

Billions In-Between

& the New Nature of Statesmanship

Democracy and autocracy, economic sustainability, microfinance, policy corruption, transparency, the relatively new development of NGOs and IGOs, as well as environmental demands and globalization are all currently key ingredients in the international development dialogue. Written to address international development today, this brief article introduces international development, presents our situation and unveils a solution that strikes at the very core of a problem that has been developing for thousands of years. The solution will unveil the new nature of statesmanship. The article is written to all persons concerned with the plight of mankind.

A person well versed in the international development dialogue will expect a solution which replaces current policy with another policy or some recommendation to be implemented by an institution. The reader can expect an additional and different approach, suggesting a less controlling and comprehensive self-reliant course of action. This article does not provide recommendations of how to directly help the 'Bottom Billion', a group recently named and defined by Paul Collier, in his insightful book, as the rightful recipient of our development efforts. This article does expose the hope that a new stability can be established from within the Billions In-Between allowing stability and self reliance to naturally flow to the Bottom Billion.

This sustainable transformation is meant to help humanity move away from dependence on institutions. The example then paves the road and shows a way to a new stability and development for the Bottom Billion. This track also situates the *Billions In-Between* so they will likely choose not to continue to exploit or negatively influence the Bottom Billion. The Bottom Billion will then be free to take the necessary steps to become self-sustaining and self-reliant through their own efforts and through more effective relations with distant communities.

The labor constraint globalism inflicts on the world is distant and obscure; the affect is so broad that it is difficult to comprehend. Global decisions are made at such an altitude that they must be reformed each time that they get closer to the working class. The workers understand little if any of the policy's distant meaning while they cope with the vast impact of such decisions. As people involved in international development continue to move toward the people by showing people how to make a difference on the community level in the developed world, the people in the so called developing world will more readily make the change.

5 Top currently accepted challenges of development

5 Top currently accepted challenges of international development today include: sustainability, illiberal democratic policy, inadequate funding, transparency and international central planning.

1.) Sustainability is a broad unwieldy word with a definition difficult to pin down. It is perhaps used in the development dialogue more than any other word. Set up by the United Nations General Assembly, the Brundtland Commission coined what has become an often-quoted definition of sustainable development; as development that "*meets the needs of the present generation without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.*" David G. Victor defined it's aim well as that of "*helping the poor live better, healthier, and fairer lives on their own terms*". The concept of sustainability has been well defined regarding aid and policy recommendations in recent decades though aid was poorly allocated in the 80's and 90's. The word sustainability communicates a critical idea, but the word has now been so broadly used and tailored to the needs of special interest groups, that it has all but worn out it's use.

2.) Illiberal Democratic Policy is accepting a narrow amount of democratic ideals and methods to suit the purposes of a controlling government leader or governing class of people. More specifically it is the restriction on exchange of coordination goods within a country by it's government; meaning soft goods like human rights which would require a high degree of intelligence and freedom in their exchange. Colleges and universities teaching and exchanging ideas regarding their representative government and checks and balances and separation of powers, would be said to be exchanging coordination goods. Other examples involve what can and cannot be printed in newspapers implying freedom and human rights, or the lack thereof.

3.) Funding is generally accepted within the international development dialogue as coming from the OECD Countries. The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development include thirty countries that accept the principles of representative democracy and free market economies. The group originated in 1948, to help administer the Marshall Plan, for the reconstruction of Europe, after World War II. There is never quite enough funding, somewhat like a puppeteer operating with just two strings, always wanting more strings to manipulate a puppet; there are always new puppets with just two strings. Scarcity of funding in this model is the norm and asking for it doesn't get old, it is simply accepted as what is.

4.) Transparency has become a popular go-to concept. It is the idea that policy should be less disguised and available for scrutiny. Democracies are understood to thrive when a certain degree of transparency is maintained, as it is understood to help people become more aware and involved. It is most often used as a primary solution for checking corruption and inept policy making and breaking. Its primary purpose has come to mean allowing IGOs (intergovernmental or international organizations) and NGO's (Non Governmental Organizations) to more fully advise and police poor accountability and performance. "social responsibility" has used transparency in a somewhat less advisory context where the pressure accountability comes from an institution's constituents. Some highly successful results have been experienced in Brazil.

