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INTRODUCTION

During the period when I was searching for a thesis topic, my advisor Dr. Stan Taylor suggested that the Stephen L Richards papers, then awaiting cataloging in the Brigham Young University archives, might yield material relevant to a thesis topic on international relations. At that time, Stephen L Richards was a name familiar to me only as a member of the first LDS First Presidency I could recall knowing as a child, consisting of Presidents David O. McKay, Richards, and J. Reuben Clark. Through a preliminary examination of Elder Richards' papers, however, I learned of his legal background and career, the compilation of his addresses in two books, Where is Wisdom\textsuperscript{1} and The Church in War and Peace,\textsuperscript{2} and his long and varied service to the Church.

The more I examined Elder Richards' discourses, the more interested I became, not so much because there was a great volume of political content, but because I was impressed by the clarity and logic with which he expressed himself. It should be made clear from the outset that at no time did Elder Richards set out to formulate a grand theory of international relations. His statements on international political matters must be placed in the context of his central effort, that of
teaching religious principles. He had no extensive training or professional experience in matters of state as had his colleague, President Clark.

Nevertheless, Elder Richards spoke on many occasions, particularly during World War II, of the great questions of war and peace. Generally, however, neither the Church at large, nor LDS scholars have been as aware of his thinking on political issues as they have been of such Church leaders as Elders Hugh B. Brown, Ezra Taft Benson, and President Clark.

What I have attempted in this thesis is to distill from available sources (The Stephen L Richards papers in the Church archives were not available when I was doing my research.) Elder Richards' thoughts on the causes of war and the search for peace and to examine them within an organized analytical framework. The framework I have chosen is Kenneth N. Waltz' *Man, the State and War: A Theoretical Analysis.*³ Though published a generation ago, the book's consideration of the levels of analysis with which the causes of war may be examined remains valid and current. In addition, Waltz examines the ideas on war and peace of the leading political theorists of Western civilization. The collection of these ideas lends the book its "classic" quality--and its usefulness even today as an analytical
and comparative tool.

In the book's introductory chapter, Waltz notes that though peace is not the only end pursued by man, it has often been called "the problem of the twentieth century." Discovery of a long-lasting solution to this "problem" continues to elude statesmen and philosophers. Waltz asserts, however, that each attempt to "alleviate a condition implies some idea of its causes: to explain how peace can be more readily achieved requires an understanding of the causes of war." From this starting point, Waltz examines the assumptions of political leaders and philosophers relating to war and peace and points out the logical consequences of those assumptions.

To make the complexity of thought on war and peace more manageable, Waltz suggests that the causes of war may be ascribed to one or a combination of three factors or causes: man himself, the characteristics of the nation-state, and the structure of the international system. He calls each of these factors images, within which there are also differing streams of thought.

From one image, or a combination of images, thinkers have derived the prescriptions for peace advanced through the ages. According to Waltz, empirical testing of these prescriptions has proven
inconclusive for a couple of reasons. The "same set of data" he claims, may lead to differing conclusions because the image supported by the tester will lead him to "select and interpret data in different ways." Waltz also accepts the criticism of empirical studies by those who claim that a particular prescription has never been implemented. Statements such as "The League of Nations didn't fail; it was never tried," are irrefutable, he says.

While recognizing the difficulties of empirical testing, Waltz does not rule out the possibility of establishing the validity of a prescription. He believes this task can be accomplished through rigorous analysis of the cause of war, or the image undergirding each prescription.

For example, Waltz says "a prescription based on a faulty analysis" of the causes of war "would be unlikely to produce the desired consequences," i.e., peace. Turning the problem around, once the validity of an image has been established, a logical prescription growing out of that image must be found. For each image, there are logical and illogical prescriptions. "One who suffers from infected tonsils profits little from a skillfully performed appendectomy." If there is a possibility that more than one image or cause is
involved, the difficulty of determining the value of a prescription is multiplied.

Waltz concludes his introduction listing a series of questions to be asked when considering the merit of a prescription. They are as follows:

I. Is there a logical relation between prescription and image? Does the prescription attack the assigned causes?

II. Is the image adequate, or has the analyst ignored other causes of equal or greater importance?

III. Can the final proposition be implemented, and if so, how?

IV. How will attempts to fill the prescription affect other goals, since peace is not the only goal of even the most peacefully inclined men or states?10

An analysis of the ideas of Elder Richards will center on these questions. First to be examined will be Elder Richards' prescription for peace. Following will be a close look at Elder Richards' thoughts on the causes of war, or images, and an analysis of the adequacy of these. For comparison's sake, Waltz' views on each image are described at the beginning of each section. Finally, the prospects for successful implementation of Elder Richards' prescription for peace and how it might affect other goals will be considered.
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ELDER RICHARDS' PRESCRIPTION FOR PEACE

The Christian peace plan which Elder Richards expressed most often is as simple to explain and understand as peace itself has been difficult to achieve. Elder Richards believed that true, or revealed, religion affects men's attitudes by providing answers to the great mysteries of life such as the personality of God, man's relationship to Him, and the eternal nature of the soul. When men have comprehended certain realities, i.e., that God rules supreme in a universe of laws, and that we are all His spiritual children and therefore, brothers, they will be much less prone to fight one another. Peace will ensue.1

For Elder Richards, faith in the sovereignty and fatherhood of God and in the brotherhood of man was the foundation of peace. Out of this faith grows confidence in God's supremacy and in the laws he has established, the principles of which will guide human society and conduct into peaceful ways. Faith and confidence in God, as our Father, is joined with confidence and trust in each other as brothers and sisters. The acceptance of a familial relationship with our fellow human beings leads to caring and harmonious relations.2
Elder Richards also believed that the peace within a Christian soul and the emotional controls and character building that are its concomitants would bring peace and good will among men. "I cannot see how," he said in 1953, "once the brotherhood of man is established in its fullest concept, we could expect that men would continue long to strive against each other." "A man who believes in the reality of Christ, . . . who has absorbed the spirit . . . and the genius of his . . . doctrine, cannot be a militant man." The logical corollary to these ideas and the key to understanding Elder Richards' prescription for peace is that not until men accept and live the principles and commandments of the Gospel, and not until they are living lives of Christian brotherhood, will a durable peace become a reality. On one occasion, Elder Richards called immorality a "greater deterrent to world peace than conflicting ideologies. Were it not for its damning influence," he said, "the Christian people of the world alone could and would arise in such spiritual power and faith as to invoke and receive the divine benefaction of peace to the world." According to Elder Richards, world peace would be generated through individual righteousness and true feelings of brotherhood multiplied many times over.
When there are enough peaceful people in the world, he asserted, and when the peaceful Spirit of Christ has been incorporated into the governmental structures of nations, there will be peace. Elder Richards hoped that the influence of Christians in world leadership positions would lead to the integration of Gospel values into the very constitutions of nations.

The idea that peace could be attained by Gospel principles being infused into the arrangements and organizations of nations was expressed more than once by Elder Richards, particularly in reference to the founding of post-war international organizations. In contemplating the League of Nations, Elder Richards said its constitution would not be stable unless it incorporated the principles of the Gospel. He repeated the point years later when discussing the prospects for a new organization to be formed after World War II. The success of such an organization, he said, could only be assured if it "were conditioned on subscription and adherence to the laws of righteousness, equity, and justice emanating from the divine ruler of the world." A non-religious approach to world affairs, especially within international organizations, posed a mortal hazard to peace.

In the same vein, Elder Richards remarked during
World War II that post-war arrangements to keep the peace would be unsuccessful if based on force, balance of power, hatred or vengeance. He described the hoped-for post-war order this way: "Love is the keystone in the arch of its structure, righteousness and justice are its foundations."\(^{11}\) "Unless peoples begin to feel well toward each other," he added, "and repose confidence in each other," peace will fail.\(^{12}\)

As World War II neared its end, Elder Richards agreed with a speaker of the Stanford Conference on the Humanities, who said the world needed a new man, one who understood the "philosophy which underlies democracy and individual freedom," rather than men who placed their hopes on post-war economic and political organizations.\(^{13}\) For Elder Richards, the philosophy of freedom and democracy included the Gospel doctrines of the divine right of free agency and the majesty of man as a son of God. Reiterating the basic tenet of his peace plan, Elder Richards said that once these concepts were infused into men's hearts, the relations among men that naturally followed would bring peace.\(^{14}\)

In addition to the incorporation of Gospel principles into the political sphere, Elder Richards believed economies must be energized by Gospel values for peace to be sustained. An economy, to support
peace, must be imbued with brotherly love and consideration.\textsuperscript{15} Men must realize that there are things more precious than property, territory, or power.\textsuperscript{16} During the interwar period, Elder Richards noted that the industrial system and the security of property would be threatened unless men turned to God.\textsuperscript{17} Prospects for peace would be limited, he declared, until selfishness was rooted out and replaced by Gospel values.\textsuperscript{18}

It is clear from the foregoing that Elder Richards' prescription for peace on earth was the acceptance of the Gospel of Jesus Christ by enough individuals, in enough nations, who, when activated by the spirit of brotherhood inherent in the Gospel, would no longer find themselves in conflict with their fellow men. Until a sufficient number of Gospel believers was attained, reducing the number of unbelievers and those disobedient to the laws of morality, a search for a lasting peace would be futile. What is also envisioned by Elder Richards is the spread of and adherence to Gospel principles in the policies of nation-states and international organizations such as the United Nations.

The spread of the Gospel is Elder Richards' prescription for peace. His views indicate that men, nations, and the international structure itself may be
infused with and follow the principles of the Gospel to the end of promoting peace. It follows, then, that one may expect him to find the causes of war in each of Waltz' three images. The following sections will explore Elder Richards' thoughts on the causes of war in the context of Waltz' images, the adequacy of those images, and the logical relations between the causes of war and the prescription for peace Elder Richards espouses.
Endnotes


3SLR, "Peace and Good Will," Notes for Speech (Typewritten), Stephen L Richards Papers, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah (hereafter cited as SLR Papers) p. 2.

4SLR, Christmas Message to North 20th Ward, Dec. 20, 1953, Notes (Typewritten), SLR Papers, p. 5.


9SLR, "The Plan of Salvation, the True Way to Permanent Peace and the More Abundant Life," Address delivered at Deseret Sunday School Union Conference, April 7, 1946, Manuscript (Typewritten), SLR Papers, p. 11.


