



*ONE OF THE*  
MRS. ELEANOR ROOSEVELT, CHAIRMAN OF THE HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION AND AMBASSADOR OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE UNITED NATIONS; DR. EMILIO PANDO MACHADO, MEMBER OF THE CUBAN DELEGATION AND DR. GUY PEREZ-CISNEROS, CO-CHAIRMAN OF THE HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION AND AMBASSADOR OF CUBA, AS WELL AS PERMANENT DELEGATE TO THE UNITED NATIONS.

*NOTE: 1 OF  
VARIOUS  
CO-CHAIRMAN  
P.P.C.*

IT SHOULD BE NOTED THAT THE UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS WAS PROPOSED TO THE UNITED NATIONS BY DR. ERNESTO DIHIGO AND DR. GUY PEREZ-CISNEROS IN 1946. THE FINAL DOCUMENT WAS PRESENTED TO THE U.N. ON DECEMBER 10, 1948. DR. GUY PEREZ-CISNEROS, REPRESENTING CUBA, WAS THE ONE WHO GAVE THE HUMAN RIGHTS SPEECH AT THE THIRD ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS. PHOTO IS A MEMENTO OF THAT OCCASION. *AT THE PALLAIS DE CHAILLOT IN PARIS - FRANCE*

*NOTE: THERE WERE 181 MEETINGS*



LUNCHEON GIVEN TO FORMER PRIME MINISTER - WINSTON CHURCHILL  
IN 1945 - IN LONDON ENGLAND, BY THE CUBAN DELEGATION THAT  
ATTENDED THE U.N. MEETING AT WESTMINSTER. ON THAT  
OCCASION WAS CUBA THE COUNTRY THAT PROPOSED THE  
CREATION OF A U.N. - HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION UNDER  
THE ADVICE OF CHURCHILL.



AMBASSADOR, GUY PEREZ-CISNEROS  
CUBAN DELEGATE TO THE U.N.



GUY PEREZ-LISNEROS CON ERNESTO DI RIGO



# Conmemoran la Declaración de los Derechos Humanos en el Mundo

Hace Seis Años fué Proclamado Este día por la Asamblea General de las Naciones Unidas. Inaugurarán Asamblea de la ACNU

Hoy hace seis años que fué proclamada por la Asamblea General de las Naciones Unidas la Declaración Universal de Derechos Humanos. Con este motivo la propia Asamblea General en su quinto período de sesiones, celebrado en New York, en 1950, aprobó una resolución invitando a todos los Estados y Organizaciones interesadas a que cada año, el 10 de diciembre, se celebre la proclamación, como homenaje universal a los derechos del hombre.

Así pues, este año como los anteriores, en todos los países se efectuarán actos conmemorativos que reafirmarán aún más los anhelos de todos los pueblos para que la Declaración de los Derechos Humanos se convierta en guía fundamental para lograr su objetivo máximo, a fin de que tanto los individuos como las instituciones, inspirándose en ella, promuevan mediante la enseñanza y la educación, el respeto a los derechos y libertades, y aseguren, como dice la Declaración en su texto "por medidas progresivas de carácter nacional e internacional, su reconocimiento y aplicación universales y efectivos, tanto entre los pueblos de los Estados miembros, como entre los territorios colocados bajo su jurisdicción".

## En La Habana

En Cuba, entre otros varios actos, figura la Sesión de apertura de la VIII Asamblea Plenaria de la Asociación Cubana de las Naciones Unidas, que preside el doctor Cosme de la Torre.

En dicho acto, que tendrá efecto esta noche a las 9 en el salón de la Asociación de Colonos de Cuba, Agular número 360, noveno piso, el Ministro de Estado, doctor Miguel Ángel Campa, tendrá a su cargo el discurso de apertura.

Las palabras de homenaje a la fecha, serán pronunciadas por el doctor de la Torre y dirigirá un saludo a los representantes de los organismos especializados.

La directora General de la ACNU, doctora Ofelia Domínguez ofrecerá el informe anual, y a continuación se adoptará la orden del día y serán designados los presidentes de las comisiones de trabajo de la Asamblea.

## Homenaje a Guy Pérez Cisneros

EN la Escuela Primaria Superior Número 24, "Naciones Unidas", tendrá efecto hoy, un acto,

con motivo del aniversario de los Derechos Humanos, durante el cual será descubierta la placa que da nombre a dicha Escuela y se procederá a imponer el nombre del fallecido escritor y crítico de arte, señor Guy Pérez Cisneros, a la Biblioteca de las Naciones Unidas de dicha Escuela.

Durante el acto harán uso de la palabra el Ministro de Educación, la doctora Ofelia Domínguez, Directora General de la ACNU; el Presidente de la Junta de Educación del Centro, y el doctor Oscar de la Vega.

La directora y los maestros de la Escuela Superior número 24, "Naciones Unidas", invitan, para este acto.

## Trasmisión Desde la ONU

Con motivo del Día de la Declaración de los Derechos Humanos, la División de Radio de la ONU, transmitirá hoy dos programas especiales dedicados al mismo: uno titulado "Don Nadie", que será radiodifundido de 6.15 a 6.30 p. m., por las frecuencias habituales y otra a las 9.15 hasta 9.30 —hora de New York— bajo el título "Carta de un padre". Además varias emisoras afiliadas a la Cadena de la Paz, retransmisión localmente dichos programas especiales.

## Celebración Mundial

El pasado año se conmemoró el Día de los Derechos Humanos en 90 países y territorios. Desde su promulgación la Carta ha ejercido una influencia notoria en la redacción de las constituciones de diversos países, entre ellos Costa Rica, El Salvador, Haití, Indonesia, Libia y Siria. Su influjo es

patent en multitud de Convenios internacionales. Se espera que este año aumente aún el número de países que se asocien en forma cada vez más amplia a la acción emprendida para extender el conocimiento y comprensión de la Carta de los Derechos del Hombre.

Durante el presente año 1954 dos convenciones de las Naciones Unidas entraron en vigor: la Convención sobre los Derechos Políticos de la Mujer y la Convención relativa a los Estatutos de los Refugiados. Esta última, fija normas internacionales para aliviar al grupo de personas obligadas por sucesos políticos a abandonar su país y restablecerse en un país extranjero bajo condiciones difíciles. Hasta la fecha, doce Estados han ratificado la Convención que entró en vigor el 12 de abril de 1954. Con ella se asegura que los refugiados tengan todo el ejercicio de los derechos humanos y las libertades fundamentales, así como los mismos derechos en ciertos campos, como los disfrutados por los ciudadanos nacionales, sin discriminación de razas, religión y país de origen. Se refiere a la práctica de religión, acceso a los hoteles, a la ayuda legal, legislación de trabajo, seguridad social y educación elemental.

