

INTRODUCTION

At Give A Billion, we use a number of tools that we find useful. One of the best ones for organising knowledge of a subject area – any area, however vast – is using Rudyard Kipling’s 6 Honest Serving Men. This is after the rhyme: ‘I keep 6 honest serving men (they taught me all I knew); their names are what and why and when, and how and where and who’. At first glance, you may not appreciate the **genius** of these few words, particularly as they are in rhyme. But now consider this: **all** questions can be grouped broadly into 2 types (in English language structure at least), namely ‘**open**’ questions and ‘**closed**’ questions. Closed questions are of the type where answers can only be of the ‘yes/no/don’t know’ variety. Open questions are where responses can be many and varied. The author once offered over US\$1000 to a youth group, if they could come up with ONE question, that was an OPEN question, that didn’t have one of Kipling’s ‘6 honest serving men’ in it, or wasn’t basically a derivative of them. Derivatives are things like ‘whose’, instead of ‘who is the owner’ and ‘which’ instead of ‘what one from among these’. Needless to say, I kept the money.

ORGANISING KNOWLEDGE ABOUT EVERYTHING – INCLUDING POVERTY

The implications are huge for anyone wanting to LEARN anything. All that knowledge can be organised and stored using these headings. Similarly, the same tools can be used to investigate, to unearth that which you don’t already know. It is the same with knowledge about poverty. In this context, the 7 Layer Poverty Model is itself a tool, that helps with 4 of the questions: who, what, when & where. The ‘who’ is primarily the individual facing poverty, represented by the cone at the centre of the model. The other who’s are any members of the household to which the individual belongs, or the community they are part of. There is also the ‘who’ you could use to identify all the organisations that are ‘actors’, or ‘stakeholders’ in connection with that individual facing poverty.

The ‘what’ in the context of the **7 Layer Poverty Model**, is the details of the nature of the poverty that the individual is facing. This may be measured with a Simple, or Detailed Assessment, to give a Poverty Profile for that individual. That profile output itself constitutes the ‘what’, or at least an approximation to the actual reality of the ‘what’. The ‘when’ and ‘where’ are pretty self-explanatory. We live in an age where every square metre of the planet can be mapped with exact GPS co-ordinates and found fairly reliably using Google Maps, Google Earth or their equivalent. So then, we have over 7 billion people, all of whom are now uniquely identifiable and their every location on the planet also uniquely identifiable. Kipling’s honest men serve us remarkably well, in those respects.

WHY AND HOW

Yet we admit that the 7 Layer Poverty Model does not directly address the ‘why’ or the ‘how’ categories of Kipling’s questions. But that does not mean that we have nothing to say in those areas. We just use **different tools**. First, let us consider Kipling’s ‘why’. Reading through the available literature and associated opinions, well-informed experts point to a wide range of **causal factors** for poverty, ranging from the complex and sinister, to the simple: ‘**lack of money**’ explanation. It is true that by the World Bank definitions, using income per capita (‘purchasing power parity’) for example, if the definition of a person beneath the ‘**poverty line**’ is someone with an income of less than \$2 per day, then paying them over \$2 per day INSTANTLY lifts them out of poverty. Agreed? Common sense tells us that we may not have eradicated poverty from that individual’s **life**, but by the TECHNICAL definition, their poverty is thereby ‘SOLVED’. Pedants may require that income to

TOP 100 GOOGLE ARTICLES ON SOLVING GLOBAL POVERTY: SYSTEM THINKING SYNOPSIS

continue for a whole year to qualify, but you get the point, right? By THIS limited definition, money alone DOES solve poverty and can do so **immediately**. But we use a different, more sophisticated, multi-dimensional definition of poverty. Because money still needs to BUY you the things required to lift you out of the poverty you face. And for that, you require those vital things to also be **available and accessible**.

WEIGHING UP THE WHY'S

With respect to the 'whys' of poverty, we are not inclined to be prescriptive. We would encourage ALL commentators to weigh the **evidence** in each specific case. There may be **degrees** of merit and **causality** in many of the explanations. We would want the individual's case to be assessed on its own merits and details. Are they poor because they choose to be? Are there issues with addictions, gambling, wastefulness, laziness, drought, famine, poor decision-making, gender inequality, religious oppression, colonial exploitation, moral decay, or systematic manipulation of the terms of trade by the global military-industrial complex? There are plenty more contributory factors and expert opinions out there. Perhaps they **all** have some merit in some cases, maybe even a few of them have **much merit in most**. It is understandable that poverty 'fixers' will typically want to understand WHY any given individual is in poverty. If they do not deal with the underlying CAUSE, then any proscribed solution will potentially be short-lasting. Without properly addressing the 'why', causal history may simply **repeat itself** in the case of the individual – and their poverty will thus return. ***The best way to arrive at any kind of robust conclusion, would be to understand the story of that individual, in the context of their surroundings and compared against the backdrop of their household, community and country conditions.***

THE GENIUS OF GLOBAL SYSTEMS THINKING

This brings us on to another REALLY useful tool. ALL SYSTEMS made by mankind, can be understood in terms of the interoperation of 3 SETS OF FACTORS: People, Process & Technology, revolving around Assets. Each section of the triangle touches every other section, illustrating that you cannot change one, without potentially affecting the other. Imagine a simple system first, one which most of us can relate to. Think of a teacher and their class. We may imagine the teacher, students and some teaching tools. In the most sophisticated examples, the teacher may be a Nobel Prize-winning professor, using an interactive digital whiteboard and immersive learning experiences, with a state-of-the-art tiered lecture theatre, with cushioned, reclining individual seats. Conversely, you may prefer to picture a class of African children, sat on the ground under the shade of a tree, looking at a teacher write the letters of the alphabet on a blackboard, using a piece of chalk.

Both scenarios involve a teacher. There are a range of people-related factors of interest to us regarding that teacher. For example, how good are they at their job? Do they have the right 'KASE' profile (knowledge, attitude, skills and experience) to do that job well. What language are they speaking and is it the same as the students. One might equally ask a range of people-type questions about the pupils. Are they even in the right class, for example? How attentive are they? In terms of process, teaching styles may vary, but the model of the teacher at the front of the class, speaking and pointing is a usual one. They will tend to speak so as to be understood. They will usually opt to speak in a single language, shared with the students. However, you will detect that this is not always true. Students may be learning a foreign language. Some may be foreign students, so the language spoken is not their first language. There are many less obvious **process factors** going on that you

TOP 100 GOOGLE ARTICLES ON SOLVING GLOBAL POVERTY: SYSTEM THINKING SYNOPSIS

take for granted. It is commonly accepted, that while the teacher **speaks**, the students **listen**. The students should 'face the front' and pay attention to what is being taught. They should be silent. If they want to ask a question, they should raise their hand. They should be taking notes, and so on. All of these are **process-related factors**.

When it comes to '**technology**', the term includes ANYTHING that is used by the persons involved, to follow the processes. In the classroom, the technology may be as simple as pencil and paper, or as sophisticated as interactive conferencing technology. The technology relates to the kind of seating, the glasses that some students wear to be able to see, the reliability of their recording apparatus, electricity, and so on. **Anything**. But it all **inter-relates** with the people and the process factors. **And this inescapable interaction is VITAL to understand when overcoming poverty.**

WE ARE ALL IN THIS TOGETHER

ALL people, poor or otherwise, exist in a world system. Even those remote astronauts in the International Space Station. Yes, even they are subject to the all-encompassing, integrating principles of people, process & technology. As is well-illustrated in the business world, there is also the **passive** added component of ASSETS. For example, a company can **use** the technology of a factory, but that is separate to its OWNERSHIP of that asset as a **commercial entity**. The point is that we acknowledge assets are there and that they certainly have some **significance**, but they are considered passive, in terms of the **operation** of the rest of the 'system'.

AND YOUR POINT IS?

Why focus so much on this? It is because when looking for the root causes of ANY problem, it helps to recognise **the system view**, where the "problem" will have been ultimately caused by some 'failing' combination of the people, process and technology factors. Failing, in this sense, implies that the **end result** is NOT something we want to have – in this case expressed as **the individual facing poverty**. This may become clearer with some concrete examples.

GIVE ME AN EXAMPLE

If a farmer is facing poverty, we can look for all kinds of underlying causes, starting with the farmer HIMSELF. This is not to fall into any **prejudiced** view of poor people bringing poverty on themselves, but simply to understand **their** story. Is it possible to conclude that the person has the right KASE profile to succeed in their given set of circumstances? Or does something about the PERSON need to change? That change, with respect to overcoming poverty, may be as simple as they need to get medically better, so they can get back to working and earning an income for themselves and their household.

Once you have properly understood the details of that **individual**, then you need to understand them in the **context** of their **household and community**. So for example, if the farmer cannot work to generate an income, are there things that he would do that the rest of the family could be doing while he recovers? Are there others in the household that could earn an alternative income to supplement the farmer's income, or are their specific conditions which limit, or otherwise prohibit that? Are there neighbours who could cover for the farmer while he recovers, so as not to let the crops fail while he is sick. All of these have been pure LOCAL people considerations - so far. No mention of wider considerations like collectives, suppliers, markets, governments, terms of trade,

TOP 100 GOOGLE ARTICLES ON SOLVING GLOBAL POVERTY: SYSTEM THINKING SYNOPSIS

international food subsidies, trade embargoes, 'evil' multinational corporations and so on. Just a farmer, facing local challenges. This is not to say the other factors play **no role**, but they should be understood first from the perspective of the individual, in the context of their household and community.

PROCESS FACTORS WITHIN THE EXAMPLE

Now we consider briefly 'process' factors. Is there anything about the processes the farmer is following, that could be changed, with the primary goal of IMPROVING his income and alleviating his poverty? It could be some simple drip irrigation techniques, intensive agriculture, learning more about the effective farming of his land. It could be learning how to haggle, or to co-ordinate with other local farmers to get better prices for their goods. It could be storing the goods to time his produce sales more effectively, against fluctuating prices. It could be better storage techniques, to avoid the rats from eating half his crops. There's LOTS to consider regarding how the farmer generates an income from farming, before considering making an income from any alternative means. The point is that there ARE always processes involved – and those processes can vary WIDELY in their **effects and effectiveness**. Hence, the root cause of the farmer's poverty MAY be **significantly causally-linked** to failings in the current processes he happens to use. The difference that makes the difference could be as simple as a process change – and little or nothing to do with international tax havens for 'immoral' (but otherwise legally compliant) global corporations.

TECHNOLOGY: NOT JUST 'IPHONES AND INTERNET ACCESS FOR ALL'

Lastly, there is technology. We have already referred to it in the context of drip irrigation and potential intensive farming methods. Technology can be '**low-tech**' as well as 'high-tech'. The point is that it is technology that WORKS and is effective in helping the farmer generate the income (or goods) which facilitate getting and keeping him out of poverty. Again, using the simple process of **comparison and elimination**, the farmer's own effectiveness can be compared with farmers in that neighbourhood. What yields do others get from similar farms locally? What methods and technology do they use? What available and suitable technologies could be applied to improve our farmer's productivity? All these can be considered, **before** you consider relevant **constraints** – such as HOW the farmer could afford to obtain that technology.

ONE SIZE FITS ONE, POSSIBLY MANY – BUT NEVER ALL

There is clearly **NO SINGLE ANSWER** to helping this one farmer out of his poverty circumstances. So how can there possibly be a single answer to a BILLION other individuals like him? We just don't see it, do you? **Nor do we see a single cause**. There may be COMMON underlying and **significant, even primary** causal factors, but not one of them is a SUFFICIENT condition for the poverty of every individual. In most cases, we believe, the most likely single **sufficient** cause is the individual themselves and their specific inability to **adapt, improvise and overcome** their immediate circumstances. But those circumstances might equally be **overwhelming** for just about anyone – including the archetypal mighty US Marine.

It may help to use an analogy. We do not deny that there are various factors that may CREATE immense causal **headwinds** that the individual must overcome, but they are unlikely to be sufficient to FORCE that individual into poverty, in all cases. They will simply make it HARDER to make

headway OUT of poverty. Therefore, actors should look to do their ACTING at **multiple levels**. Use influence to change those HEADWINDS that make it harder for the motivated individual to overcome their personal poverty. But ALSO support the individual, in making the necessary manoeuvres to make progress IN SPITE OF those headwinds. Money can certainly help accelerate the individual's progress out of poverty. But if we are not careful, those same headwinds can blow him back. The **longest term, best-hope strategy** for the **individual** at the MICRO level, is to make them a more SKILLFUL SAILOR, better equipped to cope with and overcome the challenges that their typical circumstances are most likely to cause. This brings to mind an African proverb: '**Smooth seas do not make for skilful sailors**'. Simultaneously, we recognise that at the MACRO level, reducing headwinds can make a BIG difference for a LOT of sailors all at once. If you are a fixer, your choice of tactics and strategy will typically reflect your **preferences, competencies and capacities**. It is not that any given strategy, or tactic is necessarily better – just that it is better for you.

THE ROOT OF ALL FAILURE?

Since people/process/technology factors are at the root of failing human systems, they are also the **root to the solutions**. We maintain that a motivated person remains in poverty, due to failings within the **social structures** that would normally surround them and intervene, in an effectively functioning social 'system'. Where the social system is failing, or broken, we would typically expect to find the problem in one or more of these 3 areas. Once rectified, maintaining a dynamic and effective people/process/technology framework becomes an **ongoing task**. Factors in each of the 3 areas are all subject to change. And that change needs to be **recognised, anticipated and managed** – to the best of the individual's ability. The structures around the individual can help.

We do not wish to be exhaustive, but basic analytical skills, comparing and contrasting the individual's circumstances and story to those around them in their own community, will provide fair comparators as to why poverty remains for the individual – and which parts of the overall 'system' are the greatest contributors to the resulting 'failure' in their own case. Whatever the individual's situation, the net result is to assess the situation, decide on the best plan of action, then act to put it into practice. This pattern repeats itself: plan/do/check/act. Or a shortened, adapted version for those of us who like things in 3's is: **assess/decide/act**.

