

Has history treated Charles I badly?

Task: Cut out the cards and sort them onto the target diagram below depending on the extent to which each statement supports the idea that history has treated Charles I badly.

Charles raised an army against Parliament, was defeated in two civil wars, was tried and executed.	James I left problems for his son that he never solved - religion, ruling a multiple kingdom and keeping everyone happy.	James I failed to raise enough money for the Crown. He had many disagreements with Parliament and ruled without it 1610-1621.
Charles was an inexperienced king facing a war with two of Europe's greatest powers without having the funds to do it well.	When Charles succeeded his father in 1625 there was much rejoicing everywhere 'for the uncertainties of the last rule wearied all men'.	The main area of disagreement between Charles and Parliament was money. Charles felt that as Parliament had pressed for a war against Spain they should fund it.
Charles created too much opposition on too many fronts at the same time. He ended up upsetting lots of people for different reasons at the same time.	Charles broke from Parliament and sent them away because he felt they were stopping him from ruling for the public good.	The 1630s were a time of peace and prosperity. Charles ended the wars with France and Spain, promoted social and economic changes. He reformed the militia and the navy.
Charles was charged with treason - a crime that can only be committed <i>against</i> a King.	Charles's most controversial actions were to do with religion and the Church.	Only a half a percent of the population left England for the New World because of Charles' policies.
Charles lacked his father's ability to back down graciously when under pressure.	Charles had a tendency to tell Parliament off when it did not agree with him. James knew when to back off.	Charles failed to let others take the blame when things went wrong. This was a disaster for a monarch in the 17 th century!
Charles caused himself more problems over finance in his disagreements with Parliament.	Charles left himself with no way of raising money and a rebellion in Scotland to deal with.	Charles failed to see the need to appeal to public opinion or to explain his policies to the people.
Charles positioned himself against Parliament but showed himself to be a traditional King.	Charles stood for the rule of law, traditional monarchy and the Church against a tide of political and religious extremes.	Charles successfully turned a lot of people against Parliament and the Puritans. Without significant support he would not have been able to fight the civil war.
The civil wars did not erupt because Charles could not promote himself. They broke out because he could do this too well.	Parliament overstretched itself as it tried to take more and more power from the King. This wasn't always popular with the public.	Radical puritans, frustrated by Charles's religious reforms began to destroy altar rails and stained-glass windows. This was still shocking to ordinary people.