5.) International Central Planning finds its roots in the now historic habit of central planning by failed communist authoritarian regimes. It is not surprising that few want to own up to it or be caught doing it today. This is perhaps the most unrecognized of the five challenges, but the idea of central planning is found interwoven in most discussions, whether a people are doing it or

referring to it. It has recently been mentioned openly in accusatory and defensive postures by the most established authorities in international development.

It is very difficult to hide from the label when the very nature of international development is to know what someone else should do and to go about implementing a plan from a separate or higher “central” position. The very nature of development ideology suggests the common attributes of international central planning as is well articulated in William Easterly’s article “The Ideology of Development” where in he suggests that: “The ideology of development should be packed up in crates and sent off to the museum of dead ideologies, just down the hall from communism, socialism and fascism. It’s time to recognize that the attempt to impose a rigid development ideology on the world’s poor has failed miserably.”

4 Currently Accepted Solutions

1.) Broadened Loan Conditions hold countries responsible through need and consent. This allows a country to control its leaders and for international organizations to have a say or to leverage their say in the decisions or policy of their constituents. This is justified through an attitude of service and aid. A sort of modern patronage.

2.) Transparency this concept has a two edge sword while power is abused by people that do not keep and divulge records, transparency also encourages meddling from special interest groups, IGOs, NGOs and from mob like response of populace in referendums. The mood of the mob easily swayed by the media.

3.) Micro Finance the relatively new solution that works well with the market and trusts the people in ways that are historically uncommon. The poor people it seems have responded with powerful performance and astounding results. Unfortunately microfinance can sometimes be seen as the end and not as a means to complete independence and total ownership. This is a difficult observation in a world where a “healthy amount of debt” is encouraged across the board for individuals and organizations in developed “stable” economies.

4.) Focus on the Poorest of the Poor assumes that an organization is in a position to offer them something that they would want if they could understand it. This is reminiscent of a dialogue that took place between a successful business executive and a local fisherman in Mexico. The business man suggest that the fisherman expand his fishing from one boat to many boats hiring many more people to work for him so that someday he could retire and come fish in this beautiful location and rest. The man struggled to understand why he would leave what he was doing for the purpose of coming back someday and doing the same thing. The busy-ness of the Billions In-Between as we all know is not always the best approach to succor the poor.

A Case for the Haves and Have-nots and the Billions In-Between

Given our history on earth, those with control over the resources have seldom used it for the benefit of the poor as well as they’ve done today; nor have the poor of the earth had more opportunity to rise from their situations than they have today. Today we have an even greater

phenomenon involving the billions in-between. The billions in-between are the majority of the people on the earth living lives of relative comfort. These billions can be empowered to optimize their time and energies releasing a torrent of will power and enterprise that has never been known on the earth.

The Real Challenge

The Billions In-Between: 1.) **Model instability:** The poorest of the poor can benefit more if we focus on fixing our own materialism, warmongering, immorality, greed, selfishness, dependence on quick fix drugs and our maniacal fixation on entertainment, convenience and gain. If we do not do this we are just further infecting people with our sickness. When we model instability there is little hope that we can stabilize others. 2.) **Are too busy:** we are so busy that we outsource most everything to institutions and foreigners. 3.) **Are uninformed and uneducated:** Very few people know what is happening internationally the scope is too wide and the players too many. The day is over when the sun would set on businesses and empires. But we must begin to be aware and responsible for the people around us. 4.) **Need to be empowered and stabilized:** We need to become self stabilizing at the most basic personal and neighborhood level. But what a mammoth sized challenge this is. Who can do it? What hope is there for accomplishing such an enormous task.

