Thinking through History at Tallis
http://historyattallis.weebly.com
https://www.facebook.com/historyASA2attallis
Email: historyattallis@gmail.com

A level History. Paper 1.

Historical Assessment Objectives 1 and 3

Historical Interpretations. The Glorious Revolution 1688
How revolutionary in the years to 1701, was the Glorious Revolution 1688-1689?
www.parliament.uk - The Glorious Revolution

The crown of England being offered to William of Orange (1650 -1702) and his wife, Mary (1662 - 1694) by the Lords and Commons at Whitehall. Engraving by H. Bourne from the fresco by Edward Matthew Ward in the new Houses of Parliament, painted circa 1860. (Photo by Hulton Archive/Getty Images)

In a Nutshell: The key features and concepts

Key Features and conceptual understanding: Content and concepts.

Introduction. The course of events 1688-1701
Part 1 Students will need to understand the revolutionary ideals which led to the overthrow of James II.
Part 2 Students should be aware of the importance of the Toleration Act.
Part 3 The significance of the Triennial Act 1694 and the growth of parliamentary power.
Part 4 They should be aware that William III's war with France led to a restructuring of government finances,
Conclusion. How revolutionary was the Glorious Revolution?

Spinning conceptual understanding: How can this period be understood thematically and how differently is it interpreted?

Cracking the Puzzle – Preparing for revision and assessment.

In a Nutshell:

The key features and concepts

Activity 1 : Introductory hook to Key features and concepts

Think about the collection of visual evidence that you have been asked to consider.
Think about the following features:
What can we infer from these images about?

Activity 2 – On your marks…engaging conceptually with the key features through timeline.

The timeline makes many brief references to the events of the period X. Use the timeline to colour code according to

Blue	Lack of challenge/effective repression.
Green	Open opposition and protest.
Red	Serious opposition to threaten the future of the state.

Chronology

1685 Charles II died in February and James II's Parliament first met in May, but after November was continuously prorogued until it was dissolved in July 1687.

1686 Godden v Hales allowed James II to dispense individuals from Test Acts. The bishop of London was suspended from his office for not taking action against an anti-Catholic preacher.

1687 James II issued his Declaration of Indulgence for Nonconformists and sent agents to find potential MPs who would vote for repeal of the Test Acts.

June 1688 The "Seven Bishops" prosecuted by James II for refusing to announce the Declaration of Indulgence in their churches were acquitted. The "Immortal Seven" sent their invitation to William of Orange to invade England after the birth of James II's son.

Nov.-Dec. 1688 The "Glorious Revolution" - William of Orange invaded England and James II fled to France. A Convention was summoned to decide the political settlement.

1689 The Convention Parliament voted that James II had 'abdicated' and that William and Mary should be offered the Crown (February). The Commons read the Declaration of Rights to William and Mary, which they later enacted as statute, the Bill of Rights (December). Parliament declared war on France (the Nine Years' War) (May).

1690 Parliament passed an Act establishing a Commons' Commission of Public Accounts to oversee the Crown's use of the revenue.

1694 The Bank of England was founded by parliamentary statute (April). The Triennial Act providing for parliamentary elections every three years was passed (November). Queen Mary died and William III became sole ruler (December)

1696 Revelations of a plot to assassinate William III led to the drafting of an oath of loyalty to the King, rejected by many Tory MPs and peers.

1697 The Treaty of Ryswyck ended the Nine Years' War.

1700 The 11-year old Duke of Gloucester, last surviving child of Princess Anne and second in line to the throne, died.

June 1701 Parliament passed the Act of Settlement to prohibit Catholics from sitting on the throne and placing the succession with the House of Hanover.

1701 James II died and Louis XIV recognised his son as James III (the "Old Pretender") as rightful king of England and Scotland (September), prompting Parliament to legislate for an oath requiring a public abjuration of the Stuarts' claim to the throne.

1702 William III died (March), succeeded by Queen Anne, who almost immediately declared a renewed war against France (the War of the Spanish Succession).

Key features and conceptual understanding: Depth studies illustrating the nature of

What do we need to focus on?

This topic focuses on the Glorious Revolution of 1688–89 which led to the fall of James II and the accession of William and Mary as joint sovereigns. Students will need to understand the revolutionary ideals which led to the overthrow of James II. The significance of the Bill of Rights of 1689 and the Act of Settlement of 1701 should be understood, and the extent to which these acts confirmed the end of divine right and established a constitutional monarchy. Students should be aware of the importance of the Toleration Act and of those who were excluded from the Act's provisions. They should note the extent to which the supremacy of the Anglican Church, and of a confessional state, were both undermined. The importance of the role of parliament in the years 1688–1701 should be understood, and students should be aware of how far parliament had become a partner with the monarchy, in the government of the country. They should be aware that William III's war with France led to a restructuring of government finances, public scrutiny of government income and expenditure and the establishment of the Bank of England in 1694. Students should understand the significance of the change from royal control of finance to parliamentary oversight.

Resources on Glorious Revolution

Texts	1 2 A Anderson “Stuart Britain” Ch8 3 B Coward “The Stuart Age” Pt5 Ch12
History Today Articles	1 **Charles Wilson sets the scene for a special issue celebrating the tercentenary of the Glorious Revolution and England's 'Dutch Connection'.** 2 **Graham Goodlad reviews an ambitious and highly scholarly study of the 'Glorious Revolution'.** 3 **The Glorious Revolution was the result of a contest between two competing visions of the modern state, argues Steven Pincus. The springboard for Britain’s eventual global dominance, this surprisingly violent series of events became a model for change the world over** 4 **John Carswell analyses some of the foremost political actors in the Glorious Revolution of 1688.** 5 **John Spurr reviews two books on the Glorious Revolution.**
Videos	1 S Schama A History of Britain - 09 Revolutions 2 D Starkey Monarchy Series 3 Episode 2 The Glorious Revolution..Channel 4 on demand 3 D Starkey Monarchy Series 3 Episode 3 Rule Britannia..Channel 4 on demand
HA Podcasts	1 https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/0B1nsDxK47bFYQ1phcmJ6UEtOZHM

Online links to 17th Century British History

Lecture Links

Early Modern England with Keith E. Wrightson

- by YaleCourses
- 25 videos
- 47,782 views
- 19 hours

This course is intended to provide an up-to-date introduction to the development of English society between the late fifteenth and the early eighteenth centuries. Particular issues addressed in the lectures will include: the changing social structure; households; local communities; gender roles; economic development; urbanization; religious change from the Reformation to the Act of Toleration; the Tudor and Stuart monarchies; rebellion, popular protest and civil war; witchcraft; education, literacy and print culture; crime and the law; poverty and social welfare; the changing structures and dynamics of political participation and the emergence of parliamentary government.
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OTXtUzVKhCI&index=24&list=PL18B9F132DFD967A3
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JFwSNmV6Ijw&index=23&list=PL18B9F132DFD967A3

Documentaries

1 History of Britain by Raymond Sneyers

Taking a look at the reign of the Stuarts. An era of an expanding court, plague, fire, radical politics, religious debate, and a bloody civil war in the mid-seventeenth century between Cavaliers and Roundheads.
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pR8JUQVbaEg&index=7&list=PLJxO2DxkRtAFV_SpPpM8QckwT_nlrpTJu

2 The Stuarts by David Starkey
https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLC2C91574A2C6D0AC

3 BBC2 The Stuarts by Dr Clare Jackson
http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/p01lkn5l/clips

4 Royal Heritage: Part 3. The Stuarts George Digby
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5GF5zTv8S1s
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5NdMpNIYeiM

Maps and walks

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=igOiZdiVpi8
http://colinbrown00.com/page5.php

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=G0JpV-PobcA
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=txzgbkvcN7M

