

Features article 12: The Civil Society and the informal sector

Introduction

From a systems approach point of view, the civil society and the informal sector are sub systems of society. Together with the state and the business sub sectors, these three make up the complete whole, the society. By definition, a society is a highly structured system of human organization for large-scale community living that normally furnishes protection, continuity, security, and a national identity for its members. In terms of who furnishes protection, continuity and security, the state authorities takes charge. The businesses (profit making) organizations are of the second sector, after the state. The civil society is made up of many groups, some of which are work related (Trade Unions and trade unionism movements), some professionally related, and political or social groups, etc; below these groupings is the informal sector, whose members carry out subsistence activities in unclassified ways.

This paper advocates for, and refer to the informal sector as “the forth sector”, i.e., considered after the state, business and the organized civil society. The informal sector is made up largely of the lay people who in one way or the other carry out subsistence activities. While members of the other institutions of the civil society may be organized into groups, associations, or other forms, actors in the informal sector may not be organize into any formal style. They operate simply as individuals, each in their own right.

This paper holds the view that, the solution to meaningful and sustainable development lies in properly organizing; the social, economic and political structures, and this organization should start from the bottom, otherwise the state decision-making process will either by manipulations of the organized society or otherwise turn to ignore the most vulnerable, the informal sector people.

The phrase “Civil society” in general use

“Civil society” is a phrase in general use. Everybody uses it. When it comes to issues of mass mobilization of populations, the phrase becomes a working tool to politicians. The international community and donor organizations use it in relation to community development work, conflict and disaster management situations, etc, etc; the meaning of civil society is often contested by society. For example some businesses say they are part of the civil society; others do not. Researchers on this area do not seem to agree either. Generally, here we consider the civil society as a political space occupied by citizens who come together to define and pursue common interest. It is a space where positive social capital can be created or eroded. The intentions of civic groups may coalesce into trust and concern action or they may collide, producing factionalism, distrust and antagonistic pro- and anti positions on issues.

Definitions of the civil society

There are myriad definitions of civil society in the post-modern sense. The London School of Economics Centre for Civil Society's working definition is illustrative: Civil society refers to the arena of uncoerced collective action around shared interests, purposes and values. In theory, its institutional forms are distinct from those of the state, family and market, though in practice, the boundaries between state, civil society, family and market are often complex, blurred and negotiated.

Civil society commonly embraces a diversity of spaces, actors and institutional forms, varying in their degree of formality, autonomy and power. Civil societies are often populated by organizations such as registered charities, development non-governmental organizations, community groups, women’s organizations, faith-based organizations, professional associations, trade unions, self-help groups, social movements, business associations, coalitions and advocacy groups.

Jeffrey C.Alexander defines civil society as sphere or subsystems of society that is analytical and to, various degrees, empirically separated from the spheres of political, economic and religious life. Jeffrey

further stated, the civil society depends on resources, or inputs, from these other spheres, from political life, from economic institutions, from broad cultural discussions, from territorial organizations and from pre-modality.

Historical perspective of civil society

From a historical perspective, the actual meaning of the concept of civil society has changed twice from its original, classical form. The first change occurred after the French Revolution, the second during the fall of communism in Europe.

The post-modern way of understanding civil society was first developed by political opposition in the former Soviet block East European countries in the 1980s. From that time stems a practice within the political field of using the idea of civil society instead of political society. However, in the 1990s with the emergence of the nongovernmental organizations and the New Social Movements (NSMs) on a global scale, civil society as a third sector became a key terrain of strategic action to construct 'an alternative social and world order.' Henceforth, postmodern usage of the idea of civil society became divided into two main: as political society and as the third sector – apart from plethora of definitions.

The Washington Consensus of the 1990s, which involved conditioned loans by the World Bank and IMF to debt-laden developing states, also created pressures for states in poorer countries to shrink. This in turn led to practical changes for civil society that went on to influence the theoretical debate.

Initially the new conditionality led to an even greater emphasis on 'civil society' as a panacea, replacing the state's service provision and social care, Hulme and Edward suggested that it was now seen as 'the magic bullet.' Some development political scientists cautioned that this view created new dangers. For instance, in 'Let's get Civil Society Straight' Whaites argued that the often politicized and potentially divisive nature of civil society was being ignored by some policy makers.

