

But now we are told that this is all wrong, for war is the normal and peace the abnormal condition of existence. The struggle for existence is the basis of all healthy development and the law of the strong holds good everywhere. The aspiration for peace is directly antagonistic to the universal laws of life, and all efforts directed to the abolition of war are not only foolish, but absolutely immoral and unworthy of the human race. The desire for peace has rendered civilized nations anaemic, and war alone can secure to the true elements of progress the ascendancy over the spirits of corruption and decay.

"Might (concludes Bernhardt) is at once the supreme right, and the dispute as to what is right is decided by the arbitrament of war. War gives a biologically just decision, since its decisions rest on the very nature of things."

This invitation to return to nature in order to ascertain the rules of conduct between individuals or nations is not peculiar to modern German philosophers, historians and generals.

The Roman lawyers founded their *Jus Gentium* on an imaginary *Jus Naturale*. Grotius and his followers identified the Law of Nations with Natural Law, and Rousseau and his school based their ethics and their sociology on the theory that men must revert to a state of nature in order to be virtuous.

But to the Roman lawyers to live according to nature meant a life governed by the noble precepts of the Stoics, to Grotius is meant the reign of equality and justice, and to Rousseau an idyllic existence free from competition, jealousy or strife.

Of course, their hypothesis was historically false. There was far more truth in the doctrine of Hobbes that "the natural state of men, before they entered into society, was a mere war and that not simply, but a war of all men against all men." (*Liberty*, par. 12.) For, as he tells us, "the most frequent reason why men desire to hurt each other, ariseth hence, that many men at the same time have an appetite to the same thing; which yet very often they can neither enjoy in common, nor yet divide it; whence it follows that the strongest must have it, and who is strongest must be decided by the sword." For these reasons, Hobbes