

its elements; in its power of coalescing with another form or of giving birth to another form; in its habit of competing with other forms, as the result of which adaptation or elimination may ensue; and

on. The analogy is far-reaching and persuasive, and it is helped over some of its difficulties by the consideration that just as there are many forms of social-group, from the nomad herd to the French Republic, so there are many forms of organism from sponge to eagle.

Schäffle, in his famous work on the *Structure and Life of the Social Body* (1875), carried the metaphor of the social organism to an extreme which has induced many to recoil from it altogether. The family is the cell, and the body consists of simple connective tissue (expressed in unity of speech, etc.) and of various differentiated tissues, including a sensory and *motor* apparatus, and so on. The comparison is as interesting as a game.

In his lucid exposition of the modern outlook,* Professor Fairbanks admits that a society deserves to be called *organic*, because of its structural complexity; its dynamical unity of correlated parts; its unity and development determined from within (surely not wholly?); its dependence on the environment, both physical and social; and its intelligibility only as part of a larger process,—the evolution of human society as a whole. But he adds that a society differs from a “biological organism,” let us say a bird, in the greater original discreteness of its elements, in its less fixed and permanent form, in the greater interdependence of the parts, and in the fact that consciousness remains centered in the discrete individual elements. Perhaps the enthu-

* *Internat. Journ. Ethics*, VIII., 1897, p. 61.