Institutions block the Billions In-Between: There are five key factors that must be addressed by humanity in the next 30-50 years. 1.) Institutions monopolize the time of humanity 2.) Collective time is wrapped up in institutional interchange 3.) Sovereignty is given up in institutional interchange 4.) There remains a large amount of misplaced resources (sovereignty) 5.) Can the *Billions In-Between* resource be reallocated creating hope for eradicating poverty?

The *Billions In-Between* are blocked by relinquished sovereignty. The human and physical capital of the world are spent maintaining large organizational institutions that engage in conflict between themselves. Much of this institutional interchange can be dissolved by the optimal operation of natural sovereignties. We get lost in traditional social operations which waste human efforts. If these misplaced efforts through wise decision making can be repositioned, this new allocation of resources will likely constitute our best hope for eradicating poverty and ineffective suffering. Allocation of resources does not mean redistribution. It means people rely less on distribution and more on local contribution through self determination. The majority of all peoples on the earth are increasingly more dependent on institutions. The Billions In-Between must set the example of weening themselves from this dependence even establishing models and methods by which this can successfully take place.

The Real Solutions

1.) Embrace the New Nature of Statesmanship 2.) Give sovereignty back to the people—*Billions In-Between* 3.) Divide the Division of Labor through overlapping networks

1.) Embrace the New Nature of Statesmanship. The nature of statesmanship has changed and the ramifications can be startling. There are 2 noticeable levels of change, surface change and deep fundamental change. With surface change there are at least four major areas where discovery and momentum are taking place defining the cutting edge of the coming age: *info*, *nano*, *socio* (relationships and their social affect) and *bio*. These surface changes both stimulate and manifest deep fundamental changes. With deep fundamental change: There are at least 3 categories; *time*, *space* and *knowledge*, borrowing from Alvin and Hiedi Toffler's Deep Fundamentals of Economics found in their book "Revolutionary Wealth".

Time: We must shift from a mindset of events to one of procedures and with procedures to the process of becoming. An example of this can be found in seminars and in the classroom. The way to know if an event is procedure based is to look around the room and discover whether or not you are familiar with the personal background and "process of becoming" for at least half of the people in the room with respect to the material being covered. Knowing someone else's momentum in this regard is not common but will become more common as personal relations provide more and more stability in the turbulent age of information and transformation.

Space: Revolutions have been a part of the cyclical nature of mankind since the beginning. Statesman have found that their effectiveness is dependent on how their actions correlate with revolutions. As the world becomes less and less dependent on large organizations the most affective statesman will learn how to enhance the choice of local groups by stimulating an epidemic of widespread but very small nano revolutions. Small "nano" revolutions are personal and very diverse in scope and affect, just as science at the nano level is very diverse in scope and affect. When observing society at a "nano level" our observations are also diverse because the size of our instruments and our scope of observation both shift and detail becomes more complex. At the nano level even the fundamental physics of matter are different. As statesmanship shifts to a smaller scale a shift in spacial mindset will also need to take place.

Just as the physics change at the nano level becoming less predictable, statesman of the future will be more involved with the realtime initiative and customization regarding procedures of personal and community transformation. These transformations and applications are similarly hard to predict and difficult to arrange.

Statesman have been at work designing the right national grand strategy for the new knowledge economy and the new threat of terrorism. A fundamental spacial shift involving the new nature of statesmanship is to change "national grand strategy" to many "community scenario forecasting" initiatives implemented simultaneously by choice, and awareness, with local communities tailoring the scenarios to their situation on the nano revolution scale.

Knowledge: Knowledge has been conveyed with many different mediums through out history. For many cultures and a huge expanse of history there was an oral tradition that carried important information in a very personal way from one generation to another through stories and ritual. Then the printing press brought the literary tradition to the people and eventually free

speech. The industrial age introduced mass production of books and mediums of convenience in sharing and dressing up static information. The internet and new visual media are taking it even a step further providing a lower barrier to publish and a new interactive mode of communicating.

