

## Section C

Study Extracts 1 and 2 before you answer this question.

In the light of differing interpretations, how convincing do you find the view that, the Glorious Revolution, 'did not have revolutionary effects' (Extract 1, lines 1-2).

Extract 1: From Barry Coward, *The Stuart Age: England, 1603-1714*, published 2012.

There was a great deal of popular political activity and violence in 1688-89, but this and the events of 1688-89 did not have revolutionary effects. Even if sweeping changes had been intended in 1689, it is extremely unlikely that William would have cooperated in bringing them about. He would have seen them as an unacceptable distraction from his major preoccupation with the European war and with his task of bringing Britain into it. It is clear that those people who in 1689 hoped to make major constitutional or ecclesiastical changes were swept aside.

Most, but not all, prominent politicians had only limited aims; they were determined to restore old liberties, not enact new ones. The political nation in 1688 had united to resist what it considered to be the revolutionary innovations of James II. But conservative propertied Englishmen were united in their aim of preventing a recurrence of the violence and radicalism of the English Revolution. The prime instinct of most politicians and political groups in 1688-89 was to work for a restoration of political order as soon as possible, and not to waste time tackling theoretical, abstract questions.

Extract 2: From Robert Bucholz and Newton Key, *Early Modern England 1485-1714*, published 2009.

The Revolution of 1688-89 provided a rational and forward-looking answer to the question of sovereignty. From then on the ultimate sovereign power in England was vested in Parliament. After all, the 1689 Convention had called itself into existence, debated the succession, taken the Crown from James II, ignored his son Prince James, and offered it to William and Mary. By the Act of Settlement in 1701, Parliament ignored laws of hereditary succession, and what had been thought of as the will of God, to redraw the succession according to its own liking. The days when the monarch could dissolve Parliament to avoid confrontation or inconvenient legislation, let alone rule entirely without it, were over. Rather, Parliament had to be called every year and allowed to sit, and ministers had to be chosen with whom it could work. Thus, 1688-89 marks the shift from a monarch's parliament to parliament as a separate, permanent and ultimately dominant institution. The end result would be the modern British monarchy, limited and constitutional.

In the light of differing interpretations, how convincing do you find the view that, the *Glorious Revolution*, 'did not have revolutionary effects' (Extract 1, lines 1-2).

Introduction:

P1 quotes & own knowledge to support:

P2 quotes & own knowledge to support:

Similarities between the extracts using quotes and own knowledge (do this twice):

Differences between the extracts using quotes and own knowledge (do this twice):

Conclusion:

## Section C

Study Extracts 1 and 2 before you answer this question.

In the light of differing interpretations, how convincing do you find the view that the Glorious Revolution 'transformed the relationship between King and Parliament'? (Extract 1, line 3)

Extract 1: From John Miller, *The Stuarts*, published 2006.

The refusal to grant William sufficient revenue for life was the key decision of the Revolution. Although William was voted the civil list for life in 1698, he still had to come to Parliament each year for money for the army and navy. His financial dependence on Parliament was much greater than that of Charles II. It transformed the relationship between King and Parliament. Parliament now met every year for several months. But 1689 also marked the start of a slow and subtle process whereby monarchs found it harder and harder to use their traditional powers. Those powers were to some extent reduced by legislation. The Triennial Act of 1694 forced the king to call a general election at least once every three years. The Act of Settlement of 1701, besides excluding Catholics from the throne and settling the succession, imposed restrictions on a future foreign king that showed the resentment of many MPs against their current Dutch king. He was not to appoint any foreigner to office, or engage England in a war involving any continental territory, or even leave the country, without Parliament's consent. But most constraints under which monarchs laboured owed less to legislation than to the practical difficulties of working with Parliament.

Extract 2: From Steven C A Pincus and James A Robinson, *What really happened during the Glorious Revolution?*, published 2011.

