

IR

Historical influences coalesce with a contemporary twist to form the striking slab serif typeface **Regime**. The name alludes to the moment in history when Britain emerged as the principal naval and imperial power of the 19th century.

# Regime

## WEIGHTS

Light	<i>Light Italic</i>
Regular	<i>Regular Italic</i>
Demibold	<b><i>Demibold Italic</i></b>
<b>Bold</b>	<b><i>Bold Italic</i></b>
<b>Ultra</b>	<b><i>Ultra Italic</i></b>

## ABOUT

Historical influences coalesce with a contemporary twist to form the striking slab serif typeface Regime. In the early 19th century, as the Industrial Revolution began to transform Britain, the slab serif was born. The impact of new technology created a demand for a visual language that was compatible with mass-production and that could capture the attention of a newly-literate consumer. The design of the first slab serif typeface is credited to British punchcutter and typesetter Vincent Figgins and was released under the name Antique in 1815. In the same year, Napoleon was defeated at Waterloo. The name Regime alludes to this moment in history, when Britain emerged as the principal naval and imperial power of the 19th century.

Regime pays homage to the visual impact of its historical source material but has been drawn with a contemporary eye to incorporate a number of playful details. Regime includes a series of alternate characters and range of weights from light to ultra, the boldest weight being an extreme display weight based on 19th century woodblock poster types.

## SUPPORTED LANGUAGES

Afar / Afrikaans / Albanian / Basque / Bosnian / Breton / Catalan / Crimean Tatar (Latin) / Croatian / Czech / Danish / Dutch / English / Esperanto / Estonian / Faroese / Finnish / French / Frisian / Friulian / German / Greenlandic / Hawaiian / Hungarian / Icelandic / Indonesian / Interlingua / Irish Gaelic / Italian / Karelian / Kirundi / Kurdish (Latin) / Ladin / Latvian / Lithuanian / Luxemburgish / Malagasy / Malay / Maltese / Māori Norn / Norwegian (Bokmål) / Norwegian (Nynorsk) / Occitan / Palauan / Polish / Portuguese / Rhaeto-Romance / Romani / Romanian / Sango / Sámi (Northern) / Scottish Gaelic / Serbian (Latin) / Shona / Slovak / Slovene / Sorbian / Spanish / Swahili / Swati / Swedish / Tagalog (Filipino) / Tahitian / Tokelauan / Tsonga / Turkish / Umbundu / Veps / Welsh / Wolof / Zulu

## UNICODE RANGES

Complete: Basic Latin / Latin-1 Supplement / Latin Extended-A  
Parts of: Mathematical Operators / Latin Extended-B / Latin Extended Additional / Spacing Modifier Letters / General Punctuation / Currency Symbols / Letterlike Symbols

## WEB FONT FEATURES

frac / liga / sso1

## CREDITS

Designed by Jonathan Barnbrook and Marcus Leis Allion  
First published in 2009  
Revised and expanded character set published in 2016

Regime features a set of stylistic alternates. When using Adobe Illustrator, stylistic alternates are accessed via the OpenType panel by selecting **Stylistic Alternates**. When using Adobe InDesign, stylistic alternates are accessed via the character panel by selecting **OpenType > Stylistic Sets > Set 1**. When using CSS, stylistic alternates are activated using the **font-feature-settings** property with a value of either **salt** or **ss01**.

Aa → Δα

Dominion	Δομίνιον
Protectorate	Προτεκτοράτε
Mandate	Μανδάτε
Plantation	Πλαντάτιον
Hegemon	Ηεγεμון
Administer	Δαμίνιστερ
Partition	Παρτίτιον
Geography	Γεογραφη
Jurisdiction	Ιουρίστιον
Portfolio	Πορτφολιό













