

civilization and unsettling the world. These movements from one point of view have cut across the warp of time and destroyed the value of past history. They have created on a large scale, perhaps for the first time since Athenian days, a forward-looking mind, impatient of precedent, ready for any adventure. From another and saner point of view they have infused new life into most, if not all, the fundamental problems with which history deals. It seems to me, if teachers are to take their proper place in the community, they must have, remembering Russia, a sound knowledge of these revolutions. As subjects for Grade Eleven they present the most delicate problems teachers have to deal with. History is the truth about the past. It is not present day politics. These points should be always in our minds. We must never, however tempting it may be, allow our personal judgments, and we cannot avoid having them if we are real men and women, to obtrude in the presentation of the lesson. History does not repeat itself, we are not like Fabre's ants, so one need not be a pessimist to acknowledge that none of the problems of government have been solved or ever will be fully solved. But each generation adds something to the solution and the hope for a softening of our present antagonisms to a larger extent than the disputants care to acknowledge, lies, not in an absorbing passionate discussion of them, as in a more open-minded re-examination of the experiences and experiments of the past.

I have dwelt almost exclusively on the utilization values of history; but history has other and higher values: the ennoblement that comes from a study of former achievements; the humility that acknowledges we are the heirs of all the ages; the heroism engendered

from past deeds of daring, moral and physical; the happiness which is part of our inheritance from loving souls of yore; the balance which lifts us above the brute creation.

A word in conclusion. When I reviewed what I have written, I was very much distressed by the deadly contrast between the placid course of my remarks and the daily tenour of world news. There seemed also apparently no special reason for any allusion to the recent war. Canada has happily had no "history" for over a hundred years. With two brief interludes, she has been free to evolve a national constitution along peaceful, one might almost say, predetermined lines. She occupies today that position of splendid isolation which Britain enjoyed up to 1914. The Boer War and this recent one have not seriously affected her internal economy and she has been remarkably free from civil strife compared with the United States. Roosevelt pointed to China as the end of a country conditioned as we are. Balfour, on the other hand, sees no reason why our civilization should decline. The two arguments are no doubt not on all fours, but they bring forcibly to our attention the dangers of pure materialism. Owing to the extent of our country and its sparse population, provincial and inter-provincial problems hardly seem pressing to Westerners, preoccupied in carrying out a new civilization. The coming generation may have to face serious internal and external problems—we are a pacific power—which may challenge their statesmanship. These are mainly of course political, not historical, in their nature, but they can never be solved intelligently by a democracy devoid of the historic sense.

PROF. R. FLENLY (SUMMARY)

1. Introductory: The term "Industrial Revolution" is a misnomer, a description of the whole by a part. To-day we should call it "The Social Revolution." Arnold Toynbee was the first to bring out the importance of the agricultural changes which accompanied the more obvious changes in industry. In agriculture the Revolution hastened the working of already existing tendencies; it was more violent and more rapid in part because those changes were overdue. (of French Revolution of 1789.)

2. Agriculture before the "Revolution": England in the first half of the 18th Century was an agricultural country, with the major part of her population engaged on the land; feeding herself and—to 1773—exported wheat. By the Revolution she became an "Industrialised State", no longer feeding her own population, the greater part of whom are employed in industry or trade. Her population grew from six and one-half millions in 1750 to twenty-five millions in 1830. She was at war from

1776-83 and 1793-1815, implying disturbance of trade processes. The agricultural revolution was thus an attempt to feed a rapidly growing population in time of war.

Early in the 18th Century three-fifths of the cultivated land in England was still farmed on the "Open Field System" of the Middle Ages. The unit was the village with its three large fields, one sown in the fall with wheat or rye, one in the spring with oats or barley, peas or beans, one left fallow; there was thus a three year rotation. The village landholders had a varying number of "strips" of land in these fields with rights in the hay of the field left fallow and rights of pasture over what meadow land there was, as over waste or woodland. Each village would, of course, have a garden. The "Lord of the Manor" or "Squire" would have "strips" in the common field and in addition his own enclosed portion of land. Often villagers working on the land, save the "yeomen," would possess enough land and stock to be