## **The Historiographical debate over the Glorious Revolution 1688-1701**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **John Morrill** | **Edmund Burke** | **David Hume** | **Thomas Babington Macaulay** | **North and Weingast** | **Steven Pincus** |
| **The sensible revolution of 1688-89 was a conservative revolution. It did not create damaging new rifts in the English nation, although it did sharpen and to some extent extend divisions in Scotland and Ireland.** | **‘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.’** |  **Hume wrote ‘the powers of royal prerogative were more narrowly circumscribed and more exactly defined’** | **’The Glorious Revolution re-asserted the ‘limited monarchy and that the king could not act without ‘the consent of the representatives of the nation.’** | **Following the Glorious Revolution the government gained access to an unprecedented level of funds and became financially solvent.** | **England’s revolution of 1688-89, it is now clear, was the first modern revolution.The revolution of 1688-89 was, like all other revolutions, violent, popular and divisive.** |
| **Revisionist. Partial and less significant change. Unrevolutionary.** | **Whig Interpretation. Significant Evolutionary change** | **Revisionist. More significant revolutionary change** |
| **It was the conflict over issues and the competition for places among those loyal to William that principally shaped domestic politics 1689-1701.** | **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.** | **‘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.’** | **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 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.** | **William’s assent to the Triennial Act of 1694 ensured regular Parliaments and ushered in a period of feverish electioneering and deeply partisan politics.** |
| **Henry Horwitz** | **Christopher Hill****Marxist Historian** | **Daniel Defoe** | **George Macaulay Trevelyan** | **Andrew Lavoie** | **Edward Vallance** |

##

## **Whig versus Revisionist historiography by Andrew Lavoie**

## 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.’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.

##

## **Whig Historiography by Andrew Lavoie**

## After 1688-89 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 viewpoint 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.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.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.’ 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. Macaulay goes a step further in his analysis by arguing that Parliament had agreed to ‘assert the ancient rights and liberties of England.’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.’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.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.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.’The Tories, who Macaulay saw as his story’s villains, were the supporters of ‘divine, indefeasible, hereditary right,’ and therefore absolutism.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.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.’ 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.

**Revisionist Historiography by Andrew Lavoie**

**(a diverse group in terms of their thoughts about extent of change but united in their challenge to the Whig version of the Glorious Revolution)**

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.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.’ 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.’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.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.’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.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.

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 Williams'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.’ 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.’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. This led to a situation where ‘an unbridled legislature, combined with an empty exchequer, is halfway to political anarchy. 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. Through Plumbs’ 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.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. 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.’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.Speck concludes by stating that ‘there was not much glory in 1688. But there was a revolution.’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.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.’ 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. 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. 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.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. 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.’ Power had shifted from the king to king in Parliament, a hybrid organization that gave the political elite a method to successfully challenge royal policies 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.

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. 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.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. 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. 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.

**Conclusions on GR Historiography by Andrew Lavoie**

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.’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.’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 Williams'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.