With each shift we have both gained and lost treasures of humanity. Knowledge is so prevalent today that even quality information is overwhelmingly abundant. Knowledge is therefore less valued because it is less scarce. Knowledge is shifting; when knowledge is designed to include even integrate personal relationships it will become will permanently become less scarce and valued. Knowledge will be projected or conveyed as part of dynamic procedures involving initiative and personal relationships. These personal and community innovations will be replicable and broadcast widely.

Not only will statesman be developing procedures that individuals and communities can follow, but once a procedure is out there, it will be customized and used. Communities will be able to access user ratings from other communities just as individuals do with product and seller review ratings today.

Most statesman and social entrepreneurs will continue to work for institutions, but they will infuse those institutions with the belief that their whole purpose is to “work themselves out of a job” as families and communities do the work better than the institution. An institutions exit strategy can therefore have a totally different meaning.

The nature of statesmanship has changed. The sun is setting on the day of the traditional nation state and the institutions it generates. We need a new way to stabilize society. The new nature of statesmanship will help realize a natural transition from a dependence on statism to family and community stability.

Statesman are unique in that they not only need to inform and inspire, but to help people and communities *follow through* and improving their quality of life. This kind of social transformation requires consistent initiative over a period of time and is seldom easy to stimulate and facilitate with success. The main thrust of initiative in statesmanship comes from those experiencing the transformation. Prosumerism, defined by acclaimed futurists Alvin and Hiedi Toffler as the consumer participating in the role of the producer, is impacting even the role and nature of statesmanship in the future.

James R. Lowell, in his historic poem “*The Present Crisis*” writes, “New occasions teach new duties, time makes ancient good uncouth. We must onward then and upward who would keep abreast with truth.” The time for statesmen to have dynamic realtime relationships with community transformation is here. The nature of statesmanship must change to fit the new occasions of our time, and to keep abreast with truth. The primary tools used by statesmen in days gone by are only part of the picture today. Statesmen and change makers in society are using what might be called dynamic publishing. The new media tools often called Web 2.0 tools demonstrate this shift toward what Seth Goden has calls tribes. These people are not simply

choosing to jump on a band wagon they are participating in the development of new social structures. The difference between publishing and the new media is the relationship that the author or social entrepreneur maintains with his “tribe” as the social change occurs. Books were not capable of this kind of interactive and contributive power during the industrial age.

2.) Give sovereignty back to the people—*Billions In-Between* The first and most important action is to legitimate the family unit. Please do not confuse legitimate with legitimizing the family through government legal recognition or media based popularity. Legitimizing the family will take much more effort than legal force. The family unit can be naturally strengthened and become the expected hub for dealing with the problems we face. But how can this be done with the vast number of people in the world? The medium with the most breadth and penetration will be the internet as it is now available to a larger body of the Billions In-Between than ever before.

In using the internet we will need to take a different approach than is currently the norm. Most people would expect that we should legitimate the family unit by declaring it’s legitimacy or by some campaign or movement toward the government through legal means or the market by branding buy-in. We as families all over the earth should rather use the delivery method to communicate what we have done. In this shift there is likely much more association to the words “*by their fruits you should know them*” than we have guessed at present.

This transformation and communication will take a great effort from families everywhere. Though the change would be natural and even intuitive, we have become dependent on institutions to solve our problems and dependence is hard to shake. The time has come to legitimate the family and empower husbands and wives with ownership, know-how and some support as they become more aware and stable in their relationships.

There are many powerful people and organizations on the earth today. Much control is exercised and for good purpose—we need it. But we shouldn’t always need it, even when the majority see the institution as the end and the way things ought to be. The corrupt use of power in full, clipped and sub-sovereignties currently held by institutions can naturally dissolve and be replaced by incorruptible family and community procedures, as the family better performs its function of stabilizing and perpetuating civilization. Sovereignty was born hundreds of years ago and has been a key factor in our understanding of economic development as the nation state has emerged. As sovereignty has evolved it has risen higher and higher into ever-distant global entities.