*Revista de la  
manana  
Dic. 10, 1954*

RECORDADO AL DR. GUY PEREZ CISNEROS

20 August 1954

On the occasion of the first anniversary of the untimely death of Dr. Guy Perez Cisneros, it is well to recall his achievements, his dedicated effort and his warm personality.

I came to know Dr. Cisneros through our association at the United Nations, where he represented Cuba in the Third and later in the Fourth Committee of the General Assembly. To know him was to admire and respect him for his integrity, his outstanding ability and his courage.

Dr. Cisneros contributed significantly to the effort of the United Nations in the field of the non-self-governing peoples. He played an important role in the establishment of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories. He was Rapporteur of the Fourth Committee. Many of the resolutions relating to the United Nations Trusteeship System and to the Non-Self-Governing Territories embody the constructive ideas and the high principles which he so ably championed.

Dr. Cisneros exerted special effort toward ensuring respect for human rights and the improvement of social conditions throughout the world.

He was a tireless protector of the rights and interests of the non-self-governing peoples. He held the respect and the friendship of all who knew him for his sincerity, his idealism and his love for his fellow-men.

All of us who knew and worked with Dr. Cisneros at the United Nations retain warm memories of our association with him. We miss him greatly.

Ralph J. Bunche

RECIPIENT OF THE Nobel  
PEACE PRIZE

Held at the Palais de Chaillot, Paris,  
on Friday, 10 December 1948, at 10.45 a. m.

President : Mr. H. V. EVATT (Australia).

FINAL AU VITRAL

117. Continuation of the discussion on  
the draft universal declaration of  
human rights : report of the Third  
Committee (A/777)

AMENDMENT PROPOSED BY THE UNITED KINGDOM  
(A/778/REV.1) AND AMENDMENTS PROPOSED BY THE  
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS (A/784) TO  
THE DRAFT DECLARATION

Draft resolution proposed by the Union of Soviet  
Socialist Republics (A/785/Rev.2)

Mr. WATT (Australia) emphasized the impor-  
tance of the draft international declaration of  
human rights submitted for approval to the Gen-  
eral Assembly.

Some delegations might have preferred the  
draft declaration to be in the form of a short  
outline of fundamental principles; others, on  
the contrary, might have liked the draft to have  
been more detailed. Nations which had taken  
part in the preparation of the draft declaration  
differed profoundly from the political, economic,  
social and religious points of view and divergen-  
cies were bound to become apparent regarding  
the manner in which the various aspects of the  
question should be approached and treated.  
The draft declaration presented, therefore,  
an effort at compromise and mutual understand-  
ing. It had been said that that would preju-  
dice its authority; he thought, on the contrary,  
that having been accepted and approved by the  
majority of Member States of the United Nations,  
the declaration would go forth to the world  
with much greater strength and authority.

The Australian delegation attached particular  
importance to articles 23, 24, 25 and 26 of the  
draft declaration, which dealt with economic and  
social rights, and particularly with the right to  
social security, equitable and satisfactory working  
conditions, rest and leisure and an adequate  
standard of living to ensure the health and well-  
being of every man and his family. Those rights  
flowed from certain provisions which had been  
incorporated in the Charter on Australia's sug-  
gestion, namely, the provisions of Articles 55  
and 56, under which Member States pledged  
themselves to take joint and separate action in  
co-operation with the United Nations, so as to

Tenue au Palais de Chaillot, Paris,  
le vendredi 10 décembre 1948, à 10 h. 45.

Président : M. H. V. EVATT (Australie).

NOTA: La présidence y et Co-Chairman  
ambiguë en cette séance

117. Suite de la discussion sur le  
projet de déclaration universelle  
des droits de l'homme : rap-  
port de la Troisième Commission  
(A/777)

AMENDEMENT PROPOSÉ PAR LE ROYAUME-UNI (A/778/  
REV.1/ CORR.1) ET AMENDEMENTS PROPOSÉS PAR  
L'UNION DES RÉPUBLIQUES SOCIALISTES SOVIÉTIQUES  
(A/784) AU PROJET DE DÉCLARATION

Projet de résolution proposé par l'Union des Républi-  
ques socialistes soviétiques (A/785/Rev. 2)

M. WATT (Australie) souligne l'importance du  
projet de déclaration universelle des droits de  
l'homme actuellement soumis à l'approbation de  
l'Assemblée générale.

Certaines délégations auraient préféré que le  
projet de déclaration se présentât sous la forme  
d'un bref énoncé de principes fondamentaux;  
d'autres, au contraire, auraient souhaité que le  
projet fût plus détaillé. Les nations qui ont  
participé à l'élaboration du projet de déclaration  
étant profondément différentes les unes des  
autres aux points de vue politique, économique,  
social et religieux, des divergences devaient for-  
cément se manifester quant à la manière dont  
il convenait d'aborder et de traiter les divers  
aspects de la question. Le projet de déclaration  
représente donc un effort de compromis et de  
compréhension mutuelle. On a dit que cela nu-  
irait à son autorité; bien au contraire, étant accep-  
tée et approuvée par la majorité des États Mem-  
bres de l'Organisation des Nations Unies, la  
déclaration s'imposera au monde avec une force  
et une autorité particulièrement grandes.

La délégation de l'Australie attache une im-  
portance particulière aux articles 23, 24, 25  
et 26 du projet de déclaration, qui traitent des  
droits économiques et sociaux, notamment des  
droits à la sécurité sociale, à des conditions de  
travail équitables et satisfaisantes, au repos et  
aux loisirs et à un niveau de vie suffisamment  
élevé pour assurer la santé et le bien-être à tout  
homme et à sa famille. Ces droits découlent  
précisément de certaines dispositions qui ont été  
incorporées à la Charte sur la proposition de  
l'Australie; il s'agit des dispositions des Articles  
55 et 56, aux termes desquels les États Membres  
s'engagent à agir, tant conjointement que séparé-

La  
peut

les  
dant  
une  
ade-  
ion-  
tout  
ient  
pli-  
dis

urs,  
atic  
utte  
de  
ins  
ans  
de  
ent  
de  
re  
ch

n

?

