

INTERPRETATIONS OF THE GLORIOUS REVOLUTION PAST QUESTIONS

Glorious Revolution : Interpretation Writing Frame

Blue=Interp (less convincing)

Green=other interp (more convincing)

Pink=Own knowledge

Red=Argument/Evaluation

Introduction

In Extract, (historian's name) **claims** that.....

However a more convincing interpretation is given by (historian's name) in Extract, who argues...

Part one: analysing and evaluating weaker interpretation

In Extract.... (historian's name) **claims** that.....

He argues that ...(point).. ; "(quote)"

It is true that (own knowledge) **Therefore, one might argue that (Explanation)**

(Historian's name) also suggests...(point)...; "(quote)"

There are examples (own knowledge) **This suggests that.. (Explanation)**

It is interesting to note that (other historian's name) also acknowledges that....

However, there are some limitations to this interpretation.

(Historian's name) argues that..... "(quote)" But (own knowledge)

He also suggests.... "(quote)" However (own knowledge) **Therefore....**

Part two: analysing and evaluating stronger interpretation

In Extract....., (historian's name) **convincingly argues that.....**

Despite the fact that...(give a weakness of the interpretation), overall their argument is stronger.

(historian's name) states that ...(point).. ; "(quote)"

There are clear examples (own knowledge)

(Other Historian's name) also recognises that....

Therefore, it is evident that (explanation)

(Historian's name) also shows...(point)...; "(quote)"

There is evidence of this because (own knowledge) **This questions (Other Historian's name) claim that.... and strongly suggests that.. (explanation)**

Furthermore (historian's name) also shows...(point)...; "(quote)"

There is evidence of this because (own knowledge) **This questions (Other Historian's name) claim that.... and strongly suggests that.. (explanation)**

Conclusion

Therefore, (historian's name) ... does illustrate that..... However, (Historian's name)'s interpretation that.....is far more convincing because....

2017

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 the Glorious Revolution 'did not have revolutionary effects' (Extract 1, line 2)? To explain your answer, analyse and evaluate the material in both extracts, using your own knowledge of the issues.

Extract 1: From Barry Coward, *The Stuart Age: England, 1603–1714*, 4th edition, 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 of 1701, Parliament ignored the 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.

2017 SECTION C

5 Candidates are expected to use the extracts and their own knowledge to consider the views presented in the extracts. Reference to the works of named historians is not expected, but candidates may consider historians' viewpoints in framing their argument. Candidates should use their understanding of issues of interpretation to reach a reasoned conclusion concerning the view that the Glorious Revolution 'did not have revolutionary effects'.

In considering the extracts, the points made by the authors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:

Extract 1

- If revolutionary changes had been proposed in 1689, William III would almost inevitably have opposed them
- Those who wanted radical constitutional or ecclesiastical changes at this point had been marginalised
- Most politicians and political groups had only limited aims – the restoration of order and old liberties – and were not interested in addressing theoretical or abstract issues.

Extract 2

- The revolution of 1688-89 ensured that sovereign power now rested with parliament
- By the 1701 Act of Succession, parliament rejected the traditional form of hereditary succession in favour of a new succession it could accept
- The events of 1688-89 enhanced the status of parliament relative to the king and began the transition to a constitutional monarchy.

Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that the Glorious Revolution 'did not have revolutionary effects'. Relevant points may include:

- William's well-known dislike of constitutional constraints and the perceived need to re-establish orderly government quickly meant most politicians rejected the idea of extensive reform
- William was still able to choose his own ministers and advisers
- The Bill of Rights was a limited document representing a response to the immediate situation with its potential for disorder rather than a considered plan of constitutional and ecclesiastical reform
- Many of the demands limiting royal power made in the Declaration of Rights of 1689 were not implemented and the monarch could still decide on issues of war, peace and foreign policy
- William III remained head of the Church of England and so was able to influence the religious settlement.

Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that the Glorious Revolution 'did not have revolutionary effects'.

