friendly and appreciative of each other's company and insights, there is no clear indication of closeness as within a friendship. For instance, when looking at the "Affect" between them, it must be concluded that honesty plays a big role in the development of friendship. Roosevelt spoke about her admiration for Tito's honesty and frankness. When reading about her thoughts about their conversation, however, Roosevelt was not always fully honest. While this might not have caused any problems in the long run, it might have been detrimental to their further relationship with each other and between Yugoslavia and the US.

The one clear similarity that can be found between Roosevelt and Tito is the grand project. The goal might not have been explicitly mentioned, but the fact that ER and Tito both wanted to strengthen ties between countries like India and other states in the Third World, showed that they both wanted other nations to break free from the Soviet communist influence. However, Tito was trying to befriend these nations to create a new bloc, while the US wanted to stop the Soviet influence from spreading and used different methods to obtain this goal (economic and military help for example). Roosevelt and Tito both used personal diplomacy to achieve their goals, although not as one front. This grand project might have been more explored and developed if there were more face-to-face encounters between Roosevelt and Tito.

The altruistic reciprocity and moral obligations cannot be fully distinguished between Roosevelt and Tito, as it is never shown that they called in any favors for example. On the other hand, there were times when they both wanted the same thing, like (nuclear) disarmament. At these times, Roosevelt did not always agree with her nations policy but there was not much she could do to show her support to Yugoslavia's standpoints, which make the altruistic reciprocity and moral obligations weaker.

When it comes to equality, we can conclude that Roosevelt and Tito were probably equal to one another. Although there is no record of Tito's thoughts on Roosevelt, there are plenty of indications that they were fond of each other. This can be found in the positive way in which Roosevelt writes about Tito and her visit to Yugoslavia. It is, however, also shown that Roosevelt had some thoughts where the savior idea of the US came to light. While she

did want to listen to Tito and did not take his word for granted, it was also shown that she still wanted to have some of the American influence in the new experiments of Yugoslavia. A question that remains unanswered is if Tito thought of Roosevelt as an equal, since there are no records of his idea of her. Considering the fact that his friendship with Nehru began based on a quid pro quo relationship of forming a new bloc, it is possible that there would actually be a political friendship formed between Roosevelt and Tito if Roosevelt had more say in the American policies, like when her husband was the President.

Overall, we must conclude that Roosevelt and Tito had a slight form of political friendship, although it might not have been a strong one. It is known that Roosevelt was strong in personal diplomacy and was advocating for countries in the Third World (or, the Non-Aligned countries), like Yugoslavia. It is also proven that she admires Tito and was open to listening. On the other hand, there is no record of Tito's thoughts on Roosevelt. The connection between Roosevelt and Tito was not superficial, as is shown through the ways they treated each other and spoke with each other. There is a lot written about Yugoslavia's position and its connection to the US during the Cold War era, which can be telling of the influences of Roosevelt as well. This is discussed in the final chapter.



## 4. Positive Peace during the Cold War

The relations between the US and Yugoslavia have not always been friendly but when the US realized Yugoslavia could be an important ally in the Cold War, the diplomatic relations intensified. This was after Yugoslavia split from the Soviet Union in 1948.<sup>124</sup>

### 4.1 The Cold War

The Cold War has been studied by many academics, as well as the fact that Yugoslavia played a significant role. Especially the Tito, was a topic of interest, as he stood up against Stalin and made Yugoslavia an independent, non-aligned communist country. He was the middleman in the rivalry between the US and the Soviet Union and took full advantage of this.<sup>125</sup> The US provided aid to Yugoslavia and kept Tito afloat. In his book, Milorad Lazic (2022) mentions Yugoslavia's adoption of "a disruptive role toward détente". He made Yugoslavia an influential country on the international playing field. Yugoslavia was a country with many identities; European, communist, socialist, independent, and non-aligned, amongst others. All these identities led to Yugoslavia being a strong force in global affairs. The relationship with the US was an important factor in Tito's mission to make Yugoslavia unavoidable. Despite his best efforts and many successes, Tito could not change the Cold War structure of the world.<sup>126</sup> While Lazic mentions important developments of Yugoslavia and the US, he does not name specific people who had a significant role in the relationship with Tito.

