

## English Governing Documents

Central Historical Question:

If a law is not upheld by the King of a Country, can it really be considered a good law by historians?

Notes:

Based on your notes: if a law is not upheld by the King of a Country, can it really be considered a good law by historians? No ←-----→ Yes

Why should historians think so?

**Document #1 Magna Carta 1215**

<p>1. What is important about this law?</p>	<p>2. If it is not upheld is it a good law? No←-----→Yes</p> <p>3. Why should historians think so?</p>
---	--

**Document #2 The Petition of Right 1628 Signed by Charles I**

<p>1. What is important about this law?</p>	<p>2. If it is not upheld is it a good law? No←-----→Yes</p> <p>3. Why should historians think so?</p>
---	--

**Document #3 Habeas Corpus Act 1679 signed by Charles II**

<p>1. What is important about this law?</p>	<p>2. If it is not upheld is it a good law? No←-----→Yes</p> <p>3. Why should historians think so?</p>
---	--

**Document #4 The English Bill of Rights 1689**

<p>1. What is important about this law?</p>	<p>2. If it is not upheld is it a good law? No←-----→Yes</p> <p>3. Why should historians think so?</p>
---	--

Central Historical Question:

If a law is not upheld by the King of a Country, can it really be considered a good law by historians?

No ←-----→ Yes

Why should historians think so?

Does this same rule apply to our country and our laws? Why?