Relevant points may include:

- Under the Bill of Rights 1689 the king's power was limited in various ways e.g. he could no longer suspend the law or release individuals from its effects
- The Bill of Rights weakened the hereditary principle re-stated in 1660 and asserted the rights of Parliament
- The Act of Settlement 1701 provided for the Hanoverian succession to the throne thereby weakening the concept of hereditary monarchy and asserting Parliament's right to decide this issue
- From 1689 financial reforms provided parliamentary scrutiny of government income and expenditure.
- Regular parliamentary elections and annual parliamentary sessions were ensured by the Mutiny Act (1689) and the Triennial Act (1694).

2018

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 the Glorious Revolution 'transformed the relationship between King and Parliament'? (Extract 1, line 5)

To explain your answer, analyse and evaluate the material in both extracts, using your own knowledge of the issues.

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. 5 10 15 20 25 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.

2018 SECTION C

5 Candidates are expected to use the extracts and their own knowledge to consider the views presented in the extracts. Reference to the works of named historians is not expected, but candidates may consider historians' viewpoints in framing their argument.

Candidates should use their understanding of issues of interpretation to reach a reasoned conclusion concerning the view that the Glorious Revolution 'transformed the relationship between King and Parliament'.

In considering the extracts, the points made by the authors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:

Extract 1

- A key consequence of the Glorious Revolution was that the monarchy was now more financially dependent on Parliament than it had been under the Restoration settlement
- The monarch's prerogatives were reduced by parliamentary legislation, e.g. the Triennial Act (1694) and the Act of Settlement (1701)
- The monarch was also limited by the practical problems involved in dealing with Parliament.

Extract 2

- The Declaration of Rights did not compel the monarch to call Parliament more regularly
- Financial oversight by Parliament was not new since similar measures had been passed earlier in the 17th century
- After the Glorious Revolution, the monarch chose (but was not forced) to provide the Commons with an annual expenditure estimate.

Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that the Glorious Revolution 'transformed the relationship between King and Parliament'. Relevant points may include:

- To ensure its continued existence and role in government, Parliament controlled finance as much as possible, e.g. the Commission of Public Accounts set up in 1691
- The Act of Settlement 1701 provided for the Hanoverian succession to the throne, weakening the concept of hereditary monarchy and asserting Parliament's right to decide this issue
- The Mutiny Act (1689) and the Triennial Act (1694) ensured regular parliamentary elections and annual parliamentary sessions
- The need to cooperate with Parliament meant William III was restricted in his choice of advisers and policies; in practice William III needed advisers who could manage Parliament and ensure support in the Commons.

Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that the Glorious Revolution 'transformed the relationship between King and Parliament'. Relevant points may include:

- The Bill of Rights was a limited document representing a response to the immediate situation with its potential for disorder rather than a considered plan of constitutional and ecclesiastical reform
- During the second half of the 1690s, the Commission of Public Accounts was increasingly used to attack particular ministers rather than to act as a check on finances
- Committees of Accounts had previously been established in 1644 and 1667 and William III was actually the first to suggest that the royal accounts should be opened up for inspection

- William III could still decide on issues of war, peace and foreign policy, and was still able to choose his own ministers and advisers.

2019

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 the Toleration Act of 1689 failed to promote religious tolerance?

To explain your answer, analyse and evaluate the material in both extracts, using your own knowledge of the issues.

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. 5 10 15 20 25

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.

2019 SECTION C

5 Candidates are expected to use the extracts and their own knowledge to consider the views presented in the extracts. Reference to the works of named historians is not expected, but candidates may consider historians' viewpoints in framing their argument.

Candidates should use their understanding of issues of interpretation to reach a reasoned conclusion concerning the view that the Toleration Act of 1689 failed to promote religious tolerance.

In considering the extracts, the points made by the authors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:

Extract 1

- The Toleration Act did not promote religious tolerance because some Anglican churchmen and politicians were mainly concerned with bringing excluded Protestants into the Church of England
- Some Anglicans did not want to cooperate with Protestant Dissenters as they felt this would undermine the Anglican monopoly in Church and State
- The Toleration Act had a limited impact because, although most Protestants now had legal freedom to worship, demeaning conditions applied and the Test Acts remained in force.