UPPERCASE

**A B C D E F G H I J K L M N O P Q R S T U V W X Y Z**

LOWERCASE

**a b c d e f g h i j k l m n o p q r s t u v w x y z**

UPPERCASE  
STYLISTIC ALTERNATES

**Δ B D G H I J K M Π Π P Q R U W X**

LOWERCASE  
STYLISTIC ALTERNATES

**a b d f g h i j k l m n p p r q r t u w x y**

ACCENTED UPPER CASE

**À Á Â Ã Ä Å Æ Ç È É Ê Ë Ì Í Î Ï Ñ Ò Ó Ô Õ Ö Ø Ù Ú Û Ü Ý Þ ß**

ACCENTED UPPER CASE  
STYLISTIC ALTERNATES

**À Á Â Ã Ä Å Æ Ç È É Ê Ë Ì Í Î Ï Ñ Ò Ó Ô Õ Ö Ø Ù Ú Û Ü Ý Þ ß**

ACCENTED LOWER CASE

**à á â ã ä å æ ç è é ê ë ì í î ï ñ ò ó ô õ ö ø ù ú û ü ý þ ÿ**

ACCENTED LOWER CASE  
STYLISTIC ALTERNATES

**à á â ã ä å æ ç è é ê ë ì í î ï ñ ò ó ô õ ö ø ù ú û ü ý þ ÿ**

PUNCTUATION

**.,:;...&!;¿?‘’“”„,„«»•◊◊\*'"\_---/()[]{}|!t‡**

LIGATURES

**fi fl ij ð ñ**

STANDARD FIGURES

**0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9**

SYMBOLS

**§ © ® ™ ° ¶ @**

FRACTIONS

**1/4 1/2 3/4**

CURRENCY

**\$ £ € ¥ ₣**

ORDINALS

**1 2 3 0 a**

MATHEMATICAL

**- / ÷ × ± ∓ ∼ ≈ | < > ≤ ≥ ≠ = Ω μ % ‰ ‰ #**

UPPERCASE

**A B C D E F G H I J K L M N O P Q R S T U V W X Y Z**

LOWERCASE

**a b c d e f g h i j k l m n o p q r s t u v w x y z**

UPPERCASE  
STYLISTIC ALTERNATES

**Δ B D G H I J K M Π Π P Q R U W X**

LOWERCASE  
STYLISTIC ALTERNATES

**a b d f ς h i j k l m n p p r q r t u w x y**

ACCENTED UPPER CASE

**À Á Â Ã Ä Å Æ Ç È É Ê Ë Ì Í Î Ï Ñ Ò Ó Ô Õ Ö Ø Ù Ú Û Ü Ý Þ ß**

ACCENTED UPPER CASE  
STYLISTIC ALTERNATES

**À Á Â Ã Ä Å Æ Ç È É Ê Ë Ì Í Î Ï Ñ Ò Ó Ô Õ Ö Ø Ù Ú Û Ü Ý Þ ß**

ACCENTED LOWER CASE

**à á â ã ä å æ ç è é ê ë ì í î ï ñ ò ó ô õ ö ø ù ú û ü ý þ**

ACCENTED LOWER CASE  
STYLISTIC ALTERNATES

**à á â ã ä å æ ç è é ê ë ì í î ï ñ ò ó ô õ ö ø ù ú û ü ý þ**

PUNCTUATION

**.,:;...&!;¿?‘’“”„,„«»•◊◊\*’”\_---/()[]{} \ | #**

LIGATURES

**fi fl ij ð Œ**

STANDARD FIGURES

**0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9**

SYMBOLS

**§ © ® ™ ° ¶ | @**

FRACTIONS

**1/4 1/2 3/4**

CURRENCY

**\$ £ € ¥ ₣**

ORDINALS

**1 2 3 0 a**

MATHEMATICAL

**- / ÷ × ± ∓ ∼ ≈ | < > ≤ ≥ ≠ Ω μ % ‰ #**



UPPERCASE

**A B C D E F G H I J K L M N O P Q R S T U V W X Y Z**

LOWERCASE

**a b c d e f g h i j k l m n o p q r s t u v w x y z**

UPPERCASE  
STYLISTIC ALTERNATES

**À B D E G H J K M N P R Q U X**

LOWERCASE  
STYLISTIC ALTERNATES

**à b d f g h i j k l m n o p q r t u x y**

ACCENTED UPPER CASE

**À Á Â Ã Ä Å Æ Ç È É Ê Ë  
Ë Ì Í Î Ï Ñ Ò Ó Ô Õ Ö Ø Ù Ú Û Ü Ý Þ ß  
à á â ã ä å æ ç è é ê ë  
ë ì í î ï ñ ò ó ô õ ö ø ù ú û ü ý þ ß**

ACCENTED UPPER CASE  
STYLISTIC ALTERNATES

**À Á Â Ã Ä Å Æ Ç È É Ê Ë  
Ë Ì Í Î Ï Ñ Ò Ó Ô Õ Ö Ø Ù Ú Û Ü Ý Þ ß**

ACCENTED LOWER CASE

**à á â ã ä å æ ç è é ê ë  
ë ì í î ï ñ ò ó ô õ ö ø ù ú û ü ý þ ß**

ACCENTED LOWER CASE  
STYLISTIC ALTERNATES

**à á â ã ä å æ ç è é ê ë  
ë ì í î ï ñ ò ó ô õ ö ø ù ú û ü ý þ ß**

PUNCTUATION

**.,;:…&!;?‘”‘” „„«-»•◁▷\*'"\_---/()[]\|!#**

LIGATURES

**fi fl ff ij ti y IJ**

STANDARD FIGURES

**0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9**

SYMBOLS

**§ © ® ™ ° ¶ @**

FRACTIONS

**1/4 1/2 3/4**

CURRENCY

**\$ ¢ £ € ¥ ₣ ₧**

ORDINALS

**1 2 3 0 a**

MATHEMATICAL

**- / ÷ × ± ∓ ∼ ≈ | < > ≤ ≥ ≠ ∞ μ % ‰ #**

**BE**

***PATRIOTIC***

**BUY**

***EMPIRE-  
GROWN***

**TEA**

96 PT

FACILITIES

110 PT

afforded to

96 PT

branches of

110 PT

WILLETT

80 PT

manufactories

18 PT

The key concept is an increase in the rate of change, not the occurrence of change itself. The cartoon story of a preindustrial static society before 1750 with fixed technology, no capital accumulation, little or no labor mobility, and a population hemmed in by Malthusian boundaries is no longer taken seriously. Jones has stressed this point more than anyone else. At the same time Jones points out that before 1750

One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political

One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolution and from this it is further inferred, even more rashly, that hence the term is useless. The latter infer-