The assessment will involve the answers to 3 core questions: Where am I? Where do I want to get to? How am I going to get there? In answer to the last question, the individual is less likely to get there alone. Part of their strategy for success will typically be to GET ORGANISED! For anything that is beyond their immediate household and sometimes within it, there will be a **role for others to play** in the plan. At a local level, we advocate a **coalition of the willing**, comprising any person or organisation that is willing to help the individual progress out of poverty and stay out – whatever their underlying motives and motivators.

REVIEWING THE LITERATURE THROUGH THE POWERFUL LENS OF SYSTEM THINKING

Carl Sagan famously said that: "**Remarkable claims require remarkable evidence**". So we tested the 7 Layer Poverty Model against **leading thinking** among others. The following are relevant excerpts taken from the Top 100 Google responses for "solving global poverty". Omitting **our own article**, we highlight elements we felt were the most significant, as viewed through the lens of System Thinking (explained above) and the 7 Layer Poverty Model. We hope you find this **focused synopsis** useful.

1. **PoorEconomics.com, A Radical Rethinking of the Way to Fight Global Poverty, Banerjee & Duflo**

[This is a web site associated with the original book by the authors] Why would a man in Morocco who doesn't have enough to eat buy a television? Why is it so hard for children in poor areas to learn even when they attend school? Why do the poorest people in the Indian state of Maharashtra spend 7 percent of their food budget on sugar? Does having lots of children actually make you poorer?

POOR ECONOMICS argues that so much of anti-poverty policy has failed over the years because of an inadequate understanding of poverty. The battle against poverty can be won, but it will take patience, careful thinking and a willingness to learn from evidence. [The work] is a vital guide to policy makers, philanthropists, activists and anyone else who cares about building a world without poverty.

For more than fifteen years Abhijit V. Banerjee and Esther Duflo have worked with the poor in dozens of countries spanning five continents, trying to understand the specific problems that come with poverty and to find proven solutions. Their book is radical in its rethinking of the economics of poverty, but also entirely practical in the suggestions it offers. Through a careful analysis of a very rich body of evidence, including the hundreds of **randomized control trials** that Banerjee and Duflo's lab has pioneered, they show why the poor, despite having the same desires and abilities as anyone else, end up with entirely different lives.

What is striking is that even people who are that poor are just like the rest of us in almost every way. We have the same desires and weaknesses; the poor are no less rational than anyone else—quite the contrary. Precisely because they have so little, we often find them putting much careful thought into their choices: They have to be sophisticated economists just to survive. Yet our lives are as different as liquor and liquorice. And this has a lot to do with aspects of our own lives that we take for granted and hardly think about.

Living on 99 cents a day means you have limited access to information—newspapers, television, and books all cost money—and so you **often just don't know certain facts** that the rest of the world takes as given, for example, that vaccines can stop your child from getting measles. It means living in a world whose institutions are not built for someone like you. Most of the poor do not have a salary, let alone a retirement plan that deducts automatically from it. It means making decisions about things that come with a lot of small print when you cannot even properly read the large print. What does someone who cannot read make of a health insurance product that doesn't cover a lot of unpronounceable diseases? It means going to vote when your entire experience of the political system is a lot of promises, not delivered; and not having anywhere safe to keep your money, because what the bank manager can make from your little savings won't cover his cost of handling it. And so on.

2. **Becky Straw of Adventure Project**, (co-founded with Jody Landers), quoted in Business Insider 20/01/13.

"We consider ourselves VCs for *non-profits...that we feel will create the highest social return for our dollar.*"

“Each have a long term vision of sustainability, meaning that one day they are net positive and profitable and no longer in need of outside support”. They aim to create **1 million jobs over 10 years**. “If we focus on high impact solutions that build local capacity, we would end poverty faster and more efficiently.” They operate in Haiti, India, Kenya & Uganda.

They employ “Micro-consignment models”, or the “third place”, alongside traditional charity (building school or a well), and micro-lending. “We support social enterprise...who have a business mindset”. They then provide them with the tools & the training.

Average of 38% of wells are broken in developing countries and often break in first 2 years. So, they opted for training well mechanics in local communities. **US\$550 can train 1 mechanic** in India to maintain 50 wells for 5000 people in their community. Work with Water for People, for example. They say that they: ‘Only work with organisations that have an end game and have measurable results to get there.’

3. Acumen Fund: 10 Things We’ve Learned About Tackling Global Poverty: www.acumen.org

They invest in ‘**companies, leaders and the spread of ideas**’. Invest ‘patient capital’. They have invested over \$65m since 2001. They use tools of both business and philanthropy. “We can create better systems to enable people to help themselves – and if we can, we must.” They also admit: “Nothing about this work is easy.” Their list of 10 things learned is:

1. Dignity is more important to the human spirit than wealth
2. Neither grants, nor markets alone will solve the problems of poverty
3. Poverty is a description of someone’s economic situation; it does not describe who someone is.
4. We won’t succeed in the long term without cultivating local leaders, local money & strong communities.
5. Great people, every time, no exceptions
6. Great technology alone is not the answer
7. **If failing is not an option, you’ve ruled out success as well**
8. **Governments rarely invent solutions, but they can scale what works**
9. There is no currency like trust and there are no shortcuts to earning it
10. Patient capital investing is built upon a system of values; it is not a series of steps to be followed.

“What keeps people from realising their potential is lack of choice and opportunity”. They make a point of: “Listening to the poor as agents who want to change their own lives”. They admit the different economic behaviours of low-income people. Things like the Rotavirus vaccine, or long-lasting anti-malarial bed-nets can sometimes ‘move the needle’. But people buy products and services that they **understand**. They recognise the need for **innovations in DELIVERY**. Use the example of *Global Easy Water*, drip irrigation systems. Affordable & can double farming productivity.

“None of us has all the answers and all of us are needed to find them”. Listing trade-offs: “Every day we make hard, sometimes excruciating decisions- between profit and impact, efficiency and equality, short-term and long term – in a complex, imperfect world that craves quick, easy answers.”

4. Tackling Disease is key to solving poverty: www.independent.co.uk 30/10/12

Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) agreed by 123(?) UN member states back in 2000. Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis & Malaria, represents a new funding model. Equates to over half global funding to tackle malaria, two thirds of global funding to tackle TB and 21% of international financing against AIDS.

There has been uneven progress against MDGs. They make the pillars easier to “understand, measure & evaluate”, but this resulted in “oversimplification”. Ill health is both cause and consequence of poverty, the issues are interrelated...in complex ways. [This is why GAB don't make prescriptions for the why & how] “The danger is that issues are considered only in isolation. This is not real life.”

5. World Neighbours, www.wn.org

Operating in Asia, Africa and Latin America. Focus on entire community, big picture, integrated approach. “Problems and issues within a community are all interrelated and you cannot solve one problem in isolation.” Invest in “programs in agriculture, literacy, water, health and environmental protection.” Since 1951, more than 26 million people in 45 countries have transformed their lives with the support of World Neighbours.” Average time they stay in a community is 8-10 years. Currently around 500k people benefit from their programs in 11 countries. About 162m live well below extreme poverty threshold, on less than 0.5\$ per day. “Poverty is living without the basic needs that many others in this world enjoy”. [VERY close to GAB's own poverty definition]

6. Genetics, Politics and Economics Join to Solve Global Poverty, Stanford Business School, Center for Social Innovation, 2006. Wacziarg & Spolacre

“Scholars are recognizing that the only way to approach complex problems is through cross-disciplinary collaboration.” Work on idea of “genetic distance” correlating with poorer countries from rich. “Geographical remoteness” also plays a role, but genetic distance has a stronger correlation. Distance from those who came up with populations that developed “major innovations over the past 200 years.” Genetic distance's **main influence** believed to be its role in creating “cultural barriers” to the “flow of ideas and technologies”.

Genetic distance “can be determined by the degree of variation in neutral genetic markers”. Eg blood type as good marker for genetic distance. Identifies distance within Europe, north-south & east-west. “This means that policies that promote globalisation can make it much easier for people to share innovations more quickly”. “Preliminary findings are that the more culturally related two countries are, the more vigorous the trade is between them.” Wacziarg says. [Note comparisons to GAB's own article on ‘closeness driving behaviour’ (<http://giveabillion.net/are-we-getting-closer-to-solving-poverty/>)]

7. **Huffington Post**, Ying Ying Shang, 13/03/13. 70% of those billion plus living on under a dollar a day are women. [unlucky for some] “Women work two thirds of the world's working hours, produce half of the world's food, yet earn only 10% of the world's income and own less than 1% of the world's property.”.. “At least one in 3 women globally will be beaten, coerced into sex, or otherwise abused in her lifetime. In some countries, that rate reaches 70%..Women who are

educated are more likely to have fewer and healthier children". "HIV/AIDS spreads twice as quickly among uneducated girls, than among girls that have some schooling." "Educate a girl, empower a woman, change the world."

8. **Research.gov, cost effective financing strategies to mitigate poverty.** Micro-finance, Dean Karlan of Yale has pioneered the use of randomized field experiments to test the efficacy of aid programs "in studies that reveal how to make philanthropic spending really work". Eg, "a \$1 deworming pill has a greater impact on increasing school attendance than directly paying the families to send their children to school."
-

9. **Amazon's link to Dean Karlan's book, "More Than Good Intentions: Improving The Ways the World's Poor Borrow, Save, Farm, Learn & Stay Healthy.** He is Professor of Economics at Yale.

"Shows how small changes in banking, insurance, healthcare & other development initiatives, that take into account human irrationality, can dramatically improve the well-being of poor people everywhere."

"In America alone, individual donors contribute over two hundred billion to charity annually, 3 times as much as corporations, foundations & bequests combined."

10. www.globalissues.org, "Solving World Hunger Means Solving World Poverty", 2010

World Food Summit was called by UN to examine **why hunger persists**, despite the 1996 Plan of Action. Progress has lagged **at least 60%** behind the goals set for the first 5 years. "Hunger is an effect of poverty and poverty is largely a political issue. (While manifesting itself as an economic issue, conditions causing poverty are political and end up being economic)."

"People are hungry, not due to lack of availability of food, but because people do not have the ability to **purchase** food and because **distribution** of food is not equitable." [This observation is clearly referenced in the 7 Layer Poverty Model's 'Access' criteria for each Humanitarian Basic]

"There is also a lot of politics influencing how food is produced, who it is produced by (and who benefits) and for what purposes the food is produced (such as exporting, rather than for the hungry, feedstuff, etc)"

Article quotes Ross Copeland, 'The Politics of Hunger', 2000: "Access to food and other resources is not a matter of availability, but rather ability to pay. Put bluntly, those with the most money command the most resources, whilst those with little or no money go hungry..." "The richest 20% controls 85% of all wealth, whilst the poorest 20% control only 1.5%."

Quote during the world food summit in 2002, **USA stood alone in blocking the draft text for 2 reasons.** They wanted all references to "food as a human right" removed. Second, they wanted strong wording that GM crops are a key way to end hunger. The summit eventually opted instead for a "voluntary code of conduct", not mandatory, nor immediate.

Jacques Diouf, Director-General of the UN's Food & Agriculture Organisation, said: "Failure to address the silent under-nourishment of millions of children and adults in peacetime should also be regarded as a violation of the right to food." [We see it as a Humanitarian Basic, people can live on less, but is not humane. If was a right, UN might have to force its members to act in military response, through the Security Council perhaps?]

“Solving’ world hunger by only increasing food production and not addressing the root causes of hunger (ie poverty), would not alleviate the conditions that create poverty in the first place.”

“World hunger exists because: 1) colonialism, and later subtle monopoly capitalism, dispossessed hundreds of millions of people from their land; the current owners are the new plantation managers, producing for the mother countries. 2) the low-paid, undeveloped countries sell to the highly paid developed countries, because there is no local market [because local people do not have enough to pay]... and 3) the current Third World land owners, producing for the First World, are appendages to the industrialised world, stripping all natural wealth from the land to produce food, lumber, and other products for wealthy nations.” Article goes on to suggest 4 things to address this.

Highlights **issues**, including: Production of cash crops, not nutritious food, eg cotton, sugar, tea, sisal, etc. Pasturing cattle, which is an “extremely inefficient use of land, water & energy”, but for which there is demand in wealthy countries. Plus the “Economic dumping” of food aid to depress local markets.

11. Wall Street Journal, “Bill Gates on Solving Global Problems by Measuring Them”.

BG argues that we need ‘new ways of measuring the success and failures of international efforts to provide services to health clinics, schools and family farms around the world.’ Measurement and thorough feedback can “drive global change” and solve the world’s biggest problems. Measurement alone won’t fix problems, BG admits, but ‘consistent systems of feedback, in which results are evaluated and explained, are also necessary for refining the approach to problem solving.’

[We’re right with Bill on this one! We hope our 7 layer Poverty Model will prove just such a tool.]

12. ‘No App For That: Why Tech Won’t Solve Global Poverty As Intended’, 04/07/13, Globalenvision.org

Quote: ‘**All the technological transformation of the last 200 years hasn’t come close to wiping out global poverty.**’ [To us, such statements are **plain dumb**. That is like claiming we should ditch the idea of medicine for tackling global diseases, because those diseases still persist. The issue is the proper application of those resources, not necessarily flaws in the resources themselves. Need to assess the difference that each tool makes, locally, ie: the ‘how’ in response to the ‘why’.]

13. Why It Is Impossible to Solve Poverty, youtube video

This guy spends 15 minutes laying blame on central banks with hidden agendas, same as UN, ‘and the fractional reserve’ banking system – by which money can be created out of thin air, unchecked. Whistleblower, Katherine Bolkovac (?) who allegedly exposed the UN. Hence, claims it is impossible to make progress. The Monetary System works against people trying to escape poverty. Challenges the \$1 a day metric [actually \$1.25], as countries have local economy-specific inflation, particularly food inflation, so real issue is cost of living NOT income [but seems to ignore that the figure is based on 2005 Purchasing Power Parity]. The speaker doesn’t offer any alternative. Encourages directing energies against corrupt & dysfunctional current system. Compares situation to going to a war-torn country & giving money. Need to deal with the underlying issue, which in that case would be the war. Call our current global financial system: “A system of theft & debt enslavement”.