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

ensure higher standards of living, full employ-  
ment and universal respect for, and observance  
of, human rights and funda- freedoms.

Whatever its importance, however, the decla-  
ration did not by itself constitute an international  
charter of human rights. The working plan of  
the Commission on Human Rights had laid  
down that such a charter should also include a  
covenant relating to human rights and measures  
of implementation. The declaration represented  
a common ideal to be attained by all peoples of  
the world; it had no legally binding character.  
The General Assembly should see to it that the  
rights listed in the declaration did not remain a  
dead letter and should ensure effective respect  
of those rights.

The Australian delegation had always stressed,  
therefore, both in the Commission on Human  
Rights and in the Third Committee, the impor-  
tance of the measures of implementation. Con-  
sequently, it gave its support, unreservedly, to  
draft resolution E proposed by the Third Com-  
mittee, which requested the Economic and Social  
Council to ask the Commission on Human Rights  
to continue to give priority in its work to the pre-  
paration of a draft covenant on human rights and  
draft measures of implementation.

He recalled that, at the Paris Conference in  
1946, Dr. Evatt, the head of the Australian  
delegation, had proposed the creation of an inter-  
national court of human rights to which indi-  
viduals, groups or States might have recourse  
if legitimate human rights were violated. At  
the time a number of delegations had considered  
that proposal as a rather bold one; since then,  
however, the usefulness of such a court had  
become apparent to many delegations. In the  
Commission on Human Rights, the Australian  
delegation had put forward a detailed plan relat-  
ing to the creation of an international court on  
human rights (E/CN.4/15) and the plan would  
certainly be thoroughly examined by the Com-  
mission at its next session.

The Australian delegation sincerely hoped that  
the General Assembly would adopt the draft  
universal declaration of human rights by a very  
large majority, if not unanimously.

Mr. PÉREZ CISNEROS (Cuba) reminded members  
that the Cuban delegation had submitted the  
first draft resolution which was to serve as a  
basis for the universal declaration of human  
rights.

ment, en coopération avec l'organisation des  
Nations Unies, pour assurer le relèvement du  
niveau de vie, le plein emploi, le respect universel  
et effectif des droits de l'homme et des libertés  
fondamentales.

Mais la déclaration universelle des droits de  
l'homme, quelle que soit son importance, ne  
constitue pas, à elle seule, une charte internatio-  
nale des droits de l'homme. Comme le prévoit  
le plan de travail de la Commission des droits de  
l'homme, cette charte devra comprendre en outre  
un pacte relatif aux droits de l'homme et des  
mesures de mise en œuvre. La déclaration se  
présente comme un idéal commun que devront  
atteindre tous les peuples du monde; du point  
de vue juridique, elle n'a pas un caractère obli-  
gatoire. L'Assemblée générale doit veiller à ce  
que les droits énoncés dans la déclaration ne  
restent pas lettre morte et elle doit assurer leur  
respect effectif.

C'est pourquoi la délégation de l'Australie a  
toujours insisté, à la Commission des droits de  
l'homme comme à la Troisième Commission, sur  
l'importance des mesures de mise en œuvre. Elle  
appuie donc sans réserve le projet de résolution E  
proposé par la Troisième Commission, qui invite  
le Conseil économique et social à demander à la  
Commission des droits de l'homme de continuer  
à donner la priorité, dans son plan de travail, à la  
préparation d'un projet de pacte relatif aux droits  
de l'homme et à l'élaboration des mesures de  
mise en œuvre.

M. Watt rappelle que le chef de la délégation  
de l'Australie, M. Evatt, a proposé à la Conférence  
de Paris de 1946, la création d'une cour inter-  
nationale des droits de l'homme à laquelle les  
individus, les groupes ou les États pourraient  
avoir recours, en cas de violation des droits de  
l'homme. A l'époque, un certain nombre de dél-  
gations avaient considéré cette proposition comme  
un peu trop hardie; depuis, l'utilité d'une telle  
cour est apparue à bien des délégations. A la  
Commission des droits de l'homme, la délégation  
de l'Australie a présenté un projet détaillé relatif  
à la création d'une cour internationale des droits  
de l'homme (E/CN.4/15), projet qui sera cer-  
tainement l'objet d'une étude approfondie de la  
part de la Commission lors de sa prochaine ses-  
sion.

La délégation de l'Australie espère fermement  
que l'Assemblée générale adoptera à une très  
forte majorité, sinon à l'unanimité, le projet de  
déclaration universelle des droits de l'homme.

M. PÉREZ CISNEROS (Cuba) rappelle que c'est  
la délégation de Cuba qui a présenté le premier  
projet de résolution qui devait servir de base à  
la déclaration universelle des droits de l'homme.

the d  
perse  
Rights  
draft  
and p  
twenti  
mark  
from  
speech

The  
part i  
submi  
draft;  
tance  
critica

On  
decide  
tial p  
Huma  
ples c  
been  
sugge  
drew  
tion

contai  
Cuban  
had t  
trary  
of the  
place  
mittee  
ments  
procl  
choic  
remun  
his fa  
and w  
by all  
sugge  
Comm  
provis  
and r  
writer  
sable  
to co  
Cuban  
that t  
again  
conde  
and r

Mr.  
tion h  
it wou  
the T

1-  
2-  
3-  
4-  
5-  
6-  
7-  
8-  
9-  
10-  
11-  
12-  
13-  
14-  
15-  
16-  
17-  
18-  
19-  
20-  
21-  
22-  
23-  
24-  
25-  
26-  
27-  
28-  
29-  
30-  
31-  
32-  
33-  
34-  
35-  
36-  
37-  
38-  
39-  
40-  
41-  
42-  
43-  
44-  
45-  
46-  
47-  
48-  
49-  
50-  
51-  
52-  
53-  
54-  
55-  
56-  
57-  
58-  
59-  
60-  
61-  
62-  
63-  
64-  
65-  
66-  
67-  
68-  
69-  
70-  
71-  
72-  
73-  
74-  
75-  
76-  
77-  
78-  
79-  
80-  
81-  
82-  
83-  
84-  
85-  
86-  
87-  
88-  
89-  
90-  
91-  
92-  
93-  
94-  
95-  
96-  
97-  
98-  
99-  
100-

He emphasized the importance and value of the draft declaration and paid tribute to the persevering efforts of the Commission on Human Rights and its Chairman, Mrs. Roosevelt. The draft declaration expressed in particularly clear and precise terms the most noble aspirations of twentieth-century man. That declaration would mark the advent of a world in which man, freed from fear and poverty, could enjoy freedom of speech, religion and opinion.