##

##

##

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Areas of Controversy****1 Did Revolutionary Ideals underpin the Glorious Revolution 1688-1701?** | **Whig and and some Marxist Historians argue that** | **Revisionist Historians argue that** |
| A **The Bill of Rights 1689** is often cited as a significant constitutional document. 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.B **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, following the reign of Queen Anne (who was the Protestant daughter of James II and was the successor after William’s death). The House of Hanover was connected to the Stuarts through Sophia, who was the granddaughter of James I and who was the next suitable heir as William and Mary, and Anne, had no surviving children to inherit the throne. Under the terms of the Act of Settlement, Catholics, 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 limited to providing for a smooth succession and enabled a number of legislative proposals put forward in 1689 to finally reach the statute books. The fear of absolutism and a desire to rein in the king is clear throughout the Act.  | **Significant Evolutionary change****There can be no doubt the concept of divine right monarchy was severely damaged and significantly reduced the Crown’s prerogative powers. After the Bill of Rights and the Act of Settlement were passed, it was no longer possible for monarchs to claim their powers came from God as their authority had to be approved by parliament.** 1 Macauley **a moderate political consensus** between Whigs and Tories underpinned by revolutionary ideals. Whig writers maintain that the Bill of Rights preserved England’s ‘ancient constitution’ from absolutism of James II and it therefore represented the restoration of previous political stability rather than creating an entirely new settlement. The Whig view grew to represent political settlement as a starting point of a new constitution, where Whigs and Tories compromised to form a constitutional monarchy and the line of succession clarified by the Act of Settlement. This became so well know that it was printed in school textbooks eg: Baldwin’s *the history of England for the use of schools* (1806). This view presented parliament as the supreme power in the political system.2 A key motive for those who prompted the overthrow of the King was religious conviction. For example: Whig members of parliament(MPs) shared the view of John Locke. that enforcing **religious uniformity would lead to social disorder** 3 **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 clarified any grey areas of the royal prerogative.4 **Marxist historians argue that 1688 is a continuation of the ‘bourgeoisie revolution’ of 1649**, where the propertied classes overthrew a monarchy that restricted their economic livelihoods. Even marxist historians such as Hill and Morton took much info from Whig historians and went to present a settlement like the one described by the Whigs. | **Partial change and unrevolutionary** **Despite the Bill of Rights 1689 and the Act of Settlement 1701 the Monarchy retained significant prerogative powers. What was created through the political settlement can best be described as a monarchy of parliaments choosing.** 1 John Morrill argues that, the Bill of Rights was not as significant as some historians would suggest, as it was a statute law that could be revoked by any future parliament. He believed 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.2 Furthermore the Bill of Rights did not create a new procedure by which arbitrary monarchs could be removed The monarch was still free to decide on issues surrounding war, peace, and foreign policy, and William was still able to choose his own advisers.3 John Morrill argue that the events changed nothing but the line of succession as indicated in the Act of Settlement. They believe that a constitutional monarch was not fully established but do agree that the idea of divine right to rule was destroyed. They go on to say that parliament was still effectively an advisory body and the monarch still pre-eminent in the political system and parliament still represented only 2% of the richest people. it wasn’t until 1760 that the ‘crown estate’ was created and the monarch’s property was placed under control of parliament.**Significant Revolutionary change****Steven Pincus argues the revolution is important because it was a landmark moment in the emergence of the modern state.** The Whigs were revolutionaries committed to the expansion of the state and its commercial energies, committed to religious toleration and pluralism. The revolutionaries were therefore fully committed to fighting an all-out war against France, not only to protect the British Isles from a potential French-backed Jacobite restoration, but also to ensure that there would be European markets available to English manufactures and that European liberty would be preserved against French-style absolutism.Though we have come to view the Glorious Revolution as bloodless, aristocratic and consensual, the actual event was none of these things.England’s revolution of 1688-89, it is now clear, was the first modern revolution.The revolution of 1688-89 was, like all other revolutions, violent, popular and divisive |
| **Areas of Controversy****2 Did Religious Toleration underpin the Glorious Revolution 1688-1701?** | **Whig and some Marxist Historians argue that** | **Revisionist Historians argue that** |
| **2 Did Religious Toleration underpin the Glorious Revolution 1688-1701?**1 **A religious settlement was established after the Glorious Revolution.** Anglican Churchmen were concerned with ensuring that worship within the Church remained uniform and was not modified. As a compromise William suggested that a Toleration Act be passed.2 **The Toleration Act 1689** was passed by the reluctant Tories influenced by John Locke’s “A Letter Concerning Toleration”. Under the terms of the Act, dissenters were exempted from punishment if they took the oath of the allegiance to the Crown and accepted the 1678 Test Act, meaning they could not enter public employment without swearing loyalty to the Anglican Church. 3 **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 priest refused and were deprived of their livings.  | **Significant Evolutionary change****Under the terms of the Toleration Act 1689, dissenters were exempted from punishment if they took the oath of the allegiance to the Crown and accepted the 1678 Test Act, meaning they could not enter public employment without swearing loyalty to the Anglican Church. Catholics too had little to fear from William, as he had effectively guaranteed their safety by entering into alliance with a number of Catholic powers against the French in the League of Augsburg in 1686. A number of Whigs had also commented that Catholics were the group who gained the most out of the revolution also frenchman Henri Misson had also stated that during the 1690s, Catholics appeared to enjoy universal toleration.**1 The Toleration Act and events of the period 1688-1701 served to undermine the established Anglican Church in a number of ways and establish Religious toleration and acceptance of pluralism.Marxist Historian Christopher Hill argues that the role of religion in local government and the legal system was also reduced. **For example:*** it was now accepted that the Anglican Church could not enforce complete uniformity and that some allowances had to be made for dissenters who were now 8% 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 take part 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 the church courts which were crucial in upholding authority of the confessional state before, were severely restricted by the Toleration Act.
 | **Partial change and unrevolutionary** **The Toleration Act excluded Catholics, non-Trinitarians and Jews. The lack of repeal of the Test Act had meant that non-Anglicans could not sit in parliament or hold public office, also those who had not sworn to allegiance to the Anglican church were not permitted to attend university, work in legal profession or practice medicine. Even those religious 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 which they did not attend and belong to.**J Champion argues that the Anglican Church still had an important role.**For example*** 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 Anglican church.
* to gain public employment or to join parliament, there was no choice but to swear allegiance to the crown and take Anglican communion.
* there was not a theological debate between MP’s and peers before the Toleration Act was passed. it is sometimes seen as a reactionary attempt to maintain order and preserve the Anglican Church.
* 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.