14. Another interview with Karlan, More Than Good Intentions.

Proven Impact Initiative, Innovations for Poverty Action. Track innovations and assesses their REAL impact on the ground in **quantifiable** terms. Check out the videos to see what kinds of innovations and initiatives really work & see how good ideas can maximise the one-time impact of your donor dollar.

15. Please Stop Donating: Why aid can't solve global poverty by itself,21/01/10

“Donations, if applied to the wrong cause, have the potential to do more harm than good.” Their blog argues that “The solution to global poverty is through a new form of capitalism that includes those at the bottom of the pyramid (BoP) as both consumers and suppliers...Donations have their rightful time and place, but **economic incentives are the primary drivers of progress.**”

Highlight a number of issues with certain SPECIFIC kinds of donations, which fail to take proper account of local market economies. They list: accountability, sub-optimal business ideas and reliance as key concerns. Instead, they advocate the idea of investing capital into a local business, just like any other, and applying some of the same expectations and business rigour that you would expect of any other investment, such as returns, reporting & profits.

They acknowledge certain areas where donations ARE vital, given the realities of market dynamics otherwise. They list: Medical Research & Emergency Relief. He admits, “Granted, I have used a very simplistic example to generalise.”

16. Educating Women – An Efficient Angle to Towards Solving Global Poverty,

www.borgenproject.org 24/01/14.

“To fight poverty, start educating women.” “Longstanding stance that education is the way out of poverty.” “Early childhood education...[has] a crucial role in programming the roots of individuals.”, references www.CARE.org. Lists 10 organisations working in this area, namely:

Borgen Project, Nuru International, Care.org, Kiva.com, UNICEF, UNESCO, Global Fund For Women.

17. World's 100 Richest Could End Poverty 4 Times Over, 20/01/13, www.trueactivist.com

They apparently ‘earned’ \$240bn in 2012. Claim it is enough to end extreme poverty in the world 4 times over, but don't explain how. Attributed to Oxfam [who should really know better, in our opinion]. From Oxfam report: ‘The Cost of Inequality: How Wealth & Income Extremes Hurt Us All’ . [Misunderstanding of market dynamics, as if you gave the poor that money that quickly without increasing productivity, you would just create inflation, which is the effect of too much money chasing too few goods all at once.]

Oxfam's report argues that “Extreme wealth is unethical, economically inefficient, politically corrosive, socially divisive & environmentally destructive”. [However, don't define what constitutes extreme. We have a post related to this, called ‘The Poverty Gap We Will Never Close’]

Their plan of action: 1) Close Tax Havens, generating an additional \$189bn in tax revenues [but no statement of how effective such a move would actually be, nor how those revenues would be SPENT by the countries gathering the anticipated taxes]; 2) Reversing regressive forms of taxation; 3)

Boosting wages proportional to capital returns; 4) Introducing a global minimum corporation tax rate; 5) Increasing investment in free public services.

In China, the top 10% now take home nearly 60% of the income. South Africa listed as “the most unequal country on earth”.

Highlights that “Even politics has become controlled by the super-wealthy”.

18. The Thinker & The Salesman: Bill Gates & Bono On Solving Global Poverty, Forbes India, 30/11/13

Bono: “What was shocking for me as an activist was to learn how important the role of commerce was in ending extreme poverty and the role that entrepreneurial capitalism has played in taking people out of extreme poverty.”

“Right now, capitalism is in the dark. It’s on trial. There’s a sense of ‘us’ and ‘them’, the 99%, the 1%, those who’ve gamed the situation, those who’ve been screwed by the situation. Some of these accusations, of course, are ridiculously far-fetched. But some of them are not.”

19. Solving Poverty In Malaysia, Global Voices, 03/03/14

Saya Anak Bangsa Malaysia, pushing for the passage of a Social Inclusion Act to address the problem of poverty in Malaysia. “Top down prescription is not working...For aid to really work, **one needs to get into the fine-grain pockets of pain and the ignored, because each case is unique.** For one it may be about education, for another about a gambling habit, or a handicap or of self-esteem. It’s not about opening the money tap per se, but about how you distribute these funds.”

20. 8 Ways To Solve Hunger, The Guardian newspaper, 08/06/13

“Millions of people are starving, despite the world producing more than enough to feed everyone. What can we do about it?”

“It is estimated that extensive food trade with Africa will mean that China will have no malnourished people by 2020.” 40% of grain crops are going to feed livestock & fish. Just **2.5%** of the feed given to cattle emerges as calories for our consumption. **UN says that agricultural production will have to rise 60% to feed the extra 2 billion mouths in 2050. Most African farmers are less productive than a US farmer was 100 years ago.**

“There is a consensus between NGOs and governments that training small farmers is the best possible solution to future food security.” This could spark a “green revolution” in Africa, such as the one that transformed South Asia in the 20th century.

Bill Gates: “Eliminating malnutrition is achievable, its within our reach.”

‘Economic growth does not necessarily trickle down to the hungry poor. Child malnutrition has increased in India in the past decade, despite the country’s boom. Strategy chances of success:

1. Prevent Land Grabbing. Chances: 3/10
2. Block the speculators. Chances: 3/10

3. Produce Less Biofuel. Chances: 1/10
4. Stop the Meat Feast. Chances: 0/10
5. Support Small Farmers. Chances: 8/10
6. Target Infant Nutrition. Chances: 9/10
7. Roll-Out Biotech. Chances: 6/10
8. Reduce Poverty. Chances: 2/10

21. **How Africa Can Solve Its Food Crisis By Growing More Crops**, www.theguardian.com, 18/04/13

Poverty Matters Blog. "It is time to place Sustainable Intensification at the heart of African agriculture." Sustainable intensification involves producing more crops, better nutrition and higher rural incomes from the same set of inputs – such as land, water, credit and knowledge – while reducing environmental impacts on a sustained basis.

Sub-Saharan Africa faces specific and complex challenges. The number of hungry people in the continent rose to 239 million last year and **40% of children under five years old are stunted due to malnutrition**. Africa's population is expected to almost double by 2050, bringing it to almost 2 billion people. Based on present trends, the current African food production system would be able to meet only 13% of the continent's needs by 2050.

Despite this urgent need, African crop yields have been largely stagnant over the past 50 years. Less than 4% of farmland in sub-Saharan Africa is irrigated. Almost three-quarters of its soils are degraded (pdf) due to years of planting crops without replacing nutrients; fertiliser use is by far the lowest in the world with most farmers unable to afford it.

Yet the carbon footprint of African smallholder farming is low, and problems of eutrophication and other forms of agricultural pollution are less prevalent than elsewhere. Strategy is NOT meant as a Trojan Horse for large scale industrial agriculture. A report released by the **Montpellier Panel** – international experts in agriculture, sustainable development, trade, policy and development from Africa and Europe – aims to demystify sustainable intensification and show its relevance to addressing food insecurity, malnutrition and poverty.

Sustainable intensification is achievable for African smallholder farmers, and builds on many of their traditional practices. It includes: "micro-dosing" by which smallholder farmers use the cap of a drinks bottle to measure out small amounts of fertilisers, boosting yields significantly while keeping costs down for farmers and reducing the risk of fertiliser runoff into waterways; combining mixed field and tree crops, such as nitrogen-fixing varieties; harvesting and managing scarce water for supplementary irrigation; and promoting regeneration of diverse natural species in common lands.

But sustainable intensification requires more than just inputs and technology – **it demands greater co-operation and organisation in rural areas**. For instance, supporting village "grain banks" run by local farmer associations helps smallholders to **protect their grain**. Farmers deposit grain and the bank keeps it protected against pests and diseases, so that farmers can access it as needed or sell later in the season when prices are typically higher. This type of network is supported by the Kenya Agricultural Commodity Exchange, a private-sector firm that **provides farmers with prices and other market intelligence by SMS text**.

We are calling on governments, in partnership with the private sector and NGOs, to recognise the huge potential for sustainable intensification as a driver of development – in terms of food security, better nutrition and more resilient rural livelihoods.

22. Only Trade Can Solve Global Poverty, Telegraph newspaper. 24/07/07

'Asked by pollsters whether they think "aid is a good thing and should be increased" or "aid is largely wasted and stolen", the largest group of replies were not those who said yes to the first question, nor yes to the second, but those who said **yes to both**'.

Even if the rich countries fulfil their pledges to increase aid, the total amount will still be inadequate to finance all the health, education, nutrition, water and sanitation that people living on the edge of survival need.

Above all, they need economic growth to boost their incomes. And trade is the great dynamo of growth. In our view, Real Trade would require rich countries to do **five things**: open their markets unilaterally to the products of all low-income countries; liberalise the "rules of origin" that result in 40 per cent of imports that should enter Europe tariff-free, paying duties; give incentives to reduce the high tariff barriers between developing countries; abolish export subsidies that damage Third World agriculture; and give more Aid for Trade to help poor countries develop their exports.

Yet **three quarters of the world's poor depend on agriculture** and one of the great successes of aid was the Green Revolution in Asia, which **tripled** output in irrigated farming.

There has been a tendency to sweep the issue of corruption under the carpet for fear it will undermine taxpayers' support for aid. We argue that it must be brought into the daylight, since sunshine is the best disinfectant and transparency is the best way to tackle corruption.

Survey in Honduras followed the money allocated by central government for teachers' salaries through the government system to a sample of schools and counted how many teachers were actually teaching in the classroom. It found that - because of leakages en route, the employment of phantom teachers, and the non-appearance of real teachers who had other jobs - only **20 per cent** of allocated funds ended up paying for teachers in the classroom. However, **once each school was notified of the amount due to it**, pressure from parents ensured that the position improved. A later study showed that 80 per cent of the money now reached the classroom.

Despite the DfID's [the UK Government's Aid & Development Department] declared policy of zero tolerance, it has **not pursued a single case** of governmental corruption of late.

The effectiveness of aid is undermined not just by poor governance within developing countries, but also by poor governance by donors: duplication, unreliability, top-down decision making and **emphasis on aid inputs**.

In 2001, Tanzania had to produce more than **2,400 reports to donors**, and government officials met more than 1,000 donor delegations. In Vietnam, it took donors 18 months and the time of 150 government workers just to buy five vehicles for a forestry programme.

We advocate creating **partnership trusts** in each country to **pool the aid efforts** of as many donors as possible. And we want to see a global donor index measuring each donor's performance to press them to **follow best practice**.

23. **More Than Good Intentions**, review from www.goodread.com

24. **Solving Global Poverty** – 4 likes on Facebook. [Frankly Google, how did THIS get in the list?!]

25. **Innovation In Media Partnerships as Contributor to Solving Global Poverty**,
www.impatientoptimists.org

Link TV's ViewChange.org, launched in 2013 with funding from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. ViewChange is a curated documentary hub that now hosts 450 short- and long-form character-driven documentaries from global development groups and filmmakers from around the world – all of them illustrate progress toward achieving the Millennium Development Goals. Through next-generation semantic web technology, the site pairs documentary videos with user opportunities to take action and stay on top of the latest news about each global development issue.

26. **Solving Global Poverty in Rural China** – from Georgetown University, a publication abstract

27. **Solving the Brewing Questions of Global Poverty**, Catholic Relief Services.

28. **PovertyCure.org, 'from aid to enterprise'**. Various informed articles from contributors on different strategies and tactics to tackle poverty. Some quotes on microfinance for example:

"The highest level of charity is when you can help someone get on their own feet, use their own God-given abilities to provide for their family." Peter Greer

"From my observations the most effective organizations that work to alleviate poverty are those that offer a hand-up more than a hand-out. One of the ways to achieve this which I think has struck with great success in the last sort of ten to twenty years is microfinance..." Calvin Edwards

"The microfinance institutions, they come in to talk not about savings, but to talk about credit. In always talking about credit, the poor can't save ... If you save, you can be empowered. If you don't save, you won't be". Ebow Graham

"The value of micro-finance is not the money. In each survey I've ever done and I've ever seen shows that people enjoy relationships with micro-financing institutions because it links them to a **network of productivity**". Michael Fairbanks.

"Microfinance, it seems to me, is **not good at creating small businesses**...Apart from creating self-employment, I'm not sure microfinance is great at actually creating employment. For that, you need to go one step beyond microfinance, which would be **social venture capital**". Lord Brian Griffiths

"Microfinance by itself does not lift you out of poverty into wealth, but it is a tool that makes it possible for you yourself to do that ... And some people will make use of that tool and... lift themselves up to higher and higher levels of economic activities. Some will stay at a certain level, and some will take the money and have a beer. It's as stark as that. And the big challenge for a microfinance institution...is **the ability to detect** among the thousands and thousands that would gratefully accept a loan, those that will become **productive** with that loan, that can turn that loan into value and better their lives." Damian von Stauffenberg

“You have several obstacles broken down by the microfinance organization ... where there is corruption and sort of essentially a locking out by the elite class of the public class to the systems and the assets that are needed to build a business—private organizations that provide microfinance just practically bypasses the whole system. All of a sudden a person can do that which they were not able to do with the corrupted governmental systems. So one of the geniuses of it, is it bypasses all those systems.” Calvin Edwards

29. www.oecd.org, **The Changing Aid Architecture – Can Global Initiatives Eradicate Poverty?** Lele, Sadik & Simmons.

Recently almost all the major official donors of aid have promised to double their aid levels [?]. And new champions of the global poor, notably Gates, Bono, Buffett, and Clinton, have helped to dramatically raise aid funding from unconventional sources. But what the new resources achieve will depend greatly on how they are channelled. A larger share of official development assistance now goes through partnership based global programs. Recent evaluations of global programs raise doubts about the wisdom of some popular approaches and suggest directions for reform of the aid architecture.