The Cuban delegation had taken a very active part in the work of the Third Committee and had submitted numerous amendments to the initial draft; it had done so in the belief that the importance of the question demanded much care and a critical approach on the part of every delegation.

On its suggestion, the Third Committee had decided to include in the draft some of the essential provisions contained in the Declaration of Human Rights proclaimed at Bogota by the peoples of the American continent. Article 9 had been inserted in the draft declaration on the suggestion of the Mexican representative. It drew its inspiration from the «right to protection» which was embodied in Mexican legislation. The preamble to the draft declaration contained the essential part of an article of the Cuban Constitution, which recognized that man had the right to rebel against tyranny and arbitrary action. Social rights, which were a feature of the twentieth century, occupied a prominent place in the draft declaration. The Third Committee had deemed it useful to add two amendments submitted by the Cuban delegation, which proclaimed that everyone had the right to free choice of employment and to just and favourable remuneration which would ensure for himself and his family an existence worthy of human dignity and which would be supplemented, if necessary, by all other means of social protection. On the suggestion of France, Mexico and Cuba, the Committee had included in the draft declaration provisions relating to the protection of the moral and material interests of scientists, artists and writers. Indeed, such protection was indispensable to enable that intellectual and artistic elite to continue its work with dignity. Lastly, the Cuban delegation noted with great satisfaction that the draft declaration protected individuals against any attack upon their honour, finally condemned any distinction on racial grounds, and recognized the equality of men and women.

Mr. Thors (Iceland) regretted that his delegation had been unable to participate as actively as it would have wished in the remarkable work of the Third Committee. His delegation attached

Il souligne l'importance et la valeur du projet de déclaration et rend hommage aux efforts persévérants de la Commission des droits de l'homme et de sa Présidente, M<sup>me</sup> Roosevelt. Le projet de déclaration exprime en termes remarquablement clairs et précis les aspirations les plus nobles de l'homme du vingtième siècle. Cette déclaration marquera l'avènement d'un monde où les hommes, libérés de la crainte et de la misère, pourront jouir de la liberté de parole, de croyance et d'opinion.

La délégation de Cuba a participé d'une manière très active aux travaux de la Troisième Commission et a été amenée à présenter de nombreux amendements au projet initial; elle l'a fait, persuadée que l'importance de la question exigeait beaucoup de soins et de sens critique de la part de chacune des délégations.

M. Pérez Cisneros rappelle que, sur sa proposition, la Troisième Commission a décidé d'inclure dans le projet quelques-unes des dispositions essentielles de la Déclaration des droits de l'homme publiée à Bogota par les peuples du continent américain. L'article 9 a été inséré dans le projet de déclaration à la suggestion du représentant du Mexique; cet article s'inspire du «droit à la protection» qui figure dans la législation mexicaine. Le préambule du projet de déclaration reprend l'essentiel d'un article de la Constitution de Cuba qui reconnaît à l'homme le droit de se révolter contre la tyrannie et l'arbitraire. Les droits sociaux, apport du vingtième siècle, figurent en bonne place dans le projet de déclaration; la Troisième Commission a jugé utile d'ajouter deux amendements présentés par la délégation de Cuba, qui proclament que toute personne a droit au libre choix de son travail et à une rémunération équitable et satisfaisante assurant à lui-même et à sa famille une existence conforme à la dignité humaine, à laquelle vient s'ajouter, s'il y a lieu, toute autre mesure de protection sociale. C'est sur proposition de la France, du Mexique et de Cuba que la Commission a introduit dans le projet de déclaration des dispositions relatives à la protection des intérêts moraux et matériels des savants, artistes et écrivains; en effet, cette protection est indispensable si l'on veut permettre à cette élite intellectuelle et artistique de poursuivre son œuvre dans la dignité. Enfin, la délégation de Cuba constate avec la plus vive satisfaction que le projet de déclaration protège les individus contre toute atteinte à leur honneur, condamne définitivement toute distinction pour motif de race et reconnaît l'égalité de l'homme et de la femme.

M. THORS (Islande) regrette que sa délégation ait été dans l'impossibilité de participer aussi activement qu'elle l'aurait souhaité aux travaux si remarquables de la Troisième Commission.

NOTE: ON DEC. 10, 1948 - CUBA'S REPRESENTATIVE  
 GUY PÉREZ-CISNEROS GAVE THE SPEECH AT THE ASSEMBLY  
 IN PALLAIS DE CHAILLOT - IN PARIS - FRANCE  
 U.N.  
 V. Social, Humanitarian and Cultural Questions<sup>1</sup>

## A. HUMAN RIGHTS

### 1. Universal Declaration of Human Rights

#### a. INTRODUCTION

One of the major actions of the General Assembly at its third regular session was the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. In view of the importance of this Declaration, a brief survey is given here of its background and of the steps leading towards its adoption which were taken prior to 21 September 1948.

#### (1) *Decision of the United Nations Conference on International Organization*

At the United Nations Conference on International Organization, held at San Francisco in 1945, some representatives suggested that the United Nations Charter should contain a bill of rights. Committee I/1 of the Conference, which was charged with the task of considering the Preamble, Purposes and Principles of the Charter, received the idea with sympathy, but decided that

"the present Conference, if only for lack of time, could not proceed to realize such a draft in an international contract. The Organization, once formed, could better proceed to consider the suggestion and to deal effectively with it through a special commission or by some other method. The Committee recommends that the General Assembly consider the proposal and give it effect."<sup>2</sup>

At the final plenary session, on 26 June 1945, the President of the United States stated that

"under this document [the Charter] we have good reason to expect an international bill of rights, acceptable to all the nations involved."<sup>3</sup>

#### (2) *Provisions of the United Nations Charter*

One of the principal functions of the United Nations is to promote universal respect for, and observance of, human rights.

Prior to the United Nations, provisions for safeguarding human rights had been written into many national constitutions, and certain rights in limited fields had been guaranteed in treaties. The United Nations Charter, however, goes further in its emphasis on the general obligation of all the Members of the United Nations to provide and encour-

age respect for human rights, and in providing that machinery should be set up for this purpose.