Stabilizing the Billions In-Between does not require attacking nation states, businesses or other social structures. It is a natural move toward the end to which each institution is intended. Once the family and community are stable and productive, the purpose of many organizations will have been fulfilled. It is not that all organizations will cease to exist, but due to the diminishing dependence on them, many will automate their procedures or even merge with other similar procedures.

3.) Divide the Division of Labor through overlapping networks. Labor is addressed here for two purposes. The first is that in order to maintain our currently accepted living standards, labor needs to be optimized and actually increased locally for a time. The second is that as stabilization occurs and dependence on institutions is lessened or when less labor is required, people must not feel like they are losing their jobs.

Division of labor is what fueled the industrial age providing new comforts of modern life to a growing world population. Even with its productive results the division of labor had its prophesied adverse outcomes. Adam Smith took part as a sort of founding author for the division of labor and yet he wrote: “that it leads to a 'mental mutilation' in workers; they become ignorant and insular as their working lives are confined to a single repetitive task”. With the increase of knowledge through specialization and the much more broad division of labor into career fields we have experienced a broad societal ‘mental mutilation’.

Carl Marx rightly noted the same results of capitalism naming ‘alienation’ as the result of over specialization. Buckminster Fuller described it as an overspecialization crisis noting that if we do not do something about it we will be subject to annihilation just as many species have been in the past. Today we face these problems globally and there are many words being used to identify the labor selection of entire countries who have essentially become labor slaves to the people of more advanced economies, words such as comparative advantage, market-clearing prices, trade-offs and budget constraints. If we continued this macro dialogue we would see more and more the alienation of countries as they specialize and lose voice in the global society.

A solution to our complex problem of specialization and labor constraints is to divide the division of labor into overlapping networks. At first glance one might think that a division of a division would do the opposite of what was intended by creating an even more specialized and alienated society. Though the move may allow for more specialization it would not be specialization of the laborer but rather the specialization of labor itself. Even this is not wholly true as the natural result of the overlapping would merge technologies and even industries.

Divide the division of labor and you allow the people to shift away from the bottom line and toward real service and productive communication. The specialized job mentality is mired in the Western economics of self satisfaction as the best road to happiness. This is not to say that Western economics has not been of critical importance in our history but rather that it needs to become history, it will make a solid foundation for a better more complete environment built upon the positive contributions of the past.

How does the division of labor divided work? We already accept the idea through a kind of blind acceptance. Some writers are calling our parallel economy a function of ‘prosumerism’ as mentioned above or our ‘third job’ in which we as consumers do much of the traditional work of the producer from home manufacturing (fabbing) to pumping gas and ATM banking. The division of labor simply formalizes our third, fourth and fifth jobs, while lessening our primary work load and increasing the specialization of the labor entirely.

Special interest trade organizations: An example of dividing the division of labor would be the establishment of special interest trade networks that improve the trade and extend the trade to maybe 3 times its size and in a full time working sense 3 times its need. It's the team work which when working correctly overcomes the labor constraint. The example and launch of the organizations could be accomplished through mutual goodwill initiatives stimulated by procedures alluded to above.

Networks are key to future. This need to change the division labor exposes a need to improve our networking ability. New forms of networking are a key ingredient to future solutions from terrorism to education and from political and cultural cohesion to business stability.

4 Reasons why the *Real* is better than the *Currently Accepted* Solutions

1.) Realistic: These solutions do not ask the impossible as when the Millennium Development Goals were written by a group of disjointed foreigners who are not accountable to any authority that can measure and rally results. The move facilitates change by and for the people that want it and need it and those people are in the end the only ones that will eradicate poverty and dependence completely and maintain it, because they are the only ones in the trenches living it.

2.) Short and long-term: In the short term the real solutions open the flood gates of initiative, desire, confidence and self respect and allowing it to grow in their native environment. In the long term we are helping the Billions In-Between build foundations of basic independent governance, wisdom from experience, generational independent choice and unique history.