By the end of the 1990s civil society was seen less as a panacea amid the growth of the anti-globalization movement and the transition of many countries to democracy; instead, civil society was increasingly called on to justify its legitimacy and democratic credentials. This led to the creation by the UN of a high level panel on civil society Post-modern civil society theory has now largely returned to a more neutral stance, but with marked differences between the study of the phenomena in richer societies and writing on civil society in developing states. Civil society in both areas is, however, often viewed as a counter-poise and complement rather than an alternative in relation to the state, or as Whaites stated in his 1996 article, 'the state is seen as a precondition of civil society'.

From a historical perspective, the actual meaning of the concept of civil society has changed twice from its original, classical form. The first change occurred after the French Revolution, the second during the fall of communism in Europe.

The Relationship between civil society and democracy

The literature on relations between civil society and democratic political society has their roots in early liberal writings like those of Alexis de Tocqueville. However they were developed in significant ways by 20th century theorists like Gabriel Almond and Sidney Verba, who identified the role of political culture in a democratic order as vital. They argued that the political element of many voluntary organizations facilitates better awareness and a more informed citizenry, who make better voting choices, participate in politics, and hold government more accountable as a result. The statutes of these organizations have often been considered micro-constitutions because they accustom participants to the formalities of democratic decision making. More recently, Robert D. Putnam has argued that even non-political organizations in civil society are vital for democracy. This is because they build social capital, trust and shared values, which are transferred into the political sphere and help to hold society together, facilitating an understanding of the interconnectedness of society and interests within it. Others,

however, have questioned how democratic civil society actually is. Some have noted that the civil society actors have now obtained a remarkable amount of political power without anyone directly electing or appointing them. Finally, other scholars have argued that, since the concept of civil society is closely related to democracy and

Government policy towards civil society

Governments have exhibited various attitudes and implemented a range of policies directed at civil society and the organizations and movements that compose it. Some authoritarian governments' ban most political and social rights activist organizations and civic life exists only for groups that poses no challenge to the established order. In the United States, government with the stated aim of "protecting national security, preventing violence, and maintaining the existing social and political order" has conducted campaigns to discredit and disrupt the leading organizations of important social movements.

For example, COINTELPRO was a decades' long FBI program that employed psychological warfare, wrongful imprisonment, extralegal violence and assassination and other techniques against the preeminent organizations and individuals in the women's movement, the civil rights movement, the Native American movement, and the anti-war movement.

Globalization and the Civil Society

Critics and activists currently often apply the term civil society to the domain of social life which needs to be protected against globalization and to the sources of resistance thereto, because it is seen as acting beyond boundaries and across different territories. However, as civil society can, under many definitions, include and be funded and directed by those businesses and institutions (especially donors linked to European and Northern states) who support globalization, this is a contested use. Rapid development of civil society on the global scale after the fall of the communist system was a part of neo-liberal strategies linked to the Washington Consensus. Some studies have also been published, which deal with unresolved issues regarding the use of the term in connection with the impact and conceptual power of the international aid system (see for example Tvedt 1998). On the other hand, others see globalization as a social phenomenon expanding the sphere of classical liberal values, which inevitably led to a larger role for civil society at the expense of politically derived state institutions.

Democracy

The Literature on relations between civil society and democratic political society has their roots in early liberal writings like those of Alexis de Tocqueville. However they were developed in significant ways by 20th century theorists like Gabriel Almond and Sidney Verba, who identified the role of political culture in a democratic order as vital. They argued that the political element of many voluntary organizations facilitates better awareness and a more informed citizenry, who make better voting choices, participate in politics, and hold government more accountable as a result. The statutes of these organizations have often been considered micro-constitutions because they accustom participants to the formalities of democratic decision making.

More recently, Robert D. Putnam has argued that even non-political organizations in civil society are vital for democracy. This is because they build social capital, trust and shared values, which are transferred into the political sphere and help to hold society together, facilitate an understanding of the interconnectedness of society and interests within it. Others, however, have questioned how democratic civil society actually is. Some have noted that the civil society actors have now obtained a remarkable amount of political power without anyone directly electing or appointing them. Finally, other scholars have argued that, since the concept of civil society is closely related to democracy and representation, it should in turn be linked with ideas of nationality and nationalism.