One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolution and from this it is further inferred, even more rashly, that hence the term is useless. The latter inference is absurd: how many people in the Roman Empire referred to themselves as living during "classical antiquity?" Yet the premise that contemporaries were unaware of the Industrial Revolution is simply and patently false. To be sure, they did not pay to it nearly the attention that subsequent historians have, but why should they have, not knowing where all this was leading? By confining oneself to reading Adam Smith, T.R. Malthus, or Jane Austen, one can easily misrepresent the perceptions of contemporaries. The Scottish merchant and statistician Patrick Colquhoun

One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is

One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolution and from this it is further inferred, even more rashly, that hence the term is useless. The latter inference is absurd: how many people in the Roman Empire referred to themselves as living during "classical antiquity?" Yet the premise

One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolution and from this it is further inferred, even more rashly, that hence the term is useless. The latter inference is absurd: how many people in the Roman Empire referred to themselves as living during "classical antiquity?" Yet the premise that contemporaries were unaware of the Industrial Revolution is simply and patently false. To be sure, they did not pay to it nearly the attention that subsequent historians have, but why should they have, not knowing where all this was leading? By confining oneself to reading Adam Smith, T.R. Malthus, or Jane Austen, one can easily misrepresent the perceptions of contemporaries. The Scottish merchant and statistician Patrick Colquhoun in a famous quote declared that "It is impossible to contemplate the progress of manufactures in Great Britain within the last thirty years without wonder and astonishment. Its rapidity exceeds all credibility. The improvement of the steam engines, but above all the facilities afforded to the great branches of the woolen and cotton manufactories

One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolution and from

One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolution and from this it is further inferred, even more rashly, that hence the term is useless. The latter inference is absurd: how many people in the Roman Empire referred to themselves as living during "classical antiquity?" Yet the premise that contemporaries were unaware of the Industrial Revolution is simply and patently false. To be sure, they did not pay

One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolution and from this it is further inferred, even more rashly, that hence the term is useless. The latter inference is absurd: how many people in the Roman Empire referred to themselves as living during "classical antiquity?" Yet the premise that contemporaries were unaware of the Industrial Revolution is simply and patently false. To be sure, they did not pay to it nearly the attention that subsequent historians have, but why should they have, not knowing where all this was leading? By confining oneself to reading Adam Smith, T.R. Malthus, or Jane Austen, one can easily misrepresent the perceptions of contemporaries. The Scottish merchant and statistician Patrick Colquhoun in a famous quote declared that "It is impossible to contemplate the progress of manufactures in Great Britain within the last thirty years without wonder and astonishment. Its rapidity exceeds all credibility. The improvement of the steam engines, but above all the facilities afforded to the great branches of the woolen and cotton manufactories by ingenious machinery, invigorated by capital and skill, are beyond all calculation..." At about the same time, Robert Owen added that "The general diffusion of manufactures throughout a country generates a new character in its inhabitants... This change has been owing chiefly to the mechanical inventions

120 PT

*independent*

104 PT

*machinery*

70 PT

*INVIGORATED*

124 PT

*by capital*

94 PT

*AND SKILL*

18 PT

*The key concept is an increase in the rate of change, not the occurrence of change itself. The cartoon story of a preindustrial static society before 1750 with fixed technology, no capital accumulation, little or no labor mobility, and a population hemmed in by Malthusian boundaries is no longer taken seriously. Jones has stressed this point more than anyone else. At the same time Jones points out that before 1750 periods were*

*One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and*

*One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolution and from this it is further inferred, even more rashly, that hence the term is useless. The latter inference is absurd: how*

*One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolution and from this it is further inferred, even more rashly, that hence the term is useless. The latter inference is absurd: how many people in the Roman Empire referred to themselves as living during "classical antiquity?" Yet the premise that contemporaries were unaware of the Industrial Revolution is simply and patently false. To be sure, they did not pay to it nearly the attention that subsequent historians have, but why should they have, not knowing where all this was leading? By confining oneself to reading Adam Smith, T.R. Malthus, or Jane Austen, one can easily misrepresent the perceptions of contemporaries. The Scottish merchant and statistician Patrick Colquhoun in a famous*

*One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred,*

*One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolution and from this it is further inferred, even more rashly, that hence the term is useless. The latter inference is absurd: how many people in the Roman Empire referred to themselves as living during "classical antiquity?" Yet the premise*

*One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolution and from this it is further inferred, even more rashly, that hence the term is useless. The latter inference is absurd: how many people in the Roman Empire referred to themselves as living during "classical antiquity?" Yet the premise that contemporaries were unaware of the Industrial Revolution is simply and patently false. To be sure, they did not pay to it nearly the attention that subsequent historians have, but why should they have, not knowing where all this was leading? By confining oneself to reading Adam Smith, T.R. Malthus, or Jane Austen, one can easily misrepresent the perceptions of contemporaries. The Scottish merchant and statistician Patrick Colquhoun in a famous quote declared that "It is impossible to contemplate the progress of manufactures in Great Britain within the last thirty years without wonder and astonishment. Its rapidity exceeds all credibility. The improvement of the steam engines, but above all the facilities afforded to the great branches of the woolen and cotton manufactories by ingenious machinery, invigor-*