3.) Historic Precedent: Many small transformations on the local level are the way to handle variety, unpredictability and constant change. Sovereignty has always worked best when it was natural total sovereignty. Division of labor is what fueled the industrial age providing new comforts of modern life to a growing world population.

4.) Assertions of most established authorities seem to be in support

Established Authorities: Sachs, Collier, Easterly

These 6 Policies though limited to the scope of policy, may help the development of the real solutions.

1.) No representation without taxation see Phillip Bobbitt

2.) Protect and allow for community incubation periods. Multi-track development plans originating from the communities themselves involving the education and voice of the whole community body should be encouraged, facilitated and honored by all peoples and states. People must be allowed to fail and locally reassess. With the right kind of consultative support and access to options these failures may be lessened.

3.) Allow even encourage through celebrity endorsement private incentives for open-source copyright and patent law use for physical and nonphysical properties. Unused patents should receive a reasonably limited shelf life unless deemed a mortal threat to the people. Creative commons allows a partial protection of one's intellectual property while empowering the owner with development and exposure capability involving a much larger interest group and facilitating the properties use by translation

4.) Allow community to community direct funding, open planning and improvement tutoring. Allow and protect forums developed for such networking and dialogue. This interaction will likely give rise to groups that support the dialogue and help prosperous communities realize that their situation is not the same as that of the Bottom Billion and that the best kind of aid is often not direct funding nor is it recommendation.

5.) Grant full governmental economic and political amnesty, attainable under specific agreed upon conditions, relieving countries of entangling restrictions and hindering residual alliances from past situations involving IGOs and NGOs

6.) Allow community to community temporary backing of currencies based on specific prerequisites. This would be allowed. A volunteer group of interested citizens should be called upon to develop the right procedures and facilitate successful agreements.

The Limits of Policy: Good policy at its best should affectively open a door and sometimes protect its use. But, someone or something must walk through the door. Who or what should pass through?

Mobilizing the *Billions In-Between*

About 1-3% (56-168 million people) of the 5.6 billion people in developing and 'stable' countries make up the power elite and the intellectual elite; they influence and make decisions regarding international development. Another 1-3% of the populace are active and aware of these efforts and are in the trenches contributing as well. The *Billions In-Between* 94-98% of the population (5.3-5.5 billion people) have become dependent on the 2-6% and rarely know what to do to change there own lives or even possess the inclination to do it. The stabilization and mobilization of this 94-98% can be accomplished through the new nature of statesmanship, the further division of labor and the return of full clipped and sub sovereignties.

The constraint for these billions is again partially a labor constraint or at least it is treated as such. Social entrepreneurship due to its need and the favorable conditions of widespread wealth has been on the rise and can do much to dissolve this labor constraint. The labor constraint is also felt in social entrepreneurship. Many people reading this article know the amount of work required within social entrepreneurial institutions. The automation of prosumerism with-in social entrepreneurship can relieve some of the pressures of well-meaning institutions. What we need are strategic systems of social change that can be affectively initiated and accessed by local communities. These systems of transformation could be customized, wikied and rated by users.

This will leverage the good will, hard-work and agency of the *Billions In-Between*, not to directly aid the Bottom Billion, but to stabilize themselves. Stabilizing the Billions In-Between will not just continue to provide the Bottom Billion with aid, but as stated above, their primary purpose is to set an example. By changing the circumstances in their lives this massive group will be less likely to exploit the Bottom Billion and more likely to facilitate the correct process of change as the emerging Bottom Billion follow of their own volition.

Allow communities to be the prosumers of social entrepreneurship and we will truly move globalism into the information age or better yet into the transformation age. The responsibility for this transformation will rightly rest squarely on the shoulders of local leaders—the new statesman. Factories were efficient when making physical products in the industrial age but not as efficient in protecting humanity from themselves. Shift the responsibility of social entrepreneurship from less effective industrial institutions to transformational communities and local leaders and we will give up the ugly sub-sovereignties of industrialism and development.