During tense Cold War geopolitics, Tito had officially made clear that he detached himself and Yugoslavia from Soviet leader Joseph Stalin in 1948. This made it possible for Yugoslavia to become an independent and sovereign nation, with their own form of socialist communism. This was referred to people as "Titoism".<sup>127</sup> Yugoslavia declared itself neutral during the Cold War, because it wanted to be independent from both the East and the West bloc. The US saw an opportunity in Yugoslavia since it was the perfect buffer between the Soviet Union and other countries. This is why they wanted to "keep Tito afloat". Eisenhower proactively worked on invoking a "wedge strategy" in Yugoslavia, which was later also endorsed by Roosevelt.<sup>128</sup> With his foreign policy, Eisenhower was practical and strategic, with no specific intention of befriending Tito. Roosevelt understood that it was needed to use soft powers in connecting with nations that had no initial intention of cooperating with the

---

<sup>124</sup> Eskridge-Kosmach, "Yugoslavia and US Foreign Policy," 383.

<sup>125</sup> Lorraine M. Lees, "Unmaking Détente: Yugoslavia, the United States, and the Global Cold War, 1968–1980 by Milorad Lazic (review)," *Journal of Cold War Studies* 25, no.3 (Summer 2023): 218-220.

<sup>126</sup> Lees, "Unmaking Détente," 218-220.

<sup>127</sup> Palinic, "Josip Broz Tito."

<sup>128</sup> Konta, "Eleanor Roosevelt in Yugoslavia," 66.

US, while Eisenhower was navigating between holding onto US power and making sure national interests and global stability were safeguarded.<sup>129</sup>

## 4.2 Positive/relational peace

Roosevelt’s approach has many important factors that are important when considering positive peace. Both Eisenhower and Roosevelt were determined to make sure there was peace in the world, but their approaches differ greatly as Roosevelt was striving for positive peace rather than enforcing peace negatively. Söderström, Åkebo and Jarstad (2021) established a framework for studying relational peace, which is in line with positive peace. The following table shows their components of relational peace.

*Table 2 Components of relational peace<sup>130</sup>*

<b>Component</b>	<b>Relational peace (ideal type)</b>
Behavioral interaction	Deliberation, non-domination, cooperation
Subjective attitudes towards the other	Mutual recognition, mutual trust
Idea of relationship	Fellowship or friendship

This framework aligns with the AGAME-framework very well and enhances the understanding of the political friendship between Roosevelt and Tito. The AGAME-model to study political friendship is an important factor for the component “idea of relationship,” as the ideal type for relational peace is a fellowship or friendship. During the Cold War, Truman and Eisenhower both did not realize what would happen when they would try making Tito an ally. They appreciated his independence (from the Soviet Union), but this also came at a price because Tito was not willing to let anyone endanger his sovereignty, including the US with their policies and ideas. Both Truman and Eisenhower believed that the aid (military and financial) that they provided would make Yugoslavia willing to do as the US pleased, ensuring a “wedge” to be created that would decrease the Soviet influence in the rest of Eastern Europe.<sup>131</sup> Tito was indeed willing to turn more towards the West and the US, but he was mostly willing to maintain his independence from both the Soviets and the West. It was therefore obvious that he would never adapt fully to the US. This also meant that he refused to give up some of his policies to receive aid from the US.

<sup>129</sup> Bruscinò, “Eisenhower and the onset of the Cold War,” 58.

<sup>130</sup> Söderström, Åkebo, Jarstad, “Friends, Fellows, and Foes,” 497.

<sup>131</sup> Eskridge-Kosmach, “Yugoslavia and US Foreign Policy,” 383.

The arrangement that Tito had with the US were tense. The US was dissatisfied with some of Tito's policy decisions, like for example in 1950 when the Yugoslav government was informed that if they would recognize the Ho Chi Minh government of North Vietnam, they would be proactive in the disruption of the public opinion in the US. This meant that they might consider negating aid to Yugoslavia. Tito did not approve of this threat.<sup>132</sup> This example shows how Tito was not keen on being threatened or told what to do and how the Eisenhower administration had a behavioral interaction that was based on orders, domination and control, instead of deliberation, non-domination and cooperation, as mentioned in the table above. Their approach was not beneficial for the relationship between the US and Yugoslavia and did not contribute to relational peace. The soft approach of Roosevelt later made a difference a couple of years later, when she visited in 1953. This is because her approach was based on deliberation, non-domination and cooperation. While doing her job for the UN, she gladly worked together with Yugoslav ambassadors, wanted to make friends with them and deliberate. She mentions this in her My Day series as well: "a hope that I shall be able to build a sense of personal trust and friendship with my co-workers."<sup>133</sup> Roosevelt stepped in with her personal diplomacy approach and her soft power, which put Tito more at ease and willing to cooperate with the US.