13 Ibid., pp. 178-179.

14 Ibid., pp. 179-180.


FIRST IMAGE

The Waltz View

According to Waltz, the core belief of first-image theorists is that the causes of war derive from the "nature and behavior of men." Human characteristics such as selfishness, aggressiveness, and stupidity are the key causal factors.\(^1\) If man is the root of evil, then man is also the root of war. Waltz described this view as being held in varying forms by such illuminaries as St. Augustine, Luther, Spinoza, Malthus, Swift, and Niebuhr.\(^2\) Acceptance of the prescription that the improvement of man will bring peace depends on one's acceptance of the idea that the stated reasons for war will be rationalizations of simpler motives such as pride, greed, or petulance.\(^3\)

Waltz divides the first imagists into optimists and pessimists. First-image optimists believe that people's instincts are good, but that the people are often deceived by political leaders. The premise follows that the right policies would be implemented if people knew what the right policies were. Education, then, becomes the cure for conflict.\(^4\) For the optimists, society is basically good, with great
possibilities for progress. Prescriptions vary, but common to all first-level optimists is the idea that for a peaceful world, men must be changed, either in their "moral-intellectual outlook" or in their "psychic-social behavior."\(^5\)

First-image pessimists believe that wars will continue because men are permanently flawed and their faults eliminate any opportunities for long-lasting peace.\(^6\) Optimists and pessimists agree on the cause of war, man, but they disagree on the possibility of altering the cause.\(^7\) Pessimists "accept the relevance" of the optimists' goal but they think it impossible to achieve.\(^8\) To the pessimists, men will never be "perfectly rational nor truly loving."\(^9\)

Spinoza believed that human reason and will are defective and that men are led by passions which in turn, lead to conflict.\(^10\) St. Augustine, Niebuhr, and Morgenthau denied this dualism between reason and passion, believing that "the whole man--his mind, and his body, are flawed."\(^11\)

Morgenthau claimed that evil comes from man's ineradicable lust for power.\(^12\) He rejected the assumption of "the essential goodness and infinite malleability of human nature."\(^13\) He explained political behavior through the "blind," "egotistic behavior of
men," the "undeniable and inevitable product" of a nature that cannot be changed. Morgenthau, among others, attributed political ills to a "fixed nature of man, defined in terms of an inherent potentiality for evil as well as for good."14 Waltz concludes that man does not act contrary to his nature and it is "prima facie absurd" to think otherwise.15 One may label human nature the basic and primary cause of war, but according to the pessimists, human nature is a "cause that human contrivance cannot affect."16

To summarize the first-image view, the evil in man or "improper behavior," leads to war. Goodness, if "universalized," would bring peace. Optimists believe that men are basically good and that the reform of individuals is possible. Pessimists believe that peace is a valid, but "utopian dream."17 First imagists, both optimists and pessimists, believe that what is important in politics is found beneath the political surface, that political acts and arrangements arise from the nature and behavior of man.18 "Optimists and pessimists agree on where to look" but see things differently and arrive at different conclusions.19

"Giving up on man," pessimists turn to "political remedies." Waltz claims the "unity of the first image is more perfectly preserved by those who, seeking the
cause of war in men, seek to change them." In the past, he asserts, "religious-moral appeals" and "traditional systems of education" were the vehicles of improvement. The approach of many pacifists was to the "realm of the spirit," either by waiting quietly and hoping for men to "behave as God intended," or by going out "to convert". Faith was said "to have moved mountains" and presumably would again. "Faith, courage, and character" were required. These attempts, Waltz said, have been replaced by the efforts of scientists, behavioral and social, who attempt to turn their techniques and their findings into a "prescription for social action."

The Richards View

Though Elder Richards did not often explicitly link a certain trait or behavior to the outbreak of war, it is clear from many of his statements that he found much of the world's troubles stemming from the behavior patterns of men, a first-image view. The following observations are indicative of the emphasis Elder Richards placed on the behavior of men as the central force behind events.

That man himself would be the principal cause behind events is not surprising in light of Elder Richards' beliefs concerning man's place in the
universe, a view derived from Mormon doctrine. Men, who are created in the image of God, and are His literal spirit children,\(^{22}\) are born of "high-estate and of the noblest lineage."\(^{23}\) Man's intelligence, which is of eternal duration, and his spirit, the offspring of God, are placed into mortal bodies of flesh and blood.\(^{24}\)

Beyond intelligence and matter, however, a man is formed by his "ideals, his ambitions, and the performance of his deeds." According to Elder Richards, "these elements determine his [man's] personality, that seemingly intangible essence which . . . influences the lives of his fellowman."\(^{25}\) Elder Richards thought individual personality was a critical factor in the propagation of both good and evil\(^ {26}\) because it is through personality that men are granted stature in the community and hence the power to affect lives.\(^ {27}\)

Elder Richards believed the effect of a personality on another could have other than an intellectual or an emotional basis. The power of personality, he claimed, is essentially spiritual, "built of spiritual and moral attributes and conveyed through contacts which create feelings and impressions seemingly of a spiritual nature."\(^{28}\) Not in all cases, however, would the effect of one personality on another or on a group be positive. The influence and impact on the world of the leaders of
belligerent states was regretfully noted by Elder Richards during and after the World Wars of his life-time.

One feature of man's make-up which consistently drew Elder Richards' attention was the role of emotions in the behavior of human beings. In the early 1920s, he considered emotion, more than the exercise of reason, the stronger motivating force behind men's actions. "It is not always that an analytically trained mind," he said in 1923, "will choose the right course."

The penitentiaries are full of bright people .... Leaders of some of the most inimical movements in the country and elsewhere are those who have superior intellectual training but whose emotional structure has been sadly neglected. 29

With the passing of a decade, however, Elder Richards had shifted his thinking to the view that it was most likely a combination of emotion and reason reacting to the knowledge and information one receives, most particularly, knowledge of a spiritual nature, which motivates behavior. 30 That he clung to this point of view is evident from his comment in 1956 that while he thought emotion was the greatest driving force behind behavior, he did not find human emotions, in combination with spiritual knowledge and intelligence, incompatible as a guide to proper action. 31

Elder Richards also noted that while customs and
philosophies often underwent great change, "the elemental emotions of the human family--love, hate, fear, hope, and despair are pretty stable." He made this observation to a group of soldiers in 1943 with the intention of pointing out that just as personalities may exert positive or negative influences, so too were emotions capable of leading to good or ill. "In war time," he said, "men's higher emotions and nobler sentiments should be called into play. It is a time for the subordination of selfishness for the common good." He said that though it was difficult to love one's enemies in wartime, to "control one's native passions and feelings" would allow minds to be enlightened rather than be poisoned with hate and enmity.

Among the natural emotions and inclinations in man Elder Richards most often condemned were selfishness and the prideful notion of human autonomy, or self-sufficiency. Shortly after World War I, in a period of some domestic unrest, he called selfishness the underlying cause of the nation's distress. "Selfishness is the attribute of all flesh," he said later in 1940, "but I cannot see what chance we have to overcome it unless our leaders in thought and station set the example." He complained that the "rich and intelligentsia," succumbing to selfishness and greed, were shirking their
leadership roles. Elder Richards was deeply disappointed that after the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, hopes for maximum national unity were dashed by what he called "deeply ingrained habits, thought and actions. . ." tending to selfishness, costly disputes, dissention, and partisan prejudice. Inasmuch as Elder Richards most often focused on the action of individuals as the cause of national or international disorder, it is interesting to note his comment of April 1925 that selfishness and hatred on the part of the collective were more lightly regarded than the same qualities expressed in one individual. In this instance, he alludes to and seems to criticize the realist notion that bench-marks of individual morality cannot also be considered the measuring sticks of a nation-state's "goodness".

While remarking that selfishness had hampered America's efforts at the beginning of World War II, Elder Richards stated after World War I that it was a spirit of self-sufficiency, a tendency to go it alone, or "reckoning without God," that had actually led to ruin. "One great lesson the war has taught us," he asserted in June 1919, "is that man's wisdom alone could not keep the world out of turmoil and misery." "Strong bodies and keen minds will not alone correct the
disorders of society. . . ."\(^{43}\)

Elder Richards focused on the notion of self-sufficiency as a cause of disorder over and over through the years. He said those who believe in self-sufficiency labor under the assumption that there is no higher power to depend on other than their own wisdom. Elder Richards, on the other hand, considered faith in higher powers indicative of a superior intelligence, one which "perceives spiritual concepts and adequately correlates them with things of the finite world."\(^{44}\) He felt this capability to be the soundest qualification a statesman could possess.\(^{45}\) In doing so, he implied that statesmen without spiritual understanding cannot accurately perceive the circumstances and conditions of the world as they really are. One senses here a rudimentary intuition on the part of Elder Richards that the perceptive filters of international leaders are somewhat misted, a dangerous deficiency when it comes to the delicate moments when peace hangs in the balance.

Though much of the theorizing on international politics did not occur until after World War II, one theory accounting for the recurrence of war was popular much earlier. It posited that war was the result of an instinctual aggressive drive in man. Elder Richards was well aware of this theory and, somewhat presciently,
given the conclusions of later theorists, was not entirely in accord with its conclusions. In 1925, he disagreed with the critics who dismissed Christianity as unscientific because it did not take into account the natural instinct of man to kill his own brother in order to assure his own survival. "They say it, but have they proved it?" he queried.46

A few years later he was still doubtful that it was native instinct which led to man's seeming propensity to engage in war, but he granted that there were many who propounded the theory.47 From his own study of history and personal observation, however, Elder Richards offered his feeling that men could live together in peace, though he admitted the effect of inherent tendencies and that some individuals were vicious and intentionally sought to do great harm.48

Only in a couple of instances did Elder Richards refer to another commonly-attributed instinct, the drive for power, the alleged universal possession of which forms the basis of Hans Morgenthau's theory of international politics.49 In 1938, Elder Richards denied that man was by nature, "brutal and fiendish," but acknowledged that the "overpowering temptation of man is for power, wealth, and dominion."50 The clear implication is that individuals succumbing to such temptation
are often prone to exercise nefarious means to obtain their ends. Later, in a 1943 radio speech, he praised George Washington for having "wisely called attention to the 'love of power' in the human heart."51

The preceding observations have focused on elements of man's behavior common to all men in one degree or another. Elder Richards also discussed influences that contribute to the differences in men and their behavior.

Elder Richards pointed out environmental influences as one source of the differences in men's behavior. He found that men could not help but react to the persons, things, and events which surround them. Individuals were particularly affected in their political outlook, for instance, by influences in the home, a concept borne out by modern survey research. In 1930, Elder Richards said:

Men follow creeds because their fathers did. I have observed that men align themselves with political parties largely because their fathers did likewise. They are predisposed to certain views because they lived in homes where these views prevailed. . . . It is the line of least resistance. They absorb as with the food that sustains them the ideas that their elders and their progenitors have had.52

Elder Richards also spoke of the pervasive influence that religion and theology have had on men to varying degrees throughout the centuries, whether they
have been practicants or not. Elder Richards considered religion a dominant force in the history of man, asserting in 1933 that "the civilized world of today is what it is" because of religion and theology. Even the most primitive peoples harbor concepts of a Supreme Being, he said in 1941.

America was a special case. Shortly after the United States entered World War II, Elder Richards declared, "There is not a man or woman in America whose loyalty and devotion are not affected by a preconception of political, economic, and religious right or wrong. He was not prepared, however, to accept the idea of some that because the basic teachings of Christianity influenced Americans, America was therefore a Christian nation. At best, Americans were ideological Christians. Only the recognition of Jesus Christ as the Son of God could vitalize such ideology, making of America thereby a truly Christian nation.

Elder Richards also expounded first-image views within more specific historical contexts. The following are his comments relating to the World Wars and their aftermaths. His preceding observations on man's behavior are also reflected in these more particular historical observations.
World War I

The first statement on World War I with which Elder Richards was associated appeared in the December 1914 issue of the *Juvenile Instructor*. In a Christmas editorial signed by Elders Joseph F. Smith, David O. McKay, and Richards, the war was called a "test to determine whether or not the . . . principles of Christianity shall prevail . . . against the unholy ambitions and machinations of men."57 Echoing this sharply drawn distinction 3 1/2 years later, in May 1918, Elder Richards considered the United States and the Allies to be fighting on the side of righteousness, liberty, justice, and truth. It was the obligation of liberty-loving peoples, he declared, to preserve virtue and kindness in the world against the appetites and cravings of the wicked.58 After the war concluded, he praised those who saved his home, country, and the world from an "autocracy of tyranny and evil influence."59

Elder Richards shared the Wilsonian view that the United States entered and participated in the war armed with a high moral purpose. Germany had attacked the "very roots of human life" as Wilson proclaimed in his request for a declaration of war.60 For these offenses, however, Elder Richards cast the blame on avaricious German leaders, not on the common citizenry of Germany.
Pursuing a theme he would more fully amplify during World War II, Elder Richards counseled that individual inhabitants of nations with whom the United States was at war should not become objects of hatred. Echoing Wilsonian thought, he said if the United States were to enter the war, it would be on behalf of all humanity, and would not be a campaign of hatred against a particular nation or people.61

The Aftermath of World War I

Carrying his Fourteen Points, President Woodrow Wilson was welcomed as a hero in France, but the Allied leaders were in no mood to implement wholesale Wilson's dream of a world of democratic states becoming an organized community of moral force. Piece by piece, they chipped away at Wilson's sacred principles by negotiating in secrecy, parceling out colonies, and instituting a harsh reparations policy.

