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Writing in 1689, Daniel Defoe made the following remark in one of his many pamphlets; ‘a greater Deliverance, more unexpected, and that hath plainer characters of a Divine Contrivance and Conduct hath neither been heard of, nor seen, in any place of the World, in any of the former ages of it.’[[1]](#footnote-0) He was referring to the events of the previous year when, in 1688, England underwent a political transformation the likes of which had never been seen before. It was a change that had a profound impact on the English, and by extension, the Scottish and Irish polities and an event that historians have been talking about ever since.

 The Glorious Revolution of 1688 is a topic that once seemed to be a dead end for historians. Lois Schwoerer in her introduction to *The Revolution of 1688-1689: Changing Perspectives* writes that ‘for almost three hundred years, the so-called Whig view of the Glorious Revolution prevailed, virtually unchallenged.’[[2]](#footnote-1) So dominant was this view of the events of 1688 that it appeared, on the surface at least, that there was no need for further study. However, that view has been challenged in recent decades by modern historians. Their conclusions have not only shattered the old interpretation of the Revolution but have raised new questions about its very nature and impact on British history.

 Understanding the Revolution is essential for understanding British history from the eighteenth century through to the present day. More importantly for a historian, a firm grasp is needed of the historiography of the subject before any conclusions can be made regarding what the Revolution did or did not accomplish. William of Orange’s landing at Torbay in November of 1688 set off a chain of events that no one would have imagined possible earlier that year.[[3]](#footnote-2) The events quickly became the focus of historians who sought to mold the interpretation of the Revolution and it has only really been in the last few decades that the dominant view of the Revolution has been called into question as Schwoerer’s comment earlier highlights.

 This paper seeks to chart the course of how the Glorious Revolution of 1688 has been recorded and interpreted by historians since the events unfolded over three hundred years ago. As evidenced by Defoe’s words earlier, this process began almost immediately after James II fled the country and very nearly before the political settlement of the nation had been ratified. In addition, this paper will attempt to answer the fundamental question at the heart of this historiographical debate. Just what was the Glorious Revolution? The answer to this question is not as straightforward as many historians, past and present, would suggest or want it to be. For ultimately, the Glorious Revolution was the last successful invasion of England and what makes it extraordinary is that the victor gave Parliament such discretion in crafting the new settlement.

 The story of the Glorious Revolution and its interpretation began soon after William of Orange’s successful landing in England followed by James II’s precipitous flight from the country. Daniel Defoe’s pamphlet, *the Advantages of the Present Settlement and the dangers of a relapse*, was published less than a year after William’s landing and argues that a failure to secure the new regime ‘would be a fatal Relapse into all those Miseries, under which we so lately groaned.’[[4]](#footnote-3) Defoe sought to cast the recent events in the most favorable light for the new regime but his work cannot be constituted as a history of the Revolution as the events were still unfolding at the time his pamphlet was published. However, as the years rolled on, the interpretation of the Revolution was taken over by the political party that had gained power in the aftermath of the Settlement of 1689, the Whigs, and the first official version of the events of 1688 from their view point was published in 1778 by David Hume.

 Hume’s version of the Glorious Revolution of 1688 starts with discrediting James II as king of England, Scotland, and Ireland. He writes that ‘the nation almost universally believed [James] capable, from bigotry, of committing any crime; as they had seen, that, from like motives, he was guilty of every imprudence.’[[5]](#footnote-4) In comparison, William of Orange is seen as a selfless prince motivated by a deep desire to free England from the tyranny it found itself under and with no thought in his mind that his actions would ultimately see him offered the throne of England.[[6]](#footnote-5) William of Orange, according to Hume, acted for the greater good of England against the religious bigotry of James II. Hume’s work established the character of the two principal political players during the period. Furthermore, Hume wrote that the political settlement clarified all the points of contention that had existed between the king and Parliament and because of this ‘the powers of royal prerogative were more narrowly circumscribed and more exactly defined, than in any former period of the English government.’[[7]](#footnote-6) Hume’s work did much to show the events of 1688 as a major turning point in English political history; the saving of the nation from a tyrannical king and the establishment of a more just system of government. However, the Whig interpretation of events was given its most recognizable and clear form by the great Whig Historian, Thomas Babington Macaulay in the middle of the nineteenth century.