Furthermore, when considering the subjective attitudes towards the other, Eisenhower focused on Yugoslavia as a country, while Roosevelt focused on Tito as the leader of Yugoslavia, which had more effect on the diplomatic relations between the US and Yugoslavia than the realist approach of Eisenhower. Eisenhower strived to maintain the US power on a global level, and he was determined to establish peace. This is why he was closely watching Yugoslavia from when the Cold War started. Yugoslavia was considered the most vulnerable democracy in the West and a singular state that could set an example for other states that were becoming more and more influenced by the Soviets. The Eisenhower administration was aware of the many religions and ethnicities in Yugoslavia which made the nation highly sensitive to provoking a threat to world peace. A small dispute in the nation could quickly develop in a bigger global problem.<sup>134</sup> When Yugoslavia ruptured with the Soviet Union, the US seized the opportunity to create diplomatic ties with Tito's regime. This was also for the protection of the whole West. Harry S. Truman, who was president before Eisenhower, was keen on supporting Tito, because he had respect for Yugoslavia and its right to deciding what

---

<sup>132</sup> Lees, "Keeping Tito Afloat," 88.

<sup>133</sup> Roosevelt. My Day, 22 December 1945.

<sup>134</sup> Köse, "The premiere of the post-cold war crisis in Balkans," 429.

political course it wanted to take, without being told what to do by any other power. Eisenhower had a different stance on this and was more open to globalism and promoting peace from the perspective of the US.<sup>135</sup>

Here, we can draw a connection to Eleanor Roosevelt, who was keen on promoting peace, but also was open to listening to Tito. Her subjective attitude towards Tito was changed because of her visit in 1953. The ideal type of subjective attitude is mutual recognition and trust. As recognition is the result of interaction, it is important for political figures to interact with each other and listen openly. When denying recognition, (violent) conflicts can be either provoked or preserved.<sup>136</sup> Söderström, Åkebo, and Jarstad argue that:

Recognition is related to values such as dignity but also honor, status, and prestige, which are often essential to people and groups in deeply divided societies that have experienced protracted violent conflicts in which they have invested a lot and suffered heavy losses.<sup>137</sup>

The example of Tito not wanting to follow orders from the US aligns with these values. Roosevelt recognized the importance of the values related to recognition, which is why mutual recognition could be established. Unfortunately, there is no primary source that indicates Tito's attitude towards Roosevelt as opposed to other US officials. Apart from recognition, mutual trust is also important. It is often viewed as a key component for building peace and cooperation. Trust can be between people but also between organizations, and states. Both Truman and Eisenhower were president during the Cold War, and they had different approaches to the situation with Tito. Truman focused on the containment of communism with the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan, that Tito initially declined. After his split with Stalin, he did accept the help.<sup>138</sup>

After Truman, President Eisenhower shifted the US foreign policy from containment to emphasizing nuclear deterrence. His doctrine of "massive retaliation" underlined a big shift in the US military strategy.<sup>139</sup> Yugoslavia did not agree with the stance on nuclear weapons of the US, but this did not change the relations much. Eisenhower was fully aware of the important position of Yugoslavia and was trying to make Tito willing to work together with the US because he wanted to safeguard the national interest of the US. In doing this, he made

---

<sup>135</sup> Bruscinò, "Eisenhower and the onset of the Cold War, 1945–1949," 65.

<sup>136</sup> Söderström, Åkebo, Jarstad, "Friends, Fellows, and Foes," 493.

<sup>137</sup> Ibid.

<sup>138</sup> Bruscinò, "Eisenhower and the onset of the Cold War, 1945–1949," 65.

<sup>139</sup> Bruscinò, "Eisenhower and the onset of the Cold War, 1945–1949," 67.

the mistake of threatening Tito with the withdrawal of aid if he would not cooperate. This approach was not built on mutual trust. Eisenhower did not take interpersonal connections and trust on the international level into account. These connections often seem to be forgotten, which is why the soft diplomacy of Roosevelt is an important approach to international relations, especially considering the difference it can make.

Despite not having direct quotes from Tito, his actions after Roosevelt's visit show how the ties between the US and Yugoslavia slowly strengthened. Roosevelt had a great impact on the public diplomacy that the US used in the coming years. From around the year that Roosevelt visited Yugoslavia, there was a shift going on where soft power was used more and more by the US, for example in the lobby for cultural influences of the US in Yugoslavia. This soft power lobby caused a big jump in US cultural exchange programs in Yugoslavia. More than fifty programs were up and running by the mid-1960s.<sup>140</sup> Apart from increased Americanism in Yugoslavia, this also shows the openness of Tito to American influence. The relational ties also improved, as Tito showed a more friendly approach to the US. He visited the US ten years after Roosevelt visited him and maintained a friendly attitude towards the US. In 1963, President John F. Kennedy (JFK) hosted a dinner in Tito's honor. He mentioned Yugoslavia's struggle for independence and expressed his vision for a peaceful world consisting of independent and diverse nations. Tito reiterated the importance of cooperative international relations between Yugoslavia and the United States.<sup>141</sup> Tito's talks with President Jimmy Carter in 1978 reflected mutual regard, candor, and friendship. It was decided to deepen the bilateral relations and develop equal, sovereign, and independent states.<sup>142</sup>

