Modern America has a congenital temptation: the desire to see peace and security as free goods that inhere magically in nature. We do not like to think about unpleasant realities that can intrude, as Solzhenitsyn says, on our cocktail hour or our golf time. We trust that everything is and will always be well in the peace department. Yet the peace and security that make all our other worthy endeavors possible are not free. They are the harvest of continual effort and investment—financial, intellectual, and political.

But when the necessary investments falter, as they have in this decade, any peace we enjoy is the result of the investments and savings made by earlier generations. The prospect that such peace can be preserved diminishes as real and potential adversaries perceive the growing weakness in our defense preparedness in all its dimensions—military, psychological, moral, and intellectual.

One of the fruits that we hope will result from the Institute’s educational program is the increased chance that America will be able to achieve and sustain a secure and just peace. To this end, among others, the Institute’s curriculum is designed to produce graduates who will be truly effective in detecting, preventing, deterring, managing, mitigating, and resolving international conflicts. But there are superior and inferior ways of addressing these issues. The problem is that too much of our foreign policy community is accustomed to the inferior ways. This derives, in large part, from the failure to understand the nature of peace.

Many believe that there is a natural harmony of interests in the world and that all conflicts can be solved by increased dialogue and mutual understanding. Others believe that conflicts can be eliminated through a persistent “diplomatic process” of negotiations and agreements. Some see peace as a psychological issue involving greater tolerance and benevolent attitudes. And others find the source of peace in international law, regulation, and even world government.

Whatever grains of truth they may have, the problem with many of these ideas is that they rest on utopian assumptions about human nature and fail to see both human nature and the behavior of states realistically. Peace, properly conceived, is the “tranquility of order”—a morally constituted political order that takes into account both the sinful nature of man as well as his highest moral potential: his capacity for truth, justice, and that love which transcends the requirements of justice.

Only when our foreign policy community as a whole makes the cultural transition to seeing human nature and world affairs realistically will we enjoy more consistent success in our ability to pursue this elusive ideal.