Extract 2

- The Toleration Act introduced partial religious toleration by enabling different Protestants to worship in their preferred ways
- This toleration was limited since Catholics were excluded completely and Dissenters faced restrictions
- However, the Toleration Act marked an important step in the transition to a tolerant and multi-confessional modern society.

Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that the Toleration Act of 1689 failed to promote religious tolerance. Relevant points may include:

- Parliament did not hold a theological debate before the Toleration Act was passed – it was a reactionary attempt to maintain order and preserve the Anglican Church rather than extend religious toleration
- The laws enforcing uniformity (Test Act and Act of Uniformity) were not repealed, which meant that public officials were compelled to swear allegiance to the Anglican Church
- Anyone gaining public employment or entering parliament had to swear allegiance to the Crown and take Anglican Communion
- Additional Toleration Acts were passed in Scotland and Ireland and these excluded Dissenters from local and national government.

Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that the Toleration Act of 1689 failed to promote religious tolerance. Relevant points may include:

- The Toleration Act was effectively an admission that the Church of England had to accept a degree of religious toleration, e.g. almost eight per cent of the population were Dissenters by the early 1700s
- Although excluded from the provisions of the Toleration Act, many Catholics enjoyed a degree of de facto religious toleration and were able to participate in mass without harassment
- The power of the Church courts, which had played a vital role in upholding the confessional state earlier in the 17th century, was severely weakened by the Toleration Act

In practice, William III used his royal authority to influence judges and restrict Church action against Catholics and Dissenters not covered by the Act.

2020

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 the Glorious Revolution of 1688–89 ‘did not establish a limited monarchy’ [Extract 1, lines 2 and 3]?

To explain your answer, analyse and evaluate the material in both extracts, using your own knowledge of the issues.

Extract 1: From Frank O’Gorman, *The Long Eighteenth Century: British Political and Social History 1688–1832*, published 2016.

The Glorious Revolution of 1688–89 did overthrow a Catholic monarch and eliminate any realistic prospect of a Catholic succession, but it did not establish a limited monarchy. The political and the social power of the monarchy and much of its ideological influence, too, survived the revolution. After all, William III was able to summon and dissolve Parliament, choose his own ministers (in church as well as state), conduct foreign policy (details of which he sometimes concealed from his ministers), declare war and negotiate peace. 5

At the same time, the growing demands of war created a large system of patronage. Much of this was in the gift of the crown and could be used to reward the loyalty of the royal court’s friends in both Houses of Parliament. Further, the monarch retained the power to create peers and thus to exert influence over the House of Lords. Consequently, well over one half of the upper chamber could be described as reliably loyal to the king. The Glorious Revolution actually paved the way for a potentially re-strengthened monarchy. Indeed the royal court remained the engine of executive government, with Parliament playing a subsidiary role on the political stage.

Extract 2: From Stephanie Barczewski et al, *Britain since 1688: A Nation in the World*, published 2014.

The Glorious Revolution of 1688–89 has been seen as a major step in the process of a shift away from a powerful monarchy and towards a more democratic system in which Parliament was the dominant institution. Certainly, the years after 1688 witnessed a steady erosion in the power of the monarchy. ‘Men write and speak of the King with little respect or ceremony’, wrote the monarchist Robert Filmer in 1689. Although no conditions had been imposed on William and Mary’s accession to the throne, a series of measures that constrained their power was imposed in the decade after 1688. 10 15 20

In 1694 a renewed Triennial Act required Parliament to meet every three years, while the emergence of a fiscal-military state* made a sitting Parliament a permanent feature of the political landscape. The monarchy had effectively lost one of its main prerogatives: the ability to call, or not call, Parliament into session. Parliament also gained additional powers over taxation and political appointments. Much of the bargaining power that Parliament used to extract concessions, however, did not derive from the Glorious Revolution itself. Rather this bargaining power came from William III’s desire to wage war with France, which required him to negotiate with Parliament for the necessary resources.