Finally, the last component of relational peace: idea of relationship. A fellowship or friendship is seen as the ideal type for relational peace. As the political friendship between Roosevelt and Tito could not fully be concluded, it is possible that there rather is a fellowship between them. The difference between a friendship and a relationship of fellows is that the latter means that the relationship could still be mostly determined by self-interest rather than affect or altruistic reciprocity, the fellows do associate with one another, without necessarily cooperating. They just expect each other's existence and can interact with each other on a diplomatic or professional level.<sup>143</sup> The clear distinction that Söderström, Åkebo, and Jarstad (2021) make, can be aligned with the division Schmitt (2007) makes between two types of

---

<sup>140</sup> Konta, "Waging Public Diplomacy," 189.

<sup>141</sup> JFK Library, "TOASTS OF PRESIDENT AND TITO, 17 OCTOBER 1963."

<sup>142</sup> The American Presidency Project, "Visit of President Tito of Yugoslavia Joint Statement."

<sup>143</sup> Söderström, Åkebo, Jarstad, "Friends, Fellows, and Foes," 495-496.

friendship; existential and utilitarian.<sup>144</sup> When considering the friendship between Roosevelt and Tito, it is possible that it was more of a fellowship after all. When looking at the unclear parts of the AGAME-model, the indicators that are missing are also the indicators that are not associated with a fellowship. The characteristics affect, altruistic reciprocity and moral obligation could not be determined. This calls for further research on their relationship and the true nature of their relationship.

### **4.3 Conclusion**

Considering the relationship between the US and Yugoslavia, we see that there were several approaches being used at the same time. However, regardless of the approach, the goal appeared to be the same. Yugoslavia was seen as an important ally for the US during the Cold War since it could serve as a buffer between the Soviet Union and other countries in Europe. The US presidents during the Cold War were mostly focused on the Soviet Union and its influence in Europe, which is why they wanted to offer aid to Yugoslavia in exchange for cooperating with the US. While this was a noble goal, Tito was a strong-willed man who would not give up his independence or sovereignty to the US. This is interesting to consider, since the US was based on liberal values that considered freedom and independence as one of the most important factors to live by. In the US, as well as in the liberal thought, the individual is seen as the most important point of view. Roosevelt believed that there could be a way where the US would work together with Yugoslavia and share some political or philosophical standpoints. Perhaps, if soft diplomacy was used as an approach to Yugoslavia sooner, this could have been established sooner.

Truman and Eisenhower were both presidents during the Cold War and we can conclude that they had different approaches to the situation with Yugoslavia. Neither of their approaches was the best one, as Tito was a strong-willed man who would not just accept anything from the US just because he was receiving aid from them. The US saw itself as a savior, or perhaps a helper for other nations, to prevent them from being wrongly influenced by the Soviet Union. Tito did not see his nation as a helpless cause that needed saving from the US. He was determined to stay independent from the West and the East bloc and create his own bloc, which is why he most certainly did not appreciate US threats about his actions in the international field. Roosevelt appears to have understood what the right approach was

---

<sup>144</sup> Van Hoef and Oelsner, "Friendship and Positive Peace," 117.

with Tito, because she listened openly to what Tito had to say, even though she might have had different ideas and a different agenda as well.

The way of working of Roosevelt incorporates many components from the relational peace or positive peace theory. Because of her willingness to understand and her openness, there was more room and a safe space to share best practices and cooperate. This has shown itself to be fruitful in the future between the US and Yugoslavia. The AGAME-model unfortunately could not be fully applied to the situation between Roosevelt and Tito, luckily there are other options to describe the bond that they had and how this fostered ground for positive peace.

We can conclude that Roosevelt was the initiator of a softer approach to Yugoslavia, which helped form a more friendly and open attitude from Yugoslavia to the US. This can be found in the incorporation of more and more American influences of art and culture in Yugoslavia. At first, when the approach was to directly implement certain US forms of art, there was much resistance from Yugoslavia as it felt forced upon them. But when a more indirect soft approach was taken, the Yugoslavs were more open to get to know the American culture, resulting in an increased number of cultural exchange programs to the US. This shows how a soft approach, and thus a more interpersonal connection can create a better foundation to further investigate differences and similarities between nations. This also implies that a more human and less distance touch can help strengthen the bonds between states.

