

# THE EFFECT OF POLITICAL INSTABILITY IN COUNTRY PROSPERITY

Prepared by **Dr Gabriel Alier Riak\* (PhD) & Dut Bol Ayuel Bill**

*Upper Nile University, South Sudan*

**\*Corresponding Author: -**

---

Political instability simply the opposite of political stability; according to an early definition by Butkiewicz, James and Yanikkaya, (2010) a politically stable country had been a democracy or autocracy for at least 25 years (Cavallo and Cavallo, 2010). This definition would mean that political instability was just the non-persistence in form of government, no matter what type of rule (Bussière, Matthieu and Christian Mulder, 2008).

Carmignani, (2009) related political instability to legitimacy of the political system, and thus a political system could only be more or less stable compared to it or other systems. This also suggests that individuals can be dissatisfied, loose confidence in the political system and act on their discontent (Gleditsch, Wallensteen, Sollenberg and Strand, 2012). The predominant view of political instability builds on both these definitions. Social unrest and civil disobedience may manifest itself through civil society, creating socio-political tension and a possible threat to political regimes.

According to Butkiewicz, James and Yanikkaya, (2010) the most frequently used measures of political instability fall into three categories: government stability, social unrest/stability, and political violence. They argue that the diversity of measures and different subsets of these used in different studies makes the results non-comparable (Beck, Clarke, Groff, Keefer and Walsh 2012). Nonetheless, some measures are more common than others, like revolutions, coups, and assassinations (Carmignani, 2009).

## • **Political stability**

Political stability is the durability and integrity of a current government regime (Besley, Persson and Sturm, 2011). This is determined base on the amount of violence and terrorism expressed in the nation and by citizens associated with the state. A stable society is one that is satisfied with the ruling party and system of operations and is not interested in revolutionary or despotic ideas (Beck, Clarke, Groff, Keefer and Walsh 2012). Political scene is one where the ruling government is favored by the population and does not experience strong indicators of social unrest (Anthony, 2009). While there are problems within any nation, and times of war or hardship are common, a stable political system is one that can withstand these occurrences without major societal upheaval and ongoing endurance of these circumstances (Bussière, Matthieu and Christian Mulder, 2008).

Much of the ability of a political system to sustain itself relies on how leaders respond to crises (Butkiewicz, James and Yanikkaya, 2010). People must be satisfied with how their rulers handle problems and the solutions they create or else the fallout from these events results in destruction of hierarchies and government agencies. Revolutions, terrorism and public violence are associated with failed political stability. Political stability requires that the public interacts freely and openly with legislators on a regular basis. Granting individuals a say in how a nation is run enhances the stability of the region (Carmignani, 2009).

## • **Social stability**

**Social stability is a sociological perspective that states a group always seeks to maintain equilibrium by forcing out ideas and individuals that disagree with popular opinion.** This helps keep society in balance and promotes harmonious coexistence. A lack of social stability causes revolution and unrest in the group (Cavallo and Cavallo, 2010). Social stability focuses on how all the various parts of society fit together (Cuzan, Moussalli and Bundrick, 2011). It is a mindset that strives for fluidity in every interaction within a group, prioritizing and rewarding behaviors that the group wants to encourage and finding ways to publicly discourage unwanted activities (Cavallo and Cavallo, 2010).

This sociological theory is also referred to as social equilibrium because it is based on the idea that all social circles want to remain in harmony and exclude thoughts and actions that stand in opposition to that outcome (Carmignani, 2009). This principle is popular in dogmatic societies, exclusive groups and religious circles. It opposes outside opinions and instead tries to emphasize cooperation with other members of society to maintain a stable network (Gleditsch, Wallensteen, Sollenberg and Strand, 2012). Social stability often undergoes minor changes over the passage of time. As new methods of communication and types of technology emerge, cultures take on the aspects that fit their ideologies and make their lives easier (Butkiewicz, James and Yanikkaya, 2010). This in turn results in modification of what is accepted as part of social stability in the long run

- **Political violence**

Political violence is violence outside of state control that is politically motivated. Some political scientists see political violence as part of “contentious politics” or collective political struggle, which includes such things as revolutions, civil war, riots and strikes, but also more peaceful protest movements (Bussière, Matthieu and Christian Mulder, 2008). Political violence is a common means used by people and governments around the world to achieve political goals (Butkiewicz, James and Yanikkaya, 2010). Many groups and individuals believe that their political systems will never respond to their political demands (Bussière, Matthieu and Christian Mulder, 2008). As a result they believe that violence is not only justified but also necessary in order to achieve their political objectives. By the same token, many governments around the world believe they need to use violence in order to intimidate their populace into acquiescence (Cavallo and Cavallo, 2010). At other times, governments use force in order to defend their country from outside invasion or other threats of force and to coerce other governments or conquer territory. Political violence can take a number of forms including but not limited to those listed above. Non-action on the part of the government can also be characterized as a form of political violence (Bussière, Matthieu and Christian Mulder, 2008).