Website links Britain 1688-1703

General Introduction
1 https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lRLRhDB-HxE
2 http://www.bbc.co.uk/history/british/civil_war_revolution/
3https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PE0RAgHr06U&list=PLvsS9mRi0sXZx4M4Ysdxr-THM8APIMsMy

Britain 1688-1703

1http://www.parliament.uk/about/living-heritage/evolutionofparliament/parliamentaryauthority/revolution/
2http://www.parliament.uk/about/living-heritage/evolutionofparliament/parliamentaryauthority/revolution/overview/

Content

Historical Interpretations. How revolutionary in the years to 1701, was the Glorious Revolution 1688-1689?	This topic focuses on the overview of the Glorious Revolution of 1688–89 which led to the fall of James II and the accession of William and Mary as joint sovereigns and the historiography of the development **Introduction.** The course of events 1688-1701 **Part 1** Students will need to understand the revolutionary ideals which led to the overthrow of James II. The significance of the Bill of Rights of 1689 and the Act of Settlement of 1701 should be understood, and the extent to which these acts confirmed the end of divine right and established a constitutional monarchy. **Part 2** Students should be aware of the importance of the Toleration Act and of those who were excluded from the Act's provisions. They should note the extent to which the supremacy of the Anglican Church, and of a confessional state, were both undermined. **Part 3** The significance of the Triennial Act 1694 and the growth of parliamentary power. The importance of the role of parliament in the years 1688–1701 should be understood, and students should be aware of how far parliament had become a partner with the monarchy, in the government of the country. **Part 4** They should be aware that William III's war with France led to a restructuring of government finances, public scrutiny of government income and expenditure and the establishment of the Bank of England in 1694. Students should understand the significance of the change from royal control of finance to parliamentary oversight. **Conclusion.** How revolutionary was the Glorious Revolution?

Memory Retrieval strategies 1688-1703

ICM **Part 1** The significance of revolutionary ideals in the establishment of a constitutional monarchy. 2 Hours

ITA **Part 2** The impact of the Toleration Act 1688 and the end of Anglican supremacy. 2 Hours

STA **Part 3** The significance of the Triennial Act 1694 and the growth of parliamentary power. 2 Hours

WWFR **Part 4** The importance of William III's wars in the development of a financial revolution.2 Hours

Part 1 : The significance of revolutionary ideals in the establishment of a constitutional monarchy.

Introduction

The Revolution of 1688-89 has retreated somewhat from public consciousness and is not generally viewed as a significant event, on a par with the signing of the Magna Carta in 1215, the Civil Wars of the mid-17th century or the Act of Union of 1707. This is primarily because the consensus among historians from the 18th century to the present day is that it was a bloodless revolution that restored an ancient English constitution, rather than a revolution that fundamentally changed the make-up of social, political and religious life. Some historians have countered this consensus by suggesting that the Revolution represents a radical shift in the history of Britain. Ideas of absolute monarchy and a confessional state were questioned and parliament became pre-eminent in the political system. When Charles I was faced with limits on his prerogative powers in the form of parliament's Nineteen Propositions in 1642 (see Chapter 1), his reply was that parliament's only duty was to levy taxes and ensure that monarchs did not become tyrants. Within 100 years, parliament was to become an integral part of the political system, controlling most taxation and public spending, deciding who would succeed the king and meeting more regularly than ever before. As well as this, factions developed in the form of the Whigs and the Tories, who would dominate politics for the following 200 years. Eventually, they would evolve to become the Liberal and Conservative parties.

Religious reform was a key element of the settlement established by William and Mary. Catholics were to be excluded from public life through the Toleration Act, which allowed nonconformists to worship without persecution. A revolution also came about in public finances, culminating in the foundation of the Bank of England in 1694. William's Nine Years' War with France (1688-97) put a heavy strain on government funds, necessitating a restructuring of government finances and more scrutiny of public spending. The financial revolution was also a political one, as parliament was increasingly involved in controlling and scrutinising public finances and royal expenditure.

In April 1687, James II issued a Declaration of Indulgence, suspending penal laws against Catholics as well as allowing some religious toleration for dissenters. His dissolution of parliament in the summer and his attempt to repeal the pro-Anglican Test Acts led to increased opposition from the political establishment. After seven bishops refused to read another Declaration of Indulgence in May 1688, their acquittal after they were arrested was met with public rejoicing. Seven leading figures from the political nation, terrified at the prospect of a Catholic heir after James' wife finally fell pregnant, sent an invitation to William of Orange to bring a force against James.

William arrived, and in December 1688, James fled the country. A 'convention parliament' was established in January 1689, and it declared that William would rule jointly with his wife, Mary,

the Protestant daughter of James. They were presented with a Declaration of Rights, which affirmed a number of constitutional principles, such as the prohibition of unparliamentary taxation and the need for regular parliaments. Pressure from William ensured that a Toleration Act was passed in May 1689, granting many Protestant groups, but not Catholics, religious freedom.

Meanwhile, James attempted to amass a force in Ireland in order to take back the throne, which led to William leading an army and securing victory against him at the Battle of the Boyne in 1690. William spent much of the years 1690-97 on campaign, against the supporters of James and the armies of Louis XIV of France. In 1694, Mary died, and parliament secured the passing of a Triennial Act, which ensured parliament would be called regularly, and in the same year, the Bank of England was created, primarily to finance William's war with France, which ended in 1697. The importance of parliament in these years is highlighted by the creation of the civil list in 1698, which gave William a fixed financial allowance that could only be approved by parliament. Parliament was also able to scrutinise public spending in a way they had not been able to before. Fears of a potential Catholic succession once again became pronounced in the late 1690s and, in 1701, the Act of Settlement was passed, which would lead to a German prince, George of Hanover (later George I of England) becoming king in 1714. James II died in 1701, and the Security of the Succession Act was passed, requiring nearly all public office-holders to take the oath of abjuration, denouncing James' son, also called James, as heir to the throne. Before the succession of George, when William died in 1702, he was immediately succeeded by Queen Anne, Mary's Protestant sister.

Evaluating interpretations of history

The job of the historian is to provide judgements about what happened in the past based on research and an assessment of the available evidence. It is inevitable that this process will result in their opinion or beliefs influencing the outcome of their research. This chapter contains a number of interpretations that will help you prepare for Section C of your exam. Although the interpretations historians present are based to some extent on opinion, this does not mean they should be discarded by the student. Evaluating and comparing a number of interpretations of an event can be just as useful as evaluating different primary sources in order to ascertain the truth. Some historians will clearly state their agenda throughout their work, and others will attempt to remain as neutral as possible. Either way, it is important to note that every interpretation created is informed, whether consciously or unconsciously, by factors including the political, religious, moral or cultural viewpoint of its autho[

Sound interpretations need to be backed up with evidence, and it is important for the historian to show how they have arrived at their interpretation. When reading the extracts in this chapter; consider the following questions.

- Is the author actually giving an interpretation or are they simply stating facts?
- Is the interpretation based on generalisations or is it backed up by evidence?

- Does the historian make clear the methods they have used to arrive at their interpretation?
- Do any other interpretations agree with the one given?

Activity 1

This topic focuses on the overview of the Glorious Revolution of 1688–89 which led to the fall of James II and the accession of William and Mary as joint sovereigns and the historiography of the development **Part 1** Students will need to understand the revolutionary ideals which led to the overthrow of James II. The significance of the Bill of Rights of 1689 and the Act of Settlement of 1701 should be understood, and the extent to which these acts confirmed the end of divine right and established a constitutional monarchy.

