

Was the Treaty of Le Goulet a success or failure for King John?

Using a scale of **1 – 10**, decide the views of the following Historians:

1 = John suffered a terrible defeat at Le Goulet

to

10 = Le Goulet was a great success and very beneficial for King John

Name	Rate	Reasons
John Gillingham		John had won the succession dispute & obtained his father's lands. But his acknowledgement of Philip's position was made in a "concrete and expensive" fashion. John was also diplomatically "isolated".
W L Warren		John's territorial concessions didn't really affect him that much – a firm peace was more vital. But his concessions over his feudal position were far more important. John's position with regard to Philip was "inferior" to his father's. "Many might think" John had been successful.
David Carpenter		Both sides made concessions – Philip had to give up his ambition to break up the Angevin Empire & John had to give up land on the Normandy frontier ("another deep hole was dug"). Four years later it all collapsed but this was more due to John's character & mistakes.
Maurice Ashley		A fair treaty ("statesmanlike") – both sides made concessions for positive gains. But it contained the "seeds of future disputes". John became known as 'Softsword' – "rather unfairly".
Robert Bartlett		The Treaty was a great success for John. Philip & Arthur did not make much "headway". John's power seemed as complete as his brother Richard's. But note the use of "appeared".
Ralph Turner		Mixed story – John gained 2 years of peace to consolidate his position on the continent (though note the use of the word "seemed"). But John's recognition of Philip's position would come back to "haunt" him.