*One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolution and from*

*One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolution and from this it is further inferred, even more rashly, that hence the term is useless. The latter inference is absurd: how many people in the Roman Empire referred to themselves as living during "classical antiquity?" Yet the premise that contemporaries were unaware of the Industrial Revolution is simply and patently false. To be sure, they did not pay to it nearly the attention that subsequent*

*One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolution and from this it is further inferred, even more rashly, that hence the term is useless. The latter inference is absurd: how many people in the Roman Empire referred to themselves as living during "classical antiquity?" Yet the premise that contemporaries were unaware of the Industrial Revolution is simply and patently false. To be sure, they did not pay to it nearly the attention that subsequent historians have, but why should they have, not knowing where all this was leading? By confining oneself to reading Adam Smith, T.R. Malthus, or Jane Austen, one can easily misrepresent the perceptions of contemporaries. The Scottish merchant and statistician Patrick Colquhoun in a famous quote declared that "It is impossible to contemplate the progress of manufactures in Great Britain within the last thirty years without wonder and astonishment. Its rapidity exceeds all credibility. The improvement of the steam engines, but above all the facilities afforded to the great branches of the woolen and cotton manufactories by ingenious machinery, invigorated by capital and skill, are beyond all calculation..." At about the same time, Robert Owen added that "The general diffusion of manufactures throughout a country generates a new character in its inhabitants... This change has been owing chiefly to the mechanical inventions which introduced the cotton*

100 PT

the general

94 PT

diffusion of

76 PT

manufactures

82 PT

throughout a

102 PT

COUNTRY

18 PT

The key concept is an increase in the rate of change, not the occurrence of change itself. The cartoon story of a preindustrial static society before 1750 with fixed technology, no capital accumulation, little or no labor mobility, and a population hemmed in by Malthusian boundaries is no longer taken seriously. Jones has stressed this point more than anyone else. At the same time Jones points out that

One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political

One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolution and from this it is further inferred, even more rashly, that hence the term is useless. The latter infer-

One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolution and from this it is further inferred, even more rashly, that hence the term is useless. The latter inference is absurd: how many people in the Roman Empire referred to themselves as living during "classical antiquity?" Yet the premise that contemporaries were unaware of the Industrial Revolution is simply and patently false. To be sure, they did not pay to it nearly the attention that subsequent historians have, but why should they have, not knowing where all this was leading? By confining oneself to reading Adam Smith, T.R. Malthus, or Jane Austen, one can easily misrepresent the perceptions of contemporaries. The Scottish merchant and

One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From

One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolution and from this it is further inferred, even more rashly, that hence the term is useless. The latter inference is absurd: how many people in the Roman Empire referred to themselves as living during

One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolution and from this it is further inferred, even more rashly, that hence the term is useless. The latter inference is absurd: how many people in the Roman Empire referred to themselves as living during "classical antiquity?" Yet the premise that contemporaries were unaware of the Industrial Revolution is simply and patently false. To be sure, they did not pay to it nearly the attention that subsequent historians have, but why should they have, not knowing where all this was leading? By confining oneself to reading Adam Smith, T.R. Malthus, or Jane Austen, one can easily misrepresent the perceptions of contemporaries. The Scottish merchant and statistician Patrick Colquhoun in a famous quote declared that "It is impossible to contemplate the progress of manufactures in Great Britain within the last thirty years without wonder and astonishment. Its rapidity exceeds all credibility. The improvement of the steam engines, but above all the facilities afforded to the

One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolu-

One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolution and from this it is further inferred, even more rashly, that hence the term is useless. The latter inference is absurd: how many people in the Roman Empire referred to themselves as living during "classical antiquity?" Yet the premise that contemporaries were unaware of the Industrial Revolution is simply and patently false. To be sure, they did not pay

One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolution and from this it is further inferred, even more rashly, that hence the term is useless. The latter inference is absurd: how many people in the Roman Empire referred to themselves as living during "classical antiquity?" Yet the premise that contemporaries were unaware of the Industrial Revolution is simply and patently false. To be sure, they did not pay to it nearly the attention that subsequent historians have, but why should they have, not knowing where all this was leading? By confining oneself to reading Adam Smith, T.R. Malthus, or Jane Austen, one can easily misrepresent the perceptions of contemporaries. The Scottish merchant and statistician Patrick Colquhoun in a famous quote declared that "It is impossible to contemplate the progress of manufactures in Great Britain within the last thirty years without wonder and astonishment. Its rapidity exceeds all credibility. The improvement of the steam engines, but above all the facilities afforded to the great branches of the woolen and cotton manufactories by ingenious machinery, invigorated by capital and skill, are beyond all calculation..." At about the same time, Robert Owen added that "The general diffusion of manufactures throughout a country generates a new character in its inhabitants... This change has been owing chiefly

---

*history*

---

*is inevitably*

---

*WRITTEN*

---

*with a certain amount of*

---

*PRESENTISM*

---

*The key concept is an increase in the rate of change, not the occurrence of change itself. The cartoon story of a preindustrial static society before 1750 with fixed technology, no capital accumulation, little or no labor mobility, and a population hemmed in by Malthusian boundaries is no longer taken seriously. Jones has stressed this point more than anyone else. At the same time Jones points out that before*

*One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political*

*One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolution and from this it is further inferred, even more rashly, that hence the term is useless. The latter infer-*