Role 1: Textbook Researcher and scribe. p116-121	
The revolutionary ideals leading to overthrow of James II	In 1688 it was evident that James II had lost the confidence of much of the political nation. It seemed that the fears that had caused the Civil War earlier in the century had come to fruition: a Catholic was on the throne and he was aspiring to be an absolute monarch. After he had successfully defeated Charles II's illegitimate son, the Duke of Monmouth, in 1685, James consolidated his power by apparently modelling his rule on the despotism seen in France under Louis XIV Many Protestants had been holding on to the hope that James would be succeeded by his Protestant daughter, Mary, wife of William of Orange. This changed, however, when the queen gave birth to a son and potential Catholic heir in June 1688. It is easy to depict the Glorious Revolution as a popular uprising of the Protestant majority against a tyrannical and unpopular king, leaving the path clear for William to gratefully receive the throne. However, the reality was very different from this and the beliefs that drove the actors in these events were wide-ranging. Historical interpretations of the overthrow of James II tend to explain the events with reference to a number of key themes. ● Most traditional interpretations accepted that the Glorious Revolution was the result of a foreign invasion and was not instigated by the native population of England. Another common view is that the Revolution was a bloodless one. The 19th-century Whig historian Thomas Macaulay contrasted it with the French Revolution and concluded that it was the least violent revolution known to history. More recent interpretations, as put forward by historians such as Edward Vallance, have claimed that the Revolution should be reassessed as one typified by violence, especially in Ireland and Scotland. ● Macaulay also believed that the overthrow of the king came about due to a moderate political consensus between Whigs and Tories. More recently, John Morrill has built on this and described the events of 1688-89 as the 'Sensible Revolution' .

	• Marxist historians have presented 1688 as a continuation of the 'bourgeoisie revolution' of 1649, where the propertied classes overthrew a monarchy that restricted their economic livelihoods. According to the Marxists, the propertied classes were again the only group to benefit from the events of 1688-89. A key motive for those who prompted the overthrow of the king was religious conviction. Many Whig members of parliament (MPs) shared the view of John Locke, that enforcing religious uniformity would lead to social disorder and that imposing a single 'true religion' is impossible as humans are not capable of judging which religious standpoints are the most legitimate. The Anglican Tories who opposed James had to find a way to oppose his initiatives without contradicting their established principles of non-resistance and passive obedience. In Extract 1, Tim Harris outlines the reasons why some Anglican Tories felt compelled to oppose James II. James reissued the Declaration of Indulgence in 1688, giving toleration to all religious groups, both Protestant and Catholic. As well as the obvious friction created by James· attempt to allow Catholics and, potentially, those of non-Christian faiths freedom of religion, opponents of the Declaration objected to the fact that James was attempting to overrule parliament by going against their wishes. Pamphleteering against the Declaration began promptly and the Marquis of Halifax argued that, although he understood why the dissenters were attracted to the idea of toleration offered by James, they should resist his overtures towards them and wait for parliament to pass its own law: one offering true religious freedom that did not favour Catholics and did not set a precedent for absolute rule. Gilbert Burnet offered a similar view in his Ill Effects of Animosities among Protestants in England Detected. Burnet was a clergyman who had been invited by William to live in The Hague in the Netherlands, and took up his offer in 1686, thus making his work an early piece of Williamite propaganda. Burnet explained that, since the Restoration, both Charles II and James II had attempted to create divisions among Protestants in order to pursue their agenda of promoting Catholicism and arbitrary government. He believed that both dissenting nonconformists and conformists should work together to defend the Established Church. He also claimed in 1687 that James had transgressed the constitution and laws of England, thus virtually deposing himself from government. The idea that James had abdicated himself from government would be taken up again by William's supporters in the winter of 1688-89.

	In the end, political change resulted from James resigning his throne voluntarily. This was necessary for the Revolution to take place because, although it was likely that the Commons would have managed to secure a majority against James' continued reign, the Lords would probably have rejected any proposal. The clergy, too, would not have approved of a change of personnel. There were, of course, precedents for the overthrow of the monarch dating back to the Middle Ages, and the execution of Charles I, still within living memory for many, was a more recent example. Many within the political and religious establishment were generally in favour of divine right and hereditary monarchy in order to prevent the return of the unstable governments experienced during the Interregnum, so there is a strong chance that James would have kept his crown if he had not resigned it voluntarily. The Whig argument at the time for the deposal of James II was that he had broken a solemn contract with his people. Some moderates in the Commons would argue that government existed as a result of an agreement between the king and the people, and John Locke's Two Treatises of Government (1689) tends to suggest that the Revolution was an opportunity for those who represented the people in parliament to alter the constitution. Locke's work, although published after the Revolution itself, is often seen as a justification, or even a manifesto, for the kind of government the Whigs wanted to create after James abdicated. As discussed in Chapter 3, Locke rejected the view that the Crown should have unquestioned authority and suggested that the monarch did not necessary have a divine right to rule. He believed in freedom, although he only advocated freedom from government interference in order to protect life and property and was not interested in universal suffrage. Locke and the Whigs believed that, if a ruler attempted to behave as an absolute monarch, citizens had the right to remove them. In the opening days of the Convention Parliament in January 1689, some Whig MPs voiced similar concerns to Locke. Sir Robert Howard argued that the government was grounded on a pact between king and people an□. if the king broke that pact, members of parliament were within their rights to appoint another ruler. Despite the fact that James II had openly defied both parliament and the religious establishment, prompting actions that would become revolutionary, historians are generally agreed that William's invasion was equally as important in leading to a change in government, whether William intended to take the throne or not. His invasion was invited by those who rejected James' government, but they did not necessarily have a plan in place

	when they sent their invitation.
Significance of Bill of Rights 1689	After William arrived in London and James slipped away to France in December 1688, the terms for a political settlement were not immediately clear. Had James abdicated his throne? Was William intent on working with parliament or against them? Could a parliament be summoned without a king to summon it? On 26 December, William arranged for a meeting of sympathetic peers and MPs in order to plan for the future of the monarchy and the country. A Convention Parliament was hastily elected, with its first meeting due for 22 January 1689. Radical Whigs wanted to declare William king immediately, but many others favoured a role for his wife, Mary, by hereditary right. Thus, the Crown was offered to them both, and a Declaration of Rights was presented to both William and Mary at the same time as the offer of the Crown and read out at their coronation ceremony. Although William would claim that he did not accept the throne with conditions, it was clear that both William and Mary had been placed on the throne based on terms put forward by the elected representatives of the people. At the end of 1689, the Declaration was modified and many of its terms placed on the statute book as the Bill of Rights. The Bill of Rights is often cited as a significant constitutional document, as important as the Magna Carta of 1215 and the Petition of Right of 1628. Most of the clauses included in the bill referred to specific abuses of the royal prerogative under Charles II and James II, and the important clause calling for elections to be both regular and free reflected resentment among MPs at attempts by the Crown to intimidate them and tamper with elections. The bill is also important because it made certain the legal position of the army, which had been in some doubt. The clause stating that a force could not be raised or kept in times of peace without the consent of parliament was inserted in direct reaction to the forces created by Charles II, which could have been used to enforce absolutism. As well as this, a number of Mutiny Acts were passed from 1689, ensuring that the king could not court martial at will without the consent of parliament, and as each Act was only valid for a year, the king had no choice but to turn to parliament regularly for approval. Parliament asserted its control of the military through the Bill of Rights, but many of the other clauses simply restated what was already known to be part of the constitution and cleared up grey areas of the royal prerogative. The Marxist historian Christopher Hill has argued that the Bill of Rights was vague and that references in particular to holding frequent parliaments could still allow for