Government policy

Governments have exhibited various attitudes and implemented a range of policies directed at civil society and the organizations and movements that compose it. Some authoritarian governments' ban most political and social rights activist organizations and civic life exists only for groups that poses no challenge to the established order. In the United States, government with the stated aim of "protecting national security, preventing violence, and maintaining the existing social and political order" has conducted campaigns to discredit and disrupt the leading organizations of important social movements. For example, COINTELPRO was a decades' long FBI program that employed psychological warfare, wrongful imprisonment, extralegal violence and assassination and other techniques against the preeminent organizations and individuals in the women's movement, the civil rights movement, the Native American movement, and the anti-war movement.

Examples of civil society institutions

1. Academia	10. Cooperatives	19. PVOs
2. Activist Groups	11. Cultural Groups	20. Professional associations
3. Charities	12. Environmental Groups	21. Religious organizations
4. Citizens Militia	13. Foundations	22. Social enterprise
5. Civic Groups	14. Intermediary orgs.	23. Support Groups
6. Clubs, e.g. sports etc	15. Men's Groups	24. Trade Unions
7. Community Foundations	16. NGOs	25. Voluntary Associations
8. Community Organizations	17. NPOs	26. Women's Groups
9. Consumer(s) Organization	18. Policy Institutions	27. The Informal Economy

The Informal economy

The informal sector or the forth sector, is the most vulnerable of all civil society institutions. While other forms of civil society as listed on the table above are organized by nature of member's level of training, education or professionalism, the informal sector is not. Arguably, the informal sector (No.27) on table above is the weakest in terms of organizational ability of all civil institutions.

Going by this assessment, the forth sector deserve special attention and care from the state, the business and the organized civil society sub sectors. Informal ways of working are widespread but central to the economy and markets of developing countries.

Some basic organizational standards in this sector may be based on cultural or traditional administrative systems which are rudimentary by nature. People who work in the organized sectors depends on salaries and wages for the reward of services, either to the public affairs, industry, commerce, not for profit organizations. The informal economy operators depends on basic the subsistence activities.

Definition

The informal economy is a system of trade or economic exchange used outside state controlled or money based transactions. Practiced by most of the world's population, it includes barter of goods and services, mutual self-help, odd jobs, street trading, and other such direct sale activities. Income generated by the informal economy is usually not recorded for taxation purposes, and is often unavailable for inclusion in gross domestic product (GDP) computations.

The informal economy was discovered in the beginning of the seventies. The believes about the informal economy are varied, with most of the researchers believing that the informal system is marginal and peripheral and not link to the formal sector or to modern capitalist development. The situation is therefore that the informal economy is continuously increasing in most developing countries, even in rural areas. Estimates show that the non- agricultural employment share of the informal workforce is 78% in Africa, 57% in Latin America and the Caribbean, and 45–85% In Asia.

In all developing countries, self-employment comprises a greater share of informal employment than wage employment. Specifically, self-employment represents 70% of informal employment in Sub-Saharan Africa (if South Africa is excluded, the share is 81% 1), 62% in North Africa, 60% in Latin

America and 59% in Asia. Consequently, informal wage employment in the developing world constitutes 30 to 40% of the informal employment outside of agriculture.

The state and the informal sector

As first sector level (controller) of the society, the state has to set up and to reinforce regulations to monitor and control all other sectors most appropriately. It is regrettable that the state has very little or no specific control over the activities of the informal economy, in most developing countries. Because of lack of effective state controls, the quality of output from the informal sector may not be guaranteed, as a state duty to its populations.

Government too may not be able to collect taxes from that sector, which creates a leakage in the state economy. Basic structures guarantees and are necessary for effective governance. A grassroots structure creates room for information to flow from and to the indigenous people. Empowering the population, irrespective of their literacy levels, social or political standing, and the access to contribute to and benefit from the national cake, is a key function of the state.

Relations between the formal and informal economies

There are three main schools of thought regarding the relationship between the formal and informal economies:

- 1– The dualists: the informal economy is a separate marginal economy directly linked to the formal economy, providing income or as net for the poor (ILO 1972).
- 2– The structuralists: the informal economy is subordinated to the formal economy. In order to reduce costs, privileged capitalists seek to subordinate petty producers and traders (Castells and Portes 1989).
- 3– The legalists: informal work arrangements are a rational response to Micro-entrepreneurs to over-regulation by government bureaucracies (De Soto).

From these schools of thoughts, it is clear that there are real differences between the formal and the informal economies. The key point is that whatever conclusions are drawn concerning the informal economy, the issue address by this paper is that, the informal sector has to be organized for the benefits of the perennial poor people, the state and the governance process.