Article 1 of the Charter declares that one of the principal purposes of the United Nations is:

"To achieve international co-operation . . . in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion . . ."

Moreover, universal respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms is recognized as one of the conditions of stability and friendly relations among nations (Article 55). Its encouragement is one of the basic objectives of the trusteeship system (Article 76 c).

The General Assembly may initiate studies and make recommendations for the purpose of assisting in the realization of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion (Article 13). The Economic and Social Council may make recommendations for the purpose of promoting respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all (Article 62).

<sup>1</sup>For further information, see:

*Official Records of the General Assembly* for its third session (Parts I and II) and fourth session, including summary records of plenary meetings (separate vols. covering meetings 136-187, 188-219, 220-276, and separate annex to each vol.); summary records of meetings of the Third (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural) Committee (separate vols. covering meetings 84-180, 181-229, 230-269, and separate annexes to the first and last vols.); summary records of meetings of the Fifth (Administrative and Budgetary) Committee (separate vols. covering meetings 104-178, 179-183, 194-234, and separate annex to each vol.); summary records of meetings of the Joint Second and Third Committee (separate vols. covering meetings 25-39, 40-44, and separate annex to each vol.).

*Official Records of the Economic and Social Council*, fourth year, eighth session (meetings 226-82) and *Supplement No. 1 Resolutions*, and ninth session (meetings 283-343) and *Supplement No. 1 Resolutions*.

See also, in connexion with particular questions, publications and documents referred to in text (e.g., reports of the functional and regional commissions, reports of the Secretary-General, United Nations publications).

<sup>2</sup>United Nations Information Organization. *Documents of the United Nations Conference on International Organization*, San Francisco, 1945 (published in co-operation with the Library of Congress). Vol. 6, p. 456.

<sup>3</sup>*Ibid.*, Vol. 1, p. 683.

(3) *Establishment of a Commission on Human Rights*

The importance with which the question of human rights was regarded at the San Francisco Conference is illustrated by the provision in the Charter, obliging the Economic and Social Council to set up a commission or commissions for the promotion of human rights (Article 68). The Commission on Human Rights is thus the only Commission specifically named in the Charter.

The Economic and Social Council, on 15 February 1946, established a Commission on Human Rights in nuclear form.<sup>4</sup> The Council decided that the work of the Commission should primarily be devoted to submitting proposals, recommendations and reports for an international bill of human rights. This Commission met at Hunter College, New York, from 29 April to 20 May 1946. At this meeting, the Commission studied its final composition and asked the Secretary-General to collect all possible information on the subject. At that stage, the Division of Human Rights was set up in the Secretariat. That Division began a study of various drafts submitted by the delegations of Panama, Chile and Cuba and by the American Federation of Labor, as well as private drafts, especially those of Dr. Lauterpacht of Cambridge University, Dr. Alvarez of the American Institute of International Law, the Rev. Parsons, of the Catholic Association for International Peace, Mr. McNitt of the Faculty of Law of South Western University, and Mr. H. G. Wells.

(4) *First Session of the Commission on Human Rights*

The Economic and Social Council, on 21 June 1946, adopted the terms of reference of the permanent Commission on Human Rights, and determined its membership. The Commission held its first session at Lake Success, New York, from 27 January to 10 February 1947.

The Commission, at its first session, had before it a number of working papers prepared by the Secretariat at the request of the nuclear Commission, and also a number of draft bills submitted by Governments and various organizations. The Commission devoted a great deal of its time to a discussion of the form and content of the proposed bill. It decided that the Chairman, together with the Vice-Chairman and Rapporteur, should undertake, with the assistance of the Secretariat, the task of formulating a preliminary draft international bill of human rights, to be submitted to the Commission at its second session for thorough examination. In view of the difficulties encountered by that small drafting group, it was suggested that it be expanded into a drafting committee, consisting of repre-

sentatives of the Philippines, the Ukrainian SSR, the USSR, the United Kingdom, the United States, Uruguay and Yugoslavia. The Council later endorsed this suggestion.<sup>5</sup>

(5) *First Session of the Drafting Committee on the Bill of Human Rights*

The Drafting Committee held its first session at Lake Success, from 9 to 25 June 1947. In addition to a Draft Outline of an International Bill of Human Rights prepared by the Secretariat (E/CN.4/AC.1/3 and Add.1), the Drafting Committee had before it the text of a letter from Lord Dukeston, the United Kingdom representative on the Commission on Human Rights, transmitting a draft International Bill of Human Rights and also a draft resolution which might be passed by the General Assembly when adopting the Bill (E/CN.4/AC.1/4). These two documents were considered and compared by the Drafting Committee, together with certain United States proposals for the rewording of some items appearing in the Secretariat Draft Outline (E/CN.4/AC.1/8 and Rev. 1 and 2). The Draft Outline prepared by the Secretariat was a compilation of all the rights proposed either in international drafts, or contained in national constitutions or suggested by members of the Commission on Human Rights.

Two views were put forward by the Drafting Committee regarding the form the preliminary draft Bill should take. Some representatives thought that the preliminary draft, in the first instance, should take the form of a declaration or manifesto; others felt that it should be in the form of a convention. (A declaration or manifesto would be a recommendation by the General Assembly to Member States, and, as such, would have moral weight but no legal compulsion on Members. On the other hand, a convention would be legally binding on Members which accepted it. Its application, however, would be limited to the signatories.)

It was agreed by those who favoured the declaration that it should be accompanied or followed by a convention or conventions on specific groups of rights. It was also agreed by those who favoured the convention that the General Assembly in recommending a convention to Member States might make a declaration wider in content and more general in expression. The Drafting Committee, therefore, while recognizing that the decision as to the form of the Bill was a matter for the full Commission on Human Rights, decided to pre-

<sup>4</sup>See *Yearbook of the United Nations*, 1946-47, p. 523.

<sup>5</sup>For further details on the establishment of the Drafting Committee, see *Yearbook of the United Nations*, 1946-47, p. 524.

They Parsons, Chairman  
represented all  
in all the 18  
meetings held  
over the world

They Parsons, Chairman  
represented all  
was the main  
of the draft  
Committee

pare two documents; one, a working paper in the form of a preliminary draft of a declaration or manifesto setting forth general principles, and the second, a working paper outlining a draft convention on those matters which the Committee felt might lend themselves to formulation as binding obligations.