	absolutism to creep in. The Bill made no provision for ensuring that elections were regular or free and made no definition of what 'free' actually meant. This vagueness would be partially, although not completely, removed by the Triennial Act of 1694. According to the historian John Morrill, the Bill of Rights was not as significant as some historians suggest, as it was a statute law that could be revoked by any future parliament. He believed that the Bill was not a yardstick by which other laws could be judged and did not form part of a contract between the king and the people. It did not create a new procedure by which arbitrary monarchs could be removed and, if this was to happen, it would need to be done in the same way it was done before 1688: as a result of rebellion or through parliamentary pressure The monarch was still free to decide on issues surrounding war, peace and foreign policy, and William was stilll able to choose his own advisers.
Significance of the Act of Settlement 1701	Restrictions on the rights of the Crown were not simply limited to the revolutionary years of 1688 and 1689. The Act of Settlement appeared in 1701 and stated that, in order to bypass potential Catholic heirs to the throne, the succession would be vested in the House of Hanover, a German royal dynasty, after the reign of Queen Anne (the Protestant daughter of James II), who became queen after William's death. The House of Hanover was linked to the Stuarts through Sophia, the granddaughter of James I, and as William and Mary (and Anne) had no surviving children, she was the next suitable heir Sophia married Ernst Augustus, Elector of Hanover, and died before she could inherit the throne, thus passing the succession down to her son, George I, who became King of and those married to Catholics, were barred from the succession and all future monarchs were required to be members of the Church of England. The Act was not simply limited to providing for a smooth succession and it enabled a number of legislative proposals first put forward in 1689 to finally reach the statute book. Judges could no longer be dismissed without the consent of parliament, a reaction to James' removal of disloyal members of the judiciary. Another demand that had been discussed in 1689 was for royal pardons to be declared irrelevant in cases of impeachment, but this was only included in the Act as Tories hoped to impeach William's Whig advisors. The Act can be seen as a reaction against the policies of William and not simply an attempt to resurrect some of the reforming zeal of 1689. The clause concerning the religion of the monarch reflected concerns over William's Calvinism as much as a fear of Catholicism and another proviso preventing the monarch from leaving Britain without the permission of parliament is rooted in a fear of William doing just that.

	It is no coincidence that the clause concerning the flight of the monarch was repealed in 1716, when it was no longer seen as necessary as William was no longer king. The fear of absolutism and a desire to rein in the king is clear throughout the Act. No future foreign monarch was allowed to enter England into a war in order to defend the monarch's home country without the consent of parliament, which serves as a clear response to the potential threat of William. William had entered England into the expensive Nine Years' War (the implications of which are discussed later in the chapter - see pages 129-130). All matters regarding the governing of Britain had to be discussed with the full Privy Council and not decided by the monarch alone. No foreign-born man was allowed to join the Privy Council, sit in either House of Parliament, have a military command, or be granted lands or titles.
How far did these two Acts confirm the end of Divine Right and establish principle of Constitutional monarchy	There can be no doubt that the concept of divine right monarchy was severely damaged by the Revolution settlement and many hIstonans see it as a watershed moment in the reduction of the Crown's prerogative powers. After the Bill of Rights was passed, it was no longer possible for monarchs to claim their power came from God, as their authority was approved by the people through the1r representatives in parliament. The concept of divine right was one of the issues over which the original Civil War had been fought in 1642, and the victors had briefly established a republican system between 1649 and 1660. The concept again came to the forefront of politics after the Restoration in 1660. Historians have developed different views over the centuries on the impact of the Bill of Rights and Act of Settlement. The Whig dommat1on of parliament that began during the reign of William continued with Robert Walpole, who became prime minister in 1721, and Whig writers maintained that the Bill of Rights preserved England's 'ancient constitution' from the absolutism of James II; therefore, it represented the restoration of previous political stability, rather than creating an entirely new settlement. The Whig view gradually developed to present the political settlement as a starting point of a new constitution, a revolution where both Tories and Whigs compromised and a constitutional monarchy was established. This view became so well established that it was included in school textbooks, most famously Edward □aldwin's The History of England for the Use of Schools (1806). This mterpretat1on presented parliament as the supreme authority in the polit1cal system after the settlement and the post-revolution era was seen as the beginning of a new period of English history. Even the Marxist historians Christopher Hill and AL. Morton

	borrowed much from Whig theorists and went on to present the settlement as one that created a constitutional monarchy in the interests of the existing ruling elites. Some revisionist historians such as John Morrill (Extract 3) have attacked the importance given by Whigs and Marxists to the Revolution a□d have instead presented the events as changing virtually nothing except the line of succession. They believe that a constitutional monarchy was not fully established, although the concept of divine right was effectively destroyed. Parliament was-still officially an advisory body only and the office of prime minister did not emerge until Robert Walpole informally took the title alongside the already established office of First Lord of the Treasury in 1721. The monarch was still pre-eminent within the political system, parliament still represented only the richest two percent of the population and the electorate was still small. It was not until 1760 that the 'crown estate' was created and most of the monarch's property was placed under the control of parliament. What was created through the political settlement can best be described as a monarchy of parliament's choosing. Parliament effectively decided who the next monarch would be and parliament could suspend the Mutiny Act at any time in order to restrict the king's control of the army It could also be argued that the framework for a constitutional monarchy had initially been established with the Magna Carta in 1215, as the monarch was compelled to consult a 'great council' over at least some issues. It is perhaps best to describe the Bill of Rights and Act of Settlement as the further foundations of a constitutional monarchy, rather than the end product. Royal interference with the law was now restricted, elections were to be regular and free from the interference of the monarch, and taxation by royal prerogative was theoretically no longer possible.

Part 2 : The impact of the Toleration Act 1689 and the end of Anglican supremacy.

Activity 1

Part 2 Students should be aware of the importance of the Toleration Act and of those who were excluded from the Act's provisions. They should note the extent to which the supremacy of the Anglican Church, and of a confessional state, were both undermined.

Role 1: Textbook Researcher and scribe. p 122-23	
The importance of the Toleration Act	As well as a political settlement, a religious settlement was also established after the Glorious Revolution. Anglican Churchmen were concerned with ensuring that worship within the Church remained uniform and was not modified. In early 1689, William urged the removal of the sacramental test for public office holders, which would mean repealing the Test Act that expected all office holders to take Anglican Communion. As a compromise, William suggested that a Toleration Act be passed with a promise for Tory and Anglican demands for uniformity to be referred to Convocation later in the year. William was well aware of the need to maintain good relations with both dissenters and Anglicans, so attempted to pursue a middle path. The Act was passed by the reluctant Tories and it was influenced most obviously by John Locke's A Letter Concerning Toleration, printed in 1689 but prepared in the years before. William, who favoured toleration and was originally suspicious of the Anglican Church, was met with confrontation from the Tories, who were fearful that he wanted to impose Dutch Calvinism. Under the terms of the Act, dissenters were exempted from punishments if they took the oath of allegiance to the Crown and accepted the 1678 Test Act, meaning they could not enter public employment without swearing loyalty to the Anglican Church. Dissenters were therefore not expected to attend an Anglican church, but their meetings were closely monitored and the doors of their meeting places could not be locked. The Act even made special dispensations for certain dissenting groups: as the Quakers refused to take oaths, they were allowed to declare, rather than swear, that they denied the pope's authority. The Act certainly made it easier for dissenters to worship freely and, by 1714, there were around 400,000 dissenters in England. The Toleration Act served to humiliate the Anglican clergy and Tories in the Commons. The Whig majority in parliament, who had been keen for the Act to be passed, then insisted that the clergy take an