General characteristics of the informal economy

In very general terms, the informal economy is the unregulated non-formal portion of the market economy that produces goods and services for sale or for other forms of remuneration. The term “informal economy” thus refers to all economic activities by workers and economic units that are – in law or in practice – not covered or insufficiently covered by formal arrangements. The informal economy is largely characterized by:

- 1–Low entry requirements in terms of capital and professional qualifications
- 2–A small scale of operations
- 3–Skills often acquired outside of formal education.
- 4–Labour-intensive methods of production and adapted technology

The informal economy does not comprise the reproductive or care economy, comprised of unpaid domestic work and care activities.

Practically, the informal sector includes but not limited to the following:

- 1) Subsistence work; this includes agriculture (backyard gardens and raising animals for family consumption), marginal economic projects and unpaid work in the home on the edge of the cash economy

- 2) Informal work; this includes work in the cash economy which is not taxed, or visible to the state, in unregistered businesses, and illegal or criminal activities, such as the sale of drugs or sex
- 3) Casual production; this includes sub-contracted or off-the-books' work, in regulated enterprises, which deprives workers of the benefits tied to recognized employment
- 4) Community work and barter; this includes the provision of services, such as child care, sanitation, and health care to community security, housing, informal justice systems, and borrowing and lending. These services provided to the households are often 'invisible' so the work is not assisted by the state to make it more efficient.

The operating rules of an informal economy include customs, and verbal agreements enforced by social pressure, as opposed to the official laws and regulations of the formal economy. Conflicts often exist as to who makes the decisions. Within each of the four sub heads above, the rules and customs will always be different. This means that to design suitable development policies for the informal sector, each of the above four headings should be examined differently, as comprehensive policies may not be effective.

Society power hierarchy

The state controls society through the will of the electorates, expressed through ballots by the population. The political party that wins then sets the tone of state control through exploiting planned manifestos. It is then safe to say that political power controls society, be they state institutions or Civil Society Organizations.

The unfortunate thing is that when decisions are taken about the civil society globally without segmenting the informal sector, the core Civil Society Organizations take advantage to overshadow the informal sector, which constitutes the grassroots populations.

Society power hierarchy structure

Strata	Level
State authority	<i>Supreme (Top or first level)</i>
Businesses (all forms of organizations)	<i>For - Profit – Organizations(second)</i>
Civil Society Organization	<i>Third sector (third level)</i>
Informal Sector	<i>Forth sector (Bottom or forth level)</i>

In matters of importance to society requiring effective participation of the grassroots, or the bottom –up approach, the informal sector should be the base of all important decisions. Decisions taken without due concern for the informal sector are middle – up approach decisions, rather than the most advocated bottom – up approach. With those type of decisions, the grassroots populations are minimized and taken for granted. Third sector CSOs are elitists groups, CSOs in one way or the other constitute rights bearers or better still, facilitators of people's rights. They should be seen to be ably facilitating those rights to flow to the rights bearers. Civil society activist should recognize their roles of selfless service in favour of the vulnerable.

Care must be taken to ensure that there is transparency and accountability of leaders actions, which is guided and reinforced by clear participation of all stakeholders in the decision making process. The larger (bottom populations of rural communities in developing nations) segment of the society must be actively involve in their own affairs.

Why the informal sector is the less privilege

Aside from the state control authorities, business the second sector is made up of individuals, groups and corporations whose members have decided to risks money to provide goods or services, with a view of profits. By this alone, they business sector stands taller than the third sector, talk less of the informal sector.

People who belong to the business sector have the:

- Capital or capital's worth and "the know how"

- Knowledgeable on investment matters
- Capable of exploiting societal resources
- Can take risk and absorbed the resulting effects irrespective of the outcomes

Judging by these factors, businesses are made up of knowledgeable societal members. Of people who have what it takes to promote economic growth?

Keeping businesses beside, the third sector membership includes highly enlightened people who because of professional trainings have grouped into knowledgeable groups to offer services to other members of society. To say the least, comparing the third sector with the informal or forth sector is not fair. That is, the academia, the bar associations, cooperative, NGOs, PVOs, etc, etc can not be compared with the base line people who carry out activities just for subsistence, looking for ways to survive and living under difficult financial and social conditions. The informal sector is made up mostly of people who do not and are unable to fit into the formal sectors of the economy.