*One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolution and from this it is further inferred, even more rashly, that hence the term is useless. The latter inference is absurd: how many people in the Roman Empire referred to themselves as living during "classical antiquity?" Yet the premise that contemporaries were unaware of the Industrial Revolution is simply and patently false. To be sure, they did not pay to it nearly the attention that subsequent historians have, but why should they have, not knowing where all this was leading? By confining oneself to reading Adam Smith, T.R. Malthus, or Jane Austen, one can easily misrepresent the perceptions of contemporaries. The Scottish merchant and statistician*

*One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is*

*One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolution and from this it is further inferred, even more rashly, that hence the term is useless. The latter inference is absurd: how many people in the Roman Empire referred to themselves as living during "classical antiquity?"*

*One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolution and from this it is further inferred, even more rashly, that hence the term is useless. The latter inference is absurd: how many people in the Roman Empire referred to themselves as living during "classical antiquity?" Yet the premise that contemporaries were unaware of the Industrial Revolution is simply and patently false. To be sure, they did not pay to it nearly the attention that subsequent historians have, but why should they have, not knowing where all this was leading? By confining oneself to reading Adam Smith, T.R. Malthus, or Jane Austen, one can easily misrepresent the perceptions of contemporaries. The Scottish merchant and statistician Patrick Colquhoun in a famous quote declared that "It is impossible to contemplate the progress of manufactures in Great Britain within the last thirty years without wonder and astonishment. Its rapidity exceeds all credibility. The improvement of the steam engines, but above all the facilities afforded to the great branches*

*One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolution and from*

*One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolution and from this it is further inferred, even more rashly, that hence the term is useless. The latter inference is absurd: how many people in the Roman Empire referred to themselves as living during "classical antiquity?" Yet the premise that contemporaries were unaware of the Industrial Revolution is simply and patently false. To be sure, they did not pay*

*One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolution and from this it is further inferred, even more rashly, that hence the term is useless. The latter inference is absurd: how many people in the Roman Empire referred to themselves as living during "classical antiquity?" Yet the premise that contemporaries were unaware of the Industrial Revolution is simply and patently false. To be sure, they did not pay to it nearly the attention that subsequent historians have, but why should they have, not knowing where all this was leading? By confining oneself to reading Adam Smith, T.R. Malthus, or Jane Austen, one can easily misrepresent the perceptions of contemporaries. The Scottish merchant and statistician Patrick Colquhoun in a famous quote declared that "It is impossible to contemplate the progress of manufactures in Great Britain within the last thirty years without wonder and astonishment. Its rapidity exceeds all credibility. The improvement of the steam engines, but above all the facilities afforded to the great branches of the woolen and cotton manufactories by ingenious machinery, invigorated by capital and skill, are beyond all calculation..." At about the same time, Robert Owen added that "The general diffusion of manufactures throughout a country generates a new character in its inhabitants... This change has been owing chiefly to the mechanical*

102 PT

wonderful

64 PT

of manufactures

104 PT

has been a

98 PT

temporary

132 PT

DEFENDIR

18 PT

The key concept is an increase in the rate of change, not the occurrence of change itself. The cartoon story of a preindustrial static society before 1750 with fixed technology, no capital accumulation, little or no labor mobility, and a population hemmed in by Malthusian boundaries is no longer taken seriously. Jones has stressed this point more than anyone else. At the same time Jones

One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of

One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolution and from this it is further inferred, even more rashly, that hence the term

One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolution and from this it is further inferred, even more rashly, that hence the term is useless. The latter inference is absurd: how many people in the Roman Empire referred to themselves as living during "classical antiquity?" Yet the premise that contemporaries were unaware of the Industrial Revolution is simply and patently false. To be sure, they did not pay to it nearly the attention that subsequent historians have, but why should they have, not knowing where all this was leading? By confining oneself to reading Adam Smith, T.R. Malthus, or Jane Austen, one can easily misrepresent the perceptions of contemporar-

One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years

One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolution and from this it is further inferred, even more rashly, that hence the term is useless. The latter inference is absurd: how many people in the Roman Empire referred to themselves

One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolution and from this it is further inferred, even more rashly, that hence the term is useless. The latter inference is absurd: how many people in the Roman Empire referred to themselves as living during "classical antiquity?" Yet the premise that contemporaries were unaware of the Industrial Revolution is simply and patently false. To be sure, they did not pay to it nearly the attention that subsequent historians have, but why should they have, not knowing where all this was leading? By confining oneself to reading Adam Smith, T.R. Malthus, or Jane Austen, one can easily misrepresent the perceptions of contemporaries. The Scottish merchant and statistician Patrick Colquhoun in a famous quote declared that "It is impossible to contemplate the progress of manufactures in Great Britain within the last thirty years without wonder and astonishment. Its rapidity exceeds all credibility. The improvement of the steam

One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during

One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolution and from this it is further inferred, even more rashly, that hence the term is useless. The latter inference is absurd: how many people in the Roman Empire referred to themselves as living during "classical antiquity?" Yet the premise that contemporaries were unaware of the Industrial Revolution is simply and patently false.