	oath of allegiance to William and Mary. As they had already sworn allegiance to James and believed in the concept of passive obedience to his royal authority, many were troubled by this demand, and over 400 parish priests refused and were deprived of their livings. This gave the Whigs a perfect excuse to attack the Tories and High Church clergy, accusing them of being more loyal to James than to William. The clergy that were removed from office were replaced by more moderate men, sympathetic to the Whig cause.
Who was excluded from the Act's provisions and why?	The Act excluded Catholics, non-Trinitarians and Jews. As the Test Act was not repealed, non-Anglicans could still not sit in parliament or hold public office. Those who did not swear allegiance to the Anglican Church could not attend university, work in the legal profession or practise medicine. Even those dissenting groups that were tolerated under the terms of the Act were not fully equal to Anglicans, as they still had to pay tithes to a Church to which they did not attend and did not belong. In reality, Catholics had little to fear from William, as he had effectively guaranteed their safety by entering into an alliance with a number of Catholic powers against the French in the League of Augsburg in 1686. (T his alliance would later fight together in the Nine Years' War.) A number of Whigs commented that Catholics were really the group that gained most from the Revolution and, when Frenchman Henri Misson commented on the state of England in the 1690s, he noted that, despite legal limitations, Catholics appeared to enjoy universal toleration.
Was the Anglican Church and the confessional state undermined?	The Toleration Act and events of the period 1688-1701 served to undermine the established Anglican Church in a number of ways, and the historian Christopher Hill has argued (Extract 4) that the role of religion in local government and the legal system was also reduced. • It was now accepted that the Church of England could not enforce complete uniformity and that some allowances had to be made for dissenters. The dissenters flourished and made up nearly eight percent of the population by 1714. • Catholics enjoyed a reasonable degree of freedom despite being excluded from the provisions of the Toleration Act. Contemporaries reported that many Catholics were able to participate in mass without any trouble. • William used his royal authority to influence judges and curb Church interference in the lives of Catholics and dissenting sects not covered by the Act.

	• The power of Church courts, which had been crucial in upholding the authority of the confessional state earlier in the century, was severely restricted by the Toleration Act. However, a number of historians (see Extract 5) argue that the Anglican Church still had an important role. • Crucially, the statutes enforcing uniformity (Test Act and Act of Uniformity) that had been passed under earlier Stuart monarchs were not repealed, which meant that public officials were duty-bound to swear allegiance to the Church. • To gain public employment or join parliament, there was no choice but to swear allegiance to the Crown and take Anglican Communion. • There was no great theological debate between MPs and peers before the Toleration Act was passed. It can be seen as a reactionary attempt to maintain order and preserve the Anglican Church. • As Extract 5 makes clear, further Toleration Acts were passed in Scotland and Ireland, and these did not give dissenters the opportunity to participate in national or local government. There was a fear in the royal court that the alternative to Anglican supremacy was a dangerous slide into religious radicalism and social revolution.

Part 3 The significance of the Triennial Act 1694 and the growth of parliamentary power.

Activity 1

Part 3 The significance of the Triennial Act 1694 and the growth of parliamentary power. The importance of the role of parliament in the years 1688–1701 should be understood, and students should be aware of how far parliament had become a partner with the monarchy, in the government of the country.

Role 1: Textbook Researcher and scribe. p124-28	
Williams advisors	William used his prerogative powers immediately after becoming King in order to form a Privy Council of his own choosing. His choice of Lord Halifax as Lord Privy Seal was not surprising as he had to become a close adviser to William after being dismissed by James. Halifax had led the House of Lords in their discussions about the political settlements during the Convention Parliament and perhaps most critically he was not loyal to either the Tory or Whig parties. William struggled to understand the system of political parties and was keen to appoint someone who would be able to transcend their differences. the Earl of Danby, who had helped arrange The Marriage of William and Mary in 1677 was appointed Lord President of the Council. A carefully selected balance of Whigs and Tories were appointed to other posts, although they struggled to command the respect of the Commons.
Williams relationship with the political parties	The parliament of 1690 consisted of 225 Whigs and 206 Tories. Williams' natural allies should have been the Whigs, who favoured progressive reform and who had originally called for a Protestant succession. William originally believed they were too radical and had suspicions that the number of them were in fact Republicans. he hoped to woo the Tories, who we knew to favour tradition and loyalty to the monarchy and the Anglican church. The first session of the 1690 Parliament saw a strengthening in the position of the Privy Council over parliament and an opposition attempt to establish a parliamentary commission to investigate government accounts was rejected. Meanwhile, James was amassing a force in Ireland in an attempt to return to power, and William left to fight in the summer of 1690, culminating in his victory at the Battle of the Boyne in July.

	The counselors who he left in charge in his absence reflected his clear preference for loyal Court Tories. The war in Ireland, which became known as the Williamite War (1689-91) had started when James held a parliament in Ireland in 1689, where the majority of the Catholic gentry of Ireland offered their support to his cause. Over 80,000 soldiers fought on both sides and, although William achieved a relatively swift victory, some historians have used the war as evidence that the Glorious Revolution was not the peaceful and sensible transition suggested by the Whigs. Over 8,000 people died when William's forces defended the Siege of Derry in 1689, and half of James' soldiers were killed or captured at the Battle of Aughrim in July 1691. The cost of the war in Ireland was a concern for parliament and the Whigs, headed by Robert Harley, were able to establish a commission of accounts in an attempt to control expenditure. In 1691-92, divisions in William's council over strategy led to a series of defeats to the French in the Nine Years' War (1688-97) between Louis XIV and an alliance of other European states. The Williamite War in Ireland, as well as a Jacobite rising in Scotland (1689-92), which resulted in a massacre of James' supporters by Williamites at Glencoe in 1692, have been interpreted by historians as extensions of the wider Nine Years' War. A group of Whig rebels known as the 'Whig Junto' became influential between 1692 and 1693. They favoured a strong executive and supported William's war. There was an attempt to push through a triennial bill in order to ensure regular parliaments. This was passed by both Houses and William was forced to use his royal veto to deny the bill becoming law. The king was only holding onto his position of predominance within the political system with difficulty.
The significance of the Triennial Act 1694	By the beginning of 1694, the Whig Junta was beginning to dominate government: Montagu became Chancellor of the Exchequer, Somers Lord Keeper and Russell First Lord of the Admiralty. The triennial bill was debated again and received the royal assent in January 1694. Under the terms of the Triennial Act, a parliament could not last longer than three years, which meant general elections would be held more regularly. More seats were contested in these regular elections, as Edward Vallance discusses in Extract 6. Rivalry between Whigs and Tories was stronger than ever, but regular elections meant that it was difficult for the Crown to establish a party in the House of Commons, leading to William becoming more reliant on securing support from MPs. The Act was repealed in 1716 and replaced with the Septennial Act, which allowed for elections every seven years.

	The period from circa 1690 to 1715 has been referred to by historians as the Rage of Party, characterised by the instability caused by frequent elections. With more regular elections came a renewed interest in politics from those outside the immediate political nation and the electorate were better informed than they had ever been as a result of the lapsing of the Licensing Act of 1695, which had previously led to heavy censorship of the press. This new press freedom allowed for political pamphleteering and journalism to influence the votes of the 200,000 men that could vote. The impact that the Act had on both parliament and government is discussed in Extracts 6 and 7.
The role of Parliament 1694-1701	The Triennial Act gave the Commons a new-found confidence and, in 1695, a number of inquiries were set up to investigate corruption in government. The Speaker, Sir John Trevor, was accused of accepting a bribe of 1,000 guineas in order to assist with the passage of a bill and William was convinced that parliament would have to be dissolved in order to prevent the inquiries from continuing. When this happened, another election was held in October 1695. This election favoured the Whigs, who cemented their dominance over parliament and the Privy Council. When, in February 1696, a plot by Stuart sympathisers to assassinate the king was discovered, the Whigs became more united than ever and, with the potential of a French invasion never far away, William seemed more dependent than ever on the Whig faction in parliament and the Whig Junto in the Privy Council. Both Houses adopted a Whig proposal acknowledging William as the lawful king and reasserted their belief in him through a loyal 'Association', although 89 Tories did not sign it. A reminder that opposition to the Whig faction was still lingering was given in 1697, when the opposition to the Junto in the council were able to secure a vote that limited William to sustaining an army of just 10,000 men through government grants. The tug-of-war between the king's ministry and the Commons continued throughout 1697 and 1698, although the Junta usually garnered enough support to govern as they pleased. The election of 1698 was marked by a distrust of the Whig Junta, and the rivalry between Court and Country interests was as strong as ever The Country opposition were able to secure a bill that restricted the size of the army in England to 7,000 and refused to allow the retention of William's Dutch guard. As well as this, a commission was set up to investigate the Crown's choice of recipients for confiscated lands in Ireland. In 1698, it seemed clear that William had little room for manoeuvre and parliament was dictating policy.

