

## 論文の内容の要旨

論文題目    **Talk Shop of States or Assembly for Civil Society?:  
Agreeing on the Millennium Development Goals at the United Nations General  
Assembly**

(国家および市民社会との関係における国連総会  
——ミレニアム開発目標の合意形成を事例として——)

氏名        足 立 香

The Millennium Summit took place at the UN headquarters in New York in 2000. The event was an integral part of the 55th session of the UN General Assembly and provided UN member states with an opportunity to reflect on the role of the UN for the new century. At the conclusion of the meeting, heads of state and government unanimously adopted the Millennium Declaration, which identified key fundamental values for the new millennium, including freedom, equality, solidarity, tolerance, respect for nature, and shared responsibility. In the resolution to follow up the Millennium Summit, the UN General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to develop a road map to guide the implementation of the Millennium Declaration. The road map was drafted and presented to the General Assembly in the following year and included the MDGs. The MDGs incorporated 18 targets, which were taken verbatim from the Millennium Declaration and grouped into eight goals: (1) eradicating extreme poverty and hunger; (2) achieving universal primary education; (3) promoting gender equality and empowering women; (4) reducing child mortality; (5) improving maternal health; (6) combating HIV/AIDS, malaria, and other diseases; (7) ensuring environmental sustainability; and (8) developing a global partnership for development. Each MDG target was given corresponding indicators, whose total number was 48.

The MDGs were not entirely welcomed when they were first introduced to the General Assembly and eventually revised in 2007. That the MDGs did not take off immediately is puzzling, for several reasons. First, the MDGs were taken verbatim from the Millennium Declaration, which had been unanimously adopted by the General Assembly only one year before. Second, the targets in the MDGs were found in not only the Millennium Declaration but also the international development goals that the General Assembly

had previously approved. “Redundancy” is omnipresent throughout international development goals, as states were likely to adopt overlapping goals. Third, the MDGs have time-bound targets. It is critical for time-bound targets to be agreed on at the beginning of the reporting period, in order to meet deadlines. Furthermore, the MDGs were revised in 2007, i.e., in the middle of the reporting period. Fourth, the MDGs constitute a non-binding General Assembly resolution. The UN General Assembly is often considered as a talk shop that rubber-stamps numerous ineffective resolutions.

Why, then, did the UN General Assembly continue raising the MDGs in subsequent sessions and ultimately revise them, a non-binding agreement consisting of the targets that the member states had already agreed? This research explores this question.

Some studies have attempted to identify the sources of confrontation that the MDGs encountered. One of these has suggested that hardening the Millennium Declaration, by adding indicators and promoting the MDGs as a planning template across the UN system, triggered US opposition.<sup>1</sup> UN General Assembly records indicated that a majority of the member states supported hardening the Millennium Declaration. They promoted collaboration throughout the UN system for the MDGs. UN member states, except the United States, appreciated adding indicators as they made the MDGs a useful guideline. The United States raised a concern against adding the indicator of allocating 0.7% of each member state’s Gross National Product (GNP) to Official Development Assistance (ODA). This indicator, however, was removed from the MDGs in 2002. Thus, while the US disagreement regarding the 0.7% ODA target seems to explain why the MDGs met confrontation initially, further explanation is needed to understand why the Assembly continued debating and eventually revised the MDGs in 2007.

The inclusion of Goal 8 was also seen by some as a possible source of the confrontation. Goal 8 outlined responsibilities of donor countries and entailed controversial issues, such as development aid, trade, debt relief, technology transfer, and affordable drug provision, which was considered to have caused controversy, especially US discontent.<sup>2</sup> UN General Assembly documents also suggest that developing countries underscored donor responsibilities outlined under Goal 8 and strongly called for enhanced donor support. Donor countries responded positively to these appeals and affirmed their commitments.

While the arguments above mainly focused on the relationship between UN and its member states as well as the period between the adoption of the Millennium Declaration and the introduction of the MDGs, I suggest expanding the scope of analysis, in terms of both actors and time horizon. Since its creation in 1945, the UN General Assembly has changed in many respects. Although the General Assembly was initially created as an intergovernmental decision-making organ, it is important to recognize changes, not only in UN membership but also in the General Assembly’s relationship with Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) that attempt to insert the voice of civil society into international politics. As NGOs began assuming greater prominence in world politics, the UN General Assembly decision-making

---

<sup>1</sup> Doyle, Michael W. “Dialectics of a Global Constitution: The Struggle over the UN Charter.” *European Journal of International Relations* 18, no. 4 (2011): 601–24.