The report (E/CN.4/21) submitted by the Drafting Committee to the Commission on Human Rights included, therefore, drafts for an international declaration and an international convention on human rights.

(6) *Second Session of the Commission on Human Rights*

The Commission on Human Rights met for its second session at Geneva, from 2 to 17 December 1947. It was in the course of that session that the conception of an international bill of human rights comprising three parts began to crystallize: a declaration, a convention, and measures for implementation. It had become evident that many Governments were prepared to accept a draft declaration if it were to precede and not to replace a convention. One result of that session was a report (E/600) on the measures for implementation which remained a basic document for all subsequent study in that field.

(7) *Second Session of the Drafting Committee*

The Drafting Committee met for its second session at Lake Success, New York, from 3 to 21 May 1948. It considered comments on the draft International Bill of Human Rights which had been received from a number of Member Governments. It also took into account (1) the suggestions of the United Nations Conference on Freedom of Information (held at Geneva in March and April 1948) concerning articles on freedom of information in the draft Declaration and the draft Covenant (E/CONF.6/79); (2) suggestions made by the Commission on the Status of Women on two articles in the draft Declaration (E/615); and (3) the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man, as adopted by the Ninth International Conference of American States, held in Bogotá, Colombia, in March-May 1948. It redrafted the entire draft Covenant, but had time to redraft only parts of the draft Declaration and did not consider the question of implementation.

(8) *Third Session of the Commission on Human Rights*

The third session of the Commission on Human Rights took place at Lake Success, from 24 May to 18 June 1948. The Commission, at that session, based its work on the report (E/CN.4/95) of the second session of its Drafting Committee. The in-

dividual articles of the draft Declaration were examined anew. The Commission was able to complete a re-draft of the Declaration, which was adopted without opposition, but had no time to consider the Drafting Committee's re-draft of the Covenant, nor to discuss implementation, as requested by the Economic and Social Council at its sixth session (February and March 1948).

(9) *Decision of the Economic and Social Council at its Seventh Session*

Because of pressure of business at its seventh session, the Economic and Social Council decided, on 17 August 1948, that the report (E/800) of the third session of the Commission on Human Rights, which had been referred to the Council's Human Rights Committee, should be recalled to the plenary session; and that in plenary meeting there would be an opportunity for each member to make one general statement of position.

Statements were made on 25 and 26 August by all members of the Council.<sup>6</sup> The Council then decided, on 26 August, to transmit to the General Assembly the draft International Declaration of Human Rights submitted to it by the Commission on Human Rights in the report of its third session, together with the remainder of the report of the Commission and the records of the proceedings of the Council on the subject.

b. *CONSIDERATION BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AT ITS THIRD SESSION*

(1) *Discussion in the Third Committee*

The General Assembly, at its 142nd meeting held on 24 September 1948, referred to the Third Committee the draft International Declaration of Human Rights (E/800).

The Third Committee considered the item at its 88th to 105th, 107th to 116th, 119th to 134th, 137th to 167th, and 174th to 179th meetings, held on 30 September to 18 October, 19 to 29 October, 30 October to 12 November, 15 to 30 November, and 4 to 7 December 1948. Altogether, the Third Committee spent eighty-one meetings in considering and discussing the draft Declaration prepared by the Commission on Human Rights. One hundred and sixty-eight formal draft resolutions containing amendments to the various articles of the draft Declaration were submitted during the course of the Committee's debate.<sup>7</sup>

Before beginning a detailed study of each of the

<sup>6</sup>See *Yearbook of the United Nations, 1947-48*, pp. 576-78.

<sup>7</sup>For texts of the draft resolutions submitted, see *United Nations Official Records of the Third Session of the General Assembly, Part I. Third Committee. Annexes to the Summary Records of Meetings. 1948.*

Guy Pary - Comman Jour of  
 Relato en la Conferencia de Bogota (OEA)

Guy was  
 also part  
 of the  
 Commission

articles in the draft Declaration, the Third Committee engaged in a general debate on the draft as a whole. The representatives of the following countries, among others, supported the draft Declaration: Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Lebanon, Mexico, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, the Philippines, the United Kingdom, the United States, Syria and Uruguay. The following is a summary of the main points of view expressed by various representatives in the general debate.

(a) GENERAL VIEWS EXPRESSED IN THE THIRD COMMITTEE

The Chairman of the Commission on Human Rights (the representative of the United States) stated that the members of the Commission considered that the draft Declaration represented a great step forward in the protection and promotion of human rights and fundamental freedoms and in their application. As the Commission had pointed out in its report, the Declaration, she explained, was only the first step in the elaboration of the human rights programme called for by the Charter; it was essential that it should be followed by a covenant on human rights, drafted in the form of a treaty and containing provisions for implementation. The draft Declaration, she submitted, was not a treaty or international agreement and did not impose legal obligations; it was rather a statement of basic principles of inalienable human rights setting up a common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations. Although it was not legally binding, the Declaration would, nevertheless, have considerable weight. Its adoption, she continued, would commit Member States, in the words of the preamble,

"to strive by teaching and education to promote respect for these rights and freedoms and by progressive measures, national and international, to secure their universal and effective recognition and observance, both among the peoples of Member States themselves and among the peoples of territories under their jurisdiction."

A similar opinion was expressed by the representative of Norway. He declared that, while the Declaration was designed to set moral standards rather than to impose legal obligations, it would be of practical value, since it would undoubtedly serve as a basis for the discussion in the United Nations of any question of human rights. Human rights, he argued, should not be regarded as falling within the domestic jurisdiction of States.

The representative of Mexico remarked that his Government recognized that the draft Declaration

was of the greatest importance. It would not involve legal obligations, but that would not diminish the value of the document. He said that it would define the human rights which States undertook to recognize and would serve as a criterion to guide and stimulate them. At the moment, he contended, it would be difficult to go further.

The representative of Colombia observed that the authors of the draft Declaration did not intend to interfere in relations between Governments, or in relations between the Government and the citizens of any State; they intended simply to establish a set of principles, which should, if possible, be implemented.

Although not considering the Declaration to have legal authority as an interpretation of the relevant provisions of the Charter, the representative of the United Kingdom stated that the "moral authority of the document that would be adopted" by the General Assembly, nevertheless, "would serve as a guide to Governments in their efforts to guarantee human rights by legislation and through their administrative and legal practice."

