

Two Conclusions

THERE ARE two conclusions which must be drawn from a consideration of these articles relating to the social and economic life of the world.

One is that these phrases describe possible achievements of freedom rather than freedom itself. Freedom is the opportunity to act according to one's wisdom and conscience. The opportunity to act and to be creative is the right and obligation of a free man. Medical care, or any other product of human action, is the result of man's right to be productive; it is not a right in itself. Education is not a human right; it is the process by which a free person achieves enlightenment. The freedom to learn — not the educational equipment and forms — is the fundamental human freedom. The Covenant actually endangers and imperils the existence of the fundamental freedoms by this tragic confusion of equating them with the results of freedom.

The second conclusion is that when the social results of the expression of freedom are declared to be legal rights, then the collectivization of the whole social order is thereby demanded in order that the state may attempt to produce and distribute these political claims. If Congress should declare that each baby has a right to a silver spoon, each

father can lay claim to that right for his baby. On the basis of this Covenant, each nation becomes liable for the payment of these benefits to all who make their legal claims to them. The liability of any nation would be upheld by the international tribunals. The state, therefore, would have to attempt to produce and distribute these benefits and so would inevitably move to the control and nationalization of all forms of production. The change from private ownership and free enterprise to collectivism would be automatic.

The Covenant on Human Rights is such a program, and if adopted would become the sanction for the world-wide collectivization of man.

No Common Values

THE MEMBERS of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights seem to assume that a concept of human rights can be evolved without a common consent to the meanings of language, human existence, government, or the mores of individual societies.

Among the peoples of the world there is a veritable Babel of languages, many with entirely different definitions to the words denoting certain concepts, and many with no words which define convictions of life and