Germany, of course, was dissatisfied with the treaty and the treaty's punitive measures would later provide a basis for Hitler's antagonism toward the European powers. Wilson, faced with an unrelenting Republican Congress at home, was unable to engineer the accession of the United States to the new League of Nations. Recalling the immediate post-war period, Elder Richards told a Utah State audience in 1942 that while
the war was fought to end war, "lust for power and avarice and greed quickly laid the foundations for another." It was apparent to Elder Richards, with Hitler then occupying most of Europe, that the genesis of the conflict could in large measure be traced to Versailles.

Between the wars, Elder Richards spoke often of the attitudes of power elites and opinion makers which can lead nations into war. At the base of these attitudes are first-image types of character defects which have been noted previously.

In 1930, Elder Richards accused capitalists of putting the protection of capital ahead of life itself. Capital should be protected, he felt, but it should be accomplished with methods other than those "which drink the blood of nations and satiate the world in horror and atrocities that defy even the description of man." In 1939, he described the state of the world as a "mad scramble of nations for territory and power," at the foundation of which were economic motivations, profits, markets, and the acquisition of comforts. Though personal aggrandizement influenced some, he observed, much warfare was due to economic factors. Noting the economic deprivations suffered in other parts of the world as a result of World War I, Elder Richards hoped
that in some way the Lord would make men realize there were things more precious than property, territory, and power. 65

In an important discourse in the Salt Lake Tabernacle in 1930, Elder Richards described militarism as another major impediment to the peace-making process. His statements were couched in an American context, indicating his concern that the United States was not immune to such a spirit. He found that patriotism, when defined in terms of military achievement, often influenced a nation's inclination to assume a militant posture. He did not want to minimize the contributions of such heroes as Washington or Andrew Jackson, but he felt their military accomplishments often overshadowed other significant contributions by Americans in the development of the nation. He noted the somewhat exaggerated influence wielded by veterans' organizations in the United States and expressed some dissatisfaction that American youth grew up with a disposition to interpret patriotism in terms of great military achievements. Elder Richards saw even the flag itself as a symbol for many of a "militant aggressive fighting disposition at variance with the very spirit and philosophy of peace." Finally, he observed that political recognition had often come to those of significant military achievement.
Having won their spurs on the battlefield, these individuals were often "predisposed toward the fight" as a solution to important questions. Elder Richards considered this inclination detrimental to the objectives of peace and the reduction of military spending.66

While Elder Richards had taken the offensive against economic aggression and militarism, several times he felt compelled to defend religion against accusations that it was responsible for much warfare and bloodshed. He admitted that wars and atrocities had been prosecuted in the name of religion, but denied that these were sanctioned by the Lord.67

Will anyone contend that [war] is prompted by goodness and love? And that God is the author of it? Yes, there have been perverted souls in all ages who have so held, but they were never really Christian. The spirit and the peace of Christ have never found lodgement in their hearts.... No, God is not the author and sponsor of war. Satan inspired it and rejoices in it. Greed, ambition, and hatred are its forerunners.68

From the Savior's injunction in the Sermon on the Mount that peacemakers would be the children of God, Elder Richards logically concluded that the makers of war estrange themselves from the family of God.69

World War II

In World War II, Elder Richards said the Allies were fighting against the forces of Satan, who were imbued with greed, avarice, selfishness, and
hypocrisy. To a radio audience in 1943, he pointed out the spiritual chasm between the "egotistical, self-sufficient superior race ideology" of the enemy versus the "Christian concept of the equality of men in the family of God." When one considers the justifications put forward by the Nazis for their aggressive actions, Elder Richards' statements bring to mind Waltz' assertion that the given reasons for war may be actually rationalizations of the more precise motives Elder Richards describes—pride, greed, and petulance.

Elder Richards blamed World War II on the "war lords and their militaristic parties and willing collaborators" rather than the "helpless citizenry." These perpetrators, he said, should be brought to justice, without destroying the two foundations of decent society remaining in their countries, "mutual good will and altruistic service." Even then, Elder Richards was not prepared to unconditionally condemn the warmakers. He said he could not understand the doctrine of repentance unless it applied to all who turn from sin and seek God.

Some of Elder Richards' statements, however, seem to indicate that he ascribed to the rank and file of the enemy countries the same traits as their leaders. He feared that in the course of their soldiering, American
boys would become like the enemy, who allegedly had been trained to kill and murder for the preceding decade. The "ideology of hate and revenge" he opined, had "been essential for the growth of dictatorship and a militaristic spirit in the enemy countries. Surely we who oppose such autocracy and aggression can ill afford to encourage the cultivation of the inimical and hateful atmosphere out of which grows the things we fight."

The Aftermath of World War II

During the first years of the Cold War, and consistent with his view of the Fascist states of World War II, Elder Richards blamed the "tyrants and oppressors" for the evils of the Communist states, not the common citizens. "I cannot see," he said in April 1949, "how the rank and file of the people who are classed as atheistic communists could accept the godless totalitarianism of Marx and Lenin if they really had a comprehension of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man and the eternal plans of the Father for the well-being and exaltation of his children." He continued that Communist leaders, consistently seeking to maximize their power, and at the same time fearful of losing it, would repress whatever decent and honorable inclinations they had in order to achieve their ends. If the people knew the truth, he believed they would not
support these avaricious leaders.\textsuperscript{78}

At this point it should be mentioned that on several occasions, Elder Richards suggested that it was not entirely the weakness of men that led to war, but more the influence on men of the actual author of evil, Satan, which led to conflict.

In an April 1938 Easter discourse, he pondered why the nations of the earth, after so many years of access to the teachings and example of Christ, continued "while professing Christ, to lie, cheat, steal, fight, and kill."\textsuperscript{79}

Can it be that there is a devil, an adversary of light and truth, turned loose in the world to incite men to greed, war, murder...? I am sure it must be so or men and nations could not fail to surrender and respond to the... precepts... of the Savior.\textsuperscript{80}

Two years later he claimed,

The persistence of evil in the world is more adequately and logically accounted for by the power and influence of the God of evil than in any other way... It is man with human frailty, subject to the opposing forces of evil, who needs strength, fortitude, and courage to acquire truth.\textsuperscript{81}

Elder Richards linked Communism to the Adversary when he declared that Karl Marx was "more responsible today for a misconception of human life and duty than probably any other man that ever lived," adding that this philosophy (Marxism) was prompted by "Satan himself."\textsuperscript{82} It was a terrible mockery to the divinely
planted passion for self-preservation, he would later assert, that there were so many in the world, influenced by Satan, who sought the lives of those "not of their own persuasion." 83

These are concepts which, like much of the rest of Elder Richards' core beliefs, do not lend themselves to academic analysis. What is necessary is to determine whether they are consistent with his other views.

If, as Elder Richards declares, there is a force for good, the power of the Holy Spirit, which changes hearts and leads to peace, there is nothing exceptionally inconsistent with the idea that there is also an evil force, pulling men in the opposite direction. Only if the impression is given that this evil force alone causes men to act with greed and selfishness would there seem to be a contradiction with Elder Richards' assertions on the autonomous, free-agent, albeit fallen status of man.

In his own defense, Elder Richards would probably point out that the Adversary generally has no power other than to exacerbate defects that are already the lot of fallen man, or to encourage man to emphasize the baser or more fallen aspects of his nature. He would probably add, however, and this idea is mirrored in his views on totalitarian states, that there is a point at
which, after long years of permitting the influence of the Adversary into their lives, men actually lose their free agency and become in a more total sense, Satan's soldiers. Whether a group or nation must reach this state before causing war, or whether war can be caused simply by man's own already substantial baggage of selfishness (the first-image view) it is impossible for the mortal observer to determine. In any case, Elder Richards recognized and accepted the possibility that in many instances, the decision by man to employ war as an instrument to achieve his desires is not taken free of the influence of a wicked, unearthly power.

Adequacy of the First Image

In several instances, Elder Richards' ideas are similar to first-image views of the philosophers/politicians described by Waltz. Elder Richards placed a lot of emphasis on individual selfishness, calling it the underlying cause of the nation's distress and an "attribute of all flesh." He considered avarice and greed, both components of selfishness, as bringing to pass in great part the World Wars. His mention of leaders overcoming selfishness, however, is indicative of his view that it does not have to be a permanent feature of man's character.
Elder Richards briefly touched on the aggressive instinct, but did not believe it to be the overriding factor causing war. He did not develop the idea of man's inherent lust for power except to note that it was an extremely strong temptation and that it was the goal of Communist leaders.

On the combination of reason and passion, Elder Richards eventually came to believe that reason and emotion operate in tandem in decision-making. He did not accept Spinoza's idea that passion alone ruled and caused conflict. He noted, however, that there were different degrees of passion, or emotion, some negative and some positive.

Waltz described those who think beliefs condition expectations and expectations condition actions as adhering to a first-image viewpoint. This contention coincides with Elder Richards' view that men are affected by the persons, things, and events around them, and that their political outlook is primarily influenced by what they learn in the home.

It is clear that Elder Richards believed the behavior and attitudes of individuals were in large part the cause of the wars he experienced in his lifetime. The question remains, however, whether this image is adequate.
Waltz believed the first image was inadequate because human nature, no matter how it is defined, if thought to be the one and only force driving behavior, has to explain an infinite number of events. Waltz points out, if human nature caused war in 1914, it caused peace in 1910. As Waltz continued that the search for causes is an "attempt to account for differences." An explanation is sought for the alternations between war and peace.

According to Waltz, human nature, though playing a role in causing war, "cannot by itself explain both war and peace, except by the simple statement that man's nature is such that sometimes he fights and sometimes he does not." To exaggerate the causal importance of human nature is dangerous because it can justify everything.

Waltz dismissed the first-level optimists who believe human nature can be changed by citing the efforts of those who have tried. "Often," he said, "with those who expect improvement in human behavior to bring peace to the world, the influence of social-political institutions is buried under the conviction that individual behavior is determined more by religious-spiritual inspiration than by material circumstances." Here Waltz seems to succumb to his own criticism of the
empiricists who say a particular solution has never worked because it has never been truly implemented. If Waltz calls the empiricists' argument irrefutable, he must also call the argument that men have never changed because they have never truly been taught Gospel principles irrefutable.