The vulnerable forth sector

The stand to include Civil Society Organizations (CSO) in development work was initiated and ushered in by the peasant charter of 1975 (see our features 2, article five). One is tempted to ask why despite governments' efforts, there is need for another layer of governance, the CSO. It is proven that, politics and politicians are an elitist's affair. The poor vulnerable people, the voiceless are hardly considered for political positions of leadership. Vulnerable people whom in most societies include women, children and the youth are usually written-off, and streamlined by the elites. In those elitist dominated communities, there are common tactics by the higher class to appease the vulnerable. To the children and youths, the elites will refer to them as future leaders, while women are housewives, and mothers of the nation. Elites mobilized community power, of the informal sector populations to achieve their personal ambitions irrespective of the state and conditions of their electorates, the lay populations. The masses are used as bridges to higher heights and when the individual "cross the Rubicon" the common concerns of those who constituted "the bride" are ignored.

To push home this point, hear what a former political leader, had to say about the elites. "The elite is our problem" – Obasanjo, former Nigerian president, speaking to Tell magazine, Tell No.20 pages 23 and 24, of May 14, 2007. The ordinary Nigerians are no problem, Obasanjo continued; they are wonderful in hospitality, forbearance, tolerance and in the love of their fellow human beings.

But the elites... it is when the elite want something and can not get it that they remember that you are Igbo and he is Yoruba. Or he is Hausa and you are Igbo. They constitute a problem because when they want something, they just get it. If he wants to be president and does not get it, he becomes an enemy. The elites are unreliable, Obasanjo concluded.

Are the elites unreliable or enemies of society?

Greed nourishes mistrust; creates boundaries in governance and could lead to destructive actions by the oppressed and the marginalized. Unreliability is a dangerous human quality that hampers working relationships between colleagues, peers and leadership roles. Reliability is key to trust and work with others. Once, that element is absent, team work and leadership roles will disappear. When leaders are unreliable, the governance process suffers. Frustration sets in between hierarchy and the followers. Unreliability is undemocratic, frustrating both leaders and the led. Unreliability of political leaders is based on the false undemocratic idea that government is a panacea for the world's ills. It is for this reason that, unreliable elites may be considered as enemies of society. To guard against mismanagement of public funds by unreliable politicians, Anti-Money Laundering Regulations (AMLRs) are developed to facilitate financial houses to track down state economic criminals. From past experiences on actions of politicians, the AMLRs clearly points out, Political Exposed Persons (PEPs). There is no global definition of PEPs, but most countries have based their definition on the Financial Action Task Force (FATF) definition of PEP as follows:

- current or former senior official in the executive, legislative, administrative, military, or judicial branch of a foreign government (elected or not)
- a senior official of a major foreign political party

- a senior executive of a foreign government-owned commercial enterprise, being a corporation, business or other entity formed by or for the benefit of any such individual
- an immediate family member of such individual; meaning spouse, parents, siblings, children, and spouse's parents or siblings
- any individual publicly known (or actually known by the relevant financial institution) to be a close personal or professional associate.

One social analyst, Jeffrey C. Alexander had this to say, under the following heading: ***Citizens and Enemies as symbolism classification: On the polarizing discourse on civil society***; “Sociologists have written much about the social forces that create conflict and polarize society, about interest and structures of political, economic, racial, ethnic, religious and gender groups. But they have said very little about the construction, destruction and deconstruction, of civic solidarity itself. They are generally silent about the sphere of fellow feeling that makes society into society and the processes that fragment it”.

Jeffrey went ahead to classify the following table:

Citizen and enemy as symbolic classification

Democratic Code	Counter democratic Code
• Rule regulated	• Arbitrary
• Law	• Power
• Equality	• Hierarchy
• Inclusive	• Exclusive
• Impersonal	• Personal
• Contractive	• Ascriptive loyalty
• Social Groups	• Factions
• Office	• Personality

Good governance monitoring force

Countries that suffer mismanagement which is organized and practiced by people holding government positions or offices are at the mercy of corrupt leaders. Those leaders will do whatever they want to do, at their will and pleasure just to accumulate wealth for themselves irrespective of the miseries of the people they claim to govern.

With the theory of good governance the scale is tipped in favour of the masses. This means that “everything being equal”, the masses (greater population segment), especially the less privileged should have a say in public affairs, and on matters that concern their communities. Much of good governance theory is expressed by the politicians themselves, but the will to implement is lacking. When government and governance practice rotates between the middle and upper class of society, miseries of the populations multiply.