Partnership-based global programs have been proliferating rapidly, fuelled by both old and new sources of money. These programs defy easy generalizations, because they differ widely in goals, size, age, governance structures, and modalities. But **they reflect a broadly shared view that today’s global challenges are too wide ranging and complex for single actors to address alone**, and primarily through traditional country focused assistance programs.

Typically, bilateral and multilateral donors, private foundations, and civil society organizations form partnerships to pursue shared goals, construct new formal or informal organizations, and mobilize resources to supply products or services to achieve the goals. Prominent examples in the health field include the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, TB, and Malaria (popularly referred to as GFATM or the Global Fund).

In agriculture, the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (**CGIAR**) has **member contributions of \$500 million** and research in 100 countries, and was the first global partnership established by donors to scale up the work of the international research centers started by the Rockefeller and the Ford Foundations.

Other reasons for the proliferation of global programs include a growing awareness of “**global public bads**”. Meanwhile, civil society organizations have been pressing aid donors to get third world countries to adhere to standards of labor and environmental management, social protection, and human rights that the first world took a century or more to achieve.

Aid agencies too have actively sought partnerships through which to achieve more comprehensive solutions and to deflect criticism. The World Bank, for example, supports more than 200 global programs and partnerships in ways that range from providing administrative support and secretariat facilities to providing funding out of its income and administrative budget. UN agencies also engage in a large number of partnerships.

30. Ten Solutions To Poverty, Arbitrage Magazine, Prachi Kamble

The causes of poverty are manifold. War, disease, famine and unemployment being the big players. What steps can then be taken towards addressing the massive social issue of global poverty that has afflicted humanity for centuries?

1. Employment generation
2. Drawing on various social institutions to fund poverty fighting programs e.g. charities, research institutions, U.N. , non-profit organizations, universities
3. Transparency in government spending
4. Cancelling impossible to repay world debts
5. Prioritizing programs that target fundamental human rights [Every individual should have access to housing, food, clean water, healthcare and electricity. Technically governments should only move on to other projects after they have made sure that programs that provide these basic amenities to their people are up and running]
6. Taxing the rich more and the poor less
7. Building self-sufficient economies [Creating reduced dependence on oil, external financial aid and imports]
8. Education
9. Involvement of the media
10. Microfinancing

31. Synergos.org

Synergos works with communities, leaders, institutions and partnerships, to generate, test and implement ideas that lead to sustainable and systemic change to overcome poverty.

In working with communities, leaders, institutions and partnerships we do not impose a particular set of fixed ideas about how best to solve problems. Our role is rather to help those we work with to generate, test and implement appropriate ideas that lead to sustainable and systemic change.

32. Ending Extreme Poverty in a Generation, www.globalcitizen.org, Oct 30 2013, Simon Moss of the Global Poverty Project

These 1,300,000,000 individuals live on less than what you can buy in the US for \$1.25 per day. You might think this buys more in a poor country than it does here, **but actually, it's a figure that's been adjusted for purchasing power, which means that anywhere in the world, the \$1.25 a day measure buys little more than enough basic food, clean water and cooking fuel to make two simple meals.**

In the last 30 years, **the proportion of the world's population that live below this line has halved** – from 52% in 1980, to 25% today. That's a decline from **1.9** billion people down to **1.3** billion people.

At the Global Poverty Project we're passionate about communicating these amazing achievements, and highlighting the opportunity we have to bring this number down to zero - within a generation.

The big three issues: To see an end to extreme poverty, there are three big issues that we need to see action on – governance, aid and trade. We know that we have the resources (economic, social, political and environmental) to see an end to extreme poverty. But, right now, the world works in a way that keeps some people poor, which is what we all need to focus on to see an end to extreme poverty.

Improving governance structures can ensure that decision-making works in favour of the world's poorest people. Next, we need to make sure that aid that's given – whether through donations to charities or taxes to government – is spent on programs that really work. Ultimately, extreme poverty ends when local communities can trade their way to a better future.

Ultimately, extreme poverty ends when local communities can trade their way to a better future. The amazing poverty alleviation that we've seen in the past generation has been led by countries who have joined global markets: in China 400 million citizens have been lifted out of poverty since 1980, South Korea has moved from aid recipient to aid donor by building industry and creating world-renowned brands, and **Botswana has grown faster than any other country in Africa by wisely investing proceeds from its diamond mines**. Currently, the potential of trade is limited by the rules which work against poor countries, and will need to be reformed before we will see an end to extreme poverty.

33. **Immigration History Research Centre, on Migrants Solving Poverty**, by Elizabeth Heger Boyle, Associate Professor of Sociology & Law

At that time, it was common for migrants to send money back to family members (these payments are called "**remittances**"). Remittances are still exceedingly common among new migrants today.

The international financial system, including the World Bank, is the source of this new vision of remittances. International investors believe they can harness remittances to provide security for loans to poor countries (World Bank). What seems to get lost in these discussions is that migrants' financial support of their families is **not a new source of income**. The pie can be cut into new shapes and slices, but in the end the size of the pie does not increase.

The New York Times, using Inter-American Development Bank statistics, reported that remittances are the "**largest and most direct poverty reduction program**" in Latin America, greatly exceeding the amount of foreign aid doled out by the United States to countries in that region. Celia Dugger reported in another Times article that remittances were a factor in reducing poverty in Nepal from 42 percent of the population to only (?) 31 percent.

The top five national recipients of remittances in 2004 were India, China, Mexico, France, and the Philippines—not the poorest countries in the world by a long shot. When remittances are measured as a percentage of GDP rather than in raw numbers, more poor countries are among the top recipients (such as Haiti). Nevertheless, the fact remains that most migrants' money goes to the wealthiest countries. The World Bank's own report on remittances to Latin America concludes that remittances are "neither 'manna from heaven' nor a substitute for sound development policies".

Nepal: **Remittances quadrupled from 1996 to 2004, but by the end of that period, 1 out of every 11 adult Nepali men was working abroad**. The outward flow of a country's most talented citizens will hurt that country in the long run. Despite their benefits, however, remittances are not a cure for global poverty. They did not lead to greater economic equality a century ago; they will not do so today.

34. www.unreasonable.is "**How to Solve India's Poverty Crisis: The Economists Have It All Wrong**"

By **Paul Polak**, who the article claims has brought over 22 million farmers out of poverty. No mean feat. **Their estimates are that 2.6 billion live on under \$2 a day.**

Economists have it all wrong. The only effective large-scale answer to extreme poverty is to stimulate rapid scalable growth. Here are three ways to end poverty and limitless opportunities for you to participate.

At one extreme among Indian observers, Nobel Prize winner and Harvard professor Amartya Sen urges greater government investment in programs to aid the poor. At the other, Jagdish Bhagwati, Columbia professor and leading trade economist, insists on the need to fuel the growth of industry and the middle class. From our experience in India, Bangladesh, Nepal, Zimbabwe, and many other countries, **we believe that both are wrong.**

The conventional definition of economic growth - increase in average per capita GDP - is totally irrelevant to people living in extreme poverty. If you're one of 400 million people in India earning \$400 a year or less and the board chairman of Reliance Industries earns \$18 million, the fact that the average per capita income between the two of you is \$9,000,200 will give you scant comfort.

Throughout the poor countries of the Global South, the economic growth reflected in per capita GDP is overwhelmingly commercial, industrial, and urban, with little direct impact on rural areas, where most extremely poor people live. **India has experienced almost eight percent annual GDP growth over the past decade, but according to the World Bank, two-thirds of the population still lives on less than \$2 a day, and there are still 300 million people who go hungry**—despite far-reaching but ineffective government programs to provide schooling, feed children, and directly subsidize some of the poor. We do not see any hope that increased investment either in conventional economic growth or in government assistance programs is likely to do any better.

The only effective large-scale answer to extreme poverty is to stimulate rapid scalable growth centered specifically in the villages where most poor people live, not urban-centered growth that generates only a trivial trickle-down impact. **If you ask poor people why they're poor, as we have, they'll freely tell you they simply don't have enough money.**

We see three effective ways to address the challenge of poverty by:

1. Helping poor people develop income-generating businesses of their own
2. Providing jobs that allow them to increase their incomes through wages or salaries, or
3. Selling them products that enable them to earn or save money

The opportunities are there for all to see:

- At least a billion poor farmers around the world lack access to affordable income-generating tools such as small-plot irrigation, information on how to farm better, and access to markets for the crops they grow.
- At least a billion poor farmers lack access to crop insurance, and even greater numbers have no access to health and accident insurance that could lessen their financial challenges.

TOP 100 GOOGLE ARTICLES ON SOLVING GLOBAL POVERTY: SYSTEM THINKING SYNOPSIS

- Nearly one billion people in the world go hungry on any given night, and an equal number lack access to affordable nutritious foods.
- More than a billion people live in rudimentary shelters, constituting a ready market for \$100 to \$300 houses with market and collateral value that could start them on the road to the middle class
- At least one billion people have neither latrines nor toilets
- More than one billion people have no access to electricity
- One billion or more don't have access to decent, affordable schools
- A minimum of one billion people lack affordable and professional health services.
- At least one billion use cooking and heating methods that make them sick and pollute the air.

We believe that all these areas, and many more, offer huge opportunities to create profitable global companies capable of transforming business as usual and reducing the incidence of extreme poverty in the process.

35. Solving Global Poverty May Start With Ending Gender Inequality, Yash Bhutada, March 2013, on PolicyMic

Women's rights were once again at the forefront of international controversy, as they were recently negotiated at the United Nations' Commission on the Status of Women.

With the 2015 Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) approaching, the world has much to do to "promote gender equality and empower women."

Another MDG aims to eradicate extreme poverty, which is not contentious in terms of the problem itself, **but in the way we approach the disparity**. However, the answer is obvious. The most effective starting point to resolve issues of poverty is mitigating the inequalities that affects over half of the world's population – women. **More importantly, when women are 70% of the people that are impoverished, resolving gender inequality in both a social and economic context becomes a matter of greater exigency when tackling poverty.**

The issue of gender inequality is omnipresent. **According to American Progress, "women own only 1 percent of property, earn 10 percent of all income, and yet they produce half of the world's food." Over two-thirds of the illiterate are women.**

There are 603 million women who live in countries where domestic violence is not even a crime.

When women must subject themselves to poverty in order to avoid the dominating hand of a man, the issue becomes relevant in both solving poverty and dismantling the patriarchy that disengages women.

36. Solving Global Hunger, World Food Program USA, Describes the work of the WFP.

States that 1 in 8 people on the planet go to bed hungry. [Just **under** 1 billion then]

37. Investing in Women – Solving the Poverty Puzzle, Women's Funding Network.

1. The Premise: Women are the missing piece of the poverty puzzle.

When women are afforded the equality of opportunity that is their basic human right, the potential for economic development is striking. The Economist called women “the most powerful engine” of global economic growth, estimating that over the past decade, they have contributed more to such growth than China. At the same time, opening opportunities to women is a proven strategy for tackling poverty’s many manifestations, such as hunger, illiteracy, malnutrition and disease, and maternal and infant death.

2. The Challenge: Women are Missing & Missing Out

For women, poverty means more than having little or no income. It means lacking control over their income, even in the family. It means missing opportunities because they lack power and voice. It means missing out because they are undercounted, undervalued, underserved, and underrepresented

3. The Solution: Investing In Women

Investing in women yields multiple dividends: it helps women claim their rights and realize their potential, while benefiting the economy and society as a whole.

4. Call to Action: Women’s potential must be recognized and realized

Societies where women are more equal stand a greater chance of eliminating poverty

38. **“A Better World Inc – How Companies Profit By Solving Global Problems...Where Governments Cannot”**, review at New Global Citizen, of Alice Korngold’s book

The world faces social, environmental, and economic challenges that are projected to increase exponentially over the coming decades...National governments acting alone lack the authority and resources to provide adequate responses. The international community has too often failed to achieve binding and actionable agreements to deal with these global problems...The NGO sector has made strides in advancing the human condition but lack resources and scalability sufficient to make transformational progress.

In the face of these difficult challenges, some creative responses are emerging from the business sector. Unlike governments, businesses in the twenty-first century cross national borders, spanning oceans and continents.

This book tells the story of a number of global corporations that have aligned their profit-making missions with efforts to build a better world. These companies have come to understand that they can enhance their bottom lines while improving global conditions, often through partnerships with NGOs and governments.

It is in our power to create a better world where all people will have **food, shelter, healthcare, an education, and the opportunity to work** [note the items on this list]. There are two routes that must be pursued concurrently. First, the economies of regions where there has been extreme poverty must be transformed. Second, girls and women, as well as boys and men, must be empowered and provided access to education, healthcare, and the opportunity to earn a living.

39. Harvard Business review, Can Technology End Poverty? Susan Davis, March 2013

The organization I'm part of, BRAC, is known for going to scale with solutions that are often radically low-tech. **We're more likely to scale up birthing kits that cost less than 50 cents apiece than mobile apps that might diagnose disease; more likely to open one-room schools in rented spaces or even boats, where children sit on the floor and learn to think creatively, than insist that every pupil have Internet access.**

But I'm hardly a naysayer when it comes to tech. I agree with Peter Diamandis and Steven Kotler, who write in *'Abundance: The Future is Better Than You Think'* that **higher productivity** associated with the falling cost of technology is leading us to a world of plenty.

To do that, it's vital that **technology be suitable and relevant to the lives of its users**. That's easier said than done in a world where most product innovations are geared toward the rich.

Invest in local innovation. The poor and marginalized may not have been to school, but that doesn't mean they're uneducated. They're often experts at *jugaad*, the Hindi word for **"frugal innovation."** Piecemeal, low-tech solutions often go further — and are more easily scaled-up — than anything dreamed up by R&D-centric outsiders.