Contemporaries and subsequent commentators have all noted that from 1689 parliament met every year. The post-Revolution parliaments also had a much larger set of legislative achievements. The average parliamentary session in the years after 1689 passed over twice the number of statutes than had sessions before the accession of William and Mary. Nevertheless, it is difficult to argue that the changes contained within the 1688 Revolution constrained the Crown to call parliament more regularly, let alone annually. The Declaration of Rights, that document so central to the Revolution Settlement, merely stated that 'Parliaments ought to be held frequently and permitted to sit.' Even this was no new development, as many contemporary commentators were well aware.

The Revolution Settlement was no more innovative with respect to financial accountability since financial oversight measures had been introduced previously in 1624, 1644 and 1667. After 1688 the government chose, but was not required, to provide the House of Commons with an annual estimate of its expenditure, though the Commons did create a statutory commission of accounts in 1691.

In the light of differing interpretations, how convincing do you find the view that the *Glorious Revolution* 'transformed the relationship between King and Parliament'? (Extract 1, line 3)

Introduction:

P1 quotes & own knowledge to support:

P2 quotes & own knowledge to support:

Similarities between the extracts using quotes and own knowledge (do this twice):

Differences between the extracts using quotes and own knowledge (do this twice):

Conclusion:

## Section C

Study Extracts 1 and 2 before you answer this question.

In the light of differing interpretations, how convincing do you find the view that the Toleration Act of 1689 failed to promote religious tolerance?

Extract 1: From Barry Coward, *Stuart England 1603-1714*, published 1997.

The Toleration Act gave most Protestants legal freedom to worship but it did not end religious intolerance. This is largely explained by the fact that what many in England wanted in 1688-89 was not religious toleration but the creation of a more comprehensive Church of England than had been established in the 1660s. Immediately after William's accession, the main efforts of some churchmen and politicians was to try to provide means by which most Protestants, previously excluded from the Church of England, would feel able to become members of it. However, not all Anglicans were willing to co-operate with Protestant Dissenters, fearing that any concessions would mean the end of the Anglican monopoly in Church and State.

In these circumstances, the limited scope of the Toleration Act is unsurprising. Many Dissenters could now legally worship in freedom, but only at the expense of humiliating conditions - the doors of their meeting houses had to remain open during their religious services, for example. More seriously, the Test Acts remained unrepealed. These restricted all public offices to those who had a certificate of attendance at services held in parish churches of the Church of England. Protestant Dissenters were still second-class citizens despite the Glorious Revolution.

Extract 2: From Robert Bucholz and Newton Key, *Early Modern England 1485-1714*, published 2009.

Through the Toleration Act of 1689, the Glorious Revolution solved a longstanding problem in an enlightened way by introducing partial religious toleration. For the first time since the Civil War, and now permanently, Parliament abandoned the idea of a coercive national Church. This was done by enshrining in law the notion that Protestants of different persuasions could worship in their differing ways and still be good subjects, living together in peace. Admittedly, this was a very limited toleration. Catholics were still excluded from it entirely. Nor were Dissenters fully tolerated, since they were still required to register their meeting houses with the government and keep the doors open during services.

Nevertheless, there was something revolutionary and modern in the rejection of the notion that all had to be of one faith to be good English men and women. It would take time but religious tensions would gradually ease and thereafter all these groups would be brought fully into English public life. In this sense, the Glorious Revolution was a step toward a modern society - tolerant, diverse and accepting of different personal beliefs.

In the light of differing interpretations, how convincing do you find the view that the Toleration Act of 1689 failed to promote religious tolerance?

Introduction:

P1 quotes & own knowledge to support:

P2 quotes & own knowledge to support:

Similarities between the extracts using quotes and own knowledge (do this twice):

Differences between the extracts using quotes and own knowledge (do this twice):

Conclusion:

## Section C

Study Extracts 1 and 2 before you answer this question.

In the light of differing interpretations, how convincing do you find the view that, as a result of the Glorious Revolution, parliament had a 'central role in formulating policy' (Extract 2, line 11)?

Extract 1: From J. Miller, *The Glorious Revolution*, published 1997.