In the past the military had taken the lead, acting as referees of society to over through dictators. The military too had their own shortcomings on governance. Initially, military regimes were tolerated. Having observed the hard core leaders and their governing styles, some of which turns out to be worse than the corrupt civil administrations which they had toppled to come to power, the international community have firmly denounced military regimes and favours democratic rule which in its rightful practice should give hope to the voiceless, the grassroots people. The civil society in developing nations has a great challenge.

To speak out and, and to advocate for their rights. The future of good governance monitoring is sifted from the military to the civil society, which needs to ably take the challenge. Development oriented states should facilitate the empowerment of their vulnerable populations which in turn serves as good governance structures, thereby empowering the local people to be drivers of democracy and development.

The way forward

State power originates from the people irrespective of their standing; all segments of the populations should be inclusive, a necessary link to building a free enterprise state. Recognizing peoples' power is not in the agenda of the partisans of the big states, the paternalistic super-government that assumes to know more about what the people need than the people themselves. This paper advocates for a human rights approach, peace, harmony and civil liberties of all peoples, capable of deciding what is good for indigenous peoples and the overall society, as key independent factors necessary to generating peoples' power.

The informal sector is extremely vulnerable and should be protected from the powerful members of the society. The line between the core Civil Society and the informal sector, the forth sector, should be distinctively outlined, to facilitate a clear understanding and appreciation of those indigenous community populations.

The state should create and facilitate an enabling environment, to appropriately classify, organize, register and regulate the informal sector. At the center of this community empowerment process, there must be effective decentralization processes and literacy services. This done, the civil society, joined by business, the second sector should have appropriate tools to work with, in assisting the state to strengthening societal governance, but the governments have to set the tune of events.

The Enabling environment

Although the civil society should be responsible for organizing the forth sector, it must play a vital role in guiding and facilitating this process of development. Government can improve efficiency by providing appropriate social regulatory framework as well as necessary public goods, such as decentralization of services, roads, and literacy programmes suitable to the needs of adult learners.

The policy environment

Government should be developing an environment that can enable the informal sector to function on a competitive way. Incentives to invest in organized and standardized business are provided by good monetary policies which can lead to low interest rates, which favours the vulnerable poor. Attention may also need to be paid to existing taxation and tariff structures that may discourage investment. Above all, policies must be user-friendly and consistent.

Legal and regulatory framework

There are many legal issues that governments should address in order to promote forth sector development. There is need to clearly specify legislation relating to the forth sector operators. The framework should set parameters by which informal activities graduates into formal business initiatives and land tenure policies should be clearly expressed to that effect, and practice monitored. The rights of widows and orphaned children must be clearly stated. There should be regulations relating to locally produced goods, and the standards validation process.

Infrastructure

Infrastructure should be developed at the grassroots levels. Talking about developing nations, the trouble is that, governments in most developing countries have extremely limited resources and many claims on those resources. Given this resources constrains, funds earmarked for rural development

should be used to develop rural infrastructure and support services, rather than for politically inspired subsidies that are unlikely to have long-term development impact.

The institutional environment

Decentralization is a process that is needed to devolve power to the grassroots.

At the local government or rural council level, there must be structures to guarantee implementation.

These are the basic structures of governance, coordination of policies, monitoring and overseeing implementation. Methods best suited to improve the forth sector, should be tailored to suite, modify or to improve local practices thereof. Literacy programmes designed for adult learners should be in place to improve the quality of manpower and human resources in that sector of the economy. The first, second and third sectors should work together with local government or council authorities in facilitating the setting up of basic trade unions. Practically, basic trade unionism units or Basic Trade Union (BTUs) should be organized for the following indigenous community initiatives:

- House (home) gardeners
- Home (home) livestock rarer
- Small farm to market retailer
- Small contractors of farm labour
- Barbers, hairdressers, shoe minders
- Bricklayers (masons)
- Carpenters, and metal workers
- Small restaurateurs
- Artisans and Bike riders
- Small (subsistence) farmers
- Informal micro financing systems (local operating systems) of money lending, etc, etc

Basic Trade Unions covering the activities of the informal sector, provides a base or bottom line for society and political action. Taking out the “informality” out of society and instituting control mechanisms, that creates bottom up structures for the advancement of society. BTUs will lead to formation of confederations (united force forums), a leeway to advocacy, lobbying and dialogue structures to avoid informal (unnoticed) concerns, which may lead to disastrous consequences. The State, the business and the third sector Civil Society Organizations, should take the challenge to put the informal sector in order. This paper advocates for meaningful indigenous (developing nations) community originated actions to solving under development problems.