	The heavy blows sustained by the government in 1698 contributed to the Junto dismantling. Montagu was demoted within the Privy Council and Russell was forced to resign his rank within the Admiralty. Only Somers survived. In 1699, the commission investigating confiscated lands in Ireland issued its report and found that William had made excessive grants to loyal courtiers. The Commons put forward a bill of resumption, which infuriated William, who saw it as an infringement of his royal prerogative and a personal insult. After an attempt by the Lords to stall the bill, William reluctantly gave it the royal assent, allowing the parliamentary session to be brought to an end. The Commons also petitioned for the resignation of Somers, which William again saw as a personal affront to his authority; and, although the opposition lost the vote on Somers's future, he resigned. in the election of 1701, the Tories made gains and instigated impeachment proceedings against Somers, Montagu and Russell, although they were eventually acquitted by their fellow parliamentarians.
How far did Parliament become a partner in Government.	If the Revolution did not represent the dawn of parliamentary democracy, it certainly represented a move towards parliamentary government. William needed parliamentary taxes to fight the French and this resulted m parliament gaining increased control over government finance, as discussed later in the chapter. Through the Triennial Act, it became an institution that the monarch could not ignore. Political necessity had forced William to appoint men he loathed (he refused to speak to Wharton) and he was forced to reduce the size of the army as a result of a parliamentary decision. The argument in favour of parliament becoming a partner in government is a strong one. ● Parliament was able to encroach on areas that were once firmly part of the royal prerogative, such as the kings appointment of ministers and control of the army. ● The Triennial Act did enhance the power of parliament, but this authority would not have been possible Without the Bill of Rights. Under its terms, parliament had to give approval for a standing army to be kept in peace time and taxation Without parliamentary consent was illegal. ● Earlier monarchs, such as Charles I. had refused demands for parliament to be given more power on the grounds that its only purpose was to raise money for the Crown. This was no longer the case and the monarchy was faced with no option but to work with parliament. ● The Bill of Rights gave guarantees that the abuses of power experienced under James II would not be repeated.

	• The monarch was not allowed to interfere with elections and the proceedings of parliament could not be questioned by judges • The financial settlement reached ensured that William and Mary would be financially dependent on parliament, as discussed further in the chapter Although parliament had become an integral part of the political system, there was still a desire among many of the political class to join the royal court, which strengthened William's hand. Much of the royal prerogative was left intact, such as the sovereign's power to declare war, to dissolve parliament and veto legislation if he desired. Through the Civil List Act of 1697, parliament decided to give a grant of £700,000 per year to William for life, in order to cover the expenses of the royal household, as well as salaries for diplomats and judges. This is perhaps the best example of king and parliament working in unison; he still had vast power and commanded deep respect, but was more aware than any previous monarch of the need to gain the approval of the elected representatives.

Part 4 The importance of William III's wars in the development of a financial revolution.

Activity 1

Part 4 They should be aware that William III's war with France led to a restructuring of government finances, public scrutiny of government income and expenditure and the establishment of the Bank of England in 1694. Students should understand the significance of the change from royal control of finance to parliamentary oversight.

Role 1: Textbook Researcher and scribe. p129-34	
The course of the Nine years war	The Nine Years' War (1688-97) was fought between the League of Augsburg, led by Holland, England, Spain and the Holy Roman Empire, and France under Louis XIV William, as head of state in both Holland and Britain, spent a total of six years on campaign, making many key strategic decisions himself He was concerned with ensuring that France was not able to dominate, and that balance was restored to, European politics. This marked a complete transformation in British foreign policy, and William was certainly taking a risk by committing millions of pounds and thousands of troops to the war effort. The war caused strain between William and parliament, as the huge sums he was demanding to fund the war had never been approved by a parliament before. Louis appeared to have a number of advantages, including authority through divine right in his own country and a larger number of troops. After 1691, the opposition within parliament favoured a reduction in William's participation and only voted him funding for 10,000 troops. Merchants in particular were unhappy with the continuing hostilities and trading routes in the North Sea, Mediterranean and African coast became too dangerous after 1693. William succeeded in recruiting 68,000 men at a cost of £2.8 million through borrowing, via the newly established Bank of England in 1695, and attempted to keep parliament informed of his progress at regular intervals. Despite this, criticism of the campaign was heaped on William for the impact it was having on trade, his use of foreign commanders and his poor performances. In the face of opposition from parliament, William took many key decisions himself. such as the placement of troops and negotiations with other states. Although he entered peace talks with the French after 1696, Louis did not offer a satisfactory settlement to William and French negotiators refused to acknowledge William as the legitimate King of England.

	Despite the stalling of peace talks, both sides were bankrupt by 1697, and William was facing increasing opposition from the Tories and non-Junto Whigs in parliament. They argued that the army should be reduced in size again and that the taxes that had been used to pay for the war should be reduced. Peace talks resumed and with both sides weary of war and the French suffering an economic crisis, a settlement was reached under the terms of the Treaty of Ryswick in September 1697. Peace was officially declared between France and the three powers: England , Spain and the Dutch United Provinces. The French agreed to abandon their claims for land in Germany and Holland, and Louis was forced to accept that William was the legitimate King of England, and promised to give no assistance to James II. The French had also made gains from the English in North America and so the borders were returned to those that hade existed before 1688..
Restructuring of government finances	The average annual expenditure in the Nine Years War was just over £5.4 million however the average tax revenue was just£ 3.6 million. William was able to achieve this level of revenue primarily through excise taxes on items such as tea, tobacco and alcohol. The most significant revenue stream was the land tax, which provided for around a third of all required funds. The landed elites were more liable to pay this tax and the efficiency with which it was collected suggest the war had the tacit approval of many of them. An administrative revolution was taking place, similar to that seen under Henry VIII when royal income from the dissolved monasteries buoyed the Treasury. The unprecedented levels of taxation meant that royal income doubled after 1688. The land tax was introduced in 1692 and yielded £1 million in its first year. In order to meet the shortfall in funding for the war, a new system of public credit was established. This involved the Crown taking out long-term loans from merchants and city Traders and repaying them with interest, effectively selling the government's debt. This would in turn lead to the creation of the National Debt. The National Debt stood at £16.7 million by 1698 and repayment took up around 30% of the crowns annual revenue. This was a relatively secure debt, since it has been underwritten by parliament and the loans employed by William will long term. By the end of the war, Dutch merchants could not endure further disruption to trade and the English gentry could no longer tolerate the burden of the land tax. William had raised more in tax than any previous monarch, but it was not enough. As we have seen by the end of the war government debt stood at nearly £17 million. The financial settlement of 1690 had been designed by Parliament to be