## Conclusion

The research question of this thesis was “How did Eleanor Roosevelt’s approach to diplomacy and her political friendship with Josip Broz Tito impact the bond between the US and Yugoslavia in the 1960s?”. We can conclude that the way Roosevelt approached diplomacy contributed greatly to positive peace. By befriending Tito to a certain extent, she managed to create a bond that would influence the partnership between the US and Yugoslavia. Considering the fact that Roosevelt was not an official ambassador possibly contributed to the way in which she could level with Tito. Tito was known to be a stubborn and fierce leader, which showed during the several actions he has undertaken, like standing up to Stalin, but also standing up to the US when they wanted him to change his foreign policies. Roosevelt was the one person who understood that positive peace goes a long way and listening to try to understand each other especially. Instead of blindly having a subjective bias, it is better to be open.

The sub-questions make up for a more elaborate answer to the main research question. The first sub-question was: “What is political friendship?”. In this thesis, the AGAME-framework has extensively been explained and interpreted, along with previous explanations of friendship. Political friendship was introduced using the conceptualization of Van Hoef. By considering the five key factors of friendship, there is a clear image of the political relationship between the two actors. Considering (1) affect, (2) grand project, (3) altruistic reciprocity, (4) moral obligations, and (5) equality is the perfect theory for using Interpretive Political Science. Political friendships in international relations are able to be examined beyond traditional diplomatic ties. The historiography of chapter two shows how individual relationships between leaders have often been overlooked in international relations. This research underlines the significance of personal connections in shaping international politics, particularly in the context of the Cold War. When it comes to the history of friendship, it goes all the way back to the ancient philosophical concepts, as mentioned by Plato and Aristotle amongst others. There are also more contemporary frameworks proposed by scholars like Carl Schmitt and Felix Berenskotter, but the ancient philosopher should always be considered. This shows again when the conclusion of the political friendship between Roosevelt and Tito turns out to be more of a fellowship that contributed to positive peace. This definition can be linked to Carl Schmitt’s notion of two types of friendship, where one has less of an affectionate nature and is more based on self-interest rather than altruism.

The second sub-question was: “What shaped the life of Eleanor Roosevelt and Josip Broz Tito and how did they become the international actors that we know?”. This question



was answered in the third chapter of this thesis, where an insight into the lives of Roosevelt and Tito were given. It is explained how Roosevelt grew up in a prominent family where her the relationship with her mother was never easy, and remained unfinished as she died when Roosevelt was fairly young. Roosevelt had great admiration for her father. He passed away when Roosevelt was young as well, which made her grow up without her parents for most of her life. Next to her father, Roosevelt was greatly influenced and inspired by the headmistress of her boarding school, Marie Souvestre. She made her want to be independent, bold, and radical, just like Souvestre. She was a great inspiration when it came to humanity related matters as well. Roosevelt's passion for civil rights and the representation of women and other minorities most likely came from Marie.

Tito did not grow up in a prominent family like Eleanor, but he did grow up having a big farm and working a lot on it. The farm was even thought to be more important than education which is why Tito stayed home to work on the farm a lot. He mostly grew up with his maternal grandparents. As far as his political interest and career goes, that started quite early on in his life. There were several protests from workers standing up to the Hungarian government and Tito was impressed by them. He started becoming more involved with the party and joined the workers union. When he was drafted for the army, Tito's interest only grew further. His strong will and passion got him to the position of party leader and Marshal of Yugoslavia. The conclusion to draw from both these stories is that Roosevelt and Tito both had a strong heart and passion, which makes good ground for a grand project together.

Roosevelt's diplomacy, characterized by her emphasis on humanity and public interest, stands in contrast to the more transactional approach often associated with state-level interactions. Her personal relationship with Tito suggests a nuanced understanding of the political landscape and a commitment to making connections that are based on shared values. This is where Roosevelt and Tito could find each other. Although coming from different backgrounds and sometimes having contradictory beliefs, the third chapter shows that Roosevelt and Tito still can find similarities, for example in their advocacy for civil rights and having the best interest for people. Despite having a different upbringing, Tito and Roosevelt both had some key moments in their lives that shaped them. Roosevelt had great admiration for her father, as did Tito. It appears they both somewhat followed the drive of their fathers. Furthermore, both Tito and Roosevelt were driven by the need for equality and justice. Roosevelt advocated for civil rights, women's rights, and human rights in general, not focusing on race or gender. Tito had a strong will to make sure Yugoslavia was a sovereign state with basic needs for everyone in the state, with particular attention to the workers. While

Tito was driven by communism and Roosevelt was mostly acting from the liberal thought, in the end they shared certain values, which was discussed in the final chapter.