 Macaulay’s work, *The History of England from the Accession of James the Second*, follows many of the themes laid out by Hume’s earlier history. James II is Macaulay’s villain and William of Orange, ‘whom God had made the glorious instrument of delivering the nation from superstition and tyranny,’ the savior of the nation.[[8]](#footnote-7) Macaulay goes a step further in his analysis by arguing that Parliament had agreed to ‘assert the ancient rights and liberties of England.’[[9]](#footnote-8) The Glorious Revolution re-asserted the ‘limited monarchy of the thirteenth century,’ and that the king could not act without ‘the consent of the representatives of the nation.’[[10]](#footnote-9) In ringing tones more like a preacher than a historian, Macaulay writes that the Declaration of Right ‘had made nothing law which had not been law before,’ and was the root of every good law passed since 1689 and for any future laws to be passed.[[11]](#footnote-10) For Macaulay, the Glorious Revolution was the fundamental event in English history. It banished bigotry and superstition, represented by James II tyrannical reign, and replaced it with an ancient form of English governance in which the king’s power was curtailed by Parliament. W.A. Speck in his introduction to *Reluctant Revolutionaries* writes that Macaulay saw the Revolution as a struggle between good and evil in the shape of the Whig and Tory political parties.[[12]](#footnote-11) Victory ultimately went to the Whigs, who stood for ‘the rule of law, the balanced constitution, the vital role of parliament, and the desirability of religious toleration.’[[13]](#footnote-12) The Tories, who Macaulay saw as his story’s villains, were the supporters of ‘divine, indefeasible, hereditary right,’ and therefore absolutism.[[14]](#footnote-13) The victory of the Whigs in the political settlement of 1689 ultimately ensured the triumph of Parliament in the debate over power that had existed between the Stuart monarchs and Parliament and this victory was, in Macaulay’s view, a definitively good thing.

 While Macaulay wrote the magisterial work on the Whig view of the events of 1688 and its ultimate impact on the political state of England, the final word on the subject must however go to Macaulay’s great nephew, George Macaulay Trevelyan. Following the standard Whig line, his *The English Revolution 1688-1689,* published in 1938, sticks to the main points outlined by Macaulay while toning down some of Macaulay’s fierce partisanship and attempting to create a more impartial vision of the factions involved during the Revolution. Trevelyan concludes by saying that ‘the ultimate view that we take of the Revolution of 1688 must be determined by our preference either for royal absolutism or for parliamentary government.’[[15]](#footnote-14) Writing in the prelude to World War II, there is perhaps a sense that Trevelyan is writing his argument as a counter to the sudden rise of dictatorships that had followed WWI and were now seemingly threatening Great Britain. That said, his conclusion neatly summarizes the Whig viewpoint of the Glorious Revolution; that it saved the country from absolutism by giving power to Parliament at the expense of the king.

 The Whig version of the events of 1688-1689 was accepted for many years as the definitive version of the Glorious Revolution. Even in the lead up to the tercentenary of the Glorious Revolution in 1988, this was the official line of Parliament as highlighted by the booklets published by Her Majesty’s Government for the event. The booklet concludes that the Glorious Revolution ‘destroyed the last vestiges of the Crown’s financial independence and confirmed the supremacy of Parliament.’[[16]](#footnote-15) Although the Whig version has rightly been challenged in recent years some of its conclusions should not be discarded. The Glorious Revolution did change the political framework of England and had a profound impact on England’s position on the world stage. The nature of that change is of course much more complex than the Whig history would suggest. Parliament’s strength in relation to the king came when the king pursued policies Parliament disagreed with; a point of affairs not so different from the pre-1688 relationship Parliament had with the king.

