

not neglected. I did not need to be told that the former can have little meaning without the latter. It is by no means certain that economic and social rights would have been included in the final text if I had not included them in mine. There was considerable opposition in the drafting committee to their inclusion.

"Two articles dealt with the prevention of discrimination and the protection of minorities. The Universal Declaration has a great deal to say about the prevention of discrimination, but it does not mention minorities. The refusal of the General Assembly to include rules to protect them was one of the first concrete signs that the United Nations would not continue in the role of the League of Nations as the international protector of minorities.

"After cataloguing and defining the various rights and freedoms, I went on to mention three principles, the recognition of which is essential in any effective system for the international protection of human rights.

"The first was that the right of individual petition included the right to petition the United Nations. The second was the duty of all member states to respect and protect the rights enunciated in the declaration. And the third was that its provisions were to be deemed fundamental principles of international law and of the national law of each member state.

"None of these principles was retained in the Universal Declaration, although some were put into the covenants. The Universal Declaration does not even recognize the right to petition national, let alone international, authorities.

"I had no plan for overcoming the difficulty that the General Assembly can make only recommendations. I knew very well that it had no power to impose binding obligations. But instinct told me that the declaration would later be recognized in some way as binding, perhaps by the force of custom; and that, I think, is what has now happened. By including the three principles in my text, I in any event raised most of the questions concerning the international implementation of human rights that needed to be discussed."

The drafting committee of eight members, with Mrs. Roosevelt in the chair, met in June 1947. They used Humphrey's text, but they also had a draft convention presented by Britain that provided for implementation at the national level and some enforcement procedures within the United Nations, including the ultimate power of expelling a member state that violated this bill of rights, on a two-thirds vote of the General Assembly. But the British authors did not press it energetically, and the committee did not discuss it seriously. Humphrey comments: "It probably represented the highest point ever reached by the United Kingdom in its approach to the protection of human rights by the United Nations."

The Soviet member on the drafting committee was Professor Vladimir Koretsky (later a judge on the International Court of Justice). Humphrey describes how Koretsky criticized the political philosophy in both his and the British drafts for "their tendency to liberate man not from persecution but from his government, and that meant putting him in opposition to his own government and people." Humphrey adds:

"He had, of course, hit the nail right on the head. One purpose of both drafts was to protect individuals from their governments. If the protection of