The third sub-question was: “How can the political friendship between Eleanor Roosevelt and Josip Broz Tito be assessed?.” When applying the AGAME-model to the relationship between Roosevelt and Tito, it shows that it is difficult to clearly determine a strong political friendship. For example, there is not much affect or moral obligation towards each other. On the other hand, there were times when they both wanted the same thing, like (nuclear) disarmament. At these times, Roosevelt did not always agree with her nations policy but there was not much she could do to show her support to Yugoslavia’s standpoints, which make the altruistic reciprocity and moral obligations weaker. While Roosevelt and Tito seemed to be friendly and appreciative of each other’s company and insights, there is no clear indication of closeness as within a friendship. It must also be concluded that honesty plays a big role in the development of friendship. Roosevelt spoke about her admiration for Tito’s honesty and frankness. When reading about her thoughts about their conversation, however, Roosevelt was not always fully honest. In this particular case, it was not of great importance, but mutual trust is also mentioned as an important component in relational peace and trust starts with honesty.

The one clear similarity that can be found between Roosevelt and Tito is the grand project. The goal might not have been explicitly mentioned, but the fact that ER and Tito both wanted to strengthen ties between countries like India and other states in the Third World, showed that they both wanted other nations to break free from the Soviet communist influence. However, Tito was trying to befriend these nations to create a new bloc, while the US wanted to stop the Soviet influence from spreading and used different methods to obtain this goal (economic and military help for example). Roosevelt and Tito were both using personal diplomacy to achieve the same goal (although maybe for different reasons). When it comes to equality, Roosevelt and Tito were probably equal to one another, but the balance might have been different if Roosevelt was in a position of more power, so that Tito could also ask her for a concrete favor. There were also some moments in the writings of Roosevelt, where the savior idea of the US came to light. While she did want to listen to Tito and did not take his word for granted, it was also shown that she still wanted to have some of the American influence in the new experiments of Yugoslavia.

Overall, we must conclude that Roosevelt and Tito had an interesting connection. Roosevelt was strong in personal diplomacy and was advocating for countries in the Third World (or, the Non-Aligned countries), like Yugoslavia. It is also proven that she admires Tito

and was open to listening. On the other hand, there is no record of Tito's thoughts on Roosevelt. However, the friendliness and openness of both actors showed that there was a real connection between them and not merely a diplomatic relationship like any other. This can also be concluded from the Autobiography of Roosevelt where she writes about Tito's wit and charm.

The final sub-question was: "What was the relationship between the US and Yugoslavia like in the 1960s?." In the fifth chapter, the differences between the way Truman and Eisenhower acted during the Cold War are explained. What they had in common is that neither of them had much regard for Tito as a person. The goal for both presidents appeared to be the same: Yugoslavia was seen as an important ally for the US during the Cold War since it could serve as a buffer between the Soviet Union and other countries in Europe. The US presidents during the Cold War were mostly focused on the Soviet Union and its influence in Europe, which is why they wanted to offer aid to Yugoslavia in exchange for cooperating with the US. While this was a noble goal, Tito was a strong-willed man who would not give up his independence or sovereignty to the US. This is interesting to consider, since the US was based on liberal values that considered freedom and independence as one of the most important factors to live by. In the US, as well as in the liberal thought, the individual is seen as the most important point of view. Roosevelt believed that there could be a way where the US would work together with Yugoslavia and share some political or philosophical standpoints. Perhaps, if soft diplomacy was used as an approach to Yugoslavia sooner, this could have been established.

Roosevelt understood what the right approach was with Tito, because she listened openly to what Tito had to say, even though she might have had a different agenda as well. This helped in building trust and understanding, which contributed to the positive peace. When adapting the AGAME-framework to the relational peace framework, it becomes clear how the fellowship between Roosevelt and Tito fostered positive peace and encouraged a stronger bond between the US and Yugoslavia for the years to come. We can conclude that ER was the initiator of a softer approach to Yugoslavia, which helped form a more friendly and open attitude from Yugoslavia to the US. This can be found in the incorporation of more and more American influences of art and culture in Yugoslavia. At first, when the approach was to directly implement certain US forms of art, there was much resistance from Yugoslavia as it felt forced upon them. But when a more indirect soft approach was taken, the Yugoslavs were more open to get to know the American culture, resulting in an increased number of cultural exchange programs to the US. This shows how a soft approach, and thus a more interpersonal

connection can create a better foundation to further investigate differences and similarities between nations. This also implies that a more human and less distance touch can help strengthen the bonds between states and foster positive peace.