2020 SECTION C

5 Candidates are expected to use the extracts and their own knowledge to consider the views presented in the extracts. Reference to the works of named historians is not expected, but candidates may consider historians' viewpoints in framing their argument. Candidates should use their understanding of issues of interpretation to reach a reasoned conclusion concerning the view that the Glorious Revolution of 1688-89 'did not establish a limited monarchy'.

In considering the extracts, the points made by the authors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:

Extract 1

- The Glorious Revolution 'did not establish a limited monarchy' because the political, social and much of the ideological power of the monarchy remained
- The monarch could still appoint his own ministers, conduct foreign policy, and retain support within parliament through an extensive system of patronage
- The Glorious Revolution had the potential to strengthen the monarchy with the royal court providing executive government and parliament playing a secondary role.

Extract 2

- The Glorious Revolution marked an important stage in the transition from a monarchical to a parliamentary system with measures imposed in the decade after 1688 to restrict the monarch's power
- The Triennial Act of 1694 removed the monarch's prerogative power to convene or not to convene parliament and fiscal and military issues turned it effectively into a permanently sitting institution
- Parliament gained greater influence over taxation and political appointments; it was also able to extract concessions because William's war policy required parliamentary consent for resources.

Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that the Glorious Revolution of 1688-89 'did not establish a limited monarchy'.

Relevant points may include:

- Government remained largely personal government by the monarch, e.g. William III controlled the day-to-day business of government and cabinet decisions had to be approved by him
- The royal court remained the focal point of politics and ministers were primarily concerned with retaining royal support since they knew that without the monarch's favour their political careers were under threat
- The monarch's power of patronage preserved royal influence, e.g. 18 out of 26 incumbent bishops and 36 out of 112 lay peers owed their positions directly to William III
- Many of the constraints on royal power in the Declaration of Rights were not implemented and the monarch could still decide on issues of war, peace and foreign policy and remained head of the Church of England.

Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that the Glorious Revolution of 1688-89 'did not establish a limited monarchy'. Relevant points may include:

- Parliament became a permanent institution (e.g. Mutiny Act 1689 and Triennial Act of 1694) and government authority was now based on laws agreed by the monarch, Lords and Commons
- The monarch's authority was weakened in various ways, e.g. the Bill and Declaration of Rights and the Act of Settlement
- From 1689 financial reforms provided parliamentary scrutiny of government income and expenditure

The need to cooperate with Parliament meant William III was restricted in his choice of advisers and policies; in practice he needed advisers who could manage parliament and ensure support in the Commons.

2021

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 it was the financial revolution of the 1690s, rather than the Glorious Revolution of 1688–89, that changed the relationship between the monarch and parliament?

To explain your answer, analyse and evaluate the material in both extracts, using your own knowledge of the issues.

Extract 1: From D. L. Smith, *A History of the Modern British Isles, 1603–1707*, published 1998.

The Crown's desperate need for tax revenues transformed parliament from an occasional event into a permanent institution of government. This trend was reinforced by the Triennial Act of 1694, but what guaranteed parliament's continuous existence was the monarch's dependence on taxes. The huge financial demands of war ensured that annual sessions of parliament had become an absolute necessity. Parliament was in a position not only to withhold its consent to taxation, but also to dictate and scrutinise how tax revenue was spent. Without parliament's active participation, public confidence in the legitimacy of the tax system would have collapsed – and with it the readiness to pay such high levels of taxation. 5 10

Parliament exploited this opportunity to the full. During the 1690s the principle of 'appropriation' was established, whereby parliamentary grants could only be used for the purpose for which they had been voted. The 'power of the purse' became much greater than ever before, and parliament made increasingly frequent and ferocious use of it, not least by adding clauses to redress constitutional grievances onto revenue bills that the Crown simply could not afford to veto.

Extract 2: From Kenneth O. Morgan (ed.), *The Oxford History of Britain*, published 2001.

When compared with modern revolutions, the 'Glorious Revolution' of 1688–89 seems to resemble a palace coup rather than a genuine shift of social and political power. This impression is reinforced by the relative lack of physical violence. Yet the acceptance of parliamentary monarchy was achieved and the major change of course carried out in 1688–89 can be seen to have been truly revolutionary. The Bill of Rights clearly undermined the hereditary right which formed the basis of the restored constitution of 1660 and replaced it with the will of the nation expressed through Parliament. 15 20 25

William and Mary owed their title to the support of the propertied classes. At a time when absolutism seemed to be dominant in the Western world, the importance of this change should not be underestimated. Fundamentally, the Glorious Revolution can be seen as a historic turning point involving the decisive rejection of an entire form of government.