	insufficient for William to live off. A further settlement was established in 1698 when the Civil List Act was passed. The king was now given a civil list of income estimated at £700,000 per year with any surplus only granted with the consent of Parliament. This money was allocated to meet the expenses of William's government, including the salaries of civil servants and judges, and the expenditure of the Royal Household. Importantly, all military and naval expenditure, in times of peace and War was the responsibility of Parliament. King and Parliament had to meet regularly in order to renew the civil list so it can be concluded that it was the financial settlement of the 1690s, rather than the Triennial Act or Bill of Rights, that necessitated regular meetings of Parliament.
Public scrutiny of government income and expenditure	During William's reign, concerns among backbenchers about the huge sums of money spent on war led to a number of parliamentary commissions being set up to investigate government expenditure. The commissioners with the forerunner to modern-day select committees within Parliament, made up of MPs. The commissions had the power to interrogate ministers and call for papers from the government to be read and consulted in order to establish where the money had been spent appropriately. The commissioners would then publish reports, which would often expose corruption or waste at William's Court. William was actually the first to suggest to open up his account to inspection and such scrutiny had rarely been committed before. For a while in 1689, the MPs were unsure about how they would go about their investigations as there was no precedent for this kind of procedure. The commissioners were successful in bringing a number of ministers to account. In 1690 William had agreed to the Public Accounts Act and the first Commission was set up in 1691 with 9 commissioners voted to their positions by the MPs. The commission was renewed each year until 1697, although William blocked more being established. The commission would be revived again during Queen Anne's reign. When the first commission met, Whig members such as Robert Harley and Tories such as Sir Benjamin Newland worked well together in their common concern to expose inefficiencies within government expenditure. The nine strong Commission were paid £500 per year each and were ultimately responsible to Parliament rather than the monarch. When two members Sir Robert Rich and Robert Austin were given roles in the Admirality by William, they were removed from the next commission. After this it comprised 7 members for the rest of Williams reign. The scrutiny was carried out with unprecedented attention to detail. meetings took place daily and interviews were regularly carried out,

	although government officials would often obstruct the process. As a result of this obstruction, many of the intended reports were never completed and it became difficult to make definitive suggestions for financial improvement. Despite this, the reports would make clear where ministers had evaded questions and refused to present accounts, thus implicating them in mismanagement. William was generally happy to adopt suggestions made by the commission and it was successful in compelling him to reassess the size of the army and navy. Members of the commission were able to criticise government expenditure in the chamber of the Commons and members such as Robert Harley became members of the Country opposition. In the second half of the 1690s, the commission lost some of its initial impact and was increasingly used to attack unfavourable ministers rather than to act as a check on finances. High profile members of the House, such as the speaker Sir John Trevor, were expelled for financial malpractice.
The establishment of the Bank of England	The Bank of England was the brainchild of the Whig Chancellor, Charles Montagu, and was supported by many Whigs but opposed by leading Tories. From 1692 onwards, parliament had been increasingly interested in schemes for long-term borrowing, and a tontine loan to the Crown had been levied in 1693 and was seen as a reasonable success. The interest received by the investors was to be taken from a number of excise duties for 99 years, although investors were wary of its complexities and it yielded only £108,000 for them, significantly less than expected. The Tonnage Act of 1694 provided a similar loan of £ 1.2 million at an interest rate of eight percent, although this time the investors were to be incorporated as the Bank of England. The investors in the Bank were given the authority to deal in bills of exchange. The bills were given by the Bank as £ 100 bills, which were effectively bank notes, and in return the investors would receive a guarantee that they would be paid through excise duties. Bank notes were soon produced on a larger scale and denominations as small as five pounds were produced. From William's point of view, the Bank was an essential way in which he could attract large numbers of investors who would deposit small amounts to be lent to the government, although the system was only possible as it had the backing of an Act of Parliament. Both the Bank of England and the tontine loan were examples of the long-term borrowing that has kept government afloat ever since. Other loans were levied in the form of 'lotteries', such as the scheme begun in March 1694 that enabled William to raise £1 million. 100,000 tickets

	with a value of £10 were sold and winners were drawn at random to win larger amounts. In 1698, William raised £2 million at a rate of eight percent by promising investors a stake in the 'new' East India Company. The short-term borrowing associated with earlier Stuart monarchs was always dependent on tax receipts, which were variable, and led to a lack of a confidence from creditors. Despite this, long-term loans accounted for less than half of the money borrowed during the Nine Years' War and William had to rely on high interest, short-term loans for the balance. The Bank took over affairs related to military funding and opened a branch in Holland from which to attract investors. Confidence in the Bank of England increased significantly after William's death, when more emphasis was placed on long-term investment and government borrowing was increased to over £2.5 million per year in the decade after 1701. As well as the establishment of the Bank of England, a Recoinage Act was given the royal assent in 1696. Silver coins that had been produced during the reign of Charles II had been regularly clipped on their edges or forged. This meant that their real value in England declined. However, the value of the silver was higher on the continent, leading to increasing numbers of coins being melted down and shipped abroad. Parliament requested that old coins be surrendered and weighed in order to ascertain their true value, and new coins were struck at a number of mints around the country. The effect of the recoinage was promising at first, with the value of the new coins being maintained for a time, and much confidence was restored to the economy. However, within two years silver was again worth more as bullion than it was in coin.
The significance of parliamentary control of finance	As John Miller makes clear in Extract 8, a distinction was made between military and civil expenditure. Parliament made significant steps towards relieving the king of any responsibility of the funding of the army and navy. The significance of parliament controlling various aspects of national finance is summed up by the following. • Crucially, parliamentary control of finance meant that the king had no choice but to meet with parliament regularly, thus increasing its authority. • Parliament controlled military expenditure and, if desired, it could withhold supply and effectively hold the Crown to ransom. • Parliament was able to audit government expenditure. This was unprecedented, and the fact that the commission into public accounts was paid by and accountable to parliament rather than the monarch gave it a degree of independence.

	• From 1698, the Crown's day-to-day spending was controlled through a grant, the civil list. The monarch would never again be able to use their prerogative to avoid working with parliament. The Marxist historian Christopher Hill has interpreted parliamentary control of finance through the Bank of England as a move that benefitted only the propertied classes. Government borrowing was now under the direct control of the MPs, who were the representatives of the tax-paying classes. Hill has argued that this led to a situation where monied interest played an important role in politics, and no future political faction or party could hope for sustained success without the support of the financers of the City of London. Douglass North and Barry Weingast (Extract 9) have interpreted parliamentary control over finance as beneficial to the economy. Those who had previously been reluctant to invest in the government and wider economy had a new-found confidence as parliament was effectively underwriting the Bank of England. Tony Claydon has argued that William saw parliament as the only solution to spiralling debts and increased costs, and would do anything to secure funds for the war with France (Extract 10).

Conclusion – How revolutionary was the Glorious Revolution?
Among historians, there are two broad schools of thought on the importance of the Glorious Revolution. A well-established view is that the Revolution was little more than a change of dynasty and that the events were unrevolutionary. The Act of Settlement ensured a smooth Protestant succession in line with what had existed for most of the 17th century and the Bill of Rights ensured that England reverted to an 'ancient constitution'. The Toleration Act excluded some groups, such as non-Trinitarians and Catholics, and dissenting groups had to practice their religion in registered places of worship. It was, therefore, a peaceful, Protestant and conservative succession. This view was prevalent among Whig historians and many historians of the 20th century.

The second school of thought was put forward by a number of Enlightenment thinkers and, more recently, by revisionist historians such as Tim Harris and Steve Pincus. This school focuses on the genuinely revolutionary nature of the settlement by paying attention to a number of key developments

- The events after 1688 have been reinterpreted to depict them as being characterised by violence (such as that associated with the Williamite War in Ireland) and radicalism rather than peace. It has been argued that the Revolution took place over a number of years, rather than a number of months, and it had long-term causes that can be found in the Protestant Reformation and the authoritarian actions of Charles I, as well as important consequences of which the makers of the Revolution were well aware. It has also been argued by Steve Pincus that the revolutionaries numbered in the thousands,

including the thousands of soldiers who fought for William, and were not simply a tiny political elite.