### **2.1.2 Livelihood of people**

DFID (2000) defines livelihood as comprising of the capabilities, assets (including both material and social resources) and activities required for a means of living. A livelihood is sustainable when it can cope with and recover from stresses and shocks maintain or enhance its capabilities and assets, while not undermining the natural resource base. The Sustainable Livelihood (SL) framework describes what development dedicated to poverty reduction should focus on to create sustainable livelihoods for the poor. The first basic principle is that development work has to focus on people; meaning that we have to focus on what matters for the poor, how people and their cultures are different, and how this affects the way they understand and appreciate livelihoods. Another principle is that the poor themselves have to be key actors in identifying the important aspects of their own livelihoods. Sustainable Livelihood Analysis (SLA) is a framework or tool which has evolved in the context of development approaches. It seeks to analyze the situation leading to concrete suggestions for intervention for development Allison and Horseman, (2006). There are two basic forms of development Morse and McNamara, (2013). The Immanent development, that is, what people are doing; in this context development denotes a broad process of advancement in human societies driven by a host of factors that may include advances in science, medicine, the arts, communication or governance. This is usually processes through such as globalization which is really international integration that helps share new ideas and technologies. The second form of development is the Intentional (or Interventionist) development, which is an intentionally directed process whereby government and non-government organisations implement development projects and programmes to help their people. Practically however, both of these forms can and do occur in parallel that is they run concurrently. Intentional development is largely ideas which were hatched as a post II World War process.

- **Assets in Livelihoods**

The nature of Sustainable Livelihood Assets is such that analysis of the assets will help design interventions to enhance livelihood strategies which will result in livelihood outcome. The different types of capital assets are important in the sustainable livelihood framework. Many types of capital have been identified. These capital assets include: political, natural, social, human, economic or financial and physical. All this capital assets work to give ground to varying extent for intervention and finally livelihood outcomes. Hence DFID, (2010) suggests that these capitals take on three distinct roles; Emancipatory action (challenging the structures under which one makes a living. An asset may not necessarily be owned by a household for it to be an important contributor to livelihood but could be owned by whole community or other persons in the community and that is why social capital is important.

- **The vulnerability**

Vulnerability describes the external environment that the people live in. This includes critical trends, such as technological trends or population trends. It also includes shocks such as natural disasters or economic inflation, and seasonality especially the way prices, employment opportunities and production might shift with the seasons. All of these factors will affect the assets that people have and thereby the sustainability of their livelihoods.

- **Food Security and incomes**

As the world’s population continues to grow, achieving global food security that is producing enough nutritious food that everyone can access, and doing so sustainably, is one of the greatest challenges we face today (Bender, 2013). Food security is an outcome of asset sufficient and resource sufficient system. The more food there is in the community the more will be available to raise income and therefore the more sustainable the livelihoods.

- **Safety nets**

Different organisations have given different definitions of capacity development. Some of these definitions as noted by Hattie, (2007), look at capacity development as entailing the sustainable creation, utilization and retention of the abilities of individuals, institutions and societies to perform functions, solve problems, and set and achieve objectives, in order to reduce poverty, enhance self-reliance and improve people’s lives. Capacity Development refers to the approaches, strategies and methodologies used by developing countries and external stakeholders to improve performance at individual, organisational, network or broader system levels. Capacity development involves much more than enhancing the knowledge and skills of individuals. It depends crucially on the quality of the organizations in which they work. In turn, the operations of particular organisations are influenced by the enabling environment – the structures of power and

influence and the institutions – in which they are embedded. Capacity is not only about skills and procedures; it is also about incentives and governance.

There is a relationship between Political instability and Livelihoods of people because Political instability decreases the probability of Livelihoods of people in a country (Camacho and Rodriguez, 2012). As such, armed violence can result in the loss of fixed assets, the disruption of formal and informal labour markets, reductions in (or absence of) foreign and domestic investment, declining tax revenues and diminishing service-delivery capacities and Livelihoods of people. In short, armed violence undermines sustainable development (UN's MDG Review Summit, 2010).

## **REFERENCE**

- [1]. Butkiewicz, James and Yanikkaya, (2010)
- [2]. UN's MDG Review Summit, (2010).
- [3]. Camacho and Rodriguez, (2012).
- [4]. Hattie, (2007)
- [5]. Bender, (2013)
- [6]. Allison and Horseman, (2006).
- [7]. Morse and McNamara, (2013)
- [8]. (Bussière, Matthieu and Christian Mulder, 2008).