In essence, by making William and Mary monarchs, the Glorious Revolution introduced the concept of a rightful king who owed his title to a decision of parliament, rather than the theory of divine right.

2021 SECTION C

5 Candidates are expected to use the extracts and their own knowledge to consider the views presented in the extracts. Reference to the works of named historians is not expected, but candidates may consider historians' viewpoints in framing their argument.

Candidates should use their understanding of issues of interpretation to reach a reasoned conclusion concerning the view that it was the financial revolution of the 1690s, rather than the Glorious Revolution of 1688- 89, that changed the relationship between the monarch and parliament.

In considering the extracts, the points made by the authors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:

Extract 1

- Parliament became a permanent government institution because the monarch depended on taxation, notably due to the demands of war
- Parliamentary agreement was required for taxation and parliament could decide how such revenue was spent; this sustained public confidence in the system
- During the 1690s the principle of parliamentary grants being used solely for their specified purpose was established; parliament used the 'power of the purse' to gain concessions from the monarch.

Extract 2

The Glorious Revolution of 1688 produced a parliamentary monarchy and this represented a significant change of direction, away from royal absolutism

- The Bill of Rights undermined the principle of hereditary right, which had underpinned the restored constitution of 1660, and replaced it with the notion of the national will expressed through parliament
- William and Mary owed their royal positions to a decision made by parliament rather than the concept of divine right.

Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that it was the financial revolution of the 1690s, rather than the Glorious Revolution of 1688-89, that changed the relationship between the monarch and parliament. Relevant points may include:

- Parliamentary control of finance (e.g. 'insufficient' annual settlements) meant that the king had no choice but to meet with parliament regularly, thus enhancing its influence and authority
- Through its control of military expenditure in a period of war, parliament could withhold supply and effectively hold the monarch to ransom
- Parliament was strengthened by the introduction of a Public Accounts Commission (1691) to scrutinise and audit government expenditure
- From 1698, the Crown's day-to-day spending was controlled through a renewable civil list, which meant that the monarch could not use the royal prerogative to avoid working with parliament.

Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that it was the financial revolution of the 1690s, rather than the Glorious Revolution of 1688-89, that changed the relationship between the monarch and parliament. Relevant points may include:

- Under the Bill of Rights (1689) the king's power was limited in various ways (e.g. he could no longer suspend the law) and the rights of Parliament were asserted
- Through the 1689 Mutiny Act (and 1694 Triennial Act), Parliament became a permanent institution
- The Glorious Revolution of 1688-89 ensured that government authority was now based on laws agreed by the monarch, Lords and Commons
- The Act of Settlement of 1701 built upon the Glorious Revolution of 1688- 89 by consolidating Parliament's right to decide the succession and weakening the concept of hereditary monarchy.

2022

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, after the Glorious Revolution of 1688–89, the monarch 'still ruled as well as reigned' [Extract 1, line 1]?

To explain your answer, analyse and evaluate the material in both extracts, using your own knowledge of the issues.

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

William III still ruled as well as reigned. Government was still largely personal government by the monarch. William III retained a firm grasp on the process by which government decisions were made. The royal court remained the centre of politics. Ministers might have to secure support in parliament for their measures, but their main concern was to retain royal favour. When they lost that, their political fortunes inevitably collapsed. The personal wishes and friendships of the monarch were still of major political importance.

The immense personal power of the monarch was maintained despite the developing role of the cabinet. The cabinet first appeared in the early 1690s to provide continuous day-to-day control of wartime administration during William III's frequent absences on the continent. All this though did not necessarily mean a reduction of royal power and influence. William III controlled the day-to-day business of government and all decisions of the cabinet had to be approved by him. Nor were all the important decisions of government made in cabinet; they continued to be made either in smaller committees or through informal meetings between the monarch and his ministers.