If human nature cannot be changed, as the pessimists think, then Waltz points out it is no longer a manipulable factor and therefore is not relevant to the search for peace. If it were the case that human nature was the only cause of war and human nature was unchanging, then the search for peace would be futile. If human nature is only one of the causes, then even if it is unchanging, a search for the conditions of peace can be made. Waltz concludes that dwelling on invariable factors diverts too much attention from manipulable factors.97

As a Christian religious leader principally concerned with the individual salvation of men, Elder Richards' focus was on the individual behavior of men and its consequences. He saw conflict from this first-image perspective, though not entirely so, as will be noted in further sections. To the extent, however, that he does see individual behavior as the cause of war, he does not confront the logic trap of Waltz which notes
that if individual behavior explains everything, it explains nothing. This was not an intellectual shortcoming on the part of Elder Richards, but simply a function of his interest and focus.

Where he would strongly challenge Waltz is on the contention that men are unchanging. Though he recognized the qualities inherent in men that made a rapid turnabout in conditions difficult, Elder Richards knew and had experienced the fact that lives could be changed if Gospel principles were followed. Human nature was for Elder Richards "manipulable" and therefore efforts to change human nature were relevant to the search for peace. This leads of course to a discussion of how Elder Richards' prescription for peace, the changing of men through the Gospel, could be implemented. This is also a question Waltz posed of peace prescriptions, and will be the subject of another section.
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THE SECOND IMAGE

The Waltz View

Proponents of the second image believe that "the internal organization of states is the key to understanding war and peace."¹ The second image grows out of the idea that if a first-image view explains nothing because it explains everything, then a different level of analysis, a more manipulable cause, must be sought.

The second imagists assert that if states are reformed, war can be "reduced or forever eliminated."² They know that it is individuals who fight and it is individuals who decide to go to war, but that wars are fought in the name of states.³ This contention of the second imagists, however, begs the question of what reforms states should aspire to, i.e., what is a good and therefore peaceful state.

Waltz primarily discusses the views of nineteenth-century liberals who believed that men were generally good, though afflicted with vices and imperfections. These vices and imperfections, operating together in the proper environment, were supposed to produce within a state a natural harmony of interests promoting the common good. The internal conditions of a state, according
to the liberals, determined external behavior.\(^4\) With individual initiative and free competition as the undergirding principles upon which the harmony of interests would be built, the liberals saw the good state as a limited state, one concerned internally with justice and security for persons and property and externally with defending and protecting the state from invasion.\(^5\) The liberals believed that free trade would lead to cooperation, constructive competition, and logical divisions of labor among states. Production would be most efficient in peace time.\(^6\) War could still be considered a valid instrument, but only as an extension of the state's use of force domestically to uphold the law.\(^7\)

The liberals were obliged to answer, however, why war existed. They responded that the true interest of the people was in peace. If war occurred, the true interests of the people were not being followed. Selfish leaders were to blame.\(^8\)

According to this theory, a democracy, wherein foreign policy is ultimately in the control of the people, is the prototype of a peaceful state. In a democracy there are two brakes on leaders who might otherwise more easily lead a nation into war. One is the direct voice of the people, those who suffer most in
war, through the ballot box. The second is the sanction of public opinion. Liberals felt that in a democracy reason and the common sense of the people would prevail over minorities and despots.⁹

Having established that democracies were peaceful states, the next question became how to get from A to B, that is, how to obtain a world of democratic states from a starting point of a world of mixed democratic and non-democratic states.

The liberals offered two mechanisms of change. The first was the idea of optimistic non-intervention. Traditional methods of education, peaceful trade, and a good example set by democratic states were supposed to increase the number of peaceful states. This option was criticized for leaving the good states without an agency to bring non-democratic states to democracy. If good states had to wait while bad states changed, it left open the possibility of the triumph of evil.¹⁰

The liberals decided that if an agent of change was necessary, it would have to be the democratic states themselves. This constitutes the second mechanism—messianic interventionism. Wars would be fought to establish freedom and justice. Waltz pointed out Woodrow Wilson's adherence to this view and in particular, his rationale for United States entry into World
War I, which seemed to shift from securing the safety of the United States to a "clean-up crusade."11

If there are numerous good states, according to the liberals, a minimum of international organization would be required, only that necessary to repulse non-democratic invaders. The underlying guarantee of peace would be the equilibrium of interests, which would include everyone's interest in settling disputes peacefully. Public opinion would be the major sanction.12 Wilson, however, was not one who believed in the anarchic ideal of a minimum of international organization. He foresaw the need of international organization to perform the "inescapable functions of government." His view was that democratic, self-determining states, operating together in a community of power, would bring peace.13

The Richards View

To Elder Richards, the internal organization of a state was of paramount importance, not only for peace, but for salvation. He believed that men were social beings who grouped together "for mutual helpfulness and friendship."14 Through the advantages provided by family or community living, human existence became more comfortable, even "joyous."15
The formation of family groups into communities and civil states has led perforce to the essence of politics, what David Easton has called the need for authoritative allocation of values in society. The proper mode of this allocation, or political organization, still engages the debate of philosophers and ideologues.

Most of Elder Richards' statements on the subject came at a time when the arguments over political organization had moved beyond the debating stage to become the central political and military conflict of his time. Man's free agency and incomparable status in the universe, he declared in 1939,

lie at the very foundation of and indeed constitute the essence of the most discussed and most priceless thing in the universe today . . . human liberty . . . . All other creations are designed primarily to serve man's needs and purposes; all . . . institutions, ecclesiastical, civic, and social are but adjuncts and contributors to his progress and welfare . . . . No order of society is greater than the intelligence and personality who invents, devises, executes, and maintains them.17

He expanded on this theme years later, explaining that men, all of whom are brothers and children of a divine parent, have an inherent right to freedom, and are "designed to live in a free society."18 To Elder Richards, a free society was one in which individuals retained the "voluntary power of choice" necessary for
development and progression.\textsuperscript{19}

The thrust of this philosophy is that no institution of society, political or otherwise, must be allowed to reduce or restrain the individual's capacity to develop and progress toward salvation.

Thus, a good nation was one in which sufficient liberty existed for man to develop as God intended. Similar to the views of the nineteenth-century liberals, Elder Richards believed that if this liberty was threatened, "good" nations could justify going to war in self-defense. World War II was an example.

As described previously, Elder Richards conceived World War II to be a contest between the forces of good and evil, with the Allies on the side of righteousness preserving liberty and all sacred values. The Axis, on the other hand, represented the forces of darkness.\textsuperscript{20}

Before the United States entry into the war, Elder Richards viewed it primarily in terms of the threat to the liberty of free peoples that the Axis symbolized. In early 1940, he concurred in the opinion of Great Britain's Ambassador to the United States, Lord Halifax, that the Allied effort was an attempt to preserve liberty in the civilized world.\textsuperscript{21} Nearly a year later, with Hitler controlling much of Europe, Elder Richards told a Brigham Young University audience that
Satan was in command of the forces "marching rough shod and tramping under their feet the most precious things in life—liberty, mercy, love, human hearts, and little children." 22

After Pearl Harbor, Elder Richards defined the war in similarly stark terms, finding the very survival of freedom and democracy at stake. United States participation naturally heightened his concerns. In his first major statement after United States entry into the war, he called it a conflict involving the democracies who were supporting Gospel principles such as freedom, altruism, and the policy of the good neighbor versus Satan's forces. 23 On these occasions, Elder Richards followed the Wilsonian inclination to find democracies inherently good, even spiritual states; to the extent the Fascist, totalitarian states sought to use Satan's tools of force and coercion, they were wickedness incarnate.

On another occasion, he declared the Allied cause, or the cause of freedom, to be the cause of Christ:

I would like each one to know that as he enters this great undertaking he does so with the blessing of the Priesthood of the living God. We did not create this war; we deplore it; but it is here; and it is essential that triumph come to the cause of freedom and victory. 24

In a prayer before the United States Senate June 29,
1942, (the first Mormon leader ever accorded the honor) Elder Richards again equated the Allied cause with the cause of righteousness and prayed that those "who were bearing arms to sustain these holy causes of freedom and Christ" would be potent.  

Elder Richards strongly disagreed with those who would have criticized his sentiments as inculcating the concept of a holy war. "War is not a holy business," he said, but the cause of the United States was holy. The war occurred because righteous principles had been trampled. The Allies were not bent on enforcing Christian principles (the Soviets certainly were not) but on maintaining concepts of liberty and human relations that were in essence Christian because they were derived from the word of God. There should be no effort, Elder Richards felt, to diminish the zeal of those fighting to restore such principles to humanity. With the issues thus defined, the "most conscientious can enter the conflict and justify his effort."  

For Elder Richards, the issues of World War II were therefore similar to those of World War I. The scope and scale, however, were greatly magnified, the contest more desperate. The intensity of Elder Richards' own personal concern was reflected in his radio speech, "Is Hatred Necessary?" delivered May 16,
1943. It was probably the most explicit public statement on the war he made:

Lawless enemies, in violation of every standard of right and decency, have thrown themselves at our throats in a desperate effort to throttle us and rob us of the things we hold most dear. Of course, we have no alternative but to repel them and render them impotent for the repetition of any such further assault on us.

Not only must we do this for ourselves, but we have altruistic obligations to protect others, innocent victims of these enemies. Unfortunately we cannot meet these brutal assaults with mere persuasion. We are obliged to use force, all the force at our command, to crush the enemies of our dearly-bought liberty, our freedom of religion, our homes, and our way of life. We are forced to use the methods of war and to become expert in them. . . . Our forces have to be hardened for the hard job. Their muscles should be firm and tough. Their nerves must be like steel. Their courage must be unflinching and their resolution unbeatable. 30

For the same reasons Elder Richards condemned the Fascists, he opposed Communism (though he did not mention the irony of the Anglo-American alliance with Stalinist Russia). In the years following the Red Scare of 1919-1920, he castigated the Bolsheviks for their efforts to "impose upon a people the most outrageous of all social orders." 31 The thrust of the Communist legal order, he would say many years later, was "effective maintenance of controls, imposed by arbitrary authority." 32

His primary argument with Communism was its
distortion of the value of the individual. Where Marxism-Leninism sought to minimize the importance of the individual, making of him a tool of the state, Elder Richards' calling was to promote the free agency of men so they could meet the prescribed test of mortality: choosing between right and wrong. Politically, he said, free agency is manifest in the universal franchise and sovereignty of the people. If the opportunity to choose freely is denied under a social system in which compulsion and coercion rather than election and persuasion are the norm, the Gospel plan for the salvation of man would be hindered.

Thus, for Elder Richards, democratic states were "good" states, and would be peaceful, as long as the individuals making up the states remained righteous. In 1930, he said peace was a product of "man's philosophy, the way he thinks, the way he feels, . . . a state of mind. . . . Any factor which affects a man's state of mind, will determine in large measure how he looks toward peace, . . . and the nation's action is the action of the aggregate men of the country."33

According to Elder Richards, a democratic nation was not invested nor did it act with a will or identity somehow distinct from the wills and attitudes of those populating the nation. Though he conceded after World
War II that such a concept may have been difficult to accept, given what seemed to have been a blind following of "organized groups, completely under the dominance of violent leadership," he would not accept the theory that from among the multitudes there naturally emerged a united, mass feeling or identity of concept. He often said the attitudes of a nation were but the aggregates of the attitudes of the men and women comprising the nation. "National life, national spirit, national legislation are all the products of men's thinking," and public opinion was merely the accumulated view of all the people.

What Elder Richards seems to be saying here is that a democratic nation, per se, has no foreordained foreign policy or national tendency toward peace. In his view, the external behavior of a democracy will presumably reflect the views of the individuals making up the democracy. The goodness or badness of the collective reflects no more or no less the goodness or badness of the individuals comprising the collective. It has been noted that Elder Richards had once, in fact, lamented that it was unfortunate that selfishness on the part of the collective (which would be the result of selfish attitudes by the individuals of the collective) was often considered less grievous than the same quality
when exhibited by an individual.  