Grapple with the human dimensions of the problem. **Understand not just the thrill of empowering people in principle, but the challenges in practice.** To really know what managing a well means for a group of landless villagers, one needs to understand workaday hassles easily overlooked in the excitement of helping people. One must be sensitive to the stress of uncertainty with new innovations, such as replacing cumbersome microfinance passbooks with digital money.

Immerse yourself in the details. If you find yourself frustrated, bored, or driven to distraction by the nitty-gritty (the financial yields of improved rice varieties, say), that's a sign you may be on the right track — and safer from the jester's taunts.

40. The End of Poverty, Soon – New York Times, Opinion Pages, by Jeffrey Sachs, 24/9/13, special adviser to the United Nations Secretary General on the Millennium Development Goals and director of Columbia University's Earth Institute

Appealing for peace **50 years ago, President John F. Kennedy** told the Irish Parliament, **"The problems of the world cannot possibly be solved by skeptics or cynics, whose horizons are limited by the obvious realities. We need men who can dream of things that never were and ask, why not?"**

In April 2013, the Development Committee of the World Bank set the goal of ending extreme poverty by the year 2030. More recently, the United Nations General Assembly working group on global goals concluded that **"eradicating poverty in a generation is an ambitious but feasible goal."**

The global picture will surprise doomsayers. According to the World Bank's scorecard, the proportion of households in developing countries below the extreme-poverty line (now measured as \$1.25 per person per day at international prices) has declined sharply, from 52 percent in 1980, to 43 percent in 1990, 34 percent in 1999, and 21 percent in 2010. Even sub-Saharan Africa, the region with the most recalcitrant poverty, is finally experiencing a notable decline, from 58 percent in 1999 to 49 percent in 2010.

The gains are more marked in health. According to the latest Unicef study [in September 2013], the mortality rate of children under 5 in Africa declined from 177 deaths per 1,000 births in 1990, to 155 per 1,000 births in 2000, to 98 per 1,000 in 2012. This is still too high, but the rate of progress is rapid and accelerating.

Consider two keys to Africa's recent poverty reduction. The first is the introduction of cellphones, which have revolutionized communication and much else in both remote African villages and the streets of Manhattan. Smartphones are poised to transform education, health care, finance and agricultural value chains. **Malaria control, made possible by new technologies**, including long-lasting bed nets, rapid diagnostic tests and a new generation of medicines, has also played a vital role in reducing poverty in Africa.

In both cases, the private sector has been essential, not only in developing breakthrough technologies but also enabling them to spread in a short time. **Hundreds of millions of cellphones and hundreds of millions of bed nets have helped slash rural poverty in the past few years.**

The Global Fund to Fight AIDS, TB and Malaria, an agency backed by international public funds, has financed the mass distribution of the bed nets. **Malaria is down by at least 30 percent as a result.**

Old debates of public versus private are being superseded by new strategies that involve both.

As Kennedy also declared a half-century ago, **"By defining our goal more clearly — by making it seem more manageable and less remote — we can help all people to see it, to draw hope from it, and to move irresistibly toward it."** [And so say all of us!]

41. Poverty Reduction, UNDP (UN Development Programme), web site

Economic growth will not reduce poverty, improve equality and produce jobs **unless it is inclusive**. Inclusive growth is also essential for the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). The globalization process, when properly managed, becomes an important ingredient for inclusive growth. In this context, UNDP works to make real improvements in people's lives, opening up their choices and opportunities.

UNDP promotes inclusive and sustainable human development and works to reduce poverty in all its dimensions. [UNDP Recognition of poverty as multi-dimensional]

Globally, the number of extreme poor has dropped by 650 million in the last three decades, a level of progress humankind had never seen. But still there are **more than a billion people living in extreme poverty**. As a trusted **multilateral** partner serving 177 developing countries and territories around the world, UNDP is **uniquely positioned** to help advocate for change, connect countries to the knowledge and resources they need, and **coordinate the efforts** of the UN at the country level. UNDP invests nearly US\$1 billion every year in fighting poverty and advancing progress towards the MDGs

Poverty is a multifaceted reality. It is not simply a lack of adequate income; it is a cruel mix of human deprivation in knowledge, health, dignity and rights, obstacles to participation and lack of voice. Therefore, comprehensive transformational change is needed to address the root causes of poverty. UNDP's work on poverty reduction focuses on such change through public policy

interventions that help to modify the social, cultural and economic conditions that created poverty in the first place. When men and women have equal opportunities and freedoms, economic growth accelerates and poverty declines more rapidly. UNDP thus works with developing countries to integrate the standards and principles of human rights such as non-discrimination, participation and accountability in design and implementation of development policies and programmes.

42. **PSDtuts** – solving poverty button design contest, 2008

43. Ideas Matter: Can technology Solve Poverty, The ICT4D Jester

On December 2, 2010, there was a panel discussion titled “Can Technology Solve Global Poverty?” in Cambridge, MA, hosted jointly by the Boston Review and the MIT Political Science Department.

Article goes on to summarise the positions of the key panellists:

- Toyama: Technology magnifies human and institutional intent and capacity. In international development, technology is rarely a solution by itself.

- Negroponte: Laptops transforms education for children. Anyone who can't see this needs a therapist!

- Glennerster: Look for whatever solutions work in international development, technology, or otherwise. Then do randomised control trials (RCTs) of them to verify effectiveness.

- Gómez-Márquez: We need to design technologies and systems so that they will work in a hostile environment.

44. Jennifer Buffett: Women & Girls Key to Solving Global Poverty, short video

Jennifer Buffett is a member of the ICRW Leadership Council, a team of high-profile visionaries helping to advance ICRW's mission to empower women, achieve gender equality and fight poverty in the developing world.

45. Creative Approaches to Solve the Poverty Crisis, the JustGiveBlog

Lists activities of 3 non-profits in this area. However, tone is somewhat in contrast to other more upbeat assessments about progress against poverty.

According to World Bank, 1.4 billion people [?]- or 20 percent of the world's population – live in extreme poverty, earning less than \$1.25 a day. And unfortunately, **it's getting worse**. Seven out of 10 people in the world live in countries where **economic inequality** has increased in the last 30 years. The question of how we solve this problem has become a source of debate, but one thing is clear: **what we're doing isn't working**.

The most recent thinking is that we can't solve the poverty crisis by simply throwing more money at the poor. Instead:

1. We need to consider social services a necessary safety net to keep the bottom from falling out.
 2. We need to empower the poor to improve their own lives, so they can work to get themselves out of poverty. A one-size-fits-all solution will not work—we need to help people as individuals.
-

[Economic inequality is not an ideal measure. If a country adds 100 billionaires, that will increase inequality, but might not implicitly make things worse. Income inequality is a crude KPI measure across populations.]

46. From Poverty to Power - International Guidelines to problem Solving, Oxfamblogs December 2013

[Re-posts a set of national stereotypes. Meant to be light-hearted. No insight intended, or achieved.]

47. CSRWire, Innovative Business Solutions to Global Health & Poverty

Reviews new Book, "*Pharmacy on a Bicycle: Innovative Solutions for Global Health and Poverty*", By Eric G. Bing and Marc J. Epstein

Book demonstrates how, even in the most of dire circumstances, entrepreneurs can develop cost-effective, sustainable, innovative solutions that have the potential for replication and scale. Not only are the examples inspiring and instructive, but the IMPACTS framework (Bing and Epstein's framework) has applications that extend well beyond global health.

Millions of people are dying from diseases that we can easily and inexpensively prevent, diagnose, and treat. Why? Because even though we know exactly what people need, we just can't get it to them. They are dying not because we can't solve a medical problem but because we can't solve a business logistics problem. Pharmacy on a Bicycle introduces a unique model for better global health. It saves more lives while saving money by using innovation, entrepreneurship and building on existing infrastructures.

The authors provide over 100 examples from organizations that are already using innovative business solutions to deliver and scale health care to the poor in more than 35 countries throughout Africa, Asia, and Latin America. Some of these best practices include:

- Improving access to health services in rural communities by using an army of micro-entrepreneurial health workers based in and trusted by these communities. The health workers make a small profit to support their families while providing needed health products and services
 - Dramatically lowering costs of complex procedures, including open heart surgery and cataract surgery, by using factory-like processes to increase efficiency
 - Increasing the use of simple, yet life-saving solutions, such as insecticide treated bed nets, by making them culturally appropriate and acceptable
 - Improving the quality of health services through the use of simple checklists to ensure consistency and completion of all tasks.
-

48. Solving Global Issues: GIN Quito 2013, 22/10/13

20 Global Issues, 20 Years to solve them. 3 teams from Franklin Delano Roosevelt High School went to present their solutions on different global issues.

GIN is a conference, held twice a year in different international schools in South America. It focuses on having student-led solutions and inspiring other students to implement those solutions at their own schools.

49. Ending Extreme Poverty, USAid,

“The United States will join with our allies to eradicate such extreme poverty in the next two decades **by connecting more people to the global economy**; by empowering women; by giving our young and brightest minds new opportunities to serve, and helping communities to feed, and power, and educate themselves; by saving the world’s children from preventable deaths; and by realizing the promise of an AIDS-free generation, which is within our reach.” – President Obama, 2013 State of the Union address. [Didn’t mention these aims are not accompanied by much of GDP, in the case of the USA. Nowhere near its own 0.7% of GDP commitment to achieve MDGs. Perhaps only one tenth of that committed figure]

For the first time in history, we have the tools, technologies, and approaches to end extreme poverty and its most devastating corollaries - including widespread hunger and preventable child death -- within two decades. But if we're going to tackle this great challenge, we must take stock of what we know, assess what we don't know, and work together to apply new approaches to help us eradicate extreme poverty. By bolstering inclusive growth and coalescing in partnership around this goal, the end of extreme poverty is within our reach.

Hunger hurts everyone. It cannot be ignored, especially for the 870 million people who go to bed hungry each night around the world. Hunger devastates opportunities for good health, growth, and prosperity. But hunger is not hopeless: It is solvable.

While the past decades have brought remarkable gains which have saved millions of lives, almost 19,000 children under 5 years of age still die every day from largely preventable causes. **A child dying anywhere is heartbreaking, 6.9 million children dying a year from preventable causes is unacceptable.**

[Goes on to list what activities it is involved in & supporting – again, no mention of low % of GDP]

50. Ten Reasons Why Microcredit Will Never Solve World Poverty, Microfranchises.org web site,

Microcredit is an essential part of the struggle to rid poverty from the globe. Microcredit [is] one of the only ways that low income individuals can receive loans to grow their businesses. Like education, Microcredit is a necessary tool but is inadequate to solve poverty.

[In] Bolivia Microcredit has reached market saturation. Bolivia continues to be one of the poorest countries in South and Central America with only marginal growth in per-capita GDP.

The following are 10 reasons why Microcredit has been unable to and will never solve world poverty:

1. Only a small percentage of humans have the personality characteristics to be successful entrepreneurs. Most people are better suited to waged employment.
2. Not all natural entrepreneurs are willing to risk a business loan.

3. Not all natural entrepreneurs can competently manage money.
4. Most Microcredit-enabled businesses are so small they have no employees beyond the owner-operator, and little prospect for growth.
5. Most Microcredit-enabled businesses have little market differentiation, resulting in marginal competitive advantage. Copycat enterprises abound.
6. Many Microcredit clients are playing zero sum games. If A's sales increase, B's sales decline. This is particularly true in the informal retail sector.
7. Microcredit focuses almost exclusively on women, while in most cultures men tend to create larger enterprises with higher growth potential.
8. Many older children of Microcredit-enabled mothers languish in idleness. They have been to school and have high expectations, but no formal job prospects.
9. In saturated Microcredit markets, many borrowers get caught in debt traps, taking out loans from micro lender 1 to pay off micro lender
10. Most Microcredit-enabled enterprises provide subsistence, but little or no profit. Wealth accumulation requires profit.

Is Microcredit vital? Yes. It is the first rung on the development ladder. Poverty alleviation across a community or nation, though, requires the second, third and fourth rungs on the ladder. [Contends that Micro-franchising helps provide those rungs]

51. **Only Businesses Can Solve Poverty, Mal Warwick**, author of 'The Business Solution to Poverty', at businessfightspoverty.org ,

There's nothing mysterious here. Poor people tell us they're poor because they don't have enough money—and who knows more about making money than businesspeople?

Capital, Jobs, Scale: Private business possesses three overarching and undeniable advantages in addressing the challenge of poverty:

- Profitable businesses attract substantial capital.
- Successful businesses hire lots of people.
- Successful businesses are capable of reaching scale

Seventy trillion dollars. That's \$70,000,000,000,000. This number is the estimated world gross domestic product (GDP) for 2012—clearly a very large number by anyone's standards. And the World Bank's estimate for 2013 is \$75 trillion at this writing. Most of the economic activity represented by those numbers takes place in the Global North – about \$41 trillion, in fact, or nearly two-thirds of the 2012 total, as compared with the \$12 trillion generated by the emerging economies of the South. And every year, according to the Financial Times, approximately \$1 trillion more is invested in emerging economies.

Poor people themselves almost always put first priority on making more money, because cash is **fungible**: it can be used to feed hungry members of the family, to invest in planting a more lucrative crop, to educate children, to gain access to legitimate health care, to replace a leaky thatched roof with corrugated tin—or to meet any other pressing need.

And, in the absence of a **working social safety net**, increased cash comes only from wages or salaries, or greater agricultural productivity enabled by technology, as well as money saved by access to better sanitation and health care. [Note reference to working social safety net for poverty]

Ending rural poverty is never a simple or easy thing to do, and not every poor family can attain the middle class in today's harsh reality. Subsistence farming is the rule; joblessness is rife. **More to the point, factors such as loss of hope, caste or class barriers, alcoholism, drug addiction, adherence to self-defeating religious beliefs, the subjugation of women, the lasting effects of childhood malnutrition and severe physical or mental limitations – not to mention usurious moneylenders and landlords or corrupt and oppressive governments – may make it all but impossible for a family to thrive in any one of the developing countries in particular.** [Reference to our 'poverty headwinds']

52. Academics Stand Against Poverty (ASAP),

Organisation “aimed at building an **inclusive academic consensus** on the post-MDG framework”. [Article is so information-rich that we have included much of it in this excerpt]

Interview with **Thomas Pogge**, the Director of the Global Justice Program and Leitner Professor of Philosophy and International Affairs at **Yale University**.