Extract 2: From John Miller, *Early Modern Britain 1450–1750*, published 2017.

The change of ruler in 1689 and the Bill of Rights would not seem to merit the title of a 'revolution' and yet the nature of monarchy was to change dramatically. William was able to insist on being made king in his own right and to keep the Crown's prerogatives intact, but he could not make the Commons grant his ordinary revenue for life. Moreover, his accession resulted in England's involvement in a very expensive war against France. The Commons used the King's need for money, and occasionally legislation, to make regular annual parliaments indispensable and to strengthen their bargaining position. 5
10 15 20

During the 1690s the Commons appointed committees of accounts which scrutinised public expenditure, looking for signs of waste, mismanagement and corruption. Government could no longer be seen as the private preserve of the king and his ministers. William also learned the hard way that, although in theory he was free to choose his ministers, in practice he needed to appoint men who could push his measures, especially money bills, through Parliament. By demanding the right to scrutinise Royal government, the Commons under William reflected increasing public concern about the role and scale of government and taxation.

2022 SECTION C

5 Candidates are expected to use the extracts and their own knowledge to consider the views presented in the extracts. Reference to the works of named historians is not expected, but candidates may consider historians' viewpoints in framing their argument.

Candidates should use their understanding of issues of interpretation to reach a reasoned conclusion concerning the view that, after the Glorious Revolution of 1688-89, the monarch 'still ruled as well as reigned'.

In considering the extracts, the points made by the authors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:

Extract 1

- After 1688, personal government by the monarch continued largely intact, with William III retaining a firm grasp on government decision-making
- The royal court remained central to political influence and ministers needed to retain the monarch's support in order to sustain their political careers
- The introduction of the cabinet in the early 1690s did not reduce the monarch's personal power regarding day-to-day government business and decision making.

Extract 2

- Parliament exploited the King's need to finance his war against France in order to strengthen its position relative to the monarch
- In the 1690s, parliamentary scrutiny of public expenditure constrained the King's authority and weakened the concept of personal rule
- In practice, William was restricted in his choice of ministers because he had to appoint individuals who could work with parliament.

Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that, after the Glorious Revolution of 1688-89, the monarch 'still ruled as well as reigned'. Relevant points may include:

- In 1689 the King still retained most of the executive powers restored in 1660, including the right to choose ministers and advisers, set policy and make war
- The limitations put on the monarch's powers by the coronation oath, the Declaration and Bill of Rights, and the financial settlement were much smaller than those intended by some in the Convention Parliament
- William III ensured that the cabinet was rigorously segregated in its functions to preserve monarchical power, e.g. Danby was excluded from Treasury business
- William III remained head of the Church of England.

Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that, after the Glorious Revolution of 1688-89, the monarch 'still ruled as well as reigned'. Relevant points may include:

- The Glorious Revolution weakened the monarch's authority in various ways, e.g. the coronation oath and the Declaration and Bill of Rights
- Parliamentary control of finance (e.g. 'insufficient' annual settlements) meant that the king had no choice but to meet with parliament regularly, thus enhancing its influence and authority
- The introduction of a Public Accounts Commission (1691) strengthened parliament vis-a-vis the monarch; the renewable civil list (1698) meant that the monarch's prerogative powers could not circumvent parliament
- Through the 1689 Mutiny Act and the 1694 Triennial Act, the monarch had to accept parliament as a permanent institution.

2023

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, in the years to 1701, the Glorious Revolution introduced little that was 'dramatically new' [Extract 1, line 3]?

To explain your answer, analyse and evaluate the material in both extracts, using your own knowledge of the issues.

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

Looking back at the Glorious Revolution, with its change of ruler, Bill of Rights, financial settlement and Toleration Act, there seems little that was so dramatically new as to constitute a turning point in English history. Indeed, there was little that would merit the description 'Glorious' or 'Revolution'.