If you make enough good men, Elder Richards asserted in 1939, "society and nations are good." A nation cannot render obedience to the laws and commandments of the Lord, since a "nation has no mass mind, no real soul. It is but a composite of individuals, who alone possess the minds, hearts, and souls and the free agency to obey or transgress the revealed laws of God."  

Thus, while a democracy is the preferred form of internal organization of a state, because it allows individuals to work out their salvation, the fact that men have their free agency to obey or disobey indicates that a democracy may not always be a peaceful state. Whether it is peaceful or not depends on the righteousness of the individuals of the state.  

By clinging to this concept of how a democracy operates, and by extension, how its foreign policy is formulated and executed, Elder Richards was able to maintain for men their individual responsibility for much of the disorder and conflict in the world, basically a first-image view.  

What happens, then, if the individuals of a nation, in large enough numbers, transgress God's commands? What happens if men are disobedient and lose
or forget the concept of their divine and noble heritage?

In much of the world, Elder Richards said in 1952, men had fallen victim to totalitarian states and tyrants, to "carnalistic brutal forces," because they had forgotten their true status as sons of God. Men had become "gun fodder for the lethal cannon of the state." Elder Richards saw a cause and effect in operation. Unless men are righteous, and act as true sons of God, they fall easily prey to dictators and repressive state machinery. If men forget their divine heritage, "bondage ensues." For Elder Richards, however, the reverse of the equation is equally important to remember. If a man is aware of the attributes with which he is invested at birth, he is "not easily made the tool" of a state or dictator. How does such a man resist dictatorial forces? "There is more resurgent strength in one free man," he concluded, "than in a dozen slaves."

Elder Richards expounded on the loss of righteousness theme when he declared on more than one occasion that World War II could have been avoided had the world paid more attention to the prophets. The war in Europe, he said, had begun in Christian nations, or at least in nations with access to the Bible. He felt
these nations should have learned better the lessons of the prophets and adopted principles of international relations to avoid conflict. He lamented, as countless of the Lord's chosen have in the past, that mankind ignored the prophets "because we wanted fun, and light-heartedness, and vanity."44

Elder Richards found the seeds of man's victimization in his own individual unrighteousness, but the victimization was in practice more often visited on succeeding generations, once selfish and ruthless leaders had become entrenched. These leaders often lead men into war, men who may or may not be unrighteous at that time. In the two World Wars of Elder Richards' lifetime, he characterized the people of the so-called aggressor nations as innocent victims of brutal, selfish leaders. This position coincides with the liberal view that men are led into war by selfish leaders who do not pay attention to the true interests of the people, which is peaceful commerce among nations. In non-democratic states, then, such as war-time Germany and Japan, state behavior could no longer be attributed to the aggregate wills of the men and women of the nation, as in a democracy.

In theory, however, even a democratic state could initiate conflict. Though the long-term foreign policy
of a democracy will eventually reflect the preferences of the voters, the leader of a democratic country could lead his or her country into war against the wishes of the people. If that is the case, the leader will eventually be voted out of office, but not before lives and national treasure have been expended. In other words, not in all instances would a discrete action such as going to war reflect the aggregate view of all the men and women in a democratic country.

The genealogy of how states may become warlike remains somewhat murky. In Elder Richards' theory, it appears that somewhere in the past, the population of a currently war-like state, or at least a sufficient number of the population, became unrighteous, thus somehow allowing a dictator to emerge or take power. When these dictators, who because of greed and selfishness become war-like and lead their people into war, it may no longer be the fault of the people, as if somewhere along the way they stopped being unrighteous. Perhaps it was Elder Richards' view that there is a continuum of unrighteousness wherein people may be wicked enough to give up democracy or allow a dictatorship, but still retain enough knowledge to prefer peace rather than war. Unfortunately, they often then find themselves led into war by their unrighteous leaders.
Adequacy of the Second Image

Waltz declared that the first major assumption of the nineteenth-century liberals, the idea that democracies were inherently peaceful, had proved utopian. Though democracy cannot guarantee peace, as was pointed out above (thereby rendering the second image inadequate) it has probably been true through history that democracies are less prone to initiate offensive military actions than other forms of government.

Waltz is right, though, when he asserts that disputes, real or imagined, which could lead to war, will exist as long as separate nation-states exist. The liberals believed democracies would settle these disputes peacefully and rationally, as individuals are able to do within a nation through civil law systems. Waltz remarked, however, that such a belief does not recognize that the largely invisible force which guarantees observance of the law within the modern civil state is not the same as force not being present, which is the case within the anarchic international system. The liberals wanted peace with justice, but failed to notice, according to Waltz, that such requires organization with force, a concept proposed by Wilson. Wilson believed organization was needed to perform the
functions of government.

The liberals also assumed that just as men were perfectible so were states. Perfect states would produce a perfect world. Though Waltz and Richards disagreed on the perfectibility of men, it is unlikely that Elder Richards would have maintained that even if the men in a state were perfect, an automatic harmony between states with different, particular economic interests would also exist. An imperfect equilibrium of interests would still lead to disputes and would require means of settling them. As long as sovereignty exists, resort to force remains a logical, though possibly not attractive possibility. Waltz concludes, therefore, pointing to the third image, that the international environment of sovereign states has much to do with the way states behave. "The influence to be assigned to the internal structure of states in attempting to solve the war-peace equation cannot be determined until the significance of the international environment has been reconsidered." 48

According to Waltz, the expectation that a world of democracies would bring peace is justified only if the "minimum interest of states in preserving themselves become the maximum interest of all of them, and each could rely fully upon . . . the others." 49 This is an
assumption that may be utopian even given states of perfect men.

But if a world of democracies is safer than a world of tyrannies, the question remains—how does one go from A to B. Waltz dismisses optimistic non-interventionism as too dangerous since it could lead to the triumph of evil. A major country becoming pacifistic could, in fact, hasten war. Elder Richards agreed with this view, pointing out during World War II that the days for persuasion were past and force had to be used.

Messianic interventionism, an idea that Waltz ascribes to Wilson, also creates problems. Who can decide who is right in a world where there may be a "symmetry of aspirations." Elder Richards, a Wilsonian Democrat, concurred in the interventionist view as a reason for entering World War I, and alluded to the possibilities of intervention on other occasions. The primary fault with this concept is, as Waltz describes, that it leads to "perpetual war for perpetual peace."
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THE THIRD IMAGE

The Waltz View

With regard to the third image, the structure of the international system, Waltz is more descriptive than critical. The third image that Waltz outlines rests on several fundamental assumptions about how the world operates.

The first is that men are social. They have banded together because the many can protect themselves from danger better than an individual can protect himself.\(^1\) This is also a belief of Elder Richards.\(^2\) The second given is a world of sovereign states in anarchy, with no superior legal force above that of the state.\(^3\)

These lead to a third major assumption. Because states are imperfect, crises will arise. Waltz believes crises will occur among states even if the first- and second-image faults of men and states are eliminated. He asserts that the will of a state, though good for itself, is only a particular will, and may be wrong for other states. Its execution by a state may "provoke violent resistance."\(^4\) In this view, the concept of automatic harmony does not exist, even if states acted perfectly rationally. In other words, Waltz finds the
"sources of conflict are not so much in the minds of men as they are in the nature of social activity."\(^5\)

With no superior police power above that of the state in this system, self-help on the part of states exists, with force as the strongest instrument. Force is used if the goals of the state, either redress of grievances or fulfillment of ambitions, outweigh the desire for peace. The fact that any state may use force at any time forces all states to prepare, or pay the consequences. Conflict is therefore the by-product of states seeking goals. Thus, the requirements of state action are in many cases imposed by the system.\(^6\)

Waltz concludes that under the present system, wars occur because there is nothing to prevent them. First- or second-image reasons may be the immediate causes of war, but the international system is the permissive cause. Peaceful states arm themselves because some states are willing to use force to reach their goals.\(^7\)

As a matter of clarification, Waltz defines states as actors with respect to foreign policy because foreign policy is always carried out in the name of the state. This is so whether a leader has imposed the policy or whether he extends or actualizes the general will of the population.\(^8\)
To eliminate first- or second-image causes in the Waltz framework would bring peace, but according to Waltz, an attempt to eliminate immediate causes without providing an alternative international structure would be utopian. Harmony depends as much on the framework of action as on the action itself. Until the system can determine how in each situation one's welfare is tied to everyone else's, conflicts will arise.

Under the circumstances, Waltz explains that balance of power systems are an almost inevitable outgrowth. If states seek to redistribute power in the system, other states, unwilling to give up their existence, will form coalitions to balance. The bottom line is that there is no security unless states provide it themselves. Freedom of choice is limited by other states. In certain instances, Waltz admits preservation of the state may demand seemingly immoral action. If some states break the peace, he asks, how can other states just quit, if survival remains the imperative. Balance of power groupings are inevitable as long as survival remains a goal in anarchy.

The Richards View

Elder Richards did not directly address many of the issues raised by Waltz in his explication of the
third image. One can derive from his statements, however, glimpses of his understanding of the nature and requirements of the international system.

It is apparent that Elder Richards was aware of the anarchic nature of the international system, or the lack of a controlling international authority, which Waltz termed the permissive cause of war. In 1939, Elder Richards spoke of warfare deriving from "the mad scramble of nations for territory and power." During the 1930s, he condemned capitalistic interests that were protected by "methods which drink the blood of nations and satiate the world in horror and atrocities ... ."12

After World War II, Elder Richards expressed concern that the peace and security of the world was threatened by the "chaotic conditions creeping upon the world through the role of force, fear, and capricious despotism." He believed long-term predictions of safety and stability were impossible. War, with its "attendant cruelties and barbarities," and the possibility of atomic devastation were a constant worry. The foregoing indicates that Elder Richards was acutely aware that, as Waltz puts it, war and crises may occur because there is nothing to prevent them and because there are some states willing to use force to achieve their goals.
As a partial remedy for the world's condition, Elder Richards recognized, as did President Wilson, the necessity for some international organization to perform the "inescapable police functions" growing out of the complexity of contacts and relations among sovereign nation-states.

Elder Richards had favored the League of Nations and was disappointed in its failure. He was also disappointed that the hopes raised by the post-WWI disarmament conferences, particularly the 1921-1922 Naval Conference in Washington, which he attended, had not been met. Just as anarchy in the system permits war, Elder Richards believed the presence of weapons increased the possibility that they would be used. Nevertheless, he agreed with Waltz that the nature of the system required armed preparedness.

During and shortly after World War II, Elder Richards was concerned that the same parochial, nationalistic interests which had torpedoed the League and had led to the Versailles debacle would be repeated. He felt that the merits of the proposed post-war economic and political organizations then being discussed were somewhat exaggerated, but he nevertheless expressed the view that the "expected arrangements to forestall another general uprising" (he agreed that unconditional
surrender of the enemy was necessary) would be unsuccessful if based on force, balance of power, hatred, or vengeance. \(^{21}\) Something different from post-WWI arrangements was required.