How would you characterize the process that was used for the formulation, adoption, and implementation of the MDGs? How inclusive was it? What were the main strengths and weaknesses in that process?

“We don't know very much about the process that led to the adoption of the MDGs. As you know, the predecessor version was formulated in the Millennium Declaration, and that was passed by to the UN General Assembly. This was proposed, and it was adopted by the General Assembly in the year 2000. But what then happened, what led to Article 19 of the Millennium Declaration to the MDGs is a process that is wholly unknown. The goals were substantially changed and, in particular, diluted in that process.”

What were the benefits brought about by the MDG framework?

I think that relative to having no such framework at all, there were some benefits, and one benefit in particular was to focus world attention on the urgency of overcoming poverty. The modern poverty problem is different from the past where essentially much of the poverty of humanity was unavoidable. Since, maybe, the middle of the twentieth century, we have had the means available to overcome poverty for most of the human beings in the world. And that obviously is a very important, morally speaking, very important, urgent problem. If this poverty is avoidable, it must be avoided. And so the MDGs have the advantage of focusing humanity on this very urgent moral goal.

Were there ways in which the MDGs were detrimental to poverty alleviation?

I don't think they were detrimental relative to having nothing at all. But I do think that the MDGs were much inferior to what else could have been put in their place...in particular in two respects. First I think the MDGs were not nearly ambitious enough, in that they set very low goals, [in particular], the halving of the proportion of poor people in the world over a period of twenty-five years. Given that the population in developing countries increases by somewhere around forty-six percent over that period, if you get poverty down to seventy-three percent of what it was in that same period, you have already halved the proportion. And so a twenty-seven percent reduction in the number of extremely poor people over twenty-five years is really ridiculously under-ambitious, given how rich in resources the world now is.

The second very big problem is that the goals were just put out there without the slightest hint as to who bears what responsibility towards achieving these goals. And so, of course, everybody was very happy to celebrate the goals...And nobody felt...called upon to do anything in particular to achieve the goals.

How would you assess the degree to which the MDGs have been achieved?

Well, on their own terms. The MDGs come with a very elaborate system of measurement. In the case of MDG 1...the halving of poverty, there is a big methodology that the World Bank has developed for measuring or counting the number of extremely poor people. If you take that methodology for granted—and think it's a good methodology for tracking the evolution of poverty – then you have to say that the world has been reasonably successful in achieving MDG 1.

Should the MDG successors be an extension of the current goals, an expansion/revision of the current goals, or something different altogether?

Well, it has to be something different altogether, I would say. The crucial thing here is that what we need here is not a statement of goals alone. What we need is a statement of responsibilities. So the goals have to be attached to agents. Unattached goals are no one's goals in particular, and there is just no reason to believe that these goals will be achieved. The goals should be more ambitious and they should be tied to particular agents.

So for example: we need something like statements about how much aid should be given by various countries. We should have statements about how that aid should be spent—what should be prioritized. Again, example: we have about \$120 billion in development aid today each year. But of that \$120 billion, only about \$15 billion goes for basic social services. Further, I think, and that's maybe the most important point: we have to stop thinking about the poverty reduction project as being promoted by development aid only. Development aid is a very small niche in the international institutional architecture, and what happens there cannot possibly make up for the enormous headwind that is generated by the rest of the institutional order against the poor.

What are the most important areas concerning global poverty and its alleviation that you think there is a broad consensus among informed people?

I think one very important area that we have a great deal of consensus is global health. So, the last 10, 15 years we have seen a tremendous upswing in concern for global health and also a corresponding upswing in the willingness to promote real resources to that.

Academics have played some role here, in particular by pointing out how incredibly important early childhood health is for brain development, for physical development, and therefore indirectly for poverty alleviation because people who do not have a fully developed brain, a fully developed body will be less able to fend for themselves in future years.

From informed disagreement to uninformed disagreement, what are some of the false or only partially true ideas concerning global poverty and it's alleviation that are widely used in public and political debate to justify less than should be done to alleviate global poverty.

Well, here I would like to mention first and foremost, the idea that poverty alleviation is highly correlated with overpopulation.

Really dramatic poverty eradication has led to a really dramatic drop in fertility rates because across the board, across cultures and so on. We are now at the point where 100 countries in the world fertility rates are below 2 already [which is reproduction level], and so in those countries population growth may not have peaked but certainly, the peak is in sight and there will soon be population drops.

So the best thing that we can do to deter overpopulation is to fight poverty aggressively and get it down and that would lead to an early levelling down of the population to around 9 billion or so by 2050 rather than a much later levelling off of the human population in the range of 14-16 billion near 2100 or even later. So I think a great deal is at stake in the overpopulation dimension by making an early and aggressive effort in poverty reduction.

Are there any features of the international institutional economic or political order that contribute to the persistence or perpetuation of global poverty and if so what are they?

Well there are tons and tons of such features. I think that the order is essentially designed with tender loving care, for a very small elite that is able to influence decision making about the features of this order. It's an unintended but nevertheless foreseeable effect of all this tender loving care that the poor people get a short [shriff], that their interest is disregarded.

[Gives examples] Similarly, with seeds, we have wonderful seeds, much more high yield, much less need to have pesticides and so on. But, we don't make full use of these wonderful seeds because they are protected by intellectual property rights and many farmers in the poor countries aren't able to afford protecting these crops.

Other very detrimental rules are the rules in the WTO that allow rich countries to grandfather in various protectionist measures: quotas, export credits, subsidies and so on. Which make it difficult or impossible for poor countries to export into world markets because in real world markets, they have to compete with these heavily subsidized products in agriculture and textiles from the developed world.

So taking into account these difficulties of political feasibility, which of these changes would you think would be the most realistic and effective objects for advocacy?

Well, I've obviously thrown my eggs into the basket of the Health Impact Fund, I think the health Impact Fund is a very good reform project, a realistic reform project largely because it takes

advantage of the fact that the current way of incentivizing pharmaceutical innovation is not only deeply immoral but also deeply irrational.

Moving away from international institutional factors, what other impediments to global poverty eradication would you say are extremely serious?

Well, if we move away from multi-national institutions the only other factors to mention obviously are local factors, and obviously perhaps factors that are part of the mind-set of people.

And, there's never been anything like the avoidable poverty on the scale that we find today.

The incredibly deep corruption in some countries, India for example where it is quite nice to see how many rights poor people have on paper and absolutely disheartening to see how difficult it is for poor people actually to get the objects of their rights...and that system is so likely to be taken for granted and that nobody even raises a big fuss about it anymore.

Taking into account political and economic feasibility constraints, what are the top three policies you would like to see implemented towards eradicating the end of global poverty?

Well, again I would like to mention the Health Impact Fund, I think the Health Impact Fund would be a very crucial reform that would open up further reform opportunities...It is of such a symbolic importance that it might actually change the course of human history. So, I would put that at the top of my list. I think that the second thing that for and concentrate are the political reform energies on probably has to do with the illicit financial flows, which try to shut down the opportunities for corruption of many types: tax evasion, and bribery, and so on that are now heavily operated by share corporations, banks that are helping clients avoid taxes in other countries and so on and so forth. A third thing that is gathering momentum and one could talk about in this context, is the establishment of a kind of an international revenue raising instrument.

53. Solving Poverty s Rocket Science, Christianity Today. 08/07/13, R. Stearns, President of World Vision

Christians are among America's most compassionate people. **But we can do a better job responding to the complexity of poverty.**

Most of us at one time or another have thrown a dollar bill into the cup of a homeless man standing on a street corner. We do it because we want to help even though we know that our dollar won't really solve a problem that has much deeper causes. He'll be on the street again tomorrow because we've just treated a symptom of his condition without really addressing the cause.

We are right to help, but we also need to help in the right way. In the complex system of poverty, well-meaning efforts can have unforeseen and unintended consequences in another area.

It takes wisdom and experience to recognize the difference between the symptoms of poverty and its causes. We have been called to preach the good news to the poor, to feed the hungry, bring water to the thirsty, care for the sick, and stand up against injustice. We have been sent to care for the widow, the orphan, the alien, and the stranger. This is the work of the Great Commandment and the Great Commission.

Let me propose four principles that can help guide us toward a new approach to the puzzle of poverty:

1. **Poverty goes beyond material things.** We have to get beyond the notion that providing 'stuff' to poor communities will lift them out of poverty. No amount of material assistance will transform a community that struggles with gender inequality, domestic abuse, alcoholism, inadequate education, tribal tensions, and other cultural issues.
2. **Sustainable solutions require community ownership.** This is about their community and their children's future. We can advise, encourage, help, and provide some expertise they may lack, but the community should lead and direct its own change. We simply help make it possible. When a community takes pride and ownership of its accomplishments, the solutions are more likely to be sustainable and we can work ourselves out of a job.
3. **We may need to bring in the experts.** For big and complex projects, we hire professionals. (Interested churches can start with these two umbrella groups: InterAction is a respected secular alliance of international NGOs, with many Christian members. The Accord Network brings together Christian organizations working internationally.)
4. **Change doesn't happen overnight.** Many poor communities have been poor for decades—even centuries. They won't transform in two or three years. World Vision invests between 10 and sometimes 20 years in the communities in which we work, but the changes we see are often remarkable.

54. Marxsite.com, "Bill Gates' Plan to Solve World Poverty", 2008.

Marxist viewpoint blog considering Bill Gates' plans.

One advantage of having untold billions in your bank accounts is that the people around you don't tend to tell you you're talking rubbish; in fact they tend to be very nice to you and take everything you say very seriously. And so it is with Bill Gates' new plan to generate 'creative capitalism' that he thinks will make major strides towards solving world poverty.

So how does 'creative capitalism' work? **How can it bring billions out of poverty in a way that old-fashioned normal capitalism was incapable of?** The chain of logic in his plan is precise. It goes like this (all quotes from the article linked above):

1. "Capitalism has improved the lives of billions of people"
2. However "it has left out billions more.
3. "Governments and non-profit groups have an irreplaceable role in helping them, but it will take too long if they try to do it alone. It is mainly corporations that have the skills to make technological innovations work for the poor. To make the most of those skills we need a more creative capitalism: an attempt to stretch the reach of market forces so that more companies benefit from doing work that makes people better off. We need new ways to bring people into the system – capitalism – that has done so much good in the world."
4. The situation is really bad and it's not getting better fast enough.
5. However things will chug along much faster in the poverty reduction stakes if government and NGO efforts are aided by the more intensive involvement of corporations in selling to the poor.

Because “improvements will happen faster and last longer if we channel market forces, including innovation that’s tailored to meet the needs of the poorest, to complement what governments and non-profits do...Naturally if companies are going to be involved they need some kind of return. This is the heart of creative capitalism”. Vodafone thought they would only get 400,000 customers in Kenya, now they have 10 million. Why? Innovative pricing – they charge by the second not by the minute.

6. This is a win-win situation with corporations making significant profits out of helping the poorest and the poor having their lives improved significantly, but this will take innovative products and thinking ‘outside the box’. But this is only part of the creative capitalism matrix. The other one is devising ways to make ethical and charitable actions by corporations profitable.

7. In fact creative capitalism is already underway, with some companies doing some of the things that Gates suggests. **“As I see it, there are two great forces of human nature: self-interest and caring for others. Capitalism harnesses self-interest in a helpful and sustainable way but only for those who can pay. Government aid and philanthropy channel our caring for those who can’t pay.”**

Generally we can say world poverty has three main causes. The first is that neoliberal capitalism has created a world cheap labour economy. That’s why for example the Chinese economic miracle may be able to create an aspiring consumerist middle class of 100 million, but why many more hundreds of millions are stuck in ultra-low paid jobs or are itinerant labourers treated like serfs. The one is the condition of the other. The market, not least the market for computers and hi-tech goods, relies for its fat profits on precisely these low paid workers, in China, in India, in South East Asia and in the maquiladora assembly plants along the Mexican border with the United States – and in many other places. ‘Creative capitalism’ won’t do a blind thing about this world cheap labour economy.

Second world poverty is caused and sustained by the debt and loans trap into which the corrupt local capitalist classes have dragged their economies, in alliance with the World Banks and the IMF mentioned above.

The third main cause of world poverty is the simple exclusion by international [community] of parts of the world, mainly in Africa, that are regarded as useless and basket cases, in which let it be said that ‘uneconomic’ people are regularly closed down by famine and disease. ‘Creative capitalism’ is of course incapable of dealing with, or even recognising, these structural factors that create rich and poor countries.

The billions of the poor and the oppressed need something more practical than creative capitalism to change the structures of their exploitation. Like overthrowing the social relations of capitalist oppression at a local, national and international level. **[Thus speaketh the Marxist!]**

55. Solving the Food Crisis, OECD

Eliminating hunger and malnutrition, and achieving wider global food security are among the most intractable problems humanity faces.

Though the proportion of undernourished people in the world has fallen, the pace of reduction has slowed and the absolute numbers remain stubbornly high. And a number of countries—mostly in Africa and South Asia—have seen no improvement at all.

Higher food prices have not helped, but price levels are not the fundamental problem. High prices impose undeniable hardship on the poorest consumers, including many subsistence farmers whose production is insufficient to meet their consumption needs. **Yet the persistence of global hunger—the chief manifestation of food insecurity—is a chronic problem that predates the current period of higher food prices.** Indeed, **there were as many hungry people in the world in the early 2000s, when international food prices were at an all-time low**, as there are today. Similarly, high food prices have made little difference to the overall downward trend in the proportion of undernourished people.