The significance of the change of ruler was limited and the Bill of Rights contained little that was new. Only the Toleration Act marked a clear break with what had gone before. The Declaration of Rights was in many ways a limited and conservative document. Its main concern was to prevent a recurrence of the misgovernment of Charles II and James II. The restrictions imposed by statute on the royal prerogative were limited. Although the king was subject to the Triennial Act, he still had the power to call and dismiss parliament at will. The king was also able to choose his ministers, direct the administration and formulate policy.

Extract 2: From Jonathan Scott, *England's Troubles: Seventeenth-Century English Political Instability in European Context*, published 2000.

The constitutional changes of 1689–1701 strengthened parliament and the military capability of the English monarchy. These constitutional changes created a strong parliamentary monarchy, which became the centrepiece of the newly constructed English state. In addition to the new financial settlement, these changes included the Declaration of Rights, the regulation by statute of the succession and the surrender of monarchical power over parliament. 5 10 15 20

These constitutional changes also included the new coronation oath. By this oath, the monarch agreed to govern not only 'to maintain the Protestant religion and the laws and liberties of this nation', but also 'according to the laws agreed on in parliament'. These constitutional changes included parliamentary control of the army, as demonstrated in 1698, much to William's disgust. Finally, they included the Act of Succession of 1701, which removed the power of royal pardon regarding parliamentary impeachments. The 1701 Act also subjected the King to parliamentary oversight. This oversight included aspects of foreign policy, the King's dispensation of patronage, his relationship with his Privy Council and his right to travel abroad.

2023 SECTION C

Candidates are expected to use the extracts and their own knowledge to consider the views presented in the extracts. Reference to the works of named historians is not expected, but candidates may consider historians' viewpoints in framing their argument. Candidates should use their understanding of issues of interpretation to reach a reasoned conclusion concerning the view that, in the years to 1701, the Glorious Revolution introduced little that was 'dramatically new'.

In considering the extracts, the points made by the authors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:

Extract 1

- There was little in the Glorious Revolution that could be viewed as a historical turning point
- The change of ruler, Bill of Rights and Declaration of Rights were all limited; only the Toleration Act could be viewed as ground-breaking
- The legal constraints placed on the royal prerogative were limited and the monarch retained key powers, e.g. selection of ministers and policy making.

Extract 2

- The constitutional changes of 1689-1701 established a strong parliamentary monarchy at the heart of the state
- The new financial settlement and the constitutional alterations weakened the monarch's powers with respect to parliament
- The Act of Succession removed some royal powers (e.g. the pardon for parliamentary impeachments) and subjected others (e.g. patronage) to parliamentary approval.

Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that that, in the years to 1701, the Glorious Revolution introduced little that was 'dramatically new'. Relevant points may include:

- The limits imposed by the Bill/Declaration of Rights were much smaller than those intended by some in the Convention Parliament; many of the Declaration's constraints on royal power were not implemented
- Under the Toleration Act, almost all Protestant churches were to be tolerated and Dissenters were released from obligatory church attendance
- Largely personal monarchical government survived, e.g. William III controlled government business and approved cabinet decisions; the monarch could still decide on issues of war, peace and foreign policy
- The monarch's power of patronage preserved royal influence, e.g. 18 out of 26 incumbent bishops and 36 out of 112 lay peers owed their positions directly to William III.

Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that that, in the years to 1701, the Glorious Revolution introduced little that was 'dramatically new'. Relevant points may include:

- The Bill of Rights limited the king's power (e.g. he could no longer suspend the law) and asserted parliament's rights; the 1689 Mutiny Act and 1694 Triennial Act made parliament a permanent institution
- Parliamentary control of finance (e.g. 'insufficient' annual settlements) meant that the king had no choice but to meet with parliament regularly, thus enhancing its influence and authority
- The introduction of a Public Accounts Commission (1691) strengthened parliament vis-à-vis the monarch; the renewable civil list (1698) meant that the monarch's prerogative powers could not circumvent parliament
- The Act of Settlement of 1701 built upon the Glorious Revolution of 1688-89 by consolidating Parliament's right to decide the succession and weakening the

concept of hereditary monarchy.

2024

In the light of differing interpretations, how convincing do you find the view that, in the years to 1701, the Toleration Act of 1689 did little to weaken the Anglican supremacy? To explain your answer, analyse and evaluate the material in both extracts, using your own knowledge of the issues.