- Events outside England have been reassessed by revisionist historians, who have concluded that the Revolution was not bloodless and that thousands of people lost their lives between 1689 and 1701 in Ireland, Scotland and in William's Nine Years' War. Of course these wars were well known about previously, but they were not seen to form part of the Revolution.
- The constitutional settlement confirmed that divine right monarchy was no more. The Bill of Rights is still an important constitutional document and set into law concepts of freedom of speech, free elections and parliamentary taxation. The judiciary were now independent of the Crown and no longer served 'at the king's pleasure'. After the assassination plot against William in 1696, the 'Association' was taken not only by MPs, but also by hundreds of thousands of ordinary people. By signing, they were agreeing that the events of 1688-89 had signalled the end of hereditary divine right and accepted William's authority.
- The religious settlement that came about as a result of the Toleration Act of 1689 had widespread support from leading bishops and political figures, and its basic terms were not fully repealed until the 20th century.
- The financial settlement ensured that the Crown's ability to control finance was seriously constrained, and funding for the navy and army was closely controlled by parliament. The creation of the Bank of England in 1694 represented a victory for those who supported the unlimited possibilities of economic growth based on a system of credit.

Cracking the Puzzle: Preparing for Revision and Assessment

Activity 1 : Complete Trigger Memory Activity _using your background notes. An explanation on how to complete this is in your guidance booklet.

Activity 2 : There are many excellent websites which can be used to revisit the material covered so far. You should download some of these resources to supplement your main areas of note taking in this period. These include -

The importance of William III's wars in the development of a financial revolution.This topic focuses on the overview of the Glorious Revolution of 1688–89 which led to the fall of James II and the accession of William and Mary as joint sovereigns and the historiography of the development

Part 1 Students will need to understand the revolutionary ideals which led to the overthrow of James II. The significance of the Bill of Rights of 1689 and the Act of Settlement of 1701 should be understood, and the extent to which these acts confirmed the end of divine right and established a constitutional monarchy.

Part 2 Students should be aware of the importance of the Toleration Act and of those who were excluded from the Act's provisions. They should note the extent to which the supremacy of the Anglican Church, and of a confessional state, were both undermined.

Part 3 The significance of the Triennial Act 1694 and the growth of parliamentary power. The importance of the role of parliament in the years 1688–1701 should be understood, and students should be aware of how far parliament had become a partner with the monarchy, in the government of the country.

Part 4 They should be aware that William III's war with France led to a restructuring of government finances, public scrutiny of government income and expenditure and the establishment of the Bank of England in 1694. Students should understand the significance of the change from royal control of finance to parliamentary oversight

Activity 3: Paper 1 A Level Section C Exam Technique

A Level

The extracts provided for A level are longer (about 350 words) and more complex. Extracts from textbooks will not be used in the A level paper. The task requires students to reach a judgement about the extent to which a view expressed in one is convincing in the light of their own knowledge of differing views and of the differences which they should analyse in the presented extracts. The highest level requires students to **display an understanding of the basis of the differing arguments (for example, what criteria are being used on which to base a claim or judgement). It also requires students to take account of the differences when coming to a judgement. Reference to the works of named historians is not expected, but students may consider historians' viewpoints in framing their argument.**

Part C Technique. 10 mins reading the sources and planning your 2 part answer time.

Introduction Source 1 supports this view " "whilst source 2 challenges this view and support "". It is argued that the view expressed in source 1 as some strengths, it is not the most convincing interpretation of the controversy concerning the Glorious Revolution. The most convincing interpretation is……which is supported by source 2.

Part 1 Argue. Source 1 offers an over simplistic view that
Case for. This view as some minor evidence to support it

- **Source**. For example the source 1 suggests " +S" . Use source as evidence and content
- **Knowledge**. This can be further supported by K
- **Repeat** this pattern 2 or 3 times integrating source analysis and knowledge
- **Corroborate.** Finally this is partially supported by source 2

Case against. However this view has some major limitations in terms of the evidence

- **Source**.For example source 1 suggests " -S". Use source as evidence as well as content
- **Knowledge**.This can be further supported by -K
- **Repeat** this pattern 2 times integrating source analysis and knowledge
- **Corroborate.**Finally this view is also challenged by source 2 that suggests

Summarise. Clearly this view plays an important role in understanding the controversy over the Glorious Revolution, but it is arguably not the most significant.

Part 2 Argue. The most convincing view of this controversy is which is supported by Source 2.
Case for. This view as some major evidence to support it

- **Source**. For example source 2 suggests " +S" . Use source as evidence and content
- **Knowledge**.This can be further supported by K
- **Repeat** this pattern 2 or 3 times integrating source analysis and knowledge
- **Corroborate.** Finally this is partially supported by sources 1

Case against. However this view has some minor limitations

- **Source**. For example source 2 suggests " -S". Use source as evidence as well as content
- **Knowledge**.This can be further supported by -K
- **Repeat** this pattern once integrating source analysis and knowledge
- **Corroborate.** Finally this view is also challenged by source 1 that suggests

Summarise. Clearly this view is the most convincing in understanding the controversy over the Glorious Revolution, but that is not to dismiss the other contributory interpretations which also make a significant contribution to the historiography of this in this controversy

Conclusion Display an understanding of the basis of the differing arguments (for example, what criteria are being used on which to base a claim or judgement) and why you find one more convincing than the other. Reference to the works of named historians is not expected, but students may consider historians' viewpoints in framing their argument.

Past Questions

Specimen

Study Extracts 1 and 2 in the Extracts Booklet before you answer this question.

5 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 15) in the government of the country?
To explain your answer, analyse and evaluate the material in both extracts, using your own knowledge of the issues.

Extracts for use with Section C.

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.

June 2016
Study Extracts 1 and 2 in the Extracts Booklet before you answer this question.

5 In the light of differing interpretations, how convincing do you find the view that, ?
To explain your answer, analyse and evaluate the material in both extracts, using your own knowledge of the issues.

Extract 1: From X, Title, published Y.

Extract 2: From X, Title, published Y.

Markscheme

A level	
L1 1–3	• Demonstrates only limited comprehension of the extracts, selecting some material relevant to the debate. • Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, with limited linkage to the extracts. • Judgement on the view is assertive, with little or no supporting evidence.
L2 4–7	• Demonstrates some understanding and attempts analysis of the extracts by describing some points within them that are relevant to the debate. • Contextual knowledge is added to information from the extracts, but only to expand on matters of detail or to note some aspects which are not included. • A judgement is given, but with limited support and related to the extracts overall, rather than specific issues.
L3 8–12	• Demonstrates understanding of the extracts and shows some analysis by selecting and explaining some key points of interpretation they contain and indicating differences. • Knowledge of some issues related to the debate is included to link to, or expand, some views given in the extracts. • A judgement is given and related to some key points of view in the extracts and discussion is attempted, albeit with limited substantiation.
L4 13–16	• Demonstrates understanding of the extracts, analysing the issues of interpretation raised within them and by comparison of them. • Integrates issues raised by extracts with those from own knowledge to discuss the views. Most of the relevant aspects of the debate will be discussed, although treatment of some aspects may lack depth. • Discusses evidence provided in the extracts in order to reach a supported overall judgement. Discussion of points of view in the extracts demonstrates understanding that the issues are matters of interpretation.
L5 17–20	• Interprets the extracts with confidence and discrimination, analysing the issues raised and demonstrating understanding of the basis of arguments offered by both authors. • Integrates issues raised by extracts with those from own knowledge when discussing the presented evidence and differing arguments. • Presents sustained evaluative argument, reaching fully substantiated judgements on the views given in both extracts and demonstrating understanding of the nature of historical debate.