The fundamental problem remains poverty and inadequate incomes. Even in this period of tighter world food markets, there is enough food available. Many people are just too poor to afford it. Broad-based income growth is essential to reduce global hunger in a sustainable way.

Agricultural development has a key role to play in generating the incomes needed to ensure food security. Between a half and two-thirds of the world's poor live in rural areas, where agriculture is the dominant sector. Most of the farming is done by smallholders.

...the majority of future generations will have better opportunities outside agriculture than within it.

The OECD-FAO Agricultural Outlook 2012-2021 suggests that structurally higher food prices are here for the coming decade.

World population is expected to exceed **9 billion** by 2050. Looking ahead, the areas of the world with sustainable productive potential are not the same as the areas experiencing rapid population growth. OECD countries can avoid policies that contribute artificially to higher world food prices, **most notably mandates for biofuel production.**

While WTO members may have come close to a new agreement on agriculture, conclusion of the Doha Round of trade negotiations remains elusive.

56. Jaraparilla.com Blog, Solving Global Warming & Poverty Simultaneously, 11/11/2010

Via 'global emissions entitlement'.

The seeming intractability of these problems promotes an attitude of despair and defeatism. In reality, however, the world has the resources to address global poverty and climate change. The impact on living standards in wealthy countries would be barely perceptible.

The only sustainable solution to climate change is a “converge and contract” model in which all countries converge to a common target in terms of emissions per person. Those wishing to maintain higher emissions would need to buy permits from holders in countries willing to reduce emissions below the entitlement. [Very specific view of a very specific solution]

To put it another way, if everyone on the planet had an equal claim on rights to carbon emissions, would the value of those claims be enough to lift poor people out of poverty?

Estimates based on a target CO₂ concentration of 450 ppm suggest that emissions per person need to be reduced to somewhere between 1.5 and 2.5 tonnes per person. Such a reduction would probably require a carbon price of the order of \$US200/tonne of CO₂. This would, for example, raise

the price of coal-fired electricity by about 20c/kWh (making it uneconomic in competition with gas or wind) and raise the cost of petrol by about 50c/litre.

With an entitlement of two tonnes per person per year, and a price of \$US200/tonne, a person with no net emissions would attract an entitlement worth \$400 per year, or \$1.10 per day, which is just below the World Bank's extreme poverty line of \$1.25 per day.

The cost to purchasers of emissions in middle-income and rich countries would be about \$600 billion a year, or 1% of global income.

The ultimate goal ought to be one in which, everyone, **no matter where they happen to be born**, has access to the basic requirements for a decent life. That doesn't entail a world government...but it does entail a break with ideas based on nation-states as the ultimate focus of sovereignty.

57. A Practical Solution to World Hunger, Food For Life Global,

World's largest pure food relief, up to 3m meals daily. **Hunger and malnutrition are in fact the number one risk to the health worldwide — greater than AIDS, malaria and tuberculosis combined.**

As well as the obvious sort of hunger resulting from an empty stomach, there is also **the hidden hunger of micronutrient deficiencies** which make people susceptible to infectious diseases, impair physical and mental development, reduce their labour productivity and increase the risk of premature death.

Never before in human history has such a large percentage of our species—nearly 20 percent—been malnourished. Each year, between 40 million and 60 million people around the world die from hunger and related diseases.

Sadly, the toll is heaviest on the world's children. Malnutrition contributes to more than half of the nearly 12 million deaths of children under five in developing countries each year, and malnourished children who survive often lose precious mental capacity.

The right to proper nutrition is most emphatically proclaimed in the UN's 1989 Convention on the Rights of the Child. Under the Convention, virtually every government in the world recognizes the right of all children to the highest attainable standard of health, specifically including the right to good nutrition.

Of all the agricultural land in the U.S., nearly 80 percent is used in some way to raise animals.

Food for Life's mission is to bring about peaceful and prosperity through the liberal distribution of pure **plant-based food** prepared with loving intention.

58. Freakonomics.com, Fighting Poverty With Actual Evidence, 27 Nov 2013.

I would always say we can't do **evidence-based policy without evidence**. And that became one of our mantras. It seems obvious.

As Karlan sees it, the first step in improving how those programs are designed is to **gather evidence as to what works and what doesn't**.

I think the second mantra that you use for the Nudge Unit is really applicable here. So you use the mantra "make it easy." And you mean this in the context usually of how we make it easy for people to do things. The same exact principle applies to scale up. How do we make it easy for government to make the right choices? How do we make it easy for N.G.O.s to choose the right thing? And this has implications on two levels. One is that it has the immediate implication for the type of evidence that we collect. [Consistent with simplicity of the 7 Layer Poverty Model]

59. Aljazeera.com reports on Oxfam's claim that the world's 100 richest could solve poverty 4 times over

US\$240 billion in 2012. Quoted from Oxfam.

We focus on poverty, we work with the poorest people around the world. You don't normally hear us talking about wealth. But it's gotten so out of control between rich and poor that one of the obstacles to solving extreme poverty is now extreme wealth," Ben Phillips, a campaign director at Oxfam, told Al Jazeera.

"We can no longer pretend that the creation of wealth for a few will inevitably benefit the many – too often the reverse is true," said Jeremy Hobbs, an executive director at Oxfam

In a statement, Oxfam warned that "extreme wealth and income is not only unethical it is also economically inefficient, politically corrosive, socially divisive and environmentally destructive."

60. Hyperakt.com, reviews the Acumen 10 year report & reproduces it in full, it did their web site for it

61. Probono Australia, reviews the 10 year report from Acumen

62. Stanford Social Innovation Review, reviews More Than Good Intentions & use of RCT's – randomized control trials. These test the changes in peoples' lives as a consequence of the program, vs the changes without it.

63. RT.com reviews Oxfam's claims about world's 100 richest being able to solve poverty 4 times over

64. Mashable.com, How Technological Justice Can Fight Global Poverty

Simon Trace is the CEO of the international development charity Practical Action, which works to help poor people in the developing world use technology to transform their lives.

Human development has gone hand-in-hand with technical change. Technology (defined for these purposes as both knowledge and tools) enables people to achieve well-being with less effort and drudgery, or at lower cost and with fewer resources.

Try to replay the first two hours of your day after getting out of bed on a cold, dark winter's morning in your mind. Then repeat the exercise imagining how you would have fared if you did not have an electricity or gas supply to your house, your neighborhood or your place of work. That's how a third of humanity lives. One hundred and thirty-two years after Edison introduced the first commercially viable incandescent light bulb, 1.3 billion people are still living in darkness, with no access to electricity, and 2.7 billion still cook over open fires. Clearly we have a problem ensuring well-established technologies are made available to all who need them.

Here's another couple of statistics. A 2008 Global Health Forum report estimates that only about 5% of the world's resources for health research are applied to the health problems of low and middle income countries, where 93% of the world's preventable deaths occur.

65. Yahoo Answers, What Can We Do To Make Poverty History?

It is hard to make a living, provide for your family, or start a new business when you spend your time and energy looking for safe drinking water or your next meal. We in the West take for granted our infrastructure that allows us to focus more of our energy on work and our ability to get ahead, provide for our families, etc. How much time did you spend today looking for water or standing in line for water or food?

My answer is that the next step must be to establish a framework for **what basic infrastructure must be present in each community (ie: access to food, water, health facilities, transportation, roads, education, daycare)** to allow the people in those communities to work effectively and productively. [Note the slightly different basics list]

Working from the ground up I would suggest that the ONE campaign expand to coordinate the partnering of a sponsoring community/city/town with a similar sized one in Africa. [Fostering of empathy at the community level, sharing the load, like our own "helping a billion people help a billion people"]

66. UN Documents: Gathering a Body of Global Agreements, [really good, copy whole?]

From A/42/427. Our Common Future: Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development

The Earth is one but the world is not. We all depend on one biosphere for sustaining our lives. Yet each community, each country, strives for survival and prosperity with little regard for its impact on others. Some consume the Earth's resources at a rate that would leave little for future generations. Others, many more in number, consume far too little and live with the prospect of hunger, squalor, disease, and early death.

67. Sustainable.org, Food Security & Food Access

Although there are several different working definitions of food security...the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) of the United Nations currently uses the following description: "Food security exists when all people, at all times, have physical, social and economic access to sufficient, safe and nutritious food which meets their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life." [Note based on impact on 3 factors of Life, Health & Wellbeing, same as used in Humanitarian Basics distinctions between severity for relative measurement]

The US Department of Agriculture's definition of food security is, "access by all people at all times to enough food for an active, healthy life." [Note: Access & Availability dimensions recognised]

The opposite of food security - food insecurity - is defined by the USDA as, "a household-level economic and social condition of limited or uncertain access to adequate food."

Food insecurity is **part of a continuum** that includes hunger (food deprivation), malnutrition (deficiencies, imbalances, or excesses of nutrients), and famine. Long-term lack of food security eventually becomes hunger, defined by the USDA as “an individual-level physiological condition that may result from food insecurity.” On a population level, extreme lack of food security becomes famine. **The United Nations rarely declares famine status**, even in cases of long-term food insecurity, since its **definition of famine** is quite specific – famine is declared only when **“at least 20 percent of households in an area face extreme food shortages with a limited ability to cope; acute malnutrition rates exceed 30 percent; and the death rate exceeds two persons per day per 10,000 persons.”**

68. Humansphere.org, Geek Heretic Explains Why technology can't solve the poverty problem

K Toyama was dispatched by Bill Gates to find technological solutions to poverty and inequity. After giving it his best, Toyama decided technology, though useful, cannot fix poverty.

Podcast.

69. SolvePoverty.com, clicking to give.

Your clicks help fund sustainable ventures in Asia. 3.7 million clicks so far [just another 300k before the funds are released by their sponsors, apparently [we're a bit mystified about this]

70. The Japan Times, Opinion piece: Altruistic Cooperation Key To Solving Global Issues,
07/01/2014 by Matthieu Ricard, a French Buddhist monk who holds a doctorate in molecular genetics

“Cooperation,” the Harvard University biologist Martin Nowak has written, is “the architect of creativity throughout evolution, from cells to multicellular creatures to anthills to villages to cities.”

As mankind now tries to solve new, global challenges, **we must also find new ways to cooperate. The basis for this cooperation must be altruism.**

Humanity faces three monumental challenges: ensuring everyone decent living conditions, improving life satisfaction and protecting our planet.

We worry about the state of the economy from year to year; but we consider our happiness over the course of a lifetime, while our concern for the environment will mainly benefit future generations.

This vision of the world may seem idealistic. After all, psychology, economics, and evolutionary biology have often claimed that humans share an essentially selfish nature. But research over the past 30 years indicates that true altruism does exist and can extend beyond kin and community to encompass the welfare of humans generally.

Neuroscientists have identified three components of altruism that anyone can develop as acquired skills: empathy (understanding and sharing the feelings of another), loving kindness (the wish to spread happiness) and compassion (a desire to relieve the suffering of another).

Small steps lead to big changes. As the value of altruism becomes increasingly obvious, the new approach will spread through the economy, benefiting all of society, future generations, and the planet, too.

71. Justmeans.com, 'Solving Global Poverty', 08/12/09, Blog on Ethical Consumption

Briefly discusses the findings of Bjorn Lomborg, from his book '*Cool It: The Skeptical Environmentalist*' [An excellent read, in our view]. Key theme is that although environmental change will have a disproportionate negative impact on the poor and marginalised, **there is a compelling case for directing the funds currently being earmarked to implement Kyoto into other areas, which will address more pressing issues of global poverty AND address the most significant challenges of environmental change – all for the same money.**

72. www.luc.edu, *Is Solving Global Poverty a Moral Problem?* David Schweickart, Journal of Social Philosophy 2008.

Charles Beitz observed recently that "philosophical attention to problems about global justice is flourishing in a way it has not in any time in recent memory." He attributes this phenomenon to two facts: "we face an assortment of urgent practical problems that are not likely to be solved, if they can be solved at all, **without concerted international actions,**" and "there is . . . **the emergence of a nascent global capacity to act.**"

This observation calls to mind **Marx's famous dictum, "Mankind inevitably sets itself only those tasks is it able to solve.** . . . The problem itself arises only when the material conditions for its solution are already present, or at least in the course of formation." This dictum fits the issue at hand. The "urgent practical problem" of global poverty has become a problem--as opposed to an inescapable part of the human condition--only because **material conditions now exist for its eradication.**

In this paper I will consider the similarities and differences between two major philosophers in their treatment of global poverty. Both see global poverty as massive and as eradicatable, but their normative frameworks and policy prescriptions differ. I will then point out that neither pay attention to a major causal culprit: the structural imperatives of global capitalism. I conclude by identifying four reasons for this negligence, then responds briefly to each.

Among the most prominent philosophers who have taken up the issue of global poverty are Peter Singer and Thomas Pogge. There is a substantial amount of agreement between them. They agree that the extent of global poverty is vast. Pogge points out that 46% of humanity--nearly half the global population--live below the World Bank's \$2/day poverty line; 1.2 billion people live on less than half of that, i.e., less than \$1/day.

Poverty statistics can be presented more dramatically. **Peter Singer notes that on Sept 11, 2001, 3000 people died in the World Trade Center attack; on Sept 13, 2001, two days later, UNICEF released its report indicating that 30,000 children under five had died that day of preventable diseases—and 30,000 every other day during the past year, some ten million in all.**

Thomas Pogge observes, **"[In the fifteen years since the end of the Cold War] some 18 million human beings have died prematurely each year from poverty-related causes, accounting for fully one-third of all human deaths. This fifteen-year death toll of 270 million is considerably larger than the 200-**

million death toll from all the wars, civil wars, genocides and other government repressions of the entire 20th century combined." For those who find this assertion incredible (as I did, initially), Pogge supplies a breakdown in a footnote, adding up the figures for some 284 "mega-death events of violence and repression" that occurred during the century just past, among them World War I, World War II, the atrocities of Stalin and Mao, and some 281 other calamities. The total for the century is a quarter less than the poverty deaths since the end of the Cold War.