Following this research, we can conclude that Roosevelt's approach to diplomacy greatly impacted the bond between the US and Yugoslavia, as her soft skills eased Tito into accepting the aid from the US and cooperating with them more and more. Despite there not being proof for a strong political friendship, the relationship or fellowship between Roosevelt and Tito is just as impactful as a strong political friendship in this case. Some questions that can be developed in future research are about the role of honesty in friendship. Friends are not always honest with each other, but when is it alright to tell a lie in political friendships? The dangers of dishonesty are far greater in a political friendship than in a regular friendship. Another question that is not answered is the similarity between Roosevelt and Tito on the topic of disarmament and other global policies. It would be interesting to see how their similarities made a difference or could have made a bigger difference. When it comes to friendship in general, there are some factors like humor and linguistics that are not taken into account by Van Hoef. When two individuals are not speaking the same language, they can feel a connection, but it would be interesting to investigate whether they can also build a true friendship. Another question that comes to mind is the difference between Roosevelt coming to Yugoslavia and a President coming to visit. It would be interesting to see where there is more likelihood for a friendship and what kind of friendship that would be.

## Bibliography

### Primary sources

Digital Archive. Josip Broz Tito.

JFK Library, "TOASTS OF PRESIDENT AND TITO, 17 OCTOBER 1963."

Roosevelt, Eleanor. My Day series.

Roosevelt, Eleanor. *The Autobiography of Eleanor Roosevelt*. New York: Harper Collins, 2014.

The American Presidency Project, "Visit of President Tito of Yugoslavia Joint Statement." <https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/visit-president-tito-yugoslavia-joint-statement>, accessed on 2 May 2024.

### Secondary sources

Atwell, Mary W. "Eleanor Roosevelt and the Cold War Consensus." *Diplomatic History* 3, no. 1 (Winter 1979): 99-113.

Berenskotter, Felix. "Friends, there are no friends? An intimate reframing of the international." *Millennium, Journal of International Studies* 35, no. 3 (September 2007), 647-676.

Bevir, Mark, and Rhodes, R. A. W. "Interpretation and its Others." *Australian Journal of Political Science* 40, no. 2 (June 2005): 169-187.

Bevir, Mark, and Rhodes, R. A. W. "Introduction," In *Interpretive Political Science: Mapping the Field*, ed. Mark Bevir, and R. A. W. Rhodes (London and New York: Routledge, 2016).

Britannica, "Josip Broz Tito," <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Josip-Broz-Tito>.

Bruscino, Thomas. "Eisenhower and the onset of the Cold War, 1945–1949." In *A Companion To Dwight D. Eisenhower*, edited by C.J. Pach, 57-72. New Jersey: Wiley Blackwell, 2017.

Byman, Daniel L. and Pollack, Kenneth M. "Let us now praise great men: Bringing the statesman back in." *International Security* 25, no. 104, 146.

Campbell, John C. "Tito: The Achievement and the Legacy." *Foreign Affairs*, 58, no. 5 (Summer, 1980): 1045-1059, <https://doi.org/10.2307/20040581>.

Cook, Blanche Wiesen. *Eleanor Roosevelt, Volume One, 1884-1933* (New York: Penguin Group US, 1993).

Dedijer, V. *Tito* (Arno Press: New York, 1972).

- Eskridge-Kosmach, Alena N. "Yugoslavia and US Foreign Policy in the 1960–1970s of the 20th Century," *Journal of Slavic Military Studies* 22, no. 1 (2009): 383-418.
- Funk K. Making Interpretivism Visible: Reflections after a Decade of the Methods Café. *Political Science & Politics*. 2019;52(3):465-469.
- Güroğlu, Berna. "The power of friendship: The developmental significance of friendships from a neuroscience perspective," *Child Development Perspectives* 16, no. 2 (June 2022): 110-117.
- Guisinger, and Smith, "Honest Threats: The Interaction of Reputation and Political Institutions in International Crises." *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 46(2).
- Holmes, M. (2018). Face-to-face diplomacy. Social neuroscience and international relations. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jha, N. K. (1994). Reviving US–India friendship in a changing international order. *Asian Survey* 34, no. 12, 1035–1046.
- Jovanović, Jadranka. 1985. Jugoslavija u Organizaciji Ujedinjenih Nacija (1945.-1953.). Belgrade: Institut za savremenu istoriju.
- Kaplan, Lawrence S. "Reviewed Work(s): Uncertain Friendship: American-French Diplomatic Relations Through the Cold War by Marvin R. Zahniser". *The Journal of American History* 63, no. 2 (September 1976): 401-402.
- Keys, Barbara "Emotional diplomacy: Official emotion on the international stage by Todd H. Hall". *Journal of American History* 103, no.2 (September 2016).
- Konta, Carla. "Eleanor Roosevelt in Yugoslavia Between Wedge Strategy and Cold War Internationalism." In *Eleanor Roosevelt's Views on Diplomacy and Democracy: The Global Citizen*, edited by Anya Luscombe and Dario Fazzi, 65-82. Switzerland: Springer Nature, 2020.
- Konta, Carla. "Waging Public Diplomacy: The United States and the Yugoslav Experiment (1950- 1972)." PhD Diss., University of Trieste, 2016.
- Köse, Ismail. "The premiere of the post-cold war crisis in Balkans: CIA documents on the disintegration of former Yugoslavia (1989-1992)," *Codrul Cosminului* 23, no. 2 (January 2017): 425-444.
- Lees, Lorraine M. "Keeping Tito Afloat: The United States, Yugoslavia, and the Cold War." Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2005.
- Luscombe, Anya, Fazzi, Dario. "Eleanor Roosevelt and Diplomacy in the Public Interest." *European journal of American studies* 12, no. 1 (March 2017): 1-5.
- Lees, Lorraine M. "Unmaking Détente: Yugoslavia, the United States, and the Global Cold War, 1968-1980 by Milorad Lazic (review)". *Journal of Cold War Studies* 25, no.3 (Summer 2023: 218-220).