"Love is the keystone in the arch of its structure, righteousness and justice are its foundations." \(^{22}\) As mentioned previously, Elder Richards suggested that any post World War II organization would need the Spirit of the Gospel, and would have to be "conditioned on subscription and adherence to the laws of righteousness, equity, and justice emanating from the divine ruler of the world." \(^{23}\) Though his expectations were unrealistic given the disparate views of the United Nations' membership, Elder Richards was disappointed with the secular orientation of the United Nations, remarking that a non-religious approach to world events was a hazard to peace. \(^{24}\) Though Elder Richards admitted that such ideas were considered impractical by critics, he said they had worked when they had been tried, \(^{25}\) presumably referring to such episodes as the City of Enoch and various periods in Book of Mormon history.

On the heretofore inevitable solution to the anarchy in the international system--balance of power arrangements--Elder Richards declared that no method had proven satisfactory and that balance of power systems
based on careful calculations of military and economic strength, rather than altruism, had surely "brought nothing but frustration and ruin."26

Elder Richards spoke only in general terms on the issue of conflicting interests between states. He said states should adopt rules of conduct to avoid war.27 Though he did not spell out these rules, the entire tenor of his work suggests a reliance on the rules of action provided by the Gospel. He did not go into the problem area of state morality versus individual morality, except when he criticized the fact that selfishness and hatred on the part of the collective were often more lightly regarded (and more acceptable) than the same qualities expressed in one individual.28

He did, however, reduce the East-West conflict to one of Christ versus the anti-Christ29 and called on the United States to live up to its ideals so the competition between ideologies could be won.

Adequacy of the Third Image

Waltz does not really dispute the logic of the third image, only its incompleteness, in explaining war. The international system as currently structured provides only the framework, or the permissive cause, of war. The immediate causes are derived from motives or
causes located in the spectra of the first and second images.

Waltz reminds that given a different framework, the immediate causes we know today may not result in war. On the other hand, even if specific immediate causes were eliminated, if the framework remained the same, war could still occur. There is nothing inherent in the framework of sovereign states in anarchy that prevents war from occurring. The constant possibility remains that conflict will be adjusted by force. In this regard, Waltz operates on the assumption, and history does not differ, that given the nature of the framework, competing state interests among imperfect states will result in conflict. The third image explains why, in the absence of changes in the first and second images, "war will be perpetually associated with existence of separate sovereign states." 30

Waltz points out that it is easy to misunderstand what happens on the world scene because we extrapolate from our own domestic experience. But that experience, he explains, takes place in a different environment of action. The state holds a monopoly on legal force and in most instances is able to control domestic events. Often, Waltz claims, this leads to explanations of international events in terms of human or state agency,
when in fact, it was the imperative of survival in an anarchic system that was the cause.\textsuperscript{31}

According to Waltz, then, no single image is adequate to explain events. An emphasis on one image will lead to particular, often distorted interpretations of the other two images,\textsuperscript{32} and at the same time will set up a logical tension to include the others.\textsuperscript{33} The third image, too, may be carried to utopian prescriptions, just as the first and second images may be. Logically, says Waltz, if anarchy among states is the illness, then as it was when man moved from a state of nature to civil society, government is the cure.\textsuperscript{34}

At present, however, Waltz finds world government to be an impractical and unobtainable prescription, though not an illogical one.\textsuperscript{35} Nevertheless, he points out that even under world government, violent conflict under another name, civil war, could occur.\textsuperscript{36}

While a third-image explanation may have the drawback of including only partial first- and second-image analyses, Waltz describes it as a "final" explanation, not dependent on accidental causes such as irrational men or defects in states. Motivation and circumstances explain individual acts, but the framework determines finally whether a state will go or not go, to war.\textsuperscript{37}
Waltz' view that war depends on the actors' interpretation of events within the international system leads to the view that under certain circumstances, seemingly immoral actions taken to preserve the state may be necessary. This, he says, negates the liberal assumption that men and states are progressing inevitably toward the millennium.\textsuperscript{38} In this context he could place, for instance, a pre-emptive attack, an immediate cause of war motivated by the permissive cause. But Waltz reminds that to eliminate the cause of war in one part of the organism may endanger that same part, as when Hitler took advantage of Europe's desire for peace.\textsuperscript{39} According to Waltz, the third image is a realistic approach that avoids attributing the immorality of world politics to inherently bad individual character. Everyone's strategy depends on everyone else's. Foreign policy becomes not moral or immoral, just a reasoned response to the world.\textsuperscript{40}

As Elder Richards had little specific to say about the points raised by Waltz, we are left to speculate on his views. He undoubtedly would have recognized the logic in defining the international framework as the permissive cause of war. It is questionable, however, whether he would have used the structure of the international system as an all-cover
excuse for "immoral" actions by policy makers.

Waltz justifies so-called "immoral" actions by states as reasoned responses to the actions of other states that may be threatening the former's survival. Particularly in World War II, Elder Richards accepted the fact that Americans had to be trained in the arts of war to ensure the survival of democracy. Following World War II, however, the superpowers have pursued activist foreign policies. At times, these policies have led many to accuse the superpowers of "immoral actions," generally because they have on occasion resorted to force, overtly or covertly, without their survival being threatened.

In these instances, the logic of asserting that foreign policy is based solely on the imperatives of survival in an anarchic international system and is always, therefore, justifiable, reasoned policy, breaks down. Both Waltz and Elder Richards would likely accept this view.

One requirement of the international system, in the absence of world government, is that for most states, some sort of balance of power is necessary for survival. It has often been easy for Americans, including Elder Richards, to dismiss the balance of power as not being applicable to the United States. Given the
durability of the system of sovereign states, and the inexorable logic of balancing for survival, however, Elder Richards' condemnation of balance of power systems is premature.

Elder Richards also fell into the logic trap explicated by Waltz when he said states should adopt rules to prevent war. A fool-proof agreement on such rules already presupposes a consensus among states that would have eliminated the outbreak of war in any case.

Finally, on the concept of world government, Elder Richards probably would have accepted Waltz' logic that only world government would be able to eliminate today's permissive cause of war. Undoubtedly, he could have added a vision of world government of his own, based on LDS millenial doctrines. Until such time, however, as the conditions for the fulfillment of those doctrines were in place, Elder Richards probably would not have wanted to reduce American sovereignty in any substantial way for the sake of world government administered by imperfect mortals.
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CAN THE FINAL PROPOSITION BE IMPLEMENTED?

The Waltz View

Before moving to an analysis of the proposals for peace presented by Elder Richards, it is useful for the sake of comparison to briefly summarize Waltz' conclusions on the prospects for peace. These conclusions are related in the main to Waltz' analysis of the adequacies of each image.

The first imagists claim that if everyone were perfect, there would be no war. They are correct, Waltz concludes, when they argue that changing the individual would bring peace.¹ Nevertheless, he finds this argument invalid because he posits the impossibility of perfection.² He believes that man, the subject of first-image analysis, is the least manipulable of the three levels of analysis.³

Waltz dismisses the propositions for peace offered by the first-image optimists as impractical, given modern political realities. These propositions revolve for the most part around various kinds of universal education.⁴ The naivete of the first-image optimists regarding the forces operating in international politics, he asserts, weakens their efforts to
overcome conflicts and disputes and to make a new world through some sort of education.\(^5\)

When it comes to the second image, Waltz implies that democracies are a more inherently peaceful form of state than other types; but he is not convinced that a world of democracies would always be peaceful.\(^6\) He seems to believe that the chances for peace are better, however, in a world of democratic states.

The problem then becomes how to change non-peaceful state systems to peaceful democratic ones. Waltz describes two modes of thinking on this issue--optimistic non-interventionism and messianic interventionism.\(^7\) The first he dismisses by asking whether the good states can wait while the evil states take advantage through aggression.\(^8\)

The problem with the second mode is timing--how much change is required to bring peace and how fast must these changes occur.\(^9\) There is also the question of which states to trust while the changes are being carried out and the question of who must be taught--leaders or masses.\(^10\) Waltz also points out that a solution, if rational when adopted by all, may be worse when adopted by a few.\(^11\) This is a strategic problem faced by both interventionists and non-interventionists.

Changes within several states or even in a single
society may take generations. The timing of the changes in the context of international power realities is crucial. Changes, Waltz explains, if possible at all, "come slowly and with insufficient force."12 And if the changes are produced, he asks, are the problems solved? "A partial 'solution,' such as one major country becoming pacifistic, might be a real contribution to world peace; but it might as easily hasten the coming of another major war."13 How, he asks, can some states improve in safety while others follow aggressive policies? On the other hand, how can all improve at the same time, with all trusting all? Waltz notes that while it is true that the greater the force applied to a situation, the more rapid the change,14 he also points out that a policy of applying force could lead to "perpetual war for perpetual peace."15 Finally, there is the question of who to change--leaders or masses. If leaders are the target, what advice must be given them and what will convince them to follow the advice?16

For necessary changes to be accepted and implemented, it would require beforehand the willingness and cooperation of the nations. To build up a desire for change requires some sort of identification and loyalty to a concept of allegiance for all.17 When states have reached that point, however, the problems causing war
will already have been overcome.\(^\text{19}\) Waltz concludes that for the moment, the forces among nations are too strong to be controlled by a "vague allegiance to all men everywhere."\(^\text{19}\) Waltz ascribes to the proponents of solutions within the interventionist spectrum a form of political utopianism. He believes that in many cases, both first and second imagists fall prey to the rational fallacy—in which they equate knowing with doing, knowledge with control. Knowing the solution is one thing, says Waltz, implementing it is another.\(^\text{20}\)

For this reason, Waltz also finds what seems to be his preferred solution, world government, impractical for the time being.\(^\text{21}\) Waltz finds world government necessary even if the world were filled with good states. In such a world, peace without world government would be possible only if the "minimum interest of states in preserving themselves became the maximum interest of all of them, and each could rely fully upon the . . . others."\(^\text{22}\)

Waltz dismisses first-image solutions as impossible. On second- and third-image solutions, he concludes that any proposed remedy will cure or harm depending on the timing of the acts of all states. The "near perfection" required either of states or the international system to bring about a durable peace
leads to pessimism, given current international realities. Efforts to eliminate one cause while neglecting causes of war deriving from other images may even make matters worse.

**The Richards View**

Elder Richards' plan for peace requires men to follow the precepts of Christ, in order to master their appetites and passions. It is the "Gospel factor" which makes men's nature a manipulable variable in reducing the recurrence of conflict. Therefore, Elder Richards' proposition for peace and the practicality thereof can be examined in a first-image context.

Elder Richards asserted that the Lord in His infinite wisdom, knowing that man would be subject to temptation and passion, made it possible for the spirit to have dominion over the body. "The spirit," he said, "is the loving part of man and longs for peace and goodwill." The Spirit of God strives with the spirit of man for his uplift and advancement. These are concepts notably absent from the analysis of theorists who dismiss the perfectibility of man as an utopian ideal. If it is not the case, Elder Richards concluded, that man can conquer the weaknesses inherent in mortality, it would be futile to search for any plan to govern human
relationships, an eventuality he was not prepared to concede. 27

Elder Richards realized there were many in the world not yet ready to receive the Gospel message, but he recognized the responsibility of the Church to propagate it. 28 Though not certain how the Church's influence could penetrate nations and national leaders, he expressed faith that if God willed it, the task could be accomplished. 29 If all the Church were living the commandments, he claimed, the Lord would greatly magnify the personal influence of individuals for the world's benefit. 30 He remarked in 1943 that technology had made it possible for a small number to reach a large audience. 31 This would make it possible for the spread of Church influence to be effected through the spiritual power and gifts of the Priesthood. In essence, men would become partners with God through the Priesthood, ministering to the needs of humanity. The influence and fraternity of the Priesthood diffused throughout the world would bring peace. 32

Though the Church was small in numbers, Elder Richards also felt the influence of the Church could be exercised forcefully in the economic sphere by extolling self-reliance, industriousness, and community cooperation—in short, the "gospel of work." 33
Elder Richards consistently sought to impress upon his hearers that peace was attainable only if men practiced the uncomplicated formulas taught by the Savior. Unfortunately, mankind has proven stubbornly resistant to such appeals, a fact Elder Richards recognized and lamented.