Singer and Pogge also agree that it is technically feasible to eliminate poverty. Pogge calculates that \$312b per year could eliminate global poverty; that is to say, raise everybody **above the \$2/day threshold**. This represents a mere 1% of total global annual income.

Finally, Singer and Pogge are in basic agreement that something must be done--by us. Singer concludes his classic 1972 article, "Famine, Affluence and Morality" with a moral demand:

Discussion is not enough. What is the point of relating philosophy to public (and personal) affairs if we do not take our conclusions seriously? In this instance, taking our conclusion seriously means acting upon it. The philosopher will not find it any easier than anyone else to alter his attitudes and way of life to the extent that, if I am right, is involved in doing everything we ought to be doing.

As is well known, Peter Singer is a utilitarian. From a utilitarian perspective, there is no morally relevant distinction between killing and letting die, at least not when that death could be easily prevented by your action.

The principle here is straightforward: "If it is in our power to prevent something bad from happening, without thereby sacrificing anything of comparable moral importance, we ought, morally, to do it."

In his early essay, "Famine, Affluence, and Morality," he cites approvingly Aquinas's even more stringent dictum:

Whatever a man has in superabundance is owed, of natural right, to the poor for their sustenance. So Ambrosius says, and it is also to be found in the Decretum Gratiani: "The bread which you withhold belongs to the hungry; the clothing you shut away to the naked . . ."

Goes into some detail comparing their views on morality, ethics and solutions.

73. **Can We Really Solve Poverty**, relevantmagazine.com , Dec 14 2010

Richard Stearns, the **president of World Vision** [huge international Christian charity with annual income over US\$2bn] explains why poverty is getting worse—and how this generation can stop it.

Our world is increasingly divided between rich and poor. **When I was born, the richest countries were 35 times as wealthy as the poorest. Half a century later, it stood at 75 to 1.**

Today, 2.6 billion people—40 percent of the world's population—live on less than \$2 a day. Americans, who make up less than 5 percent of the world's population, live on an average \$105 a day. That means the typical American has more material wealth than 96 percent of the world's people. Even a student earning \$105 a week is wealthier than 85 percent of the world

But it's more than money. Poverty is about lack of essentials such as food, clean water, and basic health care. [Note the list!]

It is not our fault that people are poor, but it is our responsibility to do something about it.

Nobel Prize-winning Economist Milton Friedman explained, "The poor stay poor, not because they are lazy but because they have no access to capital." [Not the only reason, but a factor]

After the first loan is repaid—and 98.7 percent of our loans are—they often take a larger loan to expand their businesses, creating local jobs. **In one Kenyan community, for every \$1,000 in loans, nearly 11 jobs were created or sustained, and the lives of more than 28 children were improved.**

The lack of clean water causes millions of needless child deaths each year. Yet the cost to bring clean water to one person costs only \$1 per year. [Doesn't explain how]

74. From UN Documents, Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development: Our Common Future. www.un-documents.net , [Excellent – but how gain access to the whole thing?]

75. Worldbank.org, Harnessing Science to Solve Global Poverty & Hunger, 'Flexibility & Freedom of Action are Essential for Ensuring Rapid Progress.

1998, by the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR)

Environmental stress has often been seen as the result of the growing demand on scarce resources and the pollution generated by the rising living standards of the relatively affluent. **But poverty itself pollutes the environment, creating environmental stress in a different way.** Those who are poor and hungry will often **destroy their immediate environment in order to survive:** They will cut down forests; their livestock will overgraze grasslands; they will overuse marginal land; and in growing numbers they will crowd into congested cities. The cumulative effect of these changes is so far-reaching as to make poverty itself a major global scourge.

76. OpenIDEO.com, What global challenge do you think innovation leaders should work to solve right now?

Formed in 2009, the i20 group consists of some 35 '**chief innovation officers**' from different nations who demonstrate leadership in innovation. Its members hold positions of power from which they can drive their respective countries' development over time. They strive to identify and address some of the grand challenges faced by civil society worldwide.

The January 2011 summit marks the first time that these innovation principals will convene to design a global agenda for innovation. The summit's overall goals are to:

- Create a common, relevant framework for addressing global 'grand challenges'
- Align US and global agendas on how to foster engagement
- Sponsor global challenges by offering prizes, incentives and novel funding methods
- Introduce the i20 to the US government innovation community and vice versa
- Outline specific ongoing goals and strategies

77. **Solving Global Poverty**, CBS Video, cbsnews.com , review of More Than Good Intentions book.

78. **ThinkProgress.org**, podcast – Solving Energy Poverty Without Addressing Climate Change is the “Biggest Threat Multiplier of All”, 31/10/11

Even today, there are roughly 1.5 billion people living without access to modern electricity services, limiting education opportunities, health services and quality of life. And there are 2.5 billion people who only have access to **biomass for indoor cooking — resulting in more deaths per year than Malaria, according to the World Health Organization.**

Expanding access to these billions of people in energy poverty is one of the most important global challenges of our time, says Kandeh Yumkella, director general of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization. And not doing it in a way that also addresses climate change will be “the biggest threat multiplier of all,” he says.

That’s why Yumkella, together with dozens of world leaders and global investors, are working on **raising \$45 billion per year by 2030 to finance clean projects that expand access to the energy poor — all while doubling the penetration of renewable energy and doubling energy efficiency.**

79. **Global Urban Development Magazine**, @globalurban.org , ‘Eliminating Poverty Through Market Based Social Entrepreneurship’, by **Muhammad Yunus**

I have chosen to discuss **the most daring of all Millennium Development Goals — halving poverty by 2015.** I have chosen it for two reasons. First, this is the most courageous goal mankind ever set for itself. For the last two decades I have been talking about creating a world free from poverty. I talk about it not because it is unjust to have a world with poverty, which is, of course, true. I talk about it simply because **I am totally convinced from my experience of working with poor people that they can get themselves out of poverty if we give them the same or similar opportunities we give to others.** The poor themselves can create a poverty-free world — **all we have to do is to free them from the chains that we have put around them.**

I have chosen this subject secondly because a **feeling is getting stronger in me everyday that very few people are really serious about reaching the goal of halving poverty by 2015.** Leaders who made this bold announcement went back to their other important commitments feeling happy that they have captured the world's imagination. They are expecting that as the decision has been made at the highest level, actions will follow, and a well-coordinated powerful machinery will get activated to get the job done. Unfortunately, so far it has not happened. Only the donor agency officials, supported by the thriving consulting business, are carrying the ball. What is emerging reminds us of the decade of the 1990s when the global goals were put in the form of ‘education for all by the year 2000’, ‘health for all by the year 2000’, ‘everything else for all by the 2000’. My worry is that these courageous Millennium Development Goals may degenerate into a cut-and-paste job of the earlier edition, merely replacing the ‘year 2000’ with the ‘year 2015’, with appropriate changes in the text

I am an optimist because I am convinced that poverty is not as difficult a subject as the experts keep warning us. It is not a difficult subject because it is not about space science, or about an intricate design of a complicated machine. This is about people. I don't see the possibility of a human being becoming a 'problem' when it comes to his or her own well-being. All the ingredients for ending a person's poverty always comes neatly packaged within that person.

Here is my explanation. Poverty is not created by people who are poor. So we shouldn't give them an accusing look. They are the victims. **Poverty has been created by the economic and social system that we have designed for the world.**

The essence of my argument is that in order to reduce, and ultimately eliminate, poverty we must go back to the drawing board. Concepts, institutions, and framing conditions which created poverty cannot end poverty. If we can intelligently rework these framing conditions, poverty will be gone, never to come back again.

In this article I will draw your attention to five issues which need to be urgently revisited:

- (a) widening the concept of employment;
- (b) ensuring financial services even to the poorest person;
- (c) recognizing every single human being as a potential entrepreneur;
- (d) recognizing social entrepreneurs as potential agents for creating a world of peace, harmony, and progress;
- (e) recognizing the role of globalization and information technology in reducing poverty

The most important step to ending poverty is to create employment and income opportunities for the poor. But orthodox economics recognizes only wage-employment. It has no room for self-employment. Yet self-employment is the quickest and easiest way to create employment for the poor.

The behavior pattern of a social-objective-driven entrepreneur, i.e. a social entrepreneur, is as follows:

1. He or she competes in the marketplace inspired by a set of social objectives. This is the basic reason for being in the business.
2. He or she may earn personal profit as well. This personal profit may range from zero to a significantly large amount, even larger than the personal gain-driven competitors. But in this case, personal profit is a secondary consideration, rather than the prime consideration. On the other hand, a personal profit-driven entrepreneur may contribute in achieving some social objectives. But this will be a by-product of the business, or a secondary consideration in the business. This will not make him or her a social entrepreneur.
3. The higher the social impact per dollar invested, the higher will be the market rating of the social entrepreneur. Here 'market' will consist of the potential investors who are looking for opportunities to invest their money in social objective-driven enterprises. Social investment dollars will move from low social impact enterprises to higher social impact enterprises, from general impact enterprises to specific and visible impact enterprises, from traditional social enterprises to highly innovative and efficient social enterprises.

80. **ForeignPolicy.com, Does It Take A Village?** Jeffrey Sachs dazzled the development world with his plan to end poverty. But now critics say **there's no way to prove whether it works**. 24/06/13

8 years ago, when Jeffrey Sachs launched an ambitious project to fight global poverty, he surely didn't suspect that it might end up calling into question his work as one of America's leading economists. In the 1980s and '90s, Sachs had made headlines with his work advising reformist governments in Latin America and Eastern Europe -- a record that firmly established him as a first-rank public intellectual and ensured him easy access to the offices of presidents and prime ministers from Warsaw to Moscow. There's a reason the New York Times once described him as "probably the most important economist in the world."

Then, in 2005, Sachs embarked on his most ambitious undertaking yet. He vowed to attack the root causes of poverty by establishing a series of model villages across Africa that would demonstrate the efficacy of targeted measures to address the corrosive lack of health care, education, and employment that keep so many people around the world in a pernicious "poverty trap."

This isn't just an obscure academic debate about research methods. It's also an argument that cuts to the heart of how aid to the world's poorest people should work. At one end of the spectrum, polar opposite from Sachs, are skeptics such as his longtime intellectual foe, economist William Easterly, who tend to view aid as having a pernicious, debilitating effect, creating a culture of dependency. In between are economists, such as Abhijit Banerjee and Esther Duflo, who doubt that attacking poverty is as simple as Sachs would have it and instead advocate highly specific small-scale changes that can make for what they call a "quiet revolution" of sustainable progress.

Sachs's idea for the Millennium Villages grew out of a visit to rural southern Zambia in the mid-1990s. He observed that chronic diseases, such as AIDS and malaria, were not only a threat to the health of rural Africans but also a reason villages remained mired in severe poverty. Illness on its own contributes to low economic productivity. For example, "When children die in large numbers" from diseases like malaria, "parents overcompensate and have more children, with devastating results,"

"Too poor to invest in the education of all of their children, the family might educate just one child, usually the elder son. If children in malarious regions manage to survive, they enter adulthood without the proper education they need to succeed."

His trips to Africa left him convinced that there are two crucial ingredients to attacking extreme poverty, and these insights became the basis for the design and implementation of MVP. The first key is to target the village as the unit for aid, not individual households, and to provide an integrated package of aid to address a spectrum of needs, including health care, education, agriculture, and infrastructure. This tack was a departure from the usual method of providing aid for very particular purposes.

The second key is money. Sachs vehemently argued that extreme poverty in rural Africa (and elsewhere) is not attributable to corruption or other aspects of flawed governance, but to a lack of sufficient funds.

In his conception of MVP as a ground-breaking demonstration project -- "a new approach to ending poverty," as Sachs titled one talk in 2006 -- not only was there no plan to use comparison villages as a way to measure progress, but Sachs was **personally opposed** to any such plan.

At the project's outset, Sachs resisted the idea of ongoing monitoring and assessment of MVP by independent experts unaffiliated with the project, as urged by Berkeley's Miguel and Nancy Birdsall at the Center for Global Development, a Washington think tank on whose board Sachs once served. "Jeff felt it wasn't necessary," Birdsall told FP.

Clemens: "The only ethical way to expose hundreds of millions of people to an intervention, the only ethical way to divert those resources from other potentially helpful uses, is to be sure that the intervention does what it claims. It's very difficult to do that without comparison to sites that didn't get the intervention."

Meanwhile, state-of-the-art thinking in the development field is in flux. There is no consensus on what works best to get rid of extreme poverty. [So it seems, when reviewing these many articles]

After several decades that saw the largest poverty reduction in history -- with the number of "extremely poor individuals" falling most spectacularly in China, from 683 million in 1990 to 156 million in 2010, according to the World Bank, and not because of foreign aid and well-intentioned foreigners but because of booming economic growth -- some analysts now argue that the best medicine for poverty is reforms to scale back the role of the state in the economy and to open sheltered markets to global investors. Sachs counters that poverty in rural Africa remains so extreme that without aid programs there can be no platform for market-based economic growth.

As for Sachs himself, the charitable view among economic development specialists is that he "stands for being ambitious," in Morduch's words, representing the hope of what aid can accomplish if not yet the reality of having done so, while the harshest perspective is that he is a traitor to his field. As Princeton's Deaton put it, "He stopped being an academic a long time ago and became a propagandist for aid."

[AND THAT'S IT. SOME WERE MISSED OUT DUE TO BEING REPEATS, PARTICULARLY 'MORE THAN GOOD INTENTIONS' BOOK REVIEWS, REPEATS OF ARTICLES COVERED ELSEWHERE – AND OF COURSE A REVIEW OF OURSELVES...FOR WHICH, INSTEAD, WE WILL LET YOU BE THE JUDGE]

SUMMARY: Lots of different views on **causes** and hence **solutions**, even among experts.