**Significant Revolutionary change****Steven Pincus argues the revolution is important because it was a landmark moment in the emergence of the modern state.** The Whigs were revolutionaries committed to the expansion of the state and its commercial energies, committed to religious toleration and pluralism. The revolutionaries were therefore fully committed to fighting an all-out war against France, not only to protect the British Isles from a potential French-backed Jacobite restoration, |
| **Areas of Controversy****3 Did Parliamentary governance underpin the Glorious Revolution 1688-1701?** | **Whig and some Marxist Historians argue that** | **Revisionist Historians argue that** |
| **1** The Parliament of 1690 consisted of 225 Whigs and 206 Tories. William’s natural allies should have been the Whigs, who favoured progressive reform and had originally called for a Protestant succession. William originally believed they were too radical and had suspicions that a number of them were republicans. He hoped to woo the Tories, who favoured tradition and strict 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. **2** The king was only holding onto his position of predominance within the political system with difficulty. By the beginning of 1694 the Whig Junto was beginning to dominate government. **The Triennial Act was debated again and in 1694 it received Royal assent.** As a consequence of the Act, Parliament was banned, by law, from lasting longer than 3 years which meant general elections could be held more regularly. These regular elections meant that it was increasingly difficult for the Crown to establish a party in the House of Commons leading to William becoming more reliant on securing support from MP’s. The period c1690-1715 has been referred to as the Rage of Party characterised by instability as a result of frequent elections. | **Significant Evolutionary change****The Whig 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 King’s appointment of ministers and control of the army.
* The Triennial Act did change the power of parliament, but this authority would not have been possible without the Bill of Rights
* 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.
* The Bill of rights gave guarantees that the abuses of power experienced under James II would not be respected.
* 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.
 | **Partial change and unrevolutionary** **Revisionist argue that, 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 over that of Parliament. Furthermore 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.**H Horwitz argues that Parliament was the focal point and vital instrument of the Glorious Revolution and the competition for places in government was significantly affected by the enhanced importance of Parliament. Seats in the Commons were increasingly stepping stones to office. H Horwitz argues that 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.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 was the best example of the King and parliament working in unison. 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 in parliament gaining increased control over government finance. Through the Triennial Act, it became an institution that the monarch could not completely ignore. Political necessity had forced William to appoint men he loathed and he was forced to reduce the size of the army as a result of a parliamentary decision. **Significant Revolutionary change**E Vallance contend that it is a myth that the Glorious Revolution of 1688 was a Parliamentary one since most of the decisions that really mattered with regard to politics, religion and finance had been taken before the Convention Parliament met even if it did become the ultimate heir and beneficiary of the Crowns gradual demise. E Vallance argues that Williams assent to the Triennial Act of 1694 ushered in a period of feverish electioneering and deeply partisan politics in which the Crown retained substantial prerogative powers. |
| **Areas of Controversy****4 Did financial governance through parliament underpin the Glorious Revolution 1688-1701?** | **Whig and some Marxist Historians argue that** | **Revisionist Historians argue that** |
| **1 The Nine Years War 1688-97** marked a complete transformation in Britain’s foreign policy, and William was certainly taking a risk by committing millions of pounds and thousands of troops in the war effort. This caused strain between William and Parliament**2** The annual average expenditure: 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 by **taxing items** such as tea, tobacco and alcohol. The most significant revenue stream was the land tax, a third of all required funds. **3** 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. 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. It was the financial settlement of the 1690’s, rather than the Triennial Act or Bill of Rights, that necessitated regular meetings of parliament.**  | **Significant Evolutionary change****John Miller makes clear that a distinction was made between military and civil expenditure. Parliament made significant steps forward in relieving the King of any 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 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 crowns day-to-day spending was controlled through a grant, the civil list. The monarch would never again be able use their prerogative to avoid working with parliament. **Such Parliamentary scrutiny of gov finance is evidenced by**1 In 1690, William had agreed to the Public Accounts Act and the first commission was set up in 1691, with nine commissioners voted to their positions by the MPs. The commission was renewed each year until 1697, although William blocked more being established. 2 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. 3 The Bank of England was the brainchild of Whig Chancellor Charles Montagu and was supported by many Whigs and opposed by many 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.4 The investors in the Bank were given authority to deal in bills of exchange. From William’s point of view, the bank was essential way in which he could attract large numbers of investors who would deposit small amounts to be lent,.  | **Partial change and unrevolutionary**Largely accepts the Whig view but in addition T Claydon argues that what distinguished William from previous Stuart Kings was that William saw a central role for Parliament in ensuring financial probity and have a central role in formulating policy.**Significant Revolutionary change****Douglas North and Barry Weingast go further and have interpreted parliamentary control over finance as beneficial to the economy as a whole. Those who had been previously reluctant to invest in the government and wider economy had a newfound confidence as parliament was effectively underwriting the Bank of England..**This therefore was different than the financial arrangements under previous Stuart Monarchs who under mounting financial pressure resorted to a series of forced loans as had Charle I indicating that it could not raise funds at rates it was either willing or able to pay.Following the financial developments in the 1690’s government became financially solvent and gained access to hitherto unprecedented sums for the government.In the Nine years war government borrowing increased by more than an order of magnitude because it was subject to Parliamentary scrutiny and underwritten by the Bank of England This sharp increase in the willingness of lenders to supply funds was further propped up by the perceived willingness on the part of government to honour its financial agreements.These expectations were borne out and remained a pattern of state finance into the 18th Century and beyond.**Steven Pincus goes even further and suggests** it was significant for the economy not because it solved a problem of credible commitment, but for two other reasons. First, because the institutional changes it led to meant that party political ministries, rather than the king’s private advisors, now initiated policy. Second, because these ministries were dominated by Whigs with a specific program of economic modernization**The Marxist historian 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 financiers of the City of London. |