During most of his ministry, Elder Richards was ambivalent about the prospects for peace, as the following statements will show. He was aware that knowledge of the divine plan for peace was not the same as establishing peace in the world. How the diffusion of Gospel principles in the earth would ultimately be accomplished he was not quite certain. Whether, in fact, peace was attainable prior to the millenium, he could not be sure. He finally concluded that perhaps the only peace obtainable was the peace that surpasseth all understanding promised by the Savior, not the peace defined as the absence of conflict.

It must be said, however, that Elder Richards' doubts were doubts of scale. He wondered whether enough hearts could be changed to bring peace, not whether hearts could be changed at all through the Gospel.

In an undated speech from the late 1920s or early 1930s, Elder Richards had expressed optimism that humans were becoming more peaceful and hatreds less intense.34
By 1936, however, he found he had to agree with the statement of Dr. Henry Link (made at the Harvard Tercentenary celebrations) that nations were more inclined to strife and further apart from international peace than ever before. Elder Richards repeated this statement several times throughout the ensuing years. 

Shortly after the United States entered World War II, Elder Richards said there was still time to turn from erroneous ways into peaceful paths. But it seems he became discouraged by the long nightmare of war. In October 1944, he implied in a General Conference address that peace may not be the be-all and end-all of man's hopes, but rather the prospects of a glorious resurrection.

The end of the war brought some renewed hopes for long-lasting peace. In February 1946, Elder Richards commented on the spectre of man's inhumanity to man hanging over the earth. Except for this factor, Elder Richards said, man might be brought into the "relative sunshine of peace, prosperity, and freedom." With the advent of the Cold War, however, and numerous brushfire conflicts around the world, Elder Richards again felt that prospects for a lasting peace had diminished.

In 1954, he said the great Christian doctrines of mutual consideration and love of neighbor were so
missing in the actions of men and among nations that "we have mostly forgotten that it ever existed and despair that it may ever be. Only the Lord knows what the future holds in store. We as a people are resigned to the acceptance of his will and purposes." The next year, Elder Richards seemed to have recovered some optimism, declaring that the Kingdom was growing in influence and becoming an important factor in the peace process by its teaching of the conduct necessary to set up peaceful nations.

Elder Richards' last major statement on peace was a gloomy one, however. Not only had man's prayers seemed to him to have been in vain, but he speculated that peace may not even be a part of God's plan.

No one who intelligently appraises the conditions in this destructive world can feel very much assured that all of the difficulties will be composed by the intelligence of men. Indeed, as the days go by, we become more and more disturbed by new developments, by failure to reach agreements and conciliation as to the future peace of the world.

The only comfort he could offer was the Savior's promise of the peace that comes with knowing that family associations are eternal.
Endnotes


2Ibid., p. 41.

3Ibid., p. 33.

4Ibid., p. 43.

5Ibid., p. 39.

6Ibid., p. 122.

7Ibid., p. 103.

8Ibid., p. 108.

9Ibid., pp. 55-56.

10Ibid., p. 61.

11Ibid., p. 54.

12Ibid., p. 229.

13Ibid., p. 231.

14Ibid., p. 58.

15Ibid., p. 113.

16Ibid., p. 65.

17Ibid., p. 69.

18Ibid., pp. 65-66.


20Ibid., p. 59.
21Ibid., p. 238.
22Ibid., p. 227.
23Ibid., p. 229.
27SLR, Relief Society Magazine 27 (December 1940): 811.
29SLR, Conference Report of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (hereafter cited as Conference Report) (Salt Lake City: Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, April 5, 1943), p. 79.
30Ibid.
31Ibid.
34SLR, "Around Christmas Fires," Manuscript (Typewritten), Stephen L Richards Papers, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah (hereafter cited as SLR Papers), p. 2.


38 SLR, "The Humanities, Character, Education," Address delivered at BYU Leadership Week, Feb. 2, 1946, Manuscript (Typewritten), SLR Papers, pp. 3-4.

39 SLR, Christmas Message to North 20th Ward, December 20, 1953, Manuscript (Typewritten), SLR Papers, p. 6.


41 SLR, Address to MIA June Conference, June 12, 1955, Manuscript (Typewritten), SLR Papers, p. 11.

42 SLR, Message to Park Stake Conference, December 8, 1957, Manuscript (Typewritten), SLR Papers, p. 1.
HOW ATTEMPTS TO FILL THE PRESCRIPTION FOR PEACE WILL AFFECT OTHER GOALS

The final question asked by Waltz is how attempts to fill the prescription for peace (in this study, the spread of the Gospel) will affect other goals, since, as Waltz asserts, peace is not the only goal of even the most peacefully inclined of men or states.¹ Many of the goals described below by Waltz and Elder Richards have already been discussed in other contexts.

**Waltz - Other Goals**

Waltz describes the logical progression of goals between the first and second images. He believes that if all men were changed for the better, the primary goal of the first imagists, war and conflict would be reduced. But believing as he does that a permanent change in human nature is impossible, he asserts that consideration of the form and content of man's social and political institutions is necessary. What is needed are institutions which either improve human nature (to the extent possible) or repress evil.² This a second-image goal.

In his chapters on the internal structure of
states, Waltz describes the various views of those who have had a goal or vision of what was required to construct the "good" state. For Marx it was the ownership of the means of production, for Kant, voluntary cooperation, for Wilson, self-determination and democracy. The nineteenth-century liberals believed democracy was pre-eminently the peaceful state and for some, this led to the view that democracies could be agents of change, able to bring about the goals of freedom and justice.\textsuperscript{3}

In his section on the third image, Waltz asserts that force will be used if a state's goals outweigh its desires for peace.\textsuperscript{4} He does not spell out specific goals but concludes that conflict is inherent in the nature of social activity, given the economic laws of scarcity.\textsuperscript{5} In disputes where the goal is domination rather than simple gain, he says a solution without force is impossible to assure.\textsuperscript{6} While the goals of each country will be of particular, rather than general validity,\textsuperscript{7} this very fact leads to the universal goal of security. When survival does not exhaust a state's ambitions, Waltz claims other states look to their defenses.\textsuperscript{8}

Under this system, Waltz has no universal answer as to how peaceful or belligerent a state must be to
live in peace. He only knows that all effects must be considered (all other goals, "ours" and "theirs"). The peace strategies of one state depend on the peace strategies of other states. Given this picture of the international system, Waltz finds that peace is the primary goal of few men or states because if it were, it could always be obtained through surrender or capitulation.

Richards - Other Goals

Elder Richards was always extremely clear about what he considered the most important political goal—the preservation of free agency, man's "incomparable status in the universe." He called liberty the most priceless thing on earth. The thrust of his philosophy was that no institution or society should be allowed to reduce or restrain the individual's capacity to develop and progress toward salvation. For Elder Richards, as was noted before, the good state is one in which sufficient liberty is available to work out one's salvation.

During the World Wars, Elder Richards considered the goal of preserving freedom more critical than keeping the peace. He saw World War I as a contest between the principles of Christianity and the "unholy ambitions
and machinations of men." Elder Richards defended American participation in World War II for similar reasons. He believed the war to be a conflict between good and evil, with the Allies on the side of righteousness, preserving liberty and sacred values. The Axis represented the forces of darkness. These circumstances obliged the Allies to use force "to crush the enemies of our dearly-bought liberty, homes, and way of life."

During the interwar period, Elder Richards spoke of other goals. He noted the threats to "wealth, property, and acquired possessions," unless men turned to God. On the other hand, while believing that capital should be protected, he believed it should be accomplished without shedding blood. Much warfare, he said, was due to economic factors. Elder Richards implies here that some or most economic interests, unless vital to the nation's security, are goals that should not outweigh the importance of peace.

Elder Richards also believed that liberty must be protected from Communist and anarchist subversion. Elder Richards described the conflict between West and
East as Christ versus the Anti-Christ.  

Finally, Elder Richards touched on the goals of development after completing a visit to South America. He said there would be far less instability and opportunity for insurrection in that region if the virtues of democracy and the American way of life were inculcated.  

There would be "no greater blessing," he continued, for the world's inhabitants "than to have such great, beneficent rules of government extended to them as the people of the United States of America now enjoy." This goal was not one to be achieved by force or intimidation. Respect for the United States, Elder Richards said, must grow not "out of fear of our great military prowess" or of envy of our economy and standard of living, but from our integrity and character.  

Waltz--Peace Prescriptions' Effect on Other Goals

As noted previously, Waltz claimed that one of the problems associated with peace prescriptions of the first and second imagists was that their solutions, though useful if adopted by all, may be worse when adopted by few. He implies that nations which adopt a peaceful course can become the victims of nations whose goals are not so peacefully oriented. In these cases, a nation's attempts to fulfill a prescription for peace
may be more affected by the possibly non-peaceful goals of other nations than by its own peaceful goals.

Based on this factor, Waltz found three areas of difficulty that have to be considered by those contemplating the implementation of a peace plan. They are: the time required for all societies to change, the proper timing or sequence of the necessary changes, and the solution of how to change one society. This is why Waltz asserts that the "near perfection" required by a single cause (for example, widespread acceptance of the Gospel) can lead to pessimism because the changes, if they come at all, "come slowly and with insufficient force."

This led to Waltz' conclusion that world government was the only conceivable way to bring off the necessary changes. His logic was that the greater the force applied, the more rapid the change. Waltz described peace as "made up of a compound of contradictory feelings and motives." What would bring peace would be loyalty to a larger unit than one's own nation-state. World government becomes the psychology of the foundation for peace. The concrete authority of government is needed not just to build identification, but to speed things up. For Waltz, then, any prescription for peace requires a prescription for a
certain type of political organization and that leads to another goal--world government.

Waltz favors world government over a collection of numerous "good", i.e., democratic states, because competing national interests among these states cannot guarantee that, in the absence of a superior authority, force will not be used. Waltz noted Wilson's views in this regard--peace with justice requires organization with force.33

The Effect of Elder Richards' Peace Prescription on Other Goals

As seen from Elder Richards' prior observations, he held first-image views. He believed the world would become peaceful through the perfection of man. He did not examine the problems of timing or the modalities of this procedure in a political perspective. He left all up to the Lord. However, from the way Elder Richards tied the free agency principles of the Gospel to the democratic principles of government, it is clear he believed that when an individual accepts the Gospel he or she will attain not only a peaceful but a democratic outlook. Elder Richards' prescription for peace is, therefore, also a prescription for democracy and liberty. His comments indicate though, that under
almost any circumstances, if one or the other has to be sacrificed, it should be peace rather than liberty.

While Elder Richards' ultimate goal—a Kingdom of God transcending national boundaries and knitting societies together in the service and worship of God—seems congruent with the Waltz goal of world government leading to peace, it is the getting from the here and now to the there and then where the analysis is missing from Elder Richards' propositions—though it must be said that Waltz has no solution either for the bringing about of world government, given the durability of the sovereign state system.

The idea that conflict is based on the nature of the international system leads to the conclusion that widespread acceptance of the Gospel by individuals in one or many countries would not immediately usher in an era of peace, even if all of those countries which accepted the Gospel were or became democratic. It only takes one powerful "outsider" to shatter the goal of peace.

