

I think the 2 approaches are complementary. The first approach, the Declaration on the Right to Development that attempts to formalize the obligations of all States to promote their own development, as well as to contribute to the development of other, particularly poorer, States, and the second approach, the notion of extraterritorial obligations that builds on binding obligations of Articles 55 and 56 of the UN Charter, with provisions referring to international assistance and co-operation in various human rights treaties in order to ground an international duty to cooperate the fulfillment of all human rights are complementary rather than conceptually or practically opposed. They both seek the same goal of international human rights and the duty to help others particularly the less fortunate. The advantage of the first approach is that it formalizes the obligations of States to promote their own development as well as contribute to others. The advantage of the second approach is that they focus exclusively on the promotion of human rights of others less fortunate, where as the first approach divides its obligation to itself and others.