

judgment, ought to be more on procedures than on standards, for the no more complicated reason than that we have the former (by and large), but lack the latter; and that time and energy concentrated in this particular way on the further elucidation of standards may be misplaced. Highly generalized theorizing can hardly be said to be a matter of priority in the context we are talking about. We would think moreover that the conference and the programmes should not become bogged down in attempting a dreary catalogue of facts about human rights in each and every country. This is an impossible and often counter productive task. And, as we all know, it can have a very high nuisance value indeed.

Secondly, the conference might well think it worthwhile to consider afresh the relationship that ought to obtain between the Universal Declaration, the two proposed covenants, and the interlocking declarations that are in existence already, all this with a view to reviewing the unity, the orientation and the momentum of the total United Nations programme. This is a matter of principle rather than of fact gathering, and it would involve an appraisal of the broad course which the United Nations has charted for itself in this area of activity. A related inquiry might pertain to the possibility of co-ordinating all major human rights activities within the United Nations system itself. What one has in mind here - and we raise this point only for purposes of discussion - is the feasibility of harmonizing the policies and actions of the various organs and agencies that deal with human rights on the United Nations level, and of