leaving John with a lot of repairing to do. This suggests John was a good king because he was reliable in protecting his country even if it meant using valuable money. Also it shows he is a good king since he knew the Pope was a powerful enemy so made amends and then gained him as an effective associate. The extract written by David Bates in 1994 talks about how impossible John’s difficulties were. This is evidence that John did go through some difficulties. This was quite a significant aspect of John’s reign because the Pope at that time was powerful so if you didn’t have him as a friend but an enemy he could be deadly. Also it was important that John repaired and upgraded his navy so he could protect his country from potential invaders.

The third most important thing John did was to agree to a peace truce with King Philip II of France. John was in a constant warfare with the King of France and to end the conflict John agreed to a peace truce. This was an intelligent move since Philip II had the capability to steal all his land in Normandy since he was based in France and John wasn’t. This shows he was a good king because he accepted the fact that he couldn’t beat the King of France since he had a much bigger stronger fighting force and had a huge advantage against John. John however made the right decision of a truce and did what a good king would have done. The extract from William Stubbs written in 1873 shows how tough it was for John and how hard he had to work to keep things under control. This was relatively significant as an issue because King Philip had a lot of power, a good navy and had the capability to steal French land back from John – overall he was a big threat to John. John had made the wrong decision to keep on fighting – which he didn’t – he would have lost everything.

The fourth most important thing John did was to chose the new archbishop of Canterbury and argue against the Pope over that matter. Even though in the end John gave in to the Pope he had all the right to chose the archbishop of Canterbury since almost all kings in the past had chosen the archbishop and he was just expressing his kingly rights. This shows he was a good king because he stood up for his rights and didn’t allow the Pope to win the battle in just one round. The extract written by R. Turner in 1994 shows how John could have been extremely successful if it wasn’t for his opponents and his few personality flaws. He stood up for himself and showed the Pope he wasn’t a pushover. This matter is the least significant because even though in the end John didn’t get what he wanted he showed his worth to the Pope and gained him as a powerful ally. This wasn’t as important because the Pope didn’t have as much impact on John’s reign unlike other people such as the barons or King Philip II of France.

My line of argument has been that John was, overall, a good king. He made a few mistakes but then worked hard to fix them. I think if John wasn’t so unlucky - he inherited many problems from Richard and was up against the toughest opponents – he