<sup>2</sup> Fukuda-Parr, Sakiko, and David Hulme. *International Norm Dynamics and “the End of Poverty”: Understanding the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)*. Manchester: The University of Manchester Brooks World Poverty Institute, 2009.

processes were not immune from their influence, especially given the wide range of issues that the body addresses. Furthermore, since the UN General Assembly has been in existence for several decades and passed numerous resolutions, the effects of the Assembly's past commitments should not be underestimated, especially its international development goals adopted before the Millennium Declaration.

This study elaborates on the framework of orchestration proposed by Abbott, Genschel, Snidal, and Zangl, with insights from historical institutionalism. International organizations with limited capabilities orchestrate to fulfill their responsibilities; in other words, they enlist and support intermediaries, such as NGOs, to influence targets, such as states. In orchestration, the relationship between the orchestrator and the intermediary is soft, i.e., the orchestrator does not have an effective means to control the intermediary. While states could tighten institutional control mechanisms over international organizations to discourage orchestration, international organizations do not possess hard control over intermediaries. Drawing on the spillover effect, I suggest that orchestration is more likely to lead to unanticipated consequences, through path dependency.

The goals and targets of the MDGs were found among the international development goals agreed by UN special conferences in the 1990s. UN special conferences are convened upon the request of the General Assembly or the UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) and organized on an ad-hoc basis to address specific global issues that require special attention. Notable examples of such conferences in the areas of development and environment in the 1990s included the UN Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED, also known as the Earth Summit) in Rio de Janeiro in 1992, the International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD) in Cairo in 1994, the World Summit for Social Development in Copenhagen in 1995, as well as the Fourth World Conference on Women in Beijing in 1995. A review of the historical development of UN-NGO relations indicated that the UN sought inputs from civil society for the success of these conferences, which were organized outside of the General Assembly's regular sessions. The ad-hoc arrangements allowed NGO participation. By taking part in these conferences, NGOs enhanced their networks and strengthened their capacity.

As NGOs increased their presence in international decision-making processes, NGO involvement often evoked controversy, and UN member states became more cautious of them. In this context, the Millennium Summit was organized in 2000 as a part of the General Assembly regular session, and the Millennium Declaration was adopted. Some of the goals agreed to at the UN special conferences were included in the MDGs, while several other goals had been left out. The exclusion of previously agreed-upon goals provoked controversy among NGOs. In general, NGOs work in specific issue areas and it is critical for them to have their areas of concern reflected in international agreements, including the MDGs.

The scope of the MDGs was narrower than the development goals agreed at the UN special conferences in the 1990s. While the number of actors increased in the 1990s, as the UN orchestrated NGOs for the UN special conferences, the scope of the international development agendas that the UN General Assembly established for the twenty-first century, i.e., the Millennium Declaration and the MDGs, was narrowed. The framework of the Rational Design of International Institutions developed by Koremenos, Lipson, and Snidal suggested that issue scope increases as the number of actors increases. Contrary to the

Rational Design projection, the scope of the MDGs decreased as the number of actors increased, which I argue led to the confrontation and revision of the MDGs.

The proceedings and resolutions of the UN General Assembly suggested that several member states called for a more comprehensive approach to international development than the MDGs, especially in light of the UN conferences and summits in the 1990s. As a result of the 2005 World Summit, a high-level event to review the progress towards the MDGs and other international development goals, UN member states agreed to introduce four additional targets into the MDGs. When the revised MDGs are compared with the original MDGs, it can be seen that all the additional targets had related targets or indicators in the initial MDGs, except the target to achieve universal access to reproductive health by 2015. The scope of the MDGs was therefore increased with the inclusion of reproductive health. In the field of reproductive health, NGOs have been a leading advocate. At the 1994 ICPD, NGOs played an active role in introducing reproductive health into the international agenda. It was also reported that NGOs spared no effort to include reproductive health concerns in the MDGs.