Other representatives attributed a greater importance to the Declaration. According to the representative of Pakistan, it was imperative that the peoples of the world should recognize the existence of a code of civilized behavior which would apply not only in international relations but also in domestic affairs.

The representative of Bolivia expressed the opinion that the Declaration, when adopted, should provide protection against persecution.

Some representatives went even further. The representative of Panama objected to the "oft-repeated sophistry" that the United Nations was helpless to prevent violation of human rights because under Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter it could not interfere in matters which were within the domestic jurisdiction of States. He observed that the Charter also included provisions concerning human rights. Article 2, paragraph 7, he protested, dealt only with questions which fell exclusively within domestic jurisdiction, and could not apply to matters covered under international law. Consequently, he argued, it could not be invoked in the case under discussion.

According to the representative of Brazil, by making human rights international, the United Nations Charter had placed upon States positive legal obligations.

In the opinion of the representative of the Philippines, the primary purpose of the Declaration was not simply to achieve a moral success, but to enable man, all over the world, to develop his rights and, in consequence, his personality. It was

essential, he indicated, that man should feel confident that executive, legislative and judicial powers could not impair his fundamental rights.

The representative of Chile remarked that the draft Declaration merely stated, explicitly, rights granted by the Charter. While he agreed that the proposed covenant on human rights alone would be legally binding, violation by any State of the rights enumerated in the Declaration, he declared, would mean violation of the principles of the United Nations.

The representative of France said that the Declaration could be considered as an authoritative interpretation of the United Nations Charter. By the adoption of the Declaration, the question of human rights was a matter no longer of domestic, but of international concern.

A similar opinion was expressed by the representative of China who said that the Charter committed all Member States to the observance of human rights, and the Declaration stated those rights explicitly.

The representative of Australia also considered that the draft Declaration represented a considerable advance towards a satisfactory definition of the "fundamental human rights" referred to in the Charter.

The representative of Lebanon categorically stated that no State could violate the principles of the Declaration without also violating the terms of the Charter. In actual fact, he observed, the resolution for its adoption was more than a recommendation, because there already existed a place in the Charter for a declaration of human rights.

A few representatives—among them, the representative of Ecuador—regretted the fact that only the draft Declaration could be adopted at the present session of the Assembly, thus leaving to a future session the adoption of a proposed convention on human rights.

Other representatives, including those of Belgium, China and France, praised the universal character of the draft Declaration, considering it to be a compromise among the many points of view expressed by various States.

The representatives of New Zealand, the Union of South Africa, Saudi Arabia, the USSR, Poland, the Byelorussian SSR, the Ukrainian SSR, Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia criticized the draft Declaration.

The representative of New Zealand felt that the Declaration should not be approved by itself, but together with documents which would provide means of implementation. In her opinion, the draft Declaration was not yet a mature document

which would reflect the views of all the Members of the United Nations.

The representative of the Union of South Africa stated that the Declaration should refer only to those fundamental rights, the universal applicability of which was recognized all over the world. The Declaration, as it stood, went beyond those generally accepted rights. He declared that his delegation could not possibly accept the thesis that human dignity would be impaired if a person were told he could not reside in a particular area. Such a thesis, he explained, would destroy the whole basis of the multi-racial structure of the Union of South Africa and would not be in the interests of the less advanced indigenous population. Similarly, the right to participate in government was not universal; it was conditioned not only by nationality but also by qualifications of franchise. The representative of South Africa wondered how many States were in a position to say that they could assume any international responsibility for the full exercise of certain economic rights mentioned in the Declaration.

The representative of Saudi Arabia called attention to the fact that the Declaration was based largely on Western patterns of culture, which were frequently at variance with the patterns of culture of Eastern States. That did not mean, however, that the Declaration went counter to the latter, even if it did not conform to them.

Although admitting that the Declaration contained many good points, the representative of Poland considered the Declaration in its existing form to be unsatisfactory, as it contained only one mention of the word "democracy" and made no provision for limiting the application of the rights. He thought that the application of those articles dealing with the right of asylum, the freedom of opinion and expression, and the granting of freedom of assembly and association should be limited so that fascists would not be able to profit by those provisions in order to overthrow democracy. He submitted that the adoption of the Declaration should not entail any interference in the domestic jurisdiction of sovereign States. He also felt that there were several omissions in the draft, such as the omission of the right of nations to use their own language and to develop their own culture.

The representative of the USSR considered that the draft Declaration did not satisfy the three conditions which were, in the opinion of the USSR delegation, indispensable to the completion of the Declaration, namely: a guarantee of basic freedoms for all, with due regard to the national sovereignty of States; a guarantee that human rights could be exercised with due regard to the particular eco-

conomic, social and national circumstances prevailing in each country; and a definition of the duties of citizens to their country, their people and their State. He regretted that fascism was nowhere condemned in the draft. He declared that the rights specified in the draft were illusory as they lacked effective guarantees.

Similar criticisms were expressed by the representatives of the Byelorussian SSR and the Ukrainian SSR.

The representative of Yugoslavia expressed the fear that, through lack of real substance, the Declaration might be forgotten even before the ink of the signatures affixed to the document had dried. For that reason, he urged the members of the Third Committee "to exert every possible effort to draw up a text which would fulfil the legitimate aspirations of the peoples."

The representative of Czechoslovakia also considered the Declaration too abstract.

(b) DETAILED CONSIDERATION OF THE ARTICLES OF THE DRAFT DECLARATION

After concluding the general debate on the draft Declaration, the Third Committee, at its 94th meeting, held on 5 October, decided by 41 votes to 3, with 7 abstentions, to consider only the draft Declaration, as the other two documents (the covenant and measures of implementation) were not yet in a state suitable for consideration. The Committee did not, however, exclude an exposition of views on the other parts of the International Bill of Rights.

The Committee, at its 95th meeting, held on 6 October, decided by 43 votes to 6, with 7 abstentions, to start by discussing article 1 of the draft Declaration. A detailed examination of each article and the preamble of the draft Declaration was then entered into by the Committee, which devoted eighty-one meetings to its task. One hundred and sixty-eight amendments were presented. The Committee's work lasted from 6 October until 7 December.<sup>8</sup>

(c) EXAMINATION OF THE ARTICLES BY SUB-COMMITTEE

At its 166th meeting on 30 November, the Third Committee adopted a Lebanese proposal (A/C.3/380) to set up a sub-committee "to examine the totality of the declaration of human rights, i.e., the twenty-nine articles and the preamble, adopted by the Third Committee, solely from the standpoint of arrangement, consistency, uniformity and style and to submit proposals thereon to the Third Committee." The Sub-Committee was also asked to "set up a language group

of five members, one for each of the official languages, to check and secure the exact correspondence of the text in the five official languages."