Apart from the goal of peace, even if a nation or several nations were living in Christian harmony, competing national interests in a world of economic scarcity could not guarantee for those Christian nations that their material and developmental needs would be
fulfilled. One could argue with this assertion, however, by pointing to the scriptural promises that material blessings follow obedience to Gospel principles.

Elder Richards' prescription for peace depends to a large extent on the political environment in which the Gospel is spread. This political environment, even if consisting of many liberty-loving democracies, can affect other goals that men may have, and these other goals are not always outweighed by desires for peace.

While Elder Richards was firm on the prescription for peace, and the kind of world it would be if that prescription were entirely fulfilled, he did not offer a plan for overcoming the obstacles to peace inherent in the current international political environment. He did not publicly consider how the goal of peace and those goals which now override it would be finally reconciled. The answers to those problems he left up to the Lord. Elder Richards was an Apostle, not a political theorist. He considered it sufficient to his duty and calling to offer a true prescription for peace and a strong witness for the Divine agency that would bring it about.
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BIOGRAPHIC SKETCH

Stephen L Richards was born June 18, 1879 at Mendon, Cache County, Utah, the son of Dr. Stephen Longstroth Richards and Emma Louise Stayner. He was a grandson of LDS leader Willard Richards and Arthur Stayner, a noted chemist.

Elder Richards' early schooling was in Farmington, Utah, where he attended St. Mary's Academy, Farmington Public Schools, and Davis Stake Academy. His family moved to the Sugarhouse section of Salt Lake City in 1889. He studied at Salt Lake City public schools and at LDS University. His first Church callings were in the Sugarhouse Ward. He taught MIA and Sunday School and served as Sunday School secretary, the beginning of a long association with the Deseret Sunday School Union (DSSU). Elder Richards was baptized and confirmed in March 1893 at the age of thirteen, and that same year attended the dedication services of the Salt Lake Temple.

From 1895 to 1898, Elder Richards attended the University of Utah where he was a member of the debate team and the track team. It was at the University of Utah that he met and became a close friend of David O. McKay, who would later call Elder Richards into the
First Presidency of the Church. After graduating, Elder Richards engaged in farming, teaching, and business in the Salt Lake area until March 1900 when he moved to a Malad, Idaho farm and lived, in the beginning, in a one room log cabin. With him was his bride, Irene Merrill of Fillmore, Utah, the daughter of Clarence Merrill and Bathsheba Smith, the second President of the Relief Society, and granddaughter of LDS Apostle George A. Smith. Elder and Sister Richards were married February 21, 1900. Sister Richards had been, like her husband, a student at the University of Utah, and in addition, a member of the Mormon Tabernacle Choir. With the choir she sang at the 1893 Chicago World's Fair.

When Elder Richards settled in Malad, he earned his living by farming, until he delivered a speech honoring the assassinated President McKinley, after which he was asked to be Principal of the Malad public schools. He accepted, and held that position until 1902 when he entered the University of Michigan Law School.

Elder Richards stayed two years at Michigan, then transferred to the University of Chicago. He graduated 2nd and cum laude in the first Chicago Law School graduating class in June 1904. Law School Dean James Parker Hall later told BYU President Ernest L. Wilkinson that Stephen L Richards had been the most capable student he
had known during his twenty-five year tenure at Chicago.¹

Elder Richards returned to Salt Lake City after graduating and was admitted to the Utah bar later in 1904. He practiced law in Salt Lake City and County thereafter until 1917. He was an officer of both the Utah Bar Association and the Utah Chapter of the American Bar Association. He taught courses in equity and jurisprudence at the University of Utah Law School. (He was offered a professorship to teach law at the University of Missouri, but declined.)

These were Elder Richards' most active years politically, as well as being a period of growing responsibility in the Church. In 1905, he was elected City Attorney of Murray, Utah. He ran unsuccessfully as a Democratic candidate for the state legislature, the state senate, and Salt Lake City Attorney. In 1916, he ran for the Democratic nomination for governor, losing to George Bamberger on the fourth ballot at the state Democratic convention.

It was in the Sunday Schools of the Church that Elder Richards was first called to significant leadership roles. After serving on the Salt Lake and Granite Stake Sunday School Boards, he was called to the General Board of the DSSU in 1906. In April 1909, upon the death of George Reynolds, Elder Richards became the 2nd Assistant General Superintendent of the DSSU, join-
ing his close friend, David O. McKay, and Elder Joseph Fielding Smith in the Superintendency. Earlier, in 1908, he had become a member of the Church Correlation Committee, with particular oversight of the Aaronic Priesthood. He served on the Correlation Committee until 1922, during which time the Auxiliaries and the Social Advisory Committee were brought under the Correlation Committee umbrella. He was chairman of the Correlation Committee for two years, from 1920 to 1922.

On January 17, 1917, following the death of Elder Francis Lyman, Stephen L Richards was called to the Quorum of the Twelve. He was thirty-seven years old. When he was sustained the following April at General Conference, there were less than 75 stakes of Zion, with under 500,000 members of the Church.

Elder Richards continued his Sunday School work, becoming First Assistant General Superintendent in November 1918, a position he held until October 1932. He also began a long association with Church education in 1919, when he was called as First Assistant Church Commissioner of Education, in April, and appointed a member of the General Church Board of Education in July. From this position, he was able to make important contributions to the growth and development of the Seminaries and Institutes program of the Church. As a
member of the Twelve, Elder Richards would also become involved in the management and supervision of several Church-owned business entities. Among these were Beneficial Life, Zions Security Corp., ZCMI, U & I Sugar, and several others.

Among Elder Richards' non-Church related activities was his presidency in 1922-1923 of the Beet Sugar Finance Corporation, which under the aegis of the United States Government's War Finance Corporation lent millions of dollars to Western sugar companies in an effort to save the beet sugar industry in the West. During the 1920s, Elder Richards also served as President of the Central Bank of Bingham, Utah and the Hyland Motor Company, and was a member of the Utah State Board of Corrections.

Elder Richards traveled widely after his call to the Twelve, attending temple dedications in Hawaii (1919), Alberta, Canada (1923) and Mesa, Arizona (1927). He toured and reorganized the Southern States Mission in November and December of 1928. During that trip, he and Elder Charles Callis went to Cuba to investigate prospects for missionary work. Other Church assignments included service on the General Priesthood Committee, the Priesthood Study Committee, and the Board of Control of the Deseret Gym. In 1925, he was involved in the
founding of the Salt Lake City Mission Home.

During the Depression years, Elder Richards lent his managerial skills to economic recovery efforts. In 1934, he was appointed to the Governor's Advisory Committee on Emergency Aid and as Utah State Chairman of the Federal Works Administration, a forerunner of the Works Progress Administration (WPA) which was established November 9, 1933 to provide public works jobs for the unemployed. Elder Richards was responsible for the administration of the program in Utah. He also served on the Governor's Water Commission during the 1930s.

Significant Church-related activities of the period included his chairmanship of the Church Radio, Publicity, and Mission Literature Committee, through whose auspices the Church presented its beliefs and image to the world. A young Gordon B. Hinckley worked with Elder Richards on this committee.

Elder Richards' influence on Church education was also felt. According to the late Ernest L. Wilkinson, Elder Richards was largely responsible for the decision of the General Authorities that the First Presidency and Council of the Twelve became members of BYU's Board of Trustees. Prior to this decision, the Board had been composed of residents of Utah County. That decision, Brother Wilkinson wrote to Elder Richards, was "the most
important step forward ever taken in making the Brigham Young University the university of the Church." Elder Richards became a member of the Executive Committee of the Board in 1939, serving in that capacity until April 1951, when he was appointed First Vice President of the Board. From 1939 to 1941, he also gave service to his alma mater, the University of Utah, as a member of the Board of Regents.

One of Elder Richards most enduring achievements came during the war years, when out of necessity, many normal activities of the Church were reduced or suspended. From December 27, 1942 to June 13, 1943, Elder Richards delivered a series of 24 radio addresses which were compiled and published in book form under the title *The Church in War and Peace.* Another milestone came when Elder Richards was on a tour of the Eastern States Mission in the summer of 1942. He was granted the opportunity of offering the invocation before a session of the United States Senate on June 29, 1942, the first Mormon leader so honored.

With the ending of the war, the Church's overseas missionary program picked up steam. As a member of the Quorum of the Twelve, one of Elder Richards' assignments was to visit the missions of the Church. From the overseas visits that he made, he was able to observe
international conditions and formulate opinions with respect to both political and ecclesiastical circumstances. In 1948, he toured the missions of South America, Argentina, Brazil and Uruguay. This was the first visit of a General Authority to South America since the Argentine and Brazilian missions had been organized in 1925. In 1950, he toured the Western European missions and visited Palestine and the Soviet zone of Germany. His assignment was to observe the conditions in which the 1400 LDS missionaries were laboring in post-war Europe. Part of his task was to gather the information necessary to draw up contingency plans in the event of an emergency.

On April 8, 1951, Elder Richards was sustained and set apart as First Counselor in the First Presidency of the Church, upon the death of President George Albert Smith. As part of his new calling, along with the aforementioned First Vice Presidency of the BYU Board of Trustees, he was also appointed to administer the Church Missionary Committee, a job he was well-suited for after working closely with the missionary program for 35 years. It was during this period of the early 1950s, in connection with the Korean hostilities, that Elder Richards conducted delicate and successful negotiations with General Lewis Hershey of the Selective Service so
that both the missionary needs of the Church and the manpower needs of the military could be met.

Of this effort, Elder Gordon B. Hinckley said the issue caused bitterness and false accusations

... against the Church by those who were not acquainted with the facts. The natural disposition was to argue back. But he [Stephen L Richards] said no, we shall gain more by composing the difficulty. And compose it he did, with patience and skill that came of his great personality and the inspiration of the Lord manifest through him.4

President Richards continued his travels in the 1950s discussing missionary matters with State Department officials in Washington in 1952 and going to Europe in 1954 and 1955 for the laying of the cornerstone and the dedication of the Swiss Temple. Other highlights during the 1950s were his receipt of an honorary doctor of laws degree from BYU in June 1953 and the publication of his second book, Where is Wisdom,5 a compilation of discourses, in 1955.

President Richards passed away May 19, 1959, at the age of 79 years, 11 months. On his passing, the remaining members of the First Presidency, David O. McKay and J. Reuben Clark, Jr. stated that President Richards'

... great love and devotion to his country and its free institutions made of him a great patriotic citizen. His influence for the preservation of the Constitution and the government formed
under it placed him among the foremost citizens of his generation.

Six and a half years later, on November 5, 1965, the Stephen L Richards Building was dedicated to his honor at Brigham Young University.
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ABSTRACT

In Man, the State and War, Kenneth N. Waltz claims that for a peace prescription to be valid, it must be based on a proper view of the causes of war. Waltz analyzes the validity of three basic causes of war: man himself, the characteristics of the nation-state, and the international system.

I have examined the views of Elder Stephen L Richards on peace and war in the context of the Waltz framework. Elder Richards believed that the failings of men were the primary causes of war. His prescription for peace was widespread acceptance of the Gospel. He disagreed with the Waltz view that men are unchanging and that peace plans based on the reform of men are futile. Elder Richards' views coincided with Waltz' that democracies are more likely to be peaceful than dictatorships. He recognized, too, that aspects of the international system contribute to conflict. Elder Richards was ambivalent, however, about the prospects of the Gospel being accepted by enough people for peace to be established.
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