- Mišković, Nataša. "Between idealism and pragmatism: Tito, Nehru and the Hungarian crisis, 1956" in *The Non-Aligned Movement and the Cold War*, ed. Nataša Mišković, Harald Fischer- Tiné, Nada Boškovska (New York: Routledge, 2014).
- National Women's History Museum, "Eleanor Roosevelt," <https://stage.womenshistory.org/education-resources/biographies/eleanor-roosevelt>.
- Oelsner, Andrea. "The construction of international friendship in South America," in S. Koschut & A. Oelsner (Eds.), *Friendship and international relations* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2014).
- Palinic, Katarina. "Josip Broz Tito: The Man Who Was Too Tough for Stalin." *The Collector*, July 22, 2022.
- Rajak, Svetozar. "Nonalignment at the Crossroads: 'Castro Is a Brother, Nasser Is a Teacher but Tito Is an Example'\*,", *The International History Review* 45, no. 4. (March 2023), 662.
- Research Methods for the Social Sciences, retrieved from <https://courses.lumenlearning.com/suny-hccc-research-methods/>.
- Schmitt, Carl. "The concept of the political." Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007.
- Schwarzenbach, Sibyl. "A political reading of the reproductive soul in Aristotle." *History of Philosophy Quarterly* 9, no. 3 (1992), 243-264.
- Sheffield, F. C. C. 2011. "VIII—Beyond Eros: Friendship in the Phaedrus." *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, 111, no. 2. (February 2011), 251–273.
- Söderström, J., Åkebo, M., Jarstad, A. K., "Friends, Fellows, and Foes: A New Framework for Studying Relational Peace," *International Studies Review* 23, no. 3 (September 2021): 497.
- Standish, K., Devere, H., Suazo, A., Rafferty, R. "Defining the Platform of Positive Peace," in *The Palgrave Handbook of Positive Peace*, ed. Standish, K., Devere, H., Suazo, A., Rafferty, R. (Singapore: Palgrave Macmillan, 2021).
- Swain, Geoffrey. *Tito: a biography* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011).
- The American Presidency Project, "Visit of President Tito of Yugoslavia Joint Statement."
- Turnbull, N. Interpretivism and practice in governance studies: The critique of methodological institutionalism. *Br Polit* 6, 252–264 (2011). <https://doi.org/10.1057/bp.2011.8>
- U.S. Department of State. (1952-1954). *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1952-1954, Volume VIII: Iran, Iraq*. Retrieved from <https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1952-54v08/d350>.

Van Hoef, Yuri, and Oelsner, Andrea. "Friendship and Positive Peace: Conceptualizing Friendship in Politics and International Relations." *Politics and Governance* 6, no.4 (December 2018): 115-124.

Van Hoef, Yuri. "Interpreting affect between state leaders. Assessing the Churchill–Roosevelt friendship." In *Researching emotions in IR: Methodological perspectives for a new paradigm*, ed. M. Clément & E. Sangar. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018, 51-73.

Van Hoef, Yuri. "Modelling Friendship between Elite Political Actors: Interpreting the Relationships of Schmidt and Giscard d'Estaing, Kohl and Mitterrand, Thatcher and Reagan, and Bush and Major" (PhD diss., The University of Leeds, 2018).

Wolfers, Arnold. "Discord and collaboration: Essays on international politics." Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1962.