One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolution and from this it is further inferred, even more rashly, that hence the term is useless. The latter inference is absurd: how many people in the Roman Empire referred to themselves as living during "classical antiquity?" Yet the premise that contemporaries were unaware of the Industrial Revolution is simply and patently false. To be sure, they did not pay to it nearly the attention that subsequent historians have, but why should they have, not knowing where all this was leading? By confining oneself to reading Adam Smith, T.R. Malthus, or Jane Austen, one can easily misrepresent the perceptions of contemporaries. The Scottish merchant and statistician Patrick Colquhoun in a famous quote declared that "It is impossible to contemplate the progress of manufactures in Great Britain within the last thirty years without wonder and astonishment. Its rapidity exceeds all credibility. The improvement of the steam engines, but above all the facilities afforded to the great branches of the woolen and cotton manufactories by ingenious machinery, invigorated by capital and skill, are beyond all calculation..." At about the same time, Robert Owen added that "The general diffusion of manufactures throughout a country

102 PT

*beginning*

70 PT

***A SUSTAINED***

56 PT

*cumulative process*

64 PT

***OF SOCIAL AND***

78 PT

*technological*

112 PT

***CHANGE***

18 PT

***The key concept is an increase in the rate of change, not the occurrence of change itself. The cartoon story of a preindustrial static society before 1750 with fixed technology, no capital accumulation, little or no labor mobility, and a population hemmed in by Malthusian boundaries is no longer taken seriously. Jones has stressed this point more than anyone else. At the same time Jones***

**One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political**

**One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolution and from this it is further inferred, even more rashly, that hence the term is useless. The**

**One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolution and from this it is further inferred, even more rashly, that hence the term is useless. The latter inference is absurd: how many people in the Roman Empire referred to themselves as living during "classical antiquity?" Yet the premise that contemporaries were unaware of the Industrial Revolution is simply and patently false. To be sure, they did not pay to it nearly the attention that subsequent historians have, but why should they have, not knowing where all this was leading? By confining oneself to reading Adam Smith, T.R. Malthus, or Jane Austen, one can easily misrepresent the perceptions of contemporaries.**

**One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years**

**One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolution and from this it is further inferred, even more rashly, that hence the term is useless. The latter inference is absurd: how many people in the Roman Empire referred to themselves as living during "classical antiquity?" Yet**

**One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolution and from this it is further inferred, even more rashly, that hence the term is useless. The latter inference is absurd: how many people in the Roman Empire referred to themselves as living during "classical antiquity?" Yet the premise that contemporaries were unaware of the Industrial Revolution is simply and patently false. To be sure, they did not pay to it nearly the attention that subsequent historians have, but why should they have, not knowing where all this was leading? By confining oneself to reading Adam Smith, T.R. Malthus, or Jane Austen, one can easily misrepresent the perceptions of contemporaries. The Scottish merchant and statistician Patrick Colquhoun in a famous quote declared that "It is impossible to contemplate the progress of manufactures in Great Britain within the last thirty years without wonder and astonishment. Its rapidity exceeds all credibility. The improvement of the steam engines, but above all the**

**One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolution and**

**One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolution and from this it is further inferred, even more rashly, that hence the term is useless. The latter inference is absurd: how many people in the Roman Empire referred to themselves as living during "classical antiquity?" Yet the premise that contemporaries were unaware of the Industrial Revolution is simply and patently false. To be sure, they did not pay to it nearly the attention**

**One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolution and from this it is further inferred, even more rashly, that hence the term is useless. The latter inference is absurd: how many people in the Roman Empire referred to themselves as living during "classical antiquity?" Yet the premise that contemporaries were unaware of the Industrial Revolution is simply and patently false. To be sure, they did not pay to it nearly the attention that subsequent historians have, but why should they have, not knowing where all this was leading? By confining oneself to reading Adam Smith, T.R. Malthus, or Jane Austen, one can easily misrepresent the perceptions of contemporaries. The Scottish merchant and statistician Patrick Colquhoun in a famous quote declared that "It is impossible to contemplate the progress of manufactures in Great Britain within the last thirty years without wonder and astonishment. Its rapidity exceeds all credibility. The improvement of the steam engines, but above all the facilities afforded to the great branches of the woolen and cotton manufactories by ingenious machinery, invigorated by capital and skill, are beyond all calculation..." At about the same time, Robert Owen added that "The general diffusion of manufactures throughout a country generates a new character**

102 PT

**economic**

136 PT

**change**

90 PT

**IS RARELY**

110 PT

**SUDDEN**

110 PT

**or heroic**

18 PT

**The key concept is an increase in the rate of change, not the occurrence of change itself. The cartoon story of a preindustrial static society before 1750 with fixed technology, no capital accumulation, little or no labor mobility, and a population hemmed in by Malthusian boundaries is no longer taken seriously. Jones has stressed this point more than anyone else. At the same**

**One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing**

**One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolution and from this it is further inferred, even more**

**One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolution and from this it is further inferred, even more rashly, that hence the term is useless. The latter inference is absurd: how many people in the Roman Empire referred to themselves as living during “classical antiquity?” Yet the premise that contemporaries were unaware of the Industrial Revolution is simply and patently false. To be sure, they did not pay to it nearly the attention that subsequent historians have, but why should they have, not knowing where all this was leading? By confining oneself to reading Adam Smith,**