Having distinguished between the civil and military elements in the Crown's ordinary expenditure, the Commons increasingly took over responsibility for military and naval expenditure, voting money to pay the interest on debts incurred on the various branches of the ordinary revenue. Under the pressures of war, the old distinction between ordinary and extraordinary revenue became so blurred as to be meaningless: some argued that the revenue 'is in the crown as a trust' and that 'what is given to the king...is not as he is king, but for support of the nation'. It was superseded by a more realistic distinction between civil and military expenditure. Such a distinction seemed particularly necessary in 1697-8, when many were unwilling to trust William with the army, left over from the war, but it would probably have developed anyway. With the king given a revenue adequate only for his civil expenditure, the tradition that he should 'live of his own', which had received some mortal blows in 1689-90, was buried forever. From the reign of Anne, the monarch was voted the civil list for life, while the army and navy estimates were put before Parliament each year.

The failure to grant William an adequate revenue in 1689-90 was deliberate.... Dislike or distrust of William made the Commons determined not to surrender the financial weapon placed in their hands by the Revolution... whatever the motives, the destruction of all hope of an independent royal revenue transformed the Crown's relationship with parliament. Now the Commons, if they chose, could force their wishes on the king by withholding supply.

Extract 2: From T. Claydon, *Parliament, Policy and Politics in the Reign of William III*, published 2002.

William treasured the legislature as a fierce financial watchdog. Earlier Stuart kings had faced calls for Commons control over how the court spent money. Fears of corruption and extravagance in the royal household had sparked demands that parliament scrutinise and supervise public expenditure to ensure that all sums were used for the public good. Being Stuart kings, Williams predecessors had resisted these calls. They had taken the traditional line that money voted for the king became his private revenue, and insisted that parliamentary comments on the king's finances were unwarranted intrusions into the mysteries of the state. By contrast, William saw a use for Commons mistrust. He knew that parliamentarians suspected that money was wasted and embezzled at court. At the same time, he was determined that money his legislators voted for the struggle with France should actually be used for that purpose... William, therefore, saw a central role for parliament in ensuring financial probity [integrity]. He also seems to have had wider views on the usefulness of his assembly. He appears to have had a vision of it as a source of information and counsel which could provide an alternative to his own circle. He apparently believed that a parliament which represented the nation and knew its condition should have a central role in formulating policy.

In the light of differing interpretations, how convincing do you find the view that, as a result of the Glorious Revolution, parliament had a 'central role in formulating policy' (Extract 2, line 11)?	
Introduction:	
P1 quotes & own knowledge to support:	
P2 quotes & own knowledge to support:	
Similarities between the extracts using quotes and own knowledge (do this twice):	
Differences between the extracts using quotes and own knowledge (do this twice):	
Conclusion:	



Study Extracts 1 and 2 before you answer this question.  
In the light of differing interpretations, how convincing do you find the view that, as a result of the Glorious Revolution, 'the English monarchy became limited' (Extract 2, line 3)?

Extract 1: From J. Morrill, *The Sensible Revolution, 1688 in The Nature of the English Revolution*, published 1993.

The Sensible Revolution of 1688-89 was a conservative Revolution. It did create damaging new rifts in the English nation, although it did sharpen and to some extent extend divisions in Scotland and Ireland that were of lasting consequence. The constitutional settlement and the ecclesiastical settlements were both fudges. It was possible in 1689 for all kinds of people to continue to believe all sorts of contradictory things...(such as that)... James had been lawfully resisted by his subjects because he had violated their civil rights and threatened the true religion; or that there had been no resistance in 1688, only passive disobedience, and that William's expedition had been intended merely to remonstrate with his uncle about the violation of Englishmen's rights, and to secure his wife's rights to the succession in the face of a possible dynastic fraud... If the actors in 1689 were confused, largely unprincipled, living day-to-day and scrambling for solutions, then there can be no turning-point, no great divide. The 'revisionist' question precludes the Whig answer. In establishing a new pattern of constitutional relationships (many of them unanticipated); in creating a new context within which men and women had to make sense of spiritual and moral imperatives; in crystallizing out the two great parties which, in constant evolution, would dominate English politics for the next 200 years; in forcing a redefinition of England's relationship to Europe and the world...the events of 1688-89 quickened and nurtured a distinctive phase in British historical development.