 The Whig history was not the only version of events that existed until the twentieth century. The first major challenge to the significance of the Revolution came from Edmund Burke and his work *Reflections on the Revolution in France.* Burke, writing in opposition to the revolution in France and seeking to distance England from the events on the continent, writes that while some claim that England gained the right to choose its own government from the Revolution settlement it did not do so for all.[[17]](#footnote-16) He writes that ‘this new, and hitherto unheard-of bill of rights, though made in the name of the whole people, belongs to those gentlemen and their faction only. The body of the people of England have no share in it. They utterly disclaim it.’[[18]](#footnote-17) Burke argues that the Declaration of Rights makes no mention of the right of Englishmen to choose their own rulers or form their own government but is rather a document ‘declaring the rights and liberties of the subject.’[[19]](#footnote-18) Burke downplays the Revolution and its impact on the English polity, regarding it as just a blip on the radar of succession as the deposition of James II was a matter of necessity to secure the country against tyranny.[[20]](#footnote-19) The Revolution was of minor consequence in Burke’s mind and therefore unworthy of comparison to the current Revolution raging through France.

 This downplaying of the Revolution of 1688 was also taken up by Marxist historians in the latter nineteenth century and continues to the present. Historians such as Christopher Hill are more interested in the events of 1640 arguing that the real revolution in English politics occurred in the 1640s as it broke down ‘traditional patriarchal relations between landlords and tenants.’[[21]](#footnote-20) The 1640s saw a rise in an English bourgeois class that wrestled power and acceptance from the traditional elites; ‘the coup d’état of 1688-89’ was a manifestation of the new power relations in England.[[22]](#footnote-21) Hill, and Marxists like him, dismiss the events of 1688 as unimportant for English politics. In their version of events, the real revolution came in 1640 with the Civil Wars and the results of that event were recognized as fact by the 1689 settlement.

 Both the Marxists and Burke take the interpretation of the Revolution of 1688 to the other extreme of interpretation by attempting to downplay or eliminate any significance the events of 1688-1689 might have for the English polity. Whereas the Whigs attribute the current state of the British state and politics to the Settlement of 1689, the Marxists and, to a lesser extent, Burke would give no significance to what happened in 1688. Clearly, there is an issue with interpretation and historiography between these two viewpoints and like most events in history, the truth lies somewhere in between. Burke is right in arguing that the Revolution was a necessity in order to free the nation from the political tyranny of James II. J.R. Jones argues that James’ political efforts were designed to emulate European sovereigns ‘by making himself independent of his subjects.’[[23]](#footnote-22) W.A. Speck writes that ‘[James’] whole autocratic temperament was inimical to the role of a limited monarch.’[[24]](#footnote-23) James actions, especially in light of his two other kingdoms of Scotland and Ireland, certainly cast him in a negative light, despite attempts to rehabilitate him from Macaulay’s picture of evil. While certainly no demon, James was certainly a threat to the status quo of the English polity. With this in mind, from the mid-twentieth century onwards, there has been a new examination of just why the Revolution came about and what exactly the Settlement in 1689 actually meant for the English polity.

 The Whig version of events began to face serious challenge in the lead up to the tercentenary in 1988. Stephen Baxter in his biography of William III of Orange argues that William’s actions were not purely for the good of England alone. He argues that ‘[William] intervened, not for himself or for his wife but for his faith and for the protection of his native land, the United Provinces.’[[25]](#footnote-24) Furthermore, Baxter argued that William III was in a much greater position of power in relation to the English Parliament in the immediate aftermath of the invasion stating that ‘In December of 1688 he could have had anything he wanted.’[[26]](#footnote-25) Rather than Parliament dictating terms, this interpretation sees William, a victorious conqueror, allowing Parliament to craft its own surrender terms but in such a manner that no one could accuse William of forcing Parliament. Baxter’s William III is a shrewd politician who appears to be more human that the selfless saint of Macaulay’s history.