The Sub-Committee was composed of the representatives of the following eleven countries: Australia, Belgium, China, Cuba, Ecuador, France, Lebanon, Poland, the USSR, the United Kingdom and the United States. It held ten meetings, from 1 to 4 December, and examined in detail each article of the draft Declaration. Among other things, the Sub-Committee proposed the division into two parts of two of the articles of the draft—those dealing with (1) slavery and torture, and (2) equality before the law and right to an effective remedy by competent national tribunals. The Sub-Committee also proposed that the article of the draft dealing with the right to rest and leisure should be placed after the article dealing with the right to work rather than after the article dealing with the right to education.

*They took a very active part.*

(d) ADOPTION OF THE DRAFT DECLARATION BY THE THIRD COMMITTEE

The report (A/C.5/400/Rev.1) of the Sub-Committee was considered by the Third Committee at its 175th to 178th meetings, held on 4 and 6 December. At the Committee's 175th meeting, on 4 December, an oral proposal of the Chairman (the representative of Lebanon) to have the Committee proceed to an examination, paragraph by paragraph, of the text submitted by the Sub-Committee to make certain, first of all, that the sense had not been altered, was adopted by 31 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

Only minor drafting changes in the text proposed by the Sub-Committee were made by the Committee. The arrangement of articles was discussed at the Committee's 178th meeting on 6 December, at which time a number of changes were agreed to.

After it had adopted separately the substance and the arrangement of the draft Declaration, it also, at its 178th meeting, voted on the text as a whole. The draft Declaration was adopted by a roll-call vote of 29 to none, with 7 abstentions.

The voting was as follows:

*In favour:* Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, China, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, France, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, India, Iran, Lebanon, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand,

<sup>8</sup>For reasons of space, a detailed account of the Committee's work is not included in the present Yearbook. A full account of the Committee's debate may be found in United Nations Official Records of the Third Session of the General Assembly, Part I, Social, Humanitarian and Cultural Questions, Third Committee, Summary Records of Meetings, 21 September-8 December 1948.

Peru, Philippines, Sweden, Syria, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States, Venezuela.

*Abstaining:* Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, Yugoslavia.

(e) DISSEMINATION OF THE DECLARATION

After the Third Committee had adopted the Declaration of Human Rights, it adopted by 28 votes to none, with 8 abstentions, a French draft resolution (A/C.3/381), which was slightly amended by Cuba\* (A/C.3/402), the Dominican Republic, China, Lebanon and Syria, and which called upon the General Assembly to recommend that Member Governments publicize the text of the Declaration and cause it to be disseminated as widely as possible.

(f) USSR DRAFT RESOLUTION

At the 179th meeting of the Third Committee on 7 December, the representative of the USSR explained why his delegation had abstained from voting on the draft Declaration. He observed that most of the USSR amendments to the draft Declaration had been rejected, and the text adopted at the 178th meeting was practically identical with the original draft and was unsatisfactory. He therefore submitted a draft resolution (A/C.3/407) which stated that the text of the Declaration considered by the Third Committee required "serious improvements in a whole series of articles", and which requested the Assembly to postpone the final adoption of the Declaration to its next session. The USSR draft was supported by the representatives of the Byelorussian SSR and the Ukrainian SSR.

The representatives of the United States, the Philippines, France and Ecuador opposed the USSR draft. They maintained that the action contemplated in the USSR draft would be illegal in view of the fact that the Committee had already adopted the draft Declaration.

On being put to the vote, the USSR draft resolution was rejected by 6 votes in favour to 26 against, with 1 abstention.

(2) Discussion by the General Assembly in Plenary Meeting

The report of the Third Committee (A/777) was considered at the 180th to 183rd plenary meetings of the General Assembly, on 9 and 10 December. Altogether, thirty-five delegations spoke in the general debate, many of them raising points which they had previously raised in the Third Committee.

(a) VIEWS EXPRESSED BY REPRESENTATIVES

Various representatives underlined the importance of the Declaration. The representative of Lebanon stated that the Declaration was destined to

mark an important stage in the history of mankind.

The representative of the United States said that the Declaration was inspired by a sincere desire for peace, and that it was based on the conviction that man must have freedom in order to develop his personality to the full and have his dignity respected. The representative of Chile maintained that once the Declaration were approved, no one could infringe upon the rights proclaimed in it without becoming an outcast from the community of nations. The representative of France considered the Declaration to be the most vigorous and the most urgently needed of humanity's protests against oppression. The representative of the Philippines pointed out that, during its third session, the United Nations had been on trial for its life and that it was at that very moment that it had justified its existence before an anxious world by producing the Declaration.

The representative of Cuba\* proclaimed that the Declaration expressed in particularly clear and precise terms the most noble aspirations of twentieth-century man. The representative of Iceland regarded the Declaration as a preamble to a future world constitution. The representative of the United Kingdom stressed the fact that the preparation of the draft Declaration was a milestone on the road of human progress. Never before, he said, had so many nations joined together to agree on what they considered to be the fundamental rights of the individual.

According to the representative of Mexico, the adoption of the Declaration was one of the most important actions in the history of the United Nations. The representative of Pakistan stated that his delegation fully associated itself with what had been said in praise of the Declaration. In the opinion of the representative of Denmark, the Declaration made the promises of the Charter regarding equality of men and women a living reality. The representative of India expressed the hope that the Declaration would pave the way to a new era of international solidarity, because the basis of rights was neither the State nor the individual, but the social human being, participating in social life, and striving for national and international co-operation. The representative of Canada stated that the Declaration was inspired by the highest ideals and expressed the most noble principles and aspirations. As a result of the Declaration, the representative of Bolivia said, humanity would enter upon a new phase which should lead to the establishment of a true international constitution, founded on the limitation of the sovereignty of States for the benefit of the individual. Though imperfect, the Declaration was the most harmonious, comprehensive and

Guy  
won the  
one

GUY  
PEREZ  
CISNEROS