Conclusion

The civil society is of a higher level than the informal economy. The civil society per se, has many facets, e.g. of politicians, academicians, lawyers, etc, etc. The elites of the civil society, be they political leaders or political aspirants, trade union leaders, etc, usually dominate and take advantage of the forth sector’s populations to achieve selfish ambitions, that is, ambitions that do not favour the majority, the people at the base level of society usually referred to as the grassroots. This “pretentious” recognition usually comes into play during political electioneering campaign periods, when massive vote are expected, to gain but to later highjack peoples power, in favour of selfish (personal) gains. Arguably, the forth sector in perennial rural communities in the developing nations, constitutes the largest population segments of those countries. The civil

Society should be stratified and the informal sector made to take their rightful place. Decisions concerning the Civil Society Organizations without clear distinctive lines between the third and forth sectors are not healthy for the growth and development of society, because the grassroots people are dominated and left out. Developing nations should create enabling environments for basic trade unions to be organized, for effective control of the forth sector. That gives a formal route to the lay indigenous people to be able to lobby, dialogue and to speak out on issues that concern them and their communities.

This paper is call to the Government, the corporate business sector and, especially the charitable Civil Society Organizations, to take action towards revamping and developing the informal sector (the power base) of their economies. A procedure aimed at establishing bottom-up decision making structures, for proper development of the rural communities in developing nations. This done is a panacea for people's power, a solid foundation for free enterprise and equal opportunities for all.

Why do states, the first sector, which is the driving force of society ignore these options and opt for dangerous unknown adventures of gambling with their populations' emotions, concerns, wellbeing and future?

Gideon Njini, FCCEA

Appendix

The strength in numbers and weakness in professionalism of the third and fourth sectors can be seen on the classification table below:

Comparisons between the third sector and the Fourth sector (developing nations)

<i>System / Issue</i>	<i>CSO (third sector)</i>	<i>Informal (fourth sector)</i>
Rules	Formal	Non or cultural
Professionalism	Ethical	Non or cultural
Education/ Literacy	High	Low or non existence
State control	In place and functioning	Little or non
Populations	Low	High
Community dominance	High	Little or non
Trade unionism	Organized	Few or non
Vulnerability	Little or non	High
Knowledge on Human rights	High	Low or non
Knowledge on climate change	High	Low or non
Knowledge on emerging health issues	High	Low or non
Use of ICT (emerging technologies)	High	Low or non
Skills	Professional or semi skills	Low or Traditional skills
Taxes to government	Easy to tax	Not easy to tax
Child labour	Low	High
Organization	High	Little or non
Trade Information systems	Many	Local or non
Advocacy	Can easily advocate	Little or no organization

References

Alan Fowler: The Virtual Spiral - A guide to sustainability for NGOs in international development. Page 113

Paul G.H. Engel: The social organization of innovation - A focus on stakeholder interaction.

Tell magazine, Tell No.20 pages 23 and 24, of May 14, 2007

Development in Practice – Volume 6 Number 4, 1996: Oxfam publications

Civil society statement on the provision of essential services

(Prepared for the Commonwealth Finance Ministers Meeting 16-18 September 2003)

World Neighbours in Action: – Sustainability of Community Organizations, Volume 26. No. 2E of Fall/Winter 1999.

Cultivating Differences: Symbolic boundaries and the making of inequality: Pages 288 to 295, by Michele Lamont and Marcel Fournier.

Links July 2000: A news letter on gender for Oxfam GB staff and partners, page 8 and 9

SIDA: Fact finding study The Informal economy; MARCH 2004 • KRISTINA FLODMAN BECKER, Link <http://rru.worldbank.org/Documents/PapersLinks/Sida.pdf>

FOOTSTEPS magazines

Civil Society, The state, and the Role of NGOs, published by the Institute for Development Research: by Rajesh Tandon

Business, Management and Society: Book unpublished, by Njini, Gideon

Links: <http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/informal-economy.html>

Link: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Civil_society

Link: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Civil_society

Links: <http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/informal-economy.html>

Link <http://www.worlded.org/docs/Publications/idr/pdf/8-3.pdf>

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Politically_exposed_person

<http://www.wolfsberg-principles.com/faq-persons.html>