**One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years**

**One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolution and from this it is further inferred, even more rashly, that hence the term is useless. The latter inference is absurd: how many people in the**

**One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolution and from this it is further inferred, even more rashly, that hence the term is useless. The latter inference is absurd: how many people in the Roman Empire referred to themselves as living during “classical antiquity?” Yet the premise that contemporaries were unaware of the Industrial Revolution is simply and patently false. To be sure, they did not pay to it nearly the attention that subsequent historians have, but why should they have, not knowing where all this was leading? By confining oneself to reading Adam Smith, T.R. Malthus, or Jane Austen, one can easily misrepresent the perceptions of contemporaries. The Scottish merchant and statistician Patrick Colquhoun in a famous quote declared that “It is impossible to contemplate the progress of manufactures in Great Britain within the last thirty years without wonder and**

**One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were**

**One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolution and from this it is further inferred, even more rashly, that hence the term is useless. The latter inference is absurd: how many people in the Roman Empire referred to themselves as living during “classical antiquity?” Yet the premise that contemporaries were unaware of the Industrial Revolu-**

**One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolution and from this it is further inferred, even more rashly, that hence the term is useless. The latter inference is absurd: how many people in the Roman Empire referred to themselves as living during “classical antiquity?” Yet the premise that contemporaries were unaware of the Industrial Revolution is simply and patently false. To be sure, they did not pay to it nearly the attention that subsequent historians have, but why should they have, not knowing where all this was leading? By confining oneself to reading Adam Smith, T.R. Malthus, or Jane Austen, one can easily misrepresent the perceptions of contemporaries. The Scottish merchant and statistician Patrick Colquhoun in a famous quote declared that “It is impossible to contemplate the progress of manufactures in Great Britain within the last thirty years without wonder and astonishment. Its rapidity exceeds all credibility. The improvement of the steam engines, but above all the facilities afforded to the great branches of the woolen and cotton manufactories by ingenious machinery, invigorated by capital and skill, are beyond all calculation...” At about the**

106 PT

***ludicrous***

64 PT

***for an economic***

108 PT

***historian***

72 PT

***TO PRETEND***

80 PT

***to be equally***

84 PT

***IGNORANT***

18 PT

***The key concept is an increase in the rate of change, not the occurrence of change itself. The cartoon story of a preindustrial static society before 1750 with fixed technology, no capital accumulation, little or no labor mobility, and a population hemmed in by Malthusian boundaries is no longer taken seriously. Jones has stressed this point more than anyone else. At the same***

**One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing**

**One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolution and from this it is further inferred, even more rashly, that hence the term**

**One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolution and from this it is further inferred, even more rashly, that hence the term is useless. The latter inference is absurd: how many people in the Roman Empire referred to themselves as living during "classical antiquity?" Yet the premise that contemporaries were unaware of the Industrial Revolution is simply and patently false. To be sure, they did not pay to it nearly the attention that subsequent historians have, but why should they have, not knowing where all this was leading? By confining oneself to reading Adam Smith, T.R. Malthus, or Jane Austen, one can easily**

**One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years**

**One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolution and from this it is further inferred, even more rashly, that hence the term is useless. The latter inference is absurd: how many people in the**

**One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolution and from this it is further inferred, even more rashly, that hence the term is useless. The latter inference is absurd: how many people in the Roman Empire referred to themselves as living during "classical antiquity?" Yet the premise that contemporaries were unaware of the Industrial Revolution is simply and patently false. To be sure, they did not pay to it nearly the attention that subsequent historians have, but why should they have, not knowing where all this was leading? By confining oneself to reading Adam Smith, T.R. Malthus, or Jane Austen, one can easily misrepresent the perceptions of contemporaries. The Scottish merchant and statistician Patrick Colquhoun in a famous quote declared that "It is impossible to contemplate the progress of manufactures in Great Britain within the last thirty years without wonder and astonishment. Its rapidity exceeds all**

**One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were**

**One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolution and from this it is further inferred, even more rashly, that hence the term is useless. The latter inference is absurd: how many people in the Roman Empire referred to themselves as living during "classical antiquity?" Yet the premise that contemporaries were unaware of the Industrial Revolution is simply**

**One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolution and from this it is further inferred, even more rashly, that hence the term is useless. The latter inference is absurd: how many people in the Roman Empire referred to themselves as living during "classical antiquity?" Yet the premise that contemporaries were unaware of the Industrial Revolution is simply and patently false. To be sure, they did not pay to it nearly the attention that subsequent historians have, but why should they have, not knowing where all this was leading? By confining oneself to reading Adam Smith, T.R. Malthus, or Jane Austen, one can easily misrepresent the perceptions of contemporaries. The Scottish merchant and statistician Patrick Colquhoun in a famous quote declared that "It is impossible to contemplate the progress of manufactures in Great Britain within the last thirty years without wonder and astonishment. Its rapidity exceeds all credibility. The improvement of the steam engines, but above all the facilities afforded to the great branches of the woolen and cotton manufactories by ingenious machinery, invigorated by capital and skill, are beyond all calculation..." At about the same time, Robert Owen added**