 Other histories leading up to the tercentenary chipped away at the myth of the 1688 Revolution. J. H. Plumb argues that ‘the key to political instability was Parliament,’ an institution that the monarch failed to control effectively.[[27]](#footnote-26) This led to a situation where ‘an unbridled legislature, combined with an empty exchequer, is half way to political anarchy.’[[28]](#footnote-27) The events of 1688-1689 began the process of Parliamentary control, eliminating its inherent instability and giving Parliament the structures it needed in order to be effective. J. R Jones attributes the success of the Revolution settlement to James II actions in exile, proving his falsehood regarding religious toleration and because the revolution ‘protected and perpetuated existing rights and liberties.’[[29]](#footnote-28) Even though these rights were for a minority, Jones argues that part of the reason for the Revolution’s success was the Whigs abandonment of their calls for ‘reform of popular grievances,’ which had led to frequent instability, in order to focus on protecting the existing, ancient constitution from radical change.[[30]](#footnote-29) Through Plumb and Jones’ arguments we do not see the almost omniscient Parliament of the Whig tradition but a Parliament racked by instability in desperate need of reform and control to function smoothly and efficiently. This efficiency was only achieved after the events of 1688 which led England become embroiled in foreign wars and morph into the power of Great Britain.

 Three hundred years after the Revolution in 1688, the Revolution was under a full scale re-examination by historians and one of the first to publish in time for the tercentenary was W.A. Speck. The title of his book, *Reluctant Revolutionaries*, explains his thesis admirably well. Speck argues that England, while chafing under the restrictions and actions of James II was not a country that would have revolted against him in 1688.[[31]](#footnote-30) He points out that the later Stuarts nearly succeeded in establishing an absolutist state in England but that it was James II’s Catholicism that broke the support the Crown had enjoyed under Charles II and led to the widespread discontent of James’ subjects.[[32]](#footnote-31) Even then, the majority of English people took a non-active role in the events of 1688 allowing William to succeed in his invasion; as Speck writes, ‘In 1685 the loyalty of [James’] subjects contributed to the king’s successful crushing of [Monmouth’s] rebellion. In 1688 the alienation of his subjects helped the cause of the Revolution.’[[33]](#footnote-32) Speck argues that while the settlement of 1689 ensured that Parliament became an institution rather than an event it would be hard to argue that it created a better system of government or secured human liberty.[[34]](#footnote-33) Speck concludes by stating that ‘there was not much glory in 1688. But there was a revolution.’[[35]](#footnote-34) Speck’s argument and analysis systematically laid bare and discredited many of the arguments regarding the Revolution that had once been perpetuated by the Whigs while also rejecting the Marxist interpretation of events. While Speck downplayed the nature of the events in 1688 he rightfully concludes that 1688 was a revolution. The problem, and the source for the continuing fascination with the events of 1688, is determining what kind of revolution it was.

 There were numerous conferences and symposiums held in 1988 that met to discuss the events of 1688 and their impact on Great Britain.[[36]](#footnote-35) The talks held at these events covered every aspect of the Revolution from the meaning of the name to a broader interpretation of where exactly the Revolution occurred. Lois Schwoerer wrote that, in regards to the term Glorious Revolution, ‘People who used the epithet revealed how myopic and narrow was their perspective, for obviously “Glorious Revolution: could apply only to England, not to Scotland or Ireland.’[[37]](#footnote-36) This is particularly true for Ireland where the Catholic majority rallied to James II in 1689 only to face a crushing defeat under William III that ensured that Ireland would be ruled by a Protestant minority.[[38]](#footnote-37) K.H.D. Haley wrote that William’s invasion of England would not have succeeded if he had not had support from the Dutch States-General, thereby adding support to the argument that William’s actions in 1688 were in some aspect a foreign invasion.[[39]](#footnote-38) John C. Rule extended the international element of the Revolution of 1688 to a discussion regarding why Louis XIV did seemingly nothing to help his potential ally, James II, ward off William III.[[40]](#footnote-39) These new arguments revealed that historians were finally asking the deep complex questions about the Revolution that the Whig historians had ignored and broadening the impact of the Revolution beyond England to the whole of the British Isles and Europe.

