

Section C In the light of differing interpretations, how convincing do you find the view that, there had been a revolution in the relationship between the Monarchs government and Parliament? To explain your answer, analyse and evaluate the material in both extracts, using your own knowledge of the issues.

Extract 1: From E Vallance, The Glorious Revolution 1688 Britain's fight for Liberty, published 2006. p125

Military success made Parliament more ready to lend money, Williams assent to the Triennial Act of 1694 insured regular parliaments and ushered in a period of feverish electioneering and deeply partisan politics. Between 1689 and 1715 there were 12 general elections in 1689 1690 1695 1698 1701 (two) 1702 1705 1708 1710 1713 and 1715. Each of these saw on average 100 out of 269 seats contested. Over that period only 19 constituencies managed to avoid having contest at all, meaning that in almost every constituency in England local electorate was at some point asked to decide between rival candidates. Politics was increasingly being governed by loyalty to one or other party. There is strong evidence that after 1695 voting in The Commons was conducted largely along party lines with only 14% of MPs regularly engaging in cross-party voting.

Extract 2: From H Horwitz, Parliament, Policy and Politics in the reign of William III, published 1977. p126

It was the conflict over issues and the competition for places among those loyal to William that principally shaped domestic politics between 1689 and 1702. Pre Revolution issues were not at all resolved in 1689. The Revolution itself was a subject of controversy, and the King's policies and engendered new disputes. Despite the enlargement of the government apparatus during the war, there was never a shortage of suitors for the offices of profit in the Crowns gift. William is said to have exclaimed on occasion that he wished every man that was in any office immortal so that he would not be badgered about the disposition of their posts. The competition for place was affected in turn by the enhanced importance of Parliament. Seats in the Commons were more and more Stepping Stones to office so that Hartley's prediction before the general election of 1695 that the new triennial legislation would help to render gentleman less willing to spend money to come into the house proved to be mistaken. As Lord Cheyne observed " in truth a seat in Parliament is not worth the pains we undergo to attain, but a place at court with a seat there is most people's aim"

Key	
	Case for. Source. For example source 2 suggests “ <u>+S</u> ” . Use source as evidence and content
	Case for. Knowledge. This can be further supported by <u>K</u>
	Case for. Repeat this pattern 2 or 3 times integrating source analysis and knowledge
	Case for. Corroborate. Finally this is partially supported by sources 1
	Case against. For example source 2 suggests “ <u>+S</u> ” . Use source as evidence and content
	Case against. Knowledge. This can be further supported by <u>K</u>
	Case against. Repeat this pattern once integrating source analysis and knowledge
	Case against. Corroborate. Finally this view is also challenged by source 1 that suggests

Planning your Answer

Source 1 supports the Revisionist view that the relationship between Parliament and King had only been partially changed with parliament only becoming gradually more powerful over appointments to the King's Privy Council "Williams assent to the Triennial Act of 1694 insured regular parliaments". The Whig view presented in Source 2 challenges this interpretation and suggests that whilst King retained considerable influence he was now obligated to consider the wishes of Parliament and work in partnership "it was competition for places among those loyal to William that principally shaped domestic politics between 1689 and 1702". The most convincing interpretation is offered by source 2.

Source 1 offers an over simplistic revisionist view of more significant revolutionary change that Parliamentary politics was increasingly significant in this period of "feverish electioneering". Source 1 suggests that the King's need for money led to Parliament becoming continuously more consulted, and regular Parliamentary elections supported the view that Parliamentary politics was increasing in significance. This is supported by the fact that "Williams assent to the Triennial Act of 1694 insured regular parliaments and ushered in a period of feverish electioneering and deeply partisan politics". Source 1 also suggests that attitudes regarding to politics were changing, and that there was a gradual shift both amongst MPs and the electorate from support of monarchical power to the support of parliamentary parties. Source 1 suggests "that politics was increasingly being governed by loyalty to one or other party", this idea can be further supported by the evidence that suggests that only "14% of MPs regularly engaging in cross-party voting." Finally this is partially supported by Source 2 in that "The competition for place was affected in turn by the enhanced importance of Parliament. ." This supports the idea that there was considerable political change within the political system where the King could no longer ignore Parliament. **However** this view has some major limitations in terms of the evidence, it shows that there was limited change within parliament rather than a significant evolutionary shift. For example Source 1 infers continued Crown influence in the statement "Williams assent to the Triennial Act of 1694 insured regular parliaments". This supports the idea that there was considerable political continuity within the political system where the King still retained significant influence through appointments over the direction of policy and legislation. This is further challenged by the view that there was a Glorious Revolution in politics along the lines that the Whig historians have argued with increasing parliamentary power in partnership with the Monarchy. Finally this view is also challenged by Source 2 that suggests it was the conflict over issues and the competition for places among those loyal to William that principally shaped domestic politics between 1689 and 1702. Clearly this revisionist view plays an important role in understanding the controversy over the Glorious Revolution, but it is arguably not the most significant.

The most convincing view of this controversy is that supported by the revisionist historian Horwitz in Source 2 which support the idea of less significant change. It reveals the King retained considerable influence whilst working in partnership with Parliament and the political parties and MPs. This view has some major evidence to support it. For example Source 2 suggests there was "conflict over issues and the competition for places among those loyal to William that principally shaped domestic politics between 1689 and 1702" which led to the King's policies and engendered new disputes. This can be further supported by Parliament was able to encroach on areas that were once firmly part of the royal prerogative, such as the King's appointment of ministers and control of the army. Furthermore the Triennial Act did change the power of parliament, but this authority would not have been possible without the Bill of Rights. In addition, Source 2 suggests Despite the enlargement of the government apparatus during the war, there was never a shortage of suitors for the offices of profit in the Crowns gift. This is further supported since 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 from the Crown. Furthermore, "William is said to have exclaimed on occasion that he wished every man that was in any office immortal so that he would not be badgered about the disposition of their posts" which meant that he retained significant influence Finally this is partially supported by Sources 1 where "Williams assent to the Triennial Act of 1694 insured regular parliaments" supporting the argument that there was an evolution of enhanced partnership between Parliament and the Monarchy. **However** this view has some minor limitations as there is a view of a more significant revolution in the relationship between the Crown and Parliament in favour of the latter which is supported by Source 1. For example Source 2 suggests "the enlargement of the government apparatus" which suggested that parliament had become more significant in the governance of the country. This can be further supported by the fact that the two main political parties contested for places in Parliament in increasingly frequent elections.. Finally this view is also challenged by Source 1 that suggests Between 1689 and 1715 there were 12 general elections. showing that Parliaments often did not sit for significant periods of time to establish full scrutiny over the King's government. Clearly this view is the most convincing in understanding the controversy over the Glorious Revolution since it demonstrates the growing significance of the concept of a constitutional monarchy in which the King and Parliament were partners, whilst explicitly outlining the continuation of the Crown influence over suitors and appointments to government posts.

To conclude, Source 1 shows the view that the Monarchy needed money to fight the Irish and French wars which led to the King being forced to call the Parliament in order to gain finance and this led to a period in which Parliamentary ascendancy over the Crown's prerogative powers revealed a significant revolutionary shift in the direction of a more

modern state. This led to a period of "feverish electioneering" as indicated in source 1 even though revisionist historians contest the extent to which the Parliament had superseded the prerogative powers of the Monarchy. In contrast, Source 2 more convincingly shows how the Monarchy worked in partnership with Parliament and that the Crown retained significant prerogative powers in the governance of the country at War. Furthermore, it suggests that Parliament, political parties and their MPs were trying to gain favour from the King to consolidate this Glorious Revolution and to this extent it was more evolutionary.