

Solutions

Each answer shows the steps, then the **result**.

2.1

- whether the crown could tax, legislate and maintain force without parliamentary consent; the conflict decided that it could not

2.2

- both were attempts to act without consent, so the same body raised the same objection in each case

2.3

(a)

- the franchise remained narrow and property-based

(b)

- a formulation describing a transfer from crown to propertied parliament

3.1 B

- parliamentary control over taxation was central

3.2 B

- property qualifications remained

3.3

(a)

- consent for a standing army

(b)

- an army maintained without consent gives the crown means to act without parliament, which is the same danger as revenue raised without consent