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

The bishops and Tory politicians agreed to toleration in order to prevent the weakening, or destruction, of the pure spirit of Anglicanism, or, even worse, a split within the Church. The Toleration Act of 1689 was the product of a cynical political deal. It was introduced reluctantly. It did not repeal any of the laws against Dissent, but laid down that laws against dissenting meetings should not be enforced against mainstream Protestant dissenters. There was to be no freedom of worship for Catholics, Unitarians* or Jews. Meeting-houses had to be registered with local Justices of the Peace and had to keep their doors open during meetings, as there was still the clear suspicion that dissenters were plotting treason. The laws against dissenters holding office (including the Test and Corporation Acts) were to remain in force, as was the ban on dissenters attending England's two universities. Public office and higher education were to remain under Anglican control.

***Unitarians – a form of Christian religion that believes in the unity of God and rejects the doctrine of the Trinity – that God has three forms, the Father, Son and Holy Spirit**

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

In 1689, the Convention Parliament passed the Toleration Act. From then on, virtually all Protestant Churches were to be tolerated. Most of the penalties passed by the Cavalier Parliament were removed. The chief remaining obstacle faced by Dissenters was the Test Act. This was very important psychologically, but it could be overcome by the practice of occasional conformity. Occasional conformity meant that, on appointment and twice a year thereafter, all a Dissenting officeholder had to do was set aside his religious convictions and participate in an Anglican service. Catholics, of course, could do no such thing; they remained subject to extensive legal restrictions. The Toleration Act freed not only Dissenters from having to go to church, but also the sceptical, the lazy or the plain sleepy. Church courts, which had traditionally regulated personal behaviour (for example to discourage swearing, adultery, drunkenness and falling into debt) were in decline in most parts of the country. In short, the Church's ability to demand obedience and good behaviour from its followers was weakening.

2024 SECTION C

Candidates should use their understanding of issues of interpretation to reach a reasoned conclusion concerning the view that, in the years to 1701, the Toleration Act of 1689 did little to weaken the Anglican supremacy. In considering the extracts, the points made by the authors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include

Extract 1

- The Toleration Act (1689) had been conceded reluctantly and was designed to preserve the privileged position of Anglicanism
- Although the Act relaxed the laws against dissenting meetings for mainstream Protestant dissenters, it still completely excluded Catholics, Unitarians and Jews
- After the Act was passed, it was still the case that only Anglicans could hold public office and attend the universities of Oxford and Cambridge.

Extract 2

- Once the Act was passed, almost all Protestant churches were to be tolerated
- Dissenting officeholders could circumvent legal restrictions via the practice of occasional conformity
- The Toleration Act released dissenters and others from the obligation to attend Church, which weakened Anglican influence.

Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that, in the years to 1701, the Toleration Act of 1689 did little to weaken the Anglican supremacy. Relevant points may include:

- The laws enforcing uniformity (Test Act and Act of Uniformity) were not repealed, which meant that public officials were compelled to swear allegiance to the Anglican Church
- Anyone gaining public employment or entering Parliament had to swear allegiance to the Crown and take Anglican Communion
- Parliament did not hold a theological debate before the Toleration Act was passed – it was a reactionary attempt to maintain order and preserve the Anglican Church
- Additional Toleration Acts were passed in Scotland and Ireland and these excluded dissenters from local and national government.

Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that, in the years to 1701, the Toleration Act of 1689 did little to weaken the Anglican supremacy. Relevant points may include:

- The Toleration Act was effectively an admission that the Church of England could not enforce complete uniformity, e.g. almost eight per cent of the population were dissenters by 1701
- Although excluded from the provisions of the Toleration Act, many Catholics enjoyed a degree of freedom and were able to participate in mass without harassment
The power of the Church courts, which had played a vital role in upholding the confessional state earlier in the 17th century, was severely weakened by the Toleration Act
In practice, William III used his royal authority to influence judges and restrict Church interference in the lives of Catholics and dissenters not covered by the Act

2025
SECTION C