74 PT

**INVENTION**

76 PT

**becomes an**

80 PT

**exogenous**

104 PT

**variable**

96 PT

**that then**

94 PT

**AFFECTS**

18 PT

**The key concept is an increase in the rate of change, not the occurrence of change itself. The cartoon story of a preindustrial static society before 1750 with fixed technology, no capital accumulation, little or no labor mobility, and a population hemmed in by Malthusian boundaries is no longer taken seriously. Jones has stressed this point more**

**One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to**

**One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolution**

**One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolution and from this it is further inferred, even more rashly, that hence the term is useless. The latter inference is absurd: how many people in the Roman Empire referred to themselves as living during "classical antiquity?" Yet the premise that contemporaries were unaware of the Industrial Revolution is simply and patently false. To be sure, they did not pay to it nearly the attention that subsequent historians have, but why should they have, not knowing where all**

**One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists**

**One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolution and from this it is further inferred, even more rashly, that hence the term is useless.**

**One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolution and from this it is further inferred, even more rashly, that hence the term is useless. The latter inference is absurd: how many people in the Roman Empire referred to themselves as living during "classical antiquity?" Yet the premise that contemporaries were unaware of the Industrial Revolution is simply and patently false. To be sure, they did not pay to it nearly the attention that subsequent historians have, but why should they have, not knowing where all this was leading? By confining oneself to reading Adam Smith, T.R. Malthus, or Jane Austen, one can easily misrepresent the perceptions of contemporaries. The Scottish merchant and statistician Patrick Colquhoun in a famous quote declared that**

**One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly,**

**One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolution and from this it is further inferred, even more rashly, that hence the term is useless. The latter inference is absurd: how many people in the Roman Empire referred to themselves as living during "classical**

**One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolution and from this it is further inferred, even more rashly, that hence the term is useless. The latter inference is absurd: how many people in the Roman Empire referred to themselves as living during "classical antiquity?" Yet the premise that contemporaries were unaware of the Industrial Revolution is simply and patently false. To be sure, they did not pay to it nearly the attention that subsequent historians have, but why should they have, not knowing where all this was leading? By confining oneself to reading Adam Smith, T.R. Malthus, or Jane Austen, one can easily misrepresent the perceptions of contemporaries. The Scottish merchant and statistician Patrick Colquhoun in a famous quote declared that "It is impossible to contemplate the progress of manufactures in Great Britain within the last thirty years without wonder and astonishment. Its rapidity exceeds all credibility. The improvement of the steam engines, but above all the facilities afforded to the**

48 PT

**REPREHENSIBLE**

54 PT

**and abominable**

114 PT

**factory**

66 PT

**CONDITIONS**

92 PT

**described**

98 PT

**in novels**

18 PT

**The key concept is an increase in the rate of change, not the occurrence of change itself. The cartoon story of a preindustrial static society before 1750 with fixed technology, no capital accumulation, little or no labor mobility, and a population hemmed in by Malthusian boundaries is no longer taken seriously. Jones has stressed this point more**

**One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to**

**One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolution and from this it is**

**One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolution and from this it is further inferred, even more rashly, that hence the term is useless. The latter inference is absurd: how many people in the Roman Empire referred to themselves as living during "classical antiquity?" Yet the premise that contemporaries were unaware of the Industrial Revolution is simply and patently false. To be sure, they did not pay to it nearly the attention that subsequent historians have, but why should they have, not knowing where all**

**One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists**

**One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolution and from this it is further inferred, even more rashly, that hence the term is useless.**

**One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolution and from this it is further inferred, even more rashly, that hence the term is useless. The latter inference is absurd: how many people in the Roman Empire referred to themselves as living during "classical antiquity?" Yet the premise that contemporaries were unaware of the Industrial Revolution is simply and patently false. To be sure, they did not pay to it nearly the attention that subsequent historians have, but why should they have, not knowing where all this was leading? By confining oneself to reading Adam Smith, T.R. Malthus, or Jane Austen, one can easily misrepresent the perceptions of contemporaries. The Scottish merchant and statistician Patrick Colquhoun in a famous quote declared that "It is impossible to contem-**

**One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly,**

**One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolution and from this it is further inferred, even more rashly, that hence the term is useless. The latter inference is absurd: how many people in the Roman Empire referred to themselves as living during "classical**

**One of the more perplexing phenomena is that contemporaries seemingly were unaware of the Industrial Revolution. A number of scholars have commented on the notable absence of references to anything as dramatic in the writing of political economists and novelists writing in the years before 1830. From this it is inferred, somewhat rashly, that contemporaries were unaware that they were living during an Industrial Revolution and from this it is further inferred, even more rashly, that hence the term is useless. The latter inference is absurd: how many people in the Roman Empire referred to themselves as living during "classical antiquity?" Yet the premise that contemporaries were unaware of the Industrial Revolution is simply and patently false. To be sure, they did not pay to it nearly the attention that subsequent historians have, but why should they have, not knowing where all this was leading? By confining oneself to reading Adam Smith, T.R. Malthus, or Jane Austen, one can easily misrepresent the perceptions of contemporaries. The Scottish merchant and statistician Patrick Colquhoun in a famous quote declared that "It is impossible to contemplate the progress of manufactures in Great Britain within the last thirty years without wonder and astonishment. Its rapidity exceeds all credibility. The improvement of the steam engines, but above all the facilities afforded to the**