 These were important steps taken in beginning to truly understand what had happened in 1688 and there were a number of conclusions that many of these historians all seemed to reach a consensus on. Most seem to agree that the Revolution settlement did alter the nature of the English Polity. Jones relates William III’s shock when Parliament, in opposition to his wishes, forced through the disbandment of the army at the end of the war which had immediately followed the Revolution.[[41]](#footnote-40) Jones shows that ‘the Revolution did lead to a transformation in the way in which government was administered,’ the king and his ministers were bound by law and ‘the executive became dependent on the active cooperation of Parliament and the political nation.’[[42]](#footnote-41) Power had shifted from the king to king in Parliament, a hybrid organization that gave the political elite a method to successfully challenge royal polices or the king an arena for garnering overwhelming support for his actions from the nation at large. This was an important step for the British political system.

 There were other aspects of the Revolution that historians have returned to examine and that impact our understanding of the events of 1688-1689. Whig historians have glossed over how the crown passed to William from James but as Lois Schwoerer points out, James II’s newborn son should have been the next in line for the throne; instead the English politicians threw out the concept of direct hereditary succession in order to favor William and Mary and not another potential Catholic monarch.[[43]](#footnote-42) However, the old Whig view that the Revolution changed the nature of kingship by subjecting it to Parliament has been somewhat upheld. Again turning to Schwoerer, it is shown that the coronation oath administered to William and Mary was altered by Parliament in order to highlight ‘the primacy of statutory law, reinforced the Declaration of Rights, and limited royal legal powers.’[[44]](#footnote-43) The Revolution settlement changed the nature of kingship in England but whether this was for the good as Lord Macaulay claimed is still debated. In addition, the military nature of William’s invasion is now rightly acknowledged and historians such as K.H.D. Haley and John Childs have successfully argued that William’s actions in 1688 cannot be viewed as entirely altruistic and that an argument could be made that 1688 saw the last successful invasion of England.[[45]](#footnote-44)

 The scholarship since 1988 has generally accepted these new principles of interpreting the Glorious Revolution of 1688 but the scholarship did not stagnate like it did in earlier centuries. In particular, new work has been done incorporating the Kingdoms of Scotland and Ireland into the picture of the Glorious Revolution. Lois Schwoerer mentioned this new development in her introduction to *The Revolution of 1688-1689* and articles became more common around the tercentenary.[[46]](#footnote-45) However, the first comprehensive view of the Glorious Revolution outside of England was accomplished by Tim Harris in his book *Revolution: the Great Crisis of the British Monarchy, 1685-1720*. In his book, Harris highlights how for the English polity, James’ actions in both Scotland and Ireland caused widespread concern, especially when compared with his claims for religious toleration.[[47]](#footnote-46) The Glorious Revolution was certainly not glorious for Ireland where the war between James and William led to a severe penal code for the majority Catholic population and Scotland ultimately lost its independent political sovereignty during the decades that followed.[[48]](#footnote-47) As Harris writes in his introduction, the omission of Scotland and Ireland ‘has helped perpetuate an image of the Glorious Revolution as a rather tame affair.’[[49]](#footnote-48) The inclusion of Scotland and Ireland is essential to fully understanding the events of the Glorious Revolution which saw England emerge as the dominant power in the British Isles and reveals that the Glorious Revolution was a much more complex affair than historians have perhaps been willing to admit. William became king of England, Scotland, and Ireland and the Revolutionary settlement was designed to apply to all three kingdoms even though it had been written primarily by English politicians. The three kingdoms version of the Glorious Revolution creates the most nuanced and balanced picture of what the Glorious Revolution achieved and just how high a price the people of the British Isles paid for those achievements.

 The Whig version of events has been dealt a serious blow in recent years. Scholarship has shown how complex the events of the Glorious Revolution actually were and has taken the historiography of the Revolution in new directions. This being the case, it comes as no surprise that some scholars have sought to conflate the events of 1688 with later revolutions such as the American or French Revolutions as a radical event. One proponent of this new interpretation of events is Steve Pincus. In his grandly named book, *1688: The First Modern Revolution*, Pincus argues that the English created the first modern revolution as its events ‘pitted two groups of modernizers against each other.’[[50]](#footnote-49) Pincus argues that the revolution had long term causes and consequences and that ‘if the Glorious Revolution was a critical moment in the development of modern liberalism, that liberalism was not antagonistic to the state. The liberalism spawned in 1688-89 was revolutionary and interventionist rather than moderate and anti-statist.’[[51]](#footnote-50) For these reasons, the Glorious Revolution was the forerunner of all other revolutions since it changed the entire fabric of English society.

 It would be a stretch, perhaps quite a large one, to say that the Glorious Revolution of 1688 changed the fabric of English society. For on the whole, the Revolution’s major impact was on the political scene. There we can see that the Whigs were right when they viewed the Revolution as an event of profound change for the country. The reestablishment of the ‘ancient constitution’ came with the Declaration of Rights, a document that curtailed the powers of the monarch and did much to resolve the difficulties that had existed since the start of the seventeenth century between Parliament and the king. As we have seen earlier with William’s failure to secure his army, the king and his government realized that in order to secure their policies they would need the active co-operation of Parliament; anything else would lead to failure. The Revolutionary settlement provided the foundations for Parliamentary power and no king could afford to ignore the will of Parliament; later decades would show the most effective monarchs were the ones who harnessed Parliament to their own desires and gained their support.

 While the Glorious Revolution did secure the institution of Parliament and its eventual power, it would be foolish to say that the Glorious Revolution guaranteed this state of affairs. Hindsight is after all 20/20 and there were a number of events, not least of which were two wars with France, which helped Parliament morph into the power the Whigs believed it to be. In 1688, events certainly looked less favorable. The Revolution, when it came, was not an event launched by the majority of Englishmen as W.A. Speck has shown. There is reason to believe that England would have ultimately accepted the growing absolutism of James II had not William invaded when he did. For William’s intervention must be seen as the last successful invasion of the British Isles. William arrived with an army and, as Stephen Baxter and others have made clear, organized the entirety of the Convention, allowing Parliament the freedom to depose James and create him and Mary as co-rulers. It was an extraordinary political act done with consummate skill and shows William in a more human light than the sainthood Macaulay attributes to him. The actions of the new English regime towards Scotland and Ireland also reveal that the Revolution, in terms of being ‘Glorious’, was only true for the English as both Scotland and Ireland lost much of their independence through the events of 1688-1689.

 History is never as clear cut as the black and white printed words would have us believe. The Glorious Revolution is a prime example of that fact. The historiography has shown that the reaction against the Whig and Marxist histories has revealed a hitherto unseen depth and complexity to the event that continues to be debated and analyzed to the present. The Glorious Revolution had a profound impact on the Three Kingdoms of the British Isles, the political framework of these lands, and the Isles international standing. It is not a stretch to admit that the events following the Glorious Revolution saw the creation of a new polity, Great Britain, and its emergence as a Great Power upon the European and World stage. The Revolution deserves to be studied and analyzed for this fact alone if for no other reason. Its very complexity is what makes it fascinating to historians and its lessons still have as much relevance for a modern audience as they did for the contemporaries who lived through it.
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