Extract 2: From T. Harris, *The Great Crisis of the British Monarchy, 1685-1720*, published 2006.

One scholar has even claimed that the true English revolution occurred neither in mid-century nor in 1688-9 but in the 1690s. (Historians) disagree, however, over whether such changes were the result of the Glorious Revolution itself or of the subsequent war against France...in which England became involved...The English monarchy became limited, bureaucratic and parliamentary. It ceased to be a personal monarchy in quite the same way it had been under Charles II or James II. Yet in many respects it became a monarchy with more real power, as a result of the creation of the fiscal military state and the concomitant (associated) ability to harness the economic wealth of the country in the service of the sovereign - now the king-(or queen)-in-parliament. It is in this sense that the Glorious Revolution, despite the legal conservatism of the Declaration of Rights, truly brought about a revolutionary transformation of the English state.

In the light of differing interpretations, how convincing do you find the view that, as a result of the Glorious Revolution, 'the English monarchy became limited' (Extract 2, line 3)?

Introduction:

P1 quotes & own knowledge to support:

P2 quotes & own knowledge to support:

Similarities between the extracts using quotes and own knowledge (do this twice):

Differences between the extracts using quotes and own knowledge (do this twice):

Conclusion:

## Section C

Study Extracts 1 and 2 before you answer this question.

In the light of differing interpretations, how convincing do you find the view that, as a result of the Glorious Revolution, parliament became 'pre-eminent' (Extract 1, line 10) in the government of the country?

Extract 1: From Julian Hoppit, *A Land of Liberty?: England 1689-1727*, published 2000.

Truly the Glorious Revolution was miraculous. The reigning monarch [James II] was ousted and his crown placed upon the head of a foreigner and his wife [William of Orange and Mary]. In England it all happened with virtually no bloodshed, though in Ireland and Scotland the toll was much heavier. For many, William's invasion and dynastic revolution was the price of restoring an 'ancient constitution'.

In truth, however, the constitution which emerged after 1688 was new, not old. The permanent place of Parliament within the government of the nation, the willingness of all monarchs to rule through it, and the decline in monarchical power eventually created a workable form of government which the nation had sought for over a century. To contemporaries this was essentially a mixed and balanced government, with monarchy, aristocracy and democracy all present.

Few disagreed that absolute authority resided only in parliamentary legislation, that is, the agreed deliberations of Crown, Peers and Commons. Parliament in its widest sense became pre-eminent in ways that had been unimaginable before 1688.

Extract 2: From John Morrill, *The Oxford Illustrated History of Tudor and Stuart Britain*, published 2009.

There was held to have been an official interval from James's flight until William and Mary's acceptance of the crown. Both were then offered full monarchical authority with decision making in William's hands. This was more of a medieval than a modern takeover.

It changed the King without doing much to change the monarchy. James was deemed to have deserted the kingdom and thereby forfeited the throne (the

Scots promptly deposed him as a tyrant and the Protestants in Ireland just did what the English told them). Those who wanted to, could believe this meant that James had been deposed; those that did not want to believe it, could believe that William and Mary were rightful successors. No blood was shed and there was no way of showing that there had been actual resistance or a loss of support for the monarchy from the people. Those who wanted to, could believe that a contract now existed between Crown and people; those that did not, did not have to.

In the light of differing interpretations, how convincing do you find the view that, as a result of the Glorious Revolution, parliament became 'pre-eminent' (Extract 1, line 10) in the government of the country?

Introduction:

P1 quotes & own knowledge to support:

P2 quotes & own knowledge to support:

Similarities between the extracts using quotes and own knowledge (do this twice):

Differences between the extracts using quotes and